|                                  |  |                              |  |   |                      | 3          |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--|---|----------------------|------------|
|                                  |  |                              | 1  | <u>INDE</u>   | X                    |            |
|                                  |  | 1                            | 2  | WITNESSES   | SWORN P.             | A G E      |
|                                  | 1 BOROUGH OF WOODCLIFF LAKE<br>MUNICIPAL BUILDING  | :                            | 3  | Sally Gellert<br>210 Broadway   | 9                    |            |
|                                  | 2 ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMEN TUESDAY, JUNE 25, 2019 COMMENCING AT 7:41 P.M.   |                              | 4  | RICHARD PREISS, P.P. Direct Examination by M                          |                      | 18 41      |
|                                  | 4  | TRANSCRIPT                   | 6  | Board Questions   | 5 6<br>3 9 , 4       | 18,41,     |
|                                  | 5  | OF<br>PROCEEDINGS            |  | -   | 8 6                  |            |
|                                  | 6 188 Broadway Block 2701/Lot 3  |                              |  | Cross Examination by M<br>Redirect Examination by<br>Public Questions | Mr. Princiotto<br>90 | 5 9<br>8 8 |
|                                  | 8 BEFORE:  |                              | 9  | Craig Padover<br>27 Campbell Avenue                                   | 9 0                  |            |
|                                  | 9 BOROUGH OF WOODCLIFF LAKE ZONING BOARD<br>THERE BEING PRESENT:   | OF ADJUSTMENT                | 10   | Alex Couto 18 Cressfield Court  | 92,11                | 1          |
|                                  | 10 CHRISTINA HEMBREE, CHAIRWOMAN   |                              |  | Gwenn Levine  | 9 6                  |            |
|                                  | 11 ROBERT HAYES, MEMBER  |                              |  | 65 Campbell Avenue<br><b>Ulises Cabrera</b>                           | 9 6                  |            |
|                                  | 12 ROBIN EFFRON-MALLEY, MEMBER   |                              | 12   | 14 Dorchester Road Cheryl Dispoto                                     | 100                  |            |
|                                  | JOHN SPIRIG, MEMBER  |                              | 13   | 7 Bonnie Lane   |                      |            |
|                                  | 14 GARY NEWMAN, MEMBER   |                              | 14   | <b>Veronica Appelle</b><br>23 Cressfield Court                        | 107                  |            |
|                                  | 15 HASMIG YETEMIAN, ALTERNATE #1   |                              | 15   | <b>Josephine Higgins</b><br>10 Pond Road                              | 1 1 1                |            |
|                                  | 16 MICHAEL KAUFMAN, ALTERNATE #2   |                              |  | Ann Marie Borrelli<br>18 Cressfield Court                             | 111                  |            |
|                                  | 17   |                              |  | 16 Cressileia Court   |                      |            |
|                                  | 18   |                              | 17   | BRIAN A. INTINDOLA  | , <b>P.E.</b> 114    |            |
|                                  | 19   |                              | 18   |   |                      | . 1 4      |
|                                  | 20   |                              | 19   | Public Questions  | 1 3 1                |            |
|                                  | 21   |                              | 20   | Alex Couto 18 Cressfield Court  | 1 3 1                |            |
|                                  | 22 LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R.  | LLC                          | 21   | Cross Examination by M  | r. Delia 1           | 3 4        |
|                                  | 23 CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS P.O. BOX 505  |                              |  |   |                      |            |
|                                  | 24 SADDLE BROOK, NJ 07663<br>201-641-1812  |                              | 22   | EVAN M. JACOBS, P.E.<br>Direct Examination by M                       |                      | . 3 5      |
|                                  | 25 201-843-0515 FAX LauraACaruccillc@gmail.com   |                              | 23   | Board Questions   | 1 3 3                |            |
|                                  | naurancaruccirio gamari. com   | •                            | 24   |   |                      |            |
|                                  |  |                              | 25   |   |                      |            |
|                                  |  | 2                            |  |   |                      |            |
| 1                                |  | 2                            | 1  |   |                      | 4          |
| 2                                |  |                              | 2  |   |                      |            |
| 3                                | APPEARANCES:   |                              |  | INDEX (con  | tin u e d )          |            |
| 4                                |  |                              | 3  | BUBLIC COMMENT  | C.W. O.D.N.          | D 4 C 5    |
| 5                                | S. ROBERT PRINCIOTTO, ESQUIRE Counsel to the Board   |                              | 4  | PUBLIC COMMENT  | SWORN                | PAGE_      |
|                                  | counsel to the Bourd   |                              | _  | Sally Gellert   | 141 141              |            |
| 6                                | W ELLS, JAW ORSKI & LIEBMAN, LLP   |                              | 5  | 210 Broadway  |                      |            |
| 7                                | BY: JAMES J. DELIA, ESQUIRE 12 North Route 17 North  |                              | 6  | Veronica Appelle  | 1 4 5                | i          |
| 8                                | P.O. Box 1827  |                              | 7  | 23 Cressfield Court   |                      |            |
| 9                                | Paramus, NJ 07653-1827<br>Counsel to the Applicant   |                              | <b>'</b>                                     | Craig Marson  | 157,                 | 174        |
| 10                               |  |                              | 8  | 7 Cricket Lane  | •                    |            |
|                                  |  |                              | 9  | Ann Marie Borrelli  | 160 16               | 50,167     |
| 11                               | ALSO PRESENT:  |                              |  | 18 Cressfield Court   | 100 10               | 33,10/     |
| 12                               |  |                              | 10   | Alam Cart   | . = .                |            |
| 13                               | EVAN M. 14 CORO D. F. D. D.  |                              | 11   | Alex Couto 18 Cressfield Court  | 170                  |            |
| 14                               | EVAN M. JACOBS, P.E., P.P.<br>NEGLIA ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES  | 3                            | ''   | 5.55511614 60411  |                      |            |
| 15                               | Board Engineer   |                              | 12   | Cheryl Dispoto  | 182                  |            |
|                                  | BRIAN A. INTINDOLA, P.E.   |                              | 13   | 7 Bonnie Lane   |                      |            |
|                                  | Board Traffic Engineer   |                              |  | Alvin Star  | 187                  |            |
| 17                               | RICHARD PREISS, P.P., AICP<br>PHILLIPS PREISS GRYGIEL LEHENY   | HUGHES LLC                   | 14   | 209 Glen Road   |                      |            |
|                                  |  |                              | 15   |   |                      |            |
| 18                               | Board Planner  |                              | 15   |   |                      | 1          |
|                                  | Board Planner MEG SMITH  |                              |  |   |                      |            |
|                                  | Board Planner  |                              | 16   |   |                      |            |
| 19<br>20                         | Board Planner MEG SMITH  |                              | 16<br>17                                     |   |                      |            |
| 19<br>20<br>21                   | Board Planner MEG SMITH  |                              | 16<br>17<br>18                               |   |                      |            |
| 19<br>20                         | Board Planner  MEG SMITH  Board Secretary  | 3 . P . R L . L . C .        | 16<br>17                                     |   |                      |            |
| 19<br>20<br>21                   | Board Planner  MEG SMITH Board Secretary  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., I  CERTIFIED COURT REPO  |                              | 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             |   |                      |            |
| 19<br>20<br>21<br>22             | Board Planner  MEG SMITH Board Secretary  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., I  CERTIFIED COURT REPO  P.O. BOX 505  SADDLE BROOK, NJ 076  | RTERS                        | 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22       |   |                      |            |
| 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | Board Planner  MEG SMITH Board Secretary  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., I  CERTIFIED COURT REPO  P.O. BOX 505  | RTERS                        | 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21             |   |                      |            |
| 19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | Board Planner  MEG SMITH Board Secretary  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., I CERTIFIED COURT REPO P.O. BOX 505 SADDLE BROOK, NJ 076 201-641-1812 201-843-0515 FAX LauraACaruccillc@gmail. | O R T E R S<br>5 6 3<br>.com | 16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23 |   | 07/08/2019 1         |            |

| 5  |   |
|--|---|
| 1 INDEX (continued)  | 7   |
| 2 <u>E X H I B I T S</u> -02:-49   | 1 matter and a consultant only. He has no interest      |
| 3 NO. DESCRIPTION ID EVID  | 2 whatsoever in the project, other than as a            |
| 4 ZBA-3 Letter to K. Walsh, Esq.,  | 3 consultant.   |
| from N. Saluzzi, dated 6/1/18 17 -02:49  | 4 As I understand it, consultants can be                |
| ZBA-4 Letter from Chief A.  Garage Jannicelli dated 6/15/18 17   | 5 used by anyone who deems to use them.                 |
| -02:-49  | 6 Thank you.  |
| 7 ZBA-5 Neglia Engineering Associates Report issued 8/20/18 17   | 7 I just want to give you my position,                  |
| ZBA-6 Memorandum from R. Preiss,   | 8 because this may come up again, I just figured let me |
| <b>9</b> P.P., dated 8/29/18 17 -02:49   | <b>9</b> get that on the record.                        |
| <b>10</b> ZBA-7 email from Clay Bosch dated 11/23/18 17  | 10 I'd like to hear from Mr. Princiotto as              |
| 11 January 2 BA-8 Memorandum from R. Preiss,   | <b>11</b> well.   |
| <b>12</b> P.P., dated 6/20/19 17 -02:49  | MR. NEWMAN: And I'd also like to hear                   |
| 13 ZBA-9 Settlement Agreement 17 -02:49  | 13 if anybody from the public has any objection or if   |
| 14 ZBA-10 Note & attachments from V. Appelle 17  | , , , ,   |
| 15   | , ,   |
| <b>16</b> O-1 Veronica Appelle letter 125  |   |
| 17 O-2 One page double-sided   | , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,                   |
| photographs 143 -02:49  18 -0-3 Photograph 162 -02:49  |   |
| 19   |   |
| O-4 Photograph 165   | · ·   |
| 21   |   |
| 22   | 3,  |
| 23   |   |
| <b>24</b>  | J   |
| 25   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                |
| LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812   | 201-641-1812  |
| 6  | 8   |
| -02:-51 <b>1</b> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Now we have the -02:-48   | 1 I had an architect who actually                       |
| -02:-51 <b>2</b> continuation of 188 Broadway.   | 2 designed the plans. That architect is from            |
| -02:-50 <b>3</b> MR. DELIA: Good evening, Chairwoman -02:-48   | 3 Philadelphia. He has decided that it's not worth it   |
| -02:-50 <b>4</b> Hembree, members of the board.  | 4 to come down.   |
| -02:-50 <b>5</b> MR. NEWMAN: Madam Chairwoman, if -02:-48  | 5 I telephoned Mr. Dattoli. I have                      |
| -02:-50 <b>6</b> you'll just give me a minute. I always find it  | 6 orally made arrangements with Mr. Dattoli as to his   |
| -02:-50 <b>7</b> appropriate to disclose if there's any potential of   | 7 fees. He has sent me a proposal, which I agreed to,   |
| -02:-50 <b>8</b> conflict. You have an architect who has testified in -02:-48  | 8 and he is going to represent the entity which is      |
| -02:-50 <b>9</b> this matter, Mr. Albert Dattoli. I happen to own  | 9 known as "Dovetail Commons LLC" over which I am       |
| -02:-50 <b>10</b> property in Lincoln Park, New Jersey, in Morris -02:-48  |   |
| -02:-50 11 County, and I am going to use Mr. Dattoli I have -02:-48  | ·   |
| -02:-50 12 discussed with him retaining him I'm going to use -02:-48   |   |
| -02:-48 loos on the spect to my own application. I have loos of the spect to my own application. I have  | ,   |
| -02:-50 <b>14</b> partners on the project, but effectively I am a -02:-48  |   |
| -02:-48 -02:-50 <b>15</b> 50-percent owner in this project, and I am going to -02:-48 -02:-50 <b>16</b> use Mr. Dattoli in that project. He is going to be | ,   |
| -02:-48 use Mr. Dattoli in that project. He is going to be -02:-48 -02:-50 <b>17</b> my architect.   | •   |
| -02:-48  |   |
| -02:-47  |   |
| -02:-50 <b>20</b> have any objection to that.  | •   |
| -02:-50 21 MR. DELIA: I do not believe that is a -02:-47   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                   |
| -02:-49 <b>22</b> conflict of interest or is it any violation of the   | , , ,   |
| -02:-49 23 it will come to me in a second the other act that -02:-47   |   |
| -02:-49 <b>24</b> deals with professional conduct at hearings02:-47  | 24 motion to open to the public on this limited issue?  |
| -02:49 <b>25</b> Mr. Dattoli is a consultant in this -02:47  | 25 MR. HAYES: Motion to open to the                     |
| -0249 <b>23</b> M1. Datton is a consultant in this   | PR. HATES. Motion to open to the                        |
| LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                |

|  |   | 1   |  |
|--|---|---|--|
|  | 9   | 1   | MD DDINGIOTTO: Vee   |
| -02:-47 1  | public.   | -02:-45 1   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.   |
| -02:-47 <b>2</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Second?   | -02:-45 <b>2</b>  | MR. HAYES: Motion to close to the  |
| -02:-47 <b>3</b>   | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Second.  | -02:-45 <b>3</b>  | public.  |
| 02. 47   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?   | -02:-45 <b>4</b>  | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Second. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?   |
|  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond  |   |  |
| _  | in the affirmative.)  | _   | (Whereupon, all resent members respond   |
|  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?  | _   | in the affirmative.)   |
| -02:-47 <b>8</b><br>-02:-47 <b>9</b>   | (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. So open.   | -02:-45 <b>8</b><br>-02:-45 <b>9</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  |
| -02:-47 <b>9</b><br>-02:-47 <b>10</b>  | I think we want to know if there are  | -02:-45 <b>9</b><br>-02:-45 <b>10</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Closed to the  |
| -02:-47 <b>10</b><br>-02:-47 <b>11</b>   | any members of the public who have a problem with   | -02:-45 <b>10</b><br>-02:-45 <b>11</b>  | public.  |
| -02:-47 <b>11</b>  | Gary's disclosure?  | -02:-45 <b>11</b>   | MR. DELIA: So, if you could, and I'll  |
| -02:-47 <b>12</b><br>-02:-47 <b>13</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: Or any questions, only  | -02:-45 <b>12</b><br>-02:-45 <b>13</b>  | tab them for you, take a look at page 82, where I put  |
| -02:-47 <b>13</b>  | directed at this particular issue.  | -02:-45 <b>14</b>   | an X, there are four common law items, and then on   |
| -02:-47 <b>15</b>  | MS. GELLERT: Yes.   | -02:-45 <b>15</b>   | 85, under the Local Government Ethics Law, and I'll  |
| -02:-47 <b>16</b>  | Sally Gellert, 210 Highview.  | -02:-45 <b>16</b>   | circle each category, and some of them, you know, go   |
| -02:-47 <b>17</b>  | I don't have a problem, I do have a   | -02:-44 <b>17</b>   | on for a bit, but in the first paragraph there's some  |
| -02:-47 <b>17</b>  | question as to why you happened to choose an  | -02:-44 <b>17</b>   | explanation as to the types of conflict.   |
| -02:-47 <b>10</b>  | architect who you knew had a current project before   | -02:-44 <b>19</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.  |
| -02:-47 <b>20</b>  | this board?   | -02:-44 <b>20</b>   | MR. DELIA: Anyway, here we go.   |
| -02:-47 <b>21</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: The reason why I chose him  | -02:-44 <b>21</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, I have them.  |
| -02:-47 <b>22</b>  | is, as I disclosed probably at the start of this, I   | -02:-44 <b>22</b>   | I mean, one is a direct pecuniary  |
| -02:-46 <b>23</b>  | happen to know him, I'm very good friends with a  | -02:-44 <b>23</b>   | interest. You don't have any direct pecuniary  |
| -02:-46 <b>24</b>  | gentleman in town named Matt Bruziggi (phonetic), and   | -02:-44 <b>24</b>   | interest in this application?  |
| -02:-46 <b>25</b>  | he uses him on occasion. I respect his work, and he   | -02:-44 <b>25</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: In this application,   |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  | 201-641-1812  |   | 201-641-1812   |
|  |   |   |  |
|  | 10  |   | 12   |
| -02:-46 <b>1</b>   | 10 seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak,  | -02:-44 <b>1</b>  | absolutely not.  |
| -02:-46 <b>1</b><br>-02:-46 <b>2</b>   |   | -02:-44 <b>1</b><br>-02:-44 <b>2</b>  |  |
| 1  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak,   | _   | absolutely not.  |
| -02:-46 <b>2</b>   | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.   | -02:-44 <b>2</b>  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect   |
| -02:-46 <b>2</b><br>-02:-46 <b>3</b>   | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in   | -02:-44 <b>2</b><br>-02:-44 <b>3</b>  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that   |
| -02:-46 <b>2</b> -02:-46 <b>3</b> -02:-46 <b>4</b>                                   | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.   | -02:-44 <b>2</b> -02:-44 <b>3</b> -02:-44 <b>4</b>  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.   |
| -02:-46 <b>2</b> -02:-46 <b>3</b> -02:-46 <b>4</b> -02:-46 <b>5</b>                  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  | -02:-44 <b>2</b> -02:-44 <b>3</b> -02:-44 <b>4</b> -02:-44 <b>5</b>   | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up,  |
| -02:-46 <b>2</b> -02:-46 <b>3</b> -02:-46 <b>4</b> -02:-46 <b>5</b> -02:-46 <b>6</b> | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?   | -02:-44 <b>2</b> -02:-44 <b>3</b> -02:-44 <b>4</b> -02:-44 <b>5</b> -02:-44 <b>6</b>  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect  pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I  can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 3 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 9   | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that. Indirect pecuniary interest is when an  |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really   | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 3 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 10  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a  |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while   | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 10 -02:-44 11   | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on  | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 11 -02:-44 11   | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.   | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 10 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 13  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 10 -02:-44 11 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 13 -02:-43 14  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four  | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 10 -02:-44 11 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 14 -02:-43 15  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal  |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd  | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 10 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 13 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of  | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 10 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 13 -02:-43 14 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16 -02:-43 17  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of those pertain to you, in your opinion.   | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 10 -02:-44 11 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 14 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 17  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close friend in a non-financial way.  |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of those pertain to you, in your opinion.  If you could just bear with me for one  | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 10 -02:-44 11 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16 -02:-43 18 -02:-43 19                                   | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close friend in a non-financial way.  MR. NEWMAN: The matter here is not at   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of those pertain to you, in your opinion.  If you could just bear with me for one more second, I just want to see if there's anything  | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 10 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 13 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 18 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 20                       | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close friend in a non-financial way.  MR. NEWMAN: The matter here is not at issue.  |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of those pertain to you, in your opinion.  If you could just bear with me for one more second, I just want to see if there's anything specific in the Local Government Ethics Law, which is   | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 10 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 13 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 18 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 20 -02:-43 21                       | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close friend in a non-financial way.  MR. NEWMAN: The matter here is not at issue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And, four, indirect   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of those pertain to you, in your opinion.  If you could just bear with me for one more second, I just want to see if there's anything specific in the Local Government Ethics Law, which is the other statute I could not remember off the top of   | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 4 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 11 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 14 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 18 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 21 -02:-43 21 -02:-43 21  | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close friend in a non-financial way.  MR. NEWMAN: The matter here is not at issue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And, four, indirect personal interest is when the board member here votes   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of those pertain to you, in your opinion.  If you could just bear with me for one more second, I just want to see if there's anything specific in the Local Government Ethics Law, which is the other statute I could not remember off the top of my head.  | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 10 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 14 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 20 -02:-43 21 -02:-43 22 -02:-43 23 | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close friend in a non-financial way.  MR. NEWMAN: The matter here is not at issue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And, four, indirect personal interest is when the board member here votes on a matter in which his or her judgment may be   |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of those pertain to you, in your opinion.  If you could just bear with me for one more second, I just want to see if there's anything specific in the Local Government Ethics Law, which is the other statute I could not remember off the top of my head.  MR. NEWMAN: Before we get to that,                                | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 10 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 14 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 20 -02:-43 21 -02:-43 23 -02:-43 23 | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close friend in a non-financial way.  MR. NEWMAN: The matter here is not at issue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And, four, indirect personal interest is when the board member here votes on a matter in which his or her judgment may be affected because of membership in some organization.  |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of those pertain to you, in your opinion.  If you could just bear with me for one more second, I just want to see if there's anything specific in the Local Government Ethics Law, which is the other statute I could not remember off the top of my head.  MR. NEWMAN: Before we get to that, should we close to the public? | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 8 -02:-44 10 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 14 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 20 -02:-43 21 -02:-43 22 -02:-43 23 | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close friend in a non-financial way.  MR. NEWMAN: The matter here is not at issue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And, four, indirect personal interest is when the board member here votes on a matter in which his or her judgment may be affected because of membership in some organization.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here. |
| -02:-46  | seemed like the right man for the job, so to speak, and that's why I asked him if he would do it.  And my architect, who's really down in Philadelphia, decided that it wasn't really fruitful.  MS. GELLERT: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: If I could follow-up?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Sure.  MR. DELIA: And, again, I'm really going straight from the Cox book. It's been a while since I had to brush-up on my conflict of interest on the spot.  I'll hand you this in a moment.  There's one spot where it talks about four circumstances which would indicate a conflict. I'd ask you to take a look at that and see if any of those pertain to you, in your opinion.  If you could just bear with me for one more second, I just want to see if there's anything specific in the Local Government Ethics Law, which is the other statute I could not remember off the top of my head.  MR. NEWMAN: Before we get to that,                                | -02:-44 2 -02:-44 5 -02:-44 6 -02:-44 7 -02:-44 9 -02:-44 10 -02:-43 12 -02:-43 14 -02:-43 15 -02:-43 16 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 17 -02:-43 19 -02:-43 20 -02:-43 21 -02:-43 23 -02:-43 23 | absolutely not.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, indirect pecuniary interest would be if you have a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to you.  COURT REPORTER: Could you speak up, please. You are not speaking into the microphone. I can't hear you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'll repeat that.  Indirect pecuniary interest is when an official, like the board member here, votes on a matter that financially benefits one closely tied to the board member, such as an employer or a family member.  MR. NEWMAN: That does not apply here.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Direct personal interest, when an official or board member here votes on a matter that benefits a blood relative or close friend in a non-financial way.  MR. NEWMAN: The matter here is not at issue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And, four, indirect personal interest is when the board member here votes on a matter in which his or her judgment may be affected because of membership in some organization.  |

|   | 13   |   | 15  |
|---|--|---|---|
| -02:-43 1   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Mr. Delia, do you have   | -02:-41 <b>1</b>  | ask everyone who would like to make a comment or to   |
| -02:-43 <b>2</b>  | anything else?   | -02:-40 2   | submit documents or testify to sign this.   |
| -02:-43 <b>3</b>  | MR. DELIA: I'm satisfied.  | -02:-40 <b>3</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Shall we  |
| -02:-43 <b>4</b><br>-02:-43 <b>5</b>  | Thank you.   | -02:-40 <b>4</b><br>-02:-40 <b>5</b>  | begin?  |
|   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Thank you.   |   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.  |
| -02:-43 <b>6</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any board member have  | _   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I think we should   |
| -02:-43 <b>7</b><br>-02:-43 <b>8</b>  | anything to say on the issue?  | -02:-40 <b>7</b><br>-02:-40 <b>8</b>  | begin while you're passing the papers around. Is  |
|   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No.  |   | that okay? We don't want to waste anymore time. We have plenty of time.   |
| -02:-43 <b>9</b><br>-02:-43 <b>10</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Did I ask you, I know you will be fair and impartial, but, for the record,   | -02:-40 <b>9</b><br>-02:-40 <b>10</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: Is there a need for this  |
| -02:-43 <b>10</b><br>-02:-43 <b>11</b>  | you feel you can decide this case and that won't have  | -02:-40 <b>10</b><br>-02:-40 <b>11</b>  | board to be up?   |
| -02:-43 <b>11</b>   | any impact on your decision?   | -02:-40 <b>11</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Is there a need,  |
| -02:-43 <b>12</b><br>-02:-43 <b>13</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Yes.   | -02:-40 <b>12</b><br>-02:-40 <b>13</b>  | Mr. Delia, for the board behind you?  |
| -02:-43 14  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other  | -02:-40 <b>13</b>   | MR. DELIA: No, not right now.   |
| -02:-43 <b>15</b>   | questions, comments?   | -02:-40 <b>15</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  |
| -02:-43 <b>16</b>   | (No response.)   | -02:-40 <b>15</b>   | MR. DELIA: You are welcome.   |
| -02:-43 <b>10</b><br>-02:-42 <b>17</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Should we move on?   | -02:-40 <b>17</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Just some  |
| -02:-42 <b>17</b><br>-02:-42 <b>18</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.   | -02:-40 <b>17</b><br>-02:-40 <b>18</b>  | recordkeeping here.   |
| -02:-42 <b>16</b><br>-02:-42 <b>19</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Please.  | -02:-40 <b>19</b>   | In terms of the exhibits, I received an   |
| -02:-42 <b>19</b><br>-02:-42 <b>20</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tonight we   | -02:-40 <b>19</b>   | exhibit list from Mr. Delia.  |
| -02:-42 <b>20</b><br>-02:-42 <b>21</b>  | expect to conclude this meeting. We have testimony   | -02:-40 <b>20</b><br>-02:-39 <b>21</b>  | Thank you.  |
| -02:-42 <b>21</b><br>-02:-42 <b>22</b>  | to take tonight, including the zoning board's  | -02:-39 <b>21</b>   | MR. DELIA: You're welcome.  |
| -02:-42 <b>22</b><br>-02:-42 <b>23</b>  | planner, testimony from the traffic engineer, and I  | -02:-39 <b>22</b><br>-02:-39 <b>23</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I have exhibits that  |
| -02:-42 <b>24</b>   | think a little bit of testimony from the engineer for  | -02:-39 <b>24</b>   | the board previously marked as ZBA-1 and ZBA-2.   |
| -02:-42 <b>25</b>   | the board.   | -02:-39 <b>25</b>   | I have, for the record, ZBA-3, which is   |
| -0242 20  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   | -0239 20  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812   |   | 201-641-1812  |
|   |  |   |   |
|   | 14   |   | 16  |
| -02:-42 <b>1</b>  | 14<br>I have tonight sign-in sheets for  | -02:-39 <b>1</b>  | 16<br>a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski &  |
| -02:-42 <b>1</b><br>-02:-42 <b>2</b>  | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because  | -02:-39 <b>1</b><br>-02:-39 <b>2</b>  |   |
| _   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for  | _   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski &  |
| -02:-42 <b>2</b>  | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because  | -02:-39 <b>2</b>  | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski &<br>Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction  |
| -02:-42 <b>2</b><br>-02:-42 <b>3</b>  | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount  | -02:-39 <b>2</b><br>-02:-39 <b>3</b>  | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski &<br>Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction<br>official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  |
| -02:-42 <b>2</b><br>-02:-42 <b>3</b><br>-02:-42 <b>4</b>  | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to  | -02:-39 <b>2</b> -02:-39 <b>3</b> -02:-39 <b>4</b>  | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski &<br>Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction<br>official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.<br>There's a letter from Chief Anthony   |
| -02:-42 <b>2</b> -02:-42 <b>3</b> -02:-42 <b>4</b> -02:-42 <b>5</b>   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  | -02:-39 <b>2</b> -02:-39 <b>3</b> -02:-39 <b>4</b> -02:-39 <b>5</b>   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  |
| -02:-42 <b>2</b> -02:-42 <b>3</b> -02:-42 <b>4</b> -02:-42 <b>5</b> -02:-42 <b>6</b>  | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for  | -02:-39 <b>2</b> -02:-39 <b>3</b> -02:-39 <b>4</b> -02:-39 <b>5</b> -02:-39 <b>6</b>  | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates   |
| -02:-42 <b>2</b> -02:-42 <b>3</b> -02:-42 <b>4</b> -02:-42 <b>5</b> -02:-42 <b>6</b> -02:-42 <b>7</b>   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet   | -02:-39 <b>2</b> -02:-39 <b>3</b> -02:-39 <b>4</b> -02:-39 <b>5</b> -02:-39 <b>6</b> -02:-39 <b>7</b>   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018,   |
| -02:-42 <b>2</b> -02:-42 <b>3</b> -02:-42 <b>4</b> -02:-42 <b>5</b> -02:-42 <b>6</b> -02:-42 <b>7</b> -02:-42 <b>8</b>                                    | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in  | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 3 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-39 8   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  |
| -02:-42 <b>2</b> -02:-42 <b>3</b> -02:-42 <b>4</b> -02:-42 <b>5</b> -02:-42 <b>6</b> -02:-42 <b>7</b> -02:-42 <b>8</b> -02:-42 <b>9</b>                   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not  | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 3 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-39 8 -02:-39 9   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss   |
| -02:-42 <b>2</b> -02:-42 <b>3</b> -02:-42 <b>4</b> -02:-42 <b>5</b> -02:-42 <b>6</b> -02:-42 <b>7</b> -02:-42 <b>8</b> -02:-42 <b>9</b> -02:-42 <b>10</b> | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third  | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 3 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-39 8 -02:-38 9 -02:-38 10  | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.   |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not  | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-39 8 -02:-38 9 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually   |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.   | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-39 8 -02:-38 9 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree  |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets  | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 3 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-38 9 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 13   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our   |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you  | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-38 9 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 13 -02:-38 13   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address   | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 8 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 13 -02:-38 14 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 16 -02:-38 17   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from  |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.  | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 8 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 13 -02:-38 14 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 16  | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20,   |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.  I'd also like to know if there's anyone   | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 8 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 16 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 18 -02:-38 18  | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20, 2019, we'll mark that as ZBA-8.   |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.  I'd also like to know if there's anyone who has any documents or evidence that they would   | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 8 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 16 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 18 -02:-38 19 -02:-38 20   | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20, 2019, we'll mark that as ZBA-8.  And then we have the settlement  |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.  I'd also like to know if there's anyone who has any documents or evidence that they would like to submit tonight or would like to testify, and  | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-38 9 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 16 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 18 -02:-38 18 -02:-38 19 -02:-38 20 -02:-38 21                       | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20, 2019, we'll mark that as ZBA-8.  And then we have the settlement agreement between the borough and the Fair Share   |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.  I'd also like to know if there's anyone who has any documents or evidence that they would like to submit tonight or would like to testify, and I'm going to ask that right now.   | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 13 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 19 -02:-38 21 -02:-38 21 -02:-38 21                      | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20, 2019, we'll mark that as ZBA-8.  And then we have the settlement agreement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center, that will be made part of the record  |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.  I'd also like to know if there's anyone who has any documents or evidence that they would like to submit tonight or would like to testify, and I'm going to ask that right now.  Okay. All right. I see four hands.   | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-38 9 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 16 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 18 -02:-38 18 -02:-38 19 -02:-38 20 -02:-38 21                       | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20, 2019, we'll mark that as ZBA-8.  And then we have the settlement agreement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center, that will be made part of the record as ZBA-9.  |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.  I'd also like to know if there's anyone who has any documents or evidence that they would like to submit tonight or would like to testify, and I'm going to ask that right now.  Okay. All right. I see four hands.  So when you sign in, just put a "T" by   | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-38 9 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 16 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 18 -02:-38 19 -02:-38 20 -02:-38 21 -02:-38 21 -02:-38 23 -02:-38 23 | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20, 2019, we'll mark that as ZBA-8.  And then we have the settlement agreement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center, that will be made part of the record as ZBA-9.  I've also marked, but not in the  |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.  I'd also like to know if there's anyone who has any documents or evidence that they would like to submit tonight or would like to testify, and I'm going to ask that right now.  Okay. All right. I see four hands.  So when you sign in, just put a "T" by your name, and that will indicate to me that you  | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 4 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 8 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 16 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 19 -02:-38 19 -02:-38 20 -02:-38 21 -02:-38 21                      | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20, 2019, we'll mark that as ZBA-8.  And then we have the settlement agreement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center, that will be made part of the record as ZBA-9.  I've also marked, but not in the record, a note that was sent to me by a resident,  |
| -02:-42   | I have tonight sign-in sheets for people who would like to make public comment, because I need to know in advance so we can budget the amount of time here tonight, because we do expect to conclude.  So I have three sheets. One is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who live within 200 feet of 188 Broadway, the subject site. Another sign-in sheet is for residents of Woodcliff Lake who do not reside within 200 feet of 188 Broadway. And a third sheet is for members of the public that are not residents of Woodcliff Lake.  So I'm going to hand these three sheets out, look carefully and determine which sheet you should be signing, and print your name and address legibly.  I'd also like to know if there's anyone who has any documents or evidence that they would like to submit tonight or would like to testify, and I'm going to ask that right now.  Okay. All right. I see four hands.  So when you sign in, just put a "T" by your name, and that will indicate to me that you would like to testify or submit some proof. So I'm | -02:-39 2 -02:-39 3 -02:-39 5 -02:-39 6 -02:-39 7 -02:-38 9 -02:-38 10 -02:-38 11 -02:-38 12 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 15 -02:-38 16 -02:-38 17 -02:-38 18 -02:-38 19 -02:-38 20 -02:-38 21 -02:-38 21 -02:-38 23 -02:-38 23 | a letter to Kathryn Walsh at Wells, Jaworski & Liebman, sent by our zoning officer/construction official at the time, Nick Saluzzi, on June 1, 2018.  There's a letter from Chief Anthony Jannicelli, dated June 15, 2018, that's ZBA-4.  The Neglia Engineering Associates report that was issued dated August 20th, 2018, ZBA-5.  A memorandum issued by Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss, dated August 29, 2018, ZBA-6.  This is an email, ZBA-7, it actually comes from Clay Bosch, from the Shade Tree Commission, dated November 23rd, 2018, sent to our board secretary.  And then we have another memo from Richard Preiss from Phillips Preiss dated June 20, 2019, we'll mark that as ZBA-8.  And then we have the settlement agreement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center, that will be made part of the record as ZBA-9.  I've also marked, but not in the record, a note that was sent to me by a resident, Veronica Appelle, and attached to it were some |

|   | 17   |  | 19   |
|---|--|--|--|
| -02:-37 <b>1</b>  | 13, 2018; an e-mail, I'm not sure of the date,   | -02:-35 <b>1</b>   | to me and certain members of the board.  |
| -02:-37 <b>2</b>  | handwritten on it, it says August 7, 2018; and   | -02:-35 <b>2</b>   | We do have new members of the board and  |
| -02:-37 <b>3</b>  | another copy of a letter issued to Chief Anthony   | -02:-35 <b>3</b>   | we have members of the public who do not have the  |
| -02:-37 <b>4</b>  | Jannicelli from Dennis D'Angelis (phonetic), traffic   | -02:-35 <b>4</b>   | benefit of your background and qualification, so I'm   |
| -02:-37 <b>5</b>  | safety supervisor. We're marking that for  | -02:-35 <b>5</b>   | going to ask you to provide us with your educational   |
| -02:-37 <b>6</b>  | identification right now.  | -02:-35 <b>6</b>   | background and your professional qualifications.   |
| -02:-37 <b>7</b>  | MR. DELIA: That's fine.  | -02:-34 <b>7</b>   | A. Right.  |
| -02:-36 <b>8</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Not into the record,   | -02:-34 <b>8</b>   | So, my name is Richard Preiss, spelled   |
| -02:-36 <b>9</b>  | and I'm probably going to ask Mr. Intindola questions  | -02:-34 <b>9</b>   | P-R-E-I-S-S.   |
| -02:-36 <b>10</b>   | about that.  | -02:-34 10   | I work for the firm of Phillips Preiss   |
| -02:-36 <b>11</b>   | MR. DELIA: Okay.   | -02:-34 <b>11</b>  | Grygiel Leheny Hughes, LLC. We're a planning and   |
| -02:-36 <b>12</b>   | Again, just for the record, I do object  | -02:-34 <b>12</b>  | real estate consultant with offices in Hoboken, New  |
| -02:-36 <b>13</b>   | to that. I only received it at noon today, so it   | -02:-34 13   | Jersey.  |
| -02:-36 <b>14</b>   | came late and it's also, in my opinion, hearsay.   | -02:-34 <b>14</b>  | I've been with that firm since 1981.   |
| -02:-36 <b>15</b>   | So for those reasons I would object to   | -02:-34 <b>15</b>  | I've been a partner in that firm since 1984.   |
| -02:-36 <b>16</b>   | its entry into evidence at some point here.  | -02:-34 <b>16</b>  | I have been the municipal planning   |
| -02:-36 17  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Technically the rules  | -02:-34 17   | consultant in Woodcliff Lake for the past four years,  |
| -02:-36 18  | of evidence don't apply, but I understand the nature   | -02:-34 18   | most particularly for the zoning board, for the  |
| -02:-36 19  | of your objection.   | -02:-34 19   | planning board, and also initially not for the   |
| -02:-36 <b>20</b>   | MR. DELIA: But it's a serious hearsay  | -02:-34 <b>20</b>  | council, but for the purposes of helping the borough   |
| -02:-36 21  | and very late. This has been out for months, and I   | -02:-34 21   | figure out its affordable housing obligation. I've,  |
| -02:-36 <b>22</b><br>-02:-36 <b>23</b>                              | get it the day of the last hearing. That's just not  | -02:-34 <b>22</b><br>-02:-34 <b>23</b>   | subsequently, also become the council's planner.   |
| -02:-36 <b>23</b><br>-02:-36 <b>24</b>                              | right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I understand   | -02:-34 <b>23</b><br>-02:-34 <b>24</b>   | By way of background in education, I have a bachelor's degree in town and regional   |
| -02:-36 <b>25</b>   | your objection, but Mr. Intindola might be able to   | -02:-34 <b>25</b>  | planning, and a master's degree in planning. I'm a   |
| -0230 20  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   | -0204 20   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|   | 201-641-1812   |  | 201-641-1812   |
|   | 18   |  | 20   |
| -02:-36 <b>1</b>  | shed some light on this.   | -02:-33 <b>1</b>   | licensed planner in the State of New Jersey. As  |
| -02:-36 <b>2</b>  | MR. DELIA: Okay.   | -02:-33 <b>2</b>   | indicated, I've been a licensed planner since 1986.  |
|   |  | _  |  |
| -02:-36 <b>3</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Perhaps you might not  | -02:-33 <b>3</b>   | I've testified before boards like this   |
| -02:-36 <b>3</b><br>-02:-36 <b>4</b>                                | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Perhaps you might not object after you hear what he has to say about it,   | -02:-33 <b>3</b><br>-02:-33 <b>4</b>   | I've testified before boards like this ever since that period of time, and I've been   |
|   | . , 5  |  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications  |
| -02:-36 <b>4</b> -02:-36 <b>5</b> -02:-36 <b>6</b>                  | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.   | -02:-33 <b>4</b> -02:-33 <b>5</b> -02:-33 <b>6</b>                                   | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board   |
| -02:-36 <b>4</b> -02:-36 <b>5</b> -02:-36 <b>6</b> -02:-36 <b>7</b> | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and  | -02:-33 <b>4</b> -02:-33 <b>5</b> -02:-33 <b>6</b> -02:-33 <b>7</b>                  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.   |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on  | -02:-33 <b>4</b> -02:-33 <b>5</b> -02:-33 <b>6</b> -02:-33 <b>7</b> -02:-33 <b>8</b> | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to  |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.   | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the  |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through   | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my  |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.   |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start  | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's  |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?   |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and  | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes.  |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?   |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.   | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And reexamination of the master plan?  A. Yes.   |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.  Do you swear or affirm to tell the   | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And reexamination of the master plan?  A. Yes.   |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.  Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?   | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And reexamination of the master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And any proposals or changes in zoning  |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.  Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MR. PREISS: I do.  | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And reexamination of the master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And any proposals or changes in zoning in the borough in the last four years?   |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.  Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MR. PREISS: I do.  RICHARD PREISS, P.P., AICP, c/o Phillips  | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And reexamination of the master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And any proposals or changes in zoning in the borough in the last four years?  A. Yes.  |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.  Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MR. PREISS: I do.  RICHARD PREISS, P.P., AICP, c/o Phillips Preiss, LLC, 33-41 Newark Street, Third Floor,   | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes. Q. And reexamination of the master plan? A. Yes. Q. And any proposals or changes in zoning in the borough in the last four years?  A. Yes. Q. Now, I know you issued an initial  |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.  Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MR. PREISS: I do.  RICHARD PREISS, P.P., AICP, c/o Phillips Preiss, LLC, 33-41 Newark Street, Third Floor, Suite D, Hoboken, New Jersey 07039, having been   | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And reexamination of the master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And any proposals or changes in zoning in the borough in the last four years?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, I know you issued an initial memorandum that I referenced.  A. It's not really a memorandum, it's an outline.   |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.  Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MR. PREISS: I do.  RICHARD PREISS, P.P., AICP, c/o Phillips Preiss, LLC, 33-41 Newark Street, Third Floor, Suite D, Hoboken, New Jersey 07039, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testified as follows:  DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:   | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And reexamination of the master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And any proposals or changes in zoning in the borough in the last four years?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, I know you issued an initial memorandum that I referenced.  A. It's not really a memorandum, it's an outline.  If I can just explain. I do have a   |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.  Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MR. PREISS: I do.  RICHARD PREISS, P.P., AICP, c/o Phillips Preiss, LLC, 33-41 Newark Street, Third Floor, Suite D, Hoboken, New Jersey 07039, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testified as follows:  DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  Q. I know, Mr. Preiss, you're well known | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And reexamination of the master plan?  A. Yes.  Q. And any proposals or changes in zoning in the borough in the last four years?  A. Yes.  Q. Now, I know you issued an initial memorandum that I referenced.  A. It's not really a memorandum, it's an outline.  If I can just explain. I do have a presentation. I'm going to look at all of the |
| -02:-36   | object after you hear what he has to say about it, maybe you will, and you certainly have a right to object.  MR. DELIA: We're talking about it and I just want to get it out there so we can continue on a seamless pace.  (Whereupon, exhibits ZBA-3 through ZBA-10 are marked for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to start with our first witness tonight, Mr. Richard Preiss.  In fact, I'll ask you to stand and raise your right hand.  Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MR. PREISS: I do.  RICHARD PREISS, P.P., AICP, c/o Phillips Preiss, LLC, 33-41 Newark Street, Third Floor, Suite D, Hoboken, New Jersey 07039, having been duly sworn/affirmed, testified as follows:  DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:   | -02:-33  | ever since that period of time, and I've been involved in most applications or all the applications that required planning review for the zoning board and the planning board.  I've also been tasked with helping to evaluate proposals for rezoning or changes to the master plan and amendments in Woodcliff Lake since my tenure here in 2015.  Q. You're familiar with the borough's master plan?  A. Yes. Q. And reexamination of the master plan? A. Yes. Q. And any proposals or changes in zoning in the borough in the last four years?  A. Yes. Q. Now, I know you issued an initial memorandum that I referenced.  A. It's not really a memorandum, it's an outline.  If I can just explain. I do have a   |

to the applicant actually having come before the board and started a hearing just to, you know, provide some background and indicate what the variances are and then the planning proofs that were required for the variance.

Yes, I did that.

-02:-30 **10** Q. And then your outline dated June 20,

-02:-30 **11** 2019?

4

5

6

7

8

9

-02:-31

-02:-31

-02:-31

-02:-30

-02:-30

-02:-30

-02:-30 **12** 

-02:-30 13

-02:-30 14

-02:-30 15

-02:-30 16

-02:-30 **17** 

-02:-30 18

-02:-30 19

-02:-30 **20** 

-02:-30 **21** 

-02:-30 **22** 

-02:-30 **23** 

## Α. Correct, which is something I'll be referring to towards the end of my testimony.

So let me start by saying that I was here for all of the hearings. I've reviewed all of the plans. I've seen all transcripts. And I will address the planning testimony last.

I'd like to deal with some of the aspects insofar as they relate to the variances related to civil engineering, the site plan, the architectural plans, and traffic testimony, traffic and parking, and also the testimony of the real estate broker.

-02:-30 **24** So let me first talk a little bit about -02:-30 **25** the site plan and the engineering testimony.

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

-02:-28 4 building, as has been proposed, to make it more 5 residential in appearance. -02:-28 6

The one thing I'll say is that I'm not -02:-28 7 going to comment on the architecture at this point. -02:-28 8 I will say that if the board did see fit to grant the -02:-28 9 variance, that I would ask that in the resolution -02:-28 -02:-28 10 they allow our office and the engineer office to work -02:-28 11 with the architect to perhaps tweak and improve the -02:-28 **12** design.

-02:-28 14 convert the front building to residential, you'll -02:-28 15 find that you'd still have excess parking behind it. -02:-28 16 So the addition of another building in -02:-27 **17** the parking lot behind it of more or less the same -02:-27 18 height, and the ability to be able to have the number -02:-27 19 of units that the remaining parking can support -02:-27 **20** through the RSIS standards, would allow you to add this extra building to the rear.

But, anyway, assuming that you can

-02:-27 **21** -02:-27 **22** You would absolutely want to make sure -02:-27 **23** that the rear building, when you add it, does not -02:-27 **24** block the view of residents to the rear, particularly -02:-27 **25** those that have views of the reservoir and also to

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

-02:-28 13

|  | 20  |  | 24  |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | 29  |  | 31  |
| -02:-21 <b>1</b>   | plan within that particular context.  | -02:-18 <b>1</b>   | have a lot of respect for him and his testimony.  |
| -02:-21 <b>2</b>   | So what I think that the board is   | -02:-18 <b>2</b>   | In his testimony, he started out by   |
| -02:-21 3  | facing really comes down to the planning arguments,   | -02:-18 3  | referencing the master plans, the 2002 Master Plan,   |
| -02:-21 4  | whether there are special reasons, the negative   | -02:-18 4  | the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination, and the 2008  |
| -02:-21 <b>5</b>   | criteria, and, in particular, what is known as the  | -02:-18 <b>5</b>   | Broadway corridor study, with particular focus on the   |
| -02:-21 6  | " <u>Medici</u> reconciliation," whether that has been met.   | -02:-18 <b>6</b>   | goals and objectives. And I will get to that a  |
| -02:-21 7  | I know that the board is familiar with  | -02:-18 <b>7</b>   | little bit later, and I will use the handout ZBA-8 to   |
| -02:-21 8  | these concepts, but before I address the planning   | -02:-18  | talk about that. So I'll come back to that last.  |
| -02:-21 9  | testimony provided by Mr. Burgis, I do want to  | -02:-18 9  | With regard to the special reasons,   |
| -02:-21 10   | clarify what the <u>Medici</u> decision basically indicates   | -02:-18 10   | there were five that he mentioned.  |
| -02:-20 11   | and what the board has to do.   | -02:-18 11   | The first one he indicated was that   |
| -02:-20 12   | The <u>Medici</u> decision, which is a Supreme  | -02:-18 12   | there are purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law that   |
| -02:-20 13   | Court decision from the 1980s, said that when you're  | -02:-18 13   | would be advanced by this project.  |
| -02:-20 14   | dealing with a use variance, in addition to, you  | -02:-18 14   | Now, I think what the board has to do   |
| -02:-20 15   | know, your special reasons and negative criteria,   | -02:-18 15   | is you have to look at these goals, because every   |
| -02:-20 16   | there's an enhanced burden of proof for a use   | -02:-17 16   | project, whether or not they conform to a zoning  |
| -02:-20 17   | variance.   | -02:-17 <b>17</b>  | ordinance, whether they're permitted or not, can be   |
| -02:-20 <b>18</b><br>-02:-20 <b>19</b>   | The first is that as part of your special reasons, you have to show that the site is  | -02:-17 <b>18</b><br>-02:-17 <b>19</b>   | said to further one or more purposes of the Municipal Land Use Law.   |
|  |   | -02:-17 <b>19</b><br>-02:-17 <b>20</b>   |   |
| -02:-20 <b>20</b><br>-02:-20 <b>21</b>   | particularly suited for the proposed use.  We have lots of testimony on that  | -02:-17 <b>20</b><br>-02:-17 <b>21</b>   | So I think the key, in the case of a use variance where the board has to grant a use which  |
| -02:-20 <b>21</b><br>-02:-20 <b>22</b>   | from as I've indicated, others, from the  | -02:-17 <b>21</b><br>-02:-17 <b>22</b>   | the governing body has prohibited in the zone, is to  |
| -02:-20 <b>22</b><br>-02:-20 <b>23</b>   | engineering, traffic and real estate broker and   | -02:-17 <b>22</b><br>-02:-17 <b>23</b>   | determine whether this proposed use goes above and  |
| -02:-20 <b>24</b>  | architecture, and we have some testimony from   | -02:-17 <b>23</b>  | beyond and does more to further those goals than  |
| -02:-20 <b>25</b>  | Mr. Burgis.   | -02:-17 <b>25</b>  | would a permitted use or the existing use on the  |
| -0220 20   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  | -0217  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|  | 201-641-1812  |  | 201-641-1812  |
|  | 30  |  | 32  |
| -02:-20 <b>1</b>   | The second part of the Medici criteria,   | -02:-17 <b>1</b>   | site. So you can't just say, well, it promotes this   |
| -02:-20 <b>2</b>   | and it's often mischaracterized, is what's known as   | -02:-17 <b>2</b>   | goal. The question is: Does it do it better or are  |
| -02:-20 <b>3</b>   | the "Medici reconciliation." And what it says is the  | -02:-17 <b>3</b>   | there certain things that this use advances to a  |
| -02:-20 <b>4</b>   | applicant doesn't only have to show that the use  | -02:-17 <b>4</b>   | greater degree in the purposes of the Municipal Land  |
| -02:-20 <b>5</b>   | would not be inconsistent with the master plan, but   | -02:-17 <b>5</b>   | Use Law than an office use was in the SO zone, which  |
| -02:-19 <b>6</b>   | the board has to reconcile the grant of the variance  | -02:-17 <b>6</b>   | is the main permitted use.  |
| -02:-19 <b>7</b>   | with the fact that the council, through its zoning,   | -02:-17 <b>7</b>   | With regard to the second special   |
| -02:-19 <b>8</b>   | has prohibited this use in the zone, and it's known   | -02:-17 <b>8</b>   | reason, he indicated that this project would assist   |
| -02:-19 <b>9</b>   | as the Medici reconciliation test.  | -02:-16 <b>9</b>   | the borough with the unmet need, and I'll also talk a   |
| -02:-19 <b>10</b>  | So you have to go beyond the argument   | -02:-16 <b>10</b>  | little bit about this because this is part of the   |
| -02:-19 <b>11</b>  | saying, oh, well, this use is supported by some of  | -02:-16 <b>11</b>  | discussion about the master plan and the history of   |
| -02:-19 <b>12</b>  | the goals in the master plan; you have to provide a   | -02:-16 <b>12</b>  | the Broadway corridor zoning, but I think what the  |
|  | the gods in the master plant, you have to provide a   |  | the broadway corridor zonning, but I think what the   |
| -02:-19 <b>13</b>  | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at   | -02:-16 <b>13</b>  | board should understand, that the borough did settle  |
| -02:-19 <b>14</b>  | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at<br>this site, when the zoning basically says this is a  | -02:-16 <b>14</b>  | board should understand, that the borough did settle<br>their affordable housing obligation with the Fair   |
| -02:-19 <b>14</b><br>-02:-19 <b>15</b>   | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at<br>this site, when the zoning basically says this is a<br>prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that  | -02:-16 <b>14</b><br>-02:-16 <b>15</b>   | board should understand, that the borough did settle<br>their affordable housing obligation with the Fair<br>Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has  |
| -02:-19 <b>14</b><br>-02:-19 <b>15</b><br>-02:-19 <b>16</b>  | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at<br>this site, when the zoning basically says this is a<br>prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that<br>in later testimony.   | -02:-16 <b>14</b><br>-02:-16 <b>15</b><br>-02:-16 <b>16</b>  | board should understand, that the borough did settle<br>their affordable housing obligation with the Fair<br>Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has<br>identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the   |
| -02:-19 <b>14</b><br>-02:-19 <b>15</b><br>-02:-19 <b>16</b><br>-02:-19 <b>17</b>   | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the  | -02:-16 <b>14</b><br>-02:-16 <b>15</b><br>-02:-16 <b>16</b><br>-02:-16 <b>17</b>   | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share  |
| -02:-19 <b>14</b><br>-02:-19 <b>15</b><br>-02:-19 <b>16</b><br>-02:-19 <b>17</b><br>-02:-19 <b>18</b>  | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.   | -02:-16 14<br>-02:-16 15<br>-02:-16 16<br>-02:-16 17<br>-02:-16 18   | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.  |
| -02:-19 14<br>-02:-19 15<br>-02:-19 16<br>-02:-19 17<br>-02:-19 18<br>-02:-19 19   | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.  Now, I know Mr. Burgis for over 30   | -02:-16 14<br>-02:-16 15<br>-02:-16 16<br>-02:-16 17<br>-02:-16 18<br>-02:-16 19   | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's correct.   |
| -02:-19 14<br>-02:-19 15<br>-02:-19 16<br>-02:-19 17<br>-02:-19 18<br>-02:-19 19<br>-02:-19 20   | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.  Now, I know Mr. Burgis for over 30 years. He's a highly respected planner. He was a  | -02:-16 14<br>-02:-16 15<br>-02:-16 16<br>-02:-16 17<br>-02:-16 18<br>-02:-16 19<br>-02:-16 20   | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's correct.  THE WITNESS: It adopted a Housing  |
| -02:-19 14<br>-02:-19 15<br>-02:-19 16<br>-02:-19 17<br>-02:-19 18<br>-02:-19 19<br>-02:-19 20<br>-02:-19 21   | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.  Now, I know Mr. Burgis for over 30 years. He's a highly respected planner. He was a consultant to the borough for many years. If you   | -02:-16 14<br>-02:-16 15<br>-02:-16 16<br>-02:-16 17<br>-02:-16 18<br>-02:-16 19<br>-02:-16 20<br>-02:-16 21                             | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's correct.  THE WITNESS: It adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, and it has adopted  |
| -02:-19 14<br>-02:-19 15<br>-02:-19 17<br>-02:-19 18<br>-02:-19 19<br>-02:-19 20<br>-02:-19 21<br>-02:-19 22   | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.  Now, I know Mr. Burgis for over 30 years. He's a highly respected planner. He was a consultant to the borough for many years. If you look at the documents that I'm referring to with  | -02:-16 14<br>-02:-16 15<br>-02:-16 16<br>-02:-16 17<br>-02:-16 18<br>-02:-16 19<br>-02:-16 20<br>-02:-16 21<br>-02:-16 22               | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's correct.  THE WITNESS: It adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, and it has adopted overlay zones to meet its unmet need.  |
| -02:-19 14<br>-02:-19 15<br>-02:-19 16<br>-02:-19 17<br>-02:-19 18<br>-02:-19 19<br>-02:-19 20<br>-02:-19 21<br>-02:-19 22<br>-02:-19 23               | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.  Now, I know Mr. Burgis for over 30 years. He's a highly respected planner. He was a consultant to the borough for many years. If you look at the documents that I'm referring to with regard to the master plan review, those were prepared  | -02:-16 14<br>-02:-16 15<br>-02:-16 16<br>-02:-16 17<br>-02:-16 18<br>-02:-16 19<br>-02:-16 20<br>-02:-16 21<br>-02:-16 22<br>-02:-16 23 | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's correct.  THE WITNESS: It adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, and it has adopted overlay zones to meet its unmet need.  And during that process of negotiation  |
| -02:-19 14<br>-02:-19 15<br>-02:-19 16<br>-02:-19 17<br>-02:-19 18<br>-02:-19 20<br>-02:-19 21<br>-02:-19 21<br>-02:-19 22<br>-02:-19 23<br>-02:-18 24 | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.  Now, I know Mr. Burgis for over 30 years. He's a highly respected planner. He was a consultant to the borough for many years. If you look at the documents that I'm referring to with regard to the master plan review, those were prepared by his office, and he has a long history here, and   | -02:-16 14<br>-02:-16 15<br>-02:-16 16<br>-02:-16 17<br>-02:-16 18<br>-02:-16 20<br>-02:-16 21<br>-02:-16 22<br>-02:-16 23<br>-02:-16 23 | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's correct.  THE WITNESS: It adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, and it has adopted overlay zones to meet its unmet need.  And during that process of negotiation or mediation with the Fair Share Housing Center, the   |
| -02:-19 14<br>-02:-19 15<br>-02:-19 16<br>-02:-19 17<br>-02:-19 18<br>-02:-19 19<br>-02:-19 20<br>-02:-19 21<br>-02:-19 22<br>-02:-19 23               | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.  Now, I know Mr. Burgis for over 30 years. He's a highly respected planner. He was a consultant to the borough for many years. If you look at the documents that I'm referring to with regard to the master plan review, those were prepared by his office, and he has a long history here, and he's very knowledgeable of the community. So I do | -02:-16 14<br>-02:-16 15<br>-02:-16 16<br>-02:-16 17<br>-02:-16 18<br>-02:-16 19<br>-02:-16 20<br>-02:-16 21<br>-02:-16 22<br>-02:-16 23 | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's correct.  THE WITNESS: It adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, and it has adopted overlay zones to meet its unmet need.  And during that process of negotiation or mediation with the Fair Share Housing Center, the borough was asked to consider adopting overlay zoning |
| -02:-19 14<br>-02:-19 15<br>-02:-19 16<br>-02:-19 17<br>-02:-19 18<br>-02:-19 20<br>-02:-19 21<br>-02:-19 21<br>-02:-19 22<br>-02:-19 23<br>-02:-18 24 | clear rationale why this use should be allowed at this site, when the zoning basically says this is a prohibited use of the site. And I'll get into that in later testimony.  So let me address a little bit the planning testimony provided by Mr. Burgis.  Now, I know Mr. Burgis for over 30 years. He's a highly respected planner. He was a consultant to the borough for many years. If you look at the documents that I'm referring to with regard to the master plan review, those were prepared by his office, and he has a long history here, and   | -02:-16 14<br>-02:-16 15<br>-02:-16 16<br>-02:-16 17<br>-02:-16 18<br>-02:-16 20<br>-02:-16 21<br>-02:-16 22<br>-02:-16 23<br>-02:-16 23 | board should understand, that the borough did settle their affordable housing obligation with the Fair Share Housing Center. I know Mr. Princiotto has identified it, I think as ZBA-9, which is the settlement between the borough and the Fair Share Housing Center.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's correct.  THE WITNESS: It adopted a Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, and it has adopted overlay zones to meet its unmet need.  And during that process of negotiation or mediation with the Fair Share Housing Center, the   |

| 35   36   36   37   38   38   39   39   39   39   39   39  |
|--|
| e2-16 2 south of Highview where this site is located, to 62-16 4 level and apartments above. 62-16 5 Center agreed that that wasn't necessary, and other 62-16 6 to go in that direction, and Fair Share Housing 62-16 7 Center agreed that that wasn't necessary, and other 62-16 8 overlay zoning was adopted. And in that respect, 62-16 9 this particular area and this site in particular was 62-16 10 not included in overlay zoning. 62-16 11 Interms of the area north of Highview 62-16 12 and I think cohe has to distinguish in terms of the area north of Highview, and brough did agree to rezone or 62-16 16 redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent 62-16 17 affordable housing, that's known as the "North 62-16 18 Broadway" site. I twas declared an area in need of or 62-16 12 a residential development in the state of the smart growth. 62-17 The fourth special reason is, he oricincted that it furthers the purposes of the state or elevelope for the area south of Highview and the state in Planning Area 62-16 12 in the area south of Highview and the state or rezone or 62-16 16 redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent 62-16 17 affordable housing, that's known as the "North 62-16 18 redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals 62-16 19 redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals 62-16 12 a residential development in the state plan, it does 62-16 12 a residential development in the state plan in the smart growth principles ofted in the prior 62-17 The fourth special reason is, he indicated that it furthers the purposes of the state or encouraged. 62-18 19 Interms of the area north of Highview and the site in Planning Area 62-18 18 Broadway" site. I twas declared an area in need of 12-16 redevelopment in the particular or 12-16 redevelopment in the prior or 12-16 redev |
| each         3         allow for mixed use, that would be retail ground         62-16         3         mixed use, that would further it to a much greater         4         extent, but essentially a residential development of this type close to a train station does further the principles of the third, the principles of the third that direction, and Fair Share Housing         6         to go in that direction, and Fair Share Housing         62-16         6         to go in that direction, and Fair Share Housing         62-16         6         this type close to a train station does further the principles of smart growth.         62-16         6         this type close to a train station does further the principles of smart growth.         62-16         6         this type close to a train station does further the principles of smart growth.         62-16         6         this type close to a train station does further the principles of smart growth.         62-16         6         this type close to a train station does further the principles of smart growth.         62-16         6         this type close to a train station does further the principles of smart growth.         62-16           |
| 4 event and apartments above. And in the end, the borough decided not And in the end, the borough decided not to go in that direction, and Fair Share Housing 2-15 7 Center agreed that that wasn't necessary, and other 2-15 8 overlay zoning was adopted. And in that respect, 2-15 9 plan. He mentioned that the site is in Planning Area 2-15 10 not included in overlay zoning.  2-15 11 In terms of the area north of Highview 2-15 11 In terms of the area north of Highview 2-15 12 In terms of the area north of Highview 2-15 13 2 In terms of the area north of Highview 2-15 14 Highview, the borough did agree to rezone or 2-15 16 Broadway's lite. It was declared an area in need of 2-15 15 Broadway's lite. It was declared an area in need of 2-15 12 In terms of the proof 2-15 2 In the proof |
| 4 And in the end, the borough decided not doubt and the state of the top on that direction, and Fair Share Housing was adopted. And in that respect, which is a metropolitan area, where growth is support to the state of the state of the area and this site in particular was obtained in cluded in overlay zoning.  4 In terms of the area north of Highview and substantial parcels for 100 percent agreed that price for being a special reason, so Time not support the state goals and substantial negative impact and a substantial negative impact and a file for a fordable housing that side, but I think significantly, in the state of the state part and the state is in Planning Area and think the board needs to a train station does further the principles of smart growth.  42-13 17 The fourth special reason is, he principles of smart growth.  42-13 18 In terms of the area and this site in particular and in think ore they are and it his state pand that it furthers the purposes of the state plan. He mentioned that the site is in Planning Area and I think one has to distinguish in terms of the area north of Highview and the area south of Highview  |
| 42-15   6   1  |
| ## 22-15 7 Center agreed that that wasn't necessary, and other overlay zoning was adopted. And in that respect, against a very a zoning was adopted. And in that respect, against a very a zoning was adopted. And in that respect, against a very aga |
| 9 this particular area and this site in particular was overlay zoning was adopted. And in that respect, solution of this particular was on the control of this particular area and this site in particular was not included in overlay zoning.  9 this particular area and this site in particular was not included in overlay zoning.  9 this particular area and this site in particular was not included in overlay zoning.  10 the area north of Highview and source of the area north of Highview and the area south of Highview and source of the state goals and source of redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent redevelop three borough country, except for two small areas in decays 15 from being unique. And I think the state goals and objectives for the PA-1 are virtually synonymous with source of the state with the Highlands, are in the PA-1. So this site is far all all, which is a metropolitan area, where growth is encouraged.  10 the mount of thighview and the area north of Highview and the area south of Highview and  |
| 9 this particular area and this site in particular was not included in overlay zoning.  10   |
| oz-15 10 not included in overlay zoning.  In terms of the area north of Highview and I think one has to distinguish in terms of zoning and master plan the area north of Highview and the area south of Highview in the area north of Highview and the area south of Highview in the area north of Highview and the area south of Highview in the area north of Highview and the area south of Highview in the area north of redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent affordable housing, that's known as the "North redevelop three borough owned parcels for 100 percent affordable housing, that's known as the "North redevelop three borough is soliciting proposals to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for a residential development in that particular to zero the state, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable to was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable to was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable to was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable to serve a street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable to was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable to serve a serve a required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the Sproadway corridor south of Highview.  Oze-14 1 1 1 2  |
| 11 In terms of the area north of Highview  12-15 12 and I think one has to distinguish in terms of  12-15 13 zoning and master plan the area north of Highview and  12-15 15 the area south of Highview in the area north of  12-15 15 Highview, the borough did agree to rezone or  12-15 16 redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent  12-15 17 affordable housing, that's known as the "North  12-15 18 Broadway" site. It was declared an area in need of  12-15 19 redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals  12-15 21 docation.  12-15 22 location.  12-15 21 docation.  12-15 23 Also north of Highview, across the  12-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  12-15 24 was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable  12-15 24 street, is reversed to the unmet need, no overlay zones were  12-15 24 street, is reversed to the unmet need, no overlay zones were  12-15 24 street, is control of Highview.  13-15 24 street, is reversed to the unmet need along the  13-15 24 street, is reversed to the street of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan  13-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part o       |
| 42-15 12 and I think one has to distinguish in terms of 32-15 13 zoning and master plan the area north of Highlylew and 4 the area south of Highlylew in the area north of Highlylew and 52-15 16 redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent 7 affordable housing, that's known as the "North 622-15 18 redevelopment. The borough idi agree or area in need of 622-15 19 redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals 7 to pick a redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals 8 operate 20 to pick a redevelopment in that particular 92-15 20 location. 42-15 21 location. 42-15 22 location. 42-15 23 Also north of Highlylew, across the 92-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 4 bousing on that side, but I think significantly, in 92-14 2 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were 92-14 3 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the 92-14 5 So I just think that the board needs to 92-14 6 know that history. 92-14 5 So I just think that the board needs to 92-14 7 Despite having said that, is there a 92-14 8 benefit to the borough where nine additional units of 92-14 10 obligation? 92-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit to the borough never granted the 20-16 por one of the profession of traffic that would be generated. 92-14 11 The office use has existed at this 92-14 12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the 92-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this 92-14 13 borough never granted the soning, granted this 92-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this 92-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this 92-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this 92-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this 92-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this 92-14 13 borough never granted the zoning that rise area out to find playe we not provide a grant of the mediatory and played provided provide       |
| 22-15 13 zoning and master plan the area north of Highview and depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the area south of Highview — in the area north of depth the proof part of the prior special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason, so I'm not sure that this is an added special reason is that this appecial reason is that this special reason is that this appecial reason i |
| 42-45 14 the area south of Highview in the area north of flughview, the borough did agree to rezone or adverted to redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent affordable housing, that's known as the "North acade to predevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for acade to pick a redeveloped for acade to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for acade to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for acade to pick a redeveloped for acade to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for acade to pick a redeveloped for acade to pick a redeveloped for acade to pick a redeveloped for a    |
| 42-15 15 Highview, the borough did agree to rezone or redevelop three borough-owned parcels for 100 percent redevelop three borough shown as the "North redevelop three borough shown as the "North redevelop three borough is soliciting proposals redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals redevelopment in that particular redevelopment redev |
| 402-15 17 affordable housing, that's known as the "North 402-15 18 Broadway" site. It was declared an area in need of 402-15 19 redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals 402-15 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-15 21 to pick a redevelopment in that particular 402-15 22 location. 402-15 23 Also north of Highview, across the 402-15 24 street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 402-16 24 to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable 402-16 21 to housing on that side, but I think significantly, in 402-16 21 to the more need, no overlay zones were 402-16 21 to place and the more need along the 402-16 5 So I just think that the board needs to 402-16 6 know that history. 402-16 7 Despite having said that, is there a 402-16 9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need 402-16 1 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit 402-16 1 Tyes, there would be certainly a benefit 402-16 1 Tyes, there would be certainly a benefit 402-17 10 to fix or more famous friend development. 402-18 21 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the 402-19 10 obligation? 402-19 10 of pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-19 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-19 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-19 21 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-19 21 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-19 21 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-19 21 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-19 21 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-19 21 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 402-19 21 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redevelopent. 402-19 21 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redevelopera to pick a rediction. 402-19 21 10 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redevelopera to reinforce the notion of transit-oriented development. 402-19 21 20 To me, I'm not quite sure that that would rise to the level of |
| ## Broadway" site. It was declared an area in need of redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals 402-15 20 to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for a residential development in that particular 10cation. 402-15 21 a residential development in that particular 10cation. 402-15 22 Also north of Highview, across the 302-15 24 about 5 24 about 5 24 about 5 24 about 5 25 Also north of Highview, across the 302-15 24 about 5 24 about 5 25 Also north of Highview, across the 302-15 24 about 5 24 about 5 25 Also north of Highview, across the 302-15 25 Also north of Highview, across the 302-15 26 Also north of Highview, across the 302-15 27 Also north of Highview, across the 302-15 22 Also north of Highview, across the 302-15 24 Also north of Highview, across the 302-15 24 Also north of Highview, across the 402-15 24 Also north of Highview, across the 402- |
| -02-45 19 redevelopment. The borough is soliciting proposals to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 492-45 21 topick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 492-45 21 topick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for 492-45 21 topick a redevelopement in that particular 492-45 22 location. 492-45 23 Also north of Highview, across the 492-45 24 topick is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 492-45 24 topick is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 492-46 25 topick is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 492-46 26 topick is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 492-46 26 topick is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 492-46 27 topick is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 492-46 27 topick is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 492-46 28 topick is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 492-46 28 topick is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan 492-46 29 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 21 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 22 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 23 project would generate less traffic. 492-42 24 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 24 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 25 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 26 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 27 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 28 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 29 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 20 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 21 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 21 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 22 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 21 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 21 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 22 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 23 project would generate less traffic. 492-42 24 topick would generate less traffic. 492-42 25 topick would  |
| to pick a redeveloper, and it will be redeveloped for a residential development in that particular a residential development in that particular location.  Also north of Highview, across the street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  34  Also north of Highview, across the street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  34  Ac2-14  1 housing on that side, but I think significantly, in terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the Broadway corridor south of Highview.  So I just think that the board needs to So I just think that the board needs to benefit to the borough where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obligation?  Despite having said that, is there a benefit to the borough where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obcligation?  The first special reason is that this project would generate less traffic.  Ac2-14  To me, I'm not quite sure that that would rise to the level of being a special reason. I LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  34  402-14  1 think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.  35  402-14  1 think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.  402-14  2 terms of the negative criteria.  402-14  3 In other words, the grant of the variance would not have a substantial negative impact on traffic, rather than the project, itself, generates less traffic.  402-14  5 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure that that this more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.  402-14  5 So I just think that the board needs to the project is project would not have a substantial negative impact on traffic, and the project is project would gen |
| a residential development in that particular location.  Also north of Highview, across the street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  34  402-14 2 1  |
| doz-15 22   location.  |
| Also north of Highview, across the street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  34  -02-14 1 housing on that side, but I think significantly, in -02-14 2 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were -02-14 3 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the -02-14 4 Broadway corridor south of Highview.  -02-14 5 So I just think that the board needs to -02-14 6 know that history.  -02-14 8 benefit to the borough where nine additional units of -02-14 9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need -02-14 10 obligation?  -02-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02-14 11 borough never granted the zoning, granted this   |
| street, is the VFW site. Part of the fair share plan was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  34  -02:-14 1 housing on that side, but I think significantly, in -02:-14 2 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were -02:-14 3 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the -02:-14 5 So I just think that the board needs to -02:-14 6 know that history.  -02:-14 7 Despite having said that, is there a -02:-14 9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need -02:-14 1 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 1 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 1 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this  -02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this  -02:-14 13 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the -02:-12 2 think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.  -02:-12 2 think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.  -02:-12 2 to think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.  -02:-12 2 to think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.  -02:-12 2 to think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.  -02:-12 2 to think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria.  -02:-12 5 on traffic, rather than the project, itself,  -02:-12 5 on traffic, rather than the project, itself,  -02:-12 7 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure that that  -02:-13 To housing would assist with its unmet need  -02:-14 10 obligation?  -02:-14 11 The office use has existed at this  -02:-14 11 The office use has existed at this  -02:-14 12 location. It's generated more traffic than the  -02:-14 13 residential use, before conversion, would create, and  |
| was to adopt overlay zoning to allow affordable  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  34  -02:-14 1 housing on that side, but I think significantly, in -02:-14 2 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were -02:-14 3 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the -02:-14 4 Broadway corridor south of Highview02:-14 5 So I just think that the board needs to -02:-14 6 know that history02:-14 7 Despite having said that, is there a -02:-14 8 benefit to the borough where nine additional units of -02:-14 9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this -02:-14 13 would rise to the level of being a special reason. I  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  34  -02:-12 1 think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria02:-12 2 terms of the negative criteria02:-12 3 In other words, the grant of the variance would not have a substantial negative impact -02:-12 5 on traffic, rather than the project, itself, generates less traffic02:-12 7 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure -02:-14 10 obligation? -02:-14 11 The office use has existed at this -02:-14 11 The office use has existed at this -02:-14 12 location. It's generated more traffic than the residential use, before conversion, would create, and  |
| LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  34  -02:-14 1 housing on that side, but I think significantly, in -02:-14 2 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were -02:-14 3 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the -02:-14 4 Broadway corridor south of Highview02:-14 5 So I just think that the board needs to -02:-14 6 know that history02:-14 7 Despite having said that, is there a -02:-14 8 benefit to the borough where nine additional units of -02:-14 9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this -02:-14 13 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the -02:-14 2 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14 13 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the -02:-14 1   |
| 201-641-1812  34  36  -02:-14  1 housing on that side, but I think significantly, in -02:-14  2 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were -02:-14  3 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the -02:-14  4 Broadway corridor south of Highview02:-14  5 So I just think that the board needs to -02:-14  6 know that history02:-14  7 Despite having said that, is there a -02:-14  8 benefit to the borough where nine additional units of -02:-14  9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need -02:-14  10 obligation? -02:-14  11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14  12 think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in -02:-12  2 terms of the negative criteria02:-12  3 In other words, the grant of the -02:-12  4 variance would not have a substantial negative impact -02:-12  5 on traffic, rather than the project, itself, generates less traffic02:-12  7 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure -02:-14  8 that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I -02:-14  9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need -02:-14  10 obligation? -02:-14  11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14  12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14  13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this -02:-14  13 ctrink it's more of appropriate criteria to address in -02:-12  2 terms of the negative criteria02:-12  5 to then words, the grant of the -02:-12  6 generates less traffic02:-12  7 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure -02:-11  8 think it's more of appropriate criteria to address in -02:-12  4 variance would not have a substantial negative impact -02:-12  5 on traffic, rather than the project, itself, -02:-12  6 generates less traffic02:-12  7 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure -02:-11  8 think the SO zoning in place presupposes a certain -02:-11  9 think the SO zoning in place presupposes a certain -02:-11  10 amount of traffic that would be generated02:-11  11 The office use has existed at this -02:-11 -02:-14 -02:-14 -03:-15 -04:-16 -05:-17 -05:-17 -                         |
| 34  -02:-14 1 housing on that side, but I think significantly, in -02:-14 2 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were -02:-14 3 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the -02:-14 4 Broadway corridor south of Highview02:-14 5 So I just think that the board needs to -02:-14 6 know that history02:-14 7 Despite having said that, is there a -02:-14 8 benefit to the borough where nine additional units of -02:-14 9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need -02:-14 10 obligation? -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this -02:-14 11 residential use, before conversion, would create, and  |
| 1 housing on that side, but I think significantly, in 1 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were 1 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were 1 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were 1 terms of the negative criteria. 1 terms of the negative criteria to address in terms of the negative criteria. 1 terms of terms of the negative criteria. 1 oc: 12 terms of the negative criteria. 1 oc: 12 terms of the negative criteria. 1 oc: 12 terms of terms of the negative criteria. 1 oc: 12 terms of terms of  |
| 2 terms of the unmet need, no overlay zones were  1-02:-14 3 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the 1-02:-14 4 Broadway corridor south of Highview. 1-02:-14 5 So I just think that the board needs to 1-02:-14 6 know that history. 1-02:-14 7 Despite having said that, is there a 1-02:-14 8 benefit to the borough where nine additional units of 1-02:-14 9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need 1-02:-14 10 obligation? 1-02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit 1-02:-14 12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the 1-02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this 1-02:-14 13 required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the 1-02:-12 2 terms of the negative criteria. 1-02:-12 3 In other words, the grant of the 1-02:-12 4 variance would not have a substantial negative impact 1-02:-12 5 on traffic, rather than the project, itself, 1-02:-12 6 generates less traffic. 1-02:-12 7 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure 1-02:-14 8 that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I 1-02:-14 10 amount of traffic that would be generated. 1-02:-14 11 The office use has existed at this 1-02:-14 12 location. It's generated more traffic than the 1-02:-14 13 residential use, before conversion, would create, and   |
| required or adopted to meet the unmet need along the broadway corridor south of Highview.  So I just think that the board needs to benefit to the borough where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need benefit to that. It's certainly not required, and if the broadway corridor south of Highview.  So I just think that the board needs to benefit to the borough where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need borough never granted the zoning, granted this  So I just think that the board needs to borough the touring would not have a substantial negative impact on traffic, rather than the project, itself, generates less traffic.  So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure borough never granted the zoning amount of traffic that would be generated.  Doz:-11 10 amount of traffic that would be generated more traffic than the borough never granted the zoning, granted this  Doz:-11 12 location. It's generated more traffic than the residential use, before conversion, would create, and   |
| 4 Broadway corridor south of Highview. 5 So I just think that the board needs to 6 know that history. 6 know that history. 6 benefit to the borough where nine additional units of 7 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need 6 obligation? 7 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit 7 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the 7 borough never granted the zoning, granted this 7 The office use has existed at this 7 Pariance would not have a substantial negative impact 7 on traffic, rather than the project, itself, 7 generates less traffic. 7 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure 7 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure 8 that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I 9 think the SO zoning in place presupposes a certain 9 amount of traffic that would be generated. 902:-11 10 amount of traffic that would be generated. 902:-11 11 The office use has existed at this 902:-11 12 location. It's generated more traffic than the 902:-11 13 residential use, before conversion, would create, and   |
| 5 So I just think that the board needs to know that history.  -02:-14 6 know that history.  -02:-14 7 Despite having said that, is there a benefit to the borough where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obligation?  -02:-14 10 obligation?  -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit to that. It's certainly not required, and if the obligation granted the zoning, granted this  -02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this  -02:-14 13 on traffic, rather than the project, itself, generates less traffic.  -02:-12 7 So, in my opinion, I'm not quite sure that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I obligation?  -02:-14 10 obligation?  -02:-14 11 The office use has existed at this location. It's generated more traffic than the residential use, before conversion, would create, and  |
| -02:-14 6 know that history02:-14 7 Despite having said that, is there a -02:-14 8 benefit to the borough where nine additional units of -02:-14 9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need -02:-14 10 obligation? -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this -02:-14 13 residential use, before conversion, would create, and  |
| Despite having said that, is there a benefit to the borough where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obligation?  Despite having said that, is there a benefit to the borough where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obligation?  Despite having said that, is there a could be defined and if the benefit to the borough where nine additional units of could be defined affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obligation?  Despite having said that, is there a could be defined and if the sold in my opinion, I'm not quite sure that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I could be greatly and in place presupposes a certain amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that, is there a could be sure that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I could be considered and this amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that, is there a could be sure that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I could be considered and this amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that, is there a could be sure that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I could be considered and this amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that, is there a could be considered and this amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that, is there a could be considered and this amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that, is there a could be considered and this amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that, is there a could be considered and this amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that this amounts to a special reason. Moreover, I could be considered and this amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that, is the could be considered and this amount of traffic that would be generated.  Despite having said that, is the could be considered and this amoun |
| benefit to the borough where nine additional units of affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obligation?  obligation.  obligation the solution the solution in the solution the solution in the solution  |
| -02:-14 9 affordable housing would assist with its unmet need obligation? -02:-14 10 obligation? -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14 12 borough never granted the zoning, granted this -02:-11 13 think the SO zoning in place presupposes a certain amount of traffic that would be generated02:-11 11 The office use has existed at this location. It's generated more traffic than the residential use, before conversion, would create, and  |
| -02:-14 10 obligation? -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this -02:-14 13 residential use, before conversion, would create, and   |
| -02:-14 11 Yes, there would be certainly a benefit -02:-14 12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-14 13 borough never granted the zoning, granted this -02:-11 11 The office use has existed at this -02:-11 12 location. It's generated more traffic than the -02:-11 13 residential use, before conversion, would create, and  |
| -02:-14 12 to that. It's certainly not required, and if the -02:-11 12 location. It's generated more traffic than the residential use, before conversion, would create, and  |
| -02:-14 <b>13</b> borough never granted the zoning, granted this   |
|  |
| 1-02-14 14 variance, I don't tillik it would have any problem in 1-02-11 14 they don't Seem to be particular problems that would   |
| -02:-14 <b>15</b> terms of its compliance with its affordable housing -02:-11 <b>15</b> be ameliorated or overcome if this project were  |
| -02:-14 <b>16</b> obligation02:-14 <b>16</b> converted to residential use.   |
| -02:-14 <b>17</b> Mr. Burgis also talked about furthering -02:-11 <b>17</b> In other words, it's not solving a   |
| -02:-13 <b>18</b> the principle of smart growth. He indicated that -02:-11 <b>18</b> traffic problem. Yes, there's less traffic.   |
| -02:-13 <b>19</b> having a high density residential development located -02:-11 <b>19</b> Is there a traffic problem now?  |
| -02:-13 <b>20</b> close to the train station and shopping, referred to -02:-13 <b>20</b> I don't think we've heard evidence that   |
| -02:-13 <b>21</b> as a "transit-oriented development," would follow the  |
| -02:-13 <b>22</b> principles of smart growth, which is encouraged by -02:-13 <b>22</b> The overall levels of service and daily   |
| -02:-13 <b>23</b> the state, that is, compact, walkable,   |
| . , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,  |
| -02:-13 <b>24</b> environmentally sustainable, varied housing.   |
| -02:-13 <b>24</b> environmentally sustainable, varied housing02:-13 <b>25</b> Yes, this project does fall within the -02:-11 <b>25</b> different or create an advantage to this area than  |

| 1 what presently exists; in other words, if the office 2 remained in place, I'm not sure that one would notice 3 the difference. 3 the difference. 4 In terms of the negative criteria, I'll 4 In terms of the negative criteria, I'll 5 just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated. 4 He did indicate to the board, and I do 4 agree with him, that all projects have some impact, 5 but the Municipal Land Use Law is clear under the 5 negative criteria, under the first prong, that the 5 impacts must rise to the level of being "substantial" 5 in order for the board to say that the negative 5 criteria have not been satisfied. 5 oin terms of the impact on the zone 5 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it 5 supported five separate goals and objectives of the 5 master plan, he pointed out that the development is 5 supported five separate goals and objectives of the 5 goz-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep 5 slope portion in the rear. 5 very 10 more for the property, which is zoned for 5 so to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's 5 see, 6 So let me now turn to what I think is 6 very 10 moster plan reaxamination, and the Broadway corridor 6 very 10 master plan say about mixed use on 6 very 10 moster plan in the Broadway corridor 11 more for the board to say that the negative 12 criteria have not been satisfied. 12 color 12 solely residential use along the Broadway corridor 13 solely residential use along the Broadway corridor 14 had to say about the prospect of revising the zoning 15 the real crux of the master plan say about mixed use on 16 master plan say about mixed use on 17 very 10 master plan for the board, and I do 18 very 10 more for the board, and I do 19 very 10 more for the beard to say that the negative 19 verified to the buffer. I'll let Mr. Jacobs opine on 10 very 10 more for the master plan and the zoning. I 10 very 11 more for the master plan say about mixed use on 10 very 11 more for the master plan for master plan | 27  |                   | 20   |
|--|---|-------------------|--|
| the difference.  1-02-10   | 37  | 20: 20 1          | There were a number of design waivers:               |
| 1-02-10 3 the difference. 1-02-10 4 In terms of the negative criteria, I'll 1-02-10 5 just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated. 1-02-10 6 He did indicate to the board, and I do 1-02-10 7 agree with him, that all projects have some impact, 1-02-10 8 but the Municipal Land Use Law is clear under the 1-02-10 9 negative criteria, under the first prong, that the 1-02-10 10 in order for the board to say that the negative 1-02-10 12 criteria have not been satisfied. 1-02-10 13 So in terms of the impact on the zone 1-02-10 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it 1-02-10 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the 1-02-10 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15 1-02-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for 1-02-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep 1-02-10 20 20 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on 1-02-10 21 Unit the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on 1-02-10 20 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on 1-02-10 22-10 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that  1-02-10 21 Broadway condor. Again, I'll address that  1-02-10 21 Unit the Mr. Jacobs opine on 1-02-08 1 those. Those are more of a technical and engineering istone. 1-02-08 So let me now turn to what I think is 1-02-08 To the real crux of the matter, which is the application in the context of the master plans and the zoning. In the context of the master plans and the zoning. In the real crux of the matter, which is the application in the context of the master plans and the zoning. In the context of the master plan say about mixed use on and what recent actions of the brough council have had to say about the prospect of revising the zoning in this regard. 1-02-07 14 In this regard. 1-02-07 15 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's really nothing in the master plan support residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone. 1-02-07 19 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's really nothing in the master plan support residential developments in |   | _                 | -  |
| In terms of the negative criteria, I'll  operation 5 just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated.  He did indicate to the board, and I do  operation 7 agree with him, that all projects have some impact,  operation 8 but the Municipal Land Use Law is clear under the  operation 9 negative criteria, under the first prong, that the  operation 10 impacts must rise to the level of being "substantial"  operation 12 criteria have not been satisfied.  operation 13 So in terms of the impact on the zone  operation 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it  operation 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the  operation 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15  operation 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for  operation 20 slope portion in the rear.  Operation 21 He indicated the project is consistent  operation 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on  operation 22 using the goal of allowing mixed use on  operation 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that  operation 24 those. Those are more of a technical and engineering issues.  So let me now turn to what I think is  operation 3 the master plans and the zoning in the context of the master plans and the zoning. I  operation 3 the context of the master plans and the zoning. I  operation 4 the master plan say about mixed use or solely residential use along the Broadway corridor  10 solely residential use along the Broadway corridor  10 solely residential use along the Broadway corridor  11 solely residential use along the Broadway corridor  12 solely residential use along the Broadway corridor  12 solely residential use along the Broadway corridor  13 and what recent actions of the borough council have  operation 16 supported five separate goals and objectives of the  operation 27 part of the board to say that the neaster plan support  operation 3 profession 1 the master plan support  operation 3 profession 2 p | · · ·   | 1 -               |  |
| Just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated.  Just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated the projects have some impact,  Just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated the projects have some impact,  Just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated the projects have some impact,  Just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated the projects have some impact,  Just go through what Mr. Burgis indicated to the board to sav the real crux of the master, which is the application  Just go through what Mr. Burgis in the context of the master plans and the zoning. I  Just go through what Mr. Burgis in the context of the master plans and the zoning. I  Just go through what Mr. Burgis in the context of the master plan sand the zoning. I  Just go through what Mr. Burgis in the context of the master plan sand the zoning. I  Just go the real crux of the master, plans and the zoning. I  Just go the real crux of the master, plan sand the zoning. I  Just go the real crux of the master, plans and the zoning. I  Jus |   |                   | ·  |
| He did indicate to the board, and I do agree with him, that all projects have some impact, but the Municipal Land Use Law is clear under the negative criteria, under the first prong, that the impacts must rise to the level of being "substantial" noz-10 11 in order for the board to say that the negative criteria have not been satisfied. So in terms of the impact on the zone So in terms of the impact on the zone supported five separate goals and objectives of the negative separate goals and objectives of the negative of the portion of the property, which is zoned for single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep single-family use, | _   | _                 |  |
| -02:-10 7 agree with him, that all projects have some impact, -02:-10 8 but the Municipal Land Use Law is clear under the -02:-10 9 negative criteria, under the first prong, that the -02:-10 10 impacts must rise to the level of being "substantial" -02:-10 11 in order for the board to say that the negative -02:-10 12 criteria have not been satisfied02:-10 13 So in terms of the impact on the zone -02:-10 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it -02:-10 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the -02:-10 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15 -02:-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for -02:-10 21 He indicated the project is consistent -02:-0 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-0 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that   |   |                   |  |
| -02:-10 8 but the Municipal Land Use Law is clear under the -02:-10 9 negative criteria, under the first prong, that the -02:-10 10 impacts must rise to the level of being "substantial" -02:-10 11 in order for the board to say that the negative -02:-10 12 criteria have not been satisfied02:-10 13 So in terms of the impact on the zone -02:-10 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it -02:-10 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the -02:-10 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15 -02:-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for -02:-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep -02:-10 21 He indicated the project is consistent -02:-09 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that  |   |                   |  |
| -02:-10 9 negative criteria, under the first prong, that the -02:-10 10 impacts must rise to the level of being "substantial" -02:-10 11 in order for the board to say that the negative -02:-10 12 criteria have not been satisfied02:-10 13 So in terms of the impact on the zone -02:-10 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it -02:-10 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the -02:-10 16 master plan, he pointed out that the development is -02:-10 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15 -02:-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for -02:-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep -02:-10 20 With the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor02:-10 19 impacts must rise to the level of being "substantial" -02:-07 10 master plan reexamination, and the Broadway corridor -02:-07 11 amendments to the master plan say about mixed use of -02:-07 12 solely residential use along the Broadway corridor -02:-07 13 and what recent actions of the borough council have -02:-07 14 had to say about the prospect of revising the zoning -02:-07 15 in this regard02:-07 16 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's -02:-07 17 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's -02:-07 18 really nothing in the master plan support -02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan support -02:-07 21 residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone02:-07 22 In the discussion on uses at page 58 on -02:-07 23 the B-1, Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed   |   |                   |  |
| -02:-10 10 impacts must rise to the level of being "substantial" -02:-10 11 in order for the board to say that the negative -02:-10 12 criteria have not been satisfied02:-10 13 So in terms of the impact on the zone -02:-10 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it -02:-10 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the -02:-10 16 master plan, he pointed out that the development is -02:-10 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15 -02:-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for -02:-10 20 slope portion in the rear02:-02 21 With the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-03 23 the Broadway corridor -02:-10 18 in order for the board to say that the negative -02:-07 11 master plan reexamination, and the Broadway corridor -02:-07 11 amendments to the master plan say about mixed use or -02:-07 12 solely residential use along the Broadway corridor -02:-07 13 and what recent actions of the borough council have -02:-07 15 in this regard02:-07 16 So I now refer to the handout, ZBA-802:-07 17 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's -02:-07 18 really nothing in the master plan, from what I could -02:-07 19 see, that talks about even mixed use or residential02:-07 21 residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone02:-07 22 In the discussion on uses at page 58 on -02:-07 23 the Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed  |   |                   | •  |
| -02:-10 11 in order for the board to say that the negative criteria have not been satisfied.  -02:-10 13 So in terms of the impact on the zone -02:-10 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it supported five separate goals and objectives of the master plan, he pointed out that the development is only located in the special office and not the R-15 portion of the property, which is zoned for single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep slope portion in the rear.  -02:-02 20 21 With the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on the zone and the Roadway corridor to the master plan say about mixed use of solely residential use along the Broadway corridor and what recent actions of the borough council have had to say about the prospect of revising the zoning in this regard.  -02:-07 15 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's really nothing in the master plan, from what I could see, that talks about even mixed use or residential.  -02:-07 19 See, that talks about even mixed use or residential use along the Broadway corridor and what recent actions of the borough council have had to say about the prospect of revising the zoning in this regard.  -02:-07 15 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's really nothing in the master plan support residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone.  -02:-07 18 Portion of the property, which is zoned for single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep slope portion in the rear.  -02:-07 19 See, that talks about even mixed use or residential.  -02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan say about mixed use or revising the zoning in this regard.  -02:-07 16 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's really nothing in the master plan support residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone.  -02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan support residential use along the Broadway to revising the zoning sole family use, and what recent actions of the borough council have sole family use and what recent actions of the broadway the zoning  |   |                   |  |
| -02:-07 12 criteria have not been satisfied02:-10 13 So in terms of the impact on the zone -02:-10 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it -02:-10 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the -02:-10 16 master plan, he pointed out that the development is -02:-10 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15 -02:-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for -02:-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep slope portion in the rear02:-07 20 So I now refer to the handout, ZBA-802:-07 18 really nothing in the master plan, from what I could -02:-07 19 see, that talks about even mixed use or residential02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan support -02:-07 21 residential use along the Broadway corridor -02:-07 18 had to say about the prospect of revising the zoning in this regard02:-07 18 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's really nothing in the master plan, from what I could -02:-07 19 see, that talks about even mixed use or residential02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan support -02:-07 21 residential use along the Broadway corridor   | · · · ·   |                   |  |
| -02:-10 13 So in terms of the impact on the zone -02:-10 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it -02:-10 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the -02:-10 16 master plan, he pointed out that the development is -02:-10 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15 -02:-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for -02:-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep -02:-10 20 slope portion in the rear02:-10 21 He indicated the project is consistent -02:-09 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that   | , ,   |                   |  |
| -02:-10 14 plan, referenced in earlier testimony that it -02:-10 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the -02:-10 16 master plan, he pointed out that the development is -02:-10 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15 -02:-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for -02:-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep -02:-10 20 slope portion in the rear02:-10 21 He indicated the project is consistent -02:-09 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that -02:-07 14 had to say about the prospect of revising the zoning -02:-07 15 in this regard02:-07 16 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's -02:-07 18 really nothing in the master plan, from what I could -02:-07 19 see, that talks about even mixed use or residential02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan support -02:-07 21 residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone02:-07 22 In the discussion on uses at page 58 on -02:-07 23 the B-1, Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed  |   |                   |  |
| -02:-10 15 supported five separate goals and objectives of the -02:-10 16 master plan, he pointed out that the development is -02:-10 17 only located in the special office and not the R-15 -02:-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for -02:-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep -02:-10 20 slope portion in the rear02:-02 21 He indicated the project is consistent -02:-09 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that -02:-07 15 in this regard02:-07 16 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's -02:-07 18 really nothing in the master plan, from what I could -02:-07 19 see, that talks about even mixed use or residential02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan support -02:-07 21 residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone02:-07 22 In the discussion on uses at page 58 on -02:-07 23 the B-1, Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed   | ·   |                   |  |
| -02:-10 16 master plan, he pointed out that the development is only located in the special office and not the R-15 only located in the special office and not the R-15 portion of the property, which is zoned for single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep slope portion in the rear.  -02:-10 21 He indicated the project is consistent only 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that  -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that  -02:-07 16 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's really nothing in the master plan, from what I could see, that talks about even mixed use or residential.  -02:-07 19 see, that talks about even mixed use or residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone.  -02:-07 22 In the discussion on uses at page 58 on the Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed  |   |                   |  |
| only located in the special office and not the R-15 olivior 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep slope portion in the rear.  olivior 21 He indicated the project is consistent olivior 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on olivior 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that  olivior 17 So to go back to the 2002 Master Plan, and there's really nothing in the master plan, from what I could see, that talks about even mixed use or residential. None of the goals in that master plan support residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone.  In the discussion on uses at page 58 on the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that  |   |                   | -  |
| -02:-10 18 portion of the property, which is zoned for -02:-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep slope portion in the rear02:-07 20 Slope portion in the rear02:-07 21 He indicated the project is consistent with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that -02:-07 23 really nothing in the master plan, from what I could see, that talks about even mixed use or residential02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan support residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone02:-07 22 In the discussion on uses at page 58 on -02:-07 23 the B-1, Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed   |   |                   | •  |
| -02:-10 19 single-family use, and was not disturbing the steep slope portion in the rear02:-10 21 He indicated the project is consistent with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that -02:-10 19 see, that talks about even mixed use or residential02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan support residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone02:-07 22 In the discussion on uses at page 58 on the Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                                 |                   |  |
| -02:-10 20 slope portion in the rear.  -02:-10 21 He indicated the project is consistent  -02:-09 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that  -02:-07 20 None of the goals in that master plan support  -02:-07 21 residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone.  -02:-07 22 In the discussion on uses at page 58 on -02:-07 23 the B-1, Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed  |   |                   |  |
| -02:-09 21 He indicated the project is consistent -02:-09 22 with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 23 the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that -02:-07 21 residential developments in the B-1 or SO zone02:-07 22 In the discussion on uses at page 58 on -02:-07 23 the B-1, Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed   | , ,   |                   | ·  |
| -02:-09 <b>22</b> with the master plan goal of allowing mixed use on -02:-09 <b>23</b> the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that -02:-07 <b>22</b> In the discussion on uses at page 58 on -02:-07 <b>23</b> the B-1, Broadway zone, there's no reference to mixed   |   |                   |  |
| -02:-09 <b>23</b> the Broadway corridor. Again, I'll address that  | 1   |                   | ·  |
|  |   |                   |  |
| -0207 24 Use of to apartment development. The same with  | ,                               |                   | •  |
| -02:-09 <b>25</b> He relied upon the traffic engineer's -02:-06 <b>25</b> regard to the discussion on the SO Broadway zone.  | ,   |                   | ·  |
| LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |   | 02.00             |  |
| 201-641-1812   |   |                   |  |
| 38 40  |   |                   |  |
| -02:-09   1 testimony in with regard to the traffic impacts.   -02:-06   1 MR. NEWMAN: I'm sorry to interrupt.   |   | -02:-06 <b>1</b>  |  |
| -02:-09 <b>2</b> Again, Mr. Intindola can weigh in on that.  |   |                   |  |
| -02:-09 <b>3</b> And he indicated that because of the  |   |                   |  |
| -02:-09 <b>4</b> bedroom mix, in particular the fact that there was a  |   | 1 .               | • ,  |
| -02:-09 <b>5</b> very large component of one bedroom units, would -02:-06 <b>5</b> Do I have that correct?   |   | -02:-06 <b>5</b>  | Do I have that correct?                              |
| -02:-09 <b>6</b> generate very few schoolchildren and have little -02:-06 <b>6</b> THE WITNESS: It does not. It doesn't.   |   | -02:-06 <b>6</b>  | THE WITNESS: It does not. It doesn't.                |
| -02:-09 <b>7</b> impact on the school, and in my experience as a -02:-06 <b>7</b> When it discusses the B-1 and the SO zone, it does   |   | -02:-06 <b>7</b>  | When it discusses the B-1 and the SO zone, it does   |
| -02:-09 <b>8</b> planner working for developers and working for -02:-06 <b>8</b> not talk about mixed use or residential development.  |   | -02:-06 <b>8</b>  |  |
| -02:-09 <b>9</b> municipalities, I would agree. One-bedroom apartment -02:-06 <b>9</b> It talks about other uses, you know, retail and so  |   | -02:-06 <b>9</b>  | •  |
| -02:-09 <b>10</b> units, in particular, and projects of this type don't -02:-06 <b>10</b> forth.   |   | -02:-06 10        | •  |
| -02:-09 <b>11</b> generate a lot of schoolchildren. So I think the   |   | -02:-06 <b>11</b> | That will change in subsequent                       |
| -02:-09 <b>12</b> board can take note of that02:-06 <b>12</b> documents, but insofar as that document is concerned,  |   | -02:-06 <b>12</b> |  |
| -02:-09 <b>13</b> I didn't see any major problems related -02:-06 <b>13</b> there's nothing in the goals or the uses that would  |   | -02:-06 <b>13</b> |  |
| -02:-09 <b>14</b> to the bulk variances, the front yard setbacks. This -02:-06 <b>14</b> support either mixed use or solely residential  |   | -02:-06 14        |  |
| -02:-09 <b>15</b> is an existing condition, it's not that much. It   | -02:-09 <b>15</b> is an existing condition, it's not that much. It    | -02:-06 <b>15</b> |  |
| -02:-09 <b>16</b> doesn't encroach that much into the front yard -02:-06 <b>16</b> The next document is the periodic   | -02:-09 <b>16</b> doesn't encroach that much into the front yard      | -02:-06 <b>16</b> | The next document is the periodic                    |
| -02:-08 <b>17</b> setback, it's not going to be exacerbated by this -02:-06 <b>17</b> reexamination of the master plan and development   | -02:-08 <b>17</b> setback, it's not going to be exacerbated by this   | -02:-06 <b>17</b> | reexamination of the master plan and development     |
| -02:-08 <b>18</b> project, so I don't think that that's a particular -02:-06 <b>18</b> regulations, the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, December  | -02:-08 <b>18</b> project, so I don't think that that's a particular  | -02:-06 <b>18</b> | regulations, the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, December |
| -02:-08 <b>19</b> issue02:-06 <b>19</b> of 2008, also prepared by Burgis Associates. They  | -02:-08 <b>19</b> issue.  | -02:-06 <b>19</b> | of 2008, also prepared by Burgis Associates. They    |
| -02:-08 <b>20</b> There is a height variance required, -02:-06 <b>20</b> did the 2002 Master Plan.   | -02:-08 <b>20</b> There is a height variance required,                | -02:-06 <b>20</b> | did the 2002 Master Plan.                            |
| -02:-08 <b>21</b> two-and-a-half stories are allowed, but three is -02:-06 <b>21</b> And at page 22, when they are talking   | -02:-08 <b>21</b> two-and-a-half stories are allowed, but three is    | -02:-06 <b>21</b> | And at page 22, when they are talking                |
| -02:-08 <b>22</b> proposed. But accommodating this building within 36 -02:-06 <b>22</b> about specific changes to the master plan, there's a   | -02:-08 <b>22</b> proposed. But accommodating this building within 36 | -02:-06 <b>22</b> | about specific changes to the master plan, there's a |
| -02:-08 <b>23</b> feet, I think that's the key area, and I think   | -02:-08 <b>23</b> feet, I think that's the key area, and I think      | -02:-05 <b>23</b> | discussion of differentiating permitted uses in the  |
| -02:-08 <b>24</b> because of that, this is relative to the new -02:-05 <b>24</b> B-1, B-2, and B-3 districts. And it says:   | -02:-08 <b>24</b> because of that, this is relative to the new        | -02:-05 <b>24</b> | B-1, B-2, and B-3 districts. And it says:            |
| -02:-08 <b>25</b> building, that that's not a substantial impact.   -02:-05 <b>25</b> "For example, the B-1 district uses  | -02:-08 <b>25</b> building, that that's not a substantial impact.     | -02:-05 <b>25</b> | "For example, the B-1 district uses                  |
| LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |   |                   |  |
| 201-641-1812 201-641-1812 201-641-1812   |   |                   |  |

|  |  | 1  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
| _  | 41   | _  | 43   |
| -02:-05 1  | should be uses appropriate for a traditional   | -02:-03 1  | south of Highview, to allow mixed-use  |
| -02:-05 2  | downtown area, since the zone is within  | -02:-03 <b>2</b>   | development and encourage redevelopments."   |
| -02:-05 3  | walking distance of the train station."  | -02:-03 3  | So I think when you summarize what's in  |
| -02:-05 <b>4</b><br>-02:-05 <b>5</b>   | It doesn't elaborate and say "mixed  | -02:-03 <b>4</b><br>-02:-03 <b>5</b>   | the earlier documents, there is no recognition, no   |
|  | use" or "residential" in that particular study.  | _  | recommendation for mixed use.  |
| _  | So, again, in the 2008 Master Plan, there is no reference to mixed use or residential.   | _  | In the Broadway corridor study, the master plan, and some of the follow-up memorandums,  |
|  |  | -02:-03 <b>7</b><br>-02:-02 <b>8</b>   | there is a reference to mixed use. But I think   |
|  | There were two Broadway corridor studies that were done, one document which is known   | -02:-02 <b>8</b><br>-02:-02 <b>9</b>   | what's critical is there were no recommendations to  |
| -02:-05 <b>9</b><br>-02:-05 <b>10</b>  | as the Broadway Corridor Phase 2 study, which was  | -02:-02 <b>3</b><br>-02:-02 <b>10</b>  | permit a mix of uses in the SO zone. It talked about   |
| -02:-05 <b>10</b>  | done in June 2012, again it's a Burgis Associates  | -02:-02 <b>10</b>  | it in the B-1 zone. And there were no  |
| -02:-05 <b>11</b>  | document, there were no recommendations or findings  | -02:-02 <b>11</b>  | recommendations to allow solely multifamily  |
| -02:-05 <b>12</b>  | related to the mix of retail/residential uses or   | -02:-02 <b>12</b>  | development south of Highview, either in the SO or   |
| -02:-05 14   | allowing residential uses alone south of Highview.   | -02:-02 14   | the B-1 zones.   |
| -02:-05 15   | That particular document focused on  | -02:-02 15   | I just want to bring the zoning board  |
| -02:-05 16   | three redevelopment sites, Malek, Mayberry, and the  | -02:-02 <b>16</b>  | up to speed in terms of some of the more recent  |
| -02:-04 17   | post office shopping center were recommended for   | -02:-02 <b>17</b>  | when I say "recent," in the past three years, the  |
| -02:-04 18   | mixed use, but mixed use as recommended in this  | -02:-02 18   | zoning history, because the council has taken up this  |
| -02:-04 19   | particular document meant retail either on the first   | -02:-02 <b>19</b>  | notion of should it allow mixed use or residential   |
| -02:-04 <b>20</b>  | floor or on two floors or retail on the ground floor   | -02:-02 <b>20</b>  | development on the Broadway corridor.  |
| -02:-04 <b>21</b>  | and office on the second. So this document didn't  | -02:-02 <b>21</b>  | And there were two instances, it   |
| -02:-04 <b>22</b>  | talk about residential uses.   | -02:-02 <b>22</b>  | started when DMR Architects were engaged by the  |
| -02:-04 <b>23</b>  | Very shortly thereafter, there was a   | -02:-02 <b>23</b>  | council to look at the Broadway corridor study and   |
| -02:-04 <b>24</b>  | Broadway corridor study master plan amendment, that's  | -02:-02 <b>24</b>  | come up with some proposed zoning.   |
| -02:-04 <b>25</b>  | August 2012, and this is the first time that this  | -02:-02 <b>25</b>  | They did put a proposal forward late in  |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 201-641-1812   |  | 201-641-1812   |
|  | 42   |  | 44   |
| -02:-04 <b>1</b>   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.   | -02:-02 1  | 44<br>2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider   |
| -02:-04 <b>2</b>   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a  | -02:-01 <b>2</b>   | 44 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  |
| -02:-04 <b>2</b><br>-02:-04 <b>3</b>   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning   | -02:-01 <b>2</b><br>-02:-01 <b>3</b>   | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this   |
| -02:-04 <b>2</b> -02:-04 <b>3</b> -02:-04 <b>4</b>   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board  | -02:-01 <b>2</b> -02:-01 <b>3</b> -02:-01 <b>4</b>   | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  |
| -02:-04 <b>2</b> -02:-04 <b>3</b> -02:-04 <b>4</b> -02:-04 <b>5</b>  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2,"  | -02:-01 <b>2</b> -02:-01 <b>3</b> -02:-01 <b>4</b> -02:-01 <b>5</b>  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for  |
| -02:-04 <b>2</b> -02:-04 <b>3</b> -02:-04 <b>4</b> -02:-04 <b>5</b> -02:-04 <b>6</b>   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  | -02:-01 <b>2</b> -02:-01 <b>3</b> -02:-01 <b>4</b> -02:-01 <b>5</b> -02:-01 <b>6</b>   | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in  |
| -02:-04 <b>2</b> -02:-04 <b>3</b> -02:-04 <b>4</b> -02:-04 <b>5</b> -02:-04 <b>6</b> -02:-04 <b>7</b>  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay   | -02:-01 <b>2</b> -02:-01 <b>3</b> -02:-01 <b>4</b> -02:-01 <b>5</b> -02:-01 <b>6</b> -02:-01 <b>7</b>  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.   |
| -02:-04 <b>2</b> -02:-04 <b>3</b> -02:-04 <b>4</b> -02:-04 <b>5</b> -02:-04 <b>6</b> -02:-04 <b>7</b> -02:-04 <b>8</b>   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely  |
| -02:-04 <b>2</b> -02:-04 <b>3</b> -02:-04 <b>4</b> -02:-04 <b>5</b> -02:-04 <b>6</b> -02:-04 <b>7</b> -02:-04 <b>8</b> -02:-04 <b>9</b>  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 9  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put   |
| -02:-04 <b>2</b> -02:-04 <b>3</b> -02:-04 <b>4</b> -02:-04 <b>5</b> -02:-04 <b>6</b> -02:-04 <b>7</b> -02:-04 <b>8</b> -02:-04 <b>9</b> -02:-04 <b>10</b>  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of  | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 9 -02:-01 10   | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the  |
| -02:-04  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough  | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 9 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a  |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 6 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 10 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone   | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 9 -02:-01 10   | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it  |
| -02:-04  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment)   | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 9 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 12  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.   |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 6 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 10 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone   | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 9 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 12 -02:-01 13  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it  |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 10 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 14   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to   | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 12 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 14   | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was   |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 10 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 15   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1   | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 12 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 14 -02:-01 15  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing   |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 6 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 10 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 14 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 16   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1 district."  | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 12 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 14 -02:-01 15 -02:00 16  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing mediation on providing the fair share obligation for  |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 10 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 16 -02:-03 17   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1 district."  And then the second thing it said is:   | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 9 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 12 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 14 -02:-01 15 -02:00 16 -02:00 17  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing mediation on providing the fair share obligation for the borough for the third round.   |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 6 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 10 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 16 -02:-03 17 -02:-03 18  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1 district."  And then the second thing it said is:  "2. Under "Apartments. Apartments, as  | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 14 -02:-01 15 -02:00 16 -02:00 17 -02:00 18   | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing mediation on providing the fair share obligation for the borough for the third round.  So when I became aware that the council  |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 10 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 16 -02:-03 17 -02:-03 18 -02:-03 19   | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1 district."  And then the second thing it said is:  "2. Under "Apartments. Apartments, as part of a mixed-use development with   | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 12 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 15 -02:-01 15 -02:-01 15 -02:-01 17 -02:-00 18 -02:00 18                                     | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing mediation on providing the fair share obligation for the borough for the third round.  So when I became aware that the council was considering allowing mixed use or even   |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 10 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 16 -02:-03 17 -02:-03 18 -02:-03 19 -02:-03 20                                  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1 district."  And then the second thing it said is:  "2. Under "Apartments. Apartments, as part of a mixed-use development with commercial space, could foster vitality in the  | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 9 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 12 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 15 -02:00 16 -02:00 17 -02:00 18 -02:00 19 -02:00 20  | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing mediation on providing the fair share obligation for the borough for the third round.  So when I became aware that the council was considering allowing mixed use or even residential use in the Broadway corridor, I indicated   |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 11 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 16 -02:-03 17 -02:-03 18 -02:-03 19 -02:-03 20 -02:-03 21                                  | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1 district."  And then the second thing it said is:  "2. Under "Apartments. Apartments, as part of a mixed-use development with commercial space, could foster vitality in the B-1 district, if permitted."   | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 9 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 14 -02:-01 15 -02:00 16 -02:00 17 -02:00 18 -02:00 20 -02:00 21                               | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing mediation on providing the fair share obligation for the borough for the third round.  So when I became aware that the council was considering allowing mixed use or even residential use in the Broadway corridor, I indicated that if this was going to happen, Fair Share Housing  |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 10 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 17 -02:-03 18 -02:-03 19 -02:-03 20 -02:-03 21 -02:-03 21 -02:-03 23 -02:-03 24 | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1 district."  And then the second thing it said is:  "2. Under "Apartments. Apartments, as part of a mixed-use development with commercial space, could foster vitality in the B-1 district, if permitted."  And then finally there was another   | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 4 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 8 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 11 -02:-01 12 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 15 -02:00 16 -02:00 17 -02:00 18 -02:00 19 -02:00 20 -02:00 21 -02:00 23 -02:00 24 | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing mediation on providing the fair share obligation for the borough for the third round.  So when I became aware that the council was considering allowing mixed use or even residential use in the Broadway corridor, I indicated that if this was going to happen, Fair Share Housing Center would insist that if that was done, either by   |
| -02:-04 2 -02:-04 3 -02:-04 4 -02:-04 5 -02:-04 7 -02:-04 8 -02:-04 9 -02:-04 10 -02:-03 12 -02:-03 13 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 15 -02:-03 17 -02:-03 18 -02:-03 19 -02:-03 20 -02:-03 21 -02:-03 23                       | notion of mixed use is mentioned in those studies.  So there was a memo from Donna Holmquist, who was a planner at Burgis, that was sent to the planning board that was entitled "Supplemental Planning Board Recommendations - Broadway Corridor Study Phase 2," and there were two recommendations.  Recommendation No. 1 was "Overlay Zone."  It says:  "To encourage redevelopment of properties in the B-1 district, the borough should consider implementing an overlay zone allowing mixed-use (commercial/apartment) development and restaurants. In addition to the other uses currently permitted in the B-1 district."  And then the second thing it said is:  "2. Under "Apartments. Apartments, as part of a mixed-use development with commercial space, could foster vitality in the B-1 district, if permitted."  And then finally there was another memorandum from Donna Holmquist to the planning board | -02:-01 2 -02:-01 3 -02:-01 5 -02:-01 6 -02:-01 7 -02:-01 9 -02:-01 10 -02:-01 12 -02:-01 13 -02:-01 15 -02:00 16 -02:00 17 -02:00 18 -02:00 19 -02:00 20 -02:00 21 -02:00 23                      | 2016, it was 2017 when the council began to consider this. So that was one of the efforts that occurred.  So, in 2017, the council was sent this proposed change to the zoning by DMR Architects.  What the architect had proposed was to allow for mixed use in the Broadway corridor, and, even, in some cases, to allow for solely residential use.  With regard to the second one, solely residential use, this was just and let me just put it in context. This was not something that the council endorsed, it was not their document, it was a document that was provided by DMR Architects and it was merely sent to the council to review that.  And at the same time, our firm was engaged with the Fair Share Housing Center in doing mediation on providing the fair share obligation for the borough for the third round.  So when I became aware that the council was considering allowing mixed use or even residential use in the Broadway corridor, I indicated that if this was going to happen, Fair Share Housing Center would insist that if that was done, either by zoning or overlay zoning, that they would have to |

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.

|   | 45   |  | 47  |
|---|--|--|---|
| -02:00 <b>1</b>   | So the council decided that they would   | -01:-57 <b>1</b>   | basically the applicant or the board can say well,  |
| -02:00 <b>2</b>   | have a community meeting, it was held at the Tice  | -01:-57 <b>2</b>   | look, since that period of time, there's been a   |
| -02:00 <b>3</b>   | Senior Center in the winter of 2017, and basically   | -01:-57 <b>3</b>   | change of circumstances, there's been a change in   |
| -02:00 4  | the community weighed in. The council, thereafter,   | -01:-57 <b>4</b>   | real estate, in market economic conditions, in state  |
| -02:00 <b>5</b>   | did not move forward with any of those   | -01:-57 <b>5</b>   | law, something which would say to the board, if the   |
| -02:00 6  | recommendations. Essentially, that discussion was  | -01:-57 <b>6</b>   | planning board were to be doing the master plan at  |
| -01:-59 <b>7</b>  | tabled.  | -01:-57 <b>7</b>   | this point, has sufficient change occurred over that  |
| -01:-59 <b>8</b>  | ,  | -01:-57 <b>8</b>   | period of time such that when the board was   |
| -01:-59 <b>9</b>  | went back to Fair Share Housing Center in that   | -01:-57 <b>9</b>   | considering making a recommendation for the zoning,   |
| -01:-59 <b>10</b>   | negotiation. We told Fair Share Housing Center that  | -01:-56 <b>10</b>  | that those changed circumstances would lead the   |
| -01:-59 <b>11</b>   | the council was not supportive of allowing mixed use   | -01:-56 <b>11</b>  | planning board in its master plan to change their   |
| -01:-59 <b>12</b>   |  | -01:-56 <b>12</b>  | policy or that the governing body would say, yes,   |
| -01:-59 13  | believe south of Highview.   | -01:-56 <b>13</b>  | there's been sufficient changes in the marketplace,   |
| -01:-59 <b>14</b>   | Fair Share Housing Center agreed with  | -01:-56 <b>14</b>  | where even though the master plan said, you know, not   |
| -01:-59 <b>15</b>   |  | -01:-56 <b>15</b>  | to permit this kind particular use at this particular   |
| -01:-59 <b>16</b>   | Share Housing Center which did not require any   | -01:-56 <b>16</b>  | location, that they might be persuaded at this point  |
| -01:-59 <b>17</b>   | overlay zoning over the Broadway corridor.   | -01:-56 <b>17</b>  | to undertake that.  |
| -01:-59 18  | •  | -01:-56 18   | So, you know, I think it's pretty clear   |
| -01:-59 19  | residential development was allowed either in the B-1  | -01:-56 19   | from the <u>Medici</u> reconciliation, the master plan, and   |
| -01:-59 <b>20</b>   |  | -01:-56 <b>20</b>  | the Broadway corridor amendment I think speaks for  |
| -01:-59 <b>21</b>   | In 2018, this was approximately a year   | -01:-56 <b>21</b>  | itself, but I think one of the questions that the   |
| -01:-59 <b>22</b>   | later, the council once again took up the discussion   | -01:-56 <b>22</b>  | board has to ask is, are those projects are those   |
| -01:-59 23  | with regard to a revised draft of changes for the B-1  | -01:-56 <b>23</b>  | documents so out of date to have circumstances change   |
| -01:-59 <b>24</b><br>-01:-59 <b>25</b>  | zone, wherein mixed uses were put forward.   | -01:-56 <b>24</b><br>-01:-56 <b>25</b>   | where you can reconcile, you can say, yes, insofar as   |
| -01:-59 <b>23</b>   | After some discussion with the council,<br>LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  | -01:-56 <b>23</b>  | the master plan and the borough is concerned, this is<br>LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|   | LAUNA A. CANUCCI, C.S.N., N.F.N., L.L.C.   |  | LAUNA A. CANUCCI, C.S.N., N.F.N., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812   |  |   |
|   | <b>201-641-1812</b>  |  | 201-641-1812  |
| -01:-58 <b>1</b>  | 46   | -01:-55 <b>1</b>   | <b>201-641-1812</b> 48  |
| -01:-58 <b>1</b>  | 46 they could not reach a consensus on the proposed  | -01:-55 <b>1</b><br>-01:-55 <b>2</b>   | 201-641-1812  48 a use now that we think should be permitted and  |
| -01:-58 <b>2</b>  | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.   | -01:-55 <b>2</b>   | 201-641-1812  48 a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has   |
| _   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan   | -01:-55 <b>2</b><br>-01:-55 <b>3</b>   | 201-641-1812  48 a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.   |
| -01:-58 <b>2</b><br>-01:-58 <b>3</b>  | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the   | -01:-55 <b>2</b>   | 201-641-1812  48 a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy   |
| -01:-58 <b>2</b> -01:-58 <b>3</b> -01:-58 <b>4</b>  | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the   | -01:-55 <b>2</b> -01:-55 <b>3</b> -01:-55 <b>4</b>   | 201-641-1812  48 a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.   |
| -01:-58 <b>2</b> -01:-58 <b>3</b> -01:-58 <b>4</b> -01:-58 <b>5</b>   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  | -01:-55 <b>2</b> -01:-55 <b>3</b> -01:-55 <b>4</b> -01:-55 <b>5</b>  | 201-641-1812  48 a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.   |
| -01:-58 <b>2</b> -01:-58 <b>3</b> -01:-58 <b>4</b> -01:-58 <b>5</b> -01:-58 <b>6</b>  | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as  | -01:-55 <b>2</b> -01:-55 <b>3</b> -01:-55 <b>4</b> -01:-55 <b>5</b> -01:-55 <b>6</b>   | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the   |
| -01:-58 <b>2</b> -01:-58 <b>3</b> -01:-58 <b>4</b> -01:-58 <b>5</b> -01:-58 <b>6</b> -01:-58 <b>7</b>   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I  | -01:-55 <b>2</b> -01:-55 <b>3</b> -01:-55 <b>4</b> -01:-55 <b>5</b> -01:-55 <b>6</b> -01:-55 <b>7</b>  | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying  |
| -01:-58   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the  | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 3 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8  | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.   |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 3 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 8 -01:-58 9   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the  | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 3 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 9  | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 3 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 8 -01:-58 9 -01:-58 10  | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And  | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 3 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 9 -01:-55 10   | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about   |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 3 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 8 -01:-58 9 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 11   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And  | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 3 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 9 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11  | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question  |
| -01:-58   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out  | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 9 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14   | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  |
| -01:-58   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out  | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14 -01:-55 15  | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question  |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 8 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 11 -01:-58 12 -01:-58 13 -01:-58 14 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 15  | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out  | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14 -01:-55 15 -01:-55 15   | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're   |
| -01:-58   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.  | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14 -01:-55 15 -01:-55 15 -01:-55 16 -01:-54 17   | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all  |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 8 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 11 -01:-58 12 -01:-58 13 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 16 -01:-58 17 -01:-58 17   | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.  One way of reconciling the grant of the   | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 15 -01:-55 16 -01:-54 17 -01:-54 18  | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all opportunity for, in my opinion, green space, open  |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 8 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 11 -01:-58 12 -01:-58 13 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 17 -01:-58 18 -01:-58 17                                  | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.  One way of reconciling the grant of the variance in cases like this is where there has been a   | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14 -01:-55 15 -01:-55 16 -01:-54 17 -01:-54 18 -01:-54 19                                  | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all opportunity for, in my opinion, green space, open space, anything that would enhance the lifestyle of  |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 9 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 12 -01:-58 13 -01:-58 14 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 17 -01:-58 18 -01:-58 17 -01:-58 18 -01:-57 19 -01:-57 20            | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.  One way of reconciling the grant of the variance in cases like this is where there has been a passage of time since the last master plan was done   | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14 -01:-55 15 -01:-55 16 -01:-54 17 -01:-54 18 -01:-54 20                                  | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all opportunity for, in my opinion, green space, open space, anything that would enhance the lifestyle of someone who is living in an apartment?   |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 9 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 11 -01:-58 12 -01:-58 13 -01:-58 14 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 17 -01:-58 18 -01:-57 20 -01:-57 21                       | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.  One way of reconciling the grant of the variance in cases like this is where there has been a passage of time since the last master plan was done and the board can point to changed circumstances.   | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 15 -01:-55 15 -01:-54 17 -01:-54 18 -01:-54 20 -01:-54 21                                  | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all opportunity for, in my opinion, green space, open space, anything that would enhance the lifestyle of someone who is living in an apartment?  And from a planning standpoint, I'm  |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 8 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 11 -01:-58 12 -01:-58 13 -01:-58 14 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 18 -01:-58 18 -01:-57 21 -01:-57 21                       | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.  One way of reconciling the grant of the variance in cases like this is where there has been a passage of time since the last master plan was done and the board can point to changed circumstances.  So you can look back and you can say,  | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14 -01:-55 15 -01:-54 17 -01:-54 18 -01:-54 19 -01:-54 20 -01:-54 21 -01:-54 22            | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all opportunity for, in my opinion, green space, open space, anything that would enhance the lifestyle of someone who is living in an apartment?  And from a planning standpoint, I'm curious to hear that.  |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 9 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 12 -01:-58 13 -01:-58 14 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 17 -01:-58 18 -01:-57 19 -01:-57 21 -01:-57 22 -01:-57 23            | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.  One way of reconciling the grant of the variance in cases like this is where there has been a passage of time since the last master plan was done and the board can point to changed circumstances.  So you can look back and you can say, well, the last master plan reexamination was done in   | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 3 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14 -01:-55 15 -01:-54 17 -01:-54 18 -01:-54 19 -01:-54 20 -01:-54 21 -01:-54 22 -01:-54 23 | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all opportunity for, in my opinion, green space, open space, anything that would enhance the lifestyle of someone who is living in an apartment?  And from a planning standpoint, I'm curious to hear that.  THE WITNESS: Yes, so I think when   |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 9 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 11 -01:-58 13 -01:-58 14 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 16 -01:-58 17 -01:-58 18 -01:-57 20 -01:-57 21 -01:-57 23 -01:-57 24 | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.  One way of reconciling the grant of the variance in cases like this is where there has been a passage of time since the last master plan was done and the board can point to changed circumstances.  So you can look back and you can say, well, the last master plan reexamination was done in 2008. The last time the planning board dealt with | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 5 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14 -01:-55 15 -01:-54 17 -01:-54 18 -01:-54 19 -01:-54 20 -01:-54 21 -01:-54 23 -01:-54 24 | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all opportunity for, in my opinion, green space, open space, anything that would enhance the lifestyle of someone who is living in an apartment?  And from a planning standpoint, I'm curious to hear that.  THE WITNESS: Yes, so I think when you're talking about most residential developments, |
| -01:-58 2 -01:-58 4 -01:-58 5 -01:-58 6 -01:-58 7 -01:-58 9 -01:-58 10 -01:-58 11 -01:-58 12 -01:-58 14 -01:-58 15 -01:-58 16 -01:-58 17 -01:-58 18 -01:-57 19 -01:-57 21 -01:-57 22 -01:-57 23 | they could not reach a consensus on the proposed zoning amendment and the matter was tabled.  So that is basically the master plan background and the history with regard to the council's taking up this question of whether to allow mixed use in this particular area.  I think it's very important insofar as the Medici reconciliation is concerned, because, as I said before, the board has to basically reconcile the fact that the governing body, through zoning, does not permit this use in this particular location. And the master plan documents and their actions in the recent past, I think, speak to that.  Let me just point something else out that does kind of perhaps open the door to a discussion, and this is in the context of a Medici reconciliation.  One way of reconciling the grant of the variance in cases like this is where there has been a passage of time since the last master plan was done and the board can point to changed circumstances.  So you can look back and you can say, well, the last master plan reexamination was done in 2008. The last time the planning board dealt with | -01:-55 2 -01:-55 3 -01:-55 4 -01:-55 6 -01:-55 7 -01:-55 8 -01:-55 10 -01:-55 11 -01:-55 12 -01:-55 13 -01:-55 14 -01:-55 15 -01:-54 17 -01:-54 18 -01:-54 19 -01:-54 20 -01:-54 21 -01:-54 22 -01:-54 23 | a use now that we think should be permitted and reconciled with the fact that the governing body has not permitted that use in the zone.  So that is my testimony, and I'm happy to take questions from the board.  MR. SPIRIG: You started the presentation saying let's have a hypothetical saying that the use variance is not in the picture.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: And talking about developing it as a residential use.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: Do you recall the question that I asked of Mr. Burgis at the last meeting with regard to considering it as a residential use, what kind of amenity is there for a resident when we're putting up a second building, which takes away all opportunity for, in my opinion, green space, open space, anything that would enhance the lifestyle of someone who is living in an apartment?  And from a planning standpoint, I'm curious to hear that.  THE WITNESS: Yes, so I think when   |

|  | 40   |   |   |
|--|--|---|---|
| _  | 49   | _   | 51  |
| -01:-54 <b>1</b>   | element, and some projects do, they will have a  | -01:-52 <b>1</b>  | sufficient testimony on the record to prove that  |
| -01:-54 <b>2</b>   | sitting area, if it's, you know, geared towards older  | -01:-52 <b>2</b>  | point, and the reason why I think they did not is   |
| -01:-54 <b>3</b>   | empty-nesters, there may be a small playground or  | -01:-52 <b>3</b>  | because they're not saying that this is a hardship,   |
| -01:-54 <b>4</b><br>-01:-54 <b>5</b>   | play equipment for younger children.   | -01:-52 <b>4</b><br>-01:-52 <b>5</b>  | that this property and this use by virtue of the  |
|  | At this particular location and in being so close to the train station and given the   |   | zoning cannot, you know, sustain a reasonable rate of return.   |
| _  | bedroom mix, as I said before, there's going to be   | -01:-51 <b>6</b><br>-01:-51 <b>7</b>  | What they are saying is that they   |
|  | very few schoolchildren generated. So to dedicate  | -01:-51 <b>8</b>  | believe that a residential development in this  |
| -01:-54 <b>8</b><br>-01:-54 <b>9</b>   | sort of a playground, that's an amenity which would  | -01:-51 <b>9</b>  | context provides substantial benefit, special reasons   |
| -01:-54 <b>9</b><br>-01:-54 <b>10</b>  | be nice. I don't think its absence, you know, is   | -01:-51 <b>10</b>   | that would enhance the community.   |
| -01:-53 <b>11</b>  | something, from a planning point of view, that would   | -01:-51 <b>11</b>   | I don't think a hardship case was made,   |
| -01:-53 <b>11</b>  | render the project totally inappropriate.  | -01:-51 <b>12</b>   | so I do agree with you in that respect.   |
| -01:-53 <b>12</b>  | It would be nice, you know, if some  | -01:-51 <b>13</b>   | MR. SPIRIG: Thank you.  |
| -01:-53 <b>13</b>  | aspect of the open space was enhanced with a walkway   | -01:-51 <b>14</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: Let me ask you a question.  |
| -01:-53 <b>15</b>  | or something like that, maybe a sitting area, that's   | -01:-51 <b>15</b>   | If I remember the testimony, there was  |
| -01:-53 <b>16</b>  | probably something that could be accommodated.   | -01:-51 <b>16</b>   | a lot of discussion about empty-nesters, meaning  |
| -01:-53 <b>17</b>  |  | -01:-51 <b>17</b>   | people who already live in the community, that their  |
| -01:-53 <b>17</b><br>-01:-53 <b>18</b>   | You know, the applicant has chosen, in this particular situation, not to provide one. I  | -01:-51 <b>17</b><br>-01:-51 <b>18</b>  | children are going to go off to school and they're  |
| -01:-53 <b>10</b><br>-01:-53 <b>19</b>   | think it's an attractive feature and it would be nice  | -01:-51 <b>10</b>   | going to downsize, so to speak.   |
| -01:-53 <b>19</b>  | to have it, but I don't think it's an absolutely   | -01:-51 <b>19</b>   | THE WITNESS: Right.   |
| -01:-53 <b>20</b><br>-01:-53 <b>21</b>   | •  | -01:-51 <b>20</b><br>-01:-51 <b>21</b>  | 5   |
| -01:-53 <b>21</b><br>-01:-53 <b>22</b>   | essential part of the project.   | -01:-51 <b>21</b><br>-01:-51 <b>22</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: How do you reconcile the  |
| -01:-53 <b>22</b><br>-01:-53 <b>23</b>   | MR. SPIRIG: So if I can just now   | -01:-51 <b>22</b><br>-01:-51 <b>23</b>  | average-sized home in Woodcliff Lake and the square   |
| -01:-53 <b>23</b><br>-01:-53 <b>24</b>   | continue, because you did make a point that I was  | -01:-51 <b>23</b><br>-01:-51 <b>24</b>  | footage of those homes with people moving into a  |
| -01:-53 <b>24</b><br>-01:-53 <b>25</b>   | tempted to only hit on at one point.   | -01:-51 <b>24</b><br>-01:-50 <b>25</b>  | one-bedroom apartment?  I mean, does that sound consistent,   |
| -01:-53 23   | With regard to determining whether or<br>LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  | -01:-50 23  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|  | 201-641-1812   |   | 201-641-1812  |
|  |  |   | 20.04.10.2  |
|  | 50   |   | 52  |
| -01:-53 <b>1</b>   | 50 not there is really a hardship associated with  | -01:-50 <b>1</b>  | 52 somebody lives in a 3.000-square-foot house and their  |
| -01:-53 <b>1</b><br>-01:-53 <b>2</b>   | not there is really a hardship associated with   | -01:-50 <b>1</b>  | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their   |
| _  |  | _   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to   |
| -01:-53 <b>2</b><br>-01:-53 <b>3</b>   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a  | -01:-50 <b>2</b>  | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their   |
| -01:-53 <b>2</b>   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.   | -01:-50 <b>2</b><br>-01:-50 <b>3</b>  | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.   |
| -01:-53 <b>2</b> -01:-53 <b>3</b> -01:-53 <b>4</b>   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from  | -01:-50 <b>2</b> -01:-50 <b>3</b> -01:-50 <b>4</b>  | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  |
| -01:-53 <b>2</b> -01:-53 <b>3</b> -01:-53 <b>4</b> -01:-53 <b>5</b>  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.   | -01:-50 <b>2</b> -01:-50 <b>3</b> -01:-50 <b>4</b> -01:-50 <b>5</b>   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your   |
| -01:-53 <b>2</b> -01:-53 <b>3</b> -01:-53 <b>4</b> -01:-53 <b>5</b> -01:-53 <b>6</b>   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could   | -01:-50 <b>2</b> -01:-50 <b>3</b> -01:-50 <b>4</b> -01:-50 <b>5</b> -01:-50 <b>6</b>  | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point  |
| -01:-53 <b>2</b> -01:-53 <b>3</b> -01:-53 <b>4</b> -01:-53 <b>5</b> -01:-53 <b>6</b> -01:-52 <b>7</b>  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?   | -01:-50 <b>2</b> -01:-50 <b>3</b> -01:-50 <b>4</b> -01:-50 <b>5</b> -01:-50 <b>6</b> -01:-50 <b>7</b>   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives   |
| -01:-53 <b>2</b> -01:-53 <b>3</b> -01:-53 <b>4</b> -01:-53 <b>5</b> -01:-53 <b>6</b> -01:-52 <b>7</b> -01:-52 <b>8</b>   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did  | -01:-50 <b>2</b> -01:-50 <b>3</b> -01:-50 <b>4</b> -01:-50 <b>5</b> -01:-50 <b>6</b> -01:-50 <b>7</b> -01:-50 <b>8</b>  | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize  |
| -01:-53  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the  | -01:-50 <b>2</b> -01:-50 <b>3</b> -01:-50 <b>4</b> -01:-50 <b>5</b> -01:-50 <b>6</b> -01:-50 <b>7</b> -01:-50 <b>8</b> -01:-50 <b>9</b>   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 9 -01:-52 10   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an  | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 6 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 9 -01:-50 10  | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say   |
| -01:-53  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or  | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 6 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 9 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I   |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 9 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 9 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 9 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the  | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 9 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they   |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 9 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 14   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the  | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 9 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 14  | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees,   |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 14 -01:-52 15  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.   | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 6 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 14 -01:-50 15   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe   |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 14 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 16   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.  THE WITNESS: Right.   | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 14 -01:-50 15   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location  |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 14 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 16 -01:-52 17  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price? And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to  | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 9 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 14 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 17   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the   |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 14 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 16 -01:-52 17 -01:-52 18   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to what you think of that.  | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 17   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the community.  |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 14 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 16 -01:-52 17 -01:-52 18 -01:-52 19  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to what you think of that.  THE WITNESS: I did not hear from  | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 6 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 16 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 18 -01:-50 18 -01:-50 19   | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the community.  So small apartments like this that are  |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 14 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 17 -01:-52 18 -01:-52 18 -01:-52 19 -01:-52 20   | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to what you think of that.  THE WITNESS: I did not hear from Mr. Burgis that this was a hardship variance. He   | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 6 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 18 -01:-50 19 -01:-50 20                                  | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the community.  So small apartments like this that are targeted towards older and younger empty-nesters, you  |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 17 -01:-52 18 -01:-52 19 -01:-52 20 -01:-52 20 -01:-52 21  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to what you think of that.  THE WITNESS: I did not hear from Mr. Burgis that this was a hardship variance. He never mentioned that as a special reason, and I   | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 6 -01:-50 9 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 14 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 18 -01:-50 19 -01:-50 20 -01:-49 21                       | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the community.  So small apartments like this that are targeted towards older and younger empty-nesters, you know, is something that is desirable in communities  |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 17 -01:-52 18 -01:-52 19 -01:-52 20 -01:-52 21 -01:-52 21                                  | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to what you think of that.  THE WITNESS: I did not hear from Mr. Burgis that this was a hardship variance. He never mentioned that as a special reason, and I didn't hear other evidence that the building couldn't   | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 18 -01:-50 19 -01:-50 19 -01:-50 20 -01:-49 21 -01:-49 22            | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the community.  So small apartments like this that are targeted towards older and younger empty-nesters, you know, is something that is desirable in communities and I think  |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 14 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 17 -01:-52 18 -01:-52 19 -01:-52 20 -01:-52 21 -01:-52 21 -01:-52 21 -01:-52 22 -01:-52 23 | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to what you think of that.  THE WITNESS: I did not hear from Mr. Burgis that this was a hardship variance. He never mentioned that as a special reason, and I didn't hear other evidence that the building couldn't be used for an office or it was absolutely impossible   | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 6 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 16 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 18 -01:-50 19 -01:-50 19 -01:-50 20 -01:-49 21 -01:-49 22 -01:-49 23 | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the community.  So small apartments like this that are targeted towards older and younger empty-nesters, you know, is something that is desirable in communities and I think  MR. NEWMAN: But   |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-53 6 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 16 -01:-52 17 -01:-52 18 -01:-52 19 -01:-52 20 -01:-52 21 -01:-52 21 -01:-52 21 -01:-52 23 -01:-52 24 | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to what you think of that.  THE WITNESS: I did not hear from Mr. Burgis that this was a hardship variance. He never mentioned that as a special reason, and I didn't hear other evidence that the building couldn't be used for an office or it was absolutely impossible to convert it for an office use. They said there  | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 16 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 18 -01:-50 19 -01:-50 20 -01:-49 21 -01:-49 23 -01:-49 24 | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the community.  So small apartments like this that are targeted towards older and younger empty-nesters, you know, is something that is desirable in communities and I think  MR. NEWMAN: But  THE WITNESS: I think their is  |
| -01:-53 2 -01:-53 3 -01:-53 4 -01:-53 5 -01:-52 7 -01:-52 8 -01:-52 9 -01:-52 10 -01:-52 11 -01:-52 12 -01:-52 13 -01:-52 15 -01:-52 16 -01:-52 17 -01:-52 18 -01:-52 19 -01:-52 20 -01:-52 21 -01:-52 21 -01:-52 23 -01:-52 24            | not there is really a hardship associated with finding an office tenant, and I really never got a clear answer to that.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: We did get an answer from the real estate person, I asked him directly could you rent this and he said yes, but at what price?  And then subsequent to that, we did hear testimony from someone with regard to, well, the infrastructure is too old to convert it into an office building because it was built in the '80s or whatever.  If you think about it, most of the office buildings in Woodcliff Lake were built in the '80s or '70s, for that matter.  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. SPIRIG: So I'm just curious as to what you think of that.  THE WITNESS: I did not hear from Mr. Burgis that this was a hardship variance. He never mentioned that as a special reason, and I didn't hear other evidence that the building couldn't be used for an office or it was absolutely impossible to convert it for an office use. They said there would be some difficulty. I don't know that we had | -01:-50 2 -01:-50 3 -01:-50 4 -01:-50 5 -01:-50 7 -01:-50 8 -01:-50 10 -01:-50 11 -01:-50 12 -01:-50 13 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 15 -01:-50 16 -01:-50 17 -01:-50 18 -01:-50 19 -01:-50 20 -01:-49 21 -01:-49 23 -01:-49 24 | somebody lives in a 3,000-square-foot house and their kids go off to school, and the couple is going to move into an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Right.  So, you know, I understand your question. I don't think the applicant made the point that these units are intended for somebody who lives in a large single-family home and now would downsize from a single-family home into a one-bedroom.  What they did say  MR. NEWMAN: "Empty-nesters," I thought.  THE WITNESS: Well, yes, but what they did say is there may be, you know, divorcees, transient people, maybe relatives, somebody who maybe left their single-family home and found a location elsewhere and now wanted to move back into the community.  So small apartments like this that are targeted towards older and younger empty-nesters, you know, is something that is desirable in communities and I think  MR. NEWMAN: But  THE WITNESS: I think their is evidence, for example, in 62 Broadway, where there |

|  | F2   |  | EE   |
|--|--|--|--|
| -01:-49 <b>1</b>   | 53   | -01:-47 <b>1</b>   | 55<br>I think 62 Broadway is evidence of   |
| -01:-49 <b>1</b><br>-01:-49 <b>2</b>   | were 14 apartments and retail space, we know that the retail space, there's trouble, you know, there's been  | -01:-47 <b>1</b><br>-01:-47 <b>2</b>   | that, those are all smaller apartment units and those  |
| -01:-49 <b>2</b><br>-01:-49 <b>3</b>   | difficulty renting those out. The 14 apartments are  | -01:-47 <b>2</b><br>-01:-47 <b>3</b>   | have all been rented, so I think there is a demand.  |
| -01:-49 <b>4</b>   | rented.  | -01:-47 <b>4</b>   | As I've indicated, there's not a   |
| -01:-49 <b>5</b>   | So, clearly and I'm not saying the   | -01:-47 <b>5</b>   | specific obligation on the part of Woodcliff Lake,   |
| -01:-49 <b>6</b>   | source of demand, you know, is a couple who is   | -01:-47 <b>6</b>   | through its fair share obligation to rezone or to  |
| -01:-49 <b>7</b>   | downsizing and would go from a 3,000-square-foot   | -01:-47 <b>7</b>   | grant the variance, but, you know, as a point, is  |
| -01:-49 <b>8</b>   | single-family home into a one-bedroom unit, but I do   | -01:-46 <b>8</b>   | there a market demand for these kinds of units?  |
| -01:-49 <b>9</b>   | believe it does fulfill a housing need, and I think  | -01:-46 <b>9</b>   | I think the evidence is clear that   |
| -01:-49 <b>10</b>  | there's ample indication in the marketplace that that  | -01:-46 <b>10</b>  | there probably is.   |
| -01:-49 <b>11</b>  | is something that would add to the variety of housing  | -01:-46 <b>11</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: But that's not how it  |
| -01:-49 <b>12</b>  | options in the community.  | -01:-46 <b>12</b>  | and again you'll correct me if I'm wrong, that's not   |
| -01:-49 <b>13</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: But do you think that's  | -01:-46 <b>13</b>  | how it was, for lack of a better term, "sold" to this  |
| -01:-49 <b>14</b>  | more designed for existing residents in the community  | -01:-46 <b>14</b>  | board.   |
| -01:-48 <b>15</b>  | who are downsizing or for somebody new who would   | -01:-46 <b>15</b>  | I think the evidence and you were  |
| -01:-48 <b>16</b>  | seeking?   | -01:-46 <b>16</b>  | here, but I think the evidence was this is a good  |
| -01:-48 <b>17</b>  | This is where I'm having a difficult   | -01:-46 <b>17</b>  | place for empty-nesters. I seem to remember  |
| -01:-48 <b>18</b>  | time reconciling that, because I could be wrong, I'm   | -01:-46 <b>18</b>  | "empty-nesters."   |
| -01:-48 <b>19</b>  | not wrong a lot, my wife tells me all the time, but  | -01:-46 <b>19</b>  | THE WITNESS: Empty-nesters doesn't   |
| -01:-48 <b>20</b>  | if I remember the testimony correctly, it was for  | -01:-46 <b>20</b>  | mean somebody whose kids have left the home and would  |
| -01:-48 <b>21</b>  | empty-nesters, which was referred to a lot.  | -01:-46 <b>21</b>  | suddenly transition.   |
| -01:-48 <b>22</b>  | THE WITNESS: Right.  | -01:-46 <b>22</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: When there was testimony   |
| -01:-48 <b>23</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: And I still don't  | -01:-46 <b>23</b>  | as to that, it was more of a referral to   |
| -01:-48 <b>24</b>  | understand how an empty-nester is going to go from a   | -01:-46 <b>24</b>  | "empty-nesters," yes, but perhaps not people who   |
| -01:-48 <b>25</b>  | 3,000 I mean the average house in Woodcliff Lake   | -01:-46 <b>25</b>  | already lived in the community.  |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  | 201-641-1812   |  | 201-641-1812   |
|  | 54   |  | FC   |
|  | 01   |  | 56   |
| -01:-48 <b>1</b>   |  | -01:-46 <b>1</b>   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on   |
| -01:-48 <b>1</b><br>-01:-48 <b>2</b>   | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.   | -01:-46 <b>1</b><br>-01:-46 <b>2</b>   |  |
| 01.40  |  |  | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on   |
| -01:-48 <b>2</b>   | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.   | -01:-46 <b>2</b>   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  |
| -01:-48 <b>2</b><br>-01:-48 <b>3</b>   | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot  | -01:-46 <b>2</b><br>-01:-46 <b>3</b>   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're  |
| -01:-48 <b>2</b><br>-01:-48 <b>3</b><br>-01:-48 <b>4</b>   | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.   | -01:-46 <b>2</b><br>-01:-46 <b>3</b><br>-01:-45 <b>4</b>   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a   |
| -01:-48 <b>2</b> -01:-48 <b>3</b> -01:-48 <b>4</b> -01:-48 <b>5</b>  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right. MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment. THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're   | -01:-46 <b>2</b> -01:-46 <b>3</b> -01:-45 <b>4</b> -01:-45 <b>5</b>  | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment?   |
| -01:-48 <b>2</b> -01:-48 <b>3</b> -01:-48 <b>4</b> -01:-48 <b>5</b> -01:-48 <b>6</b> -01:-48 <b>7</b> -01:-48 <b>8</b>   | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  | -01:-46 <b>2</b> -01:-46 <b>3</b> -01:-45 <b>4</b> -01:-45 <b>5</b> -01:-45 <b>6</b>   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps  |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or   | -01:-46 <b>2</b> -01:-46 <b>3</b> -01:-45 <b>4</b> -01:-45 <b>5</b> -01:-45 <b>6</b> -01:-45 <b>7</b>  | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing   |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances,   | -01:-46 <b>2</b> -01:-46 <b>3</b> -01:-45 <b>4</b> -01:-45 <b>5</b> -01:-45 <b>6</b> -01:-45 <b>7</b> -01:-45 <b>8</b> -01:-45 <b>9</b> -01:-45 <b>10</b>  | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.   |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  | -01:-46  | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing   |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just  | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 6 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 9 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11  | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 9 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13  | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.   |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.   | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 9 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 14   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other   |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with   | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 6 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 9 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 14 -01:-45 15  | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?   | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 9 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 14 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 16   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from  |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you,   | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 14 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 17  | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?   |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large  | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 6 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 16 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 18   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?  MR. HAYES: No.   |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large single-family home into one of these one-bedroom   | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 6 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 16 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 18 -01:-45 19   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?  MR. HAYES: No.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Robin?   |
| -01:-48  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large single-family home into one of these one-bedroom apartments, that's probably not a huge percentage of  | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 16 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 18 -01:-45 19 -01:-45 20   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?  MR. HAYES: No.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Robin?  MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: No, I think Richard   |
| -01:-48 2 -01:-48 3 -01:-48 5 -01:-48 6 -01:-48 7 -01:-48 8 -01:-48 9 -01:-47 11 -01:-47 12 -01:-47 14 -01:-47 15 -01:-47 16 -01:-47 18 -01:-47 18 -01:-47 19 -01:-47 20 -01:-47 21                                  | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large single-family home into one of these one-bedroom apartments, that's probably not a huge percentage of them, but there are other housing needs in the   | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 14 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 18 -01:-45 19 -01:-45 20 -01:-45 21   | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?  MR. HAYES: No.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Robin?  MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: No, I think Richard did a great job summing up.   |
| -01:-48 2 -01:-48 4 -01:-48 5 -01:-48 6 -01:-48 7 -01:-48 8 -01:-48 9 -01:-47 11 -01:-47 12 -01:-47 13 -01:-47 15 -01:-47 16 -01:-47 17 -01:-47 18 -01:-47 19 -01:-47 20 -01:-47 21 -01:-47 22                       | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large single-family home into one of these one-bedroom apartments, that's probably not a huge percentage of them, but there are other housing needs in the community, people who desire to live in this  | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 6 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 16 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 18 -01:-45 19 -01:-45 20 -01:-45 21 -01:-45 22                        | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?  MR. HAYES: No.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Robin?  MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: No, I think Richard did a great job summing up.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I have a question for  |
| -01:-48 2 -01:-48 4 -01:-48 5 -01:-48 6 -01:-48 7 -01:-48 8 -01:-48 9 -01:-47 11 -01:-47 12 -01:-47 13 -01:-47 15 -01:-47 16 -01:-47 17 -01:-47 18 -01:-47 20 -01:-47 21 -01:-47 22 -01:-47 23                       | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large single-family home into one of these one-bedroom apartments, that's probably not a huge percentage of them, but there are other housing needs in the community, people who desire to live in this community that don't qualify as low and moderate and   | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 6 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 14 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 16 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 18 -01:-45 20 -01:-45 21 -01:-45 22 -01:-45 23                       | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?  MR. HAYES: No.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Robin?  MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: No, I think Richard did a great job summing up.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I have a question for you.   |
| -01:-48 2 -01:-48 4 -01:-48 5 -01:-48 6 -01:-48 7 -01:-48 9 -01:-48 10 -01:-47 11 -01:-47 12 -01:-47 14 -01:-47 15 -01:-47 16 -01:-47 17 -01:-47 18 -01:-47 19 -01:-47 21 -01:-47 21 -01:-47 23 -01:-47 24           | THE WITNESS: I think you're right. MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large single-family home into one of these one-bedroom apartments, that's probably not a huge percentage of them, but there are other housing needs in the community, people who desire to live in this community that don't qualify as low and moderate and may want to live in the community, and I think this   | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 18 -01:-45 19 -01:-45 20 -01:-45 21 -01:-45 21 -01:-45 23 -01:-45 24 | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?  MR. HAYES: No.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Robin?  MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: No, I think Richard did a great job summing up.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I have a question for you.  BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:   |
| -01:-48 2 -01:-48 4 -01:-48 5 -01:-48 6 -01:-48 7 -01:-48 8 -01:-48 9 -01:-47 11 -01:-47 12 -01:-47 13 -01:-47 15 -01:-47 16 -01:-47 17 -01:-47 18 -01:-47 20 -01:-47 21 -01:-47 22 -01:-47 23                       | THE WITNESS: I think you're right.  MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right.  MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large single-family home into one of these one-bedroom apartments, that's probably not a huge percentage of them, but there are other housing needs in the community, people who desire to live in this community that don't qualify as low and moderate and may want to live in the community, and I think this kind of housing does address those needs. | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 6 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 14 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 16 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 18 -01:-45 20 -01:-45 21 -01:-45 22 -01:-45 23                       | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?  MR. HAYES: No.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Robin?  MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: No, I think Richard did a great job summing up.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I have a question for you.  BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  Q. In the CBA and in your testimony, you |
| -01:-48 2 -01:-48 3 -01:-48 5 -01:-48 6 -01:-48 7 -01:-48 8 -01:-48 9 -01:-47 11 -01:-47 12 -01:-47 14 -01:-47 15 -01:-47 16 -01:-47 17 -01:-47 18 -01:-47 19 -01:-47 21 -01:-47 21 -01:-47 21 -01:-47 23 -01:-47 24 | THE WITNESS: I think you're right. MR. NEWMAN: to an 800-square-foot apartment.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I think you're right.  There's usually a series. Somebody moving out of a single-family home might transition into, you know, a townhouse or a two- or three-bedroom apartment, but there are circumstances, you know, economic lifestyle changes and so forth.  MR. NEWMAN: Listen, it happens. Just as a general reconciliation  THE WITNESS: Right. MR. NEWMAN: you would agree with me?  THE WITNESS: I would agree with you, the number of people moving from a large single-family home into one of these one-bedroom apartments, that's probably not a huge percentage of them, but there are other housing needs in the community, people who desire to live in this community that don't qualify as low and moderate and may want to live in the community, and I think this   | -01:-46 2 -01:-46 3 -01:-45 4 -01:-45 5 -01:-45 7 -01:-45 8 -01:-45 10 -01:-45 11 -01:-45 12 -01:-45 13 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 15 -01:-45 17 -01:-45 18 -01:-45 19 -01:-45 20 -01:-45 21 -01:-45 21 -01:-45 23 -01:-45 24 | THE WITNESS: I can't really comment on that. You know, you have the evidence in the record.  From my point of view, what you're saying, would somebody transition from a 3,000-square-foot house into a one-bedroom apartment? The answer is unlikely. There may be several steps in between transition of housing and there may be lifestyle changes or legal circumstances under which people find themselves where this kind of housing becomes attractive at some point.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think we have to move on.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There might be other questions that board members have.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Questions from this side?  MR. HAYES: No.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Robin?  MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: No, I think Richard did a great job summing up.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I have a question for you.  BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:   |

|  | 57   |  | 59   |
|--|--|--|--|
| -01:-45 <b>1</b>   | stated that none of the goals of the master plan   | -01:-39 <b>1</b>   | CROSS EXAMINATION  |
| -01:-45 <b>2</b>   | support a residential development in the B-1 or the  | -01:-39 <b>2</b>   | BY MR. DELIA:  |
| -01:-45 <b>3</b>   | SO zones?  | -01:-39 <b>3</b>   | Q. Good evening, Mr. Preiss. How are you   |
| -01:-45 <b>4</b>   | A. In the 2002 Master Plan, yes.   | -01:-39 <b>4</b>   | tonight?   |
| -01:-45 <b>5</b>   | Q. Correct.  | -01:-39 <b>5</b>   | A. Good. Thanks.   |
| -01:-45 <b>6</b>   | Those goals haven't changed, have they?  | -01:-39 <b>6</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Quiet, please.   |
| -01:-44 <b>7</b>   | A. I can't remember. I didn't see  | -01:-39 <b>7</b>   | Q. So what I want to start first is to go  |
| -01:-44 <b>8</b>   | anything in the 2008 Master Plan Reexamination which   | -01:-39 <b>8</b>   | over what you understand and what we know to be the  |
| -01:-44 <b>9</b>   | indicated they had. That's a very specific question.   | -01:-39 <b>9</b>   | actual history and series of master plan documents in  |
| -01:-44 <b>10</b>  | That's goals with respect to residential development   | -01:-39 <b>10</b>  | Woodcliff Lake.  |
| -01:-44 <b>11</b>  | in B-1 and SO.   | -01:-39 <b>11</b>  | A. Uh-huh.   |
| -01:-44 <b>12</b>  | I'm not saying that there is some  | -01:-39 <b>12</b>  | <b>Q.</b> You've referred to most of them or all   |
| -01:-44 <b>13</b>  | general goals, as Mr. Burgis pointed out, that would   | -01:-39 <b>13</b>  | of them at one point in your testimony, but, we have   |
| -01:-44 <b>14</b>  | support this kind of project, but I was being very   | -01:-39 <b>14</b>  | a master plan update from 2002, which I believe is   |
| -01:-44 <b>15</b>  | specific as to related to this specific use at this  | -01:-39 <b>15</b>  | the earliest one that we have.   |
| -01:-44 <b>16</b>  | location and the answer is I wasn't able to find any.  | -01:-39 <b>16</b>  | Is that correct?   |
| -01:-44 <b>17</b>  | <b>Q.</b> From a planning standpoint, there's a  | -01:-39 <b>17</b>  | A. Yes.  |
| -01:-44 <b>18</b>  | difference between mixed-use and solely  | -01:-39 <b>18</b>  | <b>Q.</b> And then that's followed by a Broadway   |
| -01:-44 <b>19</b>  | residential-multifamily dwellings?   | -01:-39 <b>19</b>  | corridor study, which is not a master plan and it's  |
| -01:-44 <b>20</b>  | A. That's correct.   | -01:-38 <b>20</b>  | not a reexamination, that came in 2008.  |
| -01:-44 <b>21</b>  | I think, at least insofar as my reading  | -01:-38 <b>21</b>  | Is that correct?   |
| -01:-44 <b>22</b>  | of the Broadway corridor study and in connection with  | -01:-38 <b>22</b>  | A. Yes.  |
| -01:-44 <b>23</b>  | the proposed zoning changes in a fair share context,   | -01:-38 <b>23</b>  | <b>Q.</b> Then we have a periodic reexamination  |
| -01:-44 <b>24</b>  | we always looked at the possibility of doing mixed   | -01:-38 <b>24</b>  | that occurred on December 8, 2008?   |
| -01:-43 <b>25</b>  | use, which would be retail on the ground floor and   | -01:-38 <b>25</b>  | A. Yes.  |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  | 201-641-1812   |  | 201-641-1812   |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | 58   |  | 60   |
| -01:-43 <b>1</b>   | apartments above.  | -01:-38 <b>1</b>   | <b>Q.</b> And then we have a Broadway corridor   |
| -01:-43 <b>2</b>   | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious   | -01:-38 <b>2</b>   | <b>Q.</b> And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  |
| -01:-43 <b>2</b><br>-01:-43 <b>3</b>   | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential   | -01:-38 <b>2</b><br>-01:-38 <b>3</b>   | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study  |
| -01:-43 <b>2</b> -01:-43 <b>3</b> -01:-43 <b>4</b>   | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit   | -01:-38 <b>2</b> -01:-38 <b>3</b> -01:-38 <b>4</b>   | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  |
| -01:-43 <b>2</b> -01:-43 <b>3</b> -01:-43 <b>4</b> -01:-43 <b>5</b>  | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate  | -01:-38 <b>2</b> -01:-38 <b>3</b> -01:-38 <b>4</b> -01:-38 <b>5</b>  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we   |
| -01:-43 <b>2</b> -01:-43 <b>3</b> -01:-43 <b>4</b> -01:-43 <b>5</b> -01:-43 <b>6</b>   | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.   | -01:-38 <b>2</b> -01:-38 <b>3</b> -01:-38 <b>4</b> -01:-38 <b>5</b> -01:-38 <b>6</b>   | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger  |
| -01:-43 <b>2</b> -01:-43 <b>3</b> -01:-43 <b>4</b> -01:-43 <b>5</b> -01:-43 <b>6</b> -01:-43 <b>7</b>  | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other  | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  |
| -01:-43  | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?   | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  |
| -01:-43  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.   |
| -01:-43  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  | -01:-38 2 -01:-38 3 -01:-38 4 -01:-38 5 -01:-38 6 -01:-38 7 -01:-38 8 -01:-38 9 -01:-38 10   | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the   |
| -01:-43  | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?   | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the   |
| -01:-43  | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with  | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the   |
| -01:-43 2 -01:-43 4 -01:-43 5 -01:-43 6 -01:-43 7 -01:-43 8 -01:-43 9 -01:-43 10 -01:-43 11 -01:-43 12   | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?   | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?   |
| -01:-43  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with Mr. Burgis?   | -01:-38 2 -01:-38 3 -01:-38 4 -01:-38 5 -01:-38 6 -01:-38 7 -01:-38 8 -01:-38 9 -01:-38 10 -01:-38 11 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 13  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be  |
| -01:-43  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.   | -01:-38 2 -01:-38 4 -01:-38 5 -01:-38 6 -01:-38 7 -01:-38 8 -01:-38 9 -01:-38 10 -01:-38 11 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 13 -01:-38 14   | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.   |
| -01:43 2 -01:43 4 -01:43 5 -01:43 6 -01:43 7 -01:43 8 -01:43 9 -01:43 10 -01:43 11 -01:43 12 -01:43 13 -01:43 14 -01:43 15   | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.   | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct. Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not  |
| -01:-43  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.  (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  | -01:-38 2 -01:-38 3 -01:-38 4 -01:-38 5 -01:-38 6 -01:-38 7 -01:-38 8 -01:-38 10 -01:-38 11 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 13 -01:-38 14 -01:-38 15 -01:-38 15   | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not accomplished, if you know?  |
| -01:-43 2 -01:-43 4 -01:-43 5 -01:-43 6 -01:-43 7 -01:-43 8 -01:-43 10 -01:-43 11 -01:-43 12 -01:-43 13 -01:-43 14 -01:-43 15 -01:-43 16 -01:-43 17  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.  (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  MR. SPIRIG: Are we going to have any  | -01:-38 2 -01:-38 3 -01:-38 4 -01:-38 5 -01:-38 6 -01:-38 7 -01:-38 8 -01:-38 10 -01:-38 11 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 13 -01:-38 14 -01:-38 15 -01:-37 16 -01:-37 17  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not accomplished, if you know?  A. Well, I think the case law indicates   |
| -01:-43  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with  Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.  (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  MR. SPIRIG: Are we going to have any other testimony from our engineer?  | -01:-38 2 -01:-38 4 -01:-38 5 -01:-38 6 -01:-38 7 -01:-38 8 -01:-38 10 -01:-38 11 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 13 -01:-38 14 -01:-38 15 -01:-37 16 -01:-37 17 -01:-37 18   | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not accomplished, if you know?  A. Well, I think the case law indicates that if a plaintiff challenges the zoning, if the   |
| -01:-43  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with  Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.  (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  MR. SPIRIG: Are we going to have any other testimony from our engineer?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.  | -01:-38 2 -01:-38 4 -01:-38 5 -01:-38 6 -01:-38 7 -01:-38 8 -01:-38 10 -01:-38 11 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 13 -01:-38 15 -01:-37 16 -01:-37 18 -01:-37 18  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not accomplished, if you know?  A. Well, I think the case law indicates that if a plaintiff challenges the zoning, if the master plan is timely, then there is a presumption of   |
| -01:-43 2 -01:-43 4 -01:-43 5 -01:-43 6 -01:-43 7 -01:-43 8 -01:-43 10 -01:-43 11 -01:-43 12 -01:-43 13 -01:-43 15 -01:-43 16 -01:-43 17 -01:-43 17 -01:-43 18 -01:-43 19 -01:-39 20                       | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.  (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  MR. SPIRIG: Are we going to have any other testimony from our engineer?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.  MR. DELIA: Thank you.  | -01:-38 2 -01:-38 3 -01:-38 4 -01:-38 5 -01:-38 6 -01:-38 7 -01:-38 9 -01:-38 10 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 13 -01:-38 15 -01:-37 16 -01:-37 17 -01:-37 18 -01:-37 19 -01:-37 20                        | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not accomplished, if you know?  A. Well, I think the case law indicates that if a plaintiff challenges the zoning, if the master plan is timely, then there is a presumption of validity that the zoning ordinance is valid, and if   |
| -01:-43  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with  Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.  (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  MR. SPIRIG: Are we going to have any other testimony from our engineer?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.  MR. DELIA: Thank you.  We're back on the record?  | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not accomplished, if you know?  A. Well, I think the case law indicates that if a plaintiff challenges the zoning, if the master plan is timely, then there is a presumption of validity that the zoning ordinance is valid, and if it's not done in a timely fashion, that presumption   |
| -01:-43  | I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with  Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.  (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  MR. SPIRIG: Are we going to have any other testimony from our engineer?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.  MR. DELIA: Thank you.  We're back on the record?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Yes, we're  | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not accomplished, if you know?  A. Well, I think the case law indicates that if a plaintiff challenges the zoning, if the master plan is timely, then there is a presumption of validity that the zoning ordinance is valid, and if it's not done in a timely fashion, that presumption may be removed.   |
| -01:-43 2 -01:-43 4 -01:-43 5 -01:-43 6 -01:-43 7 -01:-43 8 -01:-43 10 -01:-43 11 -01:-43 12 -01:-43 13 -01:-43 15 -01:-43 15 -01:-43 16 -01:-43 17 -01:-43 18 -01:-43 19 -01:-39 20 -01:-39 21 -01:-39 23 | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with  Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.  (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  MR. SPIRIG: Are we going to have any other testimony from our engineer?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.  MR. DELIA: Thank you.  We're back on the record?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Yes, we're back on the record. | -01:-38 2 -01:-38 3 -01:-38 4 -01:-38 5 -01:-38 6 -01:-38 7 -01:-38 10 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 12 -01:-38 13 -01:-38 15 -01:-37 16 -01:-37 17 -01:-37 18 -01:-37 19 -01:-37 20 -01:-37 21 -01:-37 22 -01:-37 23 | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not accomplished, if you know?  A. Well, I think the case law indicates that if a plaintiff challenges the zoning, if the master plan is timely, then there is a presumption of validity that the zoning ordinance is valid, and if it's not done in a timely fashion, that presumption may be removed.  Q. Okay. And so, in other words, and if I  |
| -01:-43  | apartments above.  I don't think there was any serious consideration given to doing purely residential buildings in either context, even though I will admit that Mr. Reiner's document did, you know, indicate that that was something that he would propose.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any other questions?  MR. HAYES: No.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Board members?  Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: May I briefly consult with  Mr. Burgis?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Briefly.  MR. DELIA: I will.  (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)  MR. SPIRIG: Are we going to have any other testimony from our engineer?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.  MR. DELIA: Thank you.  We're back on the record?  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Yes, we're back on the record. | -01:-38  | Q. And then we have a Broadway corridor study, Phase 2, in 2012.  And another Broadway corridor study presentation in 2016.  What we don't have, if you agree, is we do not have a periodic reexamination that is younger than ten years old.  Is that correct?  A. That is correct.  Q. What is your understanding of the Municipal Land Use Law as it relates to the timeliness of providing a reexamination report?  A. Either a new master plan has to be adopted or it has to be re-examined every ten years.  Q. What is the ramification if that is not accomplished, if you know?  A. Well, I think the case law indicates that if a plaintiff challenges the zoning, if the master plan is timely, then there is a presumption of validity that the zoning ordinance is valid, and if it's not done in a timely fashion, that presumption may be removed.  Q. Okay. And so, in other words, and if I could cite right from the MLU itself, if you could |

|   | 61  |  | 63  |
|---|---|--|---|
| -01:-37 <b>1</b>  | A. It says:   | -01:-35 <b>1</b>   | occurred in the last ten years as it relates to   |
| -01:-37 <b>2</b>  | "The absence of the adoption by the   | -01:-35 <b>2</b>   | Woodcliff Lake?   |
| -01:-37 <b>3</b>  | planning board of a reexamination report  | -01:-35 <b>3</b>   | A. Yes.   |
| -01:-37 <b>4</b>  | pursuant to section, it's see 40:55D-89, shall  | -01:-35 <b>4</b>   | <b>Q.</b> And among them, an aging population,  |
| -01:-37 <b>5</b>  | constitute a rebuttable presumption that the  | -01:-35 <b>5</b>   | correct?  |
| -01:-37 <b>6</b>  | municipal development regulations are no  | -01:-35 <b>6</b>   | A. Yes, somewhat.   |
| -01:-37 <b>7</b>  | longer reasonable."   | -01:-35 <b>7</b>   | Q. We have an emphasis  |
| -01:-37 <b>8</b>  | <b>Q.</b> So at this moment in time we have a   | -01:-35 <b>8</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I don't know that.  |
| -01:-36 <b>9</b>  | rebuttable presumption that the Woodcliff Lake zoning   | -01:-35 <b>9</b>   | MR. DELIA: I know I'm aging. I was  |
| -01:-36 <b>10</b>   | ordinance is invalid.   | -01:-35 <b>10</b>  | 40-something ten years ago, and now I'm pushing 60.   |
| -01:-36 <b>11</b>   | Is that correct?  | -01:-35 <b>11</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: It happens to the   |
| -01:-36 <b>12</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I object. I mean  | -01:-35 <b>12</b>  | best of us.   |
| -01:-36 <b>13</b>   | MR. DELIA: It's a planning question   | -01:-35 <b>13</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: I mean, are you going to  |
| -01:-36 <b>14</b>   | that goes straight to the heart of the series of  | -01:-35 <b>14</b>  | present any data that the age in Woodcliff Lake is  |
| -01:-36 <b>15</b>   | master plan documents.  | -01:-34 <b>15</b>  | older than it used to be?   |
| -01:-36 <b>16</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're making a legal   | -01:-34 <b>16</b>  | BY MR. DELIA:   |
| -01:-36 <b>17</b>   | argument.   | -01:-34 <b>17</b>  | <b>Q.</b> It's in the master plan documents.  |
| -01:-36 <b>18</b>   | MR. DELIA: I'm asking him a question,   | -01:-34 <b>18</b>  | Isn't that true?  |
| -01:-36 <b>19</b>   | he can answer yes or no.  | -01:-34 <b>19</b>  | A. Yes.   |
| -01:-36 <b>20</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're making legal   | -01:-34 <b>20</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Which one?  |
| -01:-36 <b>21</b>   | argument, and he doesn't know what's going to happen  | -01:-34 <b>21</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which master plan?  |
| -01:-36 <b>22</b>   | with their application. After that, you can make  | -01:-34 <b>22</b>  | MR. DELIA: The '08.   |
| -01:-36 <b>23</b>   | your legal argument, but he didn't testify on direct  | -01:-34 <b>23</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: You mean the one that you   |
| -01:-36 <b>24</b>   | about that.   | -01:-34 <b>24</b>  | just said is outdated?  |
| -01:-36 <b>25</b>   | MR. DELIA: He commented on all the  | -01:-34 <b>25</b>  | MR. DELIA: That's right.  |
|   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812  |  | 201-641-1812  |
| -01:-36 <b>1</b>  | 62 master plans, he commented on their dates, and I just  | -01:-34 <b>1</b>   | 64<br>I'm asking this gentleman a question  |
| -01:-36 <b>1</b><br>-01:-36 <b>2</b>  | want to get on the record that the master plan is   | -01:-34 <b>1</b><br>-01:-34 <b>2</b>   | about is there an aging population. He answered the   |
| -01:-36 <b>3</b>  | outside of time by half a year now.   | -01:-34 <b>3</b>   | question yes. He did answer the question yes.   |
| -01:-36 <b>4</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're trying to make   | -01:-34 <b>4</b>   | Please, let me ask the questions and let him give the   |
| -01:-36 <b>5</b>  | a legal argument.   | -01:-34 <b>5</b>   | answers.  |
| -01:-36 <b>6</b>  | MR. DELIA: I'm making a factual   | -01:-34 <b>6</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: Okay.   |
| -01:-36 <b>7</b>  | argument. I'm asking factual questions.   | -01:-34 <b>7</b>   | MR. DELIA: And please don't interrupt.  |
| -01:-36 <b>8</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What's the factual  | -01:-34 <b>8</b>   | THE WITNESS: We did a demographic   |
| -01:-36 <b>9</b>  | question?   | -01:-34 <b>9</b>   |   |
| -01:-36 <b>10</b>   |   | -0134  | analysis in the, I think it's the 2018 Housing  |
|   | MR. DELIA: How old is your master   | -01:-34 <b>10</b>  | analysis in the, I think it's the 2018 Housing Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics  |
| -01:-36 <b>11</b>   | MR. DELIA: How old is your master plan?   |  |   |
|   | •   | -01:-34 <b>10</b>  | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics   |
| -01:-36 <b>11</b>   | plan?   | -01:-34 <b>10</b><br>-01:-34 <b>11</b>   | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in   |
| -01:-36 <b>11</b><br>-01:-36 <b>12</b>  | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the   | -01:-34 <b>10</b><br>-01:-34 <b>11</b><br>-01:-34 <b>12</b>  | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  |
| -01:-36 <b>11</b><br>-01:-36 <b>12</b><br>-01:-36 <b>13</b>   | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.   | -01:-34 <b>10</b><br>-01:-34 <b>11</b><br>-01:-34 <b>12</b><br>-01:-34 <b>13</b>   | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:   |
| -01:-36 <b>11</b><br>-01:-36 <b>12</b><br>-01:-36 <b>13</b><br>-01:-36 <b>14</b>  | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the   | -01:-34 10<br>-01:-34 11<br>-01:-34 12<br>-01:-34 13<br>-01:-34 14   | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other   |
| -01:-36 11<br>-01:-36 12<br>-01:-36 13<br>-01:-36 14<br>-01:-35 15<br>-01:-35 16<br>-01:-35 17                                      | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.   | -01:-34 10<br>-01:-34 11<br>-01:-34 12<br>-01:-34 13<br>-01:-34 14<br>-01:-34 15<br>-01:-34 16   | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but  |
| -01:-36 11<br>-01:-36 12<br>-01:-36 13<br>-01:-36 14<br>-01:-35 15<br>-01:-35 16<br>-01:-35 17<br>-01:-35 18                        | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. With the question I just asked, you  | -01:-34 10<br>-01:-34 11<br>-01:-34 12<br>-01:-34 13<br>-01:-34 14<br>-01:-34 15<br>-01:-34 16<br>-01:-34 17<br>-01:-34 18                     | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but let me ask you this.  Would it be fair to say that in the last ten years, transit-oriented design has become   |
| -01:-36 11<br>-01:-36 12<br>-01:-36 13<br>-01:-36 14<br>-01:-35 15<br>-01:-35 16<br>-01:-35 17<br>-01:-35 18<br>-01:-35 19          | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. With the question I just asked, you spoke of reconciliation.   | -01:-34 10 -01:-34 11 -01:-34 13 -01:-34 14 -01:-34 15 -01:-34 16 -01:-34 17 -01:-34 18 -01:-33 19   | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but let me ask you this.  Would it be fair to say that in the last ten years, transit-oriented design has become much more a public policy of the State of New Jersey?   |
| -01:-36 11 -01:-36 12 -01:-36 13 -01:-36 14 -01:-35 15 -01:-35 16 -01:-35 17 -01:-35 18 -01:-35 19 -01:-35 20                       | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. With the question I just asked, you spoke of reconciliation.  Do you think that the question of  | -01:-34 10 -01:-34 11 -01:-34 13 -01:-34 14 -01:-34 15 -01:-34 16 -01:-34 17 -01:-34 18 -01:-33 19 -01:-33 20                                  | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but let me ask you this.  Would it be fair to say that in the last ten years, transit-oriented design has become much more a public policy of the State of New Jersey?  A. It was a policy back in 2008.   |
| -01:-36 11 -01:-36 12 -01:-36 14 -01:-35 15 -01:-35 16 -01:-35 17 -01:-35 18 -01:-35 19 -01:-35 20 -01:-35 21                       | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. With the question I just asked, you spoke of reconciliation.  Do you think that the question of reconciliation, A, with the passage of ten years,  | -01:-34 10 -01:-34 11 -01:-34 13 -01:-34 14 -01:-34 15 -01:-34 16 -01:-34 17 -01:-34 18 -01:-33 19 -01:-33 20 -01:-33 21                       | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but let me ask you this.  Would it be fair to say that in the last ten years, transit-oriented design has become much more a public policy of the State of New Jersey?  A. It was a policy back in 2008.  Q. Do you think it's been implemented more   |
| -01:-36 11 -01:-36 12 -01:-36 14 -01:-35 15 -01:-35 16 -01:-35 17 -01:-35 18 -01:-35 19 -01:-35 20 -01:-35 21 -01:-35 22            | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. With the question I just asked, you spoke of reconciliation.  Do you think that the question of reconciliation, A, with the passage of ten years, putting aside what the Land Use Law says, but the  | -01:-34 10 -01:-34 11 -01:-34 13 -01:-34 14 -01:-34 15 -01:-34 16 -01:-34 17 -01:-34 18 -01:-33 19 -01:-33 21 -01:-33 21                       | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but let me ask you this.  Would it be fair to say that in the last ten years, transit-oriented design has become much more a public policy of the State of New Jersey?  A. It was a policy back in 2008.  Q. Do you think it's been implemented more in Bergen County in the last ten years?   |
| -01:-36 11 -01:-36 12 -01:-36 13 -01:-36 14 -01:-35 15 -01:-35 16 -01:-35 17 -01:-35 18 -01:-35 20 -01:-35 21 -01:-35 22 -01:-35 23 | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. With the question I just asked, you spoke of reconciliation.  Do you think that the question of reconciliation, A, with the passage of ten years, putting aside what the Land Use Law says, but the passage of ten years, when you talk about changed  | -01:-34 10 -01:-34 11 -01:-34 13 -01:-34 14 -01:-34 15 -01:-34 16 -01:-34 17 -01:-34 18 -01:-33 19 -01:-33 20 -01:-33 21 -01:-33 22 -01:-33 23 | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but let me ask you this.  Would it be fair to say that in the last ten years, transit-oriented design has become much more a public policy of the State of New Jersey?  A. It was a policy back in 2008.  Q. Do you think it's been implemented more in Bergen County in the last ten years?  A. Yes, it probably has.   |
| -01:-36 11 -01:-36 12 -01:-36 14 -01:-35 15 -01:-35 16 -01:-35 17 -01:-35 18 -01:-35 20 -01:-35 21 -01:-35 22 -01:-35 23 -01:-35 24 | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. With the question I just asked, you spoke of reconciliation.  Do you think that the question of reconciliation, A, with the passage of ten years, putting aside what the Land Use Law says, but the passage of ten years, when you talk about changed circumstances, wouldn't it be fair to say that there   | -01:-34 10 -01:-34 11 -01:-34 13 -01:-34 14 -01:-34 15 -01:-34 16 -01:-34 17 -01:-34 18 -01:-33 20 -01:-33 21 -01:-33 22 -01:-33 23 -01:-33 24 | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but let me ask you this.  Would it be fair to say that in the last ten years, transit-oriented design has become much more a public policy of the State of New Jersey?  A. It was a policy back in 2008.  Q. Do you think it's been implemented more in Bergen County in the last ten years?  A. Yes, it probably has.  Q. Now, referring to let me just go to   |
| -01:-36 11 -01:-36 12 -01:-36 13 -01:-36 14 -01:-35 15 -01:-35 16 -01:-35 17 -01:-35 18 -01:-35 20 -01:-35 21 -01:-35 22 -01:-35 23 | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. With the question I just asked, you spoke of reconciliation.  Do you think that the question of reconciliation, A, with the passage of ten years, putting aside what the Land Use Law says, but the passage of ten years, when you talk about changed circumstances, wouldn't it be fair to say that there were a lot of changed circumstances that have | -01:-34 10 -01:-34 11 -01:-34 13 -01:-34 14 -01:-34 15 -01:-34 16 -01:-34 17 -01:-34 18 -01:-33 19 -01:-33 20 -01:-33 21 -01:-33 22 -01:-33 23 | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but let me ask you this.  Would it be fair to say that in the last ten years, transit-oriented design has become much more a public policy of the State of New Jersey?  A. It was a policy back in 2008.  Q. Do you think it's been implemented more in Bergen County in the last ten years?  A. Yes, it probably has.  Q. Now, referring to let me just go to the periodic exams first and start there. |
| -01:-36 11 -01:-36 12 -01:-36 14 -01:-35 15 -01:-35 16 -01:-35 17 -01:-35 18 -01:-35 20 -01:-35 21 -01:-35 22 -01:-35 23 -01:-35 24 | plan?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you have the dates of the master plan.  MR. DELIA: Okay. He's answered the question, I'll move on.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. With the question I just asked, you spoke of reconciliation.  Do you think that the question of reconciliation, A, with the passage of ten years, putting aside what the Land Use Law says, but the passage of ten years, when you talk about changed circumstances, wouldn't it be fair to say that there   | -01:-34 10 -01:-34 11 -01:-34 13 -01:-34 14 -01:-34 15 -01:-34 16 -01:-34 17 -01:-34 18 -01:-33 20 -01:-33 21 -01:-33 22 -01:-33 23 -01:-33 24 | Element and Fair Share Plan, and there are statistics which indicate that generally the population in Woodcliff Lake is aging. That is a fact.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. As we move on, I'll ask you other questions perhaps about changed circumstances, but let me ask you this.  Would it be fair to say that in the last ten years, transit-oriented design has become much more a public policy of the State of New Jersey?  A. It was a policy back in 2008.  Q. Do you think it's been implemented more in Bergen County in the last ten years?  A. Yes, it probably has.  Q. Now, referring to let me just go to   |

|                                      | 65  |                                      | 67   |
|--------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| -01:-33 <b>1</b>                     | The best I can tell from a review of  | -01:-31 <b>1</b>                     | and if you have redevelopment plans, there would be a                  |
| -01:-33 <b>2</b>                     | the '02 exam, just bear with me one second, the '02   | -01:-30 <b>2</b>                     | fifth, yes.  |
| -01:-33 <b>3</b>                     | exam, there was a reference towards the end of it   | -01:-30 <b>3</b>                     | Q. And we don't have that here in any of                               |
| -01:-33 <b>4</b>                     | which said:   | -01:-30 <b>4</b>                     | the current documentation? When I say "current," I                     |
| -01:-33 <b>5</b>                     | "A further study was needed for the   | -01:-30 <b>5</b>                     | mean less than ten-years-old.  |
| -01:-33 <b>6</b>                     | Broadway corridor."   | -01:-30 <b>6</b>                     | A. The last one, which was done within                                 |
| -01:-33 <b>7</b>                     | A. Yes.   | -01:-30 <b>7</b>                     | that context, is 2008.   |
| -01:-33 <b>8</b>                     | <b>Q.</b> Which is essentially the seed that  | -01:-30 <b>8</b>                     | Q. Okay. Staying with the '02 master plan                              |
| -01:-33 <b>9</b>                     | started the whole discussion on the corridor study.   | -01:-30 <b>9</b>                     | update, which is really a reexamination, and                           |
| -01:-33 10                           | Is that correct?  | -01:-30 <b>10</b>                    | referring to page 10, is there an overview statement                   |
| -01:-33 <b>11</b>                    | A. I don't know. I mean, it's not unusual   | -01:-30 <b>11</b>                    | that the only vacant and developable land remaining                    |
| -01:-32 <b>12</b>                    | for a master plans to provide general recommendations   | -01:-30 <b>12</b>                    | in the borough consists mostly of small individual                     |
| -01:-32 <b>13</b>                    | saying, you know, issues should be looked at in the   | -01:-30 <b>13</b>                    | lots scattered throughout the community?                               |
| -01:-32 <b>14</b>                    | future, it was very general.  | -01:-30 <b>14</b>                    | A. If there's a statement in the master                                |
| -01:-32 <b>15</b>                    | I don't know whether that was the   | -01:-30 <b>15</b>                    | plan, that speaks for itself, yes.                                     |
| -01:-32 <b>16</b>                    | origin of a specific reexamination of the corridor  | -01:-30 <b>16</b>                    | <b>Q.</b> Would that be a change now ten years                         |
| -01:-32 <b>17</b>                    | studies.  | -01:-30 <b>17</b>                    | later?   |
| -01:-32 <b>18</b>                    | What I will say is even though the  | -01:-30 <b>18</b>                    | In the current setting, we now have our                                |
| -01:-32 <b>19</b>                    | re-exam was 2008, you know, in 2008, 2012, there was  | -01:-30 <b>19</b>                    | property which is vacant and of a size which could be                  |
| -01:-32 <b>20</b>                    | specific focus on the Broadway corridor in a master   | -01:-30 <b>20</b>                    | redeveloped.   |
| -01:-32 <b>21</b>                    | plan amendment, and in those documents, you know,   | -01:-30 <b>21</b>                    | Is that fair to say?   |
| -01:-32 <b>22</b>                    | those issues were addressed.  | -01:-30 <b>22</b>                    | A. I wouldn't characterize your property                               |
| -01:-32 <b>23</b>                    | So, yes, you're correct, it wasn't  | -01:-30 <b>23</b>                    | as vacant, so I disagree.  |
| -01:-32 <b>24</b>                    | addressed within the specific context of a  | -01:-29 <b>24</b>                    | There's still as Mr. Burgis  |
| -01:-32 <b>25</b>                    | reexamination report, but it's not like that  | -01:-29 <b>25</b>                    | indicated, there's still a number of scattered vacant                  |
|                                      | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |                                      | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                               |
|                                      | 201-641-1812  |                                      | 201-641-1812   |
|                                      | 66  | _                                    | 68   |
| -01:-32 <b>1</b>                     | particular issue hasn't been re-examined since then.  | -01:-29 <b>1</b>                     | parcels on the Broadway corridor and throughout the                    |
| -01:-32 <b>2</b>                     | It was done in 2012.  | -01:-29 <b>2</b>                     | community. So that hasn't changed substantially.                       |
| -01:-32 <b>3</b>                     | And zoning, as I've indicated is, the   | -01:-29 <b>3</b>                     | Q. Here's another statement.   |
| -01:-32 <b>4</b>                     | recommendations made, in particular the mixed use,  | -01:-29 <b>4</b>                     | "Multifamily development is limited to                                 |
| -01:-32 <b>5</b>                     | was something that the council has looked at in the   | -01:-29 <b>5</b>                     | affordable housing sites."   |
| -01:-32 <b>6</b><br>-01:-31 <b>7</b> | past couple of years and basically has not felt   | -01:-29 <b>6</b><br>-01:-29 <b>7</b> | That hasn't changed, has it?  A. Well, the Gables is a multifamily     |
| _                                    | appropriate or cannot reach a consensus about   |                                      | A. Well, the Gables is a multifamily development, so that has changed. |
| -01:-31 <b>8</b><br>-01:-31 <b>9</b> | actually undertaking a rezoning in that regard. <b>Q.</b> I would agree that there has been study | -01:-29 <b>8</b><br>-01:-29 <b>9</b> | Q. All right. How many units are there?                                |
| -01:-31 <b>10</b>                    | on it, but it has not been done in the context of a   | -01:-29 <b>10</b>                    | A. I believe it's 40 units.  |
| -01:-31 <b>11</b>                    | full blown master plan reexamination  | -01:-29 <b>11</b>                    | Q. And how many affordable units are                                   |
| -01:-31 <b>12</b>                    | A. That is correct.   | -01:-29 <b>12</b>                    | there?   |
| -01:-31 <b>13</b>                    | Q and the many facets that are  | -01:-29 <b>13</b>                    | A. There are no affordable units. They                                 |
| -01:-31 <b>14</b>                    | required by law in a master plan reexamination?   | -01:-29 <b>14</b>                    | paid a development fee, but they didn't provide any                    |
| -01:-31 <b>15</b>                    | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I object.   | -01:-29 <b>15</b>                    | affordable units in that development.                                  |
| -01:-31 <b>16</b>                    | That's a pretty broad question. Can you be more   | -01:-29 <b>16</b>                    | Q. You've answered the question. I'll                                  |
| -01:-31 <b>17</b>                    | specific?   | -01:-29 <b>17</b>                    | move on from there.  |
| -01:-31 <b>18</b>                    | MR. DELIA: Sure.  | -01:-29 <b>18</b>                    | When we talk about office land uses,                                   |
| -01:-31 <b>19</b>                    | BY MR. DELIA:   | -01:-29 <b>19</b>                    | where are the larger offices located in Woodcliff                      |
| -01:-31 <b>20</b>                    | Q. The master plan reexamination, in  | -01:-29 <b>20</b>                    | Lake, on what side of the Causeway, what side of the                   |
| -01:-31 <b>21</b>                    | accordance with statute 40:55D-89, lists a total of   | -01:-29 <b>21</b>                    | lake?  |
| -01:-31 <b>22</b>                    | five separate items that must be in a reexamination   | -01:-28 <b>22</b>                    | A. Well, it's predominantly along the                                  |
| -01:-31 <b>23</b>                    | report.   | -01:-28 <b>23</b>                    | Chestnut Ridge Road corridor.  |
| -01:-31 <b>24</b>                    | Is that correct?  | -01:-28 <b>24</b>                    | <b>Q.</b> Would it be fair to say that the                             |
| -01:-31 <b>25</b>                    | A. There's four mandatory requirements,   | -01:-28 <b>25</b>                    | Chestnut Ridge corridor is much more accessible than                   |
|                                      | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |                                      | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                               |
|                                      | 201-641-1812  |                                      | 201-641-1812   |

|   |                             | 69   |                        |          | 71   |
|---|-----------------------------|--|------------------------|----------|--|
| -01:-28 <b>1</b>  | the Broadwa                 |  | -01:-27                | 1        | about the Chestnut Ridge corridor.   |
| -01:-28 <b>2</b>  | Α.                          | Accessible to whom?  | -01:-27                | 2        | MR. DELIA: I'm asking about  |
| -01:-28 <b>3</b>  | Q.                          | To commuters, to visitors.                                 | -01:-27                | 3        | comparisons and I'm asking about the viability of  |
| -01:-28 4   | Α.                          | Not necessarily.   | -01:-27                | 4        | this site as an office use. That came out in his   |
| -01:-28 <b>5</b>  |                             | MR. NEWMAN: Commuters?                                     | -01:-27                | 5        | testimony and I have a right to cross on it, and   |
| -01:-28 6   |                             | MR. DELIA: People coming to work in a                      | -01:-27                | 6        | MR. PRINCIOTTO: But it's not his   |
| -01:-28 <b>7</b>  | car.                        |  | -01:-27                | 7        | testimony. He didn't perform any comparison between  |
| -01:-28 <b>8</b>  |                             | MR. NEWMAN: From the train station?                        | -01:-26                | 8        | Broadway and the Chestnut Ridge corridor.  |
| -01:-28 <b>9</b>  | BY MR. DELI                 |  |                        | 9        | MR. DELIA: I'm asking a question which   |
| -01:-28 <b>10</b>   | Q.                          | People coming to work in a car, driving                    | -01:-26                | 10       | is more suitable for office development.   |
| -01:-28 <b>11</b>   | to work.                    | , ,  | -01:-26                | 11       | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Is that the test?  |
| -01:-28 <b>12</b>   | A.                          | From where?  | -01:-26                |          | MR. HAYES: But does that speak to  |
| -01:-28 <b>13</b>   | Q.                          | From the west.   | -01:-26                | 13       | viability?   |
| -01:-28 <b>14</b>   |                             | MR. NEWMAN: What's   | -01:-26                | 14       | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't think that's   |
| -01:-28 <b>15</b>   |                             | MR. DELIA: Let me rephrase the                             | -01:-26                | 15       | the test, comparison.  |
| -01:-28 <b>16</b>   | question.                   |  | -01:-26                | 16       | THE WITNESS: Let me answer it this   |
| -01:-28 <b>17</b>   | BY MR. DELI                 | A:   | -01:-26                | 17       | way.   |
| -01:-28 <b>18</b>   | Q.                          | There was a lot of testimony, a lot of                     | -01:-26                | 18       | You know, office use within the context  |
| -01:-28 <b>19</b>   | statements                  | from the board, a lot of statements from                   | -01:-26                | 19       | of a downtown, even in communities that have large   |
| -01:-28 <b>20</b>   | the public                  |  | -01:-26                | 20       | office parks, there's a variety of office markets.   |
| -01:-28 <b>21</b>   |                             | MR. PRINCIOTTO: A question, please.                        | -01:-26                | 21       | And, clearly, this particular office   |
| -01:-28 <b>22</b>   |                             | MR. DELIA: I have to preface it.                           | -01:-26                | 22       | development, which took place in 1980, had a market,   |
| -01:-28 <b>23</b>   |                             | MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, you can just                           | -01:-26                | 23       | somebody developed it, it was occupied. It's now   |
| -01:-28 <b>24</b>   | answer a qu                 | estion. We want to get this concluded                      | -01:-26                | 24       | vacant. One of the things that I don't know  |
| -01:-28 <b>25</b>   | tonight. Ok                 | ay?  | -01:-26                | 25       | MR. NEWMAN: Is it vacant?  |
|   | LAU                         | IRA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                     |                        |          | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|   |                             | 201-641-1812   |                        |          | 201-641-1812   |
|   |                             | 70   |                        |          | 72   |
| -01:-28 <b>1</b>  |                             | MR. DELIA: Okay.   | -01:-26                | 1        | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it was  |
| -01:-28 <b>2</b>  | BY MR. DELI                 | IA:  | -01:-26                | 2        | testified to being vacant.   |
| -01:-28 <b>3</b>  | Q.                          | Do you remember anybody speaking here                      | -01:-26                | 3        | MR. NEWMAN: In the beginning of this   |
| -01:-27 <b>4</b>  |                             | lifficult it is to get across the Causeway,                | -01:-26                | 4        | application, it wasn't.  |
| _   |                             | sterly section is unique to Woodcliff                      | -01:-26                | 5        | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: It wasn't,   |
| -01:-27 6   | Lake?                       |  | -01:-26                | 6        | correct.   |
| -01:-27 <b>7</b>  | Α.                          | There was some testimony to that                           | -01:-26                | 7        | THE WITNESS: That's correct. I did   |
| -01:-27 8   | effect.                     | And on Links addition to the                               | -01:-26                | 8        | visit and there were a few tenants there about a year  |
| -01:-27 9   | Q.                          | And you've heard lots about the                            |                        | 9        | ago. Now it's empty. I did not hear  |
| -01:-27 10  | _                           | going over the Causeway, right, in terms                   | -01:-26                |          | MR. PRINCIOTTO: There was no testimony   |
| -01:-27 <b>11</b><br>-01:-27 <b>12</b>                      | of traffic cor              | From where?  | -01:-26<br>-01:-26     |          | as to how it got there.  MR. NEWMAN: No testimony at all.                                    |
| -01:-27 <b>12</b><br>-01:-27 <b>13</b>                      | Q.                          | From the west.   | -01:-26                |          | •  |
| -01:-27 <b>13</b><br>-01:-27 <b>14</b>                      | Q.<br>A.                    | No, no, no, who provided that                              | -01:-26<br>-01:-25     |          | THE WITNESS: That's the point I made.  I haven't heard testimony to say that it's infeasible |
| -01:-27 <b>14</b><br>-01:-27 <b>15</b>                      | informatio                  |  | -01:-25<br>-01:-25     |          | or there was a concerted marketing effort and there  |
| -01:-27 <b>15</b>   | Q.                          | Coming from the board, coming from the                     | -01:-25                |          | was a failure to find tenants.   |
| -01:-27 <b>17</b>   | public.                     | coming from the board, coming from the                     | -01:-25                |          | MR. NEWMAN: Or whether it was listed.  |
| -01:-27 <b>17</b>   | pasiici                     | You don't recall that?                                     | -01:-25                |          | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Next question.   |
| -01:-27 <b>19</b>   | Α.                          | No, not within the context of this                         | -01:-25                | _        | MR. DELIA: All right. Sure.  |
| -01:-27 <b>20</b>   | hearing.                    | and the context of this                                    | -01:-25                |          | Can you read that back, please, the  |
| -01:-27 <b>21</b>   |                             | Do you believe that the Chestnut Ridge                     | -01:-25                |          | last answer.   |
| -01:-27 Z   | Q.                          |  |                        |          |  |
|   | Q. properties a             |  |                        | 22       | (Whereupon, the Court Reporter reads   |
| -01:-27 <b>22</b>   | properties a                | re much more suitable for office than the                  | -01:-25                |          | (Whereupon, the Court Reporter reads back the requested portion.)                            |
| -01:-27 <b>22</b><br>-01:-27 <b>23</b>                      | properties a<br>Broadway co | re much more suitable for office than the                  | -01:-25 2              | 23       | back the requested portion.)   |
| -01:-27 <b>22</b><br>-01:-27 <b>23</b><br>-01:-27 <b>24</b> | properties a                | re much more suitable for office than the pridor?  I think | -01:-25                | 23<br>24 | back the requested portion.) BY MR. DELIA:   |
| -01:-27 <b>22</b><br>-01:-27 <b>23</b>                      | properties a<br>Broadway co | re much more suitable for office than the orridor?         | -01:-25 2<br>-01:-25 2 | 23<br>24 | back the requested portion.)   |

|   | 70  | 1  | 75   |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1   | 73  |  | 75   |
| -01:-24 1   | literally people working in there right now today,  | -01:-21 <b>1</b>   | the DMR report, I will give you a copy of our plan,  |
| -01:-24 <b>2</b>  | and we presented our case in the manner in which we   | -01:-21 2  | and I would ask you to let us know.  |
| -01:-24 <b>3</b>  | did where we've attempted, at least in our opinion,   | -01:-21 3  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's something your  |
| -01:-24 <b>4</b>  | to demonstrate particular suitability, do you agree   | -01:-21 <b>4</b>   | expert should have done, if you wanted to do it.   |
| -01:-24 <b>5</b>  | that this property is particularly well suited?   | -01:-21 <b>5</b>   | You're asking him  |
| -01:-24 <b>6</b>  | A. I would say that, you know, given the  | -01:-21 6  | MR. DELIA: He brought up the DMR   |
| -01:-23 7   | property's location and the way that you're proposing   | -01:-21 <b>7</b>   | report, okay.  |
| -01:-23 <b>8</b><br>-01:-23 <b>9</b>  | to convert it, if it were zoned for the use, it would   | -01:-21 <b>8</b><br>-01:-21 <b>9</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: Your expert testified  |
| -01:-23 <b>9</b><br>-01:-23 <b>10</b>   | <b>Q.</b> So whether or not the office vacancy  | -01:-21 <b>9</b>   | about all sorts of reports, none of which we've seen.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: He's here for cross   |
| -01:-23 <b>10</b>   | occurred by attrition, whether it occurred  | -01:-21 <b>10</b>  | examination, not to prepare an analysis for you that   |
| -01:-23 <b>11</b>   | deliberately really doesn't make a difference, does   | -01:-21 <b>11</b>  | maybe you wanted to do as part of your application.  |
| -01:-23 <b>12</b>   | it?   | -01:-21 <b>12</b>  | THE WITNESS: Let me just   |
| -01:-23 <b>13</b>   | A. Well, as I've indicated, there's no  | -01:-21 <b>13</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: I would ask that you limit   |
| -01:-23 <b>15</b>   | evidence on the record and you haven't made the   | -01:-21 <b>14</b>  | your questions to cross, as to what he testified to  |
| -01:-23 <b>16</b>   | argument that this is a hardship case, and it's up to   | -01:-20 <b>15</b>  | on direct.   |
| -01:-23 <b>17</b>   | the board to make a determination.  | -01:-20 <b>17</b>  | THE WITNESS: Let me just reinforce   |
| -01:-23 <b>17</b><br>-01:-23 <b>18</b>  | I've cited the factors and I've   | -01:-20 <b>17</b>  | what I said earlier on.  |
| -01:-23 <b>10</b>   | evaluated the testimony of all the witnesses. It's  | -01:-20 <b>10</b>  | The DMR zoning proposal was a proposal   |
| -01:-23 <b>20</b>   | up to the board to make a determination whether the   | -01:-20 <b>13</b>  | made by an architectural firm that was hired by the  |
| -01:-23 <b>21</b>   | applicant has shown that this site is particularly  | -01:-20 <b>21</b>  | council to put forward proposed changes.   |
| -01:-23 <b>21</b>   | suited for the proposed use.  | -01:-20 <b>21</b>  | It was never endorsed. It was never  |
| -01:-23 <b>22</b>   | Q. Okay, but what I'm saying, and I think   | -01:-20 <b>22</b>  | part of an amendment. The zoning that was proposed   |
| -01:-23 <b>24</b>   | I've answered it, which is, this dialogue as to   | -01:-20 <b>24</b>  | was never put in place. So all it was, it was a  |
| -01:-23 <b>25</b>   | whether the building is rented, whether there's a   | -01:-20 <b>25</b>  | proposal.  |
| -0123 20  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  | -0120 20   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|   |   |  |  |
|   | 201-641-1812  |  | 201-641-1812   |
|   | <b>201-641-1812</b><br>74   |  | <b>201-641-1812</b> 76   |
| -01:-23 <b>1</b>  | 74  | -01:-20 <b>1</b>   | 76   |
| -01:-23 <b>1</b><br>-01:-22 <b>2</b>  |   | -01:-20 <b>1</b><br>-01:-20 <b>2</b>   | 76<br>So, yes, there may be standards that   |
| -   | 74 demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our  | _  | 76   |
| -01:-22 <b>2</b>  | 74 demand, that has nothing to do with really deals   | -01:-20 <b>2</b>   | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  |
| -01:-22 <b>2</b><br>-01:-22 <b>3</b>  | 74 demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?   | -01:-20 <b>2</b><br>-01:-20 <b>3</b>   | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected   |
| -01:-22 <b>2</b> -01:-22 <b>3</b> -01:-22 <b>4</b>  | 74 demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could,  | -01:-20 <b>2</b> -01:-20 <b>3</b> -01:-20 <b>4</b>   | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?   |
| -01:-22 <b>2</b> -01:-22 <b>3</b> -01:-22 <b>4</b> -01:-22 <b>5</b>   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And   | -01:-20 <b>2</b> -01:-20 <b>3</b> -01:-20 <b>4</b> -01:-20 <b>5</b>  | THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  |
| -01:-22 <b>2</b> -01:-22 <b>3</b> -01:-22 <b>4</b> -01:-22 <b>5</b> -01:-22 <b>6</b>  | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this   | -01:-20 <b>2</b> -01:-20 <b>3</b> -01:-20 <b>4</b> -01:-20 <b>5</b> -01:-20 <b>6</b>   | THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?   |
| -01:-22 <b>2</b> -01:-22 <b>3</b> -01:-22 <b>4</b> -01:-22 <b>5</b> -01:-22 <b>6</b> -01:-22 <b>7</b>   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we  | -01:-20 <b>2</b> -01:-20 <b>3</b> -01:-20 <b>4</b> -01:-20 <b>5</b> -01:-20 <b>6</b> -01:-20 <b>7</b>  | THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?   |
| -01:-22 <b>2</b> -01:-22 <b>3</b> -01:-22 <b>4</b> -01:-22 <b>5</b> -01:-22 <b>6</b> -01:-22 <b>7</b> -01:-22 <b>8</b>                                    | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.   | -01:-20 <b>2</b> -01:-20 <b>3</b> -01:-20 <b>4</b> -01:-20 <b>5</b> -01:-20 <b>6</b> -01:-20 <b>7</b> -01:-20 <b>8</b>   | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a   |
| -01:-22 <b>2</b> -01:-22 <b>3</b> -01:-22 <b>4</b> -01:-22 <b>5</b> -01:-22 <b>6</b> -01:-22 <b>7</b> -01:-22 <b>8</b> -01:-22 <b>9</b>                   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears  | -01:-20 <b>2</b> -01:-20 <b>3</b> -01:-20 <b>4</b> -01:-20 <b>5</b> -01:-20 <b>6</b> -01:-20 <b>7</b> -01:-20 <b>8</b> -01:-20 <b>9</b>  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two   |
| -01:-22 <b>2</b> -01:-22 <b>3</b> -01:-22 <b>4</b> -01:-22 <b>5</b> -01:-22 <b>6</b> -01:-22 <b>7</b> -01:-22 <b>8</b> -01:-22 <b>9</b> -01:-22 <b>10</b> | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.   | -01:-20 <b>2</b> -01:-20 <b>3</b> -01:-20 <b>4</b> -01:-20 <b>5</b> -01:-20 <b>6</b> -01:-20 <b>7</b> -01:-20 <b>8</b> -01:-20 <b>9</b> -01:-20 <b>10</b>  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could  |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along  | -01:-20  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning   |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the  | -01:-20  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion   |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me,   | -01:-20  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to  |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's   | -01:-20  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.   |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's essentially identical to the one of DMR.  | -01:-20  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.  There was not an outright resolution on  |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's essentially identical to the one of DMR.  Are you familiar with that?  A. I did not notice that or make that comparison.  | -01:-20  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.  There was not an outright resolution on the council to say we're not going to make the   |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's essentially identical to the one of DMR.  Are you familiar with that?  A. I did not notice that or make that  | -01:-20 2 -01:-20 3 -01:-20 4 -01:-20 5 -01:-20 6 -01:-20 8 -01:-20 9 -01:-20 11 -01:-20 12 -01:-20 13 -01:-19 14 -01:-19 15 -01:-19 16 -01:-19 18 -01:-19 18  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.  There was not an outright resolution on the council to say we're not going to make the changes, but there was also a decision from the council that we're not going to move forward with these. So all it was a proposal. It wasn't an   |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's essentially identical to the one of DMR.  Are you familiar with that?  A. I did not notice that or make that comparison.  Q. But you have looked at the DMR?  A. Yes.   | -01:-20  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.  There was not an outright resolution on the council to say we're not going to make the changes, but there was also a decision from the council that we're not going to move forward with these. So all it was a proposal. It wasn't an official statement from the planning board or master  |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's essentially identical to the one of DMR.  Are you familiar with that?  A. I did not notice that or make that comparison.  Q. But you have looked at the DMR?  A. Yes.  Q. And, obviously, have you compared that  | -01:-20  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.  There was not an outright resolution on the council to say we're not going to make the changes, but there was also a decision from the council that we're not going to move forward with these. So all it was a proposal. It wasn't an official statement from the planning board or master plan or anything else.   |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's essentially identical to the one of DMR.  Are you familiar with that?  A. I did not notice that or make that comparison.  Q. But you have looked at the DMR?  A. Yes.  Q. And, obviously, have you compared that to our list of zoning parameters?                                | -01:-20  | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.  There was not an outright resolution on the council to say we're not going to make the changes, but there was also a decision from the council that we're not going to move forward with these. So all it was a proposal. It wasn't an official statement from the planning board or master plan or anything else.  BY MR. DELIA:  |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's essentially identical to the one of DMR.  Are you familiar with that?  A. I did not notice that or make that comparison.  Q. But you have looked at the DMR?  A. Yes.  Q. And, obviously, have you compared that to our list of zoning parameters?  A. I have not.                | -01:-20 2 -01:-20 3 -01:-20 4 -01:-20 5 -01:-20 6 -01:-20 8 -01:-20 9 -01:-20 10 -01:-20 11 -01:-20 12 -01:-20 13 -01:-19 15 -01:-19 16 -01:-19 17 -01:-19 18 -01:-19 19 -01:-19 20 -01:-19 21 -01:-19 22 -01:-19 23                       | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.  There was not an outright resolution on the council to say we're not going to make the changes, but there was also a decision from the council that we're not going to move forward with these. So all it was a proposal. It wasn't an official statement from the planning board or master plan or anything else.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let's move on.  |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's essentially identical to the one of DMR.  Are you familiar with that?  A. I did not notice that or make that comparison.  Q. But you have looked at the DMR?  A. Yes.  Q. And, obviously, have you compared that to our list of zoning parameters?  A. I have not.  Q. Would you? | -01:-20 2 -01:-20 3 -01:-20 4 -01:-20 5 -01:-20 6 -01:-20 7 -01:-20 9 -01:-20 10 -01:-20 11 -01:-20 12 -01:-20 13 -01:-19 14 -01:-19 15 -01:-19 16 -01:-19 17 -01:-19 18 -01:-19 20 -01:-19 21 -01:-19 21 -01:-19 22 -01:-19 23 -01:-19 24 | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.  There was not an outright resolution on the council to say we're not going to make the changes, but there was also a decision from the council that we're not going to move forward with these. So all it was a proposal. It wasn't an official statement from the planning board or master plan or anything else.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let's move on.  We'll talk about the '08 reexamination. |
| -01:-22   | demand, that has nothing to do with really deals with the positive criteria in the context of our presentation, does it?  A. All I was indicating is that it could, but in your case you've not made that argument. And I don't want the board to be led to believe that this is a hardship case, because it's not, and I think we agree on that.  Q. All right. I'm going to switch gears here now a little bit.  The DMR report that you've cited, along with the Corridor Phase 2, I believe, in one of the re-exams, or one of the corridor reports, excuse me, there is a list of zoning specifications and it's essentially identical to the one of DMR.  Are you familiar with that?  A. I did not notice that or make that comparison.  Q. But you have looked at the DMR?  A. Yes.  Q. And, obviously, have you compared that to our list of zoning parameters?  A. I have not.                | -01:-20 2 -01:-20 3 -01:-20 4 -01:-20 5 -01:-20 6 -01:-20 8 -01:-20 9 -01:-20 10 -01:-20 11 -01:-20 12 -01:-20 13 -01:-19 15 -01:-19 16 -01:-19 17 -01:-19 18 -01:-19 19 -01:-19 20 -01:-19 21 -01:-19 22 -01:-19 23                       | So, yes, there may be standards that they put  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal?  THE WITNESS: I beg your pardon?  MR. NEWMAN: It was a rejected proposal and not adopted?  THE WITNESS: I wouldn't say it was a rejected proposal. They put it forward on two occasions, and on both occasions the borough could not reach a consensus about undertaking the rezoning in concert with that report, and so that discussion has been tabled. That's the best way for me to characterize it.  There was not an outright resolution on the council to say we're not going to make the changes, but there was also a decision from the council that we're not going to move forward with these. So all it was a proposal. It wasn't an official statement from the planning board or master plan or anything else.  BY MR. DELIA:  Q. Okay. Fair enough. Let's move on.  |

|  | 77  |                   | 79  |
|--|---|-------------------|---|
| -01:-19 <b>1</b>                       | point to any specifics in the SO of recommending      | -01:-17 <b>1</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: That's not your                           |
| -01:-19 <b>2</b>                       | residential.  | -01:-17 <b>2</b>  | application. How is that relevant?                    |
| -01:-19 <b>3</b>                       | You will agree that we met a number of                | -01:-17 3         | MR. DELIA: Because he brought it up                   |
| -01:-19 <b>4</b>                       | the objectives that are set forth in the '08          | -01:-17 <b>4</b>  | that we don't have you know, there's no mix here.     |
| -01:-19 <b>5</b>                       | reexamination, would you agree with that?             | -01:-17 <b>5</b>  | He brought it up.                                     |
| -01:-19 <b>6</b>                       | A. You'd have to be specific for me to                | -01:-17 <b>6</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: There's no mixed use                  |
| -01:-19 <b>7</b>                       | comment on that.                                      | -01:-17 <b>7</b>  | allowed and there's solely multifamily residential    |
| -01:-19 <b>8</b>                       | <b>Q</b> . Okay.                                      | -01:-16 8         | permitted.  |
| -01:-19 <b>9</b>                       | A. What objective are you talking about?              | -01:-16 <b>9</b>  | MR. DELIA: Right, and Mr. Preiss                      |
| -01:-19 <b>10</b>                      | Q. We'll see about the objectives.                    | -01:-16 10        | pointed to portions of the Broadway corridor study in |
| -01:-19 <b>11</b>                      | Let's start with:                                     | -01:-16 <b>11</b> | which he says that there is essentially a requirement |
| -01:-19 <b>12</b>                      | "To encourage improvements to the                     | -01:-16 <b>12</b> | for a mixed use.                                      |
| -01:-19 <b>13</b>                      | Broadway business district corridor."                 | -01:-16 13        | We don't have that.                                   |
| -01:-18 <b>14</b>                      | Do you believe that this project would                | -01:-16 <b>14</b> | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No.                               |
| -01:-18 <b>15</b>                      | be a boost for development of the downtown corridor?  | -01:-16 <b>15</b> | MR. NEWMAN: Requirement or                            |
| -01:-18 <b>16</b>                      | A. I think the use is independent of the              | -01:-16 <b>16</b> | recommendation?                                       |
| -01:-18 <b>17</b>                      | improvements. You can undertake improvements without  | -01:-16 <b>17</b> | THE WITNESS: I don't think I said                     |
| -01:-18 <b>18</b>                      | changing the use.                                     | -01:-16 <b>18</b> | that. Let me just see if I can explain it.            |
| -01:-18 <b>19</b>                      | Q. How about "preserving natural                      | -01:-16 <b>19</b> | I said when the recommendations were                  |
| -01:-18 <b>20</b>                      | environment," have we done that here?                 | -01:-16 <b>20</b> | made, the consideration for the area south of         |
| -01:-18 <b>21</b>                      | A. Yeah, but so does the existing office              | -01:-16 <b>21</b> | Highview was only done within the context of mixed    |
| -01:-18 <b>22</b>                      | development.  | -01:-16 <b>22</b> | use.  |
| -01:-18 <b>23</b>                      | Q. If we were to do say something, a                  | -01:-16 <b>23</b> | In other words, the council, when they                |
| -01:-18 <b>24</b>                      | permitted use on the residential aspect, we would be  | -01:-16 <b>24</b> | looked at the DMR study and were proposing to move    |
| -01:-18 <b>25</b>                      | able to do a subdivision of some sort, we can put a   | -01:-16 <b>25</b> | forward and when Fair Share Housing, asked us to      |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.              |                   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.              |
|  | 201-641-1812  |                   | 201-641-1812  |
|  | 78  |                   | 80  |
| -01:-18 <b>1</b>                       | street through there?                                 | -01:-16 <b>1</b>  | consider overlay zoning, the only change that was     |
| -01:-18 <b>2</b>                       | A. I doubt it. I think the steep slope                | -01:-16 <b>2</b>  | seriously given consideration was ground floor retail |
| -01:-18 <b>3</b>                       | ordinance would preclude you from developing that     | -01:-16 <b>3</b>  | with residential above.                               |
| -01:-18 <b>4</b>                       | rear portion anyway.                                  | -01:-16 <b>4</b>  | But even that, as I've indicated, was                 |
| -01:-18 <b>5</b>                       | So the existing office development, it                | -01:-16 <b>5</b>  | not implemented, so, you know, it didn't go anywhere. |
| -01:-18 <b>6</b>                       | preserves the environment just to the same extent     | -01:-16 <b>6</b>  | So whether it was mixed use or solely                 |
| -01:-18 <b>7</b>                       | that this development does.                           | -01:-16 <b>7</b>  | residential, you know, the council has not taken any  |
| -01:-18 <b>8</b>                       | <b>Q.</b> Well, it still preserves it, yes?           | -01:-15 <b>8</b>  | action to implement those recommendations from either |
| -01:-17 <b>9</b>                       | A. You're not encroaching onto it, so if              | -01:-15 <b>9</b>  | of those sources, DMR or from the Broadway corridor   |
| -01:-17 <b>10</b>                      | you look at it from a negative criteria point of      | -01:-15 <b>10</b> | study.  |
| -01:-17 <b>11</b>                      | view, you're doing no additional harm to the natural  | -01:-15 <b>11</b> | <b>Q.</b> The settlement agreement that you           |
| -01:-17 <b>12</b>                      | environment or disturbance of steep slopes, yes, I    | -01:-15 <b>12</b> | entered or that Woodcliff Lake entered into, while    |
| -01:-17 <b>13</b>                      | would agree with that.                                | -01:-15 <b>13</b> | you stated that there was no demand or requirement    |
| -01:-17 <b>14</b>                      | <b>Q.</b> Okay. In terms of, let's talk about         | -01:-15 <b>14</b> | from affordable housing to include an overlay zone    |
| -01:-17 <b>15</b>                      | the orientation of this property, its topography, its | -01:-15 <b>15</b> | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Objection. He didn't                  |
| -01:-17 <b>16</b>                      | distance off of Broadway.                             | -01:-15 <b>16</b> | say that.   |
| -01:-17 <b>17</b>                      | Do you believe that a mixed-use                       | -01:-15 <b>17</b> | MR. DELIA: He did.                                    |
| -01:-17 18                             | development here is appropriate, based on the         | -01:-15 18        | MR. PRINCIOTTO: He didn't say there                   |
| -01:-17 <b>19</b>                      | physical features of the property?                    | -01:-15 19        | was no demand. He said what the resolution was.       |
| -01:-17 <b>20</b>                      | MR. NEWMAN: A mixed-use development?                  | -01:-15 <b>20</b> | BY MR. DELIA:   |
| -01:-17 <b>21</b>                      | MR. DELIA: Mixed use.                                 | -01:-15 <b>21</b> | Q. You advised them that you could not do             |
| -01:-17 <b>22</b>                      | THE WITNESS: When you say "mixed use,"                | -01:-15 22        | an overlay zone and they accepted that?               |
| -01:-17 <b>23</b>                      | you're saying   | -01:-15 <b>23</b> | A. Basically the way it went is Fair Share            |
| . 04                                   | D1/14D DELTA  | -01:-15 <b>24</b> | Housing Center said we would like you to consider     |
| -01:-17 <b>24</b>                      | BY MR. DELIA:   |                   | - ,   |
| -01:-17 <b>24</b><br>-01:-17 <b>25</b> | <b>Q.</b> Retail and residential.                     | -01:-15 <b>25</b> | doing an overlay zone to provide additional           |
|  |   |                   | - ,   |

|  | 81   |  | 83   |
|--|--|--|--|
| -01:-15 <b>1</b>   | affordable housing to meet your unmet need.  | -01:-12 <b>1</b>   | completely different character and it has different  |
| -01:-15 <b>2</b>   | And, basically, the settlement was   | -01:-12 <b>2</b>   | zoning than the area south of Highview.  |
| -01:-14 <b>3</b>   | negotiated, was done without that change.  | -01:-12 <b>3</b>   | <b>Q.</b> It's similar in terms of its distance,   |
| -01:-14 <b>4</b>   | So Fair Share Housing Center accepted  | -01:-12 4  | essentially, to the train station, more or less,   |
| -01:-14 <b>5</b>   | that, the borough could meet its unmet need  | -01:-12 <b>5</b>   | right?   |
| -01:-14 <b>6</b>   | obligation as well as its prospective unmet need   | -01:-12 <b>6</b>   | A. It's probably closer, but not a   |
| -01:-14 <b>7</b>   | obligation without undertaking that result.  | -01:-12 <b>7</b>   | substantial. I'm not disputing that the distance of  |
| -01:-14 <b>8</b>   | Q. Yet that same document also does  | -01:-12 <b>8</b>   | this property to the train station does make it what   |
| -01:-14 <b>9</b>   | require set aside, yes? A set aside of affordable  | -01:-11 <b>9</b>   | I would characterize as a transit-oriented   |
| -01:-14 <b>10</b>  | housing in the event of a multiunit project such as  | -01:-11 <b>10</b>  | development, yes.  |
| -01:-14 <b>11</b>  | ours?  | -01:-11 <b>11</b>  | <b>Q.</b> But that small distance difference is  |
| -01:-14 <b>12</b>  | A. Right.  | -01:-11 <b>12</b>  | what makes   |
| -01:-14 <b>13</b>  | So, to be clear, both that document and  | -01:-11 <b>13</b>  | A. It doesn't make a difference.   |
| -01:-14 <b>14</b>  | an ordinance that was adopted and which has just been  | -01:-11 <b>14</b>  | <b>Q.</b> So there really is no major character  |
| -01:-14 <b>15</b>  | readopted, which changes the affordable housing  | -01:-11 <b>15</b>  | distinction between these two properties, is there?  |
| -01:-14 <b>16</b>  | regulations in Woodcliff Lake, basically says where  | -01:-11 <b>16</b>  | A. No, there's a very substantial  |
| -01:-14 17   | you have a rezoning or a grant of variance or do a   | -01:-11 <b>17</b>  | difference. The property has been rezoned  |
| -01:-14 18   | redevelopment and you produce more than five units,  | -01:-11 18   | specifically for, you know, affordable housing in  |
| -01:-14 19   | an inclusionary element is required.   | -01:-11 19   | both of those instances. There is only one small   |
| -01:-14 <b>20</b>  | So all it's saying is the zoning board   | -01:-11 20   | retail use on the corner of Highview and Broadway,   |
| -01:-14 <b>21</b>  | is not obligated under the terms of that requirement   | -01:-11 21   | and the rest of the properties are residential, or,  |
| -01:-13 <b>22</b><br>-01:-13 <b>23</b>   | to grant the variance; however, if it does grant the   | -01:-11 <b>22</b><br>-01:-11 <b>23</b>   | in the case of the VFW, it's a small institutional use or are vacant.  |
| -01:-13 <b>23</b>  | variance, it has to require that set aside. That's all it says.  | -01:-11 <b>23</b>  | So the zoning history, the intent of   |
| -01:-13 <b>24</b>  | <b>Q.</b> Okay. And it's obviously contemplated  | -01:-11 <b>25</b>  | the borough in terms of utilizing it for a   |
| -0113 20   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   | -0111 23   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  | 201-641-1812   |  | 201-641-1812   |
|  | 82   |  | 84   |
| -01:-13 <b>1</b>   | in the context of this application, the set aside,   | -01:-11 <b>1</b>   | residential project, it's in the Housing Element and   |
| -01:-13 <b>2</b>   | you brought it up at the first hearing I was at and  | -01:-11 <b>2</b>   | Fair Share Plan. There's a redevelopment plan in   |
| -01:-13 <b>3</b>   | you mentioned it many times.   | -01:-11 <b>3</b>   | progress in which that is going to be developed for  |
| -01:-13 <b>4</b>   | Is that correct?   | -01:-10 <b>4</b>   | residential use.   |
| -01:-13 <b>5</b>   |  |  |  |
| -0113  | A. I don't think it was contemplated. All  | -01:-10 <b>5</b>   | Whereas, the area south of Broadway is   |
| -01:-13  | A. I don't think it was contemplated. All I said is that when the application was made, I  | -01:-10 <b>5</b><br>-01:-10 <b>6</b>   | Whereas, the area south of Broadway is not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for  |
| _  | -  | _  | •  |
| -01:-13 <b>6</b><br>-01:-13 <b>7</b><br>-01:-13 <b>8</b>   | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a   | -01:-10 <b>6</b><br>-01:-10 <b>7</b><br>-01:-10 <b>8</b>   | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.   |
| -01:-13 <b>6</b> -01:-13 <b>7</b> -01:-13 <b>8</b> -01:-13 <b>9</b>  | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  | -01:-10 <b>6</b> -01:-10 <b>7</b> -01:-10 <b>8</b> -01:-10 <b>9</b>  | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land  |
| -01:-13 <b>6</b> -01:-13 <b>7</b> -01:-13 <b>8</b> -01:-13 <b>9</b> -01:-13 <b>10</b>  | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north   | -01:-10 <b>6</b> -01:-10 <b>7</b> -01:-10 <b>8</b> -01:-10 <b>9</b> -01:-10 <b>10</b>  | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning  |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 9 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11  | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for   | -01:-10 <b>6</b> -01:-10 <b>7</b> -01:-10 <b>8</b> -01:-10 <b>9</b> -01:-10 <b>10</b> -01:-10 <b>11</b>  | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and  |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 9 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12   | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  | -01:-10 <b>6</b> -01:-10 <b>7</b> -01:-10 <b>8</b> -01:-10 <b>9</b> -01:-10 <b>10</b> -01:-10 <b>11</b>  | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 9 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13  | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 9 -01:-10 10 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13  | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done,  |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 9 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 14   | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 9 -01:-10 10 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 14   | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?   |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 14 -01:-13 15  | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 9 -01:-10 10 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 14 -01:-10 15  | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.   |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 14 -01:-13 15 -01:-13 16   | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and,   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 9 -01:-10 10 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 14   | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't   |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 14 -01:-13 15  | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 10 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 14 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 16   | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.   |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 9 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 14 -01:-13 15 -01:-13 16 -01:-13 17   | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and, moreover, the borough had purchased that property   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 9 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 14 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 16 -01:-10 17   | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't want to make you come back.   |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 15 -01:-13 16 -01:-13 17 -01:-12 18  | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and, moreover, the borough had purchased that property specifically to provide affordable housing and it's   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 9 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 16 -01:-10 17 -01:-10 18   | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't want to make you come back.  MR. DELIA: I don't want to come back   |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 15 -01:-13 16 -01:-13 17 -01:-12 18 -01:-12 19                                 | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and, moreover, the borough had purchased that property specifically to provide affordable housing and it's part of the fair share settlement, as is the ability  | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 10 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 16 -01:-10 17 -01:-10 18 -01:-10 19   | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't want to make you come back.  MR. DELIA: I don't want to come back either.   |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 14 -01:-13 15 -01:-13 16 -01:-13 17 -01:-12 18 -01:-12 19 -01:-12 20                      | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and, moreover, the borough had purchased that property specifically to provide affordable housing and it's part of the fair share settlement, as is the ability to develop units on the VFW.   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 10 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 17 -01:-10 18 -01:-10 19 -01:-10 20  | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't want to make you come back.  MR. DELIA: I don't want to come back either.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We have to give  |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 15 -01:-13 16 -01:-12 18 -01:-12 19 -01:-12 20 -01:-12 21                      | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and, moreover, the borough had purchased that property specifically to provide affordable housing and it's part of the fair share settlement, as is the ability to develop units on the VFW.  So that area, which is north of  | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 9 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 16 -01:-10 17 -01:-10 18 -01:-10 19 -01:-10 20 -01:-10 21                                  | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't want to make you come back.  MR. DELIA: I don't want to come back either.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We have to give everybody here an opportunity to speak, and that's a   |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 15 -01:-13 16 -01:-12 18 -01:-12 20 -01:-12 21 -01:-12 22                      | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and, moreover, the borough had purchased that property specifically to provide affordable housing and it's part of the fair share settlement, as is the ability to develop units on the VFW.  So that area, which is north of Highview, currently there's only one retail use,   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 9 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 16 -01:-10 17 -01:-10 18 -01:-10 20 -01:-10 21 -01:-10 22                                  | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't want to make you come back.  MR. DELIA: I don't want to come back either.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We have to give everybody here an opportunity to speak, and that's a problem. That's a problem.  |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 10 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 14 -01:-13 15 -01:-13 16 -01:-13 17 -01:-12 18 -01:-12 20 -01:-12 21 -01:-12 23           | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and, moreover, the borough had purchased that property specifically to provide affordable housing and it's part of the fair share settlement, as is the ability to develop units on the VFW.  So that area, which is north of Highview, currently there's only one retail use, which is right on the corner, the rest of those   | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 10 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 14 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 17 -01:-10 18 -01:-10 19 -01:-10 20 -01:-10 21 -01:-10 22 -01:-10 23           | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't want to make you come back.  MR. DELIA: I don't want to come back either.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We have to give everybody here an opportunity to speak, and that's a problem. That's a problem.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Let's not argue about that.  MR. DELIA: If I may, I've been on my |
| -01:-13 6 -01:-13 7 -01:-13 8 -01:-13 9 -01:-13 11 -01:-13 12 -01:-13 13 -01:-13 15 -01:-13 16 -01:-12 18 -01:-12 20 -01:-12 21 -01:-12 22 -01:-12 23 -01:-12 24 | I said is that when the application was made, I alerted the applicant and the board to the fact that if the board were going to approve the development, a set aside would be required.  Q. Okay. You mentioned the property north of us that's been redeveloped or approved for redevelopment.  From a planning perspective, how is that any appreciably different than our property?  A. Well, two things. It's north of Highview, which is in the R-15 district, and, moreover, the borough had purchased that property specifically to provide affordable housing and it's part of the fair share settlement, as is the ability to develop units on the VFW.  So that area, which is north of Highview, currently there's only one retail use, which is right on the corner, the rest of those properties, aside from the VFW, are single-family | -01:-10 6 -01:-10 7 -01:-10 8 -01:-10 9 -01:-10 11 -01:-10 12 -01:-10 13 -01:-10 15 -01:-10 16 -01:-10 17 -01:-10 18 -01:-10 19 -01:-10 20 -01:-10 21 -01:-10 22 -01:-10 23 -01:-10 24 | not part of the fair share plan, either proposed for rezoning or as an overlay zone to allow residential use either by itself or in a mixed-use context.  So those properties have different land use characteristics and have a different zoning history, and, obviously, from a master plan and zoning point of view, are completely different.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you almost done, Mr. Delia?  MR. DELIA: Almost. It's close.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay, because we don't want to make you come back.  MR. DELIA: I don't want to come back either.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We have to give everybody here an opportunity to speak, and that's a problem. That's a problem.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Let's not argue about that.                                       |

|  | 85  |  | 87   |
|--|---|--|--|
| -01:-10 <b>1</b>                       | feet here now for six months. All right. And for  | -01:-08 <b>1</b>                       | witness.   |
| -01:-10 <b>2</b>                       | many reasons, we've gone home, it had nothing to do   | -01:-08 <b>2</b>                       | Thank you.   |
| -01:-10 <b>3</b>                       | with me.  | -01:-08 <b>3</b>                       | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.   |
| -01:-10 4                              | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Let's finish.   | -01:-07 <b>4</b>                       | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I'm going to give  |
| -01:-09 <b>5</b>                       | MR. DELIA: I'm really trying my   | -01:-07 <b>5</b>                       | her a break after he takes his question.   |
| -01:-09 <b>6</b>                       | hardest to get it done. But, with all due respect, I  | -01:-07 <b>6</b>                       | MR. HAYES: I just have a question.   |
| -01:-09 <b>7</b>                       | need the liberty to properly  | -01:-07 <b>7</b>                       | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Speak into the   |
| -01:-09 <b>8</b>                       | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I asked the question,   | -01:-07 <b>8</b>                       | mic.   |
| -01:-09 <b>9</b>                       | okay.   | -01:-07 <b>9</b>                       | MR. HAYES: Is the idea that there are  |
| -01:-09 <b>10</b>                      | MR. DELIA: Let me finish it with this.  | -01:-07 <b>10</b>                      | changed circumstances since the last reexamination   |
| -01:-09 <b>11</b>                      | BY MR. DELIA:   | -01:-07 <b>11</b>                      | mitigated in any respect by the fact that the council  |
| -01:-09 <b>12</b>                      | <b>Q.</b> We know that affordable housing is  | -01:-07 <b>12</b>                      | has considered mixed use in the Broadway corridor and  |
| -01:-09 <b>13</b>                      | deemed by the courts to be an inherently beneficial   | -01:-07 <b>13</b>                      | purposely chosen not take any action?  |
| -01:-09 <b>14</b>                      | use, correct?   | -01:-07 <b>14</b>                      | THE WITNESS: I think one has to look   |
| -01:-09 15                             | A. I think you have to distinguish it.  | -01:-07 15                             | at all the changed circumstances in the past, you  |
| -01:-09 16                             | An inclusionary affordable housing  | -01:-07 16                             | know, 10-and-a-half, 11 years, so I think the  |
| -01:-09 17                             | development is not considered to be an inherently   | -01:-07 <b>17</b>                      | applicant is correct, there has been a change,   |
| -01:-09 <b>18</b><br>-01:-09 <b>19</b> | beneficial use. If you're a 100-percent affordable  | -01:-07 18                             | there's a greater awareness of TOD, there's been a   |
| -01:-09 <b>19</b><br>-01:-09 <b>20</b> | housing project, it is.   | -01:-07 <b>19</b>                      | change in the real estate market, but, at the same   |
| -01:-09 <b>20</b><br>-01:-09 <b>21</b> | So your project is not an inherently beneficial use.  | -01:-07 <b>20</b><br>-01:-07 <b>21</b> | time, there have been actions that have been   |
| -01:-09 <b>21</b><br>-01:-09 <b>22</b> | Q. Understood.  | -01:-07 <b>21</b><br>-01:-07 <b>22</b> | undertaken by the council with regard to   |
| -01:-09 <b>22</b><br>-01:-09 <b>23</b> | If there was a change in circumstances  | -01:-07 <b>22</b><br>-01:-07 <b>23</b> | consideration of zoning.  So I think the zoning board needs to   |
| -01:-09 <b>23</b>                      | and we came back here   | -01:-07 <b>23</b>                      | take all of those into consideration to determine  |
| -01:-09 <b>24</b>                      | MR. PRINCIOTTO: No. No summation  | -01:-07 <b>25</b>                      | whether the change in circumstances are sufficient in  |
| -0103 20                               | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  | -0107                                  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  | 201-641-1812  |  | 201-641-1812   |
|  | 86  |  | 88   |
| -01:-09 <b>1</b>                       | right now. Okay. A question, okay?  | -01:-06 <b>1</b>                       | their mind to reconcile the fact that this use is not  |
| -01:-09 <b>2</b>                       | BY MR. DELIA:   | -01:-06 <b>2</b>                       | permitted in the zone.   |
| -01:-09 <b>3</b>                       | <b>Q.</b> Question: If we were to have a fully  | -01:-06 <b>3</b>                       | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thank you.   |
| -01:-09 <b>4</b>                       | affordable project applied for here, let's say 100  | -01:-06 <b>4</b>                       | REDIRECT EXAMINATION   |
| -01:-09 <b>5</b>                       | units, is that something that you think we would, A,  | -01:-06 <b>5</b>                       | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:   |
| -01:-08 <b>6</b>                       | meet the positive criteria?   | -01:-06 <b>6</b>                       | <b>Q.</b> But the mayor and council looked at the  |
| -01:-08 <b>7</b>                       | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Objection. That's not   | -01:-06 <b>7</b>                       | Broadway corridor at least three times, two in 2017,   |
| -01:-08                                | your application.   | -01:-06 8                              | once towards the settlement for the affordable   |
| -01:-08 9                              | MR. NEWMAN: Actually I'd like him to  | -01:-06 9                              | housing issue.   |
| -01:-08 10                             | answer that, because that's not this application,   | -01:-06 10                             | A. Right.  |
| -01:-08 <b>11</b><br>-01:-08 <b>12</b> | that would be a completely different application, and   | -01:-06 <b>11</b><br>-01:-06 <b>12</b> | Q. They were aware of any changed  |
| -01:-08 <b>12</b><br>-01:-08 <b>13</b> | I actually think that in the event that this was an application to satisfy our affordable housing in this | -01:-06 <b>12</b><br>-01:-06 <b>13</b> | circumstances, and, in 2017, when they also looked at it, they were aware of any changed circumstances, as |
| -01:-08 14                             | application to satisfy our arrordable flousing in this application, it might make a difference.           | -01:-06 14                             | well as in 2018.   |
| -01:-08 <b>14</b><br>-01:-08 <b>15</b> | THE WITNESS: So it's a hypothetical   | -01:-06 <b>14</b>                      | Isn't that right?  |
| -01:-08 <b>16</b>                      | question. Obviously, just throwing it out and saying  | -01:-06 16                             | A. Yes, I would say so. I mean, you know,  |
| -01:-08 <b>17</b>                      | would you, I mean, it would depend on so many   | -01:-06 <b>17</b>                      | the presentations and the consideration were done  |
| -01:-08 <b>18</b>                      | circumstances.  | -01:-06 <b>18</b>                      | within the context of those changed circumstances.   |
| -01:-08 <b>19</b>                      | What I would say is that the burden of  | -01:-06 <b>19</b>                      | You know, TOD, revitalizing the downtown, creating   |
| -01:-08 <b>20</b>                      | proof would change substantially if this was a  | -01:-06 <b>20</b>                      | more retail space, those were all circumstances which  |
| -01:-08 <b>21</b>                      | 100-percent affordable housing project and the proofs   | -01:-05 <b>21</b>                      | had been changed in which the council was aware of   |
| -01:-08 <b>22</b>                      | would be different. We wouldn't be talking about an   | -01:-05 <b>22</b>                      | when they weighed those considerations.  |
| -01:-08 <b>23</b>                      | enhanced burden of proof under Medici, for example.   | -01:-05 <b>23</b>                      | MR. DELIA: But it was not done in the  |
| -01:-08 <b>24</b>                      | MR. DELIA: Well, again, do you I  | -01:-05 <b>24</b>                      | context of a master plan reexamination?  |
| -01:-08 <b>25</b>                      | withdraw the question. I am concluded with this   | -01:-05 <b>25</b>                      | THE WITNESS: That is correct.  |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  | 201-641-1812  | 99 of 227                              | 201-641-1812   |

|                   | 89   |                  |        | 91   |
|-------------------|--|------------------|--------|--|
| -01:-05 <b>1</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. I'm acutely                                  | 00:-55           | 1      | permitted in Woodcliff Lake.                             |
| -01:-05 <b>2</b>  | aware that it's 9:30. We have to take a break so                       | 00:-55           | 2      | So my question to you is, tell me any                    |
| -01:-05 <b>3</b>  | that this poor young woman can stand up, at least, so                  | 00:-55           | 3      | other development in Woodcliff Lake that is even         |
| -01:-05 <b>4</b>  | you all can stand up. I don't see how we can finish                    | 00:-55           | 4      | close to what the applicant is asking?                   |
| -01:-05 <b>5</b>  | this, I honestly don't. I really don't. I mean, I'm                    | 00:-54           | 5      | THE WITNESS: Okay. So I'm not saying                     |
| -01:-05 <b>6</b>  | good, but I'm not that good.   | 00:-54           | 6      | it has similar characteristics in terms of its           |
| -01:-05 <b>7</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well   | 00:-54           | 7      | aesthetics or its location, what I was indicating was    |
| -01:-05 <b>8</b>  | AUDIENCE VOICE: We have 13 members of                                  | 00:-54           | 8      | the applicant provided an exhibit, which I think was     |
| -01:-05 <b>9</b>  | the public.  | 00:-54           | 9      | A-8, in which they compared the density, the height,     |
| -01:-05 <b>10</b> | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We have to listen                                  | 00:-54           | 10     | the setbacks that are in the zoning ordinance which      |
| -01:-05 <b>11</b> | to the members. They haven't even asked Mr. Preiss a                   | 00:-54           | 11     | permits multifamily development with what this           |
| -01:-05 <b>12</b> | question.  | 00:-54           | 12     | project provided, and there's a substantial degree of    |
| -01:-05 <b>13</b> | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Take a 5-minute break.                                 | 00:-54           | 13     | similarity, so   |
| -01:-05 <b>14</b> | MR. DELIA: All we can do is proceed.                                   | 00:-54           | 14     | MR. PADOVER: Well, wait, wait, wait.                     |
| -01:-05 <b>15</b> | That's all I ask, we continue and see                                  | 00:-54           | 15     | THE WITNESS: Can I finish the answer?                    |
| -01:-05 <b>16</b> | where we land.   | 00:-54           | 16     | MR. PADOVER: Yes.  |
| -01:-05 <b>17</b> | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.  | 00:-54           |        | THE WITNESS: So with regard to the                       |
| 00:-58 18         | (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)                                  | 00:-54           |        | bulk requirements, there is a similarity; with           |
| 00:-58 19         | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Let's take                                   | 00:-54           |        | respect to other characteristics, there are              |
| 00:-56 <b>20</b>  | our seats and continue.  | 00:-54           | _      | differences.   |
| 00:-56 <b>21</b>  | I think we need a motion to open to the                                | 00:-54           |        | MR. PADOVER: So that in my mind is an                    |
| 00:-56 <b>22</b>  | public.  | 00:-54           |        | unfair characterization.                                 |
| 00:-56 <b>23</b>  | MS. SMITH: Just a minute. I have to                                    | 00:-54           | _      | MR. HAYES: Question, please.                             |
| 00:-56 24         | turn it back on.   | 00:-54           |        | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Questions at the end.                    |
| 00:-56 <b>25</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Oh, sorry.   | 00:-54           | 25     | That's a comment.  |
|                   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812               |                  |        | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812 |
|                   | 90   |                  |        | 92   |
| 00:-56 <b>1</b>   | MS. SMITH: Okay.   | 00:-54           | 1      | Listen to his testimony. He said in                      |
| 00:-56 <b>2</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We need a motion                                   | 00:-54           | 2      | the bulk requirements, there are noted similarities.     |
| 00:-56 <b>3</b>   | to open to the public for questions of Mr. Preiss                      | 00:-54           | 3      | He didn't say in every other aspect they were            |
| 00:-56 4          | only, no opinions, just questions.                                     | 00:-53           | 4      | similar.   |
| 00:-56 <b>5</b>   | May I have a motion to open to the                                     | 00:-53           | 5      | MR. PADOVER: So in a very small way,                     |
| 00:-56 6          | public?  | 00:-53           | 6      | in my mind, it's similar, but the nature of the          |
| 00:-55 7          | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Motion to open to                                   | 00:-53           | 7      | project is   |
| 00:-55 <b>8</b>   | the public for questions only.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Is there a second? | 00:-53           | 8<br>9 | MR. HAYES: Wait for the comment portion.                 |
| 00:-55 9          | MR. NEWMAN: I will second to open it                                   | 00:-53<br>00:-53 |        | MR. DELIA: By the way, it's A-18, not                    |
| 00:-55 11         | to the public for questions only of the borough's                      | 00:-53           |        | A-8.   |
| 00:-55 12         | representative, Mr. Preiss.  | 00:-53           |        | THE WITNESS: I'm sorry.                                  |
| 00:-55 13         | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?                                      | 00:-53           |        | MR. DELIA: I just want the record                        |
| 00:-55 14         | (Whereupon, all resent members respond                                 | 00:-53           |        | cleared up.  |
| 00:-55 <b>15</b>  | in the affirmative.)   | 00:-53           |        | MR. COUTO: Alex Couto, 18 Cressfield                     |
| 00:-55 <b>16</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?   | 00:-53           |        | Court.   |
| 00:-55 17         | (No response.)   | 00:-53           | 17     | Mr. Preiss, do you know the date of                      |
| 00:-55 18         | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So if you have a                                   | 00:-53           | 18     | this application, when was the date, more or less?       |
| 00:-55 19         | question, please come forward, state your name and                     | 00:-53           | 19     | MR. NEWMAN: If you know.                                 |
| 00:-55 <b>20</b>  | address and your question.   | 00:-53           | 20     | MR. COUTO: If you know, more or less.                    |
| 00:-55 <b>21</b>  | MR. PADOVER: Okay. My name is Craig                                    | 00:-53           | 21     | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think it was filed                     |
| 00:-55 <b>22</b>  | Padover. I live at 27 Campbell Avenue in town.                         | 00:-53           | 22     | in May or April of 2018.                                 |
| 00:-55 <b>23</b>  | I may have mischaracterized something                                  | 00:-53           | 23     | I'm not under oath.                                      |
| 00:-55 <b>24</b>  | you said, but I thought you said that this                             | 00:-53           | 24     | MR. COUTO: There is a question mostly                    |
| 00:-55 <b>25</b>  | application was not uncharacteristic of other housing                  | 00:-53           | 25     | to you. So the zoning laws                               |
| İ                 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                               |                  |        | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                 |
|                   | 201-641-1812   |                  |        | 201-641-1812   |

|   |   | 1  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| 00: 52 4  | 93<br>CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: For Mr. Preiss?   | 00: 54   | 95  |
| 00:-53 <b>1</b> 00:-53 <b>2</b>   |   | 00:-51 <b>1</b> 00:-51 <b>2</b>  | Are you familiar with the size of north   |
| 00:-53 <b>2</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: Nope, only Mr. Preiss.  Mr. Couto, don't be afraid if you don't have one.   | 00:-51 <b>2</b> 00:-51 <b>3</b>  | of Highview, the properties that were assigned for affordable housing, the size of those properties in  |
| 00:-53 4  | MR. COUTO: No, no.  | 00:-51 4   | relation to 188, are they similar, slightly larger or   |
| 00:-53 <b>5</b>   | The zoning laws that apply would be the   | 00:-50 <b>5</b>  | smaller, from your point of view?   |
|   |   | 00:-50 6   |   |
| 00:-53 <b>6</b> 00:-52 <b>7</b>   | zoning laws active in May 2018, is that of the application time?  | 00:-50 7   | THE WITNESS: When you say "properties," what are you referring to?  |
| 00:-52 7  | THE WITNESS: There's something known  | 00:-50 8   | MR. COUTO: The ones that are being set  |
| 00:-52 <b>9</b>   | as time of application, which means that the  | 00:-50 9   | aside for affordable housing.   |
| 00:-52 10   | application is bound by the zoning that existed at  | 00:-50 10  | THE WITNESS: The three properties that  |
| 00:-52 11   | the time that the application was deemed complete,  | 00:-50 11  | are being set aside?  |
| 00:-52 11   | not at the time when the application was decided.   | 00:-50 12  | MR. COUTO: Yes, the three together.   |
| 00:-52 13   | MR. COUTO: Was deemed complete.   | 00:-50 13  | THE WITNESS: It's 2.45 acres, the   |
| 00:-52 14   | So the zoning laws could encompass a  | 00:-50 14  | three properties together.  |
| 00:-52 15   | year?   | 00:-50 15  | MR. COUTO: So it's a little smaller,  |
| 00:-52 16   | THE WITNESS: Yes, if after that period  | 00:-50 16  | slightly smaller than this application.   |
| 00:-52 17   | of time the zoning law had changed, it would not  | 00:-50 17  | THE WITNESS: Yes.   |
| 00:-52 17   | apply to this property in terms of the use variance,  | 00:-50 17  | MR. COUTO: Okay. Were you at the last   |
| 00:-52 10   | unless it made it a permitted use, and, under those   | 00:-50 19  | council meeting where they had the proposals for  |
| 00:-52 10   | circumstances, there would be an acknowledgment that  | 00:-50 <b>20</b>   | those affordable housing was reviewed?  |
| 00:-52 <b>21</b>  | the new laws would apply.   | 00:-50 <b>21</b>   | THE WITNESS: Yes.   |
| 00:-52 <b>21</b>  | But if there were changes which, you  | 00:-50 22  | MR. COUTO: So from what I recall, and   |
| 00:-52 <b>23</b>  | know, which created further inconsistencies or  | 00:-50 23  | you tell me if I'm incorrect, was three applications  |
| 00:-52 <b>24</b>  | variances, that would not apply to this particular  | 00:-50 <b>24</b>   |   |
| 00:-52 <b>25</b>  | project.  | 00:-50 <b>25</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: We're talking   |
| 00.02 20  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  | 00.00 20   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812  |  | 201-641-1812  |
|   |   |  |   |
|   | 94  |  | 96  |
| 00:-52 <b>1</b>   | 94<br>CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your  | 00:-50 <b>1</b>  |   |
| 00:-52 <b>1</b> 00:-52 <b>2</b>   |   | 00:-50 <b>1</b> 00:-50 <b>2</b>  | 96  |
|   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your  |  | 96 about this testimony tonight.  |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  | 00:-50 <b>2</b>  | 96 about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.   |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>3</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr   | 00:-50 <b>2</b> 00:-50 <b>3</b>  | 96 about this testimony tonight. MR. COUTO: Yes. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened  |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>3</b> 00:-52 <b>4</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is   | 00:-50 <b>2</b> 00:-50 <b>3</b> 00:-50 <b>4</b>  | 96 about this testimony tonight. MR. COUTO: Yes. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>3</b> 00:-52 <b>4</b> 00:-51 <b>5</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a  | 00:-50 <b>2</b> 00:-50 <b>3</b> 00:-50 <b>4</b> 00:-50 <b>5</b>  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the   |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>3</b> 00:-52 <b>4</b> 00:-51 <b>5</b> 00:-51 <b>6</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr  MR. COUTO: My question is  MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  | 00:-50 <b>2</b> 00:-50 <b>3</b> 00:-50 <b>4</b> 00:-50 <b>5</b> 00:-50 <b>6</b>  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>3</b> 00:-52 <b>4</b> 00:-51 <b>5</b> 00:-51 <b>6</b> 00:-51 <b>7</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr  MR. COUTO: My question is  MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning   | 00:-50 <b>2</b> 00:-50 <b>3</b> 00:-50 <b>4</b> 00:-50 <b>5</b> 00:-50 <b>6</b> 00:-50 <b>7</b>  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16,  |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>3</b> 00:-52 <b>4</b> 00:-51 <b>5</b> 00:-51 <b>6</b> 00:-51 <b>7</b> 00:-51 <b>8</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  | 00:-50 <b>2</b> 00:-50 <b>3</b> 00:-50 <b>4</b> 00:-50 <b>5</b> 00:-50 <b>6</b> 00:-50 <b>7</b> 00:-50 <b>8</b>  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>3</b> 00:-52 <b>4</b> 00:-51 <b>5</b> 00:-51 <b>6</b> 00:-51 <b>7</b> 00:-51 <b>8</b> 00:-51 <b>9</b> 00:-51 <b>10</b> 00:-51 <b>11</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something. Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too,   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 9 00:-50 10 00:-50 11  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the  |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>3</b> 00:-52 <b>4</b> 00:-51 <b>5</b> 00:-51 <b>6</b> 00:-51 <b>7</b> 00:-51 <b>8</b> 00:-51 <b>9</b> 00:-51 <b>10</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel  | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 9 00:-50 10  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.   |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>3</b> 00:-52 <b>4</b> 00:-51 <b>5</b> 00:-51 <b>6</b> 00:-51 <b>7</b> 00:-51 <b>8</b> 00:-51 <b>9</b> 00:-51 <b>10</b> 00:-51 <b>11</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 9 00:-50 10 00:-50 11  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  |
| 00:-52 <b>2</b> 00:-52 <b>4</b> 00:-51 <b>5</b> 00:-51 <b>6</b> 00:-51 <b>7</b> 00:-51 <b>8</b> 00:-51 <b>9</b> 00:-51 <b>10</b> 00:-51 <b>11</b> 00:-51 <b>12</b> 00:-51 <b>13</b> 00:-51 <b>14</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 9 00:-50 10 00:-50 11  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?   |
| 00:-52 2 00:-52 3 00:-52 4 00:-51 5 00:-51 6 00:-51 7 00:-51 8 00:-51 9 00:-51 10 00:-51 11 00:-51 12 00:-51 13 00:-51 14 00:-51 15   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 9 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 14 00:-50 15  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this   |
| 00:-52     2       00:-52     3       00:-52     4       00:-51     5       00:-51     6       00:-51     7       00:-51     9       00:-51     10       00:-51     11       00:-51     12       00:-51     13       00:-51     14       00:-51     15       00:-51     16  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 14 00:-50 15 00:-49 16   | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?   |
| 00:-52 2 00:-52 3 00:-52 4 00:-51 5 00:-51 6 00:-51 7 00:-51 8 00:-51 9 00:-51 10 00:-51 11 00:-51 12 00:-51 13 00:-51 14 00:-51 15 00:-51 16 00:-51 17   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 9 00:-50 10 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 14 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 17  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much.   |
| 00:-52 2 00:-52 3 00:-52 4 00:-51 5 00:-51 6 00:-51 7 00:-51 8 00:-51 10 00:-51 11 00:-51 12 00:-51 13 00:-51 14 00:-51 15 00:-51 16 00:-51 17  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?  THE WITNESS: The master plan   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 9 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 14 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 18  | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.  |
| 00:-52 2 00:-52 3 00:-52 4 00:-51 5 00:-51 6 00:-51 7 00:-51 8 00:-51 10 00:-51 11 00:-51 12 00:-51 13 00:-51 14 00:-51 15 00:-51 16 00:-51 17 00:-51 18 00:-51 19  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?  THE WITNESS: The master plan reexamination was still valid at the time the   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 14 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 18 00:-49 19   | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  |
| 00:-52 2 00:-52 3 00:-52 4 00:-51 5 00:-51 6 00:-51 7 00:-51 8 00:-51 10 00:-51 11 00:-51 12 00:-51 13 00:-51 14 00:-51 15 00:-51 16 00:-51 17 00:-51 18 00:-51 19 00:-51 20  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?  THE WITNESS: The master plan reexamination was still valid at the time the application was made. It's no longer that's the   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 14 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 17 00:-49 18 00:-49 20   | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.  Thank you.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine.   |
| 00:-52 2 00:-52 3 00:-52 4 00:-51 5 00:-51 6 00:-51 7 00:-51 8 00:-51 9 00:-51 10 00:-51 11 00:-51 12 00:-51 13 00:-51 15 00:-51 15 00:-51 17 00:-51 18 00:-51 19 00:-51 20 00:-51 21   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?  THE WITNESS: The master plan reexamination was still valid at the time the application was made. It's no longer that's the case.   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 9 00:-50 10 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 14 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 17 00:-49 18 00:-49 19 00:-49 20 00:-49 21                      | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.  Thank you.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine.  I just have two questions for the  |
| 00:-52 2 00:-52 3 00:-52 4 00:-51 5 00:-51 6 00:-51 7 00:-51 8 00:-51 10 00:-51 11 00:-51 12 00:-51 13 00:-51 14 00:-51 15 00:-51 16 00:-51 17 00:-51 18 00:-51 19 00:-51 20 00:-51 21  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?  THE WITNESS: The master plan reexamination was still valid at the time the application was made. It's no longer that's the case.  MR. COUTO: So that's something I guess   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 17 00:-49 18 00:-49 19 00:-49 20 00:-49 21 00:-49 22                     | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.  Thank you.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine.  I just have two questions for the  |
| 00:-52     2       00:-52     3       00:-51     5       00:-51     7       00:-51     8       00:-51     9       00:-51     10       00:-51     12       00:-51     13       00:-51     14       00:-51     15       00:-51     16       00:-51     17       00:-51     18       00:-51     19       00:-51     20       00:-51     21       00:-51     23                     | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?  THE WITNESS: The master plan reexamination was still valid at the time the application was made. It's no longer that's the case.  MR. COUTO: So that's something I guess that counsel will have to decide.   | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 17 00:-49 18 00:-49 20 00:-49 21 00:-49 22 00:-49 23                     | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine.  I just have two questions for the planner.  Has the applicant clearly demonstrated   |
| 00:-52     2       00:-52     3       00:-51     5       00:-51     7       00:-51     8       00:-51     9       00:-51     10       00:-51     11       00:-51     12       00:-51     14       00:-51     15       00:-51     16       00:-51     17       00:-51     18       00:-51     20       00:-51     21       00:-51     22       00:-51     23       00:-51     24 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?  THE WITNESS: The master plan reexamination was still valid at the time the application was made. It's no longer that's the case.  MR. COUTO: So that's something I guess that counsel will have to decide.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next question.                                     | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 14 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 17 00:-49 18 00:-49 20 00:-49 21 00:-49 21 00:-49 23 00:-49 24 | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine.  I just have two questions for the planner.  Has the applicant clearly demonstrated that 188 Broadway is not suited for office use?                                     |
| 00:-52     2       00:-52     3       00:-51     5       00:-51     7       00:-51     8       00:-51     9       00:-51     10       00:-51     12       00:-51     13       00:-51     14       00:-51     15       00:-51     16       00:-51     17       00:-51     18       00:-51     19       00:-51     20       00:-51     21       00:-51     23                     | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?  THE WITNESS: The master plan reexamination was still valid at the time the application was made. It's no longer that's the case.  MR. COUTO: So that's something I guess that counsel will have to decide.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next question. MR. COUTO: I have another question. | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 17 00:-49 18 00:-49 20 00:-49 21 00:-49 22 00:-49 23                     | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much.  Thank you.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine.  I just have two questions for the planner.  Has the applicant clearly demonstrated that 188 Broadway is not suited for office use?  THE WITNESS: I think I've made my |
| 00:-52     2       00:-52     3       00:-51     5       00:-51     7       00:-51     8       00:-51     9       00:-51     10       00:-51     11       00:-51     12       00:-51     14       00:-51     15       00:-51     16       00:-51     17       00:-51     18       00:-51     20       00:-51     21       00:-51     22       00:-51     23       00:-51     24 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Your question?  MR. HAYES: Mr MR. COUTO: My question is MR. HAYES: I want to ask you a question just to clarify something.  Do you mean to reference zoning ordinances or the master plan?  MR. COUTO: I'm going to do it too, because the application was in May, and the counsel is saying that the master plan reexamination was not valid. That's in December 2008. So it's 9-and-a-half years to May 2018, it's not 10 years.  So I'm just trying to get a clarification from the point of view, I say maybe the master plan reexamination would still apply. What's your point?  THE WITNESS: The master plan reexamination was still valid at the time the application was made. It's no longer that's the case.  MR. COUTO: So that's something I guess that counsel will have to decide.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next question.                                     | 00:-50 2 00:-50 3 00:-50 4 00:-50 5 00:-50 6 00:-50 7 00:-50 8 00:-50 10 00:-50 11 00:-50 12 00:-50 13 00:-50 14 00:-50 15 00:-49 16 00:-49 17 00:-49 18 00:-49 20 00:-49 21 00:-49 21 00:-49 23 00:-49 24 | about this testimony tonight.  MR. COUTO: Yes.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not what happened at another meeting.  MR. COUTO: I just want to refer to the application.  So was three applications, one for 16, one for 24, and one for 25.  MR. NEWMAN: Objection, outside the scope.  MR. DELIA: Outside the scope.  MR. COUTO: The question is: Did they propose green areas on the back, three of the proposals or at least one of them?  THE WITNESS: It's not relevant to this application.  MR. COUTO: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MS. LEVINE: Gwenn Levine.  I just have two questions for the planner.  Has the applicant clearly demonstrated that 188 Broadway is not suited for office use?                                     |

|   | 97   |   | 99  |
|---|--|---|---|
| 00:-49 <b>1</b>   | testimony clear, and it's up to the board to make  | 00:-47 <b>1</b>   | Does the addition of 60 units that this   |
| 00:-49 <b>2</b>   | that decision.   | 00:-47 <b>2</b>   | applicant is proposing increase Woodcliff Lake's  |
| 00:-49 3  | MS. LEVINE: Okay. So that question   | 00:-47 3  | population due to the units that are being rented,  |
| 00:-49 4  | would be for all of you.   | 00:-47 4  | and does that have an impact on the borough's   |
| 00:-49 <b>5</b>   | Last question.   | 00:-47 <b>5</b>   | requirement of affordable housing with the State of   |
| 00:-49 <b>6</b>   | Has the applicant demonstrated that 188  | 00:-47 6  | New Jersey? In other words, does it increase our  |
| 00:-49 <b>7</b>   | Broadway is peculiarly suited to be a 60-unit  | 00:-47 <b>7</b>   | overall avocation once this settlement with fair  |
| 00:-49 <b>8</b>   | apartment complex?   | 00:-47 <b>8</b>   | share housing has expired?  |
| 00:-49 <b>9</b>   | THE WITNESS: Again, that's a decision  | 00:-47 <b>9</b>   | THE WITNESS: The answer is, it will   |
| 00:-49 <b>10</b>  | of the board.  | 00:-47 10   | increase the population and it has no impact on the   |
| 00:-49 11   | I presented, you know, my opinion with   | 00:-47 11   | obligation.   |
| 00:-49 <b>12</b>  | regard to certain aspects of the plan, the board has   | 00:-47 12   | MR. CABRERA: Does it have an impact on  |
| 00:-49 13   | to take that into consideration to determine whether   | 00:-46 <b>13</b>  | affordable housing units  |
| 00:-49 14   | this site is particularly suited.  | 00:-46 14   | THE WITNESS: No.  |
| 00:-49 <b>15</b>  | MS. LEVINE: Okay. Thank you.   | 00:-46 <b>15</b>  | MR. CABRERA: that were required, by   |
| 00:-49 <b>16</b>  | MR. CABRERA: Hi. Ulises Cabrera, 14  | 00:-46 16   | increasing the population.  |
| 00:-48 17   | Dorchester Road, Woodcliff Lake.   | 00:-46 17   | THE WITNESS: So let me see if I can   |
| 00:-48 18   | Before I start, I just want to thank   | 00:-46 18   | put it in context.  |
| 00:-48 19   | the members of the zoning board for their dedicated  | 00:-46 19   | There was a period of time when the   |
| 00:-48 <b>20</b>  | service to the borough.  | 00:-46 <b>20</b>  | Council on Affordable Housing adopted rules that  |
| 00:-48 <b>21</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You can thank us   | 00:-46 <b>21</b>  | basically said the amount of affordable housing that  |
| 00:-48 <b>22</b>  | by asking him a question right now.  | 00:-46 <b>22</b>  | would have to be provided is proportional to the  |
| 00:-48 <b>23</b>  | (Laughter.)  | 00:-46 <b>23</b>  | growth that's induced. That's no longer the   |
| 00:-48 <b>24</b>  | MR. CABRERA: You're adding time too.   | 00:-46 <b>24</b>  | situation. The factors which determine the numbers  |
| 00:-48 <b>25</b>  | Excuse me for repeating this guestion,   | 00:-46 <b>25</b>  | of affordable housing is not generally or   |
|   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812   |   | 201-641-1812  |
|   | 98   |   | 100   |
|   |  |   | 100   |
| 00:-48 <b>1</b>   | because I know you've probably answered it, but does   | 00:-46 <b>1</b>   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the  |
| 00:-48 <b>1</b> 00:-48 <b>2</b>   | because I know you've probably answered it, but does the applicant fulfill the <u>Medici</u> reconciliation?   | 00:-46 <b>1</b> 00:-46 <b>2</b>   |   |
|   | the applicant fulfill the <u>Medici</u> reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to  | 00:-46 <b>2</b> 00:-46 <b>3</b>   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.   |
| 00:-48 <b>2</b> 00:-48 <b>3</b> 00:-48 <b>4</b>   | the applicant fulfill the <u>Medici</u> reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and  | 00:-46 <b>2</b> 00:-46 <b>3</b> 00:-46 <b>4</b>   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  |
| 00:-48 <b>2</b> 00:-48 <b>3</b> 00:-48 <b>4</b> 00:-48 <b>5</b>   | the applicant fulfill the <u>Medici</u> reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan   | 00:-46 <b>2</b> 00:-46 <b>3</b> 00:-46 <b>4</b> 00:-46 <b>5</b>   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl   |
| 00:-48 <b>2</b> 00:-48 <b>3</b> 00:-48 <b>4</b> 00:-48 <b>5</b> 00:-48 <b>6</b>   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are,   | 00:-46 <b>2</b> 00:-46 <b>3</b> 00:-46 <b>4</b> 00:-46 <b>5</b> 00:-46 <b>6</b>   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.   |
| 00:-48  | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant  | 00:-46 <b>2</b> 00:-46 <b>3</b> 00:-46 <b>4</b> 00:-46 <b>5</b> 00:-46 <b>6</b> 00:-46 <b>7</b>   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for  |
| 00:-48  | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  | 00:-46  | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for Richard.   |
| 00:-48 <b>2</b> 00:-48 <b>3</b> 00:-48 <b>4</b> 00:-48 <b>5</b> 00:-48 <b>6</b> 00:-48 <b>7</b> 00:-48 <b>8</b> 00:-48 <b>9</b>   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 4 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 9   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake. I just have a few questions for Richard. With the passage of ten years, how many   |
| 00:-48 <b>2</b> 00:-48 <b>3</b> 00:-48 <b>4</b> 00:-48 <b>5</b> 00:-48 <b>6</b> 00:-48 <b>7</b> 00:-48 <b>8</b> 00:-48 <b>9</b> 00:-48 <b>10</b>  | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 9 00:-46 10  | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake  |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 10 00:-48 11   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill   | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 4 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 9 00:-46 10 00:-46 11   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use  |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 10 00:-48 11 00:-48 12   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 9 00:-46 10 00:-46 11  | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake. I just have a few questions for Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 10 00:-48 11 00:-48 12 00:-48 13   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the   | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 9 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13  | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know.   |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 10 00:-48 11 00:-48 12 00:-48 13 00:-48 14   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 9 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 14  | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else?  MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know.  THE WITNESS: During my tenure?   |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 11 00:-48 12 00:-48 13 00:-48 14 00:-47 15   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've   | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 14 00:-45 15   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake. I just have a few questions for Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know. THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes.   |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 10 00:-48 12 00:-48 12 00:-48 13 00:-48 14 00:-47 15 00:-47 16   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake. I just have a few questions for Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know. THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes. THE WITNESS: Twice.   |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 10 00:-48 11 00:-48 12 00:-48 13 00:-48 14 00:-47 15 00:-47 16 00:-47 17   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16 00:-45 17   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake. I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know. THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes. THE WITNESS: Twice. MS. DISPOTO: What year was that?  |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 11 00:-48 12 00:-48 13 00:-48 14 00:-47 15 00:-47 17 00:-47 18   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 15 00:-45 17 00:-45 18   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know.  THE WITNESS: During my tenure?  MS. DISPOTO: Yes.  THE WITNESS: Twice.  MS. DISPOTO: What year was that?  THE WITNESS: So let me just say,   |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 10 00:-48 11 00:-48 12 00:-48 13 00:-47 15 00:-47 16 00:-47 18 00:-47 19   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the applicant is asking for is not permitted under the   | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16 00:-45 17   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake. I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know. THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes. THE WITNESS: Twice. MS. DISPOTO: What year was that?  |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 11 00:-48 12 00:-48 13 00:-48 14 00:-47 15 00:-47 17 00:-47 18   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the applicant is asking for is not permitted under the zone.  And you can look at what the prior   | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 10 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16 00:-45 17 00:-45 19 00:-45 20   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know.  THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes.  THE WITNESS: Twice. MS. DISPOTO: What year was that? THE WITNESS: So let me just say, basically they didn't move forward, they tabled the discussion. So there wasn't a clear resolution to  |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 10 00:-48 12 00:-48 13 00:-48 14 00:-47 15 00:-47 16 00:-47 17 00:-47 18 00:-47 19 00:-47 20   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the applicant is asking for is not permitted under the zone.  And you can look at what the prior master plan says, you can look at, you know, actions  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16 00:-45 18 00:-45 19   | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know.  THE WITNESS: During my tenure?  MS. DISPOTO: Yes.  THE WITNESS: Twice.  MS. DISPOTO: What year was that?  THE WITNESS: So let me just say, basically they didn't move forward, they tabled the   |
| 00:-48 2 00:-48 3 00:-48 4 00:-48 5 00:-48 6 00:-48 7 00:-48 8 00:-48 9 00:-48 11 00:-48 12 00:-48 13 00:-48 14 00:-47 15 00:-47 16 00:-47 17 00:-47 18 00:-47 19 00:-47 20 00:-47 21   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the applicant is asking for is not permitted under the zone.  And you can look at what the prior   | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 9 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16 00:-45 17 00:-45 18 00:-45 19 00:-45 20 00:-45 21                     | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know.  THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes.  THE WITNESS: Twice.  MS. DISPOTO: What year was that?  THE WITNESS: So let me just say, basically they didn't move forward, they tabled the discussion. So there wasn't a clear resolution to say this is something that we absolutely wouldn't  |
| 00:-48     2       00:-48     3       00:-48     4       00:-48     6       00:-48     7       00:-48     9       00:-48     10       00:-48     12       00:-48     13       00:-47     15       00:-47     16       00:-47     17       00:-47     18       00:-47     19       00:-47     21       00:-47     22   | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the applicant is asking for is not permitted under the zone.  And you can look at what the prior master plan says, you can look at, you know, actions that the borough has taken, and you could look at  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16 00:-45 17 00:-45 18 00:-45 19 00:-45 21 00:-45 21                     | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I just have a few questions for Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know. THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes. THE WITNESS: Twice. MS. DISPOTO: What year was that? THE WITNESS: So let me just say, basically they didn't move forward, they tabled the discussion. So there wasn't a clear resolution to say this is something that we absolutely wouldn't consider, it is also something that they said this is  |
| 00:-48     2       00:-48     3       00:-48     4       00:-48     6       00:-48     7       00:-48     9       00:-48     10       00:-48     12       00:-48     12       00:-48     14       00:-47     15       00:-47     16       00:-47     17       00:-47     18       00:-47     19       00:-47     21       00:-47     22       00:-47     23 | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the applicant is asking for is not permitted under the zone.  And you can look at what the prior master plan says, you can look at, you know, actions that the borough has taken, and you could look at changed circumstances. At the end of the day, the  | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 7 00:-46 8 00:-46 10 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16 00:-45 17 00:-45 18 00:-45 19 00:-45 21 00:-45 22 00:-45 23                     | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake. I just have a few questions for Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know. THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes. THE WITNESS: Twice. MS. DISPOTO: What year was that? THE WITNESS: So let me just say, basically they didn't move forward, they tabled the discussion. So there wasn't a clear resolution to say this is something that we absolutely wouldn't consider, it is also something that they said this is not something that we would consider, they said we  |
| 00:-48     2       00:-48     3       00:-48     4       00:-48     6       00:-48     7       00:-48     9       00:-48     10       00:-48     12       00:-48     13       00:-48     14       00:-47     15       00:-47     16       00:-47     18       00:-47     19       00:-47     20       00:-47     21       00:-47     23       00:-47     24 | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the applicant is asking for is not permitted under the zone.  And you can look at what the prior master plan says, you can look at, you know, actions that the borough has taken, and you could look at changed circumstances. At the end of the day, the board is going to have to make that call.                          | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 4 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 9 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16 00:-45 17 00:-45 18 00:-45 19 00:-45 20 00:-45 21 00:-45 23 00:-45 24 | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake. I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know. THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes. THE WITNESS: Twice. MS. DISPOTO: What year was that? THE WITNESS: So let me just say, basically they didn't move forward, they tabled the discussion. So there wasn't a clear resolution to say this is something that we absolutely wouldn't consider, it is also something that they said this is not something that we would consider, they said we can't make a decision, there's no consensus and so   |
| 00:-48     2       00:-48     3       00:-48     4       00:-48     6       00:-48     7       00:-48     9       00:-48     10       00:-48     12       00:-48     13       00:-48     14       00:-47     15       00:-47     16       00:-47     18       00:-47     19       00:-47     20       00:-47     21       00:-47     23       00:-47     24 | the applicant fulfill the Medici reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Again, the board has to make that decision. I provided the background and the documents, I've indicated what the master plan documents have said, what the council's actions are, and the board has to determine whether the applicant has met that proof.  MR. CABRERA: And they have to just take into account the zoning that's currently there and what they're asking for the changes to fulfill this reconciliation?  THE WITNESS: Well, we know that the zoning doesn't permit it, and that's why they're here, but the Medici reconciliation, as I've indicated, is, the board, if they are going to grant the variance, has to reconcile the fact that what the applicant is asking for is not permitted under the zone.  And you can look at what the prior master plan says, you can look at, you know, actions that the borough has taken, and you could look at changed circumstances. At the end of the day, the board is going to have to make that call.  MR. CABRERA: Thank you. | 00:-46 2 00:-46 3 00:-46 4 00:-46 5 00:-46 6 00:-46 9 00:-46 10 00:-46 11 00:-46 12 00:-45 13 00:-45 15 00:-45 16 00:-45 17 00:-45 18 00:-45 19 00:-45 20 00:-45 21 00:-45 23 00:-45 24 | specifically predicated on population growth, so the answer is no.  MR. CABRERA: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody else? MS. DISPOTO: Good evening, Cheryl  Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake. I just have a few questions for  Richard.  With the passage of ten years, how many times in the last ten years did the Woodcliff Lake mayor and council reject or table the mixed-use residential plans for the Broadway corridor?  MR. NEWMAN: If you know. THE WITNESS: During my tenure? MS. DISPOTO: Yes. THE WITNESS: Twice. MS. DISPOTO: What year was that? THE WITNESS: So let me just say, basically they didn't move forward, they tabled the discussion. So there wasn't a clear resolution to say this is something that we absolutely wouldn't consider, it is also something that they said this is not something that we would consider, they said we can't make a decision, there's no consensus and so they pushed it off. So the point is that the zoning |

|  | 101   |   | 103   |
|--|---|---|---|
| 00:-45 <b>1</b>  | has remained in place where this use is prohibited.   | 00:-43 <b>1</b>   | THE WITNESS: Yes well, to some  |
| 00:-45 <b>2</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: But the Broadway corridor  | 00:-43 <b>1</b>   | extent.   |
| 00:-45 <b>2</b> 00:-45 <b>3</b>  | ordinance was actually introduced before the mayor  | 00:-43 <b>2</b> 00:-43 <b>3</b>   | So when a community is obligated to   |
| 00:-45 <b>4</b>  | and council in November of 2016, and then it had a  | 00:-43 4  | meet its fair share housing, it has to take certain   |
| 00:-45 <b>5</b>  | second introduction in December of 2017 and it was  | 00:-43 <b>5</b>   | actions to meet what's called its "perspective of   |
| 00:-45 <b>6</b>  | MR. DELIA: Objection.   | 00:-43 <b>6</b>   | future affordable housing obligation." So it has to   |
| 00:-45 <b>7</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: Do you recall that?  | 00:-43 7  | undertake direct action, such as rezoning in  |
| 00:-45 <b>8</b>  | THE WITNESS: No.  | 00:-43 <b>8</b>   | Woodcliff Lake's case, extending affordable controls;   |
| 00:-45   | MS. DISPOTO: Okay. I'll withdraw it.  | 00:-43  | it may be obligated, as Woodcliff Lake has in this  |
| 00:-45 <b>10</b>   | You talked about the density on this  | 00:-43 10   | particular situation, obligated itself to build 16  |
| 00:-45 <b>11</b>   | project at the beginning. Can you tell me what the  | 00:-43 11   | units of affordable housing. Those are all direct   |
| 00:-45 <b>12</b>   | density is for this particular project?   | 00:-43 <b>12</b>  | actions.  |
| 00:-44 13  | THE WITNESS: I don't recall what it   | 00:-43 13   | You know, in regard to the unmet need,  |
| 00:-44 <b>14</b>   | is.   | 00:-42 <b>14</b>  | the way that is done is that is not something that is   |
| 00:-44 <b>15</b>   | MS. DISPOTO: Do you know how many   | 00:-42 <b>15</b>  | necessary going to occur, but mechanisms are put in   |
| 00:-44 <b>16</b>   | units per acre?   | 00:-42 <b>16</b>  | place so that if circumstances allow it, that   |
| 00:-44 <b>17</b>   | THE WITNESS: Like 16.9, if I recall.  | 00:-42 <b>17</b>  | development will go forward.  |
| 00:-44 <b>18</b>   | MS. DISPOTO: And do you know if   | 00:-42 18   | So let's take two examples. One is the  |
| 00:-44 <b>19</b>   | Woodcliff Lake has any other projects in play or any  | 00:-42 <b>19</b>  | Teaber (phonetic) office building. At the time that   |
| 00:-44 <b>20</b>   | other existing complexes with this density that are   | 00:-42 <b>20</b>  | we mediated the fair share agreement, that building   |
| 00:-44 <b>21</b>   | not affordable housing related, are you aware?  | 00:-42 <b>21</b>  | was vacant.   |
| 00:-44 <b>22</b>   | THE WITNESS: No.  | 00:-42 <b>22</b>  | There was a proposal that was floated   |
| 00:-44 <b>23</b>   | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware of anything  | 00:-42 <b>23</b>  | by a developer to convert that into senior housing.   |
| 00:-44 <b>24</b>   | at this density?  | 00:-42 <b>24</b>  | So at that particular time, we thought that the   |
| 00:-44 <b>25</b>   | THE WITNESS: No.  | 00:-42 <b>25</b>  | borough thought that that was a possibility, it   |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812  |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812  |
|  |   |   |   |
|  | 102   |   | 104   |
| 00:-44 1   | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for  | 00:-42 <b>1</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So  |
| 00:-44 2   | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of,  | 00:-42 <b>2</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior  |
| 00:-44 <b>2</b> 00:-44 <b>3</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?   | 00:-42 <b>2</b> 00:-42 <b>3</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  |
| 00:-44 <b>2</b> 00:-44 <b>3</b> 00:-44 <b>4</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is   | 00:-42 <b>2</b> 00:-42 <b>3</b> 00:-42 <b>4</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in,   |
| 00:-44 <b>2</b> 00:-44 <b>3</b> 00:-44 <b>4</b> 00:-44 <b>5</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  | 00:-42 <b>2</b> 00:-42 <b>3</b> 00:-42 <b>4</b> 00:-42 <b>5</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay  |
| 00:-44 <b>2</b> 00:-44 <b>3</b> 00:-44 <b>4</b> 00:-44 <b>5</b> 00:-44 <b>6</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the   | 00:-42 <b>2</b> 00:-42 <b>3</b> 00:-42 <b>4</b> 00:-42 <b>5</b> 00:-42 <b>6</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use  |
| 00:-44 <b>2</b> 00:-44 <b>3</b> 00:-44 <b>4</b> 00:-44 <b>5</b> 00:-44 <b>6</b> 00:-44 <b>7</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right   | 00:-42 <b>2</b> 00:-42 <b>3</b> 00:-42 <b>4</b> 00:-42 <b>5</b> 00:-42 <b>6</b> 00:-42 <b>7</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and  |
| 00:-44 <b>2</b> 00:-44 <b>3</b> 00:-44 <b>4</b> 00:-44 <b>5</b> 00:-44 <b>6</b> 00:-44 <b>7</b> 00:-44 <b>8</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?   | 00:-42 <b>2</b> 00:-42 <b>3</b> 00:-42 <b>4</b> 00:-42 <b>5</b> 00:-42 <b>6</b> 00:-42 <b>7</b> 00:-42 <b>8</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.   |
| 00:-44 <b>2</b> 00:-44 <b>3</b> 00:-44 <b>4</b> 00:-44 <b>5</b> 00:-44 <b>6</b> 00:-44 <b>7</b> 00:-44 <b>8</b> 00:-44 <b>9</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned  | 00:-42 <b>2</b> 00:-42 <b>3</b> 00:-42 <b>4</b> 00:-42 <b>5</b> 00:-42 <b>6</b> 00:-42 <b>7</b> 00:-42 <b>8</b> 00:-42 <b>9</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of   |
| 00:-44 <b>2</b> 00:-44 <b>3</b> 00:-44 <b>4</b> 00:-44 <b>5</b> 00:-44 <b>6</b> 00:-44 <b>7</b> 00:-44 <b>8</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share  | 00:-42 <b>2</b> 00:-42 <b>3</b> 00:-42 <b>4</b> 00:-42 <b>5</b> 00:-42 <b>6</b> 00:-42 <b>7</b> 00:-42 <b>8</b>   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the  |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 6 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned  | 00:-42  | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of   |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 6 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 11  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4  | 00:-42  | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is   |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 6 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 11 00:-44 12  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's   | 00:-42  | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that  |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 6 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 11 00:-44 12 00:-44 13  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  | 00:-42  | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 11 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14   | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7   | 00:-42  | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet  |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 6 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 11 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15  | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.   | 00:-42  | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your  |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 5 00:-44 6 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 11 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15 00:-43 16   | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet  | 00:-42 2 00:-42 3 00:-42 4 00:-42 5 00:-42 6 00:-42 8 00:-42 9 00:-41 10 00:-41 11 00:-41 12 00:-41 13 00:-41 15 00:-41 15  | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.  |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 6 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 10 00:-44 11 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15 00:-43 16 00:-43 17 00:-43 18 00:-43 19                               | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet need." I heard you say, at a prior meeting, you  | 00:-42 2 00:-42 3 00:-42 4 00:-42 5 00:-42 6 00:-42 7 00:-42 8 00:-42 9 00:-41 10 00:-41 11 00:-41 12 00:-41 13 00:-41 14 00:-41 15 00:-41 16 00:-41 17   | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.  MS. DISPOTO: So you would say that in your opinion Woodcliff Lake as a borough has done things and put things in place to meet our unmet need   |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 6 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 11 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15 00:-43 16 00:-43 17 00:-43 18 00:-43 19 00:-43 20            | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet need." I heard you say, at a prior meeting, you called the unmet needs that were required "aspirational."  THE WITNESS: Yes.   | 00:-42 2 00:-42 3 00:-42 5 00:-42 6 00:-42 7 00:-42 8 00:-42 9 00:-41 10 00:-41 12 00:-41 13 00:-41 15 00:-41 16 00:-41 17 00:-41 18 00:-41 19 00:-41 20  | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.  MS. DISPOTO: So you would say that in your opinion Woodcliff Lake as a borough has done things and put things in place to meet our unmet need in this prospective requirement with Fair Share   |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 11 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15 00:-43 16 00:-43 17 00:-43 18 00:-43 19 00:-43 20 00:-43 21           | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet need." I heard you say, at a prior meeting, you called the unmet needs that were required "aspirational."  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: You recall that?  | 00:-42 2 00:-42 3 00:-42 4 00:-42 5 00:-42 6 00:-42 7 00:-42 8 00:-42 9 00:-41 10 00:-41 12 00:-41 13 00:-41 15 00:-41 15 00:-41 17 00:-41 18 00:-41 19 00:-41 20 00:-41 21                               | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.  MS. DISPOTO: So you would say that in your opinion Woodcliff Lake as a borough has done things and put things in place to meet our unmet need in this prospective requirement with Fair Share Housing?  |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 6 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 10 00:-44 11 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15 00:-43 16 00:-43 17 00:-43 18 00:-43 19 00:-43 20 00:-43 21 00:-43 22 | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet need." I heard you say, at a prior meeting, you called the unmet needs that were required "aspirational."  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: You recall that? THE WITNESS: Yes.  | 00:-42 2 00:-42 3 00:-42 4 00:-42 5 00:-42 6 00:-42 8 00:-42 9 00:-41 11 00:-41 12 00:-41 13 00:-41 15 00:-41 16 00:-41 17 00:-41 18 00:-41 19 00:-41 21 00:-41 21  | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.  MS. DISPOTO: So you would say that in your opinion Woodcliff Lake as a borough has done things and put things in place to meet our unmet need in this prospective requirement with Fair Share Housing?  THE WITNESS: Insofar as Fair Share  |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15 00:-43 16 00:-43 17 00:-43 18 00:-43 20 00:-43 21 00:-43 22 00:-43 23           | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet need." I heard you say, at a prior meeting, you called the unmet needs that were required "aspirational."  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: You recall that?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: Can you explain to the  | 00:-42 2 00:-42 3 00:-42 4 00:-42 5 00:-42 6 00:-42 8 00:-42 9 00:-41 10 00:-41 12 00:-41 13 00:-41 15 00:-41 15 00:-41 17 00:-41 18 00:-41 19 00:-41 20 00:-41 22 00:-41 22                              | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.  MS. DISPOTO: So you would say that in your opinion Woodcliff Lake as a borough has done things and put things in place to meet our unmet need in this prospective requirement with Fair Share Housing?  THE WITNESS: Insofar as Fair Share Housing is concerned, they're satisfied.   |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15 00:-43 16 00:-43 17 00:-43 18 00:-43 20 00:-43 21 00:-43 22 00:-43 23 00:-43 24 | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet need." I heard you say, at a prior meeting, you called the unmet needs that were required "aspirational."  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: You recall that?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: Can you explain to the board and to the public what that means, that it's                 | 00:-42 2 00:-42 3 00:-42 4 00:-42 5 00:-42 6 00:-42 7 00:-42 8 00:-42 9 00:-41 10 00:-41 12 00:-41 13 00:-41 15 00:-41 16 00:-41 17 00:-41 18 00:-41 19 00:-41 20 00:-41 21 00:-41 21 00:-41 23 00:-41 23 | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.  MS. DISPOTO: So you would say that in your opinion Woodcliff Lake as a borough has done things and put things in place to meet our unmet need in this prospective requirement with Fair Share Housing?  THE WITNESS: Insofar as Fair Share Housing is concerned, they're satisfied.  At the fairness hearing, the court   |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15 00:-43 16 00:-43 17 00:-43 18 00:-43 20 00:-43 21 00:-43 22 00:-43 23           | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet need." I heard you say, at a prior meeting, you called the unmet needs that were required "aspirational."  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: You recall that?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: Can you explain to the board and to the public what that means, that it's "aspirational"? | 00:-42 2 00:-42 3 00:-42 4 00:-42 5 00:-42 6 00:-42 8 00:-42 9 00:-41 10 00:-41 12 00:-41 13 00:-41 15 00:-41 15 00:-41 17 00:-41 18 00:-41 19 00:-41 20 00:-41 22 00:-41 22                              | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.  MS. DISPOTO: So you would say that in your opinion Woodcliff Lake as a borough has done things and put things in place to meet our unmet need in this prospective requirement with Fair Share Housing?  THE WITNESS: Insofar as Fair Share Housing is concerned, they're satisfied.  At the fairness hearing, the court indicated that the plan was fair, and we have to go |
| 00:-44 2 00:-44 3 00:-44 4 00:-44 5 00:-44 7 00:-44 8 00:-44 9 00:-44 10 00:-44 12 00:-44 13 00:-44 14 00:-43 15 00:-43 16 00:-43 17 00:-43 18 00:-43 20 00:-43 21 00:-43 22 00:-43 23 00:-43 24 | MS. DISPOTO: Are you aware for comparison sake, are you aware of the density of, say, the Gables?  THE WITNESS: The Gables, I think, is around 5.3 units per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: And what about the affordable housing up at north of Highview, right near this project that they talked about?  THE WITNESS: Well, we haven't rezoned that property, but the Housing Element and Fair Share Plan calls for 16 affordable housing units on 2.4 acres, so it's  MR. NEWMAN: Six per acre.  THE WITNESS: Yeah, it's around 6 or 7 per acre.  MS. DISPOTO: You mentioned "unmet need." I heard you say, at a prior meeting, you called the unmet needs that were required "aspirational."  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: You recall that?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: Can you explain to the board and to the public what that means, that it's                 | 00:-42 2 00:-42 3 00:-42 4 00:-42 5 00:-42 6 00:-42 7 00:-42 8 00:-42 9 00:-41 10 00:-41 12 00:-41 13 00:-41 15 00:-41 16 00:-41 17 00:-41 18 00:-41 19 00:-41 20 00:-41 21 00:-41 21 00:-41 23 00:-41 23 | wasn't sure, because the office building existed. So they did an overlay zone to say 100 units of senior housing could be built.  Subsequently, office tenants came in, so for the time being, it's office, but that overlay zoning is in place so that in the future, if that use ever disappears, the applicant could then come in and build 100 units of affordable housing.  So it's not like the 16 units of affordable housing that we're obligated to do on the North Broadway site, that's going to happen, this is something that's aspirational. It's something that could occur or may occur, if circumstances are right.  So that's how you address your unmet need as opposed to direct actions to address your perspective need.  MS. DISPOTO: So you would say that in your opinion Woodcliff Lake as a borough has done things and put things in place to meet our unmet need in this prospective requirement with Fair Share Housing?  THE WITNESS: Insofar as Fair Share Housing is concerned, they're satisfied.  At the fairness hearing, the court   |

|   | 105  |  | 107   |
|---|--|--|---|
| 00:-41 <b>1</b>   | back to the judge for, you know, a compliance  | 00:-39 <b>1</b>  | questions, perhaps form a line to speed it up.  |
| 00:-41 2  | hearing.   | 00:-39 <b>2</b>  | MS. APPELLE: Veronica Appelle, 23   |
| 00:-41 3  | But my understanding is that the   | 00:-39 <b>3</b>  | Cressfield Court.   |
| 00:-41 <b>4</b>   | borough doesn't have to undertake any further  | 00:-39 4   | Mr. Preiss, I must be mistaken, but I   |
| 00:-41 <b>5</b>   | rezonings, grant any variances or do any   | 00:-39 <b>5</b>  | prepared questions for the beautification of Broadway   |
| 00:-41 <b>6</b>   | redevelopment outside of what is in the Housing  | 00:-39 <b>6</b>  | corridor that you were tasked with from this board to   |
| 00:-41 <b>7</b>   | Element and Fair Share Plan in order to be compliant   | 00:-38 <b>7</b>  | come before the board as the planner. Am I wrong?   |
| 00:-40 <b>8</b>   | with its unmet need.   | 00:-38 <b>8</b>  | THE WITNESS: Okay, so that is a   |
| 00:-40 <b>9</b>   | MS. DISPOTO: Okay.   | 00:-38 <b>9</b>  | separate matter. Our firm prepared design standards   |
| 00:-40 <b>10</b>  | And counsel for the applicant asked you  | 00:-38 10  | for the Broadway corridor, which would be additional  |
| 00:-40 <b>11</b>  | about the mandatory set aside that this borough now  | 00:-38 11  | regulations that would be added to the site plan  |
| 00:-40 <b>12</b>  | has for future multifamily development, and you're   | 00:-38 12  | standards for any development within the Broadway   |
| 00:-40 13   | aware of that and you talked about that.   | 00:-38 13  | corridor. So that was introduced by the council,  |
| 00:-40 <b>14</b>  | THE WITNESS: Yes.  | 00:-38 14  | it's going to come back, not to the zoning board, but   |
| 00:-40 <b>15</b>  | MS. DISPOTO: The borough recently  | 00:-38 <b>15</b>   | to the planning board for consistency review in July,   |
| 00:-40 <b>16</b>  | passed an ordinance with the planning board and a  | 00:-38 16  | and then it will be considered for adoption by the  |
| 00:-40 17   | first introduction at the mayor and council that you   | 00:-38 17  | council thereafter. So that's the status of that.   |
| 00:-40 18   | worked on, 19-05, which is that affordable housing   | 00:-38 18  | This application, because it was deemed   |
| 00:-40 19   | control ordinance that counsel referred to.  | 00:-38 19  | complete back in 2018, even if it were adopted and  |
| 00:-40 <b>20</b>  | THE WITNESS: Yes.  | 00:-38 <b>20</b>   | the board had made its decision, would not be subject   |
| 00:-40 21   | MS. DISPOTO: Is there a provision in   | 00:-38 21  | to those requirements.  |
| 00:-40 <b>22</b> 00:-40 <b>23</b>   | that ordinance that states that the set aside  | 00:-38 <b>22</b> 00:-38 <b>23</b>  | MS. APPELLE: And vice versa? I mean, how does   |
| 00:-40 <b>23</b>  | requirement does not give developers the right to any such rezoning variances or other relief or   | 00:-38 <b>23</b>   | THE WITNESS: The merits of this   |
| 00:-40 <b>24</b> 00:-40 <b>25</b>   | establishes any obligation on the part of the  | 00:-37 <b>24</b> 00:-37 <b>25</b>  | application rests on what the application has   |
| 0040 23   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   | 0037 20  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812   |  | 201-641-1812  |
|   | 106  |  | 108   |
|   |  |  | 100   |
| 00:-40 <b>1</b>   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or  | 00:-37 <b>1</b>  | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time   |
| 00:-40 <b>1</b> 00:-40 <b>2</b>   |  | 00:-37 <b>1</b> 00:-37 <b>2</b>  |   |
|   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  | _  | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is   |
| 00:-40 <b>2</b> 00:-40 <b>3</b> 00:-40 <b>4</b>   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with  | 00:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-37 <b>3</b> 00:-37 <b>4</b>  | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on   |
| 00:-40 <b>2</b> 00:-40 <b>3</b> 00:-40 <b>4</b> 00:-40 <b>5</b>   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  | 00:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-37 <b>3</b> 00:-37 <b>4</b> 00:-37 <b>5</b>  | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.   |
| 00:-40 <b>2</b> 00:-40 <b>3</b> 00:-40 <b>4</b> 00:-40 <b>5</b> 00:-40 <b>6</b>   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes.   | 00:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-37 <b>3</b> 00:-37 <b>4</b> 00:-37 <b>5</b> 00:-37 <b>6</b>  | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very  |
| 00:-40 <b>2</b> 00:-40 <b>3</b> 00:-40 <b>4</b> 00:-40 <b>5</b> 00:-40 <b>6</b> 00:-40 <b>7</b>   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two  | 00:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-37 <b>3</b> 00:-37 <b>4</b> 00:-37 <b>5</b> 00:-37 <b>6</b> 00:-37 <b>7</b>  | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  |
| 00:-40 <b>2</b> 00:-40 <b>3</b> 00:-40 <b>4</b> 00:-40 <b>5</b> 00:-40 <b>6</b> 00:-40 <b>7</b> 00:-40 <b>8</b>   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.   | 00:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-37 <b>3</b> 00:-37 <b>4</b> 00:-37 <b>5</b> 00:-37 <b>6</b> 00:-37 <b>7</b> 00:-37 <b>8</b>  | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the   | 00:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-37 <b>3</b> 00:-37 <b>4</b> 00:-37 <b>5</b> 00:-37 <b>6</b> 00:-37 <b>7</b> 00:-37 <b>8</b> 00:-37 <b>9</b>  | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was  | 00:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-37 <b>3</b> 00:-37 <b>4</b> 00:-37 <b>5</b> 00:-37 <b>6</b> 00:-37 <b>7</b> 00:-37 <b>8</b> 00:-37 <b>9</b> 00:-37 <b>10</b>                                       | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming   |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 11   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing  | 00:-37   | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.   |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 11 00:-39 12   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?  | 00:-37   | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 11 00:-39 12 00:-39 13   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us? THE WITNESS: It was the planning board   | 00:-37   | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.   |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 11 00:-39 12   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?  THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that  | 00:-37   | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins, Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018,  |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 11 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 14   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us? THE WITNESS: It was the planning board   | 00:-37   | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.   |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 11 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 14 00:-39 15   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?  THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  | 00:-37 2 00:-37 3 00:-37 4 00:-37 5 00:-37 6 00:-37 7 00:-37 8 00:-37 10 00:-37 11 00:-37 12 00:-37 13 00:-37 14 00:-37 15   | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with  |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 11 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 14 00:-39 15 00:-39 16   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us? THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of   | 00:-37   | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the   |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 14 00:-39 15 00:-39 16 00:-39 17   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?  THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of the law firm that he worked for?   | 00:-37 2 00:-37 3 00:-37 4 00:-37 6 00:-37 7 00:-37 8 00:-37 9 00:-37 10 00:-37 11 00:-37 12 00:-37 13 00:-37 14 00:-37 15 00:-37 16 00:-37 17   | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the master plan during 2018?  |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 14 00:-39 15 00:-39 16 00:-39 17 00:-39 18   | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?  THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of the law firm that he worked for?  THE WITNESS: Yes, but I don't think  | 00:-37 2 00:-37 3 00:-37 4 00:-37 5 00:-37 6 00:-37 7 00:-37 8 00:-37 10 00:-37 11 00:-37 12 00:-37 13 00:-37 15 00:-37 16 00:-37 17 00:-37 17   | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the master plan during 2018?  THE WITNESS: They have done so now.   |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 15 00:-39 15 00:-39 16 00:-39 17 00:-39 18 00:-39 19                               | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us? THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of the law firm that he worked for? THE WITNESS: Yes, but I don't think it's relevant to this application.   | 00:-37 2 00:-37 3 00:-37 4 00:-37 5 00:-37 6 00:-37 7 00:-37 8 00:-37 10 00:-37 11 00:-37 12 00:-37 13 00:-37 14 00:-37 15 00:-37 16 00:-37 17 00:-37 18 00:-36 19                     | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the master plan during 2018?  THE WITNESS: They have done so now. There was some discussion about it, but there wasn't  |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 11 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 15 00:-39 15 00:-39 16 00:-39 17 00:-39 18 00:-39 19 00:-39 20 00:-39 21           | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?  THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of the law firm that he worked for?  THE WITNESS: Yes, but I don't think it's relevant to this application.  MS. DISPOTO: Okay. Nothing further. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any other   | 00:-37 2 00:-37 3 00:-37 4 00:-37 5 00:-37 6 00:-37 7 00:-37 8 00:-37 10 00:-37 11 00:-37 12 00:-37 13 00:-37 15 00:-37 16 00:-37 17 00:-37 18 00:-36 19 00:-36 21 00:-36 22           | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the master plan during 2018?  THE WITNESS: They have done so now.  There was some discussion about it, but there wasn't a direct request from the planning board to do so,  |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 15 00:-39 15 00:-39 16 00:-39 17 00:-39 18 00:-39 19 00:-39 20 00:-39 21 00:-39 21 | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us? THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of the law firm that he worked for? THE WITNESS: Yes, but I don't think it's relevant to this application. MS. DISPOTO: Okay. Nothing further. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any other questions for Mr. Preiss?  | 00:-37 2 00:-37 3 00:-37 4 00:-37 5 00:-37 6 00:-37 7 00:-37 8 00:-37 10 00:-37 11 00:-37 12 00:-37 13 00:-37 15 00:-37 15 00:-37 16 00:-37 17 00:-37 18 00:-36 20 00:-36 21 00:-36 22 | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the master plan during 2018?  THE WITNESS: They have done so now.  There was some discussion about it, but there wasn't a direct request from the planning board to do so, not that I recall.  MS. HIGGINS: Was there a discussion in 2018?   |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 15 00:-39 15 00:-39 17 00:-39 18 00:-39 19 00:-39 20 00:-39 21 00:-39 21 00:-39 22 | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?  THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of the law firm that he worked for?  THE WITNESS: Yes, but I don't think it's relevant to this application.  MS. DISPOTO: Okay. Nothing further. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any other questions for Mr. Preiss? Okay.                                     | 00:-37 2 00:-37 3 00:-37 4 00:-37 6 00:-37 7 00:-37 8 00:-37 10 00:-37 11 00:-37 12 00:-37 14 00:-37 15 00:-37 16 00:-37 17 00:-37 18 00:-36 20 00:-36 21 00:-36 23 00:-36 24          | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the master plan during 2018?  THE WITNESS: They have done so now.  There was some discussion about it, but there wasn't a direct request from the planning board to do so, not that I recall.  MS. HIGGINS: Was there a discussion in 2018?  THE WITNESS: There has been some   |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 15 00:-39 15 00:-39 16 00:-39 17 00:-39 18 00:-39 19 00:-39 20 00:-39 21 00:-39 21 | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?  THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of the law firm that he worked for?  THE WITNESS: Yes, but I don't think it's relevant to this application.  MS. DISPOTO: Okay. Nothing further. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any other questions for Mr. Preiss? Okay. MR. NEWMAN: If anybody else has any | 00:-37 2 00:-37 3 00:-37 4 00:-37 5 00:-37 6 00:-37 7 00:-37 8 00:-37 10 00:-37 11 00:-37 12 00:-37 13 00:-37 15 00:-37 15 00:-37 16 00:-37 17 00:-37 18 00:-36 20 00:-36 21 00:-36 22 | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the master plan during 2018?  THE WITNESS: They have done so now.  There was some discussion about it, but there wasn't a direct request from the planning board to do so, not that I recall.  MS. HIGGINS: Was there a discussion in 2018?  THE WITNESS: There has been some discussion in the borough about perhaps doing a new |
| 00:-40 2 00:-40 3 00:-40 4 00:-40 5 00:-40 6 00:-40 7 00:-40 8 00:-40 9 00:-39 10 00:-39 12 00:-39 13 00:-39 15 00:-39 15 00:-39 17 00:-39 18 00:-39 19 00:-39 20 00:-39 21 00:-39 21 00:-39 22 | Woodcliff Lake Zoning Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other relief?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: So you're familiar with that?  THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DISPOTO: And then I just have two final questions.  Do you recall when you worked on the fair share housing committee, who the attorney was representing Woodcliff Lake on the fair share housing committee? Who was on that committee with us?  THE WITNESS: It was the planning board attorney and he was appointed to that committee, that was Marc Leibman.  MS. DISPOTO: Do you know the name of the law firm that he worked for?  THE WITNESS: Yes, but I don't think it's relevant to this application.  MS. DISPOTO: Okay. Nothing further. Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any other questions for Mr. Preiss? Okay.                                     | 00:-37 2 00:-37 3 00:-37 4 00:-37 6 00:-37 7 00:-37 8 00:-37 10 00:-37 11 00:-37 12 00:-37 14 00:-37 15 00:-37 16 00:-37 17 00:-37 18 00:-36 20 00:-36 21 00:-36 23 00:-36 24          | proposed and the zoning that was in place at the time it was deemed complete.  So the fact that Woodcliff Lake is considering and designing guidelines has no impact on this application.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Thank you very much.  THE WITNESS: You're welcome.  MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one in line.  MS. YETEMIAN: No, someone is coming up.  MS. HIGGINS: Josephine Higgins,  Woodcliff Lake.  Mr. Preiss, during the year of 2018, did the planning board ever ask you to go forth with review of the master plan or anything to do with the master plan during 2018?  THE WITNESS: They have done so now.  There was some discussion about it, but there wasn't a direct request from the planning board to do so, not that I recall.  MS. HIGGINS: Was there a discussion in 2018?  THE WITNESS: There has been some   |

|   | 109  |   | 111   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 00:-36 <b>1</b>   | master plan, but there was no direction given out to   | 00:-34 <b>1</b>   | that, those who are testifying, that you could cut  |
| 00:-36 <b>2</b>   | our firm, nor did we commit to doing a master plan   | 00:-34 2  | into the comment portion, we might have to limit the  |
| 00:-36 <b>3</b>   | update or reexamination.   | 00:-34 3  | comment times and divide it up.   |
| 00:-36 4  | MS. HIGGINS: Okay. So nothing was  | 00:-34 4  | AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No!   |
| 00:-36 <b>5</b>   | requested of your firm during 2018?  | 00:-34 <b>5</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: Wait. For   |
| 00:-36 <b>6</b>   | THE WITNESS: That's correct.   | 00:-34 <b>6</b>   | clarification, are you saying that not everyone will  |
| 00:-36 7  | MS. HIGGINS: On the planning board?  | 00:-34 <b>7</b>   | be able to even comment, is that what you're saying?  |
| 00:-36 <b>8</b>   | THE WITNESS: That's correct.   | 00:-34 <b>8</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, I didn't say that.  |
| 00:-36 <b>9</b>   | MS. HIGGINS: Because there's only one  | 00:-34 <b>9</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: Okay. Just for  |
| 00:-36 <b>10</b>  | meeting in 2018 of the planning board.   | 00:-34 10   | clarification, so everyone will get a chance to   |
| 00:-36 11   | THE WITNESS: Yes.  | 00:-34 11   | comment?  |
| 00:-36 <b>12</b>  | MS. HIGGINS: Okay. Thank you.  | 00:-34 12   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: We might have to  |
| 00:-36 13   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You remember that  | 00:-34 13   | divide up the time. You know, we have to see how  |
| 00:-36 14   | one meeting.   | 00:-34 14   | things go.  |
| 00:-36 <b>15</b>  | THE WITNESS: I do remember that one  | 00:-34 <b>15</b>  | AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Is that a zoning  |
| 00:-36 <b>16</b>  | meeting.   | 00:-34 <b>16</b>  | board rule?   |
| 00:-36 17   | MS. HIGGINS: I remember.   | 00:-34 17   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Pardon me?  |
| 00:-36 18   | MR. NEWMAN: Again, seeing no one in  | 00:-34 18   | AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Is that a zoning  |
| 00:-36 19   | line, I would like to make a motion to close to the  | 00:-34 19   | board rule or your rule? To maybe limit it  |
| 00:-36 <b>20</b>  | public.  | 00:-34 <b>20</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: It's a statutory rule,  |
| 00:-36 <b>21</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.  | 00:-33 <b>21</b>  | okay.   |
| 00:-36 <b>22</b>  | MR. HAYES: Second.   | 00:-33 <b>22</b>  | MR. COUTO: Let me ask you a question.   |
| 00:-36 <b>23</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?  | 00:-33 <b>23</b>  | What documents do you want to share with council? I   |
| 00:-36 <b>24</b>  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond   | 00:-33 <b>24</b>  | didn't understand exactly what you wanted to give in,   |
| 00:-36 <b>25</b>  | in the affirmative.)   | 00:-33 <b>25</b>  | what you said?  |
|   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812   |   | 201-641-1812  |
|   | 110  |   | 110   |
|   | 110  |   | 112   |
| 00:-36 <b>1</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?   | 00:-33 <b>1</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I   |
| 00:-36 <b>1</b> 00:-36 <b>2</b>   |  | 00:-33 <b>1</b> 00:-33 <b>2</b>   |   |
| _   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?   | _   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I   |
| 00:-36 <b>2</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  | 00:-33 2  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  |
| 00:-36 <b>2</b> 00:-36 <b>3</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.  | 00:-33 <b>2</b> 00:-33 <b>3</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some   |
| 00:-36 <b>2</b> 00:-36 <b>3</b> 00:-36 <b>4</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you  | 00:-33 <b>2</b> 00:-33 <b>3</b> 00:-33 <b>4</b> 00:-33 <b>5</b> 00:-33 <b>6</b> | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  |
| 00:-36 <b>2</b> 00:-36 <b>3</b> 00:-36 <b>4</b> 00:-36 <b>5</b> 00:-35 <b>6</b> 00:-35 <b>7</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any   |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long.  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.   |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 9   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I   |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 9 00:-35 10   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.   |
| 00:-36  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive. So just to go over the results of the  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the   |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 9 00:-35 10 00:-35 11 00:-35 12   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have   | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?   |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 9 00:-35 10 00:-35 11 00:-35 12 00:-35 13   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the   | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do   |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 9 00:-35 10 00:-35 11 00:-35 12 00:-35 13 00:-35 14   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.   |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 9 00:-35 10 00:-35 11 00:-35 12 00:-35 13 00:-35 14 00:-35 15   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two   | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 10 00:-35 11 00:-35 12 00:-35 13 00:-35 14 00:-35 15 00:-35 16  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or   | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to  |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 10 00:-35 11 00:-35 12 00:-35 13 00:-35 14 00:-35 15 00:-35 16 00:-35 17  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the   |
| 00:-36         2           00:-36         3           00:-36         4           00:-35         5           00:-35         6           00:-35         7           00:-35         9           00:-35         10           00:-35         12           00:-35         12           00:-35         14           00:-35         15           00:-35         16           00:-35         17           00:-35         18  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. COUTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.   |
| 00:-36         2           00:-36         3           00:-36         4           00:-35         6           00:-35         7           00:-35         8           00:-35         10           00:-35         11           00:-35         12           00:-35         13           00:-35         14           00:-35         15           00:-35         16           00:-35         17           00:-35         18           00:-35         19   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like perhaps three maybe want to testify.   | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.  We are permitted to have limits on comment and to   |
| 00:-36       2         00:-36       3         00:-36       5         00:-35       6         00:-35       7         00:-35       9         00:-35       10         00:-35       12         00:-35       13         00:-35       14         00:-35       15         00:-35       16         00:-35       17         00:-35       18         00:-35       20   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like perhaps three maybe want to testify. And I can tell you that if we hear  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.  We are permitted to have limits on comment and to exclude repetitious statements or evidence. If  |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 10 00:-35 11 00:-35 12 00:-35 13 00:-35 15 00:-35 15 00:-35 16 00:-35 17 00:-35 18 00:-35 19 00:-35 20 00:-35 21  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like perhaps three maybe want to testify.  And I can tell you that if we hear repetitive testimony, I'm going to ask you not to do  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.  We are permitted to have limits on comment and to exclude repetitious statements or evidence. If people keep saying the same things over and over   |
| 00:-36 2 00:-36 3 00:-36 4 00:-36 5 00:-35 6 00:-35 7 00:-35 8 00:-35 10 00:-35 11 00:-35 12 00:-35 13 00:-35 15 00:-35 15 00:-35 16 00:-35 17 00:-35 18 00:-35 19 00:-35 20 00:-35 21 00:-34 22  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like perhaps three maybe want to testify.  And I can tell you that if we hear repetitive testimony, I'm going to ask you not to do it, not to be rude, but just to move this along. And   | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.  We are permitted to have limits on comment and to exclude repetitious statements or evidence. If people keep saying the same things over and over again, we just have to move on, because we have to  |
| 00:-36       2         00:-36       3         00:-36       5         00:-35       6         00:-35       7         00:-35       9         00:-35       10         00:-35       12         00:-35       13         00:-35       14         00:-35       15         00:-35       16         00:-35       17         00:-35       19         00:-35       20         00:-34       21         00:-34       23   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like perhaps three maybe want to testify.  And I can tell you that if we hear repetitive testimony, I'm going to ask you not to do it, not to be rude, but just to move this along. And if the testimony takes too long, doesn't get right to  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.  We are permitted to have limits on comment and to exclude repetitious statements or evidence. If people keep saying the same things over and over again, we just have to move on, because we have to get to a resolution.   |
| 00:-36       2         00:-36       3         00:-36       5         00:-35       6         00:-35       7         00:-35       9         00:-35       10         00:-35       12         00:-35       12         00:-35       14         00:-35       15         00:-35       16         00:-35       17         00:-35       18         00:-35       19         00:-35       20         00:-35       21         00:-34       22         00:-34       23         00:-34       24   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like perhaps three maybe want to testify.  And I can tell you that if we hear repetitive testimony, I'm going to ask you not to do it, not to be rude, but just to move this along. And if the testimony takes too long, doesn't get right to the point, it may impact the amount of time that the  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.  We are permitted to have limits on comment and to exclude repetitious statements or evidence. If people keep saying the same things over and over again, we just have to move on, because we have to get to a resolution.  So I'm not suggesting that anyone not  |
| 00:-36       2         00:-36       3         00:-36       5         00:-35       6         00:-35       7         00:-35       9         00:-35       10         00:-35       12         00:-35       13         00:-35       14         00:-35       15         00:-35       16         00:-35       17         00:-35       19         00:-35       20         00:-34       21         00:-34       23   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like perhaps three maybe want to testify.  And I can tell you that if we hear repetitive testimony, I'm going to ask you not to do it, not to be rude, but just to move this along. And if the testimony takes too long, doesn't get right to the point, it may impact the amount of time that the public has to make comments. So just be aware of | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.  We are permitted to have limits on comment and to exclude repetitious statements or evidence. If people keep saying the same things over and over again, we just have to move on, because we have to get to a resolution.  So I'm not suggesting that anyone not be given an opportunity, I'm suggesting that you |
| 00:-36         2           00:-36         3           00:-36         4           00:-35         6           00:-35         7           00:-35         9           00:-35         10           00:-35         12           00:-35         13           00:-35         14           00:-35         15           00:-35         16           00:-35         17           00:-35         19           00:-35         20           00:-35         21           00:-34         22           00:-34         23           00:-34         24 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. THE WITNESS: Thank you. MR. PRINCIOTTO: If we may go a little bit out of order here, Mr. Delia, just tell me if you have any objection. We do have Mr. Jacobs here, I don't think his testimony would take very long. We're still waiting for our traffic engineer to arrive.  So just to go over the results of the sign-in sheet, Mr. Delia and everyone else, we have 13 people that do not reside within 200 feet of the Broadway that would like to make comments. One person indicated he would like to testify. Two indicated that they have some type of exhibits or documents for evidence. We have six people that do live within 200 feet of Broadway, and it looks like perhaps three maybe want to testify.  And I can tell you that if we hear repetitive testimony, I'm going to ask you not to do it, not to be rude, but just to move this along. And if the testimony takes too long, doesn't get right to the point, it may impact the amount of time that the  | 00:-33  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: What documents do I want to share?  MR. COUTO: No, you said some people have documents.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know, some people said that they have handouts.  MR. NEWMAN: He has a right to see any handouts.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I haven't seen them, I don't know what they are.  MR. COUTO: So when we give the handouts?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I'm trying to do that right now.  MR. COUTO: Thank you.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I want to try to move this along. As I said in the beginning of the night, we need to get this matter to a resolution.  We are permitted to have limits on comment and to exclude repetitious statements or evidence. If people keep saying the same things over and over again, we just have to move on, because we have to get to a resolution.  So I'm not suggesting that anyone not  |

|                                   | 110  |                                   | 445   |
|-----------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| 00:00 1                           | 113  | 00:-31 <b>1</b>                   | 115   |
| 00:-32 1                          | should use the time valuably and not to repeat the                           |                                   | I'm a graduate of NJIT, with a  |
| 00:-32 2                          | same questions or the same comments, when we get to                          | 00:-31 2                          | bachelor's and also a master's. I'm a licensed                                    |
| 00:-32 3                          | that point.  | 00:-31 3                          | professional engineer, and I've been serving 20 such                              |
| 00:-32 <b>4</b>                   | So let's get to testimony. And as I  | 00:-31 4                          | years as a municipal traffic engineer for this scale                              |
| 00:-32 <b>5</b>                   | said, the priority would be those who reside within                          | 00:-31 <b>5</b>                   | type of project and also traffic signals and                                      |
| 00:-32 6                          | 200 feet.  | 00:-31 6                          | reviewing engineering and an engineer for applicants                              |
| 00:-32 7                          | Sally Gellert, you indicated that you  | 00:-30 7                          | in similar scale.   |
| 00:-32 8                          | wanted to testify.   | 00:-30 8                          | So this is basically my niche in terms  |
| 00:-32 9                          | MR. PREISS: Sorry. Brian just arrived  | 00:-30 9                          | of traffic engineering.   |
| 00:-32 10                         | and Evan has to testify before the public.                                   | 00:-30 10                         | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Any questions   |
| 00:-32 11                         | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. We were going  | 00:-30 11                         | on the qualifications?  |
| 00:-32 12                         | to go out of order.  | 00:-30 12                         | MR. DELIA: None. Thank you.   |
| 00:-32 13                         | MR. PREISS: I think the public should  | 00:-30 13                         | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  |
| 00:-32 14                         | hear that testimony before they comment. I hate to                           | 00:-30 14                         | Q. Your position with the zoning board in   |
| 00:-32 15                         | say it but   | 00:-30 15                         | the Borough of Woodcliff Lake?  |
| 00:-32 16                         | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You did.   | 00:-30 16                         | A. Yes.   |
| 00:-32 17                         | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Brian, come on in.   | 00:-30 17                         | Right now I serve as the traffic  |
| 00:-32 18                         | (Mr. Intindola is now present at 10:00                                       | 00:-30 18                         | engineer on behalf of the zoning board of Woodcliff                               |
| 00:-32 19                         | p.m.)  | 00:-30 19                         | Lake.   |
| 00:-32 <b>20</b>                  | MR. INTINDOLA: Hello, everyone.  | 00:-30 20                         | Q. You're familiar with the property that   |
| 00:-32 21                         | MR. DELIA: Don't sit down.   | 00:-30 21                         | is the subject of this application?   |
| 00:-32 22                         | MR. INTINDOLA: You had a long day so   | 00:-30 <b>22</b> 00:-30 <b>23</b> | A. Yes. Q. Okay. And can you describe for us the                                  |
| 00:-31 <b>23</b> 00:-31 <b>24</b> | far, everyone?  MR. NEWMAN: You don't know the half of                       | 00:-30 <b>23</b>                  | <b>Q.</b> Okay. And can you describe for us the closest intersection to the site? |
| 00:-31 <b>24</b>                  | it.  | 00:-30 <b>24</b>                  | A. Well, there is the actual intersection,  |
| 0031 23                           | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                                     | 0030 23                           | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|                                   | 201-641-1812   |                                   | 201-641-1812  |
|                                   | 114  |                                   | 116   |
| 00:-31 <b>1</b>                   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, we're going                                       | 00:-30 <b>1</b>                   | which is the driveway intersection, and then just                                 |
| 00:-31 <b>2</b>                   | to put you right to work.  | 00:-30 <b>2</b>                   | north there is the signalized intersection of                                     |
| 00:-31 <b>3</b>                   | MR. INTINDOLA: Okay.   | 00:-30 <b>3</b>                   | Broadway, Woodcliff Lake that is just to the north of                             |
| 00:-31 <b>4</b>                   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So raise your right  | 00:-30 <b>4</b>                   | us and also serves as access to the New Jersey                                    |
| 00:-31 <b>5</b>                   | hand.  | 00:-30 <b>5</b>                   | Transit station as well as what we'll call the                                    |
| 00:-31 <b>6</b>                   | Do you swear or affirm to tell the   | 00:-29 <b>6</b>                   | "Causeway" to get to the other side of Woodcliff                                  |
| 00:-31 7                          | truth under penalties of law?  | 00:-29 7                          | Lake.   |
| 00:-31 8                          | MR. INTINDOLA: Yes, I do.  | 00:-29 8                          | Q. Now, it's a difficult intersection to  |
| 00:-31 9                          | BRIAN A. INTINDOLA, P.E., c/o Neglia   | 00:-29 9                          | describe, but it is not what you would call a typical                             |
| 00:-31 10                         | Engineering Associates, 34 Park Avenue,                                      | 00:-29 10                         | intersection.   |
| 00:-31 <b>11</b> 00:-31 <b>12</b> | Lyndhurst, New Jersey 07071, having been duly                                | 00:-29 <b>11</b> 00:-29 <b>12</b> | Is that correct?  A. Correct.   |
| 00:-31 12                         | sworn/affirmed, testified as follows:  MR. PRINCIOTTO: State your full name. | 00:-29 12                         | Q. What aspects of it are not typical?  |
| 00:-31 13                         | MR. INTINDOLA: Yes.  | 00:-29 13                         | A. Well, one is that the train does cause   |
| 00:-31 15                         | Brian A Intindola. Spelling of my last                                       | 00:-29 14                         | a regular interruption of flow, and in that you get a                             |
| 00:-31 16                         | name, I-N-T-I-N-D-O-L-A.   | 00:-29 16                         | traffic signal that calls for red to avoid, you know,                             |
| 00:-31 <b>17</b>                  | I'm a principal at Neglia Engineering  | 00:-29 17                         | vehicles going across the railroad crossing. So one                               |
| 00:-31 <b>18</b>                  | Associates and serve as their principal traffic                              | 00:-29 18                         | element is that it's a skewed intersection. It also                               |
| 00:-31 <b>19</b>                  | engineer.  | 00:-29 <b>19</b>                  | has the geometric interruption of the railroad                                    |
| 00:-31 <b>20</b>                  | DIRECT EXAMINATION   | 00:-29 <b>20</b>                  | tracks, which also furthers askew and has its own                                 |
| 00:-31 <b>21</b>                  | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:   | 00:-29 <b>21</b>                  | demands of itself.  |
| 00:-31 <b>22</b>                  | Q. Okay. Can you give us quickly the   | 00:-29 <b>22</b>                  | Q. Can you describe for someone who would   |
| 00:-31 <b>23</b>                  | benefit of your educational background and                                   | 00:-28 <b>23</b>                  | read this transcript the alignment of the Causeway at                             |
| 00:-31 <b>24</b>                  | qualifications.  | 00:-28 <b>24</b>                  | Highview, and explain how they relate to one another?                             |
| 00:-31 <b>25</b>                  | A. Yes.  | 00:-28 <b>25</b>                  | A. Well, basically, if you were to  |
|                                   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                                     |                                   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|                                   | 201-641-1812   | 0 116 of 227                      | 201-641-1812  |

|  | 117   | 4   | 119   |
|--|---|---|---|
| 00:-28 1   | negotiate going from Highview across, you'd have to   | 00:-26 1  | A. If it was able to, but right now the   |
| 00:-28 <b>2</b> 00:-28 <b>3</b>  | chicane through the intersection, and that is what is   | 00:-26 <b>2</b> 00:-26 <b>3</b>   | geometry prevents that from happening.  Q. Well, that's because there's a building  |
|  | your through movement.  |   | ., .,   |
| 00:-28 4   | And because it is a connector, because  | 00:-26 <b>4</b> 00:-26 <b>5</b>   | there, correct?   |
| 00:-28 <b>5</b>  | you have the rest of the auto body in your way, it's  |   | <ul><li>A. Right, right.</li><li>Q. The way it was built, correct?</li></ul>  |
| _  | not like one of few connection points that you can  | 00:-26 <b>6</b> 00:-26 <b>7</b>   | ,   |
| _  | avail yourself to get to the other side of Woodcliff  | 00:-26 <b>8</b>   | A. Right.     Q. Does that particular configuration of  |
| 00:-28 <b>8</b> 00:-28 <b>9</b>  | Lake, so it has that function as well.  So it is a hard-working intersection  | 00:-26 <b>9</b>   | this, you know, intersection pose any traffic issues  |
| 00:-28 10  | and it's slightly geometrically unique.   | 00:-25 10   | or concerns to you?   |
| 00:-28 11  | Q. Now, how many traffic lights are there   | 00:-25 11   | A. Well, other than the train station or  |
| 00:-28 12  | at that intersection?   | 00:-25 11   | the commuter line taking green time away from the   |
| 00:-28 13  | A. Well, in its totality, it is a signal.   | 00:-25 12   | intersection, it is not a totally unusual   |
| 00:-28 14  | If I were to count the heads, it would be more than   | 00:-25 14   | intersection, it is not a totally unusual   |
| 00:-28 15  | ordinary. Typically, you would have two to three  | 00:-25 15   | of skew intersections, because, you know, if you go   |
| 00:-28 16  | traffic indicators.   | 00:-25 16   | back and you want to hear the whole story of Bergen   |
| 00:-27 17  | In this instance, you probably have 50  | 00:-25 17   | County, there was property lines along property   |
| 00:-27 18  | percent more, just to account for in giving the   | 00:-25 18   | lines, that's where the roads forms, and sometimes  |
| 00:-27 19  | motorists the adequate read they need to know whether   | 00:-25 19   | the property lines and the roads didn't really  |
| 00:-27 <b>20</b>   | to go forward, that they have a green light to go   | 00:-25 <b>20</b>  | line-up, so sometimes you'll have offset  |
| 00:-27 <b>21</b>   | through.  | 00:-25 <b>21</b>  | intersections or at least you're going through a  |
| 00:-27 <b>22</b>   | Q. Now, the Causeway, when you approach a   | 00:-25 <b>22</b>  | skew.   |
| 00:-27 <b>23</b>   | train station, the Causeway   | 00:-25 <b>23</b>  | So excepting the train station  |
| 00:-27 <b>24</b>   | MR. DELIA: Excuse me. I have to   | 00:-25 <b>24</b>  | facility, the geometry is not unusual in Bergen   |
| 00:-27 <b>25</b>   | interject here. We're talking about off-site  | 00:-25 <b>25</b>  | County, and it's typically because it is managed by a   |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|  | 201-641-1812  |   | 201-641-1812  |
|  |   |   |   |
|  | 118   |   | 120   |
| 00:-27 <b>1</b>  | 118 conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of   | 00:-25 <b>1</b>   | 120 traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  |
| 00:-27 <b>1</b> 00:-27 <b>2</b>  |   | 00:-25 <b>1</b> 00:-25 <b>2</b>   |   |
| _  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of   | _   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b>  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that  | 00:-25 <b>2</b>   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign,  |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b>  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by   | 00:-25 <b>2</b> 00:-25 <b>3</b>   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or   |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b> 00:-27 <b>6</b>  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we   | 00:-25 <b>2</b> 00:-25 <b>3</b> 00:-24 <b>4</b>   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't   |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b> 00:-27 <b>6</b> 00:-27 <b>7</b>  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and  | 00:-25 <b>2</b> 00:-25 <b>3</b> 00:-24 <b>4</b> 00:-24 <b>5</b> 00:-24 <b>6</b> 00:-24 <b>7</b>   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for  |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b> 00:-27 <b>6</b> 00:-27 <b>7</b> 00:-27 <b>8</b>  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions  | 00:-25 <b>2</b> 00:-25 <b>3</b> 00:-24 <b>4</b> 00:-24 <b>5</b> 00:-24 <b>6</b> 00:-24 <b>7</b> 00:-24 <b>8</b>   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique,  |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b> 00:-27 <b>6</b> 00:-27 <b>7</b> 00:-27 <b>8</b> 00:-27 <b>9</b>  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress  | 00:-25 <b>2</b> 00:-25 <b>3</b> 00:-24 <b>4</b> 00:-24 <b>5</b> 00:-24 <b>6</b> 00:-24 <b>7</b> 00:-24 <b>8</b> 00:-24 <b>9</b>   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board  |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b> 00:-27 <b>6</b> 00:-27 <b>7</b> 00:-27 <b>8</b> 00:-27 <b>9</b> 00:-26 <b>10</b>   | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within  | 00:-25 <b>2</b> 00:-25 <b>3</b> 00:-24 <b>4</b> 00:-24 <b>5</b> 00:-24 <b>6</b> 00:-24 <b>7</b> 00:-24 <b>8</b> 00:-24 <b>9</b> 00:-24 <b>10</b>                              | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the   |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b> 00:-27 <b>6</b> 00:-27 <b>7</b> 00:-27 <b>8</b> 00:-27 <b>9</b> 00:-26 <b>10</b> 00:-26 <b>11</b>  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think   | 00:-25 <b>2</b> 00:-25 <b>3</b> 00:-24 <b>4</b> 00:-24 <b>5</b> 00:-24 <b>6</b> 00:-24 <b>7</b> 00:-24 <b>8</b> 00:-24 <b>9</b> 00:-24 <b>10</b> 00:-24 <b>11</b>             | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming   |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b> 00:-27 <b>6</b> 00:-27 <b>7</b> 00:-27 <b>8</b> 00:-27 <b>9</b> 00:-26 <b>10</b> 00:-26 <b>11</b> 00:-26 <b>12</b>                                   | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection  | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 7 00:-24 8 00:-24 9 00:-24 11 00:-24 12   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.   |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b> 00:-27 <b>6</b> 00:-27 <b>7</b> 00:-27 <b>8</b> 00:-27 <b>9</b> 00:-26 <b>10</b> 00:-26 <b>11</b> 00:-26 <b>12</b> 00:-26 <b>13</b>                  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record  | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 7 00:-24 8 00:-24 9 00:-24 10 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 13   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you  |
| 00:-27 <b>2</b> 00:-27 <b>3</b> 00:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-27 <b>5</b> 00:-27 <b>6</b> 00:-27 <b>7</b> 00:-27 <b>8</b> 00:-27 <b>9</b> 00:-26 <b>10</b> 00:-26 <b>11</b> 00:-26 <b>12</b> 00:-26 <b>13</b> 00:-26 <b>14</b> | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular   | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 7 00:-24 8 00:-24 9 00:-24 11 00:-24 11 00:-24 13 00:-24 13   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?   |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 13 00:-26 14 00:-26 15  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 7 00:-24 8 00:-24 10 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 14 00:-24 15  | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report  |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 13 00:-26 14 00:-26 15 00:-26 16  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection.   | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 8 00:-24 9 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 13 00:-24 15 00:-24 15  | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what  |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 13 00:-26 14 00:-26 15 00:-26 16 00:-26 17  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection. You can continue.   | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 7 00:-24 9 00:-24 10 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 13 00:-24 15 00:-24 16 00:-24 17  | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that  |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 13 00:-26 14 00:-26 15 00:-26 16 00:-26 17  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection. You can continue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.   | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 7 00:-24 8 00:-24 10 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 13 00:-24 15 00:-24 16 00:-24 17 00:-24 18                                | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that may be a concern to the board is that in the morning   |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 13 00:-26 14 00:-26 15 00:-26 16 00:-26 17 00:-26 18 00:-26 19  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection. You can continue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you. BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 8 00:-24 10 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 13 00:-24 15 00:-24 16 00:-24 18 00:-24 18   | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that may be a concern to the board is that in the morning there would be more left turns out as compared to the   |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 13 00:-26 14 00:-26 15 00:-26 16 00:-26 17 00:-26 18 00:-26 19 00:-26 20                                | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection. You can continue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  Q. What direction does the Causeway head   | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 7 00:-24 8 00:-24 10 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 13 00:-24 15 00:-24 16 00:-24 17 00:-24 18 00:-24 19 00:-24 20            | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that may be a concern to the board is that in the morning there would be more left turns out as compared to the office use. That's put into the context that the  |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 15 00:-26 15 00:-26 16 00:-26 18 00:-26 19 00:-26 20 00:-26 21  | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection. You can continue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you. BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  Q. What direction does the Causeway head as you approach the train station; does it take a  | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 7 00:-24 9 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 13 00:-24 15 00:-24 16 00:-24 17 00:-24 18 00:-24 19 00:-24 20 00:-23 21                     | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that may be a concern to the board is that in the morning there would be more left turns out as compared to the office use. That's put into the context that the overall trip generation will be less, will be less,  |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 13 00:-26 14 00:-26 15 00:-26 16 00:-26 17 00:-26 18 00:-26 19 00:-26 20 00:-26 21                                | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection.  You can continue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  Q. What direction does the Causeway head as you approach the train station; does it take a bend to the right?   | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 7 00:-24 10 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 15 00:-24 15 00:-24 16 00:-24 18 00:-24 18 00:-24 19 00:-23 21 00:-23 22           | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that may be a concern to the board is that in the morning there would be more left turns out as compared to the office use. That's put into the context that the overall trip generation will be less, will be less, but, specifically, if you were looked at that traffic  |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 15 00:-26 15 00:-26 17 00:-26 18 00:-26 19 00:-26 20 00:-26 21 00:-26 22                                | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection. You can continue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  Q. What direction does the Causeway head as you approach the train station; does it take a bend to the right?  A. Yes.   | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 7 00:-24 8 00:-24 10 00:-24 12 00:-24 12 00:-24 15 00:-24 15 00:-24 16 00:-24 17 00:-24 18 00:-24 19 00:-24 19 00:-23 21 00:-23 22 | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that may be a concern to the board is that in the morning there would be more left turns out as compared to the office use. That's put into the context that the overall trip generation will be less, will be less, but, specifically, if you were looked at that traffic movement in the morning, the way it was presented by   |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 15 00:-26 15 00:-26 17 00:-26 18 00:-26 19 00:-26 20 00:-26 21 00:-26 23 00:-26 24                      | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection. You can continue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  Q. What direction does the Causeway head as you approach the train station; does it take a bend to the right?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. All right. And if that Causeway | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 6 00:-24 9 00:-24 10 00:-24 11 00:-24 12 00:-24 15 00:-24 16 00:-24 17 00:-24 18 00:-24 19 00:-24 20 00:-23 21 00:-23 23 00:-23 24 | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that may be a concern to the board is that in the morning there would be more left turns out as compared to the office use. That's put into the context that the overall trip generation will be less, will be less, but, specifically, if you were looked at that traffic movement in the morning, the way it was presented by the applicant, there would be seven more left turns |
| 00:-27 2 00:-27 3 00:-27 4 00:-27 5 00:-27 6 00:-27 7 00:-27 8 00:-27 9 00:-26 10 00:-26 11 00:-26 12 00:-26 15 00:-26 15 00:-26 17 00:-26 18 00:-26 19 00:-26 20 00:-26 21 00:-26 22                                | conditions, which is irrelevant for the purposes of existing off-site conditions. To the degree that impacts were discussed, they were discussed by Mr. Luglio in that context. I would suggest that we narrow the focus to the impact of this project and not continue to have this talk of existing conditions that are off-site, especially in the context of the county approval that we received.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: The ingress and egress to this property, the applicant's property, is within the vicinity and I'll establish it, although I think it's on the record of this particular intersection and that there is, I think, issues and the record should have a description of this particular intersection which  MR. DELIA: It's a standing objection. You can continue.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:  Q. What direction does the Causeway head as you approach the train station; does it take a bend to the right?  A. Yes.   | 00:-25 2 00:-25 3 00:-24 4 00:-24 5 00:-24 7 00:-24 8 00:-24 10 00:-24 12 00:-24 12 00:-24 15 00:-24 15 00:-24 16 00:-24 17 00:-24 18 00:-24 19 00:-24 19 00:-23 21 00:-23 22 | traffic signal, that kind of ameliorates the offset.  Sometimes when you have a stop sign, it's hard to align the intersection to work right or you try to go to a four-way stop and that doesn't work too well. I don't want to go too far afield for this particular intersection, although it's unique, it doesn't mean it doesn't work well.  Q. Now, the traffic flow in this particular application will change if the board approves this application; in other words, the peak-hour flow will be different in terms of coming into the property and coming out of the property.  Does that present any concerns to you as a traffic engineer?  A. So, as we reviewed Mr. Luglio's report of May 17th, we asked that specific question and what we ascertained is that the differential movement that may be a concern to the board is that in the morning there would be more left turns out as compared to the office use. That's put into the context that the overall trip generation will be less, will be less, but, specifically, if you were looked at that traffic movement in the morning, the way it was presented by   |

|                                   |   | 1                                 |  |
|-----------------------------------|---|-----------------------------------|--|
|                                   | 121   |                                   | 123  |
| 00:-23 1                          | So the differential in that one   | 00:-20 1                          | courtesy gap is provided in the flow of traffic, and   |
| 00:-23 2                          | critical turn, in my mind, would be seven more over   | 00:-20 2                          | what I'm finding in driving behavior, the courtesy   |
| 00:-23 3                          | the peak hour. You have 60 minutes, you have seven  | 00:-20 3                          | gaps are less and less. You're at the driveway,  |
| 00:-23 <b>4</b> 00:-23 <b>5</b>   | additional cars.  | 00:-20 <b>4</b> 00:-20 <b>5</b>   | someone waives you on or like no, I'm not letting you  |
|                                   | The other turn that is different would  | _                                 | go. What I'm saying is if there is a do not block  |
| _                                 | be in the PM, which would be the southbound left into   | _                                 | the box painted and there's any number of signage  |
| _                                 | the site, and in that instance, people are returning  | _                                 | that we can put as do not block the box or whatever,   |
| 00:-23 <b>8</b> 00:-23 <b>9</b>   | home from work. And the way the applicant has presented, and I don't disagree with it, would be   | 00:-20 <b>8</b> 00:-20 <b>9</b>   | that can be under the county purview, then that takes care of two things.                      |
| 00:-23 10                         | eight additional left turns that would be more than   | 00:-20 <b>9</b>                   | One, the left turns in can access the  |
| 00:-23 11                         | what the office presents.   | 00:-20 10                         | site, which would be the southbound turns, and also  |
| 00:-23 11                         | So that is the specific differential in   | 00:-20 11                         | the left turns out in the morning can get out if   |
| 00:-23 12                         | the project, but in the context of the total trip   | 00:-20 12                         | there is a traffic signal or the train is holding up   |
| 00:-22 14                         | generation being less than the resumption of the  | 00:-20 14                         | traffic, then they can have the courtesy gap, which  |
| 00:-22 15                         | office space, but, you know, at full occupancy. And   | 00:-20 15                         | is pretty much memorialized by painting the do not   |
| 00:-22 16                         | to put that into context, I'm just going to look at   | 00:-20 16                         | block the box, and the reason why I say that is  |
| 00:-22 17                         | the trip generation as presented. And so for the  | 00:-19 <b>17</b>                  | because the alternative is if you do a right in,   |
| 00:-22 18                         | office, it would have 66 total AM trips and 50 total  | 00:-19 <b>18</b>                  | right out. You know, I'm thinking about this as I  |
| 00:-22 19                         | PM trips, single peak hour each, compared to 29   | 00:-19 <b>19</b>                  | heard the testimony in the hearings, I think it  |
| 00:-22 <b>20</b>                  | residential trips in the morning and 37 residential   | 00:-19 <b>20</b>                  | presents more issues than it solves. So you have,  |
| 00:-22 <b>21</b>                  | trips in the evening.   | 00:-19 <b>21</b>                  | you know, you say if you want to make a left, but you  |
| 00:-22 <b>22</b>                  | So globally the trips are less, the   | 00:-19 <b>22</b>                  | made the right turn out and come back around, you  |
| 00:-22 <b>23</b>                  | vehicle trips are less, but, locally, with those two  | 00:-19 <b>23</b>                  | really have to come back around, it's not like one   |
| 00:-22 <b>24</b>                  | specific movements, the left turn out, there's an   | 00:-19 <b>24</b>                  | block around, it's a while. So we're trying to avoid   |
| 00:-22 <b>25</b>                  | increase of seven, and the left turn in the   | 00:-19 <b>25</b>                  | that. So the applicant's traffic should stay where   |
|                                   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |                                   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|                                   | 201-641-1812  |                                   | 201-641-1812   |
|                                   | 122   |                                   | 124  |
| 00:-21 <b>1</b>                   | afternoon is an increase of eight.  | 00:-19 <b>1</b>                   | it belongs, and that's on Washington. And if we  |
| 00:-21 <b>2</b>                   | So that is the difference of the two  | 00:-19 <b>2</b>                   | provide the do not block the box striping, I think   |
| 00:-21 <b>3</b>                   | uses.   | 00:-19 <b>3</b>                   | that solves that problem. You know, and not to go on   |
| 00:-21 <b>4</b>                   | <b>Q.</b> Do you have any recommendations to the  | 00:-19 <b>4</b>                   | and on   |
| 00:-21 <b>5</b>                   | board   | 00:-19 <b>5</b>                   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Broadway?  |
| 00:-21 <b>6</b>                   | A. Well, the difficulty is that   | 00:-19 <b>6</b>                   | THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. Broadway.  |
| 00:-21 <b>7</b>                   | <b>Q.</b> from a traffic standpoint?  | 00:-19 <b>7</b>                   | Broadway. Sorry.   |
| 00:-21 <b>8</b>                   | A. Yeah.  | 00:-19 <b>8</b>                   | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:   |
| 00:-21 <b>9</b>                   | The difficulty is that we have the  | 00:-19 <b>9</b>                   | <b>Q.</b> We all knew what you meant.  |
| 00:-21 <b>10</b>                  | queue of the traffic signal that we just discussed.   | 00:-19 <b>10</b>                  | A. Broadway, and I was thinking about  |
| 00:-21 <b>11</b>                  | When it's green I mean when it's red, it  | 00:-19 <b>11</b>                  | Colonial times and Washington, that's what happens to  |
| 00:-21 <b>12</b>                  | backwashes across the subject site in the context of  | 00:-19 <b>12</b>                  | me, I get a little cross wired sometimes.  |
| 00:-21 <b>13</b>                  | any use would experience that queue.  | 00:-19 <b>13</b>                  | So that being said, and then I think   |
| 00:-21 <b>14</b>                  | So what I've done in the past, and I  | 00:-18 <b>14</b>                  | that solves the problem or the issue where it belongs  |
| 00:-21 <b>15</b>                  | don't know if the applicant would be amenable to it,  | 00:-18 <b>15</b>                  | where it should be at the location.  |
| 00:-21 <b>16</b>                  | is to bring this to the attention of the county,  | 00:-18 <b>16</b>                  | <b>Q.</b> I'm going to ask one question.   |
| 00:-21 <b>17</b>                  | regardless of whether they're approved or not, and  | 00:-18 17                         | If you have this do not block the box  |
| 00:-21 <b>18</b>                  | see if they can put a do not block the box striping   | 00:-18 <b>18</b>                  | and people don't honor it, then there is potential   |
| 00:-21 19                         | at the driveway that takes care of a couple of  | 00:-18 19                         | for traffic to backup on Broadway?   |
| 00:-21 <b>20</b>                  | things.   | 00:-18 <b>20</b>                  | A. Well, it is as it exists, and we heard  |
| 00:-21 <b>21</b>                  | If it's respected, and it is after a  | 00:-18 <b>21</b>                  | from their traffic engineer that it certainly does go  |
| 00:-21 <b>22</b>                  | while, people get used to it, if it's respected, then   | 00:-18 22                         | past the driveway. And I think that do we have the   |
| 00:-20 23                         | those left turns that need to get out can get out,  | 00:-18 23                         | opportunity to correct that here, and I have   |
| 00:-20 <b>24</b> 00:-20 <b>25</b> | because there's a gap made, some traffic engineers  | 00:-18 <b>24</b> 00:-18 <b>25</b> | implemented it, people do respect it and they'll be  |
| 0020 <b>23</b>                    | will testify that people can get out anyway because a<br>LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. | 0018 23                           | times when people don't respect it, but, overall, it  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
|                                   |   |                                   |  |
|                                   | 201-641-1812  | I                                 | 201-641-1812   |

|                  |   | 1                |   |
|------------------|---|------------------|---|
|                  | 125   |                  | 127   |
| 00:-18 <b>1</b>  | seems to be a plausible solution for an inconvenience | 00:-15 1         |   |
| 00:-18 2         | that the site experiences now under the existing      | 00:-15           | 3   |
| 00:-18 3         | condition.  | 00:-15           |   |
| 00:-18 4         | Q. Any other comments on the traffic?                 | 00:-15           |   |
| 00:-18 <b>5</b>  | A. I think that the applicant had                     | 00:-15           |   |
| 00:-18 6         | testified that they are going to provide a sidewalk   | 00:-15           | — · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·               |
| 00:-18 7         | down the driveway. And if this is positioned as a     | 00:-15 <b>7</b>  |   |
| 00:-17 8         | transportation or transit-oriented development or     | 00:-15           |   |
| 00:-17 9         | somewhere in that shade of development, that          | 00:-15           |   |
| 00:-17 <b>10</b> | certainly should be provided, because that would be   | 00:-15 <b>10</b> | •   |
| 00:-17 <b>11</b> | conducive for people that live there to walk down the | 00:-15 <b>11</b> | •   |
| 00:-17 <b>12</b> | driveway and be on the sidewalk, as opposed to in the | 00:-15 <b>12</b> | .,  |
| 00:-17 <b>13</b> | driveway, and I think that would be a good            | 00:-15 <b>13</b> |   |
| 00:-17 <b>14</b> | recommendation to move forward.                       | 00:-15 <b>14</b> | A. Yeah.  |
| 00:-17 <b>15</b> | (Veronica Appelle letter is marked as                 | 00:-14 <b>15</b> | Q and traffic counts?                                 |
| 00:-17 <b>16</b> | exhibit O-1 for identification.)                      | 00:-14 <b>16</b> | A. Yes.   |
| 00:-17 <b>17</b> | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:                                    | 00:-14 <b>17</b> | 3 , 1   |
| 00:-17 <b>18</b> | <b>Q.</b> I'm going to show you what we marked as     | 00:-14 <b>18</b> | approximately 4,500 trips on December 4th, going      |
| 00:-17 <b>19</b> | O-1, which is a letter to me from Veronica Appelle,   | 00:-14 <b>19</b> | Broadway southbound for a 24-hour period.             |
| 00:-17 <b>20</b> | which certain attachments.                            | 00:-14 <b>20</b> | And then Broadway northbound,                         |
| 00:-17 <b>21</b> | Mr. Delia has a copy of it.                           | 00:-14 <b>21</b> | approximately 5,500 vehicles, not trips, on December  |
| 00:-17 <b>22</b> | MR. DELIA: And once again for the                     | 00:-14 <b>22</b> | ch.   |
| 00:-17 <b>23</b> | record, I object to parts of that, which were         | 00:-14 23        | <b>Q.</b> These are traffic counts, right?            |
| 00:-17 <b>24</b> | received at noon today.                               | 00:-14 <b>24</b> | A. These are 24-hour, it looks like they              |
| 00:-17 <b>25</b> | THE WITNESS: And it is a cover letter,                | 00:-14 <b>25</b> | are tube counts that they did, I don't know the exact |
|                  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.              |                  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.              |
|                  | 201-641-1812  |                  | 201-641-1812  |
|                  | 126   |                  | 128   |
| 00:-16 <b>1</b>  | handwritten cover letter. I'm sure it was entered     | 00:-14 <b>1</b>  | methodology that they did, but it looks that way.     |
| 00:-16 <b>2</b>  | into the record. I don't want to belabor that.        | 00:-14 2         | And then what I can say about this is                 |
| 00:-16 <b>3</b>  | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:                                    | 00:-14           | not that I did the data myself, but it is consistent  |
| 00:-16 <b>4</b>  | Q. All right. Just very quickly, I                    | 00:-14           | with what the applicant's traffic engineer has        |
| 00:-16 <b>5</b>  | submitted this to you, you've reviewed this before.   | 00:-14           | reported in his previous testimony.                   |
| 00:-16 <b>6</b>  | A. I had the opportunity to read through              | 00:-14           | So it's kind of like another data point               |
| 00:-16 <b>7</b>  | it, yes.  | 00:-14           | to confirm both the peak hour and the 24 hours that   |
| 00:-16 <b>8</b>  | <b>Q.</b> And the information on what was the         | 00:-14           | have been previously reported by the expert's [sic]   |
| 00:-16 <b>9</b>  | handwritten date of August 7, 2018, the data there    | 00:-14           | 3   |
| 00:-16 <b>10</b> | with regard to trips and 60 dwellings and 600 trips   | 00:-14 10        | So like when I look at the data, I see                |
| 00:-16 <b>11</b> | for a 24-hour period, are you familiar where that     | 00:-13 <b>11</b> |   |
| 00:-16 <b>12</b> | data came from?                                       | 00:-13 <b>12</b> | , ,   |
| 00:-16 <b>13</b> | A. Yeah, the plausible source of that                 | 00:-13 13        |   |
| 00:-16 <b>14</b> | would be from the Residential Site Improvement        | 00:-13 <b>14</b> | hour trips northbound, which is in the order or the   |
| 00:-16 <b>15</b> | Standards, which reports per a dwelling, I believe    | 00:-13 <b>15</b> | , , , , ,   |
| 00:-16 <b>16</b> | it's a single-family detached, it would be 10 trips   | 00:-13 <b>16</b> | traffic engineer, so it kind of converges on that     |
| 00:-16 <b>17</b> | on a 24-hour basis, and it doesn't say this           | 00:-13 <b>17</b> | same data, so it seems to be consistent.              |
| 00:-16 <b>18</b> | explicitly, but I'm just drawing from what I know,    | 00:-13 <b>18</b> | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. I don't                    |
| 00:-15 <b>19</b> | that probably came from RSIS, which is a typical      | 00:-13 <b>19</b> | have any other questions.                             |
| 00:-15 <b>20</b> | calculation to figure out the number of trips when    | 00:-13 <b>20</b> | · · ·   |
| 00:-15 <b>21</b> | you're designing the type of road that a residential  | 00:-13 <b>21</b> | 1 3   |
| 00:-15 <b>22</b> | project would host.                                   | 00:-13 <b>22</b> | So the trip generation, you stated, per               |
| 00:-15 <b>23</b> | <b>Q.</b> Okay. So the Residential Site               | 00:-13 <b>23</b> | the applicant's expert witness is less, but that only |
| 00:-15 <b>24</b> | Improvement Standards would have this particular      | 00:-13 <b>24</b> | relates to the designated peak hours, correct?        |
| 00:-15 <b>25</b> | data?   | 00:-13 <b>25</b> | THE WITNESS: Less with the reported                   |
|                  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.              |                  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.              |
| 1                | 201-641-1812  |                  | 201-641-1812  |

|   | 129  |  | 131  |
|---|--|--|--|
| 00:-13 <b>1</b>   | peak hours, yes.   | 00:-10 <b>1</b>  | with me right now, because I was focusing on the peak  |
| 00:-13 2  | MR. HAYES: So, in your opinion, which  | 00:-10 2   | hour.  |
| 00:-12 3  | use do you think generates more trips in the 22 other  | 00:-10 3   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Any other  |
| 00:-12 4  | off-peak hours?  | 00:-10 4   | questions?   |
| 00:-12 5  | THE WITNESS: Well, that's what we  | 00:-10 <b>5</b>  | MR. SPIRIG: Yeah, I have one.  |
| 00:-12 6  | design. So, then, there are like, say, to answer   | 00:-10 6   | You were given a copy of the   |
| 00:-12 7  | your question  | 00:-10 7   | conditional approval by the Bergen County Planning   |
| 00:-12 8  | MR. HAYES: I understand you studied  | 00:-10 8   | Board. Have you seen a copy of that?   |
| 00:-12 9  | it, how you gear the study to measure the peak hours.  | 00:-10 9   | THE WITNESS: I haven't.  |
| 00:-12 10   | For these two particular uses we're  | 00:-10 <b>10</b>   | MR. SPIRIG: Then I won't ask.  |
| 00:-12 11   | talking about, a residential use or a commercial use,  | 00:-10 <b>11</b>   | Thank you.   |
| 00:-12 12   | for the remainder of the day that is not that peak   | 00:-10 <b>12</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Motion to open to the  |
| 00:-12 13   | hour, including weekends, which use generates more   | 00:-10 13  | public?  |
| 00:-12 14   | total trips?   | 00:-10 14  | MR. HAYES: Motion to open to the   |
| 00:-12 15   | THE WITNESS: I would think that it   | 00:-10 <b>15</b>   | public.  |
| 00:-12 16   | would be comparable. Like in terms of order of   | 00:-10 <b>16</b>   | MR. SPIRIG: Second.  |
| 00:-12 17   | magnitude over 24 hours, like it would be a similar  | 00:-10 <b>17</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?  |
| 00:-12 18   | trip generation with a little bit more on the  | 00:-10 18  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond   |
| 00:-12 19   | weekends when people are home, because typical   | 00:-10 19  | in the affirmative.)   |
| 00:-12 <b>20</b>  | offices are 9 to 5 and closed on Saturday, depending   | 00:-10 <b>20</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?   |
| 00:-12 <b>21</b>  | on the office. So then specific to a Saturday, the   | 00:-10 <b>21</b>   | (No response.)   |
| 00:-11 <b>22</b>  | Saturday peak hours for a residential use are similar  | 00:-10 <b>22</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. If you have  |
| 00:-11 <b>23</b>  | to   | 00:-10 <b>23</b>   | a question for this witness, yes, for this witness.  |
| 00:-11 <b>24</b>  | MR. HAYES: I'm not talking about peak  | 00:-10 <b>24</b>   | MR. COUTO: I just have a quick   |
| 00:-11 <b>25</b>  | hours, I'm talking about all other times.  | 00:-10 <b>25</b>   | question.  |
|   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|   | 201-641-1812   |  | 201-641-1812   |
|   | 400  |  |  |
|   | 130  |  | 132  |
| 00:-11 <b>1</b>   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying   | 00:-10 <b>1</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask  |
| 00:-11 <b>1</b> 00:-11 <b>2</b>   |  | 00:-10 <b>1</b> 00:-10 <b>2</b>  |  |
|   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying   |  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  |
| 00:-11 <b>2</b> 00:-11 <b>3</b> 00:-11 <b>4</b>   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same   | 00:-10 <b>2</b> 00:-10 <b>3</b> 00:-10 <b>4</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  |
| 00:-11 <b>2</b> 00:-11 <b>3</b> 00:-11 <b>4</b> 00:-11 <b>5</b>   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  | 00:-10 <b>2</b> 00:-10 <b>3</b> 00:-10 <b>4</b> 00:-10 <b>5</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane  |
| 00:-11 <b>2</b> 00:-11 <b>3</b> 00:-11 <b>4</b> 00:-11 <b>5</b> 00:-11 <b>6</b>   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually  | 00:-10 <b>2</b> 00:-10 <b>3</b> 00:-10 <b>4</b> 00:-10 <b>5</b> 00:-10 <b>6</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You   |
| 00:-11 <b>2</b> 00:-11 <b>3</b> 00:-11 <b>4</b> 00:-11 <b>5</b> 00:-11 <b>6</b> 00:-11 <b>7</b>   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.   | 00:-10 <b>2</b> 00:-10 <b>3</b> 00:-10 <b>4</b> 00:-10 <b>5</b> 00:-10 <b>6</b> 00:-09 <b>7</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that   |
| 00:-11 <b>2</b> 00:-11 <b>3</b> 00:-11 <b>4</b> 00:-11 <b>5</b> 00:-11 <b>6</b> 00:-11 <b>7</b> 00:-11 <b>8</b>   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your  | 00:-10 <b>2</b> 00:-10 <b>3</b> 00:-10 <b>4</b> 00:-10 <b>5</b> 00:-10 <b>6</b> 00:-09 <b>7</b> 00:-09 <b>8</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  | 00:-10 <b>2</b> 00:-10 <b>3</b> 00:-10 <b>4</b> 00:-10 <b>5</b> 00:-10 <b>6</b> 00:-09 <b>7</b> 00:-09 <b>8</b> 00:-09 <b>9</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the  |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you   | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 9 00:-09 10  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 9 00:-09 10 00:-09 11  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's  | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 9 00:-09 10 00:-09 11 00:-09 12  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a  | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 9 00:-09 10 00:-09 11 00:-09 12 00:-09 13  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it  |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 13 00:-11 14   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 9 00:-09 10 00:-09 11 00:-09 12 00:-09 13 00:-09 14  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 13 00:-11 14 00:-11 15   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to  | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 9 00:-09 10 00:-09 11 00:-09 12 00:-09 13  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with  |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 13 00:-11 14 00:-11 15 00:-11 16   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 9 00:-09 10 00:-09 11 00:-09 12 00:-09 13 00:-09 14 00:-09 15  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 13 00:-11 14 00:-11 15   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to  | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 10 00:-09 11 00:-09 12 00:-09 13 00:-09 14 00:-09 15 00:-09 16   | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?  THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 13 00:-11 14 00:-11 15 00:-11 16 00:-11 17   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the  | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 10 00:-09 11 00:-09 12 00:-09 13 00:-09 14 00:-09 15 00:-09 16 00:-09 17   | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 13 00:-11 15 00:-11 15 00:-11 17 00:-11 18   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the board.   | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 10 00:-09 11 00:-09 12 00:-09 13 00:-09 14 00:-09 15 00:-09 16 00:-09 18   | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?  THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.  MR. COUTO: I don't know what "joint"   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 13 00:-11 15 00:-11 15 00:-11 16 00:-11 17 00:-11 18 00:-11 19   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the board.  MR. HAYES: What your opinion is.   | 00:-10 2 00:-10 3 00:-10 4 00:-10 5 00:-10 6 00:-09 7 00:-09 8 00:-09 10 00:-09 11 00:-09 12 00:-09 13 00:-09 14 00:-09 15 00:-09 16 00:-09 17 00:-09 18 00:-09 19   | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?  THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.  MR. COUTO: I don't know what "joint" means.  |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 13 00:-11 14 00:-11 15 00:-11 16 00:-11 17 00:-11 18 00:-11 19 00:-11 20   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the board.  MR. HAYES: What your opinion is.  THE WITNESS: There's actual data from  | 00:-10       2         00:-10       4         00:-10       5         00:-10       6         00:-09       7         00:-09       8         00:-09       9         00:-09       10         00:-09       11         00:-09       12         00:-09       13         00:-09       14         00:-09       15         00:-09       16         00:-09       17         00:-09       18         00:-09       19         00:-09       20   | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?  THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.  MR. COUTO: I don't know what "joint" means.  THE WITNESS: Let me be clear.   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 15 00:-11 15 00:-11 17 00:-11 18 00:-11 18 00:-11 19 00:-11 20 00:-11 21   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the board.  MR. HAYES: What your opinion is.  THE WITNESS: There's actual data from the ITE that shows you and takes you through the   | 00:-10     2       00:-10     4       00:-10     5       00:-10     6       00:-09     7       00:-09     8       00:-09     9       00:-09     10       00:-09     11       00:-09     12       00:-09     13       00:-09     14       00:-09     15       00:-09     16       00:-09     17       00:-09     18       00:-09     19       00:-09     20       00:-09     21   | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?  THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.  MR. COUTO: I don't know what "joint" means.  THE WITNESS: Let me be clear.  It is a joint effort with Bergen   |
| 00:-11 2 00:-11 3 00:-11 4 00:-11 5 00:-11 6 00:-11 7 00:-11 8 00:-11 9 00:-11 10 00:-11 11 00:-11 12 00:-11 13 00:-11 15 00:-11 15 00:-11 16 00:-11 17 00:-11 18 00:-11 19 00:-11 20 00:-11 21   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the board.  MR. HAYES: What your opinion is.  THE WITNESS: There's actual data from the ITE that shows you and takes you through the 24-hour bell curve of trip generation or the sinusoid   | 00:-10       2         00:-10       4         00:-10       5         00:-10       6         00:-09       7         00:-09       8         00:-09       9         00:-09       10         00:-09       12         00:-09       13         00:-09       14         00:-09       15         00:-09       16         00:-09       17         00:-09       18         00:-09       19         00:-09       20         00:-09       21         00:-09       22   | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?  THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.  MR. COUTO: I don't know what "joint" means.  THE WITNESS: Let me be clear.  It is a joint effort with Bergen  County, New Jersey Transit, and NJ DOT.  |
| 00:-11     2       00:-11     3       00:-11     5       00:-11     6       00:-11     7       00:-11     9       00:-11     10       00:-11     12       00:-11     13       00:-11     14       00:-11     15       00:-11     16       00:-11     17       00:-11     18       00:-11     19       00:-11     20       00:-11     21       00:-11     21       00:-11     23   | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the board.  MR. HAYES: What your opinion is.  THE WITNESS: There's actual data from the ITE that shows you and takes you through the 24-hour bell curve of trip generation or the sinusoid through trip generation for both the residential use  | 00:-10       2         00:-10       4         00:-10       5         00:-10       6         00:-09       7         00:-09       9         00:-09       10         00:-09       12         00:-09       12         00:-09       14         00:-09       15         00:-09       16         00:-09       17         00:-09       18         00:-09       19         00:-09       20         00:-09       21         00:-09       23  | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?  THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.  MR. COUTO: I don't know what "joint" means.  THE WITNESS: Let me be clear.  It is a joint effort with Bergen  County, New Jersey Transit, and NJ DOT.  MR. COUTO: That our town can initiate?  |
| 00:-11     2       00:-11     3       00:-11     4       00:-11     5       00:-11     7       00:-11     8       00:-11     9       00:-11     10       00:-11     11       00:-11     12       00:-11     14       00:-11     15       00:-11     16       00:-11     17       00:-11     18       00:-11     19       00:-11     20       00:-11     21       00:-11     23       00:-11     24  | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the board.  MR. HAYES: What your opinion is.  THE WITNESS: There's actual data from the ITE that shows you and takes you through the 24-hour bell curve of trip generation or the sinusoid through trip generation for both the residential use and for the commercial use.  | 00:-10         2           00:-10         4           00:-10         5           00:-10         6           00:-09         7           00:-09         8           00:-09         9           00:-09         10           00:-09         11           00:-09         12           00:-09         13           00:-09         14           00:-09         15           00:-09         16           00:-09         17           00:-09         18           00:-09         19           00:-09         20           00:-09         21           00:-09         22           00:-09         23           00:-09         24 | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?  THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.  MR. COUTO: I don't know what "joint" means.  THE WITNESS: Let me be clear.  It is a joint effort with Bergen  County, New Jersey Transit, and NJ DOT.  MR. COUTO: That our town can initiate?  THE WITNESS: They can always initiate   |
| 00:-11       2         00:-11       3         00:-11       5         00:-11       7         00:-11       8         00:-11       9         00:-11       10         00:-11       12         00:-11       13         00:-11       14         00:-11       15         00:-11       16         00:-11       17         00:-11       18         00:-11       20         00:-11       21         00:-11       22         00:-11       23         00:-11       24 | THE WITNESS: No, well, I'm just saying all other times they would be comparable, with the exception of the weekend.  MR. HAYES: From 9:00 at night, same trip generation, office building, residential use?  THE WITNESS: No, it would be, actually there would be more activity at the residential use.  I'm not prepared to answer your question.  MR. HAYES: I'm just asking what you think.  THE WITNESS: So my answer is, it's comparable, and in the off-peak it's probably a little bit more with the residential.  MR. HAYES: I'm not asking for you to support anything with statistics.  THE WITNESS: I can provide that to the board.  MR. HAYES: What your opinion is.  THE WITNESS: There's actual data from the ITE that shows you and takes you through the 24-hour bell curve of trip generation or the sinusoid through trip generation for both the residential use and for the commercial use.  Unfortunately, I don't have that data  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812 | 00:-10         2           00:-10         4           00:-10         5           00:-10         6           00:-09         7           00:-09         8           00:-09         9           00:-09         10           00:-09         11           00:-09         12           00:-09         13           00:-09         14           00:-09         15           00:-09         16           00:-09         17           00:-09         18           00:-09         19           00:-09         20           00:-09         21           00:-09         22           00:-09         23           00:-09         24 | MR. NEWMAN: You don't have to ask questions.  (Laughter.)  MR. COUTO: Very quick. Very quick.  Who would control to make the lane through with the train is on, who is in control? You have to make a application to the county to make that lane flow through, north, south?  THE WITNESS: As I understand the question, that would be a joint application with Bergen County to the NJ DOT to convene a diagnostic team meeting at the site and then take it through that process. It's a long, drawn out process, but it can be done.  MR. COUTO: Then it would be done with the owner of the site and the town together?  THE WITNESS: No, I did not say that.  MR. COUTO: I don't know what "joint" means.  THE WITNESS: Let me be clear.  It is a joint effort with Bergen  County, New Jersey Transit, and NJ DOT.  MR. COUTO: That our town can initiate?  THE WITNESS: They can always initiate that, and I'd be glad to talk to Bergen County to see  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812 |

|  |                                 | 405  |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| 0:-09 <b>1</b> if that process is, you know, feasible to be                                  | 00:-07 <b>1</b>                 | 135<br>MR. DELIA: Oh, I will say we will   |
| 2:-09 <b>2</b> initiated.  | 00:-07 2                        | stipulate that we will approach the county on a do                                   |
| 0:-09 <b>3</b> MR. COUTO: Thank you.   | 00:-07 3                        | not block the box.   |
| o:-09 <b>4</b> MS. BORRELLI: Hi. Ann Marie Borrelli.   | 00:-07 <b>4</b>                 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.  |
| 2:-08 <b>5</b> You talked about the do not block box,  | 00:-07 <b>5</b>                 | THE WITNESS: Thank you for your time,  |
| 0:-08 <b>6</b> right?  | 00:-07 <b>6</b>                 | board members.   |
| 0:-08 <b>7</b> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Use a microphone.   | 00:-07 <b>7</b>                 | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thank you.   |
| 0:-08 <b>8</b> MS. BORRELLI: I'm sorry.  | 00:-07 <b>8</b>                 | Okay.  |
| 9 You talked about the do not block box  | 00:-07 <b>9</b>                 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Raise your right hand.   |
| o:-08 <b>10</b> as about a solution for the proposed apartments, but                         | 00:-07 <b>10</b>                | Do you swear or affirm to tell the   |
| 0:-08 <b>11</b> that also could be a solution for the existing office                        | 00:-07 <b>11</b>                | truth under penalties of the law?  |
| o:-08 <b>12</b> building, correct?   | 00:-07 <b>12</b>                | MR. JACOBS: I do.  |
| THE WITNESS: No doubt.   | 13                              | EVAN M. JACOBS, P.E., P.P., c/o Neglia   |
| o:-08 <b>14</b> MS. BORRELLI: Okay. Thank you.   | 14                              | Engineering Associates, 34 Park Avenue,  |
| or:-08 <b>15</b> MR. NEWMAN: Seeing no one else in line                                      | 15                              | Lyndhurst, New Jersey 07071, having been duly  |
| o:-08 <b>16</b>  | 16                              | sworn/affirmed, testifies as follows:  |
| c:-08 <b>17</b> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, close the  | 17                              | DIRECT EXAMINATION   |
| o:-08 <b>18</b> meeting.   | 18                              | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:   |
| o:-08 <b>19</b> MR. NEWMAN: I'd like to make a motion  | 00:-07 <b>19</b>                | <b>Q.</b> State your full name for the record.                                       |
| o:-08 <b>20</b> to close to the public.  | 00:-07 <b>20</b>                | A. Evan M. Jacobs.   |
| or-08 <b>21</b> MR. HAYES: Second.   | 00:-07 <b>21</b>                | Q. And very briefly state your   |
| 0:-08 <b>22</b> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?  | 00:-07 <b>22</b>                | qualifications.  |
| 0:-08 <b>23</b> (Whereupon, all resent members respond                                       | 00:-07 <b>23</b>                | A. Sure.   |
| o:-08 <b>24</b> in the affirmative.)   | 00:-06 <b>24</b>                | I'm a licensed professional engineer   |
| 0:-08 <b>25</b> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?   | 00:-06 <b>25</b>                | and planner in the State of New Jersey.  |
| LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |                                 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
| 201-641-1812   |                                 | 201-641-1812   |
| 134  |                                 | 136  |
| 0:-08 1 (No response.)   | 00:-06 1                        | I'm employed at Neglia Engineering   |
| 2:-08 <b>2</b> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Thank you very  | 00:-06 2                        | Associates.  |
|  | 00:-06 <b>3</b>                 | I represent the Borough of Woodcliff  Lake as the borough engineer, and also for the |
| 0:-08 <b>4</b> MR. DELIA: I have a question or two. 0:-08 <b>5</b> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. | 00:-06 <b>4</b> 00:-06 <b>5</b> | planning board, as well as the zoning board, as well                                 |
| 0:-08 <b>6</b> MR. DELIA: Very quick, I promise.   | 00:-06 6                        | as two other municipalities in Bergen County and one                                 |
| 2:-08 <b>7</b> CROSS EXAMINATION   | 00:-06 7                        | in Essex County.   |
| 0:-08 <b>8</b> BY MR. DELIA:   | 00:-06 8                        | I graduated from NJIT with a bachelor's  |
| 2:-08 <b>9 Q.</b> Mr. Intindola, reference was made to                                       | 00:-06 9                        | and a master's degree in civil engineering.  |
| 0:-08 <b>10</b> not the traffic counts but the exhibit before that,                          | 00:-06 10                       | I've been employed at Neglia for about   |
| 2:-08 <b>11</b> an e-mail that set out different types of trip                               | 00:-06 11                       | four years.  |
| 0:-08 <b>12</b> generation.  | 00:-06 12                       | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Any questions on the   |
| 2:-08 <b>13</b> Your best guess is it comes from RSIS  | 00:-06 13                       | qualifications?  |
| 0:-07 <b>14</b> and it pertains to detached single family homes.                             | 00:-06 14                       | MR. DELIA: None.   |
| 0:-07 <b>15</b> Is that correct?   | 00:-06 15                       | BY MR. PRINCIOTTO:   |
| 0:-07 <b>16</b> A. That was my testimony.  | 00:-06 <b>16</b>                | Q. All right. You issued a review letter   |
| 0:-07 <b>17</b> Q. But you don't really know what the  | 00:-06 <b>17</b>                | report dated August 20, 2018. We've marked it ZBA-5.                                 |
| 0:-07 <b>18</b> source is?   | 00:-06 <b>18</b>                | A. Correct.  |
| 2:-07 19 A. I said that was my presumption.  | 00:-06 <b>19</b>                | <b>Q.</b> Are there any open issues that you have                                    |
| o:-07 <b>20</b> MR. DELIA: Understood.   | 00:-05 <b>20</b>                | based upon your review letter, after the   |
| o:-07 <b>21</b> And that's it.   | 00:-05 <b>21</b>                | modifications were made by the applicant?  |
| c:-07 <b>22</b> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Just one?  | 00:-05 <b>22</b>                | A. I have a number of relatively minor   |
| o:-07 <b>23</b> MR. DELIA: Just one, I don't need to   | 00:-05 <b>23</b>                | technical comments in my letter that I believe the                                   |
| o:-07 <b>24</b> ask the second.  | 00:-05 <b>24</b>                | applicant's engineer has agreed to address.  |
| 0:-07 <b>25</b> CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.  | 00:-05 <b>25</b>                | The one outstanding thing that I have  |
| LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |                                 |  |
|  |                                 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |

|  | 137   |  | 139   |
|--|---|--|---|
| 00:-05 <b>1</b>  | not received resolution on was regarding vehicle  | 00:-03 <b>1</b>  | upgrading the handicapped curb ramps at the   |
| 00:-05 2   | circulation throughout the site. I had some   | 00:-03 2   | intersections, replacing curbs that may be broken or  |
| 00:-05 <b>3</b>  | questions and concerns about the fire truck turning   | 00:-03 <b>3</b>  | deficient to county standards; nothing in the   |
| 00:-05 <b>4</b>  | throughout the site and we've requested electronic  | 00:-03 4   | county's conditional approval that would  |
| 00:-05 <b>5</b>  | files with the turning templates to review, and to  | 00:-03 <b>5</b>  | significantly impact the design or the plans that   |
| 00:-05 6   | date I have not received that. I reached out  | 00:-03 6   | have been presented, in my opinion.   |
| 00:-05 7   | multiple times, I have not received those.  | 00:-03 7   | MR. SPIRIG: Thank you.  |
| 00:-05 8   | <b>Q.</b> And what is your concern about those?   | 00:-03 8   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Anybody   |
| 00:-05 9   | A. The exhibit that the applicant's   | 00:-03   | else?   |
| 00:-05 10  | traffic engineer brought to the meeting showed the  | 00:-03 10  | Motion to open to the public?   |
| 00:-05 11  | fire truck in conflict with a parking space, meaning  | 00:-03 11  | MR. KAUFMAN: So moved.  |
| 00:-05 11  | that the fire truck, in order to make a turning   | 00:-03 11  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Second?   |
| 00:-05 13  | maneuver, would be clipping or impacting potentially  | 00:-03 13  | MR. HAYES: Second.  |
| 00:-03 13  | something in that parking space there. It's a   | 00:-03 14  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?   |
| 00:-04 15  | relatively minor conflict that I think could be   | 00:-03 15  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond  |
| 00:-04 16  | resolved, but I have not seen a resolution of that.   | 00:-03 16  | in the affirmative.)  |
| 00:-04 17  | And, additionally, the fire truck   | 00:-03 17  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?  |
| 00:-04 17  | pictured in the turning template does not appear to   | 00:-03 17  | (No response.)  |
| 00:-04 10  | visually match the fire truck that the fire   | 00:-03 19  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Anybody from the  |
| 00:-04 10  | department has required them to analyze.  | 00:-03 10  | public who wishes to ask the engineer a question?   |
| 00:-04 21  | It could just be a graphical issue,   | 00:-03 <b>21</b>   | (No response.)  |
| 00:-04 21  | which is why I asked for the electronic files, to   | 00:-02 <b>22</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Not seeing anybody  |
| 00:-04 23  | verify it, but without anything to verify it, that's  | 00:-02 23  | standing in line, motion to close for the public?   |
| 00:-04 24  | still a concern of ours.  | 00:-02 <b>24</b>   | MS. EFFRON-MALLEY: Motion to close.   |
| 00:-04 <b>25</b>   | <b>Q.</b> Any other comments or recommendations   | 00:-02 <b>25</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: Second.   |
| 00.04 20   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  | 0002 20  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|  | 201-641-1812  |  | 201-641-1812  |
|  | 138   |  | 140   |
| 00:-04 <b>1</b>  | to the board?   | 00:-02 <b>1</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?   |
|  |   |  |   |
| 00:-04 <b>2</b>  | A. Just that the conditions in my letter,   | 00:-02 <b>2</b>  |   |
| 00:-04 <b>2</b> 00:-04 <b>3</b>  | A. Just that the conditions in my letter, if the board were to grant approval, would be made a  | _  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)   |
|  | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a  | 00:-02 2   | (Whereupon, all resent members respond  |
| 00:-04 3   |   | 00:-02 <b>2</b> 00:-02 <b>3</b>  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)   |
| 00:-04 <b>3</b> 00:-04 <b>4</b>  | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.   | 00:-02 <b>2</b> 00:-02 <b>3</b> 00:-02 <b>4</b>  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?   |
| 00:-04 <b>3</b> 00:-04 <b>4</b> 00:-04 <b>5</b>  | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any  | 00:-02 <b>2</b> 00:-02 <b>3</b> 00:-02 <b>4</b> 00:-02 <b>5</b>  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?  (No response.)   |
| 00:-04 <b>3</b> 00:-04 <b>4</b> 00:-04 <b>5</b> 00:-04 <b>6</b>  | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?   | 00:-02 <b>2</b> 00:-02 <b>3</b> 00:-02 <b>4</b> 00:-02 <b>5</b> 00:-02 <b>6</b>  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  |
| 00:-04 <b>3</b> 00:-04 <b>4</b> 00:-04 <b>5</b> 00:-04 <b>6</b> 00:-04 <b>7</b>  | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  | 00:-02 <b>2</b> 00:-02 <b>3</b> 00:-02 <b>4</b> 00:-02 <b>5</b> 00:-02 <b>6</b> 00:-02 <b>7</b>  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?  (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy.  |
| 00:-04 <b>3</b> 00:-04 <b>4</b> 00:-04 <b>5</b> 00:-04 <b>6</b> 00:-04 <b>7</b> 00:-04 <b>8</b>  | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  | 00:-02 <b>2</b> 00:-02 <b>3</b> 00:-02 <b>4</b> 00:-02 <b>5</b> 00:-02 <b>6</b> 00:-02 <b>7</b> 00:-02 <b>8</b>  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay,  |
| 00:-04 <b>3</b> 00:-04 <b>4</b> 00:-04 <b>5</b> 00:-04 <b>6</b> 00:-04 <b>7</b> 00:-04 <b>8</b> 00:-04 <b>9</b>                                    | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at  | 00:-02 <b>2</b> 00:-02 <b>3</b> 00:-02 <b>4</b> 00:-02 <b>5</b> 00:-02 <b>6</b> 00:-02 <b>7</b> 00:-02 <b>8</b> 00:-02 <b>9</b>  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay,  Mr. Princiotto.   |
| 00:-04 <b>3</b> 00:-04 <b>4</b> 00:-04 <b>5</b> 00:-04 <b>6</b> 00:-04 <b>7</b> 00:-04 <b>8</b> 00:-04 <b>9</b> 00:-04 <b>10</b>                   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county   | 00:-02 <b>2</b> 00:-02 <b>3</b> 00:-02 <b>4</b> 00:-02 <b>5</b> 00:-02 <b>6</b> 00:-02 <b>7</b> 00:-02 <b>8</b> 00:-02 <b>9</b> 00:-02 <b>10</b>   | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan. THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to   |
| 00:-04 <b>3</b> 00:-04 <b>4</b> 00:-04 <b>5</b> 00:-04 <b>6</b> 00:-04 <b>7</b> 00:-04 <b>8</b> 00:-04 <b>9</b> 00:-04 <b>10</b> 00:-04 <b>11</b>  | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  | 00:-02   | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay,  Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to  |
| 00:-04 <b>3</b> 00:-04 <b>4</b> 00:-04 <b>5</b> 00:-04 <b>7</b> 00:-04 <b>8</b> 00:-04 <b>9</b> 00:-04 <b>10</b> 00:-04 <b>11</b> 00:-04 <b>12</b> | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?   | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 9 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan. THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Princiotto. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are  |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The   | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 9 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay,  Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to   |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of  | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 9 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements   | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14 00:-02 15 00:-02 16 00:-02 17   | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan. THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person.  |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in  | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 9 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14 00:-02 15 00:-02 16  | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay,  Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person.  MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long   |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in here.  | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14 00:-02 15 00:-02 16 00:-02 17   | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay,  Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person.  MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long we're going to proceed?   |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in here.  In your opinion, does this affect the   | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14 00:-02 15 00:-02 16 00:-02 17 00:-02 18   | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person.  MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long we're going to proceed?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we need a   |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in here.  In your opinion, does this affect the presentations that were given to this board with  | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14 00:-02 15 00:-02 16 00:-02 17 00:-02 18 00:-02 19   | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay,  Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person.  MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long we're going to proceed?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we need a motion to extend. I'd like to get this application   |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in here.  In your opinion, does this affect the presentations that were given to this board with regard to engineering and architecture in any way?   | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14 00:-02 15 00:-02 16 00:-02 17 00:-02 18 00:-02 19 00:-02 20                               | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay,  Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person.  MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long we're going to proceed?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we need a motion to extend. I'd like to get this application concluded tonight.  |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in here.  In your opinion, does this affect the presentations that were given to this board with regard to engineering and architecture in any way?  THE WITNESS: No.   | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 9 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 15 00:-02 15 00:-02 16 00:-02 17 00:-02 18 00:-02 19 00:-02 20 00:-02 21            | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan. THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person. MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long we're going to proceed? MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we need a motion to extend. I'd like to get this application concluded tonight.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Extend to what?  |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in here.  In your opinion, does this affect the presentations that were given to this board with regard to engineering and architecture in any way?  THE WITNESS: No.  Generally summarizing, a lot of those  | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14 00:-02 15 00:-02 16 00:-02 17 00:-02 18 00:-02 19 00:-02 20 00:-02 21                     | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan. THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person. MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long we're going to proceed? MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we need a motion to extend. I'd like to get this application concluded tonight.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Extend to what? MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, past 10:30.  |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in here.  In your opinion, does this affect the presentations that were given to this board with regard to engineering and architecture in any way?  THE WITNESS: No.  Generally summarizing, a lot of those requirements are for improvements to existing county   | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14 00:-02 15 00:-02 16 00:-02 17 00:-02 18 00:-02 19 00:-02 20 00:-02 21 00:-02 21           | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.)  MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan.  THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay,  Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person.  MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long we're going to proceed?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we need a motion to extend. I'd like to get this application concluded tonight.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Extend to what?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, past 10:30. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: As long as it  |
| 00:-04   | if the board were to grant approval, would be made a condition of approval.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay. Any questions?  Motion to open oh, sorry.  MR. SPIRIG: I'll ask some questions.  Have you had an opportunity to look at the conditional approval from the county  THE WITNESS: I did.  MR. SPIRIG: document?  So there's a number of references. The reason it's conditional is there's a number of references here to walkways, curbs, ADA requirements and so forth. There's a lot of specific details in here.  In your opinion, does this affect the presentations that were given to this board with regard to engineering and architecture in any way?  THE WITNESS: No.  Generally summarizing, a lot of those requirements are for improvements to existing county infrastructure for the application, which is very | 00:-02 2 00:-02 3 00:-02 4 00:-02 5 00:-02 6 00:-02 7 00:-02 8 00:-02 10 00:-02 11 00:-02 12 00:-02 13 00:-02 14 00:-02 15 00:-02 16 00:-02 17 00:-02 18 00:-02 19 00:-02 20 00:-02 21 00:-02 21 00:-02 22 | (Whereupon, all resent members respond in the affirmative.)  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed? (No response.) MR. DELIA: Thank you, Evan. THE WITNESS: I got off easy. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay, Mr. Princiotto.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Next we're going to move to those who live within 200 feet that wanted to make comments and will testify, actually there are three people that indicated that they want to testify.  Sally Gellert is the first person. MR. HAYES: Do you have a time how long we're going to proceed? MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we need a motion to extend. I'd like to get this application concluded tonight.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Extend to what? MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, past 10:30. CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: As long as it takes? |

|  | 4.44  |  |  | 140   |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| 00:-02 <b>1</b>  | 141 MR. PRINCIOTTO: Motion to extend?   | 00.00  | 4  | 143   |
| _  |   | 00:00  | 1  | to get the train. I've rush to get the train. You   |
| 00:-02 2   | MR. HAYES: So moved.  | 00:00  | 2  | run out the last possible minute, and through our   |
| 00:-02 3   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Second?   | 00:00  | 3  | front yard is the quickest way to get there. There  |
| 00:-02 4   | MR. SPIRIG: Second.   | 00:00  | 4  | is a bit of a grade question, but I don't know. And   |
| 00:-02 5   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: All in favor?   | 00:00  | 5  | there are steps right now on the side by our house.   |
| 00:-02 6   | (Whereupon, all resent members respond  | 00:00  | 6  | So, you know, so I've got a bunch of pictures.  |
| 00:-02 7   | in the affirmative.)  | 00:00  | 7  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to mark   |
| 00:-02 8   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Opposed?  | 00:00  | 8  | that for identification, O-2.   |
| 00:-02 9   | MR. NEWMAN: Opposed.  | 00:00  | 9  | (One page double-sided photographs is   |
| 00:-01 10  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: He flew from  | 00:00  |  | marked as exhibit O-2 for identification.)  |
| 00:-01 11  | somewhere else today, that's why it's the next day  | 00:00  |  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Is there writing on   |
| 00:-01 12  | for him.  | 00:00  |  | there?  |
| 00:-01 13  | Okay. Ms. Gellert.  | 00:00  |  | MS. GELLERT: It's just my descriptions  |
| 00:-01 14  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I need to swear you   | 00:00  |  | of what I was photographing, you know, how can  |
| 00:-01 <b>15</b>   | in.   | 00:00  |  | someone say the southern view would not change  |
| 00:-01 <b>16</b>   | Raise your right hand.  | 00:00  |  | COURT REPORTER: Sorry. Speak slower.  |
| 00:-01 17  | Do you swear or affirm to tell the  | 00:00  |  | MS. GELLERT: Okay.  |
| 00:-01 18  | truth under penalties of law?   | 00:00  |  | Above left side steps of building on  |
| 00:-01 19  | MS. GELLERT: I do.  | 00:00  |  | north side, and so forth descriptors.   |
| 00:-01 <b>20</b>   | SALLY GELLERT,  | 00:00  |  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Can you please show it  |
| 00:-01 <b>21</b>   | 210 Broadway, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey,   | 00:00  |  | to Mr. Delia.   |
| 00:-01 22  | having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:   | 00:00  |  | MS. GELLERT: Okay.  |
| 00:-01 23  | MS. GELLERT: Okay. I have taken some  | 00:00  |  | MR. DELIA: Okay. No objection.  |
| 00:-01 24  | pictures of our property. I heard that there will be  | 00:00  |  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You wish to submit  |
| 00:-01 <b>25</b>   | no impact to my view, and, yet, when I sit behind my  | 00:00  | 25   | that to the board as evidence?  |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812  |  |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812  |
|  | 142   |  |  | 144   |
| 00:-01 <b>1</b>  | driveway looking across at 188, I can see a corner of   |  | 4  |   |
|  |   | 00:00  | 1  | MS. GELLERI: Sure.  |
| 00:-01 <b>2</b>  | •   | 00:00  | 2  | MS. GELLERT: Sure.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other   |
| 00:-01 <b>2</b> 00:-01 <b>3</b>  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire  | 00:00  | _  | MS. GELLERT: Sure.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  |
|  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire  | 00:00  | 2  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other   |
| 00:-01 3   | the building now.   | 00:00<br>00:00   | 2  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  |
| 00:-01 <b>3</b> 00:-01 <b>4</b>  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00  | 2 3 4  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see.   |
| 00:-01 <b>3</b> 00:-01 <b>4</b> 00:-01 <b>5</b>  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay.   |
| 00:-01 <b>3</b> 00:-01 <b>4</b> 00:-01 <b>5</b> 00:-01 <b>6</b>  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take  | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies   |
| 00:-01 <b>3</b> 00:-01 <b>4</b> 00:-01 <b>5</b> 00:-01 <b>6</b> 00:-01 <b>7</b>  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others   |
| 00:-01 <b>3</b> 00:-01 <b>4</b> 00:-01 <b>5</b> 00:-01 <b>6</b> 00:-01 <b>7</b> 00:-01 <b>8</b>  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country   |
| 00:-01 <b>3</b> 00:-01 <b>4</b> 00:-01 <b>5</b> 00:-01 <b>6</b> 00:-01 <b>7</b> 00:-01 <b>8</b> 00:-01 <b>9</b>  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment  |
| 00:-01 <b>3</b> 00:-01 <b>4</b> 00:-01 <b>5</b> 00:-01 <b>6</b> 00:-01 <b>7</b> 00:-01 <b>8</b> 00:-01 <b>9</b> 00:-01 <b>10</b>   | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or   |
| 00:-01 <b>3</b> 00:-01 <b>4</b> 00:-01 <b>5</b> 00:-01 <b>6</b> 00:-01 <b>7</b> 00:-01 <b>8</b> 00:-01 <b>9</b> 00:-01 <b>10</b> 00:-01 <b>11</b>  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or MS. GELLERT: I don't know.  |
| 00:-01 3 00:-01 4 00:-01 5 00:-01 6 00:-01 7 00:-01 8 00:-01 9 00:-01 10 00:-01 11   | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay.   |
| 00:-01 3 00:-01 4 00:-01 5 00:-01 6 00:-01 7 00:-01 8 00:-01 9 00:-01 10 00:-01 11 00:-01 12 00:00 13  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert.  |
| 00:-01 3 00:-01 4 00:-01 5 00:-01 6 00:-01 7 00:-01 8 00:-01 9 00:-01 10 00:-01 11 00:-01 12 00:00 13 00:00 14   | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic   |
| 00:-01 3 00:-01 4 00:-01 5 00:-01 6 00:-01 7 00:-01 8 00:-01 9 00:-01 10 00:-01 11 00:-01 12 00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent  | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for   |
| 00:-01 3 00:-01 4 00:-01 5 00:-01 6 00:-01 7 00:-01 8 00:-01 10 00:-01 11 00:-01 12 00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15 00:00 16  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?   |
| 00:-01     3       00:-01     4       00:-01     5       00:-01     7       00:-01     8       00:-01     9       00:-01     10       00:-01     11       00:-01     12       00:00     13       00:00     14       00:00     15       00:00     16       00:00     17       00:00     18       00:00     19   | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent  | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01   | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18                                     | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, and I don't mean  |
| 00:-01       3         00:-01       4         00:-01       5         00:-01       7         00:-01       8         00:-01       9         00:-01       10         00:-01       12         00:-01       12         00:00       13         00:00       14         00:00       15         00:00       16         00:00       17         00:00       18         00:00       19         00:00       20  | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent through the property.  | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01  | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19                               | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, and I don't mean to interrupt you.  |
| 00:-01       3         00:-01       4         00:-01       5         00:-01       7         00:-01       8         00:-01       9         00:-01       10         00:-01       11         00:-01       12         00:00       13         00:00       14         00:00       15         00:00       16         00:00       17         00:00       18         00:00       19         00:00       20         00:00       21                       | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent through the property.  So I was, like, standing between the  | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01                                     | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20                         | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, and I don't mean to interrupt you. MS. GELLERT: No, that's fair. You  |
| 00:-01       3         00:-01       4         00:-01       5         00:-01       7         00:-01       8         00:-01       9         00:-01       10         00:-01       11         00:-01       12         00:00       13         00:00       14         00:00       15         00:00       16         00:00       17         00:00       18         00:00       20   | the building now.  Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent through the property.  So I was, like, standing between the driveway and the next property up on Highview,   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01                            | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21                   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, and I don't mean to interrupt you. MS. GELLERT: No, that's fair. You know, this is new.   |
| 00:-01       3         00:-01       4         00:-01       5         00:-01       7         00:-01       8         00:-01       9         00:-01       11         00:-01       12         00:00       13         00:00       14         00:00       15         00:00       16         00:00       17         00:00       18         00:00       19         00:00       20         00:00       21   | Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent through the property.  So I was, like, standing between the driveway and the next property up on Highview, looking across, and then I looked up the street, up to the Highview property to locate it.  And I've got also a view from across   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01          | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23       | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, and I don't mean to interrupt you. MS. GELLERT: No, that's fair. You know, this is new. Yeah, and also I heard this described   |
| 00:-01       3         00:-01       4         00:-01       5         00:-01       7         00:-01       8         00:-01       9         00:-01       11         00:-01       12         00:00       13         00:00       14         00:00       15         00:00       16         00:00       17         00:00       18         00:00       20         00:00       21         00:00       22         00:00       23         00:00       24 | Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent through the property.  So I was, like, standing between the driveway and the next property up on Highview, looking across, and then I looked up the street, up to the Highview property to locate it.  And I've got also a view from across the front of our property on the street, where I am   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01 | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, and I don't mean to interrupt you. MS. GELLERT: No, that's fair. You know, this is new. Yeah, and also I heard this described as a catalyst to further development.   |
| 00:-01       3         00:-01       4         00:-01       5         00:-01       7         00:-01       8         00:-01       9         00:-01       10         00:-01       12         00:00       13         00:00       14         00:00       15         00:00       16         00:00       17         00:00       18         00:00       20         00:00       21         00:00       23   | Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent through the property.  So I was, like, standing between the driveway and the next property up on Highview, looking across, and then I looked up the street, up to the Highview property to locate it.  And I've got also a view from across the front of our property on the street, where I am sure that's a desire path from people who are rushing | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01          | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, and I don't mean to interrupt you. MS. GELLERT: No, that's fair. You know, this is new. Yeah, and also I heard this described as a catalyst to further development. Well, you know, we've got MR. PRINCIOTTO: That sounds like a comment. |
| 00:-01       3         00:-01       4         00:-01       5         00:-01       7         00:-01       8         00:-01       9         00:-01       11         00:-01       12         00:00       13         00:00       14         00:00       15         00:00       16         00:00       17         00:00       18         00:00       20         00:00       21         00:00       22         00:00       23         00:00       24 | Next to that would be an entire building. So how can you tell me this doesn't impact my view? It certainly does.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: When did you take those photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I took them May of this year. I didn't put a specific date on it.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And where were you standing when you took these photographs?  MS. GELLERT: I was standing, well  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Were you on the ground?  MS. GELLERT: I was on the ground. I was next to the driveway. You can see the big tree stump in the property that is kind of consistent through the property.  So I was, like, standing between the driveway and the next property up on Highview, looking across, and then I looked up the street, up to the Highview property to locate it.  And I've got also a view from across the front of our property on the street, where I am   | 00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:00<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01<br>00:01 | 2<br>3<br>4<br>5<br>6<br>7<br>8<br>9<br>10<br>11<br>12<br>13<br>14<br>15<br>16<br>17<br>18<br>19<br>20<br>21<br>22<br>23<br>24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Do you have any other testimony?  MS. GELLERT: Let's see. Okay. So I've got the okay. I understand that the traffic studies are done in a manner consistent with others throughout the community, state and country MR. PRINCIOTTO: Now, is this a comment or  MS. GELLERT: I don't know. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, okay. I don't think you're a traffic expert. MS. GELLERT: No, I'm not a traffic expert, so you want me to get back on the history for comments later?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, and I don't mean to interrupt you. MS. GELLERT: No, that's fair. You know, this is new. Yeah, and also I heard this described as a catalyst to further development. Well, you know, we've got MR. PRINCIOTTO: That sounds like a          |

|  |  | 1  |  |
|--|--|--|--|
|  | 145  | _  | 147  |
| 00:01 <b>1</b>   | MS. GELLERT: That's a comment, add it  | 00:03 1  | one of them that his best guess is where his source  |
| 00:01 2  | to the end. Okay.  | 00:03 2  | is, and he doesn't know. This is all hearsay.  |
| 00:01 3  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.   | 00:03 3  | So, for all of those reasons, again,   |
| 00:01 <b>4</b>   | MS. GELLERT: Where do I leave this,  | 00:03 4  | primarily starting with no foundation, let's start   |
| 00:01 5  | right here?  | 00:03 5  | there, and the hearsay. The two together in my   |
| 00:01 6  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can leave that   | 00:03 6  | opinion are objectionable.   |
| 00:01 7  | right there.   | 00:03 7  | That's all I have to say.  |
| 00:01 8  | MR. NEWMAN: What did we mark that?   | 00:03 8  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. I think  |
| 00:01 9  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: O-2.   | 00:03 9  | Mr. Intindola did provide some foundation. They're   |
| 00:01 <b>10</b>  | O-1 was the Appelle letter.  | 00:04 <b>10</b>  | consistent with what's in the RSIS.  |
| 00:01 11   | Next on the list, Veronica Appelle. I  | 00:04 11   | MR. DELIA: He said as best he could  |
| 00:01 12   | think I covered your exhibit, which I marked O-1,  | 00:04 12   | guess under the circumstances, that's what he said.  |
| 00:01 13   | that Mr. Intindola testified about.  | 00:04 13   | He does not know where these numbers come from, he   |
| 00:01 <b>14</b>  | MS. APPELLE: Only if you gave all of   | 00:04 <b>14</b>  | can only guess. There is no foundation. We don't   |
| 00:02 <b>15</b>  | that same information to everyone else on this board   | 00:04 <b>15</b>  | have a source. We don't have a citation.   |
| 00:02 <b>16</b>  | and the public.  | 00:04 <b>16</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Is this one document or  |
| 00:02 <b>17</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, we have  | 00:04 <b>17</b>  | several documents?   |
| 00:02 18   | MS. APPELLE: But I haven't.  | 00:04 <b>18</b>  | MS. APPELLE: They're numbered 1, 2, 3.   |
| 00:02 <b>19</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I think  | 00:04 <b>19</b>  | The first one is the police chief's,   |
| 00:02 <b>20</b>  | MS. APPELLE: I don't think they've   | 00:04 <b>20</b>  | goes to the police chief   |
| 00:02 <b>21</b>  | seen it. They've commented and talked in the ether   | 00:04 <b>21</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: There's an attachment  |
| 00:02 <b>22</b>  | about it, and people remember more when they're  | 00:04 <b>22</b>  | that's not evidence.   |
| 00:02 <b>23</b>  | visual learner. You've never seen that.  | 00:04 <b>23</b>  | Don't look at the last page.   |
| 00:02 <b>24</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: I got a great idea, why  | 00:04 <b>24</b>  | MS. APPELLE: Oh, the last page is just   |
| 00:02 <b>25</b>  | don't you pass them all here?  | 00:04 <b>25</b>  | pictures.  |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  | 201-641-1812   |  | 201-641-1812   |
|  |  | 1  |  |
|  | 146  |  | 148  |
| 00:02 <b>1</b>   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.   | 00:04 <b>1</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.   |
| 00:02 <b>2</b>   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.  Sorry about that.  | 00:04 <b>2</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page. MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so   |
| 00:02 <b>2</b> 00:02 <b>3</b>  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?  | 00:04 <b>2</b> 00:04 <b>3</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  |
| 00:02 <b>2</b><br>00:02 <b>3</b><br>00:02 <b>4</b>   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have  | 00:04 <b>2</b> 00:04 <b>3</b> 00:04 <b>4</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board  |
| 00:02 <b>2</b> 00:02 <b>3</b> 00:02 <b>4</b> 00:02 <b>5</b>  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police   | 00:04 <b>2</b> 00:04 <b>3</b> 00:04 <b>4</b> 00:04 <b>5</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page. MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others. MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.   |
| 00:02 <b>2</b> 00:02 <b>3</b> 00:02 <b>4</b> 00:02 <b>5</b> 00:02 <b>6</b>   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea.  Sorry about that.  MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please?  MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have  copies for the entire public too, of what the police  chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the   | 00:04 <b>2</b> 00:04 <b>3</b> 00:04 <b>4</b> 00:04 <b>5</b> 00:05 <b>6</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked  |
| 00:02 <b>2</b> 00:02 <b>3</b> 00:02 <b>4</b> 00:02 <b>5</b> 00:02 <b>6</b> 00:02 <b>7</b>  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows.  | 00:04 <b>2</b> 00:04 <b>3</b> 00:04 <b>4</b> 00:04 <b>5</b> 00:05 <b>6</b> 00:05 <b>7</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages,   |
| 00:02 <b>2</b> 00:02 <b>3</b> 00:02 <b>4</b> 00:02 <b>5</b> 00:02 <b>6</b> 00:02 <b>7</b> 00:02 <b>8</b>   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to   | 00:04 <b>2</b> 00:04 <b>3</b> 00:04 <b>4</b> 00:04 <b>5</b> 00:05 <b>6</b> 00:05 <b>7</b> 00:05 <b>8</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page. MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others. MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts  |
| 00:02 <b>2</b> 00:02 <b>3</b> 00:02 <b>4</b> 00:02 <b>5</b> 00:02 <b>6</b> 00:02 <b>7</b> 00:02 <b>8</b> 00:02 <b>9</b>  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia.  | 00:04 2 00:04 3 00:04 4 00:04 5 00:05 6 00:05 7 00:05 8 00:05 9  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.   |
| 00:02 <b>2</b> 00:02 <b>3</b> 00:02 <b>4</b> 00:02 <b>5</b> 00:02 <b>6</b> 00:02 <b>7</b> 00:02 <b>8</b> 00:02 <b>9</b> 00:02 <b>10</b>  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you.  | 00:04 <b>2</b> 00:04 <b>3</b> 00:04 <b>4</b> 00:04 <b>5</b> 00:05 <b>6</b> 00:05 <b>7</b> 00:05 <b>8</b> 00:05 <b>9</b> 00:05 <b>10</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the  |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like   | 00:04 2 00:04 3 00:04 4 00:04 5 00:05 6 00:05 7 00:05 8 00:05 9 00:05 10 00:05 11  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and  | 00:04 2 00:04 3 00:04 4 00:04 5 00:05 6 00:05 7 00:05 8 00:05 9 00:05 10 00:05 11 00:05 12   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you   |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes   | 00:04 2 00:04 3 00:04 4 00:04 5 00:05 6 00:05 7 00:05 8 00:05 9 00:05 10 00:05 11 00:05 12 00:05 13  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?   |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because   | 00:04 2 00:04 3 00:04 4 00:04 5 00:05 6 00:05 7 00:05 8 00:05 9 00:05 10 00:05 11 00:05 12 00:05 13 00:05 14   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first   |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because MR. DELIA: I object to all of these.  | 00:04 2 00:04 3 00:04 4 00:04 5 00:05 6 00:05 7 00:05 8 00:05 9 00:05 10 00:05 11 00:05 12 00:05 13 00:05 14 00:05 15  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because MR. DELIA: I object to all of these. MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right  | 00:04 2 00:04 3 00:04 4 00:04 5 00:05 6 00:05 7 00:05 8 00:05 10 00:05 11 00:05 12 00:05 13 00:05 14 00:05 15 00:05 16   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from   |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 17   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that.  MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows.  MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia.  MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because  MR. DELIA: I object to all of these. MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay.   | 00:04 2 00:04 3 00:04 4 00:04 5 00:05 6 00:05 7 00:05 8 00:05 9 00:05 10 00:05 11 00:05 12 00:05 13 00:05 14 00:05 15 00:05 16 00:05 17  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a  |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16 00:03 17 00:03 18   | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because MR. DELIA: I object to all of these. MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right  | 00:04       2         00:04       3         00:04       5         00:05       6         00:05       7         00:05       8         00:05       10         00:05       11         00:05       12         00:05       13         00:05       14         00:05       15         00:05       16         00:05       17         00:05       18   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the  |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16 00:03 17 00:03 18 00:03 19  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because MR. DELIA: I object to all of these. MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. You can't no arguments.  | 00:04 2 00:04 3 00:04 4 00:04 5 00:05 6 00:05 7 00:05 8 00:05 10 00:05 11 00:05 12 00:05 13 00:05 14 00:05 15 00:05 16 00:05 17 00:05 18 00:05 19  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the chief, to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Sgt. Craig   |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16 00:03 17 00:03 18 00:03 19 00:03 20                                     | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that.  MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows.  MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia.  MR. DELIA: Thank you.  MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because  MR. DELIA: I object to all of these.  MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. You can't no arguments.  MS. APPELLE: Well, he argued first.  | 00:04       2         00:04       3         00:04       5         00:05       6         00:05       7         00:05       8         00:05       9         00:05       10         00:05       12         00:05       12         00:05       14         00:05       15         00:05       16         00:05       17         00:05       18         00:05       19         00:05       20  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the chief, to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Sgt. Craig DeGeorge, right, reference, traffic counts for  |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16 00:03 17 00:03 18 00:03 19 00:03 20 00:03 21                            | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that.  MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows.  MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia.  MR. DELIA: Thank you.  MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because  MR. DELIA: I object to all of these.  MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. You can't no arguments.  MS. APPELLE: Well, he argued first.  MR. DELIA: I'm arguing through the  | 00:04       2         00:04       3         00:04       5         00:05       6         00:05       7         00:05       8         00:05       9         00:05       10         00:05       11         00:05       12         00:05       13         00:05       14         00:05       15         00:05       16         00:05       17         00:05       18         00:05       19         00:05       20         00:05       21  | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the chief, to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Sgt. Craig DeGeorge, right, reference, traffic counts for Broadway and Woodcliff Lake.   |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16 00:03 17 00:03 18 00:03 19 00:03 21 00:03 21                            | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that.  MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows.  MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia.  MR. DELIA: Thank you.  MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because  MR. DELIA: I object to all of these.  MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. You can't no arguments.  MS. APPELLE: Well, he argued first.  MR. DELIA: I'm arguing through the Chair. I'm not trying to make this personal. I'm   | 00:04       2         00:04       3         00:04       4         00:05       6         00:05       7         00:05       8         00:05       9         00:05       10         00:05       12         00:05       13         00:05       14         00:05       15         00:05       16         00:05       17         00:05       19         00:05       20         00:05       21         00:05       22                         | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the chief, to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Sgt. Craig DeGeorge, right, reference, traffic counts for Broadway and Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, December 13th, 2018   |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16 00:03 17 00:03 18 00:03 19 00:03 20 00:03 21 00:03 22 00:03 23                  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because  MR. DELIA: I object to all of these. MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. You can't no arguments. MS. APPELLE: Well, he argued first. MR. DELIA: I'm arguing through the Chair. I'm not trying to make this personal. I'm not trying to be antagonistic. I'm simply making a  | 00:04       2         00:04       3         00:04       5         00:05       6         00:05       7         00:05       9         00:05       10         00:05       12         00:05       13         00:05       14         00:05       15         00:05       16         00:05       17         00:05       19         00:05       20         00:05       21         00:05       23   | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the chief, to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Sgt. Craig DeGeorge, right, reference, traffic counts for Broadway and Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, December 13th, 2018 is the date of the letter. And this is a business   |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16 00:03 17 00:03 18 00:03 19 00:03 20 00:03 21 00:03 22 00:03 23 00:03 24 | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because MR. DELIA: I object to all of these. MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. You can't no arguments. MS. APPELLE: Well, he argued first. MR. DELIA: I'm arguing through the Chair. I'm not trying to make this personal. I'm not trying to be antagonistic. I'm simply making a legal position, which is that all these documents   | 00:04       2         00:04       3         00:04       5         00:05       7         00:05       8         00:05       9         00:05       10         00:05       12         00:05       13         00:05       14         00:05       15         00:05       16         00:05       17         00:05       19         00:05       20         00:05       21         00:05       22         00:05       23         00:05       24 | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the chief, to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Sgt. Craig DeGeorge, right, reference, traffic counts for Broadway and Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, December 13th, 2018 is the date of the letter. And this is a business record of the Woodcliff Lake Police Department.                                       |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16 00:03 17 00:03 18 00:03 19 00:03 20 00:03 21 00:03 22 00:03 23                  | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because  MR. DELIA: I object to all of these. MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. You can't no arguments. MS. APPELLE: Well, he argued first. MR. DELIA: I'm arguing through the Chair. I'm not trying to make this personal. I'm not trying to be antagonistic. I'm simply making a legal position, which is that all these documents have no foundation. We heard from Mr. Intindola on | 00:04       2         00:04       3         00:04       5         00:05       6         00:05       7         00:05       8         00:05       10         00:05       12         00:05       12         00:05       14         00:05       15         00:05       16         00:05       17         00:05       18         00:05       20         00:05       21         00:05       22         00:05       23                        | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the chief, to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Sgt. Craig DeGeorge, right, reference, traffic counts for Broadway and Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, December 13th, 2018 is the date of the letter. And this is a business record of the Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. DELIA: There is no foundation on |
| 00:02 2 00:02 3 00:02 4 00:02 5 00:02 6 00:02 7 00:02 8 00:02 9 00:02 10 00:02 11 00:02 12 00:02 13 00:02 14 00:03 15 00:03 16 00:03 17 00:03 18 00:03 19 00:03 20 00:03 21 00:03 22 00:03 23 00:03 24 | MS. APPELLE: What a good idea. Sorry about that. MR. DELIA: May I get a copy, please? MS. APPELLE: Sure, because I have copies for the entire public too, of what the police chief said, what his sergeant said, and what the planning board knows. MR. NEWMAN: You want to hand that to Mr. Delia. MR. DELIA: Thank you. MS. APPELLE: And if you would all like to distribute these and pass them out or come up and take a copy, it's not part of the five minutes because MR. DELIA: I object to all of these. MS. APPELLE: Yes, you said that right from the beginning. However, it's not hearsay. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Wait a second. You can't no arguments. MS. APPELLE: Well, he argued first. MR. DELIA: I'm arguing through the Chair. I'm not trying to make this personal. I'm not trying to be antagonistic. I'm simply making a legal position, which is that all these documents   | 00:04       2         00:04       3         00:04       5         00:05       7         00:05       8         00:05       9         00:05       10         00:05       12         00:05       13         00:05       14         00:05       15         00:05       16         00:05       17         00:05       19         00:05       20         00:05       21         00:05       22         00:05       23         00:05       24 | MR. NEWMAN: The last page.  MS. APPELLE: Were is pictures, so don't worry about those, just deal with these others.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I instruct the board to disregard it. That's comment.  If you want to make comment. I marked as O-1 is the same thing as the first three pages, and Mr. Intindola testified about the traffic counts and the data that's in all of the attachments.  MR. NEWMAN: Is this a letter to the Woodcliff Lake Police Department?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Which one are you referring to?  MR. NEWMAN: I'm looking at the first page, the front, Woodcliff Lake Police Department.  MR. SPIRIG: It's from  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, it's from a sergeant with regard to traffic counts. It's to the chief, to Chief Anthony Jannicelli from Sgt. Craig DeGeorge, right, reference, traffic counts for Broadway and Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, December 13th, 2018 is the date of the letter. And this is a business record of the Woodcliff Lake Police Department.                                       |

|  | 149   |  | 151  |
|--|---|--|--|
| 00:06 <b>1</b>   | that.   | 00:07 <b>1</b>   | public. If you wanted to ask him a question about  |
| 00:06 2  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: And actually  | 00:07 <b>2</b>   | it, you could. He indicated traffic counts.  |
| 00:06 3  | Mr. Intindola testified it was consistent with the  | 00:07 3  | MS. APPELLE: He only did half.   |
| 00:06 4  | testimony of the applicant's traffic expert, not  | 00:07 4  | MR. NEWMAN: In defense of the  |
| 00:06 <b>5</b>   | materially different, consistent to the traffic   | 00:07 <b>5</b>   | applicant, how is the applicant responsible for the  |
| 00:06 6  | counts of the applicant's traffic consultant.   | 00:07 6  | number of vehicles on Woodcliff Avenue?  |
| 00:06 7  | MS. APPELLE: I'll clarify that when I   | 00:08 7  | MS. APPELLE: They're not, but these  |
| 00:06 8  | have a chance.  | 00:08 8  | counts were done when their 60 units weren't built   |
| 00:06 <b>9</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. We have  | 00:08 9  | and when no one was in the office building.  |
| 00:06 10   | those exhibits, is there anything else you'd like to  | 00:08 10   | So these high numbers will only get  |
| 00:06 11   | testify about?  | 00:08 11   | much higher.   |
| 00:06 12   | MS. APPELLE: Me?  | 00:08 12   | MR. NEWMAN: How do you know that?  |
| 00:06 13   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes.  | 00:08 13   | MS. APPELLE: Well, doesn't it stand,   |
| 00:06 14   | MS. APPELLE: Oh, sure.  | 00:08 14   | 600 trips  |
| 00:06 <b>15</b>  | Perhaps Mr. Intindola, he suggested   | 00:08 <b>15</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Whoa. One second. Okay.  |
| 00:06 <b>16</b>  | where it came from, but I think probably it came from   | 00:08 <b>16</b>  | It's a letter dated 2018, but it doesn't say when  |
| 00:06 17   | the Federal Highway Administration's U.S. Department  | 00:08 <b>17</b>  | these counts were done.  |
| 00:06 18   | of Transportation report, 2010. The reason  | 00:08 18   | MS. APPELLE: Yes, it does, November  |
| 00:06 <b>19</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Well, there's a letter  | 00:08 <b>19</b>  | 28th, December 12th, December 4th, and December 6,   |
| 00:06 <b>20</b>  | here from the police department that states some  | 00:08 <b>20</b>  | 2018.  |
| 00:06 <b>21</b>  | data. That's what I see.  | 00:08 <b>21</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Okay. For what they're   |
| 00:07 <b>22</b>  | MS. APPELLE: So which one are you   | 00:08 <b>22</b>  | worth.   |
| 00:07 <b>23</b>  | referring to, 1, 2, or 3?   | 00:08 <b>23</b>  | MS. APPELLE: Well, before anyone built   |
| 00:07 <b>24</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Well, there's three pages   | 00:08 <b>24</b>  | anything and when the office building had no people  |
| 00:07 <b>25</b>  | of one letter.  | 00:08 <b>25</b>  | in it going to and from, that was my point.  |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  | 201-641-1812  |  | 201-641-1812   |
|  | 150   |  | 15')   |
| 00.07.4  |   | 00.00  | 152  |
| 00:07 1  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different  | 00:08 1  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board   |
| 00:07 2  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  | 00:08 2  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything   |
| 00:07 <b>2</b> 00:07 <b>3</b>  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three   | 00:08 <b>2</b> 00:08 <b>3</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to   |
| 00:07 <b>2</b> 00:07 <b>3</b> 00:07 <b>4</b>   | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  | 00:08 <b>2</b> 00:08 <b>3</b> 00:09 <b>4</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second   |
| 00:07 <b>2</b> 00:07 <b>3</b> 00:07 <b>4</b> 00:07 <b>5</b>  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different   | 00:08 <b>2</b> 00:08 <b>3</b> 00:09 <b>4</b> 00:09 <b>5</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th   |
| 00:07 <b>2</b> 00:07 <b>3</b> 00:07 <b>4</b> 00:07 <b>5</b> 00:07 <b>6</b>   | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  | 00:08 <b>2</b> 00:08 <b>3</b> 00:09 <b>4</b> 00:09 <b>5</b> 00:09 <b>6</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write  |
| 00:07 <b>2</b> 00:07 <b>3</b> 00:07 <b>4</b> 00:07 <b>5</b> 00:07 <b>6</b> 00:07 <b>7</b>  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you   | 00:08 <b>2</b> 00:08 <b>3</b> 00:09 <b>4</b> 00:09 <b>5</b> 00:09 <b>6</b> 00:09 <b>7</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.   |
| 00:07 <b>2</b> 00:07 <b>3</b> 00:07 <b>4</b> 00:07 <b>5</b> 00:07 <b>6</b> 00:07 <b>7</b> 00:07 <b>8</b>   | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I  | 00:08 <b>2</b> 00:08 <b>3</b> 00:09 <b>4</b> 00:09 <b>5</b> 00:09 <b>6</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  |
| 00:07 <b>2</b> 00:07 <b>3</b> 00:07 <b>4</b> 00:07 <b>5</b> 00:07 <b>6</b> 00:07 <b>7</b>  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff   | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the   |
| 00:07 <b>2</b> 00:07 <b>3</b> 00:07 <b>4</b> 00:07 <b>5</b> 00:07 <b>6</b> 00:07 <b>7</b> 00:07 <b>8</b> 00:07 <b>9</b>  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was  | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 9  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  |
| 00:07 2 00:07 3 00:07 4 00:07 5 00:07 6 00:07 7 00:07 8 00:07 9 00:07 10   | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 9 00:09 10   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.   |
| 00:07 2 00:07 3 00:07 4 00:07 5 00:07 6 00:07 7 00:07 8 00:07 9 00:07 10 00:07 11  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was  | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 9 00:09 10 00:09 11  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to  |
| 00:07 2 00:07 3 00:07 4 00:07 5 00:07 6 00:07 7 00:07 8 00:07 9 00:07 10 00:07 11 00:07 12   | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola   | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 9 00:09 10 00:09 11  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.   |
| 00:07 2 00:07 3 00:07 4 00:07 5 00:07 6 00:07 7 00:07 8 00:07 9 00:07 10 00:07 11 00:07 12 00:07 13  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 9 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the   |
| 00:07 2 00:07 3 00:07 4 00:07 5 00:07 6 00:07 7 00:07 8 00:07 9 00:07 10 00:07 11 00:07 12 00:07 13 00:07 14   | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did   | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 9 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I  |
| 00:07 2 00:07 3 00:07 4 00:07 5 00:07 6 00:07 7 00:07 8 00:07 10 00:07 11 00:07 12 00:07 13 00:07 14 00:07 15  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was   | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14 00:09 15  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but   |
| 00:07     2       00:07     3       00:07     4       00:07     5       00:07     7       00:07     8       00:07     10       00:07     11       00:07     12       00:07     13       00:07     14       00:07     15       00:07     16   | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was  MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible  | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 9 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14 00:09 15 00:09 16   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but anything anybody told somebody else and the person is   |
| 00:07 2 00:07 3 00:07 4 00:07 5 00:07 6 00:07 7 00:07 8 00:07 9 00:07 10 00:07 11 00:07 12 00:07 13 00:07 14 00:07 15 00:07 16 00:07 17  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was  MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible information.   | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14 00:09 15 00:09 16 00:09 17  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but anything anybody told somebody else and the person is not here, that's hearsay. So I don't want to hear   |
| 00:07     2       00:07     3       00:07     4       00:07     6       00:07     7       00:07     8       00:07     10       00:07     11       00:07     12       00:07     13       00:07     15       00:07     16       00:07     17       00:07     18  | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was  MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible information.  MS. APPELLE: Thank you.  | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14 00:09 15 00:09 16 00:09 18  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but anything anybody told somebody else and the person is not here, that's hearsay. So I don't want to hear about what the police chief told somebody else. If  |
| 00:07       2         00:07       3         00:07       4         00:07       5         00:07       7         00:07       8         00:07       10         00:07       11         00:07       12         00:07       13         00:07       14         00:07       15         00:07       16         00:07       18         00:07       19   | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was  MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible information.  MS. APPELLE: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So where are we   | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14 00:09 15 00:09 16 00:09 18 00:09 19   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but anything anybody told somebody else and the person is not here, that's hearsay. So I don't want to hear about what the police chief told somebody and that  |
| 00:07 2 00:07 3 00:07 4 00:07 5 00:07 6 00:07 7 00:07 8 00:07 10 00:07 11 00:07 12 00:07 13 00:07 14 00:07 15 00:07 16 00:07 17 00:07 18 00:07 19 00:07 20 00:07 21 00:07 22   | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was  MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible information.  MS. APPELLE: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So where are we going with this?  | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14 00:09 15 00:09 16 00:09 17 00:09 18 00:09 19 00:09 20                                     | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but anything anybody told somebody else and the person is not here, that's hearsay. So I don't want to hear about what the police chief told somebody else. If you had a direct conversation with somebody and that person told you something, that's okay, but once he   |
| 00:07       2         00:07       3         00:07       4         00:07       6         00:07       7         00:07       8         00:07       10         00:07       12         00:07       12         00:07       14         00:07       15         00:07       16         00:07       17         00:07       18         00:07       20         00:07       21         00:07       22         00:07       23                        | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was  MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible information.  MS. APPELLE: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So where are we going with this?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know.   | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 15 00:09 16 00:09 17 00:09 18 00:09 19 00:09 20 00:09 21                                     | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but anything anybody told somebody else and the person is not here, that's hearsay. So I don't want to hear about what the police chief told somebody else. If you had a direct conversation with somebody and that person told you something, that's okay, but once he told me that he said or he told me that she said  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Well, if you read the beginning, though, he's telling you when we spoke  |
| 00:07       2         00:07       3         00:07       4         00:07       6         00:07       7         00:07       9         00:07       10         00:07       12         00:07       13         00:07       14         00:07       15         00:07       16         00:07       17         00:07       18         00:07       20         00:07       21         00:07       22         00:07       23         00:07       24 | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was  MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible information.  MS. APPELLE: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So where are we going with this?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know.  MS. APPELLE: Well, Mr. Intindola didn't even mention Woodcliff Avenue with the 4,041 vehicles.                                     | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14 00:09 15 00:09 16 00:09 17 00:09 18 00:09 19 00:09 20 00:09 21                            | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but anything anybody told somebody else and the person is not here, that's hearsay. So I don't want to hear about what the police chief told somebody else. If you had a direct conversation with somebody and that person told you something, that's okay, but once he told me that he said or he told me that she said  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Well, if you read the beginning, though, he's telling you when we spoke of it, it is already part of the record from their   |
| 00:07       2         00:07       3         00:07       4         00:07       6         00:07       7         00:07       8         00:07       10         00:07       12         00:07       12         00:07       14         00:07       15         00:07       16         00:07       17         00:07       18         00:07       20         00:07       21         00:07       22         00:07       23                        | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was  MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible information.  MS. APPELLE: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So where are we going with this?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know.  MS. APPELLE: Well, Mr. Intindola didn't even mention Woodcliff Avenue with the 4,041 vehicles.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It was open to the | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 10 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14 00:09 15 00:09 16 00:09 17 00:09 18 00:09 19 00:09 20 00:09 21 00:09 22 00:09 23                   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but anything anybody told somebody else and the person is not here, that's hearsay. So I don't want to hear about what the police chief told somebody else. If you had a direct conversation with somebody and that person told you something, that's okay, but once he told me that he said or he told me that she said  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Well, if you read the beginning, though, he's telling you when we spoke of it, it is already part of the record from their traffic bureau to the planning board. So if you |
| 00:07       2         00:07       3         00:07       4         00:07       6         00:07       7         00:07       9         00:07       10         00:07       12         00:07       13         00:07       14         00:07       15         00:07       16         00:07       17         00:07       18         00:07       20         00:07       21         00:07       22         00:07       23         00:07       24 | MS. APPELLE: They're three different things.  MR. SPIRIG: I think they're three different letters.  MR. NEWMAN: They're three different letters?  MS. APPELLE: Yes, and most likely you should have had this to review, because that's why I gave it to you, just as he gives you all the stuff and then you share it. That's what I thought I was supposed to do, and I did that.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, Mr. Intindola just testified about this.  MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but what you did was  MR. HAYES: It's easily digestible information.  MS. APPELLE: Thank you.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So where are we going with this?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know.  MS. APPELLE: Well, Mr. Intindola didn't even mention Woodcliff Avenue with the 4,041 vehicles.                                     | 00:08 2 00:08 3 00:09 4 00:09 5 00:09 6 00:09 7 00:09 8 00:09 10 00:09 11 00:09 12 00:09 13 00:09 14 00:09 15 00:09 16 00:09 17 00:09 18 00:09 19 00:09 20 00:09 21 00:09 22 00:09 23 00:09 24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. The board is aware of the traffic counts. Is there anything else that you would like to  MS. APPELLE: Okay. So then the second sheet, the police chief e-mailed me on August 7th  MR. NEWMAN: Well, you didn't write these letters.  MS. APPELLE: No, these aren't mine.  MR. NEWMAN: Right, these are from the police chief.  MS. APPELLE: And from his officers to him.  MR. NEWMAN: So he's not here. So the letter being here is one thing, but, I mean, and I always defer to our counsel on the zoning board, but anything anybody told somebody else and the person is not here, that's hearsay. So I don't want to hear about what the police chief told somebody else. If you had a direct conversation with somebody and that person told you something, that's okay, but once he told me that he said or he told me that she said  MS. APPELLE: Okay. Well, if you read the beginning, though, he's telling you when we spoke of it, it is already part of the record from their   |

|   | 450  |   | 455   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 00:10 <b>1</b>  | would go back to the planning board, you would see   | 00:11 <b>1</b>  | 155<br>MS. APPELLE: Common sense.   |
| 00:10 1   | what he said in here is accurate. It's been given by   | 00:11 2   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm not certain that  |
| 00:10 2   | the traffic experts to the planning board, which   | 00:11 3   | you're qualified to do that.  |
| 00:10 <b>3</b>  | states really  | 00:11 4   | MS. APPELLE: Well, I think everyone is  |
| 00:10 <b>5</b>  | MR. DELIA: For the record, this is the   | 00:11 5   | kind of qualified to do that. That makes sense. It  |
| 00:10 6   | zoning board.  | 00:11 6   | would be common sense to expect that the traffic  |
| 00:10 7   | MS. APPELLE: Yeah, but they all work   | 00:12 7   | through Woodcliff Lake will be substantially  |
| 00:10 8   | together.  | 00:12   | increased.  |
| 00:10 9   | MR. DELIA: No, they're independent   | 00:12 9   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like you  |
| 00:10 10  | bodies.  | 00:12 10  | want to make a comment that you are concerned about   |
| 00:10 11  | MS. APPELLE: Okay.   | 00:12 11  | the traffic conditions, and if you want to make that  |
| 00:10 12  | MR. DELIA: Independent quasi-judicial  | 00:12 12  | comment   |
| 00:10 13  | bodies that should not have an interrelationship in  | 00:12 13  | MS. APPELLE: And safety, yes.   |
| 00:10 <b>14</b>   | terms of sharing information, evidence that's out of   | 00:12 <b>14</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: then you can make   |
| 00:10 <b>15</b>   | context.   | 00:12 <b>15</b>   | that when we get to comments. You see, this is what   |
| 00:10 <b>16</b>   | MS. APPELLE: In your opinion it's out  | 00:12 <b>16</b>   | I mean, you're not testifying about anything that you   |
| 00:10 <b>17</b>   | of context.  | 00:12 <b>17</b>   | have personal knowledge about, and it's going to cut  |
| 00:10 18  | MR. DELIA: In my opinion, there's no   | 00:12 18  | into the time that people have to make comments.  |
| 00:10 <b>19</b>   | foundation for these documents. In my opinion, they  | 00:12 <b>19</b>   | MS. APPELLE: Well, it's not going to  |
| 00:10 <b>20</b>   | are hearsay. That is my opinion.   | 00:12 <b>20</b>   | do, because we're going to be here until we've all  |
| 00:10 <b>21</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, I think  | 00:12 <b>21</b>   | had our five minutes of comments. I didn't know the   |
| 00:10 22  | Mr. Intindola indicated that these traffic counts are  | 00:12 22  | procedure, I did the best I could with it, and we'll  |
| 00:10 23  | not any different than the traffic counts that your  | 00:12 23  | see how it goes.  |
| 00:10 <b>24</b>   | expert came up with.   | 00:12 <b>24</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  |
| 00:10 <b>25</b>   | MR. DELIA: He said they were close.  | 00:12 <b>25</b>   | I can't read the name, it looks like  |
|   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812   |   | 201-641-1812  |
|   |  |   |   |
|   | 154  |   | 156   |
| 00:10 <b>1</b>  | 154 MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing   | 00:12 <b>1</b>  | 156 it's Walter Appelle.  |
| 00:10 <b>1</b> 00:10 <b>2</b>   |  | 00:12 <b>1</b> 00:13 <b>2</b>   |   |
|   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing   |   | it's Walter Appelle.  |
| 00:10 2   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  | 00:13 <b>2</b>  | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody  |
| 00:10 <b>2</b> 00:11 <b>3</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for  | 00:13 <b>2</b> 00:13 <b>3</b>   | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?   |
| 00:10 <b>2</b> 00:11 <b>3</b> 00:11 <b>4</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  | 00:13 <b>2</b> 00:13 <b>3</b> 00:13 <b>4</b>  | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the   |
| 00:10 <b>2</b> 00:11 <b>3</b> 00:11 <b>4</b> 00:11 <b>5</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  | 00:13 <b>2</b> 00:13 <b>3</b> 00:13 <b>4</b> 00:13 <b>5</b>   | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't  |
| 00:10 <b>2</b> 00:11 <b>3</b> 00:11 <b>4</b> 00:11 <b>5</b> 00:11 <b>6</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.   | 00:13 <b>2</b> 00:13 <b>3</b> 00:13 <b>4</b> 00:13 <b>5</b> 00:13 <b>6</b>  | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  |
| 00:10 <b>2</b> 00:11 <b>3</b> 00:11 <b>4</b> 00:11 <b>5</b> 00:11 <b>6</b> 00:11 <b>7</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  | 00:13 <b>2</b> 00:13 <b>3</b> 00:13 <b>4</b> 00:13 <b>5</b> 00:13 <b>6</b> 00:13 <b>7</b>   | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there   |
| 00:10 <b>2</b> 00:11 <b>3</b> 00:11 <b>4</b> 00:11 <b>5</b> 00:11 <b>6</b> 00:11 <b>7</b> 00:11 <b>8</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic   | 00:13 <b>2</b> 00:13 <b>3</b> 00:13 <b>4</b> 00:13 <b>5</b> 00:13 <b>6</b> 00:13 <b>7</b> 00:13 <b>8</b>  | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.   |
| 00:10 <b>2</b> 00:11 <b>3</b> 00:11 <b>4</b> 00:11 <b>5</b> 00:11 <b>6</b> 00:11 <b>7</b> 00:11 <b>8</b> 00:11 <b>9</b> 00:11 <b>10</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and  | 00:13 <b>2</b> 00:13 <b>3</b> 00:13 <b>4</b> 00:13 <b>5</b> 00:13 <b>6</b> 00:13 <b>7</b> 00:13 <b>8</b> 00:13 <b>9</b> 00:13 <b>10</b> 00:13 <b>11</b>                                       | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony? MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts  |
| 00:10 <b>2</b> 00:11 <b>3</b> 00:11 <b>4</b> 00:11 <b>5</b> 00:11 <b>6</b> 00:11 <b>7</b> 00:11 <b>8</b> 00:11 <b>9</b> 00:11 <b>10</b> 00:11 <b>11</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people   | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12  | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument  | 00:13   | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to  |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13 00:11 14  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.   | 00:13   | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony? MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.   |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13 00:11 14 00:11 15   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some  | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 14  | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I   |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13 00:11 14 00:11 15 00:11 16  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have that's relevant to  | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 14 00:13 15 00:13 16  | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and  |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13 00:11 14 00:11 15 00:11 16 00:11 17   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have any personal knowledge  | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 14 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17   | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony? MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get  |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13 00:11 14 00:11 15 00:11 16 00:11 17 00:11 18  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have any personal knowledge that you would like to testify about?  | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 14 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18  | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?   |
| 00:10     2       00:11     3       00:11     5       00:11     6       00:11     8       00:11     9       00:11     10       00:11     11       00:11     12       00:11     13       00:11     14       00:11     15       00:11     16       00:11     18       00:11     19  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have any personal knowledge that you would like to testify about?  MS. APPELLE: Well, I live there so I  | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 14 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18 00:13 19                                     | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, this is testimony.   |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13 00:11 14 00:11 15 00:11 16 00:11 17 00:11 18 00:11 19 00:11 20  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have that's relevant to this application. Do you have any personal knowledge that you would like to testify about?  MS. APPELLE: Well, I live there so I certainly know what it looks like and what it's like.   | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 15 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18 00:13 19 00:13 20                            | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, this is testimony.  MR. DELIA: And then they get to speak  |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13 00:11 15 00:11 15 00:11 16 00:11 17 00:11 18 00:11 19 00:11 20 00:11 21   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have that's relevant to this application. Do you have any personal knowledge that you would like to testify about?  MS. APPELLE: Well, I live there so I certainly know what it looks like and what it's like. I can tell you about the trains, how many times they  | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18 00:13 19 00:13 20 00:13 21                            | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony? MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, this is testimony.  MR. DELIA: And then they get to speak again?  |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13 00:11 15 00:11 15 00:11 16 00:11 17 00:11 18 00:11 19 00:11 20 00:11 21 00:11 22  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have any personal knowledge that you have any personal knowledge that you would like to testify about?  MS. APPELLE: Well, I live there so I certainly know what it looks like and what it's like. I can tell you about the trains, how many times they stop now, why you're going to have more trains with  | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 15 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18 00:13 19 00:13 20 00:13 21 00:13 22          | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, this is testimony.  MR. DELIA: And then they get to speak again?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: To make comments, yes.   |
| 00:10     2       00:11     3       00:11     5       00:11     7       00:11     8       00:11     9       00:11     10       00:11     12       00:11     12       00:11     14       00:11     15       00:11     16       00:11     17       00:11     18       00:11     19       00:11     20       00:11     21       00:11     22       00:11     23                    | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have that's relevant to this application. Do you have any personal knowledge that you would like to testify about?  MS. APPELLE: Well, I live there so I certainly know what it looks like and what it's like. I can tell you about the trains, how many times they stop now, why you're going to have more trains with more cars taking more time to stop at that                                     | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 15 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18 00:13 19 00:13 20 00:13 21 00:13 22 00:13 23         | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, this is testimony.  MR. DELIA: And then they get to speak again?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: To make comments, yes.  AUDIENCE MEMBERS: We heard from you  |
| 00:10     2       00:11     3       00:11     4       00:11     6       00:11     7       00:11     9       00:11     10       00:11     11       00:11     12       00:11     14       00:11     15       00:11     16       00:11     17       00:11     18       00:11     19       00:11     20       00:11     21       00:11     22       00:11     23       00:11     24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have that's relevant to this application. Do you have any personal knowledge that you would like to testify about?  MS. APPELLE: Well, I live there so I certainly know what it looks like and what it's like. I can tell you about the trains, how many times they stop now, why you're going to have more trains with more cars taking more time to stop at that intersection.                       | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18 00:13 19 00:13 20 00:13 21 00:13 22 00:13 23 00:13 24 | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, this is testimony.  MR. DELIA: And then they get to speak again?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: To make comments, yes.  AUDIENCE MEMBERS: We heard from you for six months.                            |
| 00:10 2 00:11 3 00:11 4 00:11 5 00:11 6 00:11 7 00:11 8 00:11 9 00:11 10 00:11 11 00:11 12 00:11 13 00:11 14 00:11 15 00:11 16 00:11 17 00:11 18 00:11 19 00:11 20 00:11 21 00:11 22 00:11 23   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have that's relevant to this application. Do you have any personal knowledge that you would like to testify about?  MS. APPELLE: Well, I live there so I certainly know what it looks like and what it's like. I can tell you about the trains, how many times they stop now, why you're going to have more trains with more cars taking more time to stop at that intersection.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 15 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18 00:13 19 00:13 20 00:13 21 00:13 22 00:13 23         | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, this is testimony.  MR. DELIA: And then they get to speak again?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: To make comments, yes.  AUDIENCE MEMBERS: We heard from you for six months.  MR. DELIA: That's totally |
| 00:10     2       00:11     3       00:11     4       00:11     6       00:11     7       00:11     9       00:11     10       00:11     11       00:11     12       00:11     14       00:11     15       00:11     16       00:11     17       00:11     18       00:11     19       00:11     20       00:11     21       00:11     22       00:11     23       00:11     24 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: So what are we arguing about?  MS. APPELLE: But his expert did it for two hours, these are over a 24-hour period.  MR. NEWMAN: But they're not disagreeing with one another.  MS. APPELLE: Okay. All right.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: There are traffic counts, I think it's acknowledged by both experts.  MS. APPELLE: And is it also acknowledged that when you put more buildings up and you have more people  MR. PRINCIOTTO: This is an argument that you can make.  The testimony has to do with some personal knowledge that you have that's relevant to this application. Do you have any personal knowledge that you would like to testify about?  MS. APPELLE: Well, I live there so I certainly know what it looks like and what it's like. I can tell you about the trains, how many times they stop now, why you're going to have more trains with more cars taking more time to stop at that intersection.                       | 00:13 2 00:13 3 00:13 4 00:13 5 00:13 6 00:13 7 00:13 8 00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18 00:13 19 00:13 20 00:13 21 00:13 22 00:13 23 00:13 24 | it's Walter Appelle.  MR. APPELLE: Can I defer to somebody else or do I have to go?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You're next on the list. Then we're going to move to people who don't live within 200 feet.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I thought there were more people.  MR. COUTO: As a comment or testimony?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Testimony.  MR. NEWMAN: Personal knowledge. Facts that you have personal knowledge of.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to move to the evidence.  MR. DELIA: The gentleman is asking, I think, is there a difference between testimony and comments? And at this point, the answer is, they get to speak. Isn't this their final say?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, this is testimony.  MR. DELIA: And then they get to speak again?  MR. PRINCIOTTO: To make comments, yes.  AUDIENCE MEMBERS: We heard from you for six months.                            |

|  | 157  |   | 159   |
|--|--|---|---|
| 00:13 <b>1</b>   | inappropriate at this stage of the game, to have them  | 00:15 <b>1</b>  | MR. MARSON: I'm happy to do it as   |
| 00:13 <b>2</b>   | comment. Essentially what they're doing now is   | 00:15 <b>2</b>  | commentary, if you like, your decision. I'm happy to  |
| 00:13 <b>3</b>   | commenting and then they'll comment again.   | 00:15 <b>3</b>  | do it as commentary.  |
| 00:13 <b>4</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: Well, they shouldn't be  | 00:15 <b>4</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: All right. Let them   |
| 00:13 <b>5</b>   | commenting, they should only testify to personal   | 00:15 <b>5</b>  | figure it out.  |
| 00:13 <b>6</b>   | facts they have personal knowledge.  | 00:15 <b>6</b>  | MR. DELIA: You know, three pages plus   |
| 00:13 <b>7</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Craig Marson.  | 00:15 <b>7</b>  | exhibits, so for me to sit here now and say yes or  |
| 00:13 <b>8</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: So testimony,  | 00:15 <b>8</b>  | no, I can't do it. I don't know. All I can tell you   |
| 00:13 <b>9</b>   | Mr. Marson, no comments.   | 00:16 <b>9</b>  | is what is alleged are conflicts of interest which  |
| 00:13 <b>10</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: This is only testimony.  | 00:16 <b>10</b>   | are factual in nature to start with.  |
| 00:14 <b>11</b>  | MR. MARSON: No comments, but let me  | 00:16 <b>11</b>   | So mere documentation to prove such an  |
| 00:14 <b>12</b>  | ask you for your help. I have three pages to read  | 00:16 <b>12</b>   | allegation I think is inappropriate, without direct   |
| 00:14 <b>13</b>  | with full attachments. The attachments, some of it   | 00:16 <b>13</b>   | personal knowledge attached to that.  |
| 00:14 <b>14</b>  | is my observation, some of it is direct facts that I   | 00:16 <b>14</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. All right.  |
| 00:14 <b>15</b>  | have knowledge of as do you. You make the decision,  | 00:16 <b>15</b>   | This is what I'm going to do on this. I'm going to  |
| 00:14 <b>16</b>  | I just want to read my three page. I have  | 00:16 <b>16</b>   | defer on this. It looks more like comments to me, so  |
| 00:14 <b>17</b>  | attachments for you and the whole board, everybody   | 00:16 <b>17</b>   | let me see what else we have, and then we'll come   |
| 00:14 <b>18</b>  | gets a packet.   | 00:16 <b>18</b>   | back to this. Okay?   |
| 00:14 19   | Do you want me to read the three pages   | 00:16 <b>19</b>   | MR. MARSON: I should sit?   |
| 00:14 <b>20</b>  | or not?  | 00:16 <b>20</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: And then I'll come  |
| 00:14 <b>21</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, are the pages  | 00:16 <b>21</b>   | back to you.  |
| 00:14 <b>22</b>  | comments?  | 00:16 <b>22</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: Let's see if there are  |
| 00:14 23   | MR. MARSON: The pages, everything is   | 00:16 <b>23</b>   | some simpler issues.  |
| 00:14 <b>24</b>  | researched, everything is documented. It's three   | 00:16 <b>24</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Ann Marie Borrelli,   |
| 00:14 <b>25</b>  | pages about my observations about the deal.  | 00:16 <b>25</b>   | you said you have a handout. I don't know what the  |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|  | 201-641-1812   |   | 201-641-1812  |
|  |  |   |   |
|  | 158  |   | 160   |
| 00:14 <b>1</b>   |  | 00:16 <b>1</b>  |   |
| 00:14 <b>1</b> 00:14 <b>2</b>  | 158  | 00:16 <b>1</b> 00:16 <b>2</b>   | 160   |
| _  | 158<br>MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter?  |   | nature of this handout is.  |
| 00:14 2  | 158<br>MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter?<br>MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  | 00:16 2   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?   |
| 00:14 <b>2</b> 00:14 <b>3</b>  | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188. It is all related to 188 and people that had to do   | 00:16 <b>2</b> 00:17 <b>3</b>   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures  |
| 00:14 <b>2</b> 00:14 <b>3</b> 00:14 <b>4</b>   | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all  | 00:16 <b>2</b> 00:17 <b>3</b> 00:17 <b>4</b>  | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the   |
| 00:14 <b>2</b> 00:14 <b>3</b> 00:14 <b>4</b> 00:14 <b>5</b>  | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three  | 00:16 <b>2</b> 00:17 <b>3</b> 00:17 <b>4</b> 00:17 <b>5</b>   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15   |
| 00:14 <b>2</b> 00:14 <b>3</b> 00:14 <b>4</b> 00:14 <b>5</b> 00:14 <b>6</b>   | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.   | 00:16 <b>2</b> 00:17 <b>3</b> 00:17 <b>4</b> 00:17 <b>5</b> 00:17 <b>6</b>  | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.   |
| 00:14 <b>2</b> 00:14 <b>3</b> 00:14 <b>4</b> 00:14 <b>5</b> 00:14 <b>6</b> 00:14 <b>7</b>  | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down. MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment  | 00:16 <b>2</b> 00:17 <b>3</b> 00:17 <b>4</b> 00:17 <b>5</b> 00:17 <b>6</b> 00:17 <b>7</b>   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you   |
| 00:14 <b>2</b> 00:14 <b>3</b> 00:14 <b>4</b> 00:14 <b>5</b> 00:14 <b>6</b> 00:14 <b>7</b> 00:14 <b>8</b>   | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down. MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.   | 00:16 <b>2</b> 00:17 <b>3</b> 00:17 <b>4</b> 00:17 <b>5</b> 00:17 <b>6</b> 00:17 <b>7</b> 00:17 <b>8</b>  | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  |
| 00:14 <b>2</b> 00:14 <b>3</b> 00:14 <b>4</b> 00:14 <b>5</b> 00:14 <b>6</b> 00:14 <b>7</b> 00:14 <b>8</b> 00:14 <b>9</b>  | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down. MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to  | 00:16 <b>2</b> 00:17 <b>3</b> 00:17 <b>4</b> 00:17 <b>5</b> 00:17 <b>6</b> 00:17 <b>7</b> 00:17 <b>8</b> 00:17 <b>9</b>   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay.  |
| 00:14 <b>2</b> 00:14 <b>3</b> 00:14 <b>4</b> 00:14 <b>5</b> 00:14 <b>6</b> 00:14 <b>7</b> 00:14 <b>8</b> 00:14 <b>9</b> 00:14 <b>10</b>  | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down. MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me. MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  | 00:16 <b>2</b> 00:17 <b>3</b> 00:17 <b>4</b> 00:17 <b>5</b> 00:17 <b>6</b> 00:17 <b>7</b> 00:17 <b>8</b> 00:17 <b>9</b> 00:17 <b>10</b>   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay.  You have photographs, correct?  |
| 00:14 <b>2</b> 00:14 <b>3</b> 00:14 <b>4</b> 00:14 <b>5</b> 00:14 <b>6</b> 00:14 <b>7</b> 00:14 <b>8</b> 00:14 <b>9</b> 00:14 <b>10</b> 00:14 <b>11</b>                              | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down. MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision. MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by  | 00:16 <b>2</b> 00:17 <b>3</b> 00:17 <b>4</b> 00:17 <b>5</b> 00:17 <b>6</b> 00:17 <b>7</b> 00:17 <b>8</b> 00:17 <b>9</b> 00:17 <b>10</b> 00:17 <b>11</b>   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay.  You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11  | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down. MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me. MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision. MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?   | 00:16 2 00:17 3 00:17 4 00:17 5 00:17 6 00:17 7 00:17 8 00:17 9 00:17 10 00:17 11 00:17 12  | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay. You have photographs, correct? MS. BORRELLI: Yes. MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or  |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13  | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we   | 00:16 2 00:17 3 00:17 4 00:17 5 00:17 6 00:17 7 00:17 8 00:17 9 00:17 10 00:17 11 00:17 12 00:17 13   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay. You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?   |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:14 14   | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your page.   | 00:16 2 00:17 3 00:17 4 00:17 5 00:17 6 00:17 7 00:17 8 00:17 9 00:17 10 00:17 11 00:17 12 00:17 13 00:17 14  | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay.  You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely.  |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:14 14 00:15 15 00:15 16   | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your   | 00:16 2 00:17 3 00:17 4 00:17 5 00:17 6 00:17 7 00:17 8 00:17 9 00:17 10 00:17 11 00:17 12 00:17 13 00:17 14 00:17 15 00:17 16  | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay. You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely. Yes.  ANN MARIE BORRELLI, 18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey,  |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:15 15 00:15 16 00:15 17   | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your page.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, so then other than that we have   | 00:16 2 00:17 3 00:17 4 00:17 5 00:17 6 00:17 7 00:17 8 00:17 9 00:17 10 00:17 11 00:17 12 00:17 13 00:17 14 00:17 15 00:17 16 00:17 17   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay.  You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely.  Yes.  ANN MARIE BORRELLI,  18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:   |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:15 15 00:15 16 00:15 17 00:15 18 00:15 19                                     | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your page.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, so then other than that we have  MR. MARSON: I've been waiting and  | 00:16     2       00:17     3       00:17     5       00:17     6       00:17     8       00:17     9       00:17     10       00:17     12       00:17     13       00:17     14       00:17     15       00:17     16       00:17     18       00:17     19   | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay. You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely.  Yes.  ANN MARIE BORRELLI,  18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And you stated your   |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:15 15 00:15 16 00:15 17 00:15 18 00:15 19 00:15 20                            | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your page.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, so then other than that we have  MR. MARSON: I've been waiting and waiting patiently. I am not trying to be rude.   | 00:16 2 00:17 3 00:17 4 00:17 5 00:17 6 00:17 7 00:17 8 00:17 9 00:17 10 00:17 11 00:17 12 00:17 13 00:17 14 00:17 15 00:17 16 00:17 17 00:17 18 00:17 19 00:17 20  | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay.  You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely.  Yes.  ANN MARIE BORRELLI,  18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And you stated your name, Ann Marie Borrelli, right?   |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:15 15 00:15 16 00:15 17 00:15 18 00:15 19 00:15 20 00:15 21                   | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your page.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, so then other than that we have  MR. MARSON: I've been waiting and waiting patiently. I am not trying to be rude.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Don't hand it out yet,   | 00:16     2       00:17     3       00:17     5       00:17     6       00:17     7       00:17     9       00:17     10       00:17     12       00:17     13       00:17     15       00:17     16       00:17     18       00:17     19       00:17     20       00:17     21  | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay. You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely. Yes.  ANN MARIE BORRELLI,  18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And you stated your name, Ann Marie Borrelli, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.   |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:15 15 00:15 16 00:15 17 00:15 18 00:15 19 00:15 20 00:15 21                           | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your page.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, so then other than that we have  MR. MARSON: I've been waiting and waiting patiently. I am not trying to be rude.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Don't hand it out yet, I haven't seen it and Mr. Delia hasn't seen it.   | 00:16       2         00:17       3         00:17       5         00:17       6         00:17       8         00:17       9         00:17       10         00:17       12         00:17       13         00:17       14         00:17       15         00:17       16         00:17       18         00:17       19         00:17       20         00:17       21         00:17       22                        | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay. You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely. Yes.  ANN MARIE BORRELLI,  18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And you stated your name, Ann Marie Borrelli, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You took these   |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:15 15 00:15 16 00:15 17 00:15 18 00:15 20 00:15 21 00:15 22                   | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your page.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, so then other than that we have  MR. MARSON: I've been waiting and waiting patiently. I am not trying to be rude.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Don't hand it out yet, I haven't seen it and Mr. Delia hasn't seen it. Please, hand it back, just give one to me.                                  | 00:16       2         00:17       3         00:17       5         00:17       6         00:17       8         00:17       9         00:17       10         00:17       12         00:17       13         00:17       15         00:17       16         00:17       17         00:17       18         00:17       20         00:17       21         00:17       22         00:17       23                        | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay. You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely. Yes.  ANN MARIE BORRELLI,  18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And you stated your name, Ann Marie Borrelli, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You took these photographs. When did you take the photographs?                                       |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:15 15 00:15 16 00:15 17 00:15 18 00:15 20 00:15 21 00:15 22 00:15 23 00:15 24 | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your page.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, so then other than that we have  MR. MARSON: I've been waiting and waiting patiently. I am not trying to be rude.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Don't hand it out yet, I haven't seen it and Mr. Delia hasn't seen it.  Please, hand it back, just give one to me.  MR. NEWMAN: One to you, one to | 00:16       2         00:17       3         00:17       5         00:17       6         00:17       8         00:17       9         00:17       10         00:17       12         00:17       13         00:17       14         00:17       15         00:17       16         00:17       18         00:17       19         00:17       20         00:17       21         00:17       23         00:17       24 | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15  Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay.  You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely.  Yes.  ANN MARIE BORRELLI,  18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And you stated your name, Ann Marie Borrelli, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You took these photographs. When did you take the photographs?  MS. BORRELLI: I took these in the |
| 00:14 2 00:14 3 00:14 4 00:14 5 00:14 6 00:14 7 00:14 8 00:14 9 00:14 10 00:14 11 00:14 12 00:14 13 00:15 15 00:15 16 00:15 17 00:15 18 00:15 20 00:15 21 00:15 22                   | MR. HAYES: What is the subject matter? MR. MARSON: The subject matter is 188.  It is all related to 188 and people that had to do with 188 and the transaction. It is all interrelated. I've got packets for everybody, three pages to read, and then I'll sit down.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: It sounds like comment to me.  MR. MARSON: I'll wait. I'm happy to wait. Your decision.  MR. NEWMAN: Why don't you start by doing it?  MR. DELIA: It's a mystery, until we see what he has.  MR. NEWMAN: Let's start giving your page.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, so then other than that we have  MR. MARSON: I've been waiting and waiting patiently. I am not trying to be rude.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Don't hand it out yet, I haven't seen it and Mr. Delia hasn't seen it. Please, hand it back, just give one to me.                                  | 00:16       2         00:17       3         00:17       5         00:17       6         00:17       8         00:17       9         00:17       10         00:17       12         00:17       13         00:17       15         00:17       16         00:17       17         00:17       18         00:17       20         00:17       21         00:17       22         00:17       23                        | nature of this handout is.  Do you have a copy for Mr. Delia?  MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I took pictures from my front window and I took a picture from the deck of the house across the street from me at 15 Cressfield Court.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. Can you raise your right hand.  You're going to testify. Okay. You have photographs, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Do you swear or affirm to tell the truth under penalties of law?  MS. BORRELLI: Of course. Definitely. Yes.  ANN MARIE BORRELLI,  18 Cressfield Court, Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:  MR. PRINCIOTTO: And you stated your name, Ann Marie Borrelli, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You took these photographs. When did you take the photographs?                                       |

201-641-1812

201-641-1812

| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 18 00:19 19 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 20 00:19 21 00:19 22 00:19 23 00:19 24 00:19 25                             | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I do see it.  Now  MR. HAYES: What date did you take the photograph?  MS. BORRELLI: It was on a Sunday. The actual date I don't have. It was in April.  MR. HAYES: Approximate date, April? MS. BORRELLI: I don't remember.  MR. COUTO: I'm not sure.  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. | 00:20 25  00:20 1  00:20 2  00:20 3  00:20 6  00:20 7  00:20 8  00:20 9  00:20 10  00:21 13  00:21 14  00:21 15  00:21 15  00:21 17  00:21 18  00:21 18  00:21 19  00:21 20  00:21 21  00:21 22  00:21 23  00:21 24  00:21 25 | sliver here.  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind you, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes, you can see that it is taller, and this is a misrepresentation because it's not tucked below the mountain in obscurity. It is very visible, as you can see from these pictures, and it is higher.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That building is not there yet.  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. |
|--|--|---|--|
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2  00:18 25  00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 19 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 20 00:19 21 00:19 22 00:19 23 00:19 24   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I do see it.  Now  MR. HAYES: What date did you take the photograph?  MS. BORRELLI: It was on a Sunday. The actual date I don't have. It was in April.  MR. HAYES: Approximate date, April? MS. BORRELLI: I don't remember.   | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 10 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15 00:21 16 00:21 17 00:21 18 00:21 19 00:21 20 00:21 21 00:21 23 00:21 23                                 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind you, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes, you can see that it is taller, and this is a misrepresentation because it's not tucked below the mountain in obscurity. It is very visible, as you can see from these pictures, and it is higher.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: That building is not  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2  00:18 2  00:18 2  00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 19 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 19 00:19 20 00:19 21 00:19 22 00:19 23 | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I do see it.  Now  MR. HAYES: What date did you take the photograph?  MS. BORRELLI: It was on a Sunday. The actual date I don't have. It was in April.  MR. HAYES: Approximate date, April?  | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 10 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15 00:21 16 00:21 17 00:21 18 00:21 19 00:21 20 00:21 21 00:21 22 00:21 23  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind you, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes, you can see that it is taller, and this is a misrepresentation because it's not tucked below the mountain in obscurity. It is very visible, as you can see from these pictures, and it is higher.  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:18 25  00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 19 00:19 20 00:19 21 00:19 22   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I do see it.  Now  MR. HAYES: What date did you take the photograph?  MS. BORRELLI: It was on a Sunday. The actual date I don't have. It was in April.   | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15 00:21 16 00:21 17 00:21 18 00:21 19 00:21 20 00:21 21  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind you, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes, you can see that it is taller, and this is a misrepresentation because it's not tucked below the mountain in obscurity. It is very visible, as you can see from these pictures,   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:18 25  00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 19 00:19 20 00:19 21 00:19 22   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I do see it.  Now  MR. HAYES: What date did you take the photograph?  MS. BORRELLI: It was on a Sunday. The  | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 10 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15 00:21 16 00:21 17 00:21 18 00:21 18 00:21 19 00:21 20 00:21 21   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind you, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes, you can see that it is taller, and this is a misrepresentation because it's not tucked below the mountain in obscurity. It  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 19 00:19 19  | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I do see it.  Now  MR. HAYES: What date did you take the photograph?   | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15 00:21 16 00:21 17 00:21 18 00:21 19 00:21 20   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind you, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes, you can see that it is taller, and this is a misrepresentation because   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18 00:19 17  | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I do see it.  Now  MR. HAYES: What date did you take the   | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15 00:21 16 00:21 17 00:21 18 00:21 19  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind you, right?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes, you can see that it   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17 00:19 18   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I do see it.  Now  | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 10 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15 00:21 17 00:21 18   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind you, right?  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 9 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 16 00:19 17   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I do see it.   | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 10 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15 00:21 16 00:21 17   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Like that's behind   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15 00:19 15 00:19 15   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the sun bouncing off the lake, I can see it shining, so I  | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 10 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15 00:21 16  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I will wind up with hardly like anything to see, so   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 9 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14 00:19 15   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny when I took it, but when it's sunny, I can see the  | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 9 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14 00:21 15  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and it will definitely reduce the view of the lake, and I   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13 00:19 14  | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can see the lake. And this day, it wasn't that sunny   | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 9 00:20 10 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13 00:21 14  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's plans that the second building will have higher, and   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 9 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12 00:19 13   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a zoom lens. And so when I look out my window, I can  | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 9 00:20 10 00:20 11 00:21 12 00:21 13   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of the second building, and we saw on the architect's  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 9 00:19 10 00:19 11 00:19 12  | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on this one, I am standing, I'm by my house and I had a   | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 9 00:20 10 00:20 11   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  MS. BORRELLI: So from the height of   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 23 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 9 00:19 10 00:19 11   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?  MS. BORRELLI: O-3, I am standing on  | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 9 00:20 10 00:20 11   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that, that's O-3.  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 9 00:19 10  | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when you took O-3?   | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8 00:20 9 00:20 10  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  MR. PRINCIOTTO: You can consider that,  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8 00:19 9   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Where were you when   | 00:20 1<br>00:20 2<br>00:20 3<br>00:20 4<br>00:20 5<br>00:20 6<br>00:20 7<br>00:20 8<br>00:20 8   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  MR. NEWMAN: Your photograph  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6 00:19 7 00:19 8   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  MS. BORRELLI: Yes.  | 00:20 1 00:20 2 00:20 3 00:20 4 00:20 5 00:20 6 00:20 7 00:20 8   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.  MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 7   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay, you took O-3, correct?  | 00:20 1<br>00:20 2<br>00:20 3<br>00:20 4<br>00:20 5<br>00:20 6<br>00:20 7   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  MR. DELIA: No, I have no objection.   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5 00:19 6   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Tell us, okay,   | 00:20 <b>1</b> 00:20 <b>2</b> 00:20 <b>3</b> 00:20 <b>4</b> 00:20 <b>5</b> 00:20 <b>6</b>   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an objection to the photograph itself?  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4 00:19 5   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3 for identification.)   | 00:20 <b>1</b> 00:20 <b>2</b> 00:20 <b>3</b> 00:20 <b>4</b> 00:20 <b>5</b>  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, do you have an  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  00:18 1 00:18 2 00:19 3 00:19 4   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  (Photograph is marked as exhibit O-3  | 00:20 <b>1</b> 00:20 <b>2</b> 00:20 <b>3</b> 00:20 <b>4</b>   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going to be higher, slightly higher in context but   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark that O-3. Okay.  | 00:20 <b>1</b> 00:20 <b>2</b> 00:20 <b>3</b>  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  MR. DELIA: It is not. It's not going  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed things up. On the first photograph, can you mark  | 00:20 <b>1</b> 00:20 <b>2</b>   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be higher and it's going  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  162  going to ask you to do me a favor, just to speed   | 00:20 <b>1</b>  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. 201-641-1812  164  Now, the second building is going to be  |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24 00:18 25  | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  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.<br>201-641-1812   |
| 00:18 16 00:18 17 00:18 18 00:18 19 00:18 20 00:18 21 00:18 22 00:18 23 00:18 24   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  201-641-1812  | 00:20 <b>25</b>   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812   |
| 00:18 16<br>00:18 17<br>00:18 18<br>00:18 19<br>00:18 20<br>00:18 21<br>00:18 22<br>00:18 23<br>00:18 24   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm<br>LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  | 00:20 <b>25</b>   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
| 00:18 16<br>00:18 17<br>00:18 18<br>00:18 19<br>00:18 20<br>00:18 21<br>00:18 22<br>00:18 23<br>00:18 24   | mark the photographs. Okay. All right. So I'm  | 00:20 <b>25</b>   |  |
| 00:18 16<br>00:18 17<br>00:18 18<br>00:18 19<br>00:18 20<br>00:18 21<br>00:18 22<br>00:18 23<br>00:18 24   | -  | 00:20 <b>25</b>   | Silver fiele.  |
| 00:18 16<br>00:18 17<br>00:18 18<br>00:18 19<br>00:18 20<br>00:18 21<br>00:18 22<br>00:18 23   |  | 1   | cliver here  |
| 00:18 16<br>00:18 17<br>00:18 18<br>00:18 19<br>00:18 20<br>00:18 21<br>00:18 22   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. We have to  | 00:20 <b>24</b>   | part of the lake, but you can see that I have this   |
| 00:18 16<br>00:18 17<br>00:18 18<br>00:18 19<br>00:18 20<br>00:18 21   | view.  | 00:20 <b>23</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: The top of 188 obstructs   |
| 00:18 <b>16</b> 00:18 <b>17</b> 00:18 <b>18</b> 00:18 <b>19</b> 00:18 <b>20</b>  | stripes of the parking spaces, so they will have full  | 00:20 <b>22</b>   | at 188 Broadway?   |
| 00:18 <b>16</b> 00:18 <b>17</b> 00:18 <b>18</b> 00:18 <b>19</b>  | and see the parking lot and actually see the painted   | 00:20 <b>21</b>   | can't see it from here, but can you see the building   |
| 00:18 <b>16</b> 00:18 <b>17</b> 00:18 <b>18</b>  | building, because from their view they can look down   | 00:20 <b>20</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. I mean, I   |
| 00:18 <b>16</b> 00:18 <b>17</b>  | will have full view of the back of the apartment   | 00:20 <b>19</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: Yes, yes.  |
| 00:18 <b>16</b>  | backyards overlook the proposed apartment, that they   | 00:20 18  | your view of the lake?   |
|  | show that from the deck of the homes on where the  | 00:20 <b>17</b>   | standing outside your front window is a photograph of  |
| 00.10 13   | to show the area of the lake, and I have it marked to  | 00:20 <b>16</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: And that photograph  |
| 00:18 <b>15</b>  | MS. BORRELLI: And I have them marked   | 00:20 <b>15</b>   | out my front window.   |
| 00:18 <b>14</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.  | 00:20 <b>14</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: I was standing looking   |
| 00:18 <b>13</b>  | MS. BORRELLI: Yes.   | 00:20 13  | standing when you took that photograph?  |
| 00:18 <b>12</b>  | Mr. Delia just now?  | 00:20 <b>12</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: And where were you   |
| 00:18 <b>11</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: You gave two to  | 00:20 <b>11</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: I took it, yes.  |
| 00:18 <b>10</b>  | and I have copies.   | 00:20 <b>10</b>   | photograph?  |
| 00:18 <b>9</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: There's two pictures,  | 00:20 <b>9</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: And you took that  |
| 00:18 <b>8</b>   | you take?  | 00:20 <b>8</b>  | MS. BORRELLI: Sometime before  |
| 00:18 <b>7</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: How many pictures did  | 00:20 <b>7</b>  | took on or about April 20th? Sometime in April?  |
| 00:17 <b>6</b>   | indeed there would be an obstruction of view.  | 00:20 <b>6</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: This is a picture that you   |
| 00:17 <b>5</b>   | obstructed, so I took these pictures to show that  | 00:20 <b>5</b>  | don't see the lake.  |
| 00:17 <b>4</b>   | contrary to testimony that no one's view would be  | 00:19 <b>4</b>  | there was testimony that there's trees there, so we  |
| 00:17 <b>3</b>   | And I took these pictures to prove,  | 00:19 <b>3</b>  | So, as you can see, though, and so   |
| 00:17 <b>2</b>   | MS. BORRELLI: Of 2019.   | 00:19 <b>2</b>  | April.   |
| 00:17 <b>1</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Of?  | 00:19 <b>1</b>  | MS. BORRELLI: I don't know. It was in  |
|  | 161  |   | 163  |

|                                    | 165  |                                 | 167  |
|------------------------------------|--|---------------------------------|--|
| 00:21 <b>1</b>                     | MS. BORRELLI: This building, right,  | 00:23 <b>1</b>                  | objection to O-3 and O-4, can you put those on the   |
| 00:21 2                            | this building.   | 00:23 2                         | other photographs that we marked.  |
| 00:21 <b>2</b>                     | We all can see the top of this building  | 00:23 <b>3</b>                  | MS. BORRELLI: Okay.  |
| 00:21 <b>4</b>                     | very clearly, and we can also see down to the parking                                    | 00:23 4                         | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Put them on top of the   |
| 00:21 <b>5</b>                     | lot.   | 00:23 <b>5</b>                  | four green photographs.  |
| 00:21 6                            | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. And the next   | 00:23 6                         | MS. BORRELLI: Okay. Do you want me to  |
| 00:21 <b>7</b>                     | photograph you have, mark that O-4.  | 00:23 7                         | hand these out to anybody?   |
| 00:21 7                            | MS. BORRELLI: Okay.  | 00:23 8                         |  |
| 00.21 <b>8</b>                     | (Photograph is marked as exhibit 0-4   | 00:23 9                         | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, you gave two to Mr. Delia?   |
| 00:21 <b>10</b>                    | for identification.)   | 00:23 10                        |  |
| 00:21 10                           | •  | 00:23 11                        | MR. DELIA: Yes, I have them.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: If you want to leave                             |
| 00:21 11                           | MS. BORRELLI: This picture was taken from the deck of the home at 15 Cressfield Court,   | 00:23 11                        | -  |
| 00:21 12                           | •  | 00:23 12                        | some extra copies.   |
| 00:21 13                           | which their backyard overlooks 188 Broadway. And as you can see                          | 00:23 13                        | MS. BORRELLI: Okay, I'll leave these here like that.   |
| 00:21 14                           | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Who lives there?   | 00:23 15                        | I also have an article that was in the   |
| 00:22 15                           | MS. BORRELLI: Who lives there are the  | 00:23 16                        | northjersey.com. It's an article about the owners of   |
|                                    |  |                                 |  |
| 00:22 <b>17</b> 00:22 <b>18</b>    | Burnidges (phonetic).  MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: I do.                                       | 00:23 <b>17</b> 00:23 <b>18</b> | 188, and it's just an article about the type of  |
|                                    |  | 00:23 10                        | character that they have, and it's an article  |
| 00:22 19                           | MR. NEWMAN: You took that picture?   |                                 | MR. DELIA: Objection. That's a   |
| 00:22 <b>20</b>                    | MS. BORRELLI: Yes. I went over to his  | 00:23 <b>20</b> 00:23 <b>21</b> | comment, not testimony.  |
| 00:22 21                           | house. He was very kind to let me stand on his deck,                                     |                                 | MR. HAYES: Ma'am, this is comment, not   |
| 00:22 <b>22</b><br>00:22 <b>23</b> | because they're kind neighbors.  | 00:23 <b>22</b> 00:23 <b>23</b> | testimony.   |
| 00:22 <b>23</b>                    | MR. NEWMAN: And that photograph truly  | 00:23 <b>23</b>                 | MS. BORRELLI: I just want to present this as well. It's an article about                       |
| 00:22 <b>24</b>                    | and accurately depicts the view from his house of the site as it currently exists today? | 00:23 <b>24</b>                 | MR. NEWMAN: You want to submit a   |
| 00.22 23                           | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   | 00.23 23                        | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|                                    | 201-641-1812   |                                 | 201-641-1812   |
|                                    | 166  |                                 | 168  |
| 00:22 <b>1</b>                     | MS. BORRELLI: Yes, and you can see   | 00:23 <b>1</b>                  | periodical article that was written  |
| 00:22 <b>2</b>                     | that he can clearly see a good view of the parking                                       | 00:23 <b>2</b>                  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: By somebody else?  |
| 00:22 <b>3</b>                     | lot where the proposed second building will stand.                                       | 00:24 <b>3</b>                  | MR. NEWMAN: by somebody else?  |
| 00:22 <b>4</b>                     | MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, any objection   | 00:24 <b>4</b>                  | MR. DELIA: About someone's character?  |
| 00:22 <b>5</b>                     | to that particular photograph?   | 00:24 <b>5</b>                  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Well, here's a problem   |
| 00:22 <b>6</b>                     | MR. DELIA: Just a question. Did you  | 00:24 <b>6</b>                  | with that, okay. Don't give it to me. We can mark  |
| 00:22 <b>7</b>                     | use a zoom lens on that one?   | 00:24 7                         | it for identification, if you want only, but the   |
| 00:22 8                            | MS. BORRELLI: This one I did not use a   | 00:24 8                         | problem with it is that somebody wrote something, and  |
| 00:22 9                            | zoom lens.   | 00:24 9                         | whoever wrote it is entitled to their opinion,   |
| 00:22 10                           | MR. DELIA: So how close is that to the   | 00:24 10                        | however, Mr. Delia also has the right to   |
| 00:22 11                           | property?  | 00:24 11                        | cross-examine that person who wrote that and to check  |
| 00:22 <b>12</b> 00:22 <b>13</b>    | MS. BORRELLI: This was taken with the  | 00:24 <b>12</b> 00:24 <b>13</b> | the veracity of it and ask him questions, but just having that piece of paper, he can't do it. |
|                                    | regular lens.  | 00:24 13                        |  |
| 00:22 <b>14</b> 00:22 <b>15</b>    | MR. DELIA: How far away would you say  | 00:24 14                        | MS. BORRELLI: Okay. I'll leave it here.  |
| 00:22 15                           | you are MS. BORRELLI: From the property?   | 00:24 15                        | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.  |
| 00:22 16                           | Whatever you have in your documentation  | 00:24 16                        | MR. NEWMAN: So you're two out of three   |
| 00:22 17                           | as far as what the distance is.  | 00:24 17                        | so far.  |
| 00:22 10                           | MR. DELIA: Let me say, where on this   | 00:24 10                        | MS. BORRELLI: But it's there, if   |
| 00:22 19                           | gentleman's property were you standing?  | 00:24 19                        | anybody needs a little reading.  |
| 00:22 <b>21</b>                    | MS. BORRELLI: I'm standing on this   | 00:24 <b>20</b>                 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right.   |
| 00:22 21                           | deck.  | 00:24 21                        | MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.   |
| 00:23 23                           | MR. DELIA: Okay. I have no further   | 00:24 22                        | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Alex Couto.  |
| 00:23 <b>24</b>                    | questions.   | 00:24 <b>24</b>                 | MR. DELIA: Wait, wait, wait. I have a  |
| 00:23 <b>25</b>                    | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. And no   | 00:24 <b>25</b>                 | question.  |
|                                    | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |                                 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|                                    | 201-641-1812   |                                 | 201-641-1812   |

|                               | 169   |                               | 171  |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------------|--|
| 00:24 <b>1</b>                | MS. BORRELLI: To who? To me?  | 00:26 <b>1</b>                | property was purchased?                                  |
| 00:24 2                       | MR. DELIA: Yes, to you.   | 00:26 2                       | MR. COUTO: Not the deed, the date the                    |
| 00:24 3                       | You took photographs, did you do any  | 00:26 3                       | deed was recorded.                                       |
| 00:25 4                       | line-of-sight studies?  | 00:26 4                       | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Why is that important?                   |
| 00:25 5                       | MS. BORRELLI: Well, that's my view  | 00:26 <b>5</b>                | MR. COUTO: Because I'm going to make                     |
| 00:25 6                       | when I look out my window, my line of sight is what I                                 | 00:26 6                       | some comments of the date of deed versus the date of     |
| 00:25 7                       | see.  | 00:26 7                       | the application.   |
| 00:25 8                       | MR. DELIA: Did you do any   | 00:26 8                       | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I know you're going to                   |
| 00:25 <b>9</b>                | line-of-sight studies, yes or no?   | 00:26 <b>9</b>                | make a comment, but why is it relevant? They signed      |
| 00:25 <b>10</b>               | MS. BORRELLI: (Shakes head.)  | 00:26 10                      | the certification they don't own the property when       |
| 00:25 11                      | No.   | 00:26 11                      | they filed the application.                              |
| 00:25 <b>12</b>               | MR. DELIA: I'll take that as a no.  | 00:26 <b>12</b>               | Is that correct?   |
| 00:25 <b>13</b>               | MS. BORRELLI: Why would I do a line of  | 00:26 13                      | MR. DELIA: I haven't looked at that                      |
| 00:25 <b>14</b>               | sight?  | 00:26 14                      | application in some time. I know it was signed by        |
| 00:25 <b>15</b>               | MR. NEWMAN: The witness is nodding her  | 00:26 <b>15</b>               | the owner. I have to look at it to see who exactly       |
| 00:25 <b>16</b>               | head that you didn't do a line of sight.  | 00:26 <b>16</b>               | signed it.   |
| 00:25 <b>17</b>               | MS. BORRELLI: No, I didn't do a line  | 00:26 <b>17</b>               | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Are you saying they                      |
| 00:25 <b>18</b>               | of site, but that's my view. You can't disagree with                                  | 00:26 18                      | didn't own the property?                                 |
| 00:25 <b>19</b>               | my view, right?   | 00:26 19                      | MR. COUTO: No, I'm not saying nothing                    |
| 00:25 <b>20</b>               | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Asked and   | 00:26 <b>20</b>               | like that. It's related to the use that the comment      |
| 00:25 <b>21</b>               | answered. Okay.   | 00:27 <b>21</b>               | that was made by some experts that they couldn't make    |
| 00:25 <b>22</b>               | MS. BORRELLI: Thank you.  | 00:27 <b>22</b>               | a living as a rental office. So related to the time      |
| 00:25 <b>23</b>               | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right.  | 00:27 <b>23</b>               | they added as a rental office versus the time they       |
| 00:25 <b>24</b>               | Mr. Couto, do you have any evidence or  | 00:27 <b>24</b>               | made an application.                                     |
| 00:25 <b>25</b>               | exhibits or did you want to testify?  | 00:27 <b>25</b>               | MR. HAYES: I don't think that's in                       |
|                               | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812                              |                               | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812 |
|                               | 170   |                               | 172  |
| 00:25 <b>1</b>                | MR. COUTO: It's third-party exhibits,   | 00:27 <b>1</b>                | dispute.   |
| 00:25 2                       | I don't know if I hand it now or hand it under the                                    | 00:27 <b>2</b>                | MR. DELIA: I think timing of ownership                   |
| 00:25 3                       | comments.   | 00:27 3                       | is absolutely irrelevant to this land use proceeding.    |
| 00:25 4                       | MR. NEWMAN: What do you mean by   | 00:27 4                       | MR. NEWMAN: I would say that,                            |
| 00:25 <b>5</b>                | "third-party exhibits"?   | 00:27 5                       | Mr. Couto, we haven't heard a lot of evidence about      |
| 00:25 <b>6</b>                | MR. COUTO: One is, I did some research on the date the deed was recorded. I've done   | 00:27 <b>6</b>                | them leasing it out as an office building and that       |
| 00:25 <b>7</b> 00:25 <b>8</b> | MR. NEWMAN: This is a copy of the   | 00:27 <b>7</b> 00:27 <b>8</b> | it's not possible. I don't recall much of that at        |
| 00:25 <b>8</b> 00:25 <b>9</b> | public document   | 00:27 <b>8</b> 00:27 <b>9</b> | all.  MR. COUTO: Okay. I can leave it for                |
| 00:25 10                      | MR. COUTO: Yes.   | 00:27 10                      | comment.   |
| 00:25 11                      | MR. NEWMAN: from the recording of   | 00:27 11                      | MR. NEWMAN: All right. Why don't we                      |
| 00:26 12                      | the deed?   | 00:27 11                      | leave that for comment?                                  |
| 00:26 13                      | MR. COUTO: From what I assume is  | 00:27 13                      | MR. COUTO: I will leave it for                           |
| 00:26 14                      | correct, but counselor can say if it is correct or                                    | 00:27 14                      | comments.  |
| 00:26 15                      | not.  | 00:27 <b>15</b>               | Thank you.   |
| 00:26 <b>16</b>               | And the other that I have is a copy of  | 00:27 <b>16</b>               | MR. NEWMAN: Moving right along.                          |
| 00:26 <b>17</b>               | the notice of settlement from Woodcliff Lake, which                                   | 00:27 <b>17</b>               | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. So we're                      |
| 00:26 18                      | is affordable housing settlement, so I took it from                                   | 00:27 18                      | done with everyone who wanted to testify. All right.     |
| 00:26 19                      | the Woodcliff Lake website.   | 00:27 <b>19</b>               | AUDIENCE MEMBERS: No. No.                                |
| 00:26 <b>20</b>               | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay. Why is this   | 00:27 <b>20</b>               | MR. COUTO: Can we take this down                         |
| 00:26 <b>21</b>               | relevant to this application?   | 00:27 <b>21</b>               | (indicating)?  |
| 00:26 <b>22</b>               | MR. COUTO: I have some comments to  | 00:27 <b>22</b>               | MR. DELIA: Sure. Sorry about that.                       |
|                               |   | 00:27 <b>23</b>               | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Except for                               |
| 00:26 <b>23</b>               | make related to that.   |                               | ·  |
| 00:26 <b>24</b>               | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm asking you now why  | 00:28 <b>24</b>               | Mr. Marson.  |
|                               | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm asking you now why is it you have a copy of what, a deed when the |                               | Mr. Marson.  MR. DELIA: These are comments now           |
| 00:26 <b>24</b>               | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm asking you now why  | 00:28 <b>24</b>               | Mr. Marson.  |

|   | 173  |   | 175   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 00:28 <b>1</b>  | versus testimony?  | 00:32 <b>1</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Okay.   |
| 00:28 <b>2</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: Well, this is  | 00:32 <b>2</b>  | MR. MARSON: He failed to disclose to  |
| 00:28 3   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, I'm just reviewing   | 00:32 3   | the planning board attorney supposedly.   |
| 00:28 4   | what he handed up to me and he handed to you.  | 00:33 4   | MR. NEWMAN: Okay, but this is before  |
| 00:28 <b>5</b>  | MR. DELIA: Okay. I have not.   | 00:33 <b>5</b>  | the zoning board.   |
| 00:28 6   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Okay.  | 00:33 6   | MR. MARSON: No, no, it is before  |
| 00:28 <b>7</b>  | MR. MARSON: Do you need a copy? Does   | 00:33 <b>7</b>  | the zoning board, but the zoning board is now faced   |
| 00:28 <b>8</b>  | anyone need a copy?  | 00:33 8   | with the result of a conflicted transaction.  |
| 00:28 <b>9</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: We need to take a look   | 00:33 <b>9</b>  | And the problem is in this case the   |
| 00:28 10  | at it and I'll take a look at it.  | 00:33 10  | fruits, so to speak, of this transaction is you are   |
| 00:28 11  | MR. DELIA: I'll stipulate that this  | 00:33 11  | being asked to make adjustments or approvals of (d)   |
| 00:30 <b>12</b>   | document, at least in part, purports to be or alleges  | 00:33 <b>12</b>   | variances to a property that was subject to a series  |
| 00:31 <b>13</b>   | a conflict of interest by our architect, who was a   | 00:33 <b>13</b>   | of conflicted transactions between law partners   |
| 00:31 <b>14</b>   | planner board member, not a zoning board member. We  | 00:33 14  | let me finish law partners and people that were   |
| 00:31 <b>15</b>   | had testimony on this.   | 00:33 <b>15</b>   | supposed to be directly supervised that had duty to   |
| 00:31 <b>16</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.   | 00:33 <b>16</b>   | disclose not only to themselves but to Woodcliff  |
| 00:31 <b>17</b>   | MR. DELIA: It's irrelevant and   | 00:33 <b>17</b>   | Lake, the planning board, and anybody else that may   |
| 00:31 <b>18</b>   | unfounded, and that's No. 1.   | 00:33 18  | have been affected.   |
| 00:31 <b>19</b>   | And No. 2, as it relates to again some   | 00:33 19  | MR. NEWMAN: Let me ask you a question.  |
| 00:31 <b>20</b>   | purported impropriety on the part of the owner, one  | 00:33 <b>20</b>   | The people that are sitting here on   |
| 00:31 <b>21</b>   | of the managers, it's an allegation and I don't  | 00:33 <b>21</b>   | this board  |
| 00:31 22  | really fully understand it.  | 00:33 22  | MR. MARSON: Yes, sir.   |
| 00:31 23  | I do know that the deed is attached,   | 00:33 23  | MR. NEWMAN: are any of them   |
| 00:31 24  | and it was dated and recorded right around the time  | 00:33 24  | involved?   |
| 00:31 <b>25</b>   | we filed this application.   | 00:33 <b>25</b>   | MR. MARSON: Absolutely not. No.   |
|   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.<br>201-641-1812   |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-041-1812<br>174  |   | <b>201-641-1812</b> 176   |
|   |  |   |   |
| 00:21 1   |  | 00:33 1   |   |
| 00:31 1   | So, yes, we did own the property. And  | 00:33 1   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is   |
| 00:31 <b>2</b>  | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're  | 00:33 2   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are  |
| 00:31 <b>2</b> 00:31 <b>3</b>   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's  | 00:33 <b>2</b> 00:34 <b>3</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other   |
| 00:31 <b>2</b> 00:31 <b>3</b> 00:31 <b>4</b>  | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's   | 00:33 <b>2</b> 00:34 <b>3</b> 00:34 <b>4</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that  |
| 00:31 <b>2</b> 00:31 <b>3</b>   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  | 00:33 <b>2</b> 00:34 <b>3</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other   |
| 00:31 <b>2</b> 00:31 <b>3</b> 00:31 <b>4</b> 00:31 <b>5</b>   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's   | 00:33 <b>2</b> 00:34 <b>3</b> 00:34 <b>4</b> 00:34 <b>5</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?   |
| 00:31 <b>2</b> 00:31 <b>3</b> 00:31 <b>4</b> 00:31 <b>5</b> 00:31 <b>6</b>  | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations   | 00:33 <b>2</b> 00:34 <b>3</b> 00:34 <b>4</b> 00:34 <b>5</b> 00:34 <b>6</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned,   |
| 00:31 <b>2</b> 00:31 <b>3</b> 00:31 <b>4</b> 00:31 <b>5</b> 00:31 <b>6</b> 00:31 <b>7</b>   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?   | 00:33 <b>2</b> 00:34 <b>3</b> 00:34 <b>4</b> 00:34 <b>5</b> 00:34 <b>6</b> 00:34 <b>7</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a  |
| 00:31 <b>2</b> 00:31 <b>3</b> 00:31 <b>4</b> 00:31 <b>5</b> 00:31 <b>6</b> 00:31 <b>7</b> 00:31 <b>8</b>  | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.   | 00:33 <b>2</b> 00:34 <b>3</b> 00:34 <b>4</b> 00:34 <b>5</b> 00:34 <b>6</b> 00:34 <b>7</b> 00:34 <b>8</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary   |
| 00:31 <b>2</b> 00:31 <b>3</b> 00:31 <b>4</b> 00:31 <b>5</b> 00:31 <b>6</b> 00:31 <b>7</b> 00:31 <b>8</b> 00:32 <b>9</b>   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it  | 00:33 2<br>00:34 3<br>00:34 4<br>00:34 5<br>00:34 6<br>00:34 7<br>00:34 8<br>00:34 9  | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  |
| 00:31 <b>2</b> 00:31 <b>3</b> 00:31 <b>4</b> 00:31 <b>5</b> 00:31 <b>6</b> 00:31 <b>7</b> 00:31 <b>8</b> 00:32 <b>9</b> 00:32 <b>10</b>   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with  | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 9 00:34 10  | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.   |
| 00:31 2 00:31 3 00:31 4 00:31 5 00:31 6 00:31 7 00:31 8 00:32 9 00:32 10 00:32 11   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this  | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 9 00:34 10 00:34 11   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing  |
| 00:31 2 00:31 3 00:31 4 00:31 5 00:31 6 00:31 7 00:31 8 00:32 9 00:32 10 00:32 11 00:32 12 00:32 13 00:32 14  | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. MARSON: Yes, sir.   | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 9 00:34 10 00:34 11   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between  |
| 00:31 2 00:31 3 00:31 4 00:31 5 00:31 6 00:31 7 00:31 8 00:32 9 00:32 10 00:32 11 00:32 12 00:32 13 00:32 14 00:32 15   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 9 00:34 11 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 14 00:34 15   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who   |
| 00:31       2         00:31       3         00:31       5         00:31       6         00:31       7         00:31       8         00:32       9         00:32       10         00:32       11         00:32       12         00:32       13         00:32       14         00:32       15         00:32       16  | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. MARSON: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content   | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 9 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  |
| 00:31     2       00:31     3       00:31     5       00:31     6       00:31     7       00:32     9       00:32     10       00:32     11       00:32     12       00:32     13       00:32     14       00:32     15       00:32     16       00:32     17   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. MARSON: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content   | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 10 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.   |
| 00:31 2 00:31 3 00:31 4 00:31 5 00:31 6 00:31 7 00:31 8 00:32 9 00:32 10 00:32 11 00:32 12 00:32 13 00:32 14 00:32 15 00:32 16 00:32 17 00:32 18  | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. NEWMAN: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: what is your proffer,   | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 9 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18   | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a  |
| 00:31       2         00:31       3         00:31       5         00:31       6         00:31       8         00:32       9         00:32       10         00:32       11         00:32       12         00:32       13         00:32       14         00:32       15         00:32       16         00:32       17         00:32       18         00:32       19   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. NEWMAN: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: what is your proffer, what is it that you want to show by these documents?  | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 10 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 15 00:34 15 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19  | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a legal issue independent from us.  |
| 00:31 2 00:31 3 00:31 4 00:31 5 00:31 6 00:31 7 00:31 8 00:32 9 00:32 10 00:32 11 00:32 12 00:32 13 00:32 14 00:32 15 00:32 16 00:32 17 00:32 18 00:32 19 00:32 20  | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. NEWMAN: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: what is your proffer, what is it that you want to show by these documents?  MR. MARSON: The failure to disclose   | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 10 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20                            | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a legal issue independent from us.  MR. NEWMAN: So let's just say for the   |
| 00:31       2         00:31       3         00:31       5         00:31       7         00:31       8         00:32       9         00:32       10         00:32       11         00:32       13         00:32       14         00:32       15         00:32       16         00:32       17         00:32       18         00:32       19         00:32       20         00:32       21  | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. MARSON: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: what is your proffer, what is it that you want to show by these documents?  MR. MARSON: The failure to disclose economic and work relationships have so sullied   | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 10 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 15 00:34 15 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20 00:34 21                            | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a legal issue independent from us.  MR. NEWMAN: So let's just say for the sake of this discussion that the mayor has a huge   |
| 00:31       2         00:31       3         00:31       5         00:31       7         00:31       8         00:32       9         00:32       10         00:32       12         00:32       13         00:32       14         00:32       15         00:32       16         00:32       17         00:32       18         00:32       19         00:32       21         00:32       21         00:32       22   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: what is your proffer, what is it that you want to show by these documents?  MR. MARSON: The failure to disclose economic and work relationships have so sullied  MR. NEWMAN: By whom?  | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 10 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 21 00:34 21                            | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a legal issue independent from us.  MR. NEWMAN: So let's just say for the sake of this discussion that the mayor has a huge financial interest in this transaction. Nobody on   |
| 00:31       2         00:31       3         00:31       5         00:31       7         00:31       8         00:32       9         00:32       10         00:32       12         00:32       13         00:32       14         00:32       15         00:32       16         00:32       17         00:32       18         00:32       19         00:32       21         00:32       21         00:32       23   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. MARSON: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: what is your proffer, what is it that you want to show by these documents?  MR. MARSON: The failure to disclose economic and work relationships have so sullied  MR. NEWMAN: By whom?  MR. MARSON: By whom.   | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 10 00:34 12 00:34 12 00:34 15 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20 00:34 21 00:34 22 00:35 23          | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a legal issue independent from us.  MR. NEWMAN: So let's just say for the sake of this discussion that the mayor has a huge financial interest in this transaction. Nobody on this board is involved in that. And while that may  |
| 00:31       2         00:31       3         00:31       5         00:31       7         00:31       8         00:32       9         00:32       10         00:32       12         00:32       13         00:32       14         00:32       15         00:32       16         00:32       17         00:32       18         00:32       19         00:32       21         00:32       21         00:32       22         00:32       23         00:32       24 | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. MARSON: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: what is your proffer, what is it that you want to show by these documents?  MR. MARSON: The failure to disclose economic and work relationships have so sullied  MR. NEWMAN: By whom?  MR. MARSON: By whom.  The general or managing partner of the                                     | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 10 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20 00:34 21 00:34 22 00:35 23 00:35 24 | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a legal issue independent from us.  MR. NEWMAN: So let's just say for the sake of this discussion that the mayor has a huge financial interest in this transaction. Nobody on this board is involved in that. And while that may have a legal ramification, and when I say the  |
| 00:31       2         00:31       3         00:31       5         00:31       7         00:31       8         00:32       9         00:32       10         00:32       12         00:32       13         00:32       14         00:32       15         00:32       16         00:32       17         00:32       18         00:32       19         00:32       21         00:32       21         00:32       23   | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. MARSON: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: what is your proffer, what is it that you want to show by these documents?  MR. MARSON: The failure to disclose economic and work relationships have so sullied  MR. NEWMAN: By whom?  MR. MARSON: By whom.  The general or managing partner of the entity that purchased the building. | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 10 00:34 12 00:34 12 00:34 15 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20 00:34 21 00:34 22 00:35 23          | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a legal issue independent from us.  MR. NEWMAN: So let's just say for the sake of this discussion that the mayor has a huge financial interest in this transaction. Nobody on this board is involved in that. And while that may have a legal ramification, and when I say the "mayor," I am just using that as an example. |
| 00:31       2         00:31       3         00:31       5         00:31       7         00:31       8         00:32       9         00:32       10         00:32       12         00:32       13         00:32       14         00:32       15         00:32       16         00:32       17         00:32       18         00:32       19         00:32       21         00:32       21         00:32       22         00:32       23         00:32       24 | So, yes, we did own the property. And I don't know what more to get from that. If we're going to sit here and have allegations on someone's credibility, on their ethics, I think it's inappropriate.  MR. NEWMAN: Do any of the allegations refer to anybody who's on this board?  MR. DELIA: No.  There's no allegations whatsoever as it pertains to the relationship or the dialogue with this board or in any way impacts any member of this board.  MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Marson?  MR. MARSON: Yes, sir.  MR. NEWMAN: Without telling us the content  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. NEWMAN: what is your proffer, what is it that you want to show by these documents?  MR. MARSON: The failure to disclose economic and work relationships have so sullied  MR. NEWMAN: By whom?  MR. MARSON: By whom.  The general or managing partner of the                                     | 00:33 2 00:34 3 00:34 4 00:34 5 00:34 6 00:34 7 00:34 8 00:34 10 00:34 11 00:34 12 00:34 13 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20 00:34 21 00:34 22 00:35 23 00:35 24 | MR. NEWMAN: So if nobody who is sitting here is involved, we're the ones who are ultimately making the decisions, and these are other people who have perhaps bad interests, how does that directly relate to the decision of this board?  MR. MARSON: As far as I'm concerned, the facts that I am attempting to present show a pattern of self dealing while serving in a fiduciary capacity let me finish now. You're asking.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. MARSON: And that the self dealing so infected the transaction that whether it's between law partners, planning board partners, or people who were serving in a capacity has now tainted this transaction so that the zoning application is tainted.  MR. NEWMAN: Okay.  MR. HAYES: This sounds like possibly a legal issue independent from us.  MR. NEWMAN: So let's just say for the sake of this discussion that the mayor has a huge financial interest in this transaction. Nobody on this board is involved in that. And while that may have a legal ramification, and when I say the  |

| 00.05 4  | MD MADCON. Landoustered Believe and   | 00.07.4   | 179   |
|--|---|---|---|
| 00:35 1  | MR. MARSON: I understand. Believe me,   | 00:37 1   | individuals before they filed the application, the  |
| 00:35 2  | we're not going to call Mr. Rendo. Sorry, Carlos,   | 00:37 2   | board is not going to conduct an investigation.   |
| 00:35 3  | you're not getting the call, you're still standing.   | 00:37 3   | MR. NEWMAN: You may have a valid  |
| 00:35 4  | Thank you.  | 00:37 4   | basis, again, I haven't read it   |
| 00:35 <b>5</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: It's a hypothetical.  | 00:37 5   | MR. MARSON: I understand.   |
| 00:35 <b>6</b>   | MR. MARSON: All right. Fair enough.   | 00:37 <b>6</b> 00:37 <b>7</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: investigating somebody  |
| 00:35 <b>7</b> 00:35 <b>8</b>  | I'm with you.  MR. NEWMAN: So I don't see how it  | _   | or something, but this is not the place.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Where is?  |
| 00:35 <b>8</b> 00:35 <b>9</b>  | would be relevant to the decision of this board.  | 00:37 <b>8</b> 00:37 <b>9</b>   | MR. NEWMAN: Well  |
| 00:35 <b>9</b>   | unless there was an allegation that somebody who's  | 00:37 <b>10</b>   | AUDIENCE MEMBER: Ethics board.  |
| 00:35 10   | sitting here who's ultimately going to make this  | 00:38 11  | MR. NEWMAN: You need to see one of the  |
| 00:35 <b>11</b>  | decision is involved and has a financial interest,  | 00:38 11  | 80,000 lawyers licensed to practice law within the  |
| 00:35 12   | which is the same reason why, when we started this  | 00:38 13  | State of New Jersey.  |
| 00:35 14   | meeting, I disclosed that I may hire Mr. Dattoli for  | 00:38 14  | MR. MARSON: Am I allowed to this  |
| 00:35 15   | an unrelated project.   | 00:38 15  | during the comment section?   |
| 00:36 16   | MR. MARSON: Well, I appreciate that   | 00:38 16  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: No.   |
| 00:36 17   | but   | 00:38 17  | MR. DELIA: I will object.   |
| 00:36 17   | MR. NEWMAN: At this point I'm going to  | 00:38 17  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I would say not about   |
| 00:36 19   | turn it over to our actual attorney, who gets paid to   | 00:38 19  | the individuals that didn't testify, but comments   |
| 00:36 <b>20</b>  | make these calls.   | 00:38 <b>20</b>   | about the application, you may. You know, you can   |
| 00:36 <b>21</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: After you   | 00:38 21  | comment about anyone who testified before this board  |
| 00:36 <b>21</b>  | slandered the mayor, Gary.  | 00:38 22  | during this application.  |
| 00:36 <b>22</b>  | MR. NEWMAN: I did not slander the   | 00:38 23  | MR. MARSON: Some of the writing is,   |
| 00:36 <b>24</b>  | mayor. It's not the actual mayor.   | 00:38 24  | yes.  |
| 00:36 <b>25</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: I'm reading your  | 00:38 <b>25</b>   | MR. DELIA: He's speaking of   |
| 00.00 20   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  | 00.00 20  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|  | 201-641-1812  |   | 201-641-1812  |
|  |   |   |   |
|  | 178   |   | 180   |
| 00:36 <b>1</b>   | 178 summary and it says, after you give us all this   | 00:38 1   | 180 Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the   |
| 00:36 <b>1</b> 00:36 <b>2</b>  |   | 00:38 <b>1</b> 00:38 <b>2</b>   |   |
| _  | summary and it says, after you give us all this   |   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the   |
| 00:36 <b>2</b>   | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the  | 00:38 <b>2</b>  | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.   |
| 00:36 <b>2</b> 00:36 <b>3</b>  | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full   | 00:38 <b>2</b> 00:38 <b>3</b>   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.   |
| 00:36 <b>2</b> 00:36 <b>3</b> 00:36 <b>4</b>   | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  | 00:38 <b>2</b> 00:38 <b>3</b> 00:38 <b>4</b>  | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  |
| 00:36 <b>2</b> 00:36 <b>3</b> 00:36 <b>4</b> 00:36 <b>5</b>  | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged   | 00:38 <b>2</b> 00:38 <b>3</b> 00:38 <b>4</b> 00:38 <b>5</b>   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here   |
| 00:36 <b>2</b> 00:36 <b>3</b> 00:36 <b>4</b> 00:36 <b>5</b> 00:36 <b>6</b>   | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their  | 00:38 <b>2</b> 00:38 <b>3</b> 00:38 <b>4</b> 00:38 <b>5</b> 00:38 <b>6</b>  | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the   |
| 00:36 <b>2</b> 00:36 <b>3</b> 00:36 <b>4</b> 00:36 <b>5</b> 00:36 <b>6</b> 00:36 <b>7</b>  | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law.   | 00:38 <b>2</b> 00:38 <b>3</b> 00:38 <b>4</b> 00:38 <b>5</b> 00:38 <b>6</b> 00:38 <b>7</b>   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever   |
| 00:36 <b>2</b> 00:36 <b>3</b> 00:36 <b>4</b> 00:36 <b>5</b> 00:36 <b>6</b> 00:36 <b>7</b> 00:36 <b>8</b>   | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not  | 00:38 <b>2</b> 00:38 <b>3</b> 00:38 <b>4</b> 00:38 <b>5</b> 00:38 <b>6</b> 00:38 <b>7</b> 00:38 <b>8</b>  | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before   |
| 00:36 <b>2</b> 00:36 <b>3</b> 00:36 <b>4</b> 00:36 <b>5</b> 00:36 <b>6</b> 00:36 <b>7</b> 00:36 <b>8</b> 00:36 <b>9</b>  | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have   | 00:38 <b>2</b> 00:38 <b>3</b> 00:38 <b>4</b> 00:38 <b>5</b> 00:38 <b>6</b> 00:38 <b>7</b> 00:38 <b>8</b> 00:38 <b>9</b>   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.   |
| 00:36 <b>2</b> 00:36 <b>3</b> 00:36 <b>4</b> 00:36 <b>5</b> 00:36 <b>6</b> 00:36 <b>7</b> 00:36 <b>8</b> 00:36 <b>9</b> 00:36 <b>10</b>  | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the   | 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:38 5 00:38 6 00:38 7 00:38 8 00:38 9 00:39 10  | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in  |
| 00:36 <b>2</b> 00:36 <b>3</b> 00:36 <b>4</b> 00:36 <b>5</b> 00:36 <b>6</b> 00:36 <b>7</b> 00:36 <b>8</b> 00:36 <b>9</b> 00:36 <b>10</b> 00:36 <b>11</b>  | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't   | 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:38 5 00:38 6 00:38 7 00:38 8 00:38 9 00:39 10 00:39 11   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor  |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12   | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even  | 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:38 5 00:38 6 00:38 7 00:38 8 00:38 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12  | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?   |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13  | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their  | 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:38 5 00:38 6 00:38 7 00:38 8 00:38 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.   |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14   | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this  | 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:38 5 00:38 6 00:38 7 00:38 8 00:38 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no. AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable   |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15  | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we   | 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:38 5 00:38 6 00:38 7 00:38 8 00:38 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14  | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive criteria.  |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15 00:37 16   | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we should halt this application on the day we're trying  | 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:38 5 00:38 6 00:38 7 00:38 8 00:38 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 16  | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive  |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15 00:37 16 00:37 17  | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we should halt this application on the day we're trying to conclude it, but it doesn't matter, because the   | 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:38 5 00:38 6 00:38 7 00:38 8 00:38 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 16 00:39 17   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive criteria.  |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15 00:37 16 00:37 17 00:37 18 00:37 19 00:37 20                                     | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we should halt this application on the day we're trying to conclude it, but it doesn't matter, because the board doesn't have the jurisdiction to conduct the  | 00:38       2         00:38       3         00:38       5         00:38       6         00:38       7         00:38       8         00:39       10         00:39       11         00:39       12         00:39       13         00:39       14         00:39       15         00:39       16         00:39       17         00:39       18  | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive criteria.  MR. NEWMAN: I don't remember any of   |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15 00:37 16 00:37 17 00:37 18 00:37 19 00:37 20 00:37 21                            | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we should halt this application on the day we're trying to conclude it, but it doesn't matter, because the board doesn't have the jurisdiction to conduct the type of investigations that you're talking about. It   | 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:38 5 00:38 6 00:38 7 00:38 8 00:38 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 15 00:39 15 00:39 16 00:39 17 00:39 18 00:39 19 00:39 20 00:39 21   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive criteria.  MR. NEWMAN: I don't remember any of that.   |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15 00:37 16 00:37 18 00:37 19 00:37 20 00:37 21 00:37 22                                    | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we should halt this application on the day we're trying to conclude it, but it doesn't matter, because the board doesn't have the jurisdiction to conduct the type of investigations that you're talking about. It looks like you might have asked the mayor and council   | 00:38       2         00:38       3         00:38       5         00:38       6         00:38       7         00:38       8         00:39       10         00:39       11         00:39       12         00:39       13         00:39       14         00:39       15         00:39       16         00:39       17         00:39       18         00:39       19         00:39       20         00:39       21         00:39       22                        | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive criteria.  MR. NEWMAN: I don't remember any of that.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: But we weren't on  |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15 00:37 16 00:37 17 00:37 18 00:37 19 00:37 20 00:37 21 00:37 22                           | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we should halt this application on the day we're trying to conclude it, but it doesn't matter, because the board doesn't have the jurisdiction to conduct the type of investigations that you're talking about. It looks like you might have asked the mayor and council or other people to look at it.  So you do have some comments in here, which you can make during the comments portion, but   | 00:38       2         00:38       3         00:38       5         00:38       6         00:38       7         00:38       8         00:39       10         00:39       12         00:39       12         00:39       14         00:39       15         00:39       16         00:39       17         00:39       18         00:39       19         00:39       20         00:39       21         00:39       23   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive criteria.  MR. NEWMAN: I don't remember any of that.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: But we weren't on the affordable housing board or part of those  |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15 00:37 16 00:37 17 00:37 18 00:37 19 00:37 20 00:37 21 00:37 22 00:37 23 00:37 24 | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we should halt this application on the day we're trying to conclude it, but it doesn't matter, because the board doesn't have the jurisdiction to conduct the type of investigations that you're talking about. It looks like you might have asked the mayor and council or other people to look at it.  So you do have some comments in here, which you can make during the comments portion, but if you're asking this board to conduct an   | 00:38       2         00:38       3         00:38       5         00:38       6         00:38       7         00:38       9         00:39       10         00:39       12         00:39       13         00:39       14         00:39       15         00:39       16         00:39       17         00:39       18         00:39       19         00:39       20         00:39       21         00:39       22         00:39       23         00:39       24 | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive criteria.  MR. NEWMAN: I don't remember any of that.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: But we weren't on the affordable housing board or part of those discussions.   |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15 00:37 16 00:37 17 00:37 18 00:37 19 00:37 20 00:37 21 00:37 22                           | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we should halt this application on the day we're trying to conclude it, but it doesn't matter, because the board doesn't have the jurisdiction to conduct the type of investigations that you're talking about. It looks like you might have asked the mayor and council or other people to look at it.  So you do have some comments in here, which you can make during the comments portion, but if you're asking this board to conduct an investigation with regard to certain actions taken by | 00:38       2         00:38       3         00:38       5         00:38       6         00:38       7         00:38       8         00:39       10         00:39       12         00:39       12         00:39       14         00:39       15         00:39       16         00:39       17         00:39       18         00:39       19         00:39       20         00:39       21         00:39       23   | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive criteria.  MR. NEWMAN: I don't remember any of that.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: But we weren't on the affordable housing board or part of those discussions.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we'll move on to the comments.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: I hate to be the |
| 00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:37 15 00:37 16 00:37 17 00:37 18 00:37 19 00:37 20 00:37 21 00:37 22 00:37 23 00:37 24 | summary and it says, after you give us all this information, that you're asking us to halt the administrative procedures and engage in full conflicts investigation where warranted.  You know, this board is not charged with conducting these types of investigations. Their authority is pursuant to the Municipal Land Use Law. If you have any conflicts or issues, they're not before this board, this board doesn't have jurisdiction to hear those conflicts. Some of the people that you seem to be complaining about didn't even testify at this hearing, so that you can't even argue whatever you want to argue of their credibility, because they did not testify in this case. And it's very late in the day to say that we should halt this application on the day we're trying to conclude it, but it doesn't matter, because the board doesn't have the jurisdiction to conduct the type of investigations that you're talking about. It looks like you might have asked the mayor and council or other people to look at it.  So you do have some comments in here, which you can make during the comments portion, but if you're asking this board to conduct an   | 00:38       2         00:38       3         00:38       5         00:38       6         00:38       7         00:38       9         00:39       10         00:39       12         00:39       13         00:39       14         00:39       15         00:39       16         00:39       17         00:39       18         00:39       19         00:39       20         00:39       21         00:39       22         00:39       23         00:39       24 | Mr. Dattoli, and the cross examination or the questioning occurred in the transcript.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, it did.  MR. DELIA: And, once again,  Mr. Dattoli was a planning board member. We're here for a use variance. So I don't know where the planning board comes into play at all. Whatever happened there, true or not, is irrelevant before this board.  AUDIENCE VOICE: Is it relevant in terms of fair share housing and the Broadway corridor ordinance that were booth before the planning board?  MR. DELIA: That never got adopted, no.  AUDIENCE MEMBER: Well, affordable housing did, and it was a basis for a lot of their testimony. Unmet need was part of the positive criteria.  MR. NEWMAN: I don't remember any of that.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: But we weren't on the affordable housing board or part of those discussions.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I think we'll move on to the comments.                                       |

|  | 181  |   | 183  |
|--|--|---|--|
| 00:39 <b>1</b>   | wicked witch, but we have 20 minutes that we've  | 00:41 <b>1</b>  | have strictly adhered to our longstanding zoning   |
| 00:39 <b>2</b>   | authorized, so let's move it.  | 00:41 <b>2</b>  | codes in this borough.   |
| 00:39 <b>3</b>   | FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: That's not   | 00:41 <b>3</b>  | In 2017, our mayor and council, and  |
| 00:39 <b>4</b>   | fair. We sat here for the same six months.   | 00:41 <b>4</b>  | this is where I beg to differ with Richard, rejected   |
| 00:39 <b>5</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: What do you want   | 00:41 <b>5</b>  | an idea to rezone the Broadway corridor. It was  |
| 00:39 <b>6</b>   | us to do, ma'am?   | 00:41 <b>6</b>  | rejected. It was presented before the mayor and  |
| 00:39 <b>7</b>   | FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Keep going   | 00:41 <b>7</b>  | council in 2016 at meetings in November and December,  |
| 00:39 <b>8</b>   | until we are heard.  | 00:41 <b>8</b>  | and it was pulled from the agenda.   |
| 00:39 <b>9</b>   | AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Then let's   | 00:42 <b>9</b>  | In 2017, there was a town hall meeting.  |
| 00:39 10   | reschedule.  | 00:42 <b>10</b>   | Broadway corridor was discussed ad nauseam, and there  |
| 00:39 11   | MR. DELIA: Look, we're not getting   | 00:42 <b>11</b>   | was extraordinary public outcry, so much so that the   |
| 00:39 <b>12</b>  | done by 11:30. Go to 11:30 and take it from there.   | 00:42 <b>12</b>   | mayor and council and this borough as a whole on a   |
| 00:39 13   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Okay.  | 00:42 <b>13</b>   | policy basis decided that apartment housing was not a  |
| 00:40 <b>14</b>  | MR. MARSON: May I ask one question?  | 00:42 <b>14</b>   | suitable use along Broadway and that's not what was  |
| 00:40 <b>15</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes.   | 00:42 <b>15</b>   | wanted here. So much so, that when I was appointed   |
| 00:40 <b>16</b>  | MR. MARSON: So during comments, do I   | 00:42 <b>16</b>   | in the spring of 2017 to the fair share housing  |
| 00:40 17   | try to parse what I'm reading and limit it?  | 00:42 17  | committee, as Richard testified today, as part of our  |
| 00:40 18   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Yes, I don't want you  | 00:42 18  | settlement agreement, we decided not to present the  |
| 00:40 19   | to make any comments about any individuals who did   | 00:42 19  | Broadway corridor as part of our fair share housing  |
| 00:40 <b>20</b>  | not testify before this board.   | 00:42 <b>20</b>   | settlement. And Fair Share Housing was okay with   |
| 00:40 21   | MR. MARSON: Okay.  | 00:42 21  | that, provided we presented other things as part of  |
| 00:40 22   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: And I don't want you   | 00:42 22  | our settlement.  |
| 00:40 23   | to make any comments about investigations that you   | 00:42 23  | This application is for a use variance,  |
| 00:40 24   | want this board to conduct.  | 00:42 24  | because the proposed use is not permitted in this  |
| 00:40 <b>25</b>  | So, if those are comments, you can   | 00:42 <b>25</b>   | zone.  |
|  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|  | 201 641 1912   |   | 201 611 1912   |
|  | 201-641-1812   |   | 201-641-1812   |
| 00:40 1  | 182  | 00:42 1   | 184  |
| 00:40 <b>1</b>   | leave them out.  | 00:43 <b>1</b>  | 184<br>I do think you should consider that it  |
| 00:40 <b>2</b>   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the   | 00:43 <b>2</b>  | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing   |
| 00:40 <b>2</b> 00:40 <b>3</b>  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against  | 00:43 <b>2</b> 00:43 <b>3</b>   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this  |
| 00:40 <b>2</b> 00:40 <b>3</b> 00:40 <b>4</b>   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you   | 00:43 <b>2</b> 00:43 <b>3</b> 00:43 <b>4</b>  | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the  |
| 00:40 <b>2</b> 00:40 <b>3</b> 00:40 <b>4</b> 00:40 <b>5</b>  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has   | 00:43 <b>2</b> 00:43 <b>3</b> 00:43 <b>4</b> 00:43 <b>5</b>   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.   |
| 00:40 <b>2</b> 00:40 <b>3</b> 00:40 <b>4</b> 00:40 <b>5</b> 00:40 <b>6</b>   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has  | 00:43 <b>2</b> 00:43 <b>3</b> 00:43 <b>4</b> 00:43 <b>5</b> 00:43 <b>6</b>  | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times  |
| 00:40 <b>2</b> 00:40 <b>3</b> 00:40 <b>4</b> 00:40 <b>5</b> 00:40 <b>6</b> 00:40 <b>7</b>  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of   | 00:43 <b>2</b> 00:43 <b>3</b> 00:43 <b>4</b> 00:43 <b>5</b> 00:43 <b>6</b> 00:43 <b>7</b>   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the  |
| 00:40 <b>2</b> 00:40 <b>3</b> 00:40 <b>4</b> 00:40 <b>5</b> 00:40 <b>6</b> 00:40 <b>7</b> 00:40 <b>8</b>   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  | 00:43 <b>2</b> 00:43 <b>3</b> 00:43 <b>4</b> 00:43 <b>5</b> 00:43 <b>6</b> 00:43 <b>7</b> 00:43 <b>8</b>  | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their  |
| 00:40 <b>2</b> 00:40 <b>3</b> 00:40 <b>4</b> 00:40 <b>5</b> 00:40 <b>6</b> 00:40 <b>7</b>  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of   | 00:43 <b>2</b> 00:43 <b>3</b> 00:43 <b>4</b> 00:43 <b>5</b> 00:43 <b>6</b> 00:43 <b>7</b>   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help   |
| 00:40 <b>2</b> 00:40 <b>3</b> 00:40 <b>4</b> 00:40 <b>5</b> 00:40 <b>6</b> 00:40 <b>7</b> 00:40 <b>8</b> 00:40 <b>9</b>  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.   | 00:43 <b>2</b> 00:43 <b>3</b> 00:43 <b>4</b> 00:43 <b>5</b> 00:43 <b>6</b> 00:43 <b>7</b> 00:43 <b>8</b> 00:43 <b>9</b>   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their  |
| 00:40 <b>2</b> 00:40 <b>3</b> 00:40 <b>4</b> 00:40 <b>5</b> 00:40 <b>6</b> 00:40 <b>7</b> 00:40 <b>8</b> 00:40 <b>9</b> 00:40 <b>10</b>  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 10  | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.   |
| 00:40 2 00:40 3 00:40 4 00:40 5 00:40 6 00:40 7 00:40 8 00:40 9 00:40 10 00:40 11  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 10 00:43 11   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And  |
| 00:40 2 00:40 3 00:40 4 00:40 5 00:40 6 00:40 7 00:40 8 00:40 9 00:40 10 00:40 11 00:40 12   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 10 00:43 11   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think  |
| 00:40 2 00:40 3 00:40 4 00:40 5 00:40 6 00:40 7 00:40 8 00:40 9 00:40 10 00:40 11 00:40 12 00:40 13  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are. Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.   | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 10 00:43 11 00:43 12 00:43 13   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as   |
| 00:40 2 00:40 3 00:40 4 00:40 5 00:40 6 00:40 7 00:40 8 00:40 9 00:40 10 00:40 11 00:40 12 00:40 13 00:40 14   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.   | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 10 00:43 11 00:43 12 00:43 13 00:43 14  | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary   |
| 00:40 2 00:40 3 00:40 4 00:40 5 00:40 6 00:40 7 00:40 8 00:40 9 00:40 10 00:40 11 00:40 12 00:40 13 00:40 14 00:41 15  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.  Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 11 00:43 11 00:43 12 00:43 14 00:43 15  | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with  |
| 00:40 2 00:40 3 00:40 4 00:40 5 00:40 6 00:40 7 00:40 8 00:40 9 00:40 10 00:40 11 00:40 12 00:40 13 00:40 14 00:41 15 00:41 16   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.  Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I actually have several comments about  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 10 00:43 11 00:43 12 00:43 13 00:43 14 00:43 15 00:43 16  | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with Woodcliff Lake's legal requirements. We are already  |
| 00:40     2       00:40     4       00:40     5       00:40     7       00:40     8       00:40     9       00:40     10       00:40     12       00:40     13       00:41     15       00:41     16       00:41     17  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.  Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I actually have several comments about this application.  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 10 00:43 12 00:43 12 00:43 13 00:43 14 00:43 15 00:43 16 00:44 17   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with Woodcliff Lake's legal requirements. We are already building what is legally required and satisfying our   |
| 00:40     2       00:40     4       00:40     5       00:40     6       00:40     7       00:40     9       00:40     10       00:40     11       00:40     12       00:40     13       00:41     15       00:41     16       00:41     17       00:41     18  | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.  Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I actually have several comments about this application.  First, let me start by saying that  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 11 00:43 12 00:43 12 00:43 14 00:43 15 00:43 16 00:44 17 00:44 18   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with Woodcliff Lake's legal requirements. We are already building what is legally required and satisfying our Fair Share Housing obligations.   |
| 00:40     2       00:40     3       00:40     5       00:40     6       00:40     8       00:40     9       00:40     10       00:40     12       00:40     13       00:41     15       00:41     16       00:41     18       00:41     19   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.  Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I actually have several comments about this application.  First, let me start by saying that  Woodcliff Lake is not an apartment town. Our master   | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 10 00:43 11 00:43 12 00:43 13 00:43 15 00:43 15 00:43 16 00:44 17 00:44 18 00:44 19                                     | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with Woodcliff Lake's legal requirements. We are already building what is legally required and satisfying our Fair Share Housing obligations.  In fact, our planning board just passed  |
| 00:40     2       00:40     4       00:40     5       00:40     6       00:40     8       00:40     9       00:40     10       00:40     12       00:40     13       00:40     14       00:41     15       00:41     16       00:41     17       00:41     19       00:41     20       00:41     21       00:41     22   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.  Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I actually have several comments about this application.  First, let me start by saying that  Woodcliff Lake is not an apartment town. Our master plan does not talk about or contemplate mixed use or  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 10 00:43 12 00:43 12 00:43 13 00:43 15 00:43 16 00:44 17 00:44 18 00:44 19 00:44 20                             | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with Woodcliff Lake's legal requirements. We are already building what is legally required and satisfying our Fair Share Housing obligations.  In fact, our planning board just passed an ordinance that revised our set aside to comply  |
| 00:40     2       00:40     3       00:40     5       00:40     6       00:40     8       00:40     9       00:40     10       00:40     12       00:40     13       00:41     15       00:41     16       00:41     17       00:41     18       00:41     20       00:41     21       00:41     21       00:41     23   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.  Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I actually have several comments about this application.  First, let me start by saying that  Woodcliff Lake is not an apartment town. Our master plan does not talk about or contemplate mixed use or residential in this zone.  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 9 00:43 10 00:43 11 00:43 12 00:43 13 00:43 15 00:43 16 00:44 17 00:44 18 00:44 20 00:44 21                             | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with Woodcliff Lake's legal requirements. We are already building what is legally required and satisfying our Fair Share Housing obligations.  In fact, our planning board just passed an ordinance that revised our set aside to comply with our settlement agreement, which Richard   |
| 00:40       2         00:40       4         00:40       6         00:40       7         00:40       8         00:40       9         00:40       11         00:40       12         00:40       13         00:40       14         00:41       15         00:41       16         00:41       17         00:41       18         00:41       20         00:41       21         00:41       22         00:41       23         00:41       24 | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.  Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I actually have several comments about this application.  First, let me start by saying that  Woodcliff Lake is not an apartment town. Our master plan does not talk about or contemplate mixed use or residential in this zone.  I think that I've established, through  | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 10 00:43 11 00:43 12 00:43 13 00:43 14 00:43 15 00:43 16 00:44 17 00:44 18 00:44 19 00:44 20 00:44 21 00:44 23 00:44 24 | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with Woodcliff Lake's legal requirements. We are already building what is legally required and satisfying our Fair Share Housing obligations.  In fact, our planning board just passed an ordinance that revised our set aside to comply with our settlement agreement, which Richard testified to. And in that ordinance it states   |
| 00:40     2       00:40     3       00:40     5       00:40     6       00:40     8       00:40     9       00:40     10       00:40     12       00:40     13       00:41     15       00:41     16       00:41     17       00:41     18       00:41     20       00:41     21       00:41     21       00:41     23   | leave them out.  You can make comments about the application, you're in favor of it, you're against it, you don't like it for X, Y, and Z reasons, you think it has these positive aspects, you think it has these negative comments, you think the applicant has met the burden of proof or not met the burden of proof and the reasons why. So tell us.  MR. MARSON: Okay.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: I don't know if everyone is still here that wanted to make a comment.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Yes, they are.  Cheryl Dispoto, you're next.  MS. DISPOTO: Thank you.  Cheryl Dispoto, Woodcliff Lake.  I actually have several comments about this application.  First, let me start by saying that  Woodcliff Lake is not an apartment town. Our master plan does not talk about or contemplate mixed use or residential in this zone.  I think that I've established, through Richard Preiss' testimony tonight, that we have no | 00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:43 8 00:43 10 00:43 11 00:43 12 00:43 15 00:43 15 00:43 16 00:44 17 00:44 18 00:44 19 00:44 20 00:44 21 00:44 22                   | I do think you should consider that it is very difficult to reconcile that the governing body did not change this zone, choose to change this zone, or approve any development like this in the past in this area.  This applicant has cited numerous times throughout these hearings that it has met the positive criteria, and one of the things that their planner talked about was that this project will help the borough meet its affordable housing unmet need.  That's where I strongly disagree. And I think that Richard testified to this, and I think that these affordable units are not required, as Woodcliff Lake has gone through all the necessary steps to fulfill our legal obligation to comply with Woodcliff Lake's legal requirements. We are already building what is legally required and satisfying our Fair Share Housing obligations.  In fact, our planning board just passed an ordinance that revised our set aside to comply with our settlement agreement, which Richard testified to. And in that ordinance it states specifically, this set aside requirement does not |

201-641-1812

201-641-1812

|   | 185   |   | 187   |
|---|---|---|---|
| 00:44 <b>1</b>  | obligation on the part of the Woodcliff Lake Zoning   | 00:47 <b>1</b>  | prides itself on open space and its sprawling   |
| 00:44 <b>1</b>  | Board to grant such rezoning or variances or other  | 00:47 <b>1</b> 00:47 <b>2</b>   | single-family residential homes, and vote no to this  |
| 00:44 <b>2</b> 00:44 <b>3</b>   | relief.   | 00:47 2   | apartment complex that we just don't need and we are  |
| 00:44 <b>4</b>  | In other words, you have no obligation  | 00:47 <b>4</b>  | not required to approve.  |
| 00:44 <b>5</b>  | and no requirement to grant the applicant's variance  | 00:47 <b>5</b>  | I also want to say that I did agree   |
| 00:44 6   | based on our Fair Share Housing settlement.   | 00:47 6   | with Mr. Preiss, and I'm just backtracking a little   |
| 00:44 7   | Throughout the Pascack Valley, we've  | 00:47 <b>7</b>  | bit. I did agree that the applicant's real estate   |
| 00:44 8   | seen predatory developers using affordable housing  | 00:47 8   | broker, I thought his opinion was absolutely he   |
| 00:45 9   | requirements to overdevelop every inch of this area.  | 00:47 9   | was very unqualified, it was a net opinion, and I   |
| 00:45 <b>10</b>   | Woodcliff Lake, as a borough, has done an excellent   | 00:47 10  | also disagree, though, with Mr. Preiss that this will   |
| 00:45 <b>11</b>   | job of preventing that from happening here. We  | 00:47 11  | have no impact on our J rated school district. I  |
| 00:45 <b>12</b>   | solved our affordable housing problem in a concise  | 00:47 12  | think that the real estate brokers testimony  |
| 00:45 13  | and measured way, and we are not overdeveloping in  | 00:47 13  | demonstrated that he knows nothing about Woodcliff  |
| 00:45 <b>14</b>   | this town.  | 00:47 14  | Lake and what makes Woodcliff Lake a great place to   |
| 00:45 <b>15</b>   | We do not need these additional units,  | 00:47 <b>15</b>   | live in.  |
| 00:45 <b>16</b>   | and Fair Share Housing was satisfied with us not  | 00:47 16  | Thank you.  |
| 00:45 17  | putting an overlay zone before the Broadway corridor.   | 00:48 17  | (Applause.)   |
| 00:45 17  | Residents are tired from developers in  | 00:48 18  | MR. NEWMAN: Mr. Delia, you closed,  |
| 00:45 19  | the state and now in this region in the Pascack   | 00:48 19  | right? I know you have commentary at the end.   |
| 00:45 <b>20</b>   | Valley and now tonight before this board in our own   | 00:48 <b>20</b>   | MR. DELIA: Yes, but I have a closing  |
| 00:45 <b>21</b>   | town that using the affordable housing argument to  | 00:48 <b>21</b>   | argument.   |
| 00:45 <b>22</b>   | overdevelop.  | 00:48 22  | MR. NEWMAN: You have a closing  |
| 00:45 <b>23</b>   | This applicant is disingenuous with   | 00:48 23  | argument?   |
| 00:45 <b>24</b>   | their affordable housing argument, because when they  | 00:48 <b>24</b>   | MR. DELIA: Uh-huh.  |
| 00:45 <b>25</b>   | initially submitted their application, they weren't   | 00:48 <b>25</b>   | MR. STAR: And Alvin Star, a resident  |
| 33.13 23  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812  |   | 201-641-1812  |
|   | 100   |   |   |
|   | 186   |   | 188   |
| 00:45 <b>1</b>  | 186 even suggesting to add any affordable units until   | 00:48 <b>1</b>  | 188 of Woodcliff Lake.  |
| 00:45 <b>1</b> 00:45 <b>2</b>   |   | 00:48 <b>1</b> 00:48 <b>2</b>   |   |
|   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until   |   | of Woodcliff Lake.  |
| 00:45 <b>2</b>  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until<br>they were reminded of the set aside that was part of   | 00:48 <b>2</b>  | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing   |
| 00:45 <b>2</b> 00:45 <b>3</b>   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until<br>they were reminded of the set aside that was part of<br>our settlement agreement. And they should have known   | 00:48 <b>2</b> 00:48 <b>3</b>   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  |
| 00:45 <b>2</b> 00:45 <b>3</b> 00:46 <b>4</b>  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until<br>they were reminded of the set aside that was part of<br>our settlement agreement. And they should have known<br>full well the terms of our settlement agreement,   | 00:48 <b>2</b> 00:48 <b>3</b> 00:48 <b>4</b>  | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  |
| 00:45 <b>2</b> 00:45 <b>3</b> 00:46 <b>4</b> 00:46 <b>5</b>   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in   | 00:48 <b>2</b> 00:48 <b>3</b> 00:48 <b>4</b> 00:48 <b>5</b>   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of  |
| 00:45 <b>2</b> 00:45 <b>3</b> 00:46 <b>4</b> 00:46 <b>5</b> 00:46 <b>6</b>  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough   | 00:48 <b>2</b> 00:48 <b>3</b> 00:48 <b>4</b> 00:48 <b>5</b> 00:48 <b>6</b>  | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.   |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     5       00:46     6       00:46     7   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by   | 00:48 <b>2</b> 00:48 <b>3</b> 00:48 <b>4</b> 00:48 <b>5</b> 00:48 <b>6</b> 00:48 <b>7</b>   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a  |
| 00:45 <b>2</b> 00:45 <b>3</b> 00:46 <b>4</b> 00:46 <b>5</b> 00:46 <b>6</b> 00:46 <b>7</b> 00:46 <b>8</b>  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and   | 00:48 <b>2</b> 00:48 <b>3</b> 00:48 <b>4</b> 00:48 <b>5</b> 00:48 <b>6</b> 00:48 <b>7</b> 00:48 <b>8</b>  | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35  |
| 00:45 <b>2</b> 00:45 <b>3</b> 00:46 <b>4</b> 00:46 <b>5</b> 00:46 <b>6</b> 00:46 <b>7</b> 00:46 <b>8</b> 00:46 <b>9</b> 00:46 <b>10</b> 00:46 <b>11</b>   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved   | 00:48 <b>2</b> 00:48 <b>3</b> 00:48 <b>4</b> 00:48 <b>5</b> 00:48 <b>6</b> 00:48 <b>7</b> 00:48 <b>8</b> 00:48 <b>9</b>   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.   |
| 00:45 <b>2</b> 00:45 <b>3</b> 00:46 <b>4</b> 00:46 <b>5</b> 00:46 <b>6</b> 00:46 <b>7</b> 00:46 <b>8</b> 00:46 <b>9</b> 00:46 <b>10</b>   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.   | 00:48 <b>2</b> 00:48 <b>3</b> 00:48 <b>4</b> 00:48 <b>5</b> 00:48 <b>6</b> 00:48 <b>7</b> 00:48 <b>8</b> 00:48 <b>9</b> 00:48 <b>10</b>   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather   |
| 00:45 <b>2</b> 00:45 <b>3</b> 00:46 <b>4</b> 00:46 <b>5</b> 00:46 <b>7</b> 00:46 <b>8</b> 00:46 <b>9</b> 00:46 <b>10</b> 00:46 <b>11</b> 00:46 <b>12</b> 00:46 <b>13</b>  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no   | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 11   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody  |
| 00:45 2 00:45 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:46 11 00:46 12  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts  | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 11 00:48 12  | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.   |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     5       00:46     6       00:46     7       00:46     8       00:46     9       00:46     10       00:46     11       00:46     12       00:46     13       00:46     14       00:46     15   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.   | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 11 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 14 00:48 15   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     5       00:46     7       00:46     8       00:46     9       00:46     10       00:46     11       00:46     12       00:46     13       00:46     14       00:46     15       00:46     16  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize,   | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 11 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 14 00:48 15 00:48 16  | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway  |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     5       00:46     7       00:46     8       00:46     9       00:46     10       00:46     12       00:46     13       00:46     14       00:46     15       00:46     16       00:46     17  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it   | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 11 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 14 00:48 15 00:48 16 00:48 17   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no  |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     5       00:46     7       00:46     8       00:46     9       00:46     10       00:46     11       00:46     12       00:46     13       00:46     14       00:46     15       00:46     16       00:46     17       00:46     18  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality,  | 00:48     2       00:48     3       00:48     4       00:48     5       00:48     6       00:48     7       00:48     9       00:48     10       00:48     12       00:48     13       00:48     14       00:48     15       00:48     16       00:48     17       00:48     18                     | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for  |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     5       00:46     7       00:46     8       00:46     10       00:46     11       00:46     12       00:46     13       00:46     14       00:46     15       00:46     16       00:46     17       00:46     18       00:46     19   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality, as we pride ourselves here in Woodcliff Lake on  | 00:48     2       00:48     3       00:48     4       00:48     5       00:48     7       00:48     8       00:48     10       00:48     11       00:48     12       00:48     13       00:48     14       00:48     15       00:48     16       00:48     17       00:48     18       00:48     19 | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for additional traffic flow.   |
| 00:45 2 00:45 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 10 00:46 11 00:46 12 00:46 13 00:46 14 00:46 15 00:46 16 00:46 17 00:46 18 00:46 19 00:46 20  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality, as we pride ourselves here in Woodcliff Lake on keeping out urban sprawl and maintaining our treeline  | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 14 00:48 15 00:48 16 00:48 17 00:48 18 00:48 19 00:48 20   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for additional traffic flow.  Broadway and Woodcliff Lake Avenue is  |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     6       00:46     7       00:46     9       00:46     10       00:46     12       00:46     13       00:46     14       00:46     15       00:46     16       00:46     17       00:46     18       00:46     20       00:46     21   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality, as we pride ourselves here in Woodcliff Lake on keeping out urban sprawl and maintaining our treeline character and green space.   | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 11 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 15 00:48 15 00:48 17 00:48 18 00:48 19 00:48 20 00:48 21  | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for additional traffic flow.  Broadway and Woodcliff Lake Avenue is arguably the worst intersection in town.   |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     6       00:46     7       00:46     8       00:46     9       00:46     11       00:46     12       00:46     13       00:46     14       00:46     15       00:46     16       00:46     17       00:46     19       00:46     20       00:46     21       00:46     22  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality, as we pride ourselves here in Woodcliff Lake on keeping out urban sprawl and maintaining our treeline character and green space.  For all these reasons, I urge you to   | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 11 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 14 00:48 15 00:48 16 00:48 17 00:48 18 00:48 19 00:48 20 00:48 21 00:49 22  | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for additional traffic flow.  Broadway and Woodcliff Lake Avenue is arguably the worst intersection in town.  Traffic is severely backed up at rush  |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     6       00:46     7       00:46     8       00:46     10       00:46     11       00:46     12       00:46     13       00:46     14       00:46     15       00:46     16       00:46     17       00:46     18       00:46     20       00:46     21       00:46     22       00:46     23  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality, as we pride ourselves here in Woodcliff Lake on keeping out urban sprawl and maintaining our treeline character and green space.  For all these reasons, I urge you to reject this application. I urge this board to think   | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 14 00:48 15 00:48 16 00:48 17 00:48 18 00:48 19 00:48 20 00:49 22 00:49 23   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for additional traffic flow.  Broadway and Woodcliff Lake Avenue is arguably the worst intersection in town.  Traffic is severely backed up at rush hours at Broadway/Woodcliff, Broadway/Prospect,  |
| 00:45       2         00:45       3         00:46       4         00:46       5         00:46       7         00:46       8         00:46       9         00:46       10         00:46       12         00:46       12         00:46       14         00:46       15         00:46       16         00:46       17         00:46       19         00:46       20         00:46       21         00:46       23         00:47       24 | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality, as we pride ourselves here in Woodcliff Lake on keeping out urban sprawl and maintaining our treeline character and green space.  For all these reasons, I urge you to reject this application. I urge this board to think long and hard about everything that I've said and   | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 11 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 14 00:48 15 00:48 16 00:48 17 00:48 18 00:48 19 00:48 20 00:49 21 00:49 23 00:49 24   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for additional traffic flow.  Broadway and Woodcliff Lake Avenue is arguably the worst intersection in town.  Traffic is severely backed up at rush hours at Broadway/Woodcliff, Broadway/Prospect, Broadway/Highview and on the Causeway, the only  |
| 00:45     2       00:45     3       00:46     4       00:46     6       00:46     7       00:46     8       00:46     10       00:46     11       00:46     12       00:46     13       00:46     14       00:46     15       00:46     16       00:46     17       00:46     18       00:46     20       00:46     21       00:46     22       00:46     23  | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality, as we pride ourselves here in Woodcliff Lake on keeping out urban sprawl and maintaining our treeline character and green space.  For all these reasons, I urge you to reject this application. I urge this board to think long and hard about everything that I've said and remember this is Woodcliff Lake, a community that | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 14 00:48 15 00:48 16 00:48 17 00:48 18 00:48 19 00:48 20 00:49 22 00:49 23   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for additional traffic flow.  Broadway and Woodcliff Lake Avenue is arguably the worst intersection in town.  Traffic is severely backed up at rush hours at Broadway/Woodcliff, Broadway/Prospect, Broadway/Highview and on the Causeway, the only east/west connector of Woodcliff Lake. |
| 00:45 2 00:45 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 10 00:46 11 00:46 12 00:46 13 00:46 14 00:46 15 00:46 16 00:46 17 00:46 18 00:46 19 00:46 20 00:46 21 00:46 23 00:47 24   | even suggesting to add any affordable units until they were reminded of the set aside that was part of our settlement agreement. And they should have known full well the terms of our settlement agreement, because the applicant, one of the equity partners in this project, his law partner represented the Borough of Woodcliff Lake, which was established by Mr. Preiss on our Fair Share Housing Committee, and was also our planning board attorney and was involved with the Broadway corridor ordinance.  I hope you will see that there is no need for these units, and the negative impacts significantly outweighs any benefit.  This applicant is seeking to maximize, in my opinion, its profit at the expense of the residents by proposing two buildings and over building this lot with no green or open space, and it is not in keeping with who we are as a municipality, as we pride ourselves here in Woodcliff Lake on keeping out urban sprawl and maintaining our treeline character and green space.  For all these reasons, I urge you to reject this application. I urge this board to think long and hard about everything that I've said and   | 00:48 2 00:48 3 00:48 4 00:48 5 00:48 6 00:48 7 00:48 8 00:48 9 00:48 10 00:48 11 00:48 12 00:48 13 00:48 14 00:48 15 00:48 16 00:48 17 00:48 18 00:48 19 00:48 20 00:49 21 00:49 23 00:49 24   | of Woodcliff Lake.  MR. NEWMAN: And these are all closing arguments now.  MR. DELIA: Agreed.  I haven't asked a single question of anyone on these closing arguments.  MR. STAR: Hi. I'm Alvin Star. I'm a resident of Woodcliff Lake for approximately 35 years.  Thank you for the time. I'd rather read this, it will be quicker and make everybody happy.  CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: She's been sitting here for three hours (indicating). So  MR. STAR: She's a marvel.  Local roadways, including the Broadway corridor, are over 100-years-old, with little or no roadway structure improvements to allow for additional traffic flow.  Broadway and Woodcliff Lake Avenue is arguably the worst intersection in town.  Traffic is severely backed up at rush hours at Broadway/Woodcliff, Broadway/Prospect, Broadway/Highview and on the Causeway, the only  |

|   | 189   |  | 191  |
|---|---|--|--|
| 00:49 <b>1</b>  | New Jersey Transit trains at Woodcliff  | 00:51 <b>1</b>   | of the site.   |
| 00:49 2   | Lake station further and severely aggravate and   | 00:51 2  | And this was discussed by Mr   |
| 00:49 3   | otherwise backup traffic  | 00:51 3  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: The traffic  |
| 00:49 <b>4</b>  | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Slow down. She  | 00:51 <b>4</b>   | engineer.  |
| 00:49 <b>5</b>  | has to get it down.   | 00:51 <b>5</b>   | MR. STAR: The traffic engineer from  |
| 00:49 <b>6</b>  | MR. STAR: Okay. You're right.   | 00:51 <b>6</b>   | Neglia.  |
| 00:49 7   | All three parking lots with complex   | 00:51 7  | This is an impossible situation. Just  |
| 00:49 8   | geometries are full with no expansion planned. There  | 00:51 8  | imagine the traffic mess   |
| 00:49 <b>9</b>  | are blocked views with dangerous ingress/egress, all  | 00:51 <b>9</b>   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, how many pages do   |
| 00:49 <b>10</b>   | traffic is stopped when the train enters the station.   | 00:51 <b>10</b>  | you have?  |
| 00:49 11  | A car had driven into the station a few years ago,  | 00:51 <b>11</b>  | MR. STAR: It's three. It's fast.   |
| 00:49 <b>12</b>   | due to the dangerous curve in the road.   | 00:51 <b>12</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: But you're not even  |
| 00:49 13  | Okay. Now I'll talk about traffic,  | 00:51 <b>13</b>  | done with one page.  |
| 00:49 <b>14</b>   | about this thing right now.   | 00:51 <b>14</b>  | MR. STAR: Well, I'm at the bottom of   |
| 00:49 <b>15</b>   | It is pretty much universally   | 00:51 <b>15</b>  | the page.  |
| 00:49 <b>16</b>   | recognized that the current traffic situation is bad  | 00:51 <b>16</b>  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: We're going to have to   |
| 00:49 <b>17</b>   | at the location of the applicant's project. The   | 00:52 <b>17</b>  | limit the time, and I don't like to do it, but we  |
| 00:49 18  | applicant believes that too heavily   | 00:52 18   | just don't have time to hear everybody.  |
| 00:49 <b>19</b>   | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Slowly.   | 00:52 19   | MR. STAR: Well, just bear with me. I   |
| 00:49 <b>20</b>   | MR. STAR: The applicant believes that   | 00:52 <b>20</b>  | want my five minutes, please.  |
| 00:49 <b>21</b>   | too heavily occupied apartment buildings will result  | 00:52 <b>21</b>  | Other high-density developments in Park  |
| 00:50 <b>22</b>   | in a decrease in vehicular ingress and egress during  | 00:52 <b>22</b>  | Ridge and Montvale will add to the traffic flows, and  |
| 00:50 <b>23</b>   | rush hours compared to the existing single commercial   | 00:52 <b>23</b>  | a great incidence of traffic accidents will result.  |
| 00:50 <b>24</b>   | building with a recent history of no occupancy.   | 00:52 <b>24</b>  | New Jersey Transit may schedule more   |
| 00:50 <b>25</b>   | Do not believe this! It's my view that  | 00:52 <b>25</b>  | frequent trains and propose a train bypass in town to  |
|   | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   |
|   | 201-641-1812  |  | 201-641-1812   |
|   | 190   |  | 192  |
|   | the applicant has manipulated the data through  |  |  |
| 00:50 <b>1</b>  | the applicant has manipulated the data through  | 00:52 <b>1</b>   | serve the ever increasing needs of computation into  |
| 00:50 <b>2</b>  | questionable modeling assumptions and used its  | 00:52 <b>2</b>   | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.   |
| 00:50 <b>2</b> 00:50 <b>3</b>   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he   | 00:52 <b>2</b> 00:52 <b>3</b>  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess  |
| 00:50 <b>2</b> 00:50 <b>3</b> 00:50 <b>4</b>  | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will   | 00:52 <b>2</b> 00:52 <b>3</b> 00:52 <b>4</b>   | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants   |
| 00:50 <b>2</b> 00:50 <b>3</b> 00:50 <b>4</b> 00:50 <b>5</b>   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows   | 00:52 <b>2</b> 00:52 <b>3</b> 00:52 <b>4</b> 00:52 <b>5</b>  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional   |
| 00:50 <b>2</b> 00:50 <b>3</b> 00:50 <b>4</b> 00:50 <b>5</b> 00:50 <b>6</b>  | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are   | 00:52 <b>2</b> 00:52 <b>3</b> 00:52 <b>4</b> 00:52 <b>5</b> 00:52 <b>6</b>   | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so   |
| 00:50 <b>2</b> 00:50 <b>3</b> 00:50 <b>4</b> 00:50 <b>5</b> 00:50 <b>6</b> 00:50 <b>7</b>   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial  | 00:52 <b>2</b> 00:52 <b>3</b> 00:52 <b>4</b> 00:52 <b>5</b> 00:52 <b>6</b> 00:52 <b>7</b>  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  |
| 00:50 <b>2</b> 00:50 <b>3</b> 00:50 <b>4</b> 00:50 <b>5</b> 00:50 <b>6</b> 00:50 <b>7</b> 00:50 <b>8</b>  | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  | 00:52 <b>2</b> 00:52 <b>3</b> 00:52 <b>4</b> 00:52 <b>5</b> 00:52 <b>6</b> 00:52 <b>7</b> 00:52 <b>8</b>   | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  |
| 00:50 <b>2</b> 00:50 <b>3</b> 00:50 <b>4</b> 00:50 <b>5</b> 00:50 <b>6</b> 00:50 <b>7</b> 00:50 <b>8</b> 00:50 <b>9</b>   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used  | 00:52 <b>2</b> 00:52 <b>3</b> 00:52 <b>4</b> 00:52 <b>5</b> 00:52 <b>6</b> 00:52 <b>7</b> 00:52 <b>8</b> 00:52 <b>9</b>  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to   |
| 00:50 <b>2</b> 00:50 <b>3</b> 00:50 <b>4</b> 00:50 <b>5</b> 00:50 <b>6</b> 00:50 <b>7</b> 00:50 <b>8</b> 00:50 <b>9</b> 00:50 <b>10</b>   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the   | 00:52 <b>2</b> 00:52 <b>3</b> 00:52 <b>4</b> 00:52 <b>5</b> 00:52 <b>6</b> 00:52 <b>7</b> 00:52 <b>8</b> 00:52 <b>9</b> 00:52 <b>10</b>  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing  |
| 00:50 2 00:50 3 00:50 4 00:50 5 00:50 6 00:50 7 00:50 8 00:50 9 00:50 10 00:50 11   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly  | 00:52 <b>2</b> 00:52 <b>3</b> 00:52 <b>4</b> 00:52 <b>5</b> 00:52 <b>6</b> 00:52 <b>7</b> 00:52 <b>8</b> 00:52 <b>9</b> 00:52 <b>10</b> 00:52 <b>11</b>  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.   |
| 00:50 2 00:50 3 00:50 4 00:50 5 00:50 6 00:50 7 00:50 8 00:50 9 00:50 10 00:50 11 00:50 12  | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove  | 00:52 2 00:52 3 00:52 4 00:52 5 00:52 6 00:52 7 00:52 8 00:52 9 00:52 10 00:52 11 00:52 12   | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent   |
| 00:50 2 00:50 3 00:50 4 00:50 5 00:50 6 00:50 7 00:50 8 00:50 9 00:50 10 00:50 11 00:50 12 00:50 13   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.   | 00:52 2 00:52 3 00:52 4 00:52 5 00:52 6 00:52 7 00:52 8 00:52 9 00:52 10 00:52 11 00:52 12 00:53 13  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was  |
| 00:50 2 00:50 3 00:50 4 00:50 5 00:50 6 00:50 7 00:50 8 00:50 9 00:50 10 00:50 11 00:50 12 00:50 13 00:50 14  | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that   | 00:52 2 00:52 3 00:52 4 00:52 5 00:52 6 00:52 7 00:52 8 00:52 9 00:52 10 00:52 11 00:52 12 00:53 13 00:53 14   | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to  |
| 00:50 2 00:50 3 00:50 4 00:50 5 00:50 6 00:50 7 00:50 8 00:50 9 00:50 10 00:50 11 00:50 12 00:50 13 00:50 14 00:51 15   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush   | 00:52 2 00:52 3 00:52 4 00:52 5 00:52 6 00:52 7 00:52 8 00:52 9 00:52 10 00:52 11 00:52 12 00:53 13 00:53 14 00:53 15  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.   |
| 00:50     2       00:50     3       00:50     4       00:50     5       00:50     7       00:50     8       00:50     9       00:50     10       00:50     11       00:50     12       00:50     13       00:51     15       00:51     16   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared   | 00:52     2       00:52     3       00:52     5       00:52     6       00:52     7       00:52     8       00:52     9       00:52     10       00:52     11       00:52     12       00:53     13       00:53     14       00:53     15       00:53     16   | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New   |
| 00:50     2       00:50     3       00:50     4       00:50     5       00:50     7       00:50     8       00:50     9       00:50     10       00:50     11       00:50     12       00:50     13       00:50     14       00:51     15       00:51     16       00:51     17   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.   | 00:52 2 00:52 3 00:52 4 00:52 5 00:52 6 00:52 7 00:52 8 00:52 9 00:52 10 00:52 11 00:52 12 00:53 13 00:53 14 00:53 15 00:53 16 00:53 17  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this   |
| 00:50 2 00:50 3 00:50 4 00:50 5 00:50 6 00:50 7 00:50 8 00:50 9 00:50 10 00:50 11 00:50 12 00:50 13 00:51 15 00:51 16 00:51 17 00:51 18   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.  Increased traffic flows into and out of  | 00:52     2       00:52     3       00:52     4       00:52     6       00:52     7       00:52     8       00:52     9       00:52     10       00:52     11       00:52     12       00:53     13       00:53     15       00:53     16       00:53     17       00:53     18  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.  |
| 00:50       2         00:50       3         00:50       4         00:50       5         00:50       6         00:50       7         00:50       8         00:50       9         00:50       10         00:50       12         00:50       12         00:50       13         00:51       15         00:51       16         00:51       17         00:51       18         00:51       19  | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.  Increased traffic flows into and out of this project site at this very dangerous intersection  | 00:52       2         00:52       3         00:52       5         00:52       6         00:52       7         00:52       9         00:52       10         00:52       11         00:52       12         00:53       13         00:53       14         00:53       15         00:53       16         00:53       17         00:53       18         00:53       19  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.  The applicant has done very little in   |
| 00:50 2 00:50 3 00:50 4 00:50 5 00:50 6 00:50 7 00:50 8 00:50 9 00:50 10 00:50 11 00:50 12 00:50 13 00:51 15 00:51 16 00:51 17 00:51 18   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.  Increased traffic flows into and out of  | 00:52     2       00:52     3       00:52     4       00:52     6       00:52     7       00:52     8       00:52     9       00:52     10       00:52     11       00:52     12       00:53     13       00:53     15       00:53     16       00:53     17       00:53     18  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.  The applicant has done very little in terms of the traffic analysis, and its findings have  |
| 00:50       2         00:50       3         00:50       4         00:50       5         00:50       7         00:50       8         00:50       9         00:50       10         00:50       11         00:50       12         00:50       13         00:51       15         00:51       16         00:51       17         00:51       18         00:51       19         00:51       20         00:51       21  | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.  Increased traffic flows into and out of this project site at this very dangerous intersection are unacceptable and present a huge risk to human life.  | 00:52       2         00:52       3         00:52       5         00:52       6         00:52       7         00:52       9         00:52       10         00:52       12         00:53       13         00:53       14         00:53       15         00:53       16         00:53       17         00:53       19         00:53       20   | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.  The applicant has done very little in terms of the traffic analysis, and its findings have inspired very little confidence.   |
| 00:50     2       00:50     3       00:50     4       00:50     6       00:50     7       00:50     8       00:50     9       00:50     10       00:50     12       00:50     12       00:50     14       00:51     15       00:51     16       00:51     17       00:51     18       00:51     19       00:51     20   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.  Increased traffic flows into and out of this project site at this very dangerous intersection are unacceptable and present a huge risk to human life.  There is one point of ingress and   | 00:52       2         00:52       3         00:52       5         00:52       6         00:52       7         00:52       9         00:52       10         00:52       11         00:52       12         00:53       13         00:53       15         00:53       16         00:53       17         00:53       19         00:53       20         00:53       21  | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.  The applicant has done very little in terms of the traffic analysis, and its findings have inspired very little confidence.  In my opinion, it gives every  |
| 00:50       2         00:50       3         00:50       4         00:50       6         00:50       7         00:50       8         00:50       10         00:50       11         00:50       12         00:50       13         00:50       14         00:51       15         00:51       16         00:51       17         00:51       18         00:51       19         00:51       20         00:51       21         00:51       22  | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.  Increased traffic flows into and out of this project site at this very dangerous intersection are unacceptable and present a huge risk to human life.  | 00:52       2         00:52       4         00:52       5         00:52       6         00:52       7         00:52       9         00:52       10         00:52       11         00:52       12         00:53       13         00:53       14         00:53       16         00:53       17         00:53       18         00:53       19         00:53       20         00:53       21         00:53       22                        | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.  The applicant has done very little in terms of the traffic analysis, and its findings have inspired very little confidence.   |
| 00:50       2         00:50       3         00:50       4         00:50       5         00:50       7         00:50       8         00:50       9         00:50       10         00:50       12         00:50       12         00:50       14         00:51       15         00:51       16         00:51       17         00:51       18         00:51       20         00:51       21         00:51       22         00:51       23   | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.  Increased traffic flows into and out of this project site at this very dangerous intersection are unacceptable and present a huge risk to human life.  There is one point of ingress and egress to serve the apartment dwellers. Cars will   | 00:52       2         00:52       3         00:52       5         00:52       6         00:52       7         00:52       9         00:52       10         00:52       12         00:53       13         00:53       14         00:53       16         00:53       17         00:53       18         00:53       19         00:53       20         00:53       21         00:53       22         00:53       23                        | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.  The applicant has done very little in terms of the traffic analysis, and its findings have inspired very little confidence.  In my opinion, it gives every appearance of trying to avoid further analysis,  |
| 00:50       2         00:50       3         00:50       4         00:50       6         00:50       7         00:50       8         00:50       9         00:50       10         00:50       12         00:50       13         00:50       14         00:51       15         00:51       16         00:51       17         00:51       18         00:51       19         00:51       20         00:51       21         00:51       22         00:51       23         00:51       24 | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.  Increased traffic flows into and out of this project site at this very dangerous intersection are unacceptable and present a huge risk to human life.  There is one point of ingress and egress to serve the apartment dwellers. Cars will exist into an overcapacity queued Broadway during   | 00:52       2         00:52       3         00:52       4         00:52       6         00:52       7         00:52       9         00:52       10         00:52       12         00:53       13         00:53       14         00:53       15         00:53       16         00:53       17         00:53       19         00:53       20         00:53       21         00:53       22         00:53       23         00:53       24 | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.  The applicant has done very little in terms of the traffic analysis, and its findings have inspired very little confidence.  In my opinion, it gives every appearance of trying to avoid further analysis, knowing the results may not be supportive to a   |
| 00:50       2         00:50       3         00:50       4         00:50       6         00:50       7         00:50       8         00:50       10         00:50       11         00:50       12         00:50       13         00:50       14         00:51       15         00:51       16         00:51       17         00:51       19         00:51       20         00:51       21         00:51       22         00:51       23         00:51       24                       | questionable modeling assumptions and used its modeling to provide a beneficial result, that is, he states and I repeat that the traffic situation will improve during rush hours or that the traffic flows of too heavily occupied apartment buildings are compared to past low occupancy of one commercial building. This is a false positive.  Consider if the applicant had used actual historic occupancy data associated with the commercial building as a baseline. This data clearly exists. Such an analysis would very likely disprove the false positives.  In reality, it is very likely that future traffic flows during rush hours and non-rush hours would be forecasted to be much worse compared to this baseline.  Increased traffic flows into and out of this project site at this very dangerous intersection are unacceptable and present a huge risk to human life.  There is one point of ingress and egress to serve the apartment dwellers. Cars will exist into an overcapacity queued Broadway during rush hours, with uncontrolled left turns into and out | 00:52       2         00:52       3         00:52       4         00:52       6         00:52       7         00:52       9         00:52       10         00:52       12         00:53       13         00:53       14         00:53       15         00:53       16         00:53       17         00:53       19         00:53       20         00:53       21         00:53       22         00:53       23         00:53       24 | New York City. This will tie up traffic even more.  The applicant has refused to assess cumulative growth as part of his study. Applicants in other towns are required to perform additional studies associated with cumulative growth and do so at their cost. This is a standard of the industry.  Don't believe otherwise.  The applicant has also refused to prepare a pedestrian safety plan of the crossing across Broadway to the New Jersey Transit station.  People will be at risk. The applicant has not sent his traffic study, nor pedestrian study, which was never done, to the Bergen County engineer assigned to this case, nor to New Jersey Transit for review.  Broadway is a county road, and New Jersey Transit is a party of interest in this application.  The applicant has done very little in terms of the traffic analysis, and its findings have inspired very little confidence.  In my opinion, it gives every appearance of trying to avoid further analysis, knowing the results may not be supportive to a positive outcome, to a positive vote on the |

|   | 402  |   | 405   |
|---|--|---|---|
| 00.50 4   | 193  | 00.50 4   | 195   |
| 00:53 1   | application by the zoning board.   | 00:56 1   | nearby houses could be properly fought. Again, the  |
| 00:53 2   | This is indeed very unfortunate, and,  | 00:56 2   | basic phrase, "trust my judgment."  |
| 00:53 3   | in my view, counter to good engineering practice.  | 00:56 3   | The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has  |
| 00:53 4   | The zoning board recognizes the  | 00:56 4   | indicated, following questioning, that a vegetation   |
| 00:53 5   | additional risk to public safety from additional   | 00:56 5   | management plan for the steep slope prepared as a   |
| 00:53 6   | traffic flows as a result of this application, and   | 00:56 6   | component of an emergency response plan is  |
| 00:53 7   | that town does not need to be sued for negligence in   | 00:56 7   | unnecessary.  |
| 00:54 8   | the event of traffic accidents or injuries or  | 00:56 8   | I find it hard to believe.  |
| 00:54 9   | fatalities.  | 00:56 9   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Thank you.  |
| 00:54 10  | Now circulation.   | 00:56 10  | MR. STAR: Okay. I have this much and  |
| 00:54 11  | The applicant, with the involvement of   | 00:56 11  | I'm done.   |
| 00:54 12  | Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has presented a  | 00:56 12  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. You're   |
| 00:54 13  | rudimentary study illustrating how a large fire truck  | 00:56 13  | going to have to cut it short. Okay. Just sum up,   |
| 00:54 14  | could enter and exit the site during a fire  | 00:56 14  | please. You're well over five minutes. Okay. We're  |
| 00:54 15  | emergency.   | 00:56 15  | going to have to limit the time.  |
| 00:54 16  | The most glaring and obvious omission  | 00:56 16  | MR. STAR: Okay.   |
| 00:54 17  | is that the applicant assumes no cars in the parking   | 00:56 17  | Plain and simple, this project will   |
| 00:54 18  | lot, nor tenants, including children, scurrying in   | 00:56 18  | result in a fire trap, and that's my opinion. And   |
| 00:54 19  | the night as the realistic worst case scenario trying  | 00:56 19  | the zoning board of Woodcliff Lake, knowing these   |
| 00:54 <b>20</b> 00:54 <b>21</b>   | to leave the site.   | 00:56 <b>20</b> 00:56 <b>21</b>   | conditions, leaves the town liable to litigation for  |
|   | Consider the imagery. One point of   |   | negligence in the case of a fire.   |
| 00:54 <b>22</b> 00:54 <b>23</b>   | ingress/egress, and it will remain as such.  | 00:56 22  | Now I'm going to address the sight line   |
| 00:54 <b>23</b>   | How is the flow of emergency response  | 00:56 <b>23</b> 00:56 <b>24</b>   | issues that was brought up by other people.   |
| 00:54 <b>25</b>   | vehicles and residents to be managed in a chaotic situation that is all too certain to occur?  | 00:56 <b>25</b>   | The applicant has performed but one sight line analysis, resulting in his position that   |
| 00.54 23  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.   | 00.50 23  | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.  |
|   | 201-641-1812   |   | 201-641-1812  |
|   | 194  |   | 196   |
|   |  |   |   |
| 00·54 <b>1</b>  |  | 00:56 1   |   |
| 00:54 <b>1</b>  | Answer: It won't be managed, because   | 00:56 <b>1</b>  | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake   |
| 00:54 <b>2</b>  |  | 00:57 <b>2</b>  | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b>   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.   | 00:57 <b>2</b> 00:57 <b>3</b>   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this   |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b>  | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of   | 00:57 <b>2</b> 00:57 <b>3</b> 00:57 <b>4</b>  | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one   |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b>  | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared  | 00:57 <b>2</b> 00:57 <b>3</b>   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading  |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b> 00:54 <b>5</b>   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of   | 00:57 <b>2</b> 00:57 <b>3</b> 00:57 <b>4</b> 00:57 <b>5</b>   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one   |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b> 00:54 <b>5</b> 00:54 <b>6</b>  | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because  | 00:57 <b>2</b> 00:57 <b>3</b> 00:57 <b>4</b> 00:57 <b>5</b> 00:57 <b>6</b>  | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b> 00:54 <b>5</b> 00:54 <b>6</b> 00:55 <b>7</b>   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.   | 00:57 <b>2</b> 00:57 <b>3</b> 00:57 <b>4</b> 00:57 <b>5</b> 00:57 <b>6</b> 00:57 <b>7</b>   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to   |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b> 00:54 <b>5</b> 00:54 <b>6</b> 00:55 <b>7</b> 00:55 <b>8</b>  | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said   | 00:57 <b>2</b> 00:57 <b>3</b> 00:57 <b>4</b> 00:57 <b>5</b> 00:57 <b>6</b> 00:57 <b>7</b> 00:57 <b>8</b>  | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.   |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b> 00:54 <b>5</b> 00:54 <b>6</b> 00:55 <b>7</b> 00:55 <b>8</b> 00:55 <b>9</b>   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this   | 00:57 <b>2</b> 00:57 <b>3</b> 00:57 <b>4</b> 00:57 <b>5</b> 00:57 <b>6</b> 00:57 <b>7</b> 00:57 <b>8</b> 00:57 <b>9</b>   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b> 00:54 <b>5</b> 00:54 <b>6</b> 00:55 <b>7</b> 00:55 <b>8</b> 00:55 <b>9</b> 00:55 <b>10</b>   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of   | 00:57 <b>2</b> 00:57 <b>3</b> 00:57 <b>4</b> 00:57 <b>5</b> 00:57 <b>6</b> 00:57 <b>7</b> 00:57 <b>8</b> 00:57 <b>9</b> 00:57 <b>10</b>   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning  |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b> 00:54 <b>5</b> 00:54 <b>6</b> 00:55 <b>7</b> 00:55 <b>8</b> 00:55 <b>9</b> 00:55 <b>10</b> 00:55 <b>11</b>   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this  | 00:57 2 00:57 3 00:57 4 00:57 5 00:57 6 00:57 7 00:57 8 00:57 9 00:57 10 00:57 11   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present  |
| 00:54 <b>2</b> 00:54 <b>3</b> 00:54 <b>4</b> 00:54 <b>5</b> 00:54 <b>6</b> 00:55 <b>7</b> 00:55 <b>8</b> 00:55 <b>9</b> 00:55 <b>10</b> 00:55 <b>11</b> 00:55 <b>12</b>   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  | 00:57 2 00:57 3 00:57 4 00:57 5 00:57 6 00:57 7 00:57 8 00:57 9 00:57 10 00:57 11   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those  |
| 00:54 2 00:54 3 00:54 4 00:54 5 00:54 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department  | 00:57 2 00:57 3 00:57 4 00:57 5 00:57 6 00:57 7 00:57 8 00:57 9 00:57 10 00:57 11 00:57 12 00:57 13   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life  |
| 00:54 2 00:54 3 00:54 4 00:54 5 00:54 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:55 14 00:55 15 00:55 16  | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though   | 00:57 2 00:57 3 00:57 4 00:57 5 00:57 6 00:57 7 00:57 8 00:57 9 00:57 10 00:57 11 00:57 12 00:57 13 00:57 14  | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a  |
| 00:54 2 00:54 3 00:54 4 00:54 5 00:54 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:55 14 00:55 15 00:55 16 00:55 17   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project   | 00:57         2           00:57         3           00:57         4           00:57         6           00:57         7           00:57         8           00:57         10           00:57         11           00:57         12           00:57         13           00:57         14           00:57         15           00:57         16           00:57         17   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.   |
| 00:54 2 00:54 3 00:54 4 00:54 5 00:54 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:55 14 00:55 15 00:55 16 00:55 17 00:55 18  | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings   | 00:57         2           00:57         3           00:57         5           00:57         6           00:57         7           00:57         8           00:57         10           00:57         11           00:57         12           00:57         13           00:57         14           00:57         15           00:57         16           00:57         17           00:57         18  | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.  We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't  |
| 00:54 2 00:54 3 00:54 4 00:54 5 00:54 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:55 14 00:55 15 00:55 16 00:55 17 00:55 18 00:55 19   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings in town in a very, very constrained site.   | 00:57       2         00:57       3         00:57       4         00:57       5         00:57       6         00:57       8         00:57       9         00:57       10         00:57       12         00:57       13         00:57       14         00:57       15         00:57       16         00:57       18         00:57       19   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.  We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't need low home values resulting from unbridled owner  |
| 00:54 2 00:54 3 00:54 4 00:54 5 00:54 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:55 14 00:55 15 00:55 16 00:55 17 00:55 18 00:55 19 00:55 20  | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings in town in a very, very constrained site.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has   | 00:57     2       00:57     3       00:57     5       00:57     6       00:57     7       00:57     8       00:57     10       00:57     12       00:57     12       00:57     13       00:57     15       00:57     16       00:57     17       00:57     18       00:57     19       00:57     20   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.  We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't need low home values resulting from unbridled owner development and higher property taxes when the town  |
| 00:54 2 00:54 3 00:54 4 00:54 5 00:54 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:55 14 00:55 15 00:55 16 00:55 17 00:55 18 00:55 19 00:55 20 00:55 21   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings in town in a very, very constrained site.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has no such firefighting experience or none truly worthy  | 00:57       2         00:57       3         00:57       5         00:57       6         00:57       7         00:57       8         00:57       10         00:57       11         00:57       12         00:57       13         00:57       15         00:57       16         00:57       17         00:57       18         00:57       20         00:57       21   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.  We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't need low home values resulting from unbridled owner development and higher property taxes when the town is sued for negligence. Please reject this   |
| 00:54 2 00:54 3 00:54 4 00:54 5 00:54 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:55 14 00:55 15 00:55 16 00:55 17 00:55 18 00:55 19 00:55 20 00:55 21   | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings in town in a very, very constrained site.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has no such firefighting experience or none truly worthy of this application.   | 00:57       2         00:57       3         00:57       5         00:57       6         00:57       7         00:57       8         00:57       10         00:57       12         00:57       13         00:57       14         00:57       15         00:57       16         00:57       18         00:57       19         00:57       21         00:57       21         00:57       22  | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.  We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't need low home values resulting from unbridled owner development and higher property taxes when the town is sued for negligence. Please reject this application.  |
| 00:54       2         00:54       3         00:54       5         00:54       6         00:55       7         00:55       8         00:55       10         00:55       12         00:55       12         00:55       13         00:55       15         00:55       16         00:55       17         00:55       18         00:55       19         00:55       20         00:55       21         00:55       23                       | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings in town in a very, very constrained site.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has no such firefighting experience or none truly worthy of this application.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department also  | 00:57     2       00:57     3       00:57     5       00:57     6       00:57     7       00:57     8       00:57     10       00:57     12       00:57     12       00:57     13       00:57     15       00:57     16       00:57     17       00:57     18       00:57     20       00:57     21       00:57     22       00:57     23   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.  We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't need low home values resulting from unbridled owner development and higher property taxes when the town is sued for negligence. Please reject this application.  Thank you, all.   |
| 00:54       2         00:54       3         00:54       5         00:54       6         00:55       7         00:55       8         00:55       9         00:55       10         00:55       12         00:55       12         00:55       14         00:55       15         00:55       16         00:55       17         00:55       19         00:55       20         00:55       21         00:55       23         00:55       24 | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings in town in a very, very constrained site.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has no such firefighting experience or none truly worthy of this application.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department also hasn't addressed how a fire on the steep slope   | 00:57         2           00:57         3           00:57         5           00:57         6           00:57         7           00:57         9           00:57         10           00:57         12           00:57         13           00:57         14           00:57         15           00:57         16           00:57         18           00:57         19           00:57         20           00:57         21           00:57         23           00:57         24 | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.  We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't need low home values resulting from unbridled owner development and higher property taxes when the town is sued for negligence. Please reject this application.  Thank you, all.  AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Well said.             |
| 00:54       2         00:54       3         00:54       5         00:54       6         00:55       7         00:55       8         00:55       10         00:55       12         00:55       12         00:55       13         00:55       15         00:55       16         00:55       17         00:55       18         00:55       19         00:55       20         00:55       21         00:55       23                       | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings in town in a very, very constrained site.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has no such firefighting experience or none truly worthy of this application.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department also hasn't addressed how a fire on the steep slope immediately east of the new building leading to the | 00:57     2       00:57     3       00:57     5       00:57     6       00:57     7       00:57     8       00:57     10       00:57     12       00:57     12       00:57     13       00:57     15       00:57     16       00:57     17       00:57     18       00:57     20       00:57     21       00:57     22       00:57     23   | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.  We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't need low home values resulting from unbridled owner development and higher property taxes when the town is sued for negligence. Please reject this application.  Thank you, all.  AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Well said. (Applause.) |
| 00:54       2         00:54       3         00:54       5         00:54       6         00:55       7         00:55       8         00:55       9         00:55       10         00:55       12         00:55       12         00:55       14         00:55       15         00:55       16         00:55       17         00:55       19         00:55       20         00:55       21         00:55       23         00:55       24 | Answer: It won't be managed, because the configuration of the property doesn't allow for it.  The applicant, with the involvement of the Woodcliff Lake Fire Department, has not prepared an emergency response plan. Most likely because there isn't one that can pass a true review.  Woodcliff Lake fire personnel has said that they will judge how to handle a fire at this time when one would occur and that the preparation of an emergency response plan as part of this application is unnecessary.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department indicates that its judgment and experience, though excellent that it is, should be trusted, as they have extensive experience in fighting fires in town.  However, the applicant's project involves the first high-density apartment buildings in town in a very, very constrained site.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department has no such firefighting experience or none truly worthy of this application.  The Woodcliff Lake Fire Department also hasn't addressed how a fire on the steep slope   | 00:57         2           00:57         3           00:57         5           00:57         6           00:57         7           00:57         9           00:57         10           00:57         12           00:57         13           00:57         14           00:57         15           00:57         16           00:57         18           00:57         19           00:57         20           00:57         21           00:57         23           00:57         24 | the back building will not obstruct views to the lake from the houses above.  The applicant has indicated that this one analysis is the worst-case analysis. He did one analysis. This assumption is wrong headed, leading to an illogical and unsubstantiated conclusion.  MR. PRINCIOTTO: Sir, I asked you to conclude.  MR. STAR: It is nonsense.  Ladies and gentlemen of the zoning board, this application has major faults that present unacceptable risk to life and limb, including those of children. There are associated quality-of-life issues as well; public safety; not making money for a few people must be paramount in our decision making. We need know protect people and the reputation of Woodcliff Lake.  We enjoy a lifestyle here, and we don't need low home values resulting from unbridled owner development and higher property taxes when the town is sued for negligence. Please reject this application.  Thank you, all.  AUDIENCE MEMBERS: Well said.             |

|                                 | 197   |       |            |              | 199   |
|---------------------------------|---|-------|------------|--------------|---|
| 00:57 <b>1</b>                  | MR. HAYES: It is 11:30.   | 01:00 | 1          | earlier.     | 199   |
| 00:58 2                         | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: Wait a minute,                                    | 01:00 | 2          | Cui IICI .   | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right, 7:30, July                             |
| 00:58 <b>2</b> 00:58 <b>3</b>   | please.   | 01:00 | 3          | 23rd.        | MR. FRINCIOTTO. All right, 7.30, July                             |
| 00:58 4                         | MR. PRINCIOTTO: How many more people                                  | 01:00 | 4          | 2514.        | MR. DELIA: Thank you. Have a good                                 |
| 00:58 <b>5</b>                  | want to make comments from the public?                                | 01:00 | 5          | night.       | That Been a mark you. Have a good                                 |
| 00:58 6                         | MR. DELIA: We have to come back.                                      | 01.00 | 6          | ingiici      | (Time noted: 11:33 p.m.)  |
| 00:58 7                         | MR. SPIRIG: Based on the number of                                    |       | 7          |              | (Time Hoteu: 11.35 p.m.)  |
| 00:58 8                         | people that you mentioned, if everybody gets five                     |       | 8          |              |   |
| 00:58 9                         | minutes, it will be an hour-and-a-half.                               |       | 9          |              |   |
| 00:58 10                        | MR. DELIA: I want to thank you for                                    |       | 10         |              |   |
| 00:58 11                        | pushing as hard as you can, but we have to come back.                 |       | 11         |              |   |
| 00:58 12                        | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: You should have                                   |       | 12         |              |   |
| 00:58 13                        | listened to me.   |       | 13         |              |   |
| 00:58 14                        | Thank you.  |       | 14         |              |   |
| 00:58 15                        | MR. PRINCIOTTO: That's appreciated.                                   |       | 15         |              |   |
| 00:58 16                        | All right. Our next meeting is July 23rd. We have                     |       | 16         |              |   |
| 00:59 17                        | two other applications on.  |       | 17         |              |   |
| 00:59 18                        | MR. DELIA: Can't be older than this.                                  |       | 18         |              |   |
| 00:59 <b>19</b>                 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: No, but   |       | 19         |              |   |
| 00:59 <b>20</b>                 | notwithstanding that you're coming back, I don't                      |       | 20         |              |   |
| 00:59 <b>21</b>                 | think that we should extend it beyond what is                         |       | 21         |              |   |
| 00:59 22                        | necessary, so people who already made comments, I                     |       | 22         |              |   |
| 00:59 <b>23</b>                 | think we should have well, we probably have about                     |       | 23         |              |   |
| 00:59 <b>24</b>                 | 15 people that still need to make comments, and,                      |       | 24         |              |   |
| 00:59 <b>25</b>                 | Mr. Delia, you want to say something to the board.                    |       | 25         |              |   |
|                                 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                              |       |            | LAU          | JRA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                            |
|                                 | 201-641-1812  |       |            |              | 201-641-1812  |
|                                 | 198   |       |            |              | 200   |
| 00:59 <b>1</b>                  | MR. DELIA: Yes, and that's going to be                                |       | 1          |              | CERTIFICATION   |
| 00:59 <b>2</b>                  | a while.  |       | 2          |              |   |
| 00:59 <b>3</b>                  | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. I'm going                                  |       | 4          | ī            | KIM O. FURBACHER, License No.                                     |
| 00:59 <b>4</b>                  | to ask our Chairwoman, Ms. Hembree, do you want to                    |       | 5          |              | Certified Court Reporter, Registered Merit                        |
| 01:00 <b>5</b>                  | hear this on the 23rd, and, Mr. Delia, does that work                 |       | 6          |              | ertified Realtime Court Reporter, and                             |
| 01:00 6                         | for you?  |       | 7          | Notary Publi | ic of the State of New Jersey, hereby                             |
| 01:00 7                         | MR. DELIA: It does.   |       | 8          | •            | the foregoing is a verbatim record of                             |
| 01:00 8                         | CHAIRWOMAN HEMBREE: It's fine with me.                                |       | 9          |              | ny provided under oath before any court,                          |
| 01:00 9                         | Can everybody be here?  |       | 10<br>11   |              | ord, commission or other body created by the State of New Jersey. |
| 01:00 <b>10</b>                 | MR. NEWMAN: Wouldn't miss it for the                                  |       | 12         |              | am not related to the parties                                     |
| 01:00 11                        | world actually for the world, I would.                                |       | 13         |              | this action; I have no financial                                  |
| 01:00 12                        | MR. PRINCIOTTO: All right. So for the                                 |       | 14         |              | r am I related to an agent of or employed                         |
| 01:00 <b>13</b> 01:00 <b>14</b> | record, you're going to extend the time, Mr. Delia<br>MR. DELIA: Yes. |       | 15         | by anyone v  | vith a financial interest in the outcome of                       |
| 01:00 14                        | MR. PRINCIOTTO: to the 23rd?  |       | 16         | this action. |   |
| 01:00 15                        | MR. DELIA: Yes.   |       | 17         |              | nis transcript complies with                                      |
| 01:00 17                        | Can we have quiet so we can finish                                    |       | 18<br>19   | _            | 13:43-5.9 of the New Jersey Administrative                        |
| 01:00 17                        | this, please.   |       | 19<br>20   | Code.        |   |
| 01:00 19                        | July 23rd, 7:30, in this room. No                                     |       | 21         |              |   |
| 01:00 <b>20</b>                 | further notice is needed.   |       | 22         | _            |   |
| 01:00 <b>21</b>                 | MR. PRINCIOTTO: Actually we should                                    |       |            | KI           | M O. FURBACHER, CRCR, CCR, RMR                                    |
| 01:00 21                        | start earlier, if we could.   |       | 23         |              | cense #XIO1042, and Notary Public                                 |
| 01:00 <b>23</b>                 | MR. DELIA: We'll be first on the                                      |       | <b>.</b> . | of           | New Jersey  |
| 01:00 <b>24</b>                 | agenda.   |       | 24         | My Carrer    | sian Evniros  |
| 01:00 <b>25</b>                 | MR. HAYES: I will not be able to start                                |       | 25         | 7/11/19      | sion Expires:   |
|                                 | LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                              |       | _5         |              | JRA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.                            |
|                                 | 201-641-1812  |       |            |              | 201-641-1812  |
| I .                             | 10:20:E1 DM Page 107 to   | 1     |            |              | E0 of 77 shoot  |

| #  | <b>13th</b> [1] - 148:22<br>- <b>14</b> [4] - 3:12, 53:1, | 59:20, 59:24, 64:20, 65:19, 67:7, 94:12      | <b>3,000-square-foot</b> [3] - 52:1, 53:7, 56:5 | 6th [1] - 127:22                |
|--|---|--|---|---------------------------------|
|  | 53:3, 97:16   | 201-641-1812 [2] -                           | <b>30</b> [1] - 30:19                           | 7                               |
| #XIO1042 [1] - 200:23  | <b>141</b> [2] - 4:4                                      | 1:24, 2:24                                   | <b>33-41</b> [1] - 18:20                        |                                 |
|  | <b>143</b> [1] - 5:17                                     | 201-843-0515 [2] -                           | <b>34</b> [2] - 114:10, 135:14                  |                                 |
| •  | <b>145</b> [1] - 4:6                                      | 1:25, 2:25                                   | <b>35</b> [1] - 188:8                           | <b>7</b> [6] - 3:13, 4:8, 4:12, |
|  | <b>15</b> [4] - 16:5, 160:5,                              | <b>2010</b> [1] - 149:18                     | <b>36</b> [1] - 38:22                           | 17:2, 102:14, 126:9             |
|  | 165:12, 197:24  | <b>2012</b> [7] - 41:11,                     | <b>37</b> [1] - 121:20                          | <b>7/11/19</b> [1] - 200:25     |
| <b>'02</b> [3] - 65:2, 67:8                                  | <b>157,174</b> [1] - 4:7                                  | 41:25, 42:24, 46:25,                         | <b>39</b> [1] - 3:6                             | <b>7:30</b> [2] - 198:19,       |
| <b>'08</b> [3] - 63:22, 76:24,                               | <b>16</b> [5] - 96:7, 102:11,                             | 60:2, 65:19, 66:2                            | <b>35</b> [1] - 3.0                             | 199:2                           |
| 77:4   | 103:10, 104:9,  | <b>2015</b> [1] - 20:11                      | 4   | <b>7:41</b> [1] - 1:3           |
| <b>'70s</b> [1] - 50:15                                      | 182:25  | <b>2016</b> [4] - 44:1, 60:4,                | 4   | 7th [1] - 152:5                 |
| <b>'80s</b> [2] - 50:11, 50:15                               |   | 101:4, 183:7                                 |   |                                 |
|  | <b>16.9</b> [1] - 101:17                                  | <b>2017</b> [9] - 44:1, 44:3,                | <b>4,041</b> [1] - 150:23                       | 8                               |
| 0  | <b>160</b> [1] - 4:9                                      | 45:3, 88:7, 88:12,                           | <b>4,500</b> [1] - 127:18                       |                                 |
|  | <b>160,167</b> [1] - 4:9                                  | 101:5, 183:3, 183:9,                         | <b>40</b> [1] - 68:10                           |                                 |
| 07000 40-04  | <b>162</b> [1] - 5:18                                     | 183:16                                       | 40-something [1] -                              | <b>8</b> [1] - 59:24            |
| <b>07039</b> [1] - 18:21                                     | <b>165</b> [1] - 5:19                                     |  | 63:10   | <b>8/20/18</b> [1] - 5:7        |
| <b>07071</b> [2] - 114:11,                                   | <b>17</b> [10] - 2:7, 5:4, 5:6,                           | <b>2018</b> [26] - 16:3, 16:5,               | <b>40:55D-89</b> [2] - 61:4,                    | <b>8/29/18</b> [1] - 5:9        |
| 135:15   | 5:7, 5:9, 5:10, 5:12,                                     | 16:7, 16:10, 16:13,                          | 66:21   | <b>80,000</b> [1] - 179:12      |
| <b>07653-1827</b> [1] - 2:8                                  | 5:13, 5:14, 182:25  | 17:1, 17:2, 21:25,<br>45:21, 64:9, 88:14,    | 40:55D-89.1 [1] -                               | 800-square-foot [2] -           |
| <b>07663</b> [2] - 1:24, 2:24                                | <b>170</b> [1] - 4:10                                     | 92:22, 93:6, 94:13,                          | 60:25   | 52:3, 54:3                      |
| 4  | <b>17th</b> [1] - 120:16                                  | 107:19, 108:14,                              | <b>41</b> [1] - 3:5                             | <b>82</b> [1] - 11:13           |
| 1  | <b>18</b> [9] - 3:4, 3:5, 3:10,                           | 108:17, 108:23,                              | <b>450</b> [1] - 128:13                         | <b>85</b> [1] - 11:15           |
|  | 3:16, 3:20, 4:9, 4:11,                                    | 109:5, 109:10,                               | <b>48</b> [1] - 3:6                             | <b>86</b> [1] - 3:6             |
| <b>1</b> [7] - 1:15, 16:3,                                   | 92:15, 160:17   | 126:9, 127:8,                                | 4th [2] - 127:18,                               | <b>88</b> [1] - 3:7             |
| 35:10, 42:7, 147:18,   | <b>182</b> [1] - 4:12                                     | 136:17, 148:22,                              | 151:19  |                                 |
| 149:23, 173:18   | <b>1827</b> [1] - 2:8                                     | 151:16, 151:20                               | 131.19  | 9                               |
| <b>10</b> [5] - 3:15, 67:10,                                 | <b>187</b> [1] - 4:13                                     | <b>2019</b> [4] - 1:2, 16:17,                | 5   |                                 |
| 94:13, 126:16, 127:5   | <b>188</b> [16] - 1:5, 1:6, 6:2,                          | 22:11, 161:2                                 | J   | 0 m 2:2 120:20                  |
| 10-and-a-half [1] -  | 14:8, 14:10, 95:4,  | <b>209</b> [1] - 4:14                        |   | <b>9</b> [2] - 3:3, 129:20      |
| 87:16  | 96:24, 97:6, 142:1,                                       | <b>20th</b> [2] - 16:7, 163:7                | <b>5</b> [1] - 129:20                           | 9-and-a-half [1] -              |
| <b>100</b> [5] - 3:12, 33:16,                                | 158:2, 158:3, 158:4,                                      | <b>210</b> [4] - 3:3, 4:5, 9:16,             | <b>5,500</b> [1] - 127:21                       | 94:13                           |
| 86:4, 104:2, 104:8   | 163:22, 163:23,   | 141:21                                       | 5-minute [1] - 89:13                            | <b>90</b> [2] - 3:8, 3:8        |
| 100-percent [2] -  | 165:13, 167:17  | <b>22</b> [2] - 40:21, 129:3                 | <b>5.3</b> [1] - 102:5                          | <b>92</b> [1] - 3:9             |
| 85:18, 86:21   | <b>19-05</b> [1] - 105:18                                 | <b>23</b> [3] - 3:14, 4:6,                   | <b>50</b> [2] - 117:17, 121:18                  | <b>96</b> [2] - 3:10, 3:11      |
| 100-years-old [1] -  | <b>1980</b> [1] - 71:22                                   | 107:2  | 50-percent [2] - 6:15,                          | 9:00 [1] - 130:4                |
| 188:17   | <b>1980s</b> [1] - 29:13                                  | <b>23rd</b> [6] - 16:13,                     | 8:10  | <b>9:30</b> [1] - 89:2          |
| <b>107</b> [1] - 3:13  | <b>1981</b> [1] - 19:14                                   | 197:16, 198:5,                               | <b>505</b> [2] - 1:23, 2:23                     | _                               |
| <b>10:00</b> [1] - 113:18                                    | <b>1984</b> [1] - 19:15                                   | · ·  | <b>550</b> [1] - 128:13                         | A                               |
| <b>10:30</b> [1] - 140:22                                    | <b>1986</b> [1] - 20:2                                    | 198:15, 198:19,<br>199:3                     | <b>56</b> [1] - 3:5                             |                                 |
| <b>11</b> [1] - 87:16  | _   |  | <b>58</b> [1] - 39:22                           | <b>A-18</b> [1] - 92:10         |
| <b>11/23/18</b> [1] - 5:10                                   | 2   | <b>24</b> [4] - 7:25, 96:8,<br>128:7, 129:17 | <b>59</b> [1] - 3:7                             | <b>A-8</b> [3] - 26:2, 91:9,    |
| <b>111</b> [3] - 3:9, 3:14,                                  |   | <b>24-hour</b> [6] - 126:11,                 |   | 92:11                           |
| 3:15   | <b>2</b> [9] - 1:16, 41:10,                               | 126:17, 127:19,                              | 6   | ability [2] - 24:18,            |
| <b>114</b> [2] - 3:17, 3:18                                  | 42:5, 42:18, 60:2,  | 120.17, 127.19, 127:24, 130:22,              |   | 82:19                           |
| <b>11:30</b> [4] - 140:25,                                   | 74:12, 147:18,  | 154:4  |   | able [10] - 17:25, 21:9         |
| 181:12, 197:1  | 149:23, 173:19  | <b>25</b> [2] - 1:2, 96:8                    | <b>6</b> [3] - 42:24, 102:14,                   | 24:18, 26:17, 28:19             |
| <b>11:33</b> [1] - 199:6                                     | <b>2.4</b> [1] - 102:11                                   | <b>27</b> [2] - 3:9, 90:22                   | 151:19  | 57:16, 77:25, 111:7             |
|  | <b>2.45</b> [1] - 95:13                                   |  | <b>6/1/18</b> [1] - 5:4                         | 119:1, 198:25                   |
| <b>12</b> [1] - 2:7  | <b>20</b> [5] - 16:16, 22:10,                             | 2701/Lot [1] - 1:6                           | <b>6/15/18</b> [1] - 5:6                        | absence [3] - 28:3,             |
| <b>125</b> [1] - 5:16  | 115:3, 136:17, 181:1                                      | <b>28th</b> [1] - 151:19                     | <b>6/20/19</b> [1] - 5:12                       | 49:10, 61:2                     |
| <b>128</b> [1] - 3:18  |   | <b>29</b> [3] - 16:10, 21:25,                | <b>60</b> [5] - 63:10, 99:1,                    | absolutely [8] - 12:1,          |
| <b>12th</b> [1] - 151:19                                     | <b>200</b> [7] - 14:7, 14:10,                             | 121:19                                       | 121:3, 126:10, 151:8                            | 24:22, 49:20, 50:23             |
| <b>13</b> [4] - 17:1, 89:8,                                  | 110:13, 110:18,   | 2  | <b>60-unit</b> [1] - 97:7                       | 100:21, 172:3,                  |
| 110:13, 127:8  | 113:6, 140:11, 156:6                                      | 3  | <b>600</b> [2] - 126:10,                        | 175:25, 187:8                   |
| <b>131</b> [2] - 3:19, 3:19                                  | <b>2002</b> [6] - 31:3, 39:17,                            |  | 151:14  | accepted [2] - 80:22,           |
| <b>133</b> [1] - 3:23  | 40:2, 40:20, 57:4,  | <b>3</b> [3] - 1:6, 147:18,                  | <b>62</b> [2] - 52:25, 55:1                     | 81:4                            |
| <b>134</b> [1] - 3:20  | 59:14<br>2008 (42) - 31:4 40:10                           | 149:23                                       | <b>65</b> [1] - 3:11                            | access [3] - 28:18,             |
| <b>135</b> [2] - 3:22, 3:22<br><b>13:43-5.9</b> [1] - 200:18 | <b>2008</b> [13] - 31:4, 40:19, 41:6, 46:24, 57:8,        | <b>3,000</b> [1] - 53:25                     | <b>66</b> [1] - 121:18                          | 116:4, 123:10                   |
|  |   |  |   |                                 |

| 200000ible to: 60:25    |
|-------------------------|
| accessible [2] - 68:25, |
| 69:2                    |
| accidents [2] -         |
| 191:23, 193:8           |
| accommodated [1] -      |
| 49:16                   |
| accommodating [1] -     |
| 38:22                   |
| accomplished [1] -      |
| 60:16                   |
| accordance [1] -        |
| 66:21                   |
| account [2] - 98:10,    |
| 117:18                  |
| accurate [1] - 153:2    |
| accurately [1] -        |
| 165:24                  |
| acknowledged [2] -      |
| 154:9, 154:11           |
| acknowledgment [1] -    |
|                         |
| 93:20                   |
| acre [5] - 101:16,      |
| 102:5, 102:13,          |
| 102:15, 182:25          |
| acres [2] - 95:13,      |
| 102:12                  |
| act [1] - 6:23          |
| action [5] - 80:8,      |
| 87:13, 103:7,           |
| 200:13, 200:16          |
| actions [9] - 39:13,    |
| 46:12, 87:20, 98:6,     |
| 98:21, 103:5,           |
| 103:12, 104:15,         |
| 178:25                  |
| active [1] - 93:6       |
| activity [1] - 130:7    |
|                         |
| actual [7] - 59:9,      |
| 115:25, 130:20,         |
| 162:22, 177:19,         |
| 177:24, 190:10          |
| acutely [1] - 89:1      |
| <b>ad</b> [1] - 183:10  |
| <b>ADA</b> [1] - 138:15 |
| add [7] - 24:20, 24:23, |
| 25:21, 53:11, 145:1,    |
| 186:1, 191:22           |
| added [3] - 35:18,      |
| 107:11, 171:23          |
| adding [2] - 25:8,      |
| 97:24                   |
| addition [5] - 24:16,   |
| 26:13, 29:14, 42:14,    |
| 99:1                    |
|                         |
| additional [11] - 34:8, |
| 78:11, 80:25,           |
| 107:10, 121:4,          |
| 121:10, 185:15,         |
| 188:19, 192:5, 193:5    |
| additionally [1] -      |

| 127:17  |
|---|
| 137:17 <b>address</b> [14] - 14:15,             |
| 22:17, 28:14, 29:8,                             |
| 30:17, 36:1, 36:21,                             |
| 37:23, 54:25, 90:20,                            |
| 104:14, 104:15,<br>136:24, 195:22               |
| addressed [3] - 65:22,                          |
| 65:24, 194:24                                   |
| addressing [1] - 23:13                          |
| adequate [1] - 117:19                           |
| adhered [1] - 183:1                             |
| <b>ADJUSTMENT</b> [2] - 1:2, 1:9                |
| adjustments [1] -                               |
| 175:11  |
| Administration's [1] -                          |
| 149:17 Administrative [1] -                     |
| 200:18  |
| administrative [1] -                            |
| 178:3   |
| admit [1] - 58:4                                |
| adopt [1] - 33:25                               |
| <b>adopted</b> [10] - 32:20, 32:21, 33:8, 34:3, |
| 60:14, 76:7, 81:14,                             |
| 99:20, 107:19,                                  |
| 180:13  |
| adopting [1] - 32:25                            |
| <b>adoption</b> [2] - 61:2,<br>107:16           |
| advance [1] - 14:3                              |
| advanced [1] - 31:13                            |
| advances [1] - 32:3                             |
| advantage [1] - 36:25                           |
| advised [1] - 80:21                             |
| aesthetics [1] - 91:7<br>affect [1] - 138:18    |
| affected [2] - 12:24,                           |
| 175:18  |
| <b>affirm</b> [5] - 18:16,                      |
| 114:6, 135:10,                                  |
| 141:17, 160:13<br>affordable [50] -             |
| 19:21, 25:20, 32:14,                            |
| 33:17, 33:25, 34:9,                             |
| 34:15, 68:5, 68:11,                             |
| 68:13, 68:15, 80:14,                            |
| 81:1, 81:9, 81:15,<br>82:18, 83:18, 85:12,      |
| 85:16, 85:18, 86:4,                             |
| 86:13, 86:21, 88:8,                             |
| 95:3, 95:9, 95:20,                              |
| 99:5, 99:13, 99:21,                             |
| 99:25, 101:21,                                  |

102:7, 102:11,

103:6, 103:8,

103:11, 104:8,

104:10, 105:18,

| 170:18, 180:14,                   |
|-----------------------------------|
| 180:21, 184:10,                   |
| 184:13, 185:8,                    |
| 185:12, 185:21,                   |
| 185:24, 186:1                     |
| <b>Affordable</b> [1] - 99:20     |
| afield [1] - 120:5                |
| <b>afraid</b> [1] - 93:3          |
| afternoon [1] - 122:1             |
| <b>age</b> [1] - 63:14            |
| <b>agenda</b> [2] - 183:8,        |
| 198:24                            |
| agent [1] - 200:14                |
| aggravate [1] - 189:2             |
| aging [4] - 63:4, 63:9,           |
| 64:2, 64:12                       |
| <b>ago</b> [4] - 7:22, 63:10,     |
| 72:9, 189:11                      |
| agree [17] - 26:15,               |
| 27:6, 33:15, 37:7,                |
| 38:9, 51:12, 54:15,               |
| 54:17, 60:5, 66:9,                |
| 73:4, 74:8, 77:3,                 |
| 77:5, 78:13, 187:5,<br>187:7      |
| agreed [5] - 8:7, 33:7,           |
| 45:14, 136:24, 188:4              |
| Agreement [1] - 5:13              |
| agreement [8] - 16:19,            |
| 45:15, 80:11,                     |
| 103:20, 183:18,                   |
| 184:21, 186:3, 186:4              |
| ahead [1] - 21:19                 |
| <b>AICP</b> [3] - 2:17, 3:4,      |
| 18:19                             |
| Albert [1] - 6:9                  |
| alerted [1] - 82:7                |
| <b>Alex</b> [5] - 3:9, 3:19,      |
| 4:10, 92:15, 168:23               |
| align [2] - 118:25,               |
| 120:3                             |
| alignment [1] - 116:23            |
| allegation [3] -                  |
| 159:12, 173:21,                   |
| 177:10                            |
| allegations [3] -                 |
| 174:3, 174:6, 174:9               |
| <b>alleged</b> [1] - 159:9        |
| alleges [1] - 173:12              |
| <b>allow</b> [15] - 23:22,        |
| 24:10, 24:20, 33:3,               |
| 33:25, 43:1, 43:12,               |
| 43:19, 44:5, 44:7,                |
| 46:5, 84:7, 103:16,               |
| 188:18, 194:2                     |
|                                   |
| allowed [6] - 25:24,              |
| 30:13, 38:21, 45:19,              |
| 30:13, 38:21, 45:19, 79:7, 179:14 |
| 30:13, 38:21, 45:19,              |

```
44:19, 45:11
allows [1] - 23:8
almost [3] - 23:2,
 84:13, 84:15
alone [1] - 41:14
ALTERNATE [2] -
 1:15, 1:16
alternative [1] -
 123:17
Alvin [3] - 4:13,
 187:25, 188:7
AM [1] - 121:18
ameliorated [1] -
 36:15
ameliorates [1] -
 120:1
amenable [1] - 122:15
amendment [6] -
 41:24, 46:2, 46:25,
 47:20, 65:21, 75:23
amendments [2] -
 20:10, 39:11
amenity [2] - 48:16,
 49:9
amount [4] - 14:3,
 36:10, 99:21, 110:24
amounts [1] - 36:8
ample [1] - 53:10
analysis [9] - 64:9,
 75:11, 190:12,
 192:20, 192:23,
 195:25, 196:4, 196:5
analyze [1] - 137:20
Ann [5] - 3:15, 4:9,
 133:4, 159:24,
 160:20
ANN [1] - 160:16
answer [19] - 27:18,
 50:3, 50:5, 56:6,
 57:16, 61:19, 64:3,
 69:24, 71:16, 72:21,
 86:10, 91:15, 99:9,
 100:2, 129:6, 130:8,
 130:12, 156:17,
 194:1
answered [6] - 62:14,
 64:2, 68:16, 73:24,
 98:1, 169:21
answers [1] - 64:5
antagonistic [1] -
 146:23
Anthony [3] - 16:4,
 17:3, 148:19
anyway [4] - 11:20,
 24:13, 78:4, 122:25
apartment [19] - 38:9,
 39:24, 48:20, 51:24,
 52:3, 54:4, 54:10,
```

55:2, 56:5, 97:8,

161:18, 161:19,

```
182:19, 183:13,
 187:3, 189:21,
 190:6, 190:23,
 194:18
apartments [14] -
 23:22, 23:24, 24:1,
 25:6, 26:13, 26:23,
 33:4, 42:18, 52:19,
 53:1, 53:3, 54:20,
 58:1, 133:10
Apartments [1] -
 42:18
appear [1] - 137:18
appearance [2] - 24:5,
 192:23
APPELLE [44] - 107:2,
 107:22, 108:6,
 145:14, 145:18,
 145:20, 146:1,
 146:4, 146:11,
 146:16, 146:20,
 147:18, 147:24,
 148:2, 149:7,
 149:12, 149:14,
 149:22, 150:1,
 150:7, 150:14,
 150:18, 150:22,
 151:3, 151:7,
 151:13, 151:18,
 151:23, 152:4,
 152:8, 152:11,
 152:22, 153:7,
 153:11, 153:16,
 154:3, 154:7,
 154:10, 154:19,
 155:1, 155:4,
 155:13, 155:19,
 156:2
Appelle [11] - 3:13,
 4:6, 5:14, 5:16,
 16:24, 107:2,
 125:15, 125:19,
 145:10, 145:11,
 156:1
Applause [2] - 187:17,
 196:25
Applicant [1] - 2:9
applicant [51] - 6:19,
 21:7, 21:18, 22:4,
 25:4, 25:22, 26:3,
 27:25, 28:9, 30:4,
 47:1, 49:17, 52:6,
 73:21, 82:7, 87:17,
 91:4, 91:8, 96:23,
 97:6, 98:2, 98:7,
 98:18, 99:2, 104:7,
 105:10, 120:24,
 121:8, 122:15,
 125:5, 136:21,
 151:5, 182:6, 184:6,
```

| 185:23, 186:5,               |
|------------------------------|
| 186:14, 189:18,              |
| 189:20, 190:1,               |
| 190:9, 192:3, 192:9,         |
| 192:12, 192:19,              |
| 193:11, 193:17,              |
| 194:4, 195:24, 196:3         |
| applicant's [13] -           |
| 118:10, 123:25,              |
| 128:4, 128:15,               |
| 128:23, 136:24,              |
| 137:9, 149:4, 149:6,         |
| 185:5, 187:7,                |
| 189:17, 194:17               |
| applicants [2] - 115:6       |
| 192:4                        |
| application [65] -           |
| 6:13, 8:12, 11:24,           |
| 11:25, 21:1, 39:7,           |
| 61:22, 72:4, 75:12,          |
| 79:2, 82:1, 82:6,            |
| 86:8, 86:10, 86:11,          |
| 86:13, 86:14, 90:25,         |
| 92:18, 93:7, 93:9,           |
| 93:10, 93:11, 93:12,         |
| 94:10, 94:20, 95:16,         |
| 96:6, 96:16, 106:19,         |
| 107:18, 107:25,              |
| 108:5, 115:21,               |
| 120:9, 120:10,               |
| 132:7, 132:10,               |
| 138:24, 140:19,              |
| 154:17, 170:21,              |
| 171:7, 171:11,               |
| 171:14, 171:24,              |
| 173:25, 176:15,              |
| 178:16, 179:1,               |
| 179:20, 179:22,              |
| 182:3, 182:17,               |
| 183:23, 185:25,              |
| 186:23, 192:18,              |
| 193:1, 193:6,                |
| 194:12, 194:22,              |
| 196:11, 196:22               |
| applications [5] -           |
| 20:5, 95:23, 96:7,           |
| 197:17                       |
| applied [1] - 86:4           |
| apply [8] - 12:14,           |
| 12:25, 17:18, 93:5,          |
| 93:18, 93:21, 93:24,         |
| 94:16                        |
| appointed [2] -              |
| 106:14, 183:15               |
| <b>appraiser</b> [1] - 26:17 |
| appreciably [1] -            |
| 82:14                        |
| appreciate [1] -             |
| 177:16                       |
| appreciated [1] -            |
|                              |

| 197:15   |
|--|
| approach [3] - 117:22,                                 |
| 118:21, 135:2  |
| <b>appropriate</b> [7] - 6:7, 28:25, 36:1, 41:1,       |
| 66:7, 73:9, 78:18                                      |
| approval [8] - 7:24,                                   |
| 118:8, 131:7, 138:3,                                   |
| 138:4, 138:10,<br>138:25, 139:4                        |
| approvals [1] - 175:11                                 |
| approve [3] - 82:8,                                    |
| 184:4, 187:4   |
| approved [2] - 82:11,                                  |
| 122:17   |
| approves [1] - 120:10<br>approximate [1] -             |
| 162:23   |
| <b>April</b> [7] - 92:22,                              |
| 160:25, 162:22,  |
| 162:23, 163:2, 163:7                                   |
| <b>architect</b> [11] - 6:8, 6:17, 7:24, 8:1, 8:2,     |
| 9:19, 10:3, 24:11,                                     |
| 28:4, 44:5, 173:13                                     |
| architect's [1] -                                      |
| 164:13   |
| <b>Architects</b> [3] - 43:22, 44:4, 44:12             |
| architectural [3] -                                    |
| 8:20, 22:21, 75:20                                     |
| architecture [3] - 24:7,                               |
| 29:24, 138:20  |
| <b>Area</b> [1] - 35:9 <b>area</b> [22] - 23:20, 33:1, |
| 33:9, 33:11, 33:13,                                    |
| 33:14, 33:18, 35:10,                                   |
| 36:25, 38:23, 41:2,                                    |
| 46:6, 49:2, 49:15,                                     |
| 79:20, 82:21, 83:2, 84:5, 161:16, 184:5,               |
| 185:9  |
| areas [2] - 35:13,                                     |
| 96:13  |
| arguably [1] - 188:21                                  |
| argue [3] - 84:23,<br>178:13                           |
| argued [1] - 146:20                                    |
| arguing [2] - 146:21,                                  |
| 154:1  |
| argument [14] - 23:2,                                  |
| 30:10, 61:17, 61:21, 61:23, 62:5, 62:7,                |
|  |
| 13.10, 14.3, 134.13.                                   |
| 73:16, 74:5, 154:13, 185:21, 185:24,                   |
|  |

```
167:16, 167:17,
 167:18, 167:24,
 168:1
ascertained [1] -
 120:17
aside [17] - 23:3,
 27:14, 44:24, 62:22,
 81:9, 81:23, 82:1,
 82:9, 82:24, 95:9,
 95:11, 105:11,
 105:22, 184:20,
 184:23, 186:2
askew [1] - 116:20
aspect [3] - 49:14,
 77:24, 92:3
aspects [6] - 21:1,
 22:19, 27:19, 97:12,
 116:13, 182:5
aspirational [3] -
 102:19, 102:25,
 104:12
assess [1] - 192:3
assigned [2] - 95:2,
 192:14
assist [2] - 32:8, 34:9
associated [4] - 50:1,
 190:10, 192:6,
 196:13
Associates [8] - 5:7,
 16:6, 40:19, 41:11,
 114:10, 114:18,
 135:14, 136:2
ASSOCIATES [1] -
 2:14
assume [3] - 23:5,
 25:6, 170:13
assumes [1] - 193:17
assuming [4] - 23:21,
 24:13, 26:10, 26:11
assumption [1] -
 196:5
assumptions [1] -
 190:2
AT [1] - 1:3
attached [3] - 16:24,
 159:13, 173:23
attachment [1] -
 147:21
attachments [6] -
 5:14, 125:20, 148:9,
 157:13, 157:17
attempted [1] - 73:3
attempting [1] - 176:7
attended [1] - 7:23
attention [1] - 122:16
attorney [5] - 106:10,
 106:14, 175:3,
```

arrive [1] - 110:10

arrived [1] - 113:9

article [6] - 167:15,

146:19, 188:3, 188:6

arrangements [1] -

8:6

177:19, 186:9 attract [1] - 27:10 attractive [3] - 28:11, 49:19, 56:10 attrition [1] - 73:11 **AUDIENCE** [15] - 89:8, 111:4, 111:15, 111:18, 156:23, 165:18, 172:19, 179:8, 179:10, 180:10, 180:14, 181:3, 181:7, 181:9, 196:24 August [9] - 16:7, 16:10, 17:2, 21:25, 41:25, 42:24, 126:9, 136:17, 152:5 authority [1] - 178:7 authorized [1] - 181:2 auto [1] - 117:5 avail [1] - 117:7 Avenue [9] - 3:9, 3:11, 90:22, 114:10, 127:9, 135:14, 150:23, 151:6, 188:20 average [2] - 51:22, 53:25 average-sized [1] -51:22 avocation [1] - 99:7 avoid [3] - 116:16, 123:24, 192:23 aware [12] - 44:18, 88:11, 88:13, 88:21, 89:2, 101:21, 101:23, 102:1, 102:2, 105:13, 110:25, 152:2 awareness [1] - 87:18 В

B-1 [14] - 39:21, 39:23, 40:7, 40:24, 40:25, 42:11, 42:15, 42:21, 43:11, 43:14, 45:19, 45:23, 57:2, 57:11 **B-2** [1] - 40:24 **B-3** [1] - 40:24 bachelor's [3] - 19:24, 115:2, 136:8 backed [1] - 188:22 background [7] -19:4, 19:6, 19:23, 22:6, 46:4, 98:4, 114:23 backtracking [1] -187:6

backup [2] - 124:19, 189:3 backwashes [1] -122:12 backyard [1] - 165:13 backyards [1] -161:18 bad [2] - 176:4, 189:16 bars [1] - 27:10 based [6] - 45:8, 78:18, 127:5, 136:20, 185:6, 197:7 baseline [2] - 190:11, 190:17 **basic** [1] - 195:2 basis [4] - 126:17, 179:4, 180:15, 183:13 bear [3] - 10:19, 65:2, 191:19 beautification [1] -107:5 became [1] - 44:18 become [2] - 19:22, 64:18 becomes [1] - 56:10 bedroom [10] - 38:4, 38:5, 38:9, 49:7, 51:24, 52:9, 53:8, 54:10, 54:19, 56:5 beg [2] - 76:5, 183:4 began [1] - 44:1 begin [3] - 7:20, 15:4, 15:7 beginning [6] - 72:3, 101:11, 112:17, 146:17, 152:23, 160:25 behalf [1] - 115:18 behavior [1] - 123:2 behind [6] - 15:13, 23:18, 24:15, 24:17, 141:25, 164:17 **BEING** [1] - 1:9 belabor [1] - 126:2 believes [2] - 189:18, 189:20 bell [1] - 130:22 belongs [2] - 124:1, 124:14 below [2] - 23:18, 164:21 bend [1] - 118:22 beneficial [4] - 85:13, 85:18, 85:21, 190:3 benefit [7] - 19:4, 21:6, 34:8, 34:11,

51:9, 114:23, 186:13

12:11, 12:17, 28:22

benefits [4] - 12:4,

| Bergen [11] - 35:13,  | 106:13, 107:6,   | 97:20, 98:22,   | 113:9, 113:17,   | 137:10, 195:23  |
|---|--|---|--|---|
| 64:22, 119:14,  | 107:7, 107:14,   | 103:25, 104:18,   | 114:15   | brush [1] - 10:12   |
|   | 107:15, 107:14,  | 105:4, 105:11,  |  |   |
| 119:16, 119:24,   |  | · ·   | BRIAN [2] - 2:15, 3:17   | brush-up [1] - 10:12  |
| 131:7, 132:11,  | 108:15, 108:20,  | 105:15, 108:25,   | brief [2] - 58:16, 89:18   | Bruziggi [1] - 9:24   |
| 132:21, 132:25,   | 109:7, 109:10,   | 136:4, 182:25,  | briefly [3] - 58:12,   | budget [1] - 14:3   |
| 136:6, 192:14   | 111:16, 111:19,  | 183:2, 183:12,  | 58:14, 135:21  | <b>buffer</b> [1] - 39:3  |
| best [7] - 63:12, 65:1,   | 115:14, 115:18,  | 184:10, 185:10  | <b>bring</b> [2] - 43:15,  | <b>buffers</b> [1] - 23:19  |
| 76:13, 134:13,  | 120:9, 120:18,   | BOROUGH [2] - 1:1,  | 122:16   | <b>build</b> [2] - 103:10,  |
| 147:1, 147:11,  | 122:5, 130:18,   | 1:9   | broad [1] - 66:16  | 104:8   |
| 155:22  | 135:6, 136:5, 138:1,   | Borough [4] - 40:18,  | <b>BROADWAY</b> [1] - 1:5  | building [50] - 23:17,  |
| better [3] - 32:2, 35:2,  | 138:3, 138:19,   | 115:15, 136:3, 186:6  | Broadway [89] - 1:6,   | 23:25, 24:4, 24:14,   |
| 55:13   | 143:25, 145:15,  | borough's [3] - 20:12,  | 3:3, 4:5, 6:2, 14:8,   | 24:16, 24:21, 24:23,  |
| between [11] - 16:19,   | 146:7, 148:4, 152:1,   | 90:11, 99:4   | 14:10, 25:3, 27:7,   | 25:11, 25:21, 25:22,  |
| 32:17, 36:23, 56:7,   | 152:15, 152:25,  | borough-owned [1] -   | 31:5, 32:12, 33:1,   | 27:23, 28:2, 28:5,  |
| 57:18, 71:7, 83:15,   | 153:1, 153:3, 153:6,   | 33:16   | 33:18, 34:4, 37:23,  | 38:22, 38:25, 48:17,  |
| 142:19, 156:16,   | 157:17, 173:14,  | Borrelli [5] - 3:15, 4:9,   | 39:10, 39:12, 39:23,   | 50:11, 50:22, 72:25,  |
| 175:13, 176:12  | 174:7, 174:11,   | 133:4, 159:24,  | 39:25, 41:8, 41:10,  | 73:25, 103:19,  |
| beyond [3] - 30:10,   | 174:12, 175:3,   | 160:20  | 41:24, 42:5, 43:6,   | 103:20, 104:1,  |
| 31:24, 197:21   | 175:5, 175:7,  | BORRELLI [53] -   | 43:20, 43:23, 44:6,  | 119:3, 130:5,   |
| <b>big</b> [2] - 26:10, 142:16  | 175:17, 175:21,  | 15:10, 15:15, 111:5,  | 44:20, 45:12, 45:17,   | 133:12, 142:2,  |
| bit [12] - 11:17, 13:24,  | 176:5, 176:13,   | 111:9, 133:4, 133:8,  | 46:25, 47:20, 52:25,   | 142:4, 143:18,  |
| 22:24, 30:17, 31:7,   | 176:23, 177:9,   | 133:14, 160:3,  | 55:1, 57:22, 59:18,  | 151:9, 151:24,  |
| 32:10, 74:10, 110:6,  | 178:5, 178:9,  | 160:11, 160:14,   | 60:1, 60:3, 65:6,  | 161:20, 163:21,   |
| 129:18, 130:14,   | 178:18, 178:24,  | 160:16, 160:21,   | 65:20, 68:1, 69:1,   | 164:1, 164:13,  |
| 143:4, 187:7  | 179:2, 179:10,   | 160:24, 161:2,  | 70:23, 71:8, 77:13,  | 164:14, 164:24,   |
| Block [1] - 1:6   | 179:21, 180:5,   | 161:9, 161:13,  | 78:16, 79:10, 80:9,  | 165:1, 165:2, 165:3,  |
| block [11] - 24:24,   | 180:7, 180:9,  | 161:15, 162:8,  | 83:20, 84:5, 87:12,  | 166:3, 172:6,   |
| 122:18, 123:5,  | 180:12, 180:21,  | 162:11, 162:21,   | 88:7, 96:24, 97:7,   | 174:25, 184:17,   |
| 123:7, 123:16,  | 181:20, 181:24,  | 162:24, 163:1,  | 100:12, 101:2,   | 186:17, 189:24,   |
| 123:24, 124:2,  | 184:19, 185:20,  | 163:8, 163:11,  | 104:11, 107:5,   | 190:8, 190:11,  |
| 124:17, 133:5,  | 186:9, 186:23,   | 163:14, 163:19,   | 107:10, 107:12,  | 194:25, 196:1   |
| 133:9, 135:3  | 193:1, 193:4,  | 163:23, 164:8,  | 110:14, 110:18,  | BUILDING [1] - 1:1  |
| blocked [1] - 189:9   | 195:19, 196:11,  | 164:12, 164:19,   | 116:3, 124:5, 124:6,   | buildings [7] - 50:14,  |
| blood [1] - 12:17   | 197:25, 200:10   | 165:1, 165:8,   | 124:7, 124:10,   | 58:4, 154:11,   |
| blown [1] - 66:11   | Board [12] - 2:5, 2:14,  | 165:11, 165:16,   | 124:19, 127:9,   | 186:16, 189:21,   |
| board [148] - 6:4, 8:11,  | 2:16, 2:18, 2:19, 3:6,   | 165:20, 166:1,  | 127:10, 127:19,  | 190:6, 194:18   |
| 9:20, 12:10, 12:12,   | 3:18, 3:23, 42:4,  | 166:8, 166:12,  | 127:20, 128:11,  | <b>built</b> [6] - 50:11,   |
| 12:16, 12:22, 13:6,   | 106:1, 131:8, 185:2  | 166:16, 166:21,   | 141:21, 148:21,  | 50:14, 104:3, 119:6,  |
|   | <b>BOARD</b> [2] - 1:2, 1:9  | 167:3, 167:6,   | 163:22, 165:13,  | 151:8, 151:23   |
| 13:25, 15:11, 15:13,<br>15:24, 16:14, 19:1,   | board's [1] - 13:22  | 167:13, 167:23,   | 180:11, 183:5,   | <b>bulk</b> [4] - 26:8, 38:14,  |
|   | boards [1] - 20:3  | 168:14, 168:19,   | 183:10, 183:14,  | 91:18, 92:2   |
| 19:2, 19:18, 19:19,   | bodies [2] - 153:10,   | 168:22, 169:1,  | 183:19, 185:17,  |   |
| 20:6, 20:7, 21:12,  | 153:13   | 169:5, 169:10,  | 186:10, 188:16,  | bunch [1] - 143:6   |
| 21:17, 22:5, 24:8,  | <b>body</b> [7] - 31:22,   | 169:13, 169:17,   | 188:20, 190:24,  | <b>burden</b> [5] - 29:16,  |
| 26:20, 29:2, 29:7,  | 46:10, 47:12, 48:2,  | 169:22  | 192:11, 192:16   | 86:19, 86:23, 182:7   |
| 29:11, 30:6, 31:14,   | 117:5, 184:3, 200:10   | Bosch [2] - 5:10,   | Broadway/Highview  | <b>bureau</b> [2] - 127:7,<br>152:25  |
| 31:21, 32:13, 34:5,   |  |   |  | 152.75  |
| 27.6 27.44 20.42  |  |   |  |   |
| 37:6, 37:11, 38:12,   | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12  | 16:12   | [1] - 188:24   | <b>Burgis</b> [14] - 29:9,  |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,  | <b>Bonnie</b> [2] - 3:13, 4:12 <b>book</b> [1] - 10:11   | 16:12<br><b>bottom</b> [1] - 191:14   | [1] - 188:24<br>Broadway/Prospect  | <b>Burgis</b> [14] - 29:9, 29:25, 30:18, 30:19,   |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,   | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15   | 16:12<br>bottom [1] - 191:14<br>bouncing [1] - 162:16   | [1] - 188:24<br>Broadway/Prospect<br>[1] - 188:23  | <b>Burgis</b> [14] - 29:9,<br>29:25, 30:18, 30:19,<br>34:17, 37:5, 40:19,   |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,   | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12   | 16:12<br>bottom [1] - 191:14<br>bouncing [1] - 162:16<br>bound [1] - 93:10  | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff   | Burgis [14] - 29:9,<br>29:25, 30:18, 30:19,<br>34:17, 37:5, 40:19,<br>41:11, 42:3, 48:14,   |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,   | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2   | 16:12<br>bottom [1] - 191:14<br>bouncing [1] - 162:16<br>bound [1] - 93:10<br>BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23  | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  | Burgis [14] - 29:9,<br>29:25, 30:18, 30:19,<br>34:17, 37:5, 40:19,<br>41:11, 42:3, 48:14,<br>50:20, 57:13, 58:13,   |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,<br>47:22, 48:5, 55:14,  | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2<br>borough [39] - 16:19,  | 16:12<br>bottom [1] - 191:14<br>bouncing [1] - 162:16<br>bound [1] - 93:10<br>BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23<br>box [9] - 122:18,   | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  broken [1] - 139:2  | Burgis [14] - 29:9,<br>29:25, 30:18, 30:19,<br>34:17, 37:5, 40:19,<br>41:11, 42:3, 48:14,<br>50:20, 57:13, 58:13,<br>67:24  |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,<br>47:22, 48:5, 55:14,<br>56:15, 58:10, 61:3,   | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2<br>borough [39] - 16:19,<br>19:20, 20:18, 25:17,  | 16:12<br>bottom [1] - 191:14<br>bouncing [1] - 162:16<br>bound [1] - 93:10<br>BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23<br>box [9] - 122:18,<br>123:6, 123:7,  | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  broken [1] - 139:2  broker [5] - 22:23,   | Burgis [14] - 29:9,<br>29:25, 30:18, 30:19,<br>34:17, 37:5, 40:19,<br>41:11, 42:3, 48:14,<br>50:20, 57:13, 58:13,<br>67:24<br>Burgis' [1] - 21:7  |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,<br>47:22, 48:5, 55:14,<br>56:15, 58:10, 61:3,<br>69:19, 70:16, 73:17,   | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2<br>borough [39] - 16:19,<br>19:20, 20:18, 25:17,<br>25:19, 30:21, 32:9,   | 16:12<br>bottom [1] - 191:14<br>bouncing [1] - 162:16<br>bound [1] - 93:10<br>BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23<br>box [9] - 122:18,<br>123:6, 123:7,<br>123:16, 124:2,  | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  broken [1] - 139:2  broker [5] - 22:23, 26:15, 26:16, 29:23,  | Burgis [14] - 29:9,<br>29:25, 30:18, 30:19,<br>34:17, 37:5, 40:19,<br>41:11, 42:3, 48:14,<br>50:20, 57:13, 58:13,<br>67:24<br>Burgis' [1] - 21:7<br>Burnidges [1] -   |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,<br>47:22, 48:5, 55:14,<br>56:15, 58:10, 61:3,<br>69:19, 70:16, 73:17,<br>73:20, 74:6, 76:20,  | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2<br>borough [39] - 16:19,<br>19:20, 20:18, 25:17,<br>25:19, 30:21, 32:9,<br>32:13, 32:17, 32:25,   | 16:12 bottom [1] - 191:14 bouncing [1] - 162:16 bound [1] - 93:10 BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23 box [9] - 122:18, 123:6, 123:7, 123:16, 124:2, 124:17, 133:5,  | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  broken [1] - 139:2  broker [5] - 22:23, 26:15, 26:16, 29:23, 187:8  | Burgis [14] - 29:9,<br>29:25, 30:18, 30:19,<br>34:17, 37:5, 40:19,<br>41:11, 42:3, 48:14,<br>50:20, 57:13, 58:13,<br>67:24<br>Burgis' [1] - 21:7<br>Burnidges [1] -<br>165:17   |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,<br>47:22, 48:5, 55:14,<br>56:15, 58:10, 61:3,<br>69:19, 70:16, 73:17,<br>73:20, 74:6, 76:20,<br>81:20, 82:7, 82:8,  | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2<br>borough [39] - 16:19,<br>19:20, 20:18, 25:17,<br>25:19, 30:21, 32:9,<br>32:13, 32:17, 32:25,<br>33:5, 33:15, 33:16,  | 16:12 bottom [1] - 191:14 bouncing [1] - 162:16 bound [1] - 93:10 BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23 box [9] - 122:18, 123:6, 123:7, 123:16, 124:2, 124:17, 133:5, 133:9, 135:3   | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  broken [1] - 139:2  broker [5] - 22:23, 26:15, 26:16, 29:23, 187:8  brokers [1] - 187:12  | Burgis [14] - 29:9,<br>29:25, 30:18, 30:19,<br>34:17, 37:5, 40:19,<br>41:11, 42:3, 48:14,<br>50:20, 57:13, 58:13,<br>67:24<br>Burgis' [1] - 21:7<br>Burnidges [1] -<br>165:17<br>business [2] - 77:13,                    |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,<br>47:22, 48:5, 55:14,<br>56:15, 58:10, 61:3,<br>69:19, 70:16, 73:17,<br>73:20, 74:6, 76:20,<br>81:20, 82:7, 82:8,<br>87:23, 97:1, 97:10,   | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2<br>borough [39] - 16:19,<br>19:20, 20:18, 25:17,<br>25:19, 30:21, 32:9,<br>32:13, 32:17, 32:25,<br>33:5, 33:15, 33:16,<br>33:19, 34:8, 34:13,   | 16:12 bottom [1] - 191:14 bouncing [1] - 162:16 bound [1] - 93:10 BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23 box [9] - 122:18, 123:6, 123:7, 123:16, 124:2, 124:17, 133:5, 133:9, 135:3 Box [1] - 2:8                               | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  broken [1] - 139:2  broker [5] - 22:23, 26:15, 26:16, 29:23, 187:8  brokers [1] - 187:12  BROOK [2] - 1:24,                           | Burgis [14] - 29:9,<br>29:25, 30:18, 30:19,<br>34:17, 37:5, 40:19,<br>41:11, 42:3, 48:14,<br>50:20, 57:13, 58:13,<br>67:24<br>Burgis' [1] - 21:7<br>Burnidges [1] -<br>165:17   |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,<br>47:22, 48:5, 55:14,<br>56:15, 58:10, 61:3,<br>69:19, 70:16, 73:17,<br>73:20, 74:6, 76:20,<br>81:20, 82:7, 82:8,<br>87:23, 97:1, 97:10,<br>97:12, 97:19, 98:3,                        | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2<br>borough [39] - 16:19,<br>19:20, 20:18, 25:17,<br>25:19, 30:21, 32:9,<br>32:13, 32:17, 32:25,<br>33:5, 33:15, 33:16,<br>33:19, 34:8, 34:13,<br>39:13, 42:11, 44:17,                         | 16:12 bottom [1] - 191:14 bouncing [1] - 162:16 bound [1] - 93:10 BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23 box [9] - 122:18, 123:6, 123:7, 123:16, 124:2, 124:17, 133:5, 133:9, 135:3 Box [1] - 2:8 break [3] - 87:5, 89:2,       | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  broken [1] - 139:2  broker [5] - 22:23, 26:15, 26:16, 29:23, 187:8  brokers [1] - 187:12  BROOK [2] - 1:24, 2:24                      | Burgis [14] - 29:9, 29:25, 30:18, 30:19, 34:17, 37:5, 40:19, 41:11, 42:3, 48:14, 50:20, 57:13, 58:13, 67:24 Burgis' [1] - 21:7 Burnidges [1] - 165:17 business [2] - 77:13, 148:23 but [1] - 113:15                       |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,<br>47:22, 48:5, 55:14,<br>56:15, 58:10, 61:3,<br>69:19, 70:16, 73:17,<br>73:20, 74:6, 76:20,<br>81:20, 82:7, 82:8,<br>87:23, 97:1, 97:10,<br>97:12, 97:19, 98:3,<br>98:7, 98:16, 98:24, | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2<br>borough [39] - 16:19,<br>19:20, 20:18, 25:17,<br>25:19, 30:21, 32:9,<br>32:13, 32:17, 32:25,<br>33:5, 33:15, 33:16,<br>33:19, 34:8, 34:13,<br>39:13, 42:11, 44:17,<br>47:25, 67:12, 76:10, | 16:12 bottom [1] - 191:14 bouncing [1] - 162:16 bound [1] - 93:10 BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23 box [9] - 122:18, 123:6, 123:7, 123:16, 124:2, 124:17, 133:5, 133:9, 135:3 Box [1] - 2:8 break [3] - 87:5, 89:2, 89:13 | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  broken [1] - 139:2  broker [5] - 22:23, 26:15, 26:16, 29:23, 187:8  brokers [1] - 187:12  BROOK [2] - 1:24, 2:24  brought [6] - 75:6, | Burgis [14] - 29:9, 29:25, 30:18, 30:19, 34:17, 37:5, 40:19, 41:11, 42:3, 48:14, 50:20, 57:13, 58:13, 67:24 Burgis' [1] - 21:7 Burnidges [1] - 165:17 business [2] - 77:13, 148:23 but [1] - 113:15 BY [27] - 2:7, 18:24, |
| 40:3, 42:4, 42:23,<br>43:15, 46:9, 46:21,<br>46:24, 47:1, 47:5,<br>47:6, 47:8, 47:11,<br>47:22, 48:5, 55:14,<br>56:15, 58:10, 61:3,<br>69:19, 70:16, 73:17,<br>73:20, 74:6, 76:20,<br>81:20, 82:7, 82:8,<br>87:23, 97:1, 97:10,<br>97:12, 97:19, 98:3,                        | Bonnie [2] - 3:13, 4:12<br>book [1] - 10:11<br>boost [1] - 77:15<br>booth [1] - 180:12<br>borne [1] - 26:2<br>borough [39] - 16:19,<br>19:20, 20:18, 25:17,<br>25:19, 30:21, 32:9,<br>32:13, 32:17, 32:25,<br>33:5, 33:15, 33:16,<br>33:19, 34:8, 34:13,<br>39:13, 42:11, 44:17,                         | 16:12 bottom [1] - 191:14 bouncing [1] - 162:16 bound [1] - 93:10 BOX [2] - 1:23, 2:23 box [9] - 122:18, 123:6, 123:7, 123:16, 124:2, 124:17, 133:5, 133:9, 135:3 Box [1] - 2:8 break [3] - 87:5, 89:2,       | [1] - 188:24  Broadway/Prospect [1] - 188:23  Broadway/Woodcliff [1] - 188:23  broken [1] - 139:2  broker [5] - 22:23, 26:15, 26:16, 29:23, 187:8  brokers [1] - 187:12  BROOK [2] - 1:24, 2:24                      | Burgis [14] - 29:9, 29:25, 30:18, 30:19, 34:17, 37:5, 40:19, 41:11, 42:3, 48:14, 50:20, 57:13, 58:13, 67:24 Burgis' [1] - 21:7 Burnidges [1] - 165:17 business [2] - 77:13, 148:23 but [1] - 113:15                       |

63:16, 64:13, 66:19, 69:9, 69:17, 70:2, 72:24, 76:22, 78:24, 80:20, 85:11, 86:2, 88:5, 114:21, 115:13, 118:19, 124:8, 125:17, 126:3, 134:8, 135:18, 136:15 bypass [1] - 191:25

## С

C.S.R [2] - 1:22, 2:22 c/o [3] - 18:19, 114:9, 135:13 Cabrera [2] - 3:11, 97:16 CABRERA [7] - 97:16, 97:24, 98:9, 98:25, 99:12, 99:15, 100:3 calculation [1] -126:20 Campbell [3] - 3:9, 3:11, 90:22 cannot [2] - 51:5, 66:7 capacity [2] - 176:9, 176:14 car [3] - 69:7, 69:10, 189:11 care [2] - 122:19, 123.9 carefully [1] - 14:14 Carlos [1] - 177:2 cars [4] - 121:4, 154:23, 190:23, 193:17 CARUCCI [2] - 1:22, 2:22 case [19] - 13:11, 24:1, 28:9, 31:20, 51:11, 60:17, 73:2, 73:16, 74:5, 74:7, 83:22, 94:21, 103:8, 175:9, 178:15, 192:15, 193:19, 195:21, 196:4 cases [2] - 44:7, 46:19 catalyst [1] - 144:22 category [1] - 11:16 Causeway [10] -68:20, 70:4, 70:10, 116:6, 116:23, 117:22, 117:23, 118:20, 118:24, 188:24 CBA [1] - 56:25 CCR [1] - 200:22

Center [14] - 16:20,

32:15, 32:18, 32:24, 33:7, 44:15, 44:22, 45:3, 45:9, 45:10, 45:14, 45:16, 80:24, 81:4 center [1] - 41:17 certain [11] - 19:1, 28:22, 28:23, 32:3, 36:9, 97:12, 103:4, 125:20, 155:2, 178:25, 193:25 certainly [8] - 18:5, 34:11, 34:12, 124:21, 125:10, 142:5, 154:20, 182:24 certification [1] -171:10 **CERTIFIED** [2] - 1:23, 2:23 Certified [2] - 200:5, 200:6 certify [1] - 200:8 Chair [1] - 146:22 CHAIRWOMAN [106] -1:10, 6:1, 9:2, 9:4, 9:7, 9:9, 10:6, 10:9, 11:5, 11:8, 11:10, 13:5, 13:8, 13:17, 15:3, 15:6, 15:12, 56:16, 56:19, 58:19, 58:22, 59:6, 63:8, 63:11, 72:1, 72:5, 79:14, 84:20, 87:4, 87:7, 88:3, 89:1, 89:10, 89:17, 89:19, 89:25, 90:2, 90:9, 90:13, 90:16, 90:18, 93:1. 94:1. 95:25. 96:3, 97:21, 100:4, 106:22, 109:13, 109:21, 109:23, 110:1, 110:3, 113:16, 124:5, 131:3, 131:17, 131:20, 131:22, 133:7, 133:17, 133:22, 133:25, 134:2, 134:5, 134:22, 134:25, 135:4, 135:7, 138:5, 139:8, 139:12, 139:14, 139:17, 139:19, 139:22, 140:1, 140:4, 140:8, 140:21, 140:23, 141:5, 141:8, 141:10, 150:19, 156:7, 157:8, 164:17, 169:20,

173:16, 177:21, 179:16, 180:3, 180:20, 180:25, 181:5, 181:13, 181:15, 182:12, 188:13, 189:4, 189:19, 191:3, 197:2, 197:12, 198:8 Chairwoman [3] - 6:3, 6:5, 198:4 challenges [1] - 60:18 chance [2] - 111:10, 149:8 change [20] - 24:2, 40:11, 44:4, 47:3, 47:7, 47:11, 47:23, 67:16, 80:1, 81:3, 85:23, 86:20, 87:17, 87:19, 87:25, 120:9, 143:15, 184:3 changed [17] - 46:21, 47:10, 57:6, 62:23, 62:25, 64:15, 68:2, 68:6, 68:8, 87:10, 87:15, 88:11, 88:13, 88:18, 88:21, 93:17, 98:23 changes [13] - 20:9, 20:17, 40:22, 45:23, 47:13, 54:11, 56:8, 57:23, 75:21, 76:17, 81:15, 93:22, 98:11 changing [1] - 77:18 chaotic [1] - 193:24 character [5] - 83:1, 83:14, 167:18, 168:4, 186:21 characteristics [3] -84:10. 91:6. 91:19 characterization [1] -91:22 characterize [3] -67:22, 76:14, 83:9 charged [1] - 178:5 check [1] - 168:11 Cheryl [5] - 3:12, 4:12, 100:5, 182:13, 182:15 Chestnut [5] - 68:23, 68:25, 70:21, 71:1, 71:8 chicane [1] - 117:2 chief [6] - 146:6, 147:20, 148:19, 152:5, 152:10, 152:18 Chief [4] - 5:5, 16:4, 17:3, 148:19 **chief's** [1] - 147:19

51:18, 193:18, 196:13 choose [2] - 9:18, 184:3 chose [1] - 9:21 chosen [2] - 49:17, 87:13 **CHRISTINA** [1] - 1:10 circle [1] - 11:16 circulation [3] - 28:17, 137:2, 193:10 circumstances [25] -10:16, 25:13, 46:21, 47:3, 47:10, 47:23, 54:10, 56:8, 62:24, 62:25, 64:15, 85:23, 86:18, 87:10, 87:15, 87:25, 88:12, 88:13, 88:18, 88:20, 93:20, 98:23, 103:16, 104:13, 147:12 citation [1] - 147:15 cite [1] - 60:24 cited [4] - 35:17, 73:18, 74:11, 184:6 City [1] - 192:2 civil [2] - 22:20, 136:9 clad [1] - 24:3 clarification [3] -94:15, 111:6, 111:10 clarify [3] - 29:10, 94:6, 149:7 Clay [2] - 5:10, 16:12 clear [11] - 27:20, 27:22, 30:13, 37:8, 47:18, 50:3, 55:9, 81:13, 97:1, 100:20, 132:20 cleared [1] - 92:14 clearly [6] - 53:5, 71:21, 96:23, 165:4, 166:2, 190:11 clipping [1] - 137:13 close [16] - 10:25, 11:2, 12:17, 25:25, 34:20, 35:5, 49:6, 84:15, 91:4, 109:19, 133:17, 133:20, 139:23, 139:24, 153:25, 166:10 closed [3] - 11:10, 129:20, 187:18 closely [2] - 12:4, 12:11 closer [2] - 7:16, 83:6 closest [1] - 115:24 closing [4] - 187:20, 187:22, 188:2, 188:6 Code [1] - 200:19 codes [1] - 183:2

coffee [1] - 27:9 Colonial [1] - 124:11 coming [9] - 27:2, 69:6, 69:10, 70:16, 108:10, 120:11, 120:12, 197:20 COMMENCING [1] -1:3 **COMMENT** [1] - 4:3 comment [33] - 14:2, 15:1, 24:7, 56:1, 77:7, 91:25, 92:8, 111:2, 111:3, 111:7, 111:11, 112:19, 113:14, 144:9, 144:25, 145:1, 148:5. 148:6. 155:10, 155:12, 156:9, 157:2, 157:3, 158:7, 167:20, 167:21, 171:9, 171:20, 172:10, 172:12, 179:15, 179:21, 182:11 commentary [3] -159:2, 159:3, 187:19 commented [3] -61:25, 62:1, 145:21 commenting [2] -157:3, 157:5 comments [37] -13:15, 110:14, 110:25, 113:2, 125:4, 136:23, 137:25, 140:12, 144:16, 155:15, 155:18, 155:21, 156:17, 156:22, 157:9. 157:11. 157:22, 159:16, 170:3, 170:22, 171:6, 172:14, 172:25, 178:22, 178:23, 179:19, 180:24, 181:16, 181:19, 181:23, 181:25, 182:2, 182:6, 182:16, 197:5, 197:22, 197:24 commercial [6] -42:20, 129:11, 130:24, 189:23, 190:7, 190:11 commercial/ apartment [1] -42:13 commission [1] -200:10

children [4] - 49:4,

Commission [2] -

16:13, 200:24 commit [1] - 109:2 committee [5] -106:10, 106:12, 106:14, 183:17 Committee [1] - 186:8 common [3] - 11:14, 155:1, 155:6 Commons [1] - 8:9 communities [2] -52:21, 71:19 community [17] -30:25, 45:2, 45:4, 51:10, 51:17, 52:18, 53:12, 53:14, 54:22, 54:23, 54:24, 55:25, 67:13, 68:2, 103:3, 144:8, 186:25 commuter [1] - 119:12 commuters [1] - 69:3 Commuters [1] - 69:5 compact [1] - 34:23 comparable [3] -129:16, 130:2, 130:13 compare [1] - 25:19 compared [7] - 74:21, 91:9, 120:19, 121:19, 189:23, 190:7, 190:16 comparison [5] - 26:3, 71:7, 71:15, 74:18, 102:2 comparisons [1] -71:3 complaining [1] -178:11 complete [4] - 93:11, 93:13, 107:19, 108:2 completely [3] - 83:1, 84:12, 86:11 complex [3] - 97:8, 187:3, 189:7 complexes [1] -101:20 compliance [2] -34:15, 105:1 compliant [1] - 105:7 complies [1] - 200:17 comply [2] - 184:15, 184:20 component [3] - 27:8, 38:5, 195:6 computation [1] -192:1 concepts [1] - 29:8 concern [3] - 120:18, 137:8, 137:24 concerned [6] - 40:12, 46:8, 47:25, 104:23,

155:10, 176:6 concerns [3] - 119:10, 120:13, 137:3 concert [1] - 76:12 concerted [1] - 72:15 concise [1] - 185:12 conclude [4] - 13:21, 14:5, 178:17, 196:8 concluded [3] - 69:24, 86:25, 140:20 conclusion [1] - 196:6 condition [3] - 38:15, 125:3, 138:4 conditional [4] -131:7, 138:10. 138:14, 139:4 conditions [7] - 47:4, 118:1, 118:2, 118:6, 138:2, 155:11, 195:20 conducive [1] -125:11 conduct [5] - 6:24, 178:18, 178:24, 179:2, 181:24 conducting [1] - 178:6 confidence [1] -192:21 configuration [2] -119:8, 194:2 confirm [1] - 128:7 conflict [8] - 6:8, 6:22, 10:12, 10:16, 11:18, 137:11, 137:15, 173:13 conflicted [2] - 175:8, 175:13 conflicts [4] - 159:9, 178:4, 178:8, 178:10 conform [1] - 31:16 congestion [1] - 70:11 connection [2] -57:22, 117:6 connector [2] - 117:4, 188:25 consensus [4] - 46:1, 66:7, 76:11, 100:24 consider [11] - 32:25, 42:12, 44:1, 80:1, 80:24, 100:22, 100:23, 164:10, 184:1, 190:9, 193:21 consideration [7] -58:3, 79:20, 80:2,

87:22, 87:24, 88:17,

85:17, 87:12, 107:16

considerations [1] -

considered [3] -

97:13

88:22

considering [4] -44:19, 47:9, 48:15, 108:4 consistency [1] -107:15 consistent [9] - 37:21, 51:25, 128:3, 128:17, 142:17, 144:7, 147:10, 149:3, 149:5 consists [1] - 67:12 constitute [1] - 61:5 constrained [1] -194:19 consult [1] - 58:12 consultant [7] - 6:25, 7:1, 7:3, 19:12, 19:17, 30:21, 149:6 consultants [1] - 7:4 contemplate [1] -182:20 contemplated [2] -81:25, 82:5 content [1] - 174:16 contention [1] - 8:22 context [31] - 25:18, 25:23, 29:1, 39:8, 44:10, 46:16, 51:9, 57:23, 58:4, 65:24, 66:10, 67:7, 70:19, 71:18, 74:2, 79:21, 82:1, 84:8, 88:18, 88:24, 99:18, 118:4, 118:7, 120:20, 121:13, 121:16, 122:12, 153:15, 153:17, 164:4 continuation [1] - 6:2 continue [7] - 18:8, 28:2, 49:23, 89:15, 89:20, 118:6, 118:17 continued [2] - 4:2, 5:1 contrary [1] - 161:4 control [3] - 105:19, 132:5, 132:6 controls [1] - 103:8 convene [1] - 132:11 converges [1] -128:16 conversation [1] -152:19 conversion [3] -26:13, 27:20, 36:13 convert [6] - 24:14, 25:21, 50:10, 50:24, 73:8, 103:23 converted [1] - 36:16 converting [2] - 23:25, 25:8

copies [4] - 21:13, 146:5, 161:10, 167:12 copy [13] - 17:3, 75:1, 125:21, 131:6, 131:8, 146:3, 146:13, 160:2, 170:8, 170:16, 170:25, 173:7, 173:8 corner [3] - 82:23, 83:20, 142:1 correct [40] - 22:12, 32:19, 40:5, 55:12, 57:5, 57:20, 59:16, 59:21, 60:8, 60:9, 61:11, 63:5, 65:10, 65:23, 66:12, 66:24, 72:6, 72:7, 82:4, 85:14, 87:17, 88:25, 109:6, 109:8, 116:11, 116:12, 119:4, 119:6, 124:23, 127:1, 128:24, 133:12, 134:15, 136:18, 160:10, 162:7, 170:14. 171:12 correctly [1] - 53:20 corridor [53] - 27:7, 31:5, 32:12, 33:1, 34:4, 37:23, 39:10, 39:12, 41:8, 41:24, 43:6, 43:20, 43:23, 44:6. 44:20. 45:12. 45:17, 46:25, 47:20, 57:22, 59:19, 60:1, 60:3, 65:6, 65:9, 65:16, 65:20, 68:1, 68:23, 68:25, 69:1, 70:23, 71:1, 71:8, 74:13, 77:13, 77:15, 79:10, 80:9, 87:12, 88:7, 100:12, 101:2, 107:6, 107:10, 107:13, 180:11, 183:5, 183:10, 183:19, 185:17, 186:10, 188:17 Corridor [3] - 41:10, 42:5, 74:12 cost [1] - 192:7 council [36] - 19:20, 30:7, 39:13, 43:18, 43:23, 44:1, 44:3, 44:11, 44:13, 44:18, 45:1, 45:4, 45:11, 45:22, 45:25, 66:5, 75:21, 76:16, 76:18, 79:23, 80:7, 87:11, 87:21, 88:6, 88:21,

95:19, 100:11, 101:4, 105:17, 107:13, 107:17, 111:23, 178:20, 183:3, 183:7, 183:12 Council [1] - 99:20 council's [3] - 19:22, 46:5, 98:6 Counsel [2] - 2:5, 2:9 counsel [6] - 26:15, 94:10, 94:23, 105:10, 105:19, 152:15 counselor [1] - 170:14 count [1] - 117:14 counter [1] - 193:3 country [1] - 144:8 counts [16] - 127:8, 127:15, 127:23, 127:25, 134:10, 148:8, 148:18, 148:20, 149:6, 151:2, 151:8, 151:17, 152:2, 153:22, 153:23, 154:9 county [10] - 118:8, 122:16, 123:8, 132:7, 135:2, 138:10, 138:23, 138:25, 139:3, 192:16 County [13] - 6:11, 35:13, 64:22, 119:14, 119:17, 119:25, 131:7, 132:11, 132:22, 132:25, 136:6, 136:7, 192:14 county's [1] - 139:4 couple [4] - 52:2, 53:6, 66:6, 122:19 course [3] - 23:12, 26:10. 160:14 Court [16] - 3:10, 3:14, 3:16, 3:20, 4:6, 4:9, 4:11, 29:13, 72:22, 92:16, 107:3, 160:6, 160:17, 165:12, 200:5, 200:6 COURT [4] - 1:23, 2:23, 12:5, 143:16 court [2] - 104:24, 200:9 courtesy [3] - 123:1, 123:2, 123:14 courts [1] - 85:13 Couto [8] - 3:9, 3:19, 4:10, 92:15, 93:3,

168:23, 169:24,

| 172:5                            |      |
|----------------------------------|------|
|                                  | =    |
| COUTO [41] - 92:15               |      |
| 92:20, 92:24, 93:                |      |
| 93:13, 94:4, 94:9                |      |
| 94:22, 94:25, 95:                |      |
| 95:12, 95:15, 95:                | 18,  |
| 95:22, 96:2, 96:5                | ,    |
| 96:12, 96:17,                    |      |
| 111:22, 112:3,                   |      |
| 112:11, 112:15,                  |      |
| 131:24, 132:4,                   |      |
| 132:15, 132:18,                  |      |
| 132:23, 133:3,                   |      |
| 156:9, 162:25,                   |      |
|                                  |      |
| 170:1, 170:6,                    |      |
| 170:10, 170:13,                  |      |
| 170:22, 171:2,                   |      |
| 171:5, 171:19,<br>172:9, 172:13, |      |
| 172:9, 172:13,                   |      |
| 172:20                           |      |
| cover [2] - 125:25,              |      |
| 126:1                            |      |
| covered [1] - 145:1              | 2    |
| Cox [1] - 10:11                  | _    |
|                                  |      |
| Craig [5] - 3:8, 4:7,            |      |
| 90:21, 148:19, 15                | )/:/ |
| <b>CRCR</b> [1] - 200:22         |      |
| create [2] - 36:13,              |      |
| 36:25                            |      |
| created [2] - 93:23,             |      |
| 200:10                           |      |
| creating [1] - 88:19             | )    |
| credibility [2] - 174            |      |
| 178:14                           | ·,   |
|                                  | 10   |
| Cressfield [12] - 3:             |      |
| 3:14, 3:16, 3:20,                | 4.0, |
| 4:9, 4:11, 92:15,                |      |
| 107:3, 160:6,                    |      |
| 160:17, 165:12                   |      |
| Cricket [1] - 4:8                |      |
| criteria [13] - 29:5,            |      |
| 29:15, 30:1, 36:1                |      |
| 36:2, 37:4, 37:9,                |      |
| 37:12, 74:2, 78:1                | 0.   |
| 86:6, 180:17, 184                |      |
| critical [2] - 43:9,             | 1.0  |
|                                  |      |
| 121:2                            |      |
| cross [6] - 71:5,                |      |
| 75:10, 75:15,                    |      |
| 124:12, 168:11,                  |      |
| 180:1                            |      |
| <b>CROSS</b> [2] - 59:1,         |      |
| 134:7                            |      |
| Cross [2] - 3:7, 3:2             | 0    |
| cross-examine [1]                |      |
| 168:11                           | -    |
|                                  | 47   |
| crossing [2] - 116:              | 17,  |
| 192:10                           |      |
| crux [1] - 39:7                  |      |
| cumulative [2] -                 |      |
| 1                                |      |

```
192:4, 192:6
curb [1] - 139:1
curbs [2] - 138:15,
 139:2
curious [2] - 48:22,
 50:17
current [5] - 9:19,
 67:4, 67:18, 189:16
curve [2] - 130:22,
 189:12
cut [3] - 111:1, 155:17,
 195:13
          D
D'Angelis [1] - 17:4
daily [1] - 36:22
dangerous [3] - 189:9,
 189:12, 190:19
data [15] - 63:14,
 126:9, 126:12,
 126:25, 128:3,
 128:6, 128:10,
 128:17, 130:20,
 130:25, 148:9,
 149:21, 190:1,
 190:10, 190:11
date [15] - 17:1, 47:23,
 92:17, 92:18, 126:9,
 137:6, 142:9,
 148:23, 162:19,
 162:22, 162:23,
 170:7, 171:2, 171:6
dated [17] - 5:4, 5:6,
 5:9, 5:10, 5:12, 16:5,
 16:7, 16:10, 16:13,
 16:16, 16:25, 22:10,
 42:24, 127:8,
 136:17, 151:16,
 173:24
```

dates [2] - 62:1, 62:13

Dattoli [9] - 6:9, 6:11,

6:16, 6:25, 8:5, 8:6,

177:14, 180:1, 180:5

deal [3] - 22:18, 148:3,

dealing [3] - 29:14,

deals [2] - 6:24, 74:1

16:25, 40:18, 59:24,

94:12, 101:5, 127:8,

127:18, 127:21,

148:22, 151:19,

decide [2] - 13:11,

decided [7] - 8:3,

183:7

94.23

176:8, 176:11

dealt [1] - 46:24

December [13] -

157:25

10:4, 33:5, 45:1, 93:12, 183:13, 183:18 decision [17] - 13:12, 29:10, 29:12, 29:13, 76:17, 97:2, 97:9, 98:4, 100:24, 107:20, 157:15, 158:10, 159:2, 176:5, 177:9, 177:12, 196:15 decisions [1] - 176:3 deck [5] - 160:5, 161:17, 165:12, 165:21, 166:22 declared [1] - 33:18 decrease [1] - 189:22 dedicate [1] - 49:8 dedicated [2] - 25:16, 97:19 deed [7] - 170:7, 170:12, 170:25, 171:2, 171:3, 171:6, 173:23 deemed [5] - 85:13, 93:11, 93:13, 107:18, 108:2 deems [1] - 7:5 defense [1] - 151:4 defer [3] - 152:15, 156:2, 159:16 deficient [1] - 139:3 definitely [2] - 160:14, 164:15 DeGeorge [1] - 148:20 degree [6] - 19:24, 19:25, 32:4, 91:12, 118:2, 136:9 Delia [24] - 3:7, 3:20, 13:1, 15:13, 15:20, 58:11, 84:14, 110:6, 110:12, 125:21, 143:21, 146:9, 158:22, 158:25, 160:2, 161:12, 164:5, 166:4, 167:9, 168:10, 187:18, 197:25, 198:5, 198:13 **DELIA** [139] - 2:7, 6:3, 6:21, 7:15, 10:8, 10:10, 11:12, 11:20, 13:3, 15:14, 15:16, 15:22, 17:7, 17:11, 17:20, 18:2, 18:7, 58:12, 58:15, 58:20, 58:24, 59:2, 61:13, 61:18, 61:25, 62:6, 62:10, 62:14, 62:17, 63:9, 63:16, 63:22,

63:25, 64:7, 64:13, 66:18, 66:19, 69:6, 69:9, 69:15, 69:17, 69:22, 70:1, 70:2, 71:2, 71:9, 72:19, 72:24, 75:6, 76:22, 78:21, 78:24, 79:3, 79:9, 80:17, 80:20, 84:15, 84:18, 84:25, 85:5, 85:10, 85:11, 86:2, 86:24, 88:23, 89:14, 92:10, 92:13, 96:11, 101:6, 113:21, 115:12, 117:24, 118:16, 125:22, 134:4, 134:6, 134:8, 134:20, 134:23, 135:1, 136:14, 140:6, 143:23, 146:3, 146:10, 146:15, 146:21, 147:11, 148:25, 153:5, 153:9, 153:12, 153:18, 153:25, 156:15, 156:20, 156:25, 158:13, 159:6, 164:3, 164:7, 166:6, 166:10, 166:14, 166:19, 166:23, 167:10, 167:19, 168:4, 168:24, 169:2, 169:8, 169:12, 171:13, 172:2, 172:22, 172:25, 173:5, 173:11, 173:17, 174:8, 179:17, 179:25, 180:4, 180:13, 181:11, 187:20, 187:24, 188:4, 197:6, 197:10, 197:18, 198:1, 198:7, 198:14, 198:16, 198:23, 199:4 deliberately [1] -73:12 demand [8] - 26:22, 27:15, 53:6, 55:3, 55:8, 74:1, 80:13, 80:19 demands [1] - 116:21 demographic [1] -64:8 demonstrate [2] -26:4, 73:4 demonstrated [3] -96:23, 97:6, 187:13

Dennis [1] - 17:4 dense [1] - 25:25 density [10] - 34:19, 91:9, 101:10, 101:12, 101:20, 101:24, 102:2, 182:24, 191:21, 194:18 Department [11] -127:8, 148:11, 148:15, 148:24, 149:17, 193:12, 194:5, 194:13, 194:20, 194:23, 195:3 department [2] -137:20, 149:20 depicts [1] - 165:24 describe [3] - 115:23, 116:9, 116:22 described [1] - 144:21 **DESCRIPTION** [1] -5:3 description [1] -118:14 descriptions [1] -143:13 descriptors [1] -143:19 design [6] - 24:12, 39:1, 64:18, 107:9, 129:6, 139:5 designated [1] -128:24 designed [3] - 8:2, 28:5, 53:14 designing [2] - 108:4, 126:21 designs [1] - 8:21 desirable [1] - 52:21 desire [2] - 54:22, 142:25 despite [1] - 34:7 detached [2] - 126:16, 134:14 details [1] - 138:16 determination [2] -73:17, 73:20 determine [7] - 14:14, 23:24, 31:23, 87:24, 97:13, 98:7, 99:24 determining [1] -49:25 develop [1] - 82:20 developable [1] -67:11 developed [3] - 23:22, 71:23, 84:3 developer [2] - 23:24, 103:23

| developers [5] - 38:8,                         |  |
|--|--|
| 105:23, 184:24,                                |  |
| 185:8, 185:18                                  |  |
| <b>developing</b> [2] - 48:11, 78:3            |  |
| development [51] -                             |  |
| 23:23, 25:12, 25:14,                           |  |
| 26:7, 33:21, 34:19,                            |  |
| 34:21, 35:4, 35:21, 37:16, 39:24, 40:8,        |  |
| 40:15, 40:17, 42:14,                           |  |
| 42:19, 43:2, 43:13,                            |  |
| 43:20, 45:12, 45:19,                           |  |
| 51:8, 57:2, 57:10,                             |  |
| 61:6, 68:4, 68:8,<br>68:14, 68:15, 71:10,      |  |
| 71:22, 77:15, 77:22,                           |  |
| 78:5, 78:7, 78:18,                             |  |
| 78:20, 82:8, 83:10,                            |  |
| 85:17, 91:3, 91:11, 103:17, 105:12,            |  |
| 107:12, 125:8,                                 |  |
| 125:9, 144:22,                                 |  |
| 182:24, 184:4,                                 |  |
| 196:20   |  |
| <b>developments</b> [3] - 39:21, 48:24, 191:21 |  |
| diagnostic [1] -                               |  |
| 132:11   |  |
| dialogue [2] - 73:24,                          |  |
| 174:10<br>differ [1] - 183:4                   |  |
| difference [10] -                              |  |
| 36:23, 37:3, 57:18,                            |  |
| 73:12, 83:11, 83:13,                           |  |
| 83:17, 86:14, 122:2, 156:16                    |  |
| differences [1] - 91:20                        |  |
| different [17] - 36:25,                        |  |
| 82:14, 83:1, 84:9,                             |  |
| 84:10, 84:12, 86:11,                           |  |
| 86:22, 120:11,<br>121:5, 134:11,               |  |
| 149:5, 150:1, 150:4,                           |  |
| 150:5, 153:23                                  |  |
| differential [3] -                             |  |
| 120:17, 121:1,                                 |  |
| 121:12<br>differentiating [1] -                |  |
| 40:23  |  |
| difficult [4] - 53:17,                         |  |
| 70:4, 116:8, 184:2                             |  |
| difficulty [5] - 28:1,                         |  |
| 50:25, 53:3, 122:6,<br>122:9                   |  |
| digestible [1] - 150:16                        |  |
| <b>DIRECT</b> [3] - 18:23,                     |  |
| 114:20, 135:17                                 |  |
| <b>Direct</b> [3] - 3:5, 3:18, 3:22            |  |
|  |  |

| direct [12] - 11:22,         | 78:16, 83:3, 83:7,             |
|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 11:23, 12:15, 61:23,         | 83:11, 166:18                  |
| 75:16, 103:7,                | <b>distinction</b> [1] - 83:15 |
| 103:11, 104:15,              | distinguish [2] -              |
| 108:20, 152:19,              | 33:12, 85:15                   |
| 157:14, 159:12               | distribute [1] - 146:12        |
| directed [1] - 9:14          | distributed [1] - 21:11        |
| direction [3] - 33:6,        | district [8] - 25:7,           |
| 109:1, 118:20                | 40:25, 42:11, 42:16,           |
| directly [3] - 50:6,         | 42:21, 77:13, 82:16,           |
| 175:15, 176:5                | 187:11                         |
| disagree [5] - 67:23,        | districts [2] - 25:24,         |
| 121:9, 169:18,               | 40:24                          |
| 184:11, 187:10               | disturbance [1] -              |
| disagreeing [1] -            | 78:12                          |
| 154:6                        | disturbing [1] - 37:19         |
| disappears [1] - 104:7       | <b>divide</b> [2] - 111:3,     |
| disclose [4] - 6:7,          | 111:13                         |
| 174:20, 175:2,               | divorcees [2] - 27:1,          |
| 175:16                       | 52:14                          |
| disclosed [3] - 7:23,        | <b>DMR</b> [11] - 43:22,       |
| 9:22, 177:14                 | 44:4, 44:12, 74:11,            |
| disclosure [2] - 6:18,       | 74:15, 74:19, 75:1,            |
| 9:12                         | 75:6, 75:19, 79:24,            |
| discussed [6] - 6:12,        | 80:9                           |
| 118:3, 122:10,               | document [17] - 40:2,          |
| 183:10, 191:2                | 40:12, 40:16, 41:9,            |
| discusses [1] - 40:7         | 41:12, 41:15, 41:19,           |
| discussion [17] -            | 41:21, 44:11, 44:12,           |
| 32:11, 39:22, 39:25,         | 58:5, 81:8, 81:13,             |
| 40:23, 45:6, 45:8,           | 138:12, 147:16,                |
| 45:22, 45:25, 46:16,         | 170:9, 173:12                  |
| 51:16, 65:9, 76:12,          | documentation [3] -            |
| 100:20, 108:19,              | 67:4, 159:11, 166:17           |
| 108:22, 108:25,              | documented [1] -               |
| 176:21                       | 157:24                         |
| discussions [1] -            | documents [21] -               |
| 180:22                       | 14:18, 15:2, 30:22,            |
| disingenuous [1] -           | 40:12, 43:4, 46:12,            |
| 185:23                       | 47:23, 59:9, 61:15,            |
| Dispoto [5] - 3:12,          | 63:17, 65:21, 98:5,            |
| 4:12, 100:6, 182:13,         | 98:6, 110:17,                  |
| 182:15                       | 111:23, 112:1,                 |
| <b>DISPOTO</b> [23] - 100:5, | 112:4, 146:24,                 |
| 100:15, 100:17,              | 147:17, 153:19,                |
| 101:2, 101:7, 101:9,         | 174:19                         |
| 101:15, 101:18,              | done [35] - 25:19,             |
| 101:23, 102:1,               | 41:9, 41:11, 44:22,            |
| 102:6, 102:16,               | 46:20, 46:23, 60:21,           |
| 102:21, 102:23,              | 66:2, 66:10, 67:6,             |
| 104:17, 105:9,               | 75:4, 77:20, 79:21,            |
| 105:15, 105:21,              | 81:3, 84:13, 85:6,             |
| 106:4, 106:7,                | 88:17, 88:23,                  |
| 106:16, 106:20,              | 103:14, 104:18,                |
| 182:14                       | 108:18, 122:14,                |
| disprove [1] - 190:12        | 132:14, 132:15,                |
| dispute [1] - 172:1          | 144:7, 151:8,                  |
|                              | 454.47 470.7                   |

disputing [1] - 83:7

distance [6] - 41:3,

disregard [1] - 148:5

| 192:14, 192:19,<br>195:11                             |
|---|
| <b>Donna</b> [2] - 42:2,                              |
| 42:23   |
| door [1] - 46:15                                      |
| <b>Dorchester</b> [2] - 3:12,                         |
| 97:17   |
| <b>DOT</b> [2] - 132:11, 132:22                       |
| double [2] - 5:17,                                    |
| 143:9   |
| double-sided [2] -                                    |
| 5:17, 143:9   |
| doubt [2] - 78:2,                                     |
| 133:13  |
| Dovetail [1] - 8:9                                    |
| <b>down</b> [12] - 8:4, 10:3, 29:3, 113:21, 125:7,    |
| 125:11, 158:6,  |
| 161:20, 165:4,  |
| 172:20, 189:4, 189:5                                  |
| downsize [2] - 51:19,                                 |
| 52:8 <b>downsizing</b> [3] - 27:2,                    |
| 53:7, 53:15   |
| downtown [4] - 41:2,                                  |
| 71:19, 77:15, 88:19                                   |
| draft [1] - 45:23                                     |
| draw [1] - 27:6                                       |
| <b>drawing</b> [1] - 126:18 <b>drawn</b> [1] - 132:13 |
| driven [1] - 189:11                                   |
| driveway [10] - 116:1,                                |
| 122:19, 123:3,  |
| 124:22, 125:7,  |
| 125:12, 125:13,                                       |
| 142:1, 142:16,<br>142:20                              |
| driving [2] - 69:10,                                  |
| 123:2   |
| due [3] - 85:6, 99:3,                                 |
| 189:12  |
| duly [5] - 18:22,                                     |
| 114:11, 135:15,<br>141:22, 160:18                     |
| during [14] - 32:23,                                  |
| 100:14, 108:14,                                       |
| 108:17, 109:5,<br>178:23, 179:15,                     |
| 178:23, 179:15,                                       |
| 179:22, 181:16,                                       |
| 189:22, 190:5,<br>190:15, 190:24,                     |
| 193:14  |
| duty [1] - 175:15                                     |
| dwellers [1] - 190:23                                 |
| dwelling [1] - 126:15                                 |
| <b>dwellings</b> [2] - 57:19, 126:10                  |
| 120.10  |
|   |
|   |

# Ε

| E   |
|---|
|   |
| <b>e-mail</b> [2] - 17:1,<br>134:11         |
| e-mailed [1] - 152:5                        |
| e-mails [1] - 16:25                         |
| earliest [1] - 59:15                        |
| easily [1] - 150:16                         |
| east [1] - 194:25                           |
| east/west [1] - 188:25                      |
| easterly [1] - 70:5                         |
| easy [1] - 140:7                            |
| economic [3] - 47:4,                        |
| 54:11, 174:21                               |
| education [1] - 19:23                       |
| educational [2] - 19:5,                     |
| 114:23                                      |
| effect [1] - 70:8                           |
| effectively [1] - 6:14                      |
| <b>effort</b> [2] - 72:15,<br>132:21        |
| efforts [1] - 44:2                          |
| <b>EFFRON</b> [6] - 1:12,                   |
| 9:3, 11:4, 56:20,                           |
| 90:7, 139:24                                |
| EFFRON-MALLEY [6]                           |
| - 1:12, 9:3, 11:4,                          |
| 56:20, 90:7, 139:24                         |
| egress [3] - 118:9,                         |
| 189:22, 190:23                              |
| eight [2] - 121:10,                         |
| 122:1                                       |
| either [11] - 40:14,                        |
| 41:19, 43:13, 44:22,<br>45:19, 58:4, 60:13, |
| 80:8, 84:6, 84:8,                           |
| 84:19                                       |
| elaborate [1] - 41:4                        |
| electronic [2] - 137:4,                     |
| 137:22                                      |
| element [3] - 49:1,                         |
| 81:19, 116:18                               |
| Element [5] - 32:21,                        |
| 64:10, 84:1, 102:10,                        |
| 105:7                                       |
| elsewhere [2] - 26:7,                       |
| 52:17                                       |
| email [2] - 5:10, 16:11                     |
| <b>emergency</b> [5] - 193:15, 193:23,      |
| 194:6, 194:11, 195:6                        |
| emphasis [1] - 63:7                         |
| employed [3] - 136:1,                       |
| 136:10, 200:14                              |
| employer [1] - 12:12                        |
| emptied [1] - 27:23                         |
| empty [12] - 27:11,                         |
| 40.2 E1.16 E2.11                            |

49:3, 51:16, 52:11,

52:20, 53:21, 53:24,

151:17, 170:7,

172:18, 181:12,

185:10, 191:13,

55:17, 55:18, 55:19, 55:24, 72:9 empty-nester [1] -53:24 empty-nesters [10] -27:11, 49:3, 51:16, 52:11, 52:20, 53:21, 55:17, 55:18, 55:19, 55:24 encompass [1] -93:14 encourage [3] - 42:10, 43:2, 77:12 encouraged [2] -34:22, 35:11 encroach [1] - 38:16 encroaching [1] - 78:9 end [7] - 22:13, 33:5, 65:3, 91:24, 98:23, 145:2, 187:19 endorsed [2] - 44:11, 75:22 engage [1] - 178:3 engaged [2] - 43:22, 44:15 engineer [24] - 13:23, 13:24, 24:10, 28:18, 58:18, 110:9, 114:19, 115:3, 115:4, 115:6, 115:18, 120:14, 124:21, 128:4, 128:9, 128:16, 135:24, 136:4, 136:24, 137:10, 139:20, 191:4, 191:5, 192:14 Engineer [2] - 2:14, 2:16 engineer's [1] - 37:25 ENGINEERING [1] -2:14 Engineering [6] - 5:7, 16:6, 114:10, 114:17, 135:14, 136:1 engineering [10] -22:20, 22:25, 23:10, 29:23, 39:4, 115:6, 115:9, 136:9, 138:20, 193:3 engineers [1] - 122:24 enhance [2] - 48:19, 51:10 enhanced [3] - 29:16, 49:14, 86:23 enjoy [1] - 196:18 enter [1] - 193:14 entered [3] - 80:12, 126:1

enters [1] - 189:10 entertainment [1] -27:8 entire [2] - 142:3, 146:5 entitled [2] - 42:4, 168:9 entity [2] - 8:8, 174:25 entry [1] - 17:16 environment [3] -77:20, 78:6, 78:12 environmentally [1] -34:24 equipment [1] - 49:4 equity [1] - 186:5 especially [2] - 27:11, 118:7 **Esq** [1] - 5:4 ESQUIRE [2] - 2:4, 2:7 essential [1] - 49:21 essentially [7] - 35:4, 45:6, 65:8, 74:15, 79:11, 83:4, 157:2 Essex [1] - 136:7 establish [1] - 118:11 established [3] -23:19, 182:22, 186:7 establishes [2] -105:25, 184:25 estate [10] - 19:12, 22:23, 26:15, 26:16, 29:23, 47:4, 50:6, 87:19, 187:7, 187:12 ether [1] - 145:21 ethics [2] - 174:4, 179:10 Ethics [2] - 10:21, 11:15 evaluate [1] - 20:9 evaluated [1] - 73:19 Evan [3] - 113:10, 135:20, 140:6 **EVAN** [2] - 2:13, 3:22 evening [5] - 6:3, 21:16, 59:3, 100:5, 121:21 event [3] - 81:10, 86:12, 193:8 **EVID** [1] - 5:3 evidence [21] - 14:18, 17:16, 17:18, 27:24, 36:20, 50:22, 52:25, 55:1, 55:9, 55:15, 55:16, 56:2, 73:15, 110:17, 112:20, 143:25, 147:22, 153:14, 156:14, 169:24, 172:5

evident [1] - 28:23

exacerbated [1] -

exact [1] - 127:25 exactly [2] - 111:24, 171:15 exam [3] - 65:2, 65:3, 65:19 **EXAMINATION** [6] -18:23, 59:1, 88:4, 114:20, 134:7, 135:17 Examination [6] - 3:5, 3:7, 3:7, 3:18, 3:20, 3:22 examination [2] -75:11, 180:1 examine [2] - 39:9, 168:11 examined [2] - 60:14, 66:1 example [5] - 26:5, 40:25, 52:25, 86:23, 176:25 examples [1] - 103:18 exams [2] - 64:25, 74:13 excellent [2] - 185:10, 194:15 except [2] - 35:13, 172:23 excepting [1] - 119:23 exception [1] - 130:3 excess [1] - 24:15 exclude [1] - 112:20 excuse [3] - 74:13, 97:25, 117:24 exhibit [10] - 15:20, 91:8, 125:16, 127:6, 134:10, 137:9, 143:10, 145:12, 162:4, 165:9 exhibits [9] - 15:19, 15:23, 18:10, 110:16, 149:10, 159:7, 169:25, 170:1, 170:5 exist [1] - 190:24 existed [3] - 36:11, 93:10, 104:1 existence [1] - 25:10 existing [13] - 23:17, 31:25, 38:15, 53:14, 77:21, 78:5, 101:20, 118:2, 118:6, 125:2, 133:11, 138:23, 189:23 exists [4] - 37:1, 124:20, 165:25, 190:12 exit [1] - 193:14

38:17

expect [3] - 13:21, 14:4, 155:6 expense [1] - 186:15 experience [5] - 38:7, 122:13, 194:14, 194:16, 194:21 experiences [1] -125:2 expert [8] - 75:4, 75:8, 128:23, 144:13, 144:15, 149:4, 153:24, 154:3 expert's [1] - 128:8 experts [3] - 153:3, 154:9, 171:21 expired [1] - 99:8 Expires [1] - 200:24 explain [4] - 20:24, 79:18, 102:23, 116:24 explanation [1] -11:18 explicitly [1] - 126:18 extend [5] - 140:19, 140:21, 141:1, 197:21, 198:13 extending [1] - 103:8 extensive [1] - 194:16 extent [4] - 25:2, 35:4, 78:6, 103:2 extra [2] - 24:21, 167:12 extraordinary [1] -183:11 F

faced [1] - 175:7 facets [1] - 66:13 facility [1] - 119:24 facing [1] - 29:3 fact [14] - 18:14, 23:3, 25:11, 30:7, 38:4, 46:10, 48:2, 64:12, 82:7, 87:11, 88:1, 98:17, 108:3, 184:19 factors [2] - 73:18, 99:24 facts [4] - 156:11, 157:6, 157:14, 176:7 factual [4] - 62:6, 62:7, 62:8, 159:10 failed [1] - 175:2 failure [2] - 72:16, 174:20 fair [28] - 8:14, 8:15, 8:17, 13:10, 25:17, 33:24, 44:16, 55:6, 57:23, 62:24, 64:17,

67:21, 68:24, 76:23, 82:19, 84:6, 99:7, 103:4, 103:20, 104:25, 106:10, 106:11, 144:19, 177:6, 180:11, 181:4, 183:16, 183:19 Fair [26] - 16:19, 32:14, 32:17, 32:21, 32:24, 33:6, 44:15, 44:21, 45:9, 45:10, 45:14, 45:15, 64:10, 79:25, 80:23, 81:4, 84:2, 102:10, 104:20, 104:22, 105:7, 183:20, 184:18, 185:6, 185:16, 186:8 fairness [1] - 104:24 fall [1] - 34:25 false [2] - 190:8, 190:13 familiar [8] - 20:12, 29:7, 74:16, 95:1, 106:4, 115:20, 126:11, 127:12 family [12] - 12:12, 37:19, 52:8, 52:9, 52:16, 53:8, 54:8, 54:19, 82:24, 126:16, 134:14, 187:2 far [7] - 35:14, 113:23, 120:5, 166:14, 166:18, 168:18, 176:6 fashion [1] - 60:21 fast [1] - 191:11 fatalities [1] - 193:9 faults [1] - 196:11 favor [11] - 9:4, 11:5, 90:13, 109:23, 131:17, 133:22, 139:14, 140:1, 141:5, 162:1, 182:3 FAX [2] - 1:25, 2:25 feasible [1] - 133:1 feature [1] - 49:19 features [1] - 78:19 Federal [1] - 149:17 fee [1] - 68:14 fees [1] - 8:7 feet [9] - 14:7, 14:10, 38:23, 85:1, 110:13, 110:18, 113:6, 140:11, 156:6 felt [1] - 66:6 **FEMALE** [2] - 181:3,

181:7

expansion [1] - 189:8

| <b>few</b> [7] - 38:6, 49:8,    |
|---------------------------------|
| 72:8, 100:7, 117:6,             |
| 189:11, 196:15                  |
| fiduciary [1] - 176:8           |
| fifth [1] - 67:2                |
| fighting [1] - 194:16           |
| figure [3] - 19:21,             |
| 126:20, 159:5                   |
| figured [1] - 7:8               |
| filed [4] - 92:21,              |
| 171:11, 173:25,                 |
| 179:1                           |
| files [2] - 137:5,              |
| 137:22                          |
| final [2] - 106:8,              |
| 156:18                          |
| finally [1] - 42:22             |
| financial [5] - 12:18,          |
| 176:22, 177:12,                 |
| 200:13, 200:15                  |
| financially [2] - 12:4,         |
| 12:11                           |
| findings [2] - 41:12,           |
| 192:20                          |
| fine [2] - 17:7, 198:8          |
| finish [7] - 85:4,              |
| 85:10, 89:4, 91:15,             |
| 175:14, 176:9,                  |
| 198:17                          |
| Fire [6] - 193:12,              |
| 194:5, 194:13,                  |
| 194:20, 194:23,                 |
| 195:3                           |
| fire [14] - 28:17, 137:3,       |
| 137:11, 137:12,                 |
| 137:17, 137:19,                 |
| 193:13, 193:14,                 |
| 194:8, 194:9,                   |
| 194:24, 195:18,                 |
| 195:21                          |
| firefighting [1] -              |
| 194:21                          |
| fires [1] - 194:16              |
| <b>firm</b> [9] - 19:10, 19:14, |
| 19:15, 44:14, 75:20,            |
| 106:17, 107:9,                  |
| 109:2, 109:5                    |
| first [24] - 11:17,             |
| 18:13, 22:24, 23:23,            |
| 27:22, 29:18, 31:11,            |
| 35:22, 37:9, 41:19,             |
| 41:25, 59:7, 64:25,             |
| 82:2, 105:17,                   |
| 140:15, 146:20,                 |
| 147:19, 148:7,                  |
| 148:14, 162:2,                  |
| 182:18, 194:18,                 |
| 198:23                          |
|                                 |

66:22, 81:18, 146:13, 155:21, 191:20, 195:14, 197:8 flew [1] - 141:10 floated [1] - 103:22 Floor [1] - 18:20 floor [4] - 41:20, 57:25, 80:2 floors [1] - 41:20 flow [7] - 116:15, 120:8, 120:11, 123:1, 132:8, 188:19, 193:23 flows [5] - 190:5, 190:15, 190:18, 191:22, 193:6 focus [5] - 23:9, 31:5, 65:20, 118:5, 127:9 focused [1] - 41:15 focusing [1] - 131:1 follow [4] - 10:8, 21:14, 34:21, 43:7 follow-up [2] - 10:8, 43:7 followed [1] - 59:18 following [1] - 195:4 follows [6] - 18:22, 42:24, 114:12, 135:16, 141:22, 160:18 footage [1] - 51:23 footprint [1] - 24:2 forecasted [1] -190:16 foregoing [1] - 200:8 form [1] - 107:1 forms [1] - 119:18 forth [6] - 40:10, 54:11, 77:4, 108:15, 138:16, 143:19 forward [12] - 43:25, 45:5, 45:24, 75:21, 76:9, 76:18, 79:25, 90:19, 100:19, 103:17, 117:20, 125:14

foster [1] - 42:20

fought [1] - 195:1

146:25, 147:4,

147:9, 147:14,

148:25, 153:19

11:14, 12:21, 14:21,

19:17, 20:18, 66:25,

120:4, 136:11, 167:5

four-way [1] - 120:4

frequent [1] - 191:25

fourth [1] - 35:7

four [10] - 10:15,

foundation [6] -

friend [1] - 12:18 friends [1] - 9:23 front [12] - 23:17, 24:14, 25:10, 25:25, 38:14, 38:16, 142:24, 143:3, 148:15, 160:4, 163:15, 163:17 fruitful [1] - 10:4 fruition [1] - 8:12 fruits [1] - 175:10 fulfill [4] - 53:9, 98:2, 98:11, 184:15 full [10] - 66:11, 114:13, 121:15, 135:19, 157:13, 161:19, 161:22, 178:3, 186:4, 189:8 fully [2] - 86:3, 173:22 function [1] - 117:8 FURBACHER [2] -200:4, 200:22 furthering [1] - 34:17 furthers [2] - 35:8, 116:20 future [5] - 65:14, 103:6, 104:6, 105:12, 190:15

# G

Gables [3] - 68:7, 102:3, 102:4 game [1] - 157:1 gap [3] - 122:24, 123:1, 123:14 gaps [1] - 123:3 Gary [1] - 177:22 **GARY** [1] - 1:14 Gary's [1] - 9:12 gear [1] - 129:9 geared [1] - 49:2 gears [1] - 74:9 Gellert [6] - 3:3, 4:4, 9:16, 113:7, 140:15, 141:13 **GELLERT** [18] - 9:15, 10:5, 141:19, 141:20, 141:23, 142:8. 142:12. 142:15, 143:13, 143:17, 143:22, 144:1, 144:4, 144:11, 144:14, 144:19, 145:1, 145:4 general [5] - 54:13, 57:13, 65:12, 65:14, 174:24

64:11, 99:25, 138:22 generate [3] - 35:23, 38:6, 38:11 generated [4] - 28:19, 36:10, 36:12, 49:8 generates [3] - 36:6, 129:3, 129:13 generation [10] -120:21, 121:14, 121:17, 128:21, 128:22, 129:18, 130:5, 130:22, 130:23, 134:12 gentleman [3] - 9:24, 64:1, 156:15 gentleman's [1] -166:20 gentlemen [1] -196:10 geometric [1] - 116:19 geometrically [1] -117:10 geometries [1] - 189:8 119:24 49:6, 58:3, 73:6,

geometry [2] - 119:2, given [10] - 27:16, 80:2, 109:1, 112:25, 131:6, 138:19, 153:2 glad [1] - 132:25 glaring [1] - 193:16 Glen [1] - 4:14 globally [1] - 121:22 goal [2] - 32:2, 37:22 goals [12] - 30:12, 31:6, 31:15, 31:24, 35:15, 37:15, 39:20, 40:13, 57:1, 57:6, 57:10, 57:13 governing [5] - 31:22, 46:10, 47:12, 48:2, 184:2 Government [2] -10:21, 11:15 grade [2] - 39:2, 143:4 graduate [1] - 115:1 graduated [1] - 136:8 grant [15] - 24:8, 30:6, 31:21, 36:3, 46:18, 55:7, 81:17, 81:22, 98:16, 105:5, 106:1, 138:3, 185:2, 185:5 granted [2] - 34:13 graphical [1] - 137:21 great [4] - 56:21, 145:24, 187:14, 191:23 greater [3] - 32:4,

35:3, 87:18

green [8] - 48:18,

96:13, 117:20, 119:12, 122:11, 167:5, 186:17, 186:21 ground [6] - 33:3, 41:20, 57:25, 80:2, 142:14, 142:15 growth [10] - 34:18, 34:22, 35:1, 35:6, 35:10, 35:17, 99:23, 100:1, 192:4, 192:6 Grygiel [1] - 19:11 **GRYGIEL** [1] - 2:17 guess [5] - 94:22, 134:13, 147:1, 147:12, 147:14 guidelines [1] - 108:4 Gwenn [2] - 3:10, 96:20 gyms [1] - 27:9

# Н

half [5] - 38:21, 62:3, 113:24, 151:3, 197:9 hall [1] - 183:9 halt [2] - 178:2, 178:16 hand [14] - 10:14, 14:13, 14:25, 18:15, 114:5, 135:9, 141:16, 146:8, 158:21, 158:23, 160:8, 167:7, 170:2 handed [2] - 173:4 handicapped [1] -139:1 handle [1] - 194:9 handout [4] - 31:7, 39:16, 159:25, 160:1 handouts [3] - 112:6, 112:8, 112:12 hands [1] - 14:21 handwritten [3] - 17:2, 126:1, 126:9 happy [5] - 48:4, 158:9, 159:1, 159:2, 188:12 hard [5] - 117:9, 120:3, 186:24, 195:8, 197:11 hard-working [1] -117:9 hardest [1] - 85:6 hardly [1] - 164:16 hardship [6] - 50:1, 50:20, 51:3, 51:11, 73:16, 74:7 harm [1] - 78:11 **HASMIG** [1] - 1:15

generally [4] - 28:15,

fit [1] - 24:8

five [9] - 31:10, 37:15,

| hate [2] - 113:14,      | HEMBREE [106] -               | 194:18                             | 190:25                   | identical [1] - 74:15  |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|
| 180:25                  | 1:10, 6:1, 9:2, 9:4,          | higher [7] - 151:11,               | house [8] - 52:1,        | identification [8] -   |
| HAYES [35] - 1:11,      | 9:7, 9:9, 10:6, 10:9,         | 164:2, 164:4,                      | 53:25, 56:5, 143:5,      | 17:6, 18:11, 125:16,   |
| 8:25, 11:2, 56:18,      | 11:5, 11:8, 11:10,            | 164:14, 164:23,                    | 160:5, 162:12,           | 143:8, 143:10,         |
| 58:9, 71:12, 87:6,      | 13:5, 13:8, 13:17,            | 196:20                             | 165:21, 165:24           | 162:5, 165:10, 168:7   |
| 87:9, 91:23, 92:8,      | 15:3, 15:6, 15:12,            | Highlands [1] - 35:14              | houses [2] - 195:1,      | identified [1] - 32:16 |
| 94:3, 94:5, 109:22,     | 56:16, 56:19, 58:19,          | highly [1] - 30:20                 | 196:2                    | illogical [1] - 196:6  |
| 128:20, 129:2,          | 58:22, 59:6, 63:8,            |                                    |                          | _                      |
|                         |                               | Highview [24] - 9:16,              | Housing [27] - 16:20,    | illustrating [1] -     |
| 129:8, 129:24,          | 63:11, 72:1, 72:5,            | 33:2, 33:11, 33:13,                | 32:15, 32:18, 32:20,     | 193:13                 |
| 130:4, 130:10,          | 79:14, 84:20, 87:4,           | 33:14, 33:15, 33:23,               | 32:24, 33:6, 44:15,      | imagery [1] - 193:21   |
| 130:15, 130:19,         | 87:7, 88:3, 89:1,             | 34:4, 41:14, 43:1,                 | 44:21, 45:9, 45:10,      | imagine [1] - 191:8    |
| 131:14, 133:21,         | 89:10, 89:17, 89:19,          | 43:13, 45:13, 79:21,               | 45:14, 45:16, 64:9,      | immediately [1] -      |
| 139:13, 140:16,         | 89:25, 90:2, 90:9,            | 82:16, 82:22, 83:2,                | 79:25, 80:24, 81:4,      | 194:25                 |
| 141:2, 150:16,          | 90:13, 90:16, 90:18,          | 83:20, 95:2, 102:7,                | 84:1, 99:20, 102:10,     | impact [18] - 13:12,   |
| 158:1, 162:19,          | 93:1, 94:1, 95:25,            | 116:24, 117:1,                     | 104:21, 104:23,          | 25:1, 26:18, 36:4,     |
| 162:23, 167:21,         | 96:3, 97:21, 100:4,           | 118:25, 142:20,                    | 105:6, 183:20,           | 37:7, 37:13, 38:7,     |
| 171:25, 176:18,         | 106:22, 109:13,               | 142:22                             | 184:18, 185:6,           | 38:25, 99:4, 99:10,    |
| 197:1, 198:25           | 109:21, 109:23,               | Highway [1] - 149:17               | 185:16, 186:8            | 99:12, 108:4,          |
| head [4] - 10:23,       | 110:1, 110:3,                 | hire [1] - 177:14                  | housing [63] - 19:21,    | 110:24, 118:5,         |
| 118:20, 169:10,         | 113:16, 124:5,                | hired [1] - 75:20                  | 25:16, 25:20, 32:14,     | 139:5, 141:25,         |
| 169:16                  | 131:3, 131:17,                | historic [1] - 190:10              | 33:17, 34:1, 34:9,       | 142:4, 187:11          |
| headed [1] - 196:5      | 131:20, 131:22,               | history [10] - 30:24,              | 34:15, 34:24, 44:25,     | impacting [1] - 137:13 |
| heads [1] - 117:14      | 133:7, 133:17,                | 32:11, 34:6, 43:18,                | 53:9, 53:11, 54:21,      | impacts [5] - 37:10,   |
| hear [16] - 7:10, 7:12, | 133:22, 133:25,               | 46:4, 59:9, 83:24,                 | 54:25, 56:7, 56:9,       | 38:1, 118:3, 174:11,   |
| 12:7, 18:4, 48:22,      | 134:2, 134:5,                 | 84:11, 144:15,                     | 68:5, 80:14, 81:1,       | 186:12                 |
| 50:9, 50:19, 50:22,     | 134:22, 134:25,               | 189:24                             | 81:10, 81:15, 82:18,     | impartial [4] - 8:14,  |
| 72:9, 110:20,           | 135:4, 135:7, 138:5,          | hit [1] - 49:24                    | 83:18, 85:12, 85:16,     |                        |
| 113:14, 119:16,         | 139:8, 139:12,                |                                    | 85:19, 86:13, 86:21,     | 8:16, 8:18, 13:10      |
| 152:17, 178:10,         | 139:14, 139:17,               | Hoboken [2] - 18:21,<br>19:12      | 88:9, 90:25, 95:3,       | implement [1] - 80:8   |
| 191:18, 198:5           | 139:19, 139:22,               |                                    | 95:9, 95:20, 99:5,       | implementation [1] -   |
|                         | 140:1, 140:4, 140:8,          | holding [1] - 123:13               | 99:8, 99:13, 99:21,      | 42:25                  |
| heard [12] - 36:20,     | 140:21, 140:23,               | Holmquist [2] - 42:2,              | 99:25, 101:21,           | implemented [3] -      |
| 70:9, 72:14, 102:17,    | 141:5, 141:8,                 | 42:23                              | 102:7, 102:11,           | 64:21, 80:5, 124:24    |
| 123:19, 124:20,         | 141:10, 150:19,               | home [13] - 51:22,                 | 103:4, 103:6,            | implementing [1] -     |
| 141:24, 144:21,         | 156:7, 157:8,                 | 52:8, 52:9, 52:16,                 |                          | 42:12                  |
| 146:25, 156:23,         | 164:17, 169:20,               | 53:8, 54:8, 54:19,                 | 103:11, 103:23,          | important [2] - 46:7,  |
| 172:5, 181:8            | 173:16, 177:21,               | 55:20, 85:2, 121:8,                | 104:3, 104:8,            | 171:4                  |
| hearing [9] - 17:22,    |                               | 129:19, 165:12,                    | 104:10, 105:18,          | impossible [2] -       |
| 21:6, 21:20, 22:5,      | 179:16, 180:3,                | 196:19                             | 106:10, 106:11,          | 50:23, 191:7           |
| 70:20, 82:2, 104:24,    | 180:20, 180:25,               | homes [4] - 51:23,                 | 170:18, 180:11,          | imprimatur [1] - 35:20 |
| 105:2, 178:12           | 181:5, 181:13,                | 134:14, 161:17,                    | 180:15, 180:21,          | impropriety [1] -      |
| hearings [4] - 6:24,    | 181:15, 182:12,               | 187:2                              | 183:13, 183:16,          | 173:20                 |
| 22:15, 123:19, 184:7    | 188:13, 189:4,                | honestly [1] - 89:5                | 183:19, 184:10,          | improve [2] - 24:11,   |
| hearsay [7] - 17:14,    | 189:19, 191:3,                | honor [1] - 124:18                 | 185:8, 185:12,           | 190:5                  |
| 17:20, 146:17,          | 197:2, 197:12, 198:8          | hope [1] - 186:11                  | 185:21, 185:24           | Improvement [2] -      |
| 147:2, 147:5,           | hereby [1] - 200:7            | host [1] - 126:22                  | huge [3] - 54:20,        | 126:14, 126:24         |
| 152:17, 153:20          | heuristically [1] -           | hour [9] - 120:11,                 | 176:21, 190:20           | improvements [5] -     |
| heart [1] - 61:14       | 128:12                        | 121:3, 121:19,                     | Hughes [1] - 19:11       | 77:12, 77:17,          |
| heavily [3] - 189:18,   | <b>hi</b> [3] - 97:16, 133:4, | 128:7, 128:13,                     | <b>HUGHES</b> [1] - 2:17 | 138:23, 188:18         |
| 189:21, 190:6           | 188:7                         | 128:14, 129:13,                    | human [1] - 190:20       |                        |
| height [5] - 24:3,      | HIGGINS [7] - 108:12,         | 131:2, 197:9                       | hypothetical [4] -       | IN [1] - 1:4           |
| 24:18, 38:20, 91:9,     | 108:22, 109:4,                |                                    | 23:2, 48:7, 86:15,       | inappropriate [4] -    |
| 164:12                  | 109:7, 109:9,                 | <b>hour-and-a-half</b> [1] - 197:9 | 177:5                    | 49:12, 157:1,          |
| held [1] - 45:2         | 109:12, 109:17                |                                    |                          | 159:12, 174:5          |
| hello [1] - 113:20      | Higgins [2] - 3:14,           | hours [16] - 128:7,                | I                        | inch [1] - 185:9       |
| help [2] - 157:12,      | 108:12                        | 128:24, 129:1,                     | •                        | incidence [1] - 191:23 |
| 184:9                   | high [6] - 26:1, 34:19,       | 129:4, 129:9,                      |                          | include [1] - 80:14    |
|                         | 151:10, 182:24,               | 129:17, 129:22,                    | I-N-T-I-N-D-O-L-A [1] -  | included [1] - 33:10   |
| helping [2] - 19:20,    | 191:21, 194:18                | 129:25, 154:4,                     | 114:16                   | including [5] - 13:22, |
| 20:8                    | high-density [3] -            | 188:14, 188:23,                    | <b>ID</b> [1] - 5:3      | 129:13, 188:16,        |
| Hembree [2] - 6:4,      | 182:24, 191:21,               | 189:23, 190:5,                     | idea [4] - 87:9, 145:24, | 193:18, 196:12         |
| 198:4                   |                               | 190:15, 190:16,                    | 146:1, 183:5             | inclusionary [3] -     |
|                         |                               |                                    |                          |                        |

25:14, 81:19, 85:16 income [2] - 25:16, 44:24 inconsistencies [1] -93:23 inconsistent [4] -26:6, 30:5, 127:2, 127:4 inconvenience [1] -125:1 incorrect [1] - 95:23 increase [5] - 99:2, 99:6, 99:10, 121:25, increased [2] - 155:8, 190:18 increasing [2] - 99:16, 192:1 indeed [2] - 161:6, 193:2 independent [4] -77:16, 153:9, 153:12, 176:19 indicate [8] - 10:16, 14:23, 22:6, 28:19, 28:25, 37:6, 58:5, indicated [28] - 20:2, 26:24, 29:22, 31:11, 32:8, 34:18, 35:8, 37:5, 37:21, 38:3, 44:20, 55:4, 57:9, 66:3, 67:25, 73:14, 80:4, 98:5, 98:16, 104:25, 110:15, 110:16, 113:7, 140:13, 151:2, 153:22, 195:4, 196:3 indicates [4] - 29:10, 42:24, 60:17, 194:14 indicating [3] - 74:4, 91:7, 172:21 indicating) [1] -188:14 indication [1] - 53:10 indicators [1] - 117:16 indirect [3] - 12:2, 12:9, 12:21 individual [1] - 67:12 individuals [3] -179:1, 179:19, 181:19 induced [1] - 99:23 industry [1] - 192:7 infeasible [2] - 28:6, 72:14 infected [1] - 176:12 information [6] -70:15, 126:8, 145:15, 150:17,

153:14, 178:2 infrastructure [2] -50:10, 138:24 ingress [3] - 118:9, 189:22, 190:22 ingress/egress [2] -189:9, 193:22 inherently [3] - 85:13, 85:17, 85:20 initial [2] - 20:20, 22:3 initiate [2] - 132:23, 132:24 initiated [1] - 133:2 initiation [2] - 7:19, 7:21 injuries [1] - 193:8 insist [1] - 44:22 insofar [6] - 22:19, 40:12, 46:7, 47:24, 57:21, 104:22 inspired [1] - 192:21 instance [2] - 117:17, 121:7 instances [2] - 43:21, 83:19 institutional [1] -83:22 instruct [1] - 148:4 intended [1] - 52:7 intent [1] - 83:24 interest [16] - 6:22, 7:1, 10:12, 11:23, 11:24, 12:3, 12:9, 12:16, 12:22, 159:9, 173:13, 176:22, 177:12, 192:17, 200:14, 200:15 interests [1] - 176:4 interject [1] - 117:25 internal [1] - 28:17 interrelated [1] - 158:5 interrelationship [1] -153:13 interrupt [4] - 21:22, 40:1, 64:7, 144:18 interruption [2] -116:15, 116:19 intersection [20] -115:24, 115:25, 116:1, 116:2, 116:8, 116:10, 116:18, 117:2, 117:9, 117:12, 118:12, 118:15, 119:9, 119:13, 119:14, 120:3, 120:6, 154:24, 188:21, 190:19

intersections [3] -

119:15, 119:21,

139:2 INTINDOLA [7] - 2:15, 3:17, 113:20, 113:22, 114:3, 114:8, 114:14 Intindola [17] - 17:9, 17:25, 28:14, 36:21, 38:2, 113:18, 114:15, 134:9, 145:13, 146:25, 147:9, 148:8, 149:3, 149:15, 150:12, 150:22, 153:22 introduced [2] -101:3, 107:13 introduction [2] -101:5, 105:17 invalid [1] - 61:10 investigating [1] -179:6 investigation [3] -178:4, 178:25, 179:2 investigations [3] -178:6, 178:19, 181:23 involved [7] - 20:5, 175:24, 176:2, 176:23, 177:12, 186:9, 200:13 involvement [2] -193:11, 194:4 involves [1] - 194:18 irrelevant [4] - 118:1, 172:3, 173:17, 180:8 issue [12] - 8:24, 9:14, 12:20, 13:7, 23:13, 38:19, 39:5, 66:1, 88:9, 124:14, 137:21, 176:19 issued [7] - 5:7, 16:7, 16:9, 17:3, 20:20, 127:7, 136:16 issues [11] - 8:19, 65:13, 65:22, 118:13, 119:9, 123:20, 136:19, 159:23, 178:8, 195:23, 196:14 ITE [1] - 130:21 items [2] - 11:14, 66:22 itself [10] - 23:9, 36:5, 47:21, 60:24, 67:15, 84:8, 103:10, 116:21, 164:6, 187:1

J

**JACOBS** [3] - 2:13,

110:7, 135:20 **JAMES** [1] - 2:7 Jannicelli [4] - 5:6, 16:5, 17:4, 148:19 Jaworski [1] - 16:1 **JAWORSKI** [1] - 2:6 Jersey [23] - 6:10, 18:21, 19:13, 20:1, 64:19, 99:6, 114:11, 116:4, 132:22, 135:15, 135:25, 141:21, 160:17, 179:13, 189:1, 191:24, 192:11, 192:15, 192:17, 200:7, 200:11, 200:18, 200:23 job [3] - 10:1, 56:21, 185:11 jobs [1] - 138:25 **JOHN** [1] - 1:13 joint [3] - 132:10, 132:18, 132:21 Josephine [2] - 3:14, 108:12 judge [2] - 105:1, 194:9 judgment [3] - 12:23, 194:14, 195:2 judicial [1] - 153:12 July [4] - 107:15, 197:16, 198:19, 199.2 June [5] - 16:3, 16:5, 16:16, 22:10, 41:11 **JUNE** [1] - 1:2 jurisdiction [2] -178:10, 178:18

3:22, 135:12

Jacobs [3] - 39:3,

## K

Kathryn [1] - 16:1 KAUFMAN [2] - 1:16, 139:11 keep [2] - 112:21, 181:7 keeping [2] - 186:18, 186:20 key [2] - 31:20, 38:23 kids [2] - 52:2, 55:20 **KIM** [2] - 200:4, 200:22 kind [17] - 23:1, 40:4, 46:15, 47:15, 48:16, 48:25, 54:25, 56:9, 57:14, 120:1, 128:6, 128:16, 142:17, 155:5, 165:21,

165:22, 182:24 kinds [1] - 55:8 knowing [2] - 192:24, 195:19 knowledge [8] -154:16, 154:17, 155:17, 156:11, 156:12, 157:6, 157:15, 159:13 knowledgeable [1] -30:25 **known** [9] - 8:9, 18:25, 29:5, 30:2, 30:8, 33:17, 41:9, 93:8, 186:3 knows [2] - 146:7, 187:13

#### L

L.L.C [2] - 1:22, 2:22 lack [1] - 55:13 lacks [1] - 27:7 ladies [1] - 196:10 Lake [75] - 14:7, 14:9, 14:12, 19:17, 20:10, 25:12, 25:24, 26:6, 40:18, 50:14, 51:22, 53:25, 55:5, 59:10, 61:9, 63:2, 63:14, 64:12, 68:20, 70:6, 80:12, 81:16, 91:1, 91:3, 97:17, 100:6, 100:10, 101:19, 103:9, 104:18, 106:1, 106:11, 108:3, 108:13, 115:15, 115:19, 116:3, 116:7, 117:8, 127:7, 136:4, 141:21, 148:11, 148:15, 148:21, 148:24, 155:7, 160:17, 170:17, 170:19, 175:17, 182:15, 182:19, 184:14, 185:1, 185:10, 186:7, 186:19. 186:25. 187:14, 188:1, 188:8, 188:20, 188:25, 189:2, 193:12, 194:5, 194:8, 194:13, 194:20, 194:23, 195:3, 195:19, 196:17 lake [9] - 68:21, 161:16, 162:14,

162:16, 163:5,

|   |                                  |  | 1   | T.                            |
|---|----------------------------------|--|---|-------------------------------|
| 163:18, 163:24,                             | 145:6, 167:11,                   | 20:2, 115:2, 135:24,   | 11:15   | maintaining [1] -             |
| 164:15, 196:1                               | 167:13, 168:14,                  | 179:12   | locally [1] - 121:23  | 186:20                        |
| <b>LAKE</b> [2] - 1:1, 1:9                  | 172:9, 172:12,                   | Liebman [1] - 16:2   | locate [1] - 142:22   | major [3] - 38:13,            |
| Lake's [3] - 99:2,                          | 172:13, 182:1,                   | <b>LIEBMAN</b> [1] - 2:6   | located [4] - 33:2,   | 83:14, 196:11                 |
| 103:8, 184:16                               | 193:20                           | life [3] - 190:21,   | 34:19, 37:17, 68:19   | MALE [1] - 165:18             |
| land [5] - 67:11, 68:18,                    | leaves [1] - 195:20              | 196:12, 196:13   | location [16] - 26:24,  | Malek [1] - 41:16             |
| 84:9, 89:16, 172:3                          | led [1] - 74:6                   | lifestyle [4] - 48:19,   | 26:25, 27:5, 27:16,   | MALLEY [6] - 1:12,            |
| Land [7] - 31:12,                           | left [14] - 52:16, 55:20,        | 54:11, 56:8, 196:18  | 28:11, 33:22, 36:12,  | 9:3, 11:4, 56:20,             |
| 31:19, 32:4, 37:8,                          | 120:19, 120:24,                  | light [3] - 18:1, 21:9,  | 46:11, 47:16, 49:5,   | 90:7, 139:24                  |
| 60:11, 62:22, 178:7                         | 121:6, 121:10,                   | 117:20   | 52:16, 57:16, 73:7,   | man [1] - 10:1                |
| Lane [3] - 3:13, 4:8,                       | 121:24, 121:25,                  | lights [1] - 117:11  | 91:7, 124:15, 189:17  | managed [3] - 119:25          |
| 4:12  | 122:23, 123:10,                  | likely [4] - 150:7,  | locations [1] - 25:20   | 193:24, 194:1                 |
| lane [2] - 132:5, 132:8                     | 123:12, 123:21,                  | 190:12, 190:14,  | longstanding [1] -  | management [1] -              |
| large [6] - 23:18, 38:5,                    | 143:18, 190:25                   | 194:6  | 183:1   | 195:5                         |
| 52:8, 54:18, 71:19,                         | legal [10] - 56:8,               | limb [1] - 196:12  | look [31] - 7:16, 10:17,  | managers [1] - 173:2          |
| 193:13                                      | 61:16, 61:20, 61:23,             | limit [6] - 75:14, 111:2,  | 11:13, 14:14, 20:25,  | managing [1] - 174:24         |
| larger [2] - 68:19, 95:4                    | 62:5, 146:24,                    | 111:19, 181:17,  | 23:14, 24:1, 28:21,   | mandatory [2] - 66:25         |
| last [24] - 7:22, 17:22,                    | 176:19, 176:24,                  | 191:17, 195:15   | 30:22, 31:15, 43:23,  | 105:11                        |
| 20:18, 21:4, 22:17,                         | 184:15, 184:16                   | limited [2] - 8:24, 68:4   | 46:22, 47:2, 78:10,   | maneuver [1] - 137:13         |
| 31:8, 46:20, 46:23,                         | legally [1] - 184:17             | limits [1] - 112:19  | 87:14, 98:20, 98:21,  | manipulated [1] -             |
| 46:24, 48:14, 63:1,                         | legibly [1] - 14:16              | Lincoln [2] - 6:10,  | 98:22, 121:16,  | 190:1                         |
| 64:18, 64:22, 67:6,                         | <b>LEHENY</b> [1] - 2:17         | 8:11   | 128:10, 128:12,   |                               |
| 72:21, 87:10, 95:18,                        | Leheny [1] - 19:11               | line [15] - 107:1,   | 138:9, 147:23,  | manner [2] - 73:2,<br>144:7   |
| 97:5, 100:10,                               | Leibman [1] - 106:15             | 108:9, 109:19,   | 161:20, 162:13,   |                               |
| 114:15, 143:2,                              | lens [4] - 162:13,               | 119:12, 119:20,  | 169:6, 171:15,  | Marc [1] - 106:15             |
| 147:23, 147:24,                             | 166:7, 166:9, 166:13             | 133:15, 139:23,  | 173:9, 173:10,  | <b>Marie</b> [5] - 3:15, 4:9, |
| 148:1                                       | less [19] - 24:17, 25:3,         | 169:4, 169:6, 169:9,   | 178:21, 181:11  | 133:4, 159:24,                |
| late [4] - 17:14, 17:21,                    | 28:20, 35:23, 36:6,              | 169:13, 169:16,  | looked [10] - 57:24,  | 160:20                        |
| 43:25, 178:15                               | 36:18, 67:5, 83:4,               | The state of the s | 65:13, 66:5, 74:19,   | MARIE [1] - 160:16            |
| Laughter [2] - 97:23,                       | 92:18, 92:20,                    | 169:17, 195:22,<br>195:25  | 79:24, 88:6, 88:12,   | mark [7] - 16:17,             |
| 132:3                                       | 120:21, 121:14,                  |  | 120:22, 142:21,   | 143:7, 145:8,                 |
|   | 121:22, 121:23,                  | line-of-sight [2] -  | 171:13  | 161:25, 162:2,                |
| LAURA [2] - 1:22, 2:22<br>LauraACaruccillc@ | 123:3, 128:23,                   | 169:4, 169:9   | looking [5] - 23:5,   | 165:7, 168:6                  |
| gmail.com [2] - 1:25,                       | 128:25                           | line-up [1] - 119:20   | 142:1, 142:21,  | marked [16] - 15:24,          |
| •   | Letter [2] - 5:4, 5:5            | lines [3] - 119:17,  | 148:14, 163:14  | 16:22, 18:11, 21:11           |
| 2:25  | letter [21] - 5:16, 16:1,        | 119:18, 119:19   | looks [8] - 16:25,  | 22:1, 125:15,                 |
| Law [9] - 10:21, 11:15,                     | 16:4, 16:25, 17:3,               | list [5] - 15:20, 74:14,   | 110:18, 127:24,   | 125:18, 136:17,               |
| 31:12, 31:19, 32:5,                         |                                  | 74:22, 145:11, 156:5   | 128:1, 154:20,  | 143:10, 145:12,               |
| 37:8, 60:11, 62:22,<br>178:7                | 22:3, 125:15,<br>125:19, 125:25, | listed [1] - 72:17   | 155:25, 159:16,   | 148:6, 161:15,                |
|   | 126:1, 136:16,                   | listen [3] - 54:12,  | 178:20  | 161:16, 162:4,                |
| law [16] - 11:14, 18:17,                    | 136:20, 136:23,                  | 89:10, 92:1  | low [5] - 25:16, 44:24,   | 165:9, 167:2                  |
| 47:5, 60:17, 66:14,                         | 138:2, 145:10,                   | listened [1] - 197:13  | 54:23, 190:7, 196:19  | market [5] - 26:22,           |
| 93:17, 106:17,                              | 148:10, 148:23,                  | lists [1] - 66:21  | Luglio [1] - 118:4  | 47:4, 55:8, 71:22,            |
| 114:7, 135:11,                              | 149:19, 149:25,                  | literally [1] - 73:1   | Luglio's [1] - 120:15   | 87:19                         |
| 141:18, 160:13,                             |                                  | litigation [1] - 195:20  | Lyndhurst [2] -   | marketing [1] - 72:15         |
| 175:13, 175:14,                             | 151:16, 152:14                   | live [12] - 14:7, 25:1,  | •                           | marketplace [3] -             |
| 176:13, 179:12,                             | letters [3] - 150:4,             | 51:17, 54:22, 54:24,   | 114:11, 135:15  | 27:16, 47:13, 53:10           |
| 186:6                                       | 150:6, 152:7                     | 90:22, 110:18,   | N.A   | markets [1] - 71:20           |
| laws [5] - 92:25, 93:5,                     | letting [1] - 123:4              | 125:11, 140:11,  | M   | marking [1] - 17:5            |
| 93:6, 93:14, 93:21                          | level [3] - 33:4, 35:25,         | 154:19, 156:6,   |   | MARSON [28] -                 |
| lawyers [1] - 179:12                        | 37:10                            | 187:15   | ma'am [2] - 167:21,   | 157:11, 157:23,               |
| lead [1] - 47:10                            | levels [1] - 36:22               | lived [1] - 55:25  | 181:6   | 158:2, 158:9,                 |
| leading [2] - 194:25,                       | <b>Levine</b> [2] - 3:10,        | lives [4] - 52:1, 52:7,  | <b>Madam</b> [1] - 6:5  | 158:19, 159:1,                |
| 196:5                                       | 96:20                            | 165:15, 165:16   | magnitude [2] -   | 159:19, 173:7,                |
| learner [1] - 145:23                        | <b>LEVINE</b> [3] - 96:20,       | living [2] - 48:20,  | 128:15, 129:17  | 174:14, 174:17,               |
| leasing [1] - 172:6                         | 97:3, 97:15                      | 171:22   | MAI [1] - 26:17   | 174:20, 174:23,               |
| loact rot 0:22 57:21                        | liable [1] - 195:20              | <b>LLC</b> [4] - 2:17, 8:9,  | mail [2] - 17:1, 134:11   | 175:2, 175:6,                 |
| least [8] - 8:22, 57:21,                    | 1:1t O.E. 7                      | 18:20, 19:11   |   | 175:22, 175:25,               |
| 73:3, 88:7, 89:3,                           | liberty [1] - 85:7               | 10.20, 19.11   | mailed M 150-5  | - ,,                          |
|   | License [2] - 200:4,             | LLP [2] - 1:5, 2:6   | mailed [1] - 152:5  | 176:6, 176:11,                |
| 73:3, 88:7, 89:3,                           | • • •                            |  | mailed [1] - 152:5<br>mails [1] - 16:25<br>main [2] - 23:13, 32:6 |                               |

| 470.44 470.00                                    |
|--|
| 179:14, 179:23,                                  |
| 181:14, 181:16,<br>181:21, 182:9                 |
| Marson [5] - 4:7,                                |
| 157:7, 157:9,                                    |
| 172:24, 174:13                                   |
| marvel [1] - 188:15                              |
| Master [7] - 31:3, 31:4,                         |
| 39:17, 40:20, 41:6,                              |
| 57:4, 57:8                                       |
| master [65] - 20:10,                             |
| 20:13, 20:15, 21:8,                              |
| 30:5, 30:12, 30:23,                              |
| 31:3, 32:11, 33:13,                              |
| 37:16, 37:22, 39:8,                              |
| 39:9, 39:10, 39:11,<br>39:18, 39:20, 40:17,      |
| 40:22, 41:24, 43:7,                              |
| 46:3, 46:12, 46:20,                              |
| 46:23, 47:6, 47:11,                              |
| 47:14, 47:19, 47:25,                             |
| 57:1, 59:9, 59:14,                               |
| 59:19, 60:13, 60:19,                             |
| 61:15, 62:1, 62:2,                               |
| 62:10, 62:13, 63:17,                             |
| 63:21, 65:12, 65:20,                             |
| 66:11, 66:14, 66:20,<br>67:8, 67:14, 76:20,      |
| 84:11, 88:24, 94:8,                              |
| 94:11, 94:16, 94:18,                             |
| 98:5, 98:21, 108:16,                             |
| 108:17, 109:1,                                   |
| 109:2, 182:19                                    |
| master's [3] - 19:25,                            |
| 115:2, 136:9                                     |
| match [1] - 137:19                               |
| MATER [1] - 1:4                                  |
| materially [1] - 149:5                           |
| Matt [1] - 9:24                                  |
| <b>matter</b> [18] - 6:9, 7:1, 8:16, 8:18, 8:20, |
| 12:3, 12:11, 12:17,                              |
| 12:19, 12:23, 39:7,                              |
| 46:2, 50:15, 107:9,                              |
| 112:18, 158:1,                                   |
| 158:2, 178:17                                    |
| maximize [1] - 186:14                            |
| Mayberry [1] - 41:16                             |
| mayor [13] - 88:6,                               |
| 100:11, 101:3,                                   |
| 105:17, 176:21,                                  |
| 176:25, 177:22,<br>177:24, 178:20,               |
| 183:3, 183:6, 183:12                             |
| mean [22] - 11:22,                               |
| 21:22, 51:25, 53:25,                             |
| 55:20, 61:12, 63:13,                             |
| 63:23, 65:11, 67:5,                              |
| 86:17, 88:16, 89:5,                              |
| 94:7, 107:22, 120:7,                             |

```
122:11, 144:17,
 152:14, 155:16,
 163:20, 170:4
meaning [3] - 25:14,
 51:16, 137:11
means [3] - 93:9,
 102:24, 132:19
meant [3] - 21:13,
 41:19, 124:9
measure [1] - 129:9
measured [1] - 185:13
mechanisms [1] -
 103:15
mediated [1] - 103:20
mediation [2] - 32:24,
 44:16
Medici [12] - 29:6,
 29:10, 29:12, 30:1,
 30:3, 30:9, 46:8,
 46:16, 47:19, 86:23,
 98:2, 98:15
meet [11] - 25:19,
 28:16, 32:22, 34:3,
 81:1, 81:5, 86:6,
 103:4, 103:5,
 104:19, 184:10
meeting [16] - 7:22,
 13:21, 45:2, 48:14,
 95:19, 96:4, 102:17,
 109:10, 109:14,
 109:16, 132:12,
 133:18, 137:10,
 177:14, 183:9,
 197:16
meetings [1] - 183:7
MEG [1] - 2:19
MEMBER [10] - 1:11,
 1:12, 1:13, 1:14,
 165:18, 179:8,
 179:10, 180:14,
 181:3, 181:7
member [10] - 12:10,
 12:12, 12:13, 12:16,
 12:22, 13:6, 173:14,
 174:11, 180:5
MEMBERS [7] - 111:4,
 111:15, 111:18,
 156:23, 172:19,
 181:9, 196:24
members [23] - 6:4,
 9:5, 9:11, 11:6,
 14:11, 19:1, 19:2,
 19:3, 21:12, 21:17,
 56:15, 58:10, 89:8,
 89:11, 90:14, 97:19,
 109:24, 131:18,
 133:23. 135:6.
 139:15, 140:2, 141:6
membership [1] -
```

12:24

```
memo [3] - 16:15,
                            41:7, 41:18, 42:1,
 21:23, 42:2
                            42:13, 42:19, 43:1,
Memorandum [2] -
                            43:5, 43:8, 43:19,
                            44:6, 44:19, 45:11,
 5:8, 5:11
                            45:18, 45:24, 46:6,
memorandum [4] -
                            57:18, 57:24, 66:4,
 16:9, 20:21, 20:22,
 42:23
memorandums [1] -
                            78:22, 79:6, 79:12,
 43:7
                            79:21, 80:6, 84:8,
                            87:12, 100:11,
memorialized [1] -
                            182:20
 123:15
                           mixed-use [8] - 42:13,
mention [1] - 150:23
                            42:19, 43:1, 57:18,
mentioned [8] - 31:10,
                            78:17, 78:20, 84:8,
 35:9, 42:1, 50:21,
                            100:11
 82:3, 82:10, 102:16,
                           MLU [1] - 60:24
 197:8
                           modeling [2] - 190:2,
mere [1] - 159:11
                            190:3
merely [1] - 44:13
                           moderate [3] - 25:16,
Merit [1] - 200:5
                            44:24, 54:23
merits [1] - 107:24
                           moderate-income [1]
mess [1] - 191:8
                            - 25:16
met [6] - 29:6, 77:3,
                           modernize [1] - 28:6
 98:8, 182:7, 184:7
                           modifications [1] -
methodology [1] -
                            136:21
 128:1
                           moment [2] - 10:14,
metropolitan [1] -
                            61:8
 35:10
                           money [1] - 196:14
mic [1] - 87:8
                           month [1] - 7:22
MICHAEL [1] - 1:16
                           months [4] - 17:21,
microphone [2] -
                            85:1, 156:24, 181:4
 12:6, 133:7
                           Montvale [1] - 191:22
might [9] - 17:25,
                           moreover [3] - 27:12,
 18:3, 47:16, 54:8,
                            36:8, 82:17
 56:14, 86:14, 111:2,
                           morning [4] - 120:18,
 111:12, 178:20
                            120:23, 121:20,
millennials [1] - 27:2
                            123:12
mind [5] - 8:22, 88:1,
                           Morris [1] - 6:10
 91:21, 92:6, 121:2
                           most [8] - 19:18, 20:5,
mine [1] - 152:8
minor [2] - 136:22,
 137:15
                           mostly [2] - 67:12,
minute [4] - 6:6,
 89:23, 143:2, 197:2
                            92:24
                           motion [17] - 8:24,
minutes [7] - 121:3,
                            8:25, 11:2, 89:21,
 146:13, 155:21,
                            90:2, 90:5, 90:7,
 181:1, 191:20,
                            109:19, 131:12,
 195:14, 197:9
                            131:14, 133:19,
mischaracterized [2] -
                            138:7, 139:10,
 30:2, 90:23
                            139:23, 139:24,
misrepresentation [1]
                            140:19, 141:1
 - 164:20
                           motorists [1] - 117:19
miss [1] - 198:10
                           mountain [1] - 164:21
mistaken [1] - 107:4
                           move [21] - 13:17,
mitigated [1] - 87:11
                            45:5, 52:3, 52:17,
mix [5] - 38:4, 41:13,
 43:10, 49:7, 79:4
mixed [41] - 27:13,
                            79:24, 100:19,
 33:3, 35:3, 37:22,
                            110:22, 112:17,
 39:11, 39:19, 39:23,
 40:8, 40:14, 41:4,
```

140:11, 156:5, 156:13, 180:23, 181:2 moved [2] - 139:11, 141:2 movement [3] - 117:3, 78:17, 78:20, 78:21, 120:17, 120:23 movements [1] -121:24 movie [1] - 27:9 moving [4] - 51:23, 54:8, 54:18, 172:16 MR [641] - 6:3, 6:5, 6:21, 7:12, 7:15, 7:17, 7:21, 8:13, 8:17, 8:23, 8:25, 9:13, 9:21, 10:8, 10:10, 10:24, 11:1, 11:2, 11:12, 11:19, 11:20, 11:21, 11:25, 12:2, 12:8, 12:14, 12:15, 12:19, 12:21, 12:25, 13:1, 13:3, 13:6, 13:9, 13:13, 13:14, 13:18, 13:19, 13:20, 15:5, 15:14, 15:16, 15:17, 15:22, 15:23, 17:7, 17:8, 17:11, 17:17, 17:20, 17:24, 18:2, 18:3, 18:7, 18:12, 18:18, 18:24, 32:19, 40:1, 48:6, 48:10, 48:13, 49:22. 50:5. 50:17. 51:13, 51:14, 51:21, 52:11, 52:23, 53:13, 53:23, 54:3, 54:12, 54:15, 55:11, 55:22, 56:11, 56:13, 56:14, 56:18, 56:22, 56:24, 48:24, 50:13, 59:12, 58:7, 58:9, 58:10, 150:7, 193:16, 194:6 58:12, 58:14, 58:15, 58:17, 58:20, 58:24, 59:2, 61:12, 61:13, 61:16, 61:18, 61:20, 61:25, 62:4, 62:6, 62:8, 62:10, 62:12, 62:14, 62:16, 62:17, 63:9, 63:13, 63:16, 63:20, 63:21, 63:22, 63:23, 63:25, 64:6, 64:7, 64:13, 66:15, 66:18, 66:19, 69:5, 69:6, 69:8, 69:9, 69:14, 69:15, 69:17, 69:21, 69:22, 69:23, 56:12, 62:15, 64:14, 70:1, 70:2, 70:25, 68:17, 76:18, 76:23, 71:2, 71:6, 71:9, 71:11, 71:12, 71:14, 71:25, 72:3, 72:10, 112:22, 125:14,

| 72:11, 72:14, 72:18, 73:18, 131:14, 13 |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
|--|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|---|-----------------|
| 75:14, 758, 75:10, 75:14, 753, 756. 122.18, 132.18, 1582, 1581. 176.18, 75:20, 141.23, 142.8, 142.18, 158.18, 158.11,  | 72:12, 72:17, 72:18,                  | 131:16, 131:24,      | 157:10, 157:11,      | 175:22, 175:23,                         | 133:8, 133:14,  |
| 75:14, 76:3, 76:6, 76:22, 78:20, 78:21, 133:23, 186:9, 158:11, 176:14, 176:17, 76:17, 76:22, 78:20, 78:24, 78:1, 79:3, 79:15, 78:24, 78:1, 79:15, 79:15, 99:15, 199:15, 1 | 72:19, 72:24, 75:3,                   | 132:1, 132:4,        | 157:21, 157:23,      | 175:25, 176:1,                          | 139:24, 141:19, |
| 7.6.2.7.8.2.0.7.8.2.1. 133.15, 133.19, 188.12, | 75:6, 75:8, 75:10,                    | 132:15, 132:18,      | 158:1, 158:2, 158:7, | 176:6, 176:10,                          | 141:23, 142:8,  |
| 78:24, 79:1, 79:3, 79:6, 79:9, 79:15, 79:6, 79:9, 79:15, 79:6, 79:9, 79:15, 79:6, 79:9, 79:15, 79:6, 79:9, 79:15, 79:6, 79:9, 79:15, 79:6, 79:9, 79:15, 79:6, 79:9, 79:15, 80:16, 80:17, 80:18, 80:12, 80:14, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:13, 80:14, 80:14, 80:10, 80:12, 80:14, 80:14, 80:10, 80:12, 80:14, 80:14, 80:10, 80:14, 80:14, 80:10, 80:14, | 75:14, 76:3, 76:6,                    | 132:23, 133:3,       | 158:9, 158:11,       | 176:11, 176:17,                         | 142:12, 142:15, |
| 979, 799, 791-15, 80-16, 80-15, 80-17, 80-16, 80-15, 80-17, 80-16 | 76:22, 78:20, 78:21,                  | 133:15, 133:19,      | 158:13, 158:15,      | 176:18, 176:20,                         | 143:13, 143:17, |
| 80.15, 80.17, 80.18, 80.17, 80.18, 80.20, 84.13, 84.15, 84.16, 84.18, 84.23, 87.8, 85.10, 85.11, 85.23, 85.18, 85.13, 135.9, 159.24, 159.24, 160.7, 179.11, 179.14, 179.14, 145.24, 146.11, 145.24, 146.11, 145.24, 146.11, 145.24, 146.11, 145.24, 146.11, 145.24, 146.11, 145.24, 146.11, 145.24, 146.11, 146.24, 146.24, 14 | 78:24, 79:1, 79:3,                    | 133:21, 134:4,       | 158:17, 158:19,      | 177:1, 177:5, 177:6,                    | 143:22, 144:1,  |
| 80.20, 84-13, 84-15, 43 | 79:6, 79:9, 79:15,                    | 134:6, 134:8,        | 158:21, 158:24,      | 177:8, 177:16,                          | 144:4, 144:11,  |
| 49416, 8418, 8429, 425, 451, 451, 451, 452, 451, 451, 451, 451, 452, 451, 451, 451, 452, 451, 451, 451, 451, 451, 451, 451, 451  | 80:15, 80:17, 80:18,                  | 134:20, 134:23,      | 159:1, 159:4, 159:6, | 177:18, 177:23,                         | 144:14, 144:19, |
| 8428, 854, 855, 854, 865, 138:12, 139.7, 159.24, 160.7, 179.11, 179.14, 145.20, 1461.1, 185.28, 862, 867, 867, 867, 867, 867, 868, 86.24, 873, 139.11, 139.13, 161.7, 161.11, 179.14, 180.13, 179.25, 146.16, 146.20, 182.25, 161.1, 180.22, 161.1, 180.4, 180.13, 179.25, 146.16, 146.20, 182.25, 161.2, 181.14, 181. | 80:20, 84:13, 84:15,                  | 135:1, 135:9,        | 159:14, 159:19,      | 177:25, 179:3,                          | 145:1, 145:4,   |
| 88.8 8.6 10, 85.11, 136.15, 138.8, 160.12, 160.19, 179.17, 179.18, 146.1, 146.11, 182.2, 86.2, 86.7, 86.9, 86.24, 87.3, 139.11, 139.13, 161.7, 161.11, 180.4, 180.13, 147.18, 147.24, 147.24, 97.6, 87.9, 88.5, 139.25, 140.6, 161.14, 161.24, 180.18, 180.23, 181.11, 181.14, 189.14, 90.10, 90.21, 140.18, 140.22, 140.18, 140.22, 140.18, 140.22, 140.18, 140.22, 140.18, 140.22, 141.19, 141.23, 162.25, 163.6, 181.11, 181.18, 181.12, 191.23, 91.24, 92.5, 141.14, 141.9, 162.25, 163.6, 181.21, 181.22, 187.16, 181.20, 181.21, 181.20, 187.18, 187.20, 187.28, 187.28, 187.28, 187.28, 187.28, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, 187.29, 187.28, | 84:16, 84:18, 84:23,                  | 135:12, 135:18,      | 159:20, 159:22,      | 179:5, 179:6, 179:9,                    | 145:14, 145:18, |
| 852,8,62,662,867, 869,8864,873, 139:11, 139:13, 161:7, 161:11, 179:23, 179:25, 140:13, 140:10, 140:16, 162:6, 162:9, 181:11, 181:14, 180:18, 180:23, 148:12, 149:7, 149:12, 141:2, 141:3, 161:2, 162:25, 163:6, 181:21, 181:22, 150:7, 150:14, 149:12, 149:14, 149:12, 149:14, 149:22, 150:1, 141:1, 141:2, 141:3, 161:2, 163:3, 163:20, 187:18, 187:24, 141:1, 141:2, 141:3, 161:19, 162:25, 163:3, 163:20, 187:18, 187:24, 148:12, 149:7, 150:7, 150:14 | 84:25, 85:4, 85:5,                    | 136:12, 136:14,      | 159:24, 160:7,       | 179:11, 179:14,                         | 145:20, 146:1,  |
| 86.9. 86.24, 87.3, 139.11, 139.13, 161.7, 161.11, 180.4, 180.13, 180.23, 187.6, 87.9, 88.5, 89.7, 89.13, 89.14, 90.10, 90.21, 140.18, 140.22, 162.9, 163.14, 91.16, 191.21, 141.9, 162.25, 163.6, 163.20, 181.11, 181.14, 149.21, 149.12, 149.13, 162.25, 163.6, 181.21, 181.16, 181.18, 149.22, 150.1, 181.29, 182.29, 182.10, 182.3, 181.21, 181.22, 150.7, 150.14, 191.29, 191.29, 191.29, 192.20, 142.10, 142.13, 162.25, 163.6, 163.20, 187.18, 187.20, 151.3, 151.7, 192.18, 92.19, 92.20, 142.10, 142.13, 164.5, 164.7, 164.21, 164.24, 165.26, 163.24, 164.24, 165.6, 188.24, 187.22, 187.24, 187.22, 187.24, 181.22, 187.24, 188.2, 143.20, 143.23, 164.24, 165.6, 188.44, 188.7, 152.8, 152.3, 152.4, 163.44, 166.19, 166.54, 166.14, 166.19, 166.15, 166.25, 166.25, 166.24, 166.25, 166.24, 166.25, 166.24, 166.25, 166.24, 166.25, 166.24, 166.25, 166.24, 166.24, 166.25, 166.24, 166.24, 166.25, 166.24, 166.24, 167.4, 167.8, 197.11, 170.14, 170.16, 171.20, 148.14, 148.16, 169.24, 169.22, 110.5, 148.11, 148.14, 148.16, 169.24, 169.22, 110.5, 148.11, 148.12, 169.22, 110.5, 148.11, 148.12, 169.22, 110.5, 148.11, 148.12, 169.22, 110.5, 148.11, 148.12, 169.24, 169.2, 169.24, 169.2, 110.11, 170.13, 101.6, 161.13, 162.25, 167.24, 169.24, 169.2, 110.24, 161.2, 169.24, 161.2, 111.21, 111.22, 1121.1, 149.9, 149.13, 112.21, 112.1, 149.9, 149.13, 169.24, 169.24, 169.2, 169.24, 169.2, 169.24, 169.2, 169.24, 169.2, 169.14, 149.9, 149.13, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 112.15, 113.15, 152.24, 153.14, 153.12, 153 | 85:8, 85:10, 85:11,                   | 136:15, 138:8,       | 160:12, 160:19,      | 179:17, 179:18,                         | 146:4, 146:11,  |
| 876, 879, 885, 813, 897, 8913, 140:10, 140:16, 162:6, 162:9, 181:11, 181:14, 181:14, 191:16, 91:21, 140:18, 140:22, 162:19, 162:23, 181:16, 181:18, 149:22, 150:11, 140:18, 140:22, 162:19, 162:23, 181:16, 181:18, 149:22, 150:11, 140:18, 140:22, 162:19, 162:23, 181:16, 181:18, 149:22, 150:11, 190:21, 190:21, 141:14, 141:2, 141:3, 162:26, 163:36, 181:21, 181:22, 182:10, 150:7, 150:14, 150:21, 190:22, 192:24, 992.2, 141:14, 141:2, 141:3, 164:3, 164:5, 164:7, 187:22, 182:20, 192:49, 992.2, 143:7, 143:11, 164:9, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:10, 164:15, 166:14, 166:19, 191:19, 191:11, 191:11, 196:19, 196:19, 199:19, 191:10, 196:19, 191:10, 191:19, 191:10, 196:19, 191:10, 191:19, 191:10, 196:19, 191:10, 191:19, 191:10, 196:22, 150:1, 166:24, 166:6, 166:10, 191:19, 191:10, 191:19, 191:10, 196:24, 166:10, 166:14, 166:19, 191:10, 191:19, 191:10, 191:19, 191:10, 196:24, 166:10, 166:14, 166:19, 191:19, 191:10, 191:19, 191:10, 196:24, 166:10, 166:14, 166:19, 191:19, 191:10, 191:19, 191:10, 196:24, 166:25, 166:44, 166:19, 191:10, 191:19, 191:10, 196:24, 166:10, 166:15, 167:19, 167:21, 166:25, 166:24, 169:24,  | 85:25, 86:2, 86:7,                    | 138:12, 139:7,       | 160:22, 161:1,       | 179:23, 179:25,                         | 146:16, 146:20, |
| 8823, 897, 8913, 49:10, 49:10, 90:21, 49:16, 9124, 91:16, 91:24, 91:3, 91:24, 92:5, 141:1, 141:2, 141:3, 162:25, 163:6, 181:11, 181:14, 149:22, 150:1, 150:14, 191:29, 91:24, 92:5, 141:1, 141:2, 163:16, 163:20, 182:10, 187:20, 182:10, 150:18, 150:22, 192:24, 93:2, 93:2, 93:2, 143:7, 143:11, 164:9, 164:10, 184:14, 148:9, 143:11, 184:29, 143:11, 184:29, 143:11, 184:29, 143:11, 184:29, 143:11, 184:29, 143:11, 184:29, 143:11, 184:29, 143:11, 184:29, 143:20, 143:23, 164:24, 165:6, 188:4, 188:7, 182:28, 152:11, 182:18, 98:12, 143:11, 143:24, 148:12, 182:23, 166:24, 189:20, 191:5, 183:11, 153:16, 198:15, 189:10, 191:12, 191:14, 191:12, 191:14 | 86:9, 86:24, 87:3,                    | 139:11, 139:13,      | 161:7, 161:11,       | 180:4, 180:13,                          | 147:18, 147:24, |
| 89:14, 90:10, 90:21,   140:18, 140:22,   141:14, 141:2, 141:3,   162:25, 163:6,   181:21, 181:22,   150:14,   150:7, 150:14,   150:19, 162:19, 162:25, 163:6,   181:21, 181:22,   150:14,   150:7, 150:14,   150:19, 163:19, 163:19, 163:10,   187:18, 187:20,   151:3, 151:18,   150:7, 150:14,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:14,   150:19, 150:14,   150:19, 150:14,   150:19, 150:14,   150:19, 150:14,   150:19, 150:14,   150:19, 150:14,   150:19, 150:14,   150:19, 150:14,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:11,   150:19, 150:19,   150:11,   150:19, 150:19,   150:11,   150:19, 150:19,   150:11,   150:19, 150:19,   150:11,   150:19, 150:19,   150:11,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150:19, 150:19,   150   | 87:6, 87:9, 88:5,                     | 139:25, 140:6,       | 161:14, 161:24,      | 180:18, 180:23,                         | 148:2, 149:7,   |
| 91:43, 91:46, 91:21, 141:1, 141:2, 141:3, 182:25, 183:6, 183:21, 181:22, 182:9, 182:10, 92:13, 92:10, 92:13, 141:14, 141:26, 163:16, 163:20, 187:18, 187:20, 151:3, 151:17, 152:2, 192:29, 92:29, 92:24, 93:2, 142:10, 142:13, 164:3, 164:6, 164:7, 187:22, 187:24, 151:13, 151:17, 152:2, 152:4, 93:24, 94:29, 93:2, 142:20, 143:23, 164:24, 165:6, 188:4, 188:7, 182:22, 153:7, 143:24, 144:2, 165:15, 165:19, 188:4, 188:7, 189:6, 152:22, 153:7, 143:24, 144:2, 165:15, 165:19, 188:4, 188:7, 189:6, 152:21, 153:15, 155:19, 188:10, 189:20, 191:5, 153:11, 153:16, 155:18, 95:12, 95:15, 144:17, 144:24, 165:4, 166:6, 166:10, 191:9, 191:11, 154:3, 154:7, 155:19, 155:1 |                                       | 140:10, 140:16,      | 162:6, 162:9,        |   | 149:12, 149:14, |
| 99128, 99210, 9213, 14114, 14126, 16329, 16312, 18718, 18720, 15131, 1517, 1513, 1513, 151 | 89:14, 90:10, 90:21,                  | 140:18, 140:22,      | 162:19, 162:23,      | 181:16, 181:18,                         | 149:22, 150:1,  |
| 92:8, 92:10, 92:13, 141:14, 142:6, 163:16, 163:20, 187:18, 187:20, 151:13, 151:17, 92:15, 92:19, 92:24, 93:2, 142:10, 142:13, 164:45, 164:7, 187:22, 187:24, 151:13, 151:18, 151:23, 193:3, 94:3, 143:20, 143:23, 164:424, 165:6, 188:4, 188:7, 152:8, 152:2, 153:7, 94:22, 94:24, 94:25, 144:9, 144:12, 165:15, 165:19, 188:15, 189:6, 152:22, 153:7, 94:22, 94:24, 94:25, 95:15, 144:9, 144:12, 165:23, 166:4, 189:20, 191:5, 153:11, 153:16, 95:8, 95:12, 95:15, 144:9, 144:12, 166:6, 166:10, 191:19, 191:11, 154:3, 154:7, 154:10 |                                       | 141:1, 141:2, 141:3, | 162:25, 163:6,       |   | 150:7, 150:14,  |
| 92:16, 92:19, 92:20, 92:24, 93:2, 93:2, 143:7, 143:11, 164:3, 164:5, 164:7, 187:22, 187:24, 151:13, 151:18, 151:28, 152:4, 93:4, 93:13, 94:3, 94:5, 94:9, 143:24, 144:2, 165:16, 165:19, 188:15, 189:6, 152:21, 152:3, 152:4, 94:2, 94:24, 94:25, 94:24, 94:25, 94:24, 94:25, 96:11, 144:9, 144:12, 165:23, 166:4, 189:20, 191:5, 153:11, 153:16, 153:11, 153:11, 153:11, 153:16, 153:11, 153: | , , , ,                               |                      |                      | 182:9, 182:10,                          | 150:18, 150:22, |
| 9221, 9224, 9322, 943, 14320, 14323, 16449, 165619, 1884, 1887, 1528, 15211, 1934, 945, 94-9, 9422, 9424, 9425, 9424, 9425, 9515, 14419, 14412, 166523, 1664, 16610, 1919, 19111, 15311, 15311, 15316, 15511, 15311, 15316, 15511, 15311, 15316, 15511, 15311, 15316, 15511, 15311, 15316, 15511, 15311, 15316, 15511, 15311, 15311, 15316, 15511, 15511, | , , , , ,                             | · · ·                |                      | · ·                                     |                 |
| 934, 93-13, 94-3, 94-4, 94-5, 94-9, 94-24, 94-25, 94-24, 94-25, 94-24, 94-25, 95-16, 95-16, 95-16, 95-17, 144-9, 144-12, 165-23, 166-4, 169-10, 191-19, 191-11, 154-3, 154-7, 153-11, 153-16, 166-14, 166-19, 191-12, 191-11, 154-3, 154-7, 153-11, 153-16, 166-14, 166-19, 191-12, 191-11, 154-3, 154-7, 153-11, 153-16, 166-19, 191-12, 191-11, 154-3, 154-7, 154-19, 195-19, 191-12, 191-14, 154-19, 195-19, 191-19, 191-11, 154-19, 195-19, 191-19 |                                       |                      |                      | l l                                     |                 |
| 9.44, 9.45, 9.49, 9.42, 94.22, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 94.24, 94.25, 95.18, 95.22, 96.2, 96.19, 96.11, 96.5, 96.9, 96.11, 145.9, 145.11, 145.24, 166.14, 166.19, 191.12, 191.114, 154.10, 154.19, 155.1, 155.4, 96.12, 96.17, 97.16, 145.19, 145.24, 167.4, 167.8, 195.12, 191.16, 191.19, 191.11, 154.10, 154.19, 155.1, 155.4, 96.12, 96.17, 97.16, 145.19, 145.24, 167.14, 167.18, 167.14, 167.18, 195.12, 195.10, 155.13, 155.19, 97.24, 98.9, 98.25, 98.25, 146.3, 146.8, 146.15, 167.19, 167.21, 195.12, 195.10, 195.12, 195 |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 94:22, 94:24, 94:25, 95:18, 95:12, 95:15, 95:18, 95:22, 96:2, 96:11, 95:23, 156:44; 166:44, 166:19, 191:12, 191:14, 154:10, 154:19, 96:5, 96:9, 96:11, 145:9, 145:17, 145:9, 145:17, 145:9, 145:17, 96:12, 96:17, 97:16, 96:17, 97:16, 96:17, 97:16, 96:12, 96:17, 97:16, 96:19, 146:3, 146:8, 166:24, 167:4, 167:8, 195:9, 195:10, 155:13, 155:19, 155:13, 155:19, 199:12, 99:15, 100:3, 146:10, 146:15, 167:19, 167:21, 196:12, 196:10, 196:10, 146:13, 160:11, 100:13, 101:6, 146:18, 146:21, 167:25, 168:2, 197:4, 197:6, 197:1, 160:24, 161:2, 102:13, 106:25, 147:8, 147:11, 168:3, 168:4, 168:5, 199:2, 119:10, 197:15, 161:9, 161:13, 109:22, 110:5, 148:11, 148:4, 168:24, 168:23, 198:11, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:10, 198:12, 198:14, 148:15, 169:15, 169:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 113:11, 113:13, 150:12, 150:16, 170:24, 171:2, 171:14, 151:15, 151:21, 171:14, 151:15, 151:21, 171:14, 151:15, 151:21, 171:14, 151:15, 151:21, 171:22, 172:14, 172:3, 172:24, 173:24, 174:14, 174:14, 174:14, 174:15, 175:24, 175:2 | , , , ,                               | · · ·                |                      |   | , ,             |
| 95.8, 95.12, 95.15, 95.14, 95.16, 95.22, 96.2, 96.12, 96.13, 145.6, 145.8, 145.8, 145.17, 146.23, 166.24, 166.19, 191.12, 191.14, 154.10, 155.13, 155.19, 96.12, 96.17, 97.16, 145.19, 145.24, 167.24, 167.24, 199.9, 195.10,  | , , ,                                 |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 9518, 95:22, 96:2, 96:3, 145:3, 145:6, 145:8, 96:5, 96:9, 96:11, 96:12, 96:17, 97:16, 145:19, 146:18, 146:15, 167:19, 167:21, 196:7, 196:9, 197:1, 160:14, 160:21, 100:13, 106:25, 147:8, 147:11, 168:3, 168:4, 168:5, 197:10, 197:15, 161:9, 161:13, 108:9, 109:18, 147:16, 147:21, 168:16, 168:17, 197:18, 197:19, 197:15, 161:19, 161:13, 109:22, 110:5, 111:2, 148:10, 148:12, 168:24, 169:2, 168:24, 169:2, 198:10, 198:12, 162:24, 163:1, 111:17, 111:20, 148:14, 148:16, 168:24, 169:2, 198:10, 198:12, 162:24, 163:1, 111:22, 112:14, 148:22, 149:2, 170:1, 170:4, 170:6, 198:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 112:19, 112:15, 112:15, 112:15, 148:19, 149:19, 149:13, 170:8, 170:10, 170:13, 170:13, 170:13, 170:13, 170:13, 170:13, 170:13, 170:13, 170:13, 170:13, 170:20, 170:22, 170:1, 170:24, 170:2, 170:20, 170:22, 170:1, 170:4, 170:6, 113:11, 113:13, 150:12, 150:16, 170:24, 171:2, 171:13, 171:17, 171:20, 150:16, 150:15, 150:16, 170:24, 171:2, 171:13, 171:17, 171:17, 171:20, 171:13, 171:17, 171:1 |                                       | 144:9, 144:12,       |                      |   |                 |
| 96:5, 96:9, 96:11, 145:9, 145:17, 166:23, 166:25, 191:16, 191:19, 155:13, 155:14, 156:14, 96:12, 96:17, 97:16, 199:12, 99:17, 100:3, 146:10, 146:15, 167:19, 167:21, 196:7, 196:9, 197:1, 160:3, 150:11, 100:13, 101:6, 146:18, 146:21, 167:25, 168:2, 197:4, 197:6, 197:1, 160:24, 161:2, 102:13, 166:25, 147:8, 147:11, 168:3, 168:4, 168:5, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:15, 197:10, 197:18, 197:19, 161:13, 197:18, 197:19, 161:15, 162:8, 199:14, 191:11, 191:12, 111:12, 148:10, 148:12, 168:24, 169:2, 198:10, 198:12, 162:24, 163:1, 111:17, 111:20, 148:14, 148:16, 169:8, 169:12, 198:10, 198:15, 163:38, 153:11, 111:12, 111:12, 112:1, 148:17, 148:22, 169:15, 169:23, 198:16, 198:21, 163:34, 163:31, 170:8, 170:10, 199:2, 199:4, 164:12, 164:19, 112:13, 112:15, 112:7, 148:25, 149:2, 170:11, 170:13, 198:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 112:16, 113:9, 150:3, 150:5, 170:20, 170:22, 171:4, 171:20, 171:4, 171:5, 171:8, 171:10, 171:30, 171:10, 150:14, 151:15, 151:21, 151:14, 151:15, 151:21, 171:19, 171:25, 171:30, 171:14, 171:19, 171:25, 171:30, 171:14, 171:13, 171:17, 100:15, 100:17, 100:19, 166:16, 166:21, 172:24, 1 |                                       | · · ·                |                      |   |                 |
| 96:12, 96:17, 97:16, 145:19, 145:24, 167:4, 167:8, 195:9, 195:10, 155:13, 155:19, 196:24, 98:9, 98:25, 146:3, 146:8, 167:10, 167:11, 196:7; 196:9, 197:1, 160:3, 160:1, 160:14, 160:21, 100:13, 101:6, 146:18, 146:21, 167:25, 168:2, 107:13, 106:25, 147:8, 147:11, 168:3, 168:4, 168:5, 197:10, 197:15, 161:9, 161:13, 108:9, 109:18, 147:16, 147:21, 168:16, 168:17, 197:18, 197:19, 161:15, 162:8, 109:22, 110:5, 148:1, 148:4, 168:21, 168:24, 169:2, 198:10, 198:3, 198:7, 162:24, 163:1, 111:17, 111:20, 148:14, 148:16, 169:8, 169:12, 198:14, 198:15, 163:8, 163:11, 111:25, 112:7, 148:25, 149:2, 170:1, 170:4, 170:6, 198:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 112:15, 112:15, 149:19, 149:24, 170:11, 170:13, 170:14, 151:15, 151:21, 170:24, 171:2, 113:22, 150:16, 170:24, 171:2, 171:19, 171:25, 173:24, 114:1, 151:15, 151:21, 171:19, 171:25, 173:14, 141:14, 152:13, 153:12, 172:21, 172:24, 172:22, 172:4, 172:29, 172:14, 151:10, 153:9, 153:12, 172:24, 172:21, 172:22, 172:24, 172:22, 172:4, 172:29, 172:14, 151:10, 153:9, 153:12, 172:24, 172:23, 172:25, 173:6, 173:7, 173:9, 155:19, 195:12, 195:14, 160:24, 160:24, 160:24, 160:24, 160:24, 160:24, 161:2, 160:24, 161:2, 160:24, 161:2, 160:24, 161:2, 160:24, 161:2, 160:24, 161:2, 160:24, 161:2, 161:15, 162:8, 160:12, 160:24, 160:24, 161:2, 197:18, 197:19, 161:15, 162:8, 160:12, 198:10, 198:3, 198:7, 162:14, 163:19, 163:14, 163:19, 198:10, 198: |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 97:24, 98:9, 98:25, 99:15, 100:3, 146:10, 146:15, 167:19, 167:21, 196:7, 196:9, 197:1, 160:24, 160:21, 100:13, 101:6, 146:10, 146:15, 167:21, 167:25, 168:2, 197:4, 197:6, 197:7, 160:24, 161:2, 102:13, 106:25, 147:8, 147:11, 168:3, 168:4, 168:5, 197:10, 197:15, 161:9, 161:13, 108:9, 109:18, 147:16, 147:21, 168:16, 168:17, 197:18, 197:19, 161:15, 162:8, 109:22, 110:5, 148:1, 148:4, 168:21, 168:23, 198:1, 198:3, 198:7, 162:21, 162:24, 163:1, 111:17, 111:20, 148:10, 148:12, 168:24, 169:2, 198:10, 198:12, 162:24, 163:1, 111:22, 112:1, 148:17, 148:22, 169:15, 169:23, 198:10, 198:21, 163:18, 163:11, 112:21, 112:11, 149:9, 149:13, 170:8, 170:10, 170:6, 198:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 170:11, 170:13, 170:11, 170:13, 170:11, 170:13, 170:11, 170:13, 170:11, 170:13, 170:11, 170:13, 170:14, 170:15, 150:12, 150:16, 170:24, 171:2, 151:15, 56:20, 89:23, 165:20, 166:1, 165:14, 165:16, 166:21, 170:24, 171:2, 171:30, 171:17, 100:15, 100:17, 166:34, 166:21, 167:34, |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 99:12, 99:15, 100:3, 146:10, 146:15, 167:19, 167:21, 196:7, 196:9, 197:1, 160:14, 160:21, 100:13, 101:6, 146:18, 146:21, 168:25, 168:2, 197:4, 197:6, 197:7, 160:24, 161:2, 102:13, 106:25, 147:8, 147:11, 168:3, 168:4, 168:5, 197:10, 197:15, 161:9, 161:13, 108:9, 109:18, 147:16, 147:21, 168:16, 168:17, 197:18, 197:19, 161:15, 162:8, 109:22, 110:5, 148:1, 148:4, 168:21, 168:23, 198:1, 198:3, 198:7, 162:11, 162:21, 111:12, 114:10, 148:10, 148:12, 168:24, 169:2, 198:10, 198:11, 198:11, 162:24, 163:1, 111:22, 112:1, 148:17, 148:22, 169:15, 169:23, 198:16, 198:21, 163:14, 163:19, 112:3, 112:5, 112:7, 148:25, 149:2, 170:11, 170:4, 170:6, 198:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 112:9, 112:11, 149:9, 149:13, 170:8, 170:10, 199:2, 199:4, 166:14, 163:19, 163:14, 163:19, 170:14, 170:13, 170:10, 199:2, 199:4, 166:14, 163:19, 163:14, 163:19, 163:14, 163:19, 170:14, 170:13, 170:14, 170:13, 170:10, 199:2, 199:4, 166:14, 163:14, 163:19, 163:14, 163:19, 170:14, 170:14, 170:15, 169:25, 163:23, 164:8, 163:11, 163:14, 163:19, 170:14, 170:13, 170:10, 199:2, 199:4, 166:14, 163:14, 163:19, 170:14, 170:10, 170:14, 170:14, 170:14, 170:1 |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 100:13, 101:6, 146:18, 146:21, 167:25, 168:2, 197:4, 197:6, 197:7, 160:24, 161:2, 102:13, 106:25, 147:8, 147:11, 168:3, 168:4, 168:5, 197:18, 197:19, 197:15, 161:9, 161:13, 108:9, 109:18, 147:16, 147:21, 168:16, 168:17, 168:23, 198:1, 198:3, 198:7, 162:24, 163:1, 111:8, 111:12, 148:10, 148:12, 168:24, 169:2, 198:10, 198:12, 162:24, 163:1, 111:22, 112:1, 148:14, 148:16, 169:8, 169:12, 198:10, 198:12, 163:4, 163:1, 163:8, 163:11, 111:22, 112:1, 148:17, 148:22, 169:15, 169:23, 198:10, 198:12, 163:4, 163:11, 163:24, 163:1, 111:22, 112:1, 148:25, 149:2, 170:1, 170:4, 170:6, 198:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 112:9, 112:11, 149:9, 149:24, 170:11, 170:13, 170:8, 170:10, 199:2, 199:4, 164:12, 164:19, 112:13, 112:15, 113:9, 150:3, 150:5, 170:20, 170:22, 151:15, 56:20, 89:23, 165:20, 166:1, 165:10, 113:17, 113:20, 150:21, 150:25, 171:4, 171:2, 171:24, 172:9, 112:14, 114:4, 114:8, 152:13, 153:5, 172:11, 172:13, 100:15, 100:15, 100:15, 100:17, 101:9, 167:13, 167:23, 114:13, 114:14, 151:15, 151:21, 172:13, 173:14, 173:10, 153:9, 153:12, 172:20, 172:22, 102:1, 102:23, 103:10, 169:13, 169:17, 173:14, 173:17, 173:24, 174:4, 175:22, 155:24, 155:24, 155:24, 156:25, 156:25, 174: |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 102:13, 106:25,  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 108:9, 109:18,   147:16, 147:21,   168:16, 168:17,   197:18, 197:19,   161:15, 162:8,   109:22, 110:5,   148:1, 148:4,   168:21, 168:23,   198:1, 198:3, 198:7,   162:21, 162:21,   111:17, 111:20,   148:10, 148:12,   168:24, 169:2,   198:10, 198:12,   162:24, 163:1,   111:22, 112:1,   148:17, 148:22,   169:15, 169:23,   198:16, 198:21,   163:8, 163:11,   112:23, 112:5, 112:7,   148:25, 149:2,   170:1, 170:4, 170:6,   198:23, 198:25,   163:23, 164:8,   112:9, 112:11,   149:9, 149:24,   170:11, 170:13,   199:2, 199:4,   164:12, 164:19,   112:13, 112:15,   149:19, 149:24,   170:11, 170:13,   189:23, 198:25,   163:23, 164:8,   112:16, 113:9,   150:3, 150:5,   170:20, 170:22,   105:5, 11:4, 15:10,   165:11, 165:16,   113:11, 113:13,   150:12, 150:16,   170:24, 171:2,   15:15, 56:20, 89:23,   165:20, 166:1,   113:22,   151:4, 151:12,   171:13, 171:17,   97:3, 97:15, 100:5,   166:16, 166:21,   114:3, 114:4,   114:8,   152:13, 153:5,   172:11, 172:13,   101:15, 101:18,   168:14, 168:19,   169:24, 189:1,   153:19, 153:12,   172:20, 172:22,   102:23,   102:21, 102:23,   169:10,   169:10,   117:24, 118:9,   153:25, 154:1,   172:23, 172:25,   102:21, 102:23,   169:10,   169:22, 182:14,   181:19, 124:8,   155:14, 155:24,   174:6, 174:8,   106:4, 106:7,   25:11, 43:12, 57:19,   166:13, 156:15,   174:18, 174:20,   106:4, 106:7,   25:11, 43:12, 57:19,   106:4, 106:7,   25:11, 43:12, 57:19,   106:14, 109:7, 109:9,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:17,   109:17, 109:1   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 109:22, 110:5,   148:1, 148:4,   168:21, 168:23,   198:1, 198:3, 198:7,   162:11, 162:21,   111:8, 111:12,   148:10, 148:12,   169:8, 169:12,   198:10, 198:12,   163:8, 163:11,   111:22, 112:1,   148:17, 148:22,   169:15, 169:23,   198:16, 198:21,   163:14, 163:19,   112:3, 112:5, 112:7,   148:25, 149:2,   170:1, 170:4, 170:6,   198:23, 198:25,   163:23, 164:8,   112:9, 112:11,   149:9, 149:13,   170:8, 170:10,   199:2, 199:4   164:12, 164:19,   112:13, 112:15,   149:19, 149:24,   170:11, 170:13,   MS [163] - 9:3, 9:15,   165:11, 165:8,   112:16, 113:9,   150:3, 150:5,   170:20, 170:22,   10:5, 114, 151:0,   165:11, 165:16,   13:11, 113:20,   150:12, 150:16,   170:24, 171:2,   15:15, 56:20, 89:23,   165:20, 166:1,   165:13, 13:14, 114:4,   144:4,   145:13, 144:4,   145:13, 144:4,   145:13, 153:12,   172:21, 172:4, 172:9,   101:15, 100:17,   167:13, 167:6,   114:21, 115:10,   153:9, 153:12,   172:20, 172:22,   102:6, 102:16,   169:21, 169:10,   169:10   |                                       |                      |                      | · ·                                     | · ·             |
| 111:8, 111:12,   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 111:17, 111:20,       148:14, 148:16,       169:8, 169:12,       198:14, 198:15,       163:8, 163:11,         111:22, 112:1,       148:17, 148:22,       169:15, 169:23,       198:16, 198:21,       163:14, 163:19,         112:3, 112:5, 112:7,       148:25, 149:2,       170:1, 170:4, 170:6,       198:23, 198:25,       163:23, 164:8,         112:19, 112:11,       149:9, 149:13,       170:8, 170:10,       199:2, 199:4       164:12, 164:19,         112:16, 113:9,       150:3, 150:5,       170:20, 170:22,       10:5, 11:4, 15:10,       165:11, 165:16,         113:11, 113:13,       150:12, 150:16,       170:24, 171:2,       15:15, 56:20, 89:23,       165:20, 166:1,         113:17, 113:20,       150:21, 150:25,       171:4, 171:5, 171:8,       90:1, 90:7, 96:20,       166:8, 166:12,         113:24, 114:1,       151:15, 151:21,       171:13, 171:17,       97:3, 97:15, 100:5,       166:16, 166:21,         114:3, 114:4,       152:1, 152:6, 152:9,       172:2, 172:4, 172:9,       101:2, 101:7, 101:9,       167:3, 167:6,         114:3, 114:14,       152:13, 153:5,       172:11, 172:13,       101:15, 101:18,       168:14, 168:19,         114:21, 115:10,       153:9, 153:12,       172:16, 172:17,       101:23, 102:1,       168:22, 169:1,         115:12, 151:13,       153:18, 153:21,       172:20, 172:22,   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 111:22, 112:1, 148:17, 148:22, 169:15, 169:23, 170:1, 170:4, 170:6, 198:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 112:9, 112:11, 149:9, 149:13, 170:13, 170:10, 198:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 112:15, 112:15, 149:19, 149:24, 170:11, 170:13, 170:13, 170:13, 170:10, 113:13, 113:13, 150:3, 150:5, 170:20, 170:22, 170:24, 171:2, 15:15, 56:20, 89:23, 165:20, 166:1, 13:11, 113:20, 150:21, 150:25, 171:4, 171:5, 171:8, 171:22, 151:15, 151:21, 171:13, 171:17, 171:22, 151:15, 151:21, 171:13, 171:17, 171:24, 114:4, 114:8, 152:13, 153:5, 172:11, 172:13, 172:14, 171:13, 173:14, 114:14, 152:13, 153:12, 172:16, 172:17, 101:23, 102:1, 168:22, 169:1, 118:16, 118:18, 154:5, 154:8, 154:15, 154:8, 154:15, 155:24, 155:24, 155:24, 156:24, 156:24, 156:24, 156:24, 156:24, 156:24, 156:24, 156:24, 156:34, 156:15, 174:17, 106:4, 106:7, 126:34, 126:14, 156:16, 173:7, 173:9, 106:4, 106:7, 126:14, 130:10, 156:22, 156:24, 156:15, 174:14, 174:14, 106:16, 106:20, |                                       |                      |                      | ' '                                     |                 |
| 112:3, 112:5, 112:7, 148:25, 149:2, 170:1, 170:4, 170:6, 198:23, 198:25, 163:23, 164:8, 112:9, 112:11, 149:9, 149:24, 170:11, 170:13, 112:15, 113:9, 150:3, 150:5, 170:20, 170:22, 105; 114, 15:10, 165:11, 165:16, 170:24, 171:2, 171:13, 171:17, 171:3, 190:1, 190:7, 96:20, 166:3, 166:12, 171:13, 114:14, 114:8, 152:1, 152:15, 152:1, 172:14, 172:13, 101:15, 101:15, 101:18, 168:14, 168:19, 144:13, 114:14, 115:10, 153:9, 153:12, 172:14, 172:13, 101:23, 102:1, 166:16, 166:21, 172:4, 171:10, 172:17, 101:9, 167:3, 167:23, 167:23, 172:11, 172:13, 101:15, 101:18, 168:14, 168:19, 142:1, 115:13, 153:5, 172:11, 172:22, 102:15, 102:15, 102:23, 169:23, 169:10, 172:24, 178:9, 173:24, 173:2, 173:3, 173:5, 102:1, 103:24, 114:1, 151:15, 153:21, 172:25, 172:22, 172:22, 172:23, 172:25, 173:3, 173:5, 104:17, 105:9, 169:13, 169:17, 129:8, 129:2, 155:2, 155:2, 155:4, 155:24, 174:14, 173:14, 173:17, 106:4, 106:7, 25:11, 43:12, 57:19, 129:8, 129:24, 156:10, 156:20, 174:22, 174:23, 109:4, 109:7, 109:9, 118:16, 118:10, 156:10, 156:11, 174:14, 173:17, 108:4, 108:10, 108:12, 108:22, 199:10, 156:20, 156:20, 156:20, 174:22, 174:23, 109:4, 109:7, 109:9, 118:10, 156:10, 156:10, 156:10, 156:10, 156:10, 156:10, 156:10, 156:10, 156:10, 156:10, 156:20, 174:22, 174:23, 109:4, 109:7, 109:9, 118:18, 32:4, 37:8, 175:11, 175:2, 175:4, 155:10, 109:17, 109:9, 118:15, 130:10, 156:20, 174:22, 174:23, 109:4, 109:7, 109:9, 118:18, 32:4, 37:8, 175:11, 175:2, 175:4, 156:21, 109:17, 109:9, 118:15, 130:10, 156:20, 174:22, 174:23, 109:4, 109:7, 109:9, 118:18, 32:4, 37:8, 175:11, 175:2, 175:4, 156:21, 109:17, 109:17, 109:17, 118:10, 118:10, 118:10, 118:10, 118:10, 118:10, 118:10, 118:10, 156:20, 174:22, 175:4, 175:2, 175:4, 109:12, 109:17, 109:9, 118:18, 32:4, 37:8, 175:11, 175:2, 175:4, 175:2, 175:4, 109:12, 109:17, 109:9, 118:18, 32:4, 37:8, 175:11, 175:2, 175:4, 109:12, 109:17, 109:17, 118:10, 118:1 |                                       | · · ·                |                      |   |                 |
| 112:9, 112:11,       149:9, 149:13,       170:8, 170:10,       199:2, 199:4       164:12, 164:19,         112:13, 112:15,       149:19, 149:24,       170:11, 170:13,       10:5, 11:4, 15:10,       165:1, 165:8,         112:16, 113:9,       150:3, 150:5,       170:20, 170:22,       10:5, 11:4, 15:10,       165:11, 165:16,         113:11, 113:13,       150:12, 150:16,       170:24, 171:2,       15:15, 56:20, 89:23,       165:20, 166:1,         113:21, 113:22,       151:4, 151:12,       171:13, 171:17,       90:1, 90:7, 96:20,       166:8, 166:12,         113:24, 114:1,       151:15, 151:21,       171:19, 171:25,       100:15, 100:17,       167:3, 167:6,         114:3, 114:44,       1152:13, 153:5,       172:11, 172:13,       101:15, 101:18,       168:14, 168:19,         114:21, 115:10,       153:9, 153:12,       172:16, 172:17,       101:23, 102:1,       168:22, 169:1,         117:24, 118:9,       153:25, 154:1,       172:20, 172:22,       102:6, 102:16,       169:5, 169:10,         118:16, 118:18,       154:13, 154:25,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:20,       169:13, 169:17,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:8, 174:4,       106:10, 106:20,       169:13, 169:17,         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:18, 174:20,       108:6, 108:10,  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 112:13, 112:15,  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 112:16, 113:9,       150:3, 150:5,       170:20, 170:22,       10:5, 11:4, 15:10,       165:11, 165:16,         113:11, 113:13,       150:12, 150:16,       170:24, 171:2,       15:15, 56:20, 89:23,       165:20, 166:1,         113:17, 113:20,       150:21, 150:25,       171:4, 171:5, 171:8,       90:1, 90:7, 96:20,       166:8, 166:12,         113:21, 113:22,       151:4, 151:12,       171:13, 171:17,       97:3, 97:15, 100:5,       166:16, 166:21,         113:24, 114:1,       151:15, 151:21,       171:19, 171:25,       100:15, 100:17,       167:3, 167:6,         114:3, 114:14,       152:1, 152:6, 152:9,       172:2, 172:4, 172:9,       101:2, 101:7, 101:9,       167:13, 167:23,         114:13, 114:14,       152:13, 153:5,       172:11, 172:13,       101:15, 101:18,       168:14, 168:19,         114:21, 115:10,       153:9, 153:12,       172:16, 172:17,       101:23, 102:1,       168:22, 169:1,         115:12, 115:13,       153:18, 153:21,       172:20, 172:22,       102:6, 102:16,       169:5, 169:10,         117:24, 118:9,       153:25, 154:1,       172:23, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:13, 169:17,         118:16, 118:18,       154:5, 154:8,       173:2, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:22, 182:14         118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:  |                                       |                      |                      |   | · ·             |
| 113:11, 113:13,  | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 113:17, 113:20,       150:21, 150:25,       171:4, 171:5, 171:8,       90:1, 90:7, 96:20,       166:8, 166:12,         113:21, 113:22,       151:4, 151:12,       171:13, 171:17,       97:3, 97:15, 100:5,       166:16, 166:21,         113:24, 114:1,       151:15, 151:21,       171:19, 171:25,       100:15, 100:17,       167:3, 167:6,         114:3, 114:4, 114:8,       152:1, 152:6, 152:9,       172:2, 172:4, 172:9,       101:2, 101:7, 101:9,       167:13, 167:23,         114:13, 114:14,       152:13, 153:5,       172:11, 172:13,       101:15, 101:18,       168:14, 168:19,         114:21, 115:10,       153:9, 153:12,       172:16, 172:17,       101:23, 102:1,       168:22, 169:1,         115:12, 115:13,       153:18, 153:21,       172:20, 172:22,       102:6, 102:16,       169:5, 169:10,         117:24, 118:9,       153:25, 154:1,       172:23, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:13, 169:17,         118:16, 118:18,       154:5, 154:8,       173:2, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:22, 182:14         118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:9,       105:15, 105:21,       169:22, 182:14         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:18, 174:2  |                                       |                      | · · ·                |   |                 |
| 113:21, 113:22,  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 113:24, 114:1,       151:15, 151:21,       171:19, 171:25,       100:15, 100:17,       167:3, 167:6,         114:3, 114:4, 114:8,       152:1, 152:6, 152:9,       172:2, 172:4, 172:9,       101:2, 101:7, 101:9,       167:13, 167:23,         114:13, 114:14,       152:13, 153:5,       172:11, 172:13,       101:15, 101:18,       168:14, 168:19,         115:12, 115:10,       153:9, 153:12,       172:16, 172:17,       101:23, 102:1,       168:22, 169:1,         115:12, 115:13,       153:18, 153:21,       172:20, 172:22,       102:6, 102:16,       169:5, 169:10,         117:24, 118:9,       153:25, 154:1,       172:23, 172:25,       102:21, 102:23,       169:13, 169:17,         118:16, 118:18,       154:5, 154:8,       173:2, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:22, 182:14         118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:9,       105:15, 105:21,       multifamily [8] -         125:17, 125:22,       155:2, 155:9,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:7,       25:11, 43:12, 57:19,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:19, 156:20,       174:22, 175:4,   | · ·                                   |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 114:3, 114:4, 114:8,       152:1, 152:6, 152:9,       172:2, 172:4, 172:9,       101:2, 101:7, 101:9,       167:13, 167:23,         114:13, 114:14,       152:13, 153:5,       172:11, 172:13,       101:15, 101:18,       168:14, 168:19,         114:21, 115:10,       153:9, 153:12,       172:16, 172:17,       101:23, 102:1,       168:22, 169:1,         115:12, 115:13,       153:18, 153:21,       172:20, 172:22,       102:6, 102:16,       169:5, 169:10,         117:24, 118:9,       153:25, 154:1,       172:23, 172:25,       102:21, 102:23,       169:13, 169:17,         118:16, 118:18,       154:5, 154:8,       173:2, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:22, 182:14         118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:9,       105:15, 105:21,       169:22, 182:14         125:17, 125:22,       155:2, 155:9,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:7,       25:11, 43:12, 57:19,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       101:13, 109:4, 109:7, 109:9,         130:15, 130:19,       156:19, 156:20,       174:22, 175:4,       109:4, 109:7, 109:9,       101:18, 101:10         14:10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10, 10,   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 114:13, 114:14,       152:13, 153:5,       172:11, 172:13,       101:15, 101:18,       168:14, 168:19,         114:21, 115:10,       153:9, 153:12,       172:16, 172:17,       101:23, 102:1,       168:22, 169:1,         115:12, 115:13,       153:18, 153:21,       172:20, 172:22,       102:6, 102:16,       169:5, 169:10,         117:24, 118:9,       153:25, 154:1,       172:23, 172:25,       102:21, 102:23,       169:13, 169:17,         118:16, 118:18,       154:5, 154:8,       173:2, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:22, 182:14         118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:9,       105:15, 105:21,       multifamily [8] -         125:17, 125:22,       155:2, 155:9,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:7,       25:11, 43:12, 57:19,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         128:20, 129:2,       156:2, 156:4, 156:9,       174:13, 174:14,       107:2, 107:22,       91:11, 105:12         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:19, 156:20,       174:22, 174:23,       109:4, 109:7, 109:9,       Municipal [6] - 31:12,         131:5, 131:10,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 114:21, 115:10,       153:9, 153:12,       172:16, 172:17,       101:23, 102:1,       168:22, 169:1,         115:12, 115:13,       153:18, 153:21,       172:20, 172:22,       102:6, 102:16,       169:5, 169:10,         117:24, 118:9,       153:25, 154:1,       172:23, 172:25,       102:21, 102:23,       169:13, 169:17,         118:16, 118:18,       154:5, 154:8,       173:2, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:22, 182:14         118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:9,       105:15, 105:21,       multifamily [8] -         125:17, 125:22,       155:2, 155:9,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:7,       25:11, 43:12, 57:19,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         128:20, 129:2,       156:2, 156:4, 156:9,       174:13, 174:14,       107:2, 107:22,       91:11, 105:12         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:20,       174:22, 174:23,       109:4, 109:7, 109:9,       Municipal [6] - 31:12,         131:5, 131:10,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 115:12, 115:13,       153:18, 153:21,       172:20, 172:22,       102:6, 102:16,       169:5, 169:10,         117:24, 118:9,       153:25, 154:1,       172:23, 172:25,       102:21, 102:23,       169:13, 169:17,         118:16, 118:18,       154:5, 154:8,       173:2, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:22, 182:14         118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:9,       105:15, 105:21,       multifamily [8] -         125:17, 125:22,       155:2, 155:9,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:7,       25:11, 43:12, 57:19,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         128:20, 129:2,       156:2, 156:4, 156:9,       174:13, 174:14,       107:2, 107:22,       91:11, 105:12         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:20,       174:22, 174:23,       109:4, 109:7, 109:9,       Municipal [6] - 31:12,         131:5, 131:10,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 117:24, 118:9,       153:25, 154:1,       172:23, 172:25,       102:21, 102:23,       169:13, 169:17,         118:16, 118:18,       154:5, 154:8,       173:2, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:22, 182:14         118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:9,       105:15, 105:21,       multifamily [8] -         125:17, 125:22,       155:2, 155:9,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:7,       25:11, 43:12, 57:19,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         128:20, 129:2,       156:2, 156:4, 156:9,       174:13, 174:14,       107:2, 107:22,       91:11, 105:12         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:20,       174:22, 174:23,       109:4, 109:7, 109:9,       Municipal [6] - 31:12,         131:5, 131:10,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 118:16, 118:18,       154:5, 154:8,       173:2, 173:3, 173:5,       104:17, 105:9,       169:22, 182:14         118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:9,       105:15, 105:21,       multifamily [8] -         125:17, 125:22,       155:2, 155:9,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:7,       25:11, 43:12, 57:19,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         128:20, 129:2,       156:2, 156:4, 156:9,       174:13, 174:14,       107:2, 107:22,       91:11, 105:12         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:15,       174:18, 174:20,       108:12, 108:22,       multiunit [1] - 81:10         131:5, 131:10,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 118:19, 124:8,       154:13, 154:25,       173:6, 173:7, 173:9,       105:15, 105:21,       multifamily [8] -         125:17, 125:22,       155:2, 155:9,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:7,       25:11, 43:12, 57:19,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         128:20, 129:2,       156:2, 156:4, 156:9,       174:13, 174:14,       107:2, 107:22,       91:11, 105:12         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:15,       174:18, 174:20,       108:12, 108:22,       multiunit [1] - 81:10         130:15, 130:19,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,   |                                       |                      |                      | * |                 |
| 125:17, 125:22,       155:2, 155:9,       173:11, 173:17,       106:4, 106:7,       25:11, 43:12, 57:19,         126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         128:20, 129:2,       156:2, 156:4, 156:9,       174:13, 174:14,       107:2, 107:22,       91:11, 105:12         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:15,       174:18, 174:20,       108:12, 108:22,       multiunit [1] - 81:10         130:15, 130:19,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,   |                                       |                      |                      |   | •               |
| 126:3, 128:18,       155:14, 155:24,       174:6, 174:8,       106:16, 106:20,       68:4, 68:7, 79:7,         128:20, 129:2,       156:2, 156:4, 156:9,       174:13, 174:14,       107:2, 107:22,       91:11, 105:12         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:15,       174:18, 174:20,       108:12, 108:22,       multiunit [1] - 81:10         130:15, 130:19,       156:20,       174:22, 174:23,       109:4, 109:7, 109:9,       Municipal [6] - 31:12,         131:5, 131:10,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,   |                                       |                      |                      |   | • • •           |
| 128:20, 129:2,       156:2, 156:4, 156:9,       174:13, 174:14,       107:2, 107:22,       91:11, 105:12         129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:15,       174:18, 174:20,       108:12, 108:22,       multiunit [1] - 81:10         130:15, 130:19,       156:19, 156:20,       174:22, 174:23,       109:4, 109:7, 109:9,       Municipal [6] - 31:12,         131:5, 131:10,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 129:8, 129:24,       156:10, 156:11,       174:15, 174:17,       108:6, 108:10,       multiple [1] - 137:7         130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:15,       174:18, 174:20,       108:12, 108:22,       multiunit [1] - 81:10         130:15, 130:19,       156:19, 156:20,       174:22, 174:23,       109:4, 109:7, 109:9,       Municipal [6] - 31:12,         131:5, 131:10,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 130:4, 130:10,       156:13, 156:15,       174:18, 174:20,       108:12, 108:22,       multiunit [1] - 81:10         130:15, 130:19,       156:19, 156:20,       174:22, 174:23,       109:4, 109:7, 109:9,       Municipal [6] - 31:12,         131:15, 131:10,       156:22, 156:25,       175:1, 175:2, 175:4,       109:12, 109:17,       31:18, 32:4, 37:8,   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 130:15, 130:19, 156:19, 156:20, 174:22, 174:23, 109:4, 109:7, 109:9, 131:5, 131:10, 156:22, 156:25, 175:1, 175:2, 175:4, 109:12, 109:17, 31:18, 32:4, 37:8,  |                                       |                      |                      |   | • • • •         |
| 131:5, 131:10, 156:22, 156:25, 175:1, 175:2, 175:4, 109:12, 109:17, 31:18, 32:4, 37:8,   |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
| 101.10.101.11  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
|  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |
|  |                                       |                      |                      |   |                 |

MUNICIPAL [1] - 1:1 municipal [3] - 19:16, 61:6, 115:4 municipalities [2] -38:9, 136:6 municipality [1] -186:18 must [4] - 37:10, 66:22, 107:4, 196:15 mystery [1] - 158:13

### N

name [11] - 14:15, 14:23, 19:8, 90:19, 90:21, 106:16, 114:13, 114:16, 135:19, 155:25, 160:20 named [1] - 9:24 **narrow** [1] - 118:5 natural [2] - 77:19, 78:11 nature [4] - 17:18, 92:6, 159:10, 160:1 nauseam [1] - 183:10 near [1] - 102:8 nearby [1] - 195:1 necessarily [1] - 69:4 necessary [4] - 33:7, 103:15, 184:14, 197:22 need [41] - 14:3, 15:10, 15:12, 32:9, 32:22, 33:18, 34:2, 34:3, 34:9, 53:9, 81:1, 81:5, 81:6, 85:7, 89:21, 90:2, 102:17, 103:13, 104:15, 104:16, 104:19, 105:8, 112:18, 117:19, 122:23, 134:23, 140:18, 141:14, 173:7, 173:8, 173:9, 179:11, 180:16, 184:10, 185:15, 186:12, 187:3, 193:7, 196:16, 196:19, 197:24 needed [2] - 65:5, 198:20 needs [9] - 23:4, 27:1, 34:5, 54:21, 54:25, 87:23, 102:18, 168:20, 192:1 negative [10] - 29:4, 29:15, 36:2, 36:4, 37:4, 37:9, 37:11,

78:10, 182:6, 186:12 Neglia [8] - 5:7, 16:6, 114:9, 114:17, 135:13, 136:1, 136:10, 191:6 **NEGLIA** [1] - 2:14 negligence [3] -193:7, 195:21, 196:21 negotiate [1] - 117:1 negotiated [1] - 81:3 negotiation [2] -32:23, 45:10 neighbors [1] - 165:22 nester [1] - 53:24 nesters [10] - 27:11, 49:3, 51:16, 52:11, 52:20, 53:21, 55:17, 55:18, 55:19, 55:24 net [1] - 187:9 never [9] - 34:13, 50:2, 50:21, 75:22, 75:24, 145:23, 180:13, 192:14 New [24] - 6:10, 18:21, 19:12, 20:1, 64:19, 99:6, 114:11, 116:4, 132:22, 135:15, 135:25, 141:21, 160:17, 179:13, 189:1, 191:24, 192:2, 192:11, 192:15, 192:16, 200:7, 200:11, 200:18, 200:23 **new** [8] - 19:2, 38:24, 53:15, 60:13, 93:21, 108:25, 144:20, 194:25 Newark [1] - 18:20 **NEWMAN** [135] - 1:14, 6:5, 7:12, 7:21, 8:17, 9:13, 9:21, 10:24, 11:25, 12:14, 12:19,  $12{:}25,\ 13{:}13,\ 13{:}19,$ 40:1, 51:14, 51:21, 52:11, 52:23, 53:13, 53:23, 54:3, 54:12, 54:15, 55:11, 55:22, 56:13, 63:13, 63:20, 63:23. 64:6. 69:5. 69:8, 69:14, 71:25, 72:3, 72:12, 72:17, 75:8, 75:14, 76:3, 76:6, 78:20, 79:1, 79:15, 86:9, 90:10, 92:19, 93:2, 96:9, 100:13, 102:13, 106:25, 108:9,

109:18, 112:7,

113:24, 132:1, 133:15, 133:19, 139:25, 141:9, 145:8, 145:24, 146:8, 147:16, 148:1, 148:10, 148:14, 148:22, 149:19, 149:24, 150:5, 151:4, 151:12, 151:15, 151:21, 152:6, 152:9, 152:13, 154:5, 156:11, 157:4, 157:10, 158:11, 158:15, 158:24, 159:4, 159:22, 163:6, 163:9, 163:12, 163:16, 164:5, 164:9, 165:19, 165:23, 166:4, 167:25, 168:3, 168:17, 169:15, 170:4, 170:8, 170:11, 172:4, 172:11, 172:16, 173:2, 174:6, 174:13, 174:15, 174:18, 174:22, 175:1, 175:4, 175:19, 175:23, 176:1, 176:10, 176:17, 176:20, 177:5, 177:8, 177:18, 177:23, 179:3, 179:6, 179:9, 179:11, 180:18, 187:18, 187:22, 188:2, 198:10 next [14] - 40:16, 72:18, 94:24, 127:6, 140:10, 141:11, 142:3, 142:16, 142:20, 145:11, 156:4, 165:6, 182:13, 197:16 nice [3] - 49:10, 49:13, 49:19 niche [1] - 115:8 Nick [1] - 16:3 night [4] - 112:18, 130:4, 193:19, 199:5 nine [1] - 34:8 **NJ** [5] - 1:24, 2:8, 2:24, 132:11, 132:22 **NJIT** [2] - 115:1, 136:8 NO [1] - 5:3 nobody [2] - 176:1,

190:15 non-financial [1] -12:18 non-rush [1] - 190:15 none [6] - 39:20, 57:1, 75:9, 115:12, 136:14, 194:21 nonsense [1] - 196:9 noon [2] - 17:13, 125:24 north [13] - 33:11, 33:13, 33:14, 33:23, 82:10, 82:15, 82:21, 95:1, 102:7, 116:2, 116:3, 132:8, 143:19 North [4] - 2:7, 33:17, 104:11 northbound [3] -127:20, 128:11, 128:14 northjersey.com [1] -167:16 Notary [2] - 200:7, 200:23 note [3] - 16:23, 26:21, 38:12 Note [1] - 5:14 noted [2] - 92:2, 199:6 nothing [10] - 39:18, 40:3, 40:13, 74:1, 85:2, 106:20, 109:4, 139:3, 171:19, 187:13 notice [4] - 37:2, 74:17, 170:17, 198:20 noting [1] - 35:19 notion [3] - 35:21, 42:1, 43:19 notwithstanding [1] -197:20 November [4] - 16:13, 101:4, 151:18, 183:7 number [13] - 24:18, 39:1, 54:18, 67:25, 77:3, 123:6, 126:20, 127:5, 136:22, 138:13, 138:14, 151:6, 197:7 numbered [1] - 147:18 numbers [3] - 99:24, 147:13, 151:10 numerous [1] - 184:6

#### 0

**O-1** [6] - 5:16, 125:16, 125:19, 145:10, 145:12, 148:7

**O-2** [4] - 5:17, 143:8, 143:10, 145:9 **O-3** [8] - 5:18, 162:3, 162:4, 162:7, 162:10, 162:11, 164:11, 167:1 **O-4** [4] - 5:19, 165:7, 165:9, 167:1 oath [2] - 92:23, 200:9 object [9] - 17:12, 17:15, 18:4, 18:6, 61:12, 66:15, 125:23, 146:15, 179:17 **Objection** [1] - 96:9 objection [15] - 6:20, 7:13, 17:19, 17:25, 80:15, 86:7, 101:6, 110:7, 118:16, 143:23, 164:6, 164:7, 166:4, 167:1, 167:19 objectionable [1] -147:6 objective [1] - 77:9 **objectives** [5] - 31:6, 35:16, 37:15, 77:4, 77:10 obligated [5] - 81:21, 103:3. 103:9. 103:10, 104:10 obligation [17] -19:21, 25:17, 25:20, 32:14, 34:10, 34:16, 44:16, 55:5, 55:6, 81:6, 81:7, 99:11, 103:6, 105:25, 184:15, 185:1, 185:4 obligations [1] -184:18 obscurity [1] - 164:21 observation [1] -157:14 observations [1] -157:25 obstruct [1] - 196:1 **obstructed** [1] - 161:5 obstruction [1] -161:6 obstructs [1] - 163:23 obtain [1] - 23:25 **obvious** [1] - 193:16 obviously [4] - 74:21, 81:25, 84:11, 86:16 occasion [1] - 9:25 occasions [2] - 76:10 occupancy [4] -121:15, 189:24,

190:7, 190:10

occupied [4] - 71:23,

176:22

non [2] - 12:18,

| 72:25 180:21 100:6             |
|--------------------------------|
| 72:25, 189:21, 190:6           |
| occur [5] - 103:15,            |
| 104:13, 193:25,                |
| 194:10                         |
| occurred [8] - 7:21,           |
| 44:2, 47:7, 59:24,             |
| 63:1, 73:11, 180:2             |
| occurs [1] - 25:14             |
| <b>OF</b> [6] - 1:1, 1:2, 1:4, |
| 1:5, 1:9                       |
| off-peak [2] - 129:4,          |
| 130:13                         |
| off-site [3] - 117:25,         |
| 118:2, 118:7                   |
| office [53] - 23:17,           |
| 23:25, 24:10, 25:8,            |
| 25:10, 28:1, 28:2,             |
| 28:7, 28:20, 30:24,            |
| 32:5, 36:11, 36:23,            |
| 37:1, 37:17, 41:17,            |
| 41:21, 45:8, 50:2,             |
| 50:11, 50:14, 50:23,           |
| 50:24, 68:18, 70:22,           |
| 71:4, 71:10, 71:18,            |
| 71:20, 71:21, 73:10,           |
| 77:21, 78:5, 96:24,            |
| 103:19, 104:1,                 |
| 104:4, 104:5,                  |
| 120:20, 120:25,                |
| 121:11, 121:15,                |
| 121:18, 129:21,                |
| 130:5, 133:11,                 |
| 151:9, 151:24,                 |
| 171:22, 171:23,                |
| 172:6                          |
| officer/construction           |
| [1] - 16:2                     |
| officers [1] - 152:11          |
| offices [3] - 19:12,           |
| 68:19, 129:20                  |
| official [4] - 12:10,          |
| 12:16, 16:3, 76:20             |
| officially [1] - 8:10          |
| offset [2] - 119:20,           |
| 120:1                          |
| often [1] - 30:2               |
| <b>old</b> [4] - 50:10, 60:7,  |
| 62:10, 67:5                    |
| older [5] - 27:10, 49:2,       |
| 52:20, 63:15, 197:18           |
| omission [1] - 193:16          |
| once [6] - 45:22, 88:8,        |
| 99:7, 125:22,                  |
| 152:20, 180:4                  |
| one [101] - 10:15,             |
| 10:19, 11:22, 12:4,            |
| 12:11, 14:6, 21:25,            |
| 23:21, 23:23, 24:6,            |
| 25:21, 31:11, 31:18,           |
|                                |
| 33:12, 37:2, 38:5,             |

```
38:9, 41:9, 44:2,
 44:8, 46:18, 47:21,
 49:18, 49:24, 51:24,
 52:9, 53:8, 54:19,
 56:5, 59:13, 59:15,
 63:20, 63:23, 65:2,
 67:6, 71:24, 74:12,
 74:13, 74:15, 76:25,
 82:22, 83:19, 87:14,
 93:3, 96:7, 96:8,
 96:14, 103:18,
 108:9, 109:9,
 109:14, 109:15,
 109:18. 110:14.
 116:14, 116:17,
 116:24, 117:6,
 121:1, 123:10,
 123:23, 124:16,
 131:5, 133:15,
 134:22, 134:23,
 136:6, 136:25,
 147:1, 147:16,
 147:19, 148:12,
 149:22, 149:25,
 151:9, 151:15,
 152:14, 154:6,
 158:23, 158:24,
 162:12, 166:7,
 166:8, 170:6,
 173:20, 179:11,
 181:14, 184:8,
 186:5, 190:7,
 190:22, 191:13,
 193:21, 194:7,
 194:10, 195:24,
 196:4
One [2] - 5:17, 143:9
one's [1] - 161:4
one-bedroom [6] -
 38:9, 51:24, 52:9,
 53:8, 54:19, 56:5
ones [2] - 95:8, 176:2
open [20] - 8:24, 8:25,
 9:9, 46:15, 48:18,
 48:25, 49:14, 89:21,
 90:3, 90:5, 90:7,
 90:10, 131:12,
 131:14, 136:19,
 138:7, 139:10,
 150:25, 186:17,
 187:1
opine [2] - 26:18, 39:3
opinion [22] - 10:18,
 17:14, 36:7, 48:18,
 73:3, 97:11, 104:18,
 129:2, 130:19,
 138:18, 139:6,
 147:6, 153:16,
```

153:18, 153:19,

153:20, 168:9,

```
187:9, 192:22,
 195:18
opinions [1] - 90:4
opportunity [7] -
 21:19, 48:18, 84:21,
 112:25, 124:23,
 126:6, 138:9
opposed [3] - 104:15,
 125:12, 141:9
Opposed [9] - 9:7,
 11:8, 90:16, 110:1,
 131:20, 133:25,
 139:17, 140:4, 141:8
options [1] - 53:12
orally [1] - 8:6
order [7] - 37:11,
 105:7, 110:6,
 113:12, 128:14,
 129:16, 137:12
ordinance [14] -
 31:17, 60:20, 61:10,
 78:3, 81:14, 91:10,
 101:3, 105:16,
 105:19, 105:22,
 180:12, 184:20,
 184:22, 186:10
ordinances [1] - 94:8
ordinary [1] - 117:15
organization [1] -
 12:24
orientation [1] - 78:15
oriented [5] - 34:21,
 35:21, 64:18, 83:9,
 125:8
origin [1] - 65:16
otherwise [2] - 189:3,
 192:8
ourselves [1] - 186:19
outcome [2] - 192:25,
 200:15
outcry [1] - 183:11
outdated [1] - 63:24
outline [3] - 20:23,
 21:10, 22:10
outright [1] - 76:15
outside [5] - 62:3,
 96:9, 96:11, 105:6,
 163:17
outstanding [1] -
 136:25
outweighs [1] -
 186:13
overall [4] - 36:22,
 99:7, 120:21, 124:25
overcapacity [1] -
 190:24
overcome [1] - 36:15
overdevelop [2] -
 185:9, 185:22
```

186:15, 187:8,

```
overdeveloping [1] -
 185:13
overlay [18] - 32:22,
 32:25, 33:8, 33:10,
 33:25, 34:2, 42:12,
 42:25, 44:23, 45:17,
 80:1, 80:14, 80:22,
 80:25, 84:7, 104:2,
 104:5, 185:17
Overlay [1] - 42:7
overlook [1] - 161:18
overlooks [1] - 165:13
overly [1] - 25:25
overview [1] - 67:10
own [7] - 6:9, 6:13,
 116:20, 171:10,
 171:18, 174:1,
 185:20
owned [1] - 33:16
owner [5] - 6:15,
 132:16, 171:15,
 173:20, 196:19
owners [1] - 167:16
ownership [1] - 172:2
           P
```

P-R-E-I-S-S [1] - 19:9 P.E [6] - 2:13, 2:15, 3:17, 3:22, 114:9, 135:13 **P.M** [1] - 1:3 p.m [2] - 113:19, 199:6 P.O [3] - 1:23, 2:8, 2:23 **P.P** [8] - 2:13, 2:17, 3:4, 3:22, 5:9, 5:12, 18:19, 135:13 **PA-1** [2] - 35:14, 35:16 pace [1] - 18:9 packet [1] - 157:18 packets [1] - 158:5 PADOVER [5] - 90:21, 91:14, 91:16, 91:21, 92:5 Padover [2] - 3:8, 90:22 **PAGE** [2] - 3:2, 4:3 page [15] - 5:17, 11:13. 21:10. 39:22. 40:21, 67:10, 143:9, 147:23, 147:24, 148:1, 148:15, 157:16, 158:16, 191:13, 191:15 pages [10] - 148:7, 149:24, 157:12, 157:19, 157:21, 157:23, 157:25,

158:6, 159:6, 191:9 paid [2] - 68:14, 177:19 painted [2] - 123:6, 161:21 painting [1] - 123:15 paper [1] - 168:13 papers [1] - 15:7 paragraph [1] - 11:17 parameters [1] - 74:22 paramount [1] -196:15 Paramus [1] - 2:8 parcels [2] - 33:16, 68:1 pardon [2] - 76:5, 111:17 Park [5] - 6:10, 8:11, 114:10, 135:14, 191:21 parking [15] - 22:22, 23:18, 24:15, 24:17, 24:19, 28:15, 137:11, 137:14, 161:21, 161:22, 165:4, 166:2, 189:7, 193:17 parks [1] - 71:20 parse [1] - 181:17 part [28] - 16:20, 21:15, 29:18, 30:1, 32:10, 33:24, 42:19, 49:21, 55:5, 75:12, 75:23, 82:19, 84:6, 105:25, 146:13, 152:24, 163:24, 173:12, 173:20, 180:16, 180:21, 183:17, 183:19, 183:21, 185:1, 186:2, 192:4, 194:11 particular [42] - 8:20, 9:14, 23:22, 25:7, 25:18, 25:23, 29:1, 29:5, 31:5, 33:1, 33:9, 33:21, 36:14, 38:4, 38:10, 38:18, 41:5, 41:15, 41:19, 46:6, 46:11, 47:15, 49:5, 49:18, 66:1, 66:4, 71:21, 73:4, 93:24, 101:12, 103:10, 103:24, 118:12, 118:14, 119:8, 120:6, 120:9, 126:24, 129:10, 166:5

particularly [11] -

19:18, 21:1, 21:17,

24:24, 27:5, 28:4,

| 28:17, 29:20, 73:5,                         |
|---|
| 73:21, 97:14                                |
| parties [1] - 200:12                        |
| partner [4] - 8:10,<br>19:15, 174:24, 186:6 |
| partners [6] - 6:14,                        |
| 175:13, 175:14,                             |
| 176:13, 186:5                               |
| parts [1] - 125:23                          |
| party [3] - 170:1,<br>170:5, 192:17         |
| Pascack [2] - 185:7,                        |
| 185:19                                      |
| pass [3] - 145:25,                          |
| 146:12, 194:7                               |
| passage [4] - 46:20,                        |
| 62:21, 62:23, 100:9 passed [2] - 105:16,    |
| 184:19                                      |
| passing [1] - 15:7                          |
| past [10] - 19:17,                          |
| 43:17, 46:13, 66:6,                         |
| 87:15, 122:14,                              |
| 124:22, 140:22,<br>184:5, 190:7             |
| path [1] - 142:25                           |
| patiently [1] - 158:20                      |
| pattern [1] - 176:8                         |
| peak [15] - 120:11,                         |
| 121:3, 121:19,                              |
| 128:7, 128:13,                              |
| 128:24, 129:1,<br>129:4, 129:9,             |
| 129:12, 129:22,                             |
| 129:24, 130:13,                             |
| 131:1                                       |
| peak-hour [1] - 120:11                      |
| peculiarly [1] - 97:7                       |
| pecuniary [4] - 11:22,                      |
| 11:23, 12:3, 12:9<br>pedestrian [2] -       |
| 192:10, 192:13                              |
| penalties [5] - 18:17,                      |
| 114:7, 135:11,                              |
| 141:18, 160:13                              |
| people [49] - 14:2,                         |
| 27:1, 27:2, 51:17, 51:23, 52:15, 54:18,     |
| 54:22, 55:24, 56:9,                         |
| 69:6, 69:10, 73:1,                          |
| 110:13, 110:17,                             |
| 112:3, 112:6,                               |
| 112:21, 121:7,<br>122:22, 122:25,           |
| 122:22, 122:25,<br>124:18, 124:24,          |
| 124:25, 125:11,                             |
| 129:19, 140:13,                             |
| 142:25, 145:22,                             |

```
156:8, 158:3,
 175:14, 175:20,
 176:4, 176:13,
 178:11, 178:21,
 192:12, 195:23,
 196:15, 196:16,
 197:4, 197:8,
 197:22, 197:24
per [8] - 101:16,
 102:5, 102:13,
 102:15, 126:15,
 127:5, 128:22,
 182:25
percent [2] - 33:16,
 117:18
percentage [1] - 54:20
perform [2] - 71:7,
 192:5
performed [1] -
 195:24
perhaps [10] - 18:3,
 24:11, 46:15, 55:24,
 64:15, 107:1,
 108:25, 110:19,
 149:15, 176:4
period [8] - 20:4, 47:2,
 47:8, 93:16, 99:19,
 126:11, 127:19,
 154:4
periodic [4] - 40:16,
 59:23, 60:6, 64:25
periodical [1] - 168:1
permit [4] - 43:10,
 46:11, 47:15, 98:14
permits [1] - 91:11
permitted [23] - 23:6,
 23:21, 25:6, 25:12,
 26:7, 26:12, 28:7,
 31:17, 31:25, 32:6,
 40:23, 42:15, 42:21,
 48:1, 48:3, 77:24,
 79:8, 88:2, 91:1,
 93:19, 98:18,
 112:19, 183:24
person [6] - 50:6,
 110:15, 140:15,
 152:16, 152:20,
 168:11
personal [11] - 12:15,
 12:22, 146:22,
 154:16, 154:17,
 155:17, 156:11,
 156:12, 157:5,
 157:6, 159:13
personnel [1] - 194:8
perspective [3] -
 82:13, 103:5, 104:16
persuaded [1] - 47:16
```

pertain [1] - 10:18

pertains [2] - 134:14,

```
174:10
Phase [4] - 41:10,
 42:5, 60:2, 74:12
Philadelphia [2] - 8:3,
 10:4
PHILLIPS [1] - 2:17
Phillips [4] - 16:10,
 16:16, 18:19, 19:10
phonetic [3] - 9:24,
 17:4, 103:19
phonetic) [1] - 165:17
Photograph [3] - 5:18,
 5:19, 165:9
photograph [12] -
 162:2, 162:4,
 162:20, 163:10,
 163:13, 163:16,
 163:17, 164:6,
 164:9, 165:7,
 165:23, 166:5
photographing [1] -
 143:14
photographs [11] -
 5:17, 142:7, 142:11,
 143:9, 160:10,
 160:23, 161:25,
 167:2, 167:5, 169:3
phrase [1] - 195:2
physical [1] - 78:19
pick [1] - 33:20
picture [5] - 48:8,
 160:4, 163:6,
 165:11, 165:19
pictured [1] - 137:18
pictures [10] - 141:24,
 143:6, 147:25,
 148:2, 160:3, 161:3,
 161:5, 161:7, 161:9,
 164:22
piece [1] - 168:13
place [12] - 36:9, 37:2,
 55:17, 71:22, 75:24,
 101:1, 103:16,
 104:6, 104:19,
 108:1, 179:7, 187:14
plain [1] - 195:17
plaintiff [1] - 60:18
Plan [12] - 31:3, 31:4,
 32:21, 39:17, 40:20,
 41:6, 57:4, 57:8,
 64:10, 84:2, 102:11,
 105:7
plan [87] - 20:10,
 20:13, 20:15, 21:8,
 22:20, 22:25, 23:6,
 23:9, 23:14, 25:5,
 25:9, 26:9, 28:23,
 29:1, 30:5, 30:12,
 30:23, 32:11, 33:13,
 33:24, 35:9, 35:20,
```

```
37:14, 37:16, 37:22,
 39:9, 39:10, 39:11,
 39:18, 39:20, 40:17,
 40:22, 41:24, 43:7,
 46:3, 46:12, 46:20,
 46:23, 47:6, 47:11,
 47:14, 47:19, 47:25,
 57:1, 59:9, 59:14,
 59:19, 60:13, 60:19,
 61:15, 62:2, 62:11,
 62:13, 63:17, 63:21,
 65:21, 66:11, 66:14,
 66:20, 67:8, 67:15,
 73:9, 75:1, 76:21,
 84:2, 84:6, 84:11,
 88:24, 94:8, 94:11,
 94:16, 94:18, 97:12,
 98:5, 98:21, 104:25,
 107:11, 108:16,
 108:17, 109:1,
 109:2, 182:20,
 192:10, 194:6,
 194:11, 195:5, 195:6
planned [1] - 189:8
Planner [1] - 2:18
planner [14] - 13:23,
 19:22, 20:1, 20:2,
 21:7, 21:18, 30:20,
 38:8, 42:3, 96:22,
 107:7, 135:25,
 173:14, 184:9
planning [48] - 19:11,
 19:16, 19:19, 19:25,
 20:6, 20:7, 21:1,
 21:12, 22:7, 22:17,
 23:10, 23:14, 29:3,
 29:8, 30:18, 42:3,
 42:23, 46:24, 47:6,
 47:11, 48:21, 49:11,
 57:17, 61:3, 61:13,
 76:20, 82:13,
 105:16, 106:13,
 107:15, 108:15,
 108:20, 109:7,
 109:10, 136:5,
 146:7, 152:25,
 153:1, 153:3, 175:3,
 175:17, 176:13,
 180:5, 180:7,
 180:12, 184:19,
 186:9
Planning [3] - 35:9,
 42:4, 131:7
plans [12] - 8:2, 8:21,
 22:16, 22:21, 31:3,
 39:8, 62:1, 65:12,
 67:1, 100:12, 139:5,
 164:14
plausible [2] - 125:1,
 126:13
```

```
play [3] - 49:4, 101:19,
 180:7
playground [2] - 49:3,
 49.9
plenty [1] - 15:9
plus [1] - 159:6
PM [2] - 121:6, 121:19
point [39] - 17:16,
 23:10, 23:14, 24:2,
 24:7, 25:5, 26:9,
 26:21, 28:15, 35:12,
 46:14, 46:21, 47:7,
 47:16, 49:11, 49:23,
 49:24, 51:2, 52:6,
 55:7, 56:3, 56:10,
 59:13, 72:13, 77:1,
 78:10, 84:12, 94:15,
 94:17, 95:5, 100:25,
 110:24, 113:3,
 128:6, 151:25,
 156:17, 177:18,
 190:22, 193:21
pointed [3] - 37:16,
 57:13, 79:10
points [1] - 117:6
Police [4] - 127:7,
 148:11, 148:15,
 148:24
police [7] - 146:5,
 147:19, 147:20,
 149:20, 152:5,
 152:10, 152:18
policy [4] - 47:12,
 64:19, 64:20, 183:13
Pond [1] - 3:15
poor [1] - 89:3
population [7] - 63:4,
 64:2, 64:11, 99:3,
 99:10, 99:16, 100:1
portion [7] - 37:18,
 37:20, 72:23, 78:4,
 92:9, 111:2, 178:23
portions [1] - 79:10
pose [1] - 119:9
position [4] - 7:7,
 115:14, 146:24,
 195:25
positioned [1] - 125:7
positive [8] - 74:2,
 86:6, 180:16, 182:5,
 184:8, 190:8, 192:25
positives [1] - 190:13
possibility [2] - 57:24,
 103:25
possible [3] - 25:2,
 143:2, 172:7
possibly [1] - 176:18
post [1] - 41:17
potential [2] - 6:7,
 124:18
```

151:24, 154:12,

155:18, 156:5,

| potentially [1] -<br>137:13             |
|---|
| practice [2] - 179:12,<br>193:3         |
| preclude [1] - 78:3                     |
| predatory [1] - 185:8                   |
| predicated [1] - 100:1                  |
| predominantly [1] -                     |
| 68:22                                   |
| preface [1] - 69:22                     |
| Preiss [25] - 5:8, 5:11,                |
| 16:9, 16:10, 16:16,                     |
| 18:13, 18:20, 18:25,                    |
| 19:8, 19:10, 59:3,                      |
| 79:9, 89:11, 90:3,                      |
| 90:12, 92:17, 93:1,                     |
| 93:2, 106:23, 107:4,                    |
| 108:14, 186:8,                          |
| 187:6, 187:10                           |
| PREISS [6] - 2:17,                      |
| 2:17, 3:4, 18:18,                       |
| 113:9, 113:13                           |
| Preiss' [1] - 182:23 preparation [1] -  |
| 194:10                                  |
| prepare [2] - 75:11,                    |
| 192:10                                  |
| prepared [7] - 30:23,                   |
| 40:19, 107:5, 107:9,                    |
| 130:8, 194:5, 195:5                     |
| PRESENT [1] - 1:9                       |
| present [8] - 63:14,                    |
| 113:18, 120:13,                         |
| 167:23, 176:7,                          |
| 183:18, 190:20,                         |
| 196:11                                  |
| presentation [6] -                      |
| 20:25, 21:5, 21:16,                     |
| 48:7, 60:4, 74:3                        |
| presentations [2] -                     |
| 88:17, 138:19                           |
| presented [9] - 73:2,<br>97:11, 120:23, |
| 121:9, 121:17,                          |
| 139:6, 183:6,                           |
| 183:21, 193:12                          |
| presently [1] - 37:1                    |
| presents [2] - 121:11,                  |
| 123:20                                  |
| preserves [3] - 23:20                   |
| preserves [2] - 78:6,<br>78:8           |
| preserving [1] - 77:19                  |
| presumption [5] -                       |
| 60:19, 60:21, 61:5,                     |
| 61:9, 134:19                            |
| presupposes [1] -                       |
| 36:9                                    |
| pretty [4] - 47:18,                     |

```
145:17, 145:19,
 146:18, 147:8,
 147:21, 148:4,
 148:12, 148:17,
 149:2, 149:9,
 149:13, 150:12,
 150:21, 150:25,
 152:1, 153:21,
 154:1, 154:8,
 154:13, 154:25,
 155:2, 155:9,
 155:14, 155:24,
 156:4, 156:10,
 156:13, 156:19,
 156:22, 157:7,
 157:21, 158:7,
 158:17, 158:21,
 159:14, 159:20,
 159:24, 160:7,
 160:12, 160:19,
 160:22, 161:1,
 161:7, 161:11,
 161:14, 161:24,
 162:6, 162:9,
 163:20, 164:10,
 164:24, 165:6,
 165:15, 166:25,
 167:4, 167:8,
 167:11, 168:2,
 168:5, 168:16,
 168:21, 168:23,
 169:23, 170:20,
 170:24, 171:4,
 171:8, 171:17,
 172:17, 172:23,
 173:3, 173:6, 173:9,
 177:25, 179:18,
 180:23, 181:18,
 181:22, 182:10,
 191:9, 191:12,
 191:16, 195:9,
 195:12, 196:7,
 197:4, 197:15,
 197:19, 198:3,
 198:12, 198:15,
 198:21, 199:2
Princiotto [8] - 3:5,
 3:7, 3:18, 3:22, 7:10,
 26:16, 32:15, 140:9
principal [2] - 114:17,
114:18
principle [1] - 34:18
principles [3] - 34:22,
 35:6, 35:17
print [1] - 14:15
priority [1] - 113:5
problem [13] - 9:11,
 9:17, 34:14, 36:18,
 36:19, 84:22, 124:3,
 124:14, 168:5,
```

168:8, 175:9, 185:12 problems [2] - 36:14, 38:13 procedure [1] - 155:22 procedures [1] - 178:3 proceed [2] - 89:14, 140:17 proceeding [1] - 172:3 PROCEEDINGS [1] -1:5 process [6] - 7:19, 21:3, 32:23, 132:13, 133:1 produce [1] - 81:18 professional [4] -6:24, 19:6, 115:3, 135:24 proffer [1] - 174:18 **profit** [1] - 186:15 progress [1] - 84:3 prohibited [4] - 30:8, 30:15, 31:22, 101:1 project [44] - 6:14, 6:15, 6:16, 7:2, 7:25, 9:19, 27:24, 28:20, 31:13, 31:16, 32:8, 34:25, 35:23, 36:5, 36:15, 37:21, 38:18, 49:12, 49:21, 57:14, 77:14, 81:10, 84:1, 85:19, 85:20, 86:4, 86:21, 91:12, 92:7, 93:25, 101:11, 101:12, 102:8, 115:5, 118:5, 121:13, 126:22, 177:15, 184:9, 186:6, 189:17, 190:19, 194:17, 195:17 projects [5] - 37:7, 38:10, 47:22, 49:1, 101:19 promise [1] - 134:6 promotes [1] - 32:1 prong [1] - 37:9 proof [7] - 14:24, 29:16, 86:20, 86:23, 98:8, 182:7, 182:8 proofs [2] - 22:7, 86:21 proper [1] - 26:19 properly [2] - 85:7, 195:1 properties [12] -42:11, 70:22, 82:24, 82:25, 83:15, 83:21, 84:9, 95:2, 95:3, 95:7, 95:10, 95:14 property [42] - 6:10,

23:4, 26:4, 26:18, 37:18, 51:4, 67:19, 67:22, 73:5, 78:15, 78:19, 82:10, 82:14, 82:17, 83:8, 83:17, 93:18, 102:10, 115:20, 118:10, 119:17, 119:19, 120:12, 141:24, 142:17, 142:18, 142:20, 142:22, 142:24, 166:11, 166:16, 166:20, 171:1, 171:10, 171:18, 174:1, 175:12, 194:2, 196:20 property's [1] - 73:7 proportional [1] -99:22 proposal [12] - 8:7, 26:12, 26:23, 43:25, 75:19, 75:25, 76:4, 76:6, 76:9, 76:19, 103:22 proposals [5] - 20:9, 20:17, 33:19, 95:19, 96:14 **propose** [3] - 58:6, 96:13, 191:25 proposed [21] - 24:4, 27:1, 27:12, 28:12, 29:20, 31:23, 38:22, 43:24, 44:4, 44:5, 46:1, 57:23, 73:22, 75:21, 75:23, 84:6, 108:1, 133:10, 161:18, 166:3, 183:24 proposing [6] - 25:4, 25:22, 73:7, 79:24, 99:2, 186:16 prospect [1] - 39:14 prospective [2] - 81:6, 104:20 protect [1] - 196:16 prove [3] - 51:1, 159:11, 161:3 proved [1] - 28:9 provide [15] - 19:5, 22:6, 25:17, 30:12, 44:24, 49:18, 65:12, 68:14, 80:25, 82:18, 124:2, 125:6, 130:17, 147:9, 190:3 provided [16] - 26:4, 26:23, 27:21, 28:24, 29:9, 30:18, 44:12,

66:16, 123:15,

70:14, 91:8, 91:12,

98:4, 99:22, 123:1,

125:10, 183:21, 200:9 provides [1] - 51:9 providing [2] - 44:16, 60:12 provision [1] - 105:21 proximity [2] - 27:6, 27:17 Public [4] - 3:8, 3:19, 200:7, 200:23 public [41] - 6:19, 7:13, 8:24, 9:1, 9:11, 10:25, 11:3, 11:11, 14:2, 14:11, 19:3, 21:13, 25:3, 64:19, 69:20, 70:17, 89:9, 89:22, 90:3, 90:6, 90:8, 90:11, 102:24, 109:20, 110:25, 113:10, 113:13, 131:13, 131:15, 133:20, 139:10, 139:20, 139:23, 145:16, 146:5, 151:1, 170:9, 183:11, 193:5, 196:14, 197:5 **PUBLIC** [1] - 4:3 pulled [1] - 183:8 purchased [3] - 82:17, 171:1, 174:25 purely [2] - 25:5, 58:3 purported [1] - 173:20 purports [1] - 173:12 purposely [2] - 27:23, 87:13 purposes [7] - 19:20, 23:5, 31:12, 31:18, 32:4, 35:8, 118:1 pursuant [2] - 61:4, 178:7 purview [2] - 35:1, 123:8 pushed [1] - 100:25 pushing [2] - 63:10, 197:11 put [25] - 11:13, 14:22, 21:5, 21:10, 23:3, 43:25, 44:9, 45:24, 75:21, 75:24, 76:2, 76:9, 77:25, 99:18, 103:15, 104:19, 114:2, 120:20, 121:16, 122:18, 123:7, 142:9, 154:11, 167:1, 167:4 putting [4] - 27:14, 48:17, 62:22, 185:17

Q qualification [1] - 19:4 qualifications [5] -19:6, 114:24, 115:11, 135:22, 136:13 qualified [2] - 155:3, 155:5 qualify [1] - 54:23 quality [1] - 196:13 quality-of-life [1] -196:13 **quasi** [1] - 153:12 quasi-judicial [1] -153:12 questionable [1] -190:2 questioning [2] -180:2, 195:4 questions [36] - 7:14, 9:13, 13:15, 17:9, 47:21, 48:5, 56:15, 56:16, 58:8, 62:7, 64:4, 64:15, 75:15, 90:3, 90:4, 90:8, 90:11, 91:24, 96:21, 100:7, 106:8, 106:23, 107:1, 107:5, 113:2, 115:10, 128:19, 128:20, 131:4, 132:2, 136:12, 137:3, 138:6, 138:8, 166:24, 168:12 Questions [5] - 3:6, 3:8, 3:18, 3:19, 3:23 queue [2] - 122:10, 122:13 queued [1] - 190:24 quick [5] - 128:20, 131:24, 132:4, 134:6 quicker [1] - 188:11 quickest [1] - 143:3 quickly [2] - 114:22, 126:4 quiet [2] - 59:6, 198:17 quite [2] - 35:24, 36:7

# R

R-15 [2] - 37:17, 82:16 R.P.R [2] - 1:22, 2:22 railroad [2] - 116:17, 116:19 raise [5] - 18:15, 114:4, 135:9,

141:16, 160:8 ramification [2] -60:15, 176:24 ramps [1] - 139:1 rate [1] - 51:5 rated [1] - 187:11 rather [2] - 36:5, 188:10 rationale [1] - 30:13 re [5] - 24:3, 60:14, 65:19, 66:1, 74:13 re-clad [1] - 24:3 re-exam [1] - 65:19 re-examined [2] -60:14, 66:1 re-exams [1] - 74:13 reach [3] - 46:1, 66:7, 76:11 reached [1] - 137:6 read [14] - 60:25, 72:20, 116:23, 117:19, 126:6, 127:17, 152:22, 155:25, 157:12, 157:16, 157:19, 158:6, 179:4, 188:11 reading [4] - 57:21, 168:20, 177:25, 181:17 readopted [1] - 81:15 reads [1] - 72:22 real [11] - 19:12, 22:22, 26:15, 26:16, 29:23, 39:7, 47:4, 50:6, 87:19, 187:7, 187:12 realistic [1] - 193:19 reality [1] - 190:14 really [25] - 8:21, 10:3, 10:4, 10:10, 20:22, 23:15, 27:22, 28:9, 29:3, 39:18, 50:1, 50:2, 56:1, 67:9, 73:12, 74:1, 76:25, 83:14, 85:5, 89:5, 119:19, 123:23, 134:17, 153:4, 173:22 Realtime [1] - 200:6 rear [7] - 23:20, 24:21, 24:23, 24:24, 26:1, 37:20, 78:4 reason [14] - 9:21, 32:8, 35:7, 35:18,

reasons [11] - 17:15, 29:4, 29:15, 29:19, 31:9, 51:9, 85:2, 147:3, 182:4, 182:8, 186:22 rebuttable [2] - 61:5, 61:9 received [7] - 15:19, 17:13, 118:8, 125:24, 137:1, 137:6, 137:7 recent [5] - 39:13, 43:16, 43:17, 46:13, 189:24 recently [1] - 105:15 recess [2] - 58:16, 89:18 recognition [1] - 43:4 recognized [1] -189:16 recognizes [1] - 193:4 recommendation [5] -42:7, 43:5, 47:9, 79:16, 125:14 recommendations [11] - 41:12, 42:6, 43:9, 43:12, 45:6, 65:12, 66:4, 79:19, 80:8, 122:4, 137:25 Recommendations [1] - 42:5 recommended [2] -41:17, 41:18 recommending [1] -77:1 reconcile [7] - 30:6, 46:9, 47:24, 51:21, 88:1, 98:17, 184:2 reconciled [1] - 48:2 reconciliation [12] -29:6, 30:3, 30:9, 46:8, 46:17, 47:19, 54:13, 62:19, 62:21, 98:2, 98:12, 98:15 reconciling [2] -46:18, 53:18 record [28] - 7:9, 8:15, 8:19, 13:10, 15:25, 16:20, 16:23, 17:8, 17:12, 27:25, 51:1, 56:2, 58:21, 58:23, 60:25, 62:2, 73:15, 92:13, 118:12, 118:13, 125:23, 126:2, 135:19, 148:24, 152:24, 153:5, 198:13, 200:8 recorded [3] - 170:7, 171:3, 173:24

recording [1] - 170:11

recordkeeping [1] -15:18 red [2] - 116:16, 122:11 redevelop [1] - 33:16 redeveloped [3] -33:20, 67:20, 82:11 redeveloper [1] -33:20 redevelopment [8] -33:19, 41:16, 42:10, 67:1, 81:18, 82:12, 84:2, 105:6 redevelopments [1] -43:2 **Redirect** [1] - 3:7 **REDIRECT** [1] - 88:4 reduce [1] - 164:15 reexamination [24] -20:15, 39:10, 40:17, 46:23, 59:20, 59:23, 60:6, 60:12, 61:3, 65:16, 65:25, 66:11, 66:14, 66:20, 66:22, 67:9, 76:24, 77:5, 87:10, 88:24, 94:11, 94:16, 94:19, 109:3 Reexamination [2] -31:4, 57:8 refer [3] - 39:16, 96:5, 174:7 referee [1] - 200:10 reference [8] - 21:21, 39:23, 41:7, 43:8, 65:3, 94:7, 134:9, 148:20 referenced [2] - 20:21, 37:14 references [2] -138:13, 138:15 referencing [1] - 31:3 referral [1] - 55:23 referred [4] - 34:20, 53:21, 59:12, 105:19 referring [8] - 21:23, 22:13, 30:22, 64:24, 67:10, 95:7, 148:13, 149:23 refused [2] - 192:3, 192:9 regard [23] - 26:21, 28:13, 30:23, 31:9, 32:7, 38:1, 39:15, 39:25, 44:8, 45:23, 46:4, 48:15, 49:25, 50:9, 66:8, 87:21, 91:17, 97:12, 103:13, 126:10, 138:20, 148:18,

178:25

35:19, 35:22, 35:25,

36:8, 50:21, 51:2,

123:16, 138:14,

149:18, 177:13

61:7

reasonable [2] - 51:5,

regarding [1] - 137:1 regardless [1] -122:17 region [1] - 185:19 regional [1] - 19:24 **Registered** [1] - 200:5 regular [2] - 116:15, 166:13 regulation [1] - 200:18 regulations [4] -40:18, 61:6, 81:16, 107:11 Reiner's [1] - 58:5 reinforce [2] - 35:21, 75:17 reject [3] - 100:11, 186:23, 196:21 rejected [5] - 76:3, 76:6, 76:9, 183:4, 183:6 relate [3] - 22:19, 116:24, 176:5 related [13] - 22:20, 38:13, 39:3, 41:13, 57:15, 101:21, 128:21, 158:3, 170:23, 171:20, 171:22, 200:12, 200:14 relates [4] - 60:11, 63:1, 128:24, 173:19 relating [1] - 21:8 relation [1] - 95:4 relationship [1] -174:10 relationships [1] -174:21 relative [2] - 12:17, 38:24 relatively [2] - 136:22, 137:15 relatives [1] - 52:15 relevant [8] - 79:2, 96:15, 106:19, 154:16, 170:21, 171:9, 177:9, 180:10 relied [1] - 37:25 relief [4] - 105:24, 106:2, 184:25, 185:3 remain [1] - 193:22 remainder [1] - 129:12 remained [3] - 37:2, 101:1, 120:25 remaining [2] - 24:19, 67:11 remarks [1] - 21:21 remember [13] -10:22, 51:15, 53:20, 55:17, 57:7, 70:3, 109:13, 109:15,

71 of 77 sheets

109:17, 145:22, 162:24, 180:18, 186:25 reminded [1] - 186:2 removed [1] - 60:22 render [1] - 49:12 Rendo [1] - 177:2 renovate [1] - 28:6 rent [1] - 50:7 rental [2] - 171:22, 171:23 rented [4] - 53:4, 55:3, 73:25, 99:3 renting [1] - 53:3 repeat [3] - 12:8, 113:1, 190:4 repeating [1] - 97:25 repetitious [1] -112:20 repetitive [1] - 110:21 rephrase [1] - 69:15 replacing [1] - 139:2 report [13] - 5:7, 16:7, 60:12, 61:3, 65:25, 66:23, 74:11, 75:1, 75:7, 76:12, 120:15, 136:17, 149:18 reported [4] - 128:5, 128:8, 128:15, 128:25 Reporter [4] - 72:22, 200:5, 200:6 **REPORTER** [2] - 12:5, 143:16 REPORTERS [2] -1:23, 2:23 reports [4] - 74:13, 75:9, 126:15, 127:17 represent [3] - 8:8, 8:11, 136:3 representative [1] -90:12 represented [1] -186:6 representing [1] -106:11 reputation [1] -196:16 request [1] - 108:20 requested [3] - 72:23, 109:5, 137:4 require [4] - 45:16, 81:9, 81:23, 138:25 required [15] - 20:6, 22:8, 34:3, 34:12, 38:20, 66:14, 81:19, 82:9, 99:15, 102:18,

137:20, 184:13,

requirement [9] -

184:17, 187:4, 192:5

79:11, 79:15, 80:13, 81:21, 99:5, 104:20, 105:23, 184:23, 185:5 requirements [8] -66:25, 91:18, 92:2, 107:21, 138:15, 138:23, 184:16, 185:9 reschedule [1] -181:10 research [1] - 170:6 researched [1] -157:24 resent [9] - 9:5, 11:6, 90:14, 109:24, 131:18, 133:23, 139:15, 140:2, 141:6 reservoir [1] - 24:25 reside [3] - 14:10, 110:13, 113:5 resident [4] - 16:23, 48:16, 187:25, 188:8 Residential [2] -126:14, 126:23 residential [56] - 24:5, 24:14, 25:12, 27:13, 33:21, 34:19, 35:4, 36:13, 36:16, 36:24, 39:12, 39:19, 39:21, 40:8, 40:14, 41:5, 41:7, 41:14, 41:22, 43:19, 44:7, 44:9, 44:20, 45:12, 45:19, 48:11, 48:15, 48:24, 51:8, 57:2, 57:10, 57:19, 58:3, 77:2, 77:24, 78:25, 79:7, 80:3, 80:7, 82:25, 83:21, 84:1, 84:4, 84:7, 100:12, 121:20, 126:21, 129:11, 129:22, 130:5, 130:7, 130:14, 130:23, 182:21, 187:2 residentialmultifamily [1] -57:19 residents [9] - 14:7, 14:9, 14:12, 24:24, 25:1, 53:14, 185:18, 186:16, 193:24 resolution [8] - 24:9, 76:15, 80:19, 100:20, 112:18, 112:23, 137:1, 137:16 resolved [1] - 137:16 respect [12] - 6:13,

9:25, 26:19, 31:1, 33:8, 51:12, 57:10, 85:6, 87:11, 91:19, 124:24, 124:25 respected [3] - 30:20, 122:21, 122:22 respond [9] - 9:5, 11:6, 90:14, 109:24, 131:18, 133:23, 139:15, 140:2, 141:6 response [15] - 9:8, 10:7, 11:9, 13:16, 90:17, 110:2, 131:21, 134:1, 139:18, 139:21, 140:5, 193:23, 194:6, 194:11, 195:6 responsible [1] -151:5 rest [3] - 82:23, 83:21, 117:5 restaurants [2] -27:10, 42:14 rests [1] - 107:25 result [8] - 45:18, 81:7, 175:8, 189:21, 190:3, 191:23, 193:6, 195:18 resulting [2] - 195:25, 196:19 results [2] - 110:11, 192:24 resumption [1] -121:14 retail [13] - 27:8, 33:3, 40:9, 41:19, 41:20, 53:1, 53:2, 57:25, 78:25, 80:2, 82:22, 83:20, 88:20 retail/residential [1] -41:13 retaining [1] - 6:12 return [1] - 51:6 returning [1] - 121:7 review [14] - 20:6, 21:19, 22:3, 30:23, 44:13, 65:1, 107:15, 108:16, 136:16, 136:20, 137:5, 150:8, 192:15, 194:7 reviewed [4] - 22:15, 95:20, 120:15, 126:5 reviewing [3] - 21:3, 115:6, 173:3 revised [2] - 45:23, 184:20 revising [1] - 39:14 revitalizing [1] - 88:19

rezone [3] - 33:15,

55:6, 183:5

rezoned [3] - 26:5, 83:17, 102:9 rezoning [10] - 20:9, 66:8, 76:11, 81:17, 84:7, 103:7, 105:24, 106:1, 184:24, 185:2 rezonings [1] - 105:5 Richard [11] - 16:9, 16:16, 18:13, 19:8, 56:20, 100:8, 182:23, 183:4, 183:17, 184:12, 184:21 RICHARD [2] - 2:17, 3:4 Ridge [6] - 68:23, 68:25, 70:21, 71:1, 71:8, 191:22 rise [2] - 35:25, 37:10 risk [4] - 190:20, 192:12, 193:5, 196:12 RMR [1] - 200:22 road [3] - 126:21, 189:12, 192:16 Road [5] - 3:12, 3:15, 4:14, 68:23, 97:17 roads [2] - 119:18, 119:19 roadway [1] - 188:18 roadways [1] - 188:16 **ROBERT** [2] - 1:11, 2:4 **Robin** [1] - 56:19 **ROBIN** [1] - 1:12 room [1] - 198:19 round [1] - 44:17 Route [1] - 2:7 RSIS [5] - 24:20, 28:16, 126:19, 134:13, 147:10 rude [2] - 110:22, 158:20 rudimentary [1] -193:13 rule [5] - 111:16, 111:19, 111:20, 128:12 rules [2] - 17:17, 99:20 **run** [1] - 143:2 rush [7] - 143:1, 188:22, 189:23, 190:5, 190:15, 190:25 rushing [1] - 142:25

### S

**SADDLE** [2] - 1:24, 2:24 safety [5] - 17:5, 155:13, 192:10, 193:5, 196:14 sake [2] - 102:2, 176:21 **Sal** [1] - 26:15 **SALLY** [1] - 141:20 Sally [5] - 3:3, 4:4, 9:16, 113:7, 140:15 **Saluzzi** [2] - 5:4, 16:3 sat [1] - 181:4 satisfied [4] - 13:3, 37:12, 104:23, 185:16 satisfy [1] - 86:13 satisfying [1] - 184:17 Saturday [3] - 129:20, 129:21, 129:22 saw [1] - 164:13 scale [3] - 115:4, 115:7, 128:15 scattered [2] - 67:13, 67:25 scenario [1] - 193:19 schedule [1] - 191:24 **school** [4] - 38:7, 51:18, 52:2, 187:11 schoolchildren [3] -38:6, 38:11, 49:8 scope [2] - 96:10, 96:11 **scurrying** [1] - 193:18 seamless [1] - 18:9 seats [1] - 89:20 second [31] - 6:23, 9:2, 9:3, 10:20, 11:4, 30:1, 32:7, 41:21, 42:17, 44:8, 48:17, 65:2, 74:25, 90:9, 90:10, 101:5, 109:22, 131:16, 133:21, 134:24, 139:12, 139:13, 139:25, 141:3, 146:18, 151:15, 152:4, 164:1, 164:13, 164:14, 166:3 Second [1] - 141:4 seconds [1] - 7:15 Secretary [1] - 2:19 secretary [1] - 16:14 section [4] - 25:15, 61:4, 70:5, 179:15

10:17, 10:20, 14:21, 21:24, 23:9, 23:15, 24:8, 38:13, 39:19, 57:7, 61:4, 77:10, 79:18, 89:4, 89:15, 99:17, 111:13, 112:7, 122:18, 128:10, 132:25, 142:1, 142:16, 144:4, 149:21, 153:1, 155:15, 155:23, 158:14, 159:17, 159:22, 161:21, 162:14, 162:15, 162:16, 162:17, 163:3, 163:5, 163:21, 163:24, 164:16, 164:19, 164:22, 165:3, 165:4, 165:14, 166:1, 166:2, 169:7, 171:15, 177:8, 179:11, 186:11 seed [1] - 65:8 seeing [4] - 108:9, 109:18, 133:15, 139:22 seeking [2] - 53:16, 186:14 seem [3] - 36:14, 55:17, 178:11 self [2] - 176:8, 176:11 senior [2] - 103:23, 104:2 Senior [1] - 45:3 sense [6] - 23:11, 23:15, 25:9, 155:1, 155:5, 155:6 sent [8] - 8:7, 16:2, 16:13, 16:23, 42:3, 44:3, 44:13, 192:12 separate [3] - 37:15, 66:22, 107:9 separately [1] - 37:24 sergeant [2] - 146:6, 148:18 **series** [4] - 54:7, 59:9, 61:14, 175:12 serious [2] - 17:20, 58:2 seriously [1] - 80:2 serve [5] - 27:1,

114:18, 115:17,

190:23, 192:1

serves [1] - 116:4

service [2] - 36:22,

serving [3] - 115:3,

176:8, 176:14

97:20

set [15] - 44:24, 77:4, 81:9, 81:23, 82:1, 82:9, 95:8, 95:11, 105:11, 105:22, 134:11, 184:20, 184:23, 186:2 setback [1] - 38:17 setbacks [2] - 38:14, 91:10 setting [1] - 67:18 settle [1] - 32:13 settlement [17] -16:18, 32:17, 45:15, 80:11, 81:2, 82:19, 88:8, 99:7, 170:17, 170:18, 183:18, 183:20, 183:22, 184:21, 185:6, 186:3, 186:4 **Settlement** [1] - 5:13 seven [4] - 120:24, 121:2, 121:3, 121:25 several [3] - 56:6, 147:17, 182:16 severely [2] - 188:22, 189:2 Sgt [1] - 148:19 Shade [1] - 16:12 shade [1] - 125:9 shakes [1] - 169:10 **shall** [2] - 15:3, 61:4 share [18] - 25:17, 33:24, 44:16, 55:6, 57:23, 82:19, 84:6, 99:8, 103:4, 103:20, 106:10, 106:11, 111:23, 112:2, 150:10, 180:11, 183:16, 183:19 Share [26] - 16:19, 32:15, 32:17, 32:21, 32:24, 33:6, 44:15, 44:21, 45:9, 45:10, 45:14, 45:16, 64:10, 79:25, 80:23, 81:4, 84:2, 102:10, 104:20, 104:22, 105:7, 183:20, 184:18, 185:6, 185:16, 186:8 sharing [1] - 153:14 shed [1] - 18:1 sheet [5] - 14:9, 14:11, 14:14, 110:12, 152:5 sheets [4] - 14:1, 14:6, 14:13, 14:25 shining [1] - 162:16 shopping [2] - 34:20, 41:17

short [1] - 195:13 shortly [1] - 41:23 **show** [9] - 29:19, 30:4, 125:18, 143:20, 161:5, 161:16, 161:17, 174:19, 176:7 showed [1] - 137:10 shown [1] - 73:21 shows [1] - 130:21 sic [1] - 128:8 side [11] - 25:1, 25:25, 34:1, 56:17, 68:20, 116:6, 117:7, 143:5, 143:18, 143:19 sided [2] - 5:17, 143:9 sidewalk [2] - 125:6, 125:12 sight [7] - 169:4, 169:6, 169:9, 169:14, 169:16, 195:22, 195:25 sign [6] - 14:1, 14:8, 14:22, 15:2, 110:12, 120:2 sign-in [3] - 14:1, 14:8, 110:12 signage [1] - 123:6 signal [5] - 116:16, 117:13, 120:1, 122:10, 123:13 signalized [1] - 116:2 signals [1] - 115:5 signed [4] - 45:15, 171:9, 171:14, 171:16 significantly [3] -34:1, 139:5, 186:13 signing [1] - 14:15 similar [8] - 83:3, 91:6, 92:4, 92:6, 95:4, 115:7, 129:17, 129:22 similarities [1] - 92:2 similarity [2] - 91:13, 91:18 simple [1] - 195:17 simpler [1] - 159:23 simply [2] - 7:24, 146:23 single [14] - 37:19, 52:8, 52:9, 52:16, 53:8, 54:8, 54:19, 82:24, 121:19, 126:16, 134:14, 187:2, 188:5, 189:23 single-family [10] -37:19, 52:8, 52:9, 52:16, 53:8, 54:8, 54:19, 82:24,

126:16, 187:2 sinusoid [1] - 130:22 sit [6] - 113:21, 141:25, 158:6, 159:7, 159:19, 174:3 site [46] - 14:8, 22:20, 22:25, 23:6, 23:9, 23:14, 23:16, 23:19, 25:5, 25:9, 26:9, 28:23, 29:19, 30:14, 30:15, 32:1, 33:2, 33:9, 33:18, 33:24, 35:9, 35:14, 71:4, 73:21, 97:14, 104:11, 107:11, 115:24, 117:25, 118:2, 118:7, 121:7, 122:12, 123:11, 125:2, 132:12, 132:16, 137:2, 137:4, 165:25, 169:18, 190:19, 191:1, 193:14, 193:20, 194:19 Site [2] - 126:14, 126:23 sites [2] - 41:16, 68:5 sitting [6] - 49:2, 49:15, 175:20, 176:2, 177:11, 188:13 situation [8] - 28:10, 49:18. 99:24. 103:10, 189:16, 190:4, 191:7, 193:25 six [5] - 85:1, 102:13, 110:17, 156:24, 181:4 size [4] - 39:2, 67:19, 95:1, 95:3 **sized** [1] - 51:22 **skew** [2] - 119:15, 119:22 skewed [1] - 116:18 slander [1] - 177:23 slandered [1] - 177:22 slightly [4] - 95:4, 95:16, 117:10, 164:4 sliver [1] - 163:25 **slope** [4] - 37:20, 78:2, 194:24, 195:5 slopes [1] - 78:12 slow [1] - 189:4 slower [1] - 143:16 slowly [1] - 189:19 **small** [8] - 35:13, 49:3, 52:19, 67:12, 83:11, 83:19, 83:22, 92:5 smaller [4] - 55:2, 95:5, 95:15, 95:16

shops [1] - 27:9

see [57] - 6:19, 8:20,

| smart [5] - 34:18,   |
|--|
| 34:22, 35:1, 35:6,   |
| 35:17  |
| <b>SMITH</b> [3] - 2:19,                                   |
| 89:23, 90:1<br><b>SO</b> [11] - 32:5, 36:9,                |
| 39:21, 39:25, 40:7,  |
| 43:10, 43:13, 45:20,                                       |
| 57:3, 57:11, 77:1  |
| <b>so</b> [2] - 164:16,                                    |
| 188:14<br>sold [1] - 55:13                                 |
| solely [9] - 27:13,  |
| 39:12, 40:14, 43:12,                                       |
| 44:7, 44:8, 57:18,   |
| 79:7, 80:6   |
| <b>soliciting</b> [1] - 33:19 <b>solution</b> [3] - 125:1, |
| 133:10, 133:11   |
| solved [1] - 185:12  |
| <b>solves</b> [3] - 123:20,                                |
| 124:3, 124:14  |
| solving [1] - 36:17<br>someone [6] - 48:20,                |
| 50:9, 108:10,  |
| 116:22, 123:4,   |
| 143:15   |
| <b>sometime</b> [2] - 163:7, 163:8                         |
| sometimes [4] -  |
| 119:18, 119:20,  |
| 120:2, 124:12  |
| somewhat [1] - 63:6<br>somewhere [2] -                     |
| 125:9, 141:11  |
| <b>Sorry</b> [1] - 143:16                                  |
| sorry [11] - 40:1,   |
| 89:25, 92:12, 113:9,                                       |
| 124:6, 124:7, 133:8, 138:7, 146:2,                         |
| 172:22, 177:2  |
| sort [2] - 49:9, 77:25                                     |
| sorts [1] - 75:9   |
| sound [1] - 51:25  |
| <b>sounds</b> [4] - 144:24,<br>155:9, 158:7, 176:18        |
| source [5] - 53:6,   |
| 126:13, 134:18,  |
| 147:1, 147:15  |
| sources [1] - 80:9   |
| <b>south</b> [11] - 33:2, 33:14, 34:4, 41:14,              |
| 43:1, 43:13, 45:13,  |
| 79:20, 83:2, 84:5,   |
| 132:8  |
| <b>southbound</b> [5] - 121:6, 123:11,                     |
| 127:19, 128:11,  |
| 128:13   |

128:13

southern [1] - 143:15

| <b>space</b> [14] - 42:20,                |
|---|
| 48:18, 48:19, 48:25,                      |
| 49:14, 53:1, 53:2,                        |
| 88:20, 121:15,                            |
| 137:11, 137:14,<br>186:17, 186:21,        |
| 187:1                                     |
| spaces [1] - 161:22                       |
| speaking [3] - 12:6,                      |
| 70:3, 179:25                              |
| speaks [2] - 47:20,                       |
| 67:15                                     |
| <b>special</b> [14] - 29:4,               |
| 29:15, 29:19, 31:9, 32:7, 35:7, 35:18,    |
| 35:19, 35:22, 35:25,                      |
| 36:8, 37:17, 50:21,                       |
| 51:9                                      |
| <b>specific</b> [17] - 10:21,             |
| 40:22, 55:5, 57:9,                        |
| 57:15, 65:16, 65:20,                      |
| 65:24, 66:17, 77:6,                       |
| 120:16, 121:12,<br>121:24, 129:21,        |
| 138:16, 142:9                             |
| specifically [5] -                        |
| 82:18, 83:18, 100:1,                      |
| 120:22, 184:23                            |
| specifications [1] -                      |
| 74:14                                     |
| specifics [1] - 77:1                      |
| <b>speed</b> [3] - 43:16,<br>107:1, 162:1 |
| spelled [1] - 19:8                        |
| spelling [1] - 114:15                     |
| <b>SPIRIG</b> [19] - 1:13,                |
| 48:6, 48:10, 48:13,                       |
| 49:22, 50:5, 50:17,                       |
| 51:13, 58:17, 131:5,                      |
| 131:10, 131:16,                           |
| 138:8, 138:12,<br>139:7, 141:4,           |
| 148:16, 150:3, 197:7                      |
| <b>spot</b> [2] - 10:13, 10:15            |
| <b>sprawl</b> [1] - 186:20                |
| <b>sprawling</b> [1] - 187:1              |
| <b>spring</b> [1] - 183:16                |
| <b>square</b> [1] - 51:22                 |
| stage [1] - 157:1                         |
| stalls [1] - 39:2<br>stand [6] - 18:14,   |
| 89:3, 89:4, 151:13,                       |
| 165:21, 166:3                             |
| standard [2] - 28:16,                     |
| 192:7                                     |
| Standards [2] -                           |
| 126:15, 126:24                            |
| standards [6] - 24:20,                    |
| 26:8, 76:1, 107:9,                        |
| 107:12, 139:3                             |

| standing [13] - 118:16             |
|------------------------------------|
| 139:23, 142:11,                    |
| 142:12, 142:19,                    |
| 162:11, 162:12,                    |
| 163:13. 163:14.                    |
| 163:17, 166:20,                    |
| 166:21, 177:3                      |
| standpoint [3] - 48:21             |
| 57:17, 122:7                       |
| Star [3] - 4:13, 187:25,           |
| 188:7                              |
| <b>STAR</b> [12] - 187:25,         |
| 188:7, 188:15,                     |
| 189:6, 189:20,                     |
| 191:5, 191:11,                     |
| 191:14, 191:19,                    |
| 195:10, 195:16,                    |
| 196:9                              |
| <b>start</b> [14] - 9:22, 18:12    |
| 22:14, 59:7, 64:25,                |
| 77:11, 97:18, 147:4,               |
| 158:11, 158:15,                    |
| 159:10, 182:18,                    |
| 198:22, 198:25                     |
| started [6] - 22:5,                |
| 31:2, 43:22, 48:6,                 |
| 65:9, 177:13                       |
| starting [1] - 147:4               |
| state [10] - 8:19,                 |
| 34:23, 35:8, 35:15,                |
| 35:20, 47:4, 90:19,                |
| 135:21, 144:8,                     |
| 185:19                             |
| <b>State</b> [9] - 20:1, 64:19,    |
| 99:5, 114:13,                      |
| 135:19, 135:25,                    |
| 179:13, 200:7,                     |
| 200:11                             |
| <b>statement</b> [4] - 67:10,      |
| 67:14, 68:3, 76:20                 |
| statements [3] -                   |
| 69:19, 112:20                      |
| states [5] - 105:22,               |
| 149:20, 153:4,                     |
| 184:22, 190:4                      |
| station [18] - 27:6,               |
| 27:17, 34:20, 35:5,                |
| 41:3, 49:6, 69:8,                  |
| 83:4, 83:8, 116:5,                 |
|                                    |
| 117:23, 118:21,<br>119:11, 119:23, |
| 189:2, 189:10,                     |
| 189:11, 192:11                     |
| <b>statistics</b> [3] - 64:10,     |
| 127:12, 130:16                     |
| status [1] - 107:17                |
| <b>statute</b> [3] - 10:22,        |
| 66:21, 200:11                      |
| <b>statutory</b> [1] - 111:20      |
| stay [1] - 123:25                  |
| 3tay [1] - 123.23                  |

```
staying [1] - 67:8
steep [6] - 23:20,
 37:19, 78:2, 78:12,
 194:24, 195:5
steps [4] - 56:6, 143:5,
 143:18, 184:15
still [12] - 24:15,
 53:23, 67:24, 67:25,
 78:8, 94:16, 94:19,
 110:9, 137:24,
 177:3, 182:11,
 197:24
stipulate [2] - 135:2,
 173:11
stop [4] - 120:2,
 120:4, 154:22,
 154:23
stopped [1] - 189:10
stories [1] - 38:21
story [2] - 23:17,
119:16
straight [3] - 10:11,
61:14, 118:25
street [5] - 33:24,
78:1, 142:21,
 142:24, 160:5
Street [1] - 18:20
strictly [1] - 183:1
stripes [1] - 161:22
striping [2] - 122:18,
 124:2
strongly [1] - 184:11
structure [1] - 188:18
studied [1] - 129:8
studies [7] - 41:9,
 42:1, 65:17, 144:6,
 169:4, 169:9, 192:6
Study [1] - 42:5
study [22] - 26:19,
 31:5, 41:5, 41:10,
 41:24, 43:6, 43:23,
 57:22, 59:19, 60:2,
 60:3, 65:5, 65:9,
 66:9, 79:10, 79:24,
 80:10, 129:9, 192:4,
 192:13, 193:13
stuff [1] - 150:9
stump [1] - 142:17
subdivision [1] -
77:25
subject [7] - 14:8,
 107:20, 115:21,
 122:12, 158:1,
 158:2, 175:12
submit [5] - 14:19,
 14:24, 15:2, 143:24,
 167:25
submitted [2] - 126:5,
 185:25
```

subsequent [2] -

40:11, 50:8 subsequently [2] -19:22, 104:4 substantial [8] -27:25, 36:4, 37:10, 38:25, 51:9, 83:7, 83:16, 91:12 substantially [4] -36:24, 68:2, 86:20, suddenly [1] - 55:21 sued [2] - 193:7, 196:21 sufficient [4] - 47:7, 47:13, 51:1, 87:25 suggest [1] - 118:4 suggested [1] -149:15 suggesting [3] -112:24, 112:25, suitability [1] - 73:4 suitable [4] - 28:11, 70:22, 71:10, 183:14 Suite [1] - 18:21 suited [6] - 29:20, 73:5, 73:22, 96:24, 97:7, 97:14 sullied [1] - 174:21 sum [1] - 195:13 summarize [1] - 43:3 summarizing [1] -138:22 summary [1] - 178:1 **summation** [1] - 85:25 summing [1] - 56:21 sun [1] - 162:16 Sunday [1] - 162:21 sunny [2] - 162:14, 162:15 supervised [1] -175:15 **supervisor** [1] - 17:5 Supplemental [1] -42:4 support [6] - 24:19, 39:20, 40:14, 57:2, 57:14, 130:16 supported [2] - 30:11, 37:15 supportive [2] - 45:11, 192:24 supposed [2] -150:11, 175:15 supposedly [1] -175:3 **Supreme** [1] - 29:12 surmising [1] - 127:5 sustain [1] - 51:5 sustainable [1] -

34:24 swear [6] - 18:16, 114:6, 135:10, 141:14, 141:17, 160:12 **switch** [1] - 74:9 **SWORN** [2] - 3:2, 4:3 sworn [2] - 141:22, 160:18 sworn/affirmed [3] -18:22, 114:12, 135:16 synonymous [1] -35:16

### Т

tab [1] - 11:13 table [2] - 26:3, 100:11 tabled [4] - 45:7, 46:2, 76:13, 100:19 tainted [2] - 176:14, 176:16 talks [3] - 10:15, 39:19, 40:9 taller [1] - 164:20 targeted [1] - 52:20 tasked [2] - 20:8, 107:6 taxes [1] - 196:20 Teaber [1] - 103:19 team [1] - 132:12 technical [2] - 39:4, 136:23 technically [1] - 17:17 telephoned [1] - 8:5 template [1] - 137:18 templates [1] - 137:5 tempted [1] - 49:24 ten [12] - 60:7, 60:14, 62:21, 62:23, 63:1, 63:10, 64:18, 64:22, 67:5, 67:16, 100:9, 100:10 ten-years-old [1] -67:5 tenant [1] - 50:2 tenants [6] - 27:23, 28:1, 72:8, 72:16, 104:4, 193:18 tenure [2] - 20:11, 100:14 term [1] - 55:13 terms [25] - 15:19, 26:8, 26:22, 33:11, 33:12, 34:2, 34:15, 36:2, 37:4, 37:13, 43:16, 70:10, 78:14,

81:21, 83:3, 83:25,

91:6, 93:18, 115:8, 120:11, 129:16, 153:14, 180:11, 186:4, 192:20 test [3] - 30:9, 71:11, 71:15 testified [16] - 6:8, 18:22, 20:3, 72:2, 75:8, 75:15, 114:12, 125:6, 145:13, 148:8, 149:3, 150:13, 179:21, 183:17, 184:12, 184:22 testifies [3] - 135:16, 141:22, 160:18 testify [21] - 14:19, 14:24, 15:2, 61:23, 110:15, 110:19, 113:8, 113:10, 122:25, 140:12, 140:14, 149:11, 154:18, 157:5, 160:9, 169:25, 172:18, 178:12, 178:14, 179:19, 181:20 testifying [2] - 111:1, 155:16 testimony [73] - 13:21, 13:23, 13:24, 21:2, 21:7, 22:13, 22:17, 22:21, 22:22, 22:25, 26:14. 26:21. 27:20. 28:3, 28:13, 28:22, 28:24, 29:9, 29:21, 29:24, 30:16, 30:18, 31:1, 31:2, 37:14, 38:1, 48:4, 50:9, 51:1, 51:15, 53:20, 55:22, 56:25, 58:18, 59:13, 69:18, 70:7, 71:5, 71:7, 72:10, 72:12, 72:14, 73:19, 92:1, 96:1, 97:1, 110:8, 110:21, 110:23, 113:4, 113:14, 123:19, 128:5, 134:16, 144:3, 149:4, 154:15, 156:9, 156:10, 156:16, 156:19, 157:8, 157:10, 161:4, 163:4, 167:20, 167:22, 173:1, 173:15, 180:16, 182:23, 187:12,

200:9

THE [105] - 1:4, 32:20,

40:6, 48:9, 48:12, 48:23, 50:4, 50:16, 50:19, 51:20, 52:4, 52:13, 52:24, 53:22, 54:2, 54:5, 54:14, 54:17, 55:19, 56:1, 64:8, 71:16, 72:7, 72:13, 75:13, 75:17, 76:5, 76:8, 78:22, 79:17, 86:15, 87:14, 88:25, 91:5, 91:15, 91:17, 92:12, 93:8, 93:16, 94:18, 95:6, 95:10, 95:13, 95:17, 95:21, 96:15, 96:19, 96:25, 97:9, 98:3, 98:13, 99:9, 99:14, 99:17, 100:14, 100:16, 100:18, 101:8, 101:13, 101:17, 101:22, 101:25, 102:4, 102:9, 102:14, 102:20, 102:22, 103:1, 104:22, 105:14, 105:20, 106:3, 106:6, 106:13, 106:18, 107:8, 107:24, 108:8, 108:18, 108:24, 109:6, 109:8, 109:11, 109:15, 110:4, 124:6, 125:25, 128:25, 129:5, 129:15, 130:1, 130:6, 130:12, 130:17, 130:20, 131:9, 132:9, 132:17, 132:20, 132:24, 133:13, 135:5, 138:11, 138:21, 140:7 theaters [1] - 27:9 themselves [2] - 56:9, 175:16 THERE [1] - 1:9 thereafter [3] - 41:23, 45:4, 107:17 they've [2] - 145:20, 145:21 thinking [2] - 123:18, 124:10 third [4] - 14:10, 44:17, 170:1, 170:5 Third [1] - 18:20 third-party [2] - 170:1, 170:5 three [35] - 14:6, 14:13, 14:25, 21:10,

23:17, 33:16, 38:21, 41:16, 43:17, 54:10, 88:7, 95:10, 95:12, 95:14, 95:23, 96:7, 96:13, 110:19, 117:15, 140:13, 148:7, 149:24, 150:1, 150:3, 150:5, 157:12, 157:16, 157:19, 157:24, 158:5, 159:6, 168:17, 188:14, 189:7, 191:11 three-bedroom [1] -54:10 three-page [1] - 21:10 three-story [1] - 23:17 throughout [7] -67:13, 68:1, 137:2, 137:4, 144:8, 184:7, 185:7 throwing [1] - 86:16 thumb [1] - 128:12 Thursday [1] - 21:4 Tice [1] - 45:2 tie [1] - 192:2 tied [2] - 12:4, 12:11 timeliness [1] - 60:12 timely [2] - 60:19, 60:21 timing [1] - 172:2 tired [1] - 185:18 **TOD** [2] - 87:18, 88:19 today [6] - 17:13, 73:1, 125:24, 141:11, 165:25, 183:17 together [7] - 21:6, 21:10, 95:12, 95:14, 132:16, 147:5, 153:8 tonight [12] - 13:20, 13:22, 14:1, 14:4, 14:19, 18:13, 59:4, 69:25, 96:1, 140:20, 182:23, 185:20 tonight's [1] - 21:19 took [20] - 45:22, 71:22, 142:8, 142:11, 160:3, 160:4, 160:22, 160:24, 161:3, 161:5, 162:7, 162:10, 162:15, 163:7, 163:9, 163:11, 163:13, 165:19, 169:3, 170:18 top [4] - 10:22, 163:23, 165:3, 167:4

total [5] - 66:21, 121:13, 121:18, 129.14 totality [1] - 117:13 totally [3] - 49:12, 119:13, 156:25 towards [5] - 22:13, 49:2, 52:20, 65:3, 88.88 town [17] - 9:24, 19:24, 27:3, 90:22, 132:16, 132:23, 182:19, 183:9, 185:14, 185:21, 188:21, 191:25, 193:7, 194:16, 194:19, 195:20, 196:20 townhouse [1] - 54:9 towns [1] - 192:5 tracks [1] - 116:20 traditional [1] - 41:1 traffic [91] - 13:23, 17:4, 22:21, 28:13, 28:18, 28:19, 29:23, 35:23, 36:5, 36:6, 36:10, 36:12, 36:18, 36:19, 36:23, 37:25, 38:1, 70:11, 110:9, 114:18, 115:4, 115:5, 115:9, 115:17, 116:16, 117:11, 117:16, 119:9, 120:1, 120:8, 120:14, 120:22, 122:7, 122:10, 122:24, 123:1, 123:13, 123:14, 123:25. 124:19. 124:21, 125:4, 127:7, 127:8, 127:15, 127:23, 128:4, 128:9, 128:16, 134:10, 137:10, 144:6, 144:13, 144:14, 148:8, 148:18, 148:20, 149:4, 149:5, 149:6, 151:2, 152:2, 152:25, 153:3, 153:22, 153:23, 154:8, 155:6, 155:11, 188:19, 188:22, 189:3, 189:10, 189:13, 189:16, 190:4, 190:5, 190:15, 190:18, 191:3, 191:5, 191:8, topography [1] -191:22, 191:23, 78:15

192:2, 192:13, 192:20, 193:6, 193:8 Traffic [1] - 2:16 train [20] - 27:6, 27:17, 34:20, 35:5, 41:3, 49:6, 69:8, 83:4, 83:8, 116:14, 117:23, 118:21, 119:11, 119:23, 123:13, 132:6, 143:1, 189:10, 191:25 trains [4] - 154:21, 154:22, 189:1, 191:25 transaction [6] -158:4, 175:8, 175:10, 176:12, 176:15, 176:22 transactions [1] -175:13 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 1:4 transcript [3] - 116:23, 180:2, 200:17 transcripts [2] - 21:4, 22:16 transient [1] - 52:15 transit [5] - 34:21, 35:21, 64:18, 83:9, 125:8 Transit [7] - 116:5, 132:22, 189:1, 191:24, 192:11, 192:15, 192:17 transit-oriented [5] -34:21, 35:21, 64:18, 83:9. 125:8 transition [4] - 54:8, 55:21, 56:4, 56:7 transportation [1] -125:8 Transportation [1] -149:18 trap [1] - 195:18 Tree [1] - 16:12 tree [1] - 142:16 treeline [1] - 186:20 trees [1] - 163:4 trip [10] - 120:21, 121:13, 121:17, 128:21, 128:22, 129:18, 130:5, 130:22, 130:23, 134:11 trips [18] - 121:18, 121:19, 121:20, 121:21, 121:22,

121:23, 126:10,

126:16, 126:20,

127:5, 127:18,

127:21, 128:13, 128:14, 129:3, 129:14, 151:14 trouble [1] - 53:2 troubles [1] - 70:10 truck [6] - 137:3, 137:11, 137:12, 137:17, 137:19, 193:13 true [3] - 63:18, 180:8, 194:7 truly [3] - 39:9, 165:23, 194:21 trust [1] - 195:2 trusted [1] - 194:15 truth [5] - 18:17, 114:7, 135:11, 141:18, 160:13 try [3] - 112:16, 120:4, 181:17 trying [11] - 62:4, 85:5, 94:14, 112:13, 123:24, 146:22, 146:23, 158:20, 178:16, 192:23, 193:19 tube [1] - 127:25 tucked [1] - 164:21 TUESDAY [1] - 1:2 turn [8] - 39:6, 89:24, 121:2, 121:5, 121:24, 121:25, 123:22, 177:19 turning [4] - 137:3, 137:5, 137:12, 137:18 turns [8] - 120:19, 120:24, 121:10, 122:23, 123:10, 123:11, 123:12, 190:25 tweak [1] - 24:11 twice [1] - 100:16

two [34] - 7:15, 27:19,

28:8, 35:13, 38:21,

41:8, 41:20, 42:6,

43:21, 54:9, 76:9,

96:21, 103:18,

106:7, 110:15,

122:2, 123:9,

154:4, 161:9,

161:11, 167:8,

197:17

38:21

168:17, 186:16,

two-and-a-half [1] -

117:15, 121:23,

128:20, 129:10,

134:4, 136:6, 147:5,

82:15, 83:15, 88:7,

type [10] - 26:7, 26:25, 27:7, 35:5, 38:10, 110:16, 115:5, 126:21, 167:17, 178:19 types [3] - 11:18, 134:11, 178:6 typical [5] - 116:9, 116:13, 126:19, 129:19, 138:25 typically [3] - 27:10, 117:15, 119:25 U **U.S** [1] - 149:17 Ulises [2] - 3:11, 97:16 ultimately [2] - 176:3, 177:11 unacceptable [2] -190:20, 196:12 unbridled [1] - 196:19 uncharacteristic [1] -90:25 uncontrolled [1] -190:25 under [20] - 11:15, 18:17, 37:8, 37:9, 42:18, 56:8, 81:21, 86:23, 92:23, 93:19, 98:18, 114:7, 123:8, 125:2, 135:11, 141:18, 147:12, 160:13, 170:2, 200:9 understood [2] -85:22, 134:20 undertake [4] - 47:17,

196.6 89:4, 92:14, 97:1, 77:17, 103:7, 105:4 102:7, 107:1, undertaken [1] - 87:21 108:11, 111:3, 70:5, 117:10, 120:6 24:19, 25:8, 25:15, 26:25, 27:15, 34:8, 38:5, 38:10, 52:7, 68:10, 68:11, 68:13, 68:15, 81:18, 82:20,

86:5, 99:1, 99:3, 99:13, 101:16, 102:5, 102:11, 103:11, 104:2, 104:8, 104:9, 151:8, 182:25, 184:13, 185:15, 186:1, 186:12 universally [1] -189:15 unless [2] - 93:19, 177:10

unlikely [1] - 56:6 unmet [16] - 32:9, 32:22, 34:2, 34:3, 34:9, 81:1, 81:5, 81:6, 102:16, 102:18, 103:13, 104:14, 104:19, 105:8, 180:16, 184:10

unnecessary [2] -194:12, 195:7 unqualified [1] - 187:9 unreasonable [1] -26:12 unrelated [1] - 177:15 unsubstantiated [1] -

unusual [3] - 65:11, 119:13, 119:24 up [43] - 7:8, 10:8, 10:12, 12:5, 15:11, 43:7, 43:16, 43:18, 43:24, 45:22, 46:5, 48:17, 56:21, 73:16, 73:20, 75:6, 79:3, 79:5, 82:2, 89:3,

111:13, 119:20, 123:13, 142:20, 142:21, 146:12, 153:24, 154:11, 162:2, 164:16, 173:4, 188:22,

192:2, 195:13, 195:23 update [3] - 59:14, 67:9, 109:3

upgrading [1] - 139:1 urban [1] - 186:20 urge [2] - 186:22, 186:23 useful [1] - 23:4

uses [17] - 9:25, 39:22. 40:4. 40:9. 40:13, 40:23, 40:25, 41:1, 41:13, 41:14,

41:22, 42:15, 43:10, 45:24, 68:18, 122:3, 129:10 utilizing [1] - 83:25



vacancy [1] - 73:10 vacant [10] - 67:11, 67:19, 67:23, 67:25, 71:24, 71:25, 72:2, 82:25, 83:23, 103:21 valid [4] - 60:20, 94:12, 94:19, 179:3 validity [1] - 60:20 Valley [2] - 185:7, 185:20 valuably [1] - 113:1 values [2] - 26:18, 196:19 variance [23] - 22:8, 23:4, 23:12, 24:9, 29:14, 29:17, 30:6, 31:21, 34:14, 36:4, 38:20, 46:19, 48:8, 50:20, 55:7, 81:17, 81:22, 81:23, 93:18, 98:17, 180:6, 183:23, 185:5 variances [10] - 22:7, 22:19, 38:14, 93:24, 105:5, 105:24, 106:2, 175:12, 184:25, 185:2 varied [1] - 34:24 variety [2] - 53:11, 71:20 vegetation [1] - 195:4 vehicle [2] - 121:23, 137:1 vehicles [5] - 116:17, 127:21, 150:24, 151:6, 193:24 vehicular [1] - 189:22 veracity [1] - 168:12 verbatim [1] - 200:8 verify [2] - 137:23 Veronica [8] - 3:13, 4:6, 5:16, 16:24, 107:2, 125:15, 125:19, 145:11 versa [1] - 107:22 versus [3] - 171:6, 171:23, 173:1 VFW [4] - 33:24, 82:20, 82:24, 83:22 **viability** [2] - 71:3, 71:13

vice [1] - 107:22

undertaking [3] -

unfair [1] - 91:22

unfortunate [1] -

unfortunately [1] -

unfounded [1] -

unique [4] - 35:15,

193:2

130:25

173:18

unit [1] - 53:8

units [36] - 7:25,

55:2, 55:8, 68:9,

66:8, 76:11, 81:7

vicinity [1] - 118:11 view [31] - 23:15, 24:2, 24:24, 25:6, 26:10, 26:21, 28:15, 49:11, 56:3, 78:11, 84:12, 94:15, 95:5, 141:25, 142:5, 142:23, 143:15, 161:4, 161:6, 161:19, 161:20, 161:23, 163:18, 164:15, 165:24, 166:2, 169:5, 169:18, 169:19, 189:25, 193:3 views [3] - 24:25, 189:9, 196:1 **violation** [1] - 6:22 virtually [3] - 25:13, 35:12, 35:16 virtue [1] - 51:4 visible [2] - 25:3, 164:22 visit [1] - 72:8 visitors [1] - 69:3 visual [1] - 145:23 visually [1] - 137:19 vitality [1] - 42:20 VOICE [2] - 89:8, 180:10 volumes [1] - 36:23 vote [2] - 187:2, 192:25 votes [3] - 12:10, 12:16, 12:22

### W

wait [12] - 91:14, 92:8, 111:5, 146:18, 158:9, 158:10, 168:24, 197:2 waiting [3] - 110:9, 158:19, 158:20 waivers [1] - 39:1 waives [1] - 123:4 walk [1] - 125:11 walkable [1] - 34:23 walking [2] - 39:2, 41:3 walkway [1] - 49:14 walkways [1] - 138:15 Walsh [2] - 5:4, 16:1 Walter [1] - 156:1 wants [1] - 21:13 warranted [1] - 178:4 Washington [2] -124:1, 124:11 waste [1] - 15:8

website [1] - 170:19 week [1] - 21:4 weekend [1] - 130:3 weekends [2] -129:13, 129:19 weigh [1] - 38:2 weighed [2] - 45:4, 88:22 welcome [4] - 15:16, 15:22, 96:19, 108:8 WELLS [1] - 2:6 Wells [1] - 16:1 west [2] - 69:13, 70:13 whatsoever [2] - 7:2, 174:9 whereas [1] - 84:5 wherein [1] - 45:24 whoa [1] - 151:15 whole [4] - 65:9, 119:16, 157:17, 183:12 wicked [1] - 181:1 wife [1] - 53:19 wind [1] - 164:16 window [5] - 160:4, 162:13, 163:15, 163:17, 169:6 winter [1] - 45:3 wired [1] - 124:12 wish [1] - 143:24 wishes [1] - 139:20 witch [1] - 181:1 withdraw [2] - 86:25, 101:9 WITNESS [104] -32:20, 40:6, 48:9, 48:12, 48:23, 50:4, 50:16, 50:19, 51:20, 52:4, 52:13, 52:24, 53:22, 54:2, 54:5, 54:14, 54:17, 55:19, 56:1, 64:8, 71:16, 72:7, 72:13, 75:13, 75:17, 76:5, 76:8, 78:22, 79:17, 86:15, 87:14, 88:25, 91:5, 91:15, 91:17, 92:12, 93:8, 93:16, 94:18, 95:6, 95:10, 95:13, 95:17, 95:21, 96:15, 96:19, 96:25, 97:9, 98:3, 98:13, 99:9, 99:14, 99:17, 100:14, 100:16, 100:18, 101:8,

101:13, 101:17,

101:22, 101:25,

102:14, 102:20,

102:22, 103:1,

102:4, 102:9,

104:22, 105:14, **WOODCLIFF** [2] - 1:1, 105:20, 106:3, 1:9 106:6, 106:13, words [8] - 36:3, 106:18, 107:8, 36:17, 37:1, 60:23, 107:24, 108:8, 79:23, 99:6, 120:10, 108:18, 108:24, 185:4 109:6, 109:8, world [2] - 198:11 109:11, 109:15, worry [1] - 148:3 110:4, 124:6, worse [1] - 190:16 125:25, 128:25, worst [3] - 188:21, 129:5, 129:15, 193:19, 196:4 130:1, 130:6, worst-case [1] - 196:4 130:12, 130:17, worth [3] - 8:3, 35:19, 130:20, 131:9, 151:22 132:9, 132:17, worthy [1] - 194:21 132:20, 132:24, write [1] - 152:6 133:13, 135:5, writing [2] - 143:11, 138:11, 138:21, 179:23 140:7 written [1] - 168:1 witness [6] - 18:13, wrote [3] - 168:8, 87:1, 128:23, 168:9, 168:11 131:23, 169:15 witnesses [2] - 28:25, X 73:19 woman [1] - 89:3 Woodcliff [81] - 14:7, XIO1042 [1] - 200:5 14:9. 14:12. 19:17. Y 20:10, 25:12, 25:24, 26:6, 40:18, 50:14, 51:22, 53:25, 55:5, 59:10, 61:9, 63:2, 143:3 63:14, 64:12, 68:19, 70:5, 80:12, 81:16,

yard [3] - 38:14, 38:16, 143:3
yards [1] - 26:1
year [7] - 45:21, 62:3, 72:8, 93:15, 100:17, 108:14, 142:9
years [25] - 19:17, 20:18, 30:20, 30:21, 43:17, 60:7, 60:14, 62:21, 62:23, 63:1, 63:10, 64:18, 64:22, 66:6, 67:5, 67:16, 87:16, 94:13, 100:9, 100:10, 115:4, 136:11, 188:9, 189:11

**YETEMIAN** [2] - 1:15, 108:10 **York** [1] - 192:2

young [1] - 89:3 younger [4] - 27:11, 49:4, 52:20, 60:6 yourself [1] - 117:7

### Ζ

**ZBA-1** [1] - 15:24 **ZBA-10** [2] - 5:14, 18:11 **ZBA-2** [1] - 15:24 ZBA-3 [3] - 5:4, 15:25, 18:10 **ZBA-4** [2] - 5:5, 16:5 **ZBA-5** [3] - 5:7, 16:8, 136:17 **ZBA-6** [3] - 5:8, 16:10, 22:1 **ZBA-7** [2] - 5:10, 16:11 **ZBA-8** [5] - 5:11, 16:17, 21:11, 31:7, 39:16 **ZBA-9** [3] - 5:13, 16:21, 32:16 **Zone** [1] - 42:8 zone [28] - 23:7, 30:8, 31:22, 32:5, 37:13, 39:21, 39:23, 39:25, 40:7, 41:2, 42:12, 42:25, 43:10, 43:11, 45:24, 48:3, 80:14, 80:22, 80:25, 84:7, 88:2, 98:19, 104:2, 182:21, 183:25, 184:3, 184:4, 185:17 zoned [2] - 37:18, 73:8 zones [5] - 32:22, 34:2, 43:14, 45:20, 57:3 zoning [80] - 7:24,

8:11, 13:22, 16:2, 19:18, 20:6, 20:17, 30:7, 30:14, 31:16, 32:12, 32:25, 33:8, 33:10, 33:13, 33:25, 34:13, 36:9, 39:8, 39:14, 43:15, 43:18, 43:24, 44:4, 44:23, 45:17, 46:2, 46:10, 47:9, 51:5, 57:23, 60:18, 60:20, 61:9, 66:3, 74:14, 74:22, 75:19, 75:23, 80:1, 81:20, 83:2, 83:24, 84:10, 84:12, 87:22, 87:23, 91:10, 92:25, 93:5, 93:6, 93:10, 93:14, 93:17, 94:7, 97:19, 98:10, 98:14, 100:25, 104:6, 107:14, 108:1, 111:15, 111:18, 115:14, 115:18, 136:5, 152:15, 153:6, 173:14, 175:5, 175:7, 176:15, 183:1, 193:1, 193:4, 195:19, 196:10 **Zoning** [2] - 106:1, 185:1

91:1, 91:3, 97:17,

101:19, 103:8,

103:9, 104:18,

106:1, 106:11,

108:3, 108:13,

115:15, 115:18,

141:21, 148:11,

148:15, 148:21,

148:24, 150:23,

160:17, 170:17,

170:19, 175:16,

182:15, 182:19,

184:14, 184:16,

185:1, 185:10,

186:7, 186:19,

186:25, 187:13,

187:14, 188:1,

188:8, 188:20,

188:25, 189:1,

193:12, 194:5,

194:8, 194:13,

194:20, 194:23,

195:3, 195:19,

196:17

151:6, 155:7,

116:3, 116:6, 117:7,

127:7, 127:9, 136:3,

99:2, 100:6, 100:10,

**ZONING** [2] - 1:2, 1:9 **zoom** [3] - 162:13, 166:7, 166:9