The Delran Township Zoning Board regular meeting of Tuesday, September 20, 2011, was called to order by Mr. Fox at 7:00 p.m. in the Delran Township municipal building.

The open public meetings act announcement was read by Mr. Fox and the pledge of allegiance was performed.

ROLL CALL

Present: Mr. Smith, Mr. Harley, Mr. Gonzaga, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Kohli, Mr. Hejnas and Mr. Fox.

Absent: None.

Mr. Vajapey arrived to the meeting at 7:08 p.m.

Professionals: Mark Asselta, Esquire, Board's Solicitor; Terrence Combs, PP, Board's Planner; John Pettit, PE,

Board's Engineer; and Lynn Curry, Board's Secretary.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

Pizza Mia, LLC
 ZZ2010-10
 77 Hartford Road – Block 120, Lot 41.01
 Use Variance

William Begley, the attorney for the applicant, requested that the following witness be sworn in to testify before the Board:

1. James McCrackin, Applicant

Mr. McCracken stated that the pizzeria restaurant business has been in existence for 12 years at this location. He indicated that the hours of operation were 10am to 10pm, 7 days a week and there were 2 employees in addition to himself. He testified that he was proposing to move a 100 square feet walk-in refrigerator, which was 8' high, from inside the existing restaurant to outside on an existing concrete pad located behind the building. He suggested that by moving the refrigerator it would free up some space that could be used for preparation space within the kitchen area. He noted that the second story of the restaurant was currently being used for storage. He added that the properties around his restaurant were being used as a hair salon, a trucking business and a landscaping company and there were no residences in his immediate area.

Mr. McCracken suggested that there was no excessive water runoff from his property from the recent large amount of rainfall. He testified that there would be no negative impact to the area as a result of his application.

Mr. McCracken reminded the Board that he needed a use variance for the expansion of his pre-existing nonconforming use. He stated that he was requesting a submission waiver for providing deed restrictions since he is unaware of any deed restrictions on the property. He indicated that he was unaware of any easements on his property. He suggested that a waiver for providing information on environmental sensitive areas, the requirement of providing clearing limits and contours and from showing the boundary limit of large trees within the clearing limits could be granted given the nature of his application.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Pizza Mia, LLC ZZ2010-10 (Continued)

Mr. McCracken stated that currently his business consisted of approximately 85% takeout. He indicated that there were approximately 28 seats within the restaurant consisting of booths and tables. He expressed interest in adding a delivery service in the future with the delivery driver using one of the existing parking stalls. He noted that in the event he should add the delivery service he would hire one additional employee with the possibility of hiring up to as many as 3 in the event it would become necessary based upon the volume of deliveries. He suggested that if he would add a delivery service it may create the need for less parking since less people would actually have the need to dine in the restaurant or do take out.

At that time, Mr. Fox opened the meeting to the public for any comments or questions concerning this application. There being nobody present from the public to testify on this application, Mr. Fox closed the public portion of this application.

Mr. McCracken stated that there was already a 6' high fence existing to enclosure the unit. He indicated that the large refrigeration unit and scaffolding currently located outside was broken and would be removed from the site in the future.

Mr. Combs stated that the original approval of the restaurant shows some additional landscaping which is not currently on site or proposed with this application. He indicated that there was a note on the plan that lists landscaping but not details are shown on the actual site plan. He noted that the concrete pad in the rear of the property was not shown on the original site plan. He suggested that the landscaping on the berms could be improved. He recommended that any trash areas located outdoors be enclosed.

Mr. Begley reminded the Board that the original site plan was obtained by the former property owner. Mr. McCracken stated that he would be interested in providing landscaping but questioned whether the Board could grant him any leeway in the amount of landscaping being required.

Mr. Combs noted that the amount of parking required for the restaurant was insufficient under the terms of the ordinance given the number of seats and the number of employees. He suggested that the high take out ratio could provide adequate reason for the Board to grant relief for the parking requirements.

Mr. Pettit stated that he has no objection to the Board granting the requested submission waivers. He expressed concern given the increase of impervious coverage from the original approval with the 1800 square feet concrete pad that was installed. He suggested that the applicant's engineer could provide a calculation on the plan addressing the increase and addressing any negative impact as a result of the pad.

Mr. Begley stated that the applicant was having issues with his engineer since they were failing to address the Board's professional's comments. He noted that the concrete pad was added a long time ago and the applicant has not had any issues with stormwater runoff, he has not received any complaints concerning runoff nor to his knowledge the township has not received any complaints. He indicated that no changes to the impervious coverage were being proposed as a result of this application. He requested that the applicant not be required to provide additional engineering information than what was already provided.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Pizza Mia, LLC ZZ2010-10 (Continued)

Mr. Combs noted that he reviewed the history of the project. He reminded the Board that they previously granted a waiver for drainage improvements on the site based on some calculations the original applicant provided. He stated that the calculation that was provided was not located in the file. He indicated that concrete pad doubled the amount of impervious coverage from what was originally approved.

Mr. Pettit stated that the applicant's engineer provided a calculation on one of the plans that was submitted that calculated the runoff for a 25 year storm of 1 ½ C.F.S., which is not a significant amount of runoff. He suggested that it because a situation where whether or not the township wants something on file to justify the addition of the 1,800 square feet concrete pad.

Mr. Asselta noted that the applicant does not require a variance for the 43 % impervious coverage with the concrete pad.

The Board noted that there was nobody present from the public voicing any complaints concerning the drainage on the property.

Mr. McCracken acknowledged that there was some minor ponding on the site but was not very problematic. He indicated that some of the stone had been moved as a result of the plowing that occurred over the winter with the heavy snow. He added that in his approximately 10 year history with the site he has not witnessed any problems or complaints with concerning the drainage of the site.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to grant the application for a use variance for the expansion of the nonconforming use, bulk variances (for the pre-existing conditions of the front yard setback and lot size as well as variance for the parking) and site plan along with the requested submission waivers subject to the applicant working with the Board's Planner on the landscaping details. Mr. Smith seconded the motion. The result of the voting is as follows:

AYES: Mr. Taylor, Mr. Smith, Mr. Harley, Mr. Gonzaga, Mr. Kohli, Mr. Hejnas and Mr. Fox.

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: Mr. Vajapey (arrived after the start of the public hearing).

The motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T)
 ZZ2011-7
 99 Hartford Road – Block 118 Lot 5
 Bulk & Use Variances w/Site Plan
 Request For Submission Waivers

Christopher Stracco, the attorney for the applicant, requested that the following witness be sworn in to testify before the Board:

1. Craig Zeidnan, Applicant's General Engineer

Mr. Zeidnan stated that the property contains an existing 217' high tower along with equipment buildings located at the base of the tower. He indicated that the applicant currently has 9 antennas located on the tower with a center line height of 181' and the applicant was proposing to install an additional 3 antennas on the tower at that same height and install an equipment rack to be located inside of the existing equipment building. He noted that the existing antennas were 4' and the new proposed antennas would be 6'.

Mr. Zeidnan indicated that there were no ground disturbances being proposed as a result of this application.

Mr. Pettit noted that the applicant was requesting a number of waivers since the application is technically considered a site plan application. He agreed that a number of the required items were not necessary given the nature of the application. He suggested that the Board could require the applicant to submit any required item once they get into the substance of the application, if it should determine it to be necessary.

Mr. Stracco stated that the applicant is willing to provide any testimony on any of the required items should the Board desire additional information or the applicant would also be willing to provide any required additional item as a condition of any approval.

At that time, Mr. Fox opened the meeting to the public for any comments or questions on this application concerning the requested submission waivers. There being nobody present from the public to testify on this matter, Mr. Fox closed the public portion of the discussion on the submission waivers.

Mr. Vajapey made a motion to grant the requested submission waivers. Mr. Hejnas seconded the motion. The result of the voting is as follows:

AYES: Mr. Vajapey, Mr. Hejnas, Mr. Harley, Mr. Gonzaga, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Kohli and Mr. Fox.

NAYS: None.

The motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

Bee Dee Associates
 ZZ2010-11
 75 Hartford Road – Block 120, Lots 40 & 40.02
 Amended Subdivision
 Discussion On Status of Application & Whether To Dismiss the Application Without Prejudice

Joseph Pinto, the attorney for the applicant, noted that he received a letter from the Board indicating the matter was going to be discussed on whether the application should be dismissed without prejudice and the applicant wanted to update the Board on the status of their proposal. He indicated that the major change to project includes changing the fire land from a paved surface to a stone surface. He reminded the Board that the old application, which was approved by this Board, was for the subdivision of property to separate the property with the beauty salon, which included a paved fire lane and an electrical pole that needed to be moved. He suggested that the option for that fire lane was not cost effective.

Mr. Pinto acknowledged the receipt of the reports from the Board's professionals listing the additional issues of the landscaping businesses and equipment storage on the site. He suggested that the access was in place long before the ordinance and therefore the applicant was requesting a nonconforming use to keep that access in place. He noted that the applicant did recently submit an amended application in an attempt to address the professionals concerns.

Mr. Asselta reminded the Board that the only issue they should be discussing at this meeting is whether the applicant has made enough of an effort to keep the application going or whether sufficient time has passed requiring the applicant to make a new application for their proposal.

Mr. Combs agreed that the applicant did submit a revised application, which was the first correspondence they've received from the applicant in approximately 8 months.

The Board questioned whether it was the applicant's intension to proceed with this matter in an expeditious manner. Mr. Pinto stated that the applicant has been working on obtaining quotes for the proposed work, which is what delayed the process.

Mr. Combs mentioned that the original approval was not regarding the fire access but the site access which was supposed to be through the driveway for the residential home with the fire lane being located through the salon site. He indicated that now the applicant is moving the site access to the adjoining property, which during the hearing at that time the applicant indicated he was unable to do so. He suggested that the application should be revised to include that request. Mr. Pinto indicated that it was his intent to amend the application in that manner.

Mr. Combs suggested that the biggest issue concerning the plans at this point in time was the addition of the new use of the landscaping business.

Mr. Pinto questioned whether new professional letters would be issued for this project. Mr. Pettit stated that his office would issue additional letters since the only thing his office has addressed at this point is strictly on the completeness issues.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

2. Bee Dee Associates ZZ2010-11 (Continued)

Mr. Pinto stated that he did not anticipate any unreasonable gaps in time responding to the professional letters once they are issued. He agreed that the applicant would submit revised plans addressing the comments of the Board's professionals once they received professional reports.

Mr. Fox opened the meeting to the public on the discussion of the dismissal of this application. There being nobody present from the public to testify concerning the dismissal of this application, Mr. Fox closed the public portion of the discussion of this application dealing with the dismissal without prejudice.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to continue to allow the applicant to proceed with their application at this time and not to dismiss the application without prejudice. Mr. Gonzaga seconded the motion. The result of the voting is as follows:

AYES: Mr. Taylor, Mr. Gonzaga, Mr. Harley, Mr. Kohli, Mr. Hejnas and Mr. Fox.

NAYS: None. ABSTAIN: Mr. Vajapey.

The motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

The Board noted that the application could be considered for dismissal without prejudice in the future if the Board should determine that the applicant has not made enough of an effort to proceed with the project.

3. Liberty Towers

ZZ2010-14

28 Conrow Road - Block 177, Lot 16.02

Use Variance w/Minor Site Plan

Discussion On Status of Application & Whether To Dismiss the Application Without Prejudice

The Board noted that Mrs. Curry sent a letter to the applicant's attorney indicating that the matter was being scheduled for this meeting for discussion on whether to dismiss the application without prejudice and there was nobody present at this meeting representing the applicant.

Mr. Asselta reminded the Board that in the event the Board should dismiss this application without prejudice the applicant would have to the right to re-file a new application. He noted that if the applicant does wish to re-file a new application the applicant will be required to post new application fees.

Mr. Combs stated that in the beginning the applicant was responding to his requests and at some point after the last review letter was issued the applicant stopped responding. He indicated that one of the issues that arose during the last review was the issue concerning the access to the site and the applicant showing an accessing easement on the neighboring property, he requested that the applicant have the neighboring property sign off on the application.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

3. Liberty Towers ZZ2010-14 (Continued)

Mrs. Curry stated that the last revision submitted by the applicant was on April 28, 2011, which was deemed incomplete on June 6, 2011. She indicated that since the application was deemed incomplete at that time, she has had no contact from the applicant. She noted that her recent attempts to obtain additional escrow money from the applicant have also gone unanswered. She reminded the Board that her initial letter requesting additional escrow payment was sent on June 16, 2011 and there have been approximately 6 additional letters also requesting escrow payment since that time. She added that she sent a letter on September 6, 2011 advising the applicant (attorney) that the requested escrow has not been paid, which was under "final notice" and that the applicant has failed to address their outstanding completeness issues therefore the matter was scheduled for this meeting for discussion on whether to dismiss the application without prejudice.

Mr. Asselta stated that the Board's decision on whether to dismiss this application does not affect the issue concerning the outstanding escrow. He indicated that the township could still hold up permits or other approvals and the township would still have the capacity to file suite against the applicant, if necessary. He reminded the Board that if they decided to dismiss the application without prejudice an applicant would have the option to make a request to reinstate that application and it would be up to the Board at that time to make a decision on the reinstatement of the existing application.

Mr. Fox opened the meeting to the public on the discussion of the dismissal of this application. The following witnesses from the public were present to testify before the Board on this matter:

1. Robert Graham (217 Swedes Run Drive) – He questioned where the applicant would have go in the event the application was dismissed and the applicant wanted to proceed with the matter. He asked what the tie was between the applicant and the Montessori school and how this project relates to the Montessori school addition and what affects this decision and application have on that project.

Mr. Asselta indicated that the applicant would be required to make a new application before the Zoning Board if the matter was dismissed and the applicant wishes to proceed with the project. He stated that the project was located on the land of the Montessori school. He suggested that a decision would need to be made by the Township Solicitor for a determination on whether permits and certificates of occupancy for the school could be withheld based upon the outstanding escrow for the Liberty Towers application.

Mrs. Curry indicated that Montessori school previously obtained site plan approval from the Planning Board to construct their addition, which was approved approximately 1-2 years ago. She noted that there were currently permits pending on that project. Mrs. Curry stated that she believed the tax records list the property as being owned by the Barns Arts Center.

2. Virginia Colangelo (215 Swedes Run Drive) – She noted that she lived directly behind the Montessori school. She questioned who would check the property for safety since there are children using the property for school. She suggested that the property was in deplorable condition and the construction was in a standstill.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

3. Liberty Towers ZZ2010-14 (Continued)

The Board suggested that the she contact the Construction Code Official concerning the state of the property. They noted that they could address the situation of the site in the event the applicant should appear before the Board as part of a public hearing recommended that she appear at any such hearing to bring the issues to light at that time.

Mr. Asselta requested that the Board and the public limit their discussion to the issue as to whether the matter should be dismissed and not get into the merits of the application at this time.

There being nobody else present from the public to testify concerning the dismissal of this application, Mr. Fox closed the public portion of the discussion of this application dealing with the dismissal without prejudice.

Mr. Taylor made a motion to dismiss the application for a use variance along with a minor site plan without prejudice. Mr. Gonzaga seconded the motion. The result of the voting is as follows:

AYES: Mr. Taylor, Mr. Gonzaga, Mr. Harley, Mr. Vajapey, Mr. Kohli, Mr. Hejnas and Mr. Fox.

NAYS: None.

The motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

The Board noted that in the event the applicant chooses to proceed with this project in the future they will be required to file a new application.

4. Annual Report On Variances & Fee Schedule Report

Mr. Asselta indicated that his office reviewed issue concerning the fees that were raised last month concerning the township being able to recover their costs for administrative purposes. He reminded the Board that the Land Use Law does not specify any exact numbers that township's should use for their fees, however it does stipulate that the fees have to be reasonable in relationship to the township costs. He suggested that the Board may not want to increase the fees to the extent that it would discourage people from making their application so the Board and the Township should attempt to balance those scenarios. He added that any decision concerning fees would be the decision of Township Council and the Board could only make a recommendation concerning the fees.

Mrs. Curry suggested that the Board may wish to consider recommending that the escrow fees for a use variance be increased to help cover the costs of professional review. She also recommended that the Board may wish to increase the application fees by some amount to help address the short fall in the budget.

Mr. Vajapey indicated that there was a deficit for other applications as well and the Board should consider raising their all of their fees.

MATTERS FOR DISCUSSION

4. Annual Report On Variances & Fee Schedule Report (Continued)

Mr. Asselta reminded the Board that in the matter of escrow fees the township wouldn't necessarily be increasing the overall fee an applicant has to pay they would only increase the amount the applicant would post at the beginning of the application and if the amount was not used the applicant could be refunded the money. He suggested that the Board may wish to consider establishing separate fees based upon certain types of applications or possibly separating residential and commercial fees.

The Board discussed whether they wanted the ordinance to be amended for fencing regulations to allow some relief for applicant's on a corner property. Mrs. Curry noted that permits are used for fencing of any type up to 6' in height regardless of the type of fence. The Board noted that the current ordinance was complicated and maybe should be revised for easier enforcement.

Mr. Fox volunteered to draft a proposal concerning fencing regulations. Mr. Vajapey stated that he was going to attempt to draft a recommendation on the fees for the next regular meeting scheduled for October 18, 2011.

5. Discussion On Handling Future Hunter's Glen Application(s)

The Board discussed who should handle the future application for Hunter's Glen since they were going to be required to return to the Zoning Board for their final site plan for the expansion of their existing complex. The Board noted that they previously requested that the prior professionals handle the future applications given the extensive history of the project.

Mr. Fox a motion to continue to use the firm of Alaimo Associates as the Planner and Engineer for the future site plan application for Hunter's Glen but to use the firm of Brown & Connery as the attorney for the project. Mr. Harley seconded the motion. The result of the voting is as follows:

AYES: Mr. Fox, Mr. Harley, Mr. Gonzaga, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Vajapey, Mr. Kohli and Mr. Hejnas.

NAYS; None.

The motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

RESOLUTIONS

Susan & Terrill Bohnsack
 ZZ2009-6
 74 Stoneham Drive – Block 118.03, Lot 18
 Bulk Variance

The Board noted that the resolution for a bulk variance was not ready to be adopted and was being continued until the next regular meeting scheduled for October 18, 2011.

RESOLUTIONS

2. Manhattan Management

ZZ2007-20

3001 Route 130 South - Block 9, Lots 46, 47.05; Block 9.04, Lot 4; Block 9.05, Lot 4

Use Variance

The Board noted that the resolution dismissing the use variance without prejudice was not ready to be adopted and was being continued until the next regular meeting scheduled for October 18, 2011.

3. Larry & Jane Herman

ZZ2011-4

8004 Route 130 North - Block 120, Lot 5

Use Variance

Mr. Taylor made a motion to adopt the resolution granting the use variance. Mr. Hejnas seconded the motion. The result of the voting is as follows:

AYES: Mr. Taylor, Mr. Hejnas, Mr. Smith, Mr. Harley, Mr. Vajapey, Mr. Kohli and Mr. Fox.

NAYS: None. ABSTAIN: Mr. Gonzaga.

The motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

4. Manhattan Management Co, LLC

ZZ2011-2

3001 Route 130 South – Block 9, Lot 46 Minor Subdivision w/Bulk Variances

Mr. Hejnas made a motion to adopt the resolution granting the minor subdivision and bulk variances. Mr. Taylor seconded the motion. The result of voting is as follows:

AYES: Mr. Hejnas, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Gonzaga, Mr. Vajapey and Mr. Fox.

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: Mr. Smith, Mr. Harley and Mr. Kohli.

The motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

MINUTES

1. Zoning Board Regular Meeting – 10/20/09

The Board noted that the Zoning Board regular meeting minutes from October 20, 2009 were not ready to be adopted and were being continued until the next regular meeting scheduled for October 18, 2011.

MINUTES

2. Zoning Board Regular & Reorganization Meeting – 7/20/10

The Board noted that the Zoning Board regular and reorganization meeting minutes from July 20, 2010 were not ready to be adopted and were being continued until the next regular meeting scheduled for October 18, 2011.

3. Zoning Board Regular Meeting – 7/19/11

The Board noted that the Zoning Board regular meeting minutes from July 19, 2011, were not ready to be adopted and were being continued until the next regular meeting scheduled for October 18, 2011.

4. Zoning Board Regular Meeting – 8/16/11

Mr. Taylor made a motion to adopt the Zoning Board regular meeting minutes from August 16, 2011. Mr. Hejnas seconded the motion. The result of the voting is as follows:

AYES: Mr. Taylor, Mr. Hejnas, Mr. Gonzaga, Mr. Vajapey and Mr. Fox.

NAYS: None.

ABSTAIN: Mr. Smith, Mr. Harley and Mr. Kohli.

The motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

BILL LIST

(See Attached Sheet)

Mr. Hejnas made a motion to approve the Delran Township Zoning Board bill list for September 20, 2011. Mr. Harley seconded the motion. With all present voting affirmatively, the motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

PENDING ITEMS

1. Bee Dee Associates

ZZ2010-11

75 Hartford Road - Block 120, Lots 40 & 40.02

Amended Subdivision

The Board noted that the amended application that was recently submitted was currently being reviewed by the Board's professional staff.

PENDING ITEMS

2. Liberty Towers
 ZZ2010-14
 28 Conrow Road – Block 177, Lot 16.02
 Use Variance w/Minor Site Plan

The Board noted that the application was dismissed without prejudice earlier during this meeting and if the applicant wishes to proceed with the project in the future they will be required to submit a new application, post new fees and pay the outstanding escrow for this project.

3. New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T)
ZZ2011-6
8006 Route 130 North – Block 120, Lot 4.01
Bulk & Use Variance w/Site Plan

The Board noted that the application was certified as an incomplete submission and they were waiting for the applicant to address their completeness issues before the matter is scheduled for a public hearing.

New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC (AT&T)
 ZZ2011-7
 99 Hartford Road – Block 118, Lot 5
 Bulk & Use Variance w/Site Plan

The Board noted that they granted the applicant's requested submission waivers earlier at this meeting and the application would be scheduled for a public hearing to take place on October 18, 2011.

Communication Infrastructure Corp.
 ZZ2011-8
 99 Hartford Road – Block 118, Lot 5
 Bulk & Use Variance w/Site Plan

The Board noted that the application was currently certified as an incomplete submission and they were waiting for the applicant to address their completeness issues before it is scheduled for a public hearing.

6. R.D.M.D., LLC
ZZ2011-9
23 Hartford Road – Block 120.07, Lot 31
Bulk & Use Variance w/Site Plan

The Board noted that the application was currently being reviewed for completeness by the Board's professionals and was not currently scheduled for a public hearing.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to discuss, Mr. Hejnas made a motion to adjourn the Delran Township Zoning Board regular meeting of Tuesday, September 20, 2011 at 9:25 p.m. Mr. Vajapey seconded the motion. With all present voting affirmatively, the motion was carried; so ordered Mr. Fox.

Respectfully submitted,

Lynn Curry, Secretary Zoning Board

Delran Township Zoning Board of Adjustment Bill List September 20, 2011

Budget Bills					
Vender	Desciption	Invoice #	Amount		
Brown & Connery	Misc. Services	119241	\$1,282.09		

Escrow Accounts					
Vender	Applicant	File #	Invoice #	Amount	
Brown & Connery	T-Mobile	ZZ2010-9	119205	\$208.00	
Brown & Connery	Bee Dee	ZZ2010-11	119206	\$81.32	
Brown & Connery	Manhattan Management	ZZ2011-2	119209	\$368.00	
Brown & Connery	Herman	ZZ2011-4	119210	\$1,008.00	
Brown & Connery	New Cingular	ZZ2011-6	119272	\$16.00	
Brown & Connery	Communication Infrastructure	ZZ2011-8	119273	\$16.00	
Adams Rehmann & Heggan	Manhattan Management	ZZ2011-2	43449	\$1,170.00	
Pettit Associates	New Cingular	ZZ2011-6	3389	\$360.00	
Pettit Associates	New Cingular	ZZ2011-7	3392	\$390.00	