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PROCEEDINGS
MR. NORDELO: Good evening, and welcome to this evening's meeting of the Cranford Planning Board on Wednesday, December 14, 2022, at 7:30 p.m. in Room 108 of the Municipal Building, 8 Springfield Avenue, Cranford, New Jersey. This meeting is in compliance with the Open Public Meetings Act as adequate notice of this meeting has been provided to the Westfield Leader and the Star Ledger with the agenda specifying the time, place, and matters to be heard having been posted on the bulletin board in the Town Hall reserved for such announcements and the filing of said agenda with the Township Clerk of Cranford. Formal action may be taken at this meeting.

May we all rise for the Pledge of Allegiance, please.
(Recitation of "Pledge of Allegiance.")
MR. NORDELO: Ms. Lenahan, roll call, please.

MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Pistol.
MR. PISTOL: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber.
MR. LEBER: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor.
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MR. TAYLOR: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Sen.
MS. SEN: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Rappa.
MS. RAPPA: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mayor Prunty.
MAYOR PRUNTY: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Pedde.
MS. PEDDE: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis.
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Didzbalis.
MS. DIDZBALIS: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo.
MR. NORDELO: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Kellett has recused herself.

Mr. Drill.
MR. DRILL: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Dickerson.
MR. DICKERSON: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Apgar.
MR. APGAR: Here.
MS. LENAHAN: And Mr. Boyer.
MR. BOYER: Here.

MR. NORDELO: Prior to calling up, Mr. Drill has an announcement.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. So I'd like you to call the 201 Walnut application first.

MR. NORDELO: So that's application number PB22-003 adjourned from December 7 applicant 201 Walnut Avenue LLC, 201 Walnut Avenue, block 484, Lot 1901 DT zone. The applicant in this matter is seeking preliminary and final major site plan approval to construct a three-story multifamily apartment building consisting of 34 market rate units, two affordable housing units, and three special needs housing units, for a total of 39 units.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So there's been back-andforth letters between Mr. Tuvall, Mr. Kent-Smith and myself. And then Mr. Tuvall, sent the letter in December 14 today, and just paraphrasing some of it. He says that the applicants understand that the Hartz application public comment portion will most likely take the entirety of tonight's board meeting, resulting in the board's first January meeting beginning with board deliberations and a subsequent vote on the Hartz application.

With this in mind, the applicants
acknowledge that the board will not be -- will not proceed with the application this evening, but the applicants are willing to consent to an extension of time through February 28, 2023, provided that the board agrees to the following, and he lists three things. And I'm going to read them. And my advice to the board is that -- that you accept those three things. The first one is that the applicants request the entirety of the board's January 18 meeting, excluding the deliberations and voting on the Hartz application be dedicated to the application hearing. And that's the first thing I'm going to recommend that the board accept.

Number two, should the application require a subsequent hearing, the applicants request the entirety of the board's first February meeting or a duration of time sufficient to finish the application hearing if the entire meeting is not required, be dedicated to the applicants. And that one, I'm also recommending to the -- that the board accept.

And number three that the application be carried at tonight's meeting with me making an
announcement that it's been carried to the January 18 meeting without further notice, which I would do.

I just want to fill in some dates on this. So the first meeting in February, Ms. Lenahan, is what February? February 1. So the first part of this is it's -- I'm going to recommend that the chair declare the following and if any board members want to reverse him on majority vote, they can, that the board grant the applicant's request for that part of the January 18 meeting after deliberations and voting on the Hartz application be dedicated to the 201 application.

Number two, that if the 201 Walnut application requires a subsequent hearing that the board dedicate the February 1, 2022, meeting to finish that application. Those are the two things that I -- I need from the board and I'll do the third if the board agree.

So Mr. Chair, you agree.
MR. NORDELO: I agree.
MR. DRILL: Anyone on the board want to make a motion to reverse the chair?

Seeing none.
So that's what the board is going to do. And

I will announce right now the hearing on the 201 Walnut application is going to be carried to January 18, 2023, without need for further notice.

Now there's some requests that have been made. And the requests are that if the public portion of the Hartz application does not conclude at tonight's meeting, so as to not infringe on the January 18 meeting beyond deliberations and voting, the applicant has asked me for a special meeting for the board to finish the Hartz application. So it's the 201 Walnut applicant asking that there be a special meeting for the 750 Walnut application to finish that off. And I'm sure if -- 750 Walnut doesn't object to that.

You don't have to say anything, Mr. KentSmith, unless you do object to that.

And sounds like a good idea to me. I'd like to play that by ear and see what happens. So anyone doesn't think that's a good idea, say something. Okay.

And the applicant humbly requests that the board consider the first January meeting an hour earlier than typically scheduled to allow for the
duration of time not to exceed the typical evening adjournment. So in other words, they're not asking that the board tack an hour on the end; they're asking the board tack an hour on in the beginning. Does anyone have a problem -- can anyone not make a meeting -- in other words, instead of the meeting starting at 7:30, if the meeting started at 6:30 on January 18, would anyone have a problem making that? No.

Now since it also involves 750 Walnut, any of you guys have a problem that that meeting -UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No objection.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So you can -- actually you should --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: That will be played by ear as well, correct?

MR. DRILL: Yeah. Played by ear. You might enter your appearance on the record please.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you, Mr. Attorney. Dan Klein, K-l-e-i-n, (inaudible) Hackensack on behalf of the applicants.

MR. DRILL: So you can bring that -- tell that to -- pass it on to Jason and your client.

MR. KLEIN: I will.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Have a nice night.

MR. KLEIN: Thank you.
Thank you, board members.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Yep.
MR. NORDELO: Okay. So thank you,
Mr. Drill.
Now we'll be continuing -- apologies -application number PB-22002, continued from December 7, 2020. The applicant being Hartz Mountain Industries Incorporated, 750 Walnut Avenue, Block 541, Lot 2. The applicant in this matter is seeking preliminary and final major subdivision, preliminary and final major site plan, residential and preliminary and final major site plan approval non-residential.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the board.

Henry Kent-Smith, Fox Rothschild, on behalf the applicant Hartz. We are continuing and hopefully concluding our presentation tonight and public comment.

Just to remind the board, on December 7, we presented the testimony of our witnesses, including our landscape architect and our planner. The meeting left off without -- with the planner having completed direct but not
public questioning. I asked the board's indulgence because there were -- there's one really major issue that was raised at the December 7 meeting which we have proactively, I think, worked through an agreeable solution, and that was the berm. There was public comment and concern from the board and the public relative to the state of the existing berm.

We had agreed that we would do a site visit -- to with the board's consultants to do a full analysis of the berm and then come back tonight with a I think more accurate representation of the scope of what we will agree to as it relates to a condition of any approval that would result in the supplementation of landscaping for the berm. So Mr. Chairman with -- I just want to address that one issue.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. Before you do that, the -the chair wanted to say something, and he -- he forgot; now he's remembered.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
So as we head towards public comment, first and foremost, we appreciate the members of the public that have come to every single meeting that have asked thoughtful and diligent
questions. And thank you for your service in that regard. As we head to the public comment, if we could keep your -- your comments to five minutes or so we'd really appreciate it if --

MR. DRILL: It's not five minutes or so. You're asking them to keep their comments to five minutes.

MR. NORDELO: To five minutes. Yes. So that would just be an announcement to have.

Thank You, Mr. Kent-Smith.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you very much. So what I would like to do is to call Mr. DeVitto back -- no, not you -- Mr. DeVitto back up. So --

MR. DRILL: Okay. Could you just for the record identify yourself?

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. Paul DeVitto.
MR. DRILL: And you remain under oath, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And while you're getting things set up just to please describe to the board what actions you've undertaken in consultation with the Township's consultants relative to the review and analysis of the berm.

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So on 12/12/2022, a site investigation with the township engineer, landscape architect, and Shade Tree Commission representative took place on site. This was in -to review the existing condition of the berm and provide recommendations for the appropriate planting and -- or as it relates to the tree counts.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And you have shared your findings in consultation with the board's consultants?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Now, Mr. Drill, I have mounted the exhibits for that. I just -- ask to quick question. We submitted this package of three plans.

MR. DRILL: Yes.
MR. KENT-SMITH: But I have each plan separately mounted. Do you want me to mark them collectively as one exhibit or as consecutive exhibits?

MR. DRILL: You know what? make them A31 --A30-1, A30-2 and A30-3, and do the -- the dashes based on the page numbers. Follow me on that one?

MR. KENT-SMITH: I did.

So Mr. DeVitto, I have marked as A30-1 -could you identify that plan for the record?

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So this is the Walnut Avenue frontage starting with Raritan Road to the east portion or south portion --

MR. DRILL: Start with -- that exhibit is titled Landscape Berm Analysis, page 1 of 3, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: And it's dated October 3 --
MR. DEVITTO: 12/13/2022.
MR. DRILL: Right. Okay. And who prepared was?

MR. DEVITTO: And north instead of right on the page.

MR. DRILL: Right. Who prepared this?
MR. DEVITTO: Stonefield Engineering, myself.

MR. DRILL: Someone under your direction?
MR. DEVITTO: Myself personally.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Now, please just describe what you did when you analyzed the berm, what discussions that you had with the township consultants and then what was concluded relative
to what we will be doing with the berm?
MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So during the site visit, we really identified two main conditions of the berm. One of those conditions, we've came up with Planting Scheme A and the other condition, Planting Scheme B. Those areas are marked or hatched in two colors along the frontage -- the -- the entire frontage along the property. Scheme A, this area is before --

MR. KENT-SMITH: I get into that because I also want you to -- and I'm going to mark this -this is page 3 as Exhibit A30-3. Again, identify this for the record. What is this?

MR. DEVITTO: This is A30-3, titled Berm Analysis Exhibit.

MR. DRILL: Okay. It's landscape berm analysis, 3 of 3. And it's also prepared by you with the same date of --

MR. DEVITTO: 12/13.
MR. DRILL: 12/13?
MR. DEVITTO: 2022.
MR. DRILL: Right?
MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Doesn't look like it's --
no. Doesn't look like it's working. Well, here.

You know what I'm going to --
MR. DRILL: You have enough bodies there. Throw someone -- make someone into a holder.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yeah. Why don't -- why don't you be the holder? Forget it.

Okay. So that what you have just described to the board being the $A$ and $B$--

MR. DEVITTO: Right.
MR. KENT-SMITH: -- just -- just representationally what -- what -- what we're talking about?

MR. DEVITTO: So Planting Scheme A, this -this is the condition that took place in more sparse portions of the site areas that had White Pines with -- with sparse bottoms and the crest of the berm with no plantings.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Now under View 1, you have a photograph. Where did you get the photograph?

MR. DEVITTO: So this photograph was provided by one of the --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you.
MR. DEVITTO: Yep -- residents. This was a prior submitted exhibit. This photograph was scanned and put onto the plan.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Alright. Please describe
then what it is that you're showing.
MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So the -- the first photo here is the existing berm condition as it is today. The middle image, this is the Planting Scheme A. This is -- this would be the planting condition at the approximate time of planting.

We zoom in on this.
These are artists' representations. So there is some natural variation that would take place but we did our best to try to estimate the length of the -- the -- the frontage along with the Proposed Planting Scheme A.

MR. NORDELO: Can you repeat yourself? I didn't hear you. You said these are artists representing -- can you repeat yourself please?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. These -- so they're rendered images. They're not -- it's not a -- we don't have an exact distance on it. It is -- it is an image that we've created.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
MR. DEVITTO: And the last image here is a Planting Scheme A, approximately five -- five years after planting.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Now you have also a second scheme, please.

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So oops.
MR. DEVITTO: Planting Scheme B, this takes place in the -- along the heavily -- heavily vegetated evergreen areas within the site. These areas had considerably less opportunity to plant additional plantings. So within these areas, we -- we thought upon walking and upon analysis of our -- of our survey and plans that we'd be able to plant a smattering of evergreen trees, but really supplement it with -- with shrubs that would be able to kind of cover that -- that bottom layer within the berm.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And you have representational photographs?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. Correct. So we have another image. Same thing. This -- this photograph was an image that we -- that we took just based on the Photoshop capabilities and -and providing a good image for the board.

The first image is the condition as is today. The middle image is Planting Scheme B at the time of planting. You can kind of see how it's -- the shrubs are taking up the bottom portion of that berm and then we have some
additional evergreen trees.
Let me zoom in for you.
Some additional evergreen trees placed in there where the opportunity exists. And then, that same Planting Scheme B at five years' time.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Now you've shared this plan with Colliers and received feedback?

MR. DEVITTO: We have.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And what was that feedback?
MR. DEVITTO: They were in agreement with the planting densities, quantities, and with our analysis of both planting schemes.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And with regard to quantities on Exhibit 30-3, please point out the board. We have agreed to basically a max planting within the discretion of the location of that maximum planting to achieve the greatest screening, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Go through that please.
MR. DEVITTO: So each planting scheme has a rough planting rate. Planting Scheme A has --

MR. KENT-SMITH: No. The total.
MR. DEVITTO: Okay. The totals. Evergreen trees 100 total trees proposal on the frontage,
sub canopy trees 30 total across the frontage, and large shrubs 200 across the frontage.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Now, the A and B planting schemes have representation of a planning amount but that's still open to achieving the maximum screening capability?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And yet still provide for sufficient growth?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Describe that, please.
MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So the part -- part of the reason to create these planting schemes is the nature of the berm. There are existing trees on site. So it's going to be -- it's going to be a field effort to go out there, stake the trees, place them in positions where not only the existing trees can thrive, but the proposed trees can also thrive.

So we don't want to create a competition between the new trees that are replanting and then the trees that are existing. So we want to really complement each other. And with that, we're going to have that natural variation. It's not -- it's going to be a very organic planting
plan. This is not going to be a row of trees. There's going to be a significant amount of staggering which -- which is what we're going to want. It's going to block sightlines and appear natural.

MR. NORDELO: Just one question before we proceed. And if I'm -- if I'm getting ahead of myself, Mr. Kent-Smith, let me know.

But you gave the totals. At some point, can you explain briefly what goes into calculating those totals?

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So the -- the totals -the totals for Planting Scheme A per 100 linear feet, we have six evergreen trees. And -- and all these totals are in accordance with the proposed maximums. They -- they play hand in hand.

MR. NORDELO: So it's a formula that's considered --

MR. DEVITTO: Formula, yes. This is just broken down a little bit further. But these are -- they are hand in hand with each other.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
MR. KENT-SMITH: So let me just walk you then through Exhibit 30-1 and let's just start
from the intersection of Rariton and Walnut and let's go northbound on Walnut and just walk through the board then what your analysis of the berm show.

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. Going back to Exhibit A30-1, starting at the corner of Raritan Road and Walnut Avenue, moving north along the roadway. We have a first section of property that is going to be proposed for Planting Scheme A. And within this section, we're going to be proposing evergreen trees, subcanopy trees, and shrubs.

Then we come into a section of pretty heavily dense -- pretty heavily planted and evergreen trees that are in good shape. This area would receive evergreen trees where applicable, and evergreen -- or evergreen shrubs across the bottom of it. As we move towards the first driveway entrance, on either side of it, we have two applications of the Planting Scheme A.

Between the -- moving along Walnut Avenue towards the north portion of the site, we're coming to the intersection or the cross street of Mitchell place. Again, this entire berm area, this is actually where the rendered photo image one was taken from in this area this -- this
entire strip will receive Planting Scheme A.
Flip the page to A30-2. Yes. So continuing along, we have an -- we have a section of Planting Scheme A where the old driveway will be removed or proposed to be removed, which then transitions into a -- the -- where the image of -- the photoshopped image number two was taken of the evergreen screen. And that -- and that will lead to the additional driveway -- or the new proposed driveway entrance towards the northern portion of the site.

We are now entering towards the railroad track portion. And this area is to receive Planting Scheme A.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And there's another representation of an area between the Planning Area A and the sidewalk on Walnut Avenue. What is that?

MR. DEVITTO: This -- this area is -- are the steep slopes heading from the top of the berm to the sidewalk.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And what are you going to do there?

MR. DEVITTO: This area, we can propose to reseed and stabilize the slopes.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So, again, just so the board's aware, we're providing this as a representation of a condition that we would agree to so that we have a frame of reference relative to what we're agreeing to to supplement relative to the berm. It's not a plan that's approval ready because we're not seeking approval, but that this would be a condition that we're requesting that the -- and green that the board may oppose to address the berm.

The app- -- the applicant would agree to implement the landscape plan representation set forth in $A 30-1,-2,-3$ in the quantities as represented on that plan subject to two municipal landscape architects or engineers' review as to the specific location of plantings for maximum survivability, growth, and screening.

Okay. I have no further questions.
MR. NORDELO: Do any of our board members?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I have a question. So the existing driveways now.

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. Before you realign anything, what's going to happen with those? Can you just reiterate that?

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. I believe -- believe that one driveway was largely going to be re- -reused, just modified.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Right.
MR. DEVITTO: This is the driveway along Walnut --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes.
MR. DEVITTO: -- close to the Raritan Road.
In here, $I$ think this just provided additional planting area. Let me zoom in for you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Well, you create a berm there also?

MR. KENT-SMITH: That one's going to stay. That -- it's just going to be slightly modified but that driveway stays.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So this -- this is the same driveway entrance as there is now that's being modified to the one way.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Uh-huh. And then --
MR. DEVITTO: In this area, this berm is being cut back just slightly, but the top of this berm is remaining.

MR. KENT-SMITH: All right. If you would then move to 30-2 because that's the other existing driveway that is being closed.

MR. DEVITTO: Correct. Let's go to this.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And I'm just pointing out to the board on Exhibit A30-2, this is -- this is the existing driveway right here.

MR. DEVITTO: So right. We looked into this area. I know this was a comment from the prior hearing. There are existing trees on this higher side. This is the existing berm. We can adjust some of the grades in here. However, if we do, we run the risk of suffocating the roots from these trees on top of the berm. So we could -- there's -- there's some play available in there. We might be able to increase that, you know, 6 to 12 inches. But it becomes a delicate game of preserving the trees and enhancing the berm.

Right now, there is about a two-and-a-half to three-foot berm. It's just pushed back a little bit in the rear or pushed back from the roadway a little bit. We can get creative and put a little -- maybe a little mound up front. But in -- in this area, it was -- it was tight just due to the site constraints -- due to those trees due to the basin and just trying to preserve as many trees as long that frontage as can -- as we possibly could that are healthy.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.
MS. DIDZBALIS: You gave us a count for the various trees and shrubs, but could you tell me the minimum caliper or -- and/or height?

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So the -- these were -these would remain consistent with our landscape plan itself. I Believe the evergreen trees were six- or seven-foot height. And then the caliper of the trees --

MS. DIDZBALIS: Three and a half to four and a half. Was that what -- I mean --

MR. DEVITTO: No. So these would be subcanopy trees. These would be ornamental trees proposed. So typically, they're a little smaller because they grow a little slower --

MS. DIDZBALIS: Uh-huh.
MR. DEVITTO: -- from the nurseries. And for this, I would recommend a two-inch caliper.

MS. DIDZBALIS: Just two?
MR. DEVITTO: It -- yeah, I would. So planting -- so planting smaller material is actually -- it's healthier for the tree in relation to the size of the caliper to the root ball itself. The larger tree you -- you go with --

MS. DIDZBALIS: Uh-huh.
MR. DEVITTO: -- you run the risk of that -that specimen tree kind of dying out because that root ball isn't as large -- isn't large enough to support the canopy or the trunk itself. The other thing with planting larger trees, it takes longer for it to stabilize. The first couple of years of growth, it spends its time repairing the tree roots rather than growing out. So while most people want the immediate impact of "I want the larger tree," sometimes it's not always the best for the tree or for the neighborhood because that smaller tree is going to be able to adapt much faster to that soil, grow quicker and -- and run less of a risk of perishing.

MS. DIDZBALIS: But wouldn't it be dependent on the specific tree that you picked? So in certain cases, couldn't you go to a larger caliber tree on the ones that can adapt better?

MR. DEVITTO: It's -- it's really more of a function of the -- of the root ball size. And from the nurseries, the way that they cut them, it's just typically not -- it's typically not large enough to really support the size root ball that's -- that's required.

MS. DIDZBALIS: Okay.
MR. DEVITTO: There are some trees that are fall dig hazards, but all trees would struggle with the larger -- the larger size of tree, the more it's going to struggle as -- as it's transplanted.

MS. DIDZBALIS: I understand this is a difficult planting spot for you.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah.
MS. DIDZBALIS: But I think where you can choose height and a larger caliber, I'm sure that you could work something in a little bigger in certain spots. I'm sure you could --

MR. DEVITTO: Sure.
MS. DIDZBALIS: -- kind of cherry pick those a little bit better so that you can maybe fill in some of that. I mean, really, that's the biggest concern. So okay. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I don't know if you're an arborist or if you have one on staff.

MR. DEVITTO: Uh-huh.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Do any of the existing trees needed to be trimmed? Or do you have that as a part of your proposal?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So on our plans, we have
a note that -- that trees in poor condition. I think some of those white pines, they do need to be trimmed -- trimmed up a little bit. So while it's while on site over there, they can be safety pruned.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: So that would be part of your plan?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. That is incorporated into the plan.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Thank you.
MR. NORDELO: Okay. Go ahead Mr. Leber.
MR. LEBER: I just need some -- some
clarification. So the -- the berm on the northern side is -- is lower than the berm on the southern side. So what you were saying before is you really can't enhance that because it would damage the -- the tree roots. Is -- is there any way that because -- because I'm going through there is a significant height difference between those two. Is there anything that can be done that could rectify that aside from maybe more dense planting of shrubs without damaging the roots of the existing trees?

MR. DEVITTO: I'm sorry. Which portion are we --

MR. LEBER: The portion of -- there's -there's -- the -- the berm that's on the north part closer to the -- to the railroad --

MR. DEVITTO: Okay.
MR. LEBER: -- it seems to me to be significantly lower -- just the -- the soil part seems to be lower than the part closer to Raritan Road. And it's pretty material. Is there anything that you can do to -- to rectify that without endangering the existing trees that are there?

MR. DEVITTO: I think when -- to preserve the trees, we're going to want to stay out of the drip zone. I know this is a -- this is a touchy area. So it's a tough spot. I lean away from just disturbing the soil in this area, if possible, to preserve -- preserve as many trees as we can.

MR. NORDELO: Yeah. All right. I'm seeing Mr. Dickerson. If you have any question, and specifically, if you could go over the memorandum prepared. Just for clarity sake. If you could -- that's dated December 14. It's regarding the berm landscaping at 750 Walnut. if you could summarize what's been agreed to. If you have any questions, so ask questions.

MR. DICKERSON: So as was mentioned, our office did have a chance to visit the site on Monday. And this exhibit that's being shown is the product of the discussion from the landscape architect on my staff who visited the site. And he had a chance to review these plans when they were prepared earlier this morning. And through his review, we prepared this memo. And he notes that -- let's see, just the bottom line point is that we are satisfied that this will provide the desired screening and buffering in a manner that will be aesthetically pleasing. I -- I believe the intent here is, as was mentioned, is to fill in the gaps.

MR. NORDELO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Dickerson.

Okay. Now I'll invite members of the public to ask questions of this witness. Please remember, name, and address. Thank you.

MR. DRILL: And if you can, this is the -right -- the standing area right over here. It's very helpful for us.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Rita LaBrutto, 104 Arlington
Road. Can I just comment that I looked at the bylaws, and there's nothing in there about public
comments being five minutes?
MR. DRILL: Correct. There's case law that says if the board wants to they could limit public comment to three minutes. And they didn't say they're going to limit it, but they said -they're asking people to try to keep their comments to five minutes.

MS. LA BRUTTO: It's a very large application.

MR. DRILL: I understand. So we'll see -we'll see what happens. Right now, there's only three members of the public here.

MS. LA BRUTTO: I understand that.
MR. DRILL: So maybe -- maybe it won't be a problem. But the chairman's asking -- again, the MLUL says there's three instances where questions or comments can be prohibited. That's if they're irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitious. So maybe if they're not repetitious, maybe, especially in light of the fact there's three people that you won't be limited to five minutes. The chairman asked if you could try to --

MS. LA BRUTTO: But the problem, Mr. Drill, that has been with this application is that the public is constantly surprised by new testimony.

And when did the public have a chance to see this December 14 memo. That is today. Okay. When did --

MR. DRILL: Hold up.
MS. LA BRUTTO: December 13.
MR. DRILL: Right. Remember. December 7, we had a big discussion, they were going to go out and do this. And they went out. They testified December 12. And then the board said they wanted it witnessed and they had someone from Collier's witness it.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Correct.
MR. DRILL: And he -- and you -- I just said to the chairman that after --

MS. LA BRUTTO: But they weren't --
MR. DRILL: -- I just said to the chairman that after this witness is questioned, you could question Mr. Dickerson

MS. LA BRUTTO: We don't have any of the memos. This wasn't supposed to happen tonight. This was supposed to happen at a subsequent meeting.

MR. DRILL: So you know --
MS. LA BRUTTO: So you know what? This application has been rushed. It has been all over
the place. The board has been -- I don't even know what to say to be honest with you --

MR. DRILL: Mr. Dickerson, you have an extra copy of your memo?

MS. LA BRUTTO: -- amount of questions that this board has even asked of the applicant.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Kathy, you have an extra copy of the memo?

It's a one-page memo. And after you question him and someone else's question him and someone else else was questioning, you can read the memo and then you question Mr. Dickerson.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Well --
MR. DRILL: But why don't you -- why don't you ask your questions if this witness.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. Here's the question. You mentioned in Plan A evergreen trees and shrubs, where did shrubs come into this picture? It was always supposed to be trees.

MR. DEVITTO: Sure. So this was a result of the sidewalk. On Monday, it was recommended that we not only include the trees, the evergreen trees, include subcanopy trees as well as shrubs to create like you can see in this photo, to just aid and provide additional -- additional
screening for the top of this crest on the berm. So it's --

MS. LA BRUTTO: The top of the crest -- the shrubs are never going to get to the top. Now, you don't have one rendering here of the building --

MR. NORDELO: There has to be a question, Ms. La Brutto. You can't comment. Thank you. If you could just ask the question.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Is there any -- any rendering of the building behind what you plan to do?

MR. DEVITTO: We do not have one right now, no.

MS. LA BRUTTO: So how do you know that it's going to cover the building?

MR. DEVITTO: I never said it will cover the building at this point. They're shrubs.

MS. LA BRUTTO: How do you know that the --
MR. DRILL: Whoa, whoa, whoa. Listen.
You're gonna get to cross him. We have a memo you're --

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: -- gonna get to read. Please ask him the questions.

MS. LA BRUTTO: So we don't know -- okay. So you really don't know that the buffering is sufficient?

MR. DEVITTO: No. I am confident as the buffer matures, it will do a good job --

MS. LA BRUTTO: It's going to go to 30 feet?
MR. DEVITTO: The trees selected, yes, they will grow.

MS. LA BRUTTO: The shrubs are gonna go to 40 feet?

MR. DEVITTO: The shrubs will cover the -the bottom part of the berm.

MS. LA BRUTTO: The bottom part of the berm is -- won't there be a building behind the bottom part? I mean, you're gonna see the building?

MR. DEVITTO: Sure, yes.
MS. LA BRUTTO: The idea is to not see the building.

MR. DEVITTO: The shrubs -- the shrubs aren't --

MR. DRILL: Is --
MR. DEVITTO: -- the entire building.
MR. DRILL: Have you looked at the redevelopment plan?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.

MR. DRILL: When you look at the redevelopment plan is the purpose of the landscape berm to totally screen the building or some other purpose?

MR. DEVITTO: The purpose -- actually, let me -- I don't -- I don't want to misspeak.

MR. DRILL: Get that part of the redevelopment plan out. Because I'm not sure what the purpose is supposed to be.

MS. LA BRUTTO: It's today --
MR. DRILL: Let -- let -- let's -- so let's -- so let's find out -- let's find out what the purpose of the landscape berm is supposed to be.

Nick, can you pull this up because we're gonna end up asking you. And if we don't, Mr. La Brutto is.

MR. DEVITTO: So --
MR. DRILL: Yeah. Give us the paragraph you're reading from and reading into the record nice and slowly, please.

Tell you what. To speed this along, Mr. Henry, I'm going to ask Nick, if he has it up just to read it. Nick read -- give him microphone, please.

MR. DICKERSON: So the section I'm looking
at here -- and this is -- in my draft, this is page 42. So I believe that there might be a two page or two margin of error.

Okay. That's 39 (inaudible) for landscaping and buffers. And so this is subsection $K$, landscaping and buffers, subsection one. Landscaping shall be provided along property lines to create buffers with adjacent property uses. Buffers are intended to establish clear delineation between properties and to minimize the visual impacts between properties.

MR. DRILL: Okay. You have any other section that you guys think is relevant to read?

MR. KENT-SMITH: There's another section. Let me just make sure $I$ get the citation correct. it's -- yes, 4.7D7.

MR. DEVITTO: 4.7D7, the existing berm along Walnut Avenue frontage --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Whoa, whoa. Slow.
MR. DEVITTO: Sorry.
The existing berm along Walnut Avenue frontage shall remain. Changes to the existing berm for pedestrian access may be approved by the township.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Do you see that, Nick?

MR. DICKERSON: I do see that section as well.

MR. DRILL: All right. Is there anything else in that section?

MR. DEVITTO: We'll read -- 4.7 -- or 4.8 -I'm sorry -- 4.7D8, the design of the privatelyowned public space should --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible) no, just talking about the part. That's --

MR. DEVITTO: No. That's it.
MR. DRILL: Okay. You see anything else about that berm?

MR. DICKERSON: No, I do not.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Keep on asking.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Does Hartz intend to show a rendering with the buildings behind what you're proposing as far as buffering?

MR. DEVITTO: No.
MS. LA BRUTTO: No? Okay.
Can I ask the board if they intend to ask for that?

MR. DRILL: No. You can -- in your comments, you can say that they should.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Yeah, they should. So how -if you could go to the one photo, I guess it was
the one below this. So all of these trees and even the one above, all the trees are very leggy at the top. Because they were pine trees that at one time were completely full.

MR. DRILL: So your question is, Do you agree -- do you agree with that statement?

MS. LA BRUTTO: My question is, Do you agree that those were at one time full pine trees.

MR. DEVITTO: In the past, I -- it'd be an assumption on my end. I don't know what the condition of the site was.

MR. DRILL: You would assume it, but you don't know it.

MR. DEVITTO: You could assume, but I do not know.

MR. DRILL: Listen to --
MS. LA BRUTTO: Well, in your expert opinion being a landscape architect, if you ended up with evergreens 40-foot high, what do you think happened between zero and 39? Do you think there were evergreens in between there?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. So you would agree that that is now gone. And how do you intend to fill that area where you only have evergreens up
at the very top?
MR. DEVITTO: Sure, so -- so we're proposing different tree species. Ones not -- not like these white pines that have become a little -- a little sparse throughout the lower and middle portions. So -- so we are confident in the tree species that we're proposing that it's going to supplement and fill -- fill in the rest of this.

MS. LA BRUTTO: So you don't intend to take those leggy pines that are dead potentially out and put something of that height back?

MR. DEVITTO: No. I would not recommend removing those trees.

MS. LA BRUTTO: And why wouldn't you?
MR. DEVITTO: They do provide a fairly decent buffer with the existing condition.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Would you agree that -that --

MR. DRILL: I thought she asked you if you're going to take out dead ones and you just answered you weren't? I think you gotta listen to the question.

MR. DEVITTO: I'm sorry. I'm sorry. Yeah, the dead ones would be removed from this area. I thought you meant the whole thing.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. Okay. And a pine tree like that, where there's approximately two feet of evergreen and the rest of it is pretty much bark, what -- what are you calling that? Are you calling that dead or are you calling that an actual tree?

MR. DEVITTO: This -- this tree is proposed to remain.

MS. LA BRUTTO: That's proposed to remain?
MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. LA BRUTTO: And you're going to, you think, fill that tree with what? A two-foot bush?

MR. DEVITTO: No, we're proposing evergreen trees in this area?

MS. LA BRUTTO: No. But right there where that gap is. Basically there's a gap --

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So this is just a representation. These -- these trees can be shifted around in any number of ways. It's -it's merely just a discussion point. These -these trees that we're proposing can be shifted over to the left or to the right. They can be grouped in an area. It's -- the -- the intent is that we're providing trees for this area and that
we're going to identify where they go in the fields.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. So can I just ask you this? What, then, happens to that area where you can see right through to the -- where the building would be? You say here at your planning scheme, which is a real scheme, but in Scheme B. If you move over to Scheme B down here.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Go to the other.
MS. LA BRUTTO: You see the pawn. Yeah. So you have Scheme B here, right?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Maybe it would be better if you use --

MR. DRILL: Yeah. Why -- why don't you get the hard line exhibit and go up there and point. It's easier. So he can see what you're asking.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I think it's better because you have the -- you could actually --

MS. LA BRUTTO: Fine. So this is at five years and we still have these leggy pines. What did you -- do you intend to do anything with this at any point in time?

MR. DEVITTO: No, it's --
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: He needs to be on the mic.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Take the microphone.
MR. DEVITTO: The existing trees, even though they may have portions that are a little lucky towards the bottom or the center, they are providing a canopy cover, something that we wouldn't want to remove in this area.

MS. LA BRUTTO: (Inaudible).
MR. DEVITTO: Yes. Those trees are providing valuable -- valuable coverage in the -at the top of the tree and they will continue to do so.

MS. LA BRUTTO: (Inaudible).
MR. DEVITTO: Correct. But they -- above that is viable plant growth.

MS. LA BRUTTO: So this is even after five years. This is what you have is these -- these trees down here. And how high are they?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Microphone (inaudible).

MR. DEVITTO: The -- the trees in this area, after five years, could expect to grow at a rate of plus or minus 18 inches a year.

MS. LA BRUTTO: 18 inches?
MR. DEVITTO: A year, yes. Well, 18 inches a year on top of -- on top of there -- on top of
the berm on top of their already starting height.
MS. LA BRUTTO: At 18 inches, (inaudible)
MR. DEVITTO: It would be about a 15-foot tall evergreen after about five years.

MS. LA BRUTTO: We have to wait five years for (inaudible).

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. It would be about five years to be about 15 -- 15 feet tall. It could be taller. They could grow quicker.

MS. LA BRUTTO: (Inaudible).
MR. DEVITTO: Those, a rough approximation, it would be about -- it's about the height of a utility pole. Yeah, it's about -- it's about 40 feet -- 30 -- 30 or maybe a little less, 35 feet tall.

MS. LA BRUTTO: And how tall is the building (inaudible)?

MR. DEVITTO: It's about 40 feet.
MS. LA BRUTTO: (Inaudible). and in five years, we'll have 15 feet?

MR. DEVITTO: Sure, but --
MR. KENT-SMITH: The building will be set back, though, further.

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah. So -- so the building -the building will be set back. And from the
viewing angle, it's -- it will provide enough coverage from an visual cone of analysis that you will not see the building.

MS. LA BRUTTO: (Inaudible)?
MR. DEVITTO: Yes.
MS. LA BRUTTO: So why wasn't there a rendering of the building behind (inaudible)?

MR. DEVITTO: It was just the focus on the berm condition.

MS. LA BRUTTO: But isn't the idea of buffering and screening the building?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Wasn't -- didn't you just read into the record what the requirements were for the buffer on the existing berm and just explained what it says.

MR. DEVITTO: Yes, it's to supplement.
MR. DRILL: You've asked him now -- this is the third time about the rendering. Okay. My opinion, this is asked and answered. She doesn't like the answer, but that's what the answer is. They're not doing it. They're not willing to do it. No one asked him to do it. And If you think that should be done, make it in your comments. But you can't -- this is getting unduly repetitive.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: That's -- that's my advice to the chair. Do you make that ruling?

MR. NORDELO: Yes, I make that ruling. Please just proceed with new line of questioning or you just can't -- it's already been answered. So continue.

MS. LA BRUTTO: You have a schedule of (inaudible) that's been provided to the board?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes. The -- the plant -- the proposed planting species were in accordance and recommended by the township landscape architects.

MS. LA BRUTTO: (Inaudible)?
MR. DEVITTO: Or professional or board professional? I'm sorry.

MS. LA BRUTTO: And who was that?
MR. DRILL: From Nick's office, correct?
MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MR. DRILL: That's why you're going to question him.

MS. LA BRUTTO: (Inaudible).
MR. DRILL: Correct.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Would you say this is a cheap way of filling in?

MR. DEVITTO: No. This is very -- this is a
significant monetary contribution.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Would you (inaudible) not sure (inaudible) but since Hartz bought this property, they've --

MR. NORDELO: That's not a question.
MR. DRILL: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. That's irrelevant -- my opinion, that's irrelevant to this application.

MR. NORDELO: Please ask a --
MR. DRILL: Do you agree?
MR. NORDELO: Yes, I agree.
MS. LA BRUTTO: It goes to maintenance.
MR. NORDELO: But just ask the question.
MR. DRILL: No. It doesn't go to
maintenance. From what happened in the past.
They're proposing this going forward? In my opinion, it's irrelevant and immaterial.

MR. NORDELO: Correct. I -- I agree.
MS. LA BRUTTO: All right. Thank you. (inaudible)

MR. DRILL: Yeah, after the questions are done of their witness --

MS. LA BRUTTO: (Inaudible).
MR. DRILL: That's right.
Ms. Esposito.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Yeah. And I just wanted to confirm. I just -- if there's a dead tree -- and you're going to remove it, correct?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Will you replace it with a tree the same height?

MR. DEVITTO: No. The -- the dead trees are taken into account, both on the exhibit and within the planting schemes.

MS. LA BRUTTO: And is there a certain type of tree that you're going to replace it with, just like a new tree that's little that's growing or any criteria?

MR. DEVITTO: Yeah, it would be -- it would be an evergreen tree. it would be never -- yeah, it'd be it would be an evergreen tree. Okay. Thank you.

MR. NORDELO: Just name and address.
MS. ESPOSITO: Yep. Thank you. Everyone knows my name.

MR. NORDELO: Sorry. Go ahead.
MS. ESPOSITO: That's okay. Christine Esposito, 11 Behnert Place. I have four questions, and they'll be short.

Do you have an artist's rendering or can you
show us on the plan the plantings that are proposed at the new entrance along with the signage at that proposed entrance across from Behnert Place?

MR. DEVITTO: So we don't have a rendering for that area. We would have -- we have the proposed Planting Scheme A which would take place there?

MS. ESPOSITO: Is that where the old driveway was, or is that the new driveway location -- proposed new driveway location?

MR. DEVITTO: Let's go take a look. Which would you like to see right now?

MS. ESPOSITO: It's a trick question.
MR. DEVITTO: This is the old -- so this is the --

MS. ESPOSITO: That's the existing driveway.
MR. DEVITTO: The existing driveway location, correct.

MS. ESPOSITO: Do you have any of these designs that show the proposed driveway location and the planting scheme in that area?

MR. DEVITTO: We don't have -- this is the proposed planting scheme for this area for -it's for all the areas

MR. DRILL: When you say -- when you say this, you're saying Berm Planting Scheme A?

MR. DEVITTO: Yes, berm planting scheme A is the proposed planting scheme for both those areas.

MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. Including the area around where the berm is going to be proposed to be removed for the new driveway?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MS. ESPOSITO: Did parts for our board professional discuss that area specifically with you during your walkabout?

MR. DEVITTO: We did -- we did mention a -that this was going to be a new driveway location in this area. And part of that was the preservation of those existing trees in that area. We can go to it right now. Zoom in on this. So -- so one of the things that's happening here is these contours are being taken back for the berm and the tree -- we are able -- because these contours are so tight and so condensed in this area, we are able to preserve a lot of that existing tree material.

MS. ESPOSITO: So is there going to be provided to the board a rendering of the
landscape design with the signage and the new driveway, the street view?

MR. DEVITTO: At this time, it is -- it is not.

MS. ESPOSITO: So the board is going to deliberate without that information?

MR. DEVITTO: Correct.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay.
MR. NORDELO: Do we have any additional members of the public to ask questions of this witness?

MR. DRILL: Okay. So if not, let's open up questioning of Nick on this landscape issue.

MR. NORDELO: Members of the public to our board professional on this issue.

Mr. Dickerson, grab a mic.
MR. DRILL: And my suggestion now is that the members of the public come up to the podium mic and Mr. Dickerson will answer on the handheld mic.

Now, Rita, did you have a chance to read the one-page memo?

MS. LA BRUTTO: It says nothing.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Into the microphone?
MS. LA BRUTTO: Yes, I did have a chance to
read.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Right.
MR. DRILL: Fire away.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. So Mr. Dickerson -and by the way, in my opinion, this should not only be questions of Mr . Dickerson about landscaping, but since you wanted to question him about other things you had told me, maybe we can get two for the price of one and have questions about Mr. Dickerson -- questions for Mr. Dickerson on landscaping and anything else. Unless you want to save that for later. Do you have an objection to that?

MR. DICKERSON: No, I don't.
MR. NORDELO: Okay. You can proceed on any questions to Mr. Dickerson.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. So I'm looking at the memo that was just handed to me now, even though the public did not have this available before the meeting.

MR. DRILL: Okay. What's the date on that memo?

MS. LA BRUTTO: December 14.
MR. DRILL: And what's today's date?

December 14.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Right.
MR. DRILL: Right. The board member -- the board members got it maybe a couple hours ago, so it's not like the public is -- we purposely -like it was hidden or anything just for the record.

MS. LA BRUTTO: And --
MR. DRILL: It's a late breaking memo. Ask him the questions, and you've read it.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Having read this memo, it really doesn't say anything about what kind of trees, the height of the trees, it just basically says that they met with them and they were, you know --

MR. DRILL: Make it a question, please.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Make it --
MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. So would you agree it says the applicant agrees to remove all dead trees from the buffer and clear areas of excessive growth?

MR. DICKERSON: Is that a question?
MS. LA BRUTTO: Yes. Do you agree that the applicant --

MR. DICKERSON: That's -- they provided testimony demonstrating that they would be removing dead trees?

MR. DRILL: Nick, you've got to talk louder even though you have the mic.

MR. DICKERSON: Yes, it is -- and from the testimony that they provided that they would be removing the dead trees and, $I$ believe, trimming the dead portions of the other trees remaining.

MS. LA BRUTTO: And the trees that are being planted, Mr. Dickerson, by -- are they the same height of the trees that they're removing?

MR. DICKERSON: I don't believe so. And I believe that was the testimony provided.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Right. And have you seen any rendering of the building behind any of this landscape berm?

MR. DICKERSON: I have not seen any renderings.

MS. LA BRUTTO: So how do you feel --
MR. DRILL: Just for the -- just for the record, there is no such rendering that the board's aware of because it hasn't been submitted.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Right.

MR. DRILL: Have they submitted --
MS. LA BRUTTO: So --
MR. DRILL: Anything to you --
MS. LA BRUTTO: -- how --
MR. DRILL: -- that they haven't submitted to the board?

MR. DICKERSON: Not that I'm aware of.
MS. LA BRUTTO: So how can you feel
confident that this will provide sufficient buffering or screening, if you haven't seen any rendering?

MR. DICKERSON: Well, you're making the assumption that we have a problem with seeing a portion of the building. We understand the fact that trees are not going to block the building 100 percent. We understand that the building is set back far enough where you have a nice park and buffer area between it. We understand that there's lots of plantings and improvements that are being made, that are not going to shield this building from who's ever driving down Walnut Avenue. And that's not the purpose of the -- of the buffer.

MS. LA BRUTTO: So our planter is
comfortable with not -- not really seeing or I
guess you have a level of comfort that what they're providing is sufficient buffering -buffering and screening.

MR. DICKERSON: That is correct.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. The other question I had is on zoning as to what's the -- actually in the redevelopment plan. Just bear with me one minute.

So here's my question. In the land use ordinance, it states that office distribution centers shall not include mini warehouses or similar uses or truck depots or similar uses. During the planning board meetings, there was a lot of testimony relate -- related to tractor trailers entering the site. Given that many warehouses and truck depots are not permitted, can there even be tractor trailers on the site?

MR. DICKERSON: The representation that was made by the applicants was that this would qualify as the permitted use of a -- just going to that section of the redevelopment plan.

MR. DRILL: Not to put words in your mouth, an office distribution center, maybe?

MR. DICKERSON: Yes. An office distribution center. There are no definitions in the code for
a truck depot. And if the representation that they made was that this is an office distribution center, and based on the definition in the code and in the redevelopment plan -- let's see. Just scrolling. Bear with me. Just trying to get to the right page here.

Now the definition that is in the redevelopment plan was taken directly from the code. And I believe that this definition has been in place based on my research since at least 1990. And the definition here is that an office, distribution center includes the warehousing and distribution of goods provided that up to 10 percent of the gross floor area of any office distribution center maybe --

MR. DRILL: Slow down. Slow it down a little, Nick.

MR. DICKERSON: May be used for executive or administrative offices, office uses ancillary to the warehouse and distribution uses. Warehousing and office distribution centers shall not include the storage of fuels, hazardous materials, hazardous waste, highly flammable liquids, or gases or petrochemical products.

All warehousing and storage of goods shall
be conducted entirely within enclosed structures and buildings. Quote, office distribution centers, unquote, shall not include mini warehouses or similar uses or truck depots or similar uses. And the applicants have made the representation that they are an office distribution center, and there's nothing to suggest that they're not.

MS. LA BRUTTO: My -- that wasn't my question, though. My question is that the testimony has been related to tractor trailers entering the site. So I'm asking you, when they say --

MR. DRILL: Wait a minute. Hold, hold, hold. They've been asked questions about that, and they've answered questions about that. So -so just because they've answered questions about tractor trailers entering the site doesn't mean that's contrary to the representation of what the use is. I'm just putting that out there. You can ask him, but if you're going to ask him a question, that -- what your question implied that the applicant was presenting that as their primary use when, the way $I$ see things from up here is that they've been asked all sorts of
questions about that. And they've been answering it and it's taken a lot of hearing time, but it's -- it's been responding to questions.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. Then the question that I have for Mr. Dickerson is, what do you see as the definition of a truck depot?

MR. DRILL: Fair enough.
MR. DICKERSON: I have looked into this question and -- and there's a book of development definitions that people will look to, and that's the --

MR. DRILL: The Moscowitz book, by any chance?

MR. DICKERSON: -- the Moscowitz book. And I believe the most recent definition -- edition I have is the 2014 edition.

MR. DRILL: That's correct.
MR. DICKERSON: And there's nothing that addresses truck depots. I also tried to take a look just through some Googling around to see also if there are other ordinances out there, and there's not really much that defines what is a truck depot. I know that Cranford's code used to be based on, I believe, the SIC code and not that NAICS code. And in checking those definitions,
there's nothing relating to truck depots as well. From what I was able to search around for truck depots usually will. And this -- and this is not a scientific assumption, this is just based on from what $I$ was able to find, since there are no definitions really established that truck depots tend to refer to the storage of trucks or other vehicles like a bus depot would store buses.

MR. DRILL: That's your -- your professional opinion based on looking at things in the literature, correct?

MR. DICKERSON: Correct.
MS. LA BRUTTO: So would a truck depot allow trucks to stay there overnight. Is there a time line for how long these trucks can stay on the property?

MR. DICKERSON: There is no standards in the town code concerning truck depots. So I wouldn't have an answer for you on that one.

MS. LA BRUTTO: But you wrote the redevelopment agreement, right? What were you thinking when you wrote the truck depot?

MR. DRILL: Actually, did you have anything to do with writing that redevelopment plan?

MR. DICKERSON: I did not write the
redevelopment agreement and I did not write the redevelopment plan.

MR. DRILL: Do you know who wrote the redevelopment plan?

MR. DICKERSON: The redevelopment plan was drafted by typology.

MR. DRILL: Is that related to your firm?
MR. DICKERSON: It is not.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. So you're our planner and there's something in here called the truck depot, but we really don't know, the truck depot, like, what's the length of time a truck can stay on that property --

MR. DRILL: Again, this is your assumption. He's already told you. He looked all over the place for a definition of a truck depot. He couldn't find it. You're now asking him questions about how much time a truck has to stay there to be a depot or not. He's told you he doesn't know -- he doesn't know what a truck depot.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DICKERSON: Might I add that the previous use of this property was a warehouse with trucks that were parked on site for a prolonged period of time, so it's not anything
unusual that's -- that's going to be taking place on this site. Again --

MS. LA BRUTTO: I think those trucks were related to like JB Williams Production.

MR. DRILL: You use it for your -- your comment -- your public comments.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Right.
MR. DRILL: But you're gonna keep on asking and --

MS. LA BRUTTO: I'm just Wondering should the redevelopment plan, have a definition of what a truck depot is or what mini warehouse is?

MR. DRILL: Does the redevelopment plan have a definition for that?

MR. DICKERSON: For.
MR. DRILL: Truck depo.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Truck depo.
MR. DICKERSON: It does not.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: And, again, not to repeat because I don't want to be unduly repetitive, but did your office have anything to do with writing that redevelopment plan?

MR. DICKERSON: We did not.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Might I add for
the record that Hartz Mountain had approached the planning board for 100 percent residential development. That was turned down. And through the lawsuit, through negotiations, it was agreed that the township were the ones that partially requested a commercial aspect to this site.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Commercial, Yes. My question more relates to the amount of truck traffic. Not --

MR. DRILL: Right. Asked --
MS. LA BRUTTO: We weren't told commercial. Right. Okay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: I'm just making comments so that she understands the board knows what this application is about.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Right. Can --
MR. NORDELO: Ms. La Brutto, do you have -do you want to proceed with a question for Mr. Dickerson?

MS. LA BRUTTO: I do. Can an office distribution center use big trucks?

MR. DICKERSON: Considering -- considering that definition includes warehousing and distribution, I -- it would go without -- in my opinion, that would include trucks.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Do you have any sense of what size trucks for an office distribution center?

MR. DICKERSON: This --
MR. DRILL: Listen, it's a fair question.
MR. DICKERSON: It would have been something that would have been considered at the time of the drafting of the redevelopment plan.

MR. DRILL: And is there anything in the redevelopment plan that either restricts or talks about a truck not over certain size?

MR. DICKERSON: There is no restrictions. But as we've discussed, there are the provisions in the redevelopment plan, which we spent several hearings on discussing the traffic impacts and a traffic impact statement was one of the required provisions of the redevelopment plan.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. In your opinion, should there be a definition of warehousing in the redevelopment plan?

MR. DRILL: Okay. This one's --
MS. LA BRUTTO: That's not his --
MR. DRILL: You ready for this? This one, in my opinion, is irrelevant and immaterial, because there's no definition.

MR. NORDELO: I would agree that's an irrelevant and immaterial question. If you can move on to the next question.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Truck depots and warehousing.

MR. DRILL: If there's no definition, and you're asking him should there be a definition, that's got nothing about -- to do with this case? You can argue to the township committee that there should have been. You can argue to the board. But that that's not a -- that's not a material or relevant cross-examination question to this witness, in my opinion.

You agree?
MR. NORDELO: I agree. Next question, please.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Yeah. Is -- as a planner is, do you see that as something the redevelopment plan should be --

MR. DRILL: Again, now, this is unduly repetitious. You're just -- you're answering the -- asking the same question in a different way. Come on.

MS. LA BRUTTO: I'm asking whether you should revise the plan to put some --

MR. DRILL: That's beyond the scope of what's in front of the board, in my opinion.

MR. NORDELO: I agree with that opinion.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. All right.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
Are there any other members of the public that have any questions for our planning board professional?

Ms. Esposito?
I gotta stop saying that. I'm sorry.
MS. ESPOSITO: Christine Esposito, 11
Behnert Place. At any point as our planner, did you see a plan proposed by Hartz Mountain without the driveway location realigned with Behnert Place?

MR. DICKERSON: I did not. And again, this is -- I was not involved in the preparation of the redevelopment plan.

MR. DRILL: Now, I'm going to tell you what I tell them all the time. Answer the question. You don't have to go on with another explanation.

MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. As our planner, were you involved in any of the traffic planning or what was designated to be part of the traffic study?

MR. DICKERSON: I am not a traffic engineer. So no.

MS. ESPOSITO: But as our planner, did you -- were you privy to any of those discussions?

MR. DICKERSON: I was not.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. So at no point did you hear or see, or was it related to any statements from Union County mandating that the driveway location must be moved to Behnert Place?

MR. DICKERSON: I was not involved in those discussions.

MS. ESPOSITO: Right. In the redevelopment plan, it does state that the berm shall remain intact. However, the applicant is proposing to remove a large portion of this berm. Are you aware of that?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Large portion?
MS. ESPOSITO: 50 feet --
MR. KENT-SMITH: (Inaudible).
MS. ESPOSITO: -- at seven feet high.
MR. DICKERSON: And I'm just going to go to that section of the redevelopment plan because I believe this was just discussed a few minutes ago, where it states that the existing berm along the Walnut Avenue frontage shall remain. Changes
to the existing berm for pedestrian access may be approved by the township.

MS. ESPOSITO: Does it --
MR. DRILL: Whoa, whoa. Let him finish. Let him finish.

MS. ESPOSITO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: Are you finished?
MR. DICKERSON: There is an additional provision concerning modifications to the berm relating to the privately-owned public open space. Sorry. Mouthful. And yeah.

MS. ESPOSITO: I'm sorry. Can you just more slowly read the part about the berm shall remain. Does -- is there language in there that says it shall remain intact or does it just say it shall remain?

MR. DICKERSON: The existing berm shall remain?

MS. ESPOSITO: And so the plan that is proposed, does it appear that the applicant is planning to remove part of that berm?

MR. DRILL: You mean for the driveway access.

MS. ESPOSITO: For the driveway, yes.
MR. DICKERSON: Yes.

MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. So then is the applicant also doing so with -- with the approval of the board or is your -- the planner and -- are they planning to do this without any sort of variance?

MR. DRILL: Hold on. Hold on. This one is a legal question. I did that -- remember I did the memo. You guys asked about that. I did a memo dated September 28, 2022, and I rendered an opinion. And it's a detailed three-page single spaced memo with exhibits that the driveway access is mandated by the developers' agreement, not the redevelopment plan. So this is a legal issue that $I$ have -- I've weighed in on that. That's my opinion. That was my opinion that -- to the board, but I also purposely released this thing to the public so they would know it. So to me, this is a illegal question, not a question for the planner.

MR. NORDELO: I would agree.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: In other words, how are they going to have access if they don't cut through the berm for the access driveways and the location of the driveways. You've already got my
opinion in the memo.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. In redevelopment plan was also a basketball court, and that is no longer part of this plan --

MR. DRILL: Right. Because -- right. Because the members of the public asked them to remove it. The board didn't say you have to remove it. The board actually said to them, Listen, you hear what the public's saying? If you want to remove it, they straw polled. If you ask that it be removed, we probably vote to give you a variance to remove it. So they asked it to be -- to be removed.

Let me just ask Mr. Kent-Smith for the record. You voluntarily want to change those driveway locations?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Absolutely not.
MS. ESPOSITO: I'm sorry. So you're saying parts are saying that they don't voluntarily want to move the driveway locations? They're okay with the driveway location where it is currently?

MR. DRILL: No.
MR. KENT-SMITH: No. Absolutely not.
MR. DRILL: The proposed.
MR. KENT-SMITH: We are going to abide by
the driveway locations set forth in the redevelopment agreement and redevelopment plan. MR. DRILL: Whoa, whoa, whoa. Mr. KentSmith, first of all, don't follow my lead. Relax. Okay. Second of all, reference the redevelopment agreement because that's what ties in the driveway locations.

MR. KENT-SMITH: In the redevelopment agreement, there's attach an exhibit. The exhibit shows the driveway relocations as we're proposing them before the board tonight we are seeking this board's approval of that plan in accordance with the redevelopment agreement and redevelopment plan and the ordinances.

MS. ESPOSITO: As far as it's asking for -if Hartz had to ask for a variance to remove the basketball court which was in the redevelopment plan, would they not have to ask for the same variance to remove a portion of the berm when it states that the berm shall remain intact?

MR. DRILL: Not if -- in my legal opinion, not if the exhibit shows a driveway going through the berm? The answer's no, in my opinion. Yeah. Again, that's my -- that's -- that's a legal issue, in my opinion. And that's my -- my legal
opinion on it, my professional opinion.
MS. ESPOSITO: As a planner, did you have any concerns about the relocation of the driveways as proposed in the plan that you saw? Again, I'm not a traffic engineer. And I think that question would be it. I can't answer that question.

MR. NORDELO: Do you have any further questions?

MS. ESPOSITO: No. I don't think I do. Okay.

MR. NORDELO: Okay. Thank you.
Before you go, are there any other members of the public that have any questions of our professional and (inaudible)?

So are there any other members of the public?

Seeing none.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Next -- your next witness?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I have a question about are going to see the signs? Are we ever gonna see the signs that's going to be --

MR. KENT-SMITH: The answer is the sign is going to conform with the township ordinances.

It will be shown as a condition of approval as part of the plan set, then will be resubmitted.

MR. DRILL: Let me -- let me just clarify something. You're representing that the applicant is not going to be seeking any variances or --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes.
MR. DRILL: -- or objections for the sign. The sign is going to be compliance sign. And what you're asking is that that be a condition of approval that some board expert, presumably the planner, review the sign to make sure it complies?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Exactly.
MR. NORDELO: Mr. Kent-Smith, I'm just going to do a five-minute recess.

Five minutes, folks. Five minutes.
(A recess is taken.)
MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Again, back -- for the record, Mr. Hughes, you are under oath. You've been previously qualified and provided you direct testimony. You remain under oath. You confirm that?

MR. HUGHES: Yes.
MR. KENT-SMITH: All right.

MR. DRILL: You want the public to ask questions first and the board to ask questions?

MR. NORDELO: The board.
So are there any members of the board that have questions from last time?

Mr. Sen, I know you did.
MS. SEN: Hi, I was curious. I have a -- a community impact statement that's dated April 6, 2022. Is there any other recent -- more -- any more recent community impact statement?

MR. HUGHES: No.
MR. DRILL: What's the date on that one?
MS. SEN: April 6, 2022.
MR. DRILL: April 6?
MS. SEN: Yeah. April 6.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Thanks. Got it.
MS. SEN: Okay. Because I'm looking at this community impact statement, and I want -- I had a couple of questions. So this community impact statement, is it true that it states, quote, a -I think of the second paragraph -- a pilot-based analysis is not considered in this community impact statement; is that correct?

MR. HUGHES: Yes.
MS. SEN: Why was it not included in a
community impact statement?
MR. HUGHES: At the time of the preparation of the community impact statement, we did not have the benefit of a final agreed-upon palate analysis that could provide the basis for factoring it in this analysis.

MR. DRILL: Can you talk louder, please?
MR. HUGHES: Yes.
MS. SEN: So you're saying it was not -- you were not expecting to have a pilot in -- on April 6, 2022, when you drafted this report?

MR. HUGHES: No. What I said was at the time of drafting this report, we didn't have a final pilot analysis that can provide the basis for this analysis.

MS. SEN: Do you have that now?
MR. HUGHES: Personally, I do not.
MS. SEN: Do you know -- do you have an estimation of what that is?

MR. HUGHES: No.
MS. SEN: Why not?
MR. HUGHES: Because it wasn't part of the analysis that we prepared back in April. I mean, I do know that the settlement agreement does stipulate that both parties agree that a pilot
will be executed in connection with the residential parcel, but $I$ don't know that the final details have been worked out.

MR. DRILL: Actually, Mr. Kent-Smith, has a -- has a pilot agreement being signed?

MR. KENT-SMITH: No, it has not.
MS. SEN: So what is the status? My understanding was that there was an ordinance that was passed yesterday by the township committee authorizing a pilot; is that correct?

MR. KENT-SMITH: I believe that was -did -- okay. So yes, the council did authorize the pilot.

MS. SEN: So if there is an authorized pilot, so to speak, I mean, obviously, of course, it can be challenged by court and the like, why does not -- why is there not a revised community impact statement talking about the financial impact that this pilot program would have on the schools and the community?

MR. HUGHES: I -- I think I've already answered the question, which is we prepared this in April as part of our site plan application. It was a checklist item. And we used the best available information at that time to prepare
this analysis.
MR. DRILL: Can I ask him --
MS. SEN: Sure.
MR. DRILL: -- I think what -- what the question that you're getting to -- I think what she wants to know is, do you believe that since one was authorized albeit last night to be signed, do you in your opinion believe that that community impact statement should be amended or revised to reflect it? That's really what her question is going to be --

MS. SEN: It's one of the questions.
MR. HUGHES: I don't have an opinion obviously. If the board were to request us to do that as a condition of approval, for example, personally, I'd have no problems doing that.

MS. SEN: And what is the purpose in your expert view of a community impact statement in a redevelopment plan?

MR. HUGHES: Well, the purpose is set forth in the code, which is to describe and explain the impact and effect of the proposed land development upon the township's educational system and other municipal facilities.

MS. SEN: Well, how can we do that if you
don't have an assessment?
MR. HUGHES: Well, we do have an assessment that was based on the information available as of April 2022, which clearly demonstrates that this project will have a significantly positive fiscal impact on the community. I would not expect that to change in any way once the pilot is factored in. And as $I$ just stipulated, we could certainly do that as a condition of approval.

MS. SEN: Well, I would assert that such is -- is essential to know the community impact statement. I also had a couple other comments -Mr.

MR. KENT-SMITH: I do want to just make sure that we all understand. So the matter before this board related to the residential is part of a Mount Laurel Affordable Housing Settlement. It is axiomatic from Mount Laurel I on that the issue of fiscal impact of an affordable housing site -- well, actually Mount Laurel II, of an affordable housing site on the community is not a relevant consideration relative to whether the site meets the criteria for development, whether the municipality agrees to rezone it to create affordable housing opportunities, that that
fiscal -- fiscal impact as it relates to an inclusionary development is not a relevant consideration.

MS. SEN: Yes, but -- okay.
MR. DRILL: Where your plan and where in the ordinance does it talk about -- does it talk about community impact statement? So I want to start in the Nick, this is the code, correct?

MR. DICKERSON: That's correct.
MR. HUGHES: Not the redevelopment plan?
MR. DRILL: Not yet. First -- the first provision is in the code. This is Ordinance Section 255-24 and this is sub item 22. I don't know. There must be a letter before it, but whatever, community impact statement. And what the -- what the township code says, quote, the planning board or board of adjustment, or the development review committee, whichever is appropriate, in its sole discretion may as a condition of preliminary major subdivision or site plan approval require the applicant to prepare at its own expense a community impact statement describing and explaining the impact and effect of the proposed land development upon the township's educational system and other
municipal facilities. So I'm going to -- I'm going to see what the redevelopment plan says.

But under the code, the board, according to this, cannot consider this fiscal impact -forget about affordable housing -- on whether or not to grant preliminary or final site plan approval. They condition it because this is supposed to go to the -- the township for planning purposes. I'm going to add -- forget about the board of adjustment because that's a separate issue where I actually -- I mean, that's what the ordinance says. Maybe I wouldn't have written the ordinance that way with the board of adjustment. But for the planning board for a permitted use, this is consistent with what the -- the law would say. Now can you show me what the redevelopment plan says about it? Because this is a legal issue. Take your time. I popped in on you, $I$ know.

MR. DICKERSON: (Inaudible).
MR. DRILL: Nick, do me a favor, you're much better with the fingers. Can you get that to where it has to be? I thought you were better than me.

MR. DICKERSON: And then the page I'm
looking at is 51 , subsection 27.
MR. DRILL: So this is subsection 27. And I assume it's -- no, no, Nick, this doesn't help me here. This is a subset -- it looks like it's under Subsection B27. It looks like that this is what has to be --

MR. DICKERSON: Required submission.
MR. DRILL: -- required submission. But does it say anything about what needs to go into it?

MR. DICKERSON: No, it does not.
MR. DRILL: Does it say anything about what the planning board is allowed to do with it?

MR. DICKERSON: Does not.
MR. DRILL: Okay. So the regular code provision is going to apply. And what the code says is you can condition preliminary site plan upon them submitting one. Apparently what they said there must be a checklist item and I think that's what Nick showed me under the 27, you said?

MR. DICKERSON: Yes.
MR. DRILL: They had to submit one to get the application complete. What his testimony is they did. And at the time they submitted it on April 6, 2022, there was no pilot.

Your question which I asked for you was, do you think the thing has to be revised? And what he said was not even knowing that the ordinance would actually support what he said, but it ends up supporting what he said is, we're willing to do it as a condition. The ordinance says you can impose it as a condition.

So in my opinion, you on- -- the board can only impose it as a condition of approval. You can't require them to submit it ahead of time. You can ask him to. But even if he submitted it ahead of time, you can't take any of that the financial stuff into account in whether to approve or deny the application, even if it wasn't an affordable housing project, which it is.

MS. SEN: Okay. So I obviously would like to take the time to be able to read that because I also have gone to law school and like to look at my own view by looking at the ordinance, but $I$ do appreciate that. My question is, honestly, we've been here for -- what? I don't know -- over 10 hearings. And every time just from the beginning, I saw the community impact statement and my first question was always like, if there's an
expectation of a pilot, why is there a community impact statement that specifically exempts the analysis of pilot? Now each time -unfortunately, you haven't been here and/or I was never given the opportunity, but $I$ find it disingenuous to not proffer it, or to at least have an estimate.

I think that any financial plan would have that information. To say that Hartz Mountain does not know the cost impact that it would have, to me is disingenuous. Now, whether it's required or not, I will obviously confer with our lawyers. I will do my own assessment as well. And I would give my opinion to the board and the public, but I find it to be very disingenuous, and it is an important question. I also had several questions.

The community impact statement does not seem to assess growing inflation. Is that correct? I remember at the time it fluctuates between seven to eight percent. Is that correct?

MR. HUGHES: In what context? I mean, what the -- what the fiscal -- what the community impact statement does is essentially reflect a snapshot in time, you know, based on current
spending levels within the community to anticipate whether the revenues that are anticipated to be generated by this project, offset the anticipated costs.

MS. SEN: So was there inflation as high as we are experiencing currently, which is ranging from seven to nine percent?

MR. HUGHES: All of the data in here are based on current budgetary spending within the community, current tax rates, current estimated market rents, so there's no need to adjust for inflation.

MS. SEN: Okay.
MR. HUGHES: We're not making any projections.

MS. SEN: Was not concerned. Okay. It was not corrected. I also had a question is, when is the first year of stabilization in the car, the community impact report?

MR. HUGHES: Again, this is assuming -- this is upon full build out.

MS. SEN: So what does that mean?
MR. HUGHES: Upon full build out and assuming that the project is fully stabilized?

MS. SEN: Can you explain what that means? I
mean, I -- I know the word "stabilized," but I don't --

MR. HUGHES: I'm not sure how you -- what I'll -- what I'll tell you is how I'm interpreting it is that it's a fully built out project that is occupied at sort of fully expected levels in terms of what $a$-- what $a$ typical vacancy rate would be for both the residential and the commercial.

MS. SEN: And when is that expected?
MR. HUGHES: Oh, I don't know.
MS. SEN: So the first year of stabilization could be Year 30, it -- could it be Year 5, do you have an expectation given your expertise as an expert of --

MR. HUGHES: No. That's not a -- that's not a relevant consideration for this type of analysis.

MS. SEN: Okay. So what would be? I don't -- I guess I don't really understand what the concept of the first year stabilization and how that is a basis for a community impact statement?

MR. HUGHES: My answer is, again, this analysis is basically assuming that the project is completely built out, and it's operational.

MS. SEN: So you're saying that profitability begins once the project is completed and that is where the community impact statement begins its assessment?

MR. HUGHES: Well, it has nothing to do with profitability. It's about revenues versus costs.

MS. SEN: Okay. And then I also had a question. You use some 2018 multipliers. Is that industry standard --

MR. HUGHES: Yes.
MS. SEN: -- given that we're in 2022?
MR. HUGHES: Yes.
MS. SEN: Are there any more recent multipliers you could have used?

MR. HUGHES: No.
MS. SEN: When is the next multiplier expected?

MR. HUGHES: I don't know.
MS. SEN: I also had a question. It seemed like the community impact statement was basing its assessment on what was an expected revenue from the federal government. So in a lot of its analyses, it had the expectation that the federal government would continue to give at the same rate, such that its analysis only focused on

Cranford's taxpayers. Is that correct?
MR. HUGHES: No, I have no idea what you're referencing.

MS. SEN: So throughout the community impact statement, it talks about the revenue that is expected that Cranford would receive, and a portion of that revenue was what the federal government would normally provide. And that is in the impact statement.

MR. DRILL: Tell him where.
MS. SEN: So you know, in a lot of -- you know, I think it was multiple. So most of these charts, it talks about the revenue. Let me look at my notes. So it talks about the actual amount that the taxpayers would provide, right, the municipality taxes, right? And then it also talks about the expectation of what the federal government would provide.

MR. DRILL: Where is that?
MS. SEN: So I'm looking for it.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MS. SEN: So, you -- that -- that doesn't ring a bell to you at all?

MR. HUGHES: No, we're talking about local property taxes. Okay. It's my understanding was
that there is an assessment. I'm looking for it. But it were related to a lot of the charts, where there was an expectation that -- I think it might even be Table 3.4 for public services.

So what $I$ did is I basically felt that the -- I did a calculation of the numbers. And they seem that they were off. Because they were expecting that federal government funds would stay at the current levels. And if anyone works with the federal government, they would know that with Congress, right, these appropriations and different things vary each year. So to assume that you have the same assessment for federal government revenue was something that I thought could be problematic. But I -- I will look for the exact provision. But it seemed like that was the whole basis of all of these charts, talking about the -- the amount that would be expected.

MR. DRILL: Listen, unless you come up with a place, he's already said he doesn't know.

MS. SEN: Yeah. I mean, it's basically every chart. So there is a -- like, when you write a report, there is certain assessments or assumptions that are made. And one of the assumptions of this community impact report, when

I read it, was that it was only looking at the financing that would be provided by Cranford taxpayers, right? Is that correct? And that the understanding was all of the analysis focused on that because it was assuming that the federal government funds that New Jersey receives, right -- Cranford is also financed as well from the federal government in certain respects -- that that amount for the federal government would remain from year to year.

And I believe that that is an improper assumption that stands to discredit the community impact statement as written. Because as many of you know, with federal government funding, it varies every year. We can assume and we hope that we continue to get the same federal government stream that we do, but we know it varies widely from year to year. That's all I have.

MR. HUGHES: Okay.
MR. NORDELO: I just had a quick one. And this is more of an explanation. So in the public school formula, if you could just -- I see like -- I -- I know it's generating or expected to generate 27. This is table 2.2. I see from one
of the one bedrooms 0.360 children. I just -how do -- how do you come up with those numbers?

MR. HUGHES: Yeah. So that's based on there are per unit multipliers that are based on demographic analysis. And as you can see here in Table 2.2 for a market rate one-bedroom unit, the multiplier is 0.004 , which results in a fraction, right? It's not a full student. But when you add that all up, you know, we average it out to 27.

MR. NORDELO: What's the margin of error on something like this? If you -- I mean, just -MR. HUGHES: Off the top of my head, I don't know the margin of error in that particular study.

MR. DRILL: Where -- where are those figures coming from? Is that from the Rutger's study?

MR. HUGHES: This analysis is from the 2018, who lives in New Jersey report from the Rutger's Center for Urban Policy Research.

MR. NORDELO: But at the end of the day, it could be more than 27 , it could be less.

MR. HUGHES: Correct.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
MR. DRILL: Do planners in general rely on that study when putting together a community
impact statement?
MR. HUGHES: Yes.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
MS. SEN: Another question about the school children. So is it correct that any money from pilots that is received does not go directly to the schools?

MR. HUGHES: I think that's a legal question.

MS. SEN: Do you have an understanding of whether grant money goes to schools?

MR. NORDELO: Ms. Sen, I think might be relevant to the scope of the conversation.

MAYOR PRUNTY: That -- that goes to the agreement that the township makes with the developer? There are instances where there's a payment directly to the schools and there's an instance where -- there's various formulas, so it's not -- it's not a question for him to answer.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you. Do any members of the board have any questions for Mr. Hughes?

Do our -- Nick, any questions for Mr.
Hughes --
MR. DRILL: My microphone --

MR. NORDELO: -- or things to address?
MR. DICKERSON: Our report -- and I'm referring to my November 4 report, most of the questions that $I$ had raised had been asked as part of this. I know we had one question about just if there was any analysis of the potential development fee that would be realized as part of this project as being the affordable housing. This would be the nonresidential --

MR. DRILL: The commer- -- he's asking about the commercial. He's not asking -- right. Nick, specify. Why aren't you asking about the affordable housing project? Because they're exempt?

MR. DICKERSON: Because -- yes, that is correct.

MR. DRILL: So you're asking about an estimation of the fees from the commercial?

MR. DICKERSON: That is correct.
MR. HUGHES: We did not include that in the report. I mean, that's a -- it's a one-off fee. It would be -- you know, we certainly could, but I think the board and the township would just have to realize that that's a one-off event, essentially. So we were looking at this on an
annual basis going forward.
MR. DICKERSON: So looking at the long-term costs, and not just the one-offs.

MR. HUGHES: Correct.
MR. DICKERSON: I have no other questions.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you. We'll now proceed to members of the public that have questions of this witness, which is Mr. Hughes. Do any members of the public have any questions for this witness? Name and address, if they do.

MR. DRILL: And Mr. Dickerson is ready to hand off the microphone.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Are you --
MR. NORDELO: Name and address, please.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Rita La Brutto.
MR. DRILL: Come on. Come on. Rita, come on --

MR. NORDELO: On the microphone.
MS. LA BRUTTO: I'm sorry. Rita La Brutto, 104 Arlington Road.

Are you familiar with a memo that came from Union County dated December 8?

MR. HUGHES: No.
MS. LA BRUTTO: It was -- this memo was received December 12 in our planning and zoning
department. So you're not familiar with that?
MR. DRILL: Rita -- Rita, we're not picking you up. You've got to talk louder or make sure the mic's on.

MS. LA BRUTTO: So --
MR. DRILL: There we go. That's better.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Just for clarity, this was received in our planning and zoning office on December 12. So you're still not familiar with it?

MR. HUGHES: What is it regarding?
MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. The memo is regarding they reviewed the application --

MR. DRILL: Is it a memo? Is it a letter?
Who's it from? Who's it to? And what's the date?

MS. LA BRUTTO: It was to Ms. -Ms. Lenahan.

MR. DRILL: From?
MS. LA BRUTTO: From the planner at the county --

MR. DRILL: This is from the Union County --
MS. LA BRUTTO: Union County. It's from
Kamal --
MR. DRILL: Yeah, but is it --

MS. LA BRUTTO: -- Saleh --
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MS. LA BRUTTO: -- supervising planner.
MR. DRILL: Is it from the Union County
Planning Board, Union County, or just from him?
MS. LA BRUTTO: It's sincerely him, supervising planner. Kamal --

MR. DRILL: Okay. And what's the date on it?

MS. LA BRUTTO: It's dated December 8. We received it December 12.

MR. DRILL: So it's -- there's a memo apparently from County -- Union County planner, dated December 8, received December 12 --

MS. LA BRUTTO: 12th.
MR. DRILL: -- and her question is, do you recall seeing it?

MR. HUGHES: No. I -- and I did not have that at the time of doing my testimony last week.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. He goes on to review.
MR. DRILL: Hey. Hold -- hold on.
MS. LA BRUTTO: I'm sorry.
MR. DRILL: If it hasn't seen it, go on to the next question.

MS. LA BRUTTO: I can't ask him about it.

MR. DRILL: That's right.
MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: My recommendation is --
MS. LA BRUTTO: So is it a question for the board?

MR. HUGHES: I agree.
MS. LA BRUTTO: So is it a question for the board?

MR. DRILL: It's gonna be for your -- your sworn testimony. I mean, you can't ask someone who hasn't seen the thing a question about it.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Well, they're withholding approval.

MR. DRILL: Listen, you tell that to the board.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay. All right. Thank you.
MR. NORDELO: Do we have any other members of the public that have any questions for this witness?

Seeing none.
MR. DRILL: Okay. Mr. Kent-Smith, you have anyone else? I think you should. I think you got one -- one issue left that you had to clean.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes, I do.
MR. DRILL: Two issues left.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, I'm gonna --
MR. CHAPLIN: I'll stand there.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Oh, yes. Let's switch sides. Yeah. All right. So --

MR. DRILL: Who is this for the record, by the way?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Oh, yeah. By the way, introduce yourself.

MR. CHAPLIN: For the record, Zachary Chaplin with Stonefield.

MR. KENT-SMITH: And you affirm you remain under oath?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes.
MR. KENT-SMITH: There was a question raised at the last hearing relative to sidewalk dimensions. Did you go back out to reconfirm or reverify sidewalk dimensions?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes, I did.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And there was a question relating to the sidewalk section as the sidewalk goes down from the site, it -- underneath the railroad bridge relative to that dimension. Can you explain what went on there?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes, absolutely. I just want to refer back. This has already been marked for
the record. It's a sidewalk expansion exhibit. There's two sheets prepared by Stonefield. I don't recall the -- what we marked this as

MR. DRILL: Hold on. He's gonna -You're gonna get it up on our screen here or not.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. NORDELO: Oh, it's not on ours.
Ms. Lenahan --
MR. DRILL: Not on ours.
MR. NORDELO: Seems like it's stuck on the cursor.

MR. DRILL: And by the way, this is everyone's screen.

Mr. Kent-Smith, do you happen to --
MR. KENT-SMITH: I am looking for it as we speak.

Brian, do you know what the exhibit number was?

All right. Let's see here.
Reference the exhibit number. Get back to the microphone and reference the exhibit number. I'll take care of this.

MR. CHAPLIN: Okay. It's Exhibit A16 and

A17.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Mr. Chaplin, what -- the question was raised relative to sidewalk diameters. Did you reverify those?

MR. CHAPLIN: I think I'm just waiting for them to see it.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Oh.
MR. DRILL: It's hard to suppress a sneeze.
MR. KENT-SMITH: While we're at that, there's another question $I$ can ask you that you don't need -- so did you receive the Union County letter of December 8, 2022, that was addressed to this board?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes, I did.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And can you just briefly describe to the board response to the recommendations made by the county relative to the plan resubmission necessary for the county to proceed to act on the application?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes. So there are a number of comments from the county as is typical when submitting the app.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. CHAPLIN: Okay.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: And that's
really not hard. (inaudible).
MR. CHAPLIN: Sure. So as is typical, we submitted to the county and they provided us with comments. These are comments on the application. I believe there are six total comments which we will have to address and obtain their approval as a condition of approval, which again is standard. The comments are mostly technical in nature. Some of which are related to replacement of sidewalk, which we're doing and other comments related to providing standard county details.

MR. DRILL: So you're suggesting what as a condition of approval?

MR. KENT-SMITH: That we resolve the design issues raised in the December 8, 2022, memo to the satisfaction of the Union County Planning Board so as to receive, you know, Union County Planning Board approval.

MR. CHAPLIN: Can -- can everybody see the screen? Okay. So I personally went to the site again, just to take a closer look at the sidewalk measurements. 95 percent of the sidewalk along the frontage is approximately four feet plus or minus an inch. So where it does change is at the northern end. And what I'll say is that -- and I
think that where the confusion came with the seven-foot sidewalk is that there's a three-foot concrete swale. And actually Mr. --

MR. DRILL: Three-foot what swale?
MR. CHAPLIN: Concrete swale. And actually Mr. Seckler from my office previously testified to this when he was also presenting an exhibit. Essentially, what happens is these -- there's a very steep slope right up against the berm as we head down towards the bridge. I'm zooming into that -- that part of the exhibit.

MR. DRILL: So I just want to clarify something, 95 percent of the sidewalk is approximately four feet wide. The other 5 percent is at the northern end. It is approximately four feet wide, but there's an additional three feet for a concrete swale. That's your testimony.

MR. CHAPLIN: Almost.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MR. CHAPLIN: So there's a three-foot concrete swale. It actually starts at the limit where we are expanding the sidewalk to six feet to the point where we can't because we're trying to protect the berm. That's that differentiation between the red and the blue color, where we're
showing that at that point, it's not practical for us to --

MR. DRILL: Stop, stop, stop.
MR. CHAPLIN: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: Existing conditions. That's one of my question is.

MR. CHAPLIN: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: Existing conditions. The 5 percent at the northern end, what's the existing condition, sidewalk versus swale?

MR. CHAPLIN: So at this point, it's four feet, and it continues to be four feet until the last 50 feet of the frontage. At that point, it tapers and the last 50 feet up until our property line, it gets as high as 66 inches is at its widest point, plus the three-foot concrete swale. So only 50 feet at the very end of our frontage does it taper out and the sidewalk widens. The remainder is at 51 inches exactly, relatively four feet. And then beyond that, going south across the entire frontage, it's four feet today.

And I just want to -- as a reminder, we're replacing 785 linear feet -- or sorry -- 1268 linear feet, we're replacing and widening to six feet, which is 62 percent of the sidewalk.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Did you have an opportunity to go on the other side of the train tracks?

MR. CHAPLIN: I did not walk to the other side of the train tracks now.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Do you have any -- do you know if the sidewalk gets wider on the other side or if it stays the same?

MR. CHAPLIN: I -- I don't know offhand. I stopped at the train tracks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It stays the same. I'm pretty sure.

MR. DRILL: It's not that you're a witness, but that's based as your experience as a board member and a member of the township based on your personal observations, correct?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Correct.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: And I believe we've covered everything unless I missed something.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So who developed the plan that $I$ think our expert Jackie showed that had the seven feet -- you're saying that includes like a three-foot swale. So the survey, the way the survey was prepared,
they basically took from the curb to the edge of the concrete as a seven-foot dimension, they did not --

MR. DRILL: Differentiate. They didn't differentiate between sidewalk and swale. They just took the concrete, you're saying?

MR. CHAPLIN: Correct.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Now, what's the purpose of that concrete swale? Well, could it be removed and a sidewalk be placed instead?

MR. CHAPLIN: We would not recommend that. It was purposely put there. Because what's happening in that specific area, you have very steep slopes where when it rains, the runoff is hitting the sidewalk essentially so that swale is essentially picking up that rain and directing it to the north --

MR. DRILL: Picking up the stormwater runoff.

MR. CHAPLIN: Stormwater runoff so as to not hit the sidewalk pond (inaudible) icy conditions. It does have a purpose. And even speaking with the board's engineer, they also agree that it makes sense to have that remain.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: And then just
to look at the exhibit, so 7 and 8 that --
MR. DRILL: Photo 7 and 8?
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Those are photo 7 and 8 that $I$ know I've probably cited many times in our past hearings. So in that particular area where it literally goes from sidewalks to street without a buffer is Hartz proposing to extend those four feet sidewalks?

MR. CHAPLIN: Extend four feet how? How do we --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: So -- so -so --

MR. DRILL: Make it wider is her --
MR. CHAPLIN: No, we're not --
MR. DRILL: She said extend, but she meant wider.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Wider. Right.
MR. CHAPLIN: No. We're not proposing to do that.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. So 7
and 8 remain --
MR. CHAPLIN: Correct.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Sidewalk, street, no increase.

MR. CHAPLIN: Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: And is that four feet currently as we speak?

MR. CHAPLIN: So that's what $I$ said before. It's four feet up until the last 50 feet of linear frontage where it does taper and get the 66 inches at the -- at the end of the property.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Thank you.
MR. DRILL: I do not want to ignite a firestorm. I just -- and I'm not taking a factual position on this. I just want to just make sure that the record is clear. Last hearing, Mr. Kent-Smith and I had a spirited back and forth. And I just want to put in the record because the board is going to have to decide what it wants to do about this exception request, Mr. Kent-Smith was talking about the COA rules saying, you know, that there can't be a costgenerative requirement of the board. And we -I'm not going to rehash.

But the one thing I do want to say, I went back to look at the COA rules, and it's interesting. The second round Kohler rules say -- this is N.J.A.C. 5:93-10.1(a) talks about that municipalities shall eliminate development standards that are not essential to protect
public welfare. So in my opinion, sidewalks would be part of public welfare.

But having said that, in the second round rules in N.J.A.C. 5:93.10.2(a)(4), it actually said that the excessive requirements for sidewalks and paved paths are that the council should spell -- should give special attention to. Didn't say it was cost-generative.

But then I looked at the third round rules. And this excessive requirement for sidewalks and paved paths was taken out --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, just so you know --
MR. DRILL: Whoa, whoa, whoa. I'm not done.
MR. KENT-SMITH: -- third round rules were not adopted.

MR. DRILL: I'm not done. I'm not done -was taken out of the third round rules. And this part of the third round rules is not growth share based. And under Mount Laurel IV, in my opinion, this third round rule would apply. So therefore, in my opinion, when the board considers whether or not to grant this exemption -- exception for the sidewalk width -- and again, I'm not taking a position on whether you should grant it or not
grant it. But in my opinion, my legal opinion is if the Board found that they didn't prove -- or you weren't satisfied that they proved an exception from the eight-foot, in my opinion, denying that exception would not be costgenerative, even under the COA rules under -specifically under the third round color rule. Now, if you want to put something in the record, go for --

MR. KENT-SMITH: All I wanted to say is I respectfully disagree. I don't think that provision is applicable relative to the Court's underlying decisions under Mount Laurel III. I further -- also there's the Morris County case, which specifically states that boards are to consider reasonable deviations for the interest of creation of affordable housing, inclusive of reduction of cost-generative standards. So this is a legal issue. Drill's rendered his opinion. I respectfully disagree.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. And I just want to add one more thing. Like I said last time, if the argument is that this is going to create so much expense it's going to negatively impact on the affordable units, in my opinion, you have to put
some proofs in about that.
And I want to be clear about something we had this discussion about moving utility poles and I want to be crystal clear, in my opinion, the board should not -- if the board denies the exception and says you have to have eight-foot wide sidewalks, the board should not condition that they have to move any utility poles. Those utility poles, in my opinion, can stay right where they are and if they're right in the middle of an eight-foot sidewalk. You could argue that what's the purpose of expanding the sidewalk to eight feet if you have a utility pole in the middle of it.

But I want to ask --
Can you give the microphone to Mr. Dickerson?

Because I want to ask Mr. Dickerson: In your experience as a planner seeing, you know, sidewalks to get widened and sidewalks to get put in and utility poles, have you -- have you seen any sidewalks that have either utility poles or trees or whatever in the middle of a sidewalk? So basically, if you're walking down the sidewalk, you got to move out of the way.

MR. DICKERSON: Yes, I have.
MR. DRILL: Now, I assume that you don't think that it's a good planning principle to do that.

MR. DICKERSON: It's not pretty, no.
MR. DRILL: Right. It's not. But it happens, correct?

MR. DICKERSON: That's correct.
MR. DRILL: Okay. So you want to -- if you want to respond on the record to that, go for it. But beyond -- be clear that adding the expense of moving utility poles, you might have a point -- I want to make it clear that if the board denies the exception, you do not impose a condition in my opinion that they move the utility poles. You focus on the sidewalk, not utility poles.

MR. DICKERSON: I want to give just a refresher a little bit on just what we spoke about previously. A lot of the frontage, we're keeping that grass strip, which I think the board generally wants to see. I think that's a good thing to have. That's where the utility poles are. So what we're not -- where we're not explaining is where the berm is.

So I know the utility poles came up, but
really the main reason -- and you could see it in the exhibit that I'm showing right now, you could see the contours and that start of the berm. We don't want to expand in that direction. We don't want to expand to the east because that's the grass strip.

MR. DRILL: I get it. And this is something that the board is going to have to consider the proofs are in on it, and the board is going to have to consider it. Thank you.

MR. KENT-SMITH: So I have no further questions.

MR. NORDELO: Any questions for our board members?

Go ahead, Mr. Pistol.
MR. PISTOL: So I just want to clarify. If the board were to grant the applicant's request for a variance --

MR. DRILL: For the -- for the exception.
MR. PISTOL: -- right -- from the eight-foot sidewalk requirement, the applicant has still agreed to widen 62 percent of the sidewalk 1268 linear feet to be six feet.

MR. KENT-SMITH: That is correct.
MR. PISTOL: Okay. Thank you.

MR. NORDELO: Mr. Taylor.
MR. TAYLOR: And since Mr. Drill brought it up, I just want to point out that in the area where the -- at the northern end of this property where the sidewalk is abutting the -- the severe slope, and where that drainage swale is located, the concrete that we just found out about, from an engineering point of view, it would not be advisable to widen the sidewalk from an engineering point of view, correct?

MR. CHAPLIN: Correct.
MR. TAYLOR: Okay. I agree with you. I just wanted to make sure that when I talk to my fellow board members that --

MR. DRILL: You want to ask him to explain why so the board members would understand?

MR. TAYLOR: Well, instead of -- sure.
MR. DRILL: Not you explain why, him.
MR. TAYLOR: Can you give another overview of that, please?

MR. CHAPLIN: Yeah. When you have such a change in grade, it's such a steep slope. The stormwater runoff is basically the -- the rate of flow is very high and it's going to hit right onto the sidewalk area. So that drainage swale is
able to collect it, and is able to convey it to the south and eventually it hits storm pipe and ties into the conveyor, municipal conveyance system. So it doesn't go into the sidewalk. It doesn't go into the street, won't impact pedestrians, or even gutter flow where people are driving.

MS. SEN: Would a swale not be possible on the outside of an expanded sidewalk?

MR. CHAPLIN: Swale on the outside of the sidewalk? I'm sorry. What do you --

MS. SEN: Right. So if you -- you're saying --

MR. KENT-SMITH: In other words, she's asking -- can -- can I?

MS. SEN: Yeah.
MR. KENT-SMITH: You mind?
MS. SEN: No. Go ahead.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Ms. Sen, do you mind? What she's asking is if you expanded the sidewalk, could you then construct a new three-foot swale?

MR. CHAPLIN: No. Because that's where the steep slope starts. We'll be eating into that berm.

MS. SEN: Okay.

MR. CHAPLIN: Yeah.
MS. SEN: And how do you know that with your expertise? Because you're -- you're a traffic expert, correct?

MR. DRILL: He's the site design and civil engineer.

MS. SEN: Okay. Site designer. Okay. So my question relates to, obviously, safety, right? So if you have a street -- a sidewalk that goes straight to the street without a buffer that's only four feet, you know, how can -- and you have a very busy area? I mean, how is that possible, right? I mean, the ADA -- a wheelchair alone is like three feet. So I'm just concerned about the safety. Like is there anything that possibly you would be willing to do to expand that sidewalk, particularly, in photos 7 and 8?

MR. CHAPLIN: I think it's worth understanding that it is a common condition to have a four-foot sidewalk abutting the road without a grass strip. I think, ideally, where you have the room, you provide the grass strip, but there's plenty of towns, plenty of areas where that's not the case. You have a four-foot sidewalk, and it abuts the road. That's a common
condition that we see. I don't think it's a safety hazard the way it is. I -- I think that -- again, where we have the room and we're able to do it, it's better to have a wider sidewalk, it's better to have the grass strip, but in that specific -- in this specific case, we're doing everything we can.

We're dealing with a steep slope, you know, with the concrete gutter, and then obviously the roadway. So there's really no -- there's no feasible way for us to make it wider. So you're saying you can't widen it at all, even if it's an extra foot, an extra two feet --

MR. CHAPLIN: I would say --
MS. SEN: -- four feet, boom, fall into the street? I mean, honestly, I would not go with my kids.

MR. CHAPLIN: We could widen it by removing the swale but then $I$ think you'd have the issue of when it rains,
you're gonna have -- but you're saying it is possible, you're just not willing to do it.

MR. KENT-SMITH: It would -- in the
consideration of safety versus the widening -Mr. -- no, I have --

MR. CHAPLIN: I -- I don't recommend it as an engineer to widen the sidewalk, I think with the conditions that are in place, that the way it currently is the safest way given all the constraints that we have.

MR. KENT-SMITH: If it rains and then it freezes and if you don't have the swale, what would happen on the sidewalk?

MR. CHAPLIN: It would -- it would create icy conditions.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay.
MR. CHAPLIN: We're doing everything we can. It's not like we're purposely trying to not make it better. You can see that we've -- that we've gone out of our way to expand the sidewalk --

MS. SEN: I can tell you there's one strip -- I walk everywhere with my kids. I have walk just because $I$ hate driving. And the one area that I'm always very concerned about is when we cross the river and we're going into town, because it literally goes sidewalk to street. And it is wide. I -- it's probably about six to eight -- maybe eight feet. It complies with everything. But I'll tell you, I am very cautious, and very careful with my children when

I walk and they're very small kids.
So to know Walnut and how heavily trafficked it is and how difficult it is now, I'll tell you, it's hard every time we go to the Ani Ramen House to just walk around that area and to park to know that you literally have no buffer and you're going straight from a sidewalk to street concerns me about safety.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you, Ms. Sen.
Any other questions -- are there any other questions from our board members for this witness?

And our professionals?
No.
MR. DRILL: And the public.
MR. NORDELO: Any members of the public have questions for this witness?

MR. DRILL: (Inaudible).
MR. NORDELO: Okay. Any members of the -question -- go ahead. Members of the public. Name and address.

MR. KENT-SMITH: This is just limited to what he just has testified.

MR. NORDELO: Yeah, to this limited --
MR. KENT-SMITH: Just this testimony --

MR. NORDELO: Understand. Yep. She understands.

Can you grab her -- can you hand her the mic, please?

Well, actually, Ms. La Brutto, just one second. We have a board member that has a question.

MAYOR PRUNTY: So I was -- we can't see the picture up here of the area that Mr . Sen is talking about, but is there a possibility as you're heading towards the overpass, the Conrail site, that there could be bollards along like the curb line?

MR. CHAPLIN: It would have to be subject to county review and it's --

MAYOR PRUNTY: Okay.
MR. CHAPLIN: -- pretty on -- yeah. I do -I do want to point out there -- these are shoulders, so it's not like you're going right onto traffic.

MAYOR PRUNTY: I know. It's straight --
MR. CHAPLIN: Right.
MAYOR PRUNTY: -- straight shoulder.
MR. CHAPLIN: Yep.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you.

Mr. Kent-Smith, can you hand Ms. La Brutto the microphone. Thank you.

MS. LA BRUTTO: I gotta go --
MR. NORDELO: Yeah. Switch places. All right. Name and address.

MS. LA BRUTTO: Rita La Brutto, 104 Arlington Road. There's an item on there that talks about the flashing lights to cross Wal- --

MR. DRILL: An item on -- on where?
MS. LA BRUTTO: On the letter. I'm sorry.
MR. DRILL: The Union County letter?
MS. LA BRUTTO: Yeah, the Union County letter.

MR. DRILL: Okay.
MS. LA BRUTTO: So do you -- they're asking for proof based on the analysis as to whether or not you can justify having a flashing light there. Do you feel comfortable that you have those proofs?

MR. CHAPLIN: I don't think I can speak to this. I think the traffic engineer is more suitable to answer that.

MS. LA BRUTTO: All right.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you. Are there any other members -- members of the public that have
questions for this witness?
Seeing none, Mr. Kent-Smith.
MR. TAYLOR: Can I just ask one follow-up?
MR. NORDELO: Sure, Mr. Taylor. My apologies.

MR. TAYLOR: Well, I have my own question. Okay. If you were (inaudible) this -- or not talking about this development, but if you were doing a site plan for a residential development and you had to design a sidewalk in front of that house or -- or structure, how wide would that sidewalk have to be to get the code for Cranford?

MR. CHAPLIN: I want to say four feet, but I'm not confident.

MR. TAYLOR: Okay. I believe that's what our code is.

You know what our code says?
MR. DICKERSON: (Inaudible).
MR. NORDELO: He needs a microphone.
MR. DRILL: Microphone.
MR. NORDELO: For the record.
MR. DICKERSON: The way that it's written in the code, $I$ believe it states a minimum width of four feet. That's correct.

MR. TAYLOR: Thank you.

MR. NORDELO: Okay, Mr. Kent-Smith.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Thank you very much. At this juncture, I have no further evidence to present to the board. I do want to just reserve in the case of public comment if there's something that's raised that $I$ have an opportunity to --

MR. DRILL: You want to reserve a right to rebuttal.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Correct.
MR. DRILL: Well, maybe you should take your second five-minute break.

MR. NORDELO: So we'll adjourn for five minutes. And then we'll head into public comment.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: But no more than five?

MR. NORDELO: Okay. Too soon.
All right. Mr. Kent-Smith, proceed.
MR. DRILL: Let's just see if we -- if -- if -- let me just see if there's any other outstanding (inaudible).

MR. NORDELO: So public comment. First member of the public?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Wait a minute. I'm sorry.

You get the mic.
MR. SMITH: Don Smith, 21 Oneida Place. Just a general question at this point.

MR. DRILL: Can you identify yourself?
MR. SMITH: Don Smith, 21 Oneida Place.
MR. DRILL: All right. Raise your hand please.

You swear that the comments and testimony you're gonna give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MR. SMITH: I do.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
MR. SMITH: My question is now that this basically has all been presented to the board, what is the schedule from this date going forward as to when you plan to have a final vote?

MR. DRILL: Yes. So tonight is the public comments. And then the deliberation and vote is going to be on January 18 --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Or immediately following tonight?

MR. DRILL: Well, what we committed to do -now if you guys want to change, but I said before the end of the year, I'd give you a jury charge to give you the standards --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Okay. Understood.

MR. DRILL: Right?
MR. NORDELO: Mr. Smith, to answer your question, we will proceed as the schedule Mr. Drill just said in January.

MR. DRILL: Tonight's the public comments. And then January 18, the board's gonna deliberate and vote after I give them a jury charge. And I'm going to submit this jury charge both to Mr. Kent-Smith and anyone in the public who wants to look at it and give me comments on it. On controversial large applications, that's been my practice to do.

And it's gonna come out of -- I'm not creating, you know, not reinventing the wheel, it's gonna come out of my crib sheets. But I'm going to take the crib sheets for each type of relief that's sought and I'm going to put it out there. And I may even have like a jury form to help the board with their deliberations.

So tonight's tonight. If you want to say anything, you should -- I just swore you in.

MR. SMITH: I'm just trying to get the schedule right now. And the fact is that that
vote that this board is going to take is going to be in public?

MR. DRILL: Yes.
MR. SMITH: It's going to be public?
MR. NORDELO: Correct.
MR. DRILL: Yep.
MR. SMITH: The only other piece of information $I$ would submit is on the issue of the berm and the trees. All right. Now, our new commissioner coming on board in January is a member of the Cranford Tree Commission. And they have done some things and he's an advocate for more trees. So if by chance the berm turns out to be spots in it, with Hartz's permission, maybe the committee, your tree committee, could then participate in working to fill in the gaps at their expense, but our labor.

MS. LENAHAN: Actually, Cranford no longer has tree commission. But Mr. Curran is --

MR. SMITH: I suspect we're going to get one.

MAYOR PRUNTY: -- Mr. Curran is --
MR. SMITH: So I submit that as an item for consideration.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you, Mr. Smith.

Next witness -- not witness, member of the public.

MR. DRILL: Identify yourself for the record.

MS. SMITH: Sure. I will. Loretta Smith 21 Oneida Place.

MR. DRILL: And can you raise your right hand?

MS. SMITH: Oh.
MR. DRILL: Do you swear the comments or testimony that you're gonna get this evening will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth?

MS. SMITH: I do.
MR. DRILL: And can you pull that mic down a little bit more?

MS. SMITH: Turn this down?
MR. DRILL: Yeah. There you go. That's good.

MS. SMITH: That sounded like it was gonna break, didn't it?

MR. DRILL: Nah, it's not gonna break.
MS. SMITH: I have a question. At what point, excuse me, are any, like, the -- the fire department, when will they -- the building -- the
residential building has to be built.
MR. DRILL: Everything has been reviewed by all the agencies that are going to --

MS. SMITH: So the fire department and the chief decided that two staircases are good enough in the residential area with four elevators? Obviously, he checked out the fire conditions and whatever when the building is going to be built, I'm sure he checked out windows to make sure that little child and dogs can't fall out a window that has no screens or bars, and I'm sure he checked out that at the very end, because it's a U shape, the staircases, nothing across the front?

So my thought was always all along, if there's a fire on the one side in the -- in the -- you know, you've got the fire doors. People on the side are going to see the fire. They can't get to the staircase. They're going to come through the fire doors, past the front part, go through the next section of fire doors all the way down to the other end. Now the doors are being left open because people are crying and screaming of dogs and children, whatever. But you say the fire department said that that is okay,
only two staircases?
MR. DRILL: I'm not saying anything. You've heard the testimony. The --

MR. NORDELO: I think we've reviewed that portion of the testimony and I appreciate you reminding us of that fact and the concern that you have in that particular juncture, but that's been reviewed in the testimony that has been provided to us by the applicant.

MS. SMITH: Nobody --
MR. DRILL: In other words, listen, if you disagree with the fire chief, talk to the fire chief. The fire chief weighed in. Now, you're gonna -- you're saying that the fire chief is wrong or he's missed something --

MS. SMITH: No, I didn't say that.
MR. DRILL: -- then talk to the chief.
MS. SMITH: I said --
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: It's really not the fire chief. It's built to code. The code dictates the --

MR. DRILL: The fire codes.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: The fire codes.
MS. SMITH: So you're saying that our fire chief and our fire department have viewed this --

MR. DRILL: We're not -- listen. We're not saying anything. You can say that you think the board should impose as a condition if it's going to approve it, that'd be reviewed by the fire marshal and the fire chief. Tell that to -- if that's what you want, tell that to the board.

MS. SMITH: Okay. Then how do I do that?
MR. NORDELO: You just ask us.
MR. DRILL: Tell them right now.
MR. NORDELO: Yeah. Right now, if you --
MS. SMITH: There you go. I would like it done that way. I would like, you know, Chief Czeh to take a look into it, whoever has whatever would they do. I mean, you can't do anything in the fireplace without having somebody inspect it.

MR. DRILL: So what you're asking the --
MAYOR PRUNTY: May I? May I?
MR. DRILL: You can if you want, but you shouldn't.

MAYOR PRUNTY: It's just -- it's not an opinion. It's just fact. Any application and certainly one this large goes to the Development and Review Committee, which is made up the construction code official, the electrical inspector, fire department, police department,
health department, the whole -- all of them here in this building, review those plans before they even come here.

MR. NORDELO: And just -- just to add to that, in the -- in the -- in that review committee notes that we had, those are all taken into consideration. But $I$ understand your concern that you would like the board, you would like to reiterate that concern to this board, correct?

MS. SMITH: Yes.
MS. SEN: And I think that, ma'am, you're asking whether there was a review by the fire chief, and I believe there was a report that was filed from the fire department.

MR. NORDELO: That's correct, Ms. Sen.
MS. SMITH: Now, I sat here through all of these deliberations. I don't actually remember him ever saying that. I don't remember hearing that that was already done.

MR. KENT-SMITH: If I could just -- just -the answer is, if you recall our architect who was here at the last meeting, his testimony was that the fire department had reviewed it, that what he had done is --

MR. DRILL: Mr. Kent-Smith, we're gonna get
out the DRC memo right now. Let's just -- let's just, for the record, nail this thing down instead of -- I don't want to testify about what I remember in the file. I really would prefer if board members don't talk until the deliberations. I mean, you have the right. But I'd really prefer that --

MAYOR PRUNTY: But an application can't come before the board until it goes to the DRC. And they issued a report.

MR. DRILL: I understand. That's why I'm asking that they pull the DRC memo right now.

MS. SMITH: Hmm. It's really interesting. All these times I've been sitting here. And I don't remember Dan Czeh talking about it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No, the fire chief was not here. He did not --

MS. SMITH: I don't think so.
MR. DRILL: The fire chief doesn't have to be --

MAYOR PRUNTY: No, he doesn't have to be here.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So for the record --
MS. SMITH: I would like to have seen that -

MR. DRILL: For the record, there's a memo dated July 13, 2022, to the Cranford Planning Board from the fire official. And the fire official on -- the memo is four pages long. And the fire official has reviewed the plans and made recommendations. And I believe the applicant --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Applicant has agreed.
MR. DRILL: -- to comply with all the recommendations that the fire chief made. So you can ask tomorrow from Ms. Lenahan to get a copy. And then if you don't agree with something that fire official said -- that's why I said before talk to the fire official. But it's been reviewed and they agreed to comply with everything. On top of that, they agreed to comply, which they have to, with the fire -state fire code.

MS. SMITH: Okay. But you said that I can come tomorrow and --

MS. LENAHAN: It's online. Just go right online.

MR. DRILL: Perfect.
MS. SMITH: Oh, okay. All righty. Thank you very much.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you. May we go to our
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next member of the public, please.
Go ahead, sir.
MR. SMITH: You guys are really getting triple play from the Smith family. So Don Smith, 187 Gibson Boulevard in Clark. So --

MR. DRILL: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa.

MR. SMITH: What?
MR. DRILL: Raise your right hand.
MR. SMITH: Oh, sorry.
MR. DRILL: Do you swear the testimony and comments you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth?

MR. SMITH: Absolutely.
MR. DRILL: We don't have a Clark exception for --

MR. SMITH: Oh, okay. But I am from Cranford, so Cranford.

MR. DRILL: Okay. I understand.
MR. SMITH: So, okay. Again, 187 Gibson Boulevard in Clark. So my question is --

MR. DRILL: Why are these questions? These should be comments. This is your opportunity to make some sworn comments.

MR. SMITH: Yes. So the comments I have are
to have the board really seriously consider the traffic end of things. Okay. That's my -- been my career. I'm not a traffic engineer. I'm just a traffic reporter on $T V$, so I'm just the deliverer of the news. But in growing up in that neighborhood and just seeing how much the traffic has increased on Walnut Avenue and then it's going to -- obviously, it's spilling out onto Raritan Road and then getting down even to where I am on Gibson Boulevard going through Central Avenue. And then even further south of that with the new Valley Road and -- excuse me, Walnut Avenue Apartments, they're going to add a ton of traffic.

So now, again, seriously consider about making that left-hand turn coming out of the residential area. And I believe that -- again, I'm a little -- maybe a little late to this, but I believe that there is a left-hand turn from the commercial side. I believe is that the case that you're gonna be able to make a left-hand turn?

MR. DRILL: You're asking the Board to impose a condition saying what?

MR. SMITH: That -- that there should not be -- be able to make a left-hand turn trying to
make out of that commercial property because of the sight lines that have come underneath the -the Conrail Overpass. Because as it stands now, it's extremely difficult probably to -- I'm sure Ms. Esposito could -- could testify that, getting out of Behnert Place to make the left onto Walnut Avenue at five o'clock in the afternoon.

MR. DRILL: Mr. Kent-Smith, does the applicant agree to that it wants to board to impose a condition saying no left turns out of -MR. KENT-SMITH: No, we do not agree. No, we do not agree.

MR. DRILL: I understand you want the board to impose the condition in any event, but $I$ figured if they agreed, it would make it easier. MR. SMITH: Well, there -- there we go. All right. Got it. Everybody -- but you know, trying to make that left is going to be extremely difficult. Okay. And, again, I'm not looking for anybody to have a light in front of their house on Behnert. I'm not. But I mean, in the interest of safety, possibly that that could -- that should be really, again, a second look at that. Again, I'm not advocating for anybody to look out their window and seeing a light $24 / 7$ going red
light -- red, yellow, and green. Not at all.
But in the act of safety, I think the township itself really needs to look at the bigger picture that if somebody tries to make a left and all of a sudden you -- the sight lines or whatever coming out of the commercial side, I think could pose a major, like, legal liability for the township, that there could be a major problem and especially coming up --

MR. DRILL: I can tell you this.
MR. SMITH: Yes.
MR. DRILL: Legally, the township has design and approval immunity. So the townships -- in my opinion, the board should not worry about liability to the township if it granted approval with a left turn. The -- and I could go further about that, but I'll just leave it at that.

MR. SMITH: Okay. Again, I'm just making suggestions that the board take that and move those things to the top of the list.

Also, for the -- for that area of -- again, Sunny Acres doesn't really start there along Lexington Avenue. But it continues further out the traffic through those -- those neighborhoods. You know, who's going to -- obviously, the police
are going to -- are we going to enforce that to a degree. I mean, maybe it starts off once the building gets, you know, goes hot for the first six months or so. But I'm talking, you know, 10, 5, 10 years down the road.

MR. DRILL: Is there anything else you're looking for besides the condition of no left turn out of the commercial site?

MR. SMITH: That's basically it. The lefthand turn, because, I mean, I think it's gonna be really difficult. And again, if the board would go possibly for, you know, potentially a traffic light at that intersection again. But that's, you know --

MR. NORDELO: No. And I -- I appreciate those comments. So they are concern about the safety, and $I$ think we've already taken that down.

MR. SMITH: Okay. And as far as the -- the building itself, $I$ know my mother was talking about the fire codes. Is this building going to be a nonsmoking building? Do we know?

MR. DRILL: The board is not answering questions.

MR. SMITH: Okay. I'm just saying is that would be my recommendation.

MR. NORDELO: So your recommendation is that the building is nonsmoking?

MR. SMITH: Nonsmoking. To be nonsmoking inside. Because where -- where I've experienced that in the past.

MR. DRILL: You want -- so you're asking the board to impose the condition that there could be no smoking --

MR. SMITH: Inside the apartments itself. Inside the apartment itself. I know there's some legal things as far as what constitutes a home and whatever, and I'm not looking to get into a whole discussion on that. But $I$ do know that there are some complexes that are setting up -- I believe actually one in Clark, I think it's the one on Raritan Road across the Manny's Diner --

MR. DRILL: You know, let me give it a shot.
Mr. Kent-Smith, your client agree to have a restriction of no smoking in the building, but you could have smoking areas outside the building?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. DRILL: You pick that up on that
recording, I hope? Okay.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: If you'd like, Mr. Drill, $I$ can let you know by the 18th.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. Why don't you let us know like by the end of next week?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Oh, no, no, no. Well, before the 18th certainly.

MR. DRILL: Yeah.
MR. SMITH: And again, and the reason I make that recommendation is because I've lived in an apartment that has had that and, again, just health standards and health whatever, I think it's important here in 2022, and this is not 1982.

MR. NORDELO: Understood.
MR. SMITH: But I think that's probably really about it.

MR. NORDELO: Do you have any other -- so, it's two conditions.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Those are the two conditions he wants.

MR. SMITH: Is the traffic one and -- and the smoking recommendation.

MR. NORDELO: Yep. Understood.
MR. SMITH: Okay. Thank you.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you, sir.
Will -- our next member of the public for public comment. Remember, these are public comments, not questions to the board.

MS. ESPOSITO: Hi, I'm Christine Esposito, 11 Behnert Place. Oh.

MR. NORDELO: You have to be sworn in. Correct.

MR. DRILL: You're from Cranford.
MS. ESPOSITO: I am from Cranford.
MR. DRILL: You swear the comments and testimony you're about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth?

MS. ESPOSITO: Yes, I do. First of all, I'd like to start off by saying I thank the board members for being here and listening to this super lengthy application. I understand you're all volunteers, and I appreciate you giving the application ample and thoughtful fair review, and looking out for what's best in the interest of the applicant and of the township and the residents.

As you could tell from all of my questioning, my major concern is the driveway location in Behnert Place. And the other
statement $I$ would like to make is when the redevelopment agreement was signed, the public was told to come to the planning board and ask questions and voice their concerns, which we have done at length. And I also want you to know that I think we were given some misguided information about the ability or the oversight that the board would have in terms of the gray area between what's the agreement, what's the plan, when can things be changed with the variance, when they can't be changed with the variance, and things that were in the agreement that are just set in stone. And it's been a frustrating experience for me, and I'm sure it has been for you as well with our -- with so many of our questions.

I do want to mention the traffic again, that
I believe there's a lot of concerns with the traffic that's going to be in the area, and I believe that it should be addressed and looked at deeply before the board makes its approval.

Just to note that the traffic study did extend to the -- I'm really bad with directions -- to the west all the way to Central Avenue and Clark and ShopRite way. But to the east along Raritan road, it didn't even study like the end
of Lexington or Raritan Road, which is a major thoroughfare going up to the entrance that they had proposed for the industrial site at the top of Walnut. I think that's a huge flaw in this traffic study. And I wish you would take a greater look at that.

The next thing I would like the board to request is -- so I made sure I state it correctly. Can the board propose that the traffic as it is proposed right now exiting the residential facility does not cross into Behnert Place? I noticed that in many of the plans, there was an arrow that goes straight across. And we were under the understanding from our traffic engineer that there would be signage and mitigation of keeping traffic out of our -- out of our development.

MR. DRILL: So what are you -- what are you asking them to do now?

MS. ESPOSITO: I'm asking that there be no entrances or exits from 750 s residential driveway at Behnert Place into the neighboring area?

MR. DRILL: Yeah, I know. I'm asking. But --

MS. ESPOSITO: Right now, the way it's
proposed is the driveway leaving 750 Walnut has a straight arrow on one side crossing into Behnert Place and a right. And it has the other side, I assume, is the entrance. So the entire burden of all of the traffic at this new site is going to be at that one driveway location. So I can't understand how people will not be going directly across into Behnert Place to exit the facility down Lexington --

MR. DRILL: I don't understand it. So what do you want the board to do?

MS. ESPOSITO: A right turn -- a right turn only or a left turn only. But then how do you do that when you -- Behnert Place residents still want to make a left into their own development?

MR. PISTOL: (Inaudible).
MR. NORDELO: Please turn on your mic.
Mr. Pistol, you need to be on the mic. But -- if you're gonna make that comment.

MR. DRILL: Hold on one second.
Mr. Dickerson, can you? It's the collective recollections of board members that they testified and the board's traffic engineer testified that you can't go straight.

MS. ESPOSITO: On the most recent plans
we've been seeing, there's an arrow that shows straight across.

MR. DRILL: Okay. If there's an arrow showing straight across, what you want the board to do is as a condition to eliminate the arrow pointing across?

MS. ESPOSITO: Right.
MR. DRILL: Okay. That is something concrete.

MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. I thought that's what -- how I was explaining it.

MR. DRILL: Yeah. I'm going to -- well, you keep on asking -- you keep on giving testimony.

Mr. Kent-Smith. Henry.
MR. KENT-SMITH: (Inaudible).
MR. DRILL: I know. I'm gonna ask you when she's still asking questions, can you check to see what's shown on that plan?

MR. KENT-SMITH: That's exactly what we're doing.

MR. NORDELO: So they'll look at that Ms. Esposito if you want to continue.

MS. ESPOSITO: Also, how is -- I'd like the board to take into consideration how they do plan to fund additional mitigation of traffic concerns
in the area, and how that's going to be implemented and secured for the residents, because I believe it's been discussed that there is either a financial sum, but I'm concerned about how that is going to be appropriated to make sure that there aren't all of the major traffic issues that are --

MR. DRILL: So again, can you make this concrete? What do you want the board to do?

MS. ESPOSITO: I want the board to hold 750 -- Hartz Mountain accountable for the traffic mitigations that they had said they would fund --

MR. DRILL: Correct.
MS. ESPOSITO: -- residential neighborhood --

MR. DRILL: So you want the board if it granted approval to make that a condition of the approval?

MS. ESPOSITO: Yes.
MR. NORDELO: I believe that -- well, okay.
MR. DRILL: Okay.
Now, just quickly, Mr. Kent-Smith, just do me a favor, give this to an engineer so you're not answering about what's shown on that plan with respect to -- is there an arrow going across
to the residential street?
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Yes, there is.
MR. DRILL: Okay. You willing to remove that arrow going straight across?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, that's the one I need to answer because we have to consult with our traffic engineer. If the traffic engineer is in favor of saying it won't cause any other issues that eliminating through movement is something that is a good traffic measure, we will definitely consider it and we'll get you an answer probably by the end of next week. But we have to consult our traffic engineer.

MR. DRILL: And so you're gonna get an answer to that one and an answer to the no smoking in the building?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Correct.
MS. ESPOSITO: Is -- can I ask that the board requests that an additional traffic study is considered --

MR. DRILL: You can ask.
MS. ESPOSITO: -- if they're going to -yeah, if they're going to allow through traffic from 750 into the neighboring area across Behnert Place.

MR. DRILL: You've heard her. That's her request.

MS. ESPOSITO: Can I also request that the -- the planning board ensures that Union County is going to --

MR. DRILL: Well, there's going to be -- if there's an approval, there's going to be a condition that it has to be subject to Union County approval, because that's what the municipal land use law says they have to do.

MS. ESPOSITO: What are the mitigation efforts, then, that can happen if the county does not approve the lowering of the speed limit on that portion of Walnut to 25 miles per hour and there's a proposed crosswalk placed there. How can that be approved --

MR. DRILL: If there's a county road, they have jurisdiction over it. It's going to be up to them. You're gonna make your arguments to the county, basically, because this board, my opinion, especially on a permitted use, they can't do anything about that.

MS. ESPOSITO: So but then the board is approving a plan that may not be approved.

MR. DRILL: Correct. Happens all the time
on county roads and state highways. It's subject to -- a county road is subject to county approval and state highway is subject to DOT approval. If they don't get their approvals, they don't go ahead.

MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. All right. Again, I thank the board for their time and for your patience. I do believe that the public is very frustrated, or those of us who have been here for a long time, about the gray areas in between the agreement and the plan and not understanding where the variances are allowed or permitted. And sometimes the attention to detail in the bicycle rack versus the traffic in our neighborhood was very frustrating. So but again to the board, I appreciate your time and effort with this application.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you. Appreciate your comments.

Next member of the public, please. Name, address, and the swearing in.

MS. LEARY: Angela Leary, 4 Behnert Place.
MR. DRILL: Thank you. You swear that the comments and testimony you're gonna give will be the truth, the whole truth, nothing about the
truth?
MS. LEARY: I do.
Again, I too would like to thank the board for their time, their attention. The one issue that I would like to see addressed would be the board limiting the size of trucks that are allowed into that property. That is flex space. It seems to be wide open for interpretation as to what flex space really means. And I certainly, in line with traffic concerns, don't want to see 53foot tractor trailers in and out of that property 24-7, which we've been told that facility can operate 24-7.

So I would like to reiterate everything that Christine has said about traffic. Bennett Place cannot handle traffic. I open my car door coming out, I'm afraid it's going to be wiped off.

The other thing I would like to -- the board to really focus on is the -- I think you called it a mitigation plan. I don't recall the exact name.

MR. NORDELO: In regards to traffic?
MS. LEARY: No, in regard to the berm.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
MS. LEARY: The -- the -- the long standing
plan that will be for berm conditions and maintenance. Because I've been on that property for 43 years, we've lived on that street, and I can tell you for a fact that berm used to be pristine. The condition of it now is certainly not pristine. And so there has to be some enforcement mechanism to keep that berm in good condition where we're not constantly looking at garbage blowing through it, et cetera. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: What -- what is your proposal for --

MR. DRILL: She wants a berm maintenance plan.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: No, no, no, no. The first one. What is your proposal for limiting -- like, when you say you want to limit vehicles? What's the length that you're proposing? The height.

MS. LEARY: We were --
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: She's asking for length.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Oh, length. Okay.

MR. DRILL: Length. Yeah.
MS. LEARY: Length.

MR. DRILL: You said you want the board to limit the size of trucks.

MS. LEARY: Correct.
MR. DRILL: He wants to know what limitation are you asking for?

MS. LEARY: I believe that when George Collins spoke, he talked about 53-foot trailers. I'm not an expert by any means on size of trailers. But small box trucks would be what I would say.

MR. DRILL: And the basis for the limitation to small box truck or to 53-foot trailer is what?

MS. LEARY: What is the basis for my request?

MR. DRILL: Yeah.
MS. LEARY: It's a residential neighborhood. A 50 -- we've had issues on Springfield Avenue with tractor trailers causing vibration in homes. What makes Springfield Avenue any different than Walnut Avenue and the homes that are going to be affected there? So I would say small trucks. I was under the impression it was going to be Amazon size delivery vans, not 53-foot tractor trailers. I respect the fact that we raise -- we, the residents, raise the tractor trailer issue.

But I would like the board to consider putting a limitation on the size of those trucks.

MR. NORDELO: And then in addition, just to clarify as well, on the berm, you just want regular routine berm maintenance to ensure that it's cleaned up and pristine --

MR. DRILL: She wants -- she wants --
MR. NORDELO: I understand that condition, but I just wanted to reiterate that.

MS. LEARY: Yeah, I mean, there was a specific name that you gave the covenant. I think it was a maintenance covenant or something like that --

MR. NORDELO: Right.
MS. LEARY: -- in perpetuity --
MR. NORDELO: Understood.
MS. LEARY: -- in perpetuity.
MR. DRILL: And Mr. Kent-Smith for as long as this use is on the property, and they agreed, correct?

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yes. So we'll provide the (inaudible).

MR. DRILL: Right.
MS. LEARY: Okay. Thank you.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you so much. Do we have
any additional members of public?
MS. LA BRUTTO: Rita La Brutto, 104 Arlington Road.

MR. NORDELO: Needs to be sworn in, Ms. La Brutto.

MR. DRILL: You swear or affirm that the testimony and comments you're about to give be the truth, the whole truth, nothing but the truth?

MS. LA BRUTTO: I do.
So I just wanted to reiterate -- you know, sorry if I'm a little cranky, but this whole process has been very frustrating. I don't think the application -- I think the application has been rushed, and I don't think it was well presented. When you have a 70-million-dollar project, there are plenty of developers who walk in with models so that planning boards and residents, especially in a neighborhood, a residential area, know exactly what they're getting, what they're going to be living with, what they're going to be looking at every day.

So to not even have a color rendering of what that property will look like, I think really falls short of, you know, the requirement. And I
would really hope that this board
will --
MR. DRILL: Quick question. What requirement does not having a rendering fall short? What's the requirement that you're referring to?

MS. LA BRUTTO: I think just it should be just a basic requirement that the board should have made a motion to --

MR. DRILL: In other words, so it's not something that we've missed. There's not some redevelopment requirement that requires that. You're saying the board should just require that. MS. LA BRUTTO: Well, yeah. MR. DRILL: Okay. I got you. MS. LA BRUTTO: I mean, just as part of business as usual.

MR. DRILL: I understand. MS. LA BRUTTO: I think with something this size, $I$ think the board would be remiss in not asking or having a motion almost should have been done already to request a color rendering of what that property is going to look at -- like from every view possible. You know, when you walk there,

MR. DRILL: Okay. We got you. We got the point. Go --

MS. LA BRUTTO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: Make the next --
MS. LA BRUTTO: Got the point.
MR. DRILL: Yep.
MS. LA BRUTTO: I would also say that I
would basically back the other residents up that traffic has been very difficult. Even taking those photos was difficult. You know, even trying to get your car door open with cars coming down Walnut Avenue was a challenge.

I would also ask that -- and I think Mr. Leber brought this up at one point, that there would be a traffic study after the project is completely built out so that you can kind of test to see how good the traffic study was, and also that would help you -- if there was additional mitigation that was necessary for the neighborhood, then you could use that traffic analysis, you know, to basically backup why you needed the extra mitigation.

I would say I've lived here since 1986. At the time, I would agree the berm was pristine.

The -- the town probably should have been giving violations out for them not -- not -- I don't know if it's this owner or even previous owners, I don't know when it went into disrepair. Hartz has owned it probably since 2008, maybe. But if the berm was maintained the way it should have been maintained based on our ordinances and code, we would not be looking at what we are now.

And that's why I can tell you I hope that the board requests something that looks like a forest. I really don't care what they do on their property. I just don't want to see it. I don't want to see cars. I don't want to see lights. And I don't think especially the neighbors in the residential areas should have to look at that. So but -- but I just wanted to make that point right now.

You know, we're looking at that on (inaudible). When you pass it, it's lit up like a light bulb. You know, and that required buffering. So I just hope that we learned from our, you know, mistakes. Thank you.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you very much.
Are there any members of the public that have -- second bite at the apple?

MR. DRILL: You want to come for seconds?
MR. NORDELO: I'm sorry. We've -- we've -you've given your public comments in this particular matter. That's my ruling.

MR. DRILL: Are there any other members of the public who want to give sworn testimony or comments?

MR. NORDELO: Yeah. Go ahead. Mr. Esposito, go ahead.

MR. DRILL: Just identify for yourself for the record.

MS. ESPOSITO: I know. I know. Christina Esposito, 11 Behnert Place.

MR. DRILL: You're already sworn.
MS. ESPOSITO: No. Okay. Okay. Good. That's good. I would just like to clarify my proposal that the -- that there is no left -there is a left and right only out of Behnert Place and a left and right only at 750 Walnut.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Hold on. You're asking for left and right only out of the -- which driveways? The two driveways?

MS. ESPOSITO: There's -- well, there's really only one driveway.

MR. KENT-SMITH: That's the better driveway,
correct?
MS. ESPOSITO: The Behnert, yes.
MR. DRILL: Left and right only.
MS. ESPOSITO: That's the only driveway that has two-way traffic.

MR. DRILL: I get it. I get it.
MS. ESPOSITO: Sorry.
MR. DRILL: And they're gonna be getting back to us about that.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Correct. Yes.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: But I heard you correctly, she also said --

MS. ESPOSITO: Out of Behnert.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Well, that's we can't have -- that's a municipal.

MR. DRILL: That's not them. That's -that's a request that goes into the township committee. They can agree to come out of from left --

MS. ESPOSITO: Even if the traffic would be going directly into their residence?

MR. KENT-SMITH: No, that's a --
MR. DRILL: Henry, do me a favor. Hhm.
MS. ESPOSITO: No, keep talking.

MR. DRILL: A no left or right off of a township road is up to the township. A no left to right off a county road is up to the county. A no left to right out of private property is up to the property owner. Legally, that's how it is. It doesn't matter where the traffic's going; it matters where it's coming from.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Okay. But that's what I thought you meant, so I wrote it down when you were up earlier.

MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. And is -- can we have clarification on the address for the commercial property and the address for the residential property? Are they both 750 Walnut? Is one 751 Walnut Stuff, 751 --

MR. DRILL: Are you ready for this? I don't know. It would have been a better idea to ask someone who had it. Now, you guys do not have to answer that now if you don't want. But if you know the answer, you can put everyone out of their misery and give us the answer.

MR. KENT-SMITH: The answer is the tax assessor when we go forward with the subdivision will assign the tax block and lot. The post office based on the new block and lot will assign
the post office address.
MR. DRILL: So they're saying it's not their decision.

MR. NORDELO: Mr. Pistol.
MR. PISTOL: I have a question. If the post Office assigns it, doesn't the municipality designate if there's a new street -- that's the naming of the new street?

MR. KENT-SMITH: There is no street. No.
MR. PISTOL: Well, that's what she's asking, if there's --

MR. DRILL: No. She's asking for what address. Is there going to be a separate address for the commercial property and a separate address for the residential property? That's what she's asking.

MR. PISTOL: Is that what you're asking?
MR. KENT-SMITH: What the -- so the answer is, the address will be Walnut Avenue.

MR. PISTOL: Oh, that's --
MR. KENT-SMITH: Period.
MR. PISTOL: Okay.
MR. KENT-SMITH: Now, what number, the assessor does the lot and block. We take that to the post office. They say, Here's your address.

We take that to emergency services and give them all the information so that they all know.

MR. PISTOL: Okay. So it will be Walnut Avenue. Because $I$ think that in comments earlier, and I don't know if it was you or some other member of the public, had wondered whether it was going to be Behnert Place that was going to be extended into there, and it would be a Behnert Place address --

MR. KENT-SMITH: No.
MR. PISTOL: -- is that correct?
MR. KENT-SMITH: No, no. It's a private --
MR. PISTOL: I think that's what they had said. So it's going to be Walnut Avenue.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Yeah.
MR. PISTOL: Okay. Thanks.
MR. DRILL: Who said that?
MR. PISTOL: I thought one of the members of the public had --

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Asked if Behnert Place was going to be extended?

MR. PISTOL: They wanted to know what the address was going to be.

MS. ESPOSITO: It was me.
MR. PISTOL: Whether those --

MR. DRILL: Listen. This is very easy.
MR. PISTOL: Walnut Avenue address or --
MR. DRILL: This is one of those --
MS. ESPOSITO: If it had a street.
MR. DRILL: This is one of the -- one of those -- this is one of the times that I actually agree with Mr. Kent-Smith. The address is going to be Walnut, and what he said is how the numbers are going to be selected. And that's what you wanted to know, correct?

MS. ESPOSITO: Yes, yes.
MR. DRILL: Yeah.
MS. ESPOSITO: Can we -- can the board request that residents of 750 Walnut residential have a sticker placed on their car so that we know the residents of that area as opposed to not parking in the residential area across the street?

MR. NORDELO: You want to differentiate cars that are part of the residential complex as opposed to the commercial?

MS. ESPOSITO: No, just --
MR. KENT-SMITH: She wants to --
MS. ESPOSITO: -- the complex as opposed to general population --

MR. KENT-SMITH: -- versus all other cars in the township of Cranford.

MR. NORDELO: Oh, okay.
MR. DRILL: That'll be your ask.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay.
MR. DRILL: That's a -- that's a big ask. But okay.

MS. ESPOSITO: Just so we would know if they are --

MR. DRILL: I got you. I wrote -- I'm writing down the ask.

MS. ESPOSITO: And again, any questions related to parking on Walnut Avenue would be something with the county, correct, and not this board?

MR. NORDELO: Correct, as I understand that jurisdiction, but let's just wait for the attorney to clarify that.

MR. PISTOL: Well, actually a question related for Hartz. Would you -- are you planning to issue stickers to occupants of the apartments and businesses so that you know that there are people who belong in your parking areas?

MR. RHATICAN: Yeah. I -- I -- know Mr. Kent-Smith handed the microphone to me. But

I don't know the answer to that. We -- we don't always -- yeah, I'm sorry. It Jay Rhatican from Hartz Mountain. I -- I don't know that we would do that here.

MR. PISTOL: Okay.
MR. RHATICAN: Sometimes depending on the prep -- the project and its location. I don't know that we would do that here.

MR. PISTOL: Okay. Thank you.
MR. NORDELO: Mr. Esposito, just -- I know you wanted to clarification. So you wanted to know -- any parking questions that you had on Walnut Avenue, you wanted to know the entity that you'd have to ask those questions to, correct?

Mr. Drill, can you clarify that for
Ms. Esposito? Is that the county?
MR. DRILL: Yeah. It's a county road. The County.

MS. ESPOSITO: So it goes to the county as well?

MR. DRILL: Yeah.
MS. ESPOSITO: Okay. Thank you.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
Sir?
MR. SMITH: Don Smith, 187 Gibson Boulevard,

Clark. My addressing the board will be towards the marketing of the property.

MR. DRILL: Hmm.
MR. SMITH: No?
MR. DRILL: Huh-uh.
MR. SMITH: If I just explained it, then maybe you can --

MR. DRILL: Why don't you explain it, but --
MR. SMITH: Okay. So anyway, so the Woodmont property on South Avenue, when that was formally put on the website and it was live and they were actively seeking residents and so forth, in the photographs and all the descriptions that they had, they took out the Raritan Valley line. They literally had like grass behind it. They didn't -

MR. DRILL: Let me ask you this.
MR. SMITH: Yeah.
MR. DRILL: The -- so the purpose of -- you want them to --

MR. SMITH: Well, I just want --
MR. DRILL: Well, just hold on. You want them to agree to some sort of marketing so that prospective residents of the building --

MR. SMITH: Understand what they're getting.

MR. DRILL: -- understand what they're getting.

MR. SMITH: As far as there's going to be looking over a commercial property off to the one side.

MR. DRILL: There were a bunch of asks. That one, I'm uncomfortable putting on the list because I think that's beyond the planning board's authority to do.

MR. SMITH: I'm just saying is that -that --

MR. DRILL: I understand.
MR. SMITH: You know, you get people that come in and they're looking to rent an apartment. And then all sudden, they look at the website and materials and there's no --

MR. NORDELO: I think relevant to the scope of the board, so as Mr. Drill just -- and I appreciate those comments.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. That's fine. I wasn't sure whether this was for this board to address that. Thank you.

MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
Okay. Are there any additional -- I don't want to -- anyone else from the public want to
say any -- going once. I don't want to deny
anyone the opportunity -- twice. Anyone? Three times. Public. So we've concluded public comment.

MR. DRILL: Yes. Closed. The public is closed.

Do you want any rebuttal?
MR. KENT-SMITH: No.
MR. DRILL: Okay. So, my opinion, the chair should declare the record is closed now. That --

MR. KENT-SMITH: We've got to respond back to questions.

MR. DRILL: Yeah, but those are going to be written responses.

MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay.
MR. DRILL: We're not keeping --
MR. KENT-SMITH: I see what you're saying. Written response.

MR. DRILL: That those are two written responses. Because this -- just so you understand. The jury charge is going to have the -- you know, the crib sheets, the standard, the board has to apply to the different relief requested. But there are tons -- there's a lot of conditions that the applicant has agreed to;

I'm going to list them. And then you have these asks, and I'm going to list them. Just so -- so all the issues that the board has to decide -MR. KENT-SMITH: When do you want that by? When -- when -- I'm just asking. This as scheduled, because $I$ also would like to have the list of conditions that we think we've agreed to so that $I$ can get it to you for you to review.

MR. DRILL: Okay. I'm gonna get mine out by December 31. So if you get me whatever you want --

MR. KENT-SMITH: Okay. So I will get it before the end of next week. Okay.

MR. DRILL: Okay. So because the record is now -- the applicant has rested, the members of the public have rested, there'll be no more testimony. The hearing is closed. There are two issues that the applicant's going to get back to the board in writing on.

So I'm asking the chair to -- and again, you could be overruled by the majority of the board, which I sincerely doubt, but to carry, now, the hearing to January 18, for the purpose of deliberations and a vote.

No.

MR. NORDELO: Yep, I would agree to that.
MR. DRILL: Okay. So the hearing on this application is being continued. Even though the hearing part is closed, it's going to be continued to January 18 for deliberations and vote.

And just for the record, the applicant has extended the time for the decision to January 31. So the deliberation and vote will be before that extension. Now is there anything I've missed --

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: What time?
MR. DRILL: Right.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER:
(Inaudible). 6:30.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: But that's for reorg first. We have to reorg first. And then --

MR. DRILL: So listen. The board -- so let the board discuss. There's a reorg on January 18. Then there's deliberation and vote. And then 201 Walnut is going to start. So the request was made by 201 Walnut. It wasn't a condition for the extension. They made -- it was a humble request, if you recall.

So what does the board want to do? Does the board want to start anytime before 7:30?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible). Well, can you put your microphone?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: How about 7 o'clock.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I'll go 6:30.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: I'll go 6:30.
MR. DRILL: Can you straw poll?
MR. NORDELO: No, I need to understand the (inaudible). So the reorg -- so we're saying that the -- the time at 30 minutes max that -- we're saying we'll start right after that period? What are we negotiating? Tell me. I need to be clear on that.

MR. DRILL: To be crystal clear, because we know that we have to reorg on January 18 and because we know that the board has to deliberate and vote and because we know that 201 is going to start, 201 has asked that the January 18 meeting, instead of starting at 7:30, start at 6:30.

Now, so I'd like a straw poll on, we stick with 7:30, we go to seven or we go to $6: 30$. That's what I'd like a straw poll on.

MS. LENAHAN: Okay. So you're going to just tell me what time. Okay.

MR. DRILL: So just start at -- just straw
poll them.
MS. LENAHAN: Okay.
MR. DRILL: The answers are 7:30, 7:00. or
6:30.
MS. LENAHAN: Okay. Mr. Pistol.
MR. PISTOL: 6:30.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Leber.
MR. LEBER: 6:30.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Taylor.
MS. RAPPA: 7:00.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Sen.
MS. SEN: 6:30.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Rappa.
MS. RAPPA: 7:00.
MS. LENAHAN: Mayor Prunty.
MAYOR PRUNTY: 6:30.
MS. LENAHAN: Ms. Pedde.
MS. PEDDE: 6:30.
MS. LENAHAN: Deputy Mayor Gareis.
DEPUTY MAYOR GAREIS: 6:30.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Didzbalis.
MS. DIDZBALIS: 6:30.
MS. LENAHAN: Mr. Nordelo.
MR. NORDELO: 6:30.
MS. LENAHAN: 6:30 has it.

MR. DRILL: Okay. Now, let me just ask, Are the seven o'clocks gonna please be there at 6:30, although it's the reorg? If you're not, you'll miss the reorg. You won't miss the deliberation. UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: Maybe that won't be a bad thing.

MR. DRILL: Okay, so can you do what you have to do now with an open public meetings act notice at 6:30? But I'm going to announce that the January 18 meeting is going to start for MLUL purposes. Okay. Their application's being continued to January 18. And even though I know they're not going to be heard at 6:30, I'm going to say that they're -- it's being continued to 6:30 just in case like they reorg for five minutes.

Okay. So everyone, if you want to be here on January 18 to hear the finale, 6:30 p.m.

MR. NORDELO: Considering that, we're all set, Mr. Drill?

MR. DRILL: Yep.
MR. NORDELO: May I have a motion to adjourn, anyone?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE SPEAKER: (Inaudible).
MR. NORDELO: Second?
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UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE SPEAKER: Second.
MR. NORDELO: Thank you.
Meeting adjourned.
(End of audio-recorded proceeding.)
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| 121:16 157:7 | 147:24 | 40:12 46:1 | 161:24 |
| 160:25 | 149:22 | 47:9,14 | blowing |
| basic | 158:13,18 | 52:2,3,7,20 | 151:9 |
| 155:8 | 159:2,14 | 56:17 69:13, | blue |
| basically | 162:7,9,20 | $\begin{aligned} & 15,24 \text { 70:1, } \\ & 9,13,17,21 \end{aligned}$ | 103:25 |
| 19:15 43:17 | believe | $71: 24 \quad 73: 19$ | board |
| 55:13 87:24 | $25: 1$ $32: 12$ $30: 7$ $39: 2$ | 20,23 103:9, | 3:4,12 5:22, |
| 90:5,21 | $32: 12$ $56: 8,13,14$ | $24 \quad 112: 24$ | 23 6:2,6,8, |
| 106:1 111:24 | $56: 8,13,14$ $59: 961: 15$, | 113:3 115:24 | 15,23 7:8, |
| 114:23 | 59:9 61:15, $2469: 23$ | $126: 9,13$ | 10,16,18,19, |
| 124:14 138:9 | 24 69:23 | 150:23 | 22,25 8:11, |
| 148:20 | 78:11 79:6,8 | 151:1, 4, 7, 12 | 24 9:3,4 |
| 156:9,22 | 91:11 102:5 | 151:1,4,7,12 | 10:2,16,21 |
| basin | 105:19 | $156: 25 \quad 157: 6$ | 11:7 12:23 |
| 26:23 | 122:15,2 |  | 16:7 18:20 |
| basing | 131:13 133:6 | besides | 19:15 22:3 |
| 88:20 | 135:17,19,20 | 138: | 24:9,19 26:3 |
| basis | 139:17 | best | 33:3 34:9 |
| 77:5,14 | 142:17,19 |  | 35:1,6 40:20 |
| 87:22 90:17 | 146:3,20 | 78:24 141: | 48:9,14 |
| 95:1 152:11, | 149:8 152:6 | better | 52:10,25 |
| 13 | bell | 28:19 29:16 | 53:5,15 |
| basketball | 9: | 82-22, 23 | 55:3,4 57:6 |
| 72:3 73:17 | belong | 82:22,23 | 58:13 65:2, |
| 58:7 59:5 | 164:23 | 96:6 117:4,5 | 14 67:11 |
|  | bel |  | 68:2,7 71:3, |
|  | 41: | 158:25 | 16 72:7,8 |
|  | ben | bicycle | 73:11 75:11 |
| beginning | 77:4 | $149: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 2,3,4 \\ & 79: 14 \quad 80: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
| 5:23 9:5 | Bennett 150:15 | big | $81: 17 \text { 82:3, }$ |
| 84:23 | 150:15 | 34:7 65:21 | $10,13,14$ |
| begins | $11: 6,8,11,16$ | 164:6 | 83:12 84:8 |
| 88:2,4 | 12:25 13:5 | bigger | 85:14 93:22 |
|  | 14:7,23 | 29:12 137:4 | 94:23 97:5 |


| 98:5,8,15 | boards | 13,23 34:5, | buffer |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 101:13,16 | 110:15 | 12,15,19,24 | 37:5 42:16 |
| 102:17,18 | 154:18 | 35:5,13,16 | 47:14 55:21 |
| 105:14 | bodies | 36:3,8,10, | 57:18,23 |
| 108:14,18 | 16:2 | 15,19,23 | 107:7 116:10 |
| 109:22 110:2 | bollards | 37:1,6,9,13, | 119:6 |
| 111:5,7 | 120:12 | 17 38:10,16 | buffering |
| 112:13,20 | book | 40:15,19,24 | 32:11 37:2 |
| 113:8,9,13, | 61: 9, 12, 14 | 41:7,17,23 | 40:17 47:11 |
| 17 114:14,16 | boom | 42:9,14,17 | 57:10 58:2,3 |
| 119:11 120:6 | 117:15 | 43:1,9,11,16 | 157:21 |
| 123:4 124:14 | bottom | 44:3,10,19 | buffers |
| 125:21 | $18: 13,24$ | 45:7,12,15, | 39:5, 6, 8, 9 |
| 126:1,10 | 22:17 32:9 | 23 46:2,5, | build |
| 130:3,6 | $37: 12,13,14$ | 10,16,19 | 86:21,23 |
| 131:8,9 | 45:4 | 47:4,6,10 | building |
| $132: 5$, $133: 3$ | bottoms | $48: 1,8,13,$ | 3:5 5:11 |
| 22 136:9,13 | 16:15 | 16, $49,2,12,19$, | 36:5,11,16, |
| 137:14,19 | bought | 23 50:1,5,10 | $7:$ |
| 138:11,24 | 49:3 | 53:23,25 | 2 |
| 139:9 141:4, | Boulevard | $54: 3,5,18,24$ | $22,24,25$ |
| 15 142:3,7, | 134:5,21 | 55:2, 8, 11, | 47:3,7,11 |
| 20 143:7,9 | 135:10 | 17,19,24 | 56:16 57:14, |
| 144:11,22 | 165:25 | 56:10,15,20, | 15,16,21 |
| 145:4,24 | box | 25 57:2,4,8, | 127:25 |
| 146:9,10,16 | 152:9,12 | 24 58:5 60:9 | 128:1,8 |
| 147:19 | Boyer | 61:4 62:13, | 131:2 138:3, |
| 148:4,20,23 | 4:24,25 | 20 63:9,21 | 20,21,22 |
| 149:7,15 | break | 64:3,7,10, | 139:4,21,23 |
| 150:3, 6, 18 | 123:12 | 17,19 65:7, | 147:16 |
| 152:1 153:1 | 127:21,22 | 11,16,17,20 | 166:24 |
| 155:1,8,13, | breaking | 66:1, 18, 22 | buildings |
| 20 157:10 | 55:9 | 67:4,17,24 | 40:16 60:2 |
| 163:13 | Brian | 68:4 95:13, | built |
| 164:15 166:1 | 100:1 | 15,19,24 | $87: 5,25$ |
| $167: 18,21$ $168: 23$ | bridge | 96:5,7,12, | $128: 1,8$ |
| $168: 23$ $169: 3,19,21$ | 99:22 103:10 | $17,20,23$ | 129:20 |
| $170: 17,18,$ | briefly | $15,20,22,25$ | 156:17 |
| 24,25 171:16 | 21:10 101:15 | 98:2,4,7,12, | bulb |
| board's | bring | 16 120:5 | 157:20 |
| 5:22 6:11,18 | 9:22 | 121:1,3, 6, | bulletin |
| 11:1,10 | broken | 10,12,15,23 | 3:12 |
| 13:10 24:2 | 21:21 | 154:2,5,10 | bunch |
| 56:23 73:12 | brought | 155:7,14,16, | 167: 6 |
| 106:23 125:8 | 114:2 156:15 | 19 156:4,6,8 | burden |
| 144:23 167:9 | ```Brutto 32:23 33:8,``` | $\begin{gathered} \text { budgetary } \\ 86: 9 \end{gathered}$ | 144:4 |


| bus | career | chair | charge |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 62:8 | 135:3 | 7:8,20,23 | 124:24 |
| buses | careful | 11:19 48:3 | 125:9,10 |
| 62:8 | 118:25 | 168:9 169:20 | 168:21 |
| bush | carried | chairman | chart |
| 43:13 | 6:25 7:1 8:2 | 10:15 11:16 | 90:22 |
| busines | Carry | 33:22 34:14, | charts |
| 155:17 | 169:22 | 16 75:19 | 89:13 90:2, |
| businesses | cars | chairman's | 17 |
| 164:22 | 156: | 33:15 | cheap |
| busy | 157:13 | challenge | 48:24 |
| 116:12 | 163:19 164:1 | 156:13 | check |
| bylaws | case | challenged | 145:17 |
| 32:25 | 33:2 67:8 | 78:16 | checked |
|  | 110:14 | chance | 128:7,9,12 |
|  | 116:24 117:6 | 32:2,6 34:1 | checking |
|  | 123:5 135:20 | 53:21, 25 | 61:25 |
| calculating | 173:15 | 61:13 126:13 | checklist |
| $21: 10$ | cases | change | 78:24 83:18 |
| calculation | 28:18 | 72:15 80:7 | cherry |
| 90:6 | causing | 102:24 | 29:15 |
| caliber | 152:18 | 114:22 | chief |
| 28:19 29:11 | cautious | 124:23 | 128:5 |
| caliper | 118:2 | changed | 129:12,13, |
| 27:4,8,18,23 | center | $142: 10$ Changes | $14,17,20,25$ |
| call | $45: 458: 23$, 25 59:3,12, | Changes $39: 22 \quad 69: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 130: 5,12 \\ & 131: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 3:19 5:3 | $1560: 7$ | Chaplin | $132: 17,19$ |
| 12:12 | $65: 21 \quad 66: 3$ | 99:2,9,10 | $133: 9$ |
| called | 92:19 | $13,18,24$ | chil |
| 63:10 150:19 | centers | 100:25 | 128:10 |
| calling | 58:11 59:21 | 101:2,5,14, | children |
| 5:1 43:4,5 | 60:3 | 20,24 102:2, | 92:1 93:5 |
| canopy | Central | 19 103:5,18, | 118:25 |
| 20:1 28:5 | 135:10 | 20 104:4,7, | 128:24 |
| 45:5 | 142:23 | 11 105:4,9 | choose |
| capabilities | certain | 106:7,11,20 | 29:11 |
| 18:19 | 28:18 29:13 | 107:9,14,18, | Christina |
| capability | 50:10 66:11 | 22,25 108:3 | 158:12 |
| 20:6 | 90:23 91:8 | 114:11,21 | Christine |
| car | certainly | 115:10,22 | $50: 22 \quad 68: 11$ |
| 86:18 150:16 | 80:8 94:22 | 116:1,18 | $141: 5 \text { 150:15 }$ |
| 156:12 | 130:22 140:7 | 117:14,18 | citation |
| 163:15 | $150: 9 \quad 151: 5$ | $118: 1,9,12$ | $39: 15$ |
| care | cetera | 120:14,17, | cited |
| 100:24 | 151:9 | 22,24 121:20 | $107: 4$ |


| Civil | 61:23,24,25 | comment | common |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 116:5 | 62:18 79:21 | 5:20 10:20 | 116:19,25 |
| clarification | 81:8,12,16 | 11:6,22 12:2 | community |
| 30:13 160:12 | 82:3 83:14, | 26:6 32:24 | 76:8,10,18, |
| 165:11 | 15 122:12, | 33:4 36:8 | 19,22 77:1,3 |
| clarify | 16,17,23 | 64:6 123:5, | 78:17,20 |
| 75:3 103:12 | 129:20 | 15,23 141:3 | 79:9,18 |
| 113:16 153:4 | 130:24 | 144:19 168:4 | 80:6,11, 21 |
| 158:16 | 133:17 157:7 | comments | 81:7,15,22 |
| 164:18 | codes | 12:3,6 33:1, | 84:24 85:1, |
| 165:15 | 129:22,23 | 7,17 40:23 | 18,23 86:1, |
| clarity | 138:21 | 47:23 64:6 | 10,19 87:22 |
| 31:21 96:7 | collect | 65:14 80:12 | 88:3,20 89:4 |
| Clark | 115:1 | 101:21 | 90:25 91:12 |
| 134:5,15,21 | collective | 102:4,5,8,10 | 92:25 |
| 139:17 | 144:21 | 124:8,18 | competition |
| 142:24 166:1 | collectively | 125:7,12 | 20:20 |
| clean | 13:20 | 127:10 | complement |
| 98:23 | Collier's | 134:12,23, | 20:23 |
| cleaned | 34:11 | 24,25 138:16 | complete |
| 153: 6 | Colliers | 141:4,11 | 83:23 |
| clear | 19:7 | 154:7 158:3, | completed |
| 39:9 55:21 | Collins | $7 \quad 162: 4$ | 10:25 88:3 |
| 108:11 | 152:7 | 167:19 | completely |
| 111:2,4 | color | commer- | 41:4 87:25 |
| 112:11,13 | 103:25 110:7 | commer- | 156:17 |
| 171:12,14 | 154:23 |  | complex |
| clearly | 155:22 | $65: 6,7,11$ | 163:20,24 |
| 80:4 | colors | $87: 9 \quad 94: 11 \text {, }$ | complexes |
| Clerk | 15:7 | 18 135:20 | 139:16 |
| 3:14 | come | 136:1 137:6 | compliance |
| client | 11:11,24 | 138:8 160:12 | 3:7 75:9 |
| 9:23 139:20 | 22:12 35:18 | 161:14 | complies |
| close | 53:18 67:23 | 163:21 167:4 | 75:13 118:23 |
| 25:8 | 90:19 92:2 | commission | comply |
| closed | 95:16 | 13:3 126:11, | 133:8,14,16 |
| 25:25 168:5, | 125:15,17 | 19 126:11, | concept |
| 6,10 169:17 | 128:19 131:3 | commissioner | 87:21 |
| 170:4 | 132:8 133:19 | 126:10 | concern |
| closer | $136: 2 \quad 142: 3$ | committed | 11:7 29:18 |
| 31:3,7 | 158:1 159:19 | 124:22 | 129:6 131:7, |
| 102:21 | 167:14 | committee | 9 138:16 |
| COA | comfort | $67: 9 \quad 78: 10$ | 141:24 |
| 108:16,21 | 58:1 | $81: 18 \quad 126: 15$ | concerned |
| 110: 6 | comfortable | $130: 23 \quad 131: 6$ | 86:16 116:14 |
| code | 57:25 121:18 | $159: 19$ | 118:19 146:4 |


| concerns | 169:7 | consistent | convey |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 74:3 119:7 | conducted | 27:6 82:15 | 115:1 |
| 142:4,17 | 60:1 | consisting | conveyance |
| 145:25 | cone | 5:11 | 115:3 |
| 150:10 | 47:2 | constantly | conveyor |
| conclude | confe | 33:25 151:8 | 115:3 |
| 8:8 | 85:12 | constitutes | copy |
| concluded | confident | 139:13 | 35:4, |
| 14:25 168:3 | 37:4 42:6 | constraints | 133:10 |
| concluding | 57:9 122:14 | 26:22 118:5 | corner |
| 10:19 | confirm | construct | 22: 6 |
| concrete | 50:2 75:23 | 5:10 115:21 | correct |
| 103:3,5,17, | conform | construction | 9:16 12:19, |
| 21 104:16 | 74:25 | 130:24 | 20 13:12 |
| 106:2,6,9 | confusion | consult | 14:8 15:23 |
| 114:7 117:9 | 103:1 | 147:6,13 | 18:1,16 |
| 145:9 146:9 | Congress | consultants | 19:18,19 |
| condensed | 90:11 | 11:10 12:24 | 20:7,10 26:1 |
| 52:21 | connecti | 13:11 14:25 | 33:2 34:12 |
| condition | $78: 1$ | consultation | 39:15 45:13 |
| 11:14 13:5 | Conrail | 12:24 13:10 | 48:17,18,22 |
| 15:6 16:13 | $120: 11 \quad 136$ | context | 49:18 50:3,4 |
| 17:3,6 18:21 | consecutive | 85:22 | $51: 19$ 52:9 |
| $24: 3,830: 1$ | consecutive $13: 20$ | 85:22 | 53:7 58:4 |
| 41:11 42:16 | 13:20 | continue | 61:17 62:11, |
| 47:9 75:1,10 | consen |  | 12 76:23 |
| 79:15 80:9 | 6:4 | 88:24 91:16 | 78:10 81:8,9 |
| 81:20 82:7 | consider | 145:2 | 85:19,21 |
| 83:16 84:6, | 8:24 82:4 | continued | 89:1 91:3 |
| 7,9 102:7,13 | 110:16 | 10:7 170:3,5 | 92:22 93:5 |
| 104:10 111:7 | 113:8,10 | 173:12,14 | 94:16,19 |
| 112:14 | 135:1,15 | continues | 95:4 105:16, |
| 116:19 117:1 | 147:11 153:1 | 104:12 | 17 106:7 |
| 130:3 135:23 | considerably | 137:23 | 107:22 |
| 136:10,14 | 18: 6 | continuing | 112:7,8 |
| 138:7 139:9 | consideration | 10:6,18 23:2 | 113:24 |
| 145:5 146:17 | 80:22 81:3 | contours | 114:10,11 |
| 148:8 151:5, | 87:17 117:24 | 52:19,21 | 116:4 122:24 |
| 8 153:8 | 126:24 131:7 | 113:3 | 123:10 126:5 |
| 170:21 | 145:24 | contrar | 131:9,15 |
| conditions | considered | 60:19 | 141:8 146:13 |
| 15:3,4 | 21:19 66:7 | contribution | 147:17 |
| 104:5,8 | 76:22 147:20 | 49:1 | 148:25 152:3 |
| 106:21 | considering | controversial | 153:20 |
| 118:3,10 | 65:22 173:19 | 125:13 | 159:1,10 |
| 128:7 | considers | conversation | 162:11 |
| 140:19,21 | 109:22 | $93: 13$ | 163:10 |
| 151:1 168:25 |  | 93.13 | 164:14,16 |


| 165:14 | covenant | cross | dated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| corrected | 153:11,12 | examination | 14:10 31:22 |
| 86:17 | cover | 67:12 | 71:9 76:8 |
| correctly | 18:12 36:16, | crossin | 95:22 97:10, |
| 143:9 159:12 | 17 37:11 | 144:2 | 14 133:2 |
| cost | 45:5 | crosswal | dates |
| 85:10 | coverage | 48:15 | 7:4 |
| cost | 45:9 47:2 | crying | day |
| 108:17 110:5 | covered | 128:23 | 92:20 154:22 |
| cost | 105:19 | crystal | dead |
| generative | Cranford | 111:4 171:14 | 42:10,20 |
| 109:8 110:18 | 3:3,6,14 | curb | 43:5 50:2,7 |
| costs | 89:6 91:2,7 | 106:1 120:13 | 55:20 56:3, |
| 86:4 88:6 | 122:12 | curiou | 8,9 |
| 95:3 | 126:11,18 | 76:7 | dealing |
| council | 133:2 134:18 | Curran | 117:8 |
| 78:12 109:6 | 141:9,10 | 126:19,22 | December |
| count | 164:2 | current | 3:4 5:6,18 |
| 27:2 | Cranford' | 85:25 86:9, | 10:8,21 11:4 |
| counts | 61:23 89: | 10 90:9 | 31:22 34:2, |
| 13:8 | cran | curs | 5,6,9 54:24 |
| county | 154:12 | 100:13 | 55:1 95:22, |
| 69:8 95:22 | create | cut | $25 \text { 96:9 }$ |
| 96:21, 22, 23 | 20:13,20 | 25:21 28:22 | $97: 10,11,1$ |
| 97: 4, 5, 13 | 25:12 35:24 | 71:23 | 101:12 |
| 101:11,17, | 39:8 80:24 | Czeh | 102:15 |
| 18,21 102:3, | 110:23 118:9 | 130:12 | 169:10 |
| 11,16,17 | created | 132:15 | decent |
| 110:14 | 17:19 |  | 42:16 |
| 120:15 | creating |  | decide |
| 121:11,12 | 125:16 | D | 108:14 169:3 |
| 148:5, 9, 12, | creation | damage | decided $128: 5$ |
| $17,20149: 1$ | 110 | 30:16 |  |
| $164: 14$ | creat | damaging | $161: 3170: 8$ |
| 165:16,17, | cre | 30:22 | decision |
| 18,19 | cres | Dan | 110:13 |
| couple | crit | 9:19 132:15 | declare |
| 28:7 55:4 | $125: 17,18$ | dashes | 7:8 168:10 |
| 76:19 80:12 | 168:22 | 13:23 | dedicate |
| course | criteri | dat | 7:16 |
| 78:15 | 50:13 80:23 | 86:8 | dedicated |
| court | cross | date | 6:13,21 7:13 |
| 72:3 73:17 | 22:22 36:21 | 15:18 54:22, | deeply |
| 78:16 | 118:20 121:8 | 25 76:12 | $142: 20$ |
| Court's | 143:11 | $96: 16 \quad 97: 8$ | defines |
| 110:12 |  | 124:15 | $61: 22$ |


| definitely $147: 11$ | deny <br> 84:14 168:1 | designated 68:24 | $5,8,16,20$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| definition | denying | designer | 12,17,20 |
| 59:3,7,9,11 | 110:5 | 116:7 | 28:2,20 |
| 61: 6, 15 | department | designs | 29:2,9,14, |
| 63:16 64:11, | 96:1 127:25 | 51:21 | 21,25 30:8, |
| 14 65:23 | 128:4,25 | desired | 24 31:4,12 |
| 66:19,25 | 129:25 | 32:11 | 35:20 36:13, |
| 67:6,7 | 130:25 | detail | 17 37:4,7, |
| definitions | 131:1,14,23 | 149:1 | 11,16,19,22, |
| 58:25 61:10, | dependent | detail | 25 38:5,1 |
| 25 62:6 | 28:16 | 71:10 | 39:17,20 |
| degree | depending | details | 40:5,10,18 |
| 138:2 | 165:6 | 78:3 102:11 | 1:9,14,22 |
| deliberate | depo | developed | $\begin{aligned} & 42: 2,12,15, \\ & 23 \text { 43:7,10, } \end{aligned}$ |
| $53: 6 \text { 125: }$ | 64:16,17 | 105:22 | 14,18 44:23 |
| 171:16 | depot | developer | 45:2,8,13, |
| deliberation | 59:1 61:6,23 | 93:16 | 20,24 46:3, |
| 170:9,19 | 62:8,13,22 | developers | 7,11,18,21, |
| 173:4 | 20 64:12 | 71:12 154:17 | 24 47:5,8,16 |
| deliberations | depots | development | 48:10,14,18, |
| 5:24 6:12 | 58:12,16 |  |  |
| 7:12 8:10 | 60:4 61:19 | 79:23 80:23 | 51:5,12,15, |
| 125:21 | 62:1, 3, 6, 18 | 81:2,18,24 | 18,23 52:3, |
| 131:17 132:5 | 67:4 | 94:7 108:24 | 9,13 53:3,7 |
| 169:24 170:5 | Deputy | 122:8,9 | diameters |
| delicate | 4:10,11 |  |  |
| 26:14 | 172:19, |  | Dickerson |
| delineation | describe |  | 20,21 |
| 39:10 | 12:22 14:22 | 110:1 | 31:19 32:1, |
| deliverer | 16:25 20:11 |  |  |
| 135:4 | 79:21 101:16 | Dev | $\begin{aligned} & 35: 3,12 \\ & 38: 254 \end{aligned}$ |
| delivery | described | 20 13:1,12 | 13 53:16,19 |
| 152:23 | 16:6 | 14:1, 3, 9, 11, | 54:5, 7, 11, |
| demographic | describing | 14,17,20 | 12,15,17 |
| 92:5 | 81:23 | 15:2,14,19, | 55:23 56:1, |
| demonstrates | descriptions | 21,23 16:8, | 6,11,13,18 |
| 80:4 | 166:13 | 12,19,22 | 57:7,12 |
| demonstrating | design | 17:2,16,21 | 58:4,18,24 |
| 56:2 | 40:6 53:1 | 18:1,3,16 | 59:18 61:5, |
| denies | 102:14 116:5 | 19:8,10,19, | 8,14,18 |
| 111:5 112:13 | 122:10 | 21,24 20:7, | 62:12,17,25 |
| dense | 137:12 | 10,12 21:12, | 63:5,8,22 |
| 22:13 30:21 | designate | 20 22:5 | 64:15,18, 24 |
| densities | 161:7 | 23:19,24 | 65:19,22 |
| 19:11 |  | 24:22 25:1, | $66: 4,6,12$ |
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| engineering | 19,24 71:1, | eventually | executed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14:17 114:8, | 21 72:2,18 | 115:2 | 78:1 |
| 10 | 73:15 74:2, | evergree | executive |
| engineers' | 10 136:5 | 18:5,10 | 59:18 |
| 24:15 | 141:5,10,14 | 19:1,3,24 | exempt |
| enhance | 143:20,25 | 21:14 22:11, | 94:14 |
| 30:16 | 144:12,25 | 14,15,16 | exemption |
| enhanci | 145:7,10,22, | 23:8 27:7 | 109:23 |
| 26:15 | 23 146:10, | 35:17, 22 | exempts |
| ensure | 14,19 | $43: 3,14$ 46:4 | 85:2 |
| 153:5 | 147:18,22 | 50:15,16 | exhibit |
| ensures | $\begin{aligned} & 148: 3,11,23 \\ & 149: 6158: 8, \end{aligned}$ | evergreens | 13:20 14:6 |
| 148:4 | $12,13,15,23$ | 41:19,21,25 | 15:12,15 |
| enter |  | everybody | 16:23 19:14 |
| 9:18 | 11,14,21,25 | 102:19 | 21:25 22:5 |
| entering | 160:11 | 136:17 | $26: 3$ 32:3 |
| 23:12 58:15 | 162:24 | everyone | 44:15 50:8 |
| 60:12,18 | 163:4,11 | 50:19 160:20 | 73:9,22 |
| entire | 22,24 164:5, | 173:17 | 100:1, 19, 22, |
| 6:20 15:8 | 8,12 165:10, | everyone's $100: 15$ | 23,25 103:7, $11 \quad 107: 1$ |
| 22:23 23:1 | 16,19,22 | evidence | $113: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 22 \quad 104: 21 \\ & 144: 4 \end{aligned}$ | essential | evidence $123: 3$ | exhibits |
| entirely | essentially | exact <br> 17:18 90:16 | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 14,21 \\ & 71: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 60:1 | 85:24 94:25 | 17:18 90:16 $150: 20$ | existing |
| entirety $5: 216$ | 103:8 | exactly | 11:8 13:5 |
| entity |  | 75:14 104:19 | 17:3 20:14, |
| 165:13 | $3$ | 145:19 | 18,22 24:21 |
| entrance | established | 154:20 | 25:25 26:4, |
| 22:18 23:10 | 62:6 | exceed | 7,8 29:23 |
| 25:17 51:2,3 | estim | 9:1 | 30:23 31 |
| 143:2 144:4 | 17:10 | exception | 39:17,21,22 |
| entrances |  | 108:15 | 42:16 45:2 |
| 143:21 |  | 109:23 | 47:14 51:17, |
|  |  | 110:4,5 | 18 52:16,23 |
| $39: 3$ | estimation | 111:6 112:14 | 69:24 70: |
| $13$ | 77:19 94:18 | 113:19 | 7 104:5,8,9 |
|  | et | 134:15 | exists |
| Es | 151:9 | excessive | 19:4 |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 49: 25 & 50: 1 \\ 22,23 & 51: 9 \end{array}$ | evening | 55:22 109:5, | exit |
|  | 3:2 6:3 9:2 | 10 | 144:8 |
| $52:$ | 127:11 | excluding | exiting |
| $53: 5,868:$ | evening's | 6:11 | 143:10 |
| $11,22$ | 3:3 | e | exits |
| 6,12,18,20 | event | 127:24 | 143:21 |
| 70:3, 6,12, | 94:24 136:14 | 135:12 |  |


| expand | 166:8 | fall | 23,24,25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 113:4,5 | explained | 29:3 117:15 | 105:23 |
| 116:16 | 47:15 166:6 | 128:10 155:4 | 107:8,9 |
| 118:15 | explaining | falls | 108:2, 4 |
| expanded | 81:23 112:24 | 154:25 | 111:13 |
| 115:9,20 | 145:11 | familiar | 113:23 |
| expanding | explanation | 95:21 96:1,9 | 116:11,14 |
| 103:22 | 68:21 91:22 | family | $117: 13,15$ |
| 111:12 | extend | 134:4 | $118: 23$ |
| expansion 100:1 | 107:8, 9, 15 | far | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 122:13, } 24 \\ & \text { fellow } \end{aligned}$ |
| 100:1 |  | $40: 17$ $73: 15$ $138: 17$ | 114:13 |
| 45:21 80:6 | 162:8,21 | 139:13 167:3 | felt |
| expectation | 170:8 | faster | 90:5 |
| 85:1 87:14 | extension | 28:14 | FEMALE |
| 88:23 89:17 | 6:5 170:10, | favor | $24: 20,23$ |
| 90:3 | 22 (10) | 82:21 146:23 | $25: 11 \quad 27: 1$ |
| expected | extra | 147:8 159:24 | 4:24 74: |
| 87:7,10 | 35:3,7 | feasible | 105:21 |
| 88:17,21 | 117:13 | 117:11 | 106:8,25 |
| 89:6 90:18 | 156:23 | February | 107:3,11,17, |
| 91:24 | extremel | 6:5,18 7:5, | 20,23 108:1, |
| expecting | 136:4,18 | 6,16 | 7 160:8 |
| 77:10 90:8 |  | federal | $\begin{aligned} & 170: 11,15 \\ & 171: 1,5,6 \end{aligned}$ |
| expense | F | 88:22,23 | 174:1 |
| 81:22 110:24 |  | 89:7,17 | field |
| 112:11 | facilities | 90:8,10,13 | 20:16 |
| 126:17 | 79:24 82:1 | $91: 5,8,9,14$ | fields |
| experience <br> 105:14 | facility | $16$ | 44:2 |
| 111:19 | 143:11 144:8 |  | figured |
| 142:13 | 150:12 |  | 136:15 |
| experienced $139: 6$ | ```fact 33:20 57:14``` | $19: 7,9$ | figures 92:15 |
| ```experiencing 86:6``` | $\begin{array}{ll} 130: 21 & 151: 4 \\ 152: 24 & \end{array}$ | $56: 20$ $121: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { file } \\ & \text { 132: } 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| expert <br> 41:17 75:11 | factored | fees | $\begin{aligned} & \text { filed } \\ & \text { 131:14 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 79:18 87:15 |  |  | filing |
| 105:22 116:4 | factoring |  | 3:13 |
| 152:8 |  | 10 43:2 | fill |
| expertise | $: 9$ | 46:8,14,18, | 7:4 29:1 |
| 87:14 116:3 |  | 20 69:18,20 | 32:13 41:25 |
| explain | fair | 102:23 | 42:8 43:12 |
| 21:10 79:21 | $141: 19$ | 103:14,16,22 | 126:16 |
| 86:25 99:23 |  | 104:12,13, | filling |
| 114:15,18 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { fairly } \\ 42: 15 \end{array}$ | 14,17,20,21, | 48:24 |
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| function | 134:3 135:9 | 8,10 23:22 | 161:13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 28:21 | 136:5 154:21 | 24:24 25:2, | 162:7,14,21, |
| fund | 159:8 166:25 | 13,14 28:13 | 23 163:7,9 |
| 145:25 | 167:2 | 29:5 30:18 | 167:3 168:1, |
| 146:12 | Gibson | 31:13 33:5 | 13,21 169:1, |
| funding | 134:5,20 | 34:7 36:4,16 | 2,18 170:4, |
| 91:14 | 135:10 | 37:6 38:22 | 20 171:17,23 |
| funds | 165:25 | 42:7,20 | 173:9,10,13 |
| 90:8 91:6 | give | 43:11 44:1 | good |
|  | 38:18,23 | 48:19 49:16 | 3:2 8:19,21 |
|  | 72:11 85:14 | 50:3,11 | 18:20 22:14 |
| G | 88:24 109:7 | 52:7,14,24 | 37:5 112:3, |
|  | 111:16 | 53:5 57:15, | 21 127:19 |
| game | 112:17 | 20 58:20 | 128:5 147:10 |
|  | 114:19 | 60:21 64:1 | 151:7 156:18 |
| gap | 124:9,24,25 | 68:19 69:21 | 158:15,16 |
| 43:17 | 125:9,12 | 71:23 72:25 | goods |
| gaps | 134:12 | 73:22 74:22, | 59:13,25 |
| 32:14 126:16 | 139:19 | 23,25 75:5, | Googling |
| garbage | 141:12 | 9,15 79:11 | 61:20 |
| 151:9 | 146:23 | 82:1,2,9 | gotta |
| Gareis | 149:24 154:7 | 83:15 95:1 | 42:21 68:10 |
| 4:10,11 | 158:6 160:21 | 104:20 | 121:3 |
| 172:19,20 | 162:1 | 108:14,19 | government |
| gases | given | 110:23,24 | 88:22,24 |
| 59:24 | 58:15 85:5 | 113:8,9 | 89:8,18 |
| gave | 87:14 88:11 | $114: 24$ $118: 20$ $119: 7$ | 90:8,10,14 |
| 21:9 27:2 | 118:4 142:6 | $118: 20$ $120: 19$ | 91:6,8,9,14, |
| 153:11 | 158:3 |  | 17 |
| general | giving | $125: 10,18,19$ | grab |
| 92:24 124:3 | 141:18 | $126: 1,4,20$ | 53:16 120:3 |
| 163:25 | 145:13 157:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 126: 1,4,20 \\ & 128: 3,8,18 \end{aligned}$ | grade |
| generally | goes | $19 \quad 130: 3$ | 114:22 |
| 112:21 | 21:10 49:12 | $135: 8,10,13$ | grades |
| generate | 93:11,14 | 136:18,25 | 26:9 |
| 91:25 | 97:20 99:21 | 137:25 | grant |
| generated | 107:6 116:9 | 138:1,21 | 7:10 82:6 |
| 86:3 | 118:21 | 142:18 143:2 | 93:11 |
| generating | 130:22 132:9 | 144:5,7 | 109:23,25 |
| 91:24 | 138:3 143:13 | 145:12 | 110:1 113:17 |
| generative | 159:18 | 146:1,5,25 | granted |
| 108:18 110:6 | 165:19 | 147:4,22,23 | 137:15 |
| George | going | 148:5,6,7,18 | 146:17 |
| 152: 6 |  | 150:17 | grass |
| getting | $5 \text { 8:2 15:1 }$ | 152:20,22 | 112:20 113:6 |
| 12:21 21:7 |  | 154:21,22 | 116:21,22 |
| 47:24 79:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 24,25 \\ & 21: 3,4 \\ & 22: 5, \end{aligned}$ | 155:23 | 117:5 166:15 |
|  | 2,3,4 22:5, | 159:22 160:6 |  |


| gray | handed | healthier | high |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 142:8 149:10 | 54:19 164:25 | 27:22 | 41:19 45:17 |
| greater | handheld | healthy | 69:20 86:5 |
| 143:6 | 53:19 | 26:25 | 104:15 |
| greatest | handle | hear | 114:24 |
| 19:17 | 150:16 | 17:14 69:7 | higher |
| green | happen | 72:9 173:18 | 26:7 |
| 24:9 137:1 | 24:24 34:20, | heard | highly |
| gross | 21 100:16 | 3:11 129:3 | 59:23 |
| 59:14 | 118:8 148:12 | 148:1 159:12 | highway |
| group | happened | 173:13 | 149:3 |
| 43:2 | 41:20 49:15 | hea | highways |
| grow | happening | 6:13,17,20 | 149:1 |
| 27:15 28:14 | 52:18 106:13 | 7:15 8:1 | hit |
| 37:8 45:21 | hard | 26:7 61:2 | 106:21 |
| 46:9 | 44:15 101:8 | 99:15 108:11 | 114:24 |
| growing | 102:1 119:4 | 131:18 | hits |
| 28:9 50:12 | Hartz | 169:17,23 | 115:2 |
| 85:19 135:5 | 5:20,24 6:12 | 170:2,4 | hitting |
| growth | 7:12 8:7,12 | hearings | 106:15 |
| 20:9 24:17 | 10:8,18 | 15 84:2 | Hmm |
| 28:8 45:14 | 40:15 49:3 | 107:5 | 132:13 166:3 |
| 55:22 109:19 | 65:1 68:13 | heavily | hold |
| guess | 73:16 85:9 | 18:4 22:13 | 34:4 60:14, |
| 40:25 58:1 | 107:7 146:11 | 119:2 | $1571: 6$ |
| 87:20 | 157:4 164:20 | height | 97:21 100:5 |
| gutter | 165:3 | 27:4,8 29:11 | 144:20 |
| 115:6 117:9 | Hartz's | 30:19 42:11 | 146:10 |
| guys | 126:14 | 46:1,12 50:6 | 158:20 |
| 9:11 39:13 | hatched | $55: 13$ 56:12 | 166:22 |
| 71:8 124:23 | 15:7 | 151:18 | holder |
| 134:3 160:18 | hate | ```help 83:3 125:21``` | 16:3,5 |
|  | 118 | $156: 19$ | home |
| H | hazard 117:2 | helpful | 139:13 |
|  | hazardous | 32:22 | 152:18,20 |
| $9: 20$ | 59:22,23 | Henry <br> 10:17 38:22 | honest |
| half | hazards | $145: 14$ | 35:2 |
| 27:10,11 | 29:3 |  | honestly |
| Hall | head | 159: | 84:21 117:16 |
| 3:12 | 11:22 12:2 | Hey | hope |
| hand | 92:12 103:10 | 97:21 | 91:15 140:1 |
| 21:16, 17, 22 | 123:14 | Hhm | 155:1 157:9, |
| 95:12 120:3 | heading | 159:24 | 21 |
| 121:1 124:6 | 23:20 120:11 | hidden | hot |
| 127:8 134:9 | health | 55:6 | 138:3 |
| 138:10 | 131:1 140:12 |  |  |


| hour | idea | 10,18,24 | 171:1,9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8:24 9:3,4 | 8:19,21 | 86:19 87:22 | 173:24 |
| 148:14 | 37:17 47:10 | 88:3, 20 | inch |
| hours | 89:2 160:17 | 89:4,9 90:25 | 102:24 |
| 55:4 | ideally | 91:13 93:1 | inches |
| house | 116:21 | 110:24 115:5 | 26:14 45:22, |
| 119:4 122:11 | identified | impacts | 23,24 46:2 |
| 136:20 | 15:3 | 39:11 66:15 | 104:15,19 |
| housing | identify | implement | 108:6 |
| 5:12,13 | 12:16 14:2 | 24:12 | include |
| 80:17,19,21, | 15:12 44:1 | implemented | 35:22, 23 |
| 25 82:5 | 124:4 127:3 | 146:2 | 58:11 59:21 |
| 84:15 94:8, | 158:10 | implied | 60:3 65:25 |
| 13 110:17 | ignite | 60:22 | 94:20 |
| huge | 108:8 | important | included |
| 143:4 | II | 85:16 140:13 | 76:25 |
| Hughes | 80:20 | impose | includes |
| 75:20,24 | III | 84:7,9 | 59:12 65:23 |
| 76:11,24 | 110:13 | 112:14 130:3 | 105:24 |
| 77:2,8,12, | illegal | 135:23 | including |
| 17,20,22 | 71:18 | 136:10,14 | 10:23 52:6 |
| 78:21 79:13, | image | 139:9 | inclusionary |
| 20 80:2 | $17: 4,19,21$ | impression | 81:2 |
| 81:10 85:22 | 18:17,18,20, | 152:22 | inclusive |
| 86:8,14,20, | 21,22 22:24 | improper | 110:17 |
| 23 87:3,11, | 23:6,7 | 91:11 | incorporated |
| 16,23 88:5, | images | improvements | 10:9 30:8 |
| 10,12,15,18 | 17:17 | 57:19 | increase |
| $\begin{aligned} & 89: 2,24 \\ & 91: 20 \quad 92 \end{aligned}$ | immaterial | inaudible | 26:13 107:24 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 91: 20 \\ & 12,17,22 \end{aligned}$ | 33:18 49:17 | 9:20 39:4 | increased |
| 93:2,8,22,24 | 66:24 67:2 | 40:8 45:7, | 135:7 |
| $94: 20 \text { 95:4, }$ | immediate | 12,19 46:2, | indulgence |
| 8,23 96:11 | 28:10 | 6,10,17 | 11:2 |
| 97:18 98:6 | immediately | 47:4,7 48:9, | industrial |
| Huh-uh | 124:20 | 13,21 49:2 | 143:3 |
| 166:5 | immunity | $\begin{aligned} & 3,20,23 \\ & 69: 19 \quad 74: 15 \end{aligned}$ | Industries |
| humble | 137:13 | $82: 20 \text { 100: }$ | 10:9 |
| 170:22 | impact | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 20 \quad 100: 8 \\ & 101: 23 \quad 102: 1 \end{aligned}$ | industry |
| humbly | 28:10 66:16 | $106: 21$ | 88:9 |
| 8:23 | 76:8,10,18, | $\begin{aligned} & 106: 21 \\ & 119: 18 \end{aligned}$ | inflation |
|  | 19,23 77:1,3 | $\begin{aligned} & 119: 18 \\ & 122: 7,18 \end{aligned}$ | 85:19 86:5, |
|  | 78:18,19 | 123:22 | 12 |
| I | 79:9,18, 22 |  | information |
|  | 80:6,11,19 | 144:16 | 53:6 78:25 |
| icy 106:21 | 81:1,7,15, | $145: 15$ | 80:3 85:9 |
| 106:21 | 22,23 82:4 | $153: 22$ | 126:8 142:6 |
| 118:10 | 84:24 85:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 153: 22 \\ & 157: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 162:2 |


| infringe 8:9 | involves 9:10 | Jay $165: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21 \quad 13: 9,13, \\ & 18,2514: 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| inside | irrelevant | JB | 15:10,24 |
| 139:6,11,12 | 33:18 49:7, | 64:4 | 16:4,9,17, |
| inspect | 17 66:24 | Jersey | 21,25 17:24 |
| 130:15 | 67:2 | 3:6 91:6 | 18:2,14 |
| inspector | issue | 92:18 | 19:6, 9, 13, |
| 130:25 | 11:3,17 | job | 20,23 20:3, |
| instance | 53:13,15 | 37:5 | 8,11 21:8,24 |
| 93:18 | 71:14 73:25 | July | 23:15,22 |
| instances | 80:19 82:11, | 133:2 | 24:1 25:4,7, |
| 33:16 93:16 | 18 98:23 | juncture | 13,19,23 |
| intact | 110:19 | 123:3 129:7 | $26: 2 \text { 39:14, }$ |
| 69:14 70:15 | 117:19 126:8 | jurisdiction | $44$ |
| 73:20 | 150:4 152:25 | 148:18 |  |
| intend |  | 164:17 | $59: 17$ |
| 40:15,20 | issued | jury | 72:14,17,23, |
| 41:24 42:9 | 132:10 | 124:24 | 25 73:8 |
| 44:21 | issues | 125:9,10,20 | 74:24 75:7, |
| intended | 98:25 102:15 | 168:21 | 14,15,19,25 |
| 39:9 |  | justify | 78:4,6,11 |
| intent | $169: 3,18$ | 121:17 | 80:14 98:21, |
| 32:13 43:24 | item |  | 24 99:1,3,7, |
| interest | 78:24 81:13 | K | $11,14,19$ |
| 110:16 | 83:18 121:7, |  | $100: 16,17$ |
| 136:21 | 9 126:23 | K-L-E-I-N | 101:2,7,9,15 |
| 141:20 |  | 9:20 | 102:14 |
| interesting |  | Kamal | 105:19 |
| 108:22 | 109:20 | 96:24 97:7 | 108:12,16 |
| 132:13 |  |  | 109:13,15 |
| interpretatio | J | 35:7 | 110:10 |
|  |  |  | 113:11,24 |
| 150:8 | Jackie |  | 115:14,17,19 |
| interpreting | 105:22 | 40:14 64:8 | 117:23 |
| 87:5 | January | 145:13 151:7 | 118: 6,11 |
| intersection | 5:23 6:11 | 159:25 | 119:22,25 |
| 22:1,22 | 7:2,11 8:3, | 159.25 | 121:1 122:2 |
| 138:13 | 9,24 9:8 |  | 123:1,2,10, |
| introduce | 124:19 |  | 19,25 125:11 |
| 99:8 | 125:6,8 |  | 131:20,25 |
| investigation | 126:10 | Kel | 133:7 136:8, |
| 13:2 | 169:23 | 4:1 |  |
| invite | 170:5,8,18 |  | 15,19 |
| 32:17 | 171:15,18 | 8:17 73.3 | 146:22 |
| involved |  | Kent-smith | 153:18 |
| 68:17,23 | $9: 23$ | 5:16 10:15, | 158:25 |
| 69:10 | 9:23 | 17 12:10,11, | 159:10,12, |
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| 15,23 160:22 | 5 120:21 | 44:3,10,19 | 38:3,13 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 161:9,18,21, | 122:17 | 45:7,12,15, | 41:18 48:12 |
| 23 162:10, | 125:16 | 23 46:2,5, | 53:1,13 |
| 12,15 163:7, | 128:17 | 10,16,19 | 56:17 |
| 23 164:1,25 | 130:12 | 47:4,6,10 | landscaping |
| 168:8,11,15, | 136:17 | 48:1, 8, 13, | 11:15 31:23 |
| 17 169:4,12 | 137:25 | 16,21,23 | 39:4,6,7 |
| kids | 138:3,4,12, | 49:2,12,19, | 54:8,12 |
| 117:17 | 14,20,23 | 23 50:1,5,10 | language |
| 118:17 119:1 | 139:12,15,19 | 53:23,25 | 70:14 |
| kind | 140:3,4 | $54: 3,5,18,24$ | large |
| 18:12,23 | 142:5 143:23 | $55: 2,8,11$, | 20:2 28:4,24 |
| 28:3 29:15 | 145:16 152:4 | 17,19,24 | 33:8 69:15, |
| 55:12 156:17 | 154:11,20,25 | 56:10,15,20, | 17 125:13 |
| Klein | 155:24 | 25 57:2,4,8, | 130:22 |
| 9:19,20,24 | 156:11,22 | 24 58:5 60:9 | largely |
| 10:1 | 157:3, 4, 18, | 61:4 62:13, | 25:2 |
| know | 20,22 158:12 | 20 63:9,21 | larger |
| 13:22 16:1 | 160:17,20 | 64:3,7,10, | $27: 24 \text { 28:6, }$ |
| 21:8 26:6,13 | 162:2,5,22 | 17,19 65:7, | 11,18 29:4, |
| 29:19 31:14 | 163:10,16 | 11,16,17,20 | $11$ |
| 34:23,24 | 164:8,22, | $66: 1,18,22$ | late |
| 35:2 36:15, | $10,12,13$ | 68:4 95:13, | 55:9 135:18 |
| 19 37:1,2 | 167:13 | 15,19,24 | Laurel |
| 41:10,13,15 | 168:22 | $96: 5,7,12,$ | 80:17,18, 20 |
| 55:15 61:23 | 171:15,16,17 | $17,20,23$ | 109:20 |
| 63:3,11,19, | $171: 15,16,17$ $173: 12$ |  | 110:13 |
| 20 71:17 | knowing | $15,20,22,25$ | law |
| 76:6 77:18, | knowing $84: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 15,20,22,25 \\ & 98: 2,4,7,12, \end{aligned}$ | $33: 2 \quad 82: 16$ |
| 24 78:2 79:6 | $84: 3$ Kohler | 98:2, 4, 7, 12, $16 \text { 120:5 }$ | 84:19 148:10 |
| 80:11 81:14 | Kohler | $121: 1,3,6,$ |  |
| 82:19 84:22 | 108:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 121: 1,3,6, \\ & 10,12,15,23 \end{aligned}$ | lawsuit $65: 4$ |
| 85:10,25 |  |  |  |
| 87:1,11 | L | $155: 7,14,16$ | lawyers <br> 85:12 |
| 88:18 89:11, |  | 19 156:4,6,8 |  |
| 12 90:10,20 | La | 19 156:4,6,8 | layer |
| 91:14,17, 24 | 32:23 33:8, | labor | 18:13 |
| 92:9,13 | 13,23 34:5, | 126:17 | lead |
| 94:5,22 | 12,15,19,24 | Labrutto | 23:9 73:4 |
| 100:19 | 35:5,13,16 | 32:23 | Leader |
| 102:17 | 36:3,8,10, | land | 3:9 |
| 105:7,9 | 15,19,23 | 58:9 79:22 | lean |
| 107:4 108:17 | 37:1,6,9,13, | 81:24 148:10 | 31:15 |
| 109:13 | 17 38:10,16 | landscape | learned |
| 111:19 | 40:15,19,24 | 10:23 13:3 | 157:21 |
| 112:25 | 41:7,17,23 | 14:7 15:16 | Leary |
| 116:2,11 | 42:9,14,17 | 24:12,15 | 149:22 |
| 117:8 119:2, | $43: 1,9,11,16$ | 27:6 32:4 | 150:2,23,25 |


| 151:19,25 | 16,20,22,24 | limited | 45:3 46:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 152:3,6,13, | 7:5 96:18 | 33:21 | 50:12 59:17 |
| 16 153:10, | 100:10 | 119:22,24 | 112:18 |
| 15,17,24 | 126:18 | limiting | 127:16 |
| leave | 133:10,20 | 150:6 151:15 | 128:10 |
| 137:17 | 171:23 | line | 135:18 |
| leaving | 172:2,5,7,9, | 32:9 44:15 | 154:12 |
| 144:1 | 11,13,15,17, | 48:5 62:15 | live |
| Leber | 19,21,23,25 | 104:15 | 166:11 |
| 3:23, 24 | length | 120:13 | lived |
| 30:11,12 | 17:10 63:12 | 150:10 | 140:10 151:3 |
| 31:1,5 | 142:5 | 166:14 | 156:24 |
| 156:15 | 151:17,21, | linear | lives |
| 172:7,8 | 22,24,25 | 21:13 | 92:18 |
| Ledger | lengthy | 104:23,24 | living |
| 3:10 | 141:17 | 108:5 113:23 | 154:21 |
| left | letter | lines | LLC |
| 10:24 43:23 | 5:17 81:14 | 39:8 136:2 | 5:7 |
| 98:23,25 | 96:14 101:12 | 137:5 | local |
| 128:23 | 121:10,11,13 | liquids | 89:24 |
| 136:6,10,18 | letters | 59:23 | located |
| 137:5,16 | 5:16 | list | 114:6 |
| 138:7 | level | 137:20 167:7 | location |
| 144:13,15 | 58:1 | 169:1,2,7 | 19:16 24:16 |
| 158:17,18, | levels | listen | 51:11,19,21 |
| 19,21 159:3, | 86:1 87:7 | 36:20 41:16 | 52:14 68:14 |
| 20 160:1,2,4 | 90:9 | 42:21 66:5 | 69:9 71:25 |
| left- | Lexington | 72:9 90:19 | 72:21 141:25 |
| 138:9 | 137:23 143:1 | 98:14 129:11 | 144:6 165:7 |
| left-hand | 144:9 | 130:1 163:1 | locations |
| 135:16,19, | liability | 170:17 | 72:16,20 |
| 21,25 | 137:7,15 | listening | 73:1,7 |
| legal | light | 141:16 | long |
| 71:7,13 | 33:20 121:17 | lists | 26:24 62:15 |
| 73:21,24,25 | 136:20,25 | 6:7 | 133:4 149:10 |
| 82:18 93:8 | 137:1 138:13 | lit | 150:25 |
| 110:1,19 | 157:20 | 157:19 | 153:18 |
| 137:7 139:13 | lights | literally | long-term |
| Legally | 121:8 157:13 | 107:6 118:21 | 95:2 |
| 137:12 160:5 | limit | 119:6 166:15 | longer |
| leggy | 33:3,5 | literature | 28:6 72:4 |
| 41:2 42:10 | 103:21 | 62:11 | 126:18 |
| 44:20 | 148:13 | little | look |
| Lenahan | 151:16 152:2 | 21:21 26:18, | 15:24,25 |
| 3:19,21,23, | limitation | 19,20 27:14, | 38:1 51:12 |
| 25 4:2,4,6, | 152: 4,11 | 15 29:12,16 | 61:10,20 |
| 8,10,12,14, | 153:2 | 30:3 42:4,5 | 84:19 89:13 |
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| 90:15 102:21 | 96:3 | 117:11 | margin |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 107:1 108:21 | lower | 118:13 128:9 | 39:3 92:10, |
| 125:12 | 30:14 31:6,7 | 134:24 | 13 |
| 130:13 | 42:5 | 135:21,25 | mark |
| 136:23,24 | lowering | 136:1, 6, 15, | 13:19 15:11 |
| 137:3 143:6 | $148: 13$ | 18 137:4 | marked |
| 145:21 | lucky | 140:9 142:1 | 14:1 15:7 |
| 154:24 | 45:4 | 144:15,19 | 99:25 100:3 |
| 155:23 |  | 146:6,8,17 | market |
| 157:15 |  | 148:19 156:5 | 5:11 86:11 |
| 167:15 | M | 157:16 | 92:6 |
| looked | made | makes | marketing |
| 26:5 32:24 | 8:6 57:20 | 93:15 106:24 | 166:2,23 |
| 37:23 61:8 | 58:19 59:2 | 142:20 | marshal |
| 63:15 109:9 | $60: 5 \quad 90: 24$ | 152:19 | 130:5 |
| 142:19 | 101:17 | making | material |
| looking | 130:23 | 6:25 9:9 | 27:21 31:8 |
| $38: 25$ $62: 10$ $76: 18$ | 133:5,9 | $57: 12$ <br> $865: 14$ <br> $8.135: 16$ | 52:23 67:12 |
| $62: 10$ $83: 164: 17$ $84: 20$ | 143:8 155:9 | $\begin{aligned} & 86: 14 \quad 135: 16 \\ & 137: 18 \end{aligned}$ | materials |
| 89:20 90:1 | 170:20,22 | MALE | 59:22 167:16 |
| 91:1 94:25 | main | 9:12,15 | matter |
| 95:2 100:17 | 15:3 113: | 29:19,22 | 5:8 10:11 |
| 136:19 138:7 | maintained | 30:6,10 40:8 | 80:15 158:4 |
| 139:14 | 157:6,7 | 45:18 64:25 | 160:6 |
| 141:20 151:8 | maintenance | 65:13 100:8 | matters |
| 154:22 | 49:12,15 | 101:23,25 | 3:11 160:7 |
| 157:8,18 | 151:2,12 | 105:1,6,11, | matures |
| 167:4,14 | 153:5,12 | 17 123:16 | 37:5 |
| looks | major | 124:20 125:1 | max |
| 83: 4,5 | 5:9 10:11, | 129:19,23 | 19:15 171:10 |
| 157:10 | 12,13 11:3 | 132:16 | maximum |
| Loretta | 81:20 137:7, | 139:24 | 19:17 20:5 |
| 127:5 | 8 141:24 | 140:2, 6 | 24:16 |
| lot | 143:1 146:6 | 147:2 | maximums |
| 5:8 10:10 | majority | 151:10,14, | 21:16 |
| 52:22 58:14 | 7:9 169:21 | 20,22 162:20 | Mayor |
| 61:2 88:22 | make | 170:13 171:3 | 4:6,7,10,11 |
| 89:11 90:2 | 7:22 9:6 | 173:5,24 | 93:14 120:8, |
| 112:19 | 13:22 16:3 | mandated | 16,21,23 |
| 142:17 | 39:15 47:23 | 71:12 | 126:22 |
| 160:24,25 | 48:3,4 | mandating | 130:17,20 |
| 161:24 | 55:16,18 | 69:8 | 132:8,21 |
| 168:24 | 75:12 80:14 | manner | 172:15,16, |
| lots | 96:3 107:13 | 32:11 | 19,20 |
| 57:19 | 108:10 | Manny's | mean |
| louder | 112:13 | 139:18 | 27:11 29:17 |
| 56:4 77:7 | 114:13 |  | 37:15 60:18 |
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| 70:22 77:23 | 149:20 162:6 | mic's | 155:11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 78:15 82:11 | members | 96:4 | 170:10 |
| 85:22 86:22 | 7:9 10:2,16 | microphone | misspeak |
| 87:1 90:21 | 11:23 24:19 | 38:24 45:1, | 38:6 |
| 92:11 94:21 | 32:17 33:12 | 18 53:24 | mistakes |
| 98:10 | 53:10,14,18 | 93:25 95:12, | 157:22 |
| 116:12,13 | 55:4 68:6 | 18 100:23 | Mitchell |
| 117:16 | 72:6 74:13, | 111:16 121:2 | 22:23 |
| 130:14 132:6 | $1676: 4$ | 122:19,20 | mitigation |
| 136:21 | 93:21 95:7,8 | 164:25 171:2 | 143:16 |
| 138:2,10 | 98:17 113:14 | middle | 145:25 |
| 153:10 | 114:14,16 | 17:4 18:22 | 48:11 |
| 155:16 | 119:11,16, | 42:5 111:10, | 150:20 |
| means | 19,20 121:25 | 14,23 | 156:20,23 |
| 86:25 150:9 | 132:5 141:16 | miles | mitigations |
| 152:8 | 144:22 154:1 | 148:14 | 146:12 |
| meant | 157:24 158:5 | mind | MLUL |
| 42:25 107:15 | 162:18 | 6:1 115:17, | 33:16 173:10 |
| 160:9 | 169:15 | 19 | models |
| measure | memo | mine | 154:18 |
| 147:10 | 2:8 | 169:9 | modifications |
| measurements $102: 22$ | $36: 21 \text { 53:22 }$ | mini | 70:9 |
| mechanism | 54:19,23 | 58:11 | modified |
| 151:7 | 55:9,11 | min | 25:3,14,18 |
| meeting | 71:8,9,11 | 39:10 | Monday |
| 3:3,7,8,15 | 72:1 95:21 | minimum | 3 |
| 5:22,23 |  | 27:4 122:23 | mon |
| 6:11,18, 20 , |  | minus |  |
| 25 7:2,5,11, | 132:1,12 | $45: 22 \quad 102: 24$ | money |
| 16 8:8,9,11, |  | minute |  |
| 13,24 9:6,7, | memorandu $31: 20$ | 58:8 60:14 | months |
| 8,11 10:24 | 31:20 | 123:25 | 138: |
| 11:4,24 | memos |  | morning |
| 34:22 54:21 | 34:20 | minutes | 32:7 |
| 131:22 | mention | 3, | Morris |
| 171:18 | 52:13 142:16 | 69 | 110:14 |
| 173:10 174:3 | mentioned | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 23 \quad 75: 1 \\ & 123: 14 \end{aligned}$ | Moscowitz |
| meetings | 32:1,13 | $\begin{aligned} & 123: 14 \\ & 171: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 61:12,14 |
| 3:8 58:13 | 35:17 | 17 | mother |
| 173:8 | met |  | 138:20 |
| meets | 55:14 |  | motio |
| 80:23 | mic |  | 7:23 155:9, |
| member | 44:25 53:16, | misguided $142: 6$ | 21 173:22 |
| 55:3 105:15 | 19,20 56:5 |  | mound |
| 120:6 123:24 | 120:4 124:1 | missed | 26:20 |
| 126:11 127:1 | 127:15 | 105:20 | Mount |
| 134:1 141:2 | 144:17,18 | 129:15 | $80: 17,18,20$ |


| $\begin{aligned} & 109: 20 \\ & 110: 13 \end{aligned}$ |  | neighborhood | 7:21 10:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | N | 28:12 135:6 | 11:21 12:8 |
| Mountain |  | 146:15 | 17:13,20 |
| 10:9 65:1 | N.J.A.C. | 149:14 | 21:6,18,23 |
| 68:13 85:9 | 108:23 109:4 | 152:16 | 24:19 30:11 |
| 146:11 165:3 | Nah | 154:19 | 31:18 32:15 |
| moun | 127:22 | 156:21 | 36:7 48:4 |
| 13:14,19 | NAICS | neighborhoods | 49:5,9,11, |
| mouth | 61:25 | 137:24 | 13,18 50:18, |
| 58:22 | nail | neighboring | 21 53:9,14 |
| Mouthful | 132:2 | 143:22 | 54:16 65:17 |
| 70:11 | name | 147:24 | 67:1,15 |
| move | 32:19 50:18, | neighbors | $68: 3,571: 20$ $74: 8,12$ |
| 22:17 25:24 | 20 95:10,14 | 157:14 | $75: 1576: 3$ |
| 44:8 67:3 | 119:21 121:5 | never $36: 4,17$ | 91:21 92:10, |
| $72: 20111: 8$ $25112: 15$ | 149:20 | $36: 4,17$ $50: 15$ 85:5 | 20,23 93:3, |
| 25112 $137: 19$ | 150:21 |  | 12,21 94:1 |
| moved | 153:11 | news | 95:6,14,18 |
| moved $69: 9$ | naming | nice | 98:17 100:9, |
| movement147:9 |  | 9:25 38:20 | 12 113:13 |
|  | 17:9 20:24 | 57:17 | 114:1 119:9, |
| moving | 21:5 | Nick | 120:1,25 |
| 22:7,20 | nature | 38:14,22,23 | 121:4,24 |
| 111:3 112:12 | 20:14 102:8 | 39:25 53:13 | 122:4,19,21 |
| multifamily | necessary | 56:4 59:17 | 123:1,13,18, |
| 5:10 | 101:18 | 81:8 82:21 | 23 125:4 |
| multiple | 156:20 | 83:3,19 | 126:5,25 |
|  | need | 93:23 94:11 | 129:4 130:8, |
| multiplier | 7:18 8:3 | Nick's | 10 131:4,15 |
| 88:16 92:7 | 30:2,12 | 48:17 | 133:25 |
| multipliers | 86:11 101:11 | night | 138:15 139:3 |
| 88:8,14 92:4 | 144:18 147:5 | 9:25 79:7 | 140:15,18,24 |
| municipal | 171:8,12 | nine | 141:1,7 |
| 3:5 24:14 | needed | 86:7 | 144:17 |
| 79:24 82:1 | 29:23 156:23 | non- | 145:21 |
| 115:3 148:10 | needs | residential | 146:20 |
| 159:16 | 5:13 44:24 | 10:14 | 149:18 |
| municipalitie | 83:9 122:19 | nonresidentia | 150:22,24 |
|  | 137:3 154:4 |  | 153:3,8,14, |
| S 108:24 |  | 94:9 | 16,25 154:4 |
| municipality | 110:24 | nonsmoking | 157:23 |
| $80: 24$$161: 6$ | negotiat | 138:22 | 158:2,8 |
|  | $171: 12$ | 139:4,5 | 161:4 163:19 |
|  |  | Nordelo | 164:3,16 |
|  | $65: 4$ | $3: 2,194: 14$ | 165:10,23 |
|  | 65:4 | $155: 1,5$ | 167:17,23 |
|  |  |  | 170:1 171:8 |
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| 172:23,24 | object | 19:24 24:18, | 132:23 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 173:19,22,25 | 8:16,18 | 23 29:1,18 | 133:18,23 |
| 174:2 | objection | 30:11 31:4 | 134:17,19,20 |
| north | 9:12 54:14 | 32:15,17 | 135:2 136:19 |
| 14:14 22:7, | objections | 34:2 35:7,16 | 137:18 |
| 21 31:2 | 75:8 | 36:23 37:1 | 138:19 139:1 |
| 106:17 | observations | 39:4,12,25 | 140:1,20,25 |
| northbound | 105:16 | 40:11,14,19 | 145:3,8,10 |
| 22:2 | obtain | 41:23 43:1 | 146:20,21 |
| northern | 102:6 | 44:3 47:18 | 147:3 149:6 |
| 23:10 30:13 | obviously | 48:1 50:16, | 151:23 |
| 102:25 | obviously $78: 15 \quad 79: 14$ | 22 52:6 | 153:24 |
| 103:15 104:9 | 84:17 85:12 | 53: 8, 12, 24 | 155:15 |
| 114:4 | 116:8 117:9 | 54:2,5,16, | 156:2,4 |
| note | 128:7 135:8 | 18,22 55:19 | 158:15,20 |
| 30:1 142:21 | 137:25 | 58:5 61:4 | 159:11 |
| notes |  | 63:9,21 | 160:8,11 |
| 32:8 89:14 | 64 | 64:19 65:12 | 161:22 |
| 131:6 |  | 66:18,21 | 162:3,16 |
| otice |  | 68:4,22 69:6 | 164:3,5,7 |
| 3:8 7:2 |  | 70:6 71:1,21 | 165:5,9,22 |
| 173.9 | October | 72:2,20 73:5 | 166:9 167:24 |
| : 9 | 14:10 | 74:11,12,19 | 168:9,15 |
| noticed | offhand | 76:16,17 | 169:9,12,13, |
| 143:12 | 105:9 | 78:12 81:4 | 14 170:2 |
| November | office | 83:14 84:17 | 171:23,24 |
| 94:3 | 32:2 48:17 | 86:13,16 | 172:2,5 |
| number | 58:10,23,24 | 87:19 88:7 | 173:1,7,11, |
| 5:5 6:16,24 | 59:2,11,14, | 89:21,25 | 17 |
| 7:14 10:7 | 19,21 60:2,6 | 91:20 96:12 | on- |
| 23:7 43:20 | 64:22 65:20 | 97:2,8,20 | 84:8 |
| 100:19,22,23 | 66:2 96:8 | 98:2,16,21 | once |
| 101:20 | 103:6 160:25 | 100:25 | 80:7 88:2 |
| 161:23 | 161:1,6,25 | 101:24 | 138:2 168:1 |
| numbers | offices | 102:20 | one |
| 13:24 90:6 | 59:19 | 103:19 | 6:9,22 11:2, |
| 92:2 163:8 | official | 105:18 | 17 13:20,24 |
| nurseries | 130:24 | 107:20 112:9 | 15:4 16:20 |
| 27:17 28:22 | 133:3,4,5, | 113:25 | 21:6 22:25 |
|  | 12,13 | 114:12 | 25:2,18 |
| 0 | offs | 115:25 116:7 | 29:20 36:5, |
|  | 86:4 | 118:11 | 13 39:6 |
| -'clocks | okay | 119:19 | 40:25 41:1, |
| 173:2 | 5:15 8:22 | 120:16 | 2,4,8 47:22 |
| oath | 9:13, 25 | 121: | 52:18 54:10 |
| 12:18 75:21, | 10:3,4 12:15 | 1 | 58:7 62:19 |
| 23 99:12 | 14:12,21 |  | 66:16,23 |
| 23 99:12 | 15:16 16:6 | $\begin{array}{ll} 124: 12 & 125: 1 \\ 128: 25 & 130: 7 \end{array}$ | 71:6 76:12 |



| paved | personal | pines | 38:2,8 51:1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 109:6,11 | 105:16 | 16:15 30:2 | 58:7,21 |
| pawn | personally | 42: 4, 10 | 59:4,8 62:24 |
| 44:10 | 14:20 77:17 | 44:20 | 63:2,4,5 |
| payment | 79:16 102:20 | pipe | 64:11,13,23 |
| 93:17 | petrochemical | 115:2 | 66:8,10,14, |
| PB-22002 | 59:24 | Pistol | 17,20 67:19, |
| 10:7 | photo | 3:21, 22 | 25 68:13,18 |
| PB22-003 | 17:3 22:24 | 113:15,16, | 69:13,22 |
| 5:6 | 35:24 40:25 | 20,25 | 70:19 71:13 |
| Pedde | 107:2,4 | 144:16,18 | $72: 2,4$ 73:2, |
| 4:8,9 | photograph | 161:4,5,10, | 12,14,18 |
| 172:17,18 | 16:18,19,23 | 17,20,22 | 4 75:2 |
| pedestrian | 18:18 | 162:3,11,13, | 78:23 79:19 |
| 39:23 70:1 | photographs | 16,18,22,25 | 81:5,10,21 |
| pedestrians | 18:15 166:13 | 163:2 164:19 | 82:2,6,17 |
| 115:6 | photos | 165:5,9 | 83:16 85:8 |
| people | 116:17 | 172:5,6 | 105:22 122:9 |
| 28:10 33:6, | 156:11 | pla | 124:16 142:9 |
| 21 61:10 | Photoshop | $16 \cdot 1317 \cdot 9$ | 145:18,24 |
| 115: 6 | 18:19 | 16:13 17:9 | 146:24 |
| 128:17,23 | photoshopped | 18:4 23 20: | 148:24 |
| 144:7 164:23 | 23:7 | 50:23 51:4,7 | 149:11 |
| 167:13 | pick | 59:10 63:16 | 150:20 |
| percent | 29:15 139:25 | 64:1 68:12, | 151:1,13 |
| 57:16 59:14 | picked | 15 69:9 | planner |
| 65:2 85:21 | 28:17 | 90:20 118:3 | 10:24,25 |
| 86:7 102:22 | picking | 124:2,5 | 63:9 67:17 |
| 103:13,14 | 96:2 106:16, | 127:6 136 | 68:12,22 |
| 104:9,25 | 18 | 141:6,25 | 69:3 71:3,19 |
| 113:22 | picture | 143:12,22 | 74:2 75:12 |
| Perfect | 35:18 120:9 | 144:3,8,14 | 96:20 97:3, |
| 133:22 | 137:4 | 147:25 | 7,13 111:19 |
| period | piece | 149:22 | planners |
| 63:25 161:21 | 126:7 | 150:15 | 92:24 |
| 171:11 | pilot | 158:13,19 | planning |
| perishing | 77:10,14,25 | 162:7,9,21 | 3:3 20:4 |
| 28:15 | 78:5,10,13, | places | 23:16 44:6 |
| permission | 15,19 80:7 | 121:4 | 58:13 65:2 |
| 126:14 | 83:25 85:1,3 | plan | 68:7, 23 |
| permitted | pilot-based | 5:9 10:13,14 | 70:21 71:4 |
| 58:16,20 | 76:21 | 13:18 14:2 | 81:17 82:9, |
| 82:15 148:21 | pilots | 16:24 19:6 | 14 83:12 |
| 149:12 | 93:6 | 21:1 24:6, | 95:25 96:8 |
| perpetuity | pine | 12,14 27:7 | 97:5 102:16, |
| 153:15,17 | 41:3,8 43:1 | 30:7,9 35:17 | 18 112:3 |
|  | 41.3,8 4 .1 | $36: 11$ 37:24 | 133:2 142:3 |
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| 148:4 154:18 | 55:16 67:16 | pond | potentially |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 164:20 167:8 | 77:7 95:14 | 106:21 | 42:10 138:12 |
| plans | 114:20 120:4 | poor | practical |
| 13:16 18:9 | 124:7 134:1 | 30:1 | 104:1 |
| 29:25 32:6 | 144:17 | popped | practice |
| 131:2 133:5 | 149:20 173:2 | 82:18 | 125:14 |
| 143:12 | pleasing | population | prefer |
| 144:25 | 32:12 | 163:25 | 132:4,6 |
| plant | Pledge | portion | preliminary |
| 18:6,10 | 3:16,18 | 5:20 8:7 | 5:9 10:11, |
| 45:14 48:10 | plenty | 14:5 18:25 | 12,13 81:20 |
| planted | 116:23 | 22:21 23:11, | 82:6 83:16 |
| 22:13 56:11 | 154:17 | 13 30:24 | prep |
| planter | podium | 31:1 57:14 | 165:7 |
| 57:24 | 53:18 | 69:15,17 | preparation |
| planting | point | 73:19 89:7 | 68:17 77:2 |
| 13:7 15:5,6 | 19:14 21:9 | 129:5 148:14 | prepare |
| 16:12 17:4, | 32:9 36:18 | portions | 78:25 81:22 |
| 5,6,12,22,23 | 43:21 44:15, | 16:14 42:6 | prepared |
| 18:3, 22, 23 | 22 68:12 | 45:3 56:9 | 14:12,16 |
| 19:5,11,12, | 69:6 103:23 | pose | 15:17 31:21 |
| 16,17,21,22 | 104:1,11,13, | 137:7 | $32: 7,877: 23$ |
| 20:3,13,25 | 16 112:12 | position | 78:22 100:2 |
| 21:13 22:9, | 114:3,8,10 | 108:10 | 105:25 |
| 19 23:1,4,14 | 120:18 124:3 | 109:25 | present |
| 25:10 27:21 | 127:24 | positions | 123:4 |
| $28: 6$ $30: 29$ 29:8 | 156:3,6,15 | 20:17 | presentation |
| $30: 22 \quad 48: 11$ $50: 951: 7$ | 157:16 | positive | 10:19 |
| $50: 9$ 22,24 52:7, 2, | pointing | 80:5 | presented |
| $\begin{aligned} & 22,2452: 2, \\ & 3,4 \end{aligned}$ | 26:2 145:6 | possibility | 10:22 124:14 |
| plantings |  | 20:10 | 154:16 |
| 16:16 18:7 |  | possible | presenting |
| 24:16 51:1 |  | 31:16 115:8 | 60:23 103:7 |
| 57:19 | 21,22 | $16: 12$ | preservation |
| play | 112:12,15 | 117:22 | 52:16 |
| 8:20 21:16 | 16,22,25 |  | preserve |
| 26:12 134:4 | police | possibly | 26:24 31:12, |
| played | 130:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 25 \quad 116: 15 \\ & 136 \cdot 27 \end{aligned}$ | 17 52:22 |
| 9:16,17 | 137:25 | 138:12 | preserving |
| please | Policy |  | 26:15 |
| 3:17,20 9:18 | 92:19 | $160: 24$ | presumably |
| 12:22 14:22 | poll | 161:1,5,25 | 75:11 |
| 16:25 17:15, | 171:7,20,22 | posted | pretty |
| 25 19:14,20 | $172: 1$ | posted <br> $3 \cdot 11$ | 22:12,13 |
| 20:11 32:18 | polled | 3:11 | 31:8 43:3 |
| 36:24 38:20, | $72: 10$ | potential | 105:12 112:5 |
| 24 48:5 49:9 |  | 94:6 | 120:17 |


| previous | 123:19 125:5 | 62:16 63:13, | provide |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63:23 157:3 | proceeding | 23 89:25 | 13:6 20:8 |
| previously | 174:4 | 104:14 108:6 | 32:10 35:25 |
| 75:21 103:6 | process | 114:4 136:1 | 42:15 47:1 |
| 112:19 | 154:13 | 150:7,11 | 57:9 77:5,14 |
| price | product | 151:2 153:19 | 89:8,15,18 |
| 54:10 | 32:4 | 154:24 | 116:22 |
| primary | Production | 155:23 | 153:21 |
| 60:24 | 64:4 | 15 | provided |
| principle | roducts | 160:4,5,13, | 3:9 6:6 |
| 112:3 | $59: 24$ | 14 161:14,15 | 16:20 25:9 |
| prior | professional | 166:2,10 | 39:7 48:9 |
| 5:1 16:23 | 48:14,15 | : 4 | 52:25 56:1, |
| 26:6 | 52:11 53:15 | proposal | 7,14 59:13 |
| prist | $62: 968: 8$ | 19:25 29:24 | 75:22 91:2 |
| 151:5,6 | 74:1,15 | 151:11,15 | 102:3 129: |
| 153:6 156:25 | professionals |  | providing |
| private | 119:13 | pr | 18:20 24:2 |
| 160:4 162:12 | proffer | 3:24 143 | 43:25 45:5,9 |
| privately- | 85:6 | proposed | 8:2 102:11 |
| 40:6 | profitability |  |  |
| privately | 88:2, 6 | 23:5,10 | 83:15 90:16 |
| owned | program | 27:14 43:7,9 | 110:12 |
| 70:10 | 78:19 | 48:11 51:2, | sion |
| privy | prohibit | 3,7,11,21,24 | 66:13,17 |
| 69:4 | 33:17 | 52:4,7 68:13 | runed |
| proactively | project | $70: 20 \quad 72: 24$ | 30:5 |
| 11:4 | 80:5 84:15 | $74: 4$ 79:22 | Prunty |
| probably | 86:3,24 | 81:24 143:3, | 4:6,7 93:14 |
| 72:11 107:4 | 87:6,24 88:2 | 10 144:1 | 120:8,16,21. |
| 118:22 136:4 | 94:8,13 | 148:15 | $23 \text { 126:22 }$ |
| 140:16 | 154:17 | proposing | 130:17,20 |
| 147:12 | 156:16 165:7 | 22:10 40:17 | 132:8,21 |
| 157:1,5 | projections | 42:2,7 | 172:15,16 |
| problem | 86:15 | 43:14,22 | public |
| 9:5,9,11 | prolonged | 49:16 69:14 | 3:7 5:20 8:6 |
| 33:15,23 | 63:25 | 73:10 107:8, | 10:20 11:1, |
| 57:13 137:9 | pro | 18 151:17 | 6,7,22,24 |
| problematic | 121:1 | prospective | 12:2 32:17, |
| 90:15 | proofs | 166:24 | 25 33:4,12, |
| problems | 111:1 113:9 | protect | 25 34:1 40:7 |
| 79:16 | 121:19 | 103:24 | 53:10,14,18 |
| proceed | properties | 108:25 | 54:20 55:5 |
| 6:3 21:7 | 39:10,11 | prov | 64:6 68:6 |
| 48:5 54:16 | property | 110:2 | 70:10 71:17 |
| 65:18 95:6 | 15:9 22:8 | proved | 72:6 74:14, |
| 101:19 | 39:7,8 49:4 | 110:3 | 17 76:1 |
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| 85:14 90:4 | 160:20 | questioned | railroad |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 91:22 95:7,9 | 166:11 171:2 | 34:17 | 23:12 31:3 |
| 98:18 109:1, | putting | questioning | 99:22 |
| 2 119:15,16, | 60:20 92:25 | 11:1 35:11 | rain |
| 20 121:25 | 153:1 167:7 | 48:5 53:13 | 106:16 |
| 123:5,14,23, |  | 141:24 | rains |
| 24 124:17 | 0 | questions | 106:14 |
| 125:7,11 | $Q$ | 12:1 24:18 | 117:20 118:6 |
| 126:2,4 | qualified | $31: 25$ 32:18 | raise |
| 127:2 134:1 | 75:22 | 33:16 35:5, | 124:6 127:7 |
| 141:2,3 | qualify | 15 36:25 | 134:9 |
| 142:2 149:8, | qualify | 49:21 50:24 | 152:24,25 |
| 20154 $157 \cdot 24$ | quantities | 53:10 54:7, | raised |
| 157 | 19:11,14 | 10,11,17 | 11:3 94:4 |
| 162:6,19 | 24:13 | 55:10 60: | 99:14 101:3 |
| 167:25 | question | 63:17 68: | 102:15 123:6 |
| 168:3,5 | 13:15 21:6 | 74:17, 68 ( | Ramen |
| 169:16 173:8 | 24:21 31:19 | 76:2,5,19 | 119 |
| public's | 34:18 35:10, | 79:12 85:17 | ranging 86:6 |
| 72:9 | 12,16 36:7,9 | 93:22, 23 |  |
| pull | 41:5,7 42:22 | 94:4 95:5,7, | Rappa |
| 38:14 127:15 | 48:20 49:5, | 9 98:18 | 4:4,5 |
| 132:12 | 13 51:14 | 113:12,13 | 172:10,13,14 |
| purpose | $54: 8$ 55:16 | 119:10,11,17 | Raritan |
| 38:2,4,5,9, | $23: 58: 5,9$ $60: 10,22$ | 122:1 134:22 | 14:4 22:6 |
| 13 57:22 | $61: 4,9 \text { 65:7, }$ | 138:25 141:4 |  |
| 79:17,20 | 61:4,9 65:7, $1866: 5$ | 142:4,15 | 135:9 139:18 |
| 106:9,22 | 187:2,3,12 | 145:17 | 142:25 143:1 |
| 111:12 | 67:2,3,12, | 164:12 | 166: |
| 166:19 | 15,22 68:20 | 165:12,14 | Rariton |
| 169:23 | 71:7,18 | 168:12 | 22:1 |
| purposely | $74: 6,7,22$ $78: 22,79: 5$ | quick | rate |
| 55:5 71:16 |  | 13:15 91:21 | 5:11 19:22 |
| 106:12 | 11 84:1,21r | 155:3 | 45:21 87:8 |
| 118:13 | 25 85:16 | quicker | 88:25 92:6 |
| purposes | $\begin{aligned} & 86: 17 \\ & 1993: 4 \end{aligned}$ | 28:14 46:9 | 114:23 |
| 82:9 173:11 | 94:5 97:16, | quickly | ates |
| pushed | 24 98:4,7,11 | 146:22 | 86:10 |
| 26:17,18 | 99:14,19 | quote | re- |
| put | 101:3,10 | 60:2 76:20 | 25: |
| 16:24 26:20 | 104:6 116:8 | 81:16 | read |
| 42:11 58:22 | 119:20 120:7 |  | 6:7 35:11 |
| 67:25 106:12 | 122:6 124:3, | R | 36:24 38:23 |
| 108:13 | 13 125:5 | R | 39:13 40:5 |
| 110:8,25 | 127:23 |  | 47:13 53:21 |
| 111:20 | 134:21 155:3 | rack $149: 14$ | 54:1 55:10, |
| 125:19 | 161:5 164:19 |  | 11 70:13 |


| 84:18 91:1 | recitation | redevelopment | relate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reading | 3:18 | 37:24 38:2,8 | 58:14 |
| 38:19 | recollections | 58:7,21 | related |
| ready | 144:22 | 59:4,8 | 58:14 60:11 |
| 24:7 66:23 | recommend | 62:21,24 | 63:7 64:4 |
| 95:11 160:16 | 6:14 7:7 | 63:1,2,4,5 | 69:7 80:16 |
| real | 27:18 42:12 | 64:11,13,23 | 90:2 102:9, |
| 44:7 | 106:11 118:1 | 66:8,10,14, | 11 164:13,20 |
| realign | recommendatio | 17,20 67:18 | relates |
| 24:24 |  | 68:18 69:12, | 11:13 13:7 |
| realigned | 98:3 139:2,3 | 22 71:13 | 65:8 81:1 |
| $68: 14$ | 140:10,23 | 72:2 73:2,5, | 116:8 |
| realize | recommendatio | $\begin{aligned} & 8,13,17 \\ & 79: 1981: 10 \end{aligned}$ | relating |
| 94:24 |  | 79.1981 .10 | 70 |
| realized | 13:6 101:17 | $142: 2 \quad 155: 12$ | 99:20 |
| 94:7 | 133:6,9 |  | relation |
| rear | recommended <br> 35:21 48:1 | $110: 18$ | $27: 23$ <br> relative |
| 26:18 |  | refer | 11:7 12:2 |
| reason $20: 13$ | $6: 22$ | 62:7 99:25 | 14:25 24:4,5 |
| $140: 9$ | reco | reference | 80:22 99:15, |
| easonab | 99:16 | 24:4 73: | 22 101:3,17 |
| $110: 16$ | record | 00:22, | 110:12 |
| rebuttal | 9:18 12:16 | referencing | Relax |
| 123:9 168:7 | 14:2 15:13 |  | 73:4 |
| recall | 38:19 47:13 | referring | released |
| 97:17 100:3 | 55:7 56:22 |  | 71:16 |
| 131:21 | 65:1 72:15 |  | relevant |
| 150:20 | 75:20 99:5,9 | 79:10 85:2 | 39:13 67:12 |
| 170:23 | 100:1 | refresher | 80:22 81:2 |
| 170.23 | 108:11,13 | 112:18 | 87:17 93:13 |
| eceive | 110:8 112:10 | regard | 167:17 |
| 22:15 | 122:21 127:4 | 12:2 19:13 | relie |
| $\begin{aligned} & 138 \\ & 101: \end{aligned}$ | 132:2,23 | 150:23 | 125:19 |
|  | 133:1 158:11 | regarding | 168:23 |
|  | 168:10 | 31:22 96:11, | relocation |
| $19: 793$ | 169:14 | 12 | 74:3 |
| $95: 25 \quad 96: 8$ | recording | regular | relocations |
| 97:11,14 | 140:1 | 83:14 153:5 | 73:10 |
| receives 91:6 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rectify } \\ & 30: 2131: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rehash } \\ & \text { 108:19 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { rely } \\ & \text { 92:24 } \end{aligned}$ |
| recent | recused | reinventin | remain |
| 61:15 76:9 | 4:16 | 125:16 | 12:18 27: |
| 10 88:13 | red | reiterate | 39:22 43:8,9 |
| 144:25 | 103:25 | 24:25 131:9 | 69:13,25 |
| ecess | 136:25 137:1 | 150:14 153:9 | 70:13,15,16, |
| 75:16,18 |  | 154:11 | 18 73:20 |


| 75:23 91:10 | 155:4,22 | representatio | requirements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 99:11 106:24 | renderings | nal | 47:13 109:5 |
| 107:21 | 56:19 | 18:15 | requires |
| remainder | rent | representatio | 7:15 155:12 |
| 104:19 | 167:14 | nally | research |
| remaining | rents | 16:10 | 59:10 92:19 |
| 25:22 56:9 | 86:11 | representatio | reseed |
| remember | reorg | ns | 23:25 |
| 32:19 34:6 | 170:16,18 | 17:8 | reserve |
| 71:7 85:20 | 171:9,15 | representativ | 123:4,8 |
| 131:17,18 | 173:3,4,15 |  | reserved |
| 132:4,15 | repairing | 13:4 | 3:12 |
| 141:3 | 28:8 | represented | residence |
| remembered | repeat | 24:14 | 159:22 |
| 11:20 | 17:13,15 | representing | residential |
| remind | 64:20 | 17:15 75:4 | 10:13 65:2 |
| 10:21 | repetitious | request | 78:2 80:16 |
| reminder | 33:18,19 | 6:10,17 7:11 | 87:9 122:9 |
| 104:22 | 67:21 | 79:14 108:15 | 128:1,6 |
| reminding | repetitive | 113:17 143:8 | 135:17 |
| 129:6 | 47:25 64:21 | 148:2,3 | 143:11,21 |
| remiss | replace | 152:14 | 146:14 147:1 |
| 155:20 | 50:5,11 | 155:22 | 152:16 |
| remove | replacement | 159:18 | 154:20 |
| 45:6 50:3 | 102:9 | 163:14 | 157:15 |
| 55:20 69:15 | replaci | 170:20,22 | 160:13 |
| 70:21 72:7, | 104:23,24 | requested | 161:15 |
| 8,10,12 | replanting | 65:6 168:24 | 163:14,17,20 |
| 73:16,19 | 20:21 | requesting | residents |
| 147:3 |  | 24:9 | 16:22 141:22 |
| removed | $77: 11,13$ | requests | 144:14 146:2 |
| 23:5 42:24 | 86:19 90:23, | 8:5,6,23 | 152:25 |
| 52:8 72:11, | 25 92:18 | 147:19 | 154:19 156:9 |
| 13 106:10 | $94: 2,3,21$ | 157:10 | 163:14,16 |
| removing | 131:13 | require | 166:12,24 |
| 42:13 56:3, | 132:10 | 6:16 81:21 | resolve |
| 8,12 117:18 |  | 84:10 155:13 | 102:14 |
| rendered | $135: 4$ | required | respect |
| 17:17 22:24 | representatio | 6:21 28:25 | 146:25 |
| 71:9 110:19 | $\mathbf{n}$ | 66:16 83:7,8 | 152:24 |
| rendering | 11:12 20:4 | 85:11 157:20 | respectfully |
| 36:5,11 | 23:16 24:3 | requirement | 110:11,20 |
| 40:16 47:7, | 12 43:19 | 108:18 | respects |
| 18 50:25 | 58:18 59:1 | 109:10 | 91:8 |
| 51:5 52:25 | 60:6,19 | 113:21 | respond |
| 56:16,22 | 60:6,19 | 154:25 | 112:10 |
| 57:11 154:23 |  | 155:4,5,8,12 | 168:11 |


| responding 61:3 | reviewed $96: 13 \quad 128: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124: 6125: 3 \\ & 25126: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \text { roll } \\ 3: 1 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| response | 129:4,8 | 127:7 130:9, | room |
| 101:16 | 130:4 131:23 | 10 132:1,6, | 3:5 116:22 |
| 168:18 | 133:5,14 | 12 133:20 | 117:3 |
| responses | revise | 134:9 136:17 | root |
| 168:14,20 | 67:25 | 143:10,25 | 27:23 28:4, |
| rest | revised | 144:3,12 | 21,24 |
| 42:8 43:3 | 78:17 79:10 | 145:7 149:6 | roots |
| rested | 84:2 | 153:14,23 | 26:10 28:9 |
| 169:15,16 | rezone | 157:17 | 30:17,22 |
| restriction | 80:24 | 158:18,19,21 | Rothschild |
| 139:21 | Rhatican | 159:3 160:1, | 10:17 |
| restrictions | 164:24 |  | rough |
| 66:12 | 165:2,6 |  | 19:22 46:11 |
| restricts | right | $1$ | round |
| 66:10 | 8:1 14:12, |  | 108:22 |
| resubmission | 14,16 15:22 | ring | 109:3, 9,15, |
| 101:18 | 16:8 25:4,23 | 89:23 | 18,19,21 |
| resubmitted | 26:4,5,16 | $3 \cdot 16$ | 110:7 |
| 75:2 | 31:18 32:21 | 3:16 | routine |
| result | 33:11 34:6 | risk | 153:5 |
| 11:14 35:20 | 36:13 40:3 | 26:10 28:2, | row |
| resulting | 43:16,23 | 15 | 21:1 |
| 5:22 | 49:19,24 | Rita 32:23 53:21 | rule |
| results | 51:13 52:17 | 95:15,16,19 | 109:21 110:7 |
| 92:7 | $54: 355: 2,3$ | 96:2 121:6 | rules |
| reused | 56:15,25 | 154:2 | 108:16,21,22 |
| 25:3 | 59:6 62:21 | iv | 109:4, 9,15, |
| revenue | 64:7 65:10, | 118:20 | 18,19 110:6 |
| 88:21 89:5, | 12,16 68:4 | road | ruling |
| 7,13 90:14 | 69:12 72:5 | 14:4 22:6 | 48:3,4 158:4 |
| revenues | 75:25 89:15, | 25:8 31:8 | run |
| 86:2 88:6 | 16 90:11 | 32:24 95:20 | 26:10 28:2, |
| reverify | 91:3,6 92:8 | 116:20,25 | 14 |
| 99:17 101:4 | 94:11 98:1, | 121:7 135:9, | runoff |
| reverse | 16 99:4 | 12 138:5 | 106:14,19,20 |
| 7:9,23 | 100:21 103:9 | 139:18 | 114:23 |
| review | 107:17 | 142:25 143:1 | rushed |
| 12:25 13:5 | 111:9,10 | 148:17 149:2 | 34:25 154:15 |
| 24:15 32:6,8 | 112:6 113:2, | 154:3 160:2, | Rutger's |
| 75:12 81:18 | $20114: 24$ | 3 165:17 | 92:16,18 |
| 97:20 120:15 | 115:12 | roads |  |
| 130:23 | 116:8,13 | 149:1 | S |
| 131:2,5,12 | 120:19,22 | roadway |  |
| 141:19 169:8 | 121:5,23 | 22:7 26:19 | safest |
|  | 123:8,19 | 117:10 | 118: 4 |


| safety | scheduled | second | seeing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 30:4 116:8, | 8:25 169:6 | 17:24 73:5 | 7:24 31:18 |
| 15 117:2,24 | scheme | 76:21 108:22 | 57:13,25 |
| 119:8 136:22 | 15:5,6,9 | 109:3 120:6 | 74:18 97:17 |
| 137:2 138:17 | 16:12 17:5, | 123:12 | 98:20 111:19 |
| sake | 12,22,25 | 136:23 | 122:2 135:6 |
| 31:21 | 18:3,22 | 144:20 | 136:25 145:1 |
| Saleh | 19:5,21,22 | 157:25 | seeking |
| 97:1 | 21:13 22:9, | 173:25 174:1 | 5:9 10:11 |
| sat | 19 23:1,4,14 | seconds | 24:7 73:11 |
| 131:16 | 44:7,8,11 | 158:1 | 75:5 166:12 |
| satisfaction | 51:7,22,24 | section | selected |
| 102:16 | 52: $2,3,4$ | 22:8,10,12 | 37:7 163:9 |
| satisfied | schemes | 23:3 38:25 | Sen |
| 32:10 110:3 | 19:12 20:4, | 39:13,14 | 4:2,3 76:6, |
| save | 13 50:9 | 40:1,4 58:21 | 7,13,15,17, |
| 54:13 | school | 69:22 81:13 | 25 77:9,16, |
| saying | 84:19 91:23 | 99:20 128:21 | 18,21 78:7, |
| 30:15 52:2 | 93:4 | secured | 14 79:3,12, |
| 68:10 72:9, | schools | 146:2 | 17,25 80:10 |
| 18,19 77:9 | 78:20 93:7, | see | 81:4 84:17 |
| 88:1 105:23 | 11,17 | 8:20 18:23 | 86:5,13,16, |
| 106:6 108:17 | scientific | 32:9 33:10, | 22,25 87:10, |
| 115:13 | 62:4 | 11 34:1 | 12,19 88:1, |
| 117:12,21 | scope | 35:24 37:15, | 7,11,13,16, |
| 129:2,14,24 | 11:13 68:1 | 17 39:25 | 19 89:4,11, |
| 130:2 131:18 | 93:13 167:17 | 40:1,11 | 20,22 90:21 |
| 135:23 | screaming | 44:5,10,16 | 93:4,10,12 |
| 136:10 139:1 | 128:24 | 47:3 51:13 | 115:8,12,16, |
| 141:15 147:8 | screen | 59:4 60:24 | 18,19,25 |
| 155:13 161:2 | 23:8 38:3 | 61:5,20 | 116:2,7 |
| 167:10 | 100:6,15 | 67:18 68:13 | 117:15 |
| 168:17 | 102:20 | 69:7 74:22, | 118:16 119:9 |
| 171:9,11 | screening | 23 82:2 | 120:9 |
| says | 19:18 20:6 | 91:23,25 | 131:11,15 |
| 5:19 33:3,16 | 24:17 32:11 | 92:5 100:21 | 172:11,12 |
| 47:15 53:23 | 36:1 47:11 | 101:6 102:19 | sense |
| 55:14, 20 | 57:10 58:3 | 112:21 | 66:1 106:24 |
| 70:14 81:16 | screens | $117: 1 \text { 118:14 }$ | separate $82: 11$ |
| 82:2,12,17 | 128:11 | $120: 8$ | $161: 13,14$ |
| $83: 16$ 111.6 84: 122:17 | scrolling | 123:20,21 | separately |
| $\begin{aligned} & 111: 6122: 17 \\ & 148: 10 \end{aligned}$ | 59:5 | 128:18 | $13: 19$ |
|  | search | 145:18 | September |
| $16: 24$ | 62 | 150:5,10 | 71:9 |
| schedule | Seckler | 156:18 | seriously |
| 48:8 124:15 | 103:6 | 157:12,13 | $135: 1,15$ |


| service | shot | $103: 2,13,22$ | sir |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| services | shoulder | 105:7 1 | 165:24 |
| 90:4 162:1 | 120:23 | 10,15,21 | site |
| set | shoulders | 107:23 | 5:9 10:12,14 |
| 12:22 24:12 | 120:19 | 109:24 | 11:9 13:1,4 |
| 46:22, 25 | show | 111:11,12, | 15:2 16:14 |
| 57:17 73:1 | 22:4 40:15 | 23,24 112:16 | 18:5 20:15 |
| 75:2 79:20 | 51:1,21 | 113:21,22 | 22:21 23:11 |
| 142:12 | 82:16 | 114:5,9,25 | 26:22 30:4 |
| 173:20 | showed | 115:4,9,11, | 32:2,5 41:11 |
| setting | 83:19 105:23 | 20 116:9,16, | 58:15,17 |
| 139:16 |  | 20,25 117:4 | 60:12,18 |
| settlement | $17: 1 \quad 104: 1$ | 118:2,8,15, | 63:24 64:2 |
| 77:24 80:17 | 113:2 145:4 | 21 119:7 | 65:6 78:23 |
| seven | 113.2145 .4 | 122:10,12 | 80:20,21,23 |
| 69:20 85:20 | shown $32: 375$ | sidewalks | 81:21 82:6 |
| 86:7 105:23 | 145:18 | 107:7,8 | 83:16 99:21 |
| 171:21 173:2 | 146:24 | 109:1,6,10 | 102:20 |
| seven-foot | show | 111:7,20,22 | 116:5,7 |
| 27:8 103:2 | 73:10 | sight | 20:12 122:9 |
| 106:2 | 45:1 | 136:2 137:5 | 38:8 143: |
| several | shrubs | sightlines <br> 21:4 | 144:5 <br> sitting |
| 66:14 85:16 | 18:11,24 |  | $132: 14$ |
| severe $114: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 2 \quad 22: 11, \\ & 1627: 3 \end{aligned}$ | sign $74: 24 \quad 75: 8$, | six- |
| Shade | 30:22 35:18, |  | 27: |
| 13:3 | 23 36:4,18 | signage | size |
| shape | 37:9,11,19 | 51:3 53:1 | :23 28 |
| 22:14 128:1 | SIC | 143:1 | $66: 2,11$ |
| share | 61:24 | signed <br> $78 \cdot 5$ | 150:6 152: |
| 109:19 | side | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 5 \\ & 142: 2 \end{aligned}$ | 8,23 153:2 |
| shared | 22:18 26: |  | 155:20 |
| 13:9 19:6 | 30:14,15 | $21: 2 \quad 30: 19$ | slightly |
| sheets | 105:2,5,8 | 49: | 25:14,21 |
| 100:2 | 128:16,18 |  | slope |
| 125:17,18 | 135:20 137:6 | significantly $31: 680: 5$ | 103:9 114:6, |
| 168:22 | 144:2,3 |  | 22 115:23 |
| shield | 167:5 | signs <br> 74:22,23 | 117:8 |
| 57:20 | sides $99: 4$ | similar | slopes |
| shifted | 99:4 | $58: 12 \quad 60: 4,5$ | 23:20,25 |
| 43:20,22 | sidewalk |  | 106:14 |
| Shoprite $142: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 17,21 \\ & 35: 21 \quad 99: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $97: 6 \quad 169: 22$ | Slow $39: 19 \quad 59: 16$ |
| short | 17,20 100:1 | single | slower |
| $50: 24 \quad 154: 25$ | $102: 10,21,22$ |  | 27:15 |


| slowly | sole | 123:16 | spirited |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38:20 70:13 | 81:19 | 124:20 125:1 | 108:12 |
| small | solution | 129:19,23 | spoke |
| 119:1 152:9, | 11:5 | 132:16 | 112:18 152:7 |
| 12,21 | sort | 139:24 | spot |
| smaller | 71:4 87:6 | 140:2,6 | 29:8 31:15 |
| 27:14,21 | 166:23 | 147:2 | spots |
| 28:13 | sorts | $151: 10,14,$ | 29:13 126:14 |
| smattering | 60:25 | $20,22 \text { 160:8 }$ | Springfield |
| 18:10 | sought | 162:20 | 3:6 152:17, |
| Smith | 125:19 |  | 19 |
| 8:18 73:4 | sounded | 171:1,3,5,6 $173: 5,24$ | stabilization |
| 124:2,5,11, | 127:20 | $\begin{aligned} & 173: 5,24 \\ & 174: 1 \end{aligned}$ | 86:18 87:12, |
| 13 125:4,24 | sounds | speaking | 21 |
| 126:4,7,20, | 8:19 | $106: 22$ | stabilize |
| $9,14,17,20$ | south | special | 23:25 28:7 |
| $9,14,17,20$ $23128: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 5 \quad 104: 20 \\ & 115: 2 \quad 135: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 5:13 8:11,13 | stabilized $86: 24 \quad 87: 1$ |
| 129:10,16, | 166:10 | 109:7 | staff |
| 18,24 130:7, | southern | species | 29:20 32:5 |
| 11 131:10,16 | 30:14 | 42:3,7 48:11 | staggering |
| 132:13,18,24 | space | specific | 21:3 |
| 133:18,23 | 40:7 70:11 | 24:16 28:17 | staircase |
| $134: 3,4,8,$ | 150:7,9 |  | 128:19 |
| $25 \quad 135: 24$ | spaced | specifically | staircases |
| 136:16 | 71:11 | $31: 20 \quad 52: 11$ | 128:5,13 |
| 137:11,18 | sparse | 85:2 110:7, | 129:1 |
| 138:9,19 | 16:14,15 | 15 | stake |
| 139:1,5,11 | 42:5 | specify | 20:16 |
| 140:9,16,22, | speak | 94:12 | stand |
| 25 165:25 | 78:15 100:18 | specifying | 99:2 |
| 166:4,6,9, | 108:2 121:20 | $3: 10$ | standard |
| 18,21,25 | SPEAKER | specimen | 88:9 102:7, |
| 167:3,10,13, | 9:12,15 | $28: 3$ | 11 168:22 |
| 20 | 24:20,23 | speed | standards |
| smoking | 25:11 27:1 | 38:21 148:13 | 62:17 108:25 |
| 139:10,21,22 | 29:19,22 | spell | 110:18 |
| 140:23 | 30:6,10 40:8 | spell | 124:25 |
| 147:16 | 44:24 45:18 | 109:7 | 140:12 |
| snapshot | 64:25 65:13 | spending | standing |
| 85:25 | 74:21 100:8 | 86:1,9 | 32:21 150:25 |
| sneeze | 101:23,25 | spends | stands |
| 101:8 | 105:1, 6, 11, | 28:8 | 91:12 136:3 |
| soil | 17,21 106:8, | spent | Star |
| 28:14 31:6, | 25 107:3,11, | 66:14 | 3:10 |
| 16 | $17,20,23$ $108: 1,7$ | spilling | start |
|  | 108.1, | 135:8 | 14:6 21:25 |
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| supplement | 17,21 | taken | taxpayers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 18:11 24:5 | 104:10,16 | 3:15 22:25 | 89:1,15 91:3 |
| 42:8 47:16 | 105:24 | 23:7 50:8 | Taylor |
| supplementati | 106:5, 9, 15 | 52:19 59:8 | 3:25 4:1 |
| on | 114:6,25 | 61:2 75:18 | 114:1,2,12, |
| 11:15 | 115:8,10,21 | 109:12,18 | 17,19 122:3, |
| support | 117:19 118:7 | 131:6 138:17 | 4,6,15,25 |
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