

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: New application, continued, 188 Broadway, Block 2701, Lot 3.
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As a result of that request, Lou went back in the field and did some more studies, and we submitted to you an assessment dated May 17th. We submitted it to you on May 17th.

He is going to speak on a limited basis on the findings that came up in the context of his extra little bit of research, and then that's it, we will be done with our presentation.

At that point, obviously it will be turned over to the board for questions of the public and comments and questions from your own professionals.

And then I would be in a position to sum up for a vote.

So I've got nothing more to say at this point. I'd like to re-call Joe and get this night going.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Before you begin, I would like to make an announcement.

Members of the public, I see we have a
fair number of people here tonight, and when this application began, I think I explained what the process is. I'm not going to go over it entirely; however, I do want to make some comments about what's going to happen tonight.
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LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
                    201-641-1812
```

As was indicated by Mr. Delia, he has two witnesses tonight, and they will be followed by cross examination of those witnesses, and then testimony by board professionals.

And then after we finish all the testimony, there can be testimony from members of the public who can, as part of their comments, testify, if they take an oath.

Anyone wanting to testify has to take an oath. Statements or comments are not considered evidence, only testimony under oath is considered evidence.

Now, Mr. Burgis is going to testify tonight as well as Mr. Lou Luglio. They are what we call "expert witnesses," meaning they have education, background and experience to give opinions.

Now, you may agree or disagree with their opinions, and that is your right; however, they are permitted to give their opinions.

You are permitted to ask these witnesses questions. That does not mean that you can argue with a witness, if you don't like the answer. You can disagree, and when it comes time for the comment section and you disagree with the opinion of that witness, you can say that you disagree.
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But at the time that you ask the witness a question, you cannot argue with the witness, you can just ask questions.

And the questions should be related to this application, and, in particular, to the witness' direct testimony and what that witness testified about.

Questions with regard to what's going on in Northern Bergen County in other communities would not be deemed to be relevant to this application. We're here tonight for this application.

As I explained at the first meeting, every applicant, no matter who it is, has a right to present their application and to be heard and to be heard fairly and in a procedurally correct manner.

So that's what we expect tonight. We don't expect there to be any arguing with the witnesses. We just ask that you ask questions, it's the time for questions. Hold your comments for the comment portion of the meeting, which will come at the end. And if you want to testify, then after the board professionals testify, you'll be asked if you want to testify.

As I said, sometimes people want to say
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something in conjunction with their comments. We can swear you in at the time that you make your comment.

So I ask for your cooperation so that
we have an orderly meeting tonight and we can get this matter heard and completed.

Okay. Thank you.
MR. DELIA: Thank you.
Joe is standing to my right.

## JOSEPH H. BURGIS, P.P., AICP,

Having been previously sworn, continues to testify as follows:
CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. DELIA:
Q. Mr. Burgis, you were here back in April, and, as I stated in my comments, you were talking about special reasons.

What more have you got for us?
A. Well, actually $I$ finished all of my testimony regarding the special reasons. As you recall, there were five in number. I'm not going to repeat them again. We spent quite a bit of time on them.

I don't believe we got into the
negative criteria of the statute --
Q. Correct. LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
A. -- with respect to the special reasons.

And if you recall, I'm sure the board is familiar with this, the Municipal Land Use Law identifies two specific prongs of the negative criteria: An applicant has to show that there is no substantial detriment to the public good, and an applicant has to show there's no substantial impairment to the intent and purpose of the municipality's master plan.

As I said at the last meeting, $I$ don't use the word "substantial" lightly, it comes right out of the statute. The legislature, when they adopted these regulations, understood that with every application for any kind of a variance, there may be some impairment to a master plan or some detrimental impact, but the question is: Are those impacts substantially detrimental or substantially adversely impactful to the master plan or not?

Needless to say, we've concluded that
there is no substantial impairment to the intent of the master plan.

If you recall from my direct testimony,
I went through five specific goals and objectives of
the municipality's master plan to identify where we are consistent in furtherance of those goals and
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objectives of the plan.
One talks about preserving and protecting existing residential areas. We have a unique situation, because we are a split lot zone property. The westerly half is zoned or master planned for a nonresidential use, the easterly, roughly $\mathbf{3 0}$ percent of the property is a master plan end zone for the $\mathbf{R - 1 5}$ designation for a single-family development.

We are placing the entirety of our development in the nonresidential portion of the area, not impacting the single-family residentially zoned property, which is also, as you've heard from a number of witnesses, characterized by substantial steep slope conditions.

We also conclude that we are consistent
with that goal that talks about guiding the appropriate use of land, and with that I talked about how we are in close proximity to the train station, and the state plan and your own master plan documents talk about the propriety of having multifamily development near the train station.

We talked about there was a goal of providing light, air, and open space. And I pointed out how, with all of the regulatory controls
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regulating setbacks and building coverage and
impervious coverage, we are consistent with the ordinance requirements for those conditions.

Another goal talks about preserving natural features on the property. I just said a moment ago, we are preserving, we're not touching the environmentally sensitive portion of the site in the easterly close to 30 percent of the site.

Finally, we are consistent with the Broadway corridor master plan, which also talks about a mixed use development along the Broadway corridor and multifamily residential development along the Broadway corridor.

So for all of those reasons, I've
concluded that we meet that prong of the negative criteria.

Similarly, I've concluded that there is no substantial detriment to the public good, and I state that for a number of reasons.

Amongst others is the fact that -- you have to excuse me, I'm getting a summer cold already.

MS. SMITH: Can I also just ask that you move this microphone over, especially since you're having a little trouble, it will just make it easier to hear.
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THE WITNESS: Thank you.
A. (Continuing) You previously heard from the traffic consultant, who talked about how the proposed use represents a lesser traffic generator than a permitted use that's allowed on-site. So, consequently, the imposition of this particular development at this particular intensity of use will result in fewer peak hour trip movements than if the site were developed for its zoned use.

Typically when one looks at this issue, one looks at traffic, one looks at school impacts; that's always a significant concern to a municipality. We reached out and contacted the local school systems to find out what kind of room they have for an additional number of students.

We have projected, based on using a
variety of studies, that we are going to have single digits in terms of the number of public schoolchildren coming out of this project, and the reason I say that is because three-quarters of our 60 units are one bedroom units. And if you looked at, whether it's the Rutgers study or studies of particular projects throughout Northern Bergen County, it is clear that this kind of development does not generate a lot of public schoolchildren,
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particularly where three quarters of the units are one bedroom units.

But in looking at the Woodcliff Lake school enrollments, we find that it's dropping. For example, between 2009-2019, the number of students went from 830 to 735 .

We looked at the Pascack Hill High
School enrollment figures, they're also declining.
In 2009, they indicated that there were 841 students.
In 2019, it declined to 818 .
Interestingly enough, the borough
population for the under five set has also been
declining. In 1990, the under five cohort represented 5.9 percent of the total population of Woodcliff Lake. In the year 2000, it was
7.2 percent. In the year 2010, it's 4.9 percent.

And there were estimates from another source for 2015, it dropped a little bit more.

So, consequently, it's pretty clear
that there is room in the school system for an additional number of students, and, even given that, we do not anticipate any significant number of public schoolchildren coming out of this.

MS. YETEMIAN: Can I just ask one thing

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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Did you look into the fact that Pascack
Hills High School, that it's a combination of two towns --

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. YETEMIAN: -- Montvale and
Woodcliff Lake?
THE WITNESS: Yes, and the figures for the other town is similar.

MR. HAYES: That assumes also that resources have stayed the same or almost steady during the same amount of time, correct?

THE WITNESS: To a certain degree, that is correct. Obviously with that 2015 estimate, it looked at resources, the populations anyway. It looked at the age cohort a little closer in time than 2000-2010, obviously.

MS. YETEMIAN: Was there also a drop at all or a change at all in house sales during those times?

THE WITNESS: That I did not look at.
MR. HAYES: Or borough population in general, right? Because you give us these figures, but they're relative to --

MS. YETEMIAN: Could have gone on.
MR. HAYES: -- the borough population.
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So we're only getting a piece of the picture that you selected out.

THE WITNESS: Well, I think it's important to focus on the younger set, because that's the age cohort who is going to go through the school system.

MR. HAYES: I agree, but relative to the growth in the borough population as well is important to know.

THE WITNESS: The borough population -MR. HAYES: To judge whether or not the decrease in the under five cohort is actually meaningful, because you're just using percentages.

THE WITNESS: Your population has remained relatively steady. I don't recall the exact figure, but it's relatively steady.

MR. HAYES: It just would have been nice to know to compare is my point.

MR. DELIA: Joe, let me interject here.
BY MR. DELIA:
Q. Putting aside the existing conditions and the decline in student population, again the Rutgers studies and all the other studies, can we put a number on what they would say we will have in terms of the number of schoolchildren?
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A. The Rutgers study suggests that we would have 4 or 5 public schoolchildren coming out of this development. There will be some additional number, close to $\mathbf{3}$ or $\mathbf{4}$ additional below school age.
Q. So under 10 altogether?
A. Yes, under 10 altogether, and clearly there's room in the school system for it. And beyond that, you know, these are nominal numbers, because, again, the statute says is there a substantial detriment to the public good and we also weigh what that means.

And when we weigh it in terms of providing multifamily housing in an appropriate location near the train station, when we weigh the fact that as an aging population with residents, I think you were touching upon this, who are moving out of their larger single-family house but would like to remain in the community but there's not that much opportunity to find multifamily housing, this represents a benefit for those people.

So when you weigh all of that and you weigh whether there's a substantial detriment to the public good, and also factor in the issue of traffic, which I had mentioned earlier, I think the balance weighs out in favor of the application and with
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respect to that prong of the negative criteria.
MS. YETEMIAN: I don't know if now is the right time to ask this, but let's just say hypothetically you're a senior and you're looking to downsize and you'll downsize to one of these apartments, what is the incentive, other than staying in town to be closer to family, I mean would a senior say is the benefit to being across the street from a train station, when they don't commute, they're retired?

THE WITNESS: I know the question on a very personal level, because a number of my friends have moved out of their larger single-family house to be in a transit-oriented location, because now that they're retired, they take much greater advantage of going into the city. And that's one advantage.

Your master plan and your Broadway corridor plan talks about trying to encourage additional mixed use and nonresidential development in this corridor to create what I'll call, for lack of a better word, a truer downtown for Woodcliff Lake. That also has, you know, an attractive element for seniors.

MS. YETEMIAN: And the noise factor is the only other concern that I would think of as a
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senior, and after talking to my mom, I live up the street from it, I asked her point blank would you want to live across the street from a train that blows through 20 odd times a day? She said no.

So what would be the benefit in that sense as well?

THE WITNESS: Well, for your mother then this would not be the place. I think for a lot of people it would be. There are so many studies --

MS. YETEMIAN: It's not just children.
THE WITNESS: There are so many studies that bear that out. Seniors are welcoming this type of a location. We're seeing in Ridgewood, where 350 multifamily units are under construction in the downtown near the train station. We see in Park Ridge, where you see all that development along Kinderkamack and Park Avenue near the train station. And people are, you know, flocking to those units.

So, is it for everybody? No. But it's obviously for a good portion of the population, because you're seeing it everywhere.

We're doing a housing plan for Princeton and West Windsor, and a lot of our projects are rotated around the train station, and there seems to be a lot of positive reaction to that.
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Q. (Continuing) So, in addition to that issue, which really covers the positive and negative criteria for the use variance, there are some bulk variances that are associated with this application. Actually there's two. One is a front yard setback.

There is a requirement that we have a 70-foot setback as measured to the centerline of Broadway, and also measured from the property, the right-of-way line of 35 feet. And the existing building that is being converted from office to multifamily residential use is currently setback at 68.5 feet from the centerline and 34.1 feet from the right-of-way line.

That building is not being relocated to pickup the extra foot-and-a-half. It's a preexisting nonconforming condition that is going to stay just the way it is, for obvious reasons.

The second issue is height. There is an ordinance requirement that says you can have a building height of 36 feet and it has to no more than a 2 -and-a-half story building.

We meet that 36 -foot height, but we are at three-story building, and in some respects this is a classic (c)(1) physical features test.
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|  | 21 |  | 23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:42PM | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm sorry, I didn't | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 07: 45 \mathrm{PM} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | that 16.94 to the acre with the established zone plan |
| 07:42PM | hear you. | 07: |  |
| 07:43PM | THE WITNESS: A (c)(1) physical features | 07:45PM | a th |
| 07:43PM | test. | 07:4 | had mention |
| 07:43PM | s out | 07:4 | utset, no interior green space being |
| 07:4 | Municipal Land Use Law for bulk variances. One can | 07: | in the parking lot itself (indicating) |
| 07:43PM | argue it's from the statute 40:55D-70(c)(1), which is | 07: | of the design th |
| 07:43PM | the physical features test, which means that if there | 07:46 | up with is that we are providing all of |
| 07:43PM | are physical features, then they affect your ability | 07:46PM | eenery around the perimeter of the property |
| 07:43PM |  | 07:468M 10 | de as much buffer plantings as possible to |
| 07:43PM 11 | Or there's a (c)(2) test, which is a | 07: | rate us and screen the site from the adjoinin |
| 07: | public benefits test, which means that there are |  | neig |
| 07:43PM 13 | public benefits that will accrue from the grant of | 07:4689 13 | BY MR. DELIA |
| 07:43PM 14 |  | 07:468M 14 | Q. And, Joe, on that note, again referring |
| 07:43PM 15 | the variance. In this particular case, it's a (c)(1) | 07:4689 15 | 18, where do we stand in terms of impervious |
| 07:43PM 16 | relief, because, as I said earlier, 30 percent of | 07:4689 16 | ge compared to other multifamily zones? |
| 07:43PM | this property is characterized by steep slope, which | 07:46PM 17 | As I testified earlier, the applicant |
| 07:43PM 18 |  | 07:468M 18 | 42.4 percent impervious coverage. The zone |
| 07: | forces the building design to be concentrated in a particular area of the site and forces the applicant | 19 | ve are in permits a $\mathbf{6 0}$ percent impervious |
| 07:43PM 20 | to build up a little bit. | 07:468P 20 | rage. The other multifamily zones, the AH-2 zone |
| 07:43PM 21 | The important thing in terms of density, intensity of use, and all the other indices | 07:46PM 21 | mits 85 percent impervious. The AH-VO |
| 07:43PM 22 |  | 07:47PM 22 | ercent. The ARHO is the one zone that is less |
| 07:43PM 23 | that measure intensity, is that we still are | 07:47PM 23 | an us at $\mathbf{3 5}$ percent. The ARHO-2 zone is at $\mathbf{5 0}$ |
| 07: | consistent with the ordinance that says you can haveup to a 36 -foot building height. | 07:47PM 24 | rcent. And, as I say, we're at $\mathbf{4 2 . 4}$ percent. |
| 07:44PM 25 |  | 07:47PM 25 | Similarly, in terms of building |
|  | 201-641-1812 | 201-641-1812 |  |
|  | 22 |  | 24 |
| 07:44PM 1 | Interestingly enough, and I went | 07:47PM | coverage, we are at 19.1 percent, whereas the zone in |
| 07:44PM | through this chart, which is A-18, there are other | 07:47P | we're located is 30 percent. The other z |
| 07:44PM | multifamily residential zones that permit | 07:47PM | 40,50, 25, 35, and 45 percent. So you could |
| 07:44PM | three-story 36 -foot building height. There is one | 07:47PM | how we fit in in a very positive way in relatio |
| 07:44PM | zone that permits a three-story 48 -foot building | 07:47PM | e other multifamily zones that the municipality |
| 07:4PM | height. So this is not something that's new andunique to your municipality. | 07:47PM 6 | ed. |
| 07:44PM |  | 07:47P | had some design waiver |
| 07:44PM | And I would add that, conventionally | 07:47PM 8 | A. |
| 07:44PM | speaking, I know a number of municipalities are even | 07:47PM 9 | There are four design waivers. One is |
| 07:44PM 10 | looking at this kind of regulatory control and simply | 07:488. 10 | rking space dimension waiver. The ordinance |
| 07:44PM 11 | saying we're going to limit the footage of height, and if somebody could get one, two, or three stories | 077.48PM 11 | quires a 10-foot by $\mathbf{2 0}$-foot parking stall. We are |
| 07:4 |  | 07:48PM 12 | oposing a 9-foot by $\mathbf{2 0 - f o o t ~ p a r k i n g ~ s t a l ~}$ |
| 07:44PM 13 | in a certain height, so be it, because the concern is | 07:488M 13 | ssue that relates to the |
| 07: | usually an aesthetic image of how the building willlook. | 07:48PM 14 | about number of parking spaces and th |
| 07:44PM 15 |  | 07:48PM 15 | position of RSIS standards in contrast to the local |
| 07:44PM 16 | In addition to that, there's also the | 07:488. 16 | ning ordinance also applies to the dimensions of |
| 07:45PM | negative criteria that one has to address and for | 07:488P 17 | rking stall in a residential zone |
| 07.45PM 18 | many of the same reasons. There's no substantial detriment to the public good or substantial | 07:488. 18 | The RSIS standards says you can have a |
| 07:45PM 19 |  | 07:48PM 19 | 20-foot parking stall -- actually it says 9 b |
| 07:45PM 20 | impairment to the intent of the master plan. The | 07:488P 20 | 18 -foot parking stall. So we are consistent at $9 \times 20$ |
| 07:45PM 21 | regulate overall intensity. And we're at 16.94 units | 07:488P 21 | with the RSIS standar |
| 07:45PM 22 |  | 07:48PM 22 | here is a waiver being requested for |
| 07:45PM 23 | per acre density, which, if you recall from this | 07:48PM 23 | minimum grade of the walkway to the building |
| 07: | chart when I testified last meeting, four of the six | 07:48PM 24 | ordinance permits a four percent grade. In one |
| 07:45PM 25 | zones have a greater density than that. So we fit in | 07:49PM 25 | instance, near building \#2, that grade is increased |
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|  | 25 |  | 27 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 07:49PM 1 | to five percent. | 07:51PM 1 | We're providing additional housing to |
| 07:49PM 2 | While we do not comply with the local | 07:51PM 2 | meet the needs of a segment of the population, and |
| 07:49PM | , we do comply with the ADA requirement for that | 07.51P | the affordable housing component |
| 07:49PM | rade. | 07.51P | providing a design that I think |
| 07:49PM 5 | There's a third waiver that's really | 07.52PM | will enhance the existin |
| 07:4PM 6 | purely an engineering issue. It's a minimum grade | 07.52PM |  |
| 07:49PM | for a swale. I just hark back to what the enginee | 07.52PM | furtherance of all thos |
| 07:49PM 8 | dalked about previously, the ordinance requires a | 07.52PM 8 | Is and objectives in the master plan that I spoke |
| 07:49PM 9 | minimum two percent grade. In one area, we have a | 07.52PM 9 | about earlier tonight and at the last meeting |
| 07:49PM 10 | grade, and he testified | 07:52PM 10 | the context of all those issues, |
| 07:49PM 11 | issues related | 07:52PM 11 | I think there's a benefit her |
| 07:49PM 12 | ould add that is a | 07.52PM 12 | ELIA: No further questions. |
| 07.49PM 13 | an off-site condition | 07.52PM 13 | IRWOMAN HEMBREE: I have a question. |
| 07:49PM 14 | dhen finally, there's an issue | 07.52PM 14 | I realize you're talking in terms of |
| 07:49PM 15 | about buffers. The engineer's report, I believe | 07.52PM 15 | the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, but nobody seems to be |
| 07.50PM | d to get a waiver because | 07:52PM 16 | able to talk about the Borough of Woodcliff Lake's |
| 07.50PM | parking abuts other proper | 07.52Pm 17 | impact on the bigger community, the Pascack Valley, |
| 07:50PM 18 | a lit | 07:52PM 18 | d, conversely, the impact of what other towns in |
| 07.50PM 19 | int of fact, we are maintainin | 07.52PM 19 | Pascack Valley are creating that have an impact |
| 07:50PM 20 | all the existing buffers, and that standard relate | 07.52PM 20 | the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, and I don' |
| 07:50PM 21 | to residential, and, in contrast to nonresidentia | 07.52PM 21 | erstand why not. I mean, we're building a |
| 07:50PM | elopment, n | 07.52PM 22 | ding in Park Ridge, we're possibly building a |
| 07.50PM 23 | elopment | 07.52PM 23 | ge building in Montvale on the Sony property, and |
| 07.50PM 24 | d beyond that, I believe, as you had | 07.53PM 24 | dy is looking at the big picture. Why |
| 07:50PM 25 | ard from our engineer, we are supplementing the LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 07.53PM 25 | THE WITNESS: Well, I think in one LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
|  | 26 |  | 28 |
| 07:50PM 1 | ape plan to screen that one area, an existing | 07:53PM 1 | respect, we are. |
| 07:50PM 2 | area that is a little shy of enough buffer | 07.53PM 2 | The affordable housing obligations a |
| 07.50PM 3 | tings, and we're going to add to that one area | 07.53PM 3 | set. |
| 07.50PM 4 | ensure that it's fully | 07.53PM 4 | OMAN HEMBREE: Righ |
| 07.50PM 5 | Q. Any detriments as it pert | 07.53PM 5 | E WITNESS: You have a settlement |
| 07.50PM 6 | neighborhood, substantial detriments? | 07.53PM 6 | reement that establishes a certain obligation, plu |
| 07.50PM 7 | A. No, in terms of the waivers, none | 07.53PM 7 | unmet need obligation that is not bein |
| 07:50PM 8 | atever. The parking stall represents a safe and | 07.53PM 8 | affirmatively addressed |
| 07:51PM 9 | efficient condition, obviously it's acceptable to the | 07.53PM 9 | re not obligated to address th |
| 07:51PM 10 | IS standards. | 07.53PM 10 | tirety of that unmet need, but you are supposed to |
| 07:51PM 11 | The grading is consistent with the ADA | 07.53PM 11 | be making an effort to address a portion of |
| 07:51PM 12 | dards | 07:53PM 12 | This project helps you address |
| 07:51PM 13 | The swale, the engineer had testifie | 07.53PM 13 | tion of that. And when you go for your compliance |
| 07.51PM | in terms of the propriety of that | 07.53PM 14 | aring with the judge, that is one of the questions |
| 07:51PM 15 | And the buffer, in fact we satisfy th | 07:53PM 15 | at is typically asked, so you will be able to use |
| 07:51PM 16 | nt of the buffer requirement | 07.53PM 16 | this project and point to it as another means by |
| 07:51PM 17 | Q. And the same thi | 07.53PM 17 | which you're affirmatively addressing your affordable |
| 07:51PM 18 | hole. I know you commented on it, but if you | 07:54PM 18 | housing obligations. |
| 07:51PM 19 | just conclude as to your opinion as to how this | 07:54PM 19 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No, I understand |
| 07.51PM 20 | project impacts the neighborhood, I would appreciate | 07.54PM 20 | affordable housing piece, but that's not my |
| 07.51PM 21 | at. | 07:54PM 21 | estion. There are other things that have an impact |
| 07:51PM 22 | A. Well, in many respects I think the | 07:54PM 22 | that you know about. |
| 07.51PM 23 | whole testimony suggested the impacts are beneficial. | 07:54PM 23 | THE WITNESS: Well, some of them relate |
| 07.51PM 24 | We're reducing the amount of traffic | 07:54PM 24 | affic. |
| 07:51PM 25 | generating potential at this location. | 07:54PM 25 | HAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Correct, that's my |
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people can commute from other communities. It may have multifamily dwellings. It's got underground parking where executives don't have to get wet when it rains. So it's got a lot of positive attributes of being an office building. So, why not?

THE WITNESS: It's my understanding that this building was built in 1981, and that predates all the computerization efforts that we see in office buildings today.

Office buildings today that are built, and there are few and far between, it seems, because of the changing market, they have much greater ceilings and upper floor height to accommodate all the cables and everything else that office workers demand as part of an office environment.

This building is not easily
retrofittable for that reason.
In contrast, it's easy to retrofit this building for multifamily residential development.

I've heard the question before about
what about that reverse commute, people could commute here.

Statistically, the numbers just don't work out that way. It's a lot easier to commute from the suburbs to, you know, certain core areas, whether LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  office.

THE WITNESS: Even if that were the LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
it's New York or Jersey City, or, you know, wherever.
That reverse commute doesn't happen as often, it's very few and far between, so we're not seeing those kinds of commutes in this region.

MR. SPIRIG: So you're saying it's
unfeasible to use the building as an office building?
THE WITNESS: That is my understanding in talking to --

MR. SPIRIG: So the apartments wouldn't need the same type of wiring that the office needs?

THE WITNESS: Not at all.
MR. SPIRIG: Everything is wireless.
THE WITNESS: Not at all.
I get that from the architect. I don't recall if you asked him that question when he was here.

MR. SPIRIG: So I know you weren't here the night we had testimony from the applicant's real estate expert. I asked him the question as to whether or not he could rent this as an office building, he said yes, maybe not at the rate they would want to get, but, yes.

So it's certainly rentable as an

08:00PM 1
case, you know, when we look at the Municipal Land Use Law and you're asked as a board to analyze the merits of an application, the questions are typically are there special reasons that support the application.

So whether it could be rentable, that doesn't address the question of are there special reasons or not. And if you recall, from my testimony, I think I identified 5 or 7 special reasons to support or offer a rationale for you to grant this relief.

You heard what I said tonight about the negative criteria. I think clearly the negative criteria is also being affirmed. So within the context of what the statute asks you to examine, I think the application is on firm ground.

MR. SPIRIG: All right. So let's go to my second avenue here.

You mentioned that we fall within the proper guidelines of having open space on this property. I think as a resident of Woodcliff Lake, perhaps our opinion of open space may be a little different than yours, but I don't see open space on this property. I don't see green space for the residents that live in this building. Where is the

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 lawn? Where is the gazebo? Where is the picnic benches? Where is the area for children to play? None of that exists, primarily because of the second building that's being put in.

If you were to do this project without the second building, you would have open space and green space for the people who live there.

THE WITNESS: Unfortunately, I think you're discounting the fact that 30 percent of the site in the rear, I'm not even counting the side --

MR. SPIRIG: Unusable. That's a steep slope space.

THE WITNESS: It's open space.
MR. SPIRIG: But it's unusable.
THE WITNESS: But your master plan doesn't make that distinction. Your master plan talks about open space in terms of active recreation space, but it also talks about it in terms of preserving environmentally sensitive and steep slope properties. It talks about it in that context.

MR. SPIRIG: So why the second building? Why stick a building in every piece of open space that we have, when it could be utilized for --

THE WITNESS: No, it's not open space
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
201-641-1812
at present. The building is being placed where a parking lot is. It's not being --

MR. SPIRIG: A parking lot is today, but it --

THE WITNESS: But it's not taking green
space away. In fact, there's 2,800-square foot
additional green space being provided on-site by virtue of this application.

Interestingly enough, in terms of density, in terms of building coverage, and in terms of impervious coverage, we meet the indices of virtually all of your multifamily zones and --

MR. SPIRIG: We don't have any --
THE WITNESS: Let me finish.
Pardon me?
MR. SPIRIG: We don't have any multifamily zones.

THE WITNESS: You have six multifamily zones.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: That's affordable
housing.
MR. SPIRIG: You're talking about
affordable housing.
THE WITNESS: You've designated it for affordable housing.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.
THE WITNESS: But it's multifamily
housing.
MR. SPIRIG: Well --
THE WITNESS: So you've identified a
series of regulatory controls in all those different zones, and we meet virtually all of those regulatory controls in those various zones.

MR. SPIRIG: Yes, but yet there's no green space for the residents who live there.

THE WITNESS: Well, as I said before, only three quarters of the units are one bedroom units, so I don't envision, you know, children coming to this site. That's why I said that you're only going to have a handful of public schoolchildren coming here.

There are different kinds of projects that are designed for different segments of the population. I would not think that this is a design that is designed to encourage families with kids. I think it's designed to encourage some segment of seniors and young couples without children or singles without children, and I think that's what this is designed for.

MR. SPIRIG: But there are some two LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
bedroom units and there will be some three bedroom units.

THE WITNESS: If the affordable units
are built on-site, there would be 2 three-bedroom
units, but that's by state requirement, and it's
required in your settlement agreement to settle your affordable housing issue.

So even recognizing that, I don't see that as the issue.

MR. SPIRIG: But as a planner, from a planning standpoint, why the second building?

THE WITNESS: Because it clearly fits
in with the overall construct of not only the site
but the way in which you regulate multifamily
development here.
MR. SPIRIG: Okay. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Mr. Burgis, your
master plan is more than 10 years old, remember?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes. Okay. So things change and the master plan has not changed. I think Mr. Preiss is going to look at that.

THE WITNESS: I'm looking forward to
hearing what he has to say too.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Me too.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

```
witness?
witness?
```

Anybody else, questions for the
(No response.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Can I have a motion to open to the public?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait. I have some questions.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Oh, excuse me.
CROSS EXAMINATION
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. You mentioned a Broadway corridor in the master plan.
A. Broadway corridor study, it was in 2008.
Q. You said "master plan," I wrote it
down. Did you mean --

## A. It's entitled "Broadway Corridor

 Study."Q. What year document are you referring
to?
A. I think it's 2008 or 2009.
Q. And your chart, A-18 --
A. Yes.
Q. -- that doesn't have on it the
townhouse development on County Road. Is that
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
$\square$
correct?
A. We discussed that at the last meeting.
Q. No, I know. I'm just asking you a question, sir.
A. Okay.
Q. Is that included on your chart on A-18?
A. No.

We were directed by the board to prepare this table to identify all multifamily zones. And if you're familiar with the ordinance, that site is zoned for single-family attached housing, which is townhouses.
Q. Sir, I recall that you said that, but I just want you to answer the question.

Does A-18 have the development off County Road that has townhouses?
A. No, it does not.
Q. Okay. Thank you, sir.

And those are attached townhouses?
A. Correct.
Q. Do you know how many there are in the building?
A. No, I don't recall.
Q. Do you know what the density is for those townhouses off County Road?

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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## A. It's about 5.6 or 5.7 to the acre. <br> Q. Is there a rooftop deck as part of this

 application?A. Not that I'm aware of.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Mr. Delia?
MR. DELIA: No.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Because I thought I saw that in a report.

MR. DELIA: No, it was a question that was asked. No. We have mechanicals, and that's been fully explored.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, because I did see it in the report and it just raises another question.

MR. DELIA: No, no deck. We're talking mechanicals, and we did that with the line of sight exhibit with Mr. Dattoli and with Mr. Clark.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm just making sure, because in reviewing some of the reports, I thought I saw something on that.

MR. DELIA: No, we don't have them.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Thank you.
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. Now, you, Mr. Burgis, testified that the building was built in 1981 and it's not

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 entail? You're talking about cables, like raised flooring --

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. DHAWAN: -- for an office building?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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retrofittable for electronic-type equipment but it is retrofittable for apartments.

I would like to know what facts you
base that opinion on?
A. The discussion with the architect.
Q. And the name of the architect you're referring to?
A. Mr. Dattoli.
Q. Did he supply you with any cost estimates to compare --

## A. No, he did not.

Q. -- retrofitting apartments?
A. No, he did not.
Q. Did he indicate what the costs were for retrofitting for an office for electronic equipment versus retrofitting for apartments?

## A. No, he did not.

MR. DHAWAN: I have a question.
You're talking about this electronic

MR. DHAWAN: Is that still being done? I haven't seen that.

THE WITNESS: I'm not an architect, so I couldn't tell you.

MR. DHAWAN: Now, I think Wi-Fi, the way cables are done, now they can run it through a suspended ceiling. Is that even a legitimate concern?

THE WITNESS: He didn't raise it to me. As I said, I'm not the architect.

MR. DHAWAN: Even the computers are now
the size of a paper, laptop, and $\mathrm{Wi}-\mathrm{Fi}$ and people carry it to a cafe, so I'm not understanding what you mean by that. Is there some height restriction in this building?

THE WITNESS: That was something that should have been asked of him. He just gave me the conclusion.

MR. DHAWAN: Okay.
MR. SPIRIG: I will point out that most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the ' 80 s , with the exception of maybe the newest BMW one.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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|  | 45 |  | 47 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 08:12PM 1 | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO: | 08:15PM 1 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any other |
| 08:12PM 2 | Q. Just for clarification, your exhibit | 08:15PM 2 | questions? |
| 08:12PM 3 | A-18, the multiple dwelling zone chart that you | 08:15PM 3 | (No response.) |
| 08:12PM 4 | prepared, those are all affordable housing zones. Is | 08:15PM 4 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Can I have a |
| 08:12PM 5 | ec | 08:15PM 5 | otion to open to the public |
| 08:12PM 6 | A. That is correct. | 08:15PM 6 | MR. HAYES: Motion to open to the |
| 08:12PM 7 | Q. Okay. | 08:15PM 7 | public. |
| 08:12PM 8 | A. Except for the S-O zone, which is the | 08:15PM 8 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Is there a second? |
| 08:12PM 9 | zone we're located in. | 08:15PM 9 | MR. KAUFMAN: Second. |
| 08:12PM 10 | Q. Correct. That's why you're here. | 08:15PM 10 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor? |
| 08:12PM 11 | A. Yes. | 08:15PM 11 | (Whereupon, all Board Members respond |
| 08:12PM 12 | Q. All right. Okay. Just bear with me | 08:15PM 12 | in the affirmative.) |
| 08:12PM 13 | one second. | 08:15PM 13 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? |
| 08:12PM 14 | MR. DHAWAN: Do you have a handout of | 08:15PM 14 | (No response.) |
| 08:12PM 15 | that? | 08:15PM 15 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Members of the |
| 08:12PM 16 | THE WITNESS: I do not | 08:15PM 16 | public, you may ask Mr. Burgis questions. Please |
| 08:13Pм 17 | MR. DELIA: We handed out a bunch last | 08:15PM 17 | state your name and your address. Come up. We still |
| $\text { 08:13Рм } 18$ | time. Sorry I didn't bring extras tonight. I'll see | 08:15PM 18 | don't have proper microphones. |
| 08:13Pм 19 | if I can find one. | 08:15PM 19 | MS. LEVINE: I'll try to shout. |
| 08:13Pм 20 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I probably have | 08:15PM 20 | Gwenn Levine. |
| 08:13PM 2 | some in my pile. | 08:15PM 21 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: And your address, |
| 08:13PM 22 | THE WITNESS: Yes, I had a dozen or 15 | 08:15PM 22 | ma'am? |
| 08:13Pм 23 | copies last meeting. | 08:15PM 23 | MS. LEVINE: 65 Campbell Avenue. |
| 08:13PM 24 | MR. DELIA: I don't think I have | 08:15PM 24 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. |
| 08:13PM 25 | extras. One second. | 08:15PM 25 | MS. LEVINE: Woodcliff Lake. |
|  | 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 |
|  | 46 |  | 48 |
| 08:13PM 1 | have A-18 | 08:15PM 1 | Are you going to stand right there |
| 08:13PM 2 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: This? | 08:15PM 2 | while I speak? |
| 08:13PM 3 | HE WITNESS: Yes. | 08:15PM $\mathbf{3}$ | THE WITNESS: I thought you were going |
| 08:13PM 4 | MR. DELIA: I just handed A-18. | 08:15PM 4 | to ask me a question. |
| 08:14PM 5 | Obviously I'll take that back when you're done. | 08:15PM 5 | MS. LEVINE: I'm sort of asking the |
| 08:14PM 6 | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Just one question. | 08:15PM 6 | zoning board and you. |
| 08:14PM 7 | I know you're saying there's green space. | 08:16PM 7 | Mr. Burgis stated that this project is |
| 08:14PM 8 | There's no green space for activities. | 08:16PM 8 | consistent with ordinance requirements and the master |
| 08:14PM 9 | I'm not sure if you're the right one to ask, but is | 08:16PM 9 | plan. Maybe some aspects, but not all. |
| 08:14PM 10 | there anything in the building, nothing inside, just | 08:16pm 10 | I would like to ask about the rationale |
| 08:14PM 11 | apartments? | 08:16PM 11 | for granting -- |
| 08:14PM 12 | MR. DELIA: Very small gym for the | 08:16PM 12 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You're asking Mr. |
| 08:14PM 13 | personal use of the tenants, I'm told. | 08:16PM 13 | Burgis a question, not us. |
| 08:14PM 14 | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: So just a small | 08:16PM 14 | MS. LEVINE: Okay. |
| 08:14PM 15 | gym? | 08:16PM 15 | I would like to ask about the rationale |
| 08:14PM 16 | MR. DELIA: Small gym. | 08:16PM 16 | for granting a variance in an S-O office zone as |
| 08:14PM 17 | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO: | 08:16PM 17 | requested by the developer of 188 Broadway. |
| 08:14PM 18 | Q. The statistic that you cited for | 08:16PM 18 | According to the Woodcliff Lake Zoning |
| 08:14PM 19 | population under five, where did you get that from? | 08:16PM 19 | Board's rules, there are two kinds of variances, (c) |
| 08:14PM 20 | A. The U.S. Census and then the American | 08:16PM 20 | variances and (d) variances. I checked on the |
| 08:14PM 21 | survey for 2015. | 08:16PM 21 | website. |
| 08:14PM 22 | Q. I'm sorry, 2000 and -- | 08:16PM 22 | (c) variances relate to the dimensions |
| 08:14PM 23 | A. '15. | 08:16PM 23 | of the proposed building. I'm not going to ask about |
| 08:15PM 24 | Q. Okay | 08:16PM 24 | that. |
| 08:15PM 25 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any other questions? <br> LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 08:16PM 25 | There are five kinds of (d) variances. LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

Variance No. 1 can be granted for the
"use or principal structure in a zoning district
which does not permit such use or principal structure."

Am I correct in assuming that variance
No. 1 applies to 188 Broadway?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. LEVINE: Okay. "In addition, (d)
variances may only be granted for special reasons in particular cases. The applicant should demonstrate that the site is not suited for any zoned use and that it is peculiarly suited for the proposed use."

Has the applicant demonstrated that 188
Broadway is not suited for office use? If so, what
is the basis for this conclusion, especially given the fact that there is a large office complex right next door at 172 Broadway?

THE WITNESS: I am troubled by the wording of that.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well --
THE WITNESS: Because the Land Use Law
is clear, the Municipal Land Use Law says an applicant has to show special reasons and address the negative criteria statute.

The statute does not say that you have LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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to identify that all uses that are allowed in this zone have to be eliminated from the consideration or discussion before you make the determination as to whether or not there are special reasons to support the proposed use.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: It was a long
question, but I think the question is, is it suited for office use, that particular property?

THE WITNESS: But that's not the test. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, that's the question.

MS. LEVINE: That's one of the tests.
THE WITNESS: No, it's not.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, that's the question. Whether it's the test or not, we can talk about that, but that's the question, is it suitable for office use is the question.

THE WITNESS: Obviously there is a vacated office building on-site, but, as I pointed out in my direct testimony, there are five special reasons to support the request for multifamily dwelling at this location.

MS. LEVINE: Okay. So let me just say that I am taking this wording directly from under the zoning board of adjustment application directions.

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

Toward the end, there is an ordinance that last
December, when I first developed this question, was 09-05, for some reason when I checked it today, it's now 18-03, I'm not sure why, but the wording is all exactly the same. So all of my wording here is directly from there.

So the wording is: Has the applicant demonstrated that this zone, which is an office zone, is not suited for office use?

Just repeat that because that's --
MR. DELIA: I think I'm going to have to object here. That's not my understanding of the law.

MS. LEVINE: It's what it says.
MR. DELIA: I don't care what that says, I know what the law says.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Questions for the witness. I think your question is is it suited for office space. Okay. If you want to make a legal argument on what our ordinance says, you can do that.

MS. LEVINE: Well, I guess I'm saying, is it consistent with the zoning variance ordinance which says it must proof that it is no longer suited for zoning use in this zoning zone.

MR. DELIA: That's simply not true.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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MS. LEVINE: In this office zone.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Hold on.
Right now, questions for this witness.
I think the question is, is this property suitable for office use? That's the question.

Right now it's questions. You can make arguments or comments at the end, not arguments in terms of arguing with the witness.

MS. LEVINE: I understand.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: But an argument at the conclusion that your opinion is such.

MS. LEVINE: So the way you just stated is whether appropriate for office use.

What the ordinance says, you have to prove it is not suited anymore for office use.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Right now just ask this witness questions.

MS. LEVINE: Okay. All right. So next

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We have our planner, who will testify, you can ask him a question when he testifies as well.

MS. LEVINE: Yes, I'm hoping he will.
Okay. In addition -- well, this is
part of it. In addition, has the applicant
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
demonstrated that 180 Broadway is peculiarly suited to be a 60-unit apartment complex.

I think your answer would be yes.
(Mr. Newman is now present at this
public meeting at 8:20 p.m.)
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. LEVINE: So if so, and it was so, from what he said, how is this possible, given the following points: The S-O office zone is almost completely surrounded by an $\mathrm{R}-15$ single-family home zone.

In addition, the Woodcliff Lake master plan includes goals relevant to this request for a variance, three of them.

Goal No. 1 is to reaffirm and enhance the existing residential character of Woodcliff Lake and to preserve and protect the existing residential densities.

Goal No. 2 is to limit multifamily development.

Goal No. 10 is to prevent urban sprawl.
How can the request for a variance by the applicant possibly be granted? They do not meet the Woodcliff Lake zoning variance requirements.

THE WITNESS: Do you have a question LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
I think your answer would be yes.
(Mr. Newman is now present at this
public meeting at 8:20 p.m.)
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. LEVINE: So if so, and it was so,
from what he said, how is this possible, given the
following points: The S-O office zone is almost
completely surrounded by an R-15 single-family home
zone.
In addition, the Woodcliff Lake master
plan includes goals relevant to this request for a
variance, three of them.
Goal No. 1 is to reaffirm and enhance
the existing residential character of Woodcliff Lake
and to preserve and protect the existing residential
densities.
Goal No. 2 is to limit multifamily
development.
Goal No. 10 is to prevent urban sprawl.
How can the request for a variance by 54

## now?

As I indicated, there are five goals of the master plan that I felt were being affirmed by this application. I'm not going to repeat them all, but, in addition to that, the master plan is a 2002 document. Since then, you adopted a 2008 reexamination report, which reiterated those goals and also talked about encouraging multifamily development near the train station.

So the 2002 master plan may have had some of those goals, that -- I'm sorry, your name?

MS. LEVINE: Gwenn.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
That Gwenn had indicated.
They have been, to a large measure, superceded by other events, including your 2008 reexamination report and the 2008 or 2009 Broadway corridor study, which specifically talked about encouraging multifamily development near the train station.

Now, if there's ever a side that meets that standard, it's this one.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.
THE WITNESS: So that's why I concluded that we do meet a number of the goals of the master
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plan. I had ticked them all off before.
MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Burgis, was that in the master plan, the redesign, was that for a mixed use with commercial with apartments over it or was that strictly residential?

THE WITNESS: It talked about mixed use, but in the Broadway corridor study in 2009, I'm sorry -- yeah -- the borough recently amended the Broadway business district to include solely residential development to provide incentive for redevelopment in this area.

MR. NEWMAN: But, again, was that as part of a greater goal of commercial, residential on top or --

THE WITNESS: In that instance, it didn't talk about mixed usage, it just talked about residential.

MR. NEWMAN: And that was 2009, right?
THE WITNESS: I believe so, yeah.
MR. NEWMAN: Which is 10 years ago.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: Was that ever adopted by the mayor and council?

THE WITNESS: It would have been a planning board study, not a governing body study.

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

MR. NEWMAN: Did the mayor and council make any changes to the zoning, you know, for the zone in which this is in to allow that use as a permitted use?

THE WITNESS: No, they did not.
MR. NEWMAN: And they have the study,
correct?
THE WITNESS: I assume so. MR. NEWMAN: Thank you.
MR. DELIA: I would just like the record to reflect that Mr. Newman has arrived at approximately 8:15.

MR. NEWMAN: Correct.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thank you.
MR. DELIA: I just want it on the
record, that's all, for everyone's sake.
MR. NEWMAN: If the secretary could
provide to me either the transcripts or the
videotape, so I can watch it before I take any action on this application.

MS. SMITH: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: Thank you.
MS. LEVINE: I have a second question
or should I wait?
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: It depends on if
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
it. it.
it's a question for Mr. Burgis.
MS. LEVINE: I think it is.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right.
MS. LEVINE: If not, you can tell me.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Or DO you want to give somebody else a chance?

MS. LEVINE: Okay. Somebody else?
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: If there's nobody else, you can.

MS. LEVINE: Yes, I'll come back. Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MS. DISPOTO: I have just a brief
question.
Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.
MS. DISPOTO: Mr. Burgis, you cited
that 2008, 2009 Broadway corridor study.
I'm wondering if you're familiar with an ordinance in Woodcliff Lake called the "Broadway Corridor Ordinance" that was widely reported in the press in 2016 and 2017 and was discussed at planning board meetings on the public record and mayor and council meetings here in town?

THE WITNESS: I think I remember that. I'm not sure what years it would have been.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with corridor ordinance, there was some discussion about whether or not Woodcliff Lake wanted to permit residential uses, it would have covered this zone as well as the other zones along Broadway?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware that in 2017, after extensive public hearings, the mayor and council and the Woodcliff Lake Planning Board decided to scrap the Broadway corridor ordinance because it was widely decided that Woodcliff Lake was not an apartment town or multifamily town and did not favor residential in our Broadway corridor area?

THE WITNESS: Yes, but I'm also aware that since then it designated, as part of their settlement agreement, a site immediately to the north of this site for a 16 -unit 100 percent affordable development.

MS. DISPOTO: That's correct, but are you aware that those three lots were purchased with COAH funds by the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, and, therefore, the Borough of Woodcliff Lake was bound by law to develop the multifamily at that site because
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08:29PM 1
it was used with COAH designated funds?
THE WITNESS: Actually you could use
those funds for any site, you didn't even have to
select a site on Broadway. So I find it interesting
that irrespective of the governing body's action in
'16 and '17, in '18 they choose to use the money at
that particular location.
MS. DISPOTO: No, I just want to
correct that. The sites were purchased many years ago over a series of years well prior to the settlement agreement in 2018. When the fair share housing committee in Woodcliff Lake reviewed what we were going to do with the settlement agreement, the three parcels north of Highview, as they're known, were purchased in prior years with COAH money. So the town was faced with no choice, they were doing that well before the COAH board became defunct in the State of New Jersey. So this municipality had no choice but to locate multifamily on those three lots.

MR. DELIA: Objection.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: You could testify, if
you want. Right now, it's the opportunity for questions. You'd have to come back and take an oath, and you can testify with regard to facts that are within your knowledge.
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You can ask the witness if he's aware
of the date when it was purchased and with what
funds. You can certainly ask him all those
questions.
MS. DISPOTO: Actually I think I'll
withdraw for now and will revisit this later. I'll
reserve the right to come back and testify possibly.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
MS. DISPOTO: I just want to establish
that Mr. Burgis is familiar with the Broadway
corridor ordinance and that he acknowledged that he
was aware of that, because he cited the 2008,2009
Broadway corridor study.
I have one more question.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I don't mean to
discourage you from asking any questions.
MS. DISPOTO: I have one more question.
I appreciate that, Mr. Princiotto. I
just have one more question.
Are you aware that very recently
Woodcliff Lake, the mayor and council just approved
funds to have our planning board update our master
plan were due for an update so...
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解 unds. You can certainly ask him all those

MS. DISPOTO: Actually I think I'll
withdraw for now and will revisit this later. I'll reserve the right to come back and testify possibly.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.
MS. DISPOTO: I just want to establish that Mr. Burgis is familiar with the Broadway corridor ordinance and that he acknowledged that he was aware of that, because he cited the 2008, 2009 Broadway corridor study.

I have one more question.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I don't mean to

MS. DISPOTO: I have one more question.
I appreciate that, Mr. Princiotto. I

Are you aware that very recently
Woodcliff Lake, the mayor and council just approved funds to have our planning board update our master plan?

THE WITNESS: I am not, but I do know
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housing. We represent Saddle River. They have seen affordable housing. And it has worked. Park Ridge has affordable housing. River Vale has affordable housing. Montvale has affordable housing. I'm not aware of any of these developments that have become a burden on a municipality.

MR. COUTO: I was -- I'll let you finish.

THE WITNESS: That's the important point, that while there's this misconception as to what affordable housing is, it's not poor people's housing, it's housing for moderate income households and does not represent a burden on municipalities.

MR. COUTO: My question --
THE WITNESS: Let me finish my comment.
MR. COUTO: Sure.
THE WITNESS: If all of those
municipalities were able to absorb affordable
housing, I don't see why Woodcliff Lake cannot. In fact, you already have.

MR. COUTO: Okay. My question was not about affordable housing. I'm all for affordable housing.

My question is: You made a general testimony that it would be good to approve this
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application for the good of the town. It's actually be better for the town.

My question is: If it's not better for the town and over 10 years the town loses two percent increase in values, then the town will be carrying that burden, if your testimony is not correct.

THE WITNESS: No. Well, I think --
MR. COUTO: As overall, not affordable
housing unit, the overall testimony, good for the
town or not good for the town.
MR. DELIA: Object. This is
argumentative, honestly.
THE WITNESS: I disagree with the supposition, because --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, I think you're not going to get an answer to your question, sir. I'm sorry.

MR. COUTO: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: It's an impossible
question.
MR. COUTO: I have another question.
You mentioned that the number of
students in Montvale?
THE WITNESS: I did not.
MR. COUTO: You said the number of
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students in high school. Didn't you mention a number of students in high school?

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Can you formulate a question?

THE WITNESS: From Pascack Hills, yes.
MR. COUTO: You said that we have less
students than some years back.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. COUTO: Now projecting in the
future, did you take into account a possible
development of a thousand units in Montvale?
THE WITNESS: No, I was just reporting the historic trend.

MR. COUTO: Okay. That's all for now.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any other
members of the public?
MS. BORRELLI: Ann Marie Borrelli,
Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake.
You mentioned before about the demographics of the town.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
MS. BORRELLI: That you say was
predominantly, is it an older generation in this town? You were saying something about that it's
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pretty -- what did you say? I couldn't hear back there.

THE WITNESS: No, I said the population as a whole has been fairly stable. And I had commented about how this housing type could be attractive for seniors who no longer need their larger detached single-family house, who want to stay in the community where they raised their family and have their friends, it could be a place that they could relocate to.

MS. BORRELLI: So do you know what the demographics of the town is? Is it an older generation majority?

THE WITNESS: If memory serves, the average age is about 42, from the last census, which is about average for the county. When I compare it to all 21 counties in the state, it's higher than most.

MS. BORRELLI: So would you say that like within 10 years the demographics would change, as the older generation starts moving out of town, newer families come in, the demographics could change to a younger population with younger families, correct?

THE WITNESS: These things are always
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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cyclical.
MS. BORRELLI: Okay. All right. So like 10 to 15 years, demographics change and the school systems could become inundated again, correct?

THE WITNESS: The one fly in that ointment is the changing nature of millennials and their interests in living in the suburbs, raising families and having children or not, particularly given their additional burdens about, you know, college loans that they'll be paying into their 40 s .

MS. BORRELLI: Also you're speculating that --

MR. DELIA: Objection.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Ask a question.
MS. BORRELLI: So your question is --
THE WITNESS: It's your question.
MS. BORRELLI: Well, I'm asking a question.

It's your opinion that people who want to retire are going to want to move across a train station?

THE WITNESS: I said this could be attractive to a segment of that population, yes.

MS. BORRELLI: Okay.
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MS. BORRELLI: But that's your opinion,

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Right.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. BORRELLI: And so do you feel that this project, based on the EPA framework for smart growth, do you feel that this project is in alignment with that? Do you feel that it will promote -- let me get my notes. Sorry.

That it will support the quality of life. It will promote a vibrant downtown or a commercial district that will increase access to open space, parks and recreation, preserve natural space in the city and surrounding area, and maintain the character and distinctive community assets as per the EPA smart growth guidelines?

THE WITNESS: There's a number of smart growth principles. I only focused on the smart growth principles spelled out in the state plan. There's 10 of them. And as I testified at the previous meeting, I highlighted the encouraging mixed use development along the whole corridor. I talked about compact building design, which obviously this is. I talked about the creation of a walkable neighborhood, because as you have this and then other
mixed use development with commercial at grade, it adds to the walkability of the community, and I talked about preserving critical environmental areas, you know, that 30 percent of the site is characterized by steep slopes.

MS. BORRELLI: So let me ask you a question.

Where are all these people walking to and where are they walking for?

THE WITNESS: As the Broadway plan flushes out, because the plan does talk about and the master plan does talk about encouraging more commercial development up and down the corridor, that's where they would walk to and from.

MS. BORRELLI: And there would be places for that, if apartments are lining Broadway? There would be room for that?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. BORRELLI: So you mentioned various other multifamily dwellings along train stations, such as Ridgewood, and Ridgewood has a vibrant downtown?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. BORRELLI: You mentioned Park
Ridge. And all of these have a downtown for people
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to walk, to go shopping, to get foods, right?
THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
MS. BORRELLI: Do you feel that that is existence in the proximity of 188 ?

THE WITNESS: Not at present, but your master plan talks about that, so that's why this would fit in with that vision for the municipality.

We're the planner's in West Windsor, and there is nothing around their train station at present, but we have a plan that talks about a few hundred multifamily units, a hotel, I forget how many square feet of nonresidential development to create a true downtown for --

MS. BORRELLI: Are they restricted --
THE WITNESS: Let me finish.
MS. BORRELLI: -- by the topographic --
THE WITNESS: The issue is sound
planning, you know, is visionary.
MS. BORRELLI: Uh-huh.
THE WITNESS: I think in your master plan, you know, there's a certain vision, and that's what we're trying to a complement.

MS. BORRELLI: Now, are those plans, are they bound by topographic constraints like Broadway? Do we have a lake and a railroad on one
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| 08:51PM 3 | redevelopment. | 08:53PM 3 |  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Can we end this? |
| 08:51PM 4 | MR. NEWMAN: When you say "master | 08:53PM 4 |  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. |
| 08:51PM 5 | plan," are you talking about an approved master plan | 08:53PM 5 |  | AUDIENCE VOICE: Please. |
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| 08:51PM 18 | THE WITNESS: Your reexamination report | 08:53PM 18 |  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Tell her your name |
| 08:51PM 19 | from 2008 reaffirmed all the goals and objectives and | 08:53Рм 19 | again. |  |
| 08:51PM 20 | plan recommendations of the 2002 plan? | 08:53PM 20 |  | MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine. |
| 08:51PM 21 | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO: | 08:53PM 21 |  | A few months ago, the applicant's |
| 08:52Pm 22 | Q. I don't think I got a full answer to my | 08:53PM 22 | architect | ribed the multiunit building at 188 as |
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| 08:52PM 1 | A. We did when we did the 2008 reexam, 1 | 08:53PM 1 |  | THE WITNESS: It can be part of it. |
| 08:52PM 2 | don't remember. | 08:53PM 2 |  | You were here for my testimony at the |
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| 08:52PM 4 | Did you do it at any recent time? | 08:53PM 4 |  | MS. LEVINE: (Shakes head.) |
| 08:52PM 5 | A. There hasn't been much change since. | 08:54PM 5 |  | THE WITNESS: I had pointed out that |
| 08:52PM 6 | Q. I want to know, did you do it? Did you | 08:54PM 6 | the locatio | $s$-à-vis the train station is a |
| 08:52PM 7 | do any analysis to determine how many undeveloped | 08:54PM 7 | significant | ue, because the state plan |
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| 08:52PM 10 | I don't know the exact number. | 08:54PM 10 |  | MS. LEVINE: Okay. So I had never |
| 08:52PM 11 | Q. How did you determine the handful? | 08:54PM 11 | heard of a | before, and I'm asking: Has it been |
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THE WITNESS: Right, that's basically what a TOD is.

MS. LEVINE: The only retail north of 188 is a carpet store. There's no retail west of 188.

MR. DELIA: Objection. It's a
statement. We're not even talking TOD here. Joe's
already said that.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Ma'am --
MS. LEVINE: We talked about walkable and downtown.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: This happens
frequently, a lot of people want to make comments,
but at this point you can just ask questions.
You can make this comment later. You can say it's not a TOD.

MS. LEVINE: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And the reasons why
it's not. When you have the opportunity to make
comments, you can make the comment. Okay?
MS. LEVINE: Okay.
When it was mentioned by the architect
I wanted to ask then, I was told to wait, so...
MR. NEWMAN: Do you have any questions for him?
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86 thing, it isn't because of the reservoir.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Ma'am, you can make the comments later.

Thank you.
MS. LEVINE: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else from
the public?
MR. MARSON: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You're going to
have a quick question, right?
MR. MARSON: Craig Marson, 7 Cricket
Lane, Woodcliff Lake.
You testified that there would be a
decrease in the traffic pattern.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. Just one second.

MR. MARSON: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Mr. Delia, we have a new witness.

MR. DELIA: A new witness, I know.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I mean a new
questioner of your witness. I know you have another witness too.

MR. MARSON: You previously testified that there would be a reduction in traffic.

Was that based on the AM and PM peak hours only?

MR. HAYES: Wrong witness.
MR. MARSON: He just testified to it,
though.
MR. HAYES: No, he just referred to
Mr. Luglio's testimony. He's coming next.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: He's coming next.
Have a seat.
MS. JEFFAS: Laura Jeffas, 39 Kenwood Drive, Woodcliff Lake.

I wanted to get back to what you were alking about earlier with the additions to the
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school system.
When you called Pascack Hills and when you talked to the Woodcliff Middle and Dorchester schools, did you just ask about this particular building and how it would impact the schools or did you also take into consideration the 3,000 people, and that's from the mayor of Montvale, that will be moving into Montvale prior to Sony's building being approved and also the affordable housing that are going to Woodcliff Lake?

MR. DELIA: I'm going to object.
That's a speculative question. There's a lot of what-ifs in there.

MS. JEFFAS: It comes down to, did you just ask about the five people that you think might go to school here or did you --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Ma'am, he said it was the census.

MS. JEFFAS: -- give consideration to the big picture?

MR. HAYES: Let me help you.
Did you take into account the increases
in the immediate surrounding populations that are expected?

THE WITNESS: No, we did not do that
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analysis, as I had said.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. He answered the question.

MS. JEFFAS: Just a simple question.
THE WITNESS: We called to find out whether or not there was capacity in the school system, and he gave us their numbers over a period of time.

MS. JEFFAS: Right, for that building alone, correct?

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
We didn't even say that building, we
just said what kind of capacity was there.
MR. NEWMAN: This was with the high
school?
MS. JEFFAS: The high school and the local schools, right?

THE WITNESS: And the local schools.
MS. JEFFAS: Are you saying that you feel that any office buildings that were built before 1981 can't be used as office buildings going forward?

THE WITNESS: No, I didn't say that. MS. JEFFAS: So you think that they could?
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THE WITNESS: The architect gave me that information regarding this particular building.

MS. JEFFAS: Oh, I see. Okay.
All right. And I know there was mention earlier that there's no green space at all. So the only option --

MR. DELIA: That's wrong.
MS. JEFFAS: That's wrong?
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Ma'am, just --
MS. JEFFAS: I'm just curious.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: If you quote testimony, you're probably not going to be accurate, just ask the questions.

THE WITNESS: 42 percent of our site is covered by building and paved surface, which means 58 percent of the site is green.

MS. JEFFAS: Okay. Including the hill?
THE WITNESS: Including the hill.
MS. JEFFAS: Okay. And then when you
talk about our unmet COAH requirements, that is for future, correct?

THE WITNESS: Between now and 2025.
MS. JEFFAS: And there's no way that that's going to change, those requirements are going to change?
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THE WITNESS: No, that's part of your settlement agreement.

MS. JEFFAS: So that is absolutely set
in stone, and everything that's going on in the state
is for naught, and there's no way that that's going to change?

THE WITNESS: I don't understand that.
MS. JEFFAS: Is there any way that that could change?

THE WITNESS: No, not if you have a settlement agreement.

MS. JEFFAS: So that has to stay like that, it will never change?

THE WITNESS: No, it will change come 2025, when they have to do new housing need numbers for municipalities.

MS. JEFFAS: And you kept talking about West Windsor.

West Windsor has the same demographics that we have, it's has the same amount of open space or are there big differences between Woodcliff Lake and --

THE WITNESS: There's huge differences. All I was commenting was they're trying to create a downtown where none exists.
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MS. JEFFAS: Right, in old farmland and

## THE WITNESS: Yes.

MS. JEFFAS: Okay. Thank you.
MR. COUTO: I have a couple of questions.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Wait, let's see if there's somebody else who has a question.

MS. APPELLE: Good evening. Veronica Appelle.

AUDIENCE VOICE: Speak loud.
MS. APPELLE: I have to be loud. I've never been accused of being too quiet.

You talked a lot about the five goals of the master plan that you base your opinions on and your report on.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. APPELLE: I'm assuming then you've read them all, and you know that Woodcliff Lake is very proud of its reputation as a small, rural, bucolic community, and it's focused on keeping it that way.

Do you see any reason that what you're doing might impact that goal?

THE WITNESS: There's many different
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goals in your master plan.

MS. APPELLE: Uh-huh.
THE WITNESS: And you're right, it does
talk about keeping the charm of Woodcliff Lake, but it also talks about, you know, some of the issues that I had raised that we felt are affirmed by this application.

We are preserving 30 percent of this site as open space. It does talk about protecting established residential areas, and that's why one of the benefits of this application is you're placing this multifamily development along in the commercial zone. So you're not you're not impacting or you're not intruding into a residential zone.

MS. APPELLE: Of course we have a difference of opinion about that.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Ma'am, you can't argue. You can't have a difference of opinion.

MS. APPELLE: We don't have a
difference of opinion.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: At this time. You can make comments later. Okay?

MS. APPELLE: I know.
THE WITNESS: But the site is in two zones, and the entirety of this development is taking
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goals in your master plan.
09:04PM 1
09:04PM 2
09:04PM
place in the nonresidentially zoned portion of this
property. None of it is occurring in the residentially zoned portion of this property. So that leads me to my statement.

MS. APPELLE: Okay.
THE WITNESS: It talks about providing
adequate light, air, and open space.
Well, how do you measure that?
You measure it by setbacks, what does the town require for your front, side and rear yard setbacks.

We meet all those.
Part of it relates to building
coverage.
Well, the zone permits 30 percent of the site to be covered by building, we're at 19 percent.

MS. APPELLE: Yes, but you've stated all this before so I accept everything you've stated.

THE WITNESS: But you asked the question.

MS. APPELLE: Here's a new question.
At the previous meeting, you used the euphemism "compact" to describe the high density units of housing proposed at 188.
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Are you aware that over one-third of all Woodcliff Lake residents live on the east side, and that without even counting your proposed development at 188 or any other rentals that are being thought about on Highview, we will have 70 more residents on the east side from COAH , and that will increase the percentage above one third of people in the whole town living in Woodcliff Lake.

Now, as you've said, you believe there
is --
MR. DELIA: Objection. Answer now comes at that point.

MS. APPELLE: The question is, you said there is no substantial detriment to the quality of life of over a third of the residents of the town of Woodcliff Lake.

Do you think that having all of these extra people would make a substantial detriment to the quality of life of the people who are already living there, more than one third of the town's population?

THE WITNESS: No, I don't.
MS. APPELLE: No. Okay. I rest my
case.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thanks.
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MR. COUTO: Two short questions. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. There is no such thing. MR. COUTO: Alex Couto.

Previously, you stated that as a previous business --

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Can I ask you something, please.

MR. COUTO: It's a question.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: I know. We all heard his testimony, and you probably remember it and he probably remembers it, so I'm going to ask you, just to move this along, go right to the question.

MR. COUTO: The question is relating to the ability to after the existing business as it is, when was the property purchased, approximately?

THE WITNESS: I don't know.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: He answered the question. Next question.

MR. COUTO: Next question is, between the time the property was purchased and when the application was made for a variance, what was that timeframe?

THE WITNESS: I don't know.
I don't know when it was purchased.
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|  | 97 |  | 99 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09:06PM 1 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: He didn't know the | 09:07PM 1 | ambulance corps for Woodcliff Lake is shared with |
| 09:06PM 2 | first part, so he can't answer the second question. | 09:08PM 2 | Park Ridge and Montvale? |
| 09:06PM 3 | Next question. | 09:08PM 3 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 09:06PM 4 | Thank you. | 09:08PM 4 | MR. NEWMAN: Are you aware that the |
| 09:06PM 5 | MR. NEWMAN: No, he said he had two | 09:08PM 5 | municipal court system for Woodcliff Lake is shared |
| 09:06PM 6 | questions. | 09:08PM 6 | with Montvale? |
| 09:06PM 7 | MR. COUTO: I did say two questions. | 09:08PM 7 | THE WITNESS: No, that I was not aware |
| 09:06PM 8 | THE WITNESS: You asked two questions. | 09:08PM 8 | of. |
| 09:06PM 9 | MR. COUTO: Let me ask a third one. | 09:08PM 9 | MR. NEWMAN: In your analysis of what's |
| 09:06PM 10 | MR. NEWMAN: One more. All right, one | 09:08PM 10 | needed versus what's provided, do you think it's |
| 09:06PM 11 | more question. | 09:08PM 11 | important to determine not just what we have in |
| 09:06PM 12 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No preamble, just | 09:08PM 12 | Woodcliff Lake, but what we have in Montvale and Park |
| 09:06PM 13 | the question. | 09:08PM 13 | Ridge, in light of the fact that many of the services |
| 09:06PM 14 | MR. COUTO: Are you aware of a proposed | 09:08PM 14 | as well as many of the facilities that service the |
| 09:06PM 15 | ordinance yesterday on the town ordinance that | 09:8РР 15 | community are shared with those boroughs? |
| 09:06PM 16 | affects the area within a block or two of 188, are | 09:08Рм 16 | THE WITNESS: I think clearly, as part |
| 09:06PM 17 | you aware of the pattern recommended by the town | 09:08Рм 17 | of your master plan, you should look at that. |
| 09:06PM 18 | engineer? | 09:08PM 18 | As part of a use variance application |
| 09:06PM 19 | THE WITNESS: No. | 09:08Рм 19 | for what I perceive is a limited sized project, I |
| 09:06PM 20 | MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you. | 09:08PM 20 | don't think you have to go into that depth to address |
| 09:07PM 21 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I don't want to | 09:08PM 21 | like the court system, for example. |
| 09:07PM 22 | say this, but there's no more questions from the | 09:08PM 22 | MR. NEWMAN: Okay. Let me narrow the |
| 09:07PM 23 | public, right? | 09:08PM 23 | question a little bit. |
| 09:07PM 24 | Let's close the meeting to the public. | 09:08Рм 24 | Assuming for the sake of this |
| 09:07Pм 25 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Motion to close? | 09:09Рм 25 | discussion that the Montvale border was 300 feet from |
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| 09:07PM 1 | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: So moved. | 09:09PM 1 | this project, and I know it's not, okay, and on the |
| 09:07PM 2 | MR. NEWMAN: Second. | 09:09PM 2 | Montvale border they built 500 housing units. |
| 09:07PM 3 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any members of the | 09:09PM 3 | Would that impact whether or not there |
| 09:07PM 4 | board have a question? | 09:09PM 4 | was a need for additional residential housing units |
| 09:07PM 5 | MR. NEWMAN: Yes. | 09:09PM 5 | across the border in Woodcliff Lake? |
| 09:07PM 6 | Mr. Burgis, my apologies, I arrived at | 09:09Pм 6 | THE WITNESS: Actually with the COAH |
| 09:07PM 7 | a little late this evening and I apologize in advance | 09:09PM 7 | requirements as adjusted by the Jacobson decision and |
| 09:07PM 8 | if I'm a little repetitive of any questions that have | 09:09PM 8 | other decisions, you still have your own obligation |
| 09:07PM 9 | been asked by my fellow board members. | 09:09Pм 9 | for housing, and that has to be accommodated. |
| 09:07PM 10 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We'll tell you, | 09:09Pм 10 | MR. NEWMAN: Removing the COAH, I |
| 09:07PM 11 |  | 09:09Pм 11 | certainly understand COAH -- |
| 09:07PM 12 | MR. NEWMAN: Is it a fair statement | 09:09Рм 12 | THE WITNESS: You can't remove it. |
| 09:07PM 13 | that when you look at planning you take a look at | 09:09Рм 13 | MR. NEWMAN: But just in the sense of |
| 09:07PM 14 | what is provided in a town versus what's needed in a | 09:09PM 14 | planning, would that have an impact, and I'll get to |
| 09:07pm 15 | town? | 09:09Рм 15 | COAH? |
| 09:07PM 16 | THE WITNESS: And you look at both | 09:09Рм 16 | THE WITNESS: It would obviously have |
| 09:07PM 17 | MR. NEWMAN: Right. So you look at | 09:09Рм 17 | an impact, but you still have to address your |
| 09:07PM 18 | what you need and you look at what you have. Is that | 09:09Рм 18 | numbers. |
| 09:07PM 19 | fair? | 09:09рм 19 | MR. NEWMAN: The COAH numbers? |
| 09:07PM 20 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 09:09рм 20 | THE WITNESS: Yes. |
| 09:07PM 21 | MR. NEWMAN: Okay. Are you aware that | 09:09Pм 21 | MR. NEWMAN: Well, let's do that. |
| 09:07PM 22 | the high school for Woodcliff Lake is shared with | 09:10Рм 22 | How many COAH, affordable housing |
| 09:07PM 23 | Montvale? | 09:10Рм 23 | units, is the applicant building with this project? |
| 09:07PM 24 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 09:10Рм 24 | THE WITNESS: He is obligated by the |
| 09:07PM 25 | MR. NEWMAN: Are you aware that the | 09:10Рм 25 | regulations to provide 9, 15 percent. |
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time, the same question, the same answer.
MR. NEWMAN: Okay.
MR. DELIA: From him to you and from you to him, same question and answer.

MR. NEWMAN: So the units you're going to provide nine?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: Now, by building the other
units, will that increase Woodcliff Lake's obligation to build future units when they do our next burden for our next round?

MR. DELIA: You asked that too last time.

MR. NEWMAN: I don't think I did.
MR. DELIA: You did.
MR. NEWMAN: Refresh my recollection,
please.
MR. DELIA: I can pull out the
transcript, if you want, but you asked was there going to be an increase based on this development, whether it was going to increase the number of units, and his answer was no.

MR. NEWMAN: Okay.
MR. SPIRIG: Well, if I can add to your
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09:11PM 1 question.



THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: Okay. Then we won't ask you anymore about that.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Are you done, Gary?
MR. NEWMAN: I'm thinking.
I'm almost done.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: We have another
witness to get to tonight, so if you'd like --
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Because he's been

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We'd like to move this
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.
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THE WITNESS: I represent them in their housing litigation. I really can't comment on that.

MR. NEWMAN: Well, are you aware?
THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm aware.
MR. NEWMAN: Okay. I apologize.
THE WITNESS: No, we're in litigation,
I can't -- I meant mediation, and you're basically
supposed to swear up and down that you're not going to divulge anything.

MR. NEWMAN: Without going into your
litigation or your mediation, is it a fair assumption
that at some point there will be units built in Park Ridge?
104

MR. NEWMAN: Understood.
One more question.
Do you think that in this board's
decision -- all right, two more questions, I'm like Mr. Couto.

When you were referring earlier to the master plan, is that a master plan that was actually adopted by Woodcliff Lake?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. NEWMAN: And the year of that was?
THE WITNESS: There is a 2002
comprehensive master plan and a 2008 or '09 reexamination report.

MR. NEWMAN: Well, the report, did that
change -- I'm trying to understand. You're here
asking for a variance, and you're saying that these uses are good according to the master plan.

THE WITNESS: That's the 2002
documents, as examined by the 2008 document.
MR. NEWMAN: So since 2002, they don't
actually permit this use, which is why you're here, correct?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
MR. NEWMAN: So since 2002, even though
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there was a master plan, I guess that was supposed to change the zoning, the zoning has not been changed. Is that a fair statement?

## THE WITNESS: Yes.

MS. YETEMIAN: Can I ask a question?
Sorry.
Do you represent Park Ridge's developer or the borough, the town?

THE WITNESS: The municipality.
MS. YETEMIAN: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Gary?
MR. NEWMAN: I think that's it.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Anybody else have any question for Mr. Burgis?

I know that the stenographer has been sitting for more than two hours. I think she needs a break.

COURT REPORTER: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, she needs a
break. So five minutes, is that okay? Then we will go to your next witness, Mr. Delia.
(A short recess is held.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I'm going to
start. Please be seated.
People in the hallway, either stop
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talking or come in inside and sit down so we can hear.

Okay. Continue, Mr. Delia.
MR. DELIA: I'd like to call Lou Luglio
back to the stand. I believe this is his third appearance.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Because he's loves
us so much, right?
MR. LUGLIO: Exactly.
MR. DELIA: He's previously sworn.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.
MR. DELIA: He had his 29th
anniversary.
MR. LUGLIO: No, 25th.
MR. DELIA: 25th. Excuse me.
THE WITNESS: Don't age me.
MR. DELIA: That was mine. I'm sorry,
I got confused.
LOUIS J. LUGLIO, P.E., having been
previously sworn, testifies as follows:
CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. DELIA:

## 106

Q. Lou, you were here in March, I guess it was, and then you returned.

In that time, you prepared a report
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,
that is in front of us dated May 17, 2019. It's been submitted to the board. I'd like to get that marked as A-20 for identification.
(Report dated 5/17/19 is marked as exhibit A-20 for identification.)

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You all have it?
It's this (indicating).
BY MR. DELIA:
Q. Please tell us what you did in response to the board's requests and what you concluded?

## A. Sure.

So, again, based on A-20, my report, the board and the board's professional asked to look at the current driveway of Broadway and the site driveway in the existing condition and to look at the driveway in the future condition with a 10 percent increase in growth of traffic on Broadway to account for a development that might be in or adjacent to the site.

The second point was to look at the intersection that's signalized of Broadway and Woodcliff Avenue/Highview Avenue.

Again, under the 2019 existing
conditions and with a 10 percent increase in traffic for the 2021 conditions.
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And last, there was a concern or an issue of how the New Jersey Transit train schedule had an effect or if it did have an effect on the signalized intersection itself.

So additional traffic counts were conducted on Tuesday, April 30th, at the signalized intersection of Broadway and Highview Avenue during the 7:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 4:00 PM to 6:00 PM periods.

And on the next page, we actually provide the intersection traffic volumes for the AM and PM peak hours. And those peak hours were from 8:00 AM to 9:00 AM and 5:00 PM to 6:00 PM.

And so I will just continue to go through, I'm not going to go through every paragraph, but I wanted to get to the next page, which is page 3.

We provided an intersection analysis of both the signalized intersection and the unsignalized driveway itself. The basis of looking at how an intersection, whether it's signalized or unsignalized, can process traffic through the intersection is based on a level of service analysis, and those levels of service range from A to $F$, like the report card. And once you get to level of

1
service $D$, you have congested conditions; level of service $E$, they're more congested conditions and speeds start to go down; level of service $F$, motorists waiting for that traffic signal to change might actually have to wait additional cycles or cycle, depending on how bad that traffic congestion is.

We provided on Figure 2 and Figure 3 the existing signalized and unsignalized. We also provided additional information with respect to the queue that would be generated based on the signal or the unsignalized intersection. The queue is basically the stacking of vehicles that are waiting at the signalized approach, and so it gives you an idea of how many feet, and it could be different types of vehicles, so on average it's 20 to 22 feet per vehicle. But it gives you an idea of how well the intersection is operating in terms of additional delay that a motorist would have to wait on average, but also how far back that queue would develop.

And so we provided that information for, again, the signalized and unsignalized intersection in the existing condition. On the top of page 4 , what I've done there in Figure 4 and Figure 5 is to look at the future build condition,
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hour versus people now in the proposed condition being residential and leaving and going out in the AM peak hour.

And you could see, I guess, as an 5 example, traveling on Highview, and that would be the
again, taking the 2019 existing traffic volumes and growing them by 10 percent for the two-year period and then superimposing on the left-hand side, Figure 4, the office development fully occupied, and on the right in Figure 5 with the residential traffic volumes.

And you could see in each one of those figures, there's an AM and PM in and out and total for the specific land use, whether it be office or residential. And what I did is I tried to bold the intersection volumes, whether they be turning movement or through movement that would change as a result of either the office development in that future condition with 10 percent added traffic or the residential.

And so that really sets the stage for looking at the volumes themselves answering, I guess, part of the question is how do the volumes change with respect to the land use change, from office and people coming to the office building in the AM peak 201-641-1812
eastbound direction, that Figure 4, that 400 in parentheses is in the PM peak hour, 236 is in the AM peak hour, and if you correspond that to Figure 5, it's 406 in the PM peak hour and 217 in the AM peak hour.

So that there is certainly less vehicles that are coming to the site under the proposed residential scenario that the application is for. And when you look at the actual driveway on Figure 4, there's five making a left, five making a right in the AM, 21 and 21 in the PM on Figure 4.

On Figure 4 [sic], that shifts to 12 and 12 and 7 and 7, again higher in the AM leaving but these are not, from a traffic engineering standpoint, the number of trips associated with the residential development is far less than what is associated with the office development, and that's always true.

In this case, the office development conversion to residential reduces the number of vehicle trips overall. Certainly there is a balance between what is coming into the site and what is leaving the site, but we look at what happens at the intersection itself from an overall intersection level of service.
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have a positive effect in shifting generated traffic and reduction in trips overall on the critical movements for both the site driveway and the signalized intersection itself.

The following page is based on those traffic volumes.

Again, an analysis on the left-hand side is the unsignalized driveway intersection, on the right-hand side is the signalized intersection for the 2019 existing, 2021 build with the office development, and on the bottom the 2021 build with the residential development.

Now, as a result of having 10 percent additional growth, the operation of the intersection certainly deteriorates, deteriorates to a point, in most cases, where the northbound left turn going towards the station is in an $F$ level of service and so is the southbound in an F level of service, if we just look at the signalized intersection under existing conditions, that's the upper right-hand corner of that Figure 6 summary. And as you go into either build condition, traffic operations certainly do get worse.

They do get worse, but not as a result
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of this proposed development, but as a result of the increased traffic that would be going through the intersection at that 10 percent level.

Lastly, we looked on page 6, the New Jersey Transit Pascack Valley Line effect that it may have on the intersection itself. We provided the train schedule of trains both in the AM peak hour from 5:26 to 9:10 AM. And there were no trains in the reverse direction until 1:30 PM.

And then in the PM peak period from 4:45 PM to 7:43 PM, with three trains in the opposite direction that would occur also.

So, in the analysis of this, each train takes about approximately two minutes for when the train signals the intersection and all the intersection lights are red to when those gates go back up, it's about a two-minute period in time where everything is stopped, everything has a red signal.

The traffic signal itself operates on a 90 second cycle, and there are 40 cycles of traffic in the hour. And so by calculation, we're looking at a result of about two minutes for each train that would stop, and there's three trains in the peak hour, so six minutes of train delay would result in a relatively small amount of delay, if you look at it
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24 result of this proposed development of converting the
25 existing office space to residential space.
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Lastly, I would say that both intersections around all of Broadway is under Bergen County jurisdiction, and Bergen County has the ultimate right to determine how the roadway is accessed, both at the intersection itself and at the site driveway.

I understand that Bergen County is nearing their conclusion or their report, and so that that information, once we have that, we will be bound by whatever Bergen County wants to do with respect to operation of Broadway, and any potential restrictions in or out of the site or no restrictions at all.

So, again, based on previous testimony and work that has been done, this is a site, from a pure traffic standpoint, going from office building development to residential, it's a lower intensity of land use from a traffic perspective, and there is a net reduction of traffic that would be coming to and from the site during the peak hours in question, in the AM and PM peak hours.

There is no traffic impact associated with the conversion of this site and this land use to residential at all, but we went ahead and we provided all the backup information for your engineer to go through as well, all the detailed calculations are
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provided, and it's clear in here, although I didn't point that out yet, that during certain periods, especially during the periods in the future, traffic queues in that northbound directly certainly at times backup through where the site driveway is, and at certain points during that peak hour itself there might not be any.

So we looked at a 50th percentile queue basically, which says that 50 percent of the time what would that traffic queue be, and so that's all incorporated in here as well.

And at some point I would imagine you're going to ask Mr. Intindola his opinion and analysis as well.

That's all I have.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.
MR. SPIRIG: Just for clarification, when you said the county would take jurisdiction -THE WITNESS: The county has jurisdiction.

MR. SPIRIG: Jurisdiction over. Obviously they can't prevent people from coming and going into their property, but what they could do is they could potentially say no left-hand turns out of that parking lot.
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THE WITNESS: If the county approves
that, they can. It's up to the county. Access to and from the County Road to the driveway is still under the jurisdiction of the county, so the developer would not be able to post any restrictions, unless the county is okay with that.

MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: And just for clarification, the counts that you're giving are only AM and PM peak, they have nothing to do with the traffic all day long or residential potentially has more people in and out? MR. HAYES: The weekends or nights.

MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Right, weekends, nights. done is we look at the peak hour of the roadway, which is Broadway. And when that peak volume occurs on Broadway and we coincide that with the volume that's coming in and out of the site. Yes, volume is coming in and out of the site during all hours of the day, but typically if it's not during that AM or PM peak hour, the volume on the roadway would be less. Even though the volume to and from the site might be a little bit more, the worst case is still looking at the AM and PM peak hours from an analysis standpoint.
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## 5 THE WITNESS: So traditionally what is
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```
MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Did you look at weekends, Saturdays at all?
```

THE WITNESS: We did not look at weekend traffic. We don't have any counts of weekend traffic, just AM and PM.

MR. KAUFMAN: There is no weekend train service in Woodcliff Lake.

MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: The train runs.
MR. KAUFMAN: I know that, but it doesn't stop.

THE WITNESS: And, again, our task here was to look at AM and PM traffic operations for the driveway and the intersection itself.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Right.
Thank you.
Questions?
MR. HAYES: Mr. Luglio, to what degree
would your analysis change if the county does restrict left-hand turns out of this site?

I guess in your best estimate, what is the route then that people would most likely take?

Because I have an idea of what it is, and that intersection, being what it is already, I see as being unmanageable, if that's the case.

THE WITNESS: Right now what I project
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in here was a 50/50 split just out of ease, just to say 50/50. It's also based on the traffic volume, which along Broadway has basically a $50 / 50$ split in the northbound and southbound direction.

So there are many times where there are restrictions coming out of a site, especially making a left-hand turn.

And so, again, the county roadway system and the municipal system is really there for vehicles to travel around. So vehicles would come out, make the right turn, continue north and most likely go on Highview, travel to the east and try to circulate back to Broadway.

Will there be additional traffic on other residential streets? Most likely during that PM peak hour, maybe even in the AM peak hour when people are leaving the residential site, there certainly might be.

But the last part of what I would say is that what we've assumed so far in the residential development is that 100 percent of the people would be taking their car out, you know, and no, there was no account for transit credit, we wanted to be conservative in the analysis.

MR. HAYES: But that's not kind of
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really what I was asking.
So you think that people would take a
right-hand turn and continue north in an orderly manner?

You don't think that they would try to cut across the left turn lane, go over the reservoir and then dump back down Pascack? Because that's how I think people would do it, and I think it's a substantially worse impact than somebody who is just going to continue to travel north.

THE WITNESS: So, again, we really can't govern what individual motorists are going to do.

MR. HAYES: I'm just asking your assessment.

THE WITNESS: There might be some people that will do that, certainly. There might be people that will take a left and go into the train station parking area and turn around and come back out. So it really is a function of what is the path of least resistance, and then also how many people are really going to be coming out of the site during the AM peak hour. And if they do that for a few times and realize that that might not be the right time to leave, to make that left-hand turn, if indeed
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there's no prohibition, we tend to see that things start to work out, as far as when people leave their house, especially if it's a residential.

If it's office development, there's a time when people have to be there. From a residential standpoint, there are different times. It's almost a staggered time.

MR. HAYES: I don't know if that's fair, because you're saying we have this apartment complex, it's going to be, I forget what Mr. Burgis said, 75 percent one bedroom apartments.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.
MR. HAYES: If people have to get to the office in the morning, I'm assuming that people have to leave their homes in the morning also to get to their offices, so I don't think it's fair to say that people in homes can just wait it out and go when it's convenient for them, but if it's an office building everybody has to be there at a certain time. It's not a fair comparison, I don't think.

THE WITNESS: And if you want a fair comparison, I think half of the people that live here will most likely take mass transit, not having a vehicle coming out of this site at all, and another 25 percent of them will probably leave before the
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apacity on many different modes of travel, especially the bus, but also on commuter rail as well.
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MS. YETEMIAN: Is that not a little contradictory to what Mr. Burgis was saying about elderly probably, like those who are coming back to live closer to their family who don't work would be going in and out more as opposed to those who park their car and get on a train and go in?

THE WITNESS: I think there would be a combination of both, definitely.
CROSS EXAMINATION BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. For the cars coming out of site, if the left-hand turn is prohibited, you indicated they would go up Highview?
A. They may, yes.
Q. And then from Highview, where would they go?
A. They would circle south and then back to Broadway. I mean, I think that's -- even though it's a very roundabout way to get there.

MR. HAYES: So one car going through
the intersection twice?
THE WITNESS: No -- through the
intersection, the signalized intersection?
MR. HAYES: Yes.
THE WITNESS: They would only go once,
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if they want to go back southbound.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, I'll follow-up
with these questions.
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. They want to go south, that's why they want to turn left, they can't, so let's assume they go up Highview as you suggested.

Then in order to go south, the next road that they would hit would be Kinderkamack, right?
A. Uh-huh.
Q. And if they really wanted to get back onto Broadway in a southerly direction, they could take any one of the streets that run between
Kinderkamack and Broadway, for example, Columbus or Lincoln, correct?

MR. HAYES: Prospect too.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Or Prospect.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Where you really
have a trouble making a left.
THE WITNESS: South of the site, correct.
BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:
Q. Exactly, south of the site?

And those streets are all residential,
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correct?
A. For the most part, yes.
Q. Highview, Prospect, Columbus, and Lincoln, and Kinderkamack for that matter?
A. So what we're talking about, just to be clear, is, all 23 vehicles that would be coming out during the AM peak hour and all 14 vehicles coming out during the PM peak hour over the entire hour, which is maybe one every two minutes, it's not a significant amount of traffic. This is the same amount of traffic that is considered a standard deviation of traffic volumes on a day-to-day basis.

Traffic differences on any roadway from
a Monday through Friday has variations, it's not the constant 524 vehicles every day, right?

So what we're talking about in terms of
vehicles coming out of this site is really
insignificant to the number of vehicles that are on the roadway.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So the county also makes a decision on what streets need new traffic lights, and they're monitoring that?

THE WITNESS: If they're county roadways, yes.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: What about, is LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812

126
Prospect a county road?
THE WITNESS: I don't know.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: It is? Okay.
So that light you need to have that
traffic point dealt with and then you could time the lights better.

MR. DELIA: I'm going to make a
statement now. We are not going to produce anymore
investigations, anymore reports. We've given the board what they've asked for. This is Mr. Luglio's third time here. I intend to conclude with Mr. Luglio tonight and not bring him back, so this is our time to conclude with him, any questions on what he's provided, please do so, but we will not be producing any further reports.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Didn't ask.
MR. DELIA: Or any further
investigation, you did, you brought it up.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: No.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No, I did not.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: She just asked who would be responsible for the traffic lights.

MR. DELIA: And you said you needed to take a look at the southern intersection now.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No, I said we need LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
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to take a look at it, not you. It's a problem point.
MR. DELIA: I get that.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any other questions?
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I'm looking left.
MR. NEWMAN: I don't have any questions of this witness.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: We need a motion to open to the public -- I'm sorry, did anyone else have a question?

MR. HAYES: No.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I'm just looking at the time, and we have to go into closed session this evening.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I know, but I think that --

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I know they want to ask Mr. Luglio a question.

MR. NEWMAN: I think the applicant made you clear he wants to be done with Mr. Luglio tonight.

CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No, I got it.
MR. DELIA: Thank you.
MR. NEWMAN: Unless I'm reading you wrong.
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MR. DELIA: You read my mind perfectly. THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't think he
likes me.
MR. NEWMAN: I don't think it's that. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All right. I'm
asking a favor of the public. When you ask your questions of Mr. Luglio, please make them brief questions. Okay? Because we have time constraints, but I want to give you an opportunity to ask your questions. So please come forward -- oh, we have to open the meeting.

MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Motion to open to
the public.
MR. HAYES: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?
(No response.)
(Chorus of ayes.)
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Also if there are any
questions, I'm going to ask that you do your best not to repeat Mr. Luglio's testimony. He remembers what it is and we all just heard it. So I know that's common for people to do that, but I'm asking you not to do that and just go straight to the question.

Thank you.
MR. COUTO: Can I ask a quick question?
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|  | 129 |  | 131 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 09:51PM 1 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Probably ask a | $\text { 09:53PM } \quad 1$ | MR. NEWMAN: Anybody disagree with |
| 09:51PM 2 | yes-or-no answer. | 09:53PM 2 | that? |
| 09:51PM 3 | MR. COUTO: Yes. | 09:53PM 3 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. |
| 09:51PM 4 | You know my name, Alex Couto. | 09953PM 4 | MR. COUTO: Thank you very much. |
| 09:51PM 5 | The question is, if building \#2 was not | 09:53PM 5 | MS. GELLERT: Sally Gellert, 210 |
| 09:51PM 6 | built, would there be a significant reduction in | 09:53PM 6 | Broadway. |
| 09:51PM 7 | traffic, in addition to the reduction you mentioned? | 09:53PM 7 | We heard about the potential F grades. |
| 09:51PM 8 | THE WITNESS: Not significant, no | 09:53PM 8 | What are the grades for the other hours of the day? |
| 09:51PM 9 | It's a very low generator of traffic. So if we're | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { 09:54PM } \end{array}$ | We didn't see any of that, us in the public. |
| 09:51PM 10 | dealing with 23 vehicles coming out in the morning, | 09:54pm 10 | THE WITNESS: From a traffic |
| $\text { 09:51PM } 11$ | there might be 17, so it's not a significant amount, | $\text { 09:54PM } 11$ | engineering standpoint, we look at the AM peak hour, |
| 09:52Pм 12 | no. | 09:54pm 12 | PM peak hour. |
| 09:52PM 13 | MR. COUTO: So can you explain the | 09:54PM 13 | Traffic during the day, the |
| 09:52PM 14 | math, because from the way I understand, building \#1 | 09:54pm 14 | intersection or the roadway would have less traffic |
| 09:52PM 15 | is 36 apartments, building \#2 has 24. How did you | 09:54PM 15 | on the roadway compared to what's happening in the |
| 09:52PM 16 | come to 17, how can you explain the math? | 09:54pm 16 | peak hours. |
| 09:52PM 17 | THE WITNESS: Well, the math is based | 09:54pm 17 | MS. GELLERT: You specifically quoted |
| 09:52Pm 18 | on the Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip | 09:54pm 18 | two times when it would have an F grade. |
| 09:52PM 19 | Generation Handbook, and it's based on average rates | 09:54PM 19 | Did you do grades for any other times |
| 09:52PM 20 | of how many vehicles would be coming to and from a | 09:54PM 20 | or is this the only two? |
| 09:52PM 21 | particular land use based on, for this category, | 09:54PM 21 | THE WITNESS: Only AM and PM peak |
| 09:52PM 22 | probably thousands of studies. | 09:54PM 22 | hours. |
| 09:52PM 23 | MR. COUTO: Maybe I misled you. | 09:54PM 23 | MS. GELLERT: And nothing on the |
| 09:52PM 24 | Right now the numbers you gave is for | 09:54PM 24 | weekends? |
| 09:52PM 25 | 60 apartments. | 09:54PM 25 | THE WITNESS: That's correct. |
|  | 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 |
| 130 |  | 132 |  |
| 09952PM 1 | THE WITNESS: Yes. | 09:54PM 1 | MS. GELLERT: I live there all day |
| 09:52PM 2 | MR. COUTO: If you didn't have building | 09:54PM 2 | long. |
| 09:52PM 3 | \#2, it would be 36 apartments? | 09:54PM 3 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Ma'am, ma'am, ma'am. |
| 09:52PM 4 | THE WITNESS: That's righ | 09954PM 4 | MS. GELLERT: I know. |
| 09:52PM 5 | MR. COUTO: So wouldn't the numbers be | 09:54PM 5 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Comments later |
| 09:52PM 6 | considerably lower, if it was only 36 apartments? | 09:54PM 6 | MS. GELLERT: Now I'm trying to - |
| 09:52PM 7 | THE WITNESS: No necessarily, no | 09:54PM 7 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We understood your |
| 09:52PM 8 | MR. COUTO: Okay. I don't understand | 09:54PM 8 | question. |
| 09:52PM 9 | the logic, the numbers. | 09954PM 9 | MS. GELLERT: Where do I find that |
| 09:53PM 10 | ay | 09:54PM 10 | information? I guess that's what I need. Where do I |
| 09:53PM 11 | MR. NEWMAN: Just from a thinking out | 09:54PM 11 | learn what my life is going to be like the rest of |
| 09:53PM 12 | loud. | 09:54PM 12 | the time when I'm living there? How do I find that? |
| 09:53PM 13 | MR. COUTO: Common sense. <br> MR. NEWMAN: -- common sense, if there | 09:54PM 13 | THE WITNESS: My only comment to that |
| 09:53PM 14 |  | 09:55PM 14 | is that this development is less traffic compared to |
| 09:53PM 15 | were less units, there would be less traffic. | 09:55PM 15 | the office development that's there now. |
| 09:53PM 16 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think he used the | 09:55PM 16 | MS. GELLERT: (Makes sounds.) |
| 09:53Рм 17 | word "considerable" or "significant," and that's | 09:55PM 17 | THE WITNESS: I think I did not answer |
| 09:53PM 18 | where the witness -- | 09:55pm 18 | your question. |
| 09:53PM 19 | MR. DELIA: But Mr. Luglio said it's | 09:55pm 19 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She didn't like |
| 09:53PM 20 | already a low traffic generator, so it ends up not | 09:55PM 20 |  |
| 09:53PM 21 | being significant. That's the answer. | 09:55PM 21 | MS. GELLERT: That doesn't help me at |
| 09:53PM 22 | MR. NEWMAN: His testimony is it's not significant no matter what. Obviously, the less | 09:55PM 22 | all. Okay. |
| 09:53PM 23 |  | 09:55PM 23 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I understand what |
| 09:53PM 24 | number of units, the less significant it would be. | 09:55PM 24 | she's saying. |
| 09:53Рм 25 | MR. COUTO: Thank you. <br> LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 | 09:55PM 25 | Okay. Anybody else? |
|  |  |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
|  |  |  |  |

MS. JEFFAS: Laura Jeffas.
You were stating that you think that some of the people that live there will not have cars?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MS. JEFFAS: They'll just rely solely on the train. Is that correct?

THE WITNESS: There will certainly be a percentage of the population that does not own a car.

MS. JEFFAS: Okay. So what percentage do you think that would be in a situation like that?

THE WITNESS: I really don't know. I know there's going to be a percentage.

What we have done in the traffic analysis is assume that all people would have a car, that's what the assumption is, and that's what the analysis is based on.

After this is fully occupied, there certainly will be a percentage that does not have a car.

MS. JEFFAS: Okay.
MR. NEWMAN: Yeah, but just so I'm clear, when you did your analysis, you assumed for the sake of your analysis that everybody did have a car?

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

THE WITNESS: Yes. There was no credit

MR. NEWMAN: Okay. So even though --
THE WITNESS: I'm not saying that every person has a car, right.

MR. NEWMAN: So even though you may believe that some people may not have a car, when you did your study, your testimony is based with the assumption that everybody has a car?

THE WITNESS: The analysis and the assumption in the report is that there's no transit or other nonmotorized credit.

MS. JEFFAS: Say that again, please.
AUDIENCE VOICE: Nobody is going by
bike.
MR. NEWMAN: I think, if I understand him in English, what he's telling us is that while he believes that there will be people that will not have cars, when he did his studies, he assumed for the sake of his study that everybody had a car.

MS. JEFFAS: Okay. Got it.
MR. NEWMAN: Do I have that correct?
THE WITNESS: No, but I'll go with

MR. NEWMAN: Then please explain.
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Transportation Engineers.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: And they factor in the LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812 impact from potential residents taking mass transit or any other type of transportation?

THE WITNESS: That's right.
MR. NEWMAN: So you presume that everybody has a car, but not everybody is using the car or no, I still don't have it?

THE WITNESS: All right. So the equations are based on 95 percent or close to 100 percent of all of the residents would or could use their vehicle only. Embedded in that data is that there's some percentage that probably doesn't, but regardless of that, what I'm saying, I just want to be clear, that we didn't assume every person has a car. So a two bedroom apartment has two cars, we didn't make that assumption. We just made the assumption that there's no transit credit at all. So all the vehicles that would be coming to and from the site would be generated by the site and no one could take advantage of any transit that's on the site.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: So where did you get the numbers from?

THE WITNESS: The Institute of
Transportation Engineers.
fact that in those numbers, that probably some people take mass transit. Isn't that right?

THE WITNESS: They really don't. It is devoid of anything but vehicle traffic; however, there's some people, again, that don't have a car.
It is very close to 100 percent, but it's not every person has a car.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I understand, you're trying to be --

MR. NEWMAN: You're being honest.
THE WITNESS: I am not saying every person will have a car, I'm saying there's no credit for transit.

MR. NEWMAN: I understand.
MS. JEFFAS: Okay.
THE WITNESS: That was a long answer.
MS. JEFFAS: Yes, I know.
The study, it doesn't take into
consideration like Uber and Lyft and Amazon deliveries and people who don't have cars who have to get their groceries delivered and that stuff, right?

THE WITNESS: So, yes, it does.
MS. JEFFAS: It does only during the AM and PM hour?

THE WITNESS: Well, are only looks at
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the AM and PM peak hours, so it does take into account visitors, deliveries. It does take that information into account.

MS. JEFFAS: But during the two hours?
THE WITNESS: And, again, it's the peak
hour in the morning and the peak hour in the evening.
MS. JEFFAS: Got it.
And the trip book you keep referring
to, because I'm not familiar with that, it's
regional, it's national, it's by state, it's by county?

THE WITNESS: It's a national.
MS. JEFFAS: So we're being compared to
Arkansas.
THE WITNESS: Every transportation -MS. JEFFAS: All of those least
populated areas.
THE WITNESS: Every transportation professional relies on this document for doing traffic impact studies.

MS. JEFFAS: Whether you're doing it whether it's West Windsor, New Jersey or Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, correct?

THE WITNESS: Even Alaska.
MS. JEFFAS: All right.
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Thank you.
MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins, 10
Pond Road, Woodcliff Lake.
Lou, in the one bedrooms, did you
include that the husband and the wife could both have a car, so it could be two cars?

THE WITNESS: So it's really imbedded in the equations, right. The ITE looks at it by unit and not necessarily how many bedrooms are in that unit. And so, again, it's a sample of thousands of different sites, and so embedded in that there are one bedroom, two bedroom, three bedroom.

So if you think about it this way, if you went to a building that had 60 units and you didn't even know what type of units were in there and you just did a count of how many cars come in and out, regardless of if they're residents, if they're visitors, if they're delivery trucks, that's the number that you're going to get.

And so it's not based on number of bedrooms, it's these number of units produce this level of traffic.

MS. HIGGINS: Okay.
Coming south, the county, I know, permits them to take a left-hand turn into the
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apartment complex there.
Tell me exactly at the rush hour what happens, go up Broadway and across the railroad tracks and coming across the reservoir.

THE WITNESS: In the northbound direction?

MS. HIGGINS: Yeah, somebody is -- no, somebody comes south, they are taking a left-hand turn into the apartment complex, what is happening behind this person going north on Broadway and what's happening of the cars coming across from the reservoir behind this person taking a right and trying to go south also?

THE WITNESS: So if someone's coming in that southbound direction just south of the signal, making a left turn into the site, there might be vehicles that are behind this vehicle trying to turn in, the vehicle would be opposing the northbound traffic. Assuming that the northbound traffic is starting to go, because the southbound traffic is coming, there might be some delay associated with making that left turn into the site. During, you know, congested times in the peak hour, there might be a queue in that northbound direction that does block the site. And so then it's a question of that
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
The witns: In the nothbound
person coming southbound trying to make the left turn
into the site, waiting there, finding that gap in the northbound traffic. It's similar to many driveways along the county roads, and that's the best I could really explain that to you.

MS. HIGGINS: Okay.
Do you see any hazard in it queuing up, you know, and people start across the railroad tracks, might not make it across the railroad tracks, you know, something like that happening and a train is coming?

THE WITNESS: Well, when the train is coming, no one really should be on the railroad tracks.

MS. HIGGINS: But they do.
THE WITNESS: Based, again, on this level of development of the low intensity of traffic that's coming to and from the site, having a vehicle every other 2 or 3 minutes, I do not see this to be a major issue over what is out there today.

MS. HIGGINS: Yeah, but in your study, though, you did not study any of them taking a left-hand turn coming south and making a left-hand turn.

THE WITNESS: Oh, yes, yes, we did.
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MS. HIGGINS: And how many were in that, do you have that?

THE WITNESS: For the residential development, we have three in the AM peak hour and 12 in the PM peak hour.

MS. HIGGINS: Making a left --
THE WITNESS: Over that 60-minute period.

MS. HIGGINS: Making a left-hand turn into that?

THE WITNESS: Into the site.
As opposed to 29 and 4 if it were an office building of the same square footage that is there now.

MS. HIGGINS: All right.
Thank you.
MS. CABRERA: Hi. Ulises Cabrera, 14
Dorchester Road, Woodcliff Lake.
Before I start I just want to thank the members of the zoning board for their dedicated service to the borough.

Hi .
THE WITNESS: How you doing?
MR. CABRERA: Good.
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of vehicles is an assumption that you're making her 5 THE WITNESS: Based on the Institute of

Would you agree there is no way to
determine the demographics of the future renter of

MR. DELIA: That's outside the scope of this witness.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, he's didn't give
testimony about demographics, so the cross
examination or the questions you ask should be
related to what he just testified about.
MR. CABRERA: Okay.
Would you agree that there's no way to
accurately determine how many renters will be commuting to work and back home via a vehicle?

THE WITNESS: Accurately determine, no.
Could you have an estimate, yes, for sure, and that number and that percentage will change every year.

MR. CABRERA: But your testimony is
more than -- it's just an estimate, that's what you're saying?

THE WITNESS: Right.
Based on what the trends are for
residential near train stations, yes.
MR. CABRERA: So predicting the number
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Transportation Engineers, yes.
MR. CABRERA: It's an assumption.
Okay.
How do you know that five vehicles will
be leaving at a specific time, as you mentioned in
your testimony today, if all of this is just an
assumption?
THE WITNESS: It's not just an
assumption, it's based on thousands of studies that have been compiled into waits of how many vehicles are coming in and out of particular land uses based on their category, in this case the number of units.

So it's not an assumption that I made, it's a formula and a methodology that has been used for 75 years.

MR. CABRERA: And there could be mistakes in those calculations?

THE WITNESS: Oh, yeah, 75 years of data. It is an assumption, but it's not an assumption that's just made based on a whim, it's based on data that has been collected from thousands of other sites.

So when you say it's an "assumption," I take a little offense to it just because it's not my assumption.
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812
Transportation

MR. CABRERA: Okay. And I didn't mean it towards you.

THE WITNESS: I know you didn't.
MR. CABRERA: So given all this calculation, the assumptions that are made by the ITE -- did I say that correctly?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. CABRERA: How do they know how many residents will actually be owning a vehicle and how many won't?

THE WITNESS: So, for these 60 units, the trip generation equations assume that there's no other transit, right. So all the vehicles that could come in and out of the site is part of this equation.

We made the assumption that if there is a $50 / 50$ split of vehicles specifically coming out of the site, 12 then would be going northbound, 12 would be going southbound, adds up to 24 instead of 23 , but that's an assumption that we made based on the traffic volume on Broadway.

Going back to the assumption part, would it be 12? One day it might be 10, another day it might be 18. It is what is on average you're going to see coming in and out of the site. Granted every day there will be a different number, but it
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will be certainly a little bit higher or a little bit lower and that's why these are the average rates. MR. CABRERA: So what was provided in your study is just an average, and there was no high or low?

THE WITNESS: Right. That's typically not how the analysis is done. The analysis is based on an average day, average conditions.

MR. CABRERA: All right. And as you said, these are assumptions made by the ITE and -THE WITNESS: Based on data. MR. CABRERA: Based on the data, and these predictions can be incorrect?

THE WITNESS: I would say that not incorrect, I would say that they are averages, so on any given day, it could be higher or lower.

MR. CABRERA: Okay. All right.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.
MS. GELLERT: Briefly.
Sally Gellert again, 210 Broadway.
On the ITE, you say they're national,
but do they take into account like population density or suburban environment versus rural versus an urban and so forth?
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```
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MR. NEWMAN: Motion to close to the public.
MR. HAYES: Second.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?
(Whereupon, all Board Members respond
in the affirmative.)
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. I think you accomplished your goal.
MR. DELIA: Well, almost.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sort of.
MR. DELIA: Almost. I will rest my case, though.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No, you're not
going to rest your case now, are you?
MR. DELIA: That concludes my presentation.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it does.
MR. DELIA: So I'm resting my
presentation, yes, resting my side of the case, subject to moving in all of the items marked for identification into evidence.
CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. It's almost 10 after 10, with the Closed Session yet.
```
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Would you agree that we're not going to finish tonight?

MR. DELIA: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. But you did conclude all of your witnesses?

MR. DELIA: Yes.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: So our next meeting is on June 25th.

MR. DELIA: I'll be here.
MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you agree to extend?

MR. DELIA: I agree to extend to June 25th.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: That is appreciated. I was hoping not to have to go through the scheduling history.

MR. DELIA: No, and, again, as I said here last time and as I said to you in our conversation, I wanted to see where we ended up tonight, and we moved it along, not nearly as much as I prefer, but we moved it along, so I appreciate that, and I look forward to seeing you on the 25th.

MR. PRINCIOTTO: I expect that we will conclude at that time.

MR. DELIA: Good. That's awesome.
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My Commission Expires:
25 morning. statute of the State of New Jersey. this action. Code. of New Jersey

7/11/19

Thank you, and thank you for your efforts.
This is not easy, I understand. MS. SMITH: Send me a signed extension.
MR. DELIA: Yes. We'll talk in the
(Time noted: 10:12 p.m.)
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