APPLICATION FOR LAND DEVELOPMENT

Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board
Municipal Building
Gibbstown, New Jersey 08027

Number: Date: November 25, 2019

Application is hereby made for approval of Land Development as herein described and shown on the accompanying plans in accordance with the Code of the Township of Greenwich, Chapter 131 entitled "Subdivision of Land and Site Plan Review," Chapter 97 entitled "Land Use Procedures," Chapter 148 entitled "Zoning," and the fees relating to such land development applications included in said Code.

Check type of application submitted:

SUBDIVISION: Concept _____ Major, Preliminary_____ Minor____ Major, Final ______

SITE PLAN: Concept _____ Major (Conventional) xx - Preliminary and Final Approval Requested

CONDITIONAL USE: ________________

Conditional Use Requested: __________________________

VARIANCE: ______

Variance Requested: __________________________
GENERAL INFORMATION

1. Applicant Delaware River Partners LLC
   Phone: 856-224-7000
   Address: 200 N. Repauno Avenue, Gibbstown, NJ
   Zip: 08027
   (correspondence will be sent to the above)

2. Owner of Premises: Delaware River Partners LLC
   Phone: 856-224-7000
   Address: 200 N. Repauno Avenue, Gibbstown, NJ
   Zip: 08027

3. Nature of applicants' interest, if other than owner:

4. If applicant is a partnership, corporation or company, give the name and address of the principals:
   **Please see enclosed corporate ownership disclosure, as Exhibit B**
   Name: __________________________ Title: __________________________
   Address: __________________________ Zip: __________________________

5. Location of Property:
   Street Address: 200 N. Repauno Avenue, Gibbstown, NJ 08027
   Tax Map Page 5 Block # 8 Lot # 3, 4, and 4.01, with adjacent tidelands
   Repauno Port & Rail
   Zoning Classification: Terminal Redevelopment Plan, Tract area: +/- 3.99 acre(s) [Proposed Area of Disturbance]
   Waterfront Terminal District

6. List and types of all streets on which the development abuts:
   Route 44 Bypass, Repauno Ave., Morse St., School St.
   State Highway ______ County Highway xx Municipal Highway xx

7. Dimensions of Property: Irregular
   Total area in square feet or acres 926.96 ac frontage +/- 2,400 ft If corner lot, specify both frontages:

8. Indicate Present Use:
   Proposed area for development is currently vacant; overall facility is being developed as a
   multimodal port and rail terminal.

9. Proposed Use, if other than Present:
   Please see enclosed Project Description as Exhibit A.

10. Proposed Development Name: Repauno Port & Rail Terminal - Dock 2
GENERAL INFORMATION (CONT.)

11. Professionals: Attorney of Record -

Douglas J. Janacek, Esq. Name
Gibbons P.C., One Gateway Center Address
Newark, New Jersey 07102

Other professionals submitting plans, data, or reports: (Please attach a separate sheet listing name, address, telephone, profession and itemization of material submitted.)

12. Property is part of minor _ or major ____ subdivision granted on (date) ______________. [Not Applicable]

13. The Board of Adjustment ( ) or Planning Board (X) granted a special exception or conditional use ( ) or a Bulk () or Use () variance on ((date) ______________. [Prior Approvals for the Property are annexed hereto as Exhibit F.]

14. Description of the proposed development. Indicate present use; if subdivision, include number of lots; if site plan, indicate proposed use: Please see enclosed Project Description as Exhibit A.

15. Are the following utilities existing? Paved Streets YES xx NO _ Storm Sewers YES xx NO _ Curbs YES _ NO xx Water YES xx NO _ Sidewalks YES _ NO xx Gas YES xx NO _ Sanitary Sewer YES xx NO _ Electric YES xx NO _ Other (Specify): Please see accompanying site plans for improvements and connections to utility infrastructure.

16. Property taxes and / or assessments for local improvements levied against the property proposed to be developed / subdivided have been paid through _____________, 2019 Proof of payment must accompany this application.

Payment of Taxes is confirmed with Tax Collector's office by Phone on 11/18; written confirmation to be submitted to the Board prior to hearing.
17. List plans and documents submitted. (See appropriate Code for submission requirements, number of copies, etc. All development plans submitted for review and action by the Planning Board MUST be prepared by a professional Engineer, Architect and/or Land Surveyor licensed by the State of New Jersey, as indicated by Code.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLAN OR DOCUMENT -Title and Date</th>
<th>PREPARED BY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please see accompanying cover letter.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. If a public hearing and notice is required, copy of notice and affidavit of service is required at the public hearing.

B. SUBDIVISION INFORMATION: (Complete if subdivision requested)
1. Number of Proposed Lots: _______________________
2. Average Lot Size in square foot or acres: Proposed ________ Required ________
3. Average Street Frontage: Proposed ________ Required ________
4. Will any new streets be created? Yes ________ No ________
5. Purpose of Subdivision: Residential ________ Industrial ________ Mixed Use ________ Commercial ________ Office ________ Agriculture ________

C. SITE PLAN INFORMATION: (Complete if site plan requested)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Minimum Lot Area:</td>
<td>926.96 ac</td>
<td>3 ac (average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Building Coverage Limit</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Front Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Side Yard</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Rear Yard:</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Frontage</td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Impervious Coverage Limit</td>
<td>&lt;50%</td>
<td>50% within Redevelopment Area.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### GENERAL INFORMATION (CONT.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Clearing Limit</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Vegetated Area</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Number of Curb Cuts</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. Parking Spaces</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12. Building Height</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+/- 15 ft</td>
<td>80 ft (or 250 ft)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. Gross Floor Area</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
<th>Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. How is the Site Plan being presently used?

Area proposed for development is currently vacant.

---

15. Does the Site Plan contemplate use of existing building(s)? Yes ____ No xx __

16. Briefly describe what the site plan proposes:

Please see enclosed Project Description.

---

D. WAIVER (S): (Complete if waiver requested)

1. Site Plan / Subdivision Filing:
   Briefly describe each filing requirement waiver you are seeking:
   Please see enclosed Project Description.

2. Site Plan / Subdivision Design Standards:
   Briefly describe each filing requirement waiver you are seeking:
   None requested.

---

E. OTHER AGENCIES: (Other approvals required and date plans submitted)

1. NJ Department Environmental Protection: YES ____ NO ____ MONTH, DAY , YR
2. Gloucester County Soil Conservation District YES ____ NO ____ MONTH, DAY , YR
3. Gloucester County Planning Board YES ____ NO ____ MONTH, DAY , YR

** Please see enclosed list of governmental approvals at Exhibit D. **
GENERAL INFORMATION (CONT.)

4. New Jersey Department of Transportation YES NO MONTH, DAY, YR

5. Other: ___________________________ YES NO MONTH, DAY, YR

F. SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION:
1. Have there been previous application(s) filed with respect to the property within the last five years: YES NO If yes, state the nature, date and disposition of each prior application:
   All prior approvals are annexed hereto.

2. Expert Witness (When Applicable) List the name, address and field of expertise each witness proposed to be used:

   Name | Address | Field
   ---- | ------- | ----
   To be determined.

3. Describe any deed restriction(s) affecting the property:
   To the Applicant's knowledge, no deed restrictions affect this portion of the Property.

4. Describe any deed restriction proposed by the applicant.
   None are proposed.

5. Describe any easement(s) or right(s) of way affecting the property.
   To the Applicant's knowledge, no easements or rights of way currently affect this portion of the Property.
   Please see Exhibit E.

6. Describe any easement(s) or right(s) of way proposed by the applicant.
   None are proposed.
7. If other than to the applicant, to whom should Greenwich Township reports and correspondence be sent:

Name / Address

Douglas J. Janacek, Esq., Gibbons PC, One Gateway Center, Newark, NJ 07102 (djanacek@gibbonslaw.com)
Kevin Webb, P.E., Langan Engineering, 989 Lenox Drive, Lawrenceville, NJ 08648 (kwebb@langan.com)

G. CERTIFICATION OF APPLICANT:

The undersigned certify that the applicant(s) named in the foregoing application is/are legally authorized to submit the foregoing application and sign this Certification on behalf of the applicant. The undersigned certify that the information stated in the foregoing application and submissions therewith are true and correct. The undersigned realize that if any of the foregoing statements are willfully false, they are subject to punishment.

Signature _____________________________
Print Name: ____________________________
Print Title: _____________________________
Date: _________________________________

Signature _____________________________
Print Name: ____________________________
Print Title: _____________________________
Date: _________________________________

DELAWARE RIVER PARTNERS LLC

[Signature]

Douglas J. Janacek, Esq.
Attorney-in-Fact for the Applicant

[Print Name]
GENERAL INFORMATION (CONT.)

H. CERTIFICATION OF OWNER:

The undersigned hereby certify Delaware River Partners LLC is/are the owner(s) of the property which is the subject of the foregoing application and that the applicant named therein has been authorized to submit said application to the Greenwich Township Planning Board. The undersigned certify that they are said owner(s) or is/are legally authorized to sign this Certification on behalf of the owner. The undersigned realize that if any of the foregoing statements are willfully false, they are subject to punishment.

Signature __________________________  Signature __________________________

Print Name: __________________________  Print Name: Douglas J. Janacek, Esq.
Print Title: __________________________  Print Title: Attorney-in-Fact for the Applicant
Date: __________________________

For Township Use Only:

Received on: __________________________
Certification completed on: __________________________ by: __________________________
Submitted to GCP/ZB on: __________________________
Fee Amount $ __________________________
Action Taken __________________________
Meeting on: __________________________
EXHIBIT A
Project Description

Dock 2 – Repauno Port & Rail Terminal
Delaware River Partners LLC
200 N. Repauno Avenue
Block 8, Portions of Lots 3, 4, 4.01, and adjacent tidelands licenses
Gibbstown, NJ 08027

Application for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval

Delaware River Partners LLC ("DRP") seeks preliminary and final major site plan approval from the Township of Greenwich Planning/Zoning board for the development of a dock for the transfer of liquid products to and from vessels. Liquid products include a variety of cargos such as liquefied petroleum gases (propane and butane are examples), liquefied natural gas, and all other hazardous and non-hazardous products consistent with the permitted uses identified in the Repauno Port & Rail Terminal Redevelopment Plan. The proposed development will be on property located at 200 N. Repauno Drive, within the Repauno Port & Rail Terminal, on a portion of the property within Block 8, Lots 3, 4, and 4.01. The development will also take advantage of certain tidelands licenses secured by DRP. This portion of the property is within the Riverfront Terminal District of the Repauno Port & Rail Terminal Redevelopment Plan.

The proposed development of Dock 2 includes the construction of a dock with two (2) berths approximately 1230’ in length, and the grading and construction of a connecting roadway from the existing terminal road onto the dock structure. Each berth will include both mooring and breasting dolphins, and the construction of various lighting fixtures and safety/storage equipment on the proposed loading platforms for each berth, including operational sheds, including gangways and sump structures as necessary. Dock 2 will include connections to allow for transfers of liquid product to and from vessels. Dock 2 is being proposed with a connection to the existing rail rack and will in the future be able to accommodate all uses permitted in the Redevelopment Plan. The proposal also includes the necessary access trestles and support for piping racks, lighting, operational sheds, maintenance, and vehicle access to and from the two (2) berths.

We have confirmed by phone that taxes for the affected properties are paid to date, and written confirmation will be forwarded upon receipt.

DRP seeks the following submission waivers:
- No. 11 (Landscape Plan) No landscaping is proposed for this Application.
- No. 13 (Drainage Plan) No drainage or stormwater management is proposed for this Application, as all dock stormwater is handled by scuppers on the dock itself, and nothing ties into an upland drainage system.
- No. 16 (Drainage Calculations) No drainage or stormwater management is proposed for this Application, as all dock stormwater is handled by scuppers on the dock itself, and nothing ties into an upland drainage system.
CORPORATE DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

DELAWARE RIVER PARTNERS LLC

This Corporate Disclosure Statement is provided in compliance with the requirements of N.J.S.A. 40:55D-48.1 et seq.

Owners holding 10% or more of any class of stock of Delaware River Partners LLC:

Delaware River Partners Holdco LLC, a Delaware Limited Liability Company (>10%)

Owners holding 10% or more of any membership interest in Delaware River Partners Holdco LLC:

Fortress Worldwide Transportation and Infrastructure General Partnership, a Delaware General Partnership (100%)

Owners holding 10% or more of any class of stock of Fortress Worldwide Transportation and Infrastructure General Partnership:

Fortress Transportation and Infrastructure Investors LLC (>99%)

Owners holding 10% or more of any class of stock of Fortress Transportation and Infrastructure Investors LLC:

The equity of Fortress Transportation and Infrastructure Investors LLC is traded on the NYSE under the symbol FTAI. A link to its SEC filing is:

https://www.sec.gov/cgi-bin/browse-edgar?company=fortress+transportation&owner=exclude&action=getcompany
Application and Escrow Fee Calculation
Dock 2 – Repauno Port & Rail Terminal
Delaware River Partners LLC
200 N. Repauno Avenue
Block 8, Portions of Lots 3, 4, 4.01, and adjacent tidelands
Gibbstown, NJ 08027

Application Fee:

Preliminary and Final Site Plan Review $ 400.00

Escrow Deposit:

Preliminary and Final Site Plan Review **
Acreage of Disturbance: 3.99 acres

**DRP instead is providing an initial escrow fee of $5,000.00 to cover the costs of legal, engineering, planning, or other technical review, pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law.
LIST OF GOVERNMENT APPROVALS REQUIRED FOR
DOCK 2 SUB-PROJECT

- Township Planning Board Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan
- Gloucester County Soil Conservation District [pending]
- Gloucester County Planning Board Approval [pending]
- NJDEP Waterfront Development Individual Permit and Water Quality Certificate [originally issued May 20, 2019; reinstated September 5, 2019]
- NJDEP Tidelands Licenses [issued September 9, 2019]
- NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands LOI Line Verifications [approved July 11, 2016]
- NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands General Permits [approved June 30, 2017; modified November 29, 2018]
- Army Corps of Engineers Jurisdictional Determination [issued July 5, 2016]
- Army Corps of Engineers Section 10/404 Permit [pending]
- NJPDES 5G3 Storm Water Permit [if applicable]
- Delaware River Basin Commission [issued June 12, 2019]
EXHIBIT E
DEED RESTRICTIONS AND EASEMENTS AFFECTING THE PROPERTY

Deed Restrictions: To the knowledge of the Applicant, no deed restrictions affect the use proposed for the Property.

Easements/Rights of Way: To the knowledge of the Applicant, the following easements may be located near or on the Property, but no conflict exists between their continued operation and the use proposed:

- A roadway access easement appears to benefit Block 8, Lot 4.02, traversing Block 8, Lot 4 between Lot 4.02 and C-Line Road. However, the block and lot referenced on the survey is not consistent with title.
EXHIBIT F
RESOLUTION #R2017-16
OF THE PLANNING/ZONING BOARD OF GREENWICH TOWNSHIP REGARDING
APPLICATION NO. PB2016-06 OF DELAWARE RIVER PARTNERS LLC
GRANTING PRELIMINARY & FINAL MAJOR SITE PLAN AND VARIANCE AND
WAIVER APPROVALS FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE FORMER DUPONT
REPAUNO PLANT, DESIGNATED AS BLOCK 8, LOTS 3 & 4

WHEREAS, an application has been submitted by Delaware River Partners LLC for Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan Approval and Variance and Waiver Approvals, for property located at a portion of the former DuPont Repauno Plant, and known as Block 8, Lots 3 & 4, on the Tax Map of the Township of Greenwich, which property is owned by the Applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has given legal Notice as required by and in accordance with N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12 and applicable Greenwich Township ordinances, by serving proper Notice to property owners within 200 feet of the site, serving Notice on all required governmental agencies and public utilities and by publishing a proper Notice in the newspaper, all at least ten (10) days prior to the hearing; and

WHEREAS, in support of the application the applicant has submitted the following documents:

1. Correspondence from Douglas J. Janacek, Esq. from Gibbons, PC, dated October 20, 2016; and

2. Planning/Zoning Board Application, dated October 17, 2016; and

3. Certification of Owner, dated October 17, 2016; and

4. Submission Checklist; and

5. Corporate Disclosure Statement; and
6. List of Professionals; and  
7. Statement of Taxes Paid, dated October 13, 2016; and  
8. List of Experts; and  
9. Statement of Requested Relief; and  
10. List of Outside Agency Approvals; and  
11. 200' List of Property Owners, dated October 4, 2016; and  
12. Title Report, dated September 12, 1984; and  
13. Draft Deed Notices; and  
14. Traffic Statement, prepared by Daniel D. Disaro, PE, PTOE, of Langan, 989 Lenox Drive, Suite 124, Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648, dated October 17, 2016; and  
15. Cover Sheet, 1 of 9, (The plans 9 of 9, were prepared by Kevin J. Webb, PE., of Langan, 989 Lenox Drive, Suite 124, Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648), dated October 17, 2016; and  
16. Overall Plan, 2 of 9, dated October 17, 2016; and  
17. Demolition Plan, 3 of 9, dated October 17, 2016; and  
18. Site Plan, 4 of 9, dated October 17, 2016; and  
19. Grading Plan, 5 of 9, dated October 17, 2016; and  
20. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, 6 of 9, dated October 17, 2016; and  
21. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Details, 7 of 9, dated October 17, 2016; and  
22. Construction Details, 8 of 9, dated October 17, 2016; and
23. Construction Details 2, 9 of 9, dated October 17, 2016; and

24. Circulation Exhibit, KT101, prepared by Kevin J. Webb, PE., of Langan, 989 Lenox Drive, Suite 124, Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648; and

25. At the time of the hearing the following Exhibits were marked:
   A-1 Overall plan of the site augmented to show the area of development with respect to the Repauno property as a whole; and
   A-2 Site Plan Exhibit, slightly modified from the submitted site plan and focused on the particular site of development; and
   A-3 Traffic Circulation Plan.

WHEREAS, the Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board has made its determination in this matter based on the following:

1. The documents set forth above;

2. The representations made by the Applicant in its application and by the Applicant, Delaware River Partners LLC, through its representatives, experts and witnesses: Kevin Webb, PE, Langan and Charles Heydt, PP of Langan; and its attorney, Douglas Janacek, Esq., at the time of the hearing before the Board on December 5, 2016;

3. Letter from the Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, James A. Clancy, PE, PLS, PP, CME, dated December 1, 2016, which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;

4. Letter from the Greenwich Township Planner, Matthew K. Miller, AIA, PP, dated December 5, 2016, which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;
5. Letter from the Greenwich Township Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, J. Timothy Kernan, PE, PP, CME, dated November 23, 2016, which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;

6. Comments made by the Township Planner, Planning/Zoning Board Engineer and the Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer at the time of the hearing on December 5, 2016;

7. The following members of the public spoke at the time of the hearing before the board on December 5, 2016:

A. New Jersey Senate President, Stephen M. Sweeney addressed the Board to show his support for the redevelopment of this property. He noted the bipartisan work that has taken place between him and the Mayor and Council for at least ten (10) years to bring back this dead site and put people in the area back to work. He further noted his support for the by-pass access road, which Gloucester County had committed 2.5 million dollars towards developing.

B. Charles Breen of 64 Logan Avenue. Mr. Breen expressed concern as to whether the lighting would spill over into the neighboring residences and cause problems. The Applicant's engineer, Mr. Webb testified that in his professional opinion, given the distance from the nearest residential area, which is approximately a mile, and the natural buffering of trees and vegetation, that there would not be any light spillover into the residential areas. Mr. Breen was further concerned over the increased truck traffic for what he saw as only an additional 3 to 5 new jobs.
C. Ron Cundy, 139 Jackson Avenue. Mr. Cundy inquired as to the company that would be doing the work at the site. The Applicant indicated it, Delaware River Partners LLC would be doing the work. He inquired as to whether there were any existing agreements with the refineries in the area. The Applicant testified they had not put them in place yet, but their market studies show there will be a market for this activity. Mr. Cundy inquired about the rail cars. The Applicant testified that the facility will be set up to handle 6 rail cars at a time. Most of the deliveries of the butane to the site will be by rail car. The deliveries back out to the facilities will be by both rail and trucks.

D. Rebecca Tomlin, 110 N. Repauno Avenue. Ms. Tomlin expressed concern that the number of trucks, 48 trucks in and 48 trucks out, would create a lot of traffic for the residential areas.

E. Richard Friendlich, 52 Logan Avenue. Mr. Friendlich inquired as to whether there would be a limit on the amount of traffic until such time as the by-pass road was constructed. The Planning/Zoning Board, Mr. Clancy indicated that as each phase is brought before the Board, they would look at the traffic situation and evaluate any improvements that would need to be made. Kevin Webb, the Applicant's engineer testified that at the present time the traffic calculations showed that the service on the roadways would be excellent. Mr. Friendlich inquired about the storage of rail cars. The Applicant indicated that the rail cars would be stored on site and not near the residential areas. Lastly, he inquired about safety studies for the cavern. The Applicant testified that the studies are on file with the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). Mr. Aimino, the board's solicitor
noted that the issues of safety were pre-empted by the NJDEP. The township’s redevelopment counsel, John C. Terruso, Esq. testified that the Township has broad powers and will be reviewing all the studies and requirements as a part of the Redevelopment Agreement that the Applicant and the Township will be negotiating and entering into as to each phase of the development. The cavern will not be operational until all the permits and approvals are obtained. Mr. Kernan reviewed some of the required approvals, including but not limited to compliance with the Toxic Catastrophic Prevention Act.

F. Bill Franklin, 624 Betty Rose Avenue. Mr. Franklin testified that he works at Exit 14 and says the right turn is tight. Kevin Webb, the Applicant’s engineer testified that the typical trucks are standard tanker trucks which are smaller than tractor trailers that typically serve distribution warehouses. Mr. Webb also reviewed the truck circulation plan which shows that the trucks will not cross paths on the roadway.

G. Joseph DiMenna, 56 Memorial Avenue. Mr. DiMenna noted that the notice to the public contained language that generally asked for additional variances as needed. Mr. Clancy explained that this is typical language that Applicant’s insert in their notices in the event additional variances or waivers are noted by the Township’s professionals reviewing the project. In this case there was only the one variance and one waiver requested and needed. Mr. DiMenna inquired about the engineering results of the by-pass. The Applicant indicated that they had not yet received the results from the County. The Applicant also indicated they hope to have the cavern up and running in calendar year 2017.
H. Greg Cipolla, 607 Democrat Road. Mr. Cipolla inquired as to whether
the Applicant owned the entire site and whether additional development was
planned. It was confirmed that the Applicant did own the entire site, that additional
development was planned particularly utilizing the future port on the river, but that
the planned developments had not been finalized yet. Each phase of the
development will go before the Board with notice to the public. Mr. Cipolla expressed
his support for the construction of the by-pass road. The Mayor indicated that in his
discussions he learned that the project had been held up because of the lack of
funding in the state's transportation fund, but now that the fund was funded again,
the project would move forwarded as quickly as possible.

I. Kelly Reggieri, 9 S. Repauno Avenue. Mr. Reggieri inquired about
whether Repauno Avenue is or could be a one-way street. The Applicant indicated
the Township consultants had considered making the southern portion of Repauno
Avenue one way. If that happened, the Applicant would agree to provide adequate
signage.

J. Jamie Zaccaria, 13 Hixon Drive, Burlington, New Jersey. Ms. Zaccaria
approached the Board indicating she was there representing the New Jersey Sierra
Club. The Applicant objected to Ms. Zaccaria testifying on the basis that she did not
meet the definition of an "interested party" and that the New Jersey Sierra Club, a
corporation, could not appear before the board unless represented by a New Jersey
licensed attorney. The Board determined to hear Ms. Zaccaria's testimony, but
reserved the right to determine or contend in the future, that she did not meet the
definition of an "interested party" and that the New Jersey Sierra Club was not
properly before the Board because of a lack of legal representation. Ms. Zaccaria testified that the Sierra Club has 50 members in the Township. She contends the club represents the entire State of New Jersey with respect to environmental issues and the Delaware River. Ms. Zaccaria expressed concern about spills of toxins from trucks getting into the drinking water. She stated her belief that the project was a threat to the environment.

WHEREAS, the Board, after considering the information and testimony provided at the time of the hearing and examining the submitted and above listed documents, considering the comments and the letters of the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, James A. Clancy, P.E., C.M.E., the Township Planner, Matthew K. Miller, AIA, PP, NCARB, and the Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, J. Timothy Kernan, PE, PP, CME, makes the following findings of law and statements of fact:

1. The Applicant proposes the operation of a Subterranean Hard Rock Cavern for Liquefied Petroleum Gas (LPG), to store, sell and distribute petroleum products via tanker trucks and rail cars. The operation will have ancillary equipment on site. Additional site improvements include six (6) parking spaces for three (3) full time employees, site lighting, removal of various concrete pads, installation of a pipe rack system with an overhead catwalk above a portion of the of the pipe system, a prefabricated operations building and a bill of lading structure. The existing inactive cavern will be used to receive and store LPG during low demand times (projected to be April through August) and dispense and ship LPG during high demand times.
(projected to be November through March). The operation will be idle at times, primarily in September and October.

2. The property in question is Block 8, Lots 3 & 4 which contains approximately 921± acres of the former Dupont Repuano Plant, which totals 1,620 acres in Tract 1. The subject parcel is largely undeveloped but contains a 60' wide right of way to Atlantic City Electric and numerous dirt roads traversing it. As a part of the overall tract the subject parcel is under an administrative consent order that DuPont entered into with the NJDEP. Pursuant to the consent order, The Chemours Company (a successor to DuPont) continues to address the overall concerns of contamination on the property through monitoring, remedial actions and reports. The Applicant indicates that the development of this area would not be affected by or affect the ongoing remediation efforts on the contaminated parts of the property. The subject parcel is affected by wetlands and wetlands transition areas, flood hazard and riparian zone areas, waterfront development areas and is located in the M-D Manufacturing District which is also a Redevelopment Area.

3. The site is bordered to the north by the Delaware River, to the south and southeast by residential areas and to the east by the Ashland Hercules Redevelopment Area.

4. The property is located within the MD Manufacturing District and the E. I. DuPont Redevelopment Area and the proposed use is permitted in this zoning district and Redevelopment Plan. The development of this portion of the property will not be accessible to the general public due to the necessary security and general
safety requirements. Also, the portion of the property is located adjacent to the Delaware River approximately one (1) mile from any public visibility or public domain.

5. The Applicant sought the following variance and waiver in connection with the application, both of which were granted by the Board:

A. Variance from §700-41J, which requires a minimum buffer of 100 feet in width to any residential zone, 50 feet of which shall be landscaped in accordance with the buffer requirements of this chapter and the requirement of a buffer to any residential use which shall be a minimum of 50 feet, 25 feet of which shall be landscaped in accordance with the buffer requirements of the chapter. The Applicant does not propose any buffers as the project is approximately 4,800 feet from the nearest residential use (a daycare center) and nearly 5,000 feet or approximately one (1) mile from the nearest residential zone.

B. Design waiver from the height requirements for lighting to allow them to go 25 feet in some areas up to a maximum height of approximately 30 feet in other areas. The additional height of the lights is required as the lighting is being installed on top of the catwalks and at the truck loading areas for safety purposes.

C. The variance and waiver outlined above were supported by the Greenwich Township Planner, Mr. Miller. The Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board weighed the negative and positive criteria with respect to the variance and waiver, as well as, any potential impact on the master plan and/or zoning ordinance and determined that any detrimental effect, if any, was outweighed by the positive aspects of the development, with any conditions imposed, determined that there was no impairment to the master plan or zoning ordinance and the granting of the
variance and waiver was appropriate under the law, represented good sound planning and was in the best interest of Greenwich Township.

6. The Applicant’s engineer, Kevin Webb testified giving the Board and the public an overview of the project. Utilizing what was marked as A-1, an overall plan of the tract, he outlined where the proposed development would take place. The entire Repauno site consists of approximately 1800 acres. This site is approximately 920 acres and the project is located approximately 4,800 feet from the nearest residential use, a daycare center. The cavern was completed in 1968 and ceased operations in 1996. The development will include pipelines to move the butane in and out of the cavern facility. In the summer, butane is an excess by-product from the refineries which would be brought to the cavern facility. In the winter, butane is used as a fuel additive, at which point the butane would be sold back to the refineries for use in fuel. Most of the butane will be brought on site by rail cars. The delivery back of the butane will be done by rail car and tanker trucks. The facility will be equipped to handle six (6) rail cars at a time. An extension of the pipe system will allow for the service of tanker trucks which will be equipped to handle a maximum of 48 trucks per day, at a rate of two (2) trucks per hour, at peak times. Additional development will include ancillary equipment pads, a catwalk along the rail service, which will include safety lighting at heights ranging from 25 feet to 30 feet. At the entrance there will be an approximately 360 square foot prefabricated building for an office located on an existing pad. Three (3) employees per shift will work the site 24/7 (three (3) shifts of three (3) people). There will be on-site security on a 24/7 basis regardless of the level of activity.
7. Mr. Webb traced the truck circulation route for the board. Trucks will enter the facility off of US 1295 at Exit 14 and go down Repauno Station/Floodgate Road to Route 44 and turn right. They will make a left to head North on Repauno Avenue. Exiting they head down Repauno Avenue, make a left on Democrat Road toward US 1295 and the onto the Exit 16A ramp. Inside the plant, the trucks do not cross paths. The trucks go in a circular motion using C-Line Road and Repauno. The trucks do not use A-Line Drive where it intersects with Repauno.

8. The Applicant indicated they were attempting as best as possible to utilize existing structures, for instance existing concrete pads. Mr. Clancy, the Board engineer confirmed that there was not a need for a stormwater management plan as less than one (1) acre of land is being disturbed. All NJDEP approvals are being sought and will be submitted to the Board when obtained.

9. Mr. Kernan inquired as to whether barges would be used on the river to deliver the butane. The Applicant indicted that barges would not be utilized. If the Applicant intended to utilize barges in its operation, the Applicant agreed that it would have to return to the Board for approval.

10. The issue of a new traffic study was raised by the Board. The Applicant stated for the record that they would not be pursuing the Preliminary Approval they had recently received for the warehouse project. As such, the only proposed traffic at this time would be the 48 trucks per day maximum associated with this project. This level of traffic, (which is far below the level contemplated by the warehouse project), fits well within the traffic limits studied in the initial traffic study submitted to the Board and showed that the roadways would be in a position to
handle this level of traffic, given the improvements agreed to by the Applicant. The Applicant agreed that a revised traffic study would be required should the Applicant return to the Board to pursue the warehouse project through either an Amended Preliminary application or new application.

11. The Applicant's professional planner, Charles Heydt testified regarding the requested variance and waiver and the basis for why they should be granted. Mr. Heydt opined that the requested variance and waiver promote the purposes of zoning, specifically citing N.J.S.A. 40:55D-2: (a) encouraging municipal action to guide the appropriate use or development of all lands in a manner to promote public health, safety, morals and general welfare; (h) encouraging the location and design of transportation routes which promote the free flow of traffic; and (j) the conservation and protection of natural resources.

12. With respect to the variance request from the buffer and landscaping requirements, Mr. Heydt indicated that due to the distance from the nearest residential use of nearly a mile, there is no real gain to be had from a buffer and landscaping area near this facility. The lengthy distance and the natural vegetation and terrain are significant buffers from any residential zone. Mr. Heydt noted no negative affect from the lack of the buffer and landscaping for the same reasons. Mr. Miller, the Board Planner, supported this position, likening it to the situation the Board often deals with at the local refinery, where on-site buffers and landscaping have no real benefit or utility.

13. As to the waiver request for the lighting, Mr. Heydt noted that the increased height request was for security purposes. The lighting in question is on
top of the catwalk and provides safety and security lighting for employees using the facility. The need for the additional height is driven by the height of the catwalks which are already above ground. Mr. Heydt testified that the security benefits from the lighting outweigh any possible detriments, of which he believed there were no negative aspects to the lighting. Testimony was provided by the Applicant that given the distance from any residential area, there would be no light spill-over from this site.

14. Mr. Heydt opined that the granting of the variance and waiver would be in line with the intent and purpose of the zoning ordinance which is to insure that there are adequate buffers from residential zones, which in this case is accomplished by the lengthy distance of the site from any residential zone and the nature of existing buffers. The same would hold true for the waiver request regarding the lighting as the intent is to provide adequate lighting without detrimental spill-over to residential areas, which is accomplished by the proposed lighting. No impairment to the master plan or zoning ordinance is presented by the granting of this variance or the waiver as the use is permitted and contemplated by the zoning district in question. The Board agreed with this reasoning set forth above, and having weighed the negative and positive aspects of the requests, granted the variance and waiver.

16. Mr. Kernan testified that he had reviewed the Applicant’s traffic study and agreed that the study is adequate at this time, given the Applicant’s agreement that should the warehouse project be pursued, that a revised traffic study would be submitted.
17. Mr. Clancy confirmed with the Applicant that the daily 48 trucks at a rate of 2 per hour would be the maximum number of trucks at peak time. The Applicant confirmed this statement and indicated that the majority of delivery of butane to the site would be by rail. The delivery off site would be by rail and tanker truck.

18. The Board’s planner, Matt Miller, PP, provided testimony regarding his review of the project. He noted that the project meets all the bulk requirements for the zone in question and is a use is in keeping with the permitted uses of the M-D Zone. As indicated herein, Mr. Miller supported the granting of the variance and waiver as requested by the Applicant.

19. The Applicant, through its attorney, Douglas Janacek and its engineer, Kevin Webb indicated that they had reviewed the Planner, Matt Miller’s letter of December 5, 2016, the Board Engineer, James Clancy’s letter of December 1, 2016, and the Board Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, J. Timothy Kernan’s letter of November 23, 2016 and that they agreed to comply with all the recommendations, revisions, conditions, and/or requests set forth in those letters unless specifically modified or indicated otherwise in this resolution.

WHEREAS, the Board, has made its determinations in this matter based on the above exhibits, testimony and oral representations which are incorporated herein by way of reference, and has found and concluded that:

1. The granting of the Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan and Variance and Waiver Approvals, as revised by the terms and conditions of this Resolution, conform to the standards of sound
planning and will have no deleterious effects on the neighborhood from the standpoint of insuring the health, safety, amenities and welfare of the community and are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning and Master Plan; and

2. The benefits of the deviation from the Zoning Code would substantially outweigh any detriment.

WHEREAS, upon motion duly made and seconded to grant the "Application for Land Development" for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval and Variance and Waiver Approvals, the Board, by a vote of 8 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions, (Voting for: Rush, Shively, Byrne, Durham, Wagner, Shoulders, Hewes and Stigale), voted in favor of granting the application subject to certain conditions contained herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township that the application of Delaware River Partners LLC requesting Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval and Variance and Waiver Approvals for land located at the former DuPont Repauno Plant, Greenwich Township, New Jersey, also known as Block 8, Lots 3 & 4, is HEREBY APPROVED, subject, however, to the testimony, representations and stipulations of the Applicant and their professionals and witnesses at the time of the hearing and in their submissions, and further specifically, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Subject to the Applicants complying with and obtaining any and all necessary approvals from any other local, county, state and/or federal government or administrative body having jurisdiction over all or part of this land use development
approval. Those approvals include but are not limited to the following: Greenwich Township Building Department Building Permit (not required for sign-off of plan approval); Greenwich Sewer and Water Department; Greenwich Township Fire Official; NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands LOI line verification; NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands General Permits; NJDEP Coastal Permits; New Jersey Toxic Catastrophe Prevention Act (TCPA) Program approval; Delaware River Basin Commission (DRBC); Gloucester County Soil Conservation District; NJDEP Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permitting; and Gloucester County Planning Board Approval; and

2. In accordance with the Code of the Township of Greenwich, §131-39.1 Fees, the Municipal Land Use Law and any other applicable code provision, no Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued and no occupancy shall be permitted until all other contingencies provided for herein are satisfied and all bills and escrows relating to this property have been paid in full; and

3. The Planning/Zoning Board Engineer and/or Township Planner and/or Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, shall review all plans and amended plans and inspect the site of the development in order to determine compliance with the terms and conditions of the Planning/Zoning Board approval. Any shortcomings noted by any professional shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the professionals before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. The Applicant shall submit appropriate escrow amounts, as determined by the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer and applicable law, for inspections; and

4. The Applicant shall comply with each and every condition, revision, modification and/or other request contained in the Planner's letter of December 5,
2016, the Engineer's letter of December 1, 2016, and the Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer's letter of November 23, 2016, unless otherwise specifically modified herein; and

5. The Applicant will post, pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law and Township Ordinances, an inspection escrow, performance guarantee and a maintenance guarantee, to cover the on-site improvements proposed in this application and an estimate for all site improvements will be prepared by the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer or Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer; and

6. In accordance with the Statewide Non-Residential Development Fee Act (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-8.1-8.7), the Applicant is required to make payment of a development fee of 2.5% of the equalized assessed value of the non-residential construction. A condition of receiving a building permit is the payment of approximately ½ of this fee, the balance being calculated and paid at the time of the request for a certificate of occupancy; and

7. Traffic edge markings shall be added to the plans along the on-site roadway to delineate at night.

8. The Applicant shall timely provide the Board and the Board Professionals copies of all permits and approvals obtained by and from the NJDEP regarding the project, specifically including but not limited to those outlined in Paragraph 1 above.

9. The Applicant must enter into a Redevelopment Agreement with the Greenwich Township governing body which shall address and include, but not be
limited to, items such as the project schedule, roadway improvements, signage, one-way traffic on Repauno Avenue, no parking, etc.; sewer and water; security measures, all NJDEP permitting and safety approvals; and compliance with the New Jersey TCPA.

FRED STIGALE, Chairman
Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township

The foregoing Resolution was a memorialization of action taken at a regular meeting of the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township held on the 5th day of December 2016; and such resolution was adopted by the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township at its reorganizational and regular meeting held on January 9, 2017, by a vote 8 to approve, 0 to Oppose and 0 to abstain.

KIRK FAIRLEY, Secretary
Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township

THOSE IN FAVOR: Hewes, Rush, Wagner, Stigale, Shouters, Byrne, Shively & Durham

THOSE OPPOSED: n/a

THOSE ABSTAINED: n/a
RESOLUTION #R2017-28
OF THE PLANNING/ZONING BOARD OF GREENWICH TOWNSHIP REGARDING
APPLICATION NO. PB2017-05 OF DELAWARE RIVER PARTNERS LLC
GRANTING PRELIMINARY & FINAL MAJOR SITE PLAN AND VARIANCE AND
WAIVER APPROVALS FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT THE FORMER DUPONT
REPAUNO PLANT, DESIGNATED AS BLOCK 8, LOTS 4 & 4.02
AND ADJACENT RIPARIAN AREAS

WHEREAS, an application has been submitted by Delaware River Partners
LLC for Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan Approval and Variance and Waiver
Approvals, for property located at a portion of the former DuPont Repauno Plant, and
known as Block 8, Lots 4 & 4.02 and adjacent riparian areas, on the Tax Map of the
Township of Greenwich, which property is owned by the Applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has given legal Notice as required by and in
accordance with N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12 and applicable Greenwich Township
ordinances, by serving proper Notice to property owners within 200 feet of the site,
serving Notice on all required governmental agencies and public utilities and by
publishing a proper Notice in the newspaper, all at least ten (10) days prior to the
hearing; and

WHEREAS, in support of the application the applicant has submitted the
following documents:

1. Correspondence, Ed Wilkes, PE, Langan Engineering, dated
   September 8, 2017; and

2. Planning/Zoning Board Application, dated September 7, 2017; and

3. Application for Variance, dated September 7, 2017; and

4. Variance Checklist, dated September 7, 2017; and
5. Subdivision Site Plan Checklist; and
6. Redeveloper Corporate Disclosure; and
7. Resolution #R2017-16, dated December 5, 2016; and
8. Statement of Taxes Paid, dated August 23, 2017; and
9. Statement of Requested Relief, dated September 7, 2017; and
10. List of Experts; and
11. Deed Restrictions and Easements Affecting the Property; and
12. 200' List of Property Owners, dated June 1, 2017; and
13. Tidelands License Application Form, dated November 15, 2016; and
14. Organization Data Form; and
15. Affidavit of Title, dated November 15, 2016; and
16. NJDEP Modification of Waterfront Development Permit, dated August 3, 2017; and
17. Site Plan Application to the Gloucester County Planning Board; and
18. Cover Sheet, 1 of 9, (The plans 9 of 9, were prepared by Kevin J. Webb, PE., of Langan, 989 Lenox Drive, Suite 124, Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648), dated September 7, 2017; and
19. Overall Plan, 2 of 9, dated September 7, 2017; and
20. Demolition Plan, 3 of 9, dated September 7, 2017; and
21. Site Plan, 4 of 9, dated September 7, 2017; and
22. Grading, Drainage and Utility Plan, 5 of 9, dated September 7, 2017; and
23. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan, 6 of 9, dated September 7, 2017; and
24. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Details, 7 of 9, dated September 7, 2017; and
25. Construction Details 1, 8 of 9, dated September 7, 2017; and
26. Construction Details 2, 9 of 9, dated September 7, 2017; and
27. At the time of the hearing the following Exhibits were marked:

A-1 Overall plan of the entire site augmented to show the area where the wharf will be built, prepared by Langan Engineering and dated October 2, 2017; and


WHEREAS, the Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board has made its determination in this matter based on the following:

1. The documents set forth above;
2. The representations made by the Applicant in its application and by the Applicant, Delaware River Partners LLC, through its representatives, experts and witnesses: Kevin Webb, PE, Langan and its attorney, Douglas Janacek, Esq., at the time of the hearing before the Board on October 2, 2017;
3. Two (2) Letters from the Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, James A. Clancy, PE, PLS, PP, CME, both dated September 28, 2017, both of which are incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;
4. Letter from the Greenwich Township Planner, Matthew K. Miller, AIA, PP, dated October 2, 2017, which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;

5. Letter from the Greenwich Township Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, J. Timothy Kernan, PE, PP, CME, dated September 28, 2017, which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;

6. Comments made by the Township Planner at the time of the hearing on October 2, 2017;

7. The following members of the public spoke at the time of the hearing before the board on October 2, 2017:

   A. Al Zappola of 704 West Broad Street. Mr. Zappola was concerned about the loud pounding noise that he hears from his property very early in the morning. He has approached the construction code office seeking help in stopping the Applicant from starting work so early in the morning. Mr. Janacek informed the Board that Mr. Zappola and Gary Lewis, President of DRP had spoken and that Mr. Lewis would address the situation. Mr. Zappola inquired as to the type of cargo that would be unloaded at the dock. The Applicant does not know at this point what type of cargo will be delivered to the dock.

   WHEREAS, the Board, after considering the information and testimony provided at the time of the hearing and examining the submitted and above listed documents, considering the comments and the letters of the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, James A. Clancy, P.E., C.M.E., the Township Planner, Matthew K. Miller,
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AIA, PP, NCARB, and the Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, J. Timothy Kernan, PE, PP, CME, makes the following conclusions of law and findings of fact:

1. The Applicant proposes to replace an abandoned dock facility with the construction of a new cargo wharf, referred to as a marginal wharf, to serve as a part of an intermodal logistics center. Approximately 4.26 acres of land and 1.4 acres of intertidal/subtidal shallows will be disturbed. The project is the initial phase of the Delaware River Partners (DRP) Gibbstown Logistics Center. The improvements include paving, lighting, trench drains, storm sewer and an outfall into the Delaware River. As part of the overall tract, the stormwater management for the subject parcel has been reviewed by the NJDEP and the proposed outfall has been authorized under Permit 0807-16-0001.2.

2. The property in question is Block 8, Lots 4 & 4.02 which contains approximately 926 acres of the former Dupont Repauno Plant, along with adjacent riparian areas. The former plant totals 1,620 acres. The subject parcel is a former dock and is currently inactive. The subject parcel is affected by wetlands and wetlands transition areas, flood hazard and riparian zone areas, waterfront development areas and is located in the MD-Manufacturing District which is also a Redevelopment Area. The proposed use is in keeping with the permitted uses in the M-D Zone and is a permitted use pursuant to the applicable Redevelopment Plan.

3. The surrounding area also contains wetland and wetlands transition areas. The site is bordered to the north by the Delaware River, to the south and...
southeast by residential areas and to the east by the Ashland Hercules Redevelopment Area.

4. The Applicant seeks the following submission waivers which were reviewed and recommended by the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer and/or Planning/Zoning Board Planner. The Board granted the waivers and deemed the application complete at its meeting of October 2, 2017:

2. True and Accurate Plot at scale; uniform sheet size, Block, Lot, Plate, Tract name; and

3. Zoning Classification of Property, Location of Proposed Buildings, Open space, Parking or Recreation areas; and

4. Soil Conservation Service Soil Classification; and

9. Parking Schedule in Accordance with Zoning Ordinance; and

10. Parking and Circulation Plan; and

11. Complete Landscape Plan; and

17. Building Front, Side and Rear Elevations and Floor Plan; and

5. The following Variances were sought and granted by the Board:

A. Variance from §700-41D, which requires two side yards on each lot, neither of which shall be less than twenty (20) feet in width. No side yards are proposed for Lot 4.02; and

B. Variance from §700-57A(3) which sets the maximum heights for lighting fixtures at twenty-five (25) feet. Three (3) light standards at a height of 100 feet are proposed; and
C. Variance from the requirement that no structures be located closer than seventy-five (75) feet to a tract boundary line. The Applicant is proposing that the structure (wharf) be located closer to the boundary than permitted; and

D. Variance from §700-62B & §700-62E which limits the height of fencing to six (6) feet and prohibits the use of barbed wire on top of fencing. The Applicant proposes fencing at a height of eight (8) feet, topped with barbed wire; and

E. The variances outlined in paragraphs A through D above were supported by the Greenwich Township Planner, Mr. Miller. The Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board weighed the negative and positive criteria with respect to the variances and waivers, as well as any potential impact on the master plan and/or zoning ordinance and determined that any detrimental effect, of which they found none, was outweighed by the positive aspects of the development, with any conditions imposed, determined that there was no impairment to the master plan or zoning ordinance and the granting of the variances and waivers was appropriate under the law, represented good sound planning and was in the best interest of Greenwich Township.

6. The Applicant's engineer, Kevin Webb testified giving the Board and the public an overview of the project. Utilizing what was marked as A-1, an overall plan of the tract, he outlined where the proposed development would take place. The current proposed development consists of approximately 4&1/2 acres of land, which was highlighted on the exhibit in tan. The area is over a mile from the intersection at Repauno Avenue and a substantial distance from any residential area.
7. The development is primarily the construction of a new wharf structure (new dock). The wharf will be approximately 730 feet long and will be able to accommodate a ship approximately 870 feet in length. The wharf will be able to handle one (1) ship at a time. There will be a slight increase in the elevation to approximately 10 feet.

8. Mr. Webb noted that there is a small wetlands area proposed for fill that has already been reviewed and approved by the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). All permits have been applied for and issued by the NJDEP to allow the work to proceed forward.

9. The current development is solely for the construction of the new wharf. No warehouse, use or support facility is proposed at this time. The construction of the wharf has a long lead time and will likely take 15 to 18 months to complete. By getting this project started the Applicant will be in a better position to begin to market the facility to potential tenants who would look to utilize the wharf. The Applicant will return to the Board for approvals once a tenant has been secured and a proposed use for the property has been determined.

10. The Applicant proposes the installation of three (3) light standards which are 100 feet in height. Mr. Webb testified that while the light fixtures are tall, given their distance from the nearest residential area, there is no possible way there would be any light spillover into any adjacent residential district. Mr. Miller noted that the type of lighting being proposed is often used on interstate highways. This type of lighting eliminates most of the shadowing that is present with conventional lighting standards. Mr. Miller testified that this project presents the perfect situation for the
use of this type of lighting. He saw no possible detrimental effect from the lighting as
the nearest residential area is nearly a mile from the development site.

11. The Applicant is seeking to increase the height of the fencing from the
permitted six (6) feet to eight (8) feet and to top the fencing with barbed wire for
security purposes. Again, this is an industrial site which is a far distance from any
residential area. The increased fence height will insure better security for the site.
Mr. Miller noted that the Board often permits similar fencing at a height of eight (8)
feet in other industrial sites, such as the refineries located in the Township.

12. The Applicant's attorney, Mr. Janacek, confirmed that the Applicant
was in agreement with all the recommendations and requirements listed in the letters
of the Board's professionals, Mr. Miller, Mr. Clancy and Mr. Kernan.

13. Mr. Miller noted that the setbacks in question bordered either the
Delaware River or other property owned by DRP which would be subject to future
development. It was his opinion that the requested setback variances made perfect
sense given the configuration and location of the development area.

14. Mr. Miller testified that he supported all the variances requested by the
Applicant. In his professional opinion the benefits of the deviations outweighed any
potential detriment and that there was no impairment of the zoning ordinance or
master plan, and no detriment to the public good. In his opinion, the setbacks were
made necessary and proper by the configuration and location of the property, make
perfect planning sense in this situation and would promote the development of the
site. The proposed lighting is a better lighting proposal than could be achieved
through conventional lighting, will provide better lighting with less standards and
posed no possible detriment to any adjacent residential area. The fencing proposed was reasonable and necessary to insure security at the premises and conformed to similar fencing approved by the Board at other industrial sites. Mr. Miller noted that no landscaping was proposed by the Applicant. He confirmed that landscaping would make no planning sense in this wharf area.

WHEREAS, the Board, has made its determinations in this matter based on the above exhibits, testimony and oral representations which are incorporated herein by way of reference, and has found and concluded that:

1. The granting of the Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan and Variance and Waiver Approvals, as revised by the terms and conditions of this Resolution, conform to the standards of sound planning and will have no deleterious effects on the neighborhood from the standpoint of insuring the health, safety, amenities and welfare of the community and are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Code and Master Plan; and

2. The benefits of the deviation from the Zoning Code would substantially outweigh any detriment.

WHEREAS, upon motion duly made and seconded to grant the "Application for Land Development" for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval and Variance and Waiver Approvals, the Board, by a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions, (Voting for: Rush, Shivery, Byrne, Durham, Wagner, Sholders, Hewes, Chila and Stigale), voted in favor of granting the application subject to certain conditions contained herein.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township that the application of Delaware River Partners LLC requesting Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval and Variance and Waiver Approvals for land located at the former DuPont Repauno Plant, Greenwich Township, New Jersey, also known as Block 8, Lots 4 & 4.02 and adjacent riparian areas, is HEREBY APPROVED, subject, however, to the testimony, representations and stipulations of the Applicant and their professionals and witnesses at the time of the hearing and in their submissions, and further specifically, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Subject to the Applicants complying with and obtaining any and all necessary approvals from any other local, county, state and/or federal government or administrative body having jurisdiction over all or part of this land use development approval. Those approvals include but are not limited to the following: Greenwich Township Building Department Building Permit; Greenwich Township Fire Official, Gloucester County Soil Conservation District; New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP); Army Corps of Engineers; and Gloucester County Planning Board Approval; and

2. In accordance with the Code of the Township of Greenwich, §131-39.1 Fees, the Municipal Land Use Law and any other applicable code provision, no permits, approval or certificate shall be issued until all contingencies provided for herein are satisfied and all escrows are paid in full and no Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued and no occupancy shall be permitted until all other contingencies
provided for herein are satisfied and all bills and escrows relating to this property have been paid in full; and

3. The Planning/Zoning Board Engineer and/or Township Planner and/or Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer shall review all plans and amended plans and inspect the site of the development in order to determine compliance with the terms and conditions of the Planning/Zoning Board approval. Any shortcomings noted by any professional shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the professionals before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. The Applicant shall submit appropriate escrow amounts, as determined by the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer and applicable law, for inspections; and

4. The Applicant shall comply with each and every condition, revision, modification and/or other request contained in the Planner's letter of October 2, 2017, the Engineer's two (2) letters of September 28, 2017, and the Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer's letter of September 28, 2017, unless otherwise specifically modified herein; and

5. The Applicant will post, pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law and Township Ordinances, an inspection escrow, performance guarantee and a maintenance guarantee, to cover the on-site improvements proposed in this application and an estimate for all site improvements will be prepared by the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, Township Engineer or Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer; and

6. In accordance with the Statewide Non-Residential Development Fee Act (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-8.1-8.7), the Applicant is required to make payment of a
development fee of 2.5% of the equalized assessed value of the non-residential construction, payable in full at the time the project is deemed substantially complete by the Planning Board Engineer or at the time of the request for a certificate of occupancy, whichever comes first; and

7. The Applicant shall timely provide the Board and the Board Professionals copies of all permits, referenced plans and approvals obtained by and from the NJDEP, The Army Corps of Engineers and any other required permits, referenced plans and approvals, regarding the project, specifically including but not limited to those outlined in Paragraph 1 above; and

8. A detail of the proposed concrete retaining wall shall be provided; and

9. The footing depth/design of the light pole shall be provided; and

10. Stormwater design is subject to both the NJDEP and Soil Conservation District review and approval; and

11. All stormwater information, as applicable, shall be shown on the plan.

FRED STIGALE, Chairman
Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township
The foregoing Resolution was a memorialization of action taken at a regular meeting of the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township held on the 2nd day of October 2017; and such resolution was adopted by the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township at its reorganizational and regular meeting held on November 8, 2017, by a vote □ to approve, □ to Oppose and □ to abstain.

KIRK FAIRLEY, Secretary
Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township

THOSE IN FAVOR: Hewes, Rush, Durham, Sholders, Chi.a, Stigate, Shinery and Wagner

THOSE OPPOSED: n/a

THOSE ABSTAINED: n/a
RESOLUTION #R2019-21
OF THE PLANNING/ZONING BOARD OF THE TOWNSHIP OF GREENWICH
REGARDING APPLICATION NO. PB2019-05 SUBMITTED BY DELAWARE RIVER
PARTNERS LLC GRANTING AMENDMENTS TO SITE PLAN WITH WAIVERS
FOR PROPERTY DESIGNATED AS BLOCK 8, Lots 4 & 4.02 AND ADJACENT
RIPARIAN AREAS

WHEREAS, an Application has been submitted by Delaware River Partners LLC for
Amendments to Site Plan and Waiver Approvals, for property located at a portion of the former
DuPont Repauno Plant, and known as Block 8, Lots 4 & 4.02 and adjacent riparian areas (the
"Property"), on the Tax Map of the Township of Greenwich, which property is owned by the
Applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has given legal Notice as required by and in accordance with
N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12 and applicable Greenwich Township ordinances, by serving proper Notice to
property owners within 200 feet of the site, serving Notice on all required governmental agencies
and public utilities and by publishing a proper Notice in the newspaper, all at least ten (10) days
prior to the Hearing; and

WHEREAS, in support of the Application the Applicant has submitted the following
documents:

3. Application Exhibit A, Redeveloper Corporate Disclosure.
4. Application Exhibit B, Site Plan Submission Checklists.
7. Application Exhibit E, List of Experts.

8. Application Exhibit F, Deed restrictions regarding the property.

9. Amended Site Plans bearing a revision date of March 15, 2019:
   A. Cover Sheet.
   B. Overall Plan.
   C. Demolition Plan.
   D. Final Plat Site Plan.
   E. Grading, Drainage and Utility Plan.
   F. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan.
   G. Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Notes and Details.
   H. Construction Details #1.
   I. Construction Details #2.

WHEREAS, prior to the Board hearing, the Greenwich Township Governing Body approved the project proposed in the Application pursuant to the requirements set forth in the Master Redevelopment Agreement entered into between Delaware River Partners LLC and the Township of Greenwich, dated July 8, 2016 ("Master Redevelopment Agreement") and the Redevelopment Plan, Repauno Port & Rail Terminal, Township of Greenwich, dated January 2019 and adopted by Ordinance No. 1-2019 ("Redevelopment Plan"); and

WHEREAS, the Board has made its determination in this matter based on the following:

1. The documents set forth above;
2. The representations made by or on behalf of the Applicant in the Application as well as the testimony offered from the Applicant's professional, Kevin J. Webb, PE, LEED AP from Langan Engineering & Environmental Services;

3. Report dated May 6, 2019, from the Board’s Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer J. Timothy Kernan, P.E., P.P., C.M.E., which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;

4. Report dated May 31, 2019, from the Board’s Engineer James A. Clancy, PE, LS, PP, which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;

5. Representations made by the Applicant’s attorney, Douglas J. Janacek, Esquire;

6. Testimony from the Board’s professional J. Timothy Kernan, P.E., P.P., C.M.E;

7. Testimony from the Board’s professional Matthew K. Miller, AIA, PP, NCARB;

and

8. The Hearing was opened to the public, and no members of the public came forward to speak.

WHEREAS, the Board, after considering the information and testimony provided at the time of the hearing and examining the submitted and above listed documents, considering the comments of the Township Planner, Matthew K. Miller, AIA, PP, NCARB, and the Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, J. Timothy Kernan, PE, PP, CME, makes the following findings of law and statements of fact:

1. The Applicant proposes an amendment to its Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval for work associated with the construction of a wharf located on the Property ("Wharf Project"). According to the Applicant, the amendments are necessary as a result of changes in the storm
water management system, specifically the addition of a water quality management device, which necessitated alterations to locations of drainage routes and changes to the design of retaining walls. The Applicant further requested approval of revisions to on-site lighting, electric service, access roadway locations and other related improvements.

2. Development at the site is currently subject to the terms and conditions of Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board Resolution #R2017-28, which shall continue in full force and effect except as specifically amended herein.

3. The Property contains approximately 926 acres of the former Dupont Repauno Plant totaling approximately 1,620 acres. The Property is a former dock and is currently inactive. The Property is affected by wetlands and wetlands transition areas, flood hazard and riparian zone areas, and waterfront development areas. This Property is located in the Riverfront Terminal District, which has been designated as an area in need of redevelopment and is subject to the Redevelopment Plan.

4. The Applicant seeks submission waivers for No. 11 (Landscape Plan) and No. 19 (Lighting Plan). The waiver requests were reviewed, and the Board granted the waivers and deemed the Application complete at its meeting on June 3, 2019.

5. The Applicant sought no variances.

6. The Applicant’s Engineer, Kevin J. Webb, PE, LEED AP, testified utilizing Exhibit A-1, which was an enlarged version of the Final Plat Site Plan, Sheet 4 of 9 of the Langan plans. Mr. Webb testified concerning the specific details of the amendments, most of which were necessitated by conditions in the field. Mr. Webb testified that the changes are relatively minor in nature and will result in a better development project than was authorized in the initial
approvals. The Applicant conducted a lighting pattern analysis and is proposing upgraded lighting in the Application.

7. The Applicant's attorney represented that the Applicant has secured approvals from the Gloucester County Planning Board as well as the Gloucester County Soil Conservation District. Counsel agreed to provide the Planning Board with copies of those approvals.

8. Timothy Kernan testified consistently with the provisions of his report dated May 6, 2019. In Section 4.0 of his report, Mr. Kernan raised the issue of whether the section of Repauno Avenue between Broad Street and Democrat Road should be converted to one-way in the southbound direction. This is an issue that has been raised in the past to address truck traffic related to the development until such time as the proposed bypass road is constructed. The Applicant's attorney indicated that the Applicant had previously agreed that if Repauno Avenue was made one-way, the Applicant would implement appropriate signage for the same only if an issue was communicated to them through the Township Police Department, and no such communication has occurred. While the Applicant agreed to provide a trip generation report, the Applicant made an affirmative representation that no new trips will be generated by virtue of the Application before the Board. Mr. Kernan testified that he is agreeable to addressing revised traffic patterns in conjunction with subsequent applications, with due consideration for additional traffic burdens placed upon the Township. In the interim, Mr. Kernan testified that perceived problems may be addressed with the Applicant by the Township Police and the Township Mayor and Council. Matthew Miller testified that he agrees that changes in traffic patterns may be handled in the context of future applications.
9. Matthew Miller presented the May 31, 2019 report of James Clancy. Mr. Miller emphasized that "as built" drawings must be submitted and approved as a condition of approval. The Applicant agreed to this condition.

10. Both Mr. Kernan and Mr. Miller testified that they supported granting the amendment to site plan subject to the Applicant complying with the terms and conditions of the professional review letters. The Applicant's counsel agreed to comply with said review letters, with the exception of Section 4.0 of Mr. Keman's report addressing the "Truck Route" and the proposed conversion of Repauno Avenue to a one-way street, which may be revisited in the event an issue is communicated to the Applicant by the Police Department.

11. Applicant shall pay a development fee of 2.5% of the equalized assessed value of the non-residential construction into the State of New Jersey's Affordable Housing Trust Fund. The amount of the fee shall be subject to the approval of the Township Solicitor.

WHEREAS, the Board, has made its determinations in this matter based on the above exhibits, testimony and oral representations which are incorporated herein by way of reference, and has found and concluded that:

1. The granting of the Amendment to Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan and Waiver Approvals is reasonable and necessary and is consistent with sound land use planning and engineering principles; and

WHEREAS, upon motion duly made and seconded to grant the Amendment to Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan and Waiver Approvals, the Board, by a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions, voted in favor of granting the application subject to certain
conditions contained herein. (Voting for: Fairley, Sholders, Stigale, Wagner, Shivery, Chila, Hewes, Zampaglione, Walko).

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED,** by the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township that the Application of Delaware River Partners LLC requesting Amendment to Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan Approval and Waiver Approvals for land located at the former DuPont Repauno Plant, Greenwich Township, New Jersey, also known as Block 8, Lots 4 & 4.02 and adjacent riparian areas, is HEREBY APPROVED, subject, however, to the testimony, representations and stipulations of the Applicant and its professional at the time of the hearing and in its submissions, and further specifically, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Subject to the Applicant complying with and obtaining any and all necessary approvals from any other local, county, state and/or federal government or administrative body having jurisdiction over all or part of this land use development approval.

2. In accordance with the Code of the Township of Greenwich, §131-39.1 Fees, the Municipal Land Use Law and any other applicable code provision, no permits, approval or certificate shall be issued until all contingencies provided for herein are satisfied and all escrows are paid in full and no Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued and no occupancy shall be permitted until all other contingencies provided herein are satisfied and all bills and escrows relating to this property have been paid in full; and

3. The Planning/Zoning Board Engineer and/or Township Planner and/or Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, shall review all plans and amended plans and inspect the site of the development in order to determine compliance with the terms and conditions of the
Planning/Zoning Board approval. Any shortcomings noted by any professional shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the professionals before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy; and

4. The Applicant shall comply with each and every condition, revision, modification and/or other request contained in the Engineer's letter of May 31, 2019, and the Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer's letter of May 6, 2019 (with the exception of Section 4.0, which only needs to be addressed as referenced above if the Police Department communicates to the Applicant a need for the same), unless otherwise specifically modified herein; and

5. The Applicant will post, pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law and Township Ordinances, an inspection escrow, to cover the on-site improvements proposed in this application. An estimate will be prepared by the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, Township Engineer or Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer; and

6. In accordance with the Statewide Non-Residential Development Fee Act (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-8. 1-8.7), the Applicant is required to make payment of a development fee of 2.5% of the equalized assessed value of the non-residential construction, payable in full at the time the project is deemed substantially complete by the Planning Board Engineer or at the time of the request for a certificate of occupancy, whichever comes first; and

7. The Applicant shall timely provide the Board and the Board Professionals copies of all permits, referenced plans and approvals obtained by and from the Gloucester County Planning Board, Gloucester County Soil Conservation District, NJDEP, USACOE and Greenwich Police, Fire and Building Departments.
8. An "As Built" drawing of the work approved in conjunction with this Application shall be provided.

9. As required by the Master Redevelopment Agreement and the Redevelopment Plan, the Applicant shall execute a subproject redevelopment agreement with the Township for the Wharf Project prior to the issuance of any temporary and/or final certificate of occupancy for the Wharf Project.

ATTEST:

PLANNING/ZOING BOARD
TOWNSHIP OF GREENWICH

Fred Stigale, Chairman

ATTEST:
The foregoing Resolution was a memorialization of action taken at a regular meeting of the Planning/Zoning Board of the Township of Greenwich held on the 3rd day of June, 2019; and such resolution was adopted by the Planning/Zoning Board of the Township of Greenwich at a regular meeting held on 1st day of July, 2019, by a vote 7 to approve, 0 to oppose and 0 to abstain.

Kirk Fairley, Secretary

In favor of the resolution: Fairley, Sholders, Stigale, Chila, Zampeglione, Hewes & Shivity

Opposed to the resolution: n/c

Abstained: n/c
RESOLUTION #R2019-23
OF THE PLANNING/ZONING BOARD OF GREENWICH TOWNSHIP REGARDING
APPLICATION NO. PB2019-08 OF DELAWARE RIVER PARTNERS LLC
GRANTING PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN APPROVAL FOR PROPERTY
LOCATED AT THE FORMER DUPONT REPAUNO PLANT, DESIGNATED AS A
PORTION OF BLOCK 8, LOTS 3 & 4

WHEREAS, an application has been submitted by Delaware River Partners
LLC for Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval, for property located at a portion of
the former DuPont Repauno Plant, and known as a portion of Block 8, Lots 3 & 4, on
the Tax Map of the Township of Greenwich, which property is owned by the
Applicant; and

WHEREAS, the Applicant has given legal Notice as required by and in
accordance with N.J.S.A. 40:55D-12 and applicable Greenwich Township
ordinances, by serving proper Notice to property owners within 200 feet of the site,
serving Notice on all required governmental agencies and public utilities and by
publishing a proper Notice in the newspaper, all at least ten (10) days prior to the
hearing; and

WHEREAS, in support of the application the Applicant has submitted the
following documents:

1. Letter from the Applicant's attorney, Cameron W. MacLeod, Esq.,
dated July 12, 2019; and

2. Preliminary and Final Site Plan Application with Exhibits, dated July 12,
2019; and

3. Submission Checklist, dated July 12, 2019; and
4. Trip Generation Memorandum, prepared by Kevin J. Webb, P.E., of Langan, 989 Lenox Drive, Suite 124, Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648, dated July 12, 2019; and

5. Resolution R2017-16 (Block 8, Lots 3 & 4), adopted January 9, 2017; and

6. Resolution R2017-28 (Block 8, Lots 4 & 4.02), adopted November 6, 2017; and

7. Resolution R2019-21 (Block 8, Lots 4 & 4.02), adopted July 1, 2019; and

8. Governing Body Resolution No. 117-2019, adopted July 15, 2019; and


10. Cover Sheet, Sheet 1 of 35, (All plans prepared and signed by Kevin J. Webb, P.E., of Langan, 989 Lenox Drive, Suite 124, Lawrenceville, New Jersey 08648), dated July 12, 2019; and

11. Overall Existing Conditions Plan, Sheet 2 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

12. Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan 1, Sheet 3 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

13. Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan 2, Sheet 4 of 25, dated July 12, 2019; and
14. Existing Conditions & Demolition Plan 3, Sheet 5 of 25, dated July 12, 2019; and
15. Overall Site Plan, Sheet 6 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
16. Site Plan 1, Sheet 7 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
17. Site Plan 2, Sheet 8 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
18. Site Plan 3, Sheet 9 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
19. Overall Vehicle Movement Plan, Sheet 10 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
20. Vehicle Movement Plan Insets, Sheet 11 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
21. Overall Grading & Drainage Plan, Sheet 12 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
22. Grading & Drainage Plan 1, Sheet 13 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
23. Grading & Drainage Plan 2, Sheet 14 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
24. Grading & Drainage Plan 3, Sheet 15 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
25. Utility Plan 1, Sheet 16 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
26. Utility Plan 2, Sheet 17 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
27. Utility Plan 3, Sheet 18 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
28. Lighting Plan 1, Sheet 19 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
29. Lighting Plan 2, Sheet 20 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
30. Lighting Plan 3, Sheet 21 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
31. Lighting Details 1, Sheet 22 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
32. Lighting Details 2, Sheet 23 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and
33. Lighting Details 3, Sheet 24 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

34. Overall Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan, Sheet 25 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

35. Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan 1, Sheet 26 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

36. Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan 2, Sheet 27 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

37. Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Plan 3, Sheet 28 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

38. Soil Erosion & Sediment Control Notes and Details, Sheet 29 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

39. Outfall Profiles & Basin Cross Sections, Sheet 30 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

40. Construction Details 1, Sheet 31 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

41. Construction Details 2, Sheet 32 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

42. Construction Details 3, Sheet 33 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

43. Construction Details 4, Sheet 34 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

44. Construction Details 5, Sheet 35 of 35, dated July 12, 2019; and

45. At the time of the hearing the following Exhibits were marked:

A-1 Overview of the Site (Sheet 2); and

A-2 Close Up of the Proposed Facilities (Sheet 6).

WHEREAS, the Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board has made its determination in this matter based on the following:
1. The documents set forth above;

2. The representations made by the Applicant in its application and by the Applicant, Delaware River Partners LLC (DRP), through its representatives, experts and witnesses: Kevin Webb, PE, from Langan and its attorney, Douglas Janacek, Esq., of Gibbons P.C., at the time of the hearing before the Board on September 9, 2019;

3. Letter from the Greenwich Township Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, James A. Clancy, PE, PLS, PP, CME, dated August 26, 2019, which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;

4. Letter from the Greenwich Township Planner, Matthew K. Miller, AIA, PP, dated September 5, 2019, which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;

5. Letter from the Greenwich Township Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, J. Timothy Kernan, PE, PP, CME, dated August 19, 2019, which is incorporated and made a part of this Resolution by way of reference;

6. Comments made by the Township Planner at the time of the hearing on September 9, 2019;

7. Comments made by the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, at the time of the hearing on September 9, 2019; and

8. The following members of the public spoke at the time of the hearing before the board on September 9, 2019:
A. Steve Laszczyk, 9 Brandt Avenue. Mr. Laszczyk inquired as to the number of rail cars that can be stored on site at any time. The Applicant indicated that the facility can store up to 80 rail cars at any one time.

B. Ron Cundy, 139 Jackson Avenue. Mr. Cundy asked if there would be any storage of propane. Mr. Webb indicated that the cavern would continue to store butane. The propane would go from rail car to the wharf to a ship. Mr. Cundy further questioned emergency egress should the need arise. He was informed the by-pass road would be the emergency exit.

C. Donna O'Leary, 124 Swedesboro Road. Ms. O'Leary questioned what route would be used for the trucks in this project. Mr. Webb confirmed that the transportation of the LPG would be by train, not truck. Takes approximately 36 to 48 hours to unload an 80 car train.

D. Leslie Feaster, 156 N. Repauno Avenue. Mr. Feaster was concerned about the level of noise. Mr. Webb indicated that the majority of the noise would be in the construction phase.

E. Will Durham, 133 Dupont Avenue. Stated he was a resident for 56 years on Dupont Avenue. He thanked DRP for placing their business in Greenwich Township. He has not had any problems with the construction vehicles and noted that DRP has been very open with the local fire officials.

F. Russell Leone, 657 Paulsboro Road. Mr. Leone wanted to know if they were going to widen Route 44. He was informed they were not widening Route 44.
G. Mark Pandolfo, 251 Marshall Avenue. Inquired about LNG being brought to the site. Mr. Webb informed him that this project was for LPG to be delivered by rail, not LNG.

WHEREAS, the Board, after considering the information and testimony provided at the time of the hearing and examining the submitted and above listed documents, considering the comments and the letters of the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, James A. Clancy, P.E., C.M.E., the Township Planner, Matthew K. Miller, AIA, PP, NCARB, and the Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, J. Timothy Kernan, PE, PP, CME, makes the following conclusions of law and findings of fact:

1. The Applicant is seeking approval for a subproject referred to as "LPG Transloading Facility" which includes development of a facility on a portion of the subject property to enable transloading of liquefied petroleum gases (LPG) consisting of propane or butane between railcars and ships with the proposed improvements to include rail spurs and storage tracks; a double-sided rail rack for transloading of LPG; aboveground piping and their associated support racks to the existing wharf; a 2,000 square foot operations/control building; associated filling and grading; surface parking; circulation roadways; fire protection system; and ancillary support equipment and utility infrastructure, including stormwater management facilities as set forth the proposal for development dated June 13, 2019.

2. The property in question is Block 8, Lots 3 & 4 which contains approximately 921± acres of the former Dupont Repauno Plant which totals 1,620± acres. The subject parcel is located at the north side of the site adjacent to the
Delaware River and within proximity to the recently developed wharf. The overall property is affected by wetlands and wetlands transition areas, flood hazard and riparian zone areas, waterfront development areas and is located in the M-D Manufacturing District which has also been designated a Redevelopment Area. The proposed use is in keeping with the permitted uses in the M-D Zone and is a permitted use pursuant to the applicable Redevelopment Plan.

3. The surrounding area also contains wetland and wetlands transition areas. The site is bordered to the north by the Delaware River, to the south and southeast by residential areas and to the east by the Ashland Hercules Redevelopment Area.

4. The Applicant requested waivers for landscaping and an opinion/acknowledgment/waiver regarding lighting standards for this application.

5. The Applicant obtained approval for this subproject from the Greenwich Township governing body pursuant to Resolution No. 117-2019. The Applicant acknowledged on the record that it must, as a condition of approval, have a signed Re-Development Agreement with Greenwich Township for this subproject prior to the issuance of a temporary and/or final Certificate of Occupancy or Certificate of Approval; and

6. The Applicant's attorney, Mr. Janacek gave the Board an overview of the project. The Applicant is seeking Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval for an LPG rail terminal facility to be installed for use in connection with the recently constructed wharf. An operations building, support structures and some grading of
the site will take place. There are no variances needed or requested. Waivers for landscaping and a lighting plan are requested.

6. The Applicant’s engineer, Mr. Webb indicated that the site in question is within Block 8, Lots 3 & 4. The development will take place at the riverfront portion, about 4,000 feet from any residential property. It is adjacent to the wharf and near the butane cavern. The work will be immediately east of the cavern.

7. The existing rail line is parallel to A-Line Road. The new rail spur goes to the east of the existing line. Four (4) storage tracks and two (2) tracks for the rack itself. The railrack connects to a pipe rack which leads to the wharf and ultimately to a vessel. Forty (40) rail cars can be on the rack lines. The facility can handle 80 railcars at any one time. There is an Operations and Control building which is 2,000 square feet with 10 parking spaces provided. Typically, it would house 3 to 4 employees.

8. Mr. Webb testified that there is automatic fire suppression in the loop. The new terminal road is parallel to the river which provides access to the operations building and the wharf. A gravel road that connects to A-Line Road is provided for maintenance. Pole mounted lighting at 20 feet is provided for parking and at 30 feet for the roadways. The Applicant agreed to install reflectors in the pavement.

9. No landscaping is proposed for the project as the property is so far away any residential properties, the landscaping would never be seen. The Board’s planner supported the waiver for landscaping opining that the landscaping would serve no real purpose.
10. Mr. Webb indicated that the hours of operation would be for the most part 24/7 with multiple shifts. There would be 3 to 4 employees in the Operations Building and a total of 50 to 70 employees working at the site at peak times. This information will be added to the plans.

11. The Applicant has been working with the local fire department regarding emergency response. The Applicant agreed as a condition of approval to add one (1) fire hydrant close to the intersection of the terminal road and the gravel maintenance road.

12. Mr. Janacek confirmed that the Applicant will comply with all the conditions and requirements set forth in all the Board's professionals letters and in the Redevelopment Plan.

13. Mr. Webb confirmed that there is no on site storage of the LPG on site. The LPG goes from the rail car to the wharf to the ship.

14. Mr. Clancy raised the issue of the Applicant repairing pot holes, at a minimum in the area from the security booth to the limit of the new paving. The Applicant agreed to repair the pot holes as requested by Mr. Clancy.

15. Mr. Clancy discussed the issue of additional lighting on the rear of the Operations Building. The Applicant agreed to install two (2) additional shoe box light fixtures at the rear of the Operations Building.

16. Mr. Miller indicated his support for the landscaping waiver due to the distance from any residential area. He further did not see an issue with lighting, again because of the project being so far from any residential area. Mr. Miller noted in Mr. Kernan's letter the potential issue of NJDOT Hazmat Security Plan &
Compliance and NJDOT Hazmat Shippers Registration. The Applicant indicated that they have USDOT certification for the butane operations. If and to the extent required, the Applicant will pursue these requirements and provide proof of compliance to the Board.

17. The Board determined that the waivers for landscaping and for a lighting plan were appropriate given the extreme distance from any residential property being such that the development area will not be seen, the landscaping will serve no real purpose at this industrial site and there will be no possible impact as far as light spillage onto residential properties, and thus granted the waivers for landscaping and a lighting plan.

WHEREAS, the Board, has made its determinations in this matter based on the above exhibits, testimony and oral representations which are incorporated herein by way of reference, and has found and concluded that:

1. The application meets the standards for the granting of Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval under the Township of Greenwich Zoning Code; and

2. The granting of the Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval, as well as the requested waiver regarding lighting and landscaping, as revised by the terms and conditions of this Resolution, conform to the standards of sound planning and will have no deleterious effects on the neighborhood from the standpoint of insuring the health, safety, amenities and welfare of the community and are consistent with the purpose and intent of the Zoning Code and Master Plan.
WHEREAS, upon motion duly made and seconded to grant the “Application for Land Development” for Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval, the Board, by a vote of 9 in favor, 0 opposed and 0 abstentions, (Voting for: Sholders, Rush, Shivery, Wagner, Hewes, Byrne, Zampaglione, Chila, and Fairley), voted in favor of granting the application subject to certain conditions contained herein.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township that the application of Delaware River Partners LLC requesting Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval for land located at the former DuPont Repauno Plant, Greenwich Township, New Jersey, also known as a portion of Block 8, Lots 3 & 4, is HEREBY APPROVED, subject, however, to the testimony, representations and stipulations of the Applicant and their professionals and witnesses at the time of the hearing and in their submissions, and further specifically, subject to the following terms and conditions:

1. Subject to the Applicant complying with and obtaining any and all necessary approvals from any other local, county, state and/or federal government or administrative body having jurisdiction over all or part of this Site Plan Waiver approval. Those approvals include but are not limited to the following: United States Army Corps of Engineers (modified 1/10/2018); NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands Letter of Interpretation (approved 7/11/2016); NJDEP Waterfront Development/Flood Hazard Area/Coastal Wetlands Multi-Permit (modified 11/29/2018); NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands General Permit (modified 11/29/2018); NJPDES Permits; NJ Toxic Catastrophe Prevention Act (TCPA) Program Approval; NJ Air Pollution Control Act Permit; Greenwich Township Building Department; Greenwich Township
Fire Official; Greenwich Township Sewer Department; Gloucester County Planning Board Approval; and Gloucester County Soil Conservation District; and

2. In accordance with the Code of the Township of Greenwich, §131-39.1 Fees, the Municipal Land Use Law and any other applicable code provision, no permits, approval or certificate shall be issued until all contingencies provided for herein are satisfied and all escrows are paid in full and no Certificate of Occupancy shall be issued and no occupancy shall be permitted until all other contingencies provided for herein are satisfied and all bills and escrows relating to this application for development have been paid in full; and

3. The Planning/Zoning Board Engineer, Township Planner, or Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer, as set forth above, shall review all plans and amended plans and inspect the site of the development in order to determine compliance with the terms and conditions of the Planning/Zoning Board approval. Any shortcomings noted by any professional shall be addressed to the satisfaction of the professionals before the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy. The Applicant shall submit appropriate escrow amounts, as determined by the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer and applicable law, for inspections; and

4. The Applicant shall comply with each and every condition, revision, modification and/or other request contained in the Planner's letter of September 5, 2019, the Engineer's letter of August 26, 2019, and the Master Plan Consultant/Redevelopment Engineer's letter of August 19, 2019, unless otherwise specifically modified herein; and
5. In accordance with the Statewide Non-Residential Development Fee Act (N.J.S.A. 40:55D-8.1-8.7), the Applicant is required to make payment of a development fee of 2.5% of the equalized assessed value of the non-residential construction, payable in full at the time the project is deemed substantially complete by the Planning Board Engineer or at the time of the request for a certificate of occupancy, whichever comes first; and

6. All previous approvals for this project, including but not limited to the terms and conditions of Resolution R2017-16; Resolution R2017-28 and R2019-21, remain in full force and effect, unless specifically modified pursuant to the terms and conditions of this resolution; and

7. The Applicant, as a condition of approval, must have a signed Redevelopment Agreement with Greenwich Township for this subproject prior to the issuance of a temporary and/or final Certificate of Occupancy or Certificate of Approval; and

8. The Applicant shall install one (1) fire hydrant close to the intersection of the terminal road and the gravel maintenance road; and

9. The Applicant shall repair the pot holes, at a minimum, in the area from the security booth to the limit of the new paving; and

10. The Applicant shall install two (2) additional shoe box light fixtures at the rear of the Operations Building, or other equivalent lighting to the satisfaction of the Planning/Zoning Board Engineer; and

11. With respect to the issue of NJDOT Hazmat Security Plan & Compliance and NJDOT Hazmat Shippers Registration, if and to the extent required,
the Applicant will pursue these requirements and provide proof of compliance to the Board.

FRED STIGALE, Chairman
Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township

The foregoing Resolution was a memorialization of action taken at a regular meeting of the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township held on the 9th day of September 2019; and such resolution was adopted by the Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township at its regular meeting held on October 7, 2019, by a vote **8** to approve, **0** to Oppose and **0** to abstain.

KIRK FAIRLEY, Secretary
Planning/Zoning Board of Greenwich Township

THOSE IN FAVOR: Fairley, Wagner, Sholtes, Rush, Campagnone, Heuts, Chile & Shively

THOSE OPPOSED:

THOSE ABSTAINED:
To: Greenwich Township Planning Board  
    Greenwich Township Police Department  
From: Kevin J. Webb, PE  
Date: November 15, 2019  
Re: Trip Generation  
    Delaware River Partners, LLC  
    Repauno Port & Rail Terminal, Dock 2 Site Plan Application  
    Block 8, Lots 3, 4, and 4.01, Township of Greenwich, Gloucester County, NJ  
    Langan Project No.: 130088803  

In accordance with Item 4.4 of the Redevelopment Plan, we have prepared this assessment of anticipated site-wide traffic at the Repauno facility during the construction and operation of the proposed Dock 2.

Item 4.4.1 of the Redevelopment Plan states that the site-wide trip generation shall be limited to a maximum of 550 vehicle trips per day prior to the construction of Phase 1 of the proposed Route 44 Bypass. Furthermore, the trip generation is clarified to include both vehicles and trucks used by site employees and visitors, but excludes traffic related to the ongoing site remediation by Chemours and construction traffic related to the proposed bypass road.

The proposed Dock 2 facilities will not generate any operational traffic without an associated use within the Terminal. Operational traffic generated by any uses anticipated to utilize Dock 2 will be identified and analyzed as part of their respective future development applications, and will be subject to the limitations of Section 4.4.1 as described above. Construction of Dock 2 will start after the completion of the approved LPG Transloading Facility, which also identified as the rail rack. The number of trips generated by the existing operational activities at the site will vary due to the seasonality of the existing butane cavern operations.

The component parts of the overall site-wide traffic are described and tallied below.

**ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES TRAFFIC**

This category includes traffic associated with DRP’s employees and visitors. The total number of DRP administrative and support staff employees is estimated at 14, including employees, 2 maintenance contractors, and 3 security contractors. Visitors, consultants, and delivery trucks historically account for 3 additional vehicles per day.

Each of these 17 vehicles would be expected to account for 2 trips: 1 entering and 1 exiting. Approximately 8 employees would be expected to leave the site and return during the workday for outside meetings or meals, thereby generating additional trips.
In summary, the administrative services traffic is estimated at 50 trips per day:

\[
17 \text{ vehicles} \times 2 \text{ trips/day} + 8 \text{ vehicles} \times 2 \text{ additional trips/day} = 50 \text{ trips/day}
\]

**OPERATIONAL TRAFFIC – EXISTING BUTANE CAVERN**

The butane cavern operation is seasonal. During April through October, the cavern typically receives butane via railcar delivery or is idle, thereby generating no vehicle trips. During November through March, the cavern generally ships butane off-site by truck. The truck rack at the butane cavern can accommodate up to 2 trucks at one time or a theoretical maximum of 48 trucks in a 24-hour period. To date, no more than 16 trucks per day have served the cavern at peak operation during the shipping season, with a typical average of 8 trucks per day.

All trucks generate 2 trips: 1 entering and 1 exiting. Two operators support the butane cavern, thereby generating 4 trips/day. In summary, based on historical operations the existing butane cavern operation is estimated to generate 36 trips per day:

\[
2 \text{ vehicles} \times 2 \text{ trips/day} + 16 \text{ trucks} \times 2 \text{ trips/day} = 36 \text{ trips/day}
\]

**OPERATIONAL TRAFFIC – LPG TRANSLOADING FACILITY AND DOCK 1**

When the LPG Transloading Facility is completed and operational, the only vehicle trips that it will generate are those associated with its operators and other support personnel at Dock 1. DRP estimates a total of 11 operational staff (8 rail rack operators, 2 operators at Dock 1, and 1 supervisor) will support the rail rack operation for each of two shifts, thereby generating 44 trips/day. An additional 5 vehicles are anticipated for inspectors and support personnel at Dock 1, including those used by various inspectors and surveyors, and those for potential vessel supply deliveries.

\[
11 \text{ vehicles} \times 2 \text{ shifts} \times 2 \text{ trips/day} + 5 \text{ vehicles} \times 2 \text{ trips/day} = 54 \text{ trips/day}
\]

**CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC – DOCK 2**

Construction traffic will be comprised of construction vehicles used by construction employees to arrive at the site and those supporting the on-site construction. We estimate a total of 50 construction vehicles will support this work, including 25 vehicles used at the construction site and 25 additional personal vehicles for employees who are transported to the work area using vans that do not otherwise leave the site. In total, we estimate 100 trips/day will be generated during the construction phase.

\[
50 \text{ vehicles} \times 2 \text{ trips/day} = 100 \text{ trips/day}
\]
Upon completion of Dock 2, the only vehicle trips that it will generate are those associated with its operators. DRP estimates 4 operators will support the rail rack operation, thereby generating 8 trips/day.

\[
4 \text{ vehicles} \times 2 \text{ trips/day} = 8 \text{ trips/day}
\]

ANALYSIS

Using the figures calculated above, the current baseline administrative and operational activities generate 112 trips/day for the majority of the year and a total of 148 trips/day during the limited period when butane is being shipped off-site via truck.

During construction of Dock 2, the site-wide trip generation will increase above those baseline levels to 240 trips/day.

See Table A on page 4 for a summary of all calculations.

CONCLUSION

The proposed Dock 2 will not generate any operational traffic without an associated use within the Terminal. The site-wide trip generation will be less than the maximum 550 trips/day specified in the Redevelopment Plan, even during the construction of Dock 2.

As specified during prior applications, operational and construction-related truck traffic shall use the entrance and exit routes shown on the attached Truck Traffic Routes plan, dated November 16, 2018, prepared by Langan.
### TABLE A - TRIP GENERATION CALCULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES TRAFFIC</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Trips/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRP employees</td>
<td>9 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRP maintenance contractors</td>
<td>2 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRP security contractors</td>
<td>3 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitors</td>
<td>3 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional workday trips</td>
<td>8 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>25 vehicles</td>
<td><strong>50 trips/day</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONAL TRAFFIC - EXISTING BUTANE CAVERN</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Trips/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRP cavern operators</td>
<td>2 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butane trucks</td>
<td>16 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>18 vehicles</td>
<td><strong>36 trips/day</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONAL TRAFFIC - LPG TRANSLOADING FACILITY/RAIL RACK AND DOCK 1</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Trips/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRP operators and supervisors (Shift 1)</td>
<td>11 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRP operators and supervisors (Shift 2)</td>
<td>11 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dock 1 Inspectors and Vessel Service</td>
<td>5 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>27 vehicles</td>
<td><strong>54 trips/day</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSTRUCTION TRAFFIC - DOCK 2</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Trips/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction support vehicles</td>
<td>25 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction employees</td>
<td>25 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>50 vehicles</td>
<td><strong>100 trips/day</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OPERATIONAL TRAFFIC - DOCK 2</th>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Trips/day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DRP operators</td>
<td>4 vehicles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>4 vehicles</td>
<td><strong>8 trips/day</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL DURING DOCK 2 CONSTRUCTION PHASE** | **240 trips/day**

**TOTAL AFTER CONSTRUCTION** | **148 trips/day**
ROUTE FOR TRUCKS ENTERING SITE
ROUTE 295 EXIT 14
NORTHBOUND ON REPAUNO STATION/FLOODGATE ROAD
RIGHT TURN ONTO BROAD ST/ROUTE 44
LEFT TURN ONTO NORTH REPAUNO AVENUE/"C-LINE" ROAD
LEFT TURN ONTO BROADWAY

ROUTE FOR TRUCKS EXITING SITE
SOUTHBOUND ON "A-LINE ROAD" AND "A-LINE ROAD EXTENDED"
RIGHT TURN ONTO "C-LINE ROAD"/REPAUNO AVENUE
LEFT TURN ON DOMINIC ROAD
ACCESS ROUTE 295 AT EXIT 16A
SUBDIVISION, SITE PLAN CHECKLIST
(REQUIRED SUBMISSION by APPLICANT)

Date ______ Submit 5 copies of the preliminary Application and Supporting Documents (application dependent) for determination of completeness

PART 1 - Important Information to be Supplied

1. xx Application Form, Site Plan (18 Copies each of FINAL) and Required Fee

2. xx True and Accurate Plot at Scale. Uniform sheet size, Block, Lot, Plate, Track Name Owner(s) of Record

3. xx Zoning Classification of Property, Location of Proposed Buildings, Open Space, Parking or Recreation Areas.

4. xx Soil Conservation Service Soil Classification

5. xx Acreage of Tract to nearest 1/10thAcre

6. xx Contours at 2 Foot Intervals maximum, extended 200 Feet beyond Lot Lines where possible.

7. xx Location of Water Sources; their Extent Surface Elevation, Depths and their Flood Plains, Wetlands Delineation

8. xx All Lot Lines, Setback Lines, Railroads and their Right of Ways, Location and Purpose of any Easement. Underground or Overhead Utility Lines of any Street which abut the Property

9. xx Parking Schedule in Accordance with Zoning Ordinance

10. xx Parking and Circulation Plan showing Location, and Arrangement Vehicular Accessways and the Location, Size, and Capacity of All Parking and Loading Areas.

11. W Complete Landscape Plan, including Size and Type of All Plantings.

12. xx Paving Construction Detail: Sidewalk, Curbs and All Other Areas Devoted to Pedestrian Use.

13. W Drainage Plan Containing Size, Location, and Slope of any existing or Proposed Pipes.
SUBDIVISION, SITE PLAN CHECKLIST (Cont.)
(Required Submission by Applicant)

14. xx Size, Type, Invert Elevation and Location of any Existing or Proposed Drainage Inlets

15. xx Proposed Contours with Intervals of 1 Foot for more than 3% but less than 15% and 5 feet when 15% or more. Show Location Ditches, Swales, Berms, and Streams.

16. W Drainage Calculations to Substantiate the Capacity of Drainage System.

17. xx Buildings Front, Side and Rear Elevations and Floor Plan

18. xx Key Map Showing Location of Site within Township

19. xx Site Lighting Plan

20. xx Copy of Protective Covenants. Submit Deed Restrictions Applying to Tract.

21. xx Any Other Information which is Deemed to be Necessary for the Review of the Site Plan by the Board

Part II - Requirements for Submittal

1. xx Application Form (18 Copies)

2. xx Monthly Meeting Date

3. xx Application Deadline

4. xx Application Fees

5. xx Escrow Fees

6. xx Site Plans (Plot Plan -18 Copies)

7. xx Proof of Taxes Paid to Date

8. xx Request for List of Property Owners

11. xx Certification of Service Notice upon Adjoining Land Owners

9. xx List of Property Owners within 200'
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SUBDIVISION, SITE PLAN CHECKLIST (Cont)
(Required Submission by Applicant)

11. (to be submitted) Notices of Certified Mail (Green Cards/Receipts)
12. (to be submitted) Proof of Publication
13. xx Copy of County Planning Board Application
14. N/A Variance Questions Answered
PRELIMINARY AND FINAL SITE PLAN APPLICATION
REPAUNO PORT & RAIL TERMINAL
DOCK 2
PART OF BLOCK 8, LOTS 3, 4 & 4.01 AS SHOWN ON TAX MAP SHEET 5
TOWNSHIP OF GREENWICH, GLOUCESTER COUNTY, NEW JERSEY

SITE LOCATION PLAN
SCALE 1 INCH = 1,000 FT
MAP REFERENCE: USGS BRIDGEPORT QUADRANGLE

TAX MAP
NOT TO SCALE
MAP REFERENCE: TOWNSHIP OF GREENWICH TAX MAPS, SHEET 5
# SHEET INDEX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SHEET NO.</th>
<th>DRAWING NO.</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>LAST REVISION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>CS001</td>
<td>COVER SHEET</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>VL100</td>
<td>OVERALL EXISTING CONDITIONS PLAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>CS100</td>
<td>OVERALL SITE PLAN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>CS101</td>
<td>SITE PLAN 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CS102</td>
<td>SITE PLAN 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CG101</td>
<td>GRADING, DRAINAGE &amp; UTILITY PLAN 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CG102</td>
<td>GRADING, DRAINAGE &amp; UTILITY PLAN 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>LL101</td>
<td>LIGHTING PLAN 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>LL102</td>
<td>LIGHTING PLAN 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>LL501</td>
<td>LIGHTING DETAILS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>CE101</td>
<td>SOIL EROSION &amp; SEDIMENT CONTROL PLAN 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>CE102</td>
<td>SOIL EROSION &amp; SEDIMENT CONTROL PLAN 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>CE501</td>
<td>SOIL EROSION &amp; SEDIMENT CONTROL NOTES &amp; DETAILS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>CS501</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION DETAILS 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>CS502</td>
<td>CONSTRUCTION DETAILS 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ZONING REQUIREMENTS

**STANDARD**
- AVERAGE & LOT AREA

**REQUIRED**
- 3 AC

**PROPOSED**
- 4.64 AC LOT 3
- 916.59 AC LOT 4
- 5.73 AC LOT 4.01

**MAXIMUM BUILDING/STRUCTURE HEIGHT**
- 15' FT*

* PER REDEVELOPMENT PLAN 7.2B1K, SMOKESTACKS, TOWERS, SPINES, SILOS, UTILITY LINES, PIPING, AND ANY OTHER CONSTRUCTION OR STRUCTURES ARE LIMITED TO A MAXIMUM OF 250 FEET.

### LIST OF OUTSIDE AGENCIES RETAINING JURISDICTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENCY</th>
<th>APPROVAL REQUIRED</th>
<th>STATUS</th>
<th>DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GLOUCESTER COUNTY PLANNING BOARD</td>
<td>SITE PLAN APPLICATION</td>
<td>UNDER REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLOUCESTER COUNTY SOIL CONSERVATION DISTRICT</td>
<td>SOIL EROSION AND SEDIMENT CONTROL CERTIFICATION</td>
<td>UNDER REVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION</td>
<td>FRESHWATER WETLANDS LETTER OF INTERPRETATION</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>7/11/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT INDIVIDUAL PERMIT (IN-WATER)</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>5/20/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT INDIVIDUAL PERMIT (UPLAND)</td>
<td>MODIFIED</td>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLOOD HAZARD AREA INDIVIDUAL PERMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FLOOD HAZARD AREA VERIFICATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COASTAL WETLANDS PERMIT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRESHWATER WETLANDS INDIVIDUAL PERMIT</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>6/30/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FRESHWATER WETLANDS TRANSITION AREA WAIVER FOR REDEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>MODIFIED</td>
<td>11/29/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIDELANDS LICENSE (DOCK)</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>9/9/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TIDELANDS LICENSE (OSS/BOG)</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>9/9/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS</td>
<td>JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION</td>
<td>FUTURE SUBMITTAL (IF REQUIRED)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>INDIVIDUAL PERMIT UNDER 305 &amp; 404</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>7/5/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DELAWARE RIVER BASIN COMMISSION</td>
<td>DOCKET</td>
<td>APPROVED</td>
<td>6/12/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACID SOILS NOTES

In order to provide suitable conditions for growth and vegetation and to prevent the erosion of valuable topsoil, acid soils should be amended with lime or other pH-modifying materials. The pH of the soil should be raised to a level of 6.5 to 7.0 before planting takes place.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. Limit the excavation area and exposure time when removing soil and vegetation. The area should be approximated to the site requirements and should be kept to a minimum.
2. Topsoil stabilization should be performed using an approved method. This can be accomplished by the use of lime or a pH-modifying material.
3. Steep slopes of high-quality topsoil should be protected with the use of erosion control practices. These practices may include the use of erosion control blankets, mulch, or a combination of both.
4. Temporarily hydroseeding is recommended to prevent erosion during the construction phase. This practice should be implemented immediately after construction activities have ceased.
5. Mulching and topsoil stabilization should be performed using an approved method. The use of mulch and/or erosion control blankets is recommended.

SITE PREPARATION

1. Site preparation should include the following:
   a. The area should be graded to provide proper drainage and to prevent water accumulation.
   b. The area should be compacted to ensure proper soil stability.
   c. The area should be treated with an approved soil amendment to improve soil structure.

PROJECTIVE MATERIALS

1. The use of projective materials is required to prevent erosion. These materials may include erosion control blankets, hydroseeding, or mulch.
2. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
3. Mulching and topsoil stabilization should be performed using an approved method. The use of mulch and/or erosion control blankets is recommended.

DUST CONTROL NOTE

To control dust, use erosion control blankets, mulch, and/or projective materials. Proper vegetation should be used to help stabilize the area.

SEEDING SCHEDULE

1. Permanent seeding should be performed at a rate of 10 lb. per 1000 sq. ft. This can be done by hydroseeding or by broadcasting the seed onto the soil. The use of projective materials should be considered to prevent erosion during the establishment phase.
2. Permanent seeding should be performed at a rate of 10 lb. per 1000 sq. ft. This can be done by hydroseeding or by broadcasting the seed onto the soil. The use of projective materials should be considered to prevent erosion during the establishment phase.
3. Permanent seeding should be performed at a rate of 10 lb. per 1000 sq. ft. This can be done by hydroseeding or by broadcasting the seed onto the soil. The use of projective materials should be considered to prevent erosion during the establishment phase.
4. Permanent seeding should be performed at a rate of 10 lb. per 1000 sq. ft. This can be done by hydroseeding or by broadcasting the seed onto the soil. The use of projective materials should be considered to prevent erosion during the establishment phase.
5. Fertilizer should be applied as needed to promote the growth of vegetation. This can be accomplished by the use of hydroseeding or by broadcasting the seed onto the soil. The use of projective materials should be considered to prevent erosion during the establishment phase.
6. The use of permanent erosion control blankets is recommended. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
7. Mulching and topsoil stabilization should be performed using an approved method. The use of mulch and/or erosion control blankets is recommended.
8. If erosion control blankets are used, hydroseeding should be performed at a rate of 10 lb. per 1000 sq. ft. This can be done by hydroseeding or by broadcasting the seed onto the soil. The use of projective materials should be considered to prevent erosion during the establishment phase.

REINFORCED SILT FENCE

1. Reinforced silt fences should be installed at the base of the excavation to prevent erosion. These fences should be made of high-quality materials and should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
2. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
3. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
4. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
5. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.

STABILIZATION WITH MULCH ONLY STANDARDS

Site preparation should include the following:

1. The area should be graded to provide proper drainage and to prevent water accumulation.
2. The area should be compacted to ensure proper soil stability.
3. The area should be treated with an approved soil amendment to improve soil structure.

REINFORCEMENTS

1. Reinforcement should be provided to prevent erosion. These reinforcements may include erosion control blankets, hydroseeding, or mulch.
2. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
3. Mulching and topsoil stabilization should be performed using an approved method. The use of mulch and/or erosion control blankets is recommended.

MULCHING

1. Mulching should be performed at a rate of 10 lb. per 1000 sq. ft. This can be done by hydroseeding or by broadcasting the seed onto the soil. The use of projective materials should be considered to prevent erosion during the establishment phase.
2. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
3. Mulching and topsoil stabilization should be performed using an approved method. The use of mulch and/or erosion control blankets is recommended.
4. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
5. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
6. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
7. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
8. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
9. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
10. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
11. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
12. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
13. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
14. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
15. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
16. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
17. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
18. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
19. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
20. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
21. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
22. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
23. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
24. The use of erosion control blankets is recommended, especially on steep slopes. These materials should be installed immediately after construction activities have ceased.
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