MANALAPAN ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING Thursday, October 15, 2020 TOWNSHIP OF MANALAPAN Manalapan, NJ 07726

PUBLIC MEETING~ HD OFFICE SUITES

DUE COVID-19, IN ACCORDANCE WITH GOVERNOR MURPHY'S EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 107, THE PUBLIC WAS PERMITTED TO PARTICIPATE IN THIS MEETING VIA HD OFFICE SUITES BY ACCESSING THE LINK AND MEETING ID

https://meeting.windstream.com/j/1119834768?pwd=NldTVTBLNlp1d2dkOS93cUt6bV crdz09

HD-Office Suites Meeting Number:

Password: OCT152020

Open Public Meetings Act:

Stephen Leviton

Roll Call:

Janice Moench

In attendance at the meeting:

Mollie Kamen, Terry Rosenthal, Eliot Lilien Adam Weiss, Larry Cooper, Robert Gregowicz, David Schertz, Robert DiTota, Basil Mantagas

Stephen Leviton

Absent from the meeting:

None

Also, present

Ronald Cucchiaro, Zoning Board Attorney Brian Boccanfuso, Zoning Board Engineer Jennifer Beahm, Zoning Board Planner

Nancy DeFalco, Zoning Officer Janice Moench, Recording Secretary

MINUTES:

A Motion was made by Mr. Lilien, Seconded by Mr. Cooper, to approve the Minutes of July 16, 2020 as written.

Yes:

Kamen, Rosenthal, Cooper, Gregowicz, Lilien, Schertz, DiTota,

Mantagas, Leviton

No:

None

Abstain:

None

Absent:

None

Not Eligible: Weiss

A Motion was made by Mr. Schertz, Seconded by Mr. Cooper to approve the Minutes of October 1, 2020 as written.

Yes:

Kamen, Weiss, Cooper, Gregowicz, Schertz, Leviton

No:

None None

Abstain: Absent:

None

Not Eligible: Rosenthal, Lilien, DiTota, Mantagas

RESOLUTIONS:

A Motion was made by Mr. Cooper, Seconded by Mr. Gregowicz to approve the Resolution of memorialization for Application ZBE2028 Librizzi

Yes:

Kamen, Weiss, Cooper, Gregowicz, Schertz, Leviton

No:

None

Abstain: Absent:

None

None Not Eligible: Rosenthal, Lilien, DiTota, Mantagas

A Motion was made by Mr. Schertz and Seconded by Mr. Gregowicz to approve the Resolution of memorialization for Application ZBE2032 Todd Brown

Yes:

Weiss, Gregowicz, Schertz, Leviton

No:

None None

Abstain: Absent:

Rosenthal, Lilien, DiTota, Mantagas, Cooper

Not Eligible: Kamen

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Application No. ZBE2011 (carried to 12.17.20)

Applicant:

Yum & Chill TB Holdings LLC

Proposal:

Demo service station/Proposed Taco Bell Restaurant

Request:

Preliminary & Final Major Site Plan w/Use Variance & FAR

Location:

199 Highway Route 9 South

Block/Lot:

18.01/1.03

Zone:

OP3

Chair Leviton announced the Yum & Chill TB Holdings LLC application would not be heard. The applicant asked to be adjourned to the December 17, 2020 Zoning Board meeting. It was explained there would be no further written notice to the public. The virtual meeting information for the December 17, 2020 Zoning Board meeting would be available ten days prior on the Manalapan Township website at www.mmtnj.org

Application No. ZBE2040

Applicant:

David Kleyn

Request:

Interpretation of Zoning Ordinance

Location:

203 State Highway 33

Block/Lot: Zone: 78/12.02 SED-20/W

***Please see the attached transcript provided by Court Reporter Mary Ann Fiscor

Chair Leviton opened the meeting to the public for questions or comments on this application. There were no members of the public expressing an interest in this application. Chair Leviton closed public

A Motion to interpret the zoning ordinance for Application ZBE2040 was made by Mr. Weiss and Seconded by Ms. Kamen

Yes:

Kamen, Rosenthal, Weiss, Cooper, Gregowicz, Lilien,

No:

Leviton

Abstain:

None

Absent:

None

Not Eligible: Schertz, DiTota, Mantagas

Chair Leviton opened the meeting to the public for any non-agenda items. Being there were no comments Chair Leviton closed public.

ADJOURNMENT:

A Motion was offered by Mr. Cooper to adjourn the meeting at 10:40 PM. All were in favor and none opposed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Janice Moench

Recording Secretary

RECORDED COMPACT DISCS OF THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT ARE AVAILABLE FOR REVIEW, IN THE PLANNING/ZONING BOARD OFFICE BY APPOINTMENT.

TOWNSHIP ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT TOWNSHIP OF MANALAPAN COUNTY OF MONMOUTH STATE OF NEW JERSEY

In the Matter of:

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

The Application of: ZBE2040 - Interpretation of Zoning Ordinance

> Wednesday, October 15, 2020 Municipal Building 120 Route 522 Manalapan, New Jersey

ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT COMMITTEE:
STEPHEN LEVITON, Chairman
JANICE MOENCH, Recording Secretary
MILLIE KAMEN
TERRY ROSENTHAL
ADAM WEISS
LARRY COOPER
ROBERT GREGOWICZ
ELIOT LILIEN
DAVID SCHERTZ
ROB DITOTA
BASIL MANTAGAS

	KE	F.	OF	 ĽĽ	U	,	בו	X	:	,	M	⊒.	L 2	Z	£	1	ננ	1	1	•]	LC	38	O	Ľ	,	,	٠,	-E	•										
_		_		 		_	_	_		 _							<u>.</u>							-	_							_	 	 	 	 		 	_
_		_		 			_	_		 _														_	_					_	_	_	 	 	 	 _	_	 _	_

(1)	APPEARANCES:
(2)	THE RESIDENCE OF THE PROPERTY
(3)	GASIOROWSKI & HOLOBINKO, ESQS. 54 Broad Street, #302
(3)	Red Bank, New Jersey 07701
(4)	BY: RONALD GASIOROWSKI, ESQS.
(5)	and the Board
(6)	RONALD CUCCHIARO, Attorney for the Board
(7)	
(/)	ALSO PRESENT:
(8)	DDIAN BOCCANETICO BE
(9)	BRIAN BOCCANFUSO, BE JENNIFER BEAHM, BP
	NANCY DeFALCO
(10)	LISA NOSSEIR
(11)	
(12)	
(13)	
(14)	
(15)	
(16)	
(17)	
(18)	•
(19)	
(20)	
(21)	
(22)	
(23)	
(24)	
(25)	

And

(Commencing at 7:35 p.m.) (1) CHAIRMAN LEVITON: This is Executive (2) Orders 103 and 107, the Department of Community (3) Affairs operational guidance for the land use public (4) meetings issued April 2, 2020. (5) Notice of this virtual meeting has been (6) advertised in the Asbury Park Press. A copy of that (7)notice was posted on the bulletin board where public (8) notices are displayed and on the township's website. (9) In addition, a copy of that notice is (10)on file in the office of the municipal clerk. (11)Accordingly this meeting is deemed to gain compliance (12)with the Open Public Meetings Act, Governor Murphy's (13)Executive Orders 103 and 107 and the New Jersey (14)Department of Community Affairs operational guidance (15)for land use public meetings issued April 2nd, 2020. (16)Roll call, please. (17)MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chair, just before (18)we do that, if I could just supplement that for one (19)moment. (20)The DCA has now adopted, as of last (21)week, new emergency regulations. Those regulations (22)will be introduced in the New Jersey register next (23)month, but we now operate under the emergency (24)

regulations for holding remote public meetings.

the notice that we had sent out does comply with the (1) new regulations which are in the New Jersey (2) administrative code as well. (3) CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you. (4) (Roll call is taken.) (5) CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. And I'm (6) going to state up front, if you're here tonight for (7) Application No. ZBE2011, Yum and Chill TN Holdings, (8) LLC, that has been carried until when, Janice, (9) November 12th? (10)MS. MOENCH: I'm sorry. December 17th. (11)CHAIRMAN LEVITON: December 17th, okay. (12)There will be no further notice for that. This is (13)You received notification that that (14)your notice. meeting was tonight, and now you understand that it's (15)going to be on December 17th. Okay. (16)Tonight's first order of --(17)MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chair, just on that (18)also, that meeting also begins at 7:30. And to the (19)extent there's any difference in the login (20)information to do it remotely, that will be made (21)available at least ten days prior on the township's (22)(23)website. CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, (24)Counselor. (25)

(1)	Our first order of business this
(2)	evening is to accept the minutes from July 16th.
(3)	Will someone make the motion, please?
(4)	MR. CUCCHIARO: So moved.
(5)	MR. COOPER: Seconded by Larry.
(6)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, Larry.
(7)	MS. MOENCH: I'm sorry. I need
(8)	another (indiscernible.)
(9)	(Simultaneous voices.)
(10)	MR. COOPER: I apologize.
(11)	MS. MOENCH: And who was the second?
(12)	MR. COOPER: Larry.
(13)	MS. MOENCH: Okay. Ms. Kamen?
(14)	MS. KAMEN: Yes.
(15)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Rosenthal?
(16)	MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes.
(17)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Cooper?
(18)	MR. COOPER: Yes.
. (19)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Gregowicz?
(20)	MR. GREGOWICZ: Yes.
(21)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Lilien?
(22)	MR. LILIEN: Yes.
(23)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Schertz?
(24)	MR. SCHERTZ: Yes.
(25)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Ditola?

ſ	
(1)	MR. DITOLA: Yes.
(2)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Mantagas?
(3)	MR. MANTAGAS: Yes.
(4)	MS. MOENCH: Chair Leviton?
(5)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Yes.
(6)	We also need to accept the minutes from
(7)	October 1st, 2020.
(8)	Will someone make that motion and will
(9)	someone second that.
(10)	(Indiscernible.)
(11)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you,
(12)	gentlemen.
(13)	MS. MOENCH: Okay. Ms. Kamen?
(14)	MS. KAMEN: Yes.
(15)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Weiss?
(16)	MR. WEISS: Yes.
(17)	MS. MOENCH: I'm sorry. Mr. Rosenthal?
(18)	MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes.
(19)	. MS. MOENCH: Mr. Weiss?.
(20)	MR. WEISS: Still yes.
(21)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Cooper?
(22)	MR. COOPER: Yes.
(23)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Gregowicz?
(24)	MR. GREGOWICZ: Yes.
(25)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Schertz?

(1)	MR. SCHERTZ: Yes.
(2)	MS. MOENCH: Chair Leviton?
(3)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Yes. The first
(4)	order of business is to memorialize two resolutions.
(5)	The first one is Application No. ZBE2028.
(6)	Mr. Cucchiaro, are you familiar with
(7)	that case?
(8)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Yes, Mr. Chairman.
(9)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: I usually go to
(10)	John at this time and ask him.
(11)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chairman,
(12)	essentially the applicant was seeking both variance
(13)	relief for residential improvements. The Board voted
(14)	unanimously to approve the application. The
(15)	resolution just memorializes the Board's unanimous
(16)	approval of that matter.
(17)	So if there are any questions or
(18)	comments, you know, I will certainly I can answer
(19)	them, but essentially, you know, it grants the
(20)	both residential bulk variance relief that had been
(21)	requested.
(22)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, sir.
(23)	Will someone make a motion and will
(24)	someone second it.
(25)	MR. WEISS: Motion.

(1)		MS. KAMEN: So moved, Larry.
(2)		CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, Larry and
(3)	Eliott.	
(4)		MS. MOENCH: I'm sorry. Eliott wasn't
(5)	present.	
(6)		CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Will someone else
(7)	second that?	
(8)		MR. MANTAGAS: I'll second it. I'll
(9)	second.	
(10)		Basil Mantagas is second.
(11)		CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, Basil.
(12)		MS. MOENCH: I'm sorry. Basil
(13)	wasn't	
(14)		MR. GREGOWICZ: I wasn't I'll
(15)	second, Bob.	
(16)		CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, Bob.
(17)		MS. MOENCH: Ms. Kamen?
(18)		MS. KAMEN: Yes.
(19)		MS. MOENCH: Mr. Weiss?
(20)		MR. WEISS: Yes.
(21)		MS. MOENCH: Mr. Cooper?
(22)	e e	MR. COOPER: Yes.
(23)		MS. MOENCH: Mr. Gregowicz?
(24)		MR. GREGOWICZ: Yes.
(25)		MS. MOENCH: Mr. Schertz?

(1)	MR. SCHERTZ: Yes.
(2)	MS. MOENCH: Chair Leviton?
(3)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Yes.
(4)	And the last resolution to be
(5)	memorialized is No. ZBE2029.
(6)	MR. CUCCHIARO: And, Mr. Chairman, this
(7)	was also a residential bulk variance resolution of
(8)	the Board voted unanimously to grant. The resolution
(9)	reflects the Board's reasoning. And the eligible
(10)	members are Kamen, Weiss, Cooper, Gregowicz, Schertz
(11)	and Leviton.
(12)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, sir.
(13)	Will someone make that motion, and will
(14)	someone second it?
(15)	MR. COOPER: I'll make a motion. This
(16)	is Larry.
(17)	MR. WEISS: Adam Weiss for the second.
(18)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you,
(19)	gentleman.
(20)	MS. MOENCH: Ms. Kamen?
(21)	MS. KAMEN: Yes.
(22)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Weiss?
(23)	MR. WEISS: Yes.
(24)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Cooper?
(25)	MR. COOPER: Yes.

	nere de la constant d
(1)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Gregowicz?
(2)	MR. GREGOWICZ: Yes.
(3)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Schertz?
(4)	MR. SCHERTZ: Yes.
(5)	MS. MOENCH: Chair Leviton?
(6)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Yes.
(7)	Okay. Our only public hearing this
(8)	evening is Application No. ZBE2040, Mr. David Klein.
(9)	I hope I'm pronouncing that right, sir. Forgive me
(10)	if I butchered it. And on behalf of you, I call
(11)	Mr. Gasiorowski.
(12)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Mr. Chairman,
(13)	just before Mr. Gasiorowski and other counsel enter
(14)	their appearance, I just want to briefly talk to the
(15)	Board a little bit about what we're going to be doing
(16)	tonight because this is an an atypical application
(17)	for the Board. I don't know that you've actually
(18)	done one of these before.
(19)	So under the municipal land use law the
(20)	zoning board has several functions that it possesses
(21)	exclusive jurisdiction over. And one of the
(22)	exclusive powers of the zoning board is to interpret
(23)	the land use ordinances of the township. Nobody
(24)	else, not even the governing body, has the power to
(25)	interpret it. That's exclusively within the
	ş

(1) jurisdiction of the zoning board.

So what happened with this particular matter is there's an application that's currently pending before the planning board. And an issue came up as to whether that proposed piece, you will hear about it tonight, was permitted or not permitted under the ordinance.

So under the municipal land use law, the planning board actually doesn't get to make that decision for itself because it involves --

(Phones ringing.)

MR. CUCCHIARO: -- and it's required

MS. MOENCH: Will everybody please mute themselves when someone else is speaking.

CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Continue, Ron.

MR. CUCCHIARO: So under the municipal land use law, the planning board can't make that determination for itself. So there's a case, it's called DePetro v. Wayne Township. And in that case it says that whoever believes that the zoning ordinance does not permit the use, they are required to make an application to the zoning board for an interpretation. So that's what Mr. Gasiorowski has done pursuant to the requirements of the law. He has

that --

made an application. He has properly made it to the zoning board to make a determination as to what the ordinance needs. And again, we'll go into, you know, the arguments. There are other attorneys here who represent the applicant at the planning board.

But I also want to be very clear that interpreting the ordinance is the only thing we're doing tonight. What the words mean is the only thing that this Board is tasked or has jurisdiction to consider. It is not about the merits of the application before the planning board. It's not whether you like it, or dislike it, or what you think of it.

Further, no matter what you determine, it's not an approval or a denial of that application. The practical significance of it is if you find that the use is permitted in the zone, the planning board will continue to adjudicate the matter. If you find that the use is not permitted, what would likely happen is that the applicant will either withdraw the application before the planning board or the planning board will deny it, and that application may have to come here to the zoning board for a use variance.

But we're not talking about the merits of the application. I want to be very clear. We're

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

talking only about what the ordinance means and whether the proposed use is permitted or not permitted.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

With regard to how to interpret the ordinance, the New Jersey case law says that, you know, we are supposed to derive the intent of the ordinance, but that's not a wide-ranging task for us. It's really we have direction that the intent of the ordinance can be found in its plain language.

So what we're looking for is do the words that are in this ordinance have a plain meaning, and if they have a plain meaning then that's the meaning you're required to give it.

mean, then, you know, we can take other types of evidence into account. The other things we're looking for are, you know, how are these words or terms used in other parts of the ordinance. You don't want to take an interpretation that puts our interpretation at odds with how the word is used elsewhere in the ordinance. We also don't want to have an interpretation that results in absurd results.

But really what we're looking for is, is there a plain meaning, and if there is a plain

Γ	
(1)	meaning, that's what you give it, and that's
(2)	considered to be the legislative intent.
(3)	So with that said, Mr. Chairman, if we
(4)	could just have all the attorneys who are here
(5)	tonight enter their appearances.
(6)	Okay. Mr. Gasiorowski, are you still
(7)	here? .
(8)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Yes, I am. Hello?
(9)	Can you hear me?
(10)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Faintly, but we can
(11)	hear you.
(12)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Can you hear me
(13)	
(14)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Yeah. A little better
(15)	now, yes.
(16)	
(17)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Loud enough for me to
(18)	proceed forward?
(19)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Yes. You can go,
(20	Mr. Gasiorowski. We can hear you now.
(21	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Do you want Mr.
(22	
(23	
(24	
(25	we'll have Mr. Alfieri and anyone else, and then you

4.1	
(1)	can get going.
(2)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: My name is Ron
(3)	Gasiorowski. I'm an attorney, state of New Jersey.
(4)	I represent David Klein.
(5)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Mr. Alfieri.
(6)	MR. ALFIERI: Good evening,
(7)	Mr. Chairman, members of the board, Salvatore
(8)	Alfieri, Cleary, Giacobbe, Alfieri & Jacobs, on
(9)	behalf of the planning board applicant, but we're not
(10)	a party, if you will, to this application just yet.
(11)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, you're not the
(12)	applicant, but you are an interested party?
(13)	MR. ALFIERI: We're an interested
(14)	party.
(15)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Are there any
(16)	other attorneys that are here tonight that would like
(17)	to enter an appearance?
(18)	Okay. I see none.
(19).	Okay. Mr. Gasiorowski, you have the
(20)	floor.
(21)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Thank you very much.
(22)	I listened to the comments of Mr. Cucchiaro, and I
(23)	would agree that this is an atypical case. I've been
(24)	doing this for a long time, and perhaps have filed on
(25)	previous occasions a half a dozen or so applications

concerning the interpretation, but this one has a -kind of a different twist to it. In your zoning
ordinance when listing the permitted uses in this
particular zone, the written word says, "warehouse"
and then there's a slash, and then there's the word
"distribution center".

And a lot of what we're going to be discussing this evening has to do with what is known as or called the slash. And when one looks at it, you really, initially, I think, don't pay much attention to what that slash means. Is it simply separating the uses in question or does it have a particular or a special significance?

And after attempting to track these down, I did come up with, what I believe to be, a plausible explanation as to what it means. The slash is known as a virgule, V-I-R-G-U-L-E. That's how it's described in Webster's dictionary. And while it at first may appear to be ambiguous, it's pretty straightforward.

Legally when we would submit that a common sense interpretation of the utilization of the slash in this means that a warehouse is a permitted use and a distribution separate and apart from a warehouse -- separate and apart from the warehouse

(22) (23) (24)

(25)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

is, in fact, a approved use. So our position with (1) regard to this ordinance is that in this particular (2) zone you can have one of two uses: You can have a (3) warehouse or, or, you can have a distribution center. (4) Now, significantly, in the ordinance (5) itself there is no description of what is known as a (6) distribution center, and there are no standards (7)established in the zone with regard to what a (8) distribution center is and how you would apply it to (9) the property. (10)I'll get into this perhaps in greater (11)detail later on, but for those of us who were not (12)present at the planning board hearing -- I know that (13)Mr. Cucchiaro was, Ms. Beahm was, I was there, (14)Mr. Alfieri was there, and I believe Mr. -- my (15)traffic consultant. (16)MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, Mr. Gasiorowski, (17)just so we're clear, this is a zone hearing. (18)anything that you want to be on the record, get it in (19)here. We can't rely upon anyone's knowledge of the (20)planning board. (21)MR. GASIOROWSKI: I did submit prior to (22)the hearing a number of documents, which I would like (23)to refer to, that were part of the planning board (24)

hearing. For example, our -- the engineering report

of the engineer, the report of Ms. Beahm. I've sent in copies of the transcript of the last hearing, also the minutes of the planning board hearings that I think that are properly before the court, and I can refer to them.

So what is your position with regard to that?

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

MR. CUCCHIARO: As long as they are in the record, but I'm just saying, anything that you want to state has got to be in the record here. So if it's in what you have previously presented, that's fine. But just, also, you know, keep in mind the planning board did not interpret anything.

So to the extent that those documents are relevant, you know, we have to keep on the sole focus of interpreting what the words mean.

MR. GASIOROWSKI: I understand. I understand that completely. I acknowledge that the planning board did.not interpret anything, and I would submit that that was never an issue. That was clearly presented to the planning board, and that's why I filed for this interpretation.

But I think that some of the documents that are in the planning board records, which I sent to this board, are significant. And, for example, I

1	
(1)	would like to start with a letter of July the 3rd of
(2)	2019, which was sent to if you'll bear with me for
(3)	one second.
(4)	MR. CUCCHIARO: And Janice, although
(5)	this is in the record because it was submitted, let's
(6)	mark this as A-1. And Mr. Gasiorowski, can you just
(7)	give me the date of that letter again?
(8)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Yes, I shall. The
(9)	date of the letter is in July 2019. It's a letter
(10)	from Brian Boccanfuso, B-O-C-C-A-N-F-U-S-O,
(11)	professional engineer, who was the board engineer for
(12)	the planning board.
(13)	MS. MOENCH: Can we just hold on one
(14)	minute?
(15)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: I have also looked
(16)	through what was including, and I didn't see that
(17)	either.
(18)	MS. MOENCH: No. The only report that
(19)	you submitted was from June 26th with the planner's
(20)	report.
(21)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: You do not have the
(22)	report of
(23)	MS. MOENCH: No. No.
(24)	MS. BEAHM: Janice, I think that's what
(25)	South submitted.

(1)	MS. MOENCH: Yeah. That's what south
(2)	submitted, but I don't have a letter from
(3)	Mr. Gasiorowski for not July I don't see
(4)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: I believe it was
(5)	e-mailed. Those are orders that were submitted by
(6)	Mr. Alfieri.
(7)	MS. BEAHM: What is the date again?
(8)	MS. MOENCH: I believe it said
(9)	July 18th.
(10)	MR. LILIEN: I believe he said
(11)	July 3rd.
(12)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: What I'm referring to
(13)	is a letter sent by the board engineer, and it's
(14)	dated July the 3rd of 2019 to the Manalapan Township
(15)	planning board, and it's a part of the record before
(16)	the planning board. And I believe I e-mailed it to
(17)	this Board, but if I didn't, then I'll stand
(18)	corrected.
(19)	MS. MOENCH: Yeah. I don't have it,
(20)	so
(21)	MR. CUCCHIARO: So, Mr. Gasiorowski,
(22	what is it in that report that you believe is
(23	relevant to the interpretation of the ordinance?
(24	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Okay. What is
(25	relevant in the interpretation, and I would refer

just for the record, to Page 2 of that report where (1) the ordinance says that the applicant, taking aside (2) developers, is seeking preliminary and final major (3) site plan approvals to construct two warehouse (4) buildings. (5) So in review by the board engineer, he (6) refers to the application for two warehouse (7) buildings, nothing else. That is item -- Paragraph 1 (8) (9) on Page 2. Then on --MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, what does that (10)have to do with what the ordinance means, though? (11)

MR. GASIOROWSKI: What it has to do with what the ordinance means is that -- our position is that with regard to the ordinance, the ordinance says warehouse/distribution center. When the -- when the -- when an applicant gave testimony, and as reflected in the minutes, his position was that he wanted the ability to do whatever he wanted to do, in other.words, of all --

MR. CUCCHIARO: Yeah. But that -- but we have to interpret the ordinance, Mr. Gasiorowski. So if you have an argument, you know, as to what -- your initial argument that it's the -- virgule means or, that's very relevant to what we need to discuss.

So, I mean, what we're here to decide

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

tonight is: What does warehouse mean? What does (1) distribution center mean? What does the slash mark (2) mean in that? And then, you know, whatever that (3) definition is will determine whether the use is (4) permitted or not. (5) Mr. Boccanfuso's report as to what he (6) believes they were applying for doesn't speak to how (7) they interpret the ordinance. So I would just (8) recommend that if you have an argument or a witness (9) that is going to speak to what does warehouse mean? (10)What does this slash mark mean? What does (11)distribution center mean? I think that's what we're (12)here for tonight. (13)MR. GASIOROWSKI: I agree that that is (14)what you're here for tonight, but I also would submit (15)to you is that how it was reviewed by the engineer as (16)well as the planner is relevant as to what, in fact, (17)that word "warehouse/distribution center" means. (18). Now, in looking at the review letter of (19)Mr. Boccanfuso, he clearly found that what it meant (20)was simply a warehouse. (21)MR. CUCCHIARO: I -- well, if that's (22)your argument, that's fine. (23)MR. GASIOROWSKI: So are you saying I'm (24)precluded from going further through his letter?

(1)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, I mean, what I'm
(2)	saying is, is that the Board under the municipal land
(3)	use law has to take into account evidence that is
(4)	relevant. Mr. Boccanfuso's engineering report, which
(5)	was not submitted to this Board to begin with, you
(6)	know, is there somewhere in that report where
(7)	Mr. Boccanfuso says, here's how I interpret the
(8)	ordinance?
(9)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: There is not.
(10)	MR. CUCCHIARO: So, I guess, you know,
(11)	for this Board for the benefit of this Board, what
(12)	is it that you want this Board to take from that
(13)	report that supports your argument concerning how you
(14)	would like the ordinance to be interpreted?
(15)	MR. GASIOROWSKI:Well, on Page 4 of
(16)	his report under operations he says: The applicant
(17)	should indicate whether either warehouse, and he
(18)	identifies them as warehouses, that it potentially be
(19)	used as a fulfillment center.
(20)	So that's the question which he is
(21)	posing, and that's the question which I think this
(22)	Board will be answering.
(23)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Is there
(24)	anything else from that report that you want the
(25)	Board to be aware of?

MR. GASIOROWSKI: Yes. On Page 6 of (1) the report under Subparagraph C it states that either (2) of the proposed warehouses -- and again identifies (3) them as a warehouse -- are intended to be utilized as (4) a fulfillment center, and updated traffic and impact (5) analysis should be provided using trip generation (6) estimates to determine based upon traffic studies. (7) So the purpose, once again, with regard (8) to this ordinance, can a distribution center and (9) warehouse be used interchangeably, or does the (10)ordinance require that it be identified as either; (11)number one, a warehouse; or number two, a (12)distribution center? (13)MR. CUCCHIARO: But I think, also, (14)Mr. Gasiorowski, the statement that you read in that (15)report is really for a third use, which is a (16)fulfillment center. You didn't state distribution (17)(18)center. So I think that is relevant. (19)something we will go into tonight as to whether a (20)fulfillment center falls under either warehouse or (21) distribution center, but I, you know, I think that's (22)a valid issue for the Board to consider. (23)MR. GASIOROWSKI: Thank you. I agree (24)with that. Let me then go on, if I may, then I would (25)

]	
(1)	refer to I know these were I believe these were
(2)	sent to the Board, and then I appreciate
(3)	Mr. Cucchiaro, you know, providing me with some
(4)	leeway with regard to that letter from the interview.
(5)	There are also two letters from
(6)	Jennifer Beahm who was the board planner. One is
(7)	dated June the 26th of 2019. The second is dated
(8)	February the 25th of 2020.
(9)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Just one second,
(10)	Mr. Gasiorowski.
(11)	Janice, we do have one of those letters
(12)	because Mr. Alfieri submitted it, right?
(13)	MS. MOENCH: Correct, yes.
(14)	MR. CUCCHIARO: All right. Let's mark
(15)	that one then as A-1.
(16)	MS. MOENCH: So that's the June 26th,
(17)	2019 Ms. Beahm's order?
(18)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Correct.
(19)	MS. MOENCH: I'm sorry. We're marking
(20)	that what?
(21)	MR. CUCCHIARO: A-1.
(22)	Go ahead, Mr. Gasiorowski.
(23)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: How about the second
(24)	letter, though?
(25)	MR. CUCCHIARO: We don't have it.

And when I MR. GASIOROWSKI: Okay. (1) e-mailed them over, I believe we e-mailed them to (2)Ms. Moench, but if you haven't received them, I (3) It's you don't -believe you. (4) MR. CUCCHIARO: She has stated she (5) We can't mark what we don't have. doesn't have them. (6) MS. GASIOROWSKI: Let's go to the (7)letter, which was dated June the 26th, which was sent (8) by Mr. Reyes, our consulting engineers. And the part (9) that I would like to draw the Board's attention to is (10)the last paragraph of that letter after all of the (11)comments that Ms. Beahm made on that particular day. (12)Ms. Beahm also states that: "Please be (13)advised that additional comments may follow upon (14)completion of testimony and/or submission of further (15)revisions by the applicant. (16)"Should you have any questions (17)regarding the matter, please do not hesitate to (18)contact this office." (19)So with regard to that particular (20)letter that was not a final letter, and Ms. Beahm has (21)reserved the right, whether it be at the conclusion (22)of the planning board hearing, to comment with regard (23)to the issue of whether or not what was being applied (24)for it comports with what is in the ordinance. That (25)

(1)	will be the purpose of my comment in regard to that.
	-
(2)	Now, I take it the Board does have a
(3)	copy of the plans for this project, does it not or it
(4)	does not have that?
(5)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gasiorowski, this
(6)	board has what you submitted. You're the applicant.
(7)	So if you didn't submit it, it doesn't have it. And
(8)	I would say that the plans for the that the
(9)	planning board has, has nothing to do with what the
(10)	plain meaning of the ordinance is.
(11)	MR. GASIOROWSKI:Okay. What I'd like
(12)	to do, then, is proceed and call my first witness.
(13)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Is that Mr. Steck.
(14)	MR. GASIOROWSKI:No. I'll tell you
(15)	what, I will call Mr. Steck first. And then I
(16)	will call my traffic consultant, who is Bahman
(17)	Izadmehr.
(18)	And then, with the ability to recall
(19)	Mr. Steck if he wants to supplement what was said.
(20)	by
(21)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, I don't care what
(22)	order you go in. I just I didn't know.
(23)	So if you want to call your traffic
(24)	engineer first, that's fine.
(25)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: I want to call

(1)	Mr. Steck first.
(2)	MR. CUCCHIARO: All right. Mr. Steck,
(3)	do you swear or affirm the testimony you're about to
(4)	give this Board's the truth, the whole truth, and
(5)	nothing but the truth?
(6)	MR. STECK: I do.
(7)	
(8)	PETER G. STECK,
(9)	having been duly sworn,
(10)	testified under oath as follows:
(11)	
(12)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. State your name
(13)	
(14)	MR. STECK: My name is Peter G. Steck,
(15)	S-T-E-C-K, 80 Maplewood Avenue, Maplewood,
(16	
(17	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Mr. Gasiorowski,
(18	· 1
(19	
(20	
(21	transcript of the hearing of the planning board
(22	wherein Mr. Steck testified.
(2:	Did you receive that?
(2	MR. LEVITON: Yes, we have that.
(2	MS. MOENCH: Yes.

(1)	MR. GASIOROWSKI:I also e-mailed a
(2)	copy of the minutes from the meeting for the minutes
(3)	of September the 10th, 2020 meeting.
(4)	Did you receive that, Ms. Moench?
(5)	MR. LEVITON: We don't have that.
(6)	MS. MOENCH: No.
(7)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Just before we move on,
(8)	and let's mark the transcript as A-2.
(9)	MS. MOENCH: Thank you.
(10)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Mr. Gasiorowski,
(11)	I would recommend I mean, there are members of the
(12)	public who are here, members of the Board who may or
(13)	may not have read the transcript.
(14)	To the extent, you know, Mr. Steck has
(15)	some important arguments with regard on how to
(16)	interpret the ordinance, I would recommend he just
(17)	restate them here.
(18)	
(19)	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GASIOROWSKI:
(20)	Q. Mr. Steck, would you please identify
(21)	yourself for the Board.
(22)	A. Yes. I'm a in terms of qualifications, by
(23)	way of education, I have a Bachelor's Degree in Civil
(24)	Engineering and a Master's in City and Regional
(25)	Planning.

I was first licensed as a planner in (1) New Jersey in 1976 and still hold that license. (2)terms of experience, I was an associate with two (3) different consulting firms in New Jersey. I was the (4) planning director and the zoning administrative (5) officer for the Township of Montclair for (6) approximately nine-and-a-half years. . (7) For the past 20 some-odd years I've (8) been self-employed as the community planning (9) consultant appearing in approximately 180 (10)municipalities in New Jersey as well as in Superior (11)Court and tax court. I am also a member of the (12)league of municipalities land use law drafting (13)committee. (14)CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, (15)This Board accepts your credentials. Mr. Steck. (16)BY MR. GASIOROWSKI: (17)Now, Mr. Steck, I didn't --Q. (18)(indiscernible) to exempt -- (indiscernible) had I (19)not? (20)Yes. (21)And I believe you testified at the last Ο. (22)hearing before the planning board prior to the zoning (23)board of adjustment board? (24)That's correct. Α. (25)

At that time, I represented to the (1) Q. Board that you were unable to appear this evening (2) because you had two prior scheduled hearings, (3) correct? (4)That's correct. (5) Okay. And I just want to make sure my Ο. (6) representations were understood. Did you have two (7)hearings scheduled this evening in other (8) (9) municipalities? Up until about eight hours ago, that's (10)I already completed my first hearing that (11)started at 6 o'clock, but my second hearing got (12)carried, I believe, because of a notice defect. So (13)I'm now available. (14)And you're aware of the fact that I had (15)retained your services as another planner, but I (16)prefer to use you since you gave the original (17)(18)testimony? That's my understanding of your preference. (19)Α. Okay. Now, can you tell us -- and Q. (20)having listened to the comments of Cucchiaro with (21)regard to the jurisdictional question of what the (22)zoning board of adjustment has to do, could you just (23)relay to the Board that section of the municipal land (24)

use law that covers that, and what is your

understanding of what this Board has the jurisdiction (1) to decide this evening? (2)As the board of adjustment members are (3) Α. aware, you operate under the provisions of the (4) municipal land use law, and typically you see a (5) development application that may have C variances or (6) D variances. Well, that paragraph in the municipal (7)land use law also has Paragraphs A and b, and they (8) are exclusively the jurisdiction of the board of (9) adjustment. A talks about challenging and opinion of (10)the zoning administrative officer -- and I'll read B (11)into the record because that's why we're here this (12)evening. (13)So this is 4055 D/70 (b). Here -- and (14)this is, again, the powers of the board of (15)adjustment -- herein decide requests for (16)interpretation of the zoning map or ordinance or for (17)decision upon other special questions upon which such (18)board is authorized to pass by any zoning or official (19)map ordinance in accordance with this act. (20)So we're asking for -- it's not a (21)It's an interpretation of an issue variance release. (22)that happens to be relevant to an application (23)currently before the planning board. (24)Now, Mr. Steck, did I retain your

Q.

services at the very beginning of the planning board (1)hearing? (2) Yes, you did. (3) And were you present at most, if not (4) all, of those hearings before the planning board? (5) I was either present at the hearings or as of (6) late in attendance virtually. (7) Okay. Now, you're aware of the fact, Q. (8) are you not, that in the zoning ordinance what is (9) listed as a use that is permitted, and I utilize the (10)words "warehouse/distribution center," correct? (11)Yes. (12)Α. Now, in the zoning ordinance of the Q. (13)Township of Manalapan, is, in fact, the warehouse (14)use, is there a definition for it and is it (15)described? (16)In the definition section of your Um, yes. (17)Α. ordinance, one of the definitions listed is (18)specifically the word "warehouse." This is Section (19)95-2.4, which is defined as follows: Any structure (20)designed for or utilized primarily for the storage of (21)The term shall include goods and materials. (22)self-storage, mini or other form of commercial (23)warehouse activities. (24)Is it your opinion that if, in fact,

(25)

Q.

the applicant were to come before this Board solely (1) for a request to construct and utilize a warehouse at (2)this site, it would, in fact, be a permitted use? (3) That's correct. That is my opinion. (4) How about with regard to distribution (5)Ο. Putting aside for the sake of argument right (6) now the issue with the description of the (7) distribution center, would that also be standing (8) alone be a permitted use? (9) Um, as we'll eventually get to when I discuss (10)the interpretation, in my opinion, if there was just (11)a distribution center that would be a permitted use. (12)Okay. Now, in your experience as a Q. (13)planner, have you ever previously appeared before (14)boards dealing with the issue of an interpretation? (15)(16)Yes. What is your understanding of what is (17)Q. before this Board today and why is it here? (18)Well, the Board's attorney gave some (19.)background, but just to give some context, there is (20)an application for development before the planning (21)board with two large buildings. And together -- what (22)I mean by "large" is they total over 600,000 square (23)

feet of floor area. And the submissions are somewhat

(24)

(25)

muddled in my opinion.

The title of the plans talk about a logistic center. The buildings are labeled as warehouses. The -- there is the word "distribution" that is in the application. And so, it -- it was -- in my opinion, somewhat hazy what was being proposed before the planning board.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

At the September 10th meeting of the planning board a question was asked of a representative of the applicant, and the applicant — and I was there watching the meeting virtually — and in my opinion, the applicant essentially said that he believed he was proposing a permitted use, and he explained it as — and I'm going to phrase this in a firsthand basis — I want to do warehousing, or a distribution center, or any combination of them. I want the freedom to use these buildings as warehouse 100 percent, distribution center 100 percent or any mixture of the two because he believed that it was irrelevant whether you mixed or matched.

- Q. Okay. Now, why in your opinion is that significant?
- A. It's significant because, in my opinion, they are different uses. First of all, I just read the definition of a warehouse, and the key aspects of that are that it's primarily used for storage. There

is no definition in Manalapan's ordinance of what a distribution center is, but because it's a different word than warehouse, it's a different entity. And, indeed, if one looks at published sources, such as the Institute of Traffic Engineers trip generation map manual, there are a number of entities of the classic warehouse is labeled as Classification 150, and that doubles with your local definition. It says, primarily for the storage of goods.

TO SECURE OF THE SECURE OF THE

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

There are other definitions in that publication, such as a high-cube warehouse, which is basically a building over 200,000 square feet with a height more than 24 feet where obviously it accommodates vertical storage. That has dramatically different characteristics than a warehouse in terms of peak hour traffic or total average traffic during the day. And there's also a definition, for example, of a fulfillment center.

The point that I'm raising is that the ordinance considers a distribution center, in my opinion, different than a warehouse. And there is logic to that because a distribution center produces multiple times the traffic of a warehouse according to the Institute of Traffic Engineers, and there are other ramifications, such as the number of, you know,

(21)(22)(23)(24)

loading docks that might typically be associated with a warehouse versus a distribution center. The noise that may be -- that may emanate from the different uses, potentially hours of operation may be different, so that the ordinance treats them differently by name.

And to repeat, there is a basis for doing that because distribution warehouses have different land use impacts that I would generally consider much more intensive of a warehouse use.

Q. Let's just talk about the -- the language in the ordinance itself, which is focusing on two words. Two words and a symbol, okay. The first word being "warehouse," the second word being "distribution center," and the intervening "slash" in between those two.

Now, did you perform any independent research to what you believe to be the correct interpretation of that definition -- or the symbol and the two words?

- A. I did.
 - O. Tell us what it is.
- A. You know, I looked at dictionary definitions.

 I looked at research that your office had done in

 terms of cases, and I read the ordinance, scanned the

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

word "distribution" to find out how it was used in the ordinance. I also looked at the prior master plan and master plan amendment to try to define what the intent was.

- Q. Okay. Now, in listening as you're reciting the testimony of Mr. Terry -
 (indiscernible) whatever his last name is -- I believe he indicated that he wanted to utilize one of several or three different components. In other words, he would either have a site which is composed entirely of warehousing, or number two, a site which is composed entirely of distribution center or be able to basically mix and match. Have a portion of it be warehousing and a portion of it be distribution center, correct?
- A. That's my understanding of how he testified.
- Q. And that would mean that -- that would mean that it would be an interpretation of that slash to mean warehousing -- warehouse and distribution center, in other words, two different types of entities or uses on one site?
- A. That's one interpretation of that.

The issue that's -- there are -- we know -- we all -- well, the ordinance knows what a warehouse is, and the Institute of Traffic Engineers

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

knows what a warehouse is. The ordinance does not define a distribution center, but we know at least from the ordinance that it's different from a warehouse, and secondary information, such as surveys of such operations, show that it's the different type of use that the -- the -- the focus is not the goods that are sitting there stored in the warehouse. The focus of a distribution center, as the name implies, is the activity of bringing in goods of potentially repackaging them and sending them out.

So it's a different entity. The -- so it's a little bit of a mystery in terms of the ordinance because it doesn't define a distribution center, but the general literature, I think, confirms that it's different from a warehouse.

The focus of ambiguity here is on the slash. Now, the slash is not your computer forward slash that you may put into your browser. It's a term in the -- it's a symbol used in the English language. It's also called a virgule, as Mr. Gasiorowski said, and it's known to be ambiguous.

It's -- it can either mean a conjunctive relationship or a disjunctive relationship. So let me simplify it that if an ordinance permits A/B, if it's conjunctive, it means

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

that you have to have both A and B present at the same time to fit into that category.

So one way to interpret the slash is that an applicant before the -- before a board has to have both warehousing and distribution as a composite use on a property in order to fit within that category.

An alternate view of the slash is disjunctive, that is, you can have either A or B, but you can't have both at the same time.

Defore you go forward. Would it not be so that whether we consider the conjunctive or the disjunctive interpretation that with regard to the distribution center, you would have to have an independent analysis of the trip generation from that use, for example, if we went with the conjunctive and it were 90 percent distribution center and 10 percent warehouse, the traffic would be predicated upon 90 percent of the site being a distribution center.

MR. ALFIERI: Mr. Cucchiaro, before
the -- I'm not sure how that's relevant to the
interpretation issue. It may be an intensity issue,
but it's not an interpretation of the meaning of the
words in the ordinance.

(12) (13) (14) (15) (16) (17) (18) (19) (20) (21) (22) (23) (24) (25)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

MR. CUCCHIARO: And, Mr. Gasiorowski, (1) just in terms of the -- whatever answers Mr. Steck is (2) going to give that they be focused on not what needs (3) to be evaluated but what the words mean. (4) How should this Board interpret the (5) words? (6) So, I mean, what we've heard so far is (7)that Mr. Steck believes that perhaps there may be two (8) ways to interpret the virgule and, you know, what (9) we're going to need to determine at the end of the (10)day, though, is, which -- what is it -- which one (11)does Mr. Steck think the Board should adopt, and also (12)while, you know, I think it's accurate to say the use (13)of the virgule, or the slash, whatever you may to (14)call it, you know, may create a distinction between (15)warehouse and distribution center, you know, how you (16)wish us to define distribution center in the absence (17)of a definition in the ordinance. You know, that's (18)something we need to hear as well. (19)My recommendation would be that that's (20)really what the Board is interested in, in being of (21) assistance in determining what these words mean. (22)MR. GASIOROWSKI: Well, having said (23)that, it would be helpful certainly if in the (24)

ordinance there was a definition of distribution

(1) center.

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. But there's not, so you have to tell us why you think -- what you think the definition is and why you think that definition is what the Board should adopt.

BY MR. GASIOROWSKI:

are aware of the fact that in the ordinance the word "distribution center" is utilized, and as a planner, what is your understanding of the difference between a distribution center, and a warehouse, and why as a planner do you feel that the disjunctive rather than the conjunctive application here should be utilized?

A. Well, as I started out saying, in terms of the language of the ordinance itself, if a distribution

center were the same as a warehouse, there would be no reason to insert that word in the list of -- in the table of permitted uses.

So it is clear, in my opinion, just from the plain wording of the ordinance that it's

something different from a warehouse.

Um, secondly, part of the way to define a distribution center being different from a warehouse is that it is a use where, unlike a warehouse -- again, the warehouse is the -- the

(24) (25) primary activity is the storage of goods or materials or supplies.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

A distribution center, its primary use is the -- and I'm going to use the word, the distribution of items that are trucked in, trucked out, and oftentimes they are repackaged on different pallets. They may be stored there for shorter periods of time, but the whole purpose of the facility is not to hold items for periods of time. The primary purpose is to distribute the items to either different retailers or different middle men.

But the focus of the distribution center really arises from the English language. Its activity is to move goods around rather than to statically keep them stored. And --

MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gasiorowski,
Mr. Steck, Mr. Gasiorowski had referenced also in
Mr. Boccanfuso's report reference to a fulfillment
center, and I think that that is also relevant for
the Board to consider tonight.

I guess my question to you would be having to do with the difference between a fulfillment center, and a distribution center, and would you agree or disagree that that difference is that a distribution center largely deals with

distribution of product to wholesalers or, as you said, middle men and the fulfillment center is more focused on individual endusers, you know, bringing it to somebody's house or something like that?

THE WITNESS: I don't think that

distinction is relevant. I would consider a

fulfillment center to be a type of distribution

center. It's clearly not the classic warehouse. It

has a land use impact that is akin to a distribution

center, in my opinion. Now, I will grant you that,

you know, the latest variety ala Amazon of -- would

be distribution to potentially the ultimate consumer,

but I'm not sure -- but that's not necessarily the

functional definition.

The definitions in the Institute of
Traffic Engineers, they have several definitions. I
think it's 154, 156, 157. There's a common term
called the high-cube warehouse, which means at least
200,000 square feet and more than 20 feet -- 24 feet
tall. The building that's proposed, by the way, is
50 feet tall.

So that while one could, in subdividing categories, saying that a fulfillment center is different than a high-cube warehouse, a fulfillment center, in my opinion, is a type of distribution

(24)

(25)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7).

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

center, it is not a classic warehouse.

Now, I know that in the course of the application before the planning board the applicant's attorney said, we're not going to do a fulfillment center. That doesn't really answer the question because that's only one type of distribution center. And again, the -- the issue -- to kind of circle back -- is that the use of the slash is recognized as being ambiguous. So, essentially, before I get to my opinion, we are asking the Board to examine the meaning of that slash and to report back to the planning board so that it can continue its review of the application in light of that definition of the -- again, the record before the planning board, in my opinion, is kind of all over the place in terms of using different words.

I can tell you -- and -- that the applicant's traffic engineer before the planning board in conversations with the State -- because this -- that property is on a state highway -- has used only the traffic definition of a warehouse. The applicant has not considered -- not evaluated that use as a distribution center or as a fulfillment center.

So that's the relevance of this that so

(24)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

far the applicant's traffic engineer says, I'm going to predict the traffic based on warehousing; however, the representative of the applicant said, well, I don't want to limit it to warehousing. I want to have a distribution center, and I want to mix and match at will, depending upon who's interested in my buildings.

BY MR. GASIOROWSKI:

- Q. Let me ask you this question. Is it your opinion as a planner is the language utilized conjunctive or disjunctive?
- A. In my opinion, it's disjunctive, which means that you can -- in this zone, the SED-20W zone, you could have a warehouse use where the primary activity is the storage -- it's the storage of goods and materials or you can have a distribution center, which would also include a fulfillment center, in my opinion, where the primary activity is the redistribution of goods and materials that come in and leave.

So it is a different type of operation in its primary activities. In my opinion, the proper reading of the ordinance is that you can have A or B but not both.

So if that's your opinion -- if you

(25)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

agree with this opinion -- and this goes back to the (1) planning board -- the applicant, in light of that, (2) has to decide what they are applying for. And this (3) also makes sense because while we're talking about (4) the SED-20/W zone as permitting (5) warehouse/distribution centers, the "LI", light (6) industrial zone, also permits that same category. (7) So when you interpret this for the (8) subject property, which is in the SED-20/W zone, it's (9) also going to apply to the light industrial zone. (10)Now, I don't think anyone here would (11)doubt the fact that the -- a classic light industrial (12)zone would allow warehousing. But again, the (13)ordinance was modified over time to allow this (14)undefined distribution center. And the -- looking at (15)the way the table is structured, looking at the land (16)use differences, in my opinion, the logical and (17)proper interpretation of that phrase is that you (18)could do all warehousing, you could do all (19)distribution, but you can't do both. (20)Now, this is the significance of this (21)hearing predicated on the fact that the applicant (22)said he wants to have the ability to do both on the (23)site? (24)That's correct. That's the representation of

SECTION 1. Court of The Control of Property of the Control of Control of Management (1997).

Α.

the representative of the applicant.
 Q. And if your -- and if your
 interpretation -- if your position is contained.

interpretation -- if your position is correct that
you could have all warehouse or have all distribution
center separately, then if the applicant wanted to

(6) mix and match, they would have to get a use variance,

(7) would they not?

(4)

(5)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

.(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

de transfer de mandron antimo do presido de responsablem de transfer de messoa de transfer de en estados de est

A. That's my opinion. If the applicant modifies its application and say, okay, I'll only do warehousing, then there's no question. The planning board would continue. But if the applicant says, I want the ability to mix and match, in my opinion, that is not a permitted use in the zone, and that application can only be heard by the board of adjustment.

Q. So what this gets down to at the end of day, and we've gone through the testimony, the ordinances, the letters and whatnot, this isn't a question of whether or not the applicant can utilize the property. We all acknowledge that he can, in fact, utilize the property, correct?

A. Yes.

Q. But if the slash means that he has to have one or the other, he can choose to do that, but he can't mix and match and have different percentiles

of different uses on the same site? (1) And it has, again, land That's my opinion. Α. (2) use relevance in that -- and let's go to the ends of (3) the spectrum -- if the applicant is -- if the (4) applicant is going to continue with warehousing, it's (5) properly being analyzed at least in terms of traffic. (6) If the applicant is going to --**(**7) MR. ALFIERI: I'm going to object (8) That has no relevance to how the analysis of (9) the planning board is being done. (10)MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chairman, I would (11)I mean, I think, you know, what agree with that. (12)Mr. Steck is saying is that his interpretation of the (13)ordinance is that warehouses are permitted, (14)distribution centers are permitted, but they are only (15)permitted as their own principal uses. You cannot (16)have both of them on the site. (17)And that's how the Board should (18)interpret the ordinance as permitting only one but (19)not both. And to the extent that, you know, the (20)application before the planning board may involve (21)both, then it would, as he said, require a use (22)variance. (23)So really, you know, the testimony with (24)regard to traffic with the need be -- from the DOT is

not really relevant to what we're looking at. But what Mr. Steck's testimony was as to the use of being permitted but not being permitted at the same time on the property, that's the crux of what we're looking at here tonight.

BY MR. GASIOROWSKI:

- Q. Mr. Steck, let's look at the thought process and the logic the logic of the wording of the statute. Would you agree with me that the interpretation of this ordinance in its disjunctive is really the only logical explanation as to why that language was utilized in the way that it was?

 A. Um, in my opinion, looking at the structure of the ordinance and the fact that it is also permitted in the light industrial zone, that's the only logical
- Q. Would you agree with me that the reason why you would not interpret it in the conjunctive is that it would pose a multitude of problems with regards to determining trip generation, traffic, lighting, noise and the like?

way to read the ordinance.

A. It would be substantially different from what is being presented to the planning board. It would be difficult to determine, um, the nature of the use, especially if it allowed a mixture, that would

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

suggest that the applicant would change the mix over (1) You approve a composite use, and let's say it (2) starts out to be 10 percent warehousing, and then it (3) switches over time to 90 percent just, you know --(4) well, let's say it starts out 10 percent (5) distribution, and you're approving that composite (6) use, and then over time it changes to 90 percent (7) distribution, that's a dramatically different impact. (8) So in terms of reviewing the (9) application, the way it's used in the ordinance, and (10)especially because the ordinance recognizes that a (11)distribution center is something different than a (12)warehouse, that -- my opinion it can only be read as (13)in the disjunctive. (14)Now, isn't that really a matter of (15)common sense? (16)Well, I think it is, but I -- again, I think (17)you look at it in context of how it's used in the (18)zoning ordinance, and I think with an eye toward the (19)There's a legitimate reason to land use impacts. (20)read it in the disjunctive. (21)MR. GASIOROWSKI: I have no further (22)(23)questions. MR. CUCCHIARO: Are there any other (24)witnesses that you are going to poll tonight,

ſ	
(1)	Mr. Gasiorowski?
(2)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Yes.
(3)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, then, why don't
(4)	you call your next witness and then I'm going to let
(5)	the public question your experts.
(6)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: I'd love to. Not to
(7)	overstep my bounds, but is there any .
(8)	cross-examination by the
(9)	THE REPORTER: Can we take a break?
(10)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Yeah. That's fine.
(11)	Mr. Gasiorowski, I'm going to hold the
(12)	Board from cross-examining until after we've heard
(13)	
(14)	question, and we're going to take a five-minute break
(15)	at the request of the court reporter.
(16)	(Break was taken at 8:43 p.m.)
(17)	(Hearing recommenced at 8:49 p.m.)
(18)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: My examination of
(19)	Mr. Steck has concluded, and I would call as my next
(20)	witness my traffic consultant, Bahman Izadmehr.
(21	MR. CUCCHIARO: Is he on camera?
(22	MR. GASIOROWSKI: No. I know he's on.
(23) I spoke to him.
(24	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, he's required,
(25	anyone who's giving sworn
`	

(1)	testimony is required to be on camera. That's not
(2)	me, that's the new emergency regulations that have
(3)	been adopted by the DCA.
(4)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Mr. Izadmehr, do you
(5)	have the capacity to show yourself?
(6)	MR. IZADMEHR: Yes.
(7)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Good.
(8)	Okay.
(9)	(Witness sworn.)
(10)	MR. IZADMEHR: Yes, I do.
(11)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Please state and
(12)	spell your name for us.
(13)	MR. IZADMEHR: Sure. Bahman Izadmehr.
(14)	The first name is B-A-H-M-A-N, and the last name is
(15)	I-Z-A-D-M-E-H-R. And I'm with Development
(16)	Engineering at 155 Polifly Road, Hackensack, New
(17)	Jersey.
(18)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Mr. Gasiorowski,
(19)	can you please qualify your witness?
(20)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Sure.
(21)	DIRECT EXAMINATION
(22)	BY MR. GASIOROWSKI:
(23)	Q. Would you mind if I call you Bahman? I
(24)	don't want to, you know, not pronounce your name
(25)	correctly.

(1)	A. Sure. That's fine.
(2)	Q. Thank you for that courtesy.
(3)	If you would for the benefit of the
(4)	Board, just give them your background as well as your
(5)	professional credentials.
(6)	A. Sure. I have three degrees in civil
(7)	engineering: A Bachelor of Science, a Master of
(8)	Science, as well as a Doctorate degree.
(9)	Q. Where did you receive those degrees
(10)	from?
(11)	A. From University of Texas at Austin. I have
(12)	been a licensed professional engineer in the State of
(13)	New Jersey since 1990. And my last one is current.
(14)	I have appeared before almost every
(15)	THE REPORTER: Sir, I need you to slow
(16)	down. I can't understand what you're saying.
(17)	BY MR. GASIOROWSKI:
(18)	Q. Okay. Sure. Let's pick up from you
(19)	having graduated the University of Texas and become a
(20)	licensed professional engineer in the State of New
(21	Jersey, and let's go from there, okay?
(22	A. Sure. Since 1990, I have appeared before
(23	planning and zoning board, as well as Superior Court
(24	
(25	not sure if I have been before this particular board

in the past. And also I have been a graduate (1) school professor at New Jersey of Technology as well (2)as Rutgers, the school of civil engineer, and I have (3) practiced the professional civil engineering (4) transportation traffic, structural engineering for (5)the last 35 years. (6) CHAIRMAN LEVITON: We accept Mr. (7) Izadmehr's credentials. (8) THE WITNESS: Thank you. (9) BY MR. GASIOROWSKI: (10)Mr. Izadmehr, you were retained by me Q. (11)to present testimony with regard to this matter, were (12)(13)you not? Yes. (14)Α. And prior to our retaining you, which 0. (15)was just recently, you were, in fact, also retained (16)by another party in this matter? (17)That's correct, on the planning board (18)Α. (19)application. Now, as a result of that did you have Q. (20)occasion to be present at most, if not all, of the (21)planning board hearings? (22)Yes, I have. (23)Did you listen to Mr. Steck's (24)Q. recitation, if you will, of his recollection of what (25)

(1)	was stated before the planning board?
(2)	A. Um, yes.
(3)	Q. Can you comment as to whether or not
(4)	you were also present at those meetings and whether
(5)	or not his comments reflect your recollection of what
(6)	transpired?
(7)	A. Yes. I was in that meeting, and that's
(8)	basically my recollections of what he presented
(9)	there.
(10)	Q. Okay. And you were there when the
(11)	developer of the project presented testimony?
(12)	A. Yes, I was.
(13)	Q. Okay. Now, would you agree with me
(14)	that sort of the gist of Mr. Steck's testimony had to
(15)	with whether there were distinctions between
(16)	warehouses and distribution centers?
(17)	A. That is correct.
(18)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gasiorowski,
(19)	
(20)	
(21)	
(22)	
(23)	
(24)	
(25)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Well, I'm going to

```
proceed to another question, and I'll get right into
(1)
      that.
(2)
      BY MR. GASIOROWSKI:
(3)
                     Now, Mr. Bahman, did you review the
             Q.
(4)
      ordinance which is before the Board this evening for
(5)
      interpretation?
(6)
            Yes, I did.
(7)
                     And what is the importance in your
             Q.
(8)
      mind --
(9)
                     (Brief interruption.)
(10)
                     MR. CUCCHIARO: Marco, that was Marco.
(11)
                     MR. GASIOROWSKI: I'm sorry. I
(12)
      didn't --
(13)
                     MR. CUCCHIARO: It's okay.
                                                  Continue
(14)
      on. Ask your question.
(15)
                     MS. MOENCH: I think he signed off.
(16)
      BY MR. GASIOROWSKI:
(17)
                      Okay. Did you have occasion to review
              Q.
(18)
      the ordinance in question?
(19)
              Yes, I did.
(20)
                      And as a traffic consultant, what
(21)
       significance, if any, did you give to the matter in
(22)
       which it was drafted?
(23)
              Well, I basically confirmed what I -- what we
(24)
       Α.
       have heard tonight from Mr. Steck, and the ordinance
(25)
```

basically uses the warehousing/distribution centers. (1) (2) But --MR. ALFIERI: I'm going to object to (3) the testimony. He's a traffic expert, and the (4) planner has already said that his position, after a (5) half hour of testimony, was if -- you could either be (6) a warehouse or a distribution center; you can't be (7) (8)both. So the traffic testimony is -- his (9) opinion from a traffic expert is completely (10)irrelevant to that point. (11)MR. GASIOROWSKI: But it is relevant as (12)to the question of the applicant saying he wanted the (13)ability to mix and match, in other words, to have (14)part warehouse, part distribution center --(15)MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, I don't -- but, (16)Mr. Gasiorowski, I'm not understanding how a traffic (17)expert helps the Board to interpret an ordinance, and (18)if all he has to say is that he agrees with (19).Mr. Steck, let him say that because it seems to be (20)that's what his testimony is. But there's no (21)traffic, you know, issue for the Board. (22)does -- what does this -- what do these words mean? (23)Mr. Steck has testified to what he (24)believes the words mean. So, I mean, does this (25)

expert have something to add as to why warehouses are (1) permitted, distribution centers are permitted, but (2) they are not both permitted at the same time? (3) MR. GASIOROWSKI: Well, the relevance (4) of that is, you're looking to the intent of what the (5) ordinance says, and what was in the minds of this (6) governing body, and that's ten years ago as to why (7)they worded it as they did. And if, in fact, you (8) follow the interpretation of the applicant saying he (9)can have both distribution centers as well as (10)warehouses, the issue of the traffic being generated (11)by perhaps a 90 percent --(12)But that's MR. CUCCHIARO: Yeah. (13)not -- that doesn't go towards the interpretation, (14)So if this witness has something to Mr. Gasiorowski. (15)say as to what he thinks warehouse means, and what he (16)thinks distribution center means, and what he thinks (17)the significance of the slash means, we will (18)certainly hear it, but if he doesn't have anything to (19)say that addresses that, my recommendation is that (20)his testimony is irrelevant. (21)BY MR. GASIOROWSKI: (22)Do you have an understanding of what a Q. (23)distribution center means in the existing ordinances (24)

of the Township of Marlboro?

(1)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Manalapan.
(2)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: I'm sorry.
(3)	Manalapan?
(4)	THE WITNESS: Yes. I mean, the title
(5)	of the ordinance it says, basically
(6)	warehousing/distribution center, but there's really
(7)	no formal definition of the distribution center. So
(8)	even though I agree with what we have heard from
(9)	Mr. Steck, I will go further. I have my reservation
(10)	that we can really have not the immediate use of
(11)	either distribution or warehousing. I think the
(12)	ordinance was meant basically for warehouse rather
(13)	than a distribution center.
(14)	MR. CUCCHIARO: I'm sorry. Let me just
(15)	stop you there. Mr. Gasiorowski, I want to be very
(16)	clear as to what I think I just heard. Is this
(17)	witness saying that distribution centers are not
(18)	permitted by themselves at all?
(19)	. MR. GASIOROWSKI: I don't think he!s
(20)	saying that.
(21)	
(22)	What I'm saying is that there is no formal definition
(23)	of a distribution center in your ordinance.
(24)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay.
(25)	THE WITNESS: But in the title it says

basically distribution center --(1) warehousing/distribution center. So from the -- from (2) reading the title of the ordinance, either (3) distribution centers or warehousing is permitted. (4) But it is -- but there is no formal definition of (5) distribution center in your ordinance. (6) MR, CUCCHIARO: All right. (7) Mr. Gasiorowski, does he have anything to add as to (8) what a distribution center is or anything to say that (9) Mr. Steck didn't? (10)MR. GASIOROWSKI: Well, I would once (11)again say that I think that if you were going to be (12)talking about the significance of the conjunctive (13)interpretation of the ordinance, the traffic being (14)generated by a distribution center in a mixed use is (15)relevant. (16)You may not think so, but that is my --(17)MR. CUCCHIARO: It's not whether I (18)think so, Mr. Gasiorowski. It's that isn't a site (19)plan issue. It's not an interpretation issue. (20)we are here to determine is what does warehouse mean, (21)what does distribution center mean, what does the (22)slash mean, and what is a permitted use, not levels (23)of traffic and how you assess levels of traffic. (24)

Those are site plan issues.

So if your witness has something to say (1) that assists the Board in determining what these (2) words mean, and he's already testified that he agrees (3) with Mr. Steck, we will hear it, but I'm not hearing (4) anything other than he agrees with Mr. Steck, and I (5) certainly, you know, a traffic engineer is very (6) relevant to what the planning board is doing, but a (7)traffic engineer is not -- doesn't bring any (8) expertise to the table on what words mean. (9) MR. GASIOROWSKI: Levels of traffic is (10)relevant from the issue of what the governing body (11)meant when they put down "warehousing/distribution (12)center." (13)If they meant that you can have both on (14)one site, I'm saying that is not logical, and it's (15)not logical because of the great demands of the (16)mixing and matching of traffic, which leads to why (17)they made them separate and distinct uses. (18)That's the relevance of traffic. (19)MR. CUCCHIARO: Can I ask a question? (20)MR. GASIOROWSKI: Sure. (21)MR. CUCCHIARO: Is it -- does a (22)distribution center have greater traffic associated (23)with it than a warehouse? (24)THE WITNESS: Yes. I was going to lead (25)

PROTEST BOTTO CONTROL O CONTROL SE CONTROL DE CONTROL DE CONTROL DE CONTROL DE CONTROL DE CONTROL DE CONTROL D

to that. (1) MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, let me just ask (2) If you had 100 percent distribution center, you: (3) would that be more traffic than a distribution center (4) with some combination of warehouse? (5) THE WITNESS: Yes. Five times more. (6) MR. CUCCHIARO: So the testimony is (7) that you could have just a distribution center and (8) that would be five times more than a combination, so (9) I'm not understanding how that helps us, you know, in (10)understanding what the permitted uses are. (11)THE WITNESS: I would not say a (12)combination. (13)A traffic report or Let me say this: (14)traffic study, it's one of the checklist items in the (15)planning board. (16)So we really need to know what the (17)specific proposed use of this project is. (18)We need No. MR. CUCCHIARO: No. No. (19)to know what the permitted uses are not what the (20)specific use is. So if you have something to tell us (21)as to what you think the permitted uses are, and I (22)think you've already testified that the permitted (23)uses are either a warehouse or a distribution center (24)

Company of the Control of the Contro

but not both.

THE WITNESS: Well, I would not (1) really -- I don't feel comfortable to say that (2) because if that was the case, then the ordinance (3) would have said, warehousing and distribution. (4) Why do they use --(5) That's what I just MR. CUCCHIARO: No. (6) Your testimony is you can either have a said, sir. .(7). warehouse or you can have a distribution center, but (8) you cannot have both. (9) MR. GASIOROWSKI: That's not what he's (10)I mean, and that's not Steck said. (11)saying. did not say that. Steck said that you've got to read (12)this ordinance in its disjunctive. You can have all (13)of one or all of the other. (14)MR. CUCCHIARO: That's what I just (15)said, Mr. Gasiorowski. You can have 100 percent (16)warehouse, you can have 100 percent distribution (17)center, but you cannot have a combination of the two. (18)MR. GASIOROWSKI: That's .correct. (19)THE WITNESS: I agree. (20)MR. CUCCHIARO: All right. So that's (21)your testimony? (22)But then we need to THE WITNESS: Yes. (23)determine what the permitted use for this particular (24)site is so we can do our approval --(25)

independental numeros societamento dello delle di secretamente nombre della della secreta della di especia di

MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, you just -- you (1) just stated what the -- well, you just stated, sir, (2) what the permitted use is. It's either 100 percent (3) warehouse or 100 percent distribution center. (4) are the permitted uses. (5) THE WITNESS: That's correct. (6) once we answer that question, then we can do our (7) traffic impact study --(8) MR. CUCCHIARO: No. We're not doing (9) traffic impact here. That's a site plan issue before (10)the planning board. So that's something that when (11)you would testify before the planning board you can (12)bring up. (13)The traffic that you have stated that (14)the permitted uses are 100 percent warehouse or 100 (15)percent distribution center. (16)THE WITNESS: That's correct. (17)MR. CUCCHIARO: The rest of that it has (18)to do with whether, you know, you're in agreement (19)with the testimony of the planning board regarding (20)the impact, and that is a site plan issue. (21)not an interpretation issue. (22)THE WITNESS: That's correct. (23)is what I'm saying. That -- it brings us back to (24)determining the resolution of the zone in terms of

PROTECTION DE CONTROL DE CONTROL

It has ramification of the site the permitted use. (1) plan elements, including traffic. (2) MR. CUCCHIARO: We agree with that. (3) But that ramification gets played out at the planning (4) board not here. (5) MR. GASIOROWSKI: Mr. Cucchiaro, may I (6) address that question, please? (7)MR. CUCCHIARO: Go ahead. (8) MR. GASIOROWSKI: And I had to wrestle (9) with this as well, but we're here tonight, as I (10)understand it, for an interpretation as to whether or (11)not if the applicant wished to mix his uses under the (12)zoning ordinance, he would be permitted to do so, (13)(14)correct? MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, we're here to (15)determine what the ordinance means. (16)MR. GASIOROWSKI: Well, the ordinance (17)means one of two things; number one, it means that (18)the applicant can choose --(19)No. You're saying MR. CUCCHIARO: No. (20)the ordinance only means one thing. That the (21)ordinance means you can have 100 percent warehouse or (22)you can have 100 percent distribution center, but if (23)you want to do both, you need a use variance. (24)your position, right? (25)

MR. GASIOROWSKI: The testimony before (1) the Board of the applicant was he wanted who have the (2) ability to --(3) MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gasiorowski, we're (4) here to determine what the ordinance means. (5)incorrect -- your two witnesses just testified that (6)the ordinance means that you can either have 100 (7) percent warehouse or you can have 100 percent (8) distribution, but if you seek to combine them, you (9) are not a permitted use, and you need a use variance. (10)MR. GASIOROWSKI: But I have to have (11)the ability -- I have to have the ability to go -- to (12)explain why and give testimony why it's idealogical (13)to interpret the ordinance by saying you could have a (14)mixture of two. (15)MR. CUCCHIARO: But Mr. Steck already (16)provided that testimony. You're not providing any (17)testimony. You're providing legal arguments, which (18)you can do, but Mr. Steck provided that testimony. (19)Your traffic engineer has agreed with it and has (20)raised issues that have to do with traffic impact (21)that are properly before the planning board. (22)MR. GASIOROWSKI: Traffic issues will (23)be raised before the planning board. I agree with (24)But the issue before this Board is can this

STANDER DE LOS DE LA COMPTENSE DE LA COMPTENSE

that.

Board come up with an interpretation that says you can have a mixture of both. And the issue of traffic is relevant because it's illogical to say you're going to have a mixture throughout the history of this property of mixing warehousing with distribution centers and/or the like.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19).

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

So at the end of the day, if we walk out of here, this Board can say, look, you can have a mixture of both, you can have all of one or all of two, and then it goes to the planning board to make a determination as to whether or not it's a site plan issue. But having said that, this issue of traffic goes to what was the governing body thinking when they were passing this ordinance?

Were they thinking that you could have one of warehouse and one of distribution or were they thinking that you can combine them? The traffic is a relevant part of that equation no matter how you slice it.

MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, we haven't heard that from your witness. What is --

MR. GASIOROWSKI: Well, you didn't give him the opportunity to tell you.

MR. CUCCHIARO: -- for your witness -- and it has nothing to do necessarily with the

planning application. It has to do with any use. (1) Are you saying, then, that there's (2) going to be greater traffic associated with a mixed (3) use and the governing body wouldn't have wanted that? (4) THE WITNESS: That's correct. (5) MR. GASIOROWSKI: What I'm saying is (6) the government body would not have intended that (7) because it would have made it impossible --(8) MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gasiorowski, if you (9) want to make the legal argument, that's fine. And I (10)say let's move on from your witness. (11)MR. GASIOROWSKI: I don't understand. (12)Let me get one thing straight. You're saying to me (13)that the only reason why the governing body would (14)have permitted -- or not have permitted a mixed use, (15)that's what you're saying, correct? (16)MR. CUCCHIARO: You're saying that I've (17)now come to a conclusion. What I'm trying to (18)understand is what your conclusions are, (19)Mr. Gasiorowski. And I've asked your witness and (20)he's agreed that, number one, he agrees with (21)Mr. Steck that you can have 100 percent of warehouse (22)or 100 percent of distribution center, but you cannot (23)have a mix. And he next stated that in support of (24)that conclusion is because the traffic generation (25)

[
(1)	would be increased with a mixed use project.
(2)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: But he also as a part
(3)	of that, when you're going to the DOT or you're going
(4)	before the Board, what standard do you utilize for
(5)	the trip generation?
(6)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, but they are not
(7)	bound by our zoning ordinance. So why don't you
(8)	stick with what the words mean in our zoning
(9)	ordinance?
(10)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Now, listen to the
(11)	give and take between myself and the board engineer.
(12)	What is your interpretation
(13)	MR. CUCCHIARO: You gave me a
(14)	compliment. I have no engineering degree.
(15)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Well, what does it
(16)	have to do with the questions I'm going to ask him?
(17)	MR. CUCCHIARO: You just called me an
(18)	engineer.
(19)	. MR. GASIOROWSKI: If I did that, I
(20)	apologize.
(21)	MR. CUCCHIARO: I'm saying you gave me
(22)	a compliment.
(23)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Okay. Let's go
(24)	beyond that.
(25)	BY MR. GASIOROWSKI:

	Name of the Control o
(1)	Q. Have you formed an opinion as to what
(2)	the logical interpretation of what the zoning
(3)	ordinance in question means given the language they
(4)	utilized?
(5)	A. Um, yes.
(6)	Q. What is your
(7)	A. My understanding of the ordinance is that
(8)	distribution is permitted, distribution is permitted
(9)	by itself or warehouse but not combination of both.
(10)	And then that has to be clearly determined so that we
(11)	can do a traffic impact study and also do a proper
(12)	New Jersey do the access permit application as
(13)	well as do a proper parking demand study and so many
(14)	other things that comes with the site plan review.
(15)	Q. Would you agree would you agree that
(16)	the trip generation of a distribution center is far
(17)	greater than that of a warehouse?
(18)	A. That's correct. It's about 4.7 times on a
(19)	daily basis.
(20)	MR. ALFIERI: Mr. Chair, I'm going to
(21)	have to object again. I mean, we've spent now 9:11
(22)	and we've heard nothing tonight except that a slash
(23)	means one you could do one or the other. All of
(24)	the other testimony has been completely irrelevant.

CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Yes.

Gasiorowski, I'm going to sustain the objection. (1) intent of the ordinance is what's at stake here, and (2) this Board is going to be determining is what's being (3)proposed consistent with the ordinance exclusively. (4) Please direct your witness to answer (5) questions related to that. (6) MR. GASIOROWSKI: I'm not sure that --(7) I'm not sure that what is being proposed before the (8) planning board is really the focus of this (9) interpretation. You're here, as Mr. Cucchiaro has (10)pointed out, solely to determine what does the (11)ordinance mean, so we --(12)CHAIRMAN LEVITON: That's correct. (13)That is correct. Does Mr. Izadmehr have anything (14)further related to the intent of the ordinance? (15)BY MR. GASIOROWSKI: (16)Mr. Izadmehr, why have you formed your Q. (17)opinion as to -- what your opinion is as to the (18)intent of the ordinance? .What do you base that upon? (19)I base that upon my reading of the ordinance (20)and similar readings of other ordinances across the (21)country, as well as my review and involvement with (22)transportation engineers. And the illusion of (23)warehousing. (24)

onane del tretto dello ologo del obreso tre esperimente e o nost esperantente entre ellogoste e suvose despesa

(Brief interruption.)

CHAIRMAN LEVITON: I don't see him (1) anymore. Mr. Gasiorowski, if you'll ask your witness (2) (3) to summate, please. BY MR. GASIOROWSKI: (4) Yes. Pick up from where you left off 0. (5) and just give us your concluding remarks? (6) I was saying that basically this type of (7) category of warehouse and distribution center has (8) (9) evolved throughout the years. For example, in the last edition of the (10)ITE generation handbook, there were only three (11)categories for warehouses: Mini warehouses, (12)warehouses and distribution center. But in the (13)newest edition of ITE, they have added three or four (14)more categories. (15)So that's why it's really very critical (16)in terms of traffic, parking, noise and all the other (17)impacts to have a solid definition of what is (18)permitted in this zone and what is not permitted so (19)that we can do a true traffic impact study, parking, (20)as well as an access permit application for this (21)particular site for New Jersey to be submitted to the (22)New Jersey Department of Transportation. (23)CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, sir. (24)Mr. Gasiorowski, do you have anything

(1)	else to put on your affirmative case?
(2)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: I do not.
(3)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Would you like to
(4)	sum it up then?
(5)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: I think before I sum
(6)	up, is there going to be cross-examination or
(7)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chair, I would
(8)	suggest Mr. Gasiorowski sum up after Mr. Alfieri puts
(9)	his case on.
(10)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: All right. Then let
(11)	me go out to the public and invite the public to
(12)	cross-examine or ask questions of either Mr. Izadmehr
(13)	or Mr. Steck. If you'd like to do that, please press
(14)	9.
(15)	Is that correct, Janice, they press 9?
(16)	How do we queue them up?
(17)	MS. MOENCH: What if they just raise
(18)	their hand?
(19)	. CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. Just raise
(20)	your hand if you want to speak.
(21)	Okay. Ms. Volped, you need to
(22)	unmute yourself, ma'am.
(23]	MS. VOLPED: Okay. How about now?
(24)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Yeah. Just state
(25	your name and address, please.
	i e

	The second secon
(1)	MS. VOLPED: Eileen Volped, at 34
(2)	Crawford Road.
(3)	So in someone when I go to
(4)	this and I believe it was the first witness, when
(5)	he spoke about the zoning issues, one of the things
(6)	that I heard, and I was wondering if I can get an
(7)	interpretation, was light industrial.
(8)	When it was when they were
(9)	discussing warehouse, et cetera, there was a
(10)	pardon me?
(11)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Yes. I'm
(12)	understanding your question.
(13)	MS. VOLPED: So what would light
(14)	warehouse mean? Could it mean hundreds and hundreds
(15)	and hundreds of tractor trailers
(16)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, Mr. Chairman,
(17)	light warehouse isn't the term.
(18)	MS. VOLPED: Was it light industrial
(19)	then?
(20	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, we're not here to
(21	talk about light industrial either. Whether it's
(22	light industrial for any zone, we're here to
(23	determine what warehouse means and what distribution
(24	center means. Those are what we're seeking to
(25	define.
	1

(1)	MS. VOLPED: I'm sorry. I thought when
(2)	one of the witnesses was speaking the delineation of
(3)	the word "warehouse" in whatever zoning board was
(4)	said light industrial
(5)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, he said that our
(6)	interpretation would apply no matter what zone it was
(7)	in. So if there is a warehouse or distribution
(8)	center in the light industrial, what we do here
(9)	tonight would apply there as well.
(10)	MS. VOLPED: Maybe that's slightly over
(11)	my head, then.
(12)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, and Ms to
(13)	boil it down, what he said was, whatever we define it
(14)	as, it's not defined that way just for the site
(15)	that's the subject of the planning board application.
(16)	It would be defined that way for every lot in the
(17)	entire town.
(18)	MS. VOLPED: I see. Can I ask, also,
(19)	when was the last time the law was updated?
(20)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Meaning the ordinance?
(21)	MS. VOLPED: The ordinance.
(22)	MR. CUCCHIARO: I don't know.
(23)	MS. VOLPED: Okay. Because it would
(24)	seem to me if it was a long time ago, then you can
(25)	assume that warehouse means one thing, and if it was

(1)	fairly recently, then you can assume it might mean
(2)	something else.
(3)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, this is for
(4)	questions. So if you have questions of the
(5)	witnesses, you will have a chance to testify at the
(6)	end. But if you have a question as to their
(7)	testimony, like you had at the beginning, you can ask
(8)	that now.
(9)	MS. VOLPED: I just I'll hold off
(10)	until later.
(11)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Is there anyone else
(12)	from the public who wishes to be heard?
(13)	Okay. Seeing none, I'm going to close
(14)	the public and invite Mr. Alfieri to speak on behalf
(15)	of the client
(16)	MR. ALFIERI: Well, I'd like to
(17)	cross-examine Mr. Steck if I can, please.
(18)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Sure.
. (19)	MR. ALFIERI: Mr. Steck, are you on?
(20)	MR. STECK: Yes.
(21)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Just I can't see
(22)	you. You're on the screen, also?
(23)	MR. STECK: I thought I was. Let me
(24)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Oh, no. You're not
(25)	yet. I'll give you a second. Okay. There you go.

(1)	Mr. Alfieri, go ahead.
(2)	CROSS-EXAMINATION
(3)	BY MR. ALFIERI:
(4)	Q. Mr. Steck, you indicated that during
(5)	the course of the application the testimony was
(6)	muddled and all over the place as it relates to the
(7)	proposed use, and but you did testify that the
(8)	application, the written application, had a specific
(9)	designation of what use was proposed.
(10)	Do you recall what that was?
(11)	A. Well, there was there are different terms
(12)	on different documents because I understand
(13)	Q. No. I'm talking about the written
(14)	application itself first.
(15)	A. Well, I think that used the word well, if I
(16)	recall correctly, I think it used the word "warehouse
(17)	distribution" without a slash.
(18)	Q. Right. So the application said two
(19)	.warehouse distribution buildings? .
(20)	A. The application form that part of the
(21)	application said that, yes.
(22)	Q. Okay. And your testimony is pretty
(23)	clear that if this were a purely a distribution
(24)	center, it would be a permitted use; is that correct?
(25)	A. Yes.

(1)	Q. All right. And your whole all the
(2)	testimony you offered was essentially that the slash
(3)	means you could have one or the other but not both?
(4)	A. That's correct.
(5)	Q. Now, have you looked at the ordinance
(6)	to see if there were any other areas or definitions
(7)	where a slash was used?
(8)	A. Um, at the time yes, I did.
(9)	Q. And can you give me an example of one?
(10)	A. Well, on the title to the table, it has the
(11)	title, "industrial/transportation/communication."
(12)	Now, that would mean you don't have to have you
(13)	can't have all of them at one time. That's a
(14)	that, in my opinion, reinforces my observation that
(15)	you can have one or the other but not both.
(16)	Q. So in the SED-20/W zone, they use that
(17)	listed as a permitted use as fitness/health clubs.
(18)	Does that mean that you could either
(19)	have a fitness center or a health club but not both?
(20)	A. I didn't I didn't look at that. They may
(21)	be all defined terms in the ordinance, but in the
(22)	context of under the heading of industrial
(23)	transportation and communication issues uses, in
(24)	my opinion, the slash means one or the other and not

(25)

both.

(1)	Q. But the health the fitness/health
(2)	clubs, if you take your if you take your reasoning
(3)	to an absurd conclusion, that would mean you could
(4)	either have a fitness center I don't know what it
(5)	means. It says, fitness or a health club, but you
(6)	can't have both?
(7)	A. Well, I think you have to go to the second .
(8)	level, and to say, if they are the same types of
(9)	uses, then the slash is kind of immaterial.
(10)	In this case, we have uses that
(11)	dramatically differ in my opinion, and I think that
(12)	influences the interpretation.
(13)	Q. So it's a question of degree, then, as
(14)	to whether
(15)	A. It's a question of
(16)	Q. Let me finish the question.
(17)	It's a question of degree as to what
(18)	the slash means?
(19)	A. It's a question of context.
(20)	
(21)	
(22)	
(23)	
(24)	
(25)	same thing. In this case, there are dramatically

different uses. And in the context, in my opinion, (1) (2) this is disjunctive. The -- I asked you this at the planning Q. (3) board, but I guess I'm going to ask you again, what (4) is a distribution center, then, in your opinion --(5) can you give me a definition? (6) I would go to the definition -- well, my (7)definition, for the purposes of this interpretation, (8) is it's a use where the primary activity is not the (9) storage, the static storage, of materials or (10)The primary activity is the distribution, (11)products. the unpacking, the repacking, delivery from one truck (12)to another truck. That's the primary nature of the (13)And I would rely on -- for the lack -- because (14)the ordinance doesn't define it, I would rely on the (15)definitions in the ITE manual that talk about a (16)high-cube center. (17)So if we look at the ITE manual, Okay. (18)Ο. you used Land Use Code 155 at the planning board (19)level, did you not? (20)(21)Yes. Α. And can you describe what that means? Q. (22)Can you summarize what the 155 is? (23)Let me find it. (24)

(25)

Q.

Sure.

- (1) A. I may have to -- I may have to look at it on
 (2) minuter because I'm not sure I have a hardcopy here.
 (3) Oh, 155. Okay. That's a high-cube fulfillment
 (4) center warehouse.
 - Q. All right. And can you look at that definition a little more carefully, and I'm going to refer you to the section that says: A high-cube fulfillment center warehouse includes warehouses characterized by a significant storage function and direct distribution of E-commerce products to endusers.

It's towards the middle of the definition.

- A. Would you -- I have a copy in front of me, and I'm not following your words at the moment.
- Q. There's a -- under -- is this under the heading, "description"?
- (18) A. Yes.

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

- (19) Q. Six lines down.
- (20) A. Okay. That starts out --
- (21) Q. High-cube fulfillment center.
- (22) A. Yes. High-cube fulfillment center warehouses
 (23) include warehouses characterized by a significant
 (24) storage function and direct distribution of
- (25) E-commerce products to endusers.

So what does endusers mean to Right. Q. (1) you? (2) It's the ultimate consumer of the product. (3) Right. And the title of 155 says, (4) cube -- high-cube fulfillment center, does it not? (5) Yes, it does. (6) Have you -- and the applicant has Q. .(7). testified, number one, that it's not a fulfillment (8) And this says that the endusers are really (9) the consumers, the 155. So that's not really a (10)distribution center, that's a fulfillment center? (11)It is, in my opinion, it is -- because it is (12)different from a warehouse, which is primarily the (13)storage, in my opinion, this is a type of (14)distribution center. (15)155 is? Q. (16)It's a type of distribution center. (17)Α. Did you look at 154? (18)I did, and I -- when I find it, I will look at (19)Α. (20)it again. I have 154 in front of me. (21)So the one, two, three, four, five, six Ο. (22)seventh line down says, these facilities have a (23)primary function of consolidation and distribution of (24)pallet loads or larger for manufacturers, wholesalers (25)

or retailers. (1) So in that level, they are not going to (2) They are going to manufacturers or consumers. (3) warehouses or wholesalers, right? (4) Well, it talks about the primary function. (5) Does it say anywhere in there that they (6) can act as a fulfillment center and go directly to (7) consumers? (8) It doesn't say that in that definition. (9)So do you agree that that's the Okay. (10)Q. primary difference between 154 and 155? (11)It is one of the differences, yes. (12)All right. And the applicant -- and (13)it's our position that 154 definition is what a (14)distribution center is not 155? (15)In my opinion, Well, that's your position. (16)Α. these are subcategories of a distribution center from (17)a land use point of view. (18)And they are also subcategories of a (19)Q. warehouse, are they not? (20)In my opinion, no, because warehouse is (21)primarily the storage of goods. And none of these (22)talk about having a purpose of primary -- primarily (23)storage. (24)

Q.

(25)

Now, the other argument that the --

(1)	that I think both you and the traffic engineer
(2)	testified to is that it's not logical to have a
(3)	combination of uses because one would not be able to
(4)	determine the impact of traffic and maybe other
(5)	things.
(6)	But as Mr but as Cucchiaro pointed
(7)	out, if you allow the 100 percent distribution .
(8)	center, wouldn't that be the most intense of the uses
(9)	that could be permitted and that therefore a
(10)	combination would not be more intense, it would be
(11)	less intense?
(12)	A. That's correct.
(13)	MR. ALFIERI: I don't think I have any
(14)	other questions.
(15)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you,
(16)	Mr. Alfieri.
(17)	Ron, what do you recommend now? Should
(18)	we go out to the public again or should we
(19)	MR. CUCCHIARO: No. The public's had .
(20)	their opportunity, so I think we now leave it to
(21)	Mr. Gasiorowski to put his witness up.
(22)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay:
(23)	Mr. Gasiorowski.
(24)	MR. ALFIERI: No, you mean me, right,
(25)	Ron?

(1)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Right. I'm sorry.
(2)	Yes. All you attorneys look the same to me.
(3)	Yes. Mr. Alfieri.
(4)	MR. ALFIERI: I was going to say one of
(5)	the great benefits in this whole process is we all
(6)	learned a new word "virgule" because none of us heard
(7)	it before.
(8)	We have one witness. We have a planner
(9)	who we'd like to call.
(10)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Please do.
(11)	MR. ALFIERI: Tran, are you up there
(12)	somewhere?
(13)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay.
(14)	(Witness sworn.)
(15)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Please state and spell
(16)	your name for the record.
(17)	MR. RAHENKAMP: Good evening. It's
(18)	Craig, C-R-A-I-G, Rahenkamp, R-A-H-E-N-K-A-M-P, P.O.
(19)	Box 222, Riverton, New Jersey.
(20)	DIRECT EXAMINATION
(21)	BY MR. ALFIERI:
(22)	Q. Craig, would you place your planning
(23)	credentials on the record, please?
(24)	A. Sure. I'll give you a short version. I've
(25)	been in the field for 39 years. Licensed as a

professional planner in New Jersey for 25. Actually (1) served as a field expert in the development for (2)questions for that exam. I've qualified in the trial (3) courts in over 150 trials and hearings. I'd served (4) as a court-appointed counselor, lecturer at Rowan, (5) testified before state agencies and appeared (6) regularly before planning and zoning boards (7) throughout the state. (8)

CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you,

Mr. Rahenkamp. This Board accepts your credentials.

BY MR. ALFIERI:

- Q. And, Mr. Rahenkamp, you've had the opportunity to review the Manalapan Township ordinance not just the SED-W -- 20/W section and the list of permitted uses, but the entirety of the zoning ordinance, have you not?
- A. I have, yes.

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

- Q. And can you give the Board your -initially, your opinion as to whether the SED-20/W
 zone allows -- and we'll just go with either for
 now -- warehouses and/or distribution -- warehouses
 or distribution centers?
- A. Let me start with -- because we're trying to compare a defined use and an undefined use, and I think we have to go back to square one on this one.

The functions of warehousing have four activities that occur within the building and then two accessories. You receive goods, you store them to repackage and reorder them, and then you ship them. Those are the four activities that have occurred in warehouses forever.

And then there are two accessories that go with that. Typically there's some office space that there's some administrative function in overseeing the people and technology that's moving the goods, and there's usually some sales for activity, a display area for some of the goods, the ability to accept returns, some additional sales-related activity that occurs as part of warehousing.

And then there are the things that you store. Dry, cold and liquid are the typical divisions of the types of goods. There are the modes of transportation: Airport, train, truck, and then there's from whom you're getting the goods and to whom they go.

And how you vary all of these things, you can come up with lots of different names that are used in the industry for various concepts and in different ways. I think as a starting point, what's

(22)(23)(24)(25)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

important is that while an ordinance can theoretically differentiate amongst lots of things, yours doesn't. Yours has the headline category warehouse, which is like the headline category of office or retail in which a myriad, variety of things can occur under those top headings and add simply as a qualifier of the additional distribution.

I'm not saying an ordinance couldn't, for example, say, we don't want cold storage in our community or we don't want trains unloading in our community or, you know, the from whom to whom kinds of issues that you couldn't write an ordinance that does that. But your ordinance doesn't do that.

It simply permits the warehouse function, which includes, generically, all of those things. So starting from that perspective its foundation of how we describe the use.

The second thing I want to say is this dash that everyone seems to be so focused on isn't actually in the ordinance. It's in the table. If you go to Section 95-5.2, the description of districts, under the heading, New Jersey State Highway 33 quarter development zoning, you have the SED-20/W. And next to it is warehouse space distribution. There's no slash in the actual text of

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

the ordinance. The slash shows up in Table 99-5 and, frankly, that table is slash happy.

They are trying to fit a lot of text in a little box in basically an Excel spreadsheet. So you have slashes, for example, artisan/craft. They are not trying to make a distinction between two different kinds of things that people need. It's simply two words to try and convey that overall outset, public/quasi public, public utilities/local utilities. The table gets slash happy, but these are not slashes that are actually in the text of the ordinance. So I think we're putting way too much emphasis on the importance of that slash.

So the next thing I want to touch on is the use of the ITE as some sort of substitute or guide to try and tell us what the defined uses are.

And to try and keep this brief, I will simply say that those of us in the -- on the applicant side of planning, design have to come up with tools and techniques to assess the impact of a development.

And there are lots of tools that we use to do that that don't tie back necessarily to permitted uses.

So, for example, I did a lot of work for Commerce Bank, now TD bank, and they refer to their banking institution as stores, and they

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

generate a lot of traffic. Bank of America have well management centers, which are also banks. Still the same permitted use but have wildly different impacts in terms of traffic.

MR. GASIOROWSKI: I'm going to object

MR. GASIOROWSKI: I'm going to object to the relevance of this testimony because the purpose is supposedly what this particular ordinance in your municipality means. It's not about Commerce Bank or some other place.

MR. ALFIERI: But he's trying -- he's testifying how one would interpret language within an ordinance not what the other ordinance is saying how the interpretation --

MR. GASIOROWSKI: It's not allowed to give testimony as to how it should be interpreted predicated upon traffic counts or the like. Here we're going -- roaming all over the state to stores, to banks and the like.

MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chairman, I would recommend Mr. Rahenkamp continue. But Mr. Rahenkamp if you could, you know, sort of bring it into what you believe these words mean. I mean, you've testified, you know, clearly on what you believe the relevance and significance of the slash is.

If you can maybe just help to hone it

(23)(24)(25)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

in on how the Board should define the words. (1) I'll simply THE WITNESS: I will. (2) conclude my testimony about the ITE, saying it's no (3) different than the multipliers we use for physical (4) impact, and we use -- and value of units to figure (5) out how many school children come to the unit none of (6)which are allowed to be zoning categories. (7)So the fact that there are books that (8) we use in the industry to talk about generation of (9)traffic, or people, or school children, or anything (10)else has nothing to do with how we classify uses. (11)BY MR. ALFIERI: (12)I just want to focus you back Okay. Q. (13)just because it hasn't come up tonight at all, but in (14)referencing your Section 95-5.2, what is the (15)significance of that section of the ordinance, which (16)is entitled Description of Districts? (17)It's naming the districts in the community. (18)It's the only place actually in the text of the (19)You then go ordinance that the district is saying. (20)to the table to find permitted uses, but the slash (21)does not exist in the creation of the district (22)because warehouse is space distribution. (23)So based upon that alone, forgetting (24)

and stille see illige Belle of the triberation of the energy of the firefaction of the energy of the firefaction of the

about how it's worded in the text of the -- of the --

of the schedule, what is your opinion as to what is (1) permitted in the zone as it relates to warehouse's (2) distribution? (3) I am going to struggle because I can't do it (4) My point is that I'm about to make is on that alone. (5)that they really are not two different things. (6)you can't be one or the other because they are both (7) elements of the same thing. (8) And -- continue. I'm sorry. Okay. (9)So one of the places that we planners look to (10)for definitions in land use is a book by Moskowitz & (11)It's been in publication now for several (12)And it's the illustrated fact list for a decades. (13)In a warehouse in 1993 -- this lot of definitions. (14)is from an older version of the book. "Warehouses (15)may be for long-term or short-term storage. (16)Short-term storage facilities for a specific (17)commercial establishment are called distribution (18)centers." (19)So we are simply talking about a (20)distribution center as a warehouse that has one user, (21)a resident, rather than multiple users in the (22)building, and has a shorter storage time. Still does (23)storage, but does it over a shorter period of time.

en angelig tigene in en ten angen angen gennen in nyeren de i magetig dez den an da dez en di di di en e

That book has been amended multiple

(24)

2015 is the most recent one that I am aware times. (1) It now has four columns about how municipalities (2)can differentiate amongst kinds of warehouses, design (3) things that you can do to make them look better, (4) landscaping and that sort of thing. (5) It's the core definition of the use --(6) I'm sorry. Were you objecting, sir? (7)MR. GASIOROWSKI: If he wants to (8) produce the book that we have before us, and it can (9) be cross-examined with regards to it, that would be (10)This is just really basically hearsay. (11)MR. ALFIERI: Except that your (12)witnesses testified to the ITE standards, and they (13)weren't submitted. (14)MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gasiorowski, one, I (15)would agree with Mr. Alfieri that we provided you (16)very wide latitude to refer to things that we never (17)received. (18)Secondly, the latest illustrative book (19)of development definitions by Harvey Moskowitz and (20)Carl Lindblook is not a random text. It's a text (21)that's been recognized as a legitimate source by the (22)New Jersey courts. (23)So I think the Board can take judicial (24)notice of a text that the courts have determined to

be in authority. Similar to, you know, if someone (1) were to quote something out of the Oxford Dictionary, (2) you know, or something like that. (3) My only caution would be that my (4) recollection is that in the Moskowitz book, he does (5) have a section early on where he basically says, "Be (6) aware, I am.not a lawyer", and these are, you know, (7) definitions the way I'm proposing them that would (8) look good in an ordinance and, you know, sort of (9) pours a little bit of water on how heavily we rely (10)upon them. (11)MR. GASIOROWSKI: Why doesn't (12)Mr. Alfieri call Mr. Moskowitz, then we could (13)cross-examine him? (14)MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chairman, I (15)recommend that Mr. Gasiorowski's objection be (16)overruled. (17)This is a text that's been accepted by (18)the New Jersey courts, and he is not adopting it. (19)is saying that it's a source he looked at to help him (20)form his opinion. (21)CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, (22)Mr. Cucchiaro. (23)Continue, Mr. Rahenkamp. (24)THE WITNESS: Thank you, sir. The (25)

RECORD OF A CONTROL OF THE PROPERTY OF THE PRO

court quotes in the 2015 version, and I accept Mr. Cucchiaro's comment that this is authored by planners not lawyers.

l propertio o large serie especiase. La roperte e relativario propertir de repensa elle processimente de la co

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

In addition to the storage of goods and materials modern warehouses function as distribution centers. Products are received, broken down into smaller quantities, often assembled, and then shipped. In the modern warehouse the holding time is generally short.

Again, the -- the planning reference that a planner would turn to is essentially saying a distribution center is essentially a warehouse in a more modern context with more rapid turnover of the goods that are being stored, but the storage is still a function of a distribution center.

So in the context of the idea that you're either a warehouse or a distribution center, you can't realistically be a distribution center if you're not also undertaking the storage function at the same time. You may be doing less of it. You may be doing it for a shorter period of time, but you're still doing storage.

And the last thing I would leave you with is that as a person who's involved in the industry, we've been talking about warehouse

distribution, fulfillment has sort of come in from left field as an idea, but I'll tell you that there are words like transshipment, intermodal terminal, last mile facility, forward distribution, pack and ship, merchant support facility. There are an array of words that go in the industry used differently by different actors within the industry, different companies will use different language.

So just because they're -- if we have these words, and they are not defined in an ordinance, I don't think we can freely make them up and sort of give meaning to them because there's so I think, as I said in many and they are so varied. the very beginning, the toughest job, I think, for the Board, is going to be determining what functions are not permitted in a warehouse in this district. For a zoning administrator, that's the issue. Clearly we can is it that they can't do there. receive goods, clearly we'd be able to store goods, So I'm not sure what repackage them and ship them. the interpretation before you is asking for you to reject, and nothing beyond a normal function of a warehouse are part of the application that's before the planning board.

And that's all I have, sir.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

BY MR. ALFIERI: (1) Just one follow-up question about the (2) Q. (3) slash. Yes, sir. (4) Do you -- if we focus simply on that (5) and exclude everything else that you've testified to, (6) do you have an opinion as to how the slash should be (7) interpreted under these circumstances? (8) Um, slashes are often used in the writing of (9) Α. ordinances to incorporate sort of different flavors (10)of the same word. And that is why I highlighted the (11)artisan/craft as a parallel to this. They're not (12)creating a distinction between artisanal goods and (13)crafted goods, there are saying, there's this (14)universe of things these words can both apply, and (15)we're throwing them together with a slash to indicate (16)the broader universe. (17)I think the governing body putting the (18)word "distribution" here was essentially trying to (19)protect future applicants from the idea that you (20)could only do a standard, long-term dry good (21)warehouse that distribution was part of the (22)activities that were permitted in this district. (23)MR. ALFIERI: That's all we have, (24)

Mr. Chairman.

(1)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON:Okay. Then at this
(2)	time, let's go out to the public and ask if there's
(3)	anyone who wants to ask Mr. Rahenkamp questions about
(4)	what he's entered into testimony this evening.
(5)	I'm looking for you to raise your hand.
(6)	Okay. Seeing none, then, I will close
(7)	public. ·
(8)	Mr. Alfieri, do you want to close?
(9)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: I have some
(10)	cross-examination, if I may?
(11)	
(12)	MR. ALFIERI: And we have Mr. Chair,
(13)	we have no other witnesses.
(14)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay.
(15)	Mr. Gasiorowski.
(16)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Thank you.
(17)	CROSS-EXAMINATION
(18	
(19	
(20	
(21	you used the term "slash happy" in your testimony?
(22	
(23	
(24	
(2:	cover the entire spectrum of warehouse-distribution

centers-fulfillment centers and the like, that all of these are kind of subsidiary by the term "warehouse"?

A. I have two answers for that. First, since the mid 1920s, Standard Enabling Act model created by the chamber and others, warehouse has been one of the top five: Residential, industrial, warehouse, retail and one more that I forget.

amperul purtur la alt metromete el a Rabert e a centra menana la labral de accentence de la religió de establece de

So, yes, my testimony is the start of the position that warehouse is the top-line category in which everything else is a subset. That kind of approach is taken not only in the original zoning ordinances, but it's also reflected in the standard industrial classifications and North American Industrial Classification System, warehouse is the top --

- Q. You focus on --
- A. -- my second part of that answer is that municipalities are certainly free in creating a zoning ordinance to create distinctions. I am not saying they're bound by that, but the starting position for those words is that warehouse is the top-line category.
- Q. Let's talk about this ordinance. This ordinance says, warehouse/distribution center. It has two definitive separate names, doesn't it?

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(1) A. Sir, we disagree about that. The ordinance
(2) itself, the actual text of the ordinance has no
(3) slash. Table 95-5 has a slash.

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

. (19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

- Q. Okay. Now, let me ask you a question with regards to distribution centers. I think you said in your testimony that there is sort of a whole spectrum of distribution centers. Now, would you argue, is it your position, that with regard to a distribution center, any and all of those categories in the ITE, subjects 154, 155 and 156 are distribution centers?
- A. There is nothing in this ordinance with which distinguishes to whom goods were sent that would lead to a distinction. So, yes, under this ordinance I don't think that these subcategories exist.
- Q. Okay. Would you agree with me then that if there was a Category 156, that the trip generation being created by that is far greater than the 150 category of a warehouse?
- A. Sure. And in retail I can find something that generates more traffic than a furniture store, sure. There are lots of things that have different generation rates.
- Q. Having said that, does that not then mean that if an applicant were to come before the

Board and say that it's a distribution center, that (1) the Board could say, we are going to give -- we want (2) greater testimony with regard to the trip generations (3) of this particular use? (4) I don't see anything that limits a Um, yeah. (5)planning board in terms of the questions it wants to (6) ask, although there's obviously a limit as to the (7)degree to which off-track traffic is relevant in a (8) site plan application. (9) I'm not talking about offsite traffic. (10)

on the second second second second second

Q. I'm not talking about offsite traffic.

I'm talking about traffic on this site. The

testimony before the Court that this particular

application fit within the category under the ITE of

150, which is warehouse.

But unlike your position, the DOT and the ITE has a various subset of other distribution type centers which have far greater traffic impacts?

A. Sure. I'm working on a distribution center in another community that looks very different. It's got only a dozen tractor trailer entry points. And they are driving hundreds of vans through the building, loading the vans in buildings and leaving. It has very different traffic implication.

Q. Well, with -- your testimony all of that would be permitted in this particular use. Vans

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

could drive into the building, drive out of the (1) building and the like; isn't that so? (2)

AND TRANSPORTED BY A STATE OF THE PROPERTY OF THE STATE OF THE STATE OF THE TRANSPORT OF THE TRANSPORTED FOR THE STATE OF THE STATE OF

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

- My testimony to this Board is that the ordinance itself has no distinctions permitting or not permitting subcategories within the warehouse. The applicant before the planning board is not proposing that. That's a different issue. (7)
 - Let's just talk about this idea of the Q. conjunctive rather than the disjunctive. Would you agree with Mr. Steck saying that if you interpret the ordinance in the conjunctive, that you could have a mix of uses being a warehouse and distribution center linked together on one piece of property or is it your testimony that there's really no distinction between a warehouse and a distribution center? Um, I'm in the latter category. I understand Α. the linguistic gymnastics of saying it's A or B not both, but since a distribution center has the warehouse function, the storage function, inherently part of that activity, I have no idea what you're saying it is an applicant can't do.
 - Your basic testimony is, is that Q. the governing body in this particular municipality did not seek to establish any guidelines for use but simply said, by warehouse/distribution center you

could put any of those uses of the ITE, whether it's (1) 150, 154, 155, 156 and use them together however you (2)want to do it. (3) That's what you're saying, isn't it? (4) I don't agree with way you've expressed it, (5) but the conclusion is correct. (6) The conclusion is correct. Yeah. Q. (7)you're saying that ten years ago or whenever the (8) governing body established this ordinance they gave (9) absolutely no consideration to controlling the use? (10)Let's be clear, this is a use in a district (11)that also permits very high intensity office --(12)I don't care what --Q. (13)Sir, let me finish my answer, please. (14)It also has very -- other high traffic (15)And also this particular tract was generated uses. (16)put into the zoning district three years ago. (17)So we're not talking about ancient (18)history, we're talking about a governing body (19)designing a zone ordinance applied to this tract only (20)three years ago. (21)Is it your position as a planner that, (22)Q. in fact, just because the applicant calls this a (23)warehouse, he's entitled to all the benefits of the (24)150 -- rather than the higher -- of 156, which would

MENT MORE AND AND A CONTROL OF AN AREA OF A STATE OF A

l	
(1)	generate more traffic?
(2)	A. I don't know what those benefits are that you
(3)	think the applicant is claiming.
(4)	Q. I just have a couple more questions.
(5)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: I have no more
(6)	questions.
(7)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chair, just before
(8)	we go into closing arguments, we open it up to the
(9)	public for cross-examination. We should just open it
(10)	up if they have any direct testimony, and then we can
(11)	get the closing arguments from each counsel.
(12)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. Then at this
(13)	
(14)	without cross-examination. If you want to offer an
(15)	opinion, now would be the time.
(16)	Please raise your hand.
(17)	Okay. Seeing none, then, we'll let you
(18)	close, Mr. Gasiorowski and then Mr. Alfieri.
. (19)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, actually,
(20)	Mr. Chair, since Mr. Gasiorowski is the applicant, I
(21)	would have Mr. Alfieri close first and then Mr.
(22	Gasiorowski.
(23	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Done.
(24	MR. ALFIERI: Thank you, Mr. Chairman,
(25	members of the Board. We spent a lot of time on
`	

what's a relatively simple issue, and our planner has been very succinct in making it clear what the ordinance means.

et divers to the community of the community of the community and the community of the commu

The 95-5.2, which is the description of the district said what -- for this zone, SED-20/W, warehouse distribution without a slash. The slash comes up in the schedule of permitted uses. There is a slash used elsewhere within the ordinance. It's illogical to take -- to make the conclusion using the health fitness center, for example, that you could have one or the other but not both.

And if you look at the intensity of the use, which is where the applicant in this case was trying to emphasize, it's also illogical to presume that the governing body said you could have a distribution center, which if we stipulate how they portrayed it, is five times as much traffic. You can have 100 percent of that or you can have a warehouse, which is 20 percent of the traffic, but you can't have both. Why would the governing body allow 100 percent of an intent use versus a mixed use, which would clearly be less intense.

The other point as it relates to that is if the governing body was concerned with the mixture of uses, it would do what they do in other

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

districts where they will say you can have a (1) warehouse, and you can have 20 percent office, but (2) you can't have more than 20 percent office because (3) the office generates more parking demand than a (4) warehouse. (5) So if the governing body clear -- if (6) their intent was to limit the mixture, they could (7) have done that in some way by percentage. (8) That really was the entire -not their intention. (9)the entirety of this case was simply whether that (10)slash means disjunctive or conjunctive. We think (11)it's clear that you can have one or both, and there's (12)Thank you. no limitation on that. (13)CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, (14)Mr. Alfieri. (15)Mr. Gasiorowski. (16)MR. GASIOROWSKI: When you look at the (17)definition of warehouse in the ordinance, it says (18)quite clearly, "Any structure designed for or (19)utilized primarily for the storage of goods and (20)Terms shall include self storage, mini -materials. (21)and commercial warehouse activity." (22)Now, the witness or the expert for the (23)user is basically saying that there are no

distinctions of any of these uses. And if you look

(24)

(25)

at the use of the slash in the schedule, it would say that if the Board was just -- the governing body was just slash happy, there is significance, too. is significance to the use of a slash. A slash is a disjunctive and -- it's one or the other. we ask what's the significance of that, the significance is that if the -- if you go with just a -- let's say a distribution center use, and the intensity of the traffic is far greater, that has an impact upon the use of the property. It has an It has an impact upon sound. It impact upon noise. has an impact of the noise coming off the tractor None of that -- now, if they are going to go back, those are the things they should have to produce, and that's why it is so important to make a distinction between what is a warehouse and what is a distribution center; otherwise, the ordinance has no Thank you. significance at all.

and the <u>selection of the contract services of the contract of</u>

CHAIRMAN LEVITON: You're welcome.

Thank you, sir. Okay. At this time we are now going to go to the Board, and they are going to cross-examine expert witnesses or ask the counselors questions. And when the Board has finished, we will then go to our professionals, and they can give us some final thoughts before the Board takes action.

(25)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(1)	We're going to take a five-minute
(2)	break.
(3)	(Recess taken at 9:58 p.m.)
(4)	(Commencing at 10:01 p.m.)
(5)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. Let's
(6)	reconvene. Terry, are you nearby?
(7)	MR. ROSENTHAL: Okay.
(8)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Terry, once again,
(9)	we're going to go to the Board, and then we're going
(10)	to go to the professionals, and then the Board will
(11)	take action.
(12)	Terry?
(13)	MR. ROSENTHAL: Yeah. I have a few
(14)	comments of sort of in agreement with
(15)	Mr. Rahenkamp talking about industry custom/usage.
(16)	One firm distributes products from their warehouse to
(17)	the stores, so my feeling is that all distribution
(18)	centers are warehouses, but not all warehouses are
(19)	distribution centers.
(20)	So as far as the applicant, I would say
(21	they have to ask for a distribution center not a
(22) warehouse, unless it was strictly for storage.
(23	Does that make sense?
(24	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: It does, yes. Are
(25	you posing a question or are you just

MR. ROSENTHAL: No, I'm not. I'm just (1) My opinion is that if they have to making comments. (2)ask for a distribution center, if they are going to (3) distribute products from that building. (4) CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thanks, Terry. (5) MR. ROSENTHAL: I -- actually, that (6) answered my question, to be honest with you. (7) CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. (8) MR. GREGOWICZ: No. My questions are (9) already answered. (10)Mollie? CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. (11)MS. KARMEN: The semantics of the (12)logistics of the facility -- if this was 40 years (13)ago, you know, it would be clearly cut; however, in (14)light of the pandemic and the reality of the (15)E-commerce world that we live in today, regardless if (16)you're B to B or B to C, the flowboxity (phonetic) of (17)the people from the supply chain standard is -- they (18)bleed through to one another. I don't think really (19)you can differentiate between a warehouse versus a (20)fulfillment center, a solution center, a distribution (21)center, et cetera. Just purely depends on who the (22)supply chain manager is because in theory Mr. Steck (23)would potentially be -- a warehouse would be more (24)stacked -- however in the E-commerce world that we (25)

live in today, you know, would be storing things, but on a high season demand's time, you know, you may be storing Christmas balls in February and March, but between October and December, they will be flying out of there, and you'll be having trucks coming in and out constantly.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

So I don't have to agree with me for -that, but they all marry one another, but I have a question actually for counsel for us, it's that: trying to differentiate or establish the definition as to what the zoning for this particular parcel is, is this the -- is this just a general for distribution or solution center or any type of logistics facility umbrella, and whatever it peddles out of this parcel will not have any clear definition? Because regardless of what it is defined as, my personal concern is if this becomes, for example -- I'm just using as an example -- if this becomes like a medical marijuana dispensary distribution center, I would have a very hard time if, you know, it technically would fall under the definition of a distribution center --

MR. CUCCHIARO: I think we can be assured it does not, and that actually has its own separate set of regulations that are associated with

it, but I'll get into that in greater detail, you (1) I am going to give some final thoughts, but I (2)once -- and you can actually make that specifically a (3) part of what you say tonight if you wish, that you do (4) not believe that medical marijuana distribution is (5) one of the permitted uses under the definition. (6)MS. MOENCH: Then I'm puzzled to say (7)exactly what part of the semantics, short of a (8) caricature that we're really being focused on, is (9)(10)it --MR. CUCCHIARO: Being focused on what (11)does the word -- it's -- well, there's a definition (12)of warehouse, and they're asking you to define what (13)distribution center means, and also you have to make (14)a determination of what the slash mark means. (15)MS. MOENCH: Okay. (16)MS. BEAHM: And, Ron, if I could just (17)It's not just for this step in for half a second. (18)particular location -- it's not just for this (19)particular site, it's for, you know, what these words (20)mean overall in the -- in the overall zone, correct? (21)MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, in any zone, not (22)the overall zone. Anywhere in the municipality. (23)MS. BEAHM: So it's not specific to (24)just this one piece of property. I just want to make

(25)

(1)	sure, I mean, we spent a lot of time talking about
(2)	this particular piece of property, but it's overall
(3)	what those words mean in our ordinance, period.
(4)	MS. MOENCH: Thank you for clarifying.
(5)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, Jennifer.
(6)	Okay. David?
(7)	MR. SCHERTZ: I have no questions at
(8)	this time, no comments either.
(9)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay.
(10)	Adam?
(11)	MR. WEISS: Yeah. I have a couple for
(12)	Mr. Rahenkamp. You indicated that this particular
(13)	edition or amendment occurred about three years ago;
(14)	is that accurate?
(15)	
(16)	parcel into this zone happened about three years ago.
(17)	
(18	
(19	clarifying that In your testimony you were somewhat
(20	
(21	
(22	And I thought you were rather dismissive of the slash
(23	
(24	
(2:	instead of the slash, didn't they put an "ampersand"

or an "and" sign if they meant it to be "and"? (1) MR. RAHENKAMP: Let me clean up my (2)language since I seem to have offended with the slash (3) happy comment. (4) MR. WEISS: You didn't offend me. (5) MR. RAHENKAMP: But my broader point is (6) the ordinance itself at 95-5.2 doesn't have a slash. (7) And usually in an interpretation we look at text (8)first and tables are summaries. So the table has (9) lots of slashes. We're trying to compress (10)information into a small area, and they use the slash (11)I think we're all guilty of that when to do that. (12)The actual text of we're compressing information. (13)the ordinance doesn't have a slash. (14)MR. WEISS: Okay. And you would agree (15)with me, though, that instead of a slash in order to (16)save real estate in the table, they could have put an (17)"ampersand" or an "and" sign if they want to make it (18)mean or make it more clear that it was actually an (19)"and"; is that correct? (20)The governing MR. RAHENKAMP: Yes. (21)body could certainly have been clearer taking its (22)time and written longer paragraphs about what they (23)intended here rather than just using broad concepts. (24)That could have been done. I can't argue with Yeah. (25)

om successo de la colonidada de mássica de mássica de la colonidade del colonidade de la co

(1)	that.
(2)	MR. WEISS: Thank you.
(3)	MR. RAHENKAMP: And then perhaps that's
(4)	for your annual report to say we really do need more
(5)	detail in our warehouses and definition because we
(6)	don't want cold storage transshipment center, you
(7)	know, something completely different that nobody has
(8)	even imagined.
(9)	So I think that's a reasonable thing
(10)	for this Board to do.
(11)	MR. WEISS: Thank you.
(12)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Larry?
(13)	MR. COOPER: Well, at this time
(14)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Larry, you're still
(15)	
(16)	
(17)	
(18	that have been made, and I look forward to voting on
(19	this one way or the other.
(20	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay.
(21	Rob?
(22	MR. DITOLA: Yeah. Mr. Chairman, I
(23	
(24	
(2:	where you store goods. And a distribution center to
,	

(1)	me is a place that you store goods, and then							
(2)	immediately transport them out for distribution.							
(3)	So I think this is a clear definition.							
(4)	I don't think there was meant to be two things at the							
(5)	same time. I think it's one or the other. And							
(6)	that's just my opinion. So I have no further							
(7)	questions. I just wanted to state that opinion.							
(8)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Basil?							
(9)	Thank you, Rob.							
(10)	MR. MANTAGAS: I have no questions at							
(11)	this time.							
(12)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. Although this							
(13)	seems to be a matter exclusively for Jennifer, I							
(14)	don't want to hurt Brian's feelings, let's see if he							
(15)	has anything to say.							
(16)	Mr. Boccanfuso?							
(17)	MR. BOCCANFUSO: Thank you,							
(18)	Mr. Chairman. And I agree with that. I think that							
(19)	Ron hit it on the head at the outset here that this							
(20)	is a really just a matter of determining what the							
(21)	ordinance intends. It has little to nothing to do							
(22)	with engineering.							
(23)	In the event, I'll be available to							
(24)	answer questions if you have any, but I would defer							
(25)	to our planner and our attorney for the comment.							

CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. So Jennifer, (1) and then Ron, and then we'll call for action. (2) MS. BEAHM: Thank you, Mr. Chair. (3) have listened to all the testimony this evening, but (4) in advance of the hearing, I myself looked into a (5) number of definitions for distribution center. (6) don't frequently use the ITE as my go-to when I --(7) when the ordinance is silent on a definition. (8) I also use the Moskowitz book that was (9) referred to earlier that generally has definitions (10)for just about everything -- category you can (11)And in looking at the definition of a (12)distribution center, it talks about an establishment (13)engaged in receipt, storage and distribution of (14)goods, cargo and materials, including transshipment (15)by boat, rail, air, or motor vehicles. And then (16)underneath it says, "see warehouse." (17)You know, and then warehouse is just, (18)as our ordinance is -- states in the definition (19)section, it's a facility for the storage of goods. (20)So I would interpret a distribution (21)center to be a subset of a warehouse, which I think (22)was testified earlier by Mr. Rahenkamp that, you (23)know, the warehouse is at the top, and then there are (24)a number of different subsets of that broader land

ER BUNGER LED AND BUNGER BUNGER BUNGER DER STERN DER RETERRESE DER LEIGE DER BERTRESE DER BURGER DER STERNE DE

(25)

use category that the -- that a distribution center would fall under.

I also do want to -- thinking along those lines, I want to go back to what the definition of warehouse is in our ordinance, and it talks about any structure designed for or utilized primarily for the storage of goods and materials. This term shall include self-storage, mini or other form of commercial warehouse activity.

So I would also potentially argue that a distribution center being a subset of the global warehouse, this would fall under the category of other form of commercial warehouse activity. So, in fact -- well, it's not specifically called out as a distribution center. Maybe it does contemplate other types of warehousing in the global definition.

So I don't -- I don't necessarily agree, and I know that Ron has a lot of information on what exactly this slash mark means, but I -- I . don't read our ordinance to exclusively say one or the other. But again, it's ultimately your decision at the end of the day as to how you want to go. And I think from a legal perspective, Ron would have more insight as to, you know, how that works.

MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Mr. Chair,

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

before I follow up on my legal analysis, and Jen has (1) now provided some testimony. She's subject to (2)I don't know if -cross-examination. (3) Mr. Gasiorowski, do you have any cross-examination (4) you want to give of -- or anything of Ms. Beahm? (5) MR. GASIOROWSKI: I do have one (6) question. . (7)CROSS-EXAMINATION (8) BY MR. GASIOROWSKI: (9) Ms. Beahm, listening to your testimony, (10)can you give any explanation at all as to why the (11)slash was used in this instance? (12)The drafting of that ordinance I cannot. (13)creates my involvement, so I really don't have any (14)information as to the intent associated with the (15)slash mark. (16)Well, do you have any idea or concept Q. (17)as to the purpose of a slash being there? (18)As I said, I was not the author of the (19)I mean, I reviewed it as it could be ordinance. (20)warehouse, it could be a distribution center. (21)actually don't necessarily disagree with (22)Mr. Rahenkamp's testimony with respect to cramming in (23)all the information that needs to be put into a table (24)that has to be easily reproducible for members of the (25)

CONCERNATION OF CONTROL OF CONTROL OF CONTROL OF THE CONTROL OF CO

public, et cetera, in an eight and a half by 11 format that it's still legible at a font size that you can read. There's many instances where words are shortened, other things are done in those types of tables to make the documentation legible, but as far as like the intent associated with that introduction of that slash mark, I don't have any information with regard to that.

- Q. Well, if Mr. Rahenkamp's testimony is correct, following up on the comment of one of the other Board members, why didn't they just simply use the word "A" rather than "D"?
- A. Well, I think a slash mark can be "and/or" it doesn't have to be "and". So, you know, in going back to something that was pointed out earlier by your own witness, fitness/health center, you know, in his testimony he discussed that that's the same use, so it doesn't really matter. You know, here it's a bit different. I don't necessarily think you can cherry pick, you know, how you want to utilize those kinds of things. It either is or it isn't, I guess.

But at the end of the day, I don't -- I would not -- if I were the author of that table and were expected to provide all of the relevant information, I would not have used an "ampersand", in

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(1)	my professional experience, I would not have done it.							
(1)	Q. But you were not the author of the							
(2)								
(3)	ordinances.							
(4)	A. As I said.							
(5)	MR. GASIOROWSKI: Pass the witness.							
(6)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Mr. Alfieri, do you							
(7)	have anything?							
(8)	MR. ALFIERI: Nothing.							
(9)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. Mr. Chair,							
(10)	hearing all that							
(11)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON:Ron, give me a							
(12)	second. I want to ask Jen a question.							
(13)	Jen, you're saying distribution, which							
(14)	is short-term, is a subset of warehouse, which is							
(15)	long-term that it's not a different use, but it's							
(16)	more questionable							
(17)	MS. BEAHM: Well, I don't necessarily							
(18)	think the term "warehouse" equals long-term. I think							
(19)	it equals storage. And then, in my opinion, looking							
(20)	at how these things are, you know, differentiated, I							
(21)	think a distribution center is a subset of a global							
(22)	use of warehouse, just like you have retail as a							
(23)	global use, and then below retail you can have a							
(24	series of different types of uses that would qualify							
(25	under that category.							

So in my opinion, I think warehouse is (1) a -- kind of the upper level use, and a distribution (2)center is a subset of that. There are other types (3) of -- you could name it whatever you want; shipping (4)and receiving, fulfillment center, whatever you want (5) There are all different types of ways to (6) store and transfer materials, all of which at some (7)point are stored. (8)Like, to me, a distribution center, it (9)doesn't mean that they don't -- the materials don't (10)get to stay there. I mean, maybe they are there for (11)That could be considered short-term, but (12)it's still being stored at some point before it's (13)moved. (14)CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Let me be clear, do (15)you believe that the application before the planning (16)board is consistent with the ordinance? (17)MS. BEAHM: I -- in my opinion, based (18)on my reading of the ordinance, the application (19)before the planning board is permitted. (20)CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. (21)Mr. Cucchiaro? (22)So one, I want MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. (23)to talk about, you know, Mr. Rahenkamp's distinction (24)between the use of the virgule and the text of the (25)

ordinance versus the charts. And, you know, one of the things I talked about early on is in the ordinance interpretation, one of the goals is you have to harmonize the various sections of the ordinance, so that one doesn't render another meaningless.

So I think to say that because the text doesn't use the slash, you shouldn't interpret it as meaning anything in the chart, makes the use of it in the chart irrelevant. And I don't think you can do that as a matter of ordinance interpretation. It was used there. It has some significance.

So with the -- the use of the virgule, there's actually case law in New Jersey. It doesn't have to do with land use. Most of the -- there's about three cases. As you can imagine, the courts are not wrestling with the slash marks that often, but they have.

So the courts actually don't find the use of the virgule to be ambiguous, and they specifically state that it is not ambiguous. And I'm referring to a few cases. I'll just put them on the record. One is Danco Incorporated v. Commerce Bank Shore, New Jersey, and that is a 1996 case.

Another one is Matson Intermodal

(25)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

System, Inc. v. Kubis Enterprises (phonetic), and that is a 2005 case.

There is the comparison of the contract of the

And then the first case, which tackled the issue is Kinzig, K-I-N-Z-I-G, v. First Fidelity Bank, and that was a law division case. And that was in -- if I can skip to the first page here -- and that was in 1994.

And a lot of these cases turned on people who were trying to cash checks, actually. And the checks would say, for instance, you know, "Joe Smith/Jane Smith." And Joe would get the check and decided he wants the money, and he would endorse it and cash it, and then Jane would say, well, wait a second. There's a slash mark there, we both have to endorse it. And in every single one of these cases, and they've also referenced cases in other jurisdictions, they say that the virgule means "or" or an alternative and that both were not required to endorse the check. Only one was required to endorse the check in order to cash it.

I don't find that the -- that the definition of virgule, when it's interpreted in the context of the Uniform Commercial Code should really be any different than being used here. It is a -- it's a character. It has a meaning. And it has a

(25)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

meaning that's been interpreted by our courts several times. The unambiguous definition of that, at least in terms of, you know, these check cashing cases by our courts is that it means "or". It is an alternative.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

And I would recommend that considering there is case law to support it that that is how the virgule be interpreted in this instance, that it is warehouse or distribution center that's permitted.

Now, I just wanted to say, though, that in these cases, it also doesn't say that only one person has to endorse the check. It just says that one person is enough to endorse the check when the virgule is used. If both of them had endorsed it, there certainly would not have been a problem. It's just that both would have endorsed it when only one was required.

So I don't read the virgule, however,

to also limit since -- the only one for the other,

you know, under the way that the case law has

reviewed it.

So I think, you know, taking the case law, the virgule means "or", but it's not a limitation necessarily against one or more of them from being there.

Now, secondly, you know, the ordinance does not define distribution center. There is a definition for warehouse, and perhaps you can read into that definition something greater -- there's some language in there -- but, you know, the Board is tasked with coming up with a definition, even though it would be lovely if there was an explicit definition in the ordinance, there is not.

a this constanting the region of the region of the stantage of the sizes, of a temper region and the case of

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

So in interpreting an ordinance, we go to these other sources. Mr. Steck has told you what The traffic engineer has told you what he looked at. he has relied upon. Mr. Rahenkamp has given you his Jen Beahm has told you what she sources of reliance. I think all of those you take into account, you know, and you give them the proper I would just add another that I looked at -you know, a lot of just regular dictionaries do not have a definition; however, the Cambridge Dictionary actually does, and a distribution center in the Cambridge Dictionary is defined as a warehouse, and the business based there that stores a manufacturer's goods temporarily before they are transported to stores or customers for sale.

That seems to incorporate a lot of what has been testified to by the experts that the

distribution center is a place where products are stored, but they are ultimately distributed. And it sounded -- you know, from Mr. Steck was different, but from everyone else it sounded like it's a wholesale. Mr. Steck didn't find any distinction between a distribution center and a fulfillment center.

on the month day of the first statement of the profit in the consequence.

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

I would, however, recommend that there is a difference, and, you know, you heard the discussion that the fulfillment center is a place where things are actually going to your house. And I don't know that you can read that into just a general distribution center rather than it being part of a, you know, something that's being shipped, basically, to wholesalers or similar types of users rather than an operation that is repackaging and sending out vehicles to your home.

But I think, you know, there's three things -- or several things you need to determine. You need to determine one, what does the slash mean. My recommendation is that pursuant to the case law, the slash means "or", but that that case law also does not prohibit, you know, both being there, similar to both people are not prohibited from endorsing the check.

Secondly, you have to determine what distribution center means. It can either mean something as broad as what Mr. Steck says, which includes fulfillment, or something more narrow that, you know, there's products that are there for awhile, some period of time, that are eventually shipped to some wholesaler.

That's it, really. I mean, that's what the Board is tasked with tonight determining what that phrase means. If you determine that the phrase means that pursuant to what the applicant is proposing that you can only have a distribution center or a warehouse, you know, to the extent those are different, then clearly it would mean that the applicant would have to make one of two decisions.

One, that they are only seeking a warehouse, or only seeking a distribution center, or if they wanted some mix, they would have to file here at the zoning board for a use variance.

If you determine that the warehouse and the distribution center were both permitted, and there is no real dispute as to whether individually they are permitted, there's just an issue as to whether they are permitted together, if you determine they are permitted and permitted together, then the

(21) (22) (23)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(25)

	CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF
(1)	planning board would continue to hear the
(2)	application.
(3)	So I'm hoping that I was clear enough.
(4)	I have to confess, I've spent much more time going
(5)	through the history of the virgule. I can actually
(6)	tell you that in medieval times, it was used more as
(7)	a commaI have gone through the history of its use
(8)	that far. I wanted to call my high school English
(9)	teacher.
(10)	Do you have any questions?
(11)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Yeah. Proceed
(12)	doog anybody want to ask
(13)	Mr. Cucchiaro a question?
(14)	Adam?
(15)	WEIGG Sure Mr. Cucchiaro, the
(16)	The same anid was it Danco, I'm curious
(17)	to know which court, was it an appellate division
(18	case, was it a
. (19	MR. CUCCHIARO: Give me one second.
(20	we weree. And was it published?
(21	MR. CUCCHIARO: They were all
(22	published.
(23	MR. WEISS: Okay.
(24	MR. CUCCHIARO: And it was 200 NJ Super
(2:	lot me inst see it was the
`	

Г						
(1)	appellate division, and it was Judge Chevelle					
(2)	(phonetic).					
(3)	MR. WEISS: And it's still good?					
(4)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Yes. Yeah.					
(5)	MR. WEISS: Thank you.					
(6)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Thank you, Adam.					
(7)	. Any other Board members?					
(8)	MR. SCHERTZ: David Schertz here. You					
(9)	can't see me, but I'm here.					
(10)	Ron, are these precedent?					
(11)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Yes. They are two					
(12)	appellate division cases and one law division, but					
(13)	the law division case is actually cited in the					
(14)	appellate division cases, so they are all					
(15)	precedential and binding. However, like I said, they					
(16)	are in the context of interpreting the Uniform					
(17)	Commercial Code, but I feel they are persuasive in					
(18)	the context of interpreting the use of the slash mark					
(19)	in any context.					
(20)	· •					
(21)	Rob, was that a hand? You can shake					
(22)	.					
(23)	All right. Then procedurally, Ron, how					
(24)	do we call this question?					
(25)	MR. CUCCHIARO: So what we're looking					

for is the definition. So if somebody wants to offer a definition and move that definition, they can. if I could maybe just throw out some different options that I think are floating around, but they are certainly not exclusive, you know, if someone wanted to do something different, you know, Option A would be, you know, what the applicant is asserting that the slash mark means "or" and that the ordinance should be interpreted that warehouses are permitted or distribution centers are permitted, but they are not both permitted under the ordinance, but that also a distribution center is inclusive of a fulfillment facility or you could make a motion that says that The slash means "or" and warehousing is permitted. distribution centers are permitted, however, the slash does not mean that they are not both permitted simultaneously, and that a distribution center is also limited to distributing to wholesale or similar endusers or you can make that same motion and say that the distribution center is also inclusive of a fulfillment center.

I think that's generally the universe we are talking about, but if someone has something else, certainly you can make that motion.

CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. Mr. Weiss,

(24)

(1)

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

. (7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(25)

(1) you can make that motion.

Particle (1) serve that yet many company and serve the rest was a company of the State of the State of the State of

(2)

(3)

(4)

(5)

(6)

(7)

(8)

(9)

(10)

(11)

(12)

(13)

(14)

(15)

(16)

(17)

(18)

(19)

(20)

(21)

(22)

(23)

(24)

(25)

MR. WEISS: Okay. So I'll make a motion to interpret the virgule as being "or", that the zone that we're speaking about permits a warehouse, also permits a distribution center but not both at the same time. And also that the definition of a distribution center be limited to a distribution of items to wholesalers not the endusers, and that a fulfillment center be different from a distribution center in that a fulfillment center is distributing items to the endusers.

That's my first attempt.

CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Mr. Cucchiaro, can you break that down for the Board so that they know what their vote means? What a yes vote means and what a no vote means.

MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, a yes vote means that this is the way that the ordinance is being interpreted. So that -- was Mr. Weiss' interpretation. And what it ultimately means is that an applicant can only propose a warehouse or a distribution center on a lot but not both.

If there's some mix, it would require a D variance. So an applicant would have to make that decision. And it further states that a distribution

(1)	center is limited to distributing to wholesalers and
(2)	not what a fulfillment center would do in terms of
(3)	bringing it to an enduser at somebody's house or
(4)	office.
(5)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay.
(6)	MR. CUCCHIARO: But a yes vote is an
(7)	agreement with Mr. Weiss' interpretation.
(8)	(Brief interruption.)
(9)	MR. COOPER: I'd also like to include
(10)	the motion of what Mollie said earlier, and if Mollie
(11)	would go up and then
(12)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Well, Larry, hold
(13)	up. There's been a motion. That's what we need
(14)	to act on that motion not add to it.
(15)	MR. WEISS: Mr. Chair, he can move to
(16)	amend the motion to include and add the definition
(17)	does not include a medical marijuana facility.
(18)	Is that what you're doing?
(19	MR. COOPER: Yeah.
(20	MR. CUCCHIARO: I will amend it.
(21	On the motion to amend the motion, is
(22	there a second for that?
(23	
(24	
(25	AT ATTURET. Mr. Chair this is Sal
`	

(1)	Alfieri. Can I have one point of clarification						
(2)	before they vote?						
(3)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Of course.						
(4)	MR. ALFIERI: The comment was that they						
(5)	could be distributed to wholesalers, but the						
(6)	definition is really wholesalers and retailers, so I						
(7)	don't want to get into the middle of something where						
(8)	we can only go to another warehouse and not do						
(9)	with K-Mart or something.						
(10)	MR. CUCCHIARO: I agree. That's the						
(11)	way the Board interprets it, Mr. Alfieri. So I'll						
(12)	ensure that that's what if there's a positive						
(13)	vote, I will make sure that that's clear.						
(14)	MR. ALFIERI: Thank you.						
(15)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Okay. Someone needs						
(16)	to second the original motion with its amendment.						
(17)	MR. ROSENTHAL: This is Terry						
(18)	MS. MOENCH: Wait. Wait. Is the						
(19)	fulfillment center that Adam has delineated serving						
(20)	an external customer?						
(21	MR. CUCCHIARO: I don't know what						
(22	external customer means, but it is						
(23	va vorman, if Amaron adds on as a						
(24	there subsort rest out to vans						
(25	to the place picks up 32						
(20							

(1)	packages for the Monmouth Heights residents, and, you							
(2)	know							
(3)	MR. CUCCHIARO: That would be							
(4)	prohibited under the motion, yes.							
(5)	MS. MOENCH: Then I second Adam's							
(6)	well, I second Adam's initial proposal, Larry's							
(7)	amended.							
(8)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Well, you're seconding							
(9)	the amended proposal.							
(10)	MS. MOENCH: Then I'm seconding the							
(11)	amended proposal.							
(12)	MR. CUCCHIARO: Okay. So we just need							
(13)	a roll call, then.							
(14)	MS. MOENCH: Ms. Kamen?							
(15)	MS. KAMEN: Yes.							
(16)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Rosenthal?							
(17)	MR. ROSENTHAL: Yes.							
(18)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Weiss?							
(19)	MR. WEISS: Yes.							
(20)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Cooper?							
(21)	MR. COOPER: Yes.							
(22)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Gregowicz?							
(23)	MR. GREGOWICZ: Yes.							
(24)	MS. MOENCH: Mr. Lilien?							
(25)	MR. LILIEN: Yes.							

	3
(1)	MS. MOENCH: Chair Leviton?
(2)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: No.
(3)	MS. MOENCH: I'm sorry. Chairman
(4)	Leviton, I just want to confirm you said no?
(5)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Correct.
(6)	MS. MOENCH: Thanks.
(7)	MR. ALFIERI: Thank you, everyone.
(8)	Goodnight.
(9)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Goodnight, Mr.
(10)	Alfieri.
(11)	Before I ask for a motion to adjourn, I
(12)	want to go out to the public and ask if there's
(13)	anyone who wants to address the Board on matters
(14)	other than agenda items, now would be the time.
(15)	Seeing none, I will close public.
(16)	Mr. Cucchiaro, anything else, sir?
(17)	MR. CUCCHIARO: No, Mr. Chairman.
(18)	CHAIRMAN LEVITON: Nancy, anything
(19)	else?
(20)	Board members, anything else?
(21)	(Concluded at 10:37 p.m.)
(22)	
(23)	
(24)	
(25)	

CERTIFICATE (1) (2) I CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true (3) and accurate transcript of the proceedings as taken (4) stenographically by and before me at the time, place (5) and on the date hereinbefore set forth, to the best (6) of my ability. (7) I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that I am (8) neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor (9) counsel of any of the parties to this action, and (10)that I am neither a relative nor employee of such (11)attorney or counsel, and that I am not financially (12)interested in the action. (13)(14)(15)(16)MARY ANN FICSOR Certified Court Reporter (17)Of the State of New Jersey License No. XI01952 (18)(19)(20)(21)(22)(23)(24)(25)

		1	1		Secret
	108:25	134:23	50:9,17	99:12	114:18
A		adjourn (1)	56:13 60:8	105:18,21	120:25
A-1 (3) 19:6	117:2	136:11	64:20 66:3	105:24	analysis (4)
25:15,21		adjudicate	67:24 71:15	107:15	24:6 40:16
A-2 (1) 29:8	activities (5)	12:18	71:15 84:10	121:6,8	49:9 119:1
A/B (1) 39:25		adjustment	94:16	133:25	analyzed (1)
ability (10)	88:2,5	1:1,11	101:16	134:1,4,11	49:6
21:18 27:18	98:23	30:24 31:23	103:10	134:14	ancient (1)
47:23 48:12	activity (13)	32:3,10,16	104:5 111:7	136:7,10	104:18
58:14 67:3	39:9 43:1	48:15	114:15	allow (5)	and/or (4)
67:12,12	43:14 46:14	administra	115:17,23	47:13,14	26:15 68:6
88:13 137:7	46:18 81:9	4:3 30:5	116:18	52:13 85:7	87:21
able (3)	81:11 88:12	32:11 88:9	118:18	106:20	120:13
38:13 85:3	i i	administra	134:10	allowed (3)	Ann (2) 1:19
97:19	88:14	97:17	agreed (2)	50:25 91:14	137:16
absence (1)	103:20 107:22	adopt (2)	67:20 69:21	92:7	annual (1)
41:17	1 1	41:12 42:5	agreement	allows (1)	115:4
absolutely	118:9,13	adopted (2)	65:19	87:20	answer (7)
104:10	actors (1)	3:21 53:3	109:14	alternate (1)	7:18 45:5
absurd (2)	97:7	adopting (1)	133:7	40:8	65:7 72:5
13:22 80:3	actual (3)	95:19	agrees (4)	alternative	100:17
accept (5) 5:2	89:25 101:2		58:19 62:3	124:18	104:14
6:6 55:7	114:13	advance (1) 117:5	62:5 69:21	125:5	116:24
88:13 96:1	Adam (6)		ahead (3)	Amazon (2)	answered (2)
accepted (1)	1:14 9:17	advertised	25:22 66:8	44:11	110:7,10
95:18	113:10	3:7	78:1	134:23	answering
accepts (2)	129:14	advised (1)	air (1) 117:16	ambiguity	23:22
30:16 87:10	130:6	26:14	Airport (1)	13:14 39:16	answers (2)
access (2)	134:19	Affairs (2)	88:19	ambiguous	41:2 100:3
71:12 73:21	Adam's (2)	3:4,15	i .	16:19 39:21	anybody (1)
accessories	135:5,6	affirm (1)	akin (1) 44:9	45:9 123:20	
88:3,7	add (6) 59:1	28:3	ala (1) 44:11	123:21	anymore (1)
accommod	61:8 89:6	affirmative	Alfieri (51)	amend (3)	73:2
36:14	126:16	74:1	14:22,25	133:16,20	anyone's (1)
account (3)	133:14,16	agencies (1)	15:5,6,8,8		17:20
13:16 23:3	added (1)	87:6	15:13 17:15	amended (4)	4-4
126:15	73:14	agenda (1)	20:6 25:12	93:25 135:7	
accurate (3)	addition (2)	136:14	40:21 49:8	135:9,11	apologize (2)
41:13	3:10 96:4	ago (10)	52:13 58:3	amendmen	~
113:14	additional	31:10 59:7	71:20 74:8		
137:4	26:14 88:13			133:23	16:19 31:2
acknowled	89:7	104:17,21	78:1,3	i	appearanc
18:18 48:20) address (4)	110:14	85:13,16,24	America (1)	10:14 14:24
act (5) 3:13	66:7 74:25	113:13,16	86:3,4,11	1	15:17
32:20 84:7	105:13	113:17	86:21 87:11		
100:4	136:13	agree (27)	91:10 92:12		14:5
133:14	addresses (1)			100:13	
action (5)	59:20	24:24 43:24		ampersand	34:14 54:14
(-)	adds (1)	47:1 49:12	98:24 99:8	113:25	1 24.14.24.14
	1	I	1		

54:22 87:6	45:13 48:9	114:25	120:6	128:5	122:18
1 - 1	48:14 49:21	118:10	assume (2)		126:21
appearing 30:10	51:10 55:19	argument (8)	76:25 77:1	<u>B</u>	basic (1)
1 1	69:1 71:12	21:22,23	assured (1)	b (10) 32:8	103:22
appellate (4) 129:17	73:21 76:15	22:9,23	111:24	32:11,14	basically (1
1 ' ' 1	78:5,8,8,14	23:13 34:6	attempt (1)	40:1,9	36:12 38:13
130:1,12,14	′ ′ ′ 1	69:10 84:25	132:12	46:23	56:8 57:24
applicant (78:18,20,21 97:23 102:9	arguments	attempting	103:17	58:1 60:5
7:12 12:5		12:4 29:15	16:14	110:17,17	60:12 61:1
12:20 15:9	102:13	67:18 105:8	attendance	110:17	73:7 90:4
15:12 21:2	122:16,19	l l	33:7	B-A-H-M	94:11 95:6
21:16 23:16	129:2	105:11		53:14	107:24
26:16 27:6	application	arises (1)	attention (2)	B-O-C-C	107.24
34:1 35:9,9	15:25 54:24	43:13	16:11 26:10	19:10	Basil (5) 1:17
35:11 40:4	applied (2)	array (1)	attorney (7)	Bachelor (1)	, , ,
45:22 46:3	26:24	97:5	2:5 15:3	54:7	8:10,11,12 116:8
47:2,22	104:20	artisan/cra	34:19 45:4	Bachelor's	
48:1,5,8,11	apply (5)	90:5 98:12	116:25		basis (3)
48:19 49:4	17:9 47:10	artisanal (1)	137:9,12	29:23	35:14 37:7
49:5,7 51:1	76:6,9	98:13	attorneys (4)	back (11)	71:19
58:13 59:9	98:15	Asbury (1)	12:4 14:4	45:8,11	Beahm (17)
66:12,19	applying (2)	3:7	15:16 86:2	47:1 65:24	2:9 17:14
67:2 83:7	22:7 47:3	aside (2) 21:2	atypical (2)	87:25 90:22	18:1 19:24
84:13 90:18	appreciate	34:6	10:16 15:23	92:13 99:19	20:7 25:6
101:25	25:2	asked (3)	Austin (1)	108:14	26:12,13,21
103:6,21	approach (1)	35:8 69:20	54:11	118:4	112:17,24
104:23	100:11	81:3	author (3)	120:15	117:3 119:5
105:3,20	approval (3)	asking (4)	119:19	backgroun	119:10
105:3,20	7:16 12:15	32:21 45:10	120:23	34:20 54:4	121:17
109:20	64:25	97:21	121:2	Bahman (5)	122:18
128:11,15	approvals (112:13	authored (1)	27:16 52:20	
	21:4	aspects (1)	96:2	53:13,23	Beahm's (1)
131:7		35:24	authority (1)	57:4	25:17
132:21,24	approve (2) 7:14 51:2	assembled	95:1	balls (1)	bear (1) 19:2
applicant's	1	j	authorized	111:3	beginning (
45:3,18	approved (1)	96:7	32:19	bank (7) 2:3	33:1 77:7
46:1	17:1	asserting (1)	available (3)	90:24,24	97:14
applicants	approving	131:7	4:22 31:14	91:1,9	begins (1)
98:20	51:6	assess (2)	1	123:23	4:19
application	approxima	61:24 90:20	1	124:5	behalf (3)
1:6 4:8 7:5	30:7,10	assistance (Avenue (1)	banking (1)	10:10 15:9
7:14 10:8	April (2) 3:5	41:22	28:15	90:25	77:14
10:16 11:3	3:16	assists (1)	average (1)	banks (2)	
11:23 12:1	area (3)	62:2	36:16	91:2,18	believe (20)
12:11,15,21		1	aware (7)	1 - 4	16:15 17:15
12:22,25	114:11	30:3	23:25 31:15	base (2)	20:4,8,10
15:10 21:7	areas (1)	associated	32:4 33:8	72:19,20	20:16,22
32:6,23	79:6	37:1 62:23	42:8 94:1	based (5)	25:1 26:2,4
34:21 35:4	argue (3)	69:3 111:25		24:7 46:2	28:20 30:22
42:13 45:3	101:8	119:15	awhile (1)	92:24	31:13 37:18
!	1 - '	ļ		92:24	!

					a
38:8 75:4	26:23 27:2	129:1,12	52:9,14,16	5:1 7:4	case (25) 7:7
1	27:6,9	130:7	109:2	126:21	11:19,20
91:22,23	28:20,21	132:14	132:14	butchered	13:5 15:23
112:3	29:12,21		Brian (2) 2:8	10:10	64:3 74:1,9
"	30:16,23,24	136:13,20	19:10		80:10,25
believed (2)			Brian's (1)	C	106:13
35:12,18	31:23,24	7:15 9:9	116:14	C (7) 2:1 24:2	107:10
believes (4)	32:1,3,9,15		brief (4)	28:8 32:6	123:14,24
11:21 22:7	32:19,24	34:19	57:10 72:25	110:17	124:2,3,5
41:8 58:25	33:1,5 34:1	boards (2)	90:17 133:8	137:1,1	125:7,20,22
benefit (2)	34:18,22	34:15 87:7	briefly (1)	C-R-A-I-G	127:21,22
23:11 54:3	35:6,8 40:4	boat (1)	10:14	86:18	129:16,18
benefits (3)		117:16	bring (3)	call (18) 3:17	130:13
86:5 104:24	41:5,12,21	Bob (3) 8:15	62:8 65:13	4:5 10:10	cases (10)
105:2	42:5 43:20	8:16 110:8	91:21	27:12,15,16	37:25
best (1) 137:6	45:3,10,12	Boccanfus	bringing (3)	27:23,25	123:16,22
better (3)	45:14,19	2:8 19:10	39:9 44:3	41:15 52:4	124:8,15,16
14:13,14	47:2 48:11	22:20 23:7	133:3	52:19 53:23	125:3,11
94:4	48:14 49:10	116:16,17	brings (1)	86:9 95:13	130:12,14
beyond (2)	49:18,21	Boccanfus	65:24	117:2 129:8	cash (3)
70:24 97:22	50:23 52:12	22:6 23:4	broad (3) 2:3	130:24	124:9,13,20
binding (1)	54:4,23,25	43:18	114:24	135:13	cashing (1)
130:15	55:18,22	Y .	128:3	called (7)	125:3
bit (4) 10:15	56:1,24	body (17)	broader (3)	11:20 16:9	categories (
39:12 95:10	57:5 58:18	10:24 59:7 62:11 68:13	98:17 114:6	39:20 44:18	44:23 73:12
120:19	58:22 62:2	1	117:25	70:17 93:18	73:15 92:7
bleed (1)	62:7 63:16	69:4,7,14	broken (1)	118:14	101:9
110:19	65:11,12,20	98:18	96:6	calls (1)	category (16)
board (163)	66:5 67:2	103:23	browser (1)	104:23	40:2,7 47:7
1:1,11 2:5	67:22,24,25	104:9,19	39:18	Cambridge	
3:8 7:13 9:8	68:1,8,10	106:15,20	1	126:18,20	100:9,22
10:15,17,20	70:4,11	106:24	building (9) 1:8 36:12	camera (2)	101:17.19
10:22 11:1	72:3,9 76:3	107:6 108:2	44:20 88:2	52:21 53:1	102:13
11:4,9,18	76:15 81:4	114:22		capacity (1)	103:16
11:23 12:2	81:19 87:10	boil (1) 76:13	93:23	53:5	117:11
12:5,9,11	87:18 92:1	book (7)	102:22	care (2)	118:1,12
12:17,21,22		1	103:1,2	27:21	121:25
12:23 15:7	97:24 102:1		110:4	104.12	caution (1)
15:9 17:13	102:2,6	95:5 117:9	buildings (8)	carefully (1)	95:4
17:21,24	103:3,6	books (1)	21:5,8	82:6	CCR (1) 1:19
18:3,13,19	105:13,25	92:8	34:22 35:2	cargo (1)	center (184)
18:21,24,25	108:2,21,23	bound (2)	35:16 46:7	117:15	16:6 17:4,7
19:11,12	108:25	70:7 100:20		caricature	
20:13,15,16		bounds (1)	102:22	1 1100	22:2,12,18
20:17 21:6	115:10	52:7	bulk (2) 7:20	Carl (1)	23:19 24:5
23:2,5,11	120:11	box (2) 86:19	9:7	94:21	24:9,13,17
23:11,12,22	122:17,20	90:4	bulletin (1)	carried (2)	24:9,13,17
23:25 24:23			3:8	4 0 21 12	33:11 34:6
25:2,6	128:18	break (5)	business (3)	7.7 31.13	1 33.11.34.0

Γ-					1	5
	34:8,12	106:10,16	131:5,24	108:19	120:20	122:15
	35:2,15,17	108:8,17	Certified (1)	109:5,8,24	Chevelle (1)	129:3
	36:2,18,20	109:21	137:17	110:5,8,11	130:1	134:13
١	36:22 37:2	110:3,21,21	CERTIFY	113:5,9	children (2)	clearer (1)
	37:15 38:12	110:22	137:3,8	115:12,14	92:6,10	114:22
	38:15,20	111:13,20	cetera (3)	115:20,22	Chill (1) 4:8	clearly (11)
	39:2,8,14	111:22	75:9 110:22	116:8,12,18	choose (2)	18:21 22:20
	40:15,18,20	112:14	120:1	117:1	48:24 66:19	44:8 71:10
	41:16,17	115:6,25	chain (2)	121:11	Christmas	91:23 97:18
	42:1,9,11	117:6,13,22	110:18,23	122:15,21	111:3	97:19
	42:16,23	118:1,11,15	Chair (17)	129:11	circle (1)	106:22
	43:3,13,19	119:21	3:18 4:18	130:6,20	45:7	107:19
	43:23,23,25	120:16	6:4 7:2 9:2	131:25	circumstan	110:14
	44:2,7,8,10	121:21	10:5 71:20	132:13	98:8	128:14
	44:23,25	122:3,5,9	74:7 99:12	133:5,12	cited (1)	Cleary (1)
		125:9 126:2	105:7,20	134:15	130:13	15:8
	45:1,5,6,23 45:24 46:5	126:19	117:3	136:2,3,5,9	City (1)	clerk (1) 3:11
		120.19	118:25	136:17,18	29:24	client (1)
	46:16,17	127:1,0,7	121:9	challengin	civil (4)	77:15
ł	47:15 48:5	127:10,13	133:15,25	32:10	29:23 54:6	close (6)
	51:12 58:7	128:21	136:1	chamber (1)	55:3,4	77:13 99:6
١	58:15 59:17		Chairman	100:5	claiming (1)	99:8 105:18
	59:24 60:6	131:12,17	1:12 3:2 4:4	chance (1)	105:3	105:21
١	60:7,13,23	131:20,21	4:6,12,24	77:5	clarificatio	136:15
	61:1,2,6,9	132:5,7,9		change (1)	134:1	closing (2)
İ	61:15,22	132:10,10	5:6 6:5,11	51:1	clarifying (2)	105:8,11
	62:13,23	132:22	7:3,8,9,11	changes (1)	113:4,19	club (2)
	63:3,4,8,24	133:1,2	7:22 8:2,6	51:7	classic (4)	79:19 80:5
	64:8,18	134:19,24	8:11,16 9:3	character (1)	36:7 44:8	clubs (2)
	65:4,16	centers (22)	9:6,12,18	124:25	45:1 47:12	79:17 80:2
	66:23 69:23	47:6 49:15	10:6,12	characteris	Classificati	code (4) 4:3
	71:16 73:8	56:16 58:1	11:16 14:3	1	36:7 100:14	, ,
	73:13 75:24	59:2,10	15:7 19:15	36:15	classificati	124:23
	76:8 78:24	60:17 61:4	30:15 49:11	characteriz	100:13	130:17
	79:19 80:4	68:6 87:22	53:4 55:7	82:9,23	\$	cold (3)
-	81:5,17	91:2 93:19	71:25 72:13	chart (2)	classify (1)	88:17 89:9
١	82:4,8,21	96:6 100:1	73:1,24	123:9,10	92:11	115:6
- [82:22 83:5	101:5,7,11	74:3,10,19	charts (1)	clean (1)	1
	83:9,11,11	102:17	74:24 75:11	123:1	114:2	columns (1) 94:2
ļ	83:15,17	109:18,19	75:16 77:11	check (7)	clear (16)	combinatio
	84:7,15,17	131:10,15	77:18 85:15	124:11,19	12:6,25	
	85:8 93:21	centers-ful	85:22 86:10		17:18 42:19	j
1	96:12,15,17	100:1	87:9 91:19	125:3,12,13		
	96:18	certainly (9)	95:15,22	127:25	104:11	64:18 71:9
	100:24	7:18 41:24	98:25 99:1	checklist (1)	106:2 107:6	
-	101:9 102:1	59:19 62:6	99:11,14	63:15	107:12	combine (2)
	102:18	100:18	105:12,23	checks (2)	111:15	67:9 68:17
	103:12,15	114:22	105:24	124:9,10	114:19	come (12)
-	103:18,25	125:15	107:14	cherry (1)	116:3	12:23 16:15
•	•	1	I	I	1	•

34:1 4 68:1 6 88:23 92:6,1	9:18	89:10,11	52:19	17:16 27:16	28:20 29:2	court (10)
68:1 6 88:23	9:18	·		17,10 27,120	20120	
88:23		92:18	136:21	30:10 52:20	82:14	18:4 30:12
			concluding	57:21	core (1) 94:6	30:12 52:15
[92:0,1·		companies	73:6	consulting	correct (35)	54:23 96:1
1 0711		97:8	conclusion	26:9 30:4	25:13,18	102:12
97:11			26:22 69:18	consumer (2)	30:25 31:4	129:17,25
comes (compare (1) 87:24	69:25 80:3	44:12 83:3	31:5,11	137:17
71:14		- · · .	104:6,7	consumers	33:11 34:4	court-appo
comfort	tabi	completed	104.6,7	83:10 84:3	37:18 38:15	87:5
64:2	(2)	31:11	conclusion	84:8	47:25 48:3	courtesy (1)
coming	' ' '	completely	69:19	contact (1)	48:21 55:18	54:2
108:13		18:18 58:10		26:19	56:17 64:19	courts (8)
	126:6	71:24 115:7	confess (1)	contemplat	65:6,17,23	87:4 94:23
comma	` 1	completion	129:4	118:15	66:14 69:5	94:25 95:19
129:7	1	26:15	confirm (1)		69:16 71:18	123:16,19
Comm	- 1	compliance	136:4	context (12)	72:13,14	125:1,4
3:1 10	1	3:12	confirmed	34:20 51:18	72.13,14	cover (1)
comme	ent (8)	complimen	57:24	79:22 80:19	79:4 85:12	99:25
26:23	3 27:1	70:14,22	confirms (1)	80:20 81:1	104:6,7	covers (1)
56:3	96:2	comply (1)	39:14	96:13,16	112:21	31:25
114:4	ļ	4:1	conjunctiv	124:23		crafted (1)
116:2	25	component	39:23,25	130:16,18	114:20	98:14
120:1	ιο Ι	38:9	40:13,17	130:19	120:10	1 '
134:4		comports (1)	42:13 46:11	continue (10)	136:5	Craig (2)
comm		26:25	50:18 61:13	11:16 12:18	corrected (1)	86:18,22
	15:22	composed (2)	103:9,11	45:12 48:11		cramming
26:12		38:10,12	107:11	49:5 57:14	correctly (2)	119:23
1	1 56:5	composite (consider (6)	91:20 93:9	53:25 78:16	
109:		40:5 51:2,6	12:10 24:23			75:2
	2 113:8	compress (1)	37:10 40:13	controlling		create (2)
115:		114:10	43:20 44:6	104:10	105:11	41:15
	ierce	compressin	considerati	conversati	111:9	100:19
	4 91:8	114:13	104:10	45:19	137:10,12	created (3)
123:		computer (1)	considered	convey (1)	counselor (2)	
	ercia	39:17	14:2 45:22	90:8	4:25 87:5	101:18
	3 93:18	concept (1)	122:12	Cooper (20)	counselors	
107:		119:17	considerin	1:14 5:5,10		creates (1)
•	:9,13	concepts (2)	56:24 125:6	5:12,17,18	country (1)	119:14
124	-	88:24	considers (1)	6:21,22	72:22	creating (2)
130		114:24	36:20	8:21,22	counts (1)	98:13
	ittee	concern (1)	consistent (9:10,15,24	91:16	100:18
	1 30:14	111:17	72:4 122:1			
	non (3)	concerned			1:2	92:22
	22 44:17		83:24	133:9,19	couple (2)	credentials
51:		concerning			105:4	30:16 54:5
1		16:1 23:13	111:6	copies (1)	113:11	55:8 86:23
1	nunic	conclude (1)		1 7	course (3)	87:10
79:2			21:4 34:2	copy (6) 3:7	45:2 78:5	critical (1)
	nunity		i i		134:3	73:16
3:3	,15 30:9	Concinued	CORDURATION			

		ı			Miles Co.
cross-exam	62:20,22	cut (1)	decision (4)	118:4,16	DePetro (1)
52:8 74:6	63:2,7,19	110:14	11:10 32:18	124:22	11:20
78:2 99:10	64:6,15,21		118:21	125:2 126:3	derive (1)
99:17 105:9	65:1,9,18	D	132:25	126:4,6,8	13:6
105:14	66:3,6,8,15	D (3) 32:7	decisions (1)	126:18	describe (2)
119:3,4,8	66:20 67:4	120:12	128:15	131:1,2,2	81:22 89:17
cross-exam	67:16 68:20	132:24	deemed (1)	132:6	described (2)
74:12 77:17	68:24 69:9	D/70 (1)	3:12	133:16	16:18 33:16
95:14	69:17 70:6	32:14	DeFALCO	134:6	description
108:22	70:13,17,21	daily (1)	2:9	definitions	17:6 34:7
1	72:10 74:7	71:19	defect (1)	33:18 36:10	82:17 89:21
cross-exam	75:16,20	Danco (2)	31:13	37:23 44:15	92:17 106:4
94:10	76:5,12,20	123:23	defer (1)	44:16 79:6	design (2)
cross-exam	76:3,12,20 76:22 7 7:3	129:16	116:24	81:16 93:11	. 90:19 94:3
52:12	77:21,24	dash (1)	define (11)	93:14 94:20	designatio
crux (1) 50:4	-	89:19	38:3 39:2	95:8 117:6	78:9
cube (1) 83:5	85:6,19 86:1,13,15	date (4) 19:7	39:13 41:17	117:10	designed (3)
Cucchiaro	91:19 94:15	19:9 20:7	42:22 75:25	definitive (1)	33:21
2:5 3:18		137:6	76:13 81:15	100:25	107:19
4:18 5:4 7:6	95:15,23	dated (4)	92:1 112:13	degree (6)	118:6
7:8,11 9:6	105:7,19	20:14 25:7	126:2	29:23 54:8	designing (1)
10:12 11:12	111:23	25:7 26:8	defined (9)	70:14 80:13	
11:17 14:10	112:11,22	David (5)	33:20 76:14	80:17 102:8	
14:14,19,23	118:25	1:16 10:8	76:16 79:21	degrees (2)	17:12 112:1
15:5,11,15	121:6,9	15:4 113:6	87:24 90:16	54:6,9	115:5
15:22 17:14	122:22,23	130:8	97:10	delineated	determinat
17:17 18:8	129:13,15	day (7) 26:12	111:16	134:19	11:19 12:2
19:4 20:21	129:19,21	36:17 41:11	126:20	delineation	I I
21:10,20	129:24	10 15 60 5	definition (112:15
22:22 23:1	130:4,11,25	118:22	22:4 33:15	delivery (1)	determine
23:10,23	132:13,17	120:22	33:17 35:24	1	12:14 22:4
24:14 25:3	133:6,20	days (1) 4:22	36:1,8,17	demand (2)	24:7 41:10
25:9,14,18	134:3,10,21		, ,		
25:21,25	135:3,8,12	DCA (2) 3:21 53:3	41:25 42:4	demand's (1)	
26:5 27:5	136:16,17	7 7 (1)	42:5 44:14	111:2	67:5 72:11
27:13,21	Cucchiaro'	dealing (1)		demands (1)	1
28:2,12,17	96:2	34:15	45:13,21	62:16	127:19,20
29:7,10	curious (1)	deals (1)	60:7,22	02:10 denial (1)	128:1,10,20
31:21 40:21	129:16	43:25	61:5 73:18	12:15	128:1,10,20
. 41:1 42:2	current (1)	decades (1)	81:6,7,8		determined
43:16 49:11		93:13	82:6,13	deny (1) 12:22	71:10 94:25
51:24 52:3	currently (2)	December		1	
52:10,21,24		4:11,12,16	94:6 107:18		41:22 50:20
53:7,11,18	custom/usa	. 111:4	111:10,16	3:3,15	62:2 65:25
56:18 57:11		decide (4)	111:22	73:23	
57:14 58:16	customer (2)	21:25 32:2	112:6,12	depending.	116:20
59:13 60:1	134:20,22	32:16 47:3	115:5,24	46:6	i i
60:14,24	customers	decided (1)	116:3 117:		•
61:7,18	126:23	124:12	117:12,19	110:22	developer (1)
	1	I	1	•	and the second s

				<u></u>	
76.11	121:15,24	dislike (1)	35:3,15,17	96:17,18	124:5
56:11	122:6	12:12	36:2,20,22	97:1,4	129:17
developers		dismissive	37:2,8,15	98:19,22	130:1,12,12
21:3	124.24	113:20,22	38:1,12,14	101:5,7,9	130:13,14
developme		dispensary	38:19 39:2	101:11	divisions (1)
32:6 34:21		111:19	39:8,13	102:1,16,18	88:18
53:15 87:2	131:3,6	display (1)	40:5,15,18	103:12,15	docks (1)
89:23 90:20	1	88:12	40:20 41:16	103:18	37:1
94:20	differentiat	displayed (1)	41:17,25	106:6,16	Doctorate (1)
dictionarie	1 1	3:9	42:9,11,15	108:8,17	54:8
126:17	110:20		42:23 43:3	109:17,19	documenta
dictionary	111:10	dispute (1) 128:22	43:5,12,23	109:21	120:5
16:18 37:23	differentiat		43:25 44:1	110:3,21	documents
95:2 126:18	121:20	dissimilar (44:7,9,12	111:13,20	17:23 18:14
126:20	differently	80:21	44:7,9,12	111:22	18:23 78:12
differ (1)	37:6 97:6	distinct (1)	45:23 46:5	112:5,14	doing (10)
80:11	difficult (1)	62:18	45:23 46:3	115:25	10:15 12:8
difference (distinction	*	116:2 117:6	15:24 37:8
4:20 42:10	direct (7)	41:15 44:6	47:20 48:4 49:15 51:6	117:13,14	62:7 65:9
43:22,24	29:19 53:21	90:6 98:13		117:21	96:20,21,22
84:11 127:9		101:14	51:8,12	118:1,11,15	133:18
differences		103:14	56:16 58:7	119:21	DOT (3)
47:17 84:12		108:16	58:15 59:2	121:13,21	49:25 70:3
different (5	direction (1)	122:24	59:10,17,24	121.13,21	102:15
16:2 30:4	13:8	127:5	60:7,11,13	125:9 126:2	doubles (1)
35:23 36:2	directly (1)	distinction	60:17,23	125:9 120.2	36:8
36:3,15,21	84:7	56:15	61:1,4,6,9		doubt (1)
37:3,5,9	director (1)	100:19	61:15,22	127:1,6,13	47:12
38:9,20	30:5	103:4	62:23 63:3	128:2,12,17	dozen (2)
39:3,5,11	disagree (3)	107:25	63:4,8,24	128:21	15:25
39:15 42:21	43:24 101:1	distinguish	64:4,8,17	131:10,12	102:20
42:23 43:6	119:22	101:13	65:4,16	131:15,17	drafted (1)
43:11,11	discuss (2)	distribute (2)		131:20	` '
44:24 45:10				132:5,7,7,9	57:23
46:21 48:2		distributed	69:23 71:8	132:22,25	drafting (2)
49:1 50:22		127:2 134:5	1	district (7)	30:13 119:13
51:8,12	discussing	distributes	73:8,13	92:20,22	ľ
78:11,12	16:8 75:9	109:16	75:23 76:7	97:16 98:23	
81:1 83:13	discussion	distributin	78:17,19,23	104:11,17	36:14 51:8
88:23,25	127:10	131:18	81:5,11	106:5	80:11,25
90:7 91:3	disjunctive	132:10	82:10,24	districts (4)	draw (1)
92:4 93:6	39:23 40:9	133:1	83:11,15,17		
97:7,7,8	40:14 42:12	distributio	83:24 84:15		
98:10	46:11,12	16:6,24	84:17 85:7	Ditola (3)	103:1,1
101:22	50:10 51:14		87:21,22	5:25 6:1	drives (1)
102:19,23	51:21 64:13		89:7,25	115:22	134:25
102:19,25		24:9,13,17	92:23 93:3	DiTOTA (1)	
117:25	107:11	24:22 34:5	93:18,21	1:16	102:21
120:19	108:5	34:8,12	96:5,12,15	division (7)	dry (2) 88:17
140.17	100.0		l	 	

				1	養
1 (1) 00.0 L	eligible (1)	engineerin	7:12,19	45:10	16:16 50:11
duly (1) 28:9	9:9	17:25 23:4	35:11 45:9	example (12)	119:11
E	ELIOT (1)	29:24 53:16	79:2 80:24	17:25 18:25	explicit (1)
E (9) 2:1,1,7	1:15	54:7 55:4,5	96:11,12	36:17 40:17	126:7
2:7 28:8,8,8	Eliott (2) 8:3	70:14	98:19	73:10 79:9	expressed (1)
137:1,1	8:4	116:22	establish (2)	89:9 90:5	104:5
E-commer	emanate (1)	engineers (6)	103:24	90:23	extent (5)
82:10,25	37:3	26:9 36:5	111:10	106:10	4:20 18:14
110:16,25	1	36:24 38:25	established	111:18,18	29:14 49:20
· ·	emergency	44:16 72:23	17:8 104:9	Excel (1)	128:13
e-mailed (6)	3:22,24	English (3)	establishm	90:4	external (2)
20:5,16	53:2	39:19 43:13	93:18	exclude (1)	134:20,22
26:2,2	emphasis (1)	129:8	117:13	98:6	eye (1) 51:19
28:20 29:1	90:13	ensure (1)	estate (1)	exclusive (3)	
earlier (4)	emphasize	* *	114:17	10:21,22	<u> </u>
117:10,23	106:14	134:12	estimates (1)	131:5	F (1) 137:1
120:15	employee (2)	enter (4) 10:13 14:5	24:7	exclusively	facilities (2)
133:10	137:9,11	10:13 14:3	et (3) 75:9	10:25 32:9	83:23 93:17
early (2) 95:6	Enabling (1)		110:22	72:4 116:13	facility (8)
123:2	100:4	entered (1)	120:1	118:20	43:9 97:4,5
easily (1)	endorse (6)	99:4	evaluated (2)	Executive (2)	110:13
119:25	124:12,15	Enterprise	41:4 45:22	3:2,14	111:14
edition (3)	124:19,19	124:1	evening (12)	exempt (1)	117:20
73:10,14	125:12,13	entire (3)	5:2 10:8	30:19	131:13
113:13	endorsed (2)	76:17 99:25	15:6 16:8	exist (2)	133:17
education (1)	1	107:9	31:2,8 32:2	92:22	fact (20) 17:1
29:23	endorsing (entirely (2)	32:13 57:5	101:15	22:17 28:19
eight (2)	127:25	38:11,12	86:17 99:4	existing (1)	31:15 33:8
31:10 120:1		entirety (2)	117:4	59:24	33:14,25
Eileen (1)	enduser (1)	87:15	1	expected (1)	34:3 42:8
75:1	133:3	107:10	event (1)	120:24	47:12,22
either (28)	endusers (8)	entities (2)	116:23	! .	40.01.60.14
12:20 19:17		36:6 38:21	eventually		55:16 59:8
23:17 24:2	82:25 83:1	entitled (2)	34:10 128:0		92:8 93:13
24:11,21	83:9 131:19		everybody	expert (7)	104:23
33:6 38:10	132:8,11	104:24	11:14	58:4,10,18	113:21
39:22 40:9	engaged (1)	entity (2)	evidence (2)	59:1 87:2	118:14
43:11 58:6	117:14	36:3 39:11	13:16 23:3	107:23	Faintly (1)
60:11 61:3	engineer (19)	entry (1)	evolved (1)	107:23	14:10
63:24 64:7		102:20	73:9		0.4.1 (4)
65:3 67:7	19:11 20:13		exactly (2)	expertise (1)	77:1
74:12 75:2		121:18,19	112:8	62:9	fall (3)
79:18 80:4			118:19	experts (2)	1 11 01
80:22 87:2		68:18	exam (1)	52:5 126:2	118:2,12
96:17 113:	8 54:20 55:3	especially (2		explain (1)	falls (1)
120:21	62:6,8	50:25 51:1	1 .	67:13	أمداما
128:2	67:20 70:1	1 ESQS (2) 2:	2 29:19 52:1		familiar (1)
elements (2)	70:18 85:1	2:4	53:21 86:2	_	
66:2 93:8	126:11	essentially	examine (1)	explanatio	• '.0
	l	l	l		and the second second second second

family/one	fine (7) 18:12	15:20 34:24	71:1 72:17	88:9 89:15	43:17 46:8
80:23	22:23 27:24		forth (1)	96:5,15,19	50:6 51:22
	52:10 54:1	110:17	137:6	97:22	52:1,2,6,11
far (9) 41:7 46:1 71:16	69:10 94:11	** *	forward (5)	103:19,19	52:18,22
1	finish (2)	111:4	14:18 39:17	functional	53:18,20,22
101:18	80:16	focus (9)	40:12 97:4	44:14	54:17 55:10
102:17	104:14	18:16 39:6	115:18	functions (3)	56:18,25
108:9	finished (1)	39:8,16	found (2)	10:20 88:1	57:3,12,17
109:20	108:23	43:12 72:9	13:9 22:20	97:15	58:12,17
120:5 129:8	firm (1)	92:13 98:5	foundation	furniture (1)	59:4,15,22
February (2)	109:16	100:16	89:17	101:21	60:2,15,19
25:8 111:3		focused (5)	four (5)	further (10)	61:8,11,19
feel (3) 42:12	firms (1) 30:4	41:3 44:3	73:14 83:22	4:13 12:14	62:10,21
64:2 130:17	1	89:19 112:9	88:1,5 94:2	22:25 26:15	64:10,16,19
feeling (1)	first (24) 4:17 5:1 7:3	112:11	frankly (1)	51:22 60:9	66:6,9,17
109:17	7:5 14:24	focusing (1)	90:2	72:15 116:6	67:1,4,11
feelings (1)	16:19 27:12	37:12	free (1)	132:25	67:23 68:22
116:14	27:15,24	follow (3)	100:18	137:8	69:6,9,12
feet (7) 34:24	28:1 30:1	26:14 59:9	freedom (1)	future (1)	69:20 70:2
36:12,13	ł .	119:1	35:16	98:20	70:10,15,19
44:19,19,19	37:14 53:14	follow-up (1)	freely (1)		70:23,25
44:21	1	98:2	97:11	G	72:1,7,16
Ficsor (2)	75:4 78:14	following (3)	frequently	G (2) 28:8,14	73:2,4,25
1:19 137:16		42:7 82:15	117:7	gain (1) 3:12	74:2,5,8
Fidelity (1)	105:21	120:10	front (3) 4:7	Gasiorows	85:21,23
124:4	114:9 124:3	follows (2)	82:14 83:21	2:2,4 10:11	91:5,14
field (3)	124:4,6	28:10 33:20	fulfillment	10:13 11:24	94:8,15
86:25 87:2	132:12	font (1) 120:2	23:19 24:5	14:6,8,12	95:12 99:9
97:2	firsthand (1)	1 7	24:17,21	14:17,20,21	99:15,16,18
figure (1)	35:14	foregoing (1) 137:3	36:18 43:18	14:24 15:2	105:5,18,20
92:5	fit (4) 40:2,6		43:23 44:2	15:3,19,21	105:22
file (2) 3:11	90:3 102:13	forever (1)	44:7,23,24	17:17,22	107:16,17
128:18	fitness (4)	88:6	45:4,23	18:17 19:6	119:4,6,9
filed (2)	79:19 80:4	forget (1)	46:17 82:3	19:8,21	121:5
15:24 18:22			82:8,21,22	20:3,4,12	Gasiorows
final (4) 21:3	fitness/heal		83:5,8,11	20:21,24	95:16
26:21	79:17 80:1	92:24	84:7 97:1	21:12,21	general (3)
108:25	120:16	Forgive (1)	110:21	22:14,24	39:14
112:2	five (5) 63:6	10:9	122:5 127:6	1	111:12
financially		form (5)		24:1,15,24	127:12
137:12	100:6	33:23 78:20		25:10,22,23	generally (4)
find (10)	106:17	95:21 118:8	1	26:1,7 27:5	37:9 96:9
12:16,18	five-minut	118:13	131:12,21	27:11,14,25	117:10
38:1 81:24	52:14 109:1	1 ' '	132:9,10	28:17,19	131:22
83:19 92:21		60:7,22	133:2	29:1,10,19	generate (2)
101:20	98:10	61:5	134:19,24	20.17.20.21	91:1 105:1
123:19	floating (1)	format (1)	function (12)	41:1,23	generated (3)
124:21	131:4	120:2	82:9,24 83:24 84:5	42:6 43:16	59:11 61:15
127:5	floor (2)	formed (2)	03:24 84:3	1 .2.5 .5.15	1 27.11 01.12

					1
104.16	118:11,16	70:3,3,16	114:21	58:6 112:18	41:7 48:14
104:16	121:21,23		governmen	120:1	52:12 57:25
generates (2)	go (46) 7:9	72:3 74:6	ິ 69:7	hand (5)	60:8,16
101:21	12:3 14:19	77:13 81:4	Governor (1)	74:18,20	68:20 71:22
107:4	24:20,25	82:6 84:2,3	3:13	99:5 105:16	75:6 77:12
generation	25:22 26:7	86:4 91:5	graduate (1)	130:21	86:6 127:9
24:6 36:5	27:22 40:12	91:17 93:4	55:1	handbook	hearing (17) 🚪
40:16 50:20	49:3 54:21	97:15 102:2	graduated	73:11	10:7 17:13
69:25 70:5	59:14 60:9	108:13,20	54:19 -	happen (1)	17:18,23,25
71:16 73:11	66:8 67:12	108:21	grant (2) 9:8	12:20	18:2 26:23
92:9 101:18	70:23 74:11	109:1,9,9	44:10	happened (2)	28:21 30:23
101:23	75:3 77:25	110:3 112:2	grants (1)	11:2 113:16	31:11,12
generation	78:1 80:7	120:14	ິ7:19 `	happens (1)	33:2 47:22
102:3	81:7 84:7	·127:11	great (2)	32:23	52:17 62:4
generic (1)	85:18 87:20	129:4	62:16 86:5	happy (6)	117:5
99:24	87:25 88:8	good (6) 15:6	greater (10)	90:2,10	121:10
generically	88:21 89:21	53:7 86:17	17:11 62:23	99:21 108:3	hearings (7)
89:15	92:20 97:6	95:9 98:21	69:3 71:17	113:21	18:3 31:3,8
gentleman	99:2,19	130:3	101:18	114:4	33:5,6
9:19	105:8 108:7	Goodnight	102:3,17	hard (1)	55:22 87:4
gentlemen	103.8 108.7	136:8,9	108:9 112:1	111:20	hearsay (1)
6:12	108:14,21	goods (28)	126:4	hardcopy (1)	94:11
getting (1)	108.24	33:22 36:9	Gregowicz	82:2	heavily (1)
88:20	1	39:6,9 43:1	1:15 5:19	harmonize	95:10
Giacobbe (1)	126:9	43:14 46:15	5:20 6:23	123:4	height (1)
15:8	133:11	46:19 84:22		Harvey (1)	36:13
gist (1) 56:14	134:8	88:3,11,12	8:23,24	94:20	Heights (1)
give (27)	136:12	88:18,20	9:10 10:1,2	hazy (1) 35:5	135:1
13:13 14:1	g ₀ -t ₀ (1)	96:4,14	110:9	head (3)	Hello (1)
19:7 28:4	117:7	97:19,19	135:22,23	76:11	14:8
34:20 41:3	goals (1)	98:13,14	guess (4)	116:19	help (3)
54:4 57:22	10	101:13	23:10 43:21	130:22	56:20 91:25
67:13 68:22	goes (3) 47:1	107:20	81:4 120:21	1 /	95:20
70:11 73:6	68:10,13	115:25	guidance (2)	79:22 82:17	
77:25 79:9	going (57)	116:1	3:4,15	89:22	41:24
81:6 86:24		117:15,20	guide (1)	headings (1)	helps (2)
87:18 91:13 97:12 102:3		118:7	90:16	89:6	58:18 63:10
· ·	16:7 22:10	126:22	guidelines (headline (2)	hereinbefo
108:24				89:3,4	137:6
112:2 119:	41:3,10	10:24 59:7	guilty (1)	health (4)	hesitate (1)
119:11	43:4 45:4	62:11 68:13	1 -	79:19 80:1	26:18
121:11	46:1 47:10	69:4,14	gymnastics	. 80:5 106:10	
126:15	49:5,7,8	98:18	103:17	hear (9) 11:5	104:12,15
129:19	51:25 52:4	103:23		_ 14:9,11,12	111:2 129:8
given (2) 71:3 126:1			<u>H</u>	_ 14:20 41:19	
	56:25 58:3	106:15,20	Hackensac		
giving (1) 52:25	61:12 62:25		53:16	129:1	44:24 81:17
	68:4 69:3	107:6 108:	2 half (4) 15:2	5 heard (12)	82:3,7,21
global (4)	00.4 05.5				

					
82:22 83:5	96:16 97:2	39:8	industrial (85:8,10,11	38:18,22
higher (1)	98:20 103:8	importance	47:7,10,12	106:22	40:14,23,24
104:25	103:20	57:8 90:13	50:15 75:7	intensity (4)	47:18 48:3
highlighted	119:17	important	75:18,21,22	40:23	49:13 50:10
98:11	idealogical	29:15 89:1	76:4,8	104:12	57:6 59:9
highway (2)	67:13	108:15	79:22 100:6	106:12	59:14 61:14
45:20 89:23	identified (1)	impossible	100:13,14	108:9	61:20 65:22
history (4)	24:11	69:8	industrial/t	intensive (1)	66:11 68:1
68:4 104:19	identifies (2)	improveme	79:11	37:10	70:12 71:2
129:5,7	23:18 24:3	7:13	industry (6)	intent (12)	72:10 75:7
hit (1) 116:19	identify (1)	include (8)	88:24 92:9	13:6,8 14:2	76:6 80:12
hold (6)	29:20	33:22 46:17	96:25 97:6	38:4 59:5	81:8 91:13
19:13 30:2	illogical (3)	82:23	97:7 109:15	72:2,15,19	97:21 114:8
43:9 52:11	68:3 106:9	107:21	influences (106:21	123:3,11
77:9 133:12	106:14	118:8 133:9	80:12	107:7	132:20
holding (2)	illusion (1)	133:16,17	informatio	119:15	133:7
3:25 96:8	72:23	includes (3)	4:21 39:4	120:6	interpreted
Holdings (1)	illustrated	82:8 89:15	114:11,13	intention (1)	23:14 91:15
4:8	93:13	128:4	118:18	107:9	98:8 124:22
HOLOBIN	illustrative	including (3)	119:15,24	interchang	125:1,8
2:2	94:19	19:16 66:2	120:7,25	24:10	131:9
home (1)	imagine (2)	117:15	inherently	interested (5)	132:19
127:17	117:12	inclusive (2)	103:19	15:12,13	interpretin
hone (1)	123:16	131:12,20	initial (2)	41:21 46:6	12:7 18:16
91:25	imagined (1)	incorporat	21:23 135:6	137:13	126:9
honest (1)	115:8	98:10	initially (2)	intermodal	130:16,18
110:7	immaterial	126:24	16:10 87:19	97:3 123:25	interprets (1)
hope (1) 10:9	80:9	Incorporat	insert (1)	interpret (134:11
hoping (1)	immediate	123:23	42:17	10:22,25	interruptio
129:3	60:10	incorrect (1)	insight (1)	13:4 18:13	57:10 72:25
hour (2)	immediatel	67:6	118:24	18:19 21:21	133:8
36:16 58:6	116:2	increased (1)	instance (3)	22:8 23:7	intervenin
hours (2)	impact (16)	70:1	119:12	29:16 40:3	37:15
31:10 37:4	24:5 44:9	independe	124:10	41:5,9 47:8	interview (1)
house (4)	51:8 65:8	37:17 40:16	125:8	49:19 50:18	25:4
44:4 80:24	65:10,21	indicate (2)	instances (1)	58:18 67:14	introduced
127:11	67:21 71:11	23:17 98:16	1 '	91:11	3:23
133:3	73:20 85:4	indicated (3)	Institute (4)	103:10	introductio
hundreds (4)	90:20 92:5	38:8 78:4	36:5,24	117:21	120:6
75:14,14,15	108:10,11	113:12	38:25 44:15	123:8 132:3	invite (3)
102:21	108:11,12	indiscernib	institution	interpretat	74:11 77:14
hurt (1)	impacts (5)	5:8 6:10	90:25	1:6 11:24	105:13
116:14	37:9 51:20	30:19,19	intended (3)	13:19,20,22	involve (1)
	73:18 91:3	38:7	24:4 69:7	16:1,22	49:21
I	102:17	individual	114:24	18:22 20:23	1
I-Z-A-D-M	implication	!	intends (1)	20:25 32:17	
53:15	102:23	individuall	, ,	32:22 34:11	
idea (6)	implies (1)	128:22	intense (4)	34:15 37:19	72:22
	,	1	1 ` ` _	1	I

					1	3
 119	.14	72:17 74:12	June (4)	22:3 23:6	16:8,17	late (1) 33:7
1		Izadmehr's	19:19 25:7	23:10 24:22	17:6 39:21	latest (2)
11:1	()	55:8	25:16 26:8	25:1,3	knows (2)	44:11 94:19
	evant (5)		jurisdictio	27:22 29:14	38:24 39:1	latitude (1)
	19 58:11	J	10:21 11:1	36:25 37:23	Kubis (1)	94:17
	21 71:24	Jacobs (1)	12:9 32:1,9	38:24 39:2	124:1	law (21)
1	3:10	15:8	jurisdictio	41:9,13,15		10:19 11:8
issue		Jane (1)	31:22	41:16,18	L	11:18,25
	4 18:20	124:13	jurisdictio	44:3,11	L(1)2:7	13:5 23:3
	23 26:24	Janice (6)	124:17	45:2 49:12	labeled (2)	30:13 31:25
	22 34:7	1:12 4:9		49:20,24	35:2 36:7	32:5,8
1	15 38:23	19:4,24	K	51:4 52:22	lack (1)	76:19
1	23,23	25:11 74:15	K(1)28:8	53:24 58:22	81:14	123:14
	7 58:22	Jen (4) 119:1	K-I-N-Z-I	62:6 63:10	land (21) 3:4	124:5 125:7
	:11 61:20	121:12,13	124:4	63:17,20	3:16 10:19	125:20,23
1	1	126:13	K-Mart (1)	65:19 76:22	10:23 11:8	127:21,22
1	:20 62:11	Jennifer (5)	134:9	80:4 89:11	11:18 23:2	129:16
	:10,21,22	2:9 25:6	Kamen (13)	91:21,23	30:13 31:24	130:12,13
	:25 68:2	113:5	1:13 5:13	95:1,3,7,9	32:5,8 37:9	lawyer (1)
1	:12,12	116:13	5:14 6:13	105:2	44:9 47:16	95:7
	:17 99:20	117:1	6:14 8:1,17	110:14	49:2 51:20	lawyers (1)
	3:7 106:1	Jersey (28)	8:18 9:10	111:1,2,21	81:19 84:18	96:3
	4:4	1:3,9 2:3	9:20,21	112:2,20	93:11	lead (2)
	8:23	3:14,23 4:2	135:14,15	115:7	117:25	62:25
	ed (2) 3:5	13:5 15:3	KARMEN	117:18,24	123:15	101:13
3:1		28:16 30:2	110:12	118:18,24	landscapin	leads (1)
	es (6)	30:4,11	keep (4)	119:3	94:5	62:17
1	:25 67:21	53:17 54:13	18:12,15	120:14,16	language (league (1)
	7:23 75:5	54:21,24	43:15 90:17	120:18,20	13:9 37:12	30:13
	9:23 89:12	55:2 71:12	key (1) 35:24	121:20	39:20 42:15	learned (1)
	(12)	73:22,23	kind (8) 16:2	122:24	43:13 46:10	86:6
1	3:11,14	86:19 87:1	45:7,15	123:1	50:12 71:3	leave (3)
,	1:16,18	89:22 94:23	80:9 99:24	124:10	91:11 97:8	46:20 85:20
	0:15 92:3	95:19	100:2,10	125:3,20,22	114:3 126:5	
	4:13	123:14,24	122:2	126:1,5,15	large (2)	leaving (1)
1	01:10	137:17	kinds (4)	126:1,5,15	34:22,23	102:22
	02:13,16	1 . 7 . (4) 0.7 1.4	89:11 90:7	127:3,9,12	largely (1)	lecturer (1)
	04:1 117:7	Joe (3)	94:3 120:21	127:14,18	43:25	87:5
	n (1) 21:8	124:10,11	Kinzig (1)	127:14,10	larger (1)	leeway (1)
	ns (7)	134:25	124:4	128:5,13	83:25	25:4
	3:5,9,10	41.57.40	1	129:17	Larry (10)	left (2) 73:5
	3:15 132:8	Judge (1)	10:8 15:4	131:5,6,7	1:14 5:5,6	97:2
	32:11	130:1	know (95)	131:3,0,7	5:12 8:1,2	legal (4)
	36:14	1	7:18,19	134:21	9:16 115:12	
	dmehr (1	10:17 12:3	135:2	115:14	118:23
	7:17 52:20	July (7) 5:2	13:6,15,17	knowledge	133:12	119:1
	3:4,6,10	19:1,9 20:3		17:20	Larry's (1)	Legally (1)
ŧ	3:13,13	00.011.14	18:15 21:22	known (4)	135:6	16:21
5	55:11 72:14	20.7,11,1		*************************************	<u> </u>	

				1		CO 0 07 13
leo	gible (2)	73:24 74:3	93:12	110:16	117:5	60:3 87:13
	20:2,5	74:10,19,24	limit (4) 46:4	111:1		Manalapa
	gislative (75:11 77:11	102:7 107:7	LLC (1) 4:9	looking (14)	36:1
• -	4:2	77:18 85:15	125:19	loading (2)	13:10,17,24	Mantagas (
ì	gitimate (2)	85:22 86:10	limitation (2)	37:1 102:22	22:19 47:15	1:17 6:2,3
	51:20 94:22	87:9 95:22	107:13	loads (1)	47:16 50:1	8:8,10
	t's (21) 19:5	99:1,11,14	125:24	83:25	50:4,13	116:10
	25:14 26:7	105:12,23	limited (3)	local (1) 36:8	59:5 99:5	manual (3)
	29:8 37:11	107:14		location (1)	117:12	36:6 81:16
	49:3 50:7	108:19	132:7 133:1	112:19	121:19	81:18
	51:2,5		limits (1)	logic (3)	130:25	manufactu
	54:18,21	110:5,8,11	102:5	36:22 50:8	looks (4) 16:9	126:21
	69:11 70:23	113:5,9	Lindblook	50:8	36:4 102:19	manufactu
	99:11 70:23	115:12,14	94:21	logical (7)	126:14	83:25 84:3
1		115:12,14	line (1) 83:23	47:17 50:11	lot (13) 16:7	map (3)
1	103:8	116:8,12	lines (2)	50:15 62:15	76:16 90:3	32:17,20
	104:11	117:1	82:19 118:4	62:16 71:2	90:23 91:1	36:6
	108:8 109:5	ì	linguistic (1)	85:2	93:14	Maplewoo
	116:14	121:11 122:15,21	103:17	login (1) 4:20	105:25	28:15,15
	129:12	122:13,21	linked (1)	logistic (1)	113:1	March (1)
le	etter (14)	'	103:13	35:2	118:18	111:3
1	19:1,7,9,9	130:6,20	liquid (1)	logistics (2)	124:8	Marco (2)
	20:2,13	131:25	88:17	110:13	126:17,24	57:11,11
	22:19,25	132:13	LISA (1)	111:14	132:22	marijuana
	25:4,24	133:5,12	2:10	long (3)	lots (5) 88:23	111:19
	26:8,11,21	134:15	list (3) 42:17	15:24 18:8	89:2 90:21	112:5
	26:21	136:1,2,4,5	87:15 93:13	76:24	101:22	133:17
le	etters (3)	136:9,18	1	long-term (4)		mark (15)
1	25:5,11	LI (1) 47:6	listed (3)	93:16 98:21		19:6 22:2
	48:18	license (2)	33:10,18	121:15,18	14:17	22:11 25:14
1	evel (4) 80:8	30:2 137:18	79:17	longer (2)	love (1) 52:6	26:6 29:8
	81:20 84:2	licensed (4)	listen (3)	113:17	lovely (1)	112:15
	122:2	30:1 54:12	55:24 56:23	113.17	126:7	113:20
]	evels (3)	54:20 86:25	70:10	1	120.7	118:19
ŀ	61:23,24	light (15)	listened (3)	look (18) 50:7 51:18	$\overline{}$ M \cdot	- 119:16
	62:10	45:13 47:2	15:22 31:21	68:8 79:20	ma'am (1)	120:7,13
1)	Leviton (86)	47:6,10,12	117:4		74:22	124:14
	1:12 3:2 4:4	50:15 75:7	listening (2)	81:18 82:1	major (1)	130:18
	4:6,12,24	75:13,17,18		82:5 83:18	21:3	131:8
ļ	5:6 6:4,5,11	75:21,22	listing (1)	83:19 86:2	making (2)	marking (1)
	7:2,3,9,22	76:4,8	16:3	93:10 94:4	1000 110	
	8:2,6,11,16	110:15	literature (1)	95:9 106:13	manageme	
	9:2,3,11,12	lighting (1)	39:14	107:17,25	91:2	123:17
	9:18 10:5,6	50:21	little (7)	114:8	manager (1)	
	11:16 19:15	Lilien (6)	10:15 14:14		110:23	59:25
	28:24 29:5	1:15 5:21	39:12 82:6	looked (9)	y	
	30:15 53:4	5:22 20:10	90:4 95:10	19:15 37:2		
	55:7 71:25	135:24,25	116:21	37:24 38:2	0011601	
	72:13 73:1	Limdbloo	live (2)	79:5 95:20	7,700 41.66	Mary (2)

		ı			0.04.100.10
1:19 137:16	61:22,23	118:19	merits (2)	modern (3)	3:24 122:12
master (3)	62:3,9	124:17	12:10,24	/ /	Moskowitz
38:2,3 54:7	64:11 70:8		mid (1) 100:4	modes (1)	93:11 94:20
Master's (1)	71:21 72:12	127:22	middle (4)	88:18	95:5,13
29:24	75:14,14	128:2,10,11	43:11 44:2	modified (1)	117:9
match (6)	77:1 79:12	131:8,14	82:12 134:7	47:14	motion (21)
38:13 46:6	79:18 80:3	132:15,15	mile (1) 97:4	modifies (1)	5:3 6:8 7:23
48:6,12,25	83:1 85:24	132:16,17	MILLIE (1)	48:8	7:25 9:13
58:14	91:22,22	132:20	1:13	Moench (68)	9:15 131:13
matched (1)	101:25	134:22	mind (3)	1:12 4:11	131:19,24
35:19	112:21	meant (6)	18:12 53:23	5:7,11,13	132:1,3
matching (1)	113:1,3	22:20 60:12	57:9	5:15,17,19	133:10,13
62:17	114:19	62:12,14	minds (1)	5:21,23,25	133:14,16
materials (119:20	114:1 116:4	59:6	6:2,4,13,15	133:21,21
33:22 43:1	122:10,11	medical (3)	mini (4)	6:17,19,21	133:24
46:16,19	127:20	111:19	33:23 73:12	6:23,25 7:2	134:16
81:10 96:5	128:2,8,14	112:5	107:21	8:4,12,17	135:4
107:21	131:16	133:17	118:8	8:19,21,23	136:11
117:15	meaning (13)	medieval (1)	minute (1)	8:25 9:2,20	motor (1)
118:7 122:7	13:12,12,13	129:6	19:14	9:22,24	117:16
122:10	13:25 14:1	meeting (9)	minuter (1)	10:1,3,5	move (5)
Matson (1)	27:10 40:24	3:6,12 4:15	82:2	11:14 19:13	29:7 43:14
123:25	45:11 76:20	4:19 29:2,3	minutes (6)	19:18,23	69:11 131:2
matter (16)	97:12 123:9	35:7,10	5:2 6:6 18:3	20:1,8,19	133:15
1:5 7:16	124:25	56:7	21:17 29:2	25:13,16,19	moved (3)
11:3 12:14	125:1	meetings (5)	29:2	26:3 28:25	5:4 8:1
12:18 26:18	meaningles	3:5,13,16	mix (12)	29:4,6,9	122:14
51:15 55:12	123:6	3:25 56:4	38:13 46:5	57:16 74:17	moving (1)
55:17 57:22	means (55)	member (1)	48:6,12,25	112:7,16	88:10
68:18 76:6	13:1 16:11	30:12	51:1 58:14	113:4	muddled (2)
1	16:16,23	members (66:12 69:24	134:18,23	34:25 78:6
116:13,20	21:11,13,23	9:10 15:7	103:12	135:5,10,14	multiple (3)
120:18	22:18 39:25	29:11,12	128:18	135:16,18	36:23 93:22
123:11	44:18 46:12	32:3 105:25	132:23	135:20,22	93:25
matters (1) 136:13	48:23 56:22	119:25	mixed (6)	135:24	multipliers
	59:16,17,18	120:11	35:19 61:15	136:1,3,6	92:4
mean (58) 12:8 13:15	59:24 66:16		69:3,15	Mollie (3)	multitude (1)
18:16 21:25	1	136:20	70:1 106:21	1 '	50:19
	66:22 67:5	memorializ	1	133:10,10	municipal (
22:1,2,3,10	67:7 71:3	7:4	62:17 68:5	moment (2)	1:8 3:11
22:11,12	71:23 75:23	1	<u>-</u>	3:20 82:15	10:19 11:8
23:1 29:11	1	1	35:18 50:2:		11:17 23:2
34:23 38:17	79:3,24	memorializ		124:12	31:24 32:5
38:18,19	80:5,18	7:15	68:4,9	Monmouth	!
39:22 41:4	81:22 91:8	men (2)	106:25	1:2 135:1	municipali
41:7,22		43:11 44:2	107:7	Montclair (7
49:12 56:21		merchant (1)		30:6	31:9 94:2
58:23,25,25	112:14,15	97:5	100:4	month (2)	100:18
60:4 61:21	112.14,13	1 77.3	1	1	

91:8 103:23	63:19 64:23	31:13 94:25	102:8	77:25 78:22	35:22 36:21
112:23			offend (1)	81:18 82:3	42:19 44:10
1	74:21 90:7	3:9	114:5	82:20 84:10	44:25 45:10
Murphy's (notificatio	offended (1)	85:22 86:13	45:15 46:10
3:13	127:19,20	4:14	114:3	92:13 93:9	46:12,18,22
mute (1)	133:13	November	offer (2)	99:1,6,14	46:25 47:1
11:14	135:12	4:10	105:14	99:19,23	47:17 48:8
muted (1) 115:15	needs (4)	number (11)	131:1	101:4,16	48:12 49:2
1 ""	12:3 41:3	17:23 24:12	offered (1)	103:22	50:13 51:13
myriad (1)	119:24	24:12 36:6	79:2	105:12,17	58:10 71:1
89:5	134:15	36:25 38:11	office (10)	108:20	72:18,18
mystery (1)	neither (2)	66:18 69:21	3:11 26:19	109:5,7	79:14,24
39:12	137:9,11	83:8 117:6	37:24 88:8	110:8,11	80:11,24
N	never (2)	117:25	89:5 104:12	112:16	81:1,5
$\frac{1}{N(2)}$ 2:1,7	18:20 94:17	117.23	107:2,3,4	113:6,9,18	83:12,14
name (13)	new (33) 1:3	O	133:4	114:15	84:16,21
15:2 28:12	1:9 2:3 3:14	O(1)2:7	officer (2)	115:20	87:19 93:1
28:14 37:6	3:22,23 4:2	o'clock (1)	30:6 32:11	116:12	95:21 98:7
38:7 39:8	4:2 13:5	31:12	official (1)	117:1	105:15
53:12,14,14	15:3 28:16	oath (1)	32:19	118:25	110:2 116:6
53:24 74:25	30:2,4,11	28:10	offsite (1)	121:9	116:7
86:16 122:4	52:25 53:2	object (4)	102:10	122:21,23	121:19
names (2)	53:16 54:13	49:8 58:3	oftentimes	129:23	122:1,18
88:23	54:20,24	71:21 91:5	43:6	130:22	opportunit
100:25	55:2 71:12	objecting (1)	Oh (3) 77:24	131:25	68:23 85:20
naming (1)	73:22,23	94:7	82:3 99:11	132:2 133:5	87:13
92:18	86:6,19	objection (2)	okay (89) 4:6	134:15	Option (1)
Nancy (2) 2:9		72:1 95:16	4:12,16	135:12	131:6
136:18	94:23 95:19	observatio	5:13 6:13	older (1)	options (1)
narrow (1)	123:14,24	79:14	10:7,12	93:15	131:4
128:4	137:17	obviously (2)	14:6 15:5	once (5) 24:8	order (8)
nature (2)	newest (1)	36:13 102:7		61:11 65:7	4:17 5:1 7:4
50:24 81:13	73:14	occasion (2)	20:24 23:23	109:8 112:3	25:17 27:22
nearby (1)	nine-and-a	55:21 57:18	26:1 27:11	open (3) 3:13	40:6 114:16
109:6	30:7	occasions (1)	28:12,17	105:8,9	124:20
necessarily	NJ (1) 129:24	1 1 5 0 5	29:10 31:6	operate (2)	orders (3)
44:13 68:25		1 (2)	31:20 33:8	3:24 32:4	3:3,14 20:5
90:22	50:21 73:17	00000	34:13 35:20	operation (3)	ordinance (
118:17	108:11,12	occurred (2)	37:13 38:5	37:4 46:21	1:7 11:7,22
119:22	normal (1)	88:6 113:13		127:16	12:3,7 13:1
120:19	97:22	occurs (1)	53:7,8,11	operationa	13:5,7,9,11
121:17	North (1)	88:14	53:18 54:18	1 ~	13:18,21
125:24	100:13	October (3)	54:21 56:10		16:3 17:2,5
need (20) 5:7		1005	56:13 57:14		20:23 21:2
6:6 21:24	2:10	111:4	57:18 60:24	1	21:11,13,14
41:10,19	notice (8) 3:6	1 2 2 24 3	70:23 74:19	_	21:14,21
49:25 54:15		13:20	74:21,23	34:4,11,25	22:8 23:8
56:19 63:17	# · · · , · ·	off-track (1)	76:23 77:13	35:5,11,20	23:14 24:9
30.13 05.11	1,1,0,1,1				
	Addition to the second of the	Control - Control of the Control of			

_						1
	27:10 29:16	116:21	24:1 124:6	parts (1)	11:22 71:12	96:24
	32:17,20		pallet (1)	13:18	73:21	125:12,13
	33:9,13,18	118:5,20		party (4)	permits (6)	personal (1)
	36:1,20		pallets (1)	15:10,12,14	39:25 47:7	111:17
1	37:5,12,25	122:17,19	43:7	55.17	89:14	perspective
	38:2,24		pandemic (1)	pass (2)	104:12	89:16
	39:1,3,13	123:11	110:15	32:19 121:5	132:4,5	118:23
İ	39:25 40:25	126:1,8,9	paragraph	passing (1)	permitted (persuasive
1	41:18,25	131:8,11	21:8 26:11	68:14	11:6,6	130:17
	42:8,15,20	132:18	32:7	pay (1) 16:10	12:17,19	Peter (1)
	46:23 47:14	ordinances	paragraph	peak (1)	13:2,3 16:3	28:14
1	49:14,19	10:23 48:18	32:8 114:23	36:16	16:23 22:5	Phones (1)
	50:10,14,16	59:24 72:21	parallel (1)	peddles (1)	33:10 34:3	11:11
	51:10,11,19	98:10	98:12	111:14	34.9,12 •	phonetic (3)
	56:22 57:5	100:12	parcel (3)	pending (1)	35:12 42:18	110:17
		121:3	111:11,15	11:4	48:13 49:14	124:1 130:2
	57:19,25	original (3)	113:16	people (6)	49:15,16	phrase (4)
ļ	58:18 59:6	31:17	pardon (1)	88:10 90:7	50:3,3,14	35:13 47:18
	60:5,12,23	100:11	75:10	92:10	59:2,2,3	128:10,10
	61:3,6,14	134:16	Park (1) 3:7	110:18	60:18 61:4	physical (1)
	64:3,13	outset (2)	parking (4)	124:9	61:23 63:11	92:4
	66:13,16,17	90:9 116:19	71:13 73:17	127:24	63:20,22,23	pick (3)
1	66:21,22	overall (5)	73:20 107:4	percent (29)	64:24 65:3	54:18 73:5
	67:5,7,14	90:8 112:21	part (17)	35:17,17	65:5,15	120:20
	68:14 70:7	112:21,23	17:24 20:15	40:18,18,20		picks (1)
ļ	70:9 71:3,7	112.21,23	26:9 42:22	51:3,4,5,7	67:10 69:15	134:25
	72:2,4,12	overruled (1)	58:15,15	59:12 63:3	69:15 71:8	piece (4) 11:5
	72:15,19,20	95:17	68:18 70:2	64:16,17	71:8 73:19	103:13
-	76:20,21	1	78:20 88:14	65:3,4,15	73:19 78:24	112:25
	79:5,21	overseeing	97:23 98:22	65:16 66:22		113:2
١	81:15 87:14	88:10	100:17	66:23 67:8	85:9 87:15	place (11)
	87:16 89:1	overstep (1)	100.17	67:8 69:22	90:22 91:3	45:15 78:6
ļ	89:8,12,13	52:7	112:4,8	69:23 85:7	92:21 93:2	86:22 91:9
-	89:20 90:1	Oxford (1)	127:13	106:18,19	97:16 98:23	92:19
.	90:12 91:7	95:2	particular	106:21	102:25	115:24
	91:12,12	- P	11:2 16:4	107:2,3	106:7 112:6	
	92:16,20	P (4) 2:1,1,7	16:13 17:2	percentage	l	127:10
	95:9 97:11	28:8	26:12,20	107:8	125:9	134:25
١	100:19,23	p.m (6) 3:1	54:25 64:24	1	i	137:5
	100:24	52:16,17	73:22 91:7	48:25	128:24,25	places (1)
	101:1,2,12	109:3,4	102:4,12,25		128:25	93:10
	101:14	136:21	102:4,12,23	37:17	131:9,10,11	k
	103:4,11	P.O (1) 86:18		period (4)	131:14,15	113:15
ļ	104:9,20	pack (1) 97:4		93:24 96:2		plain (7) 13:9
	106:3,8	pack (1) 97.4 packages (1)	112:19,20	113:3 128:	· •	
	107:18	135:1		periods (2)	47:5 49:19	13:25 27:10
	108:17	(=) 01 1	113:2,12	43:8,9	103:4,5	42:20
	113:3 114:7	21:9 23:15	parties (1) 137:10	permit (3)	person (3)	plan (11)
	114:14	41.7 43.13	137.10	Permit (3)	1	1

01.429.2.2	87:7 90:19	17:1 18:6	8:5 17:13	50:8 86:5	108:10
21:4 38:3,3	96:10 97:24	21:13,17		produce (2)	112:25
61:20,25		48:3 58:5	55:12,21	94:9 108:15	113:2
65:10,21	102:6 103:6	66:25 84:14	56:4	produces (1)	proposal (3)
66:2 68:11	122:16,20		presented (5)	36:22	135:6,9,11
71:14 102:9	129:1		18:11,21	product (2)	propose (1)
1 '	plans (3)	100:21	50:23 56:8	44:1 83:3	132:21
22:17 25:6	27:3,8 35:1	101:8	· ·	products (8)	proposed (
	plausible (1)	102:15	56:11	81:11 82:10	11:5-13:2
34:14 42:9	16:16	104:22	press (3) 3:7	82:25 96:6	24:3 35:5
42:12 46:10	played (1)	positive (1)	74:13,15		44:20 63:18
58:5 86:8	66:4	134:12	presume (1)	109:16	
87:1 96:11	please (20)	possesses (1)	106:14	110:4 127:1	72:4,8 78:7
104:22	3:17 5:3	10:20	pretty (2)	128:5	78:9
106:1	11:14 26:13	posted (1)	**	profession	proposing (
116:25	26:18 29:20	3:8	previous (1)	19:11 54:5	35:12 95:8
planner's (1)	53:11,19	potentially	15:25	54:12,20	103:7
19:19	66:7 72:5	23:18 37:4	previously	55:4 87:1	128:12
planners (2)	73:3 74:13	39:9 44:12	18:11 34:14	121:1	protect (1)
93:10 96:3	74:25 77:17	110:24	primarily (8)	profession	98:20
planning (86:10,15,23	118:10	33:21 35:25	108:24	provide (1)
11:4,9,18	99:11	pours (1)	36:9 83:13	109:10	120:24
12:5,11,17	104:14	95:10	84:22,23	professor (1)	provided (5)
12:21,21	105:16	power (1)	107:20	55:2	24:6 67:17
15:9 17:13	point (10)	10:24	118:6	prohibit (1)	67:19 94:16
17:21,24	36:19 58:11	powers (2)	primary (13)	127:23	119:2
18:3,13,19	84:18 88:25	10:22 32:15	43:1,3,10	prohibited	providing (3)
18:21,24	93:5 106:23	practical (1)	46:14,18,22	127:24	25:3 67:17
19:12 20:15	114:6 122:8	12:16	81:9,11,13	135:4	67:18
1	122:13	practiced (1)	83:24 84:5	project (4)	provisions
20:16 26:23	134:1	55:4	84:11,23	27:3 56:11	32:4
27:9 28:21	pointed (3)	precedent (1)	principal (1)	63:18 70:1	public (23)
29:25 30:5	72:11 85:6	130:10	49:16	pronounce	3:4,8,13,16
30:9,23	1	precedenti	prior (6) 4:22	53:24	3:25 10:7
32:24 33:1	120:15	130:15	17:22 30:23	pronounci	29:12 52:5
33:5 34:21	points (1)	precluded (31:3 38:2	10:9	52:13 74:11
35:6,8 45:3	102:20	22:25	55:15	proper (5)	74:11 77:12
45:12,14,18	Polifly (1)	predicated	problem (1)	46:22 47:18	1
47:2 48:10	53:16	40:19 47:22	125:15	71:11,13	90:9,9 99:2
49:10,21	poll (1) 51:25	i .	problems (1)	126:15	99:7 105:9
50:23 54:23	portion (2)	91:16,	50:19	properly (4)	105:13
55:18,22	38:13,14	predict (1)	procedural	12:1 18:4	120:1
56:1 62:7	portrayed (130:23	49:6 67:22	136:12,15
63:16 65:11	106:17	prefer (1)		property (1	
65:12,20	pose (1)	31:17	proceed (4)	1 ~ ~	85:19
66:4 67:22	50:19	preference			public/qua
1	posing (2)	31:19	57:1 129:11	1	90:9
67:24 68:10				I 44A 1/11/1	1 フリ・フ
69:1 72:9	23:21	preliminar	proceeding		
		21:3	1:5 137:4 process (2)	50:4 68:5 103:13	publication. 36:11 93:1

1			ı	I	198
36:4 129:20	23:21 31:22	28:8 137:1	reading (4)	54:9 88:3	46:19
129:22		R-A-H-E	46:23 61:3	97:19	refer (7)
purely (2)	42:7 43:21	86:18	72:20	received (4)	17:24 18:5
78:23	45:5 46:9	Rahenkam	122:19	4:14 26:3	20:25 25:1
110:22	48:10,19	86:17,18	readings (1)	94:18 96:6	82:7 90:24
purpose (7)	52:5,14	87:10,12	72:21	receiving (1)	94:17
24:8 27:1	57:1,15,19	91:20,20	real (2)	122:5	reference (2)
43:8,10	58:13 62:20	95:24 99:3	114:17	Recess (1)	43:18 96:10
84:23 91:7	65:7 66:7	109:15	128:22	109:3	referenced
119:18	71:3 75:12	113:12,15	realisticall	recitation (1)	43:17
purposes (1)	77:6 80:13	114:2,6,21	96:18	55:25	124:16
81:8	80:15,16,17	115:3	reality (1)	reciting (1)	referencin
pursuant (3)	80:19 98:2	117:23	110:15	38:6	92:15
11:25	101:4	126:12	really (32)	recognized	referred (1)
127:21	109:25	Rahenkam	13:8,24	45:8 94:22	117:10
128:11	110:7 111:9	119:23	16:10 24:16	recognizes	referring (3)
put (10)	113:24	120:9	41:21 43:13	51:11	20:12 99:20
39:18 62:12	119:7	122:24	45:5 49:24	recollectio	123:22
74:1 85:21	121:12	rail (1)	50:1,11	55:25 56:5	refers (1)
104:1,17	129:13	117:16	51:15 60:6	95:5	21:7
113:25	130:24	raise (4)	60:10 63:17	recollectio	reflect (1)
114:17	questionab	74:17,19	64:2 72:9	56:8	56:5
119:24	121:16	99:5 105:16	73:16 83:9	recommen	reflected (2)
123:22	questions (raised (2)	83:10 93:6	52:17	21:17
puts (2)	7:17 26:17	67:21,24	94:11	recommen	100:12
13:19 74:8	32:18 51:23	raising (1)	103:14	22:9 29:11	reflects (1)
putting (3)	70:16 72:6	36:19	107:9	29:16 85:17	
34:6 90:12	74:12 77:4	ramificatio	110:19	91:20 95:16	1 9 ' ' . '
98:18	77:4 85:14	66:1,4	112:9 115:4	125:6 127:8	
puzzled (1)	87:3 99:3	ramificatio	116:20	recommen	18:6 21:14
112:7	102:6 105:4	36:25	119:14	41:20 59:20	
	105:6	random (1)	120:18	127:21	26:20,23
Q	108:23	94:21	124:23	reconvene	27:1 29:15
qualificatio	110:9 113:7	rapid (1)	128:8 134:6		31:22 34:5
29:22	115:17	96:13	reason (4)	record (12)	40:14 49:25
qualified (1)	116:7,10,24	rates (1)	42:17 50:17		55:12 99:20
87:3	129:10	101:23	51:20 69:14	i e	101:8 102:3
qualifier (1)	queue (1)	read (14)	reasonable	20:15 21:1	113:20
89:7	74:16	24:15 29:13		28:13 32:12	
qualify (3)	quite (1)	32:11 35:23			
28:18 53:19		37:25 50:16		86:23	26:18 65:20
121:24	quote (1)	51:13,21	recall (3)	123:23	regardless
quantities (64:12	27:18 78:10	_	
96:7	quotes (1)	118:20	78:16	1:12	111:16
quarter (1)	96:1	120:3	receipt (1)	records (1)	regards (3)
89:23		125:18	117:14	18:24	50:20 94:10
question (39)		126:3	receive (5)	Red (1) 2:3	101:5
16:12 23:20		127:12	28:23 29:4	redistribut	. Regional (1)
	1	l	<u> </u>	1	•

register (1)	relied (1)	31:7	result (1)	Riverton (1)	126:23
3:23		representat	55:20	86:19	sales (1)
regular (1)	relief (2) 7:13	35:9 46:3	results (2)	Road (2)	88:11
126:17	7:20	48:1	13:22,23	53:16 75:2	sales-relate
regularly (1)	rely (4) 17:20	represente	retail (5)	roaming (1)	88:14
87:7	81:14,15	31:1	89:5 100:6	91:17	Salvatore (1)
regulations	95:10	reproducib	101:20	Rob (4) 1:16	15:7
3:22,22,25	remarks (1)	119:25	121:22,23	115:21	save (1)
4:2 52:25	73:6	request (2)	retailers (3)	116:9	114:17
53:2 111:25	remote (1)	34:2 52:15	43:11 84:1	130:21	saying (40)
reinforces (3:25	requested (1)	134:6	ROBERT (18:9 22:24
79:14	remotely (1)	7:21	retain (1)	1:15	23:2 42:14
reject (1)	4:21	requests (1)	32:25	roll (3) 3:17	44:23 49:13
97:22	render (1)	32:16	retained (3)	4:5 135:13	54:16 58:13
related (2)	123:5	require (3)	31:16 55:11	Ron (12)	59:9 60:17
72:6,15	reorder (1)	24:11 49:22	55:16	11:16 15:2	60:20,22
relates (3)	88:4	132:23	retaining (1)	85:17,25	62:15 64:11
78:6 93:2	repackage	required (8)	55:15	112:17	65:24 66:20
106:23	88:4 97:20	11:12,22	returns (1)	116:19	67:14 69:2
relationshi	repackage	13:13 52:24	88:13	117:2	69:6,13,16
39:23,24	43:6	53:1 124:18	review (8)	118:18,23	69:17 70:21
relative (2)	repackagin	124:19	21:6 22:19	121:11	73:7 80:24
137:9,11	39:10	125:17	45:12 57:4	130:10,23	89:8 91:12
relatively (1)	127:16	requireme	57:18 71:14	RONALD	92:3,20
106:1	repacking (11:25	72:22 87:13	2:4,5	95:20 96:11
relay (1)	81:12	research (2)	reviewed (3)	Rosenthal (98:14
31:24	repeat (1)	37:18,24	22:16	1:13 5:15	100:20
release (1)	37:7	reservation	119:20	5:16 6:17	103:10,17
32:22	report (19)	60:9	125:21	6:18 109:7	103:21
relevance (7)	17:25 18:1	reserved (1)	reviewing (1)	109:13	104:4,8
45:25 49:3	19:18,20,22	26:22	51:9	110:1,6	107:24
49:9 59:4	20:22 21:1	resident (1)	revisions (1)	134:17	121:13
62:19 91:6	22:6 23:4,6	93:22	26:16	135:16,17	says (26)
91:24	23:13,16,24	residential	Reyes (1)	Route (1) 1:9	11:21 13:5
relevant (21)	24:2,16	7:13,20 9:7	26:9	Rowan (1)	16:4 21:2
18:15 20:23	43:18 45:11	100:6	right (21)	87:5	21:15 23:7
20:25 21:24	1	residents (1)	10:9 25:12	Rutgers (1)	23:16 36:9
20:23 21:24 22:17 23:4	REPORTE	135:1	25:14 26:22	_ , .	46:1 48:11
24:19 32:23	1:19	resolution (59:6 60:5
40:22 43:19	1	7:15 9:4,7,8	1	S	60:25 68:1
40:22 43:19	52:9,15	65:25	64:21 66:25	S (4) 2:1,7,7	80:5 82:7
56:24 58:12	· ·	resolutions	74:10 78:18	28:8	83:4,9,23
61:16 62:7	137:17	7:4	79:1 82:5	S-T-E-C-K	95:6 100:24
62:11 68:3	represent (2)		83:1,4 84:4	28:15	107:18
68:18 102:8	1 -	119:23	84:13 85:24	sake (1) 34:6	117:17
120:24	representat	I		A 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	125:12
reliance (1)	47:25	restate (1)	ringing (1)	133:25	128:3
126:13	representat	' '	11:11	sale (1)	131:13
120.13	1 chi cacniai	,		I	

		-			=
scanned (1)	secondly (4)	110:12	short (3)	89:6,14	39:17,17,18
37:25	42:22 94:19	112:8	86:24 96:9	90:8,17	40:3,8
schedule (3)	126:1 128:1	sending (2)	112:8	92:2 93:20	41:14 45:8
93:1 106:7	Secretary (1)	39:10	short-term	98:5 103:25	45:11 48:23
108:1	1:12	127:16	93:16,17	107:10	59:18 61:23
scheduled (section (10)	sense (4)	121:14	120:11	71:22 78:17
31:3,8	31:24 33:17	16:22 47:4	122:12	Simultaneo	79:2,7,24
Schertz (13)	33:19 82:7	51:16	shortened (5:9	80:9,18
1:16 5:23	87:14 89:21	109:23	120:4	simultaneo	89:25 90:1
5:24 6:25	92:15,16	sent (8) 4:1	shorter (4)	131:17	90:2,10,13
7:1 8:25 9:1	95:6 117:20	18:1,24	43:7 93:23	single (2)	91:24 92:21
9:10 10:3,4	sections (1)	19:2 20:13	93:24 96:21	80:23	98:3,7,16
113:7 130:8	123:4	25:2 26:8	show (2) 39:5	124:15	99:21 101:3
130:8	SED-20/W :	101:13	53:5	sir (16) 7:22	101:3 106:6
Schmo (1)	47:5,9	separate (6)	shows (1)	9:12 10:9	106:6,8
134:25	79:16 87:19	16:24,25	90:1	54:15 64:7	107:11
school (5)	89:24 106:5	56:20 62:18	side (1) 90:18	65:2 73:24	108:1,3,4,4
55:2,3 92:6	SED-20W (100:25	sign (2) 114:1	94:7 95:25	112:15
92:10 129:8	46:13	111:25	114:18	97:25 98:4	113:20,21
Science (2)	SED-W (1)	separately	signed (1)	99:22 101:1	113:22,25
54:7,8	87:14	48:5	57:16	104:14	114:3,7,11
screen (1)	see (13)	separating	significanc	108:20	114:14,16
77:22	15:18 19:16	16:12	12:16 16:13	136:16	118:19
season (1)	20:3 32:5	September	47:21 57:22	site (23) 21:4	119:12,16
111:2	73:1 76:18	29:3 35:7	59:18 61:13	34:3 38:10	119:18
second (29)	77:21 79:6	series (1)	91:24 92:16	38:11,21	120:7,13
5:11 6:9	102:5	121:24	108:3,4,6,7	40:20 47:24	123:8,17
7:24 8:7,8,9	116:14	served (2)	108:18	49:1,17	124:14
8:10,15	117:17	87:2,4	123:12	61:19,25	127:20,22
9:14,17	129:25	services (2)	significant	62:15 64:25	130:18
19:3 25:7,9	130:9	31:16 33:1	18:25 35:21	65:10,21	131:8,14,16
25:23 31:12		serving (1)	35:22 82:9	66:1 68:11	slashes (4)
37:14 77:25	77:13 99:6	134:19	82:23	71:14 73:22	90:5,11
80:7 89:18	105:17	set (2) 111:25	significantl	76:14 102:9	98:9 114:10
100:17	136:15	137:6	17:5	102:11	slice (1)
112:18	seek (2) 67:9	seventh (1)	silent (1)	112:20	68:19
121:12	103:24	83:23	117:8	sitting (1)	slightly (1)
124:14	seeking (5)	shake (1)	similar (6)	39:7	76:10
129:19	7:12 21:3	130:21	72:21 80:22	six (2) 82:19	slow (1)
133:22,23	75:24	ship (3) 88:4	95:1 127:15	83:22	54:15
134:16	128:16,17	97:5,20	127:24	size (1) 120:2	small (1)
135:5,6	self (1)	shipped (3)	131:18	skip (1)	114:11
secondary	107:21	96:8 127:14	simple (1)	124:6	smaller (1)
39:4	self-emplo	128:6	106:1	slash (73)	96:7
Seconded (1)	• ~	shipping (1)	simplify (1)	16:5,9,11	Smith (1)
5:5	self-storag	122:4	39:24	16:16,23	124:11
seconding (l .	simply (12)	22:2,11	Smith/Jane
135:8,10	semantics (2)	1	16:11 22:21	1 1	124:11
100.0,10				I	ļ

34:1 72:11 solid (1)	74:20 77:14 speaking (3) 11:15 76:2	88:25 89:16 100:20	60:9 61:10	115:25	101:10
solely (2) 34:1 72:11 solid (1) 73:18	speaking (3)				
34:1 72:11 solid (1) 73:18			62:4,5	116:1 122:7	submission
solid (1) 73:18		starts (3)	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	stored (7)	26:15
73:18 s	132:4	51:3,5	67:16,19	39:7 43:7	submission
	special (2)	82:20	69:22 74:13	43:15 96:14	34:24
1 SUIULIUII 14 1	16:13 32:18	state (21) 1:3	77:17,19,20	122:8,13	submit (5)
	specific (5)	4:7 15:3	77:23 78:4	127:2	16:21 17:22
111:13	63:18,21	18:10 24:17	103:10	stores (5)	18:20 22:15
some-odd (1)	78:8 93:17	28:12 45:19	110:23	90:25 91:17	27:7
30:8	112:24	45:20 53:11	126:10	109:17	submitted (
1	specifically	54:12,20,24	127:3,5	126:21,23	19:5,19,25
131:1	33:19 112:3	74:24 86:15	128:3	storing (2)	20:2,5 23:5
somebody'	118:14	87:6,8	Steck's (3)	111:1,3	25:12 27:6
44:4 133:3	123:21	89:22 91:17	50:2 55:24	straight (1)	73:22 94:14
	spectrum (3)	116:7	56:14	69:13	Subparagr
34:24 35:5	49:4 99:25	123:21	stenograph	straightfor	24:2
	101:7	137:17	137:5	16:20	subset (7)
113:19	spell (2)	stated (6)	step (1)	Street (1) 2:3	100:10
sorry (14) 4:11 5:7	53:12 86:15	26:5 56:1	112:18	strictly (1)	102:16
1 1		65:2,2,14	STEPHEN	109:22	117:22
	spent (4) 71:21	69:24	1:12	structural (118:11
25:19 57:12	105:25	statement (1)	stick (1) 70:8	55:5	121:14,21
60:2,14	103:23	24:15	stipulate (1)	structure (4)	122.3
76:1 86:1			106:16	33:20 50:13	subsets (1)
1	spoke (2)	states (4) 24:2 26:13	stop (1)	107:19	117:25
136:3	52:23 75:5	117:19	60:15	118:6	subsidiary
·	spreadshee	132:25	storage (32)	structured	100:2
56:14 90:15	90:4		33:21 35:25	47:16	substantial
1	square (4)	static (1)	36:9,14	struggle (1)	50:22
95:9 97:1	34:23 36:12	81:10	43:1 46:15	93:4	substitute (1)
97:12 98:10	44:19 87:25	statically (1)	46:15 81:10	studies (1)	90:15
1	stacked (1)	43:15	81:10 82:9	24:7	succinct (1)
109:14	110:25	statute (1)	82:24 83:14	study (5)	106:2
` '	stake (1) 72:2	50:9		63:15 65:8	suggest (2)
1.	stand (1)	stay (1)	84:22,24	1	51:1 74:8
sounded (2)	20:17	122:11	89:9 93:16	71:11,13 73:20	sum (3) 74:4
1	standard (5)	Steck (51)	93:17,23,24	,	74:5,8
source (2)	70:4 98:21	27:13,15,19	96:4,14,19	subcategor	summaries
94:22 95:20	100:4,12	28:1,2,6,14	96:22	84:17,19	114:9
sources (3)	110:18	28:14,18,22	103:19	101:15	
1	standards (29:14,20	107:20,21	103:5	summarize
126:13	17:7 94:13	30:16,18	109:22	subcontrac	81:23
south (2)	standing (1)	32:25 40:11	115:6	134:24	summate (1)
19:25 20:1	34:8	41:2,8,12	117:14,20	subdividin	73:3
space (3)	start (3) 19:1	42:7 43:17	118:7	44:22	Super (1)
88:8 89:24	87:23 100:8	49:13 50:7	121:19	subject (3)	129:24
92:23	started (2)	52:19 56:19	store (7) 88:3	47:9 76:15	Superior (3)
speak (4)	31:12 42:14	56:20 57:25	88:17 97:19	119:2	30:11 54:23
22:7,10	starting (3)	58:20,24	101:21	subjects (1)	129:25

Supplies (1) 3:19 27:19 T (5) 2:7 28:8 109:15 73:17 78:11 113:19 117:4 119:2 this 43:2 137:1 131:23 102:6 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:10,23 119:	93:8 94:5 96:23 115:9 ings (26) 13:16 66:18 71:14 75:5 85:5 88:16 88:22 89:2 89:5,16 90:7 93:6 94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14 111:1 116:4
3:19 27:19 T (5) 2:7 28:8 109:15 73:17 78:11 113:19 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:13 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:4 119:2 117:13 117:4 119:2 117:13 117:13 117:13 117:13 117:13 117:13 117:13 117:13 110:5	ings (26) 13:16 66:18 71:14 75:5 85:5 88:16 88:22 89:2 89:5,16 90:7 93:6 94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14
supplies (1) 28:8 137:1 13:1 79:21 91:4 117:4 119:2 this supply (2) table (14) table (14) talks (4) 107:21 120:9,17 Texas (2) 54:11,19 8 support (3) 69:24 97:5 89:20 90:1 118:5 118:5 1:13 38:6 text (14) 89:25 90:3 8 supports (1) 92:21 101:3 44:21 109:6,8,12 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 supposed (1) 13:6 120:23 12:9 126:6 128:9 134:17 94:21,25 95:18 101:2 supposedly 91:7 tables (2) 128:9 tax (1) 30:12 30:22 38:16 122:25 sure (24) tackled (1) TD (1) 90:24 56:19 58:24 123:7	13:16 66:18 71:14 75:5 85:5 88:16 88:22 89:2 89:5,16 90:7 93:6 94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14
131:23	13:16 66:18 71:14 75:5 85:5 88:16 88:22 89:2 89:5,16 90:7 93:6 94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14
supply (2) table (14) talks (4) 107:21 120:9,17 support (3) 42:18 47:16 32:10 84:5 125:3 133:2 Texas (2) support (3) 69:24 97:5 89:20 90:1 118:5 Terry (8) 54:11,19 supports (1) 90:2,10 tall (2) 44:20 109:6,8,12 89:25 90:3 supposed (1) 119:24 task (1) 13:7 115:23 90:11 92:19 supposedly 129:24 129:126:6 testified (17) 95:18 101:2 supposedly 14:9 120:5 tax (1) 30:12 30:22 38:16 122:25 sure (24) tackled (1) TD (1) 90:24 56:19 58:24 thord (30)	85:5 88:16 88:22 89:2 89:5,16 90:7 93:6 94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14
support (3) 42:18 47:16 32:10 84:5 125:3 133:2 Texas (2) 54:11,19 69:24 97:5 89:20 90:1 118:5 1:13 38:6 54:11,19 1:13 38:6 125:7 90:2,10 118:5 109:6,8,12 89:25 90:3 89:25 90:3 90:11 92:19 supports (1) 92:21 101:3 14:9,17 15:23 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:	88:22 89:2 89:5,16 90:7 93:6 94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14
support (3) 62:9 79:10 117:13 Terry (8) 54:11,19 89:20 90:1 125:7 90:2,10 118:5 1:13 38:6 89:25 90:3 89:25 90:3 supports (1) 92:21 101:3 44:21 110:5 90:11 92:19 90:11 92:19 supposed (1) 119:24 tasked (3) 134:17 94:21,25 supposedly 120:23 12:9 126:6 testified (17) 95:18 101:2 supposedly 114:9 120:5 tax (1) 30:12 30:22 38:16 122:25 sure (24) 12:9 126:6 56:19 58:24 123:7	89:5,16 90:7 93:6 94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14
69:24 97:5 125:7 supports (1) 23:13 supposed (1) 13:6 supposedly 91:7 sure (24) 89:20 90:1 118:5 tall (2) 44:20 44:21 task (1) 13:7 task (1) 13:7 task (1) 13:7 task (3) 12:9 126:6 128:9 tax (1) 30:12 14:9 120:5 tackled (1) 118:5 tall (2) 44:20 109:6,8,12 109:6,8,12 110:5 90:11 92:19 92:25 94:21 13:4:9 120:23 12:9 126:6 128:9 tax (1) 30:12 128:9 tackled (1) 128:9 tax (1) 30:12 129:25 TD (1) 90:24 129:25 TD (1) 90:24 129:26:10 120:25 120:27 14:8,13 120:25 120:27 14:9 120:5 120:24 120:25 120:25 120:26:19 58:24 120:27	90:7 93:6 94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14
125:7 90:2,10 44:20 109:6,8,12 89:25 90:3 92:21 101:3 114:9,17 13:6 supposedly 91:7 sure (24) 120:25 tackled (1) 120:25 tackled (1) 120:24 tackled (1) 120:25 tackled (1) 120:24 120:25 tackled (1) 120:24 120:25 tackled (1) 120:24 120:25 120:24 120:25 120:24 120:25 120:25 120:24 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25 120:25	90:7 93:6 94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14
supports (1) 92:21 101:3 44:21 110:5 90:11 92:19 supposed (1) 119:24 task (1) 13:7 115:23 92:25 94:21 supposedly 120:23 tasked (3) 134:17 94:21,25 supposedly 120:23 12:9 126:6 testified (17) 95:18 101:2 supposedly 114:9 120:5 tax (1) 30:12 30:22 38:16 122:25 sure (24) tackled (1) TD (1) 90:24 56:19 58:24 123:7	94:4,17 98:15 101:22 108:14
23:13	98:15 101:22 108:14
supposed (1) 114:9,17 13:6 120:23 supposedly 128:9 128:9 28:10,22 114:8,13 122:25 120:23 128:9 30:22 38:16 122:25 123:7	101:22 108:14
13:6 120:23 128:9 28:10,22 114:8,13 129:25 14:9 120:5 tackled (1) TD (1) 90:24 56:19 58:24 123:7 123:7 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10 120:10	108:14
supposedly tables (2) 91:7 114:9 120:5 sure (24) tackled (1) 128:9 28:10,22 128:9 128:10,22 114:8,13 122:25 128:9 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22 128:10,22	
91:7 tables (2) 114:9 120:5 tax (1) 30:12 30:22 38:16 122:25 123:7 tackled (1) TD (1) 90:24 56:19 58:24 123:7 takled (20)	
sure (24) tackled (1) TD (1) 90:24 56:19 58:24 123:7	120:4,21
sure (24) tackled (1) 11 (1) (2) (2) (2) (2) (4) (20)	121:20
1 4 (155 /(147 /) 1 4 5 4 5 5 1 1 2 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	123:2
124:3	127:11,19
TT. 13 33.13 take (15)	127:19
33.20 34.12 13:15,19 telification in 01:22 04:12 9:2 11 16 th	ink (78)
37.0,10,22 23:3,12 23:3,12	12:12 16:10
54.25 02.21 27:252:9 confidential 120:25 15:21 24:24	18:4,23
52:14 /0:11 () Latin (2) 20:0 20:15	19:24 22:12
77.18 61.25 80:2,2	23:21 24:14
94:24 106:9 33.24 94:24 106:9 72:24 95:15	24:19,22
109:1,11	39:14 41:12
101.20,21 120:14 27.32 42.3 01:11 05:25 00:16	41:13 42:3
taken (5) 4:5	42:4,4
52:10	43:19 44:5
123.13 100:11 07.2.120.6 29.2.21.19 109:19:20	44:17 47:11
109:3 137:4	49:12 51:17
takes (1) takes (1)	51:17,19
100.23	57:16 60:11
(a) talk (10) 50.7 104.9 56.11.14 117.2 120.5	60:16,19
10:14 33:1	61:12,17,19
3/:11 /3:21 22 22 20 10 50 21 62:7 124:14	63:22,23
81:10 84:23	74:5 78:15
92.9 100:23 00:21 24 65:20 67:1 Thanks (2)	78:16 80:7
103.0	80:11 85:1
121.19 67.10.71.24 theoreticall	85:13,20
20.5 32.25 taiked (1)	87:25 88:25
79.22.70:2 theory (1)	90:12 94:24
taking (14)	97:11,13,14
12:24 13:1 12:10:20:22 02:2 00:4 (thing (12)	98:18 101:5
47.4 01.13	101:15
76.13 93.20 27.25 20.12 100.9 101.6 66.21 60.13	105:3
90:23	107:11
124:1	110:19

111:23	40:10 43:8	92:14 112:4	61:14,24,24	transshipm	38:20 41:8
114:12	43:9 47:14	128:9	62:6,8,10	97:3 115:6	64:18 66:18
115:9,23	50:3 51:2,4	Tonight's (1)	62:17,19,23	117:15	67:6,15
116:3,4,5	51:7 59:3	4:17	63:4,14,15	treats (1)	68:10 78:18
116:18	76:19,24	tools (2)	65:8,10,14	37:5	83:22 88:3
117:22	79:8,13	90:19,21	66:2 67:20	trial (1) 87:3	88:7 90:6,8
118:23	93:23,24	top (4) 89:6	67:21,23	trials (1) 87:4	93:6 100:3
120:13,19	96:8,20,21	100:5,15	68:2,12,17	trip (8) 24:6	100:25
121:18,18	99:2 105:13	117:24	69:3,25	36:5 40:16	116:4
121:18,18	105:15,25	top-line (2)	71:11 73:17	50:20 70:5	128:15
122:1 123:7	108:20	100:9,22	73:20 85:1	71:16	130:11
123:10	111:2,20	total (2)	85:4 91:1,4	101:17	type (10)
125:10	113:1,8	34:23 36:16	91:16 92:10	102:3	39:5 44:7
125.22	114:23	touch (1)	101:21	truck (3)	44:25 45:6
120.14	115:13,16	90:14	102:8,10,11	81:12,13	46:21 73:7
127:18	116:5,11	toughest (1)	102:17,23	88:19	83:14,17
1	128:6 129:4	97:14	104:15	trucked (2)	102:17
131:4,22	132:6	town (1)	105:1	43:5,5	111:13
thinking (4)	136:14	76:17	106:17,19	trucks (1)	types (10)
68:13,15,17	137:5	township (9)	108:9	111:5	13:15 38:20
118:3		1:1,2 10:23	126:11	true (2)	80:8 88:18
thinks (4)	times (8)	11:20 20:14	trailer (1)	73:20 137:3	118:16
56:22 59:16	36:23 63:6	30:6 33:14	102:20	truth (3) 28:4	120:4
59:17,17	63:9 71:18	59:25 87:13	trailers (2)	28:4,5	121:24
third (1)	94:1 106:17	township's	75:15	try (4) 38:3	122:3,6
24:16	125:2 129:6	3:9 4:22	108:13	90:8,16,17	127:15
thought (5)	title (7) 35:1		train (1)	trying (10)	typical (1)
50:7 76:1	60:4,25	track (1) 16:14	88:19	69:18 87:23	88:17
77:23 99:20	61:3 79:10	l .	trains (1)	90:3,6	typically (3)
113:22	79:11 83:4	tract (2)	89:10	91:10 98:19	32:5 37:1
thoughts (2)	TN (1) 4:8	104:16,20	77.10 Tran (1)	106:14	88:8
108:25	today (3)	tractor (3)	86:11	111:10	00.0
112:2	34:18	75:15	1	114:10	U
three (11)	110:16	102:20	transcript (1:5 18:2	124:9	ultimate (2)
38:9 54:6	111:1	108:12	28:21 29:8	turn (1)	44:12 83:3
73:11,14	told (3)	traffic (74)	29:13 137:4	96:11	ultimately
83:22	126:10,11	17:16 24:5		1	118:21
104:17,21	126:13	24:7 27:16	transfer (1)	turned (1)	127:2
113:13,16	tonight (23)	27:23 36:5	122:7	124:8	132:20
123:16	4:7,15	36:16,16,23	transpired	turnover (1)	um (11)
127:18	10:16 11:6	36:24 38:25	56:6	96:13	33:17 34:10
throw (1)	12:8 14:5	40:19 44:16	transport (1)	twist (1) 16:2	42:22 50:13
131:3	15:16 22:1	45:18,21	116:2	two (35) 7:4	50:24 56:2
throwing (1)	22:13,15	46:1,2 49:6	transporta	17:3 21:4,7	71:5 79:8
98:16	24:20 43:20	49:25 50:20	1	24:12 25:5	98:9 102:5
tie (1) 90:22	50:5 51:25	52:20 55:5	73:23 79:23	30:3 31:3,7	103:16
time (41)	56:19,24	57:21 58:4	88:19	34:22 35:18	umbrella (1)
7:10 15:24	57:25 66:10	1 ' '	transporte	37:13,13,16	111:14
31:1 40:2	71:22 76:9	58:22 59:11	126:22	37:20 38:11	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	1	1	•	-	

					ŝ
unable (1)	upper (1)	106:13,21	utilities/loc	88:22	124:13
31:2	122:2	106:21	90:9	vehicles (2)	134:18,18
unambiguo	use (121) 3:4	108:1,4,8	utilization	117:16	walk (1) 68:7
125:2	3:16 10:19	108:10	16:22	127:17	want (50)
unanimous	10:23 11:8	114:11	utilize (7)	version (3)	10:14 12:6
7:15	11:18,22	117:7,9	33:10 34:2	86:24 93:15	12:25 13:19
unanimous	12:17,19,23	118:1	38:8 48:19	96:1	13:21 14:21
7:14 9:8	13:2 16:24	120:11,17	48:21 70:4	versus (4)	17:19 18:10
undefined	17:1 22:4	121:15,22	120:20-	37:2 106:21	23:12,24
47:15 87:24	23:3 24:16	121:23	utilized (9)	110:20	27:23,25
underneat	30:13 31:17	122:2,25	24:4 33:21	123:1	31:6 35:14
117:17	31:25 32:5	123:8,9,13	42:9,13	vertical (1)	35:16 46:4
understan	32:8 33:10	123:15,20	46:10 50:12	36:14	46:4,5
4:15 18:17	33:15 34:3	128:19	71:4 107:20	view (2) 40:8	48:12 53:24
18:18 54:16	34:9,12	129:7	118:6	84:18	60:15 66:24
56:20 66:11	35:12,16	130:18		virgule (17)	69:10 74:20
69:12,19	37:9,10	user (2)	V	16:17 21:23	89:9,10,18
78:12	39:6 40:6	93:21	v (4) 11:20	39:20 41:9	90:14 92:13
103:16	40:17 41:13	107:24	123:23	41:14 86:6	99:8 102:2
understan	42:24 43:3	users (2)	124:1,4	122:25	104:3
31:19 32:1	43:4 44:9	93:22	V-I-R-G-U	123:13,20	105:14
34:17 38:16	45:8,23	127:15	16:17	124:17,22	112:25
42:10 58:17	46:14 47:17	uses (38)	valid (1)	125:8,14,18	114:18
59:23 63:10	48:6,13	16:3,12	24:23	125:23	115:6
63:11 71:7	49:3,22	17:3 35:23	value (1)	129:5 132:3	116:14
75:12	50:2,24	37:4 38:21	92:5	virtual (1)	118:3,4,22
understood	51:2,7,20	42:18 49:1	vans (4)	3:6	119:5
31:7	60:10 61:15	49:16 58:1	102:21,22	virtually (2)	120:20
undertakin	61:23 63:18	62:18 63:11	102:25	33:7 35:10	121:12
96:19	63:21 64:5	63:20,22,24	134:24	voices (1) 5:9	122:4,5,23
Uniform (2)	64:24 65:3	65:5,15	variance (11)	Volped (12)	129:12
124:23	66:1,24	66:12 79:23	7:12,20 9:7	74:21,23	134:7 136:4
130:16	67:10,10	80:9,10,21	12:23 32:22	75:1,1,13	136:12
unit (1) 92:6	69:1,4,15	81:1 85:3,8	48:6 49:23	75:18 76:1	wanted (12)
units (1) 92:5	70:1 78:7,9	87:15 90:16	66:24 67:10	76:10,18,21	21:18,18
universe (3)	78:24 79:16	90:22 92:11	128:19	76:23 77:9	38:8 48:5
98:15,17	79:17 81:9	92:21	132:24	vote (7)	58:13 67:2
131:22	81:14,19	103:12	variances (2)	132:15,15	69:4 116:7
University	84:18 87:24	104:1,16	32:6,7	132:16,17	125:10
54:11,19	87:24 89:17	106:7,25	varied (1)	133:6 134:2	i .
unloading	90:15,21	107:25	97:13	134:13	129:8 131:6
89:10	91:3 92:4,5	112:6	variety (2)	voted (2)	wants (8)
unmute (1)	92:9 93:11	121:24	44:11 89:5	7:13 9:8	27:19 47:23
74:22	94:6 97:8	usually (3)	various (3)	voting (1)	94:8 99:3
unpacking		7:9 88:11	88:24	115:18	102:6
81:12	102:25	114:8	102:16		124:12
updated (2)	103:24	utilities (1)	123:4	W	131:1
24:5 76:19	104:2,10,11	90:10	vary (1)	wait (3)	136:13
21.5 70.17	,-,-,-,-	l	I		

warehouse	103:5,12,15	38:14,19	32:21 41:10	133:7	75:4 85:21
16:4,23,25	103:19	40:5 46:2,4	45:4 47:4	welcome (1)	86:8,14
16:25 17:4	104:24	47:13,19	50:1,4	108:19	92:2 95:25
21:4,7 22:1	106:6,18	48:10 49:5	52:13,14	went (1)	107:23
22:10,21	107:2,5,18	51:3 60:11	65:9 66:10	40:17	120:16
23:17 24:4	107:22	61:4 64:4	66:15 67:4	weren't (1)	121:5
24:10,12,21	108:16	68:5 72:24	75:20,22,24	94:14	witnesses (7)
33:14,19,24	109:16,22	88:1,15	87:23 90:12	whatnot (1)	51:25 67:6
34:2:35:16	110:20,24	118:16	91:17 98:16	48:18	76:2 <i>7</i> 7:5
35:24 36:3	112:13	131:14	104:18,19	wholesale (2)	94:13 99:13
1 .	115:24	warehousi	109:1,9,9	127:5	108:22
36:7,11,15		58:1 60:6	112:9	131:18	wondering
36:21,23	117:17,18	61:2 62:12	114:10,12	wholesaler	75:6
37:2,10,14	117:22,24	t t	114:13	128:7	word (21)
38:19,25	118:5,9,12	wasn't (3)	130:25	wholesaler	13:20 16:4
39:1,4,7,15	118:13	8:4,13,14		44:1 83:25	16:5 22:18
40:19 41:16	119:21	watching (1)	132:4	84:4 127:15	33:19 35:3
42:11,16,21	121:14,18	35:10	we've (6)	132:8 133:1	36:3 37:14
42:24,25,25	121:22	water (1)	41:7 48:17		37:14 38:1
44:8,18,24	122:1 125:9	95:10	52:12 71:21	134:5,6	I '
45:1,21	126:3,20	way (18)	71:22 96:25	wide (1)	42:8,17
46:14 48:4	128:13,16	29:23 40:3	website (2)	94:17	43:4 76:3
51:13 58:7	128:20	42:22 44:20	3:9 4:23	wide-rangi	78:15,16
58:15 59:16	132:5,21	47:16 50:12	Webster's (13:7	86:6 98:11
60:12 61:21	134:8	50:16 51:10	16:18	wildly (1)	98:19
62:24 63:5	warehouse'	76:14,16	Wednesda	91:3	112:12
63:24 64:8	93:2	90:12 95:8	1:8	wish (2)	120:12
64:17 65:4	warehouse	104:5 107:8	week (1) 3:22	41:17 112:4	worded (2)
65:15 66:22	99:25	115:19	weight (1)	wished (1)	59:8 92:25
67:8 68:16	warehouse/	125:20	126:16	66:12	wording (2)
69:22 71:9	21:15 22:18	132:18	Weiss (30)	wishes (1)	42:20 50:8
71:17 73:8	33:11 47:6	134:11	1:14 6:15	77:12	words (35)
75:9,14,17	100:24	Wayne (1)	6:16,19,20	withdraw (1)	12:8 13:11
75:23 76:3	103:25	11:20	7:25 8:19	12:20	13:14,17
76:7,25	warehouse	ways (3) 41:9	8:20 9:10	witness (41)	18:16 21:19
78:16,19	23:18 24:3	88:25 122:6	9:17,17,22	22:9 27:12	33:11 37:13
82:4,8	35:3 37:8	we'll (7) 12:3	9:23 113:11	44:5 52:4	37:13,20
83:13 84:20	49:14 56:16	14:25 34:10	113:18	52:20 53:9	38:10,20
84:21 89:4	59:1,11	56:22 87:20	114:5,15	53:19 55:9	40:25 41:4
89:14,24	73:12,12,13	105:17	115:2,11.	56:20,21	41:6,22
92:23 93:14	82:8,22,23	117:2	129:15,20	59:15 60:4	45:16 58:14
93:21 96:8	84:4 87:21	we're (45)	129:23	60:17,21,25	58:23,25
96:12,17,25	87:21 88:6	10:15 12:7	130:3,5	62:1,25	62:3,9 70:8
97:16,23	93:15 94:3	12:24,25	131:25	63:6,12	82:15 90:8
98:22 99:24	96:5 109:18	13:10,16,24	132:2	64:1,20,23	91:22 92:1
100:2,5,6,9	109:18	15:9,13	133:15,23	65:6,17,23	97:3,6,10
100:2,5,5,5	115:5 131:9	16:7 17:18	135:18,19	68:21,24	98:15
101:19	warehousi	21:25 22:12	1	69:5,11,20	100:21
102:14	35:14 38:11	25:19 32:12	132:19	72:5 73:2	112:20
102.17	33,14 30,11	1 20:17		I	

Г						
	113:3 120:3	113:13,16	0	157 (1) 44:17	25th (1) 25:8	9:58 (1)
١,	work (1)	Yum (1) 4:8	07701 (1) 2:3	16th (1) 5:2	26th (4)	109:3
	90:23		07/01 (1) 2:3	17th (3) 4:11	19:19 25:7	90 (5) 40:18
Ι,	working (1)	Z	1	4:12,16	25:16 26:8	40:20 51:4
	102:18	ZBE2011 (1)	1 (1) 21:8	180 (1) 30:10	2nd (1) 3:16	51:7 59:12
١,	works (1)	4:8	10 (3) 40:18	18th (1) 20:9		95-2.4 (1)
	118:24	ZBE2028 (1)	51:3,5	1920s (1)	3	33:20
,	world (2)	7:5	10:01 (1)	100:4	302 (1) 2:3	95-5 (1)
	110:16,25	ZBE2029 (1)	109:4	1976 (1) 30:2	32 (1) 134:25	101:3
	wouldn't (2)	9:5	10:37 (1)	1990 (2)	33 (1) 89:23	95-5.2 (4)
	69:4 85:8	ZBE2040 (2)	136:21	54:13,22	34 (1) 75:1	89:21 92:15
	wrestle (1)	1:6 10:8	100 (18)	1993 (1)	35 (1) 55:6	106:4 114:7
	66:9	zone (30)	35:17,17	93:14	39 (1) 86:25	99-5 (1) 90:1
.	wrestling (1)	12:17 16:4	63:3 64:16	1994 (1)	3rd (3) 19:1	
١	123:17	17:3,8,18	64:17 65:3	124:7	20:11,14	
- [-	write (1)	46:13,13	65:4,15,15	1996 (1)		,
	89:12	47:5,7,9,10	66:22,23	123:24	4 (1) 22 15	
	writing (1)	47:13 48:13	67:7,8	1st (1) 6:7	4 (1) 23:15	
١	98:9	50:15 65:25	69:22,23		4.7 (1) 71:18	
	written (4)	73:19 75:22	85:7 106:18	2	40 (1) 110:13	
	16:4 78:8	76:6 79:16	106:21	2 (3) 3:5 21:1	4055 (1)	
	78:13	80:23 87:20	103 (2) 3:3,14	21:9	32:14	
	114:23	93:2 104:20	107 (2) 3:3,14	20 (5) 30:8	5	
		106:5	10th (2) 29:3	44:19	50 (1) 44:21	
	X	112:21,22	35:7	106:19	522 (1) 1:9	
-	XI01952 (1)	112:23	11 (1) 120:1	107:2,3	54 (1) 2:3	
١	137:18	113:16,17	120 (1) 1:9	20/W (1)		
	Y	132:4	12th (1) 4:10	87:14	6	
		zoning (37)	15 (1) 1:8	200 (1)	6 (2) 24:1	
	yeah (17)	1:1,7,11	150 (6) 36:7	129:24	31:12	
	14:14,23	10:20,22	87:4 101:19	200,000 (2)	600,000 (1)	
١	20:1,19	11:1,21,23	102:14	36:12 44:19	34:23	
	21:20 52:10	12:2,23	104:2,25	2005 (1)		
	59:13 74:24	16:2 30:5	154 (7) 44:17	124:2	7	
l	102:5 104:7 109:13	30:23 31:23	83:18,21	2015 (2) 94:1	7:30 (1) 4:19	
۱	113:11	32:11,17,19	84:11,14	96:1	7:35 (1) 3:1	
	114:25	33:9,13	101:10	2019 (5) 19:2	8	
	114:23	51:19 54:23	104:2	19:9 20:14	·································	•
	113:22	66:13 70:7	155 (11)	25:7,17	8:43 (1)	
-	130:4	70:8 71:2	53:16 81:19	2020 (6) 1:8	52:16	
	130.4	75:5 76:3	81:23 82:3	3:5,16 6:7 25:8 29:3	8:49 (1)	
	years (12)	87:7,16	83:4,10,16		52:17	
	30:7,8 55:6	89:23 92:7	84:11,15	211 (1) 129:25	80 (1) 28:15	
	59:7 73:9	97:17	101:10	222 (1) 86:19	9	
	86:25 104:8	100:11,19	104:2	24 (2) 36:13	9 (2) 74:14,15	
	104:17,21	104:17	156 (5) 44:17	44:19	9:11 (1)	
	110:13	111:11	101:10,17	25 (1) 87:1	71:21	
	110.10	128:18	104:2,25	#3 (1) 0/.1	, ,,,,,,	
L	pp. 24.102.				<u>a de Cara de la proposición de la constanta de la constanta de la constanta de la constanta de la constanta de</u>	