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|  | 9 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| -01:-12 | Do we have an extra copy? | -01:-09 1 | about in the beginning we said no. Well, the |
| -01:-12 2 | R. DELIA: I can just take a quic | -01:-09 2 | out of the property, |
| -01:-12 | look now. | -01:-0 | , whe applicant, we worked |
| -01:-12 | k yo | $-01:-08$ | everything out to our satisfaction to make it easier |
| -01:-11 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we can just summarize it, and correct me if I'm wrong, | -01 | et in and to get out, because we're |
| -01:-11 6 |  | -01 | th a property that's been there for more |
| -01:11 | Mr. Schuster, it says: | -01:-08 | 30 years and we're used to responding to the |
| -01:11 | "After reviewing the applicant's | -01:-08 8 | property. |
| -01:-11 | revised fire truck movement exhibits, the | -01:08 9 | With the change of what's |
| 1 | department has no issues or concerns with the | 0 | er there, it was going to change |
| -01:-11 1 | revised exhibits/documents as presented," with | -01 | s, how we operate |
| -01:-11 12 | obviously some other type in the letter. | -01:08 12 | ding has |
| -01:-11 13 | But it talks about being available | -01:-08 13 | taken, the early '80s, early-mid '80s, |
|  |  | -01:08 14 | 've been responding to that building since. The |
| -01:-11 15 | Okay. Do any board members have any | -01:08 15 | only thing changing is the use, and you might be |
| -01:11 16 |  | -01:08 16 | dditi |
| -01:11 17 | MR. SPIRIG: Well, maybe you want to | 7 | approved. |
|  | just comment on what you meant by "with conditions"? | 8 | So we're working around that of how |
| -01:-10 19 | MR. FUSCO: George Fusco. | -01:-08 19 | $g$ to get there and back |
| -01:-10 20 | "With conditions" is, in the past, as we've done plan reviews, I've been doing them for 22 | -01:08 20 | Nothing really for the fir |
| 21 |  | -01:-08 | s changed of how we're going to get there, becaus |
|  | we've done plan reviews, I've been doing them for 22 years, sometimes if we were to give an all-out | -01:08 22 | 're still responding the same way we are responding |
| 23 | approval, then they're not going to come back to the | -01:08 23 |  |
| -01:-10 24 | fire department for questions or going through our open-ended bullet points. | -01:-08 24 | iggest thing was to work out us |
| -01:-10 25 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. | -01:-08 | being able to make sure the "in" will get there, but LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
|  | 10 |  | 12 |
| -01:-10 | With this application, one of them | -07 | make it a little easier to get out, because before |
| 1:10 | would be with the sprinkler system, we'd like to see | -01:-07 | at, before we worked with the applicants, they were |
| 1:-10 | a full 13 system, which would cover everything in the | -01:-07 | rrowing the area dow |
| :-10 | building, including closets, utility places. It | -01:07 | They opened it up, they opened an extra |
| -01:-10 5 | would be a better system for what's there for the | -01:-07 | eas |
| -01:-10 | residents, for us, for the general public, because it | -01:07 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I have a |
| -01:-10 | will also enhance us getting more standpipes, because | -01:-07 | uestion for you, Mr. Schuster, but, Mr. Delia, I |
| -01:-10 8 | sometimes we'll ask for more than what the code says | -01:-07 | a question for you firs |
| -01:-10 9 | the minimum is. Usually, when we do our reviews, what we look at is our operation, how are we going to | -01:-07 | Did the applicant agree to install the |
| 0 |  | 1:07 | NFPA 13 systern? |
| -01:09 11 | operate there? And that's how we plan it out. | -01:-07 11 | AUDIENCE VOICE: We agreed to all the |
| -01:09 12 | when we, as a committee, reviewed this, we asked for additional standpipes in some of the | -1:-07 12 | conditions. |
|  |  | -01:07 13 | ELIA |
| -01:09 14 | hallways and the stairways, which in the code will | -01:07 14 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You agreed. Okay. So |
| -01:-09 15 | say, okay, one here, one there, you know, one this | -01:07 15 | it's a stipulation on the record. Thank you. |
| -01:09 16 | floor, one that floor, but we might want additional | -01:07 16 | My question with the fire department |
| -01:09 17 | ones. | -01:07 17 | do you have a copy of A-14, the revised fire truck |
| -01:09 18 |  | -01:-07 18 | ent revised? |
| -01:09 19 | conditions open, that until the final plans are drawn | -01:-07 19 | , DELIA: Just give me a second. |
| -01:09 20 | up and you have the final build set to make sure that | -01:07 20 | had it on the board someplace. |
| -01:09 21 | our conditions are in there. <br> We've worked with the applicant, and | -01:-06 21 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: It's the updated March |
| -01:-09 22 |  | -01:-06 22 | 26,2019 |
| -01:09 23 | any applicants that have come before this board, | -01:-06 23 | ELIA: Yes, we have it. |
| -01:09 24 | we've had a review and work out the best we can. | -01:06 24 | So I'm referring to A-14, which has |
| -01:-09 25 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. | -01:06 25 | now put on the easel. |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |


| -01:06 1 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. You know, on |
| :---: | :---: |
| -01:-06 2 | this plan, A-14, it shows the truck movements, and |
| -01:06 3 | you see the green lines when it shows what would be a |
| -01:06 4 | fire truck backing up and turning, it looks like in a |
| -01:06 5 | easterly direction, but it clips a parking spot |
| -01:06 6 | there, the first parking space. Do you see that? |
| -01:05 7 | Okay. |
| -01:05 8 | First of all, is this turning maneuver |
| -01:05 | something that you think is acceptable or workable |
| -01:05 10 | for the fire department? |
| -01-0.05 11 | MR. FUSCO: Yes, it is. I mean, for us |
| -01:05 12 | getting in, we train our drivers. We have tighter |
| -01:05 13 | areas we have to deal with in this town. That is |
| -01:05 14 | just a matter of pulling -- if the truck has been |
| -01:05 15 | pulled in and is here -- |
| -01:05 16 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Correct. |
| -01:05 17 | MR. FUSCO: -- and is backing up, it |
| -01:05 18 | might just mean that you take one shot, come forward, |
| -01:05 19 | and another. It's not going to -- I mean, this is |
| -01:05 20 | done as far as my interpretation of one free |
| -01:-05 21 | movement, the truck is just going to move. That's |
| -01:05 22 | not how we operate. We're going to have somebody |
| -01:-05 23 | backing up the truck and the driver is going to be |
| -01:05 24 | watching both mirrors. |
| -01:-05 25 | So whether or not it will clip or not |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
|  | 201-641-1812 |
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in the free movement, most likely it's going to be taken in two shots.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. So you're saying that you might not be able to do it in one movement, but you do it in two or more?

MR. NEWMAN: Is that the plan you
approved?
MR. FUSCO: Yes.
MR. SCHUSTER: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Evan, did you have some questions about the templates, the turning radius?

MR. JACOBS: I did.
The image shown on the bottom of the exhibit there was the fire truck that I believe Mr. Luglio used or intended to use.

The graphical representation of that vehicle is not the same.

Your vehicle has a significant rear overhang, it looks like maybe 7 or 8 feet, just guessing there, and it doesn't look like that's the case on the graphical template here. So we had requested that they provide us with digital copies of this, so we can run the simulations ourself just to confirm the same.
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Because based on this plan, the truck can handle it, but, as I mentioned, it's not representative of what's in the picture there which is, I believe, the apparatus that the fire department said, you know, to model into this simulation, which we have not received those templates as of yet.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. So you're saying that the template that was used does not match the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department truck?

MR. JACOBS: Based on this exhibit alone, I don't see that. For instance, like I said, the rear overhang was a concern. The fact there's only a single axle shown, and a double axle can affect the maneuverability of a vehicle, and which is well within the capabilities of this program. So I just want to make sure what the fire department is being shown on the plan is actually the vehicle that they have specified to be used.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. So we'll have to take that up with Mr. Luglio.

MR. KAUFMAN: I believe at a meeting prior back to their engineer, he stipulated that the program shows it that way, but how it was run was run with the vehicle as shown with tandem axle at $X$ length, $X$ dimensions. You need to confirm that, that LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
-01:02 1
-01:02 2
-01:-02
$-01: 02 \quad 4$
-01:-02 5
should be in the minutes, but their engineer did, because you brought it up, Mr. Preiss brought it up, somebody did say this is not the same truck, this is just how the CAD program brings it up. So you have to confirm it.

MR. JACOBS: It may be visual. So that's why we asked for the digital file, just to confirm that.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do any board members have any questions?

MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: I have questions.
On the far end, which is not noted on that plan, there were visitor parking spots.

Does the other plan, the original one, have it on the left side?

MR. HAYES: I guess while we go through that, real quick, just, chief, Mr. Fusco, first of ali, thanks for coming out tonight, we appreciate it.

MR. SCHUSTER: Of course.
MR. HAYES: Are you aware of the speed with which this simulation was run for the entrance into the facility area or in the site?

MR. FUSCO: I do, because I watch the meetings. And I do that as a part of my --

MR. HAYES: Okay. So it was ten miles
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812


|  | 21 | 23 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:-57 1 | goes to the heart of what I'm asking, could you | 00:-56 1 | out fires for us. |
| 00:-57 2 | effectively fight the fire without accessing that | 00:-56 2 | MR. STAR: Is it your opinion that a |
| 00:-57 | side of the building? | 00:-56 3 | fire emergency can be properly addressed? |
| 00:-57 | MR. SCHUSTER: Yes, and you can look at | 00:-55 4 | MR. SCHUSTER: Yes. |
| 00:-57 5 | houses in town with 200-plus foot setbacks, 300-foot | 00:-55 5 | MR. STAR: There is no talk of a fire |
| 00:-57 6 | setbacks, where the trucks can't get, and we can | 00:-55 6 | in the night, no talk of tenants' cars, people |
| 00:-57 | effectively fight those fires as well. | 00:-55 7 | scurrying around. |
| 00:-57 8 | MR. HAYES: But you feel confident you | 00:-55 8 | Is there an evacuation plan in the |
| 00:-57 9 | can address that, because obviousiy that's a major | 00:-55 9 | works -- should there be an evacuation plan |
| 00:-57 10 | concern here -- | 00:-55 10 | established and approved prior to approving this |
| 00:-57 11 | MR. SCHUSTER: Of course. | 00:-55 11 | project? |
| 00:-57 12 | MR. HAYES: -- is safety of potential | 00:-55 12 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You're asking |
| 00:-57 13 | residents in that building. | 00:-55 13 | them? |
| 00:-57 14 | MR. SCHUSTER: And you take into | 00:-55 14 | MR. STAR: Yes. |
| 00:-57 15 | account the NFPA 13 system, that sprinkler system is | 00:-55 15 | MR. FUSCO: You want me to take it? |
| 00:-57 16 | going to do its job, which is not to extinguish the | 00:-55 16 | MR. SCHUSTER: Yes. |
| 00:-57 17 | fire, it's to keep the fire in check until the fire | 00:-55 17 | MR. FUSCO: That is done after the |
| 00:-57 18 | department arrives to extinguish the fire. | 00:-55 18 | fact. You cannot -- |
| 00:-57 19 | MR. HAYES: And the hoses that are | 00:-55 19 | MR. HAYES: Is that one of the |
| 00:-57 20 | equipped on your truck can make it, I assume they're | 00:-55 20 | conditions? |
| 00:-57 21 | ample length? | 00:-55 21 | MR. FUSCO: Well, that is in any |
| 00:-57 22 | MR. SCHUSTER: Absolutely. | 00:-55 22 | building, that is done after the fact, and a lot of |
| 00:-56 23 | MR. HAYES: Okay. | 00:-55 23 | that is also followed up through fire prevention by |
| 00:-56 24 | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: I guess our concern | $00:-5524$ | having proper signage. That all fails under the |
| 00:-56 25 | is, are you comfortable with being able to fight the | 00:-55 25 | Uniform Fire Code. |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
| 22 |  |  | 24 |
| 00:56 1 | fire? | 00:-55 1 | MR. HAYES: Which you enforce? |
| 00:-56 2 | MR. SCHUSTER: Yes. | 00:-55 2 | MR. FUSCO: Correct. |
| 00:-56 3 | MR. FUSCO: Yes, we are. | 00:-55 3 | MR. SCHUSTER: Yes, us and the fire -- |
| 00:-56 4 | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Okay. | 00:-55 4 | MR. FUSCO: And that will be after the |
| 00:-56 5 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Motion to open to the | 00:-55 5 | fact they will design it, because, until it is built, you don't know. Right now there might be a doorway |
| 00:-56 6 | public? | 00:-55 6 |  |
| 00:56 7 | MR. HAYES: Motion to open to the | 00:-54 7 | on there and they might add a doorway, you don't -- |
| 00:56 8 | public. | 00:-54 8 | MR. HAYES: It is a fruitiess effort to |
| 00:-56 9 | MR. NEWMAN: Second. | 00:-54 9 | create one now, but it does fall under that idea of |
| 00:-56 10 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor? | 00:-54 10 | "with conditions." |
| 00:-56 11 | (Whereupon, all Board Members respond | 00:-54 11 | You ultimately, by the time it's a |
| 00:-56 12 | in the affirmative.) | 00:-54 12 | final project or near completion, you continue to |
| 00:-56 13 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: If a member of the | 00:-54 13 | have a say in it? |
| 00:-56 14 | public has a question for these two gentlemen, please | 00:-54 14 | MR. FUSCO: Uh-huh. |
| 00:-56 15 | come forward. | 00:-54 15 | MR. HAYES: Okay. |
| 00:-56 16 | You have to use the mic, and state your | 00:-54 16 | MR. STAR: Because the limited access, |
| 00:-56 17 | name and address, please. | 00:-54 17 | one point of egress and ingress, how would you |
| 00:-56 18 | MR. STAR: My name is Alvin Star, 209 | 00:-54 18 | evacuate people? Vehicles are coming in, how would |
| 00:-56 19 | Glen Road, Woodcliff Lake. | 00:-54 19 | you evacuate people with people scurrying around, |
| 00:-56 20 | This high density apartment complex is | 00:-54 20 | children, people are trying to get their cars out, |
| 00:-56 21 | the first in Woodcliff Lake's history. | 00:-54 21 | how would you manage the situation? |
| 00:-56 22 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You need to ask a | 00:-54 22 | MR. SCHUSTER: That's a what-if |
| 00:-56 23 | question. | 00:-54 23 | question. |
| 00:-56 24 | MR. STAR: And I'll say this -- | 00:-54 24 | MR. STAR; It's more than a what if. |
| 00:-56 25 | MR. NEWMAN: The lovely gentlemen put | 00:-54 25 | MR. SCHUSTER: We can't answer |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
|  | - 201-641-1812 |  | 201-641-1812 |

00:-54 1 what-ifs, about what if there was a fire, what would we do to get people out. The fire could be over here, the fire could be over here, it's all what-ifs.

MR. STAR: In a worst case situation, I think the board has to be cognizant of this well in advance, as it takes on liabilities.

MR. HAYES: Mr. Star, I think what he is saying is that there are so many potential variables involved that he isn't in a position to be able to answer that sort of hypothetical question, because it's a very broad, open question.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think the question
is --
MR. STAR: I think it's a very relevant question.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: -- you know, with regard to ingress and egress, do you have any recommendation with the number and the location?

MR. FUSCO: As a simple household and you have a fire, most likely the residents -- when we teach in school, go to your meeting place. If there is a fire back here, the people are not going to be getting into their -- maybe right away they're maybe going to jump in their car and drive out, but once we go in, you're not going to have car movements going
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The people are going to have to walk away and be
taken to some other location away from the fire scene
itself. And from there, auxiliary personnet will
work, Red Cross or whoever, to take care of the people.

We're going to evacuate them away. They're going to walk away from the building, they're not going to get in their car and try to drive away, once we're on scene.

It's no different evacuating a school. When the school kids come out, they go and they walk away from the school. It's the same thing. We're not going to be worried about getting cars out of there, they're going to be parked in place. We will work around those cars.

MR. STAR: You will have to extinguish the fires in the cars too.

MR. FUSCO: But they are pretty far away.

MR. STAR: They are right here.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Do you have another question, Mr. Star?

MR. STAR: Are you satisfied with your ability to put out the fire in a steep slope to the
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east?
MR. FUSCO: Where?
MR. STAR: To the east. Up here, up the hill.

You said you are satisfied you can put it out. Would you suggest that a vegetation management plan be established first to limit the vegetation on the slope? Is that something which you would recommend?

MR. SCHUSTER: We wouldn't have any stay over the vegetation. We can make recommendation for tree height so we have access, but from what we've seen on these plans, we feel comfortable extinguishing a fire on this property.

MR. STAR: How involved will you be in putting together an emergency response pian for everybody to review, with the evacuation plan being a major component of an emergency response plan?

MR. SCHUSTER: We, as the volunteer fire department, would be involved. Fire prevention, as more of a paid position in town, would be a little more invoived than us.

MR. STAR: Thank you.
It's a very sensitive project. I hope this is addressed properly, because this is not a
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safe situation.
I'll make a comment. This is not a safe situation.

Thank you.
MR. KAUFMAN: Mr. Fusco, have you guys done a plan and done work for the Woodcliff Lake Hilton?

MR. FUSCO: Yes.
MR. KAUFMAN: What's the density of that project, how many people stay at that premise?

MR. FUSCO: That varies.
MR. KAUFMAN: Would you say a couple hundred?

MR. FUSCO: On a good Friday night with 3 or 4 weddings in there, yes.

MR. KAUFMAN: So you're confident in your ability to do this?

MR. FUSCO: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: Here's the most important question.

Are you confident in your ability to put out a fire, if this place has a fire?

MR. FUSCO: Yes.
MR. SCHUSTER: 100 percent.
MR. NEWMAN: Is there anything that you LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
would recommend to this board that would help you in your job that you see from looking at this plan?

MR. SCHUSTER: Everything that we feel would help us with our job has been brought up to them, and they have -- if you read our first letter, which was, I think, dated maybe December, all of our conditions there, everything we've questioned, they've met. So anything that we would need to help us would have been listed in there.

MR. NEWMAN: So you, as the experts, you're satisfied?

MR. FUSCO: Yes.
MR. SCHUSTER: Right.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: And they still
have a say, because they still will continue to monitor what's going on.

MR. SCHUSTER: We'll be as involved as we can moving forward to make sure everything we do is --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Right.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Anyone else?
MS. APPELLE: Veronica Appelle, 23
Cressfield Court.
Thank you, again, for having both of these gentlemen come. I know that was a question we
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had had, and we were hoping that would be addressed.
Okay. So assuming there's full
parking, all the vehicles are there, everybody, the
60 units all with their 1 or 2 cars apiece are all
there, assuming full parking, how many vehicles, emergency or otherwise, would be able to park behind the first fire truck on the property?

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Veronica.
MS. APPELLE: I'm sorry, I'm not
talking into the mic?
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes. You need to use the mic.

MS. APPELLE: So assuming full parking, how many vehicles, emergency or otherwise, would be able to park behind your first fire truck on the property?

MR. SCHUSTER: Once we're on scene, they'll be no other vehicles allowed on the property, so it would be emergency vehicles only. So there wouldn't be any other vehicles allowed in.

MS. APPELLE: So what you're saying is you probably would only need one fire truck, but of course an ambulance must accompany every fire truck to every fire, right?

MR. SCHUSTER: I didn't say only one
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
fire truck, you said emergency vehicles or otherwise, so I said once we are on scene, the only vehicles that would be allowed into the property would be emergency vehicles.

MS. APPELLE: But they'll be room for the ambulance behind this very large fire truck, maybe another fire truck, and any other emergency vehicles from any other community, they'll be room for all these people there. Is that right?

MR. SCHUSTER: We will have room for alk the apparatus that we feel is needed at the scene of that fire.

The ambulance generally isn't right up front near the first fire truck, the ambulance is usually off to the back away because of the smoke, and this way everybody gets away from that.

MS. APPELLE: All right. Thank you.
Second question.
MR. NEWMAN: You didri't know there was
going to be a final, did you?
MS. APPELLE: Can you envision the perfect storm scenario where it's snowing, there's a major fire or an emergency on the east side, not just by those buildings on the east side, the train has stopped in the station and lives are in jeopardy, can LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

| 00:-47 1 | you envision that? |
| :---: | :---: |
| 00:-47 2 | MR. SCHUSTER: We can envision it, yes, |
| 00:-47 3 | but we can't answer what-if questions. |
| 00:-46 4 | MS. APPELLE: So you can't prepare for |
| 00:-46 5 | that? |
| 00:-46 6 | MR. SCHUSTER: We prepare for |
| 00:-46 7 | everything. |
| 00:-46 8 | MS. APPELLE: You do realize that it's |
| 00:-46 9 | not just this building but many, many other buildings |
| 00:-46 10 | that are being built, and the town is developing high |
| 00:-46 11 | density on the eastside, and you think that you'll be |
| 00:-46 12 | able to handle all of this with the present equipment |
| 00:-46 13 | you have now? |
| 00:-46 14 | MR. SCHUSTER: Between our equipment |
| 00:-46 15 | and our mutual aid, yes. |
| 00:-46 16 | MS. APPELLE: My final question, you'll |
| 00:-46 17 | be happy to know, my final question is: Do you |
| 00:-46 18 | currently have, either one of you, any economic or |
| 00:-46 19 | consulting relationship to the 188 Broadway LP or any |
| 00:-46 20 | of their members or partners? |
| 00:-46 21 | MR. SCHUSTER: No. |
| 00:-46 22 | MR. FUSCO: No. |
| 00:-46 23 | MS. APPELLE: But you have been |
| 00:-46 24 | consulting with them to make this work? |
| 00:-46 25 | MR. SCHUSTER: They met us with to |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
|  | 201-641-1812 |
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address the conditions that we proposed in the letter.

MR. SPIRIG: Based on our request.
MS. APPELLE: Based on your request?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.
MS. APPELLE: Good.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: We send them the plans. We do that as a matter of course, send them to the fire department, and we seek the input from the fire department.

MS. APPELLE: Right. And I had seen or all of us have seen the back and forth where it was first denied and then modified and tweaked.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: It's usually the applicant's representatives that want to meet with the fire department to have a face-to-face and discuss it and come to an agreement.

MR. FUSCO: Can I read something that is standard in all our correspondence?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You may.
MR. FUSCO: The final paragraph.
"Please do not hesitate to contact the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department should you have any questions or comments regarding this plan review reply. We encourage all parties to set LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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up meetings with us to answer any questions with our review of these plans."

And we've done that many a time and we encourage that to work out.

MS. APPELLE: Mr. Schuster --
MR. HAYES: Ms. Appelle, as a matter of policy you want them to do that.

MS. APPELLE: Oh, I absolutely agree. I absolutely agree.

But, Mr. Schuster, do you remember I called your office a couple of times and you never called me back?

MR. SCHUSTER: No.
MS. APPELLE: When you first received

MR. SCHUSTER: We don't use the phones at the firehouse. We are volunteers who work full-time jobs.

MS. APPELLE: Well, I did try to contact him, so that we who live right behind where these buildings may go will be safe and protected and not in danger.

Can you envision people --
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: A question, Mrs. Appelle.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

00:-44 1
$00:-44 \quad 2$

MS. APPELLE: Well, that was going to be a question.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sorry. MS. APPELLE: That's okay. No, I was
going to do it as a question.
MR. NEWMAN: Ms. Appelle, with all respect --

MS. APPELLE: I'm done.
MR. NEWMAN: Okay. Because these people come out here --

MS. APPELLE: No, I'm not badgering them, I want to put it on the record.

MR. NEWMAN: They are the fire
department. They're the people in the know, so I take their word very seriously.

MS. APPELLE: Me too.
MR. NEWMAN: If you have concerns about them, maybe you want to consult your own fire person.

MS. APPELLE: No, I don't have concerns about these two gentlemen per se, I just have very deep concerns about a possible emergency. Having lived here forever, I know.

MR. NEWMAN: They are residents of Woodciff Lake. They've been to the site many times.

MS. APPELLE: When it's only been one
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
building.
MR. NEWMAN: Right, but, you know, they kind of understand --

MS. APPELLE: You're doubling it and making it higher.

MR. NEWMAN: We understand that.
MS. APPELLE: All right. Thank you all very much, and thank both of you.

MR. COUTO: The name is Alex Couto, Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake.

I guess I should raise this. I'll talk a little.

My question is: The property right now has one building. Does having a second building make some change to your ability to fight the fire?

MR. FUSCO: No.
MR. SCHUSTER: No.
MR. COUTO: Okay. The other question I have: Do you have any idea how far a fire can jump to a tree? Like we have above to the east of the property is woods, so how far can the fire jump to the woods, any idea?

MR. SCHUSTER: There is no direct answer to that, because it would be wind conditions, weather conditions.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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|  | 37 |  | 39 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:-42 1 | MR. COUTO: The concern is, I'm not | 00:-40 1 | could be fighting from east of it, next to Cressfield |
| 00:42 | concerned right now with one building as it exists, | 00:-40 2 | urt, you could be fighting the fire from that side, |
| 00:-42 | but, you know, Marcal happened not too long ago, they | 00:-40 | is that it? |
| 00:42 | have a fire unit right on staff there, and the whole | 00:-39 | MR. SCHUSTER: Odds are, no, we would |
| 00:42 | building, the whole Marcal burnt down. California, | 00:-39 | , it's kind of a |
| 00:42 | eigh | 00:-39 | stion. Which way is the wind blowing? |
| 00:42 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Ask a question. | 00:39 | How is the fire burning? |
| 00:42 8 | MR. COUTO: So my question is: Are you | 00:-39 8 | MR. COUTO: Now, is there any |
| 00:41 | sure that if there's a fire on the east side of the | 00:-39 | n, what do you call, wait, what comes |
| 00:-41 10 | second building, that will not jump to the woods up? | 00:-39 10 | il it |
| 00:41 11 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: They are not | 00:-39 11 | MR. SCHUSTER: Fire hydrants? |
| 00:41 12 | guarantors, they | 00:-39 12 | MR. COUTO: Is there any conditions to |
| 00:49 13 | O: | 00:-39 13 | the court |
| 00:41 14 | phras | 00:-39 14 | perty? |
| 00:41 15 | If there was no second building, it is | 00:-39 15 | MR. SCHUSTER: No, we wouldn't put |
| 00:41 16 | much less likely that that would happen, correct? | 00:-39 16 | the east side of the property. We |
| 00:41 17 | Because it would be 100 feet away as opposed to | 00:-39 17 | uldn't benefit from them on the east side, because |
| 00:41 18 |  | 00:-39 18 | drants are for the trucks to connect to |
| 00:41 19 | S. SCHUSTER: | 00:-39 19 | hoses directly. |
| 00:-41 20 | R. NEWMAN: I mean, | 00:-39 20 | OUTO: Okay. |
| 00:41 21 | houses in town a minimum of three-acre zoning, and we | 00:-39 21 | it possible to have your conditions |
| 00:41 22 | had an active fire spreading from one house to the | 00:-39 22 | led out and be part of a condition of approval? |
| 00:41 23 | ot | 00:-39 23 | e conditions that you mentioned that you're |
| 00:41 24 | MR. COUTO: The concern is, | 00:-39 24 | to make as you go along, is it possible to have |
| 00:41 25 | goes up in flames, basically our neighbors lose our LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 00:-39 25 | those conditions as part of any approval that the LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
|  | 38 |  | 40 |
| 00:41 1 | mes. | 00:39 | zoning board would make? |
| 00:41 2 | MR. NEWMAN: We understand, but, again, | 00:-39 2 | SCHUSTER: All of our conditions to |
| 00:41 3 | these are the experts and they have taken their day, | 00:-39 3 | te have been met, so currentiy our only conditions |
| 00:41 4 | evening to come here. | 00:-39 4 | based on watching the progress of the building. |
| 00:41 5 | COUTO: Another question | 00:-39 5 | Outo: Okay |
| 00:40 6 | Sometimes we hear like a five alarm | 00:-39 6 | R. SCHUSTER: So we can't comment on |
| 00:40 7 | es that mean five trucks come in? What does | 00:38 7 | ditions, until the progress can move. If the |
| 00:40 8 | that mean | 00:-38 8 | perty gets approved to move through with the |
| 00:40 9 | MR. SCHUSTER: Alarms is, it's kind of | 00:38 9 | ding, then we can start -- |
| 00:40 10 | relative, it's based | 00:38 10 | MR. COUTO: And you have the power to |
| 00:40 11 | Woodcliff Lake owns four pieces of fire apparatus. | 00:-38 11 | say, if these conditions are not met, we're not |
| 00:40 12 | We're dispatched for a call, that is a first alarm | 00:38 12 | proving it? |
| 00:40 13 | The first time that you're dispatched is a first | 00:-38 13 | R. SCHUSTER: We can say that we don't |
| 00:40 14 | alarm. Our second alarm brings three more pieces of | 00:-38 14 | rove. It doesn't mean that it doesn't get |
| 00:40 15 | apparatus from neighboring towns, and that continues. | 00:-38 15 | roved, but we can say we have an issue. |
| 00:40 16 | MR. COUTO: But, I mean, can we get | 00:-38 16 | R. COUTO: We can come back to th |
| 00:40 17 | more apparatus inside or do you have to go through | 00:-38 17 | ard so we have an issue? |
| 00:40 18 | the top, depending where on the property? | 00:-38 18 | CHUSTER: Correct, that's why we |
| 00:40 19 | MR. SCHUSTER: The apparatus is only | 00:-38 19 | rove with conditions, so we can be |
| 00:40 20 | going to do so much, it's the hose and the reach of | 00:-38 20 | ved |
| 00:40 21 | hose, as we discussed earlier. We have hundreds and | 00:-38 21 | MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. |
| 00:40 22 | ndreds of feet of hose on the truck. | 00:-38 22 | for your service. |
| 00:40 23 | COUTO: | 00:-38 23 | MS. BORRELLI: Ann Marie Borrelli, |
| 00:40 24 | The other question: So you could be | 00:38 24 | Woodcliff Lake. |
| 00:-40 25 | fighting the fire, if it jumped to the woods, you | 00:38 25 | Hi. Good evening. |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |



|  |  |  | MR. MARSON: I'm asking the question, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:-34 |  | answer it. |  |
| 00:34 | 3 |  | How many vehicles behind the first fire |
| 00:34 |  | uck |  |
| 00:34 | 5 |  | MR. SCHUSTER: Because it's going to be |
| 00:34 | 6 | based -- |  |
| 00:34 | 7 |  | MR. MARSON: I'm asking the question. |
| 00:-34 | 8 | How many vehicles -- |  |
| 00:34 | 9 |  | MR. SCHUSTER: It's going to -- <br> MR. MARSON: -- behind the first fire |
| 00:34 1 |  |  |  |
| 00:-34 1 |  | truck? |  |
| 00:34 1 |  |  | MR. SCHUSTER: It is going to be based |
| 00:-34 1 | 13 | off what our response is into the property. |  |
| 00:-34 1 | 14 | MR. DELIA: That's his answer. |  |
| 00:34 1 |  | Next question, please. |  |
| 00:34 1 |  | MR. HAYES: Mr. Marson, to be fair, |  |
| 00:34 1 |  | they have already answered this question. |  |
| 00:34 1 |  | MR. MARSON: No, they haven't. Not the |  |
| 00:34 1 |  | way I am going to ask it. |  |
| 00:-34 20 |  |  | MR. HAYES: And it was fact dependent |
| 00:-33 21 |  | based on -- |  |
| 00:-33 2 | 22 | MR. MARSON: Then let me add a fact. |  |
| 00:-33 2 | 23 | At full parking capacity, the first |  |
| 00:33 2 | 24 | fire truck entering these premises, how many other |  |
| 00:33 2 |  | emergency | hicles will fit behind that first fire |
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truck behind it?
MR. SCHUSTER: I will answer my question the exact same way, it depends on what our response is into the property, what are we responding for, what type of fire.

MR. MARSON: Okay.
MR. SCHUSTER: And I'm not going to explain to you how it works and how fires work and how our response is, because I don't think we want to be here for the next seven days, but while our response is going to be different for what type of response we're coming in for.

MR. MARSON: That's not the answer to the question.

MR. SCHUSTER: That's the answer I gave you.

MR. MARSON: The question that was asked, again for the record is: Assuming you have --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Mr, Marson, look, you're asking very broad questions.

MR. MARSON: No, I'm not, it's either a zero or a number.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think they're trying to answer your question.

MR. MARSON: They are not answering my
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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questions.
MR. HAYES: Mr. Marson, they have answered your questions.

MR. MARSON: No, they have not.
MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson, where is the first fire truck parked? Is it --

MR. MARSON: If it is parked at full parking capacity.

MR. SCHUSTER: Let me just.
At full parking capacity does not affect how many fire trucks I can get in here. All these spots could be full or empty, I can still get these same number of fire trucks in this lane, that does not change.

It depends on where the fire is as to where my first fire truck is stopping. So if our fire is here in the garbage area, the first fire truck is stopping here. So the number is different. If the fire is over here and there's cars burning, the first fire truck stops here and your number is different, so I cannot answer that question any better than that.

> MR. MARSON: Let me ask the question another way.

Assuming again full parking capacity,
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
is it possible then that with a single truck entering
the premises, depending where the fire is, there are emergency vehicles that could fit behind it?

MR. SCHUSTER: Yes.
MR. MARSON: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody eise? MS. JEFFAS: Yes, please.
Laura Jeffas, Woodcliff Lake.
A quick question.
When you're trained --
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Could you speak into the mic, ma'am.

MS. JEFFAS: When you're trained, you go through all the training at the academy and such, how far do they suggest you keep your vehicle from a fully engulfed fire? Is there like a distance that they say, you can actually pull up pretty close or are you going to stay 15 feet or are you going to stay 20 feet?

MR. SCHUSTER: It's going to be a decision at that moment. It's moment based.

MS. JEFFAS: So do you feel comfortable if one of these building is fully engulfed --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're not facing the microphone.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812


| 00:-27 1 | for the record, please. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 00:-27 2 | MR. BURGIS: Joe Burgis, B-U-R-G-I-S |
| 00:-27 3 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: And your address. |
| 00:-27 4 | MR. BURGIS: President of Burgis |
| 00:-27 $\quad 5$ | Associates in Westwood. |
| 00:-27 6 | DIRECT EXAMINATION |
| 00:-27 7 | BY MR. DELIA: |
| 00:-27 8 | Q. Good evening, Mr. Burgis. |
| 00:-27 9 | A. Good evening, Mr. Delia. |
| 00:-27 10 | Q. What is your profession? |
| 00:-27 11 | A. I'm a professional city planner. |
| 00:-27 12 | Q. And could you give us the benefit of |
| 00:27 13 | your training, education, and experience in that |
| 00:-27 14 | field? |
| 00:-27 15 | A. Certainly. |
| 00:-27 16 | I have a master's degree in city and |
| 00:-27 17 | regional planning from Rutgers University in 1975. |
| 00:-27 18 | I've been a planning consultant since |
| 00:-27 19 | that time. |
| 00:-26 20 | I'mi licensed as a professional planner |
| 00:-26 21 | by the State of New Jersey, license \#2450, and it is |
| 00:-26 22 | still in effect. |
| 00:-26 23 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: That's good. |
| 00:-26 24 | THE WITNESS: You seem to ask that |
| 00:-26 25 | question. |


|  |
| :--- |
| $00:-26$ |

00:-25 24
00:-25 25
qualifications?
A. (Continuing) I'm also certified by the

American Institute of Certified Planners and a member of the American Planning Association.

The firm is presently consultant to, I think, 47 municipalities throughout New Jersey, ranging from as small as Teterboro to as large as Parsippany and Princeton and West Windsor, I guess are the largest.

I recently received a Lifetime
Achievement Award from Rutgers University for my work in the field. That was 40 years ago already.

And we represent and do the kind of planning work that your planner does; you know, write master plans for municipalities, review development applications such as this on behalf our municipal clients, prepare a lot of affordable housing plans.

I'm also the special master for Judge Brogan in Passaic County on all matters associated with affordable housing.

MR. DELIA: I would tender Mr. Burgis as an expert in the field of professional planning.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any questions on the

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Contirue.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

BY MR. DELIA:
Q. Mr. Burgis, you've been to some of the meetings, you've had your colleagues at some of the meetings, you've read all the transcripts. Is that correct?
A. I have, yes.
Q. So you've become familiar with all the testimony and all the evidence that's been presented to date. Is that correct?
A. That is correct.
Q. And based on what you've heard and seen and what you know from Woodcliff Lake, have you any professional opinions as to our proposal here tonight?
A. oh, I certainly do.
Q. Well, what r'd like you to do is start us by giving us an identification of the property, its existing conditions.

## A. okay.

I'm not going to belabor at this point,
because you've heard it all before and I think
everybody in the room is familiar with the site.
We all know where it is, on the east side of Broadway between Highview Avenue and Prospect Avenue. It occupies an area of 3.54 acres. It is
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basically rectangular in shape. Its dimensions
include 324 feet of frontage on Broadway and a depth,
if measured at midpoint, of 437 feet.
We're all familiar with the sloped
character of the site. It's been mentioned a couple of times this evening already.

The westernmost part of the property is
a flat plateau; the easternmost, roughly 210 feet, is
sleep leading up to the residences farther to the east.

The surrounding development pattern has
been described by previous witnesses.
To the south, there is two-story office buildings and a bank.

To the north, there is the 20-bed
boardinghouse, then Highview Avenue and the carpet store, which if memory serves me, is a three-story building.

And continuing farther to the north, although it's not built yet, the municipality has designated a site for a 16 -unit 100 percent affordable housing development.

To the east, of course, is detached single-family-residential development, and the Woodcliff Manor.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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And then to the west, obviously, is the reservoir and the train station.

The applicant is proposing a total of 60 units in two buildings on the site. The existing building is going to be converted to a 36 -unit development, and the new three-story building to the rear of that will contain a total of 24 units.

The bedroom distribution of the units merit attention. There's a total of 46 one-bedroom units and 14 two-bedroom units identified on the plans.

Know that that will require some adjustment, because the affordable housing regulations do mandate both one-, two- and three-bedroom units for the affordables.

At a 15 percent set aside, there will be a total of 9 affordable units, and it would breakdown into, you know, 1 one-bedroom unit, 6 two-bedroom units, and 2 three-bedroom units, so there will be a slight adjustment in terms of the number of units in each individual building.

MR. NEWMAN: Are you talking about nine affordable units at this location?

THE WITNESS: At the moment, yes. You know, that can be changed over time.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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58
MR. NEWMAN: The applicant is planning
in its units to put nine affordables?
THE WITNESS: At the moment. Of course
we can discuss that with the governing body at a
later time.
MR. NEWMAN: All right. I'm just --
okay, so of the 60 units total --
THE WITNESS: Yes, there would be nine.
MR. NEWMAN: -- you're proposing nine affordables?

THE WITNESS: There would be nine
required of the site. Whether they wind up being
buit on-site or potentially off-site is a matter for
the client and the municipality to discuss.
So in terms of --
MR. NEWMAN: Well, you would agree that
--
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: -- since you're seeking a lot of variances, that this board does have the power to include affordable units?

THE WITNESS: Yes, certainly I understand that.
A. (Continuing) In terms of total site characteristics, the most notable issues to mention LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

| $00:-21$ | $\mathbf{1}$ | are the density, what is being proposed is a total of |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $00:-21$ | $\mathbf{2}$ | 16.9 units to the acre. The building coverage is |
| $00:-21$ | $\mathbf{3}$ | only 19 percent, whereas the ordinance permits a $\mathbf{3 0}$ |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{4}$ | percent building coverage. |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{5}$ | A total of 42 percent of the site will |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{6}$ | be characterized by impervious coverage, whereas the |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{7}$ | code would permit 60 percent. |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{8}$ | We are retaining the buffers around the |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{9}$ | perimeter of the property, incfuding retention of the |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 0}$ | steep slope landscape feature or wooded feature that |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ | has been mentioned earlier tonight and in the |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ | previous meetings. |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 3}$ | There is a total of 111 parking spaces |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 4}$ | being proposed, which is consistent with the RSIS |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 5}$ | standards for compliance. |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 6}$ | I know there had been a question that |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 7}$ | someone had raised about in your ordinance, you |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 8}$ | identified a different parking standard than the RSIS |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{1 9}$ | standards. |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{2 0}$ | I will point out, I'm sure the attorney |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{2 1}$ | and the planner would agree, that the RSIS standards, |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{2 2}$ | quite a number of years ago, has superceded our local |
| $00:-20$ | $\mathbf{2 3}$ | zoning regulations governing multifamily residential |
| $00:-19$ | $\mathbf{2 4}$ | parking. So 111 spaces are the number that's |
| $00:-19$ | $\mathbf{2 5}$ | required of this site, 111 parking spaces are being |

proposed.
I have reviewed a number of planning documents that are obviously necessary to review in order to come to certain conclusions that I will talk about later in my testimony.

Specifically, I reviewed the 2002 master plan, because that is the last comprehensive master pian that has been prepared by the municipality.

There is a 2008 or '09 reexamination report, and a Broadway corridor study that was aiso prepared, I think, about 2008 or 2009.

I'd like to go through each one of those documents and get the information on the record, and then we'll talk about what that means in terms of special reasons and the negative criteria of the statute.

First, the 2002 master plan.
The 2002 master plan has two
designations for this property. The westernmost portion of the property is in what's called a "special office" land use category. That office category in the master plan is designed to encourage office development, banking and financial institutions to be developed.
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The easterly 210 -foot dimension of the property is identified in a single-family medium density residential land use designation, and it's equivalent to the $\mathrm{R}-15$ zone district designation, requiring a 15,000 -square foot lot for an individual single-family house.

Now, the master pian does contain quite a number of goals and objectives. There are five which I think merit particular attention with respect to this application.

One of those goals talks about preserving and protecting the existing residential areas of the community by restricting incompatible land uses from those established residential areas.

What's interesting here is that I can conclude that we are consistent and compatible with that particular goal, because the entirety of the development of multifamily development that's being proposed is in the nonresidential zoned portion of this property, not the residentially zoned portion of the property.

I know that there had been a lot of commentary during these proceedings about that issue, but just to make it clear for the record, none of the development that is to take place on the site is
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occurring in the single-family-residential zoned portion of the site.

Now, a second goal of the master plan talks about guiding the appropriate use of land in a manner that complements the community as a whole.

Now, in planning parlance, one of the very basic tenets of planning today is that you try to encourage multifamily residential development near train stations. It's identified in the state plan. It's identified in numerous planning treatises that are published regulariy, and they all say the same thing, we would like to encourage multifamily development near train stations. It's a way to encourage mass transit. It's a way to have commutation patterns minimize the number of trips that are generated to a particular site by virtue of placing them within walking distance of a train station.

That's precisely what we have here. Everybody knows where the train station is. If you don't at this point in time, we all got a bigger problem than this application some people feel it presents.
about providing adequate light, air, and open space.
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So when we look at those terms, planners will
typically turn to an ordinance and say, well, what is
it the municipality is seeking to encourage in terms
of light, air, and open space and how do they do that?

They do that by imposing certain setback requirements and coverage factors and the like.

And in this instance, we have a situation where we are retaining the buffers that are required, that exist on this site. We are meeting all the side yard and rear yard setback requirements. The only setback requirement that we do not comply with is a front yard setback, we are short by just about two feet from the required setback along Broadway.

MR. NEWMAN: I'm sorry to interrupt, Mr. Burgis.

When you say we're maintaining the
setback requirements, for which zone?
THE WITNESS: For the zone that we're located in.

MR. NEWMAN: Okay. For the office use zone?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

MR. NEWMAN: Okay.
THE WITNESS: I will be getting into
the issue of how we match up against multifamily
residential zones in the community, because I
believe, Mr. Newman, you were the one that asked for
that information, so I will get into that in a few moments and show you how we do or are consistent with so many of the regulatory controls for the various multifamily zones in the municipality.

MR. NEWMAN: But you would agree that
that's probably a better guide versus using the office zone standards for residential use?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I think that those make more sense. Unfortunately, the case law doesn't necessarily allow us to do that, but you are right, and that's why I was glad to hear you ask about that. MR. NEWMAN: I'm sorry. Continue.
A. (Continuing) So a fourth goal of the master plan that I'd like to bring to your attention is how it seeks to ensure development that preserves natural features on the site. And here we're talking about that $\mathbf{2 1 0}$-foot swatch of steep sloped property that we are not touching. It is identified in the site plan as an element that's going to be preserved as a permanent open space feature on the property, if LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

|  | approve this. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 00:-13 2 | And then finally, the master plan talks |
| 00:-13 | about encouraging improvements to the Broadway |
| 00:-13 | business district and strengthening the linkage to |
| 00:-13 5 | the train station. And one of the elements that |
| 00:-13 | strengthens the linkage to the train station is the |
| 00:-13 | linkage between multifamily development and the tramer |
| 00:-13 | station itself. |
| 00:-13 | So, in many respects, by placing |
| 00:-13 10 | multifamily development near that train station and |
| 00:-13 11 | near other planned commercial development that's |
| 00:-13 12 | contemplated in the area, it represents sound |
| 00:-13 13 | planning for the municipality. It's consistent with |
| 00:-13 14 | the state plan that talks about this issue. It's |
| 00:-13 15 | consistent with the borough's corridor plan for |
| 00:-13 16 | Broadway, and it's consistent with the borough's |
| 00:-13 17 | planning for the site to the north, which they've |
| 00:-13 18 | acknowledged that having a 16 -unit multifamily |
| 00:-12 19 | development immediately to the north in relation to |
| 00:-12 20 | the train station represents sound planning, |
| 00:-12 21 | otherwise I assume they would not have done that. |
| 00:-12 22 | So, in addition to the $\mathbf{2 0 0 2}$ master |
| 00:-12 23 | plan, I looked at the 2008 reexamination report. |
| 00:-12 24 | There's not a lot to say about this document. It |
| 00:-12 25 | basically reaffirms all of the goals and objectives |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCl, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
|  | 201-641-1812 |
|  | 66 |

00:-12 1 that I just highlighted, and I don't need to repeat
$00:-122$ that.
00:-12 3 It does add one new goal. It
00:-12 4 specifically talks about discouraging deveiopment
00:-12 5 from intruding in steep sloped portions of property.
00:-12 $6 \quad$ Again, we're not intruding into that
00-12 7 area, so it's safe to say that we're furthering that
00:-12 8 goal that's recommended in the 2008 reexamination
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00:-11 20 lifespan as an office space. 1981 was suggested. It
00:-11 21 was built before the onset of the significant change
00:-11 22 in architectural design to accommodate all the
00:-11 23 computer data that is needed, that's provided between
00:-11 24 floors, which has resulted in increased building
00:-11 25 heights for conventional office buildings to get all
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that computerized material in these buildings to accommodate today's demands.

The plan also recognizes that there's a
significant increase in demand for multifamily
development throughout Northern Bergen County in
particular, and that's because we are an aging
population.
When you look at the demographic data, you realize that we have gone from, in this part of the county, an average age of about 36 in the year 2000 to about 42 in 2015.

That might not sound like a lot. You know, I wouldn't mind being six years younger myself right now. While that doesn't sound like a lot, in terms of demographic information, that is a significant change, and we're not going to see that trend change, it's going to continue for quite a number of years.

To comment: What does that mean for us?

It means those of us that have the large single-family house that the kids moved out of, we no longer need that large single-family house. We would be looking to find something that we could downsize into.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

00:-09 $\quad 1$

It also means that we would like to find something we could downsize into in a community where we raised our family and have our friends. And that is why multifamily development has become much more common in these municipalities throughout North Jersey and more sought after, as these changes in demographic patterns continue.

The other plan that I did look at is the municipality's Housing Element and Fair Share Plan.

Now, interestingly enough, very briefly, the affordable housing obligation for every municipality is broken down into three components. There's a rehab component which we won't bother to talk about, because it really has nothing to do with this, but there's a prior round obligation that you have of 170 dwelling units, and a prospective or future obligation of an additional 386 units that is identified in your settlement agreement with the Fair Share Housing Center.

Now, obviously you're a fully developed municipality and you're not going to meet all those numbers. You're addressing a portion of that, but not all of it, but within the philosophy of affordable housing, as established by the state and
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the courts, you have a significant unmet need that at least needs some attention. And by virtue of providing 9 units of affordable housing, either on this site or somewhere else in the municipality, if that were to be the case, we are assisting you in achieving that portion of your unmet need.

Now, the zoning ordinance --
Q. Mr. Burgis, what is the total on that need?
A. 439 units of unmet need. MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Burgis, time to interrupt again. But isn't that need based upon units of housing in the area, like how much affordable when we build housing, doesn't that set the standard for more affordable housing?

THE WITNESS: In a very simplistic way, yes, but as your planner will tell you, the formula for determining what your obligation is is like this thick and it contains many different indices that are measured. It's a function of employment. It's a function of vacant land. It's a function of environmentally sensitive property. It's a function of population change. There's a whole host of criteria that go into it.

And it's not just your municipality's
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
obligation, because the courts have ruled that
municipalities also have to take into consideration a segment of the regional need.

MR. NEWMAN: So the regional need is
important?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: And what the region provides is important?

THE WITNESS: Yes. As a means of addressing that obligation, yes.

MR. NEWMAN: Right.
So we can look not just to Woodcliff
Lake but to the region, when you're addressing the fulfillment of those needs?

THE WITNESS: Well, we look at it in terms of addressing what our obligation is, and then you take what's called your "fair share" of that obligation and show how you're going to address it. And, as I said, there is a provision in the regulations that acknowledges that there are certain municipalities, like a Woodcliff Lake, that, you know, lack sufficient vacant land to accommodate the totality of its obligation, and that's why we have this issue of unmet need, that's more of an LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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seek to address at least a portion of.
MR. NEWMAN: Let me breakdown the
question.
If we were to permit this project to go
through, based on upon the regulations would we be
getting ahead, would we be staying in place or
falling behind?
THE WITNESS: You would be catching up.
MR. NEWMAN: Exactly.
THE WITNESS: You'd be catching up by
providing 9 units.
MR. NEWMAN: So the nine you propose
for this project with the -- how many total units?
THE WITNESS: 60.
MR. NEWMAN: 60. So does that help us
catch up with our obligation, does that keep us
current with our obligation, or is that falling farther behind in our obligation, if you know?

THE WITNESS: No, certainly not the
latter. I would say it's helping you to address a portion of that unmet need, so it's, you know, getting a leg up with your number.

## A. (Continuing) So, the zoning of the

 site is consistent with the master plan land use designation. The westerly half is in that special LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-181200:-05 1
office zone, and the easterly part of the property is in the $\mathbf{R - 1 5}$ zone.

And because the site's zoning does not
permit multifamily development, that's why we're here
before you, we need what's called a (d)(1) use
variance.
We do have a preexisting nonconforming
front yard setback to the existing building. We're
required to have a 70 -foot setback from the
centerline of the street to the building. This
building was built at, I think I said 68 feet
earlier, it's 65.8 feet preexisting nonconforming condition, which obviously cannot be affected, altered because we're retaining the existing building.

There's also a height variance, because
while we are compliant with the 36 -foot height
limitation of your code, our second or proposed new building will be a three-story building and you allow a two-and-a-half-story building.

Now, having said all that background information, what does that all mean?

The statute identifies very specific criteria that an applicant has to prove in order to enable you to vote in the affirmative for any
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| 00:03 |  | project. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:03 | 2 | Now, for the kind of (d) variance that |
| 00:03 | 3 | we're seeking, we have to address what's called the |
| 00:03 | 4 | "positive and the negative criteria." The "positive |
| 00:03 | 5 | criteria" being, you know, whether or not there are |
| 00:-03 | 6 | special reasons that support this request for a use |
| 00:-03 | 7 | variance. "Special reasons" could be a number of |
| 00:-03 | 8 | different things. From my perspective, I think there |
| 00:-03 | 9 | are 5 or 6 special reasons that support this case, |
| 00:-03 |  | and $\mathrm{I}^{\prime}$ Il get into that in one second. |
| 00:-03 1 |  | In addition to that, one has to show |
| 00:03 1 |  | what's called the "negative criteria," and that's a |
| 00:-03 1 |  | twofold test. |
| 00:-03 1 |  | The first prong of that test is you |
| 00:-03 1 |  | have to show that there's no substantial detriment to |
| 00:-03 1 |  | the public good. |
| 00:-02 1 |  | And, secondly, one has to show that |
| 00:-02 1 |  | there will be no substantial impairment to the intent |
| 00:-02 1 |  | and purpose of the master plan of the community. |
| 00:02 2 |  | And I'm not using that word |
| 00:022 |  | "substantial" lightly, it's coming right out of the |
| 00:-02 2 |  | statute. The case law and the Legislature recognized |
| 00:-02 2 |  | that with every variance there is some impact, but |
| 00:-02 2 |  | the question is, is it a substantial impairment or |
| 00:-02 2 |  | substantial detriment that would rise to such a level |
|  |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |

00:-02 1
that you cannot approve a project.
And in addition to that, there is the so-called "Medici test." That is based on a certain particular case, an applicant has to state not just that you're not inconsistent with the intent of the master plan, so it's a little slight twist on that prong of negative criteria.

So in terms of special reasons, what do we have?

First, I think we further a number of the state's Municipal Land Use Law. The state, in Section 40:55D-2 identifies 14 or so specific purposes of the act, and I could identify half a dozen that I think clearly are being affirmed by this application.

One is something that you already have in your master plan and I mentioned earlier. One of the purposes of the act is to encourage municipal action to guide the appropriate use of property.

Again, not to belabor the point, but placing multifamily development near a train station certainly suggests that that's an appropriate municipal action.

Secondly, there's another goal that you've taken from the state statute, and that's

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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## "Comparison of proposed development to <br> Woodcliff Lake multi and multiple dwelling zones."

The subject site's zoning, s-o, where multifamily development is located is in this column.

We identified the AH-2 zone, the AHVO
zone, the ARHO zone, these are two overlay zones, the
ARHO-II overlay zone, and the B-1/AHO zone.
Those zones are located, and I'll just
put this up for one second.
MR. DELIA: Let's mark this as A-19.
MR. NEWMAN: Do we have copies of that,
$A-19 ?$
MR. DELIA: No, this is just the zoning
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## this table, it's entitled:

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
And for the reasons I mentioned
encourage adequate light, air, and open space.
earlier, I think that goal is also affirmed.
Thirdly is the issue of promoting an
establishment of appropriate population density.
And, as I said earlier, we are
proposing a density of 16.9 units to the acre. And
at the last meeting, and it was you, Mr. Newman, had
asked that I provide a table identifying --
MR. DELIA: And we submitted that to
the board the beginning of April.
THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
MR. DELIA: And I would have it marked
as $\mathrm{A}-18$.
It was filed with the board on April
12th.
THE WITNESS: Should I mark the
exhibit?
MR. DELIA: A-18, yes.
(Table of comparison of proposed
development to Woodcliff Lake multi and multiple dwelling zones is marked as exhibit A-18 in evidence.)
A. (Continuing) What we had prepared is


|  | 81 |  | 83 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:07 1 | MR. NEWMAN: Okay, but how many units | 00:09 1 | your range of, and from a low of 12 to a high of 20 |
| 00:07 2 | are on the site? | 00:09 2 | units to the acre. |
| 00:07 3 | THE WITNESS: That is allowed to have a | 00:09 3 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You didn't include in |
| 00:07 4 | total of 12 units, but because of its site size, it's | 00:09 | this the Pulte Homes site off County Road? |
| 00:07 5 | less, because of the site size. When you do the | 00:09 5 | THE WITNESS: No, because the directive |
| 00:07 6 | mathematical calculation, it comes out to 14 to the | 00:10 | to us was to specifically identify multifamily |
| 00:07 7 | acre. | 00:10 7 | development, and in your zoning ordinance, that site |
| 00:07 8 | MR. HAYES: You're attempting to | 00:10 8 | specifically identified as a single-family |
| 00:07 9 | compare apples to apples? | 00:10 9 | attached development. |
| 00:07 10 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 00:10 10 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you know what the |
| 00:07 11 | BY MR. DELIA: | 00:10 11 | density is there? |
| 00:07 12 | Q. Let me just ask the question. | 00:10 12 | THE WITNESS: I think it's either 5.56 |
| 00:07 13 | In terms of the densities that we've | 00:10 13 | or 5.63 units to the acre. |
| 00:07 14 | listed here, it's all based on the number of units | 00:10 14 | MR. NEWMAN: Would six be a fair |
| 00:07 15 | per acre? | 00:10 15 | assumption? |
| 00:07 16 | A. Per acre, yes. | 00:10 16 | THE WITNESS: If we rounded up, that's |
| 00:07 17 | Q. In order to be consistent and have an | 00:10 17 | fine too. |
| 00:07 18 | accurate reading of the comparison? | 00:10 18 | MR. NEWMAN: Okay. |
| 00:07 19 | A. Yes. | 00:10 19 . | THE WITNESS: I don't think it applies |
| 00:07 20 | Now, fortunately, for all the other | 00:10 20 | here, though, because, as your ordinance said, it's a |
| 00:07 21 | zones, you don't list a specific number of units, you | 00:10 21 | single-family attached building type rather than a |
| 00:08 22 | do identify simply units per acre, so the rest will | 00:10 22 | muitifamily attached building type. |
| 00:08 23 | be a lot easier to go through. | 00:10 23 | Q. And, again, back to that, those are |
| 00:08 24 | So with the ARHO zone, that zone is the | 00:10 24 | wn homes as opposed to -- |
| 00:08 25 | smallest density multifamily zone in town, that's 12 LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 00:10 25 | A. Stacked units. LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
|  | 82 |  | 84 |
| 00:08 1 | units to the acre. | 00:10 1 | Q. Right. |
| 00:08 2 | The ARHO-II zone, which is the former | 00:10 2 | MR. NEWMAN: Well, it also seems that |
| 00:08 3 | Tevia property, that has an overlay for 20 units to | 00:10 3 | the town has specified specific areas where this type |
| 00:08 4 | the acre. | 00:10 4 | of housing should be. |
| 00:08 5 | And the Broadway affordable housing | 00:10 5 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: How would you classify |
| 00:08 6 | overlay zone is zoned at 18 units to the acre. | 00:10 6 | what is on the border of Woodcliff Lake and Montvale, |
| 00:08 7 | So when you look at these various zone | 00:11 7 | the age restricted housing? I mean, you classified |
| 00:08 8 | districts, you see that our 16.94 units to the acre | 00:11 8 | those as muitiple dwellings. |
| 00:08 9 | is smack dab in the middle of the range of densities | 00:11 9 | THE WITNESS: Yes, your ordinance |
| 00:08 10 | that are identified in your affordable multifamily | 00:11 10 | classifies it that way, that's the distinction. |
| 00:08 11 | housing zones. | 00:11 11 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. |
| 00:08 12 | Q. To be clear, I misspoke a couple of | 00:11 12 | So if the ordinance classified it as |
| 00:08 13 | hearings ago stating that we had 18 units per acre. | 00:11 13 | multiple dwelling units, then you would have included |
| 00:09 14 | I meant we actually have 17 units per acre, 16.94, | 00:11 14 | it in the drawing? |
| 00:09 15 | correct? | 00:11 15 | THE WITNESS: I would have still raised |
| 00:09 16 | A. Correct, correct. | 00:11 16 | a concern about that, because town house and |
| 00:09 17 | So based on those densities and | 00:11 17 | multifamily development are really two different |
| 00:09 18 | recognizing how we fit in with all of these other | 00:11 18 | animals. Town house development are clearly attached |
| 00:09 19 | planned zone density for multifamily development, it | 00:11 19 | units, and you don't have one above or below the |
| 00:09 20 | allows me to conclude that in terms of furthering | 00:11 20 | other unit, whereas, multifamily development, which |
| 00:09 21 | that purpose of the Municipal Land Use Law that talks | 00:11 21 | is all these other zones, have units above or below. |
| 00:09 22 | about promoting the establishment of appropriate | 00:11 22 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: But they both talk in |
| 00:09 23 | population densities, it is clear that the | 00:11 23 | terms of density per acre, don't they? |
| 00:09 24 | municipality has made a determination that our | 00:11 24 | THE WITNESS: So does your detached |
| 00:09 25 | proposed 16.94 units to the acre fits well within | 00:11 25 | single-family zones, 15,000 square feet represents |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |


|  | 85 |  | 87 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:11 1 | three units to the acre. | 00:14 | I understand. |
| 00:11 2 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you could say | 00:14 2 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I just am trying |
| 00:12 3 | that | 00:14 | to find a way that -- |
| 00:12 4 | THE WITNESS: I did say that. | 00:14 | THE WITNESS: Five minutes? It will |
| 00:12 5 | A. (Continuing) A second specific support | 00:14 | get me to a good ending point. |
| 00:12 6 | of special reasons is what I mentioned earlier, how | 00:14 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. |
| 00:12 7 | we're assisting the municipality in affirmatively | 00:14 | THE WITNESS: Okay. |
| 00:12 8 | addressing, albeit a small portion, but a portion of | 00:14 | MR. NEWMAN: Just before you go, let's |
| 00:12 9 | your unmet housing need. | 00:14 | $x$ minutes. |
| 00:12 10 | That unmet housing need, | 00:14 10 | But the downtown concept, that's a |
| 00:12 11 | mentioned earlier, is 437 units. | 00:14 11 | commercial with residential on top of it. Isn't this |
| 00:12 12 | In this way, we are addressing, you | 00:14 12 | project purely residential? |
| 00:12 13 | know, 9 units of that component, and your settiement | 00:14 13 | THE WITNESS: Yes, it is, but it still |
| 00:12 14 | reement does talk about a whole series of | 00:15 14 | ds to it |
| 00:12 15 | mechanisms to try to encourage development that will | 00:15 15 | R. NEWMAN: Please continue. |
| 00:12 16 | address that unmet need. For example, there's a | 00:15 16 | THE WITNESS: I'll take back that 30 |
| 00:12 17 | mandatory set aside requirement that if the governing | 00:15 17 | seconds. |
| 00:13 18 | body were to ever rezone property in the future or if | 00:15 18 | Smart growth principles also talk about |
| 00:13 19 | this board were to approve a multifamily development, | 00:15 19 | creating a walkable neighborhood. It talks about |
| 00:13 20 | you know, you're required, through that settlement | 00:15 20 | preserving critical environmentally sensitive areas. |
| 00:13 21 | agreement, to impose a set aside requirement for | 00:15 21 | It talks about creating compact building design. |
| 00:13 22 | affordable housing. And that's just one of a couple | 00:15 22 | This project, I believe, does all of |
| 00:13 23 | of different mechanisms that you use. | 00:15 23 | ose things. |
| 00:13 24 | MR. NEWMAN: Those are the 9 units that | 00:15 24 | The last two special reasons talks |
| 00:13 25 | you're talking about? <br> LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 00:15 25 | about furthering the intent and purpose of the state LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
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| 00:13 1 | He WItNESS: Yes. | 00:15 | plan itself. |
| 00:13 2 | MR. HAYES: If I may, just to clarify, | 00:15 2 | Woodcliff Lake is identified in the |
| 00:13 3 | because I missed when you said it before or when you | 00:15 | state plan as being in the planning area No. 1. And |
| 00:13 4 | said it earlier, that's the settlement agreement from | 00:15 4 | that state plan identifies the fact that most growth |
| 00:13 5 | the fall of 2017? | 00:15 5 | or predicts that most growth in the State of New |
| 00:13 6 | THE WITNESS: No, '18, I believe -- no, | 00:15 | Jersey is going to occur in planning area one, and |
| 00:13 7 | you are right, November of 2017. | 00:15 7 | the plan concepts are so designed as to encourage |
| 00:13 8 | MR. HAYES: All right. | 00:15 8 | that to occur in this planning area. |
| 00:13 9 | A. (Continuing) Another special reason is | 00:15 9 | And then, finatly, something that the |
| 00:13 10 | how we're furthering the principles of smart growth. | 00:16 10 | affic expert had said at the last meeting where he |
| 00:13 11 | Now, smart growth principles are ten in | 00:16 11 | pointed out that by virtue of this application, this |
| 00:13 12 | number, as identified in the state plan and | 00:16 12 | will represent a less traffic generating potential |
| 00:13 13 | elsewhere. | 00:16 13 | coming out of the multifamily development in contrast |
| 00:14 14 | Amongst those principles, it talks | 00:16 14 | to if this site were developed for a number of the |
| 00:14 15 | about encouraging a mix of land uses. And by | 00:16 15 | permitted uses allowed as of right in this zone. |
| 00:14 16 | inserting multifamily development along this Broadway | 00:16 16 | So all of those items represent special |
| 00:14 17 | corridor, you're trying to encourage or create, for | 00:16 17 | reasons in support of this application. |
| 00:14 18 | lack of a better word, a downtown feel for Woodciff | 00:16 18 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. So are you |
| 00:14 19 | Lake, you know, that furthers that concept. | 00:16 19 | done with all your special reasons? |
| 00:14 20 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Burgis, | 00:16 20 | HE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 00:14 21 | we're almost ready to leave. | 00:16 21 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like a good |
| 00:14 22 | THE WITNESS: I could taik all night. | 00:16 22 | stopping point to me. |
| 00:14 23 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I know. | 00:16 23 | THE WITNESS: Okay. It took me less |
| 00:14 24 | THE WITNESS: You could turn out the | 00:16 24 | than five minutes. |
| 00:14 25 | lights, I'll still be talking. | 00:16 25 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 00:16 1 | MR. NEWMAN: Are you done with all of | 00:20 | 21st. I can do anything the week of the 14th. |
| 00:16 2 | your direct? | 00:20 2 |  |
| 00:16 3 | MR. DELIA: No, we have some more. | 00:20 3 | evening, actually two. |
| 00:16 4 | THE WITNESS: No, there's some more, | 00:20 4 | MR. DELIA: Will you be able to send |
| 00:16 5 | where I was hoping to end. | 00:20 | somebody on the 14th, Richard, here? |
| 00:17 6 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We're not finished | 00:20 6 | MR. PREISS: Yes, I could, but, you |
| 00:17 7 | with the meeting, please. | 00:20 | know, I think given the length and in terms of my |
| 00:17 8 | MR. PREISS: I'm not going to be here | 00:20 | ability to respond or answer questions, I think as |
| 00:17 9 | on the 28th. | 00:20 9 | long as the understanding was that you hoid the |
| 00:17 10 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Please talk | 00:20 10 | meeting open until the following hearing so that I |
| 00:17 11 | outside. | 00:20 11 | could appear. I would be happy to read when Joe |
| 00:17 12 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: We have to discuss | 00:20 12 | finishes his testimony and the board and the public |
| 00:17 13 | some scheduling. | 00:20 13 | asks questions. I could come to the subsequent |
| 00:18 14 | All right. Our next | 00:21 14 | meeting to be available to provide the same kind of |
| 00:18 15 | MR. DELIA: We got a problem with May | 00:21 15 | summary. |
| 00:18 16 | 28th, and, Joe, he's going to be away on a trip. Can | 00:21 16 | MR. HAYES: If I may, just to add my |
| 00:18 17 | we get a special? | 00:21 17 | two cents in, I think it's important for Mr. Preiss |
| 00:18 18 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: We have some other | 00:21 18 | to be here, because I think sometimes these |
| 00:18 19 | applications that we have to schedule. | 00:21 19 | conversations and questions go in ways that you can't |
| 00:18 20 | MR. SPIRIG: Did I hear Richard say he | 00:21 20 | predict in a response to reading testimony. I think |
| 00:18 21 |  | 00:21 21 | Mr. Preiss is valuable that he be here. |
| 00:18 22 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to taik | 00:21 22 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I agree with you. |
| 00:18 23 |  | 00:21 23 | MR. SPIRIG: I agree too. Is there any |
| 00:18 24 | I was thinking that we're going to have | 00:21 24 | other day that we couid have, the 13th, the 14th -- |
| 00:19 25 | a special meeting on May 14th, but that's for three LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 00:21 25 | well, not the 13th, there's probably a council |
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| 00:19 1 | residential applications that we have. | 00:21 | meeting the 12th. |
| 00:19 2 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there | 00:21 2 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I say to keep it on |
| 00:19 3 | was only one. | 00:21 3 | Tuesdays, June 4th, June 12th? |
| 00:19 4 | MS. SMITH: There is only one, two are | 00:21 4 | MR. PREISS: The fourth, I can do. |
| 00:19 5 | not complete. | 00:21 5 | MR. DELIA: We can do the fourth. We |
| 00:19 6 | because there is an issue with regard to that and I | 00:22 6 | really want to make best efforts to push for a vote |
| 00:19 7 |  | 00:22 7 | that night. We'll have to finish with Joe. We have |
| 00:19 8 | have to look into that, but there may be definitely | 00:22 8 | just a little bit left with Mr. Luglio, and that's |
| 00:19 9 | two that are complete and one that's been kicking | 00:22 9 | the conclusion of my presentation. |
| 00:19 10 | around quite a while. | 00:22 10 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Mr. Preiss, you'll |
| 00:19 11 | MR. DELIA: Perhaps we can switch dates | 00:22 11 | be here on June 4th? |
| 00:19 12 | with them and take the 14th and they could take the | 00:22 12 | MR. PREISS: Yes. |
| 00:19 13 | 28th? | 00:22 13 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? |
| 00:19 14 | MR. PREISS: That's a great idea, | 00:22 14 | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Do we want to start |
| 00:19 15 | except I can't be here for the 14th either. | 00:22 15 | at seven? |
| 00:19 16 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: How about thebeginning of June? | 00:22 16 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I don't mind that, |
| 00:19 17 |  | 00:22 17 | seven is fine. |
| 00:19 18 | MR. PREISS: The alternative would be | 00:22 18 | MR. DELIA: So June 4th. |
| 00:19 19 | to send somebody else, and then I come back at the | 00:22 19 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You want to do the |
| 00:19 20 | meeting after that to respond, provide a summary. | 00:22 20 | residential applications on the 14th? |
| 00:20 21 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What about the 21st,d we skip the 28th? | 00:22 21 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes. |
| 00:20 22 |  | 00:23 22 | MR. DELIA: June 4th at 7. |
| 00:20 23 | MR. NEWMAN: 21st of? | 00:23 23 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: But, look, if you take |
| 00:20 24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: May. | 00:23 24 | up all the time on June 4th, it's going to have to go |
| 00:20 25 | MR. SPIRIG: I can't be here on the | 00:23 25 | to July, because the public has to ask questions, we |
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| king ${ }_{[1]}$ - $90: 9$ | leaving [1] - 18:8 | 21:4, 46:19, 63:1 | $76: 16$ | MEG [1] - 2:17 <br> MEMBER $[5]$ - 1:11, |
| kids [2]-26:12, 67:22 | $17: 8,17: 10,17: 12$ | $15,82: 7,90:$ | market [1]-66:16 <br> MARSON [15] - 44:17 |  |
| KIM [2] - 96:4, 96:22 | 13, 17:20, 76:25, |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MEMBER }[5]-1: 11, \\ & 1: 12,1: 13,1: 14 \\ & 1: 15 \end{aligned}$ |
| kind [10] - 19:5, 20:13 $20: 25,36: 3,38: 9$ | 92:8 | looked [2] - 65:23 | MARSON [15]-44:17, |  |
| $25,36: 3,38: 9$, | left-hand [1]-17:2 | 78:8 | 45:1, 45:7, 45:10, <br> 45:18, 45:22, 46:6, | member [3]-18:16,$22: 13,54: 2$ |
| $91: 14$ | $\operatorname{leg}$ [1] - 71:2 | looking [2]-29:2 | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 13,46: 17,46: 21, \\ & 46: 25,47: 4,47: 7, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| knows [1] - 62:20 | Legislature ${ }^{\text {[1] - 73:22 }}$ | 67.2 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Members [2] - 22:11, } \\ & 50: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 2-1 | 13:4, 14:20 | 7:23, |  |
| L | $\begin{aligned} & \text { length }[3]-15: 25 \\ & 21: 21,91: 7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { loop }[1]-18: 2 \\ & \text { lose }[1]-37: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Marson }[6]-3: 10 \\ & 44: 17,45: 16,46: 19 \end{aligned}$ $47: 2,47: 5$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { members }[6]-5: 8, \\ 9: 15,16: 9,32: 20 \end{gathered}$ |
|  | less $[11]-18: 14$ | Lou [2] - 5:12, 93:1 | $\begin{gathered} 47: 2,47: 5 \\ \text { mass }[1]-62: 14 \end{gathered}$ | memory [1]-56:17 |
| L.L.C [2] - 1:22, $2: 22$ | 37:16, 51:5, 78:9 | lovely [1] - 22:25 |  |  |
| lack [3] - 70:22, 80:9, | 1, 79:3, 79:20 | 83 | master [17]-54:14, | mention [1]-58:25 |
| :18 | 24, 81:5, 88:12 | $\mathbf{L P}[1]-32: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 17,60: 7,60: 8, \\ & 60: 18,60: 19,60: 23, \end{aligned}$ | mentioned [9]-15:2, |
| Lake [21]-4:8, 6:23, | 23 | $\text { Luglio [5] - } 5: 1$ |  | 39:23, 56:5, 59:11, |
| 6, 7:18, 15:9, | Letter [2]-4:6, 8:20 | :20, 9 | $\begin{aligned} & 60: 18,60: 19,60: 23, \\ & 61: 7,62: 3,62: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 9,74: 17,75: 2, \\ & 85: 6,85: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 22:19, 28:6, 33:23, | letter [9]-7:18, 8:1 |  | 61:7, 62:3, 62:24, <br> 64:19, 65:2, 65:22, |  |
| 24, 36:10, 38:11 | 8:10, 8:14, 8:24 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 24,73: 19,74: 6, \\ & 74: 17 \end{aligned}$ | mentioning [1] -66:11 |
| :24, 48:8, 55:12, | 2, 29:5, 33:2 | M |  | $\text { merit [2] - 57:9, } 61: 9$ |
| 13, 70:21, 75:21 | level [ 1 ] - 73:25 |  | aster's [1] - 53:16 |  |
| :2, 84:6, 86:19, | ties [1]-25 | ma'am [2] - 48:12 | match [2] - 15:8, 64:3 <br> MATER [1]-1:4 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { met }[4]-29: 8,32: 25, \\ & 40: 3,40: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 88:2 | license [1]-53:21 |  |  |  |
| LAKE [2] - 1:1, 1:9 | License [2]-96:4 | 49:12 | MATER [1]-1:4 <br> material [1]-67:1 | mic [5]-22:16, 30:10, |
| Lake's [1] - 22:21 | 23 | [ 11 - 9 | materially [1] - 17:5 | 30:12, 41:4, 48:12 |
| Land [2]-74:11, | ed | maintaining [1] | mathematical $[1]$ -$81: 6$ | MICHAEL [1] - 1:16 microphone [1] - |
| 21 | man [1]-5:10 | 63:19 |  |  |
| land [9] - 60:22, 61:3 | (1) | major [3] - 21: | matter (5) - $13: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 25 \\ & \text { mid }_{[1]}-11: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| :14, 62:4, 69:21 | lifespan [1]-66:20 | 27:18, 31:23 | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 8,34: 6,41: 9, \\ & 58: 13 \end{aligned}$ |  |
| 70:22, 71:24, 86:15, | Lifetime [1]-54:9 | MALLEY [10] - 1:12 |  | mid [1]-11:13 <br> middle [1] - $82: 9$ |
| 70:22, 7124 | t [4]-43:4, 62: | 16:11, 17:19, 18:3, | matters [1] - 54: | midpoint ${ }^{[11}-56: 3$ |
| landscape [1] - 59:10 | :4, 75:1 | 21.24, 22.4, 92.14 | max [1] - 78:20 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { might }[10]-10: 16, \\ & 11: 15,13: 18,14: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| Lane [2]-3:11, 44:18 | lig | 21:24, 22:4, 92:14 | mayor [1] - 94:1 |  |
| lane $\left.{ }^{1} 1\right]-47: 13$ | lights [1] - 86:25 | manage [1]-24:2 management ${ }^{11}$ - | mean [16]-13:11, $13: 18,13: 19,19:$ | 11:15, 13:18, 14:4, 18:2, 19:22, 24:6, |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { large }[7]-31: 6,41: 2, \\ 41: 6,44: 20,54: 6, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { likely [4] - 14:1, 20:9, } \\ & 25: 20,37: 16 \end{aligned}$ | management [4] $27: 7$ | 13:18, 13:19, 19:5, | 24:7, 49:9, 67:12 <br> miles [2]-16:25, |


| 17:13 | 17:24, 17:25 | 47:4, 47:5, 47:7, | 34:8, 34:14, 34:1 | 23, 69:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mind [2]-67:13, | 18:14, 19:5, 19:9 | 47:9, 47:23, 48:4 | 35:1, 35:4, 35:8 | 69:6, 69:9, 69:10, |
| minimize [1]-62:15 | 20:6, 20:13, 20:16, | 49:5, 49:17, 49:21, | $35: 25,36: 4,36: 7$ | $0: 24,71: 21,72: 5,$ |
| minimum [3]-10:9, | 20:17, 20:18, 20:23, | 49:24, 50:4, 50:6 | 40:23, 41:5, 41:18 | 5:9, 85:10, 85:16, |
| 37:21, 79:2 | 20:25, 21:4, $21: 8$ | 8, 50:10, 50:1 | 42:2, 42:9, 42:13 | 94:17, 94:24 |
| minutes [4]-16:1, | 21:11, 21:12, 21:14, | 50:17, 51:7, $51: 9$ | 42:19, 43:2, 43:7 | needed [3]-31:1 |
| 87:4, 87:9, 88:24 | 21:19, 21:22, $21: 2$ | 1:17, 51:23, 52: | 43:12, 43:18, 43:24, | 2:12, 66 |
| mirrors [ 4 ] - 13:24 | 22:2, 22:3, 22:5, | 52:5, 52:6, 52:8, | 44:7, 44:12, 48:7, | needs [2] - 69:2, 70:14 |
| missed [1]-86:3 | $22: 7,22: 9,22: 18$, $22 \cdot 24,22 \cdot 25,23 \cdot$ | 52:9, 52:11, 52:12, | $48: 13,48: 22,49: 1,$ $49: 8,49: 14,49: 19$ | negative [4]-60:16, |
| misspoke [1]-82:12 | $22: 24,22: 25,23: 2$ | 52:15, 52:16, 52:18, $55 \cdot 20 \quad 52 \cdot 25-53 \cdot 2$ | 49:8, 49:14, 49:19 $40.23,50 \cdot 1,90: 4$ | $73: 4,73: 12,74: 7$ |
| mistaken [1] - 11:13 <br> mix [1] - $86: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 4,23: 5,23: 14, \\ & 23 \cdot 15 \cdot 15: 16 \cdot 23 . \end{aligned}$ | $52: 20,52: 25,53: 2,$ $53: 3,53: 4,53: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 23,50: 1,90: 4 \\ & 92: 14,94: 16 \end{aligned}$ | NEGLIA [1] - 2:14 neighborhood [2] |
| mix [1] - 86:15 model [ $[1]$ - 15 | $23: 19,23: 21,24$ | $: 20,54: 22,54: 2$ | multi [3]-4:9, 75: | $37: 6,87: 19$ |
| modified [1] - 33:13 | 24:2, 24:3, 24:4, | 5:1, 57:22, 58:1, | 76:2 | neighboring [1] |
| moment [4]-48:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 24: 8,24: 14,24: 1 \\ & 24: 16,24: 22,24: \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 6,58: 9,58: 16, \\ & 8: 19,63: 17,63: 23, \end{aligned}$ | multifamily [24] 59:23, 61:18, 62 | $38: 15$ |
| 57:24, 58:3 | $24: 25,25: 4,25: 7$ | $64: 1,64: 10,64: 17$ | $61: 18,62:$ | neighbors [1]-37:25 never $[5]$ - 19:2 $34: 11$ |
| monitor [1]-29:16 | 25:12, 25:14, 25:16, | 69:11, 70:4, 70:7 | 65:7, 65:10, 65:1 | 42:16, 77:17, 7 |
| month [1]-93:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 19,26: 17,26: 19, \\ & 26: 21,26: 24,27: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 70: 11,71: 2,71: 9, \\ & 71: 12,71: 15,75: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 67:4, } 68: 4,72: 4, \\ & 74: 21,76: 5,81: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { New }[8]-52: 23,53: 21 \\ & 54: 5,88: 5,96: 7 \end{aligned}$ |
| Montvale [2]-77:11, 84:6 | $27: 3,27: 10,27: 15,$ | $5: 13,75: 19,76: 11,$ | 82:10, 82:19, 83:6, | $54: 5,88: 5,96: 7,$ <br> 96:11, 96:18, 96:23 |
| morning [1]-94:22 | 27:19, 27:23, 28:5 | 6:12, 76:14, 76:19, | 83:22, 84:17, 84:20, | [4]-19:4, 57:6, |
| most [8]-14:1, 19:22, <br> $25: 20,28: 19,41 \cdot 13$ | 28:12, 28:14, 28:16, | $12,78: 15,78: 20,$ | multiple [6] - 4:9, | 66:3, 72:18 <br> NEWMAN $[74]-1$ |
| $58: 25,88: 4,88: 5$ | 28:18, 28:19, $28: 23$, | 78:24, 79:2, 79:8 | 41:19, 75:22, 76:2, | 22, 6:2, 14:6, 19:9, |
| tion [5] - 22:5, | 28:24, 28:25, 29 | 79:12, 79:16, 79:23, | 84:8, 84:13 | $2: 9$ |
| 22:7, 50:3, 50:8, | 29:10, 29:12, $29: 1$ | 80:1, 80:7, 80:13 | Municipal [2] - 74:11, | :19, 28:25, 29:10, |
| 50:10 | 29:17, 29:21, 30:17, <br> $30 \cdot 25,31: 10,31 \cdot 19$ |  | $82: 21$ | 35:6, 35:9, |
| move [3] - 13:21, 40:7, | $32: 2,32: 6,32$ | 3:10, 83:14, 83:18, | $74: 18,74: 23$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5: 13,35: 17,35: 2 \\ & 6: 2,36: 6,37: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| moved [1]- | 32:21, 32:22, 32:25, | 4:2, 84:5, 84:11, | MUNICIPAL [1] - $1: 1$ | 2, 42:18, 44:5 |
| movement $\{6]$ - 7:21 | 33:3, 33:5, | 5:2 | municipalities [5] | , 47:5, 50: |
| 9:9, 12:18, 13:21, | :14, 33:18, 33:20, | 86:2, 86:8, 87:8, | 5, 54:14, 68:5 | 0:10, 52:6, 57:22 |
| 14:1, 14:5 | 34:16, 35:6, 35:9 | $25,89: 1,89: 3$ | $70: 2,70: 2$ | :1, 58:6, 58:9 |
| movements [2] - 13:2, 25:25 | 35:13, 35:17, 35:23, | $9: 8,89: 12,89: 14$ | $56: 20,58: 14,60: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 16,58: 19,63: 17, \\ & 3: 23,64: 1,64: 10, \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 36:2, 36:6, 36:9, | 89:18, 89:20, 89:22, | :3, 64:9, 65:13 | $64: 17,69: 11,70: 4$ |
| $94: 2$ | 36:16, 36:17, 36:18, | 11, 90:14 | :13, 68:22, 69:4, | 70:11, 71:2 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { MR }[410]-5: 1,5: 2, \\ & 5: 6,5: 21,5: 22,5: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $37: 11,37: 13,37: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 16,90: 18,90: 21, \\ & 90: 23,90: 24,90: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 82:24, 85:7 | 76:12, 76:25, 78:12, |
|  | 37:20, 37:24, 38:2, | $91: 2,91: 4,91: 6,$ | municipality's [2] - |  |
| 6:2, 6:3, 6:4, 6:9, | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 5,38: 9,38: 16 \\ & 38: 19,38: 23,39: 4 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $15,78: 20,78:$ |
| 6:12, 6:14, 6:15, |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 91:16, 91:22, 91:23, } \\ & 92: 2,92: 4,92: 5, \end{aligned}$ | mutual [1] - 32:15 |  |
| 6:17, 6:22, 7:1, 7: | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 19,38: 23,39: 4 \\ & 39: 8,39: 11,39: 12 \end{aligned}$ | 92:2, 92:4, 92:5, <br> 92:12, 92:18, 92:21, |  |  |
| $8: 10,8: 12,8: 14$ | $39: 15,39: 20,40: 2$, $40: 5,40: 6,40: 10$, | $93: 11,93: 14,93: 17$ $93: 21,93: 22,93: 25,$ |  | 85:24, 87:8 |
| 8:16, 8:18, 8:23, | 40:21, 41:8, 41:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 21,93: 22,93: 25, \\ & 94: 6,94: 9,94: 12, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| 8:25, 9:2, 9:5, 9:17, | 42:7, 42:11, 42:16, | 94:23, 94:24, 95:1, | $22: 18,36: 9,52: 25$ | Newman [2]-64:5, |
| 9:19, 12:6, 12:13, | 42:18, 42:22, 42:24, | 95:2, 95:3, 95:6, | rowing [1]-12 | $75: 8$ |
| 12:14, 12:19, 12:21, <br> $12 \cdot 23$ 13.1 13.11 | 43:10, 43:14, 43:21, 44:3, 44:5, 44:11, | $95: 10,95: 11,95: 12,$ | natural (1) -64:21 | Next [1] - 93: |
| $\begin{aligned} & 12: 23,13: 1,13: 11, \\ & 13: 16,13: 17,14: 3, \end{aligned}$ |  | MS [61]-16:11, 17:19, | ar [7-24:12 | $\text { next }[6]-5: 14,39: 1 \text {, }$ |
| $14: 6,14: 8,14: 9,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 3,44: 5,44: 11 \\ & 44: 17,44: 24,45: 1 \end{aligned}$ |  | 31:14, 62:8, 62:13, | $45: 15,46: 10,80: 22,$ |
| 14:10, 14:13, 15:7, | 45:10, 45:12, 45:14, | $19: 8,21: 24,22: 4,$ |  | 9:14 |
| 15:10, 15:19, 15:21, |  |  | ssar | NFPA [2] - 12:10, |
| 16:6, 16:9, 16:16, | $45: 22,46: 2,46: 6,$ |  | ed [24] - 15: | 21:1 |
| 16:19, 16:20, 16:23, | 46:7, 46:13, 46:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 21,31: 5,31: 17, \\ & 31: 21,32: 4,32: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $17: 9,22: 22,29: 8,$ | night 81 - 23:6, 28.14 |
| 16:25, 17:7, 17:14, | $\begin{aligned} & 46: 7,46: 13,46: 15, \\ & 46: 17,46: 19,46: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $32: 16,32: 23,33: 4,$ | $30: 11,30: 22,49: 7,$ | night []]-23:6, 28:14, |
| 17:15, 17:17, 17:22, | 46:23, 46:25, 47:2, | $33: 6,33: 11,34: 5$ |  |  |
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| 41:3 | 74:71, 74:25, 86:12, | 0:2 | Teterboro [1] - 54:6 | total [16] - 57:3, 57:7, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| special [15] - 54:17, |  |  | Tevia [2]-77:21, 82:3 |  |
| :16, 60:22, 71:25, |  | si | 24 |  |
| $6,73: 7,73: 9$ | stating $[1]-82:$ <br> station [10]-31 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 59:22 } \\ & \text { support [4] - } 73 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & : 24,58: 3,58: 8 \\ & 3: 11,58: 18,58: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $: 13,69: 8,71: 13$ |
| 24, 88:16, 88:19, | 62:2 | 73:9, 85:5, 88:17 | 33:25, 64:2, | 19 |
| 89 | 65:5, 65:6, 65:8, | su | 70: | totality [1]-70:23 |
| specific [5] - 72:23, | :10, 65:20, 74 | 79:10, 79:12 | 70:15, 71:8, | totally [ 1 ] - 18:2 |
| :12, 81:21, 84:3 | stations [2]-62: | st | 71 | ching [1]-64:23 |
| specifically [ 6 |  |  |  |  |
| :4, 78:7, 78:15, | 22, | swear [4]-6:20, 7: | 78:14, 78:17, 78:22, | 0, 37:21, 42:23, |
| 83:6, 83:8 <br> pecified [2]-15:18 |  | 7:3, 52:18 | 78:25, 79:4, 79:10, | 2:25, 43:21, 81:25, |
| pecified [2] - 15:18 84:3 | stay (5) | $90: 1$ | $: 14,79: 17,79: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 24,84: 3,84: 16 \\ & 4: 18 \end{aligned}$ |
| speed [5]-16:20, |  |  | 81:3, 81:10, | -38:15 |
| 2, 17:3, |  |  | 33: | fic [2] - 88:1 |
| 17:9 | 59:10, 64:22, 66 | 10:2 | 84:15 | 88:12 |
| ed |  | 5 | 24, 85:4, 86:1 | ${ }^{13}$ |
| spend [1]-19:18 |  |  | , | 31:24, 57:2, 62:9, |
| ```SPIRIG[14]-1:14, 9:17, 33:3, 51:9, 51:17, 89:20, 90:25, 91:23, 93:17, 95:6, 95:10``` | Steve ${ }_{[1]}-17: 14$ <br> still [10]-10:18, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 87: 4,87: 7,87: 13, \\ & 87: 16,88: 20,88: 23, \\ & 89: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 62:13, 62:17, 62:20, 65:5, 65:6, 65:7, 65:10, 65:20, 74:21 |
|  | 11:22, 29:14, 29:15, 47:12, 53:22, 84:15, 86:25, 87:13, 93:17 |  |  |  |
|  |  | ```table [3] - 75:9, 75:25, 78:3 Table [2]-4:8, 75:20 talks [12] - 9:13,``` | theoretically $[1]$ - 41:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { trained }[2]-48: 10, \\ & 48: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { spot }[4]-13: 5,19: 22, \\ & 79: 23,80: 10 \end{aligned}$ | stipulated [1] - 15:22 <br> stipulation [1] - 12:15 |  | THERE [1]-1:9 they've [5]-5:20, $29: 8,35 \cdot 24,65 \cdot 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { training [3] - 42:8, } \\ & 48: 14,53: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| spots [5] - 16: | stopped [1]-31:25 <br> stopping [3] - 47:16, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 29: 8,35: 24,65: 17, \\ & 77: 18 \end{aligned}$ | TRANSCRIPT [1] - 1:4 transcript [1] - 96:17 |
| 20, 18:10, 18 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 11,62: 4,62: 24, \\ & 65: 2,65: 14,66: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 77:18 |  |
| eading [1] - 37 | stops [1]-47:20 | 82:21, 86:14, 87:19, | thinking [1] - 89:24 | ransit [1]-62:14 |
| nkler | store $[1]-56: 17$storm [1]-31-22 | $87: 21,87: 24$ tandem $[1]-15 \cdot 24$ | third [1]-62:24 |  |
| 9:14, 21:15 |  | tandem [1]-15:24 <br> teach [1]-25:21 <br> template [2]-14:22, | thirdly [1] - 75:4 | treatises [1]-62:10 |
| quare [1] - 84:25 | storm [1]-31:22 <br> story $[5]$ - 56:13, |  | Thousands [1]-50:25 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tree }[2]-27: 12,36: 20 \\ & \text { trend }[1]-67: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| cked [1]-83:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 17,57: 6,72: 19, \\ & 72: 20 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { template }[2]-14: 22 \text {, } \\ & 15: 8 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| aff [1] - 37:4 |  |  | thousands [1]-51:3 | $\operatorname{trip}[1]-89: 16$ |
| airways $\left.{ }_{[1]}\right]-10: 14$ | street ${ }_{\text {[1] }}$ - 72:10 | $15: 6$ | Three [1]-5:24 | trips [1] - 62:15 <br> truck [39]-7:21, 9:9, |
| and $[1]-78: 13$ <br> andard [3]-33:19 | Street [1] - 3:9 strengthening $[1]$ - |  | three [11]-37:21, 38:14, 56:17, 57:6, |  |
| $9: 18,69: 15$ |  | ten [3]-16:25, 17:13, | 57:15, 57:19, 68:13, | 13:14, 13:21, 13:23, |
| standards (4] - | $65: 4$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { tenants' }[1]-23: 6 \\ \text { tender }[1]-54: 20 \end{array}$ | 2:19, 80:18, 85:1. | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 15,15: 1,15: 9 \\ & 16: 3,17: 16,18: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 59:19, 59:21, 64:12 <br> standpipe [1]-41:15 |  | tenets [1]-62:7 | three-acre [1] - $37: 21$ | 16:3, 17:16, 18:9, $18: 16,18: 17,18: 19$ |
| standpipes [4]-10:7, | 66:12 | term [1]-80:9 terms [16]-57:20, 58:15, 58:24, 60:16, | three-bedroom [2] - <br> 57:15, 57:19 | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 20,30: 7 ; 30: 15, \\ & 30: 22,30: 23,31: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10:13, 19:13, 41:14 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { subject }[3]-66: 13, \\ & 76: 4,77: 5 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Star[2] - 3:6, 22:18 <br> star 21 - $25.7,26 \cdot 23$ |  | 58:15, 58:24, 60:16, <br> 63:1, 63:3, 67:15, | three-story [3] - $56: 17,57: 6,72: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 31: 6,31: 7,31: 14, \\ & 38: 22,41: 16,41: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
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