## Township of Manalapan

120 Route 522 \& Taylors Mills Road Manalapan, NJ 07726

Planning Board Minutes<br>Public Meeting February 22, 2024

The meeting was called to order with the reading of the Open Public Meetings Act by Chairwoman Kathryn Kwaak at 7:30 p.m., followed by the salute to the flag.

| Mr. Kastell read the TV Disclosure Statement and took the Roll Call of the Board. |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| In attendance at the meeting: | Todd Brown, John Castronovo, Barry Jacobson, Kathryn <br> Kwaak, Jack McNaboe, Richard Hogan, Steve Kastell, <br> Brian Shorr, Nunzio Pollifrone, Pat Givelekian. |
| Absent: | Barry Fisher |
| Also present: | Ronald Cucchiaro, Planning Board Attorney <br> Brian Boccanfus, Planning Board Engineer <br> Jennifer Beahm, Planning Board Planner <br> Nancy McGrath, Recording Secretary |

Mr. Cucchiaro swore in Brian Boccanfuso, Professional Engineer, and Jennifer Beahm, Professional Planner.

## Minutes:

A Motion was made by Chief Hogan and Seconded by Mr. Shorr to approve the Minutes of February 8, 2024 as written.

| Yes: | Brown, Castronovo, Jacobson, Kwaak, McNaboe, Hogan, Kastell, Shorr |
| :--- | :--- |
| No: | None |
| Absent: | Fisher |
| Abstain: | None |
| Not Eligible: | Pollifrone, Givelekian |

Ordinance 2024-02

## AN ORDINACE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANALAPAN AMENDING AND SUPPLEMENTING CHAPTER 95, "DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS", OF THE CODE OF THE TOWNSHIP OF MANALAPAN, SECTION 95-8.7, "SIGNS", PERTAINING TO POLITICAL SIGNS.

Mr. Cucchiaro explained the Governing Body introduced proposed Land Use Ordinance 2024-02 which regulates the time and manner which political signs can be displayed within the township. As with other ordinances pertaining to land use, the Planning Board's main role here is to determine whether it is substantially consistent with the municipal Master Plan. Mr. Cucchiaro said from a legal perspective, the Master Plan does not seek to discourage political expression within the town. However, it does seek to promote a desirable visual environment and keeping clutter and excess signage within reason. Ms. Beahm stated the master plan does not specifically address political signs but it does address issues associated with how long signage can stay up and where signs are located. Ms. Beahm, agreed with Mr. Cucchiaro that the township is looking for a desirable visual environment in all the things that are done within the town therefore this is consistent with the Master Plan.

The Board did not have additional questions or comments regarding this Ordinance.

A Motion was made by Mr. Brown and Seconded by Mr. Castronovo to approve that Ordinance 2024-02 is substantially consistent with the Master Plan.

Yes: Brown, Castronovo, Jacobson, Kwaak, McNaboe, Hogan, Kastell, Shorr<br>No: None<br>Absent: Fisher<br>Abstain: None<br>Not Eligible: Pollifrone, Givelekian

## Applications

## PMS2210~CCG Real Estate, LLC

Wood Avenue~Block 49 / Lot 7
(3) Lot Minor Subdivision

Mr. David Shafkowitz the attorney representing the applicant CCG Real Estate, gave a brief description of the property and the requested relief. The property is located in the R40/20 single-family residential zone and is currently vacant. It consists of approximately 166,000 +/- sq. feet and a little over 3.75 acres and has about 420 feet of frontage along County Road 522. Mr. Shafkowitz said there is a gravel driveway on the left side of the property that will be addressed with the property owner since there is no easement on record. The applicant is proposing a three (3) lot minor subdivision. Each lot is conforming in lot size (1+ acre) but will need bulk variances for lot frontage, width, and improvable area.

Mr. Cucchiaro swore in Mr. Robert Sive, Professional Engineer, as the next witness for the applicant. Mr. Sive stated his background and years of experience and Chairwoman Kwaak deemed his credentials were sufficient.

Mr. Sive passed out Exhibits A1 (aerial site colored rendering) and A2 (tax map with proposed overlay) and went on to describe the property. The lots are two lots west of the Englishtown boundary across from the Willows at Manalapan apartments.
The property is generally wooded and undeveloped with freshwater wetlands and associated buffer within the southerly portion of the site. The applicant is proposing threelot minor subdivision identified as lot 7.01 ( $\sim 1.27$ acres), 7.02 ( 1.27 acres) and 7.03 (about 1 acre). There are no site improvements proposed at this time but the goal is to develop each lot with a new single family home at some point. There is public sanitary sewer and potable water within Wood Avenue and will serve the future dwellings. Since there are wetlands, the applicant submitted an application with the NJDEP for the Letter of Interpretation (LOI) and proposing a transition area waiver or buffer averaging with those buffers. Mr. Sive stated there is ample property outside of the wetlands and buffers to support three homes. As far as storm water management, the plan proposes dry wells to care for the roof runoff and to stay under 1 acre of development to qualify as a minor development as it relates to storm water rules.

Applicant is seeking bulk variance relief for lot frontage and width since the R40/20 Zone requires 200 ft . The frontage/width for each proposed lot is as follows:

- Lot 7.01 Lot frontage/width 140 ft .
- Lot 7.02 Lot frontage/width 140 ft.
- Lot 7.03 Lot frontage 160 ft and Lot width 150 ft .

Improvable lot area would also require variance relief on Lots 7.02 and 7.03. The conceptual grading plan provided shows how the three houses could fit with driveway, turnaround, and have enough yard area to support each home.
Applicant is seeking a waiver for curbs and sidewalks but has indicated they are flexible if the Board decides otherwise.

Mr. Boccanfuso offered the following comments:

- At the time of plot plan submission the applicant is subject to non-major storm water development.
- Recommended a split-rail fence or barrier be installed at the limits of environmentally regulated areas.
- Applicant needs approval from the county since the lots are on a county road.
- If the County requires a right-of-way dedication it could impact the improvable area and exacerbate any variance relief that is granted.
- Confirmed the properties are within the sewer and water service area.

Ms. Beahm recommended to the Board that if the County does ask for a ROW dedication then the applicant should come back to the Board with any additional relief that is necessary.

Mr. Hogan asked when the applicant expects to hear back from Monmouth County on approvals and Mr Shafkowitz said in about two weeks. He also asked about the plans for the adjacent property and the gravel drive that is on the applicant's property. Mr. Shafkowitz stated they plan to work with the neighbor to help them relocate the driveway off the applicant's property.

Mr. Shafkowitz introduced Christine Nazzaro-Cofone testifying as a Licensed Professional Planner for the applicant. She provided her experience and qualifications to the Board and Chairwoman Kwaak deemed her credentials were sufficient.

Ms. Cofone reiterated the properties are compliant in lot area but need variances for lot frontage/width and improvable lot area.

Ms. Cofone outlined the reasons why the Board could grant the relief required under both the C1 hardship and the C2 flexible "c."

C1 - Hardship - The improvable lot area variance is not because the lots are not of a sufficient size but it is because of the encumbrances on the lots (wetlands and buffers).

In the absence of a hardship, the board can grant variance relief if the applicant demonstrates that one or more purposes of the land use law will advance by the granting of the application.

C2 criteria g - Frontage/width variance -provide sufficient space in appropriate locations for a variety of uses. Exhibit A1 shows how each lot could support a singlefamily dwelling and conform to the setbacks of the zone.
C2 criteria e - appropriate population density - The applicant meets this criteria since the lots are at least 1 acre which meets the zone requirement.

As far as negative criteria, Ms. Cofone reviewed Manalapan's Master Plan in terms of population intensity and density. Ms. Cofone concluded that in her opinion, what the applicant is proposing is not drastically out of character with the area and there is no substantial detriment to the public good, zone plan, or Master Plan.

Ms. Beahm commented that she did not agree with the C1criteria because the hardship is the result of the three lots. If the applicant proposed two lots then no variance relief is necessary. With that said, she takes no exception to the relief requested because all three lots are conforming in lot area, but feels it qualifies under the C 2 criteria. Ms. Beahm also agreed with previous comments about requiring the applicant to provide curbs and sidewalks.

Mr. Cucchiaro stated from a legal perspective that if lots are deficient in developable area there needs to be an affirmative statement by the Board recognizing that there is no future hardship claim by a homeowner at the Zoning Board level. His recommendation is to have this explicitly stipulated in the Resolution and the Resolution be recorded so it can be found in the chain of title for future owners and Boards.

Mr. McNaboe remarked that he did not understand why this is not just a two-lot subdivision variance free. In his opinion, the lots looked smaller by comparison to some of the other lots on Wood Avenue.
Chairwoman Kwaak expressed concern about the lots/driveways being on a busy road. She recommended a circular driveway if the application turns out to be a two-lot subdivision. Another concern is about the longevity of a split-rail fence for the environmentally regulated areas and asked for a more permanent solution such as markers along with the split-rail fencing. Mr. Shafkowitz agreed and said they would have to deedrestrict the back of the lots anyway for future development.

The other Board members agreed that a two-lot subdivision would make better sense. Ms. Cofone countered that this is a mixed area with some conforming lots and some nonconforming lots. She believes from a planning perspective, the three lots are consistent with the lots and structures that are existing along Wood Avenue.

Mr. Shafkowitz completed his case and said he will discuss this matter with the applicant based on the Board's comments tonight. Chair Kwaak opened this application for public comments and no one came forward to speak. Mr. Cucchiaro formally announced the application will move to the March 14 meeting and there will be no further notice to property owners.

10 minute break

## PMS2238 ~ Monmouth Battlefield Flex Co., LLC

## Route 33~Block 79.02/Lots 2, 3 \& 5

Preliminary \& Final Major Site Plan - Flex Space
Hearing \#4
After the break, the Board reconvened to hear Monmouth Battlefield Flex application. The details are in the transcript. No vote took place and the applicant was carried to the March 14, 2024 Planning Board Meeting.

Please refer to the transcript below supplied from the court reporter for the applicant. AB Court Reporting, LLC. The transcript also includes Public Comments.

## Transcript insert

## Non Agenda Items - None

## Correspondence - None

Adjournment
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(Application is called at 8:32 p.m.)

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: I would like to call our meeting back to order at 8:32. Okay, are we all here? Yes.

Application PMS-2238 Monmouth
Battlefield Flex Company, LLC, Route 33, Block 79.02, Lots 2, 3 and 5. Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan, flex space.

This is Hearing.Number 4. Mr. Giunco. ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Thank you, Ms. Chairwoman. At the last meeting there were a number of questions that were raised and we're going to try to address them tonight.

So I would first ask that Bhaskar
Halari be able to testify. He has already been sworn and qualified as an expert, and if you're okay with that, we'll proceed.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I just remind you you remain under oath.

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Go ahead.

## B. Halari, P.E.

$$
\begin{array}{lllllllllll}
\mathrm{E} & \mathrm{X} & \mathrm{~A} & \mathrm{M} & \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{~N} & \mathrm{~A} & \mathrm{~T} & \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{O} & \mathrm{~N}
\end{array}
$$

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Bhaskar, since the last meeting we had some comments and you worked on the plans to try to address those comments; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: $\quad$ So could you
describe what you have done?
THE WITNESS: Yes. A couple of points that $I$ would just like to briefly go over what we were focusing on based on the board's input that we went over at the last meeting.

One of them being the entrance sign that we felt was very small, so we have come up with a little different size based on -- we went and looked at the sign across the street on Battleground Park and tried to mimic similar lettering size and whatnot and we think it's adequate for the property.

Second thing we have done is relocated the entrance sign as per the input from the board on the other side of the driveway.

And third thing was one of the board members had a question about if there's a dump truck standing on one of the loading dock would the other
truck be able to pull in and go into the other loading dock right across from it.

So all of those three points $I$ created one exhibit which we're trying to show all three.

Here, as you can see, the sign is now located on the easterly side of the driveway, and previously it was 20 feet away from the right-of-way. But in this area the right-of-way is pretty wide so we moved it 10 feet to the property line which is still compliant. We were further distance away before.

The size of the sign is going to be 32 square feet -- sorry, 24 square feet.

PLANNER BEAHM: Bhaskar, can we just stop? So initially it was 20-foot setback and now it's 10-foot setback?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

PLANNER BEAHM: Okay.
THE WITNESS: But required setback is 10 feet, so previously it was much further away. This is the sign where we feel that minimum lettering size should be six-inch high so then they're visible from the distance. So we developed the sign where the sign is now eight feet by three feet.

We also eliminated those two columns we

## B. Halari, P.E.

had previously and the height of the sign was much higher. So now we are two and a half feet so that gives us a space for the landscaping around without obstructing the sign. And we feel this is a reasonable size sign for the property to provide a safer access.

Second thing we did is we had a directory sign, but with that we are now proposing a directional sign. So there is a small directional sign which is three square feet, which is preferred in the ordinance.

PLANNER BEAHM: I have to interrupt. Did you submit any of this to us in advance?

THE WITNESS: No.

PLANNER BEAHM: I mean I have to say, I'm not thrilled with all of this stuff being thrown at us. Like I was expecting you guys to come up, have the planner come up and talk about the variance for the signs, discuss the overall height of the building and be done with it. Now we're talking about all this stuff, which you didn't give us, and we have had zero opportunity to even look at.

I don't really think that's fair.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
PLANNER BEAHM: I mean...

## B. Halari, P.E.

THE WITNESS: So what would you suggest I do?

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: So let me just jump in here. So let me ask my professionals, did you receive anything the board asked that they said they were going to do at the last meeting, report-wise; did you receive any of that.

PLANNER BEAHM: We got the traffic study.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Yes, Mr. Rea submitted the response letter that we had requested with the supplemental information. I'm sure we're going to hear from him tonight.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
PLANNER BEAHM: But, this, this is
brandie-new.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. So,
Mr. Cucchiaro, how would you like us to proceed since our professionals have not had the time to --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, you can proceed any number of ways. My recommendation would be that let's listen to what Mr. Halari has to say.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: See if we have any questions.

## B. Halari, P.E.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: They may wish to present something that the board's professionals can have some opportunity to, you know, evaluate in an appropriate amount of time, not moments after first hearing it.

As you heard, Mr. Rea did present his updated traffic study in advance. We can certainly hear that.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Then $I$ think we can decide -- and $I$ know we have members of the public here as well.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Right, we'll get to the public this evening.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So, you know, it's the second hearing, you may want to hear from them.

## CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.

Okay, go ahead.
THE WITNESS: So basically in the last hearing we had conforming sign and we all felt it was very small, so we did some reasonable evaluation and we came up with this sign.

The directory sign is still the way we

## B. Halari, P.E.

proposed previously.
The directional sign is permitted by the ordinances which allows small size sign so you can direct the traffic from Building 1 and 2 or Building 3 and 4 so they know which way to go.

That is pretty much it as far as my input is. And this was a set down around map that we did for a tractor-trailer, where there is an existing tractor-trailer parked at one of the loading docks and this plan just shows another vehicle, another tractor-trailer can park in front of it without any difficulty.

This was another comment Todd I think had at last time.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Someone had a
comment.

THE WITNESS: Yes.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.

THE WITNESS: So this pretty much is my testimony on this tonight.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: That's it, I have no other questions for Mr. Halari.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.

Professionals.

PLANNER BEAHM: Nothing. I have nothing.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: You have nothing.
Brian?
PLANNER BEAHM: I mean we've learned about this 15 seconds ago so, no, I have nothing to add.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Well what is --
what are the dimensions of the modified site ID sign?

THE WITNESS: It's eight feet wide by three feet high.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: That's the sign panel?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: What is the total height from the ground? I see a dimension, I can't read it.

THE WITNESS: $5^{\prime} 6^{\prime \prime}$ is the total height
now.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Okay.
PLANNER BEAHM: What is it?

THE WITNESS: 5 foot 6 inch. So 13
inch is the foundation, the area under the sign. So
that is what is proposed for landscaping.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Madam Chair, if I
can recommend these are the exact type of things that, you know, that would have been understood and resolved.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Correct.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I mean the
applicant does have a right under section loB of the Municipal Land Use Law to come with exhibits that clarify. However, you take the risk, you know, that no one has seen it until you show up.

So $I$ think rather than conducting what you know, what sort of is tantamount to a workshop on the revisions, you know, if you could just submit the revisions and then the board's professionals can have an opportunity to take a look at it, digest the information and reach out to you if they have any questions.

> THE WITNESS: Understood.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
Are you good with that, Brian?
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Yes, Madam

Chair. Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: All right. So you
might as well move on to your next.

## B. Halari, P.E.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Eric Wagner, please. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Sure. While he's coming up, Chief, did they submit this to the fire commissioners to review.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: A meeting -- they
did, and the meeting is scheduled for Monday evening.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Thank you.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Giunco, was this witness previously sworn, or is this new for tonight?

ERIC WAGNER: Previously sworn.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. I just
remind you remain under oath.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Microphone.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And if you could
state and spell your name for the record again.
ERIC WAGNER: Eric Wagner, E-R-I-C, $W-A-G-N-E-R$.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, go ahead,
Mr. Wagner.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Mr. Wagner was
offered as an expert in the prior hearing.
$\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\mathrm{E} & \mathrm{X} & \text { A } & \mathrm{M} & \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{N} & \text { A } & \mathrm{T} & \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{O} & \mathrm{N}\end{array}$

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: So, Eric, the board had a bunch of questions about the screening of the rooftop equipment.

THE WITNESS: Yes. So we did -- we changed the type. We had originally been talking about kind of a fence arrangement, if you will, to screen the equipment, but now we're proposing curb-mounted equipment screening so the example that is up on the monitor now shows the type we're talking about. It's literally mounted to the curb of the mechanical equipment. It would be no higher than the mechanical equipment. And we have now established a maximum height of that mechanical equipment on the building as it was suggested that that sets the building height.

So we have a Roof Plan and a height exhibit.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: That's new for tonight? Okay, what exhibit number are we up to? So this will be A-1.

So we'll mark this as A-1. I'll preface it by saying you're likely going to hear a similar response to you having new items for tonight, but let's get this marked.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So let's mark
this as $A-1$.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: A-1.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And can we have a title for it.

THE WITNESS: This is a Roof Plan. ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, go ahead. Attorney GiUnco: Roof Plan, A-1.
(Exhibit A-1, Roof plan, was marked for identification.)

THE WITNESS: So in this plan we're showing now a setback so -- which would limit location of any rooftop equipment from the short end of the building, 15-foot minimum. The units are 30, 35 feet wide so we couldn't pull much further in. And they were holding 20 feet from the long sides of the building.

So we've created a setback box, if you will, that would limit locations of the units. We have suggested some suggested locations and sizes but, obviously, they may or may not need two rooftop units for each space, but they would be within that setback.
And then we talked about the two
northerly buildings, 1 and 4 , that are on the - across the road, Local 33 from the state park. And there we're proposing screening any rooftop equipment with the curb-type screening that we had up previously in the first four units. So when you get far enough back you won't see them at all from that road.

And Bhaskar did prepare a setback study if you want to see it. If not, we just felt that it wasn't necessary beyond the first four units to commit to the screening. So we would say any rooftop equipment for units -- the first four would be screened; beyond that they wouldn't need to be, but they would be held back with the setbacks as I described.

PLANNER BEAHM: Can you explain that to me? I mean these are long, rectangular buildings so I'm not understanding the rationale there.

You don't have the width; the width is very narrow and you don't have the length of the building. So you're required to screen them, so now you're asking for relief?

THE WITNESS: Well, if you want to screen them all -- you won't be able to see them, but if you want to screen them.

PLANNER BEAHM: It's not really -like my point is it's a requirement.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
PLANNER BEAHM: So if you are not going to do it you need relief to not do it.

And is there some exhibit that -- well, I mean, $I$ haven't seen any of this again as well so once again $I{ }^{\prime \prime m}$ being asked to do this on the fly which $I$ don't really appreciate at all.

I just don't understand why you think after the first four they're not going to be visible? People are going to be on the site, correct?

THE WITNESS: You wouldn't be able to see the --

PLANNER BEAHM: Is there any kind of like --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Let's let him finish.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, wait a second.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Let him finish.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Eric, we can screen?
THE WITNESS: Yes, we can screen every unit on the roof, absolutely.

PLANNER BEAHM: But what I'm asking
is, is there some information that we have, like a
sight line diagram that shows that you're not going
to see them?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: Which is where?

THE WITNESS: So this exhibit, this
exhibit shows --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, what is it?

Can you identify it particularly.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Eric, you prepared
this?
THE WITNESS: No, Bhaskar did.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Bhaskar, you
prepared this?
BHASKAR HALARI: Yes, I did. Yeah, this is Drawing 1 of 1 site cross-section. And the plan shows on the top views of the plan --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Is this new for tonight also?

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes. This is --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: All right, let's
mark this also. I think we're up to A-3.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: A-3.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So just what is
the title for $A-3$.

BHASKAR HALARI: Site cross-section. ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, go ahead. BHASKAR HALARI: This plan shows on the top the plan view of Building 1 and 2 and the bottom is a cross-section of that from Local 33 to Express 33.

PLANNER BEAHM: But if someone is on the site and they're not looking at the building from the end, they're looking at it from the side, that is a different sight line that you have not provided information on, correct?

THE WITNESS: We showed the worst-case scenario where it would be most visible. If you do the long side, if you do a view of the long side, the units are 20 feet back. The sight line would be even further away from the building, at some point you would be so far away you wouldn't be able to see the unit, but you wouldn't see it from the property at all.

PLANNER BEAHM: I mean, guess we'll
never know, right, because we haven't gotten any information from you about it.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, we will
know, though.
PLANNER BEAHM: But we don't know now.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I want to come back to this --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Do we need an exhibit if we're going to put a screen on?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: -- because I don't think we need to keep revisiting it.

There is information that the board is being presented with for the first time tonight. As I said you have a legal right to do that if you wish; however, you know, there's a risk associated with it. That risk is that our board professionals haven't had the opportunity to fully evaluate it and provide guidance to the board. So that's where we are.

So there's things that we're going to see for the first time tonight and I don't think we need to get, you know -- object to the manner in which it's being presented necessarily. Present it, you know, you are going to have to come back anyway because you didn't have the fire review, and the board's professionals need to see it, but let's get it on the record and we'll move from there.

BHASKAR HALARI: As we said we're going to screen all the equipment. So if that is the requirement we didn't plan to ask for any waiver
or variance for that, so we will put screening for all the equipment.

THE WITNESS: Do you want to show this?
This is new; do you want to show it?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: If they didn't see it before, no.

PLANNER BEAHM: And what is the height of the screen?

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Can you go back to the screen. Bhaskar, can you go back to the one with the screening, the various screenings.

Which screens are we talking about on the right-hand side, the green or the gray?

THE WITNESS: We weren't committing to
a color necessarily.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: I'm not talking color, I'm talking style. Is that what you're referencing, these two.

THE WITNESS: Well, two of them are vertical striations and two are horizontal. If you prefer one? They're essentially the same thing, to my mind, but, you know, if you wanted to select one - -

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: When you say
"vertical and horizontal" explain what you mean, Eric.

THE WITNESS: Well there's ribbing to strengthen the material, the screening material so that --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: The green one would be vertical?

THE WITNESS: Vertical ribbing, yes. ATTORNEY GIUNCO: And the gray is horizontal?

THE WITNESS: Horizontal. And to the left the top unit to the top left is vertical ribbing, it's just a style. Either one is available.

These photographs are all from a particular manufacturer that makes these curb-mounted equipment screens. They make them in multiple colors, as you see multiple styles.

They also make them -- they can be solid or lightly perforated to improve air flow. They don't really change how they look from a distance.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: So you haven't picked one?

THE WITNESS: No.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.

THE WITNESS: No.

PLANNER BEAHM: But again how tall are they?

THE WITNESS: We're suggesting that
the tallest unit would be six feet and the screening would match, be no higher than the tallest unit which is six feet. And we are setting that off of the average grade of the building and that's 42 feet.

PLANNER BEAHM: To the top of the screening?

THE WITNESS: Correct. And the only thing higher than that 42 feet would be the peak, that decorative end element that we discussed at the last meeting; the two buildings, the end had the decorative peak. And that would be a foot higher but only in the middle, as you see here, yeah.

So that peak would be 43 feet. That sets the building height but really the sides, the long sides are lower than that. From grade on the long sides it's 33 to 35 feet actually, as you would see the building.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay, that was my question.

Is that it?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Okay.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Is that it for this gentleman.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Any other points?
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Any other things you want to tell us.

THE WITNESS: No.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
Professionals?
PLANNER BEAHM: No.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Rick?
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Nothing.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Jack, no, nothing?
I'm a nothing. You just need to submit
them.

MEMBER SHORR: Nothing.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Barry?
COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: Nothing.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: John?

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: I'm good, thanks.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: No? Steve?
MEMBER KASTELL: I brought up the conversation about the space and the trailer space. And $I$ wasn't looking for one -- I was looking for the dimensions of the space behind the buildings, the loading dock space and the space in between the
buildings so we could determine that a 70-foot tractor-trailer could both fit in there and turn into there when there was one on both sides.

And it's not simply a matter of showing me a tractor-trailer drawn into the space but, you know, how long the loading dock is on each side, how long the space in the center is, and whether that allows, similar to the fire trucks, for someone to back into a loading dock, the third loading dock, when there's someone in space two and someone in space four with similar 65-foot trailers, 70-foot trailers.

So showing me the one picture wasn't really what $I$ was asking for. You have to address that a trailer can come down through the backs of the building and make it into a loading dock when there's, you know, five, five to the full end and one in between that doesn't have a space in it.

I also think that, looking at the plans again, there is no space for trailers to park, period. You're assuming that you are going to have 40 trailers in the loading docks and never have one that has to be pulled over to the side and be put anywhere, and $I$ think that's going to cause you a lot of problems in the long-term because there is
always going to be somebody that is going to pull in at 3 o'clock in the morning and have no place to go until -- because they would come in across country, they come, you know, on a long drive and there's no place to go until the facility opens.

So I don't think you have thought through a lot of the logistics of how to handle these larger trucks.

BHASKAR HALARI: Okay, so I understand your question now. So next time we will have an exhibit where there is all trailers parked and one empty spot in between and the person has to pull in.

So we will create that exhibit. I thought you wanted across from each other how it will go.

And going back to your question about trailer waiting and all that, they will be informed that the hours of operation, whatever it is.

And second thing is $I$ think we are confusing the applicant's proposal here of a flex space to another large warehouse operation where you have half a million square feet, because these type of tenants don't get that frequent deliveries or major tractor-trailer.

I mean, as John pointed out, he owns a
similar facility and rarely you see maybe tractor-trailer maybe once or twice a week. So it is not a high frequency tractor-trailer operation.

So that is another reason why we think that we don't -- and that is why there is reduced loading docks as well.

MEMBER KASTELL: I understand. But if there's only 60 feet between the buildings or 60-foot loading docks, if they come only twice a week they still need to be able to handle them.

BHASKAR HALARI: Oh, yes. We will
show -- there's 180 feet between the buildings, space. Between the two buildings there's 180 feet total.

MEMBER KASTELL: Okay. If you put two 70-foot trailers, one on one building and one on the other, that's leaving you with 40 feet in between. BHASKAR HALARI: That's what I'm saying, we will do the exhibit and come back to you with that, yes.

MEMBER KASTELL: Thanks.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Nunzio.
MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Yes. Mr. Wagner, apologies if you covered this at one of the earlier meetings, but $I$ don't recall seeing roof access in
any of the drawings.
Are you planning to put an exterior ladder or something like that?

THE WITNESS: We suggested that we
have two common area rooms, a sprinkler room and an electric room, and we would put a rooftop access ladder in probably the roof.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: In each of the
buildings?
THE WITNESS: In every building. Each building would have its access, internal access, yes.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Okay. No, that's fine. And one last question. When you were looking at the screening did you consider any sound attenuation in the design of that screening?

THE WITNESS: No, we didn't. These units now will be significantly smaller. Originally when the building was bigger we could have had some very large units up there, but for these small tenant sizes we're talking 12-ton unit maybe, we're saying those are going to be under six feet tall on the roof. And they're, really operationally, they're not noisy. They're not -- I don't think you would be aware of them running standing on the
ground around the side -- alongside of the building. MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Okay. Could you define what "not noisy" is in terms of decibel level?

THE WITNESS: I would have to do some research and $I$ can tell that you then, but $I$ can't testify to that tonight.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Okay. All right, so you can come back?

THE WITNESS: Just from practical experience these are the size units that are on, if you will, strip malls, little shopping centers and things and, you know, they're not -- when the people are walking around in front of the buildings, they're not aware of those units typically. But we can get some specific numbers.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Okay. And if you wouldn't mind, if you would just take a look at the difference -- I'm not trying to add to your cost, but there may be not be much of a cost difference between putting up screening from a visual perspective versus putting one up that satisfies both the visual intent and also attenuates sound. THE WITNESS: Okay, yes.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Thank you very
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much.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Pat.
MEMBER GIVELEKIAN: Nothing at this
time.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
John, your next witness.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I would like to call
John Rea.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Thank you.
Your computer went off.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Rea, you were previously sworn, correct.

JOHN REA: Yes.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: You remain under oath.

JOHN REA: Correct.
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ATTORNEY GIUNCO: John, at the last
meeting you were asked to update and resubmit your report. Did you do that?

THE WITNESS: Actually, yes. I was
requested to respond to the latest CME review letter, which if $I$ could find it here, is dated

## J. Rea, P.E.

January 10th, 2024. And what I did was I made a resubmittal that addressed the traffic items in the CME report on a point-by-point basis.

And depending upon how you want me to handle it we can go through it point by point or if Mr. Boccanfuso agrees that most of the information is acceptable and he has got some other questions, we can handle it that way.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: I think probably the most appropriate way, Mr. Rea, you did submit what we had requested. You and I discussed it earlier today and $I$ had a chance to review it.

Perhaps some of the key points would be appropriate for you to address some of the things that you weren't able to address the last time.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Not necessarily
item by item, unless the board members have questions. If there's anything that you miss I would be happy to ask you some questions afterwards.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So, first of all, I did recalculate the levels of service. Brian had asked me to expand the traffic study to a design year of 2027. Originally, because I have been with this project for several years, the original design
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year that $I$ projected traffic volumes to is 2025 .
So I included two more years of
background growth at 1.25 percent per year based on the DOT's historical growth rate data for the area, and did a reanalysis of the site driveway, the Business Route 33, and again the levels of service were $C$ for the $a . m$. peak hour and $D$ for the $p . m$. peak hour, still acceptable levels of service.

Another thing I did do was take a second look at the access level for the Route 33 freeway. There was a question and to whether or not we could apply to the NJDOT for the Access Permit. As I indicated at the last meeting, that is designated as Access Level I Highway, there is no land service access from the freeway.

And we can probably get a letter from the DOT to that extent, if we request it. I didn't think $I$ could get it in two weeks and the last meeting was two weeks ago. But $I$ can tell you we are not getting access to the freeway from Dot.

Several years ago $I$ had a client that tried to get access from the Freehold Raceway Mall from the freeway and the DOT said no luck, this is a freeway, it's access Level I. And so I can tell you that will not happen.
J. Rea, P.E.

AtTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, we didn't apply for one either.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, we didn't, because I don't want to waste my client's time, effort and money and my effort as well.

Moving on, we will be re-striping the cross-hatched area on Route 33 for a left-turn lane. I think $I$ discussed this at the last meeting.

It makes absolutely logical sense from the safety and traffic standpoint to have a left-turn lane for traffic turn into the site. We have the room to stripe it because there already is a left-turn lane for eastbound traffic turning into Monmouth Battlefield State Park, so we will just have a mirror image. And we will be making that application to the DOT for the left-turn lane.

As far as additional right-of-way requirements are concerned, and I did discuss this with Brian earlier today, if the DOT does require additional right-of-way $I$ did note that we do have a 75-foot setback to the highway. And if they do require additional right-of-way it can be done.

We did discuss that and there's a possibility that if the DOT does request additional right-of-way, it could change the calculations for
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the FAR. And how we would handle that if that becomes a reality and the DOT asks for additional right-of-way, we would either have to ask for a variance if we exceeded the FAR calculations, or downsize the buildings a bit in order to meet the requirements.

As far as accel and decel lanes, again, we will be proposing a right turn deceleration lane into the property. We think that makes sense. It's a safety factor to get traffic that's entering the property to get it out of the main line traffic flow and into the decel lane to enter the property. A decel lane is usually a good idea or any kind of a driveway on a major state highway.

An acceleration lane is different. You
don't want to construct an acceleration lane on a land service highway because you don't want traffic to pull out of our site into what would be an acceleration lane and try to get up to highway speed to merge with traffic that is already on the eastbound travel lane of Business 33. You really want them to wait for a gap.

And that's what the traffic study is predicated upon, waiting for gaps. It's safer to do it that way. An accel lane is generally not needed
J. Rea, P.E.
for a land service highway.
I think we have added curbing and sidewalks along Route 33 frontage. I think we discussed the freeway frontage. And we would rather make a payment in lieu to the township's Sidewalk Fund for the Route 33 freeway. I think we discussed that. Whatever the board prefers.

I did summarize the additional traffic counts that we took. Just to reiterate for the board I knew several meetings ago I was asked to do the additional automatic traffic counters. I put the counters out on Route 33 Business. I did that back in January. We had a snowstorm, they ripped the hoses up.

So we put the counters back out. We were lucky; we didn't have a snowstorm this time. I did get $I$ think four or 5 additional days' worth of data. And it basically confirms that the counts that are on the Business Route 33 cross-section east and westbound during the morning and afternoon peak hours are pretty consistent with the May 2022 traffic counts that we conducted. And they are substantially lower than the Colliers counts from the Colliers study that $I$ mentioned last time which were taken in October of 2019 and our pre-pandemic
counts.
And as I indicated at the last meeting just as a point of interest for the board, the Route 33 volumes based on some of the traffic counts we've conducted in the last couple of years, the morning and afternoon peak hour counts during the weekday -- I'm not talking about Saturdays, Saturdays have gotten back to pre-pandemic levels. But the morning and afternoon peak hour counts on the Route 33 corridor have not recovered to the pre-Pandemic levels presumably because of changes in people's work situations, maybe not going to the office five days a week, things of that nature so -but we did use the higher traffic volumes in doing our analysis, $I$ just want to make that clear.

Oh, the traffic -- the code that we used from the ITE in order to do our trip generation estimates. Again, I looked at the Manalapan ordinance as to what was permitted in this particular zone and $I$ tried to find an ITE land use category that fit closely with the Manalapan ordinance. I did find it, and it's documented in the report that $I$ submitted.

The closest Land Use Code that comes closest to meeting your ordinance requirements for
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flex space is Land Use Code 130 , which is industrial park and those were the numbers that $I$ used for the traffic study.

I did go back and take a look at another land use category which is 150 , which is warehousing to see how it would compare to what I used. And the warehousing trip generation numbers would be lower.

Specifically for the morning peak hour the industrial park code, which $I$ used, resulted in 67 peak-hour trips. The warehouse code would result in 50. For the afternoon peak hour similar - no, in the morning it was 67 and 47. In the afternoon the industrial park land use code was 67 peak-hour trips; the warehouse code was 50.

So in both cases $I$ used the higher of the two numbers in order to do the traffic study.

I think those are the key points unless I missed something, Brian.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Thank you.
Mr. Rea. So a couple of things.
First, as it pertains to the ability to get access from Route 33 freeway, we had actually indicated in our original report as well as our updated reports that my assessment is the same as
yours; based upon the access level, I don't see that the DOT is going to approve you access.

The only access you're permitted for an Access Level $I$ is a grade separated interchange, and based upon the intensity of the proposed use $I$ don't see any way that the DoT is going to allow you to do that. Even if you wanted to spend the money to do so I don't think they will allow it.

So, if the board would like, I'm sure you could obtain a letter or some type of language in your eventual permit, assuming you can get that permit --

THE WITNESS: We can do that.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: -- that confirms
that. I have never seen it. No one in my office has ever seen. And if you read their regulations verbatim, it says, $I$ think it says shall not be permitted except at a grade separated interchange.

THE WITNESS: When we make our Access

Permit application for the Business Route 33
driveway we will ask for, you know, if that would be considered. Not a problem.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Okay. With
regard to the analysis that you did, the supplemental counts that we had asked for, so just
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to summarize so that everybody on the board and any interested members of the public understand, you really analyzed three different sets of numbers; the May 2022 counts that your office performed, the February or January of 2024 counts that were done by an automatic traffic recorder, as well as the counts that were included in the Maser or Colliers report from October of 2019, the last of which was the highest.

So you used those as your base data; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: From there you
applied growth factors --
THE WITNESS: Correct.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: -- based upon ITE
-- I'm sorry, DOT rates.
THE WITNESS: Correct.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: In addition to
that you added trips to those estimates for adjacent or nearby developments including Manalapan Crossing --

THE WITNESS: Correct.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: And the Mercer Realty property that's next door that is currently pending before the planning board.
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THE WITNESS: Both of them, yes.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: And all of that
information gave you what we refer to in traffic engineering as your no-build traffic volumes; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Now from there, based upon the proposed use, you added trips to the roadway network, to your no-build volumes, to determine your build volumes?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: And those are
the volumes that you plugged into the traffic analysis software which generated your levels of service that you described earlier with the $C$ and $D$--

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: -- for the a.m.
and p.m. peak hours, respectively?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Okay. Would you
consider those numbers to be conservative or do you think it's a realistic estimate of what we would be seeing on the roadway network in 2027?

THE WITNESS: The trip generation
numbers or the through volumes on the highways?

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Both. Either. THE WITNESS: Okay. I think the trip generation numbers are pretty accurate in terms of what we would expect from the building. The ITE numbers have been pretty accurate as far as projecting trips.

I think the through volumes on Business
Route 33 will not reach the levels that $I$ have assumed in the report. As I indicated there has been no evidence in the last couple of years that the Route 33 corridor volumes during the morning and afternoon peak weekday hours have recovered to pre-pandemic levels.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Okay. Now, one thing we had spoken about today is whether these future traffic volumes and the trip generation associated with your use and the other uses in the vicinity, whether they would impact the signalized intersection at 33 Business and Wemrock Road in such a way, or to such an extent, that it would extend to your proposed access driveway thereby calling into question the analysis that you performed, the level of service analysis.

Did you have a chance to look at that and, if so, what were your findings?
J. Rea, P.E.

THE WITNESS: I did and I did
summarize that and $I$ can go over the numbers this evening.

I went back to the colliers report because the volumes were higher and I looked at the queueing analysis in that report, and the 95th percentile queue -- now, let me back up for a second.

What we normally use as traffic engineers as the design parameter is the 85 th percentile queue. So the $95 t h$ percentile queue is going to be longer than the 85th, so it's a very conservative estimate as to how far the traffic will back up.

During the p.m. peak hour is the critical peak hour for the queuing from the signal eastbound in the afternoon. And based on the Colliers report it was 896 feet was the 95 th percentile queue.

Our driveway is approximately a little bit less than a quarter mile. It's actually, if you look at the DOT's straight line diagrams the driveway to our property and driveway to the Monmouth Battlefield State Park is at mile point 0.678. The intersection of Wemrock Road is at 1.02.

So we're just a little bit less than a quarter mile, actually, $I$ wrote it down somewhere, 1,270 feet from the signal. So it wouldn't reach the driveway in that scenario.

What I also did, just to take a look at the traffic counts that we conducted, the May 2022 count and the auto traffic counts that we just did in January/february of this year, I plugged those numbers into the model and under that scenario the queuing would be only -- the 85 th percentile queue would be 694 feet.

So under either one of those scenarios it won't reach back to the driveway.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Great. So, therefore, you can reasonably conclude that the analysis of your access driveway with the levels of service $C$ and $D, i s$ an estimate based upon accepted standards that is accurate and not going to be impacted by any adverse conditions at the signalized intersection?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: I think just one other thing when you're speaking about the possibility of DOT requiring a right-of-way dedication, this is similar to the situation that we
J. Rea, P.E.
were discussing on the previous application, you indicated that it could result in a non-compliant floor-area ratio. I think the more critical issue is the building coverage.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: You're really close on the building coverage. We talked a little bit about this last time. The floor-area ratio I believe there's some wiggle room but even a small dedication may result in a non-compliant building coverage.

I think it's the same thing that you said, you would be faced with a choice, whether to return and request variance relief or reduce the size of the building; either way you're back here at the planning board if that's what the DOT does require.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: And I think that was it. As I stated earlier Mr. Rea did provide the information we had requested. I had a chance to review it and discuss it with him today, and it's consistent with what we were looking for and what we would have expected.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
J. Rea, P.E.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Thanks.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Jen.
PLANNER BEAHM: Nothing from me. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Ron, anything? ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Nothing,

Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Rick, anything. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: I have nothing. COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Good for now. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: I'm good for now. MEMBER SHORR: Good for now. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Barry? COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: I have nothing. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: John?

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Nothing from me. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Todd? VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Nothing from me.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Steve?
MEMBER KASTELL: I'm good. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Nunzio?

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Just a quick comment. So the use of the Colliers report which took place in October, that would then cover the
seasonal peak effect of the additional traffic that we see when the orchard is, you know, having a lot of customers there for their apple picking and that sort. Is that what your...

THE WITNESS: That's accurate.

Because $I$ went back and looked at the dates that they did their traffic counts and it was October of 2019, so it was during the fall.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Okay, thank you. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Pat.

MEMBER GIVELEKIAN: Nothing at this time.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. John.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I have no other
questions for Mr. Rea.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Do you have any other witnesses.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Christine Cofone, our planner.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to provide this board is the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

CHRISTINE COFONE: Yes, I do.
C. Cofone, P.P.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and spell your name for the record.

CHRISTINE COFONE: It's Christine
Nazarro, $N-A-Z-A-R-R-O, ~ C o f o n e, ~ C-O-F-O-N-E$.
Business address is, 125 Half Mile Road, Suite 200, Red Bank, New Jersey 07701.
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ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Christine, did you review this application for a planning presentation to this board?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I did. Do you want me to briefly --

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Yes.
THE WITNESS: -- give my credentials
real quick?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Oh, okay.
THE WITNESS: That's okay.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I noticed that you
were accepted a few minutes ago as an expert.
THE WITNESS: I know, right? But I
feel like we have to do it again.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: We still have to get it on the record.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Your licenses are still in effect.

THE WITNESS: Yes, my licenses are still intact and in good standing.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Your credentials are sufficient. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.
So this is a substantially conforming application in the SED-5 zone. We are seeking no bulk variances with respect to the layout and design of the proposed structures on the property and the use is conforming, which is why we're here jurisdictionally before the planning board.

The minimal variance relief that we're seeking is related to the signs as well as for the berming which we're not providing along Route 33 frontage.

Now we met back in August of 2023 with your board professionals, your board forestry professionals who concurred with us that it didn't make great sense to install that berm because in order to do it we would have to take down some pretty substantial trees going to 40 to 50 feet.

So it's not that we can't comply, so this is not a hardship situation. This is what I
would consider $a \operatorname{c}(2), \quad$ "flexible c," where the grant of the variance relief will resort in a better zoning alternative advancing two purposes of the land use law, criteria C, which talks about providing adequate light, air and open space, and Criteria I, which talks about creating a desirable visual environment.

The whole intent of having that berm is because the township in your land use planning documents, in your land use plan element for your Master Plan, talks about creating a green belt along Business 33.

So in order to put that berm up we would have to take down some mature trees. Again this was concurred -- our position was concurred by your board professionals; there was an on-site with our site design engineer together with your professionals, which other occurred in August of 2023.

So I believe my planning conclusions are supported by your professionals in that onsite visit and that the relief can be granted under the c(2) statute, which is "flexible c", not hardship. And statutorily we would have to advance one of the purposes of the Land Use Law and I testified to two,

Criteria C and Criteria I.
The additional variance relief that we're seeking is for the signage. We were -- we provided tonight, and we apologize we did not get them to you in advance, but they're not radically different than what the board had seen previously, but we will, of course, get them to you on a timely fashion.

That relief $I$ would also consider under the c(2) statutory criteria, meaning that there's no hardship for us to comply with the ordinance but again, if you provide, starting with our monument sign along 33, if we provide a sign that is a litte bit larger than what your ordinance requires, I believe we required 8 by 3, or 24 square feet, it makes it a little more reasonable.

Now, it's not as if we couldn't put a sign there that complies. So again, this to me functions under the $c(2)$ statutory criteria, advancing Criteria $H$ of the Land Use Law which talks about providing a free flow of traffic.

Additionally, we asked for a second sign to have a directory sign internal to our site. That second sign is not allowed; the zone does not allow us to have a secondary monument type or
freestanding sign.
Now as you see, it's interesting
because as you come closer, in my opinion, to the envisioned for the flex space zone where you have multiple users, you require more of a directory sign, right?

So in order to come closer into conformance with the SED zone and what you envisioned for flex space you would have more users generating a demand for some type of site identification sign, I think that was even raised by the board.

So I think that certainly while we are asking for relief for that sign, again in the board didn't think it was necessary we could certainly eliminate that relief.

The other thing $I$ want to point out with regard to the signs is at section 95.8-7 of the Manalapan ordinance which regulates signs, there are some purposes in that section of the ordinance. Purpose $A-3$ talks about to encourage signs which aid orientation, identify activities describe local history and character or serve other educational purposes.

Our signs that are proposed, that is
the purpose and the intent and of the sign ordinance in Manalapan. So in my opinion having the directory sign together with the sign that is somewhat more readable along Route 33 advances that stated purpose of the sign section of the Manalapan Township zoning ordinance.

The last piece of relief that we're asking for is for the foundation plantings. It's a little hard to see on what's on the screen but we are proposing foundation plantings. It's just that we're not proposing them where you have the overhead doors because that wouldn't be practical or feasible.

So I think we are meeting the intent of the ordinance in that we are proposing plantings where appropriate along the building foundations but again it becomes impossible to provide them where you have access to the doors, so we are meeting the intent. The entire perimeter of the site, you can see, is enveloped in landscaping. And where we can we have provided foundation plantings.

So I do think we meet the intent. And that is the testimony there on the waiver, is are we meeting the intent of your ordinance, right? And the reason why we have foundation plantings is
because we want to soften and filter the appearance of the building and have it look attractive. So I think our landscape plan accomplishes that.

So statutorily, again, this is from a planning point of view, this is a very straightforward and conforming application. I believe we meet our positive criteria under the c(2), "flexible c."

And as far as the negative criteria I see nothing here that rises to the level of substantial detriment. We have concurrence with your professionals that actually complying with the ordinance would require us to remove some significant trees that are actually consistent with the vision that you're looking to create in that green belt along there. So I see no substantial detriment to the zone plan or the public good.

And then with regards to our sign in the negative criteria we're actually furthering the stated purposes in your sign ordinance with our sign package but you certainly have an overture on behalf of the applicant, if the board was uncomfortable with that variance relief we could certainly comply. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: That's it,

Christine?
C. Cofone, P.P.

THE WITNESS: I have nothing further on direct.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
Professionals?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: The uses.
THE WITNESS: Well, I guess we should talk about the uses.

I went back and I read the transcript, and $I$ think there was a desire to try to have identified what -- who and what is going to go into this building. And Mr. Giunco at the last hearing talked about things like a plumber and an HVAC.

And the way the definition of flex space reads is "A building occupied by two or more uses permitted in the zone and two or more of the following uses: Contractor's offices and shops; establishments for production, processing, assembly, manufacturing, compounding, preparation, cleaning, servicing, testing or repair of materials goods or products, provided such activities or materials create no hazard from fire or explosions or produce toxic or corrosive fumes, gas, smoke, obnoxious dust or vapors, offensive noise or vibration, glare, flashes or objectionable effluent and offices. Flex space shall not include warehouse or distribution
centers."
And $I$ know that the concern of the board is that if somebody takes a number of these spaces and would occupy a warehouse or a distribution center, that is not permitted in the zone. So I think that, in my opinion, what you would see is you would see smaller perhaps like an online store or maybe a smaller bakery or something like that in here.

So I think the uses that you will see will be in line with the intended definition of flex space in the ordinance. I think we can certainly list out some of the ones -- contractors, HVAC, building -- small building supplies -- as long as it doesn't run afoul of the definition of warehouse and distribution center, which would be flagged by your zoning officer because that's not permitted here.

So I mean, I could imagine that the board could write into the resolution a condition that says something along the lines of, you know, the applicant may not, you know, lease out multiple units to form a warehouse or distribution center, something like that.

You know, I'm not sure if Mr. Giunco would be comfortable with that --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: No, it's not the ordinance so.

THE WITNESS: -- but the ordinance
doesn't allow a warehouse or distribution center, so
I think the board is protected by -- and the definition of flex space is a number of uses.

And if there's a change in the ordinance, the applicant would be governed by that; the tenant list and the tenant mix is going to be governed by the permitted uses in the zoning district at the time the applicant changes and re-tenants the building.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: That's it.
THE WITNESS: That's it.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
Professionals.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I have nothing, Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Jen. PLANNER BEAHM: So the signage -okay, so, number one, I take no exception to the relief that is requested on Business 33. I think they met with Shari. She would prefer the large mature trees to remain; it makes no sense to cut them down to build a berm to plant landscaping when
you already have a visual buffer. So I take no exception to that.

I do want to talk a little bit about the signage. So the site ID sign -- and by the way, I much prefer this design over what was presented prior, but $I$ think your calculation of the area is not correct. The sign face itself is 24 square feet, but you also have to count the base if it's more than 20 percent, right?

ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: So the base is 10 square feet so it would be 34 square feet as opposed to I think 22, which is required.

I actually don't take exception to that either. I think it's important for traffic safety for the site to be visible. I agree with the chairwoman's recommendation at the last meeting to shift the sign to the other side of the driveway.

THE WITNESS: Yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: So I don't take any exception with that.

The second sign we need relief for to have it to begin with, plus 32 square feet. So it doesn't comply with any area either, but $I$ do think -- honestly, I think that was my recommendation when
we had a professionals meeting because if you have potentially 50 -some odd tenants it's better to let them know where to go.

So I, personally, don't take any exception but, of course, it's up to the board whether you think a second sign is necessary.

The question that $I$ have, though, is that the exhibit that was shown earlier that we didn't get to see in advance, showed another sign, like a tinier sign. I don't remember which one that is.

THE WITNESS: Was that the tinier directional sign, Bhaskar?

PLANNER BEAHM: It was like 3 square feet, right?

THE WITNESS: It was 3 square feet.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: I thought it was.

> BHASKAR HALARI: Yeah, it is a
directional --
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We'll re-call
Mr. Halari.
BHASKAR HALARI: Sorry.
PLANNER BEAHM: Can you put it up on the screen.

BHASKAR HALARI: Sure.
PLANNER BEAHM: So if it's three
square feet as a directional sign that's permitted?
THE WITNESS: It's permitted, yes.
BHASKAR HALARI: Yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: But we really just
haven't seen it?
THE WITNESS: So it's really just to
show --
BHASKAR HALARI: Which direction is the building.

PLANNER BEAHM: I don't take exception to it, I just haven't seen it so -- but is that only three square feet? I can't see it.

BHASKAR HALARI: It's one-and-a-half feet high by two feet wide. So three square feet the sign.

PLANNER BEAHM: Plus the base.
BHASKAR HALARI: I think the ordinance says you can have a post.

PLANNER BEAHM: As long as it's not more than 20 percent of the width, which this is clearly more than 25 percent.

BHASKAR HALARI: I will change that to be compliant sign. That's the intent. Just a
compliant. And the purpose of seeing this sign is when somebody read the directory.

PLANNER BEAHM: So Building 1 and 2 is this way, Building 3 and 4 is that way, whatever. BHASKAR HALARI: Yes.

PLANNER BEAHM: That would be fine, but you would have to modify the post to be just a post.

THE WITNESS: Skinnier.
PLANNER BEAHM: Correct. Otherwise the base would have to be included in the area, which would require relief.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: You don't like the look of that?

PLANNER BEAHM: I don't care, you could either ask for relief or you could comply. I don't care either way, but as of right now there's no clear -- what you guys want to do.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We'll put it on the plan.

PLANNER BEAHM: I don't have a problem with the way it looks, but you would require relief for that because it would exceed the 3 square feet.

THE WITNESS: I also think the sign plan gets you closer to the smaller-type tenants,
more and smaller-type tenants that you're trying to encourage here in flex space.

PLANNER BEAHM: I don't disagree. I think the directional sign -- and the reason that, in my opinion, and you can correct me I'm wrong, that the directional sign is so big, at 32 square feet, is because you can potentially have 50-some-odd tenants in these buildings; if you had less my guess is that the sign could be smaller, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
PLANNER BEAHM: And I also don't take exception of the relief about the foundation plantings because they do have it on the three sides, it's just where the loading is they don't put it there. And even if we required it, it would die. So I don't have a problem with them not putting the plantings along the loading.

So it's up to the board with respect to that big directional sign, but $I$ do think that there's a benefit to it, but it's totally up to you.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: That's it, Jen.
PLANNER BEAHM: Yeah.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Brian.
ENGINEER BOCCANFUSO: Nothing more to
add.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Rick.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Mr. Halari
testified that the state sign, the state park sign mimics -- I think you used that word --

BHASKAR HALARI: Right.
CHIEF HOGAN: -- the new sign. Does the state sign meet our criteria in the ordinance?

BHASKAR HALARI: No, no that sign
doesn't meet the ordinance. The only purpose of mimicking was the height of the lettering and like how the dimensions of the sign was.

That sign that is on the state park is like a wooden sign with lettering inside, and there's a surface light lit externally, there is no internal lighting.

But I measured the height of the lettering, so how far you can see it. So we saw the main lettering was six-inch high, so we proposed six-inch high lettering.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Is that what you meant by "mimicking."

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes.
CHIEF HOGAN: So it does meet our ordinance, the state sign?

BHASKAR HALARI: Does not meet the ordinance?

THE WITNESS: It's bigger than your ordinances allows.

PLANNER BEAHM: Yeah.
BHASKAR HALARI: Actually, that sign is not --

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: I'm just doing a comparison since they're across the street from one another.

BHASKAR HALARI: But that sign is much bigger than we -- that sign, the width is about 10 and a half feet, it's about 2'9" inches high and 10 and a half feet wide.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Thank you. That's it.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Jack.
COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: Good for now.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: The directional sign that has the list of proposed tenants what did we, decide because $I$ don't remember and $I$ remember reading it, the actual size of the -- did we make a decision on the lettering so like it's not tiny.

PLANNER BEAHM: I don't think you made any changes to the size of the lettering from the
last meeting?
BHASKAR HALARI: It's basically three feet high by 24 -inch wide, each panel is. So on a three-inch-high panel you could have about two-inch-high letter, maximum size.

And the distance that you would be reading this from is like me reading John Castronovo sign or Todd Brown sign --

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
BHASKAR HALARI: -- this is the distance you're looking at, and that lettering is probably one and a half inch or something like that.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: All right. That's the only question $I$ have at this time.

MEMBER SHORR: I have nothing.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Barry.
COMMITTEEMAN JACOBSON: No questions.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: John?
MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Jen, I'm a little confused as to what you said -- just mentioned and asked about the sign.

So are you suggesting that the sign right now is not decided how big it's going to be until they know the quantity of tenants?

PLANNER BEAHM: What I'm suggesting is
that this is the maximum size sign that would be there for directory.

If there's less tenants the sign would be smaller because you would have less panels, you won't need as many panels. This is the max. They're not asking to have flexibility that if there's more tenants you're going to have a bigger sign. This is the maximum size. And if there's half the tenants or a quarter of the tenants depending on how much -- how you lease out the buildings, you have less tenants you don't need as many drive this way, so the sign could get smaller.

THE WITNESS: Or if the board is not comfortable and you want to say this is the size of the sign, if we had fewer tenants we could make the sizes of the sign bigger for the individual tenants.

PLANNER BEAHM: The lettering you
mean.
THE WITNESS: The letters, yes. The tenant names.

BOARD PLANNER: This is the maximum, what they're proposing. It won't be bigger.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: That's what I asked at the last meeting, if there were, instead of 50 there were 20 --
C. Cofone, P.P.

PLANNER BEAHM: 20, right.
MEMBER CASTRO NOVA: -- then the
lettering could be bigger?
THE WITNESS: The lettering could be bigger.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Okay.
THE WITNESS: The sign would be the same, the lettering name of the individual businesses, would be larger.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Okay, I'm good.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Todd.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Just so that I'm positive, the directional sign with the 52 names has not changed since our last meeting from what is shown up on the screen, correct.

BHASKAR HALARI: Correct.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
VICE-CHAIRMAN BROWN: I mentioned
three-inch letters and you made the comparison -actually two-inch lettering -- and you made a comparison of a drive-through, that you're actually sitting there reading something. And I said, okay, that's great, drive-throughs are designed for cars that stop.

Your driveway is not designed for cars to stop, correct?

BHASKAR HALARI: They could stop
there. I don't know -- it's a 30-foot-wide driveway width at that location.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: 30-foot wide. So if you have trucks or cars queuing to get off the site onto Business 33 , how many cars can come in the opposite direction entering into the site, like width-wise.

THE WITNESS: You're talking about the driveway?

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Correct. It's one car can go in, and one car out in the same time in that area of the directional sign?

BHASKAR HALARI: Correct.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: So if you have three or four or five trucks that are queuing to get out of Route 33 -- because we're not going to offer an acceleration lane, we're going to wait for a gap -- then a car wants to stop and look at this directional sign to try to read two-inch lettering is going to completely stop traffic from anybody getting into the site; would you agree with that?

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes. And I think
when you -- we discussed that last time and there was a couple of things we talked about, one is this type of operations don't have a new visitor to the site; the frequency of people who are new to the location are far and few, number one.

And the second thought we had is if you still feel it's uncomfortable or not safe, we can definitely increase the width of the driveway at that location and provide an offset where the car, if they need to read it, they can pull off the main road and read the signs.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Correct.
THE WITNESS: Are we talking about the same thing here, Mr. Brown?

I think you are talking about -- are you talking about the letters on the directory sign and somebody once you get in the site?

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Correct.
BHASKAR HALARI: What Todd is saying,
let's say, there is a car who wants to read these names and is standing at this location, and there is a truck coming in and a truck going out and now everybody is waiting until the person is reading the sign and what -- first thing I said is the chance of
that happening are very far and few because most of the people visiting the site are not new visitors, they're operational people, they know where they're going.

But, again, we discussed that last time, we can provide like eight feet wide more widening in that area where the car can pull off if he needs to read it, and then still providing more than 24 width of driveway so they can go in and out. VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: SO, respectfully, $I$ agree and disagree that last meeting --yes, you could have someone, a soccer training, that someone has a six-month subscription or training session that they know where to go, they're not going to read through it.

Then I believe $I$ asked would a design center be permitted which you may have first visits which have no idea where to go and will need to read what building that's located in.

BHASKAR HALARI: I understand.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: So I agree and
disagree that people will use it --
BHASKAR HALARI: Okay.
VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: -- more often
than what you say is often or not.
C. Cofone, P.P.

PLANNER BEAHM: Todd, I don't disagree with you. Do you think the additional sign which is proposed tonight which says Building 1, 2, Building 3, 4, I think generally when people, if there's something like that they will say our address is $X$, Building 2, and that -- that little sign Building 1, 2, Building, 3, 4, I think might solve your concern in terms of people stopping.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Absolutely agree. I was just hoping that the applicant would have come better prepared to address the concern of a turnout.

PLANNER BEAHM: I mean the thing is, they could have bigger letters, but then the sign would have to get bigger so.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Correct. But if we want to say it's as good as a drive-thru sign, let's design it to be a drive-thru-like sign where you can pull off and look at it, for the safety of egress and ingress into the site.

PLANNER BEAHM: Can you put a little bump-out there?

BHASKAR HALARI: No, that's exactly what $I$ am suggesting. Yes.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: And I thought
they would actually address that concern.
BHASKAR HALARI: So we will submit the revised plan to your professionals showing a bump-out.

VICE-CHAIRPERSON BROWN: Professionals and the board?

BHASKAR HALARI: Yes.
VICE-CHAIRMAN BROWN: That's pretty much it because two-inch lettering, that's just -- I would hope you have less tenants so the lettering can get bigger and it can be more practical.

That's all I have. Thank you.
MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Can I get a follow-up question as it relates to Todd's question.

So when you make the bump-out is the sign location moving or it's exactly where it's going to be?

BHASKAR HALARI: Well it would move a little because we need to have a transition where the cars are pulling in and cars are pulling out, in that area we would have to move the sign a little bit, yes.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: I don't know if it's going to make the access safer because now you have people that are pulling in and then they may
not look back when the car is pulling out and it can cause another problem. So I don't think we win in any situation so, $I$ don't know.

BHASKAR HALARI: Well, again we can completely eliminate the sign and because we now have a directional sign where a person needing -ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Madam Chair, if I may.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: They have the current design. They're going to provide the board with the modified design. And the board can choose, you know, which one it feels is superior, if there's an approval.

MEMBER CASTRONOVO: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Steve?
MEMBER KASTELL: No, I'm good.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Nunzio?

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Yes, but I have no questions about signs.

I think at the last meeting,
Mr. Alfieri, we did talk a bit about --
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Mr. Alfieri?

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Oh, I'm sorry,
wrong guy.
C. Cofone, P.P.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Wrong guy. This is
Mr. Giunco.
MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Well, $I$ know at
the last meeting we did discuss the last-mile fulfillment center, and $I$ think there was some talk back and forth about maybe coming up with some definition.

So I appreciate that Ms. Nazzaro did talk about the definition of flex space and mentioned that we could put a condition in this proposal that said that no full-time centers can be established.

Now that includes what they call
last-mile stations. They actually with the automation that exists today they're as small as 3,000 square feet so it could easily fit in a single segment of your building. A tenant wouldn't need two.

So as long as you're okay with that, then I'm just going to suggest as part of this that we do put that condition in, that nothing that resembles a distribution center, including a last-mile station, would be permitted.

> ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I have a big concern
about that. Let's take the example of a florist, if
we have a florist and they deliver flowers to your house or to somebody's house, they're going the last mile. I don't think the flex space ordinance intended to eliminate that from this use.

PLANNER BEAHM: I also don't think the flex space ordinance intended to include florists.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: What's that?
PLANNER BEAHM: I don't think it
intended for florists to be in this flex space building. I don't think that that's what was intended when the flex space ordinance was drafted. I think it was contractors, HVAC, those people that can't keep their materials where they live. That is what is intended with respect to flex.

So at the end of the day, $I$ don't think that the request is unreasonable. And, quite honestly, $I$ could make the argument that fulfilment and distribution equals warehouse, which is not permitted.

So I think that's not an equivalent conversation, honestly.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: Let me just add why I don't think that's a good example, is that a florist does not get the arrangements delivered to them and then turn around and send them out; a
florist gets various flowers, they make the arrangements, then they deliver it. So there is actually some work, some processing that takes place.

Whereas, a fulfilment center simply gets something in, they turn around and put it on the back of a vehicle and send it out. And number of trips are a lot higher than anything that we have been looking at. And that would be my concern.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Could I ask, why aren't you satisfied with the ordinance that was adopted that says the flex space shall not include warehouse or distribution center uses?

I mean that's already in place. That's what you advise. That's what we're --

PLANNER BEAHM: I think this is a belts-and-suspenders situation and I think --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: What is that?
PLANNER BEAHM: I think it's a
belts-and-suspenders situation; I think the board is concerned. They're recommending a condition; you know, we'll consider it.

But at end of the day if the board feels like, yes, maybe we're going to act affirmatively on the application but for a condition
of this magnitude, that's their prerogative.
MEMBER POLLIFRONE: It's just that I don't want anyone misinterpreting or expanding that use.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We're willing to stay with the ordinance, but $I$ don't want to make any more restrictions --

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: I think we
understand there's an objection.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We have to be able to get tenants.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: We understand.
But the New Jersey State Planning Commission refers to last-mile stations as a warehouse. So just want to point that out, that's why I bring it up.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I think you have to rely on your ordinance. A planning document doesn't meet the ordinance. If it says warehouse or distribution center uses, $I$ think that's pretty darn clear.

MEMBER POLLIFRONE: I have no further comments. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Pat?
MEMBER GIVELEKIAN: Nothing at this time.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Is that all
you have for your witnesses?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yep.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Board
members, professionals any questions before I...
PLANNER BEAHM: No.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: No, Madam Chair.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: At this time I'm
going to open it to the public.
Anyone from the public having any
questions, comments for this applicant please raise your hand so $I$ can call on you and get you sworn in.

Ma'am. And you are going to need to be on the record, so please come forward.

Do you want to sit, ma'am, here at the table?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, Madam Chair, do we have the cordless mic; can we just bring it to her?

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Yeah.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Ma'am, you can just sit where you are, we'll just bring it to you.

KATHLEEN CHERRY: I can go to the, table.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.

KATHLEEN CHERRY: I can use the table anyway.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: You can go to the table and use one of the microphones to get sworn in.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to provide this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

KATHLEEN CHERRY: I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Can you please state and spell your name and give us your address.

KATHLEEN CHERRY: My name is Kathleen Cherry, $C-H-E-R-R-Y . \quad I \quad$ am conservation chair of the center group of the Sierra Club, 1 North Johnson Street in Trenton.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
KATHLEEN CHERRY: So $I$ have a number of concerns. I don't think we have had much discussion about the fact that there's a state park, Battlefield state Park across the street, and so I want to bring that up.

It seems that the impact of this warehouse could be substantial on the operation and significance of Monmouth Battlefield.

The United States, in particular
Manalapan Township, is getting ready for the celebration of 250 Anniversary of the American Revolution beginning this year, 2024, which will bring out millions of foreign and domestic visitors to American Revolution battlefields, particularly Monmouth Battlefield.

A warehouse, especially the one that's being proposed -- which I understand is, I'm hearing now 42 feet tall, $I$ don't know if that includes -the plans $I$ had written down 57, so $I$ would like to understand how tall it's going to be -- which is permitted as $I$ understand it by the original zoning is to be directly across the street, Business Route 33, from the entrance to Battlefield State Park.

This proximity will, unfortunately, destroy much of the context of the park and its environs as people approach the battlefield.

The view of a large warehouse right across the street will not be conducive to the vision of British and American troops busily getting prepared for one of the largest battles in the American Revolution, and then marching on to the field of conflict.

The battle on June 28th, 1778 , was one, as $I$ said, one of the largest of the American revolution. And while it was not decisive on either side, it was a very important battle and planned on for some time.

The state park is planning the largest reenactment with thousands of reenactors and thousands and thousands of visitors for 2028 that will include a large number of mounted soldiers on horseback, a wide variety of encampments all around, many vendors who will be tending to both the visitors and the reenactors and so it will be a very big activity. And there will be many big activities leading up to it, but that will certainly be the largest.

The celebration of the American

Revolution will continue beyond that. As you know the Battle of Yorktown happened several years after. And so there's quite a period of time in which the American people are waking up to the importance of understanding democracy and the battles that led to the creation of the United States.

I'm asking the board to keep this in mind in considering the site plan and its improvements and what conditions need to be made to
minimize, minimize the impact of the project. Considering the location of the site and its proximity to the actual Battlefield we think that there probably were encampments on this site, and certainly a lot of American Revolution activity. We would like to request that you all consider strongly requiring archaeological investigation of the site before any activity starts on that site.

The proposed warehouse is out-of-scale
as far as we're concerned in terms of the environment. It has no buffers. Little landscaping is proposed. And so we are very concerned about the lack of camouflage, if you want to use that word, softening of this building vis-a-vis the Battlefield.

And so $I$ think that's a major area. And we would like to see major, major emphasis put on landscaping and camouflaging the building, which I know is exactly the opposite of what the owners of the building have in mind.

The next major issue is traffic. And it's hard to hear all that's going on there but we're not hearing very much in terms of traffic counts going into the Battlefield. We would like to understand better what numbers are being used. And
we would like to understand better what projections are being used as this tremendous celebration goes into effect.

And we're talking about people from out-of-state, a lot of people from out-of-state and a lot of people from outside the United states who may not be familiar with all our driving patterns and all that sort of thing.

We are very concerned about 18 -wheelers going in and out of the same intersection as people entering the Battlefield, and we would like to see a light there, a major light, the turning lanes, the whole kit and caboodle to make sure it's a safe way to enter Battlefield State Park.

So the next thing $I$ would like to
mention is the septic system and the stormwater systems proposed. My understanding is there are two small septic systems proposed, one for each building. Those septic systems are not going to support very many people.

So, obviously, those systems are being proposed sort of as placeholders. You know, by the time it's understood better how many people will be in the building at any one time, but that could be a big issue because there are disposal fields proposed
to take care of the septic system, the small septic system, and downhill from this building is a major stream, Wemrock Brook. And we're very concerned about fecal E. coli or some kind of material coming out of that septic system and ending up in the brook.

Also on the stormwater system there are these small filtration basins scattered around. Again the site is very full of building and not much of anything else, and we're concerned about the collection of the stormwater and its, also, movement towards the Wemrock Brook.

And this stormwater will contain all kinds of oil leaks, transmission fluids and all the stuff that comes off of trucks when they're coming in and out or sitting. Also could include spills and anything related to packaging that breaks or any of those sorts of things. So we're very concerned about that. And also salt, which will be very hard on the creek to have salt.

So we would like to see a baseline sampling of that creek so we get a profile of what is it biologically at this time in terms of water quality, so we have some way to measure what is the change of water quality because of this activity in
this building.
So the next thing $I$ want to mention is the signage. And we haven't really focused on signage at all, that is sort of way above our pay grade at this point. We're more concerned about the size of the building and its height and so we haven't even gotten to think about the issue of signage. But, obviously, signage that is good for the building is not necessarily signage that is good for preparing to enter the Battlefield. So that is something that we're very concerned about.

Also there is a tendency with diesel emissions to cluster those emissions. And if you have a bunch of trucks coming in and out of a single entrance or idling in any way, there will be a gathering of diesel emissions which are very harmful to respiratory issues and carcinogenic problems, children susceptible, and people in the gatehouses in the Battlefield will be susceptible to this, and anybody else passing through that area.

We are very concerned about that and we would like to have good housekeeping on the trucks to make sure that they're not sitting and idling.

And then $I$ think that really covers it pretty well. At this point in time we're just
beginning to really focus.
We're not quite sure yet of the solar-ready requirements, but $I$ believe this building is large enough to be requiring solar-ready, so we want to see that happen if this building goes forward.

And we would like to see charging, electric charging stations for employees and visitors.

And we would like to have air monitoring for those diesel trucks there at the entrance.

So that's it pretty much. Thank you. And, you know, we'll be sticking around. And the state will be here soon. They are sort of slow at understanding what's going on, but they're getting there. And as you well know this Battlefield is pride and joy of the state; probably there's no other park that is more important to the state. And so, you know, they want to make sure that the park doesn't suffer in all this.

And it's unfortunate that the zoning is what it is, but it is what it is and we have to see where it goes from there.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Thank you.
Anyone else from the public? Sir, come up.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to provide this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

DAVID MARTINS: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and spell your name and provide us with your address.

DAVID MARTINS: My name is David
Martin, M-A-R-T-I-N. I live at 147 Canterbury Court in East Windsor. I am president of the Friends of Monmouth Battlefield.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead, sir.
DAVID MARTINS: Thank you. First, I want to express my own concerns and then I'll get into some map work that $I$ have to share with you.

Firstly, about the tree screen along Business Route 33, which is designed to shield noise and shield the vision of this flex warehouse, which will be on the top of the rise there.

The multitude of most of the trees in that screen are deciduous, which means six months a year there is going to be no leaves on them which
really down plays the effect of the screen on the noise and on the vision. When $I$ walked it a couple weeks ago there are only maybe 12 pine trees in that stretch. Pine trees, as you know, are up all year. So if we are not going to have a berm, I would like to see pine trees added because for six months a year you have reduced effect of sound barrier and vision restriction in that section.

Secondly, a concern about traffic.
Your car counter noted that he did his surveys primarily in January, $I$ think it was March and in the fall. And he did acknowledge there's heavier traffic in this immediate area during the fall fruit picking time at the orchards. He did not recognize additional heavy traffic seasons.

Those of you who live or work around here are well aware. And I'm concerned about the crunch area, not the cars going by, the crunch area between the entrance to the park and the flex warehouse and the light at Wemrock.

In December at holiday time traffic backs up at that light going east on its way to the mall.

In July and August traffic backs up at that light from people going to the shore.

In June traffic backs up at that light for people accessing the events going on at Monmouth Battlefield because that's the time of year.

And that's not to mention the really
heavy traffic in September and October from the fruit picking places.

What I'm saying is there's a crunch space between the entrance to the park and the flex warehouse and the light at Wemrock that needs addressing. Not the average number of cars that come by at 8 in the mornings; there's crunch times and that's when you're bound to get your accidents.

I was pleased to hear tonight of turning lanes being proposed. I think a light would be appropriate. I don't know, you know, if there's restriction on how close you could have a light to the one at Wemrock Road. When $I$ walked the edge of the site a couple of weeks ago $I$ wondered if the planners had considered having a separate entrance and exit to the site.

There is right now a lane that goes in on the western side where the house is, and there's a farm lane that goes in on the eastern side. What would be the effect if there was a separate entrance and exit.

You are doing no favor to the park by having the primary entrance of the flex site directly opposite the entrance to the park where you have hundreds of and hundreds of cars every day going in.

And while $I$ want to add to that, and I don't expect it to happen, but I live 100 yards from a road going out to a major warehouse. There are trucks all the time running a stop sign there because they don't want to brake and they don't want to stop. And that just can't be happening at this busy intersection where you already have hundreds of cars entering the park to have any kind of cars - - I know it's illegal but, dang it, they do it all the time, and I see it from where I live and I hear the brakes screeching and I see accidents.

If you are going to have a heavy use, vans, trucks and semis going in and out of that entrance where the very entrance to the park is, I don't want to count the accidents that are going to happen. So that's one of the reasons I ask either for the light or to see if they could reconsider the site and put a separate entrance and exit which would space out the truck traffic a little bit more.

Lastly, $I$ want to mention that, and $I$
don't think the fellas planning the site are aware that there's a historic road that goes right through the middle of that area. And I want to take the time to show you a map, so give me a moment to put up the easel up here.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Ron, do you want to mark this, or no?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, let him set it up first.

DAVID MARTINS: Now I'll put this over here so the board members can see it.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, first of all, why don't we set you up with the cordless mic?

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: There's a hand-held right there.

DAVID MARTINS: Okay, I've been shown how to do this. I'm a school teacher, I should be able to figure this out and I'm not. There we go. So that's --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So let's just, procedurally, let's put up the exhibit.

DAVID MARTINS: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And we're going to mark this as $\mathrm{P}-1$, Public-1.

DAVID MARTINS: Okay. And I do you

```
have small --
```

    ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Hold on. Hold
    on.

DAVID MARTINS: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And can we get a title for what the exhibit is?

DAVID MARTINS: We're calling that
historic map.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. And is
there a date that it was prepared?
DAVID MARTINS: 1778.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I mean the date
that the map was prepared, that was from 1778?
DAVID MARTINS: No, it was prepared
last weekend, I mean just printed.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I thought it was
a little more current than that.

DAVID MARTINS: Yeah.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So we'll mark
this as $\mathrm{P}-1$.
(Exhibit P-1, 1778 Historic Map, was marked for identification.)

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Now you can go
ahead.
DAVID MARTINS: Okay. Thank you.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Actually, first, Mr. Giunco, do you have any objections?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I do have objections without some kind of foundation for this, because I've seen at least 12 or 13 different versions of this map. And I don't see that this has any significance; it's not documented properly. I have a significant objection --

ATtORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Giunco, on the mic.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: On the record, we need it on the mic.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I have looked at these maps of the Battlefield. There's many different versions. We don't even know which version this is.

Second, if it is from 1778 that is very peculiar because my study of this shows that those maps weren't in place.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Madam Chair?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: The first one ended
up in France.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Madam Chair.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Hold on. Ron?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: These are beyond
objections. So our recommendation is that the Rules of Evidence are not strictly applicable; the board can listen to the testimony and weigh it appropriately.

And Mr. Giunco will also have an opportunity to conduct cross-examination to investigate the authenticity and the accuracy of the map.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: So, John, do you want to remain up here so you can look at it better than sitting back there?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: No, I'm very familiar with it.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
DAVID MARTINS: I do have here present Michael Tampanaro, $T-A-M-P-A-N-A-R-O$, who is the historian at Monmouth Battlefield State Park --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, we're only taking your testimony.

DAVID MARTINS: -- who can answer
questions.
Okay. So, yes, this is the 1778 map of
the battle area drawn out to illustrate troop movements at the battle. What we did was the staff at the park --

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay, so we're going to mark this?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Hold it, sir.
We're going to mark this as $P-2$.
And what are we going to identify this as?

DAVID MARTINS: This is the historic map adjusted to modern roads.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And when was this prepared?

DAVID MARTINS: This was prepared last weekend.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
DAVID MARTINS: And do you need to put these numbers on?

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: She's got it.
(Exhibit $P-2$, Historic map with modern
roads overlayed, was marked for identification.)

DAVID MARTINS: Thank you. In
comparing the historic map with modern topographical
surveys, it was found this map is very accurate in terms of showing the lines of the streams, the houses and the hills and the roads at that time. And what we have done is to overlay on this the area of the park, and the area where the flex warehouse would be because the map from 1778 is very close to modern topographical map.

PLANNER BEAHM: Can I just ask, can you just move it a little bit closer? Because I'm blocked by her monitor so $I$ can't really see it. That's much better. Thank you very much.

DAVID MARTINS: The purpose of searching that here is there was a colonial road that went from Tennent Church down towards this area on its way to Moore's Tavern. That road is part of the southeast -- southwestern corner of the park and crosses exactly across the middle of the proposed flex warehouse site on its way to Wemrock Road then goes down to Moore's Tavern.

So what we're showing is there was a Colonial road that went through the flex warehouse site and this was used by troops going and coming from the battle which was fought right across the street.

Okay, I have had -- there were no reference in the two sessions $I$ have been here that any kind of archeological surveys being done for evidence of the battle, which was fought across the street. Okay? And we're showing here that the flex warehouse site is going to sit right on a Colonial road.

Now once the warehouse is built because of the parking lot and the building itself, whatever is buried in the ground will stay there. But when you build your drainage basins it's going to completely archaeologically destroy whatever is there and be unrecoverable. So we need archeological surveys to see what's actually there. And $I$ have one more map. ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So we will mark this as $\mathrm{P}-3$.

And if you could identify what $P-3$ is? DAVID MARTINS: This is the enlarged projection of the warehouse area. ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. And this was prepared at the same time as well? DAVID MARTINS: Yes, last weekend by the park staff.
(Exhibit P-3, Enlarged Projection of Warehouse Area, was marked for identification.)

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead.
DAVID MARTINS: And what this is
showing that the historic road is coming along here, enters the park, then makes a jog, comes across what is now business, goes across the flex warehouse site, wanders off to -- towards Wemrock Brook and then Wemrock Road, and then goes down to Moore's Tavern.

But this clearly shows that this
historic road from Colonial times the troops used going to and from the battle passes across the warehouse site and that needs to be investigated.

Okay, so that's the end of the map presentation.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Does that complete your testimony?

DAVID MARTINS: It will complete mine.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, then that's
fine. Mr. Giunco?
Before we move on, Mr. Giunco has a right to cross-examine you if he wishes.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, I do have --

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: John, microphone. ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I'm going to ask just a series of questions.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: The road that you're speaking of, now does that run from Englishtown to the battle site that goes through our property?

DAVID MARTINS: The section I'm aware of begins over at Tennent, Church, goes through the housing development over there on the western edge of the park, and then zigzags over to Wemrock Road. ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Why do you think it went to Wemrock Road?

DAVID MARTINS: On its way to Moore's Tavern, which was important during the Colonial times.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I misunderstood. Are you talking about the Anthony Wayne envelopment?

DAVID MARTINS: That was not Anthony Wayne, sir. There were 1000 Colonial troops and around six cannons posted on the Connors Farm just to the north of here.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: You know what, I have no other questions.

DAVID MARTINS: Anthony Wayne was not in this area, sir.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Now, is there someone else from your organization you wish to present?

DAVID MARTINS: Anthony Tampanaro, he's the park historian, if there were any questions that I couldn't answer.

AtTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Does he wish to provide any direct testimony?

DAVID MARTINS: He's satisfied with that. So that would conclude my testimony. I do have also a letter from the Battlefield Trust I would like to read into evidence when my portion of the testimony is done.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well that's part of your testimony so.

DAVID MARTINS: Okay. So may $I$ do that?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead. I
think we need to mark this as well. So this would be $P-4$. And this is a letter from whom?

DAVID MARTINS: This is a letter from Kathy Robertson, who is a member of American Battlefield Trust, headquartered in Washington, D.C.

And $I$ can leave a copy with you after I read it.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
(P-4, Letter dated February 22, 2024, written by Kathy Robertson, was marked for identification.)

DAVID MARTINS: Just a couple of pages so.
"The American Battlefield Trust is the largest nonprofit in the United States dedicated to the preservation of hallowed battlegrounds and educating the public on why these historic places matter.
"The Trust began more than 35 years ago as the Association for the Preservation of Civil War Sites, later known as the Civil War Preservation Trust. At the time the Chantilly and Manassas battlefields were threatened by development, Congress established the Civil War Sites Advisory Commission, taking the National Park Service -tasking the National Park Service with identifying and prioritizing Civil War battlefields.
"Congress later commissioned a similar
report for the Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 battle sites. And in 2007, the National Park Service published its report for Congress on the historic preservation of Revolutionary War and War of 1812 sites in the United States. With the support of the National Park Service, the Trust expanded its mission to include the preservation of Revolutionary War and the War of 1812 battlefields.
"The Battle of Monmouth is one of the most important and largest battles of the Revolutionary War. On a hot and humid June 28th, 1778, General George Washington and his subordinate, General Charles Lee, attacked rearguard elements of General Clinton's British Army.
"Although they were outnumbered two-to-one, the Continental Army had undergone extensive training during its winter encampment at Valley Forge. General Cornwallis commanded the rear elements of Clinton's Army. These Revolutionary War luminaries represented an important moment in our country's history, right here at Monmouth battlefield.
"Monmouth Battlefield State Park, a national historic landmark, is one of the finest examples of a battlefield park in the United States.

Its 1,818 acres provided appropriate location for the commemoration of the actions that took place here in 1778 , with approximately 15,000 soldiers.
"Living history events are held
annually at the park to attract thousands of participants and tourists to the area, generating valuable community support and educating visitors on the importance of what happened here.
"The upcoming 250 th Anniversary of both the Declaration of Independence and the Battle of Monmouth will provide unique opportunities to introduce the park to an even larger group of visitors, as well as celebrate the community and the State of New Jersey's history of agriculture. This is an opportunity to show off the park and Manalapan Township, Freehold Township, Monmouth County and the State of New Jersey.
"The proposed plan submitted by the Monmouth Battlefield Flex Company is adjacent to the park with its entrance directly across to the park entrance on New Jersey Business 33. The park is visited by hundreds of thousands of people every year.
"The Trust has serious concerns regarding the traffic that will result from the 56
flex units and the respective occupants, traffic that may include large over-sized vehicles.
"Given the historic significance of
Monmouth Battlefield State Park, the current
location of the proposed plan seems inappropriate and may negatively impact the park's visitor experience.
"In that, the Battlefield Trust urges
the careful consideration of the importance the park plays in the history of the United states and its role in the community in viewing Monmouth Battlefield Flex Company's proposed plan."

Thank you.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: If you could just
leave that with our secretary.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Anyone else
from the public having any comments?
DAVID MARTINS: I do have copies of the maps if people want them.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: We need to leave the exhibits here so that they're on file.

DAVID MARTINS: Okay.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Can I have a copy?
DAVID MARTINS: Okay. I can leave
those here if you want.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Sir, can you give Mr. Giunco a copy, please?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: And the letter please, a copy of the letter.

DAVID MARTINS: Yeah. Apologize for fumbling around.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Come up. And if you could just have a seat and get sworn in.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to provide this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

EILEEN VOLPE: I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and spell your name for the record and give us your address.

EILEEN VOLPE: Yes, my name is Eileen Volpe, I'm at 34 Crawford Road in the Village Grande at Battleground. And $I$ had a couple of comments I wanted to make.

First of all, about the traffic. I think if you check the records we have had many, many either deadly accidents or severely injured people coming down that viaduct across from our development.

I would like the board to consider what is going on in our area. The population $I$ think has probably doubled since $I^{\prime} m$ living here in 18 years. 33 now has all these major large over 55
developments. The traffic is horrendous. Half the time we can't even get out of our development.

Also, $I$ wanted to ask the board am I correct that --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well the board doesn't answer questions. You have the ability to ask the board's professionals or the applicant's professionals.

EILEEN VOLPE: Okay. What I wanted to ask is, am $I$ correct or incorrect, that there is going to be a warehouse across the street from Four Seasons being built that we had -- there was some sort of a legal issue and I think Manalapan lost and that warehouse is going to be built; am $I$ correct about that?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: That's on appeal
right now.
EILEEN VOLPE: Oh, it's on appeal. If that should come about, think what is going to happen on 33; the turn is going to be right where their site is and where we live.

I would like you to -- another thing that was never really discussed were the hours; you have all these older people living there, what are the hours going to be? We don't know.

What kind of soot, et cetera, will be coming out of whatever is coming in there for all the animals in the park, for the deer and the people? That hasn't been discussed.

The entire neighborhood has been built around the park: Battlefield Country Club, The Village Grande at Battleground, the park. Now we're going to get this massive industrial park, where is all the traffic going to go?

So if this warehouse is approved think about what is going to happen. It is already a nightmare. We had a neighbor who had a -- she pulled out of our development, she was hit. It's a miracle she is alive. We had another woman that was killed.

I understand the traffic person but if you live where we live you can't even imagine what's going on on 33; traffic is backed up. If there's -if there's President's Day, whatever little holiday it is, we can't get out of our development. That light at Wemrock Road is backed up coming from where

Livoti's is until you make that turn. It's impossible now. You have all these massive 55 development that you guys have approved, where is all the traffic going to be?

And now this flex space is going to come in with trucks and tractor-trailers, they're going to come in, they're going to go out, nobody is going to move, somebody needs an ambulance, what happens?

I mean it's not like we're on a quiet little street now that you're going to now populate; it's totally populated already.

And again, $I$ thank these two people that have come. We bought here because it was the Battleground. We wanted to be near the state park. Our developments are named after the state park.

So I ask that you keep that in consideration, the timing, the soot, the traffic, our wonderful park that will be destroyed.

I thank you for your time.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Thank you. Anyone else from the public? Come up.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to provide this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but
the truth?
JAN ZACHARY: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and spell your name for the record and give us your address.

JAN ZACHARY: Jan Zachary, 72
Millhurst Road.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Could you spell
your name for the court reporter?
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Spell your last name.

JAN ZACHARY: Zachary, Z-A-C-H-A-R-Y. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Go ahead.

JAN ZACHARY: So I was listening to Mr. Martins talk. And $I$ grew up here and, in fact, the last 50 years. I live right next to the beginning of that trail basically at 72 Millhurst Road. I walked back there before they put a development there. And we used to walk all the way through, through to the park and around on that trail across to the house that the white house that was on the hill where they're building this site and went a little further for the trail.

So I know the trail was there because I walked it all the time. And $I$ walked it when the
bar shops were there, that's where the -- the development is. And so $I$ know that there was a trail there.

In fact, there was a -- I'm on the First Aid Squad. There was a -- there was an accident on the park on that trail where a tree fell on one of the workers. So it was hell getting to that spot.

Do you remember; were you there, Rick?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: This is your
testimony.
JAN ZACHARY: Right. So $I$ know the trail is there and the reason I'm bringing this is up is because $I$ totally agree that an archeological site should be investigated before they even consider tearing everything up.

And that's my testimony.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Thank you. Ma'am, come forward.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to provide this board is the truth the whole truth and nothing but truth?

PAT SAMMARCO: I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and
spell your name and give us your address.
PAT SAMMARCO: Pat Sammarco,
$S-A-M-M-A-R-C-O, 69$ Yates Road, Manalapan, New Jersey.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead, ma'am.

PAT SAMMARCO: I do have a question. So currently the roadway on 33 is very deteriorated there. And I was just wondering, if there's tractor-trailers and box trucks now is it going to deteriorate the road more?

Can it support the weight of those vehicles? And will the roadway be resurfaced?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Giunco?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: John Rea, please.
JOHN REA: I'll take a shot at it.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Just give your name.

JOHN REA: John Rea.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Yes.

JOHN REA: Business Route 33 is a state
arterial highway. It's under the jurisdiction of the NJDOT. They have periodic maintenance programs where roads get resurfaced. The answer is I don't know; it's up to the DOT.

But trucks are permitted on state
arterial highways.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Unfortunately this
board has no control over the state road.
PAT SAMMARCO: Right. The DOT was
just out about a week ago to patch two potholes and that was it.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
PAT SAMMARCO: The rest is still
deteriorated.
And I do agree with everyone here about the traffic and the noise and the pollution which is going to occur.

My property backs up exactly to 33
business. I'm 40 feet from the roadway. And I can't -- that's my living room, my bedroom, my patio. And I'm constantly going to have more traffic going by more than there is now. And on top of that, you know, that's the noise, the pollution, I'm wondering how that's going to affect my home?

And then, also, we were trying to grow some shrubs and we have pine trees back there and stuff and the DOT just came a month ago and cut them all back, so now we have holes in the shrubbery. So that impacts us, too.

If our development is going to plant
these things and the DOT comes and cuts them back, what happens to us?

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: I can't answer that question.

Professionals, with plantings and the DOT cutting them?

PLANNER BEAHM: I mean my guess is that they're probably planted in the right-of-way. Like, if they're planted on private property the DOT won't cut them back unless they're impacting the right-of-way. So my guess is that they probably were planted in the right-of-way.

But $I$ don't know that for a fact. But we have zero control over the DOT. That goes to comments about a potential light at this location, the, you know, fixing the roads. Anything to do with 33 is DOT's jurisdiction. We have absolutely no control over the state.

PAT SAMMARCO: My only comment is, is the preschool at the end of the roadway where the merge is, during the holiday there's usually events there at the preschool where they have graduations, they have holiday events. And the grandparents come, the parents come, and they park along 33 business there. They're walking with their families
-- the grandparents, the parents, their children -along the roadway. And there's going to be more truck traffic and trailer traffic passing that which could be an issue for the safety of people.

And then my other question is what about the hours of this potential warehouse? Because, you know, people need to sleep; I still work a full-time job.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Mr. Giunco, would you like to answer that? Wait. Come up to the microphone.

I don't remember, ma'am.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Earlier in the
hearing we testified or one of my witnesses testified that we would maintain the hours permitted by the municipality.

PLANNER BEAHM: Right. But, Mr. Giunco, we did ask you to evaluate those hours considering the fact that there are residents close by and potentially ending earlier and starting a little bit later. I think the ordinance requires no activity 11 to 6. We asked you to evaluate that, to modify that, because of where you are and in the interest of being a good neighbor.

I remember that specifically coming up
and $I$ don't remember any answer coming back.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: What we'll do is show an exhibit to where the residences are relative to our site.

PLANNER BEAHM: That's not answering the question, John, to be honest. I mean, we know where the residences are.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, they're substantially removed from our site. There are three along Wemrock Road in Freehold Township.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Giunco has said he's going to comply with the ordinance. That's the sum and substance of the answer. And, you know, there's nothing that's been placed in the record that they're going to modify the hours of operation.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Mr. Giunco, can you please tell this resident what the ordinance reads because she's...

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I'll have to check it.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I believe Jen just referenced it.

PLANNER BEAHM: 11 to 6 .
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: 11 to 6 is hours
where activity is prohibited.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I thought that was
what you had said, but $I$ don't know that without checking again. But 11 to 6 is fine.

That means from 11:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. - -
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Correct.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: -- limited activity.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay. Ma'am?

PAT SAMMARCO: I don't have anything
else.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
PAT SAMMARCO: Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Thank you.
Anything else from the public?
Sir, come on up.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to provide this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

JAMES CHIRDO: Yes.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and spell your name and give us your address.

JAMES CHIRDO: James Chirdo, C-H-I-R-D-O, 6 Crawford Road, Village Grande.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, you can
have a seat and provide us with your testimony.
JAMES CHIRDO: Kind of going on what my neighbor just said, I'm concerned not only with the noise but I'm also concerned with the pollution, okay.

And I didn't -- I wasn't here when they approved Manalapan Crossings, but it's approved. There are warehouses going across from -- across 33 from Manalapan Crossings, again, warehouses. Now they put these up.

So there's really three things that should be combined if anybody is going to do an air study; I just don't know who does that. I know the traffic studies, not too happy with them, but they're there, okay.

And I just want to know what happens with pollution? We're right -- we're 40 feet. The back of some of the homes are 40 feet from that road.

ATtORNEY CUCChIARO: Mr. Giunco, do you have a position on this?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I could barely hear you and I apologize.

JAMES CHIRDO: Some of the homes from Village Grande are 40 feet from 33 --

COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: A little closer
to the mic.

JAMES CHIRDO: Oh, I'm sorry.
COMMITTEEMAN McNABOE: There's two
mics, one for each of you.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Yeah, there's two mics. Take that one, give that to Mr. Giunco.

JAMES CHIRDO: Okay. Are 40 feet from 33.

We're getting potentially your
development. We have Manalapan Crossings, which does the U-turn, goes right past us. And also the two warehouses, the huge warehouses that are across from Manalapan Crossings to make the turn. In fact, the DOT said don't make a regular turn, go into that U-turn, okay.

So there's going to be a lot of pollution, okay. I don't care what anybody says; the noise pollution and the air pollution. I just want to know who monitors it? Is there a study? I have never heard of a study on any of them.

And, you know, when something is there, you know, how do you get it to -- well, there's a lot of pollution coming here. I worked for Pfizer for many years, okay. Pfizer had a plant in old

Bridge. And they built a development across from there. And that development, they advertised as, oh, that's just a warehouse across the -- there's like a river, across that. But it was a manufacturing warehouse and it was up to the Pfizer to monitor it and that was then monitored by the EPA.

So I just want to know where we stand, a senior community, when it comes to pollution and also noise.

And you had a consultant here, a flex consultant here the last time and I did ask him the question, how many flex warehouses did you have 40 feet from homes, and he didn't answer.

So, you know, I'm just worried about the pollution and the noise.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, I think when you look at the plan you won't find any homes within 40 feet of the property line let alone - -

JAMES CHIRDO: Not the property line but on the --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Well, it's not that close.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Hold on. Hold on. You asked your question. You have to allow

Mr. Giunco to answer.
JAMES CHIRDO: I'm sorry.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: That's my answer.
JAMES CHIRDO: Okay.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: There are no residences that I'm aware of within 40 feet or even a couple hundred feet of our site.

JAMES CHIRDO: A couple hundred feet?
I don't know about that.

But anyway, what are you going to
helicopter the trucks out?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I'm not asking for helicopter service.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Guys.
JAMES CHIRDO: Now I'm talking and he's answering.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Sir, sir.
JAMES CHIRDO: One last thing.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Sir, it's not a back-and-forth like that. You get to ask questions and he gets to answer. And it has to be done a little more slowly so that we can get it with the court reporter.

Now, he answered your question. You may not agree with the answer, but that's the
answer. Mr. Giunco, there was a question about noise.

Can you address noise?
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I have to apologize,
I just didn't hear what the question is.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: There was a concern that it was going to be loud.

So I assume, I don't want to speak for you, Mr. Giunco, but $I$ assume that you're going to draw our attention to the municipal ordinance and the state statutes --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: There's no intent to exceed any ordinance or statute or regulation that regulates sound.

But all of those regulations that I'm aware of also exclude what is called impact sound. So if something was to fall on the ground, a dumpster fell off the truck or something, that's not regulated.

So we're not creating that kind of noise, or $I$ don't think we're creating that kind of sound. We meet all the sideyard setbacks and we're keeping the vegetation that we can in place.

The site next to us on our side of the highway is also proposed for a commercial
development.
And if you go to the east, there is an old pond. When the dam broke by the old mill in the back of -- on the battlefield, that pond went away. Both of them went away. And that's still there and that was there from as long as I can remember from the ' 60 s.

And I don't see that there's anybody that close to this site.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: But to bring it back to what the rules are, Mr. Giunco, there's a standard, correct?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We meet the
standards. We are requesting no variances.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And you will not exceed those standards?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yeah. We request no variances.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, we couldn't give you one anyway.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: But we are one for the sign, $I$ think.

PLANNER BEAHM: I think he's talking about the noise standards.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yes.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I'm having trouble hearing you. I apologize.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: All right. Let's
move on.
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We have nothing - I'm not proposing any use that is going to exceed the sound generation requirements.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Now, there was a concern that was expressed about general pollution that would be generated by this use.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I think that -general pollution? I guess everything creates general pollution if you look at it that way, but we're not trying to --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, let's look at it this way. You don't get to generate whatever you want to generate. I mean, there are air quality, acts, there are laws that regulate emissions, that regulate manner in which you can dispose of certain types of waste, and there's a regulatory structure that exists, isn't there?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yes. With regard to the disposal of waste we would expect that, and require in any lease, that all tenants comply with all regulatory requirements for the disposal of
waste.

The storage of any hazardous materials onsite would have to be in a properly enclosed area, and they would have to show us a permit for that.

We probably need a building department approval if they're going to put something on --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: With regard to air pollution, $I$ know there's a Clean Air Act.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Air pollution --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: There are administrative provisions.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: All our equipment will be new and it will stay with current standards, I mean like...

PLANNER BEAHM: I mean, John, I don't really know how you can even remotely say that when you don't have a single tenant, so you have no idea.

I think the concern is --

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: We know --

PLANNER BEAHM: With all due respect,
I think the concern is -- and you can correct me if I'm wrong -- is that if you have this project and then you have the other projects in the area, in the immediate area that have been approved, what is the overall impact to air quality?

So you can't tell me --
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I don't know.
PLANNER BEAHM: I understand that
answer. But you can't sit here and tell me that all the equipment is going to be new; you're not the tenant.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I think it's irrelevant.

PLANNER BEAHM: Right.
ATtORNEY CUCChIARO: It doesn't matter
whether it's new, old, in between, stolen --
ATTORNEY GIUNCO: I just don't have the answer.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: -- we have a regulatory structure. You can't just do whatever you want on a piece of property; there are rules for the emissions into the air. We have federal statutes; we have State regulations.

And I think what is necessary to appreciate is $I$ will call sort of a tapestry of laws that interrelate with each other. You know, we have certain laws that we are responsible at the local level for enforcing. Here particularly it's the zoning and the land use laws;

You heard that the DOT expressed their
jurisdiction over the roadways, and they get to do that;

And there's a combination of state and federal authorities that regulate what can be discharged and at what levels into the air. And that is their jurisdiction not here.

But rest assured, like I said, there are rules and regulations, it's not a -- it's not a free-for-all.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: This application intends to comply with all rules and regulations that are applicable to it. We asked for a deviation from the signage, that was it.

JAMES CHIRDO: But can I ask the expert something?

You kind of had my point, but what I'm really asking is if a project -- and there are potentially two, then there's a third and a fourth, they're -- I don't doubt that they're going to control the environment of the warehouses. I'm saying are they responsible for adding pollution because of the trucks?

They're adding trucks and they're adding traffic. And they're going right by our house. I know they're not -- the property doesn't --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So I'm certainly not going to say that there is no impact, but what $I$ can say is that that is all taken into account when these regulations are put into effect.

For instance, you can't bring a truck onto the property and just let it sit there idling for more than three minutes. There are state laws that prevent that in order to, you know, help maintain the quality of the air.

So within those -- and these are dense regulatory structures, they deal with a lot. Those regulations take into account, you know, anything that may be generated by cars or trucks that are visiting the property.

And, again, it's not to say that, you know, the laws are perfect or that anyone needs to agree with the laws, but they are what governs and it takes what you're concerned about into account when it creates the regulations.

JAMES CHIRDO: But I still -- and no offense, $I$ still don't think my question was answered.

PLANNER BEAHM: So $I$ can answer it. The short answer is that we do not answer that.

JAMES CHIRDO: I understand that.

PLANNER BEAHM: That's outside of our purview.

JAMES CHIRDO: I just wanted to know who.

PLANNER BEAHM: So I don't think anybody regulates that.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, no, that's not true. The state and federal government regulate air pollution. So those are the two entities that would be responsible.

JAMES CHIRDO: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: You're welcome. You can sit in any chair, sir.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to provide this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

DONALD HAWKSBY: I do.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and spell your name, give us your address.

DONALD HAWKSBY: My name is Donald
Hawksby, $H-A-W-K-S-B-Y, I$ live at 77 Yates Road Manalapan, New Jersey.

I understand what they're saying the surveys and stuff like that, when Mr. Rea did the
traffic surveys and all that stuff there, but $I$ have been living here for a long time, and that backs up. When, you know, it's apple season or pumpkin season, the road is backed up.

And now with this coming in, they say they're going to build a runoff. Why are they building a runoff? Because they know a trailer is going to be going too fast and have to pull into a runoff.

That's what happens with tractor-trailers, sometimes they lose the braking systems, it just happens. And they're coming down, they're not going up a hill, they're coming down from 33 highway to Business 33.

And every time that happens -- and you know it, the noise -- I live right on 33, right next to 33. And the noise, it ain't even about the noise, like the pollution that it's going to bring, the noise is so bad. The houses are not built too good, they're not built like years ago.

I mean my house rumbles when a tractor-trailer blows by. And don't forget they're doing 50 miles an hour. And some don't do 50, they do 60, and that house just rumbles. And you know what's going to happen, they're going to back up.

I don't even know that -- how much the overpass is going to hold poundage-wise when it stops and you've got four or five tractor-trailers backed up on the overpass. What's going to happen now?

I don't understand it, all these tests, the noise wasn't done, the shaking wasn't done.

I mean, a berm, like you said they're going to build a berm supposedly, right? A berm? When they build a berm, the berm shrinks. We had a big berm. My berm is really small now. The ground just settles down. It goes lower and lower and lower.

And that's what happens now, the noise is getting so bad, like Jim was trying to say. The noise is just so crazy.

And if you live here -- and Mr. Giunco owns a property over here, you know, he should be -and he knows Wemrock Road gets backed up. He knows 33 gets backed up, Business 33.

And like we said it's a battleground. I mean, it's a beautiful area. Why do they want to destroy something that is so beautiful?

I just don't understand why do they want to build here. Is it for him selling the
property, is that what it's about; it's about the money?

And that's what it comes down to. I mean we live here. And there's a school there, and it's not -- and you know what's going to happen, like the other person said, we had a person die and we had a person mangled from just that stop. They don't even stop. And the yield sign, you might as well not have the yield sign. If you live over here you know, they don't yield.

I watch when $I$ pull out because I'm afraid someone is going to run into me. And now you're going to have all this traffic, I mean it's going to impact everything. We all know it.

I know Mr. Rea did studies. But I
don't know if the weight can hold. And they never did a shaking survey or put something on 33 where you can hear the sound and the rumbling, where you can feel that. And I think that's something that they should do.

That's it. I appreciate you guys.
Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Thank you.
Anyone else from the public? Seeing none, $I$ close public.

Seeing the time of night it is I would like to -- Mr. Giunco, please come back up. Since he only submitted things this evening and our professionals need to review them, $I$ would like to carry this application before we make a decision. What do we have available, Nancy? SECRETARY McGRATH: Well $3 / 14$ now has a three-lot subdivision of Lamb Lane.

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: What is on for the following?

SECRETARY McGRATH: $3 / 28$ is Gateway Farm redevelopment. So the next clear agenda -ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: No, we're not looking for clear agenda. You can do multiple things on one night.

So let's look at 3/14, Madam Chair. CCG Real Estate, they're just coming back to tell us whether they're going to do two or three, that's not much.

Lambs Lane, I mean, it has to do with a farm, right, stables? I mean it's not any significant development, $I$ don't think that should take, you know, very long.

This applicant does have -- there is an expiration date so the board does need to make a
decision.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Does the 14 th work for you, Mr. Giunco; does March $14 t h$, our next meeting, work for all of your people?

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: All right. So let me just make the announcement.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Ms. Chairwoman, do you think we -- do you expect us to bring Mr. Rea back?

CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: I, truthfully, do not know that answer. So $I$ would say have all your professionals ready because you will have by then have also gone to the fire commissioners.

Correct, Chief?
CHIEF HOGAN: We offered them Monday. So we have a meeting Monday, you're on the agenda. CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: So you're on for Monday.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Good.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: All right.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So application
PMS2238, Monmouth Battlefield Flex Company, LLC will be carried to the board's March 14th, 2024 , meeting.

That meeting begins at 7:30 here in the Main Meeting Room at Town Hall. It's a live meeting. There will not be any further notice to property owners.

ATTORNEY GIUNCO: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN KWAAK: Thank you.
(Whereupon, the application is adjourned at 10:45 p.m.)

CE RT I F IC AT E

I, ANGELA C. BUONANTUONO, a Notary
Public and Certified Court Reporter of the State of New Jersey and Registered Professional Reporter, do hereby certify that prior to the commencement, the witnesses were duly sworn to testify the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the proceeding as taken stenographically by and before me at the time, place and on the date hereinbefore set forth.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that $I$ am neither a relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any of the parties to this action, and that $I$ am neither a relative nor employee of such attorney or counsel, and that $I$ am not financially interested in the action.


Angela C. Buonantuono, CCR, RPR, CLR NJ License No. 30XI00233100 Notary Public of the State of New Jersey

Dated: March 1, 2024

adjourned ${ }_{[1]}$ - 135:8 adjusted [1] - 96:11 administrative ${ }_{[1]}$ 125:11
adopted ${ }_{[1]}-77: 12$ advance [5] - 9:13, 11:8, 51:24, 52:5, 60:9
advances [1] - 54:4 advancing [2] - 51:3, 52:20
adverse [1] - 45:19 advertised [1] - 120:2 advise [1] - 77:15 Advisory [1] - 102:21
affect ${ }_{[1]}$ - 113:19 affirm [8] - 48:22,
80:7, 88:5, 106:10, 109:24, 111:21, 117:17, 129:15 affirmatively ${ }_{[1]}$ 77:25
afoul [1] - 57:15
afraid [1] - 132:12
afternoon [7]-37:20, 38:6, 38:9, 39:12, 39:13, 43:12, 44:17
afterwards [1] - 33:20
agenda [3] - 133:12, 133:14, 134:18
ago [11] - 13:6, 34:19, 34:21, 37:10, 49:21, 89:3, $90: 18$, 102:16, 113:5, 113:22, 130:20
agree [9]-59:16, 69:24, 71:11, 71:21, 72:10, 111:14, 113:10, 121:25, 128:17
agrees [1] - 33:6 agriculture [1] 104:14
ahead [13]-6:24, 6:25, 11:20, 15:20, 17:6, 21:2, 88:15, 94:1, 99:4, 100:4, 101:20, 110:13, 112:5
AIA [1] - 4:6
AICP ${ }_{[2]}-2: 18,4: 9$
Aid [1] - 111:5
aid [1] - 53:21
ain't ${ }_{[1]}-130: 17$
air $[12]-24: 18,51: 5$,
87:10, 118:12,
119:19, 124:17,
125:8, 125:25,
126:17, 127:5,
128:9, 129:9
Air ${ }_{[2]}$ - 125:8, 125:9
Alfieri [2]-74:22,
74:23
Algonquin [1] - 1:24
alive ${ }_{[1]}$ - 108:18
allow [5] - 40:6, 40:8,
52:25, 58:4, 120:25
allowed [1] - 52:24
allows [3] - 12:3,
27:8, 65:4
alone [1] - 120:19
alongside [1] - $31: 1$
alternative ${ }_{[1]}$ - 51:3
ambulance [1] 109:8
American [10]-81:3, 81:6, 81:22, 81:24, 82:2, 82:16, 82:20, 83:5, 101:24,
102:11
amount [1]-11:5
analysis [7]-38:15, 40:24, 42:14, 43:22, 43:23, 44:6, 45:16
analyzed ${ }_{[1]}$ - 41:3
AND [2] - 1:8, 2:13
Angela [1] - 136:23
ANGELA [2]-2:24, 136:3
angelabuonocsr@ gmail.com [1]-1:25
animals [1] - 108:7
Anniversary [2] 81:3, 104:9
announcement [1] 134:8
annually [1] - 104:5
answer [20]-95:23, 101:8, 107:10, 112:23, 114:3, 115:10, 116:1, 116:13, 120:14, 121:1, 121:3, 121:21, 121:25, 122:1, 126:4, 126:13, 128:23, 128:24, 134:13 answered [2] 121:24, 128:22
answering [2] 116:5, 121:16
Anthony [4]-100:18, 100:20, 101:1, 101:6
anyway [4]-22:19, 80:2, 121:10, 123:20
apologies [1]-29:24
apologize [5] - 52:4,
106:5, 118:23,
122:4, 124:2
appeal [2]-107:20, 107:22
appearance ${ }_{[1]}-55: 1$
apple [2]-48:3,
130:3
applicable [2] - 95:4,

127:12
Applicant ${ }_{[1]}$ - 3:6
applicant $[8]-14: 8$, 55:22, 57:21, 58:8,
58:11, 72:10,
79:11, 133:24
applicant's ${ }^{[2]}$ -
28:20, 107:11
Application [1] - 6:1
APPLICATION ${ }_{[1]}$ 1:9
application [12] - 6:6, 35:16, 40:20, 46:1, 49:11, 50:9, 55:6, 77:25, 127:10, 133:5, 134:23, 135:7
applied [1] - 41:14 apply [2]-34:12,
35:2
appreciate [4]-19:9, 75:8, 126:20,
132:21
approach ${ }_{[1]}$ - 81:19 appropriate [6] -
11:5, 33:10, 33:14, 54:16, 90:15, 104:1
appropriately ${ }_{[1]}$ 95:6
approval [2] - 74:14, 125:6
approve ${ }_{[1]}-40: 2$ approved [5] -
108:14, 109:3,
118:7, 125:24
archaeological ${ }_{[1]}$ 83:7
archaeologically ${ }_{[1]}$ 98:12
archeological [3] 98:3, 98:14, 111:14
Architects [1] - 4:7
Area[2]-5:9, 99:2
area[31]-8:8, 13:25,
30:5, 34:4, 35:7, 46:3, 46:8, 59:6, 59:24, 62:11, 69:15, 71:7, 73:21, 83:16, 86:20, 89:13, 89:18, 92:3, 96:1, 97:4, 97:5, 97:15, 98:20, 101:2, 104:6, 107:2, 125:3, 125:23, 125:24, 131:22
argument ${ }_{[1]}-76: 17$
Army [3]-103:14,
103:16, 103:19
arrangement ${ }_{[1]}$ 16:6
arrangements [2] -
76:24, 77:2
arterial [2]-112:21,
assembly [1]-56:17
assessment [1] -
39:25
associated [2] -
22:10, 43:17
Associates [2] - 2:17, 4:8
Association [1] -
102:17
assume [2] - 122:8, 122:9
assumed [1] - 43:9
assuming [2]-27:21, 40:11
assured $_{[1]}$ - 127:7
attacked [1] - 103:13
attention [1] - 122:10
attenuates [1] - 31:23
attenuation ${ }_{[1]}$ -
30:16
Attorney [1]-2:15
attorney [2]-136:14, 136:16
ATTORNEY [209] -
6:12, 6:20, 6:23, 6:24, 7:3, 7:8, 10:20, 10:24, 11:2, 11:11, 11:16, 12:22, 14:2, 14:7, 15:1, 15:9, 15:13, 15:16, 15:20, 15:22, 16:1, 16:18, 16:25, 17:2, 17:3, 17:6, 17:7, 19:18, 19:20, 19:22, 20:8, 20:10, 20:13, 20:18, 20:21, 20:23, 20:24, 21:2, 21:23, 22:1, 22:3, 22:5, 23:5, 23:23, 24:4, 24:7, 25:25, 26:3, 30:8, 32:7, 32:11, 32:14, 32:20, 35:1, 47:6, 48:14, 48:18, 48:21, 49:1, 49:10, 49:18, 49:20, 50:1, 56:5, 58:1, 58:17, 60:21, 62:13, 62:19, 74:7, 74:10, 75:24, 76:7, 77:10, 77:18, 78:5, 78:10, 78:16, 79:3, 79:7, 79:17, 79:21,
79:25, 80:6, 80:11, 88:4, 88:9, 88:15, 92:8, 92:12, 92:20, 92:23, 93:2, 93:5, 93:9, 93:12, 93:16, 93:19, 93:25, 94:3, 94:5, 94:11, 94:15, 94:22, 94:23,
94:25, 95:2, 95:11, 95:15, 95:21, 96:6, 96:12, 96:16,

98:16, 98:21, 99:4, 99:18, 99:21,
99:25, 100:2,
100:4, 100:5,
100:12, 100:17, 100:24, 101:3, 101:9, 101:16, 101:20, 102:3, 105:14, 105:20, 105:23, 106:3, 106:9, 106:14, 107:9, 107:20, 109:23, 110:3, 110:8, 111:10, 111:20, 111:25, 112:5, 112:13, 112:14, 112:16, 115:13, 116:2, 116:8, 116:11, 116:20, 116:22, 116:25, 117:2, 117:7, 117:21, 117:25, 118:20, 118:22, 120:17,
120:22, 120:24, 121:3, 121:5, 121:12, 121:14, 121:17, 121:19, 122:4, 122:6, 122:12, 123:10, 123:13, 123:15, 123:17, 123:19, 123:21, 123:25,
124:1, 124:3,
124:5, 124:8,
124:11, 124:15,
124:22, 125:7,
125:9, 125:10,
125:12, 125:19,
126:2, 126:7,
126:10, 126:12,
126:14, 127:10,
128:1, 129:7,
129:14, 129:19,
133:13, 134:5,
134:7, 134:9,
134:21, 134:23,
135:4
attract ${ }_{[1]}-104: 5$
attractive ${ }_{[1]}-55: 2$
August [3]-50:18,
51:18, 89:24
authenticity [1]-95:9
authorities [1] -
127:4
auto [1] - 45:7
automatic [2] - 37:11,
41:6
automation [1] -
75:15
available [2]-24:12, 133:6
Avakian [1] - 2:18
average [2]-25:7, 90:10

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { aware }[7]-30: 25, \\ & 31: 15,89: 17,92: 1, \\ & \text { 100:8, 121:6, } \\ & 122: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { battleground }[1] \text { - } \\ & \text { 131:21 } \\ & \text { Battleground }[4] \text { - } \\ & 7: 17,106: 19 \text {, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { between [11] - 26:25, } \\ & \text { 27:18, 28:12, 29:8, } \\ & \text { 29:12, 29:13, } \\ & 29: 17,31: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { 109:25, 111:22, } \\ \text { 113:3, 117:18, } \\ \text { 129:16, 133:25 } \\ \text { BOARD }[4]-1: 1,2: 1, \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { buffer }_{[1]}-59: 1 \\ & \text { buffers }[1]-83: 11 \\ & \text { build }[9]-42: 4,42: 9, \\ & 42: 10,58: 25, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B |  |  |  |  |
|  | 102:13 <br> battles [3]-81:23, 82:21, 103:10 battlesites [1] - 103:2 BEAHM [69] - 2:18, 8:13, 8:17, 9:12, 9:15, 9:25, 10:8, 10:15, 13:1, 13:5, 13:23, 18:16, 19:1, 19:4, 19:16, 19:25, 20:5, 21:7, 21:20, 21:25, 23:7, 25:1, 25:9, 26:9, 47:4, 58:20, 59:11, 59:20, 60:14, 60:24, 61:2, 61:6, 61:12, 61:18, 61:21, 62:3, 62:6, 62:10, 62:15, 62:21, 63:3, 63:12, 63:23, 65:5, 65:24, 66:25, 67:17, 68:1, 72:1, 72:13, 72:21, 76:5, 76:8, 77:16, 77:19, 79:6, 97:8, 114:7, 115:17, 116:5, 116:24, 123:23, 125:15, 125:20, 126:3, 126:9, 128:23, 129:1, 129:5 <br> beautiful [2]-131:22, 131:23 <br> becomes [2]-36:2, 54:17 <br> bedroom [1] - 113:15 began [1] - 102:16 begin [1] - 59:23 beginning [3]-81:4, 87:1, 110:17 <br> begins [2]-100:9, 135:1 <br> behalf [1] - 55:21 <br> behind [1] - 26:24 <br> belt [2]-51:11, 55:16 belts [2]-77:17, <br> 77:20 <br> belts-andsuspenders [2] 77:17, 77:20 benefit [1] - 63:21 berm [12]-50:21, 51:8, 51:13, 58:25, 89:5, 131:8, 131:9, 131:10, 131:11 berming [1] - 50:16 better [8]-51:2, 60:2, 72:11, 83:25, 84:1, 84:23, 95:13, 97:11 | 18:13, 82:17, 95:2 <br> Bhaskar [8] - 6:16, <br> 7:3, 8:13, 18:8, 20:12, 20:13, 23:10, 60:13 | 11:3, 14:15, 22:21, <br> 107:11, 134:25 <br> Boccanfuso [1] 33:6 <br> BOCCANFUSO [31] - <br> 2:16, 10:10, 13:9, <br> 13:14, 13:17, <br> 13:22, 14:22, 33:9, <br> 33:17, 39:20, <br> 40:14, 40:23, <br> 41:13, 41:16, <br> 41:19, 41:23, 42:2, <br> 42:7, 42:12, 42:17, <br> 42:20, 43:1, 43:14, <br> 45:14, 45:22, 46:6, <br> 46:19, 47:2, 59:10, <br> 60:17, 63:25 <br> bottom [1] - 21:5 <br> bought [1] - 109:14 <br> bound [1] - 90:12 <br> box [2] - 17:19, 112:9 <br> brake [1] - 91:10 <br> brakes [1]-91:16 <br> braking [1] - 130:11 <br> brandie [1] - 10:16 <br> brandie-new [1] - <br> 10:16 <br> breaks [1] - 85:17 <br> Brian [6] - 13:4, <br> 14:21, 33:22, <br> 35:19, 39:19, 63:24 <br> BRIAN [2] - 2:11, <br> 2:16 <br> Bridge [1] - 120:1 <br> briefly [2]-7:11, <br> 49:14 <br> bring [9] - 78:15, <br> 79:19, 79:22, <br> 80:22, 81:5, <br> 123:10, 128:5, <br> 130:18, 134:10 <br> bringing [1] - 111:13 <br> British [2]-81:22, <br> 103:14 <br> broke [1] - 123:3 <br> Brook [3] - 85:3, <br> 85:12, 99:9 <br> brook [1] - 85:6 <br> brought [1] - 26:21 <br> BROWN [17]-2:3, <br> 47:18, 68:13, <br> 68:19, 69:6, 69:13, <br> 69:17, 70:12, <br> 70:19, 71:10, <br> 71:21, 71:24, 72:9, <br> 72:16, 72:25, 73:5, <br> 73:8 <br> Brown [2] - 66:8, <br> 70:14 |  |






| G | 116:20, 117:2, | 21:3, 22:23, 28:9, | height [12] - 9:1, | 120:18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| gap [2] - 36:22, 69:21 | 120:17, 120:22, | $60: 19,60: 23,61: 1$ | 16:13, 16:15, | honestly [3]-59:25, |
| g | 121:3, 121:5, | 61:5, 61:10, 61:15, | 16, 23:7, 25:18, | 76:17, 76:2 |
| gas [1]-56: | 121:12, 122:4 | 61:19, 61:24, 62:5, | 64:11, 64:17, 86:6 | hope [1] - 73:1 |
| gatehouses [1] 86:18 | 122:12, 123:13, | $64: 6,64: 9,64: 23$ | held [3]-18:14, | hoping [1]-72:10 |
| Gatewa | 123:17, 123:2 |  | 104 | horizontal [4] - |
| gathering [1] - 86:16 | 124:11, 124:22 | $69: 3,69: 16,69: 25$ | 121:11, 121:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 20,23: 24,24: 8 \\ & 24: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| general [4] - 103:18, | 125:9, 125:12 | :18, 70:20 | hell [1] - 111:7 | horrendous [1] |
| 124:9, 124:12, | 125:19, 126:2 | :20, 71:23 | help [1] - 128:8 | 107:5 |
| 124 | 126:12, 127:10 | 72:23, 73:2, 73:7 | hereby [1] - 136: | horseback [1] - 82:10 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { General }[3]-103: 12, \\ \text { 103:13, 103:14 } \\ \text { generally }[2]-36: 25, \\ 72: 4 \end{gathered}$ | 134:5, 134:9, | $73: 18,74: 4$ | hereinbefore [1] - | $\text { hoses [1] - } 37: 14$ |
|  | 134:21, 135:4 | Halari [5] - 6:17, | 136:12 | hot [1] - 103:11 |
|  | GIVELEKIAN [4] | 10:22, 12:23, | high [10] - 8:21, | hour [11]-34:7, 34:8, |
| generate [2] - 124:16, 124:17 | $78: 2$ |  | $: 13,29: 3,61: 1$ | $38: 6,38: 9,39: 4$ |
|  | given [1] - 105: | $61: 15,65: 13$ | $65: 13,66: 3,66: 2$ | 39:14, 44:15 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { generated }[3]-42: 14, \\ 124: 10,128: 13 \end{gathered}$ | glare [1] - 56:23 | 65:14, 66:12, 67:9 | 66:5 | 44:16, 130:23 |
|  | goods [1] - 56:19 | Half [3] - 3:3, 49:5 | higher [9]-9:2, | hours [11]-28:1 |
| generati | governed [2] - 58:8, | 107:5 | $16: 11,25: 5,25: 12$ | 37:21, 42:18 |
|  | 58:10 | HALL [1] - 1:1 | 5:15, 38:1 | $43: 12,108: 2$ |
|  | government [1] | Hall [1] - | 39:16, 44:5, 77:8 | 108:4, 115:6 |
| $\begin{gathered} 38: 17,39: 7,42: 24 \\ 43: 3,43: 16,124: 7 \\ \text { gentleman }[1]-26: 2 \end{gathered}$ | 129:8 | HALLERAN ${ }_{[1]}-3: 2$ | highest [1] - 41:9 | $115: 15,115: 1$ |
|  | governs [1] - 128:17 | hallowed [1] - 102:13 | HIGHWAY [1] - 1:7 | 116:15, 116:25 |
|  | grade [5] - 25 | hand [3]-23:13, | Highway [1] - 34:14 | house [8] - 76:2, |
| George [1] - 103:12 | $25: 19,40: 4,40: 18$ | 79:12, 92:1 | highway [8] - 35:21, | $90: 22,110: 21,$ |
| GIORDANO [1] - 3:2 | 86:5 | hand-held [1] - 92:14 | $36: 14,36: 17$ | 127:25, 130:21 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Giunco [25] - 6:11, } \\ & \text { 15:9, 56:11, 57:24, } \end{aligned}$ | graduations [1] - | handle [5] - 28:7 | 36:19, 37:1, | 130:24 |
|  | 114:22 | 29:10, 33:5, 33:8 | 112:21, 122:2 | housekeeping [1] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 75: 2,94: 4,94: 11, \\ & 95: 7,99: 22,99: 23, \end{aligned}$ | Grande [4] - 106:18, | $36: 1$ | $130: 1$ | 86:22 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95:7, 99:22, 99:23, } \\ & \text { 106:2, 112:13, } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:11, 117:24, } \\ & 118: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { happy }[2]-33: 20 \\ 118: 14 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { highways [2] - 42:25, } \\ & \text { 113:1 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { houses [2] - 97: } \\ & 130: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 115:9, 115:18, } \\ & \text { 116:11, 116:17 } \end{aligned}$ | grandparents [2] | hard [3] - 54:9, 83:22, | hill [2] - 110:22 | housing [1] - 100:10 |
|  | $114: 23,115: 1$ | $85: 19$ | 130:13 | huge [1] - 119:13 |
| 118:20, 119:7, | grant [1] - 51:2 | hardship [3] - 50:25 | hills [1] - 97: | humid [1] - 103:11 |
| 121:1, 122:1, | granted [1] - 51:22 | 51:23, 52:11 | historian [2] - 95:20, | hundred [2] - 121:7, |
| 131:17, 133:2, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { gray }[2]-23: 13,24: 7 \\ & \text { great }[3]-45: 14, \end{aligned}$ | harmful [1]-86:1 <br> hatched [1] - 35:7 | 101:7 <br> histor | 121:8 <br> hundre |
| 134:3 | $50: 21,68: 2$ | HAWKS | 93:8, 96:10, 96:25, | $91: 12,104:$ |
| GIUNCO [91] - 3:3, | green [4]-23:13 | $129: 18,129: 2$ | 99:6, 99:13, | HVAC [3] - 56:1 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:12, 6:23, 7:3, 7:8, } \\ & \text { 12:22, 15:1, 15:22, } \end{aligned}$ | $24: 4,51: 11,55: 16$ <br> grew [1] - 110:15 | $129: 2$ <br> Hawks | $\begin{aligned} & 102: 14,103: \\ & 105: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 57:13, 76:12 |
| 16:1, 17:2, 17:7, | ground [5] - 13:18 | 129:22 | Historic [4]-5:7, 5:8, |  |
| 20:10, 20:13, |  |  |  | I.. [1]-79:5 |
| $23: 23,24: 4,24: 7$ | Group [2] - 2:15, 4:10 |  | history [5] - 53:23, | ID [2] - 13:10, 59 |
| $25: 25,26: 3,30: 8,$ | group [2] - 80:15, | 101:25 | $\text { 103:21, } 104:$ | $\text { idea }[3]-36: 13,$ |
| $32: 7,32: 14,32: 20,$ | 104:12 | hear [10]-10:13, | 104:14, 105:10 | identification |
| 35:1, 48:14, 48:18, | grow [1] - 113:20 | 11:9, 11:17, 16:22, | hit [1] - 108:17 | 17:10, 53:11, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 49: 10,49: 18 \\ & 49: 20.56: 5.58: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\text { growth }[3]-34: 3$ $34: 4,41: 14$ | :22, 90:13 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HOGAN [4] - 2:6, } \\ & 64: 7,64: 24,134: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $93: 23,96: 22,99: 2,$ |
| 60:21, 62:13, | guess [6] - 21:20 | $122: 5,132: 18$ | hold [5] - 93:2, 96:6, | 102:7 |
|  | $56: 6,63: 9,114: 7,$ | $\text { heard }[3]-11: 7$ | $120: 24,131: 2$ | identified [1] - 56:10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 62: 19,75: 24,76: 7, \\ & 77: 10,77: 18,78: 5 \end{aligned}$ | 114:11, 124:12 | 119:21, 126:25 | 132:16 | identify [4] - 20:9, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 78: 10,78: 16,79: 3, \\ & 94: 5,94: 15,94: 23 \end{aligned}$ | guidance [1] - 22:13 | Hearing [1] - 6:9 | Hold [3] - 93:2, 95:1, |  |
|  | guy [2] - 74:25, $75: 1$ | hearing [9]-11: | 120:2 | 102:23 |
| 95:11, 95:15, | guys [5] - 9:17 | 11:17, 11:22 | holding [1] - 17:17 | idling [3] - 86:15 |
| 99:25, 100:2, | 62:18, 109:3, | :23, 56:11, 81:9, | holes [1] - 113:23 | $\text { 86:23, } 128: 6$ |
| 100:5, 100:12,100:17, 100:24, | 121:14, 132:21 | :23, 115:14, | holiday [4] - 89:21, | illegal [1] - 91: |
|  |  |  | 108:23, 114:21, $114: 23$ | illustrate [1] - 96:1 |
| $105: 23,106: 3$,$112: 14,115: 13$,$116: 2,116: 8$ |  |  |  | image [1] - 35:15 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { HALARI }[39]-4: 5, \\ & 20: 15,20: 20,21: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { heavy }[3]-89: 15, \\ 90: 5,91: 17 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { home [1] - 113:19 } \\ \text { homes [4] - 118:18, } \\ \text { 118:24, 120:14 } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { imagine }[2]-57: 18, \\ & 108: 21 \end{aligned}$ |


| immediate [2] - | intact [1] - 50:4 | 110:14, 111:12 | key [2] - 33:13, 39:18 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89:13, 125:24 | intended [6]-57:11, | Jan [1] - 4:2 | killed [1] - 108:1 | lack [1] - 83:13 |
| impact [8] - 43:18, 80:23, 83:1, 105: | 4, 76:6, 76:9 | jan [1] - 110 | kind [12] - 16:6 | ladder [2] - 30:3, 30:7 |
| $22: 16,125: 25$ | int | $37: 13,41: 5,89: 11$ | $91: 13,94: 6,98: 3$ | Lamb [1] - 133: |
| 128:2, 132:14 | intensity [1] - 40:5 | January/February [1] | 108:5, 118:2 | Lambs [1] - 133:20 |
| impacted [1] - 45:19 | intent [9]-31:23 | - 45:8 | 122:21 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { land [10] - } 34: 15, \\ & 36: 17,37: 1,38: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| impacting [1] - | 51:8, 54:1, 54:14 | Jen [5] - 47:3, 58:19, | $127: 1$ kinds | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 17,37: 1,38: 20 \\ & 39: 5,39: 14,51: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| impacts [1] - 113:24 | 54:24, 61:25 | 16:22 | kit [1] - 84:13 | 51:9, 51:10, 126:24 |
| importance [3] | 122:12 | JENNIFER [1] - 2:18 | known [1] - 102:1 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Land }[5]-14: 9 \\ & 38: 24,39: 1,51: 25 \end{aligned}$ |
| 20, 104:8, 105:9 | interchange | JERSEY [2] - 1: | knows [2] - 131:19 | 38:24, 39:1, 51:25 |
| important [6]-59:15, | 40:4, 40:18 | 1:13 | KWAAK ${ }_{[130]}-2: 2$ | landmark [1] - 103:24 |
| 82:4, 87:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { interest [2] - 38:3 } \\ & 115: 24 \end{aligned}$ | Jersey [10] - 1:24, | 6:3, 6:25, 10:3, | landscape [1] - 55:3 |
| 103:20 | interested [2] - 41:2 | $04: 17,104: 21$ | $10: 23,11: 1,11: 10$ | landscaping [6] - 9:3, |
| impossible [2] - | 136:17 | 2:4, 129:23 | 11:14, 11:19 | $14: 1,54: 20,58: 25$ |
| 54:17, 109:2 | interesting [1] - 53:2 | 36:5, 136:2 | 12:15, 12:18 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 83:11, 83:18 } \\ \text { I ane - } 133 \cdot 8 \end{gathered}$ |
| improve [1] - 24:18 | internal [3]-30:11 | Jersey's [1] - 104:14 | 12:21, 12:24, 13:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Lane [2] - 133:8, } \\ & \text { 133:20 } \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { improvements }[1] \text { - } \\ & 82: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 52:23, 64:16 | jgiunco@ghclaw. com [1] - 3:5 | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 8,14: 6,14: 20 \\ & 14: 24,15: 2,15: 5 \end{aligned}$ | lane [15] - 35:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { inappropriate }{ }_{[1]} \text { - } \\ & \text { 105:5 } \end{aligned}$ | 126:2 | $\operatorname{Jim}[1]-131: 1$ | 15:8, 15:15, 19:21, | 35:11, 35:13, |
|  | interrupt [1] - 9:12 | job [1] - 115: | 23:9, 23:16, 24:21, | $35: 16,36: 8,36: 12,$ |
| Inc [1]-2:18 | intersection [5] | jog [1] - 99:7 | 24:24, 25:22, 26:1, | $16,36: 19,$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \text { inch [12] - } 8: 21, \\ 13: 24,13: 25, \end{array}$ | $43: 19,44: 25,$ | JOHN [8] - 2:4, 3:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 26:4, 26:7, 26:10, } \\ & 26: 11,26: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $36: 21,36: 25,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 13:24, 13:25, } \\ & 64: 19,64: 20,66: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $45: 20,84: 10,91: 12$ | $4: 8,32: 13,32: 16$ | 26:16, 26:18, | 69:20, 90:21, 90:23 |
| 64:19, 64:20, 66:4, 66:5, 66:12, 68:20, 68:21, 69:22, 73:9 | $104: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:15, 112:1 } \\ & 112: 20 \end{aligned}$ | 26:20, 29:22, 32:2, | lanes [3]-36:7, |
|  | investigate [1] - 95:9 | John [15] - 26:18, | 32:5, 32:9, 46:25, | 84:12, 90:14 <br> language [1] - 40:10 |
| inches [1] - 65:13 | investigated | :25, 32:6, 32:8, | 47:3, 47:5, 47:8 | large [8]-28:21, |
| include [7]-56:25, | 99:15, 111:15 | 32:20, 47:15, | $47: 9,47: 11,47: 13$ | $30: 20,58: 23$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 76: 6,77: 12,82: 9 \\ & 85: 16,103: 7,105: 2 \end{aligned}$ | investigation [1] - 83:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 13,66: 7,66: 18, \\ & 95: 12,100: 1, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47: 15,47: 17, \\ & 47: 20,47: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { 81:20, 82:9, } 87:$ |
| included [3] - 34:2,$41: 7,62 \cdot 11$ | irrelev | $: 14,112: 18$ | 48:10, 48:13, | 105:2, 107:4 |
|  | issue [6] - 46:3 | 116:6, 125:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 16,48: 20, \\ & 49: 15,49: 24,50: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { larger [4] - 28:8, } \\ & 52: 14,68: 9,104: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { includes [2] - 75:13, } \\ & 81: 10 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 21,84: 25,86: 7 \\ & 107: 17,115: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Johnson }[3]-4: 7, \\ & 4: 17,80: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 15,49: 24,50: 5 \\ & 55: 24,56: 3,58: 13 \end{aligned}$ | largest [6] - 81:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { including }[2]-41: 21 \text {, } \\ & 75: 22 \end{aligned}$ | issues [1] - 86:1 | joy [1] - 87:1 | 58:15, 58:19, | $2: 2,82: 6,82: 1$ |
|  | ITE [4]-38:17, 38:20, | July [1] - 89:2 | 63:22, 63:24, 64:2, |  |
| incorrect [1] - 107:14 | 41:16, 43:4 | jump [1] - 10:3 | 64:3, 64:21, 65:8, | 7:13, 10:6, 11:21 |
| increase [1] - 70:8 | item [2]-33:18 | June [3]-82:1, 90:1, | $65: 19,66: 9,66: 13$ | $12: 14,25: 14$ |
| Independence [1] 104:10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { items [2] - 16:23, } \\ & 33: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 103: } \\ & \text { jurisd } \end{aligned}$ | $66: 16,66: 18$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 14,32: 20 \\ & 33: 15,34: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| indicated [5] - | itself [2] - 59:7, 98:9 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 112:21, 114:17 } \\ & 127: 1,127: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $74: 18,74: 23,75: 1$ | $34: 18,35: 8,37: 24$ |
| 38:2, 39:24, 43:9, | J | jurisdictionally [1] - | $3,79: 1,79$ | $43: 10,46: 8,54: 7$ |
| individual [2] - 67:16, | J |  | $\text { 80:17, 88:1, } 92: 6$ | 56:11, 59:17, 66:1, |
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