

BOROUGH OF ALPHA LAND USE BOARD -

March 20, 2024 Regular Meeting

Municipal Building 1001 East Blvd., Alpha, New Jersey

The regular meeting of the Borough of Alpha Land Use Board was called to order at 7:01 p.m.,
by Attorney Chairman Dragotta

NOTICE

Pursuant to the Open Public Meeting Act, Chapter 231, P.L. 1975, adequate notice of this meeting has been provided by mail to the Star Ledger and the Hunterdon County Democrat; a notice of this meeting and all other regular meeting of the Land Use Board of the Borough of Alpha, which notice sets forth the time, date and location of this meeting by posting said notice on the bulletin board outside the municipal clerk's office.

Roll Call:

Present: Mr. Boyle, Mr. Dragotta, Mayor Schocko, Ms. Schocko, Mr. Schwar, Mr. Seiss, and Mr. Szanati
Absent: Mr. Castro, Ms. Dalrymple, and Mr. Gable.

Approval of Minutes:

Motion made by Mr. Schwar to approve the regular meeting minutes of 2/21/24. Motion seconded by Mr. Boyle. Roll Call: Ayes: Mr. Boyle, Mr. Dragotta, Mayor Schocko, and Ms. Schocko, Mr. Schwar, Mr. Szanati, and Mr. Seiss. Nays: None. Absent: Mr. Castro, and Ms. Dalrymple, and Mr. Gable.

Amended Preliminary, and Final Site Plan, Completeness and Public Hearing-The Cubes at Alpha Block 98, Lot 1.

Please see the transcription completed by Renzi Legal Resources attached hereto.

Old Business:

New Business:

There was no public comment at this time.

The next meeting is 6/19/24.

Adjourn:

There being no other business on the agenda, Mr. Boyle moved to adjourn the meeting at 9:56 PM. Ms. Schocko seconded the motion. The motion carried unanimously,

Respectfully submitted,

Donna L. Messina,

Land Use Board Secretary

Approved: __/__/__

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

BOROUGH OF ALPHA
LAND USE BOARD

VIDEO RECORDING

Item #4 on the Agenda

Date: Wednesday, March 20, 2024

RENZI LEGAL RESOURCES
Court Reporting, Videography & Legal Services
2277 STATE HIGHWAY #33, SUITE 410
HAMILTON SQUARE, NEW JERSEY 08690
TEL: (609) 989-9199 TOLL FREE: (800) 368-7652
www.RLResources.com No. 430771

2

1

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT:

2

3

CHRIS DRAGOTTA, Chair

4

THOMAS SEISS, Vice Chair

5

JOSEPH SCHOCKO, Mayor

6

RENEE SCHOCKO

7

MIKE SCHWAR

8

GENE BOYLE

9

SZANATI

10

DONNA L. MESSINA, Secretary

11

12

PUBLIC AND OTHER MEMBERS PRESENT

13

14

TIM O'BRIEN, Municipal Engineer

15

KEITH OTTES, Witness

16

RYAN PARISI, Witness

17

STEVE DRAGOTTA, Fire Chief

18

CRAIG DUNWELL

19

MAUREEN PERTTI

20

MONICA LARSEN-KILEY

21

BARBARA MERRITT

22

PATRICIA HAWK

23

FEMALE VOICE 1

24

FEMALE VOICE 2

25

4

1

APPEARANCES:

2

3

STEVENS & LEE'S

4

BY: CHRISTOPHER K. COSTA, ESQ.

5

3812 Mercerville Quakerbridge Rd

6

Trenton, New Jersey 08619

7

Tel: (609) 987-6653

8

E-mail: christopher.costa@stevenslee.com

9

Attorney for the Applicant

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

4

1

EXHIBITS

2

3

ID

DESCRIPTION

PAGE

4

A1

Aerial map of site

47

5

A3

Zoomed in version of Exhibit A1

51

6

A4

Lighting plan

119

7

A5

Blowup of the proposed fixtures

123

8

A6

Landscape plan

98

9

A7

Sightline rendering

133

10

A9

Packets of exhibits

46

11

B1

O'Brien's March 14th, 2024 report

119

12

(RETAINED BY COUNSEL)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

5

1

CHAIR: Pursuant to the Open Public

2

Meeting Act, Chapter 231, P.L. 1975, adequate notice of

3

this meeting has been provided by mail to the Star

4

Ledger and the Hunterdon County Democrat, a notice of

5

this meeting and all other regular meetings of the Land

6

Use Board of the Borough of Alpha, which notice sets

7

forth the time, date, and location of this meeting by

8

posting said notice on the bulletin board outside the

9

municipal clerk's office.

10

Could I have a roll call, please?

11

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Boyle.

12

MR. GENE BOYLE: Present.

13

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Castro. Ms.

14

Dalrymple. Mr. Dragotta.

15

CHAIR: Here.

16

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Gable. Mayor Schocko.

17

MAYOR JOSEPH SCHOCKO: Here.

18

THE SECRETARY: Ms. Schocko.

19

MS. RENEE SCHOCKO: Here.

20

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Schwar.

21

MR. MIKE SCHWAR: Here.

22

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Szanati.

23

MR. SZANATI: Here.

24

THE SECRETARY: Mr. Seiss.

25

VICE CHAIR: Here.

<p style="text-align: right;">6</p> <p>1 CHAIR: Thank you. We'd like to open with</p> <p>2 approval of regular meeting minutes of February 21st,</p> <p>3 2024.</p> <p>4 MR. SCHWAR: I move the motion.</p> <p>5 MR. BOYLE: So moved.</p> <p>6 CHAIR: Motion by Mr. Schwar --</p> <p>7 MR. SCHWAR: Okay.</p> <p>8 CHAIR: -- seconded by Mr. Boyle to</p> <p>9 approve the regular meeting minutes of February 21st,</p> <p>10 2024. Roll call?</p> <p>11 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Boyle.</p> <p>12 MR. BOYLE: Yes.</p> <p>13 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Dragotta.</p> <p>14 CHAIR: Yes.</p> <p>15 THE SECRETARY: Mayor Schocko.</p> <p>16 MAYOR SCHOCKO: Yes.</p> <p>17 THE SECRETARY: Ms. Schocko.</p> <p>18 MS. SCHOCKO: Yes.</p> <p>19 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Schwar.</p> <p>20 MR. SCHWAR: Yes.</p> <p>21 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Szanati.</p> <p>22 MR. SZANATI: Yes.</p> <p>23 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Seiss.</p> <p>24 VICE CHAIR: Yes.</p> <p>25 CHAIR: Thank you. Next, the --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">8</p> <p>1 history. We are seeking to have amended preliminary</p> <p>2 site plan approval of preliminary approval that was</p> <p>3 already put in place, and final approval. This will be</p> <p>4 the first application for final approval on this</p> <p>5 property.</p> <p>6 It is a two-warehouse facility. One of</p> <p>7 the warehouses will be 270,900 square feet, and the</p> <p>8 other is supposed to be 305,000 square feet, for a</p> <p>9 total of 575,900 square feet of warehouse space on this</p> <p>10 -- on this parcel. We are going to be, as the</p> <p>11 applicant, undertaking, as part of this project, an</p> <p>12 extension of Industrial Drive so that it extends to</p> <p>13 reach this parcel. This extension is being addressed</p> <p>14 as part of a developers agreement that we're working</p> <p>15 through with the Borough and the Borough attorney, but</p> <p>16 it's critical for this -- this application in terms of</p> <p>17 this board knowing that there will be access to this</p> <p>18 site.</p> <p>19 Procedurally, this application was first</p> <p>20 applied for in 2019. That's why this actually has a</p> <p>21 2019 case number. At that time, there was an</p> <p>22 application for preliminary and final approval. The</p> <p>23 final approval portion was withdrawn, and the applicant</p> <p>24 was granted preliminary approval, and they were granted</p> <p>25 that by Resolution 2020-06 on February 19, 2020.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">7</p> <p>1 MR. SCHWAR: Mr. Chairman, under the advice</p> <p>2 of counsel, I will be recusing myself because I did</p> <p>3 receive a 200-foot notice, so I'm just going to be</p> <p>4 moving down to the audience.</p> <p>5 CHAIR: No problem.</p> <p>6 MR. SCHWAR: Thank you.</p> <p>7 CHAIR: Thank you. Okay. We will -- the</p> <p>8 next thing on the agenda is the amended preliminary</p> <p>9 final site plan completeness and public hearing, The</p> <p>10 Cubes at Alpha Block 98 Lot 1, Alpha Industrial Owner,</p> <p>11 LLC.</p> <p>12 MR. CHRISTOPHER COSTA: Thank you and good</p> <p>13 evening, everyone. My name is Christopher Costa from</p> <p>14 the law firm of Stevens & Lee. I represent the</p> <p>15 applicant, Alpha Industrial Owner, LLC. They are the</p> <p>16 contract purchaser of the property in question.</p> <p>17 The property has the unusual address of 0</p> <p>18 Standard Street. It's Block 98, Lot 1 on the Borough</p> <p>19 map, and it's approximately 37 acres. It is in the I-</p> <p>20 Zone. This evening we hope to accomplish two things.</p> <p>21 One is to be deemed complete, and if we are deemed</p> <p>22 complete we hope to begin our testimony in the hearing.</p> <p>23 So that's our goal this evening. So the</p> <p>24 first step in this process is the completeness portion.</p> <p>25 By way of background, this application has a -- a long</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">9</p> <p>1 They then brought another application in</p> <p>2 2021 for a couple of reasons. One reason was that the</p> <p>3 Borough increased their height regulation for</p> <p>4 warehouses. It was previously at 35 feet, and the</p> <p>5 standard with these cube warehouses is basically you</p> <p>6 need 40-foot clear so that the new -- the new height</p> <p>7 became 43-feet in the township. So the applicant for</p> <p>8 good reason took advantage of that change to increase</p> <p>9 the height of the warehouse, and also they found that</p> <p>10 there was a slight miscalculation on the amount of</p> <p>11 impervious coverage that they applied for.</p> <p>12 It was --they had applied for 35.6</p> <p>13 percent, and they actually needed 35.63 percent. That</p> <p>14 is not a lot, but they -- they needed that little bit</p> <p>15 more. So they did receive that approval for those two</p> <p>16 changes and some other minor adjustments to the plans</p> <p>17 on July 21st 2021 with Resolution 221-06. So with the</p> <p>18 application this evening, if you were to look at the</p> <p>19 plan side by side, they would look extremely similar to</p> <p>20 what was proposed back in 2020 and 2021. We're going</p> <p>21 to go through the specific differences, and we're</p> <p>22 seeking to take the final step, which is to actually</p> <p>23 get the final approval and deal with the details that -</p> <p>24 - that were not addressed before.</p> <p>25 And just by way of background, the primary</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">10</p> <p>1 reason for the delay in this process was between 2 Industrial Drive and our property is an easement for 3 New Jersey Transit for a train line that, you know, is 4 inconceivable. It would be built, but New Jersey 5 Transit carefully protects all of their train lines, 6 whether they're built or not. So we have been 7 negotiating. And I shouldn't say, we, as much, as the 8 current owner of the property has been negotiating 9 extensively, and as part of this application we -- we 10 presented the final agreement with New Jersey Transit. 11 We probably should have gilded it because 12 it was such an accomplishment to get it, but we finally 13 -- we finally got an agreement that was -- that was 14 workable with New Jersey Transit. So that -- that has 15 allowed this project to move forward. 16 So with that background, we've gotten two 17 letters from your engineer. One on February 21st, 18 addressing completeness, and which we responded to on 19 May 7th -- on March 7th, sorry, and then we got a 20 second letter from Mr. O'Brien on March 14th in which 21 he addressed the items, you know, that we had then 22 included, and brought up, kind of, his technical review 23 of the application. And we are seeking -- I think we 24 satisfied most of the completeness criteria, and we're 25 seeking waivers in certain areas.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">12</p> <p>1 So there's a couple waivers that we're 2 asking for that pertain to those two areas, and I just 3 wanted to touch on those. Beyond that, we have 4 basically waivers that I want to touch on in three 5 categories. One is from the general submission 6 checklist. 7 MR. GRUENBERG: You know, it might be -- 8 MR. COSTA: Yeah. 9 MR. GRUENBERG: -- a good idea to go 10 through Mr. O'Brien's March 14th, 2024 report and take 11 them in the order as they're presented, that he 12 presents us items that need to be addressed by the 13 Board. Because there are certain things that he -- in 14 his updated report has now indicated there need a 15 complete -- 16 MR. COSTA: Yep. 17 MR. GRUENBERG: -- or that either support 18 a waiver from being -- purposes being granted for 19 completeness purposes only. But maybe rather than 20 taking them piecemeal, in general terms, we can go 21 through the report. 22 MR. COSTA: Yes, I will do that. Let me 23 just -- 24 MR. TIM O'BRIEN: Well, I think one of the 25 preliminary things that we're going to want to talk</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">11</p> <p>1 A couple of areas that I just wanted to 2 touch on pertain to stormwater and traffic. And in 3 terms of stormwater, we presented full stormwater 4 results for our application. And what we're doing is 5 we're seeking an exemption to be -- have the 2021 6 rules, the pre-March 2021 rules, applied to our 7 application which is permitted under New Jersey law, 8 rather than the new stormwater regulations. And in 9 order to do that, we needed to not only provide our own 10 stormwater calculations, we need to provide certain 11 corrections to the prior applications corrections. 12 And we're still in the process of 13 providing that to your engineer. So that's the reason 14 why he has asked to have stormwater pushed off to a 15 later hearing date, and we're seeking a waiver so we 16 can move forward and we can submit those stormwater 17 details to Mr. O'Brien. 18 The other issue is traffic. We submitted 19 a 2022 traffic report which was responsive to the 2021 20 approval, and Mr. O'Brien has asked that we update that 21 report. And we have our traffic engineer here tonight. 22 He has done his work. We -- it has not become a report 23 yet, but the results are virtually the same. But once 24 we have the report and we give it to the Board and its 25 professionals, we can -- we can go into that.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">13</p> <p>1 about first is the classification of the application in 2 terms of the proposed extensions. We're dealing with 3 this request per clarifications. 4 MR. COSTA: Which point are you referring 5 to there? 6 MR. O'BRIEN: Point 2, Paragraph 2, on 7 Page 3 of 40. You can interrupt me if you can, but 8 it's Paragraph 2.3, I think. 9 MR. COSTA: Right. Okay. So this was 10 something that I believe we resolved successfully with 11 Mr. O'Brien in that we initially created a notice list 12 that was based upon our property that we're -- we're 13 proposing to develop, and that included a notice list 14 within Alpha and also a notice list within pohacom 15 (ph) because it's within 200 feet. 16 Mr. O'Brien brought up the good point that 17 we are also impacting Industrial Drive, and that we're 18 completing work on Industrial Drive, and we're making 19 an alternate connection to 7th Avenue, which is going 20 to be a, you know, a locked connection and a paver 21 connection. It's not going to be essentially used, but 22 it is an impact. So we were asked to extend the notice 23 list to include those additional properties, and we did 24 do that. 25 So we have -- I have -- you know, it's</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">14</p> <p>1 almost like I have a city notice list. You know, just 2 have a big notice list. So that -- that's -- I think 3 that was addressed successfully. 4 CHAIR: Any questions on that? 5 MR. O'BRIEN: I don't. 6 MR. GRUENBERG: And assuming the 7 application is deemed complete if the Board goes that 8 way, we've reviewed the proof of service and 9 publication of the notice of hearing, including the 10 expanded certified property owners list, and we would 11 find that the Board would have jurisdiction to proceed 12 if you deem the application complete. 13 MR. COSTA: Thank you. Looking at number 14 -- following the letter, looking at Number 3. The 15 reason we submitted the roadway extension plans was, 16 again, is we submitted them to the Borough 17 simultaneously, so it's really being reviewed more by 18 the governing body, but we submitted to this board 19 because we wanted to show proof that there was a 20 connection to this property, or there would be a 21 connection to this property because that was something 22 that was noted very extensively in the prior 23 applications that that had not been clarified. 24 So that's the reason for those plans. 25 Those plans are -- they're given for informational</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">16</p> <p>1 discussed. So you stop me. Everything else is 2 complete up until Number 8, plan size. A waiver has 3 been requested and your office has no objection to the 4 request, correct? 5 MR. COSTA: Correct. 6 MR. GRUENBERG: Moving on to the 7 preliminary site plan checklist, everything is complete 8 up until 3B, where a waiver has been requested about 9 the Warren County Planning Department submission. You 10 actually have submitted to the Warren County Planning 11 Board, but I understand that application has been 12 deemed incomplete. 13 MR. COSTA: As of today, yes. 14 MR. GRUENBERG: So -- 15 MR. COSTA: And, yeah, the reason it is -- 16 has been deemed incomplete, this has been a -- this 17 would be -- we -- the prior applicant was granted 18 preliminary approval -- or conditional approval waiting 19 for final stormwater, and since that time of approval, 20 we have been extending, extending, extending it to -- 21 to this time. 22 And once we -- we formally provided this 23 application to this board, we also submitted to Warren 24 County, and they had -- they said the same thing to us, 25 we need stormwater, and that's what the incomplete</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">15</p> <p>1 purposes rather than for review by this board because 2 they're outside of this property that's being developed 3 directly. So that's that. 4 63: So all other items have been addressed in that 5 paragraph and you can go to the completeness review? 6 MR. COSTA: Yes. 7 MR. GRUENBERG: Is that correct? 8 MR. COSTA: Okay. 9 MR. GRUENBERG: So if you want to go to 10 Page 4, and you're asking for a waiver for completeness 11 purposes only as to checklist Item 20 -- 57-12 because 12 you're asking for waivers, is essentially what it 13 means? 14 MR. COSTA: Correct. Correct. 15 MR. GRUENBERG: And fees and escrow 16 deposits have that been confirmed? 17 MR. SZANATI: Okay. But, Donna, you 18 received the fees. 19 MR. COSTA: Okay. Yeah. 20 MR. GRUENBERG: So that would be complete. 21 The notice of hearing in Paragraph 3, we just 22 addressed, and that is complete. 23 MR. COSTA: Correct. 24 MR. GRUENBERG: I'm going to go through 25 every -- down to where I think a waiver needs to be</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">17</p> <p>1 letter said at this point. So there's not really a 2 feasible way for us to get Warren County completed 3 until we get this board's approval. So we're -- 4 MR. O'BRIEN: The checklist requirement is 5 that the applicant shall apply to the Warren County 6 Planning Board concurrent with the application to the 7 Borough. 8 MR. COSTA: We -- 9 MR. O'BRIEN: So I think they've 10 established that they have applied to the Warren County 11 Planning Board, and the Board can find that that has 12 been complete. Moving on to the will serve letter from 13 the town of Phillipsburg, and that's Item Number 5 in - 14 - 15 MR. COSTA: Yep. 16 MR. O'BRIEN: -- this report. 17 MR. COSTA: And that -- that is -- 18 MR. O'BRIEN: That matter, that's been 19 indicated to be incomplete. 20 MR. COSTA: Yes, that is pending. We -- 21 we -- we were initially granted a will serve letter 22 through Alpha to go -- or, you know, for the sewage to 23 go towards Industrial Drive. There was a change in 24 plan that was, you know, requested by both the 25 applicant and the Borough, and so that required us to</p>

18

1 apply to Phillipsburg.
 2 Alpha has given us an updated will serve
 3 letter, and we need approval from Phillipsburg.
 4 Fortunately with a warehouse, the
 5 sewage capacity is -- is almost a non-issue because of
 6 the limited use.
 7 MR. GRUENBERG: So are you asking --
 8 MR. COSTA: We are asking --
 9 MR. GRUENBERG: -- for a waiver for
 10 completeness purposes only?
 11 MR. COSTA: Yes.
 12 MR. GRUENBERG: This is one where I think
 13 the Board can entertain the request for a waiver for
 14 completeness purposes only. However, whether you can
 15 condition an approval without having that proof of
 16 sewer capacity, that is an issue that would have to be
 17 addressed at the public hearing.
 18 So I don't know if Tim has any comment on
 19 it. I would have no objection to a waiver for
 20 completeness purposes only as to that item, but I don't
 21 think you could entertain a vote without further
 22 information from the -- from the applicant.
 23 MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah, I would agree with
 24 that.
 25 MR. O'BRIEN: I'm in agreement also.

19

1 MR. COSTA: All right. And, you know,
 2 resolving that issue is the fact that we need to come
 3 back to this board to address the additional traffic
 4 and stormwater issues.
 5 So we know that we're going to have to
 6 come for another hearing, so we expect to have the will
 7 serve letter by that time.
 8 MR. GRUENBERG: Number 6, assuming -- if
 9 anybody has a problem or a question about anything,
 10 we're trying to move it along, but please let me know
 11 if you have an objection or anything to any of these
 12 items that we're discussing
 13 6B, I'm not sure whether that's complete
 14 or not, the JCP & L will serve.
 15 MR. O'BRIEN: Did we get that? I'm
 16 looking for the engineers. I think we're --
 17 MR. COSTA: Yeah, we're still waiting for
 18 that, and we expect to have that.
 19 MR. GRUENBERG: And so that's a waiver for
 20 --
 21 MR. COSTA: Correct.
 22 MR. GRUENBERG: -- completeness purposes
 23 only?
 24 MR. COSTA: Correct.
 25 MR. GRUENBERG: That might be something

20

1 that you need prior to a vote from the Board.
 2 MR. COSTA: That we can -- we will --
 3 we'll -- we expect to have it, and if -- if we don't,
 4 we'll address that as well.
 5 MR. GRUENBERG: Seven all deals with the
 6 stormwater to which you're asking a waiver for
 7 completeness purposes only, and understand that the
 8 Board would need that information before they act on
 9 this application.
 10 MR. COSTA: Correct. Eight is also
 11 stormwater.
 12 MR. GRUENBERG: Nine is -- is that the
 13 traffic?
 14 MR. O'BRIEN: Traffic, correct.
 15 MR. COSTA: Traffic, yeah.
 16 MR. GRUENBERG: The counsel has already
 17 indicated his request for that information to be --
 18 that report to be provided at a later time and proceed
 19 to public hearing, but not on those issues, presumably.
 20 I guess we're going to have to come back. The next one
 21 is 10.
 22 MR. O'BRIEN: Yes, they requested a waiver
 23 from providing existing and proposed right of way
 24 easements and encumbrances. I'm just recommending that
 25 it be considered a temporary waiver until we flush out

21

1 the rest of the application details as part of the
 2 public hearing.
 3 MR. COSTA: And that's fine. Yeah, I
 4 mean, we believe we have that information, but, yeah,
 5 it makes sense to wait until we -- we do our testimony
 6 and hear feedback.
 7 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. 11 is the waiver
 8 request for a road way extension information. Can I --
 9 can I pause for a second?
 10 CHAIR: Sure.
 11 MR. GRUENBERG: I mean, I'm not an
 12 engineer, of course, or anything, but the location,
 13 size, and nature of all existing and proposed rights of
 14 way, easements, other encumbrances, wouldn't we wanna
 15 have some of like -- is it a big deal to skip that at
 16 this point? Just pending, obviously, just the
 17 completeness aspect of it.
 18 But it just seems to me like it would be
 19 something that would probably need to be fleshed out.
 20 MR. O'BRIEN: They presented all their
 21 existing easements, all the -- prior to a assigned
 22 sealed survey, and they provided deeds and weighted
 23 back up. It's potential depending on the feedback on
 24 the technical letter that new easements may be
 25 generated.

<p style="text-align: right;">22</p> <p>1 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay.</p> <p>2 MR. O'BRIEN: Which are not shown on the</p> <p>3 documents, and because the comment indicates existing</p> <p>4 and proposed.</p> <p>5 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. All right. So we</p> <p>6 have existing, like we have all that.</p> <p>7 MR. O'BRIEN: We have existing, they --</p> <p>8 and they provided a signed and sealed survey that</p> <p>9 attest to the boundaries provided, and they provided</p> <p>10 all the deeds and background on the easements and the</p> <p>11 status of the easements.</p> <p>12 MR. GRUENBERG: All right. That -- that</p> <p>13 makes more sense.</p> <p>14 MR. COSTA: It's proposed only.</p> <p>15 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. That was a good</p> <p>16 question. 11 is --</p> <p>17 MR. O'BRIEN: 11 has to do with plans and</p> <p>18 profiles streets adjoining the property for a distance</p> <p>19 of 500 feet, either direction, including the location</p> <p>20 of driveways, intersecting streets, indication of the</p> <p>21 maximum value site distance.</p> <p>22 They requested a waiver from this item as</p> <p>23 part of the Industrial Drive is a part of a developer -</p> <p>24 - potential developer's agreement between the Borough,</p> <p>25 covering body, and themselves, but some of that</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">24</p> <p>1 for the Board. So for this item, it would potentially</p> <p>2 be a temporary waiver until we get through the public</p> <p>3 hearing.</p> <p>4 MR. COSTA: Get through the public</p> <p>5 hearing?</p> <p>6 MR. O'BRIEN: Or like as part of the</p> <p>7 public hearing, they have to address comments that are</p> <p>8 provided with technical letter.</p> <p>9 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay.</p> <p>10 MR. O'BRIEN: Related to the plan and</p> <p>11 profiles.</p> <p>12 MR. GRUENBERG: Are there any plans and</p> <p>13 profiles and location of driveways and intersecting</p> <p>14 streets, any maximum available site distance? Is that</p> <p>15 information that you have been provided enough</p> <p>16 information for upon which the Board can effectively</p> <p>17 weigh this application, or is that something that they</p> <p>18 need to see and you need to see before they present</p> <p>19 testimony on that?</p> <p>20 MR. O'BRIEN: They have -- I have</p> <p>21 sufficient information to review for the Board to</p> <p>22 understand.</p> <p>23 MR. GRUENBERG: So if the -- if you're --</p> <p>24 if the Board's okay with the completeness only on that</p> <p>25 matter as well.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">23</p> <p>1 information does impact the Board's understanding of</p> <p>2 the impact.</p> <p>3 So they're seeking a relief to -- relief</p> <p>4 from the requirements beyond what they've already</p> <p>5 provided in the plans.</p> <p>6 MR. GRUENBERG: The -- part of the Board's</p> <p>7 review on this application is to ensure that there's</p> <p>8 appropriate ingress and egress to the site. Those are</p> <p>9 site plan issues in terms of the site access itself,</p> <p>10 not necessarily roadways throughout the Borough, and</p> <p>11 I've talked about that before, but ingress and egress</p> <p>12 to the site, whether it can be done safely.</p> <p>13 Those are appropriate considerations for</p> <p>14 the Board. I don't know to what extent Mr. O'Brien has</p> <p>15 been provided enough information on that issue, and</p> <p>16 whether that falls within this category.</p> <p>17 MR. O'BRIEN: So we ask that they should</p> <p>18 provide testimony to ensure basically the Board's</p> <p>19 review for site access as Steve described, and</p> <p>20 clarifications if it's intended for the Board or the</p> <p>21 Borough to review and approve the road extension.</p> <p>22 They did provide some clarification</p> <p>23 already in their opening that they're more providing it</p> <p>24 for the Board's information. I did provide some</p> <p>25 technical comments on the road design for information</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">25</p> <p>1 CHAIR: I'm fine with that. As long as</p> <p>2 Tim is -- has sufficient things to review, I have no</p> <p>3 problem with that. I mean, it seems to me that that's</p> <p>4 reasonable for completeness.</p> <p>5 MR. GRUENBERG: You'll be discussing</p> <p>6 proposed staging as part of a completeness only. You</p> <p>7 don't have a staging plan that you provided.</p> <p>8 MR. COSTA: We can tell you there's --</p> <p>9 this is gonna be -- when we're approved, this will be</p> <p>10 built and there's not a staging process.</p> <p>11 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay.</p> <p>12 MR. COSTA: So there's not --</p> <p>13 MR. GRUENBERG: So it's not applicable, no</p> <p>14 staging.</p> <p>15 MR. COSTA: Right, not needed. There's no</p> <p>16 applicability to the staging question. This will not</p> <p>17 be a multi-phase development.</p> <p>18 MR. GRUENBERG: Number 13's complete, 14's</p> <p>19 complete 15's complete. 16 is the stormwater</p> <p>20 management plan. Again, that's a waiver for</p> <p>21 completeness purposes only. Moving to the site plan</p> <p>22 submission checklists. All of these are -- the waivers</p> <p>23 are pretty much, you can't give this information until</p> <p>24 such time as you have the preliminary approval.</p> <p>25 MR. COSTA: Correct.</p>

26

1 MR. GRUENBERG: So they're all waivers for
2 completeness purposes only --
3 MR. COSTA: Correct.
4 MR. GRUENBERG: -- except for Items 5, 6,
5 and 7 in the report, which are complete. Did I
6 oversimplify that?
7 MR. O'BRIEN: No, you're right. Your
8 statement's accurate.
9 MR. GRUENBERG: Anything else on the page
10 there?
11 MR. O'BRIEN: I do have a question on --
12 not to have to jump all the way back to Page 3, but
13 Number 4, is that -- is that something that we need to
14 bring up now, or is that going to be part of a -- there
15 we go, New Jersey Transit. Does that aspect need to be
16 addressed now, or is that going to be part of the
17 hearing?
18 MR. GRUENBERG: I think that's part of the
19 hearing. It's not a checklist item.
20 MR. O'BRIEN: Okay. I just -- it was on
21 the page, so I just -- yeah, noted it.
22 MR. GRUENBERG: Anything else on the final
23 checklist that needs to be discussed?
24 MR. O'BRIEN: The cost testimony would be
25 my recommendation. That's -- it's a temporary waiver

27

1 subject to any action taken by the Board as a result of
2 a public hearing. Typically, an estimate is provided
3 at the end of the job.
4 MR. GRUENBERG: Number 16, copies of all
5 applicable local, state, and federal permits that may
6 be required.
7 MR. COSTA: Yeah, I can -- I can -- I can
8 discuss those. I mean, I think that is -- you know, if
9 you go to the end of Tim's letter, he gives a list of
10 potential, yeah, state and local agencies, and we've
11 talked about several of them already. We have the
12 county, we have New Jersey Transit, which we've already
13 submitted the lease for New Jersey Transit. New Jersey
14 DOT, it's not an issue in this application. The DEP, I
15 don't think we need any DEP approval on this.
16 MR. O'BRIEN: No.
17 MR. COSTA: Not for this application.
18 Alpha Borough Fire Department, we contacted the fire
19 department. Go ahead.
20 MR. O'BRIEN: Do you -- do you have your
21 TWA?
22 MR. COSTA: Yeah.
23 MR. O'BRIEN: Your right, sorry.
24 MR. COSTA: Yeah.
25 MR. O'BRIEN: Correct.

28

1 MR. COSTA: And then borough -- we're
2 waiting for feedback from the fire department. If
3 there is any, the Warren County Soil Conservation, I
4 think we're waiting for a final statement from that.
5 MR. O'BRIEN: It's been submitted but
6 waiting for approval.
7 MR. COSTA: Right. And Highlands counsel,
8 just to address that comment, which is -- was brought
9 up later. We received a letter of no interest in March
10 17th, 2022, and we relied on this. However the Borough
11 in order to obtain sewer service for this property,
12 needed to put it into the Highlands Planning District.
13 So that made our letter, you know, not effective, and
14 meant that what we need to do is submit a narrative to
15 Highlands that shows we comply with their warehouse
16 standards, which we've already gone over and we do
17 comply with it.
18 We just need to submit that letter and get
19 their sign off on that. So that one is in the -- in
20 process, but we don't expect to have any issue with
21 that. We talked about the Phillipsburg sewer, and I
22 think that's -- yeah, we've already talked about, you
23 know, we already have the will serve for water and JCP
24 & L. The power we're waiting for. So I think that
25 covers the outside agencies.

29

1 MR. GRUENBERG: The only other checklist
2 item that I'm seeing, but you can correct me if I'm
3 wrong, is Number 13, the location of any other feature
4 directly on the property and beyond the property, if
5 such feature influences the use of said property.
6 MR. O'BRIEN: For that -- I addressed
7 that item. They did provide testimony earlier in the
8 introduction to indicate the transit property,
9 Industrial Drive, Standard Street, 7th Avenue, and
10 their potential sewer and water extension into the
11 site.
12 MR. GRUENBERG: Thank you. That's all
13 identified on the plans that have been submitted to
14 you?
15 MR. O'BRIEN: They are identified on the
16 plans. They just weren't originally part of the --
17 they were on the plans, but they weren't part of, like,
18 the 200-foot notice that -- 200-foot notification list.
19 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. So is there
20 anything else that -- a checklist item that the
21 applicant has to address?
22 MR. O'BRIEN: No.
23 MR. GRUENBERG: And I guess if the Board
24 was inclined to grant all those waivers for purposes of
25 completeness only, do you have any objection to the

<p style="text-align: right;">30</p> <p>1 Board finding the application complete?</p> <p>2 MR. O'BRIEN: I have no issue with that,</p> <p>3 actually.</p> <p>4 MR. GRUENBERG: Very good.</p> <p>5 CHAIR: Does anybody have any questions</p> <p>6 for anything to discuss? Go ahead, Mr. Seiss.</p> <p>7 VICE CHAIR: As far along as this has</p> <p>8 gone, in fact, I was here for the original, I'm</p> <p>9 surprised at the number of waivers they're looking for,</p> <p>10 for just the checklist. I mean, that is a lot of --</p> <p>11 and coming before us with all those, I'm just</p> <p>12 concerned.</p> <p>13 CHAIR: I mean, I do have that thought as</p> <p>14 well. It was something that I was going to look -- you</p> <p>15 know, discuss as well. So this applicant, what -- when</p> <p>16 you testified originally it was 2019.</p> <p>17 MR. COSTA: Mm-hm.</p> <p>18 CHAIR: And I understand that there's all</p> <p>19 of these changes and different things that occur, but I</p> <p>20 do -- and I understand you guys are coming back for</p> <p>21 your stormwater, and your traffic, and all of that, but</p> <p>22 I do kind of have the same bit of concern that Mr.</p> <p>23 Seiss does, that we are kind of deeming this complete</p> <p>24 without some of this. So --</p> <p>25 MR. COSTA: I guess what I -- what I would</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">32</p> <p>1 through those more individually, but that's -- you</p> <p>2 know, I do understand that impression because, you</p> <p>3 know, it's a long letter, but I do think if you take</p> <p>4 those items out, you know, it's a -- it's a very</p> <p>5 complete application packet that will give the Board</p> <p>6 the ability to fully review this.</p> <p>7 CHAIR: Does anybody have any thoughts? I</p> <p>8 mean, I've heard from you guys that -- our</p> <p>9 professionals as well, and you both seem like it's a</p> <p>10 reasonable thing to move along with completeness, even</p> <p>11 with a few of the stormwater, the traffic, and things</p> <p>12 like that being held.</p> <p>13 MR. GRUENBERG: I actually think that's a</p> <p>14 determination for the Board to make. Well, because --</p> <p>15 and I'm not taking a position, one way or the other,</p> <p>16 whether a waiver should be granted or not.</p> <p>17 CHAIR: Right.</p> <p>18 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah, I think you need to</p> <p>19 weigh your engineer's determination of whether he feels</p> <p>20 he has enough information to provide guidance to the</p> <p>21 Board over some of these issues, and whether the</p> <p>22 applicant's commitment to provide the additional</p> <p>23 information in order for them to start their public</p> <p>24 hearing, knowing that they're going to come back and</p> <p>25 present that information.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">31</p> <p>1 say to that, there are certain waiver items that we're</p> <p>2 seeking, so I acknowledge that. I would say that a lot</p> <p>3 of the waiver items on your final checklist list are</p> <p>4 inherently post-approval items. You know, there's no</p> <p>5 way we would have the engineering estimate, we -- no</p> <p>6 way we'd have the guarantees in places. A lot --</p> <p>7 there's a lot of bulk of these incomplete items that</p> <p>8 are not related to things that, you know, the applicant</p> <p>9 didn't do.</p> <p>10 What -- we've been communicating with Mr.</p> <p>11 O'Brien, and if we were to compare, you know, his</p> <p>12 initial letter to this letter, you'd see a -- you know,</p> <p>13 that we addressed most of the items. There were some</p> <p>14 items that are longer lead times, and they -- you know,</p> <p>15 because of the traffic, you know, report that needs to</p> <p>16 come in.</p> <p>17 And because of -- we've got a little bit</p> <p>18 of a different stormwater requirement, because we're</p> <p>19 seeking that waiver and we need to basically redo the</p> <p>20 data from 2019, so that creates a string of</p> <p>21 completeness items. So I would say if we -- if we</p> <p>22 eliminated those, I don't think the list is -- is</p> <p>23 daunting. I think that, you know, this application was</p> <p>24 put in with a great deal of detail and very carefully.</p> <p>25 So, you know, I can go -- I can kinda go</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">33</p> <p>1 It seems, I mean -- I made Mr. Costa go</p> <p>2 through each and every one of the items, but his -- his</p> <p>3 initial discussion over the main items is probably the</p> <p>4 appropriate discussion, which is stormwater --</p> <p>5 CHAIR: Uh-huh.</p> <p>6 MR. GRUENBERG: -- and traffic.</p> <p>7 CHAIR: Yeah, I agree. The rest of the</p> <p>8 little ones, I'm not (inaudible).</p> <p>9 MR. GRUENBERG: Right. So it really boils</p> <p>10 down to whether the Board feels comfortable in</p> <p>11 commencing a public hearing this evening, knowing that</p> <p>12 they're going to come back and provide that testimony,</p> <p>13 or whether you say, you know what? We really want a</p> <p>14 full complete application before we make the public</p> <p>15 come out and start testimony.</p> <p>16 And it's better to have everything in</p> <p>17 front of us all at once. And that's not for me to</p> <p>18 determine, that's for you as the Board to determine</p> <p>19 from your own standpoint whether you feel comfortable</p> <p>20 allowing a public hearing to commence.</p> <p>21 And we did notify the applicant. They did</p> <p>22 provide notice of hearing for this evening, but we</p> <p>23 notified the applicant that doing so was at their own</p> <p>24 risk, that the Board might find that the application is</p> <p>25 incomplete, and then if they did find that the</p>

34

1 application was incomplete, it's conceivable that they
 2 would have to re-notice in the future for a future
 3 hearing date.
 4 MR. COSTA: I would -- what I would say --
 5 another example of, you know, one of the -- one of the
 6 things that was a completeness item, was the, you know,
 7 potential easements. That's another area -- you know,
 8 we don't think there's any additional easements. You
 9 know, and Mr. O'Brien left it open, you know, probably,
 10 you know, a good professional idea that during the
 11 course of the hearing they might want establish
 12 easement.
 13 But again, that type of item shouldn't be
 14 a -- something that would hold back the application, in
 15 my opinion. So --
 16 MR. GRUENBERG: You know, the main issues
 17 are the will serve letter from the Phillipsburg.
 18 MR. COSTA: Mm-hm.
 19 MR. GRUENBERG: The DE -- the stormwater
 20 regs, the traffic, and some additional site information
 21 about the 500 feet, and the ingress and egress safety
 22 type of thing.
 23 MS. SCHOCKO: Yeah. And I -- that's --
 24 MR. GRUENBERG: That's a waiver request.
 25 MR. COSTA: I mean, I wouldn't even view

35

1 us as a not satisfying that. You know, we're asking
 2 for the waiver because we've been requesting it, we've
 3 provided a plan that shows the areas around it, and
 4 we've -- unlike, you know, virtually any other
 5 application, we've shown you a road that we're building
 6 off site.
 7 You know, we've provided complete plans
 8 for that -- that road. So I would say we've satisfied
 9 that, but if technically we haven't, we -- we're
 10 requesting the waiver. A lot of this is to kinda
 11 satisfy the technical language.
 12 But I -- again, that I don't see that as
 13 something that we could come back next time with more
 14 information on, because we haven't really been asked
 15 for more information on that. It's not something that
 16 I think is necessary or appropriate.
 17 MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah, that particular item
 18 has to do with the use of the extension out 7th Avenue
 19 --
 20 MR. GRUENBERG: Uh-huh.
 21 MR. O'BRIEN: -- and clarifications on how
 22 the technical comments related to Industrial Drive are
 23 provided.
 24 MR. COSTA: Right, which we have to
 25 provide testimony on. I mean --

36

1 MR. O'BRIEN: You have to come back,
 2 anyway.
 3 MR. GRUENBERG: So I think the issue's
 4 been identified to the Board, and --
 5 CHAIR: Yeah.
 6 MR. GRUENBERG: -- and if you're so
 7 inclined to grant the application -- the applicant's
 8 request for waivers, you could entertain a motion to
 9 grant the waivers as discussed for completeness
 10 purposes only, and to deem the application complete,
 11 and if you don't want to grant the waivers for a
 12 particular waiver, it would be a motion to deny that
 13 waiver request and to deem the application incomplete.
 14 VICE CHAIR: So in other words, if we deny
 15 one request for a waiver, the applicant is deemed
 16 incomplete?
 17 MR. GRUENBERG: Correct.
 18 VICE CHAIR: Mr. O'Brien, are you
 19 competent and feel that these waivers are -- are good
 20 enough to grant them? I have a problem with stormwater
 21 and traffic studies. I mean, but if you're -- you're
 22 the professional, you're gonna, you know, advise us as
 23 to whether you're comfortable with these waivers that
 24 they're requesting.
 25 MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah, so as my letter

37

1 indicates that they need to submit additional
 2 information on stormwater and traffic to understand
 3 what the impacts are and demonstrate compliance with --
 4 particularly with stormwater. However that's one
 5 element of the overall application.
 6 They have submitted stormwater showing
 7 that they intend to comply, but I don't know which
 8 regulation they actually apply under. So they have to
 9 address some corrections as they provided clarification
 10 on earlier. So if they submit that items, then they
 11 provide -- go through the public hearing on that
 12 element before you consider taking action for or
 13 against, however you end up voting, then that would be
 14 sufficient to comply with the state regulation for
 15 stormwater.
 16 And then traffic, having an updated
 17 traffic report would allow the Board to understand the
 18 full, I mean, potential impact of the project.
 19 VICE CHAIR: That they need to come back
 20 for?
 21 MR. O'BRIEN: They have to come back for
 22 those. That -- those two, they have to definitely come
 23 back for, is my recommendation, that the Board takes
 24 that position also. The rest of the items, I was able
 25 to review and provide a technical letter based on what

<p style="text-align: right;">38</p> <p>1 they submitted. Some of the items they submitted does 2 open a question -- raise the question that they would 3 need to typically address as part of the public 4 hearing, and/or if the -- which is where some of them 5 come in with waivers being needed. 6 MR. GRUENBERG: Not to argue on behalf of 7 the applicant, but an argument can be made that they 8 did satisfy the checklist requirements because they did 9 provide stormwater information and they did provide a 10 traffic study. 11 It may not be completely up to date to Mr. 12 O'Brien's satisfaction, but an argument could be made 13 that you provide something that is in that checklist; 14 yes, we provided it. And the Board can always ask for 15 additional information. 16 CHAIR: Mr. O'Brien already did. 17 MR. GRUENBERG: And he did. And is -- you 18 know, is -- does that require a waiver, or does that 19 just mean, you know, it -- yeah, we provided it. 20 CHAIR: All right. Any other questions. 21 Anybody? Do I have anybody opening any motions? 22 MR. GRUENBERG: You want me to reframe the 23 two? 24 CHAIR: Sure. That would be ideal. 25 MR. GRUENBERG: One would be a motion to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">40</p> <p>1 VICE CHAIR: Yes. 2 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. So the applicant 3 was authorized to provide notice of hearing in advance 4 condition upon them being deemed complete at their own 5 risk. We have reviewed the proof of service and 6 publication of the notice of hearing, and find that the 7 Board has jurisdiction to proceed. So assuming you 8 want to proceed this evening, counsel, you can present 9 your first witness. 10 MR. COSTA: Okay. I'm going to do a quick 11 introduction because I want to touch on the -- some of 12 the details of this matter. 13 And thank you for that completeness 14 review, and thank you for the statement on the notice. 15 So as we noted in the completeness section, we're 16 seeking to amend the prior preliminary site plan 17 approval for this project, and we're seeking final 18 approval. Our site engineer will go through the exact 19 features of how the plans have changed between the 20 earlier plans and the plans today. 21 So I'll leave that for the testimony. I 22 just wanted to touch on the variances that we're 23 seeking this evening. We're requesting the same 24 variances that were previously approved, and I guess 25 we're asking that they be ratified, so to speak. One</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">39</p> <p>1 grant the waivers for completeness purposes only as set 2 forth in Mr. O'Brien's March 14th, 2024 correspondence 3 as discussed this evening, and to deem the application 4 complete, or the other would be to deny the motion -- 5 deny the waiver request for stormwater and traffic, and 6 to deem the -- and as otherwise set forth and to deem 7 the application incomplete. 8 VICE CHAIR: I'll move to deem it complete 9 with reservation. 10 MR. BOYLE: Second. 11 CHAIR: Motion been made by Mr. Seiss, 12 seconded by Mr. Boyle to deem the application complete 13 with conditions with the waivers -- as waivers as 14 described. Roll call. 15 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Boyle? 16 MR. BOYLE: Yes. 17 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Dragotta? 18 CHAIR: Yes. 19 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Gruenberg? 20 MR. GRUENBERG: Yes. 21 THE SECRETARY: Ms. Schocko? 22 MS. SCHOCKO: Yes. 23 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Szanati? 24 MR. SZANATI: Yes. 25 THE SECRETARY: Mr. Seiss?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">41</p> <p>1 is under 410-21 for yard area and building 2 requirements, maximum lot depth. We're requesting a 3 variance to reaffirm that we have a depth of 2,276.83 4 feet, which exceeds the maximum permitted lot depth of 5 400 feet. We have a really big lot. 6 The next one is 410-21, area yard and 7 building requirements, maximum lot depth Industrial 8 Drive. Again we have a depth of 980 feet, and that 9 exceeds a maximum of 400 feet. And the next one is 10 410-21, maximum lot coverage. We're seeking to 11 reaffirm the variance for a lot coverage of 35.63, 12 whereas 30 percent -- 35.63 -- I'm sorry, 35.6 percent, 13 whereas 30 percent was permitted. 14 Let me just double check that. I think 15 we're actually seeking 35.63, which was a mistake in 16 the last application. So 35.63 is the variance we're 17 seeking there. And then we're seeking an additional 18 variance for parking requirements. We are providing 19 480 parking spaces, whereas 400 -- I'm sorry, 682 20 parking spaces are required. This same variance was -- 21 was granted previously. There was a slight difference 22 in calculation in the amount of parking required, but 23 the warehouse parking spaces that municipalities 24 require is usually significantly -- it's higher than 25 the actual usage, and we'll have our experts testify to</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">42</p> <p>1 that effect.</p> <p>2 So we'll -- we'll show the justification</p> <p>3 of that variance. Also with this iteration of the</p> <p>4 plans, there's been assumed a office portion of the</p> <p>5 property -- of the buildings, of each building, and</p> <p>6 it's been assumed as a two-floor office. We -- it's</p> <p>7 very unlikely a warehouse would use a one-floor office.</p> <p>8 And it's also been calculated as if it's like a medical</p> <p>9 office or any other office.</p> <p>10 It's just office which -- you know, with a</p> <p>11 warehouse. We have very few people in that office. So</p> <p>12 we'll provide testimony regarding that as well. There</p> <p>13 was a request for -- to include a variance for off</p> <p>14 street loading, and under 410-44. And we'll discuss</p> <p>15 that further with Mr. O'Brien. We don't -- we don't</p> <p>16 agree with that variance. And finally, Mr. O'Brien</p> <p>17 asked for us to -- or recommended we may wanna seek a</p> <p>18 variance for a higher fence.</p> <p>19 That would be between the warehouse truck</p> <p>20 parking area and Standard Street in the neighborhood's</p> <p>21 north of there. And we are comfortable with the fence,</p> <p>22 and we're going to propose a fence in our testimony.</p> <p>23 We don't think we need the -- the height variance, but</p> <p>24 we'll leave that under discussion. But that's the list</p> <p>25 of our proposed variances. There're also a number of</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">44</p> <p>1 And I have packets of the exhibits that I'm going to</p> <p>2 hand out to the Board. I could just so it's --</p> <p>3 MR. GRUENBERG: Before any of that, we're</p> <p>4 gonna swear in your witness. Sir, if you please raise</p> <p>5 your right hand. Do you swear or affirm that the</p> <p>6 testimony you're about to give before this matter will</p> <p>7 be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the</p> <p>8 truth, so help you God?</p> <p>9 MR. OTTES: Yes, I do.</p> <p>10 MR. GRUENBERG: And can you please state</p> <p>11 your name and spell your last for the record?</p> <p>12 MR. OTTES: Sure. It's actually Keith</p> <p>13 Ottes, like the elevators, and spelled O-T-T-E-S. It</p> <p>14 usually gets -- usually gets destroyed, but that's all</p> <p>15 right.</p> <p>16 MS. SCHOCKO: Could you stand further from</p> <p>17 the microphone?</p> <p>18 MR. OTTES: Sure. Keith Ottes, O-T-T-E-S.</p> <p>19 MR. GRUENBERG: O-T-T-S?</p> <p>20 MR. OTTES: O-T-T-E-S.</p> <p>21 MR. GRUENBERG: I'm sorry.</p> <p>22 MR. COSTA: And Keith, could you give the</p> <p>23 Board the benefit of your --</p> <p>24 MR. GRUENBERG: Well, before you -- I</p> <p>25 don't know what you just handed out.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">43</p> <p>1 design waivers, which we will have our professional</p> <p>2 planner address, and we'll address those in our</p> <p>3 testimony.</p> <p>4 MR. GRUENBERG: The planner can address</p> <p>5 the interior lot issue too, identified by Mr. O'Brien?</p> <p>6 MR. COSTA: Yeah, he will. We are -- we</p> <p>7 are viewing this as a corner lot, which is how the</p> <p>8 prior applicant viewed it. So but we can -- we can</p> <p>9 address that as well. Because if it was viewed as an</p> <p>10 interior lot, it would trigger a number of additional</p> <p>11 variance standards. We have the following witnesses.</p> <p>12 Keith Ottes.</p> <p>13 MR. KEITH OTTES: Ottes.</p> <p>14 MR. COSTA: Ottes. Okay. Thank you.</p> <p>15 Keith Ottes is our professional engineer from Langer --</p> <p>16 Langan. He will be doing the testimony on the site</p> <p>17 plan. Ryan Parisi is our landscape architect, and he</p> <p>18 will be addressing landscaping, screening, fencing, and</p> <p>19 lighting on the site. Fred Ferraro is our owner</p> <p>20 representative from CRG acquisitions. Jay Troutman</p> <p>21 from McDonough & Rae is our traffic engineer, and Sean</p> <p>22 Moronski is our professional planner.</p> <p>23 We're unlikely to reach Jay and Sean this</p> <p>24 evening, but they're there should we have questions for</p> <p>25 them. So my first witness this evening is Keith Ottes.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">45</p> <p>1 MR. COSTA: Yeah, sure.</p> <p>2 MR. GRUENBERG: And I don't -- I don't</p> <p>3 know whether -- we need to mark it before it goes</p> <p>4 before the Board, generally.</p> <p>5 MR. COSTA: So here's -- it is a packet of</p> <p>6 the exhibits that we are going to be showing. And I'm</p> <p>7 happy to mark it before it goes to through the Board.</p> <p>8 It was really just a convenience copy, so people can</p> <p>9 see it more easily.</p> <p>10 MR. GRUENBERG: All right. Pass that down</p> <p>11 the top.</p> <p>12 MR. COSTA: And I have two more. I have -</p> <p>13 - I --</p> <p>14 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah, we'll need it.</p> <p>15 CHAIR: Well, are you comfortable with it</p> <p>16 or what? I don't know what the --</p> <p>17 MR. COSTA: Yeah.</p> <p>18 MR. GRUENBERG: Why don't we have one of</p> <p>19 the packets marked --</p> <p>20 MR. COSTA: Yeah.</p> <p>21 MR. GRUENBERG: -- as an exhibit so it's</p> <p>22 something that's been --</p> <p>23 MR. COSTA: Sure.</p> <p>24 MR. GRUENBERG: -- we can just make</p> <p>25 reference to it? Is that different than what you just</p>

46

1 gave me?

2 MR. COSTA: It's exactly the same.

3 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay.

4 MR. COSTA: Everything is identical.

5 CHAIR: Anybody do not have (inaudible)?

6 MR. COSTA: That's everything.

7 MR. GRUENBERG: And we'll call this

8 Exhibit A9.

9 MR. COSTA: Sounds good. Thank you.

10 Actually coming.

11 KEITH OTTES, SWORN, WITNESS.

12 CHAIR: Okay. Keith, could you give the

13 Board the benefit of your education and professional

14 background, and your experience testifying before this

15 board or other boards in the State of New Jersey?

16 MR. OTTES: Sure. I have a bachelor's

17 degree in engineering from Rutgers University. Have a

18 master's degree from Villanova in water resources

19 engineering. I received my professional engineers

20 license in New Jersey in 2006, and I've been involved

21 in the practice of land development engineering for

22 just over 20 years now.

23 MR. GRUENBERG: Licenses in good standing?

24 MR. OTTES: Yes.

25 MR. GRUENBERG: Any member of the Board

47

1 have any questions as to this gentleman's

2 qualifications to provide expert engineering testimony?

3 CHAIR: No.

4 MR. GRUENBERG: And they'll be accepted

5 for the same. Thank you.

6 MR. OTTES: All right. So for the benefit

7 of the Board, what we have to my left is, I'll have to

8 have a laser pointer here, Exhibit A1. It's a --

9 essentially an aerial map showing the site in relation

10 to the surrounding road system.

11 I think the Board is generally oriented to

12 the site, but just to orient the rest of the members of

13 the Board who may or may not be, and members of the

14 public, the site is to -- the plan, the lower left-hand

15 corner of the plan, I'm pointing at Exhibit A1 with the

16 laser pointer, you can see the two warehouse buildings.

17 Mr. Costa described those in his introduction. The

18 site sits -- it's east of Vulcanite Avenue, and it's

19 north of the Lehigh Valley Railroad.

20 CHAIR: Can you --

21 MR. OTTES: That is to --

22 CHAIR: Can you hold on one second?

23 MR. OTTES: Sure.

24 CHAIR: Do you guys -- you guys in the

25 back, do you want to see? You -- you're more than

48

1 welcome to come stand over here and see what we're

2 looking at. By all means, don't think you have to --

3 MR. OTTES: We have a copy of -- the

4 Board, there's other ones on the opposite side.

5 (Interposing)

6 CHAIR: Do you want to unpack it? There

7 you go.

8 MR. COSTA: I have a couple more. I don't

9 need one for everyone, but I have a couple more.

10 FEMALE VOICE 1: Can I have a packet?

11 MR. OTTES: Sure. Yes.

12 CHAIR: Yeah, you're good. Go ahead.

13 MR. OTTES: All right. I'll continue.

14 MR. GRUENBERG: Sorry.

15 MR. OTTES: Yeah, as I stated before, it's

16 east of Vulcanite Avenue and it's also east of having

17 the address of 0 Standard Street. Standard Street is a

18 paper street just to the west of the building, to the

19 left-hand side of the plan. To the north of the site

20 is (inaudible) for municipal landfill. There's also

21 Industrial Drive that ends just before the site. As

22 Mr. Costa stated earlier, Industrial Drive is being

23 extended into the site. That's the main site access.

24 And also to the north -- just to the north

25 of the site, as I stated earlier, is a New Jersey

49

1 Transit rail -- right of way. There's no rail existing

2 there, and the applicant has secured an easement to

3 provide for that main site access at that -- across

4 that right of way.

5 Just some housekeeping, as probably stated

6 earlier in the completeness review, but the site's in

7 the industrial zoning district. The existing use is

8 agricultural. The proposed use, to restate, is two

9 warehouse distribution buildings.

10 Building 1 is the building to the right on

11 Exhibit A1 that I'm pointing to, the building on the

12 lower right, and that building is proposed at, similar

13 to the prior applications, the same size as 270,900

14 square feet, and Building 2 to the left on the plan is

15 proposed at 305,000 square feet.

16 Again, the main access, I'm going to point

17 out A1 with the laser pointer, is to the right-hand

18 side of Building 1. It's on the lower right-hand side

19 of the plan that I'm pointing to right now, and

20 Industrial Drive is proposed to be extended. It's

21 generally a length of 1,114 linear feet of new roadway

22 that's proposed to be constructed by the applicant.

23 I mentioned the easement over the New

24 Jersey Transit right of way earlier. The width -- I

25 know this came up as one of the comments, and we can

<p style="text-align: right;">50</p> <p>1 step through that later, but the width of Industrial 2 Drive is proposed at 24 feet. Generally, Industrial 3 Drive, it's in the range of 24 feet. It varies along 4 the length of it at certain points, but as was proposed 5 in prior submissions and designs for the project, the 6 Industrial Drive extension project, it was always 7 proposed as 24 feet.</p> <p>8 Alternate access to the site is provided 9 at the northwest corner of Building 2. I'm going to 10 point at Exhibit A1 again with the laser pointer. 11 There is an emergency access extension out to -- out to 12 7th Avenue. But again, that is only emergency access. 13 We ran -- it's also 24 feet.</p> <p>14 All of the driveways except for the areas 15 of the truck ports, the places where truck to trailers 16 load and unload into the building and trucks are part 17 all the driveway aisles and access around the site are 18 at 24 feet, as currently designed.</p> <p>19 So it was stated earlier in the 20 completeness review, utility will serve letters. We're 21 still waiting on sewer, electric, gas, telecom. We do 22 have a will serve letter for -- from the Borough for 23 water, but all of those other will serve letters, it 24 was -- the -- we decided this -- earlier, it was 25 decided that the waivers were granted -- the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">52</p> <p>1 the appropriate configuration. They're not deep enough 2 to have, nor is there room on the site for what's 3 considered cross docks, where there would be docks on 4 the other side of the building as well.</p> <p>5 So that's the -- essentially, that's the 6 biggest change from the prior application. There's car 7 parking. You'll see car parking. I'm pointing to 8 Exhibit A3. There's car parking around the perimeter 9 of both buildings except for the west side. I'm 10 pointing at Exhibit A3 with the laser pointer. Except 11 for the west side of Building 2, there's a gravel 12 access, 24 feet -- I'm sorry, paved access 24 feet, 13 just for emergency vehicles to get around the building 14 to the west of Building 2.</p> <p>15 MR. COSTA: And that access is going to be 16 -- I think there are gates on that, that it's only 17 going to be used for emergency purposes, correct?</p> <p>18 MR. OTTES: That's correct.</p> <p>19 MR. COSTA: That's never going to be a 20 general route to get around the building?</p> <p>21 MR. OTTES: Exactly.</p> <p>22 MR. COSTA: Okay.</p> <p>23 MR. OTTES: Exactly. And similarly, the 24 access -- again, pointing to the northwest corner of 25 Building 2, the access that we talked about, the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">51</p> <p>1 completeness waivers were granted for sewer and the 2 other utilities. So those are forthcoming.</p> <p>3 I'm going to flip over -- I'm going to 4 flip over now to exhibit -- I'm going to use a -- I'm 5 going to use A3 as a zoomed in version of A1, focusing 6 on the site itself. So what I'm going to do is I'm 7 just going to step through the plan as it stands today, 8 and then I'm going to go through a list of the changes 9 from the previous application, the plan that was 10 included in the previous application -- the previous 11 preliminary approval.</p> <p>12 So as I stated before, two warehouse 13 buildings, Building 1 is on the right-hand side, 14 Building 2 is on the left. We talked about access 15 earlier. The biggest change -- I'll probably work in 16 some of the changes to the plan as I go through, but 17 one of the biggest change you'll see to the plan is 18 that the previous application had the -- these areas, 19 these large paved areas that are -- I'm pointing to 20 Exhibit A3, the north -- plan north of both of the 21 buildings.</p> <p>22 Those are the areas where there's loading 23 docks on the buildings and trailer parking. These are 24 what are considered as rear loaded or some folks call 25 them single loaded warehouses. At this size, that's</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">53</p> <p>1 emergency access out to 7th Avenue, similarly, that's 2 going to be a gated access.</p> <p>3 MR. COSTA: That's right. A (inaudible) 4 for the fire.</p> <p>5 MR. OTTES: Correct. Correct.</p> <p>6 MR. COSTA: Okay.</p> <p>7 CHAIR: Could I -- could I stop you for a 8 second? The -- with the trucks, the areas for the 9 trucks, what were you discussing that was the 10 difference between this applicant and the previous that 11 you said was the biggest?</p> <p>12 MR. COSTA: Right. Forgive me if I missed 13 it, but the previous application had the trailer ports 14 on the opposite side of the building, the south side.</p> <p>15 CHAIR: And that's what I thought. So 16 that's, to me, a pretty material change to the 17 application that was presented to us. So I guess I'm 18 having a little bit of a hard time understanding that 19 we're coming back for amended prelim and relying on all 20 of these calculations and all of this stuff from 21 previous, but we flipped the entire project 180 22 degrees, and now the truck parking is even closer to 23 7th Avenue.</p> <p>24 FEMALE VOICE 2: Can I say something?</p> <p>25 MR. GRUENBERG: No, you can't, ma'am. Not</p>

54

1 yet. But let me explain how the process works. I
 2 don't mean to shut you down, but the applicant will
 3 present their witnesses, and after each witness is done
 4 testifying, the Board will be able to ask them
 5 questions. Mr. O'Brien and I will be able to ask them
 6 questions, and then it'll be opened up to the public to
 7 ask him questions.
 8 When they're done with all of their
 9 testimony, which isn't gonna happen tonight, then the
 10 public will have the opportunity to testify before the
 11 Board and give their input. So your first bite at the
 12 apple will be after he's done talking to ask him
 13 questions only. That's kind of the way the procedure
 14 works.
 15 So I didn't mean to shut you down --
 16 FEMALE VOICE 2: Yeah.
 17 MR. GRUENBERG: -- too quick, but I have
 18 to because that's the way the procedure is.
 19 MR. OTTES: So to your point, I would
 20 agree that is a -- it is a material change. The
 21 reasons for that change, and Mr. Ferraro from the
 22 applicant's side can go into some of the details of why
 23 we changed that, but a lot of it had to do with the
 24 length of travel that the trucks would have to take to
 25 get from where the trailer docks and trailer drops --

55

1 trailer parking, sorry, is now, as opposed to having to
 2 drive even further into other areas of the site.
 3 Plus this allows for counterclockwise
 4 rotation or circulation around the building, which is
 5 better for tractor trailer drivers to do what's called
 6 a left-shoulder backing, where they look over the left
 7 shoulder backing into the loading spaces, rather than
 8 looking to the right, if they're coming in a clockwise
 9 manner.
 10 MR. COSTA: Keith, doesn't it also allow
 11 the buildings to be moved further away from that
 12 northern section, meaning further away from Vulcanite
 13 and 7th Avenue?
 14 MR. OTTES: That's a -- that's a good
 15 point. I didn't get to the other changes from them --
 16 from the prior application, but you can't see it on
 17 this plan, even if you compared this plan next to the
 18 plan that was subject to the prior or the previous
 19 approval.
 20 This Building 2, the building to the -- to
 21 the west, closer to the -- closer to 7th, that distance
 22 from the property line of the northwest corner of
 23 Building 2 was actually increased by 50 feet. So it
 24 was pulled further away.
 25 Yes, the tractor trailer parking is on the

56

1 north side of the building now, but it was pulled even
 2 further away than it was in the previous application,
 3 50 percent, more plus or minus.
 4 MR. GRUENBERG: But that's where all the
 5 activity takes place?
 6 MR. OTTES: Exactly.
 7 MR. COSTA: That's where the tractor
 8 trailers are coming and going.
 9 MR. OTTES: Correct. Correct. And as
 10 part of Mr. O'Brien's letter, he did suggest, and the
 11 applicant has agreed, to putting a barrier, a fence
 12 along that northwest corner of the building to further
 13 buffer. There is quite a -- there is a vegetative
 14 buffer.
 15 There'll be landscaping testimony later
 16 throughout the course of the -- this presentation. But
 17 there's -- there's a very heavy landscape buffer
 18 proposed on that western property line, and there also
 19 is significant wooded areas behind those residential
 20 areas already.
 21 CHAIR: Is the fence you're going to put
 22 up going to stop the noise and the light pollution?
 23 MR. OTTES: It will stop. The lights will
 24 be blocked depending on the level of noise. We've not
 25 -- the applicant has not done a noise -- acoustical

57

1 study, but if required, based on the ordinances, there
 2 could be a -- the sound barriers, sound walls, you hear
 3 about, sound fences, they serve the same purpose. They
 4 could block noise and light.
 5 CHAIR: I just -- I have a hard time
 6 considering this the same thing we heard for 3, 4, 5
 7 years ago with those facts. You flipped the entire
 8 project 180 degrees. I respect the fact that you moved
 9 the -- that you moved it 50 feet back off Vulcanite,
 10 but you flipped the entire project 180 degrees, and now
 11 all of the activity is closer to residential.
 12 Like I don't know -- I don't know. I
 13 mean, listen, I get it it's probably easier for the
 14 trucks and all of that. That's great and wonderful,
 15 but I don't know. That's a -- that's a pretty
 16 substantial change to also consider this in a -- a
 17 continuation. I know it's not maybe the correct legal
 18 term or whatever, but I have a hard time understanding
 19 the -- the rationale for considering this more of a
 20 continuation or a -- as you went through initially,
 21 when the entire project is rotated 180 degrees.
 22 MR. COSTA: I think it -- I understand --
 23 I understand what you're saying. It is the same size
 24 buildings, the same general location. What's been
 25 flipped is the parking.

<p>58</p> <p>1 CHAIR: Yeah.</p> <p>2 MR. COSTA: I do think that the --</p> <p>3 CHAIR: Which is a problem -- which I --</p> <p>4 not to cut you off --</p> <p>5 MR. COSTA: Yeah.</p> <p>6 CHAIR: -- or anything, but that would</p> <p>7 probably be the biggest concern I would have, is that's</p> <p>8 where all the activity is, is exactly what other people</p> <p>9 would say. You know, when this came before the Board -</p> <p>10 - listen, I would -- I like farmland, like it is what</p> <p>11 it is, but I also understand that this is a project</p> <p>12 that's come before the Board, and et cetera.</p> <p>13 But I am not gonna go put words in my</p> <p>14 mouth of four years ago, but at the same time, if I'm</p> <p>15 gonna have a warehouse that's gonna go here, I would've</p> <p>16 -- when we discussed this previously with the previous</p> <p>17 applicant, the top corner closest up there to 7th was</p> <p>18 just -- was just passenger car park -- just employee</p> <p>19 parking or whatever.</p> <p>20 I mean, not going to be used all times of</p> <p>21 the day and night unless they do some shifts or</p> <p>22 whatever, but it's just cars coming and going. These</p> <p>23 are tractor trailers. They're going to be idling.</p> <p>24 They're going to be sitting there.</p> <p>25 Like, that's -- this is -- this is quite a</p>	<p>60</p> <p>1 MR. COSTA: And it would connect to the</p> <p>2 building as I understood?</p> <p>3 MR. OTTES: It could, yeah.</p> <p>4 MR. COSTA: Yeah. With a -- yeah, with a</p> <p>5 gate there.</p> <p>6 MR. OTTES: It could come down here --</p> <p>7 MR. COSTA: Right.</p> <p>8 MR. OTTES: -- and connect to the</p> <p>9 building.</p> <p>10 MR. GRUENBERG: Can I -- can I -- may I</p> <p>11 make a suggestion, and you know what, I'm not gonna put</p> <p>12 you on the spot because I don't think you're an</p> <p>13 acoustical engineer, and you've already indicated that</p> <p>14 there's no acoustical study has been -- has been</p> <p>15 provided.</p> <p>16 But if you're going to present testimony</p> <p>17 that the fence somehow is a benefit to the sound, I</p> <p>18 think you're going to need to quantify that somehow</p> <p>19 with that type of testimony as opposed to you saying</p> <p>20 it'll block the light. But I'm not an acoustical guy.</p> <p>21 MR. OTTES: Right. And what I was going to</p> <p>22 say is I think that the applicant could agree to provide</p> <p>23 an acoustical study, and if the acoustical study shows</p> <p>24 that a sound fence, not just a regular fence, is required</p> <p>25 at that location to support the installation, location, pipe,</p>
<p>59</p> <p>1 different application that is sitting here than it was</p> <p>2 in 2021. I'm -- that's my -- I'm not speaking for</p> <p>3 anybody else, but I have a very hard time feeling that</p> <p>4 we can just consider this an extension of that with</p> <p>5 this change.</p> <p>6 MR. COSTA: Mm-hm. Keith, if you could</p> <p>7 explain -- and I hear -- I hear all that. I wanna just</p> <p>8 get some more testimony on -- regarding that. Other</p> <p>9 than the moving the building 50 feet further away from</p> <p>10 that residential area, can you explain where the -- and</p> <p>11 the extent of the wall that is proposed?</p> <p>12 CHAIR: The wall -- wall's not --</p> <p>13 MR. COSTA: (Interposing) I'm sorry. The</p> <p>14 fence that's proposed along the --</p> <p>15 CHAIR: The fence isn't -- the fence is</p> <p>16 wonderful, great, but the fence is not going to do much</p> <p>17 for trucks sitting on the other side of it.</p> <p>18 MR. COSTA: Well, if you -- I think it --</p> <p>19 I guess I -- I think it's -- I think it's -- it's a</p> <p>20 relevant piece when added to the movement, 50 feet. So</p> <p>21 I wanna just make sure we get that clarified.</p> <p>22 MR. OTTES: It would be along the -- the</p> <p>23 northwest corner. It would -- it -- look, lights would</p> <p>24 be blocked by it, but I think that if we could agree to</p> <p>25 --</p>	<p>61</p> <p>1 et cetera, we could provide that.</p> <p>2 Obviously it wouldn't be me, it would be</p> <p>3 acoustical engineer who would come and testify at the</p> <p>4 next hearing.</p> <p>5 MR. GRUENBERG: I think it's not up for</p> <p>6 the Board to make that determination, but I think</p> <p>7 you're hearing concerns from at least one board member</p> <p>8 that that's going to be an issue if you are reorienting</p> <p>9 this, and that if you want to present that testimony,</p> <p>10 that might be something that you're wise to do.</p> <p>11 MR. OTTES: We will do that. We will</p> <p>12 provide an acoustical study and -- at the next hearing,</p> <p>13 we'll have an acoustical engineer here to testify to</p> <p>14 the location and specifications of the sound wall if</p> <p>15 required.</p> <p>16 VICE CHAIR: Mr. Ottes, (inaudible). I</p> <p>17 wasn't here on 2019, but I kind of have to agree with</p> <p>18 our chairman here in regards to you did flip from --</p> <p>19 what he's telling me, you did flip this completely</p> <p>20 around.</p> <p>21 And as far as noise, I live right here,</p> <p>22 right here in my backyard. I hear 78 all day long,</p> <p>23 trucks all day long. So I can just imagine these</p> <p>24 people on Vulcanite what they're going to hear all day</p> <p>25 long. I mean, you got to come up with some way, you</p>

62

1 know, with your studies to try and buffer this. So
 2 much -- because like I said, I'm here and I hear 78. I
 3 can just imagine what these people are gonna hear, with
 4 this laid out the way it is, especially coming right
 5 off of 7th Avenue.
 6 MR. OTTES: So the -- there's noise
 7 standards in the ordinance, and like I mentioned
 8 earlier, we'll -- the applicant will contract an
 9 acoustical engineer to perform a study, and the
 10 appropriate mitigation will be installed.
 11 MR. GRUENBERG: The board also has the
 12 option of retaining its own acoustical expert and -- to
 13 review the submissions from your expert, which would
 14 draw off the escrow account that's posted by the
 15 applicant in order to provide guidance to the Board
 16 about the study.
 17 I don't know if Mr. O'Brien is an
 18 acoustical engineer. I know you guys have your
 19 specialties like lawyers do, and that's --
 20 MR. O'BRIEN: No, that's not one of mine.
 21 MR. GRUENBERG: And that's not one of his.
 22 It's not one of his.
 23 MR. O'BRIEN: Not mine, no.
 24 MR. GRUENBERG: So if you --
 25 CHAIR: That would be something I would

63

1 consider.
 2 MR. BOYLE: I would consider it too.
 3 VICE CHAIR: Mr. Chairman, I got a
 4 question.
 5 CHAIR: Go ahead.
 6 VICE CHAIR: Where do you determine that
 7 you're 50 foot farther from the residential? My eyes
 8 deceive me, but I'm seeing it as being closer.
 9 CHAIR: No, we're talking about from the
 10 previous plans from '19.
 11 VICE CHAIR: Yeah.
 12 CHAIR: Yeah.
 13 VICE CHAIR: That's what I'm talking
 14 about. They moved the trucks over to the north side,
 15 which is closer to the --
 16 CHAIR: He's talking about --
 17 VICE CHAIR: -- emergency road.
 18 CHAIR: The building itself is 50 feet
 19 from the roadway.
 20 VICE CHAIR: The building -- the truck
 21 area is gonna be closer to residential than it is if it
 22 was on the other side of the building.
 23 CHAIR: What I've been saying.
 24 VICE CHAIR: According to the plan I have
 25 in front of me here.

64

1 CHAIR: Right. That's what I've been
 2 saying. He's saying that by flipping the building as
 3 it sits now, they were able to shift everything 50 feet
 4 further. Is that accurate? Is that really 50 feet? I
 5 mean, it doesn't --
 6 VICE CHAIR: Doesn't look like it to me.
 7 CHAIR: No.
 8 MR. OTTES: The building itself is
 9 farther.
 10 CHAIR: Is it?
 11 MR. OTTES: I can provide an exhibit at
 12 the next hearing showing (interposing).
 13 CHAIR: Sure. I mean, I believe, yeah,
 14 obviously, like but I just -- I don't know, it seems a
 15 bit still close.
 16 MR. OTTES: Regardless as -- like we've
 17 talked about, we will have an acoustical study done and
 18 provide appropriate mitigation.
 19 CHAIR: Yeah, but I think it's a little
 20 bit more of a concern than just an acoustical study.
 21 So if an -- if an acoustical study says we have to put
 22 like a highway type -- not the color and everything,
 23 but a highway type barrier in somebody's backyard, I
 24 don't think that's necessarily something that I would
 25 be thrilled about to consider if all we needed to do

65

1 was just abide by the previous plans that were here and
 2 the trucks were on the complete opposite side of the
 3 building.
 4 MR. OTTES: Well, what I would say to that
 5 is the previous application, it didn't get far enough,
 6 but I would assume that the Board -- just because the
 7 trailers were on the opposite side of the building, we
 8 don't know if that complies -- if that plan had
 9 complied with the noise standards.
 10 So I would -- if I was on the Board, I
 11 would've recommended as part of that, but -- that
 12 application -- that acoustical study be done for that
 13 application as well, because you still don't know, even
 14 though the trucks are somewhat further in distance, you
 15 don't know that the sound's going to travel the same
 16 way to that -- to that property line and meet the noise
 17 standards.
 18 So it might have been appropriate to
 19 recommend some sort of a sound wall for that
 20 application as well.
 21 MR. GRUENBERG: But might have been, but I
 22 guess by flipping it 180 degrees and moving all the
 23 activity much closer to the residences, I think you're
 24 hearing from the Board that that's all the more reason
 25 to have that acoustical study, and that might be

<p style="text-align: right;">66</p> <p>1 something that your analysis will show what if it was 2 on the other side, what the different impact was. 3 MR. COSTA: Right. 4 MR. OTTES: So to address a couple of the 5 -- just the -- sorry, the sound walls that you see 6 nowadays, they are actually decorative. They don't -- 7 they don't all look like the older ones that you see 8 with the, you know, tan grain. They look -- and we've 9 actually proposed them on a lot of other projects. And 10 they look like -- you can make them look like 11 architectural features as well, not just your typical 12 Jersey turnpike barriers. 13 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah, I -- maybe -- I 14 think you're hearing good input from the Board, but -- 15 MR. OTTES: Absolutely. 16 MR. GRUENBERG: -- you're gonna need to 17 get the specifics before the Board if that's what 18 you're proposing in terms of what it looks like, what 19 the height is, what the thickness is, and all of -- you 20 know, what are -- all rendering parameters. 21 MR. OTTES: Sure. Yeah. 22 (Interposing) 23 MR. OTTES: That'll -- that would 24 definitely be included. 25 MR. SZANATI: Can I ask a question first</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">68</p> <p>1 done. 2 MR. OTTES: Yeah. And what that -- what 3 those studies typically do is they'll study not just 4 that spot, it will study the entire site as it relates 5 to the ordinance requirements for (inaudible). 6 VICE CHAIR: Mr. Chairman, are we're gonna 7 wait until he's done with the rest of the questions, or 8 how are we gonna handle this? 9 CHAIR: Well, you might want to let him 10 present -- 11 VICE CHAIR: Yeah. 12 CHAIR: -- some more testimony. 13 VICE CHAIR: Yeah. 14 MR. OTTES: I've only got a little bit 15 more to go. 16 VICE CHAIR: I was over cautions. 17 MR. OTTES: Okay. 18 MR. GRUENBERG: We'll let you go. 19 VICE CHAIR: You said noise, and 20 Susquehanna Hat Factory, and you know, here we are. 21 MR. OTTES: That's fine. That's fine. 22 All right. So a couple of other -- well, just to go 23 back, I got a little thrown off track here. So talked 24 about the trailer, the location of the loading docks 25 and the trailer parking to the north of the building,</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">67</p> <p>1 of all? 2 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah. 3 MS. MONICA LARSEN-KILEY: I'm just 4 wondering, from the engineering consultant's firm, 5 their main justification or advantages for switching 6 the orientation of the building? 7 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah. 8 CHAIR: Was it -- is it just literally the 9 flow of vehicles and stuff, or? 10 MR. OTTES: It's the flow of these 11 vehicles. We were able to push the building down at 12 least Building 2. We were able to push that down 13 further. That's the building on the east side. So it 14 helped with earth work, generally, in addition to 15 circulation. Rather than importing massive amounts of 16 material, it -- disorientation worked out better for 17 the circulation and things like earth work. 18 CHAIR: Okay. Any other questions on any 19 of this? 20 MR. BOYLE: Other than I'd like to see the 21 study done, definitely. I mean, I don't -- I don't 22 have a real problem with the way the buildings sit, but 23 my biggest thing is that noise on that end -- 24 MR. OTTES: Well, what that -- 25 MR. BOYLE: -- and I would like a study</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">69</p> <p>1 parking generally around both of the buildings except 2 for -- car parking areas except for the west side of 3 Building Number 2. 4 And you'll see later on the landscaping 5 that's provided, but it's a little hard to see, but 6 there's some darker green areas scattered throughout 7 the site. Those are the stormwater detention basins. 8 Again, Mr. O'Brien still needs more information to go 9 through his review. But high level, there's stormwater 10 throughout the site. There's a small underground 11 feature in the automobile parking to the southeast of 12 Building Number 2 on the right-hand side of the plan. 13 But that essentially covers -- there's 14 lighting throughout the site. There were some comments 15 about adjusting lighting. We'll have testimony by our 16 landscape architect who also designs the lighting 17 later. But there's lighting. It meets the applicable 18 requirements. There's international requirements. Mr. 19 Parisi will go through those as they relate to the 20 ordinance. 21 But just getting back to some of the other 22 changes from the prior application, as it was stated 23 earlier in completeness, the parking count -- I'm just 24 talking about automobile parking, the total parking 25 count, and Mr. Ferraro can testify from CRG, the</p>

70

1 applicant -- he can testify to the actual need for
 2 parking for these types of warehouses. Parking -- the
 3 overall parking count for automobiles was reduced from
 4 463 to 371 spaces. So that's something to note.
 5 Generally, a positive in terms of less impervious
 6 cover. So I would look at it that way.
 7 The tractor trailer parking spaces, again,
 8 those are across from the building loading docks.
 9 Those are up in these areas on the north side of the
 10 buildings. That was -- the trailer parking spaces were
 11 reduced from 115 spaces on the last version of the plan
 12 to 109 spaces. The trailer parking spaces, I refer to
 13 them typically as trailer drops. Building 1 to the
 14 east, again on the right-hand side of the plan,
 15 Building 1 has 42 trailer parking spaces, he previous
 16 plan had 55.
 17 Building 2 has 67 trailer parking spaces,
 18 the last plan had 60. So generally very similar in
 19 terms of the number of trailer parking spaces. We did
 20 add some angled trailer parking north of Building 2,
 21 the right-hand side. I'm pointing at Exhibit A3 again,
 22 right here. Just to be able to fit them in, we were
 23 constrained by the property boundary there.
 24 But just to provide -- just to provide
 25 additional trailer parking, a lot of the modern

71

1 warehouses, the tenants are looking for more trailer
 2 parking in a lot of situations.
 3 It was stated earlier, the impervious
 4 coverage, very slight reduction from the previous plan.
 5 It went down by 0.01 percent, 70.02 to 17.01. So yeah,
 6 generally, a de minimis change, but it -- and it didn't
 7 make it worse. There is -- just to talk about
 8 utilities, I mentioned will serve letters, we're going
 9 through. There are -- there is a pump station for
 10 Building 1.
 11 It's generally in the middle of the
 12 trailer dock area. It's -- the right-hand side of the
 13 plan, there's a dark spot -- actually, I'm sorry, it's
 14 on the other side of the trailer court. There's a --
 15 an area where a pump station is proposed for Building
 16 1. That connects to a gravity system in front of
 17 building Number 2, and goes out to Vulcanite Avenue for
 18 sewer. That's a change. There wasn't a pump station
 19 associated with the prior application.
 20 The office areas are designated on the
 21 plan. They're hard to see here, but the lower the
 22 southern plan -- south portion of the plan, there's an
 23 office proposed at both corners of the buildings. And
 24 these locations I'm pointing to with the laser pointer
 25 on A3. So the southeast, southwest corner of both

72

1 buildings, there's offices proposed that wasn't
 2 indicated on the prior application. There's raised
 3 curb utility islands in the trailer ports.
 4 Those are those dark areas I started to
 5 talk about before in the trailer ports on the north
 6 side of Buildings 1 and 2, is typically where all the
 7 utilities come in. There's bollards, there's
 8 protection for utilities at those points.
 9 Let's see. There's -- I mentioned it
 10 before. The west side of Building Number 2, the left-
 11 hand side of the plan, the paved emergency access for
 12 Building Number 2. And again, I mentioned it earlier,
 13 just physical location of Building Number 2 is about 50
 14 feet further away from the property line than it was
 15 before.
 16 It's not exact, but it's plus or minus.
 17 So that concludes the presentation of the application.
 18 Mr. Costa, I don't know if you wanted to go through the
 19 rest of the testimony. Do you want to go through any
 20 other items right now?
 21 MR. COSTA: Did you -- did you go through
 22 point by point the changes in the plan? I know you did
 23 some of it. I just wanna make sure you addressed that.
 24 MR. OTTES: Yes. I started to -- we got a
 25 little sidetracked with --

73

1 MR. COSTA: Okay.
 2 MR. OTTES: -- the change in the location
 3 of the trailer ports, but I did go through those.
 4 MR. COSTA: Okay. And the only thing I
 5 would ask you to maybe point out is just the fire
 6 access and circulation, so that -- and the location of
 7 hydrants.
 8 MR. OTTES: Yes. You know what? I have -
 9 - it's on -- it's on the back there. I have a utility
 10 plan on here. I think it would be easier if I just
 11 showed it.
 12 MR. COSTA: Is this gonna be A10? Would
 13 be the --
 14 MR. GRUENBERG: It's not in this packet?
 15 MR. COSTA: It's not in this packet, yeah.
 16 MR. GRUENBERG: No. Is that something
 17 submitted to the Board already?
 18 MR. COSTA: It's part of the -- it was
 19 part of the application packet, yes.
 20 MR. GRUENBERG: So if it's part of the
 21 application packet and hasn't been colorized, we don't
 22 need to enter it as an exhibit.
 23 MR. COSTA: Okay.
 24 MR. GRUENBERG: We just need to make
 25 reference to it.

<p style="text-align: right;">74</p> <p>1 MR. COSTA: Right. I'll do that once the 2 page is up. Okay. This is the -- this is the -- I'm 3 looking for the -- I guess it's CU100. It's page -- 4 Sheet 13 of 43 from the site plan that was submitted by 5 Langan Engineering. 6 MR. OTTES: So Number 4. It's a little 7 tough from this angle, but fire hydrant locations are - 8 - I'm gonna go through and generally point to the 9 locations. They're generally within curb islands 10 around both buildings. There's one hydrant to the 11 northeast corner of Building 1 here, another one to the 12 southeast corner of Building 1 in this location. 13 There's another one probably about three quarters of 14 the way to the west along the front -- or in this case, 15 the southern end or southern face of Building 2 in this 16 location. 17 There's one in between Buildings 1 and 2, 18 generally in between -- about the midway point, plus or 19 minus of the drive aisles between the two buildings. 20 There's another one near the pump station. That dark 21 spot north of Building 1 is a pump stationary, and 22 there's a hydrant placed next to that. And then 23 similarly, Building 2 has one hydrant located in the 24 utility area just to the north in the middle. There's 25 one at the northwest corner.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">76</p> <p>1 MR. OTTES: Well -- 2 MR. GRUENBERG: Yes, it's 600 feet, sorry. 3 MR. COSTA: And we saw that was listed in 4 the resolution, 600 feet. 5 MR. GRUENBERG: In the resolution, is what 6 I'm asking. 7 MR. COSTA: Yeah. 8 MR. BOYLE: So you have three hydrants 9 around Building 2? Is that what you said? 10 MR. OTTES: Building 2, there are four 11 hydrants, two in the front, two in the rear, and one -- 12 I would say one -- each building has -- let's say each 13 building has four hydrants around the perimeter, and 14 then they share one common hydrant in between them. 15 VICE CHAIR: That's in the center of the 16 two of them, right? 17 MR. OTTES: Correct. 18 MR. BOYLE: The only reason I'm asking is 19 you're saying 7th Avenue is the emergency access, which 20 is probably where the fire company would come in from. 21 MR. COSTA: And there's a hydrant. Look - 22 - and look at your thing. There's a hydrant located -- 23 VICE CHAIR: Yes, there's -- 24 MR. COSTA: -- at the entrance at 7th, 25 right?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">75</p> <p>1 There's another one. It's generally to 2 the southwest corner, probably a few spaces down to the 3 east from that southwest corner, and there's another 4 hydrant, generally I would say, probably two thirds of 5 the way from the east -- to the east from the southwest 6 corner of Building 3. So are the only -- they're 7 actually turned on. They're colored red on the utility 8 plan that's part of the application. 9 MR. GRUENBERG: Are they all within no 10 more than 200 feet between each other? About 700 feet 11 between each other? 12 MR. OTTES: Yes. That's how they were 13 designed, the radius, and we haven't gotten -- as 14 mentioned earlier, we haven't gotten comments from the 15 fire department, but I would be happy to come and meet 16 with them personally to go over their comments, any 17 plan changes they have, and discuss those items with 18 them. 19 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah, but are they within 20 -- 21 (Interposing) 22 MR. GRUENBERG: Are they no more than 700 23 feet apart? 24 MR. RYAN PARISI: I believe it's actually 25 600 feet.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">77</p> <p>1 MR. OTTES: Right. 2 MR. COSTA: So I guess at the corner of 3 our building in that parking area, is there a hydrant? 4 You wanna show that on -- 5 MR. OTTES: Yeah. 6 MR. COSTA: -- A3? 7 MR. OTTES: In this area here. 8 MR. COSTA: Yeah. 9 MR. OTTES: In that corner. Northwest 10 corner of Building 2. 11 VICE CHAIR: I would like to see you meet 12 with the fire department in regards to that, because it 13 appears to me you have more hydrants down on Building 1 14 than you do up on Building 2, like I said, which is 15 where the company would probably come in from. 16 MR. OTTES: Happy to discuss it with them. 17 MR. BOYLE: What's the largest distance 18 between any two hydrants? 19 MR. PARISI: No more than 600 feet. 20 MR. GRUENBERG: You can't testify, sir, 21 because you're not sworn. 22 MR. PARISI: (Interposing). 23 MR. GRUENBERG: I know you can keep 24 yelling, but -- 25 MR. PARISI: Yeah, it's 600 feet.</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">78</p> <p>1 MR. GRUENBERG: -- you can supplement that 2 -- let me just finish. 3 MR. PARISI: Sure. 4 MR. GRUENBERG: You can supplement to 5 testify later. If you don't know the answer, you don't 6 know the answer. 7 MR. OTTES: I believe it's a 600 feet 8 radius, but I can get that information for you. 9 VICE CHAIR: 600 feet between? 10 MR. OTTES: Correct. 11 MR. SZANATI: Question also for Ottes. 12 MR. GRUENBERG: Yep. 13 MR. SZANATI: You mentioned using the 14 maximum height of the building that we allow. It has 15 been proven from previous fire chiefs to be able to 16 confirm that that height is still adequate for a 17 resource, or does that also need to be considered? 18 CHAIR: I'd assume it probably needs to be 19 considered, still. 20 MR. GRUENBERG: Still in my -- you're 21 jumping a little bit ahead. In my review letter, 22 there's a number of points about the configuration of 23 the hydrants and concerns about the configuration and 24 locations. I just -- I don't wanna get too far into 25 leads if you weren't planning to address all those</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">80</p> <p>1 rather not dive into every detail, but anything that 2 you want addressed specifically, by all means, we're 3 happy to. 4 MR. OTTES: Yeah, so just for a point of 5 reference without going into much detail, as I 6 indicated, some of the hydrants are not concerned about 7 the accessibility of the hydrants, the location of the 8 hydrants, and conflicts with some of the site 9 improvements proposed. 10 Some of the questions that have been 11 raised by the Board are noted in the letter. 12 MR. COSTA: Mm-hm. 13 MR. GRUENBERG: So you're not going to go 14 through the engineers report now. 15 MR. OTTES: That's fine. 16 MR. GRUENBERG: And you're gonna present 17 additional engineering testimony in the future. Do 18 come back on that issue. 19 MR. COSTA: Correct. 20 MR. GRUENBERG: And I guess the question 21 is for the Board. Do you have any other questions 22 about this gentleman's testimony so far, or anything 23 you wanna give them a heads up on that is of concern to 24 you from what you've heard so far? 25 VICE CHAIR: Yeah, I have one issue. You</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">79</p> <p>1 comments now, and you're just probably generally 2 providing an overview. Hopefully we going to go 3 through each of the related topics of the detailed 4 comments provided before. 5 MR. OTTES: I think I'd like to -- 6 MR. GRUENBERG: I guess the question, 7 maybe, to you, counselor, is there were a lot of other 8 issues that were addressed in the original application 9 and with the reorientation like the buffering, like 10 what the height of the building is gonna look like to 11 the neighboring, and they presented a lot of testimony 12 as to that, that I'm not hearing yet from this witness, 13 and I don't know if you plan on presenting -- 14 MR. COSTA: We do. 15 MR. GRUENBERG: -- additional testimony or 16 going through Mr. O'Brien's report. 17 MR. COSTA: So what I'd like to do is not 18 go through Mr. O'Brien's report with this witness right 19 now because we have our landscape architect who's gonna 20 address the view from 7th Avenue and those issues. I'd 21 like to get those items on the record for discussions. 22 I think that's going to be of interest to 23 the public. And since we're coming back with other 24 technical issues, we can come back and address these 25 issues, or we can do it later this evening. But I'd</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">81</p> <p>1 have said that you're maintaining the width of 2 Industrial Avenue in your roads to the site and around 3 the site. Well, I see a reduction in the size of the 4 road just after the railroad crossing. You can see it 5 pretty good on A3. 6 MR. OTTES: A3? I'm gonna look at the 7 site plan from the set to see if there's a dimension on 8 there. Too many plans on there. Are you referring to 9 right at the -- right at the area where the -- where 10 you come into the site across the New Jersey Transit 11 easement? 12 VICE CHAIR: Right where New Jersey 13 Transit is, when you come up to the side, the road 14 widens. 15 MR. OTTES: Yeah, that's to allow the 16 truck turn -- the trucks to turn and not overlap. So 17 there're -- there's a -- where you have turning 18 movements, sometimes you have to have variances and, 19 yeah -- 20 VICE CHAIR: Understandable, but your 21 testimony was that you maintained the width of 22 Industrial Avenue through the site, and it's not true. 23 MR. COSTA: Well I think, at least the 24 intention of testimony was that we're maintaining the 25 width of the Industrial Drive for the portion that we</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">82</p> <p>1 were improving, starting from where we're connecting to 2 it. 3 VICE CHAIR: No, no, that's not what I 4 heard. 5 MR. OTTES: Yeah, what I said -- yeah. 6 VICE CHAIR: What I heard was through the 7 site. 8 MR. OTTES: Correcting what I said, the 9 drive aisles through the site are generally 24 feet. 10 They might -- they may or may not be wider in some 11 places to allow tracks to turn without encroaching into 12 each other's drive aisles. 13 MR. GRUENBERG: Does anybody have any 14 other questions for the engineer for what he's 15 presented? Knowing that he's going to be coming back, 16 now would be the opportunity for members of the public 17 to ask him questions. 18 And we're gonna do questions only. So 19 it's not gonna be, I feel this way, or what do -- you 20 know, it's just asking him who, what, where or why. 21 And if you have a question, why don't you please come 22 up and be identified by the chair, and then identify 23 who you are, and then you can come up and ask the 24 question. You wanna ask a question? 25 MS. BARBARA MERRITT: I was just gonna</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">84</p> <p>1 MS. MERRITT: Okay. 2 MR. GRUENBERG: -- which is how is this 3 development going to impact her property, where she 4 identified it from a stormwater purpose? And you know 5 that they're gonna come back and talk about stormwater 6 and the noise in future testimony -- 7 MS. MERRITT: I heard. 8 MR. GRUENBERG: -- but can you answer her 9 question about -- generally about the noise concern and 10 the water concern? 11 MS. MERRITT: And the stormwater. 12 MR. OTTES: So stormwater is currently 13 designed, and subject to Mr. O'Brien's review, the 14 municipal engineer, is currently designed to meet the 15 Borough's ordinance standards. The noise, as we 16 discussed before, the applicant's gonna agree to 17 provide an acoustical analysis and install required 18 mitigation if needed. 19 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah, can you do a little 20 better on that stormwater answer -- 21 MS. MERRITT: Yeah, that's -- 22 MR. GRUENBERG: -- a little bit more 23 detail. What do you mean by -- 24 MS. SCHOCKO: Sure. They're -- 25 MR. GRUENBERG: -- you're gonna meet the</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">83</p> <p>1 state that I live on the corner of 6th avenue -- 2 MR. GRUENBERG: You've gotta come up and 3 say who you are, and then you have to ask a question, 4 not state something. 5 CHAIR: Right here. Right here. Here. 6 MR. GRUENBERG: Come near the microphone - 7 - 8 MR. COSTA: Oops, I'm sorry. 9 MR. GRUENBERG: -- and just say who you 10 are. 11 CHAIR: It's just a couple (inaudible). 12 MS. MERRITT: I'm Barbara Merritt. I have 13 lived in Alpha for 43 years, and I live almost on the 14 corner of 6th and Vulcanite, so I am right there. 15 MR. GRUENBERG: And what's your question 16 of the witness? 17 MS. MERRITT: The noise, like you as a 18 team said, I mean, we hear the tracks -- trailers on 78 19 and everything. I can't even imagine. And water 20 you're saying, right now the water, we get so much rain 21 water and flooding. Our basement gets wet from it, and 22 I can't imagine what the rainwater is gonna be. 23 MR. GRUENBERG: So I'm gonna -- I'm gonna 24 take what you just said as a statement and convert it 25 into a question --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">85</p> <p>1 Borough's standard? She's concerned about what's gonna 2 happen to her property. 3 MR. OTTES: Sure. There's extensive -- as 4 I mentioned before, there's detention basins which hold 5 the water back and release it slower over time. 6 They're spread out throughout the site. There's 7 underground -- there's underground features, pipes, 8 series of pipes, that will also contain water. 9 So through meeting the requirements, the 10 site can -- from that particular site, it's not 11 permitted to discharge any more stormwater than it does 12 today. That's why all these features, basins, pipes 13 under the ground, are gonna be installed to hold back 14 that water in the event of soars. 15 MS. MERRITT: Like runoff? 16 MR. OTTES: Correct, from the runoff. 17 From -- yeah. 18 MS. MERRITT: Okay. 19 MR. OTTES: Correct. 20 MR. GRUENBERG: Do you have any other 21 questions? Okay. 22 MS. MERRITT: I'm going to keep my mouth 23 shut. 24 MR. GRUENBERG: No, you're entitled -- 25 MS. MERRITT: (Interposing).</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">86</p> <p>1 MR. GRUENBERG: -- to ask absolute 2 questions. I think there's one more over there. Yeah. 3 VICE CHAIR: I think to piggyback on that 4 just to give her a better answer, will the site 5 improvements improve her problem with flooding? 6 MR. OTTES: I can't testify to the 7 specific problems for that property, but what I will 8 say is that the site has been designed to hold the 9 stormwater back from -- in the proposed condition, it's 10 designed to hold the stormwater back with some 11 reductions as well in the amounts of runoff coming off 12 the property than it does today. 13 VICE CHAIR: Okay. 14 MR. OTTES: Now if this site does in fact 15 affect that property today, in theory, this would be an 16 improvement over the existing condition, what's being 17 proposed for this property. 18 MR. COSTA: Yes, we don't know exactly 19 what is impacting her site. 20 VICE CHAIR: Yeah, that's right. I know 21 what she was looking for. 22 MR. COSTA: Right. 23 MR. GRUENBERG: Anybody else have a 24 question for this witness? Yes, ma'am. Just identify 25 yourself, please.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">88</p> <p>1 that. So what's your actual -- instead of not a whole 2 lot of people, what's your actual expectations for 3 sewage? 4 MR. OTTES: I don't have the exact 5 generation, but within these warehouses, there's no -- 6 there's no showers, there's no -- 7 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: No shower -- 8 MR. GRUENBERG: You gotta let him -- you 9 just gotta let him finish his -- 10 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: I'm sorry, go ahead. 11 MR. GRUENBERG: -- finish his answer 12 before you fire off another question. 13 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Go ahead. 14 MR. OTTES: Ma'am, I don't have the exact 15 numbers with me, but compared to like say a 16 manufacturing facility that's using a lot of water for 17 processing, these have very low sewage generations. We 18 are working with the -- Phillipsburg is a treatment 19 plant where this is going, the sewer, the pipes go 20 through the Borough of Alpha 21 We're working with the Borough to process 22 that application. It's gotta go to DEP and get 23 reviewed. It's called the treatment works approval. 24 So all those applications in -- are in process. If 25 there is some sort of a problem with those, the Borough</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">87</p> <p>1 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Monica Larsen-Kiley on 2 Williams Street, a little further away than probably 3 this. My question is, is this a 24-hour warehouse? I 4 mean, I know you said you were gonna noise dampen 5 whatever you can. We also hear -- 6 MR. GRUENBERG: So what's your hours of 7 operation? 8 MR. OTTES: So I can -- Fred Ferraro is 9 going to testify to that, but it is intended to be a 10 24-hour operation. It's unlikely it will be 24 hour, 11 but it is going to -- you know, we were seeking 12 approval for 24 hours which is what the prior approval 13 was for. 14 But we -- we'll give more details on that 15 when the owner rep testifies. 16 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: And then I have other 17 question, if that's okay. 18 MR. GRUENBERG: Yes. 19 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: So about 10 years ago, 20 we had a sewage issue because Alpha sewage system is 21 probably not the most up to date one, and you had 22 mentioned there's a sewage report earlier -- I think 23 you had mentioned that actually earlier on. You're 24 adding 300 parking spaces. We'll just figure 150 25 people, not a big impact on sewage. I beg to differ on</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">89</p> <p>1 of Phillipsburg and the DEP would let us know, but today 2 we haven't received any indication of any problem with 3 this application as it relates to sewer. 4 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: You're saying the 5 sewage is actually going to run through Alpha sewer, 6 right? 7 MR. OTTES: It has to, to get to the 8 treatment plant. 9 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Okay. So washing 10 trucks, and it's not just people take towels -- 11 MR. OTTES: There won't be any trucks 12 washed here. 13 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: There's no trucks 14 (interposing) -- 15 MR. OTTES: No truck washing there. 16 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: -- (inaudible) down 17 anything. 18 MR. OTTES: No trucks washed. 19 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Okay. 20 MR. OTTES: No, no trucks. 21 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: You're using sinks for 22 the break room and toilets? 23 MR. OTTES: Sinks and toilets. That's it. 24 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Which could still pose 25 a problem for the residents, but you're saying probably</p>

90

1 not that that much.

2 MR. OTTES: I don't -- I don't know if

3 theoretically it could pose a problem to the residents

4 if there's an issue with capacity and conveyance.

5 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Right. (Interposing).

6 MR. OTTES: We would -- we would've likely

7 known at this time, given the time that this

8 application's been in front of the Board.

9 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Okay. Thank you.

10 MR. GRUENBERG: Anybody else have a

11 question for this witness.

12 CHIEF STEVE DRAGOTTA: Steve Dragotta,

13 Fire Chief. Looking at these plans, I'm just curious

14 of was there any study done to the south side for a

15 collapse zone to get apparatus in position? I'm just

16 looking at this with -- you know, off the picture.

17 The -- Building 1 looks -- it doesn't look

18 like there's enough room, in my eyes, to get truck in

19 position, maximum height of the building. I mean, it

20 may not -- it might be without looking at, you know, a

21 real picture distance. It's kinda tough to say.

22 MR. GRUENBERG: What your specific

23 question in the beginning was the study.

24 CHIEF DRAGOTTA: Is there any sort of

25 study done to prove, you know, is there enough width to

91

1 park fire truck to be out of the collapse zone for?

2 MR. GRUENBERG: Tim, I think that was in

3 your stuff too, wasn't it?

4 MR. O'BRIEN: Correct. I had comments

5 about the collapse zone. There's also comments that

6 they need to review the site plan in detail with the

7 fire department --

8 CHIEF DRAGOTTA: Okay.

9 MR. O'BRIEN: -- to address similar

10 matters, because they're all -- they're all -- yeah,

11 I've identified them also, and then the intent was make

12 sure they sit down with you.

13 CHIEF DRAGOTTA: Okay.

14 MR. GRUENBERG: Any other question?

15 CHIEF DRAGOTTA: I guess my other question

16 was I know there's gonna be separate obviously

17 emergency access off the 7th Avenue side. Is the water

18 system, is it only going to be coming in off of

19 Industrial Ave, or is it going to be looped?

20 MR. OTTES: It's going to be looped --

21 it's going to be looped to 7th and Industrial.

22 CHIEF DRAGOTTA: Okay. Okay.

23 MR. GRUENBERG: That's it? Anything else,

24 sir?

25 CHIEF DRAGOTTA: I think that's it. Thank

92

1 you.

2 MR. GRUENBERG: Thank you.

3 MR. COSTA: Thank you.

4 MR. GRUENBERG: Anybody else have a

5 question of this witness?

6 MR. SZANATI: I actually had one other

7 question regarding similar emergency type situations

8 which could be considered with the fire chief as well.

9 But was there any consideration for, in an emergency

10 situation, evacuation plans or anything of that nature?

11 MR. OTTES: That was really the motivation

12 behind adding that secondary access to 7th Avenue.

13 There was no access there previously, but that was the

14 motivation behind adding that access.

15 MR. SZANATI: So I'm talking maybe the

16 people of the building, where they should go

17 (interposing) --

18 MR. OTTES: Yeah, there's -- it depends.

19 For example, my office, we have an evacuation plan for

20 if the fire alarm goes off. Just as we have tests

21 sometimes, we go to a certain area of the parking lot.

22 I think that would be up to the tenant. I

23 don't know if that's a requirement, necessarily, of --

24 whether it's OSHA, or any sort of building code

25 requirement, but I would just defer that to the tenant,

93

1 and Mr. Ferraro will probably speak further to the

2 operation of these buildings and how they handle those

3 sorts of things.

4 MR. GRUENBERG: Anybody on the Board have

5 any other questions for the engineer? Last chance for

6 anybody in the public to have questions for the

7 engineer. No?

8 CHAIR: There's always a taker.

9 MR. O'BRIEN: I gotta ask Mr. Costa the

10 engineers name though -- first though, I apologize.

11 MR. OTTES: It's Keith Ottes.

12 MR. O'BRIEN: Otis?

13 MR. OTTES: That's right.

14 MR. O'BRIEN: The elevator guy, right.

15 MR. CRAIG DUNWELL: Mr. Craig Dunwell.

16 Mr. Ottes, in your testimony, you mentioned that as

17 part of the reconfiguration with the -- changing the

18 loading docks to the other side, that the elevation

19 profile of Building 2 was lowered.

20 MR. OTTES: It was. It was six tenths of

21 a foot. So it was the -- the previous application, I

22 know, did -- committed to lowering the building to an

23 elevation of 310.6 feet. We got it down to 310. So it

24 was -- it started a lot higher, I think.

25 MR. COSTA: It started at 318, I think.

94

1 MR. OTTES: 318. So it's been improved
2 drastically.
3 MR. DUNWELL: And you also -- can I ask a
4 question about his response to a question that was
5 asked?
6 MR. GRUENBERG: You can ask a question.
7 We'll see if it's not appropriate.
8 MR. DUNWELL: So a question was asked
9 about stormwater runoff from the site. Is it part of
10 the stormwater plan to connect to the existing
11 stormwater infrastructure located on East Vulcanite
12 Avenue?
13 MR. OTTES: It is.
14 MR. DUNWELL: It is? So is it your
15 testimony then that right now you have an agricultural
16 field and you have a much higher elevation. You're
17 familiar with the topography of the site currently?
18 MR. OTTES: That's correct.
19 MR. DUNWELL: And so based upon the
20 current topography and your experience, would you say
21 that in rain events, there's a lot of stormwater that
22 comes from that site to the north on to east Vulcanite,
23 as Mrs. Merritt asked the question earlier?
24 MR. OTTES: Yes, that's generally -- there
25 is a very large portion of the site that does drain in

95

1 that direction to --
2 MR. DUNWELL: In an uncontrolled fashion?
3 MR. OTTES: In uncontrolled fashion. And
4 contrary to some opinions, but it's based on the
5 standards -- the Soil Conservation Service. There is a
6 high level of runoff from row crops as compared to a
7 field of grass or meadow.
8 MR. DUNWELL: And it's your -- it's your
9 contention that development of this site would improve
10 the stormwater runoff by controlling it and then piping
11 it underground to the existing stormwater
12 infrastructure on east Vulcanite?
13 MR. OTTES: Controlling it and reducing
14 the peak rates to the state requirements, yes.
15 MR. DUNWELL: Okay. Thank you. Thank
16 you.
17 MR. GRUENBERG: All right. Last, last
18 chance to ask any questions of the engineer. Nope?
19 All right. Do you want -- do you want to go to the
20 next witness?
21 CHAIR: I was going to say, if we wanted
22 to take maybe a five-minute break, if that would be all
23 right with everybody. We're going on two hours. All
24 right. So it is 8:45 now. We will readjourn at
25 approximately 8:50.

96

1 (Break)
2 CHAIR: The meeting -- Plan Board meeting
3 at 8:54 p.m.
4 MR. COSTA: Thank you. Our next is Ryan
5 Parisi, landscape architect from Langan Engineering.
6 And if we could swear him in.
7 MR. GRUENBERG: If you could please spell
8 your last name, please?
9 MR. PARISI: Oh, yes. Last name is Parisi
10 with Ionin, P-A-R-I-S-I, a little (inaudible).
11 MR. GRUENBERG: All right. I should have
12 asked the question how to pronounce all these names
13 before I started.
14 MR. PARISI: No cool way of doing a
15 (inaudible), by the way.
16 MS. SCHOCKO: Ionin.
17 MR. GRUENBERG: Please raise your right
18 hand. And do you swear or affirm that the testimony
19 you're about to give before this board will be the
20 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so
21 help you God?
22 MR. PARISI: Yes, I do.
23 R Y A N P A R I S I, SWORN, WITNESS
24
25 MR. GRUENBERG: Thank you.

97

1 MR. COSTA: All right. Ryan, could you
2 give the Board the benefit of your educational
3 background, licensing, and experience testifying before
4 boards?
5 MR. PARISI: Yes. Experience of my
6 education is I graduated with a Bachelor of Landscape
7 Architecture from Penn State. I've been a licensed
8 professional since 2018, licensed in the state of New
9 Jersey since 2023.
10 I've testified in a couple municipalities
11 in Pennsylvania, but this is my first time testifying
12 in New Jersey.
13 MR. GRUENBERG: Your license in New Jersey
14 is in good standing?
15 MR. PARISI: Yes, it is.
16 MR. GRUENBERG: Anybody have any questions
17 as to this gentleman's qualifications to present expert
18 landscape architecture testimony?
19 CHAIR: No.
20 MR. GRUENBERG: He's accepted as same.
21 MR. PARISI: All right. Thank you so
22 much.
23 MR. COSTA: Okay. If you could give an
24 overall review of the landscaping of the site and also
25 the lighting.

<p style="text-align: right;">98</p> <p>1 MR. PARISI: Yeah. So I'm gonna go 2 through three different exhibits, and it's gonna be -- 3 the first one is Exhibit A6, which is the landscape 4 plan. I'll also talk through the lighting plan. 5 And then we have some section graphics 6 that (inaudible) site plans (inaudible). So starting 7 with the landscape plan, shade trees are provided 8 throughout the parking lot areas. You can see we have 9 the parking lot, and I'm pointing at Exhibits A6 10 Building 2 and Building 1. To the southwest are the 11 parking lot areas, so there's parking lot shade trees 12 that are provided in the parking lots. 13 And then in some of the open space areas, 14 there are shade trees that are provided as well. Those 15 are provided to plan north of the building, kind of to 16 the -- to the northeast. And then to the north of the 17 entire site is an extensive landscape buffer, which 18 we'll get into in some detail as we go through here. 19 The plan species that are specified for 20 the project are all hardy and well adapted to this 21 region's climate. So there's no irrigation or anything 22 that's proposed for the -- for the project. Also, 23 what's provided throughout the site are seed mixes. We 24 actually propose three different types of seed mixes. 25 There's a side slope seed mix that's used</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">100</p> <p>1 existing. And then utilizing a lot of that existing 2 buffer. These are mature trees, you know, providing a 3 lot of great visual and ecological value for the area. 4 And then along the northern property line 5 is, you know, as I mentioned, this is an extensive 6 landscape buffer. This is also one of the -- one of 7 the changes from the previous plan. This buffer is now 8 pushed closer to the property line, and what this does 9 is it cuts down on the sightlines from the adjacent 10 residence. 11 If it's closer to the building, you're 12 going to be able to view a little bit more into the 13 site than if it's pushed up against the property line. 14 So you'll see that when we get into the section as 15 well. So that's one of the other significant changes 16 that we made. And the vegetative buffer that's 17 provided includes, you know, a mix of shrubs down on 18 the lower canopy, there's evergreen trees, and then 19 there's deciduous trees. 20 So we wanted to provide this kind of 21 layered offer that would be tucked up against the 22 property line to kind of supplement a lot of the 23 existing that's provided along Standard Street that 24 would remain. And that's in -- that's a pretty mature 25 edge there as well.</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">99</p> <p>1 in a lot of the open space areas. There's a stormwater 2 detention seed mix that's used in the larger stormwater 3 areas, and then there's a rain garden seed mix, which 4 is just -- to the northwest corner of Building 1 is a 5 small rain garden. So we specify a specific seed mix 6 for there as well. 7 And I wanted to point this out as one of 8 the main differences between the previously reviewed 9 plans and this plans is the extensive seed mixes that 10 are provided throughout the site. This is providing, 11 you know, additional biodiversity. It's, you know, 12 less maintenance, and then obviously there's, you know, 13 stormwater benefits to having the -- having the meadows 14 provided as well. 15 Along the property lines, right at the 16 edge of the limit of disturbance where the grading ties 17 back into the existing, we have a lot of adjacent -- 18 you can see it from -- you know, I'm now pointing at, I 19 believe this is Exhibit A3. 20 MR. COSTA: A3, yes. 21 MR. PARISI: A3. You can see there's 22 extensive existing vegetation all around the outside of 23 the property. So we're proposing tree protection fence 24 right along the limits of disturbance where it ties 25 back -- where the grading ties back in with the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">101</p> <p>1 So I'm going to move now. I don't know if 2 anybody has any questions about the overview of the 3 landscape plan, and then I can jump into the into the 4 lighting plan as well. 5 MR. BOYLE: Before you go any further, 6 just a quick question. Do you know the elevation of 7 the railroad tracks as opposed to the parking area? 8 MR. PARISI: Where we're tying in at the 9 entrance to the site here? 10 MR. BOYLE: No, on the west side. 11 MR. COSTA: The Conrail tracks on the east 12 side? 13 MR. PARISI: On the Conrail tracks? 14 MR. BOYLE: Yeah. 15 MR. PARISI: I don't -- I don't have that 16 information on here. I would -- I would defer to our 17 civil engineer for the grading information, sir. 18 MR. BOYLE: I mean, roughly? I mean, you 19 don't have to give me an exact. 20 MR. COSTA: I've got it on the plan 21 somewhere. We may be able to get -- our engineer who 22 already testified may be able to get to that in a 23 moment. 24 MR. PARISI: Do we have a grading plan 25 that I can direct here quickly and take a look at?</p>

102

1 Grading plan. (Inaudible).
 2 MR. OTTES: So Keith Ottes again, civil
 3 engineer on behalf of the AFTI (inaudible). The -- you
 4 were talking about -- as I was going through, it was
 5 the grading on the south side of both buildings
 6 relative to the ground, correct?
 7 Right, so the -- what I would say, I don't
 8 have the finer grading plans in hand, but the elevation
 9 will start with Building Number 1.
 10 The elevation of the car parking on the
 11 south side of the building is approximately elevation
 12 of 300, generally, at the curb line, and then it slopes
 13 down -- it -- the lowest point along that area is
 14 generally where it ties into the property line. The
 15 elevation is generally about -- it's in the range of
 16 elevation to 270 feet. So it's 30 feet lower down to
 17 the property line.
 18 It -- I believe it slopes -- I can't read
 19 the -- this level plan, but I believe it keeps on
 20 sloping down towards the rail line from that point.
 21 But if you go east to west from that low point, the tie
 22 in elevations on the property line get higher.
 23 MR. BOYLE: Okay.
 24 MR. OTTES: So less differential. If I
 25 look at Building 2, that -- similar to the car parking

103

1 area on the south side of Building 2, the elevations
 2 are about three 308 feet.
 3 There's a retaining wall along there. And
 4 then it keeps going -- at that point it goes up. It
 5 gets up to around 320 feet or so at the property line.
 6 So there's a differential with the grade wall around
 7 the site. There's different tie in elevations
 8 generally around the site.
 9 MR. BOYLE: Okay. Thank you.
 10 MR. OTTES: You're welcome.
 11 MR. SZANATI: Another question with
 12 landscape. do you expect to have any changes or
 13 modifications to account for the finalized stormwater
 14 data?
 15 MR. PARISI: I mean, what we do in the
 16 stormwater basins areas is that we'll have our seed
 17 mixes that are specialized for the -- for the basins.
 18 So it'll be a detention seed mix that can handle the
 19 saturated conditions.
 20 So any sort of changes that would be made
 21 to the stormwater, the seed mixes would change. But
 22 beyond that, beyond the seed mix, there wouldn't be
 23 anything that I would anticipate from a revised
 24 standpoint.
 25 MR. COSTA: And if I could just clarify on

104

1 the stormwater, we have created stormwater calculations
 2 and finalized our stormwater study for this plan.
 3 We have some information we're gonna
 4 provide to him. What we really needed to do was do a
 5 stormwater report for the prior plan so we could
 6 compare the two. So it's not as if we haven't designed
 7 our basin so that the landscaping would be final, you
 8 know, as proposed.
 9 MR. PARISI: And the last thing I wanted
 10 to point out on this slide before we moved on was Keith
 11 had started talking about the sound barrier that was
 12 going to be at the sound fence, and just showing where
 13 that would be located here is it would come out of the
 14 building, out of Building 2 in the northern corner.
 15 It would then cut across the emergency
 16 access drive and then wrap around probably about
 17 halfway down this stretch here, and, you know, that all
 18 kind of further confirm it with the sound engineers
 19 that, as that study's done, that that's generally where
 20 we're thinking of providing this.
 21 And it would be an attractive -- it would
 22 be an attractive barrier. So we'd work -- you know,
 23 we'd be willing to kind of work with the aesthetics and
 24 how that would kind of work just to make sure that it
 25 still has that sound barrier function as well.

105

1 CHAIR: Is that -- is that all going to
 2 get worked in with like a gate and access to that?
 3 Because I know there's obviously a gated access.
 4 MR. COSTA: Yes.
 5 CHAIR: So if you have a sound barrier
 6 across there, is that all (inaudible)?
 7 MR. COSTA: And it would be subject to the
 8 sound engineer obviously, you know, approving it, but
 9 I've seen those sound barriers as gates.
 10 MR. PARISI: Okay. We'll move on to
 11 (inaudible).
 12 MR. GRUENBERG: Does anybody have any
 13 questions, on the Board, for the landscaping
 14 (inaudible)?
 15 MR. BOYLE: Just with the landscaping,
 16 just to clarify, there's a number of landscaping
 17 technical items that weren't as part of your testimony.
 18 I just want to confirm if you're planning to go point
 19 by point through each one of those. They start on Page
 20 30 of my letter.
 21 They continue on 31.
 22 MR. COSTA: Yeah, I think if we can
 23 address them, let's --
 24 MR. PARISI: Yeah.
 25 MR. COSTA: -- yeah, let's go through

1 them.
 2 MR. PARISI: All right. So this is Page
 3 30 of the review Letter J, the landscaping plan, am I
 4 correct?
 5 MR. BOYLE: Correct.
 6 MR. PARISI: And then there's -- so we'll
 7 go through that.
 8 MR. BOYLE: Yes.
 9 MR. PARISI: Okay. So let's jump into
 10 those (inaudible). Do you want me to go through each
 11 item?
 12 MR. COSTA: I think if you can summarize
 13 and express whether you'll agree to them, then you can
 14 satisfy them.
 15 MR. PARISI: Sure. So the first note is
 16 just summarizing that, you know, the Borough of Alpha
 17 reserves the right to require additional landscaping
 18 and screening. So that's no problem. We'll happily
 19 work with the Borough on any sort of additional
 20 screening or landscaping that would be required on the
 21 site prior to, you know, the CO.
 22 So Item Number 2, shall be revised to
 23 include on site buffering and screening to shield the
 24 buildings along the railroad right of way, as the
 25 proposed plan relies on offsite landscaping to screen

1 properties for the future residential development,
 2 existing adjacent recreation and educational uses.
 3 Kind of the same response here is if
 4 there's, you know, additional buffering that you would,
 5 you know, request, you know, we'll happily work with
 6 you on providing that additional landscaping.
 7 MR. BOYLE: Yeah, to the -- to the point
 8 of that particular -- like in the testimony you
 9 provided, you pointed to the tree coverage around the
 10 quarry as being buffering. There's potential for, I
 11 need to remove some of those trees to deal with
 12 environmental -- potential environmental issues up on
 13 that property.
 14 So would there be a need based on off site
 15 to address or adjust your approach to the landscape
 16 buffering? Generally, you're relying on those two
 17 tracks. Those two frontages of the building alongside
 18 for the off sites --
 19 MR. PARISI: I don't know if you have any
 20 information on the extent of those removals. It, you
 21 know --
 22 MR. BOYLE: Could be extensive.
 23 MR. PARISI: Could be extensive, yeah. I
 24 mean, we're happily -- you know, happy to kind of work
 25 with you all to kind of --

1 MR. COSTA: Would you --
 2 MR. PARISI: -- a level of buffering along
 3 there.
 4 MR. COSTA: Would you be looking for us to
 5 increase -- potentially increase buffering on our site?
 6 Or would you be looking for us to increase buffering --
 7 MR. GRUENBERG: The test we provided was
 8 that the offsite -- off site existing forested and
 9 wooded areas provided screening of the site --
 10 MR. COSTA: Right.
 11 MR. GRUENBERG: -- as a means to limit the
 12 onsite plantings. So the concern that raises is --
 13 besides the question is that there may be quite a bit
 14 more extensive buffering needed on both long sides.
 15 MR. COSTA: So on the --
 16 MR. GRUENBERG: We actually need to
 17 provide accommodations for room for that.
 18 MR. COSTA: Okay. So on the -
 19 MR. GRUENBERG: The grading on those areas
 20 is generally steep. It doesn't accommodate plantings.
 21 MR. COSTA: Right. We would work with the
 22 town professionals to provide that.
 23 MR. PARISI: Yeah, absolutely. And there
 24 is -- you know, there is the railroad right away there,
 25 as well, that has some existing vegetation.

1 You know, but, like we were saying, we're
 2 happy to kind of work through where you would like to
 3 see additional buffering, things like that.
 4 MR. GRUENBERG: I think he's telling you
 5 that now, right?
 6 MR. BOYLE: Yeah.
 7 CHAIR: Yeah.
 8 MR. PARISI: Okay. So is it -- I guess my
 9 question then, is it -- is it the entire stretch along
 10 there?
 11 MR. O'BRIEN: Both sides. Along from it -
 12 - both. All four sides.
 13 MR. PARISI: All four sides?
 14 MR. O'BRIEN: And you're not relying on
 15 the adjacent buffering.
 16 MR. PARISI: Okay. And then would you
 17 like us to put together an exhibit, share with you,
 18 kind of discussing these -- like how densely we want
 19 this buffer to look, things like that? Because on the
 20 previous plans, I believe there were just lines of
 21 deciduous trees that were provided along those. Is
 22 that adequate?
 23 MR. O'BRIEN: The prior plans would be
 24 noted that there were similar comments that the
 25 landscaping wasn't necessarily sufficient for buffering

1 or screening that it needed to be revised, and that was
2 under preliminary going for final.

3 It would be best -- my recommendation
4 would be to provide an updated plan for the Board's
5 consideration before any action is taken. But I leave
6 that up to the Board how they would want that
7 considered or to take up that matter.

8 CHAIR: I mean, I'm not privy to changes
9 in the landscaping over on the quarry property or
10 anything like that. But at the end of the day, yes, I
11 would agree that, One, we can't be relying on other
12 offsite vegetation to buffer this where we can.

13 But, Two, yeah, there should be -- there
14 should be an update for whatever, to satisfy what Tim's
15 looking for.

16 MR. PARISI: We're happy to do something.

17 MR. COSTA: We can go by --

18 MR. O'BRIEN: It will be more of something
19 -- a bit of diversity as you spoke about before, but
20 also a consideration that we would want screening there
21 also in the winter too.

22 MR. PARISI: Yeah, yeah, so the evergreens
23 being mixed into the buffer, absolutely.

24 MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah.

25 CHAIR: Are the trees you're considering

1 shown at time of planting.

2 They're kind of an in between symbol. And
3 it's really shown for readability purposes, is why we
4 show the plants -- the symbols, the size on the plant.

5 MR. O'BRIEN: Thank you.

6 MR. COSTA: I think you're on Number 3,
7 which refers to the view from the 7th Avenue
8 neighborhood area, which we're going to have a separate
9 exhibit on. So I'm gonna defer Number 3 on that, and
10 you can jump on to Number 4.

11 MR. PARISI: Yes. So Number 4 is
12 mentioning all open space shall be reforested and use
13 of meadow mix to promote -- development of wildlife
14 habitat should be considered throughout the site.

15 So as I had testified to before, we're
16 proposing meadows throughout much of this. We feel for
17 this type of application that that's an appropriate,
18 but it's -- is an appropriate measure for, you know, a
19 facility like this. You know, we'll have the vegetated
20 buffers around the outside of the -- around the outside
21 of the perimeter of the property, but then on the
22 interior, we have meadow mixes is really what we're
23 looking at.

24 We have, you know, that range of meadow
25 mixes providing that biodiversity.

1 gonna be more mature to begin with, or like, are we
2 talking about a buffer that's gonna take 20 years to
3 grow?

4 MR. PARISI: Yeah, so we actually --
5 you'll see we do have some exhibits showing kind of the
6 growth after five years. So you'll see pretty close to
7 time of planting, we like to show them a little bit
8 growing.

9 But in terms of the -- let me actually
10 pull it up. So the deciduous shade trees that are
11 being proposed are two and a half to three-inch
12 caliper, which it would typically range in a 12 to 14-
13 foot height at time of planting. The evergreen trees
14 that are being proposed are 6 to 7 feet at time of
15 planting, and then the shrubs range from 2 feet to 36
16 inches at time of planting.

17 MR. O'BRIEN: And then for clarity
18 purposes, the landscape plan you're showing with plants
19 at maturity, or at the sizing at the time of planting
20 in terms of spread.

21 MR. PARISI: Yeah. I'd say it's a little
22 bit in between, so it's going to vary in terms of how
23 much these plants are going to grow, but they're not
24 shown -- the size of the symbols, if that's what you're
25 referring to, are not shown at maturity, they're not

1 CHAIR: What's a meadow mix? Is it just
2 the type of grass, or is it --

3 MR. PARISI: So a meadow mix, you know, it
4 wouldn't be lawn for instance. So it would be -- you
5 know, you'd have a mix of species, and these -- you
6 know, these meadow mixes that are specified.

7 And actually, let me pull them up here
8 real quick, and I can -- so for instance, the steep
9 slope meadow mix that's proposed has -- we're looking
10 at 15 different types of species that are proposed
11 within this meadow mix. The --

12 CHAIR: So it's designed though to -- it's
13 not gonna be like a manicured lawn?

14 MR. PARISI: No.

15 CHAIR: It's gonna be designed to --

16 MR. PARISI: And the idea with the
17 maintenance of these is that they're getting cut once,
18 twice a year, and just to kind of maintain that meadow,
19 from a -- from a maintenance and safety standpoint,
20 being able to keep clear sightlines throughout the
21 site, things like that.

22 MR. GRUENBERG: Tim, what's your thought
23 on that for this entire site? It kinda looks --

24 MR. O'BRIEN: I believe they will also
25 have some more traditional manicured lawns closer to

114

1 the building.

2 MR. PARISI: I figured.

3 MR. O'BRIEN: If it's not landscaped, but

4 the outer green buffer areas are open spaces that's not

5 occupied by a tree. Meadow mix, I have seen that used

6 on similar sites.

7 There's some environmental benefits that

8 it could bring in habitat for birds and stuff like

9 that, which is promoted within Highlands guidance

10 projects.

11 MR. GRUENBERG: I'm not trying to

12 misspeak, but --

13 VICE CHAIR: What about flower mix?

14 MR. O'BRIEN: But you'll see similar

15 approach was applied in another project, Bridge Point

16 over in Phillipsburg, Lopat.

17 VICE CHAIR: Okay.

18 MR. O'BRIEN: So you'll see a certain area

19 -- open spaces were replanted with saplings or

20 reforested attempt and meadow mix, and then certain

21 aspects of the site were manicured lawns.

22 MR. PARISI: Yeah, we're keeping the

23 manicured lawns, like you were mentioning, tighter to

24 the building, and then these meadow mixes -- as I

25 mentioned, it also provides that visibility and safety

115

1 concern throughout the site as well.

2 So it's not heavily vegetated, and it's a

3 good place to maintain those sightlines as well.

4 MR. COSTA: Okay. Number -- look at

5 Number 5.

6 MR. PARISI: All screening landscape roads

7 shall ensure that evergreen trees planted and

8 overlapping multi road screening to limit gaps at time

9 of planting, and then add non-evergreens to add variety

10 and color to the landscaping screening areas.

11 I believe that we accomplished this. Now

12 we have evergreen trees that are offset, they're

13 layered. We also have evergreen shrubs that are

14 provided on both sides of the buffer. And then we have

15 deciduous trees mixed in as well. So that's how we

16 kind of designed the buffer.

17 MR. O'BRIEN: It's safe to say that the

18 rest of this is stuff that you agree to do?

19 MR. PARISI: Let me just scan through real

20 quick.

21 MR. O'BRIEN: 5 through 10, (inaudible), 5

22 through 10.

23 MR. PARISI: That is correct.

24 MR. COSTA: Okay. Were you gonna do the

25 lighting plan next?

116

1 MR. PARISI: Yes. That's good. If

2 there's any other questions on landscaping?

3 MR. GRUENBERG: Is there -- is there an

4 opportunity to get some larger trees in that

5 landscaping, like, from the start? Like, I know, like,

6 you were saying 10 to 12 feet or whatever, but --

7 MR. PARISI: You specify some larger

8 calipers?

9 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah, like some bigger

10 ones, just to get some height in there. I mean, I'm

11 not looking for, obviously, anything mature, but those

12 smaller little ones have, like, six little branches.

13 Like, it's not gonna shade --

14 MR. PARISI: Right.

15 MR. GRUENBERG: -- anything for a couple

16 of years. So yeah, if we could get some larger trees

17 at least interspersed in there, I think that would be

18 evergreen and, you know, if -- however we can make it

19 work.

20 MR. PARISI: Yeah, I think -- I think,

21 yeah.

22 MR. COSTA: Yeah.

23 MR. PARISI: I think we can agree to that.

24 MR. COSTA: We can -- we can work with

25 that.

117

1 MR. GRUENBERG: Can you -- I gotta put

2 that in a, you know, resolutions. I don't know.

3 CHAIR: Just like that.

4 MR. GRUENBERG: Sure. Mix in some larger

5 trees.

6 MR. COSTA: So I think it would be

7 workable.

8 CHAIR: Could you increase the minimum

9 time of planting -- or minimum height at planting of

10 the evergreens from 6 to 8 -- 6 to 7 feet to 8 to 10

11 feet?

12 MR. COSTA: I think we were looking to do

13 kind of strategically larger trees rather than

14 wholesale, was the request.

15 CHAIR: Yeah, but I think on evergreens,

16 usually you start out at 6 to 8 feet and then the Board

17 says, why don't you do 8 to 10 feet?

18 MR. PARISI: We can agree to that.

19 MR. COSTA: Okay, yeah.

20 CHAIR: And, yeah, larger -- the

21 deciduous, I don't -- I don't have experience whether

22 12 to 14 feet height is anything.

23 MR. O'BRIEN: There's with deciduous, some

24 plantings, there's consideration that has to be taken

25 into, the soil conditions at the time of planting, and

118

1 the appropriateness of the size of the plant, that it
 2 will establish not all soils support.
 3 So potentially if you plant too big of a
 4 tree and the soils aren't productive enough for it, it
 5 may not take.
 6 CHAIR: Right. So on the deciduous, how
 7 about intersperse larger deciduous trees to the
 8 satisfaction of the Board engineer.
 9 MR. COSTA: Yes.
 10 MR. PARISI: Yes.
 11 CHAIR: Okay.
 12 MR. PARISI: And kind of to add to Mr.
 13 O'Brien's point, when you do get those larger trees,
 14 you can sometimes see the success rate of those trees
 15 drop because you're transplanting them at a larger
 16 size.
 17 CHAIR: No, I understand. Yeah.
 18 MR. PARISI: So you know, I think it makes
 19 sense to sporadically place them throughout the site to
 20 get you a little bit more bang right at the -- right at
 21 the start, but using the two and a half to three-inch
 22 caliper trees, which you know, a lot of municipalities,
 23 you see the two to two and a half inch sites already.
 24 You know, we're at that two and a half to
 25 three-inch size, so we're already slightly bigger, but,

119

1 you know, we've seen good success from that size tree.
 2 MR. GRUENBERG: Just so the record's
 3 clear, we're gonna mark Mr. O'Brien's March 14th, 2024
 4 report as B1, since we keep referencing it.
 5 All right. Any other questions on
 6 landscape? All right.
 7 MR. COSTA: Okay. So next you're going to
 8 review the lighting plan in general, is that correct?
 9 MR. PARISI: That's correct, excuse me.
 10 MR. COSTA: Okay. And then we'll address
 11 the specific questions, which are the next section of
 12 Mr. O'Brien's report on lighting.
 13 MR. PARISI: We're jumping around a little
 14 bit with these (inaudible), so the lighting plan should
 15 actually be more. So apologies for that.
 16 MR. COSTA: Do we need to change those
 17 sheets, or did -- was that already done?
 18 MR. PARISI: I think we (inaudible).
 19 MR. COSTA: Okay.
 20 MR. PARISI: Yeah, so the lighting plan
 21 we're looking at here is A4. So all the light fixtures
 22 that are proposed on the site are LED fixtures.
 23 They're 3,000 Kelvin light temperature, full cutoff,
 24 zero off light. This makes them dark sky compliant
 25 light fixtures that are being proposed on the site.

120

1 This differs from the previous application
 2 which proposed 4,000 to 5,000 Kelvin light temperature,
 3 which, you know, looking at the light temperatures,
 4 anything that's -- I like to make the comparison at
 5 4,000 to 5,000 light temperature. If you're looking at
 6 like a car dealer lot, it's very cold. It's very blue
 7 in terms of the light temperature.
 8 The 3000 light temperature is a little bit
 9 warmer, light temperature, and then it also more
 10 naturally works with your security circadian rhythms as
 11 well. So it has a -- has a great benefit from that
 12 standpoint. And then also, you know, just as I
 13 mentioned, these are dark sky compliant.
 14 The two buildings, so Building 1 and 2,
 15 once again I'm pointing at Exhibit A4, have wall packs
 16 that are proposed on the building around the outside of
 17 the building. These are proposed at 30 feet above
 18 finish grade. The one comment that we did read --
 19 receive from Mr. O'Brien was lowering the lighting
 20 closer to the northern property line where the adjacent
 21 residents are.
 22 So we're gonna look at dropping those
 23 light fixtures down to a 10-foot height that would be
 24 mounted on the building in this location. And then the
 25 pole mounted fixtures around the outside of the site

121

1 are 30 feet. These are all orientated towards the
 2 sites. They're located around the outside of the site,
 3 and they're orientated towards the site. The previous
 4 plan had some fixtures located in the middle of parking
 5 lots that then would scatter light out towards the
 6 property lines.
 7 So all pole mounted fixtures are
 8 orientated towards the site now, and the poles that are
 9 located in the truck port areas are located 12 feet
 10 behind the curb lines. This avoids any sort of
 11 conflict with trailers that would be overhanging off
 12 the back of the curbs. And the light fixtures are also
 13 going to be on three-foot exposed foundations for the
 14 pole mounted lights as well.
 15 The light levels that we have designed are
 16 all to IESNM standards, which is the Illuminating
 17 Engineering Society of North America. So this sets,
 18 essentially, the precedent and the design standards for
 19 lighting, and referencing specifically it's the
 20 lighting roadway and parking facilities, it's NCIES RP
 21 822 (ph) that we used as a reference for designing the
 22 light levels on the site. And this includes a minimum
 23 of 0.5-foot candles and a maximum ratio of 15 to 1,
 24 which we -- which we need with our lighting design.
 25 And one of the other things that was

<p style="text-align: right;">122</p> <p>1 mentioned in the comment letter, and I will go through 2 the comments as well, that we received the technical 3 comments one by one, is looking at any sort of timers 4 and understanding the use of the facility, and we will 5 look at adding ambient high-level light sensors to the 6 -- to the fixtures as well. 7 So we'll specify that in the -- in the 8 revised plan. And what the ambient high-level light 9 sensors do is they'll sense the light levels, the 10 ambient light levels outside, they'll turn on at a 11 certain point, and then they'll dim unless there's 12 motion underneath them as well. So it kind of adds 13 that nice extra kind of dimming element to the lights 14 as well. 15 CHAIR: Does that mean that all the lights 16 will be on at 24 hours, or -- and just dim to some 17 lower level? Or are you proposing that some lights on 18 site get turned off at certain hours? 19 MR. PARISI: I think we'll have to circle 20 back with the owner's testimony in terms of the timers 21 on the lights. I can just speak to the motions and 22 when they would turn off. 23 And then what I do have here just to show, 24 one of the other comments that we received was 25 shielding for the fixtures as well. (inaudible).</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">124</p> <p>1 show some illustrations of what that looks like because 2 I believe we received a comment about shielding as 3 well. So this is the shielding that's provided. 4 MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah, the comment for 5 shielding was more external shielding, so potentially, 6 particularly along the residential properties, you 7 won't actually see the lighting element because of the 8 elevation differential between the adjacent properties. 9 You're gonna -- if you -- so it's not 10 actually gonna light -- the lighting footprint that you 11 submitted doesn't show it's putting the lighting into 12 the neighbors backyards. But the fixture itself, it 13 wouldn't -- you're still gonna see the light bulb from 14 the residential property. So the intent of the comment 15 was in those sensitive areas, was to consider putting 16 an external shield to obscure the actual fixture 17 without impacting your lighting spread onto the site. 18 MR. PARISI: Yeah. And in response to 19 that, the -- that's what these backlight control optics 20 are actually providing is that external shield. It's 21 just built up into the fixture. As you can see here in 22 that right fixture, that's actually in that picture 23 here. You've probably seen in your packet as well. 24 It has that shielding that's built in 25 there. So --</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">123</p> <p>1 So does this have an exhibit number? 2 MR. COSTA: I believe so. 3 MR. PARISI: It's A5. 4 MR. COSTA: A5, yeah. 5 MR. PARISI: Okay. Oh yeah, it's blocked 6 in the top corner. Okay. So this is Exhibit A5. And 7 what you're looking at here is a blowup of the fixtures 8 that are being proposed, the pole mounted fixtures 9 around the outside of the site that are orientated 10 towards the site. 11 And what we're using for these fixtures is 12 this new backlight control optic, is what it's called. 13 So we're proposing these around the outside. You can 14 take a look at these fixtures. And this image here, I 15 think, does a really good job of illustrating it. And 16 this is what would be seen from behind. So it's 17 shielding that is built integral into the LED board. 18 So it shields, has full cut off, and 19 shields from, you know, the back side of the light 20 fixture. It angles all the lighting towards the site. 21 You can see here in some of these diagrams of the light 22 fixtures of how it cuts off right at the back of the 23 parking lot. 24 So that's -- those are the fixtures that 25 are being proposed around the outside. Just wanted to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">125</p> <p>1 MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah, I have sites using 2 similar technology and you still see the LED fixture 3 from lower elevations. 4 MR. BOYLE: This way -- this way you're 5 showing us, yeah, it'll block the light from the 6 backlight. I'm saying from down below, you're gonna 7 look up, you're still gonna see the bulb. 8 MR. PARISI: Yeah, and I think in any sort 9 of lighting application, if you're looking right at the 10 light fixture, you're gonna see -- you're gonna see the 11 light source. 12 MR. BOYLE: How far apart are these pole 13 lights? Do you know? 14 MR. PARISI: That's gonna vary on the site 15 depending on the light levels that we need to meet in 16 the different statistical zones. So the poles -- 17 MR. COSTA: What about in the area nearest 18 the residence? 19 MR. PARISI: Yes. 20 MR. O'BRIEN: Part of my comments with the 21 lighting fixture has to do with the lighting item that 22 says light fixtures are permitted up to a certain 23 height -- 24 MR. BOYLE: Right. 25 MR. O'BRIEN: -- as a design standard, but</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">126</p> <p>1 it's not so there's -- it's not a fixed number. 2 MR. PARISI: Yeah, I was gonna comment on 3 that as we got further along, but we're kind of talking 4 about right now. 5 So it's -- 30 -- Tim, is 30 feet on the 6 building's standard -- that just seems high to me. I 7 understand it's a truck and a trailer, but at the same 8 time, I feel like that's just very tall. 9 MR. O'BRIEN: My experience with similar 10 warehouse facilities, that fixture height is in the -- 11 is in the range that people target off what they -- 12 their ideal position, what they try to do. 13 MR. BOYLE: Didn't he say he was going to 14 lower the lights on the building? 15 CHAIR: He's gonna look into it and 16 respond. 17 MR. PARISI: Yeah, actually, I'm going to 18 go back to the (interposing). 19 MR. O'BRIEN: That spot's more along the 20 side of Standard -- the paper street for Standard 21 Street parallel to (inaudible). 22 MR. PARISI: So that's these two fixtures 23 along this side we were gonna lower because there's -- 24 you know, on the building, closer to the residence. 25 MR. BOYLE: What exhibit did you just</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">128</p> <p>1 MR. COSTA: I think -- 2 MR. O'BRIEN: Or do you want to go through 3 the comments? 4 MR. COSTA: I think we can go through the 5 comments fairly quickly, and I think you've gone 6 through most of them, so I think we can address them. 7 MR. GRUENBERG: I think we can start with 8 comment K3. 9 MR. PARISI: K3 -- 10 MR. GRUENBERG: (Inaudible). 11 MR. COSTA: Sorry. 12 MR. PARISI: Your light fixture height 13 should be reduced to limit impact to adjacent 14 properties where the light fixture would be invisible 15 in the track (inaudible) adjacent -- out of adjacent 16 properties as that will be taller than the landscape 17 screening. 18 So I believe I spoke to this a little bit, 19 how we're going to lower the light fixtures in that 20 area. But one other thing I do want to note 21 specifically when you start to get to some of the 22 fixtures that are -- that are up in this corner over 23 here, you know, I had mentioned, you know, spanning 24 across that and keeping the light fixtures up at a 25 certain height to be able to span that distance. We</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">127</p> <p>1 reference, sir? 2 MR. PARISI: This is Exhibit A4. 3 MR. COSTA: A4. 4 MR. PARISI: And it's on the northern -- 5 on the northern facade of the building, of Building 2. 6 And so also responding to the -- I believe 7 we were talking about the heights of the fixtures, I 8 also do want to note that because of the large expanse, 9 that we're standing here, where we're going from the 10 building, we have bays, we have a drive aisle, and then 11 we have truck park, you know, trailer parking that's 12 provided here, you know, having these fixtures up high 13 allows us to not have to tilt them. And at that point, 14 once you start to tilt the fixture, you're spreading 15 even more light. You're getting more up light. 16 So having these at a 30-foot height 17 provides an optimum height to be able to span that 18 distance, be able to maintain our zero up light levels 19 and provide a safe environment -- safety environment on 20 the parking areas. 21 MR. GRUENBERG: Do we want to go through 22 some comments like you did for landscaping, or how do 23 we want to -- 24 MR. O'BRIEN: Are you done with the 25 lighting?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">129</p> <p>1 are looking at that sound barrier that's gonna be in 2 that location that, you know, we could look at 3 sightlines coming into the site. 4 And you'll see when we get to our next 5 exhibit, when we start to cut some of these sightlines 6 so we can look at how that falls, and then potentially 7 push the light fixture left and right to be able to get 8 it out of that sightline so it's not seen from the 9 adjacent property. But the other thing with having the 10 heights of these at 30 feet versus a lower, especially 11 in these truck port areas, is you start to run into 12 shading. 13 And if you back a trailer and -- next to a 14 10-foot high fixture, that's essentially blocking all 15 of the light that's, you know, created from that 16 fixture. 17 So keeping up -- up higher, you know, 18 allows the light to continue to provide its purpose. 19 MR. GRUENBERG: Any -- 20 MR. BOYLE: One more question. On the 7th 21 Avenue side, will there be any pole lights in that 22 area, or will it strictly be off the building? 23 MR. PARISI: So the 7th Avenue connection, 24 there's no lighting that's proposed for that emergency 25 access road down there. All the lighting is kept on to</p>

130

1 the, you know, open areas of the site.
 2 MR. BOYLE: Okay. I work -- I work in a
 3 prison and you have the amount of lighting that you're
 4 talking, you get a glow. And I'm just thinking of the
 5 people that are going to be in that area.
 6 MR. PARISI: Mm-hm. Yeah. I mean, we
 7 still need to meet the safety lighting levels with any
 8 sort of design that we do here, so.
 9 MR. BOYLE: Okay.
 10 MR. O'BRIEN: K4, you indicated you're not
 11 gonna be able to provide that testimony regarding hours
 12 of site lighting.
 13 MR. PARISI: Mm-hm.
 14 MR. O'BRIEN: What's next then? D, they
 15 touch based on -- these are -- these have to do with
 16 building mounting -- building mounting fixtures along
 17 the exterior property line, particularly along
 18 Vulcanite side of the property. Item 6, there may be
 19 exhibits that you have to depict, or --
 20 MR. PARISI: Yeah, so those exhibits will
 21 be the anticipated sightlines for the lighting. So
 22 you'll see we do have a section that we'll show here in
 23 a second. We don't have the lighting in there right
 24 now. We'll have to add in the lighting and cut some
 25 sections to see what those sightlines will look like.

131

1 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. Thank you.
 2 MR. O'BRIEN: Seven is a revision just not
 3 to exceed light levels at the property line. There's
 4 some trespassing in some areas.
 5 MR. PARISI: Are there specific areas
 6 where there's trespassing on the (inaudible)?
 7 MR. O'BRIEN: I anticipate that they're at
 8 -- they're likely at the Industrial Drive and then
 9 potentially at the 7th Avenue corner, and then along
 10 the railroad.
 11 Just based on your -- proximity of your
 12 parking to the property line.
 13 MR. COSTA: And we can -- we can have a
 14 conversation with Tim before the next meeting --
 15 MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah, (interposing).
 16 MR. COSTA: -- to determine where they
 17 are. And we can fix all that.
 18 MR. O'BRIEN: Yeah, that's a -- I've seen
 19 that issue before. Sometimes it's an adjustment to the
 20 fixture itself. Because the manufacturer supplies the
 21 lighting -- the lighting footprint of it, there's
 22 potentially different settings on the input.
 23 MR. PARISI: Yeah, the different types of
 24 distribution, it's (inaudible).
 25 MR. O'BRIEN: So potentially for that, if

132

1 they're willing to indicate that they'll revise to
 2 limit any light trespass beyond the property line which
 3 complies with the Borough requirement. That would be
 4 to my satisfaction.
 5 MR. COSTA: We will.
 6 MR. PARISI: The one point that I do want
 7 to make is where Industrial Drive does enter into the
 8 site, we would ask that we don't drop down to zero.
 9 Put candles at that location where the drive aisle is
 10 coming in just from an access standpoint that being
 11 able to maintain the light coming in along the drive
 12 aisle there.
 13 MR. O'BRIEN: Okay. So you're gonna --
 14 MR. PARISI: (Inaudible) dropping down to
 15 zero.
 16 MR. O'BRIEN: When you go through your
 17 design waivers, request the needed waiver for that.
 18 MR. COSTA: Got it. Yep. Okay.
 19 MR. GRUENBERG: What's next? I thought
 20 you're willing to do everything else, and address these
 21 comments.
 22 MR. PARISI: Yeah.
 23 MR. O'BRIEN: Number 8 and Number 9, you
 24 did -- we have discussed already.
 25 MR. PARISI: Yes. The last exhibit that

133

1 we wanna show --
 2 MR. COSTA: Yeah.
 3 MR. PARISI: -- is gonna be the section
 4 line.
 5 MR. COSTA: And Ryan, if you could
 6 describe first what this exhibit is and how you derive
 7 this exhibit?
 8 MR. BOYLE: What number are we at?
 9 MR. COSTA: And we are at Exhibit A7,
 10 sightline rendering.
 11 MR. PARISI: That is correct. So what
 12 you're seeing here in this is, this is a section cut
 13 that's taken from Vulcanite up through the building,
 14 and we included a key map up in the corner showing
 15 where this section cut is taken from.
 16 So we located one of -- the closer
 17 residents to the building and kind of cut a section of
 18 line through there just to kind of give it the
 19 scenario. Can I see that?
 20 MR. COSTA: Yes.
 21 MR. PARISI: So what you're seeing on the
 22 adjacent property here, which is kinda blurred,
 23 everything that's, you know, above -- you know, this
 24 gray kind of mass is essentially the ground plane, and
 25 this is the existing -- this is the existing grade that

<p style="text-align: right;">134</p> <p>1 cuts through here, and then right after we get onto our 2 property, which is this second line here, so these two 3 vertical lines here are distinguishing Standard Street, 4 so one is the adjacent property line, and then it's our 5 property line as well, as shown on the right hand side. 6 And then the solid line that's depicted is 7 the proposed grading that's taken along this cut line 8 that we drew through the site. And so what's that -- 9 what that is showing is what the proposed condition 10 will be. And then this white block that's over to the 11 right here is where the proposed building is. 12 And we show the proposed building at that 13 43-foot height that we were -- that we were discussing 14 before. Other components of the plan is there's -- or 15 the section line, I should say, is the fire access road 16 that's shown here. As we mentioned, this is just for, 17 you know, emergency, emergency purposes along the back 18 of the building. 19 And then there's the existing vegetation 20 that we show here. This is just conceptual in nature 21 that we're showing at about -- about 40 feet. 22 MR. COSTA: And that's approximately in 23 the Standard Street, paper street right of way, 24 correct? 25 MR. PARISI: That is correct, yeah. So</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">136</p> <p>1 building. 2 CHAIR: So just a point of question on 3 this exhibit. So the sightline that you're looking at 4 based on what I can see, this is somebody standing in a 5 yard actually -- well, it was actually probably from 6 the Merritt's house, who just left. But that's across 7 Vulcanite. So I'd like to see what it looks like from 8 the house, somebody, you know, near a yard of somebody 9 on Vulcanite. So like, some of the backyards and 10 things. 11 MR. PARISI: So if you look to the left 12 side of the plan, Vulcanite's all the way to the left. 13 CHAIR: Oh. 14 MR. PARISI: This is actually -- 15 CHAIR: Okay. (Interposing). 16 MR. PARISI: And so Standard Street is 17 shown where the existing vegetation is in the middle. 18 So we're pulling this sightline from the backyard of 19 the -- of that residence. 20 MR. COSTA: And we can -- we did this in 21 response to Mr. O'Brien's letter. Quickly, we can come 22 back with shots from other houses -- 23 CHAIR: I would like to see that. 24 MR. COSTA: -- and take the actual -- the 25 actual -- you know, we were going to look at the -- you</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">135</p> <p>1 that's approximately in that right of way and then on 2 the adjacent properties as well. 3 And that vegetation is to remain in the 4 proposed plan. And then as I mentioned, we're locating 5 -- we're relocating, or shifting the vegetative buffer 6 closer to the property line. And I think this does a 7 good job of showing the benefit of that. Because this 8 is shown in five years of planting. 9 And then what you also see here is this 10 dashed line that comes from a person standing at grade 11 right next to the structure is the sightline right up 12 to the corner of the building, and it cuts right 13 through that proposed vegetation line at five years of 14 planting, whereas if this was located closer to the 15 building, it would not be providing any sort of 16 screening benefit. 17 So by locating it closer here, we're now 18 adding additional screening on top of what's already 19 provided on Standard Street. 20 MR. COSTA: And what's the overall 21 distance from the house to the building? 22 MR. PARISI: Yeah. So at this specific 23 line, so it's going to vary along the property where we 24 -- where we drew this specific line, is it's 25 approximately 274 feet between the residence and the</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">137</p> <p>1 know, what the actual planting -- existing planting is, 2 so we can get a -- another just -- 3 MR. PARISI: If I'm not -- 4 MR. COSTA: -- depiction from different 5 houses, basically. 6 MR. GRUENBERG: If I'm not mistaken then, 7 I'm going back a couple of years, I think there was 8 also renderings that we had of like a visual. So 9 instead of like a cross like this, of like the looking, 10 like I'm standing and looking at it, what it would look 11 like from my vision. 12 MR. COSTA: Yeah. 13 MR. GRUENBERG: I'd like a couple of them. 14 MR. COSTA: We will do -- that was -- that 15 is our plan. 16 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. 17 MR. SZANATI: To that point also, I was 18 going to say, I can't confirm if any of those houses 19 are two story buildings or not, but your sight of line 20 would change to not necessarily clear his proposed 21 buffer if he were on the second floor of said house. 22 MR. GRUENBERG: Right. 23 MR. COSTA: Yeah, and we've done those 24 before as well, where we do -- 25 MR. PARISI: Yeah.</p>

138

1 MR. COSTA: -- you know, shoot it from --
 2 CHAIR: Yeah, stuff like that. Yep.
 3 MR. PARISI: So would you like us to take
 4 the view from the second floor of the house, or take it
 5 from an eye level view?
 6 CHAIR: I mean, ideally both, if we can
 7 just do a couple different renderings of what it's
 8 gonna look like from different locations and heights.
 9 MR. COSTA: Yeah, right, I've done that
 10 from -- I've seen it done from both.
 11 (Interposing)
 12 VICE CHAIR: Is it -- is it safe to say
 13 that, based on your plan here, that the lumens around
 14 the building are pretty much the same, except these on
 15 the side of Standard Street, they're just going to be
 16 lower, I mean, as far as the height of the light.
 17 CHAIR: Yeah, it's the same fixture.
 18 You're just lowering it, basically.
 19 MR. PARISI: Yeah, along the north side of
 20 the building too, we're lowering the fixture, you're
 21 indicating --
 22 VICE CHAIR: Is it going to be the same
 23 lumens as the rest of the site?
 24 MR. PARISI: If we lower the fixtures, no,
 25 they would not be the same level as the rest of the

139

1 site. We're looking at this as not like a parking lot
 2 area because it's the fire access.
 3 CHAIR: Right.
 4 MR. PARISI: So we wouldn't be providing
 5 lighting along that fire access road. It's really just
 6 (interposing).
 7 VICE CHAIR: Right. That -- that's my
 8 point. We -- it should be a lot lower there because
 9 there's no activity other. Maybe when there's
 10 emergency, you know?
 11 MR. COSTA: Yeah, we can look at -- we'll
 12 give you more details on how much we can bring that
 13 down. There's got to be something there for safety,
 14 but we'll come back with details on how much we can
 15 lower that.
 16 MR. PARISI: There are some building
 17 egress points over there that will need some level of
 18 (inaudible).
 19 MR. COSTA: Right.
 20 CHAIR: Anything else you wanna testify to
 21 with respect to this exhibit? Anything else you have
 22 to disclose?
 23 MR. PARISI: I do not.
 24 CHAIR: Any questions from anybody on the
 25 Board? No. Okay. Open it up.

140

1 MR. GRUENBERG: Open it up to the public
 2 to ask this gentleman questions, questions only.
 3 Please identify yourself.
 4 MS. MAUREEN PERTTI: My name is Maureen
 5 Pertti (ph), and this house in Exhibit A7 is my house.
 6 MR. BOYLE: Ah, there you go.
 7 MS. PERTTI: So I'm just questioning how
 8 accurate this grading is, because this does not look
 9 like my backyard at all.
 10 MR. PARISI: So the grading that's taken
 11 from there is taken from our topographic survey data
 12 that we have, and then we drew -- we cut a line through
 13 it.
 14 What might not be accurate on there is we
 15 drew just a box for your -- for your building, but
 16 along that section line it was taken from our survey.
 17 MS. PERTTI: And then this landscape
 18 buffer, are you planning on digging into the ground at
 19 all, or this is accurate against the topographical
 20 (inaudible)?
 21 MR. PARISI: What do you mean by digging
 22 into it?
 23 MS. PERTTI: So in my backyard I have --
 24 it's a very steep slope, and then this looks like it
 25 goes down a little. So I'm not seeing the steep slope.

141

1 And then this looks like it goes down, which it does
 2 not. So are you going to dig into the ground?
 3 MR. PARISI: Yeah, so that's actually
 4 right at the tip of where the stormwater basin is. You
 5 can see where the property line is. So that's on our
 6 site at that point that we then start to cut down. And
 7 actually what that allows us to do is lower the height
 8 of the Building 2.
 9 MS. PERTTI: Okay.
 10 MR. PARISI: Because it won't be up in
 11 that existing grade.
 12 You can see the dash line of the existing grade that
 13 cuts -- and I'll show you this here. You can see the
 14 dash line of the existing grade cuts through here. You
 15 can see that on your exhibits as well on the property
 16 line as we carry that line through. So you can see
 17 where the existing grade is.
 18 MS. PERTTI: That's all. Thank you.
 19 MR. GRUENBERG: Anybody else have any
 20 questions?
 21 CHAIR: You have to tell everybody who you
 22 are again.
 23 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Monica Larsen-Kiley
 24 (inaudible). So for the woman whose box house this is,
 25 with these lights, when she looks at her backyard, she

1 sees the tip of a house. Does she see the lights?
 2 MR. PARISI: So the lights along that edge
 3 there, we're talking about lowering those down to just
 4 10 feet above finished grade. So you would see along
 5 that -- the edge of the proposed building. So along
 6 the edge of the proposed building here, we're talking -
 7 - and this is on the right side of the exhibit, we're
 8 talking about lowering the light fixtures along there
 9 down to 10-foot height.

10 So we could look at how that works in
 11 terms of this sightline and if those fixtures would be
 12 visible. I can accurately say, but they would be
 13 significantly lower.

14 MR. COSTA: So we could work on plantings
 15 to try to block, strategically block the sightlines.

16 MR. PARISI: (Inaudible) I would -- I
 17 would be pretty sure in saying that the plantings --
 18 the proposed plantings, are gonna block that light
 19 fixture once we lower that down to the 10 -- because
 20 they're almost blocking the top corner of the building
 21 now.

22 So once those go down to 10 feet, I feel
 23 fairly confident that the proposed plantings
 24 (inaudible).

25 MR. COSTA: And that's even the proposed

1 plant -- that's the proposed planting, but you also
 2 have the natural planting that's already there.

3 MR. PARISI: Right, the existing
 4 vegetation that's remaining as well.

5 MR. COSTA: Okay.

6 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: So that's my other
 7 question. These plantings, you're gonna do a whole
 8 combination, leaves, pine trees, all of it. Winter
 9 time, leaves fall off, leaves of pine trees. That
 10 lowers the dampening, a lot of noise, light. What are
 11 your solutions for that?

12 MR. PARISI: So what we're proposing --
 13 yeah, so there's always gonna be -- you know, obviously
 14 with deciduous plants, there's always gonna be the
 15 leave drop that's gonna happen in the fall into the
 16 winter time. And what we did provide along here is
 17 there is a solid evergreen edge. So there's not gaps
 18 in the evergreen trees that are being provided, so
 19 there is going to be that, you know, full kind of
 20 vegetative screening that's gonna be provided
 21 seasonally.

22 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: So there's not gonna be
 23 leaves on there? There's gonna be evergreen --

24 MR. PARISI: There's going to be a mix --

25 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Kay.

1 MR. PARISI: -- but the evergreen trees
 2 that are being proposed, since there's gonna be
 3 deciduous trees, there's gonna be evergreen trees,
 4 there's gonna be shrubs that are proposed as kind of a
 5 ground plane as well. So those evergreen trees that
 6 are being proposed on there actually create a full
 7 screen, full hedge.

8 And then the deciduous trees that would
 9 just be, you know, additional screening benefits when
 10 they're -- when they're in leaf.

11 MS. LARSEN-KILEY: Yeah, so -- okay.

12 CHAIR: Anybody else have a question for
 13 this gentleman? Anybody up here on the Board have any
 14 other questions? Go ahead.

15 MS. SCHOCKO: The buffer wall, instead of
 16 lowering the lights, couldn't you put the lights on the
 17 buffer wall, or is the wall gonna be too close to the
 18 building?

19 MR. PARISI: So --

20 MS. SCHOCKO: So the lights will be on the
 21 opposite side, so it won't be facing --

22 MR. PARISI: Oh, I see what you mean.

23 MS. SCHOCKO: You know what I'm saying?

24 MR. PARISI: Instead of -- instead of
 25 mounting them on the building and facing out --

1 MS. SCHOCKO: Yeah.

2 MR. PARISI: -- if you're gonna have some
 3 sort of buffer or something on --

4 MS. SCHOCKO: Yeah.

5 MR. PARISI: -- at least on a portion or
 6 even running it further --

7 (Interposing)

8 MR. PARISI: -- just rotate it.

9 MS. SCHOCKO: (Interposing).

10 MR. BOYLE: She's talking about the lights
 11 facing the building as opposed to facing you.

12 MS. SCHOCKO: Yeah.

13 MR. COSTA: So let me just understand that
 14 a little better.

15 I'm looking at A3 here. Okay. We were contemplating
 16 the wall to go along this corner, northern corner and
 17 around here --

18 MS. SCHOCKO: Okay.

19 MR. COSTA: -- as opposed to out there.

20 CHAIR: Okay.

21 MS. SCHOCKO: Okay. Thank you. Good
 22 question.

23 CHAIR: Thanks for clarifying.

24 MR. COSTA: Okay.

25 CHAIR: All right. Last chance from

<p style="text-align: right;">146</p> <p>1 anybody of the public to -- oh, (inaudible).</p> <p>2 MS. PATRICIA HAWK: Patricia Hawk, 540</p> <p>3 Williams Street, Alpha, New Jersey.</p> <p>4 MS. SCHOCKO: Welcome.</p> <p>5 THE SECRETARY: Thank you for having me.</p> <p>6 My question is, what I'm hearing about we're gonna</p> <p>7 plant all these stuff, we're gonna have all these</p> <p>8 meadows, we're gonna do this. So all that gets</p> <p>9 planted, the meadow gets planted. Who takes care of it</p> <p>10 afterward to nurture it so that it makes sure that none</p> <p>11 of those things die afterward?</p> <p>12 Because you plant things, I've seen it,</p> <p>13 places, you put trees in and then we plant borders on</p> <p>14 them --</p> <p>15 MR. PARISI: Yeah.</p> <p>16 MS. HAWK: And then you use Roundup that</p> <p>17 kills the meadow, and then you don't get all the</p> <p>18 pollinators and all the things you planted your meadow</p> <p>19 for, because I'm the person in my neighborhood that</p> <p>20 feeds pollinators to birds because most people don't.</p> <p>21 They have their little rocks and two</p> <p>22 flowers and they hire Tru Chem and whoever else to take</p> <p>23 care of --</p> <p>24 MR. GRUENBERG: I'm gonna get you back to</p> <p>25 your question which is --</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">148</p> <p>1 we move on.</p> <p>2 MR. GRUENBERG: There's -- there's a --</p> <p>3 there's gonna be a requirement of a two-year -- if</p> <p>4 there's an approval, there would be a requirement under</p> <p>5 the Municipal Land Use Law of a maintenance bond that's</p> <p>6 for two years that has to be posted to make sure that</p> <p>7 the things live at least for two years.</p> <p>8 But it's gonna be continuing condition of</p> <p>9 a resolution that they have to maintain the landscaping</p> <p>10 and the stormwater plan, so that if it -- if there's a</p> <p>11 violation, the zoning officer could go out to the site</p> <p>12 and say, you're not in compliance with your approved</p> <p>13 plan.</p> <p>14 MS. HAWK: Because everybody shows up with</p> <p>15 their big -- those big mowers. And I don't know.</p> <p>16 MR. GRUENBERG: That's not a question.</p> <p>17 You can talk about that later. I promise. All right.</p> <p>18 Oh, one more. (Inaudible).</p> <p>19 MR. DUNWELL: Craig Dunwell. I know the</p> <p>20 CRG has built these, quote/unquote, "cubes" all over</p> <p>21 the United States, in Chicago, Atlanta, all over.</p> <p>22 Could they possibly provide current photography of</p> <p>23 something they built five or ten years ago to show</p> <p>24 whether or not the landscaping was maintained properly?</p> <p>25 Could the applicant do that?</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">147</p> <p>1 MS. HAWK: But that's my question.</p> <p>2 MR. GRUENBERG: What are you -- what are</p> <p>3 you going to do -- or what do we have to make --</p> <p>4 MS. HAWK: To take care of all the things</p> <p>5 you're planting because --</p> <p>6 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. We got to -- what</p> <p>7 are you gonna do to take care of the things that are</p> <p>8 being planted?</p> <p>9 MR. PARISI: Yeah, so it'll be the</p> <p>10 tenant's responsibility to take care of them.</p> <p>11 MR. GRUENBERG: But what else is there</p> <p>12 gonna be put in place?</p> <p>13 MR. COSTA: There'll be a -- I mean,</p> <p>14 usually landscaping is bonded. That's gonna be</p> <p>15 something that's gonna be --</p> <p>16 MR. GRUENBERG: Correct.</p> <p>17 MR. COSTA: -- provided -- required by the</p> <p>18 municipality that we maintain -- that our client -- our</p> <p>19 client maintains the landscaping.</p> <p>20 MS. HAWK: You can make things -- things</p> <p>21 can look pretty shabby if they're not taken care of.</p> <p>22 MR. PARISI: That's true.</p> <p>23 MS. HAWK: And you can make promises that</p> <p>24 five years from now, people walk away and they have no</p> <p>25 commitment to us because everybody got their money and</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">149</p> <p>1 MR. COSTA: We can do that, yeah.</p> <p>2 MR. DUNWELL: Thank you.</p> <p>3 MR. GRUENBERG: So according to my notes,</p> <p>4 you've entered in all of these exhibits except for</p> <p>5 Exhibit A2 and Exhibit A8.</p> <p>6 MR. PARISI: You're absolutely correct</p> <p>7 about A2. Can you show me A8? I'm getting out.</p> <p>8 MR. GRUENBERG: The building elevation.</p> <p>9 MR. PARISI: Oh, yes. I apologize. That</p> <p>10 will come with our next witness.</p> <p>11 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. So I don't wanna</p> <p>12 lose track of the fact that those have not been</p> <p>13 authenticated and entered into evidence.</p> <p>14 MR. PARISI: Correct. Thank you.</p> <p>15 CHAIR: Well, at this time, it is 9:51.</p> <p>16 So I do -- unless there's -- I don't think we're gonna</p> <p>17 be looking to entertain any more witnesses this</p> <p>18 evening.</p> <p>19 MR. COSTA: Right. I agree. I just need</p> <p>20 to confer with my client for a moment, and I guess with</p> <p>21 the Board as well, in terms of their scheduling.</p> <p>22 Because I've got to confirm the sound engineer and</p> <p>23 things like that.</p> <p>24 But if I could ask the Board initially,</p> <p>25 what is -- when are the next meetings, what is the</p>

<p style="text-align: right;">150</p> <p>1 availability on your calendar?</p> <p>2 MR. GRUENBERG: The next meeting is gonna</p> <p>3 be the Board's April meeting.</p> <p>4 MS. SCHOCKO: 17th.</p> <p>5 MR. GRUENBERG: April 17th, my daughter's</p> <p>6 birthday.</p> <p>7 CHAIR: You gotta take her out there. The</p> <p>8 next day.</p> <p>9 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah, that be that.</p> <p>10 MR. BOYLE: 19th or 20th.</p> <p>11 MR. GRUENBERG: Believe me, long ago,</p> <p>12 she's given up on me. Birthday on her actual birthday.</p> <p>13 VICE CHAIR: April meeting is the 17th.</p> <p>14 CHAIR: Yeah, it is.</p> <p>15 MR. GRUENBERG: While you're conversing,</p> <p>16 can I just make a suggestion that it would be really</p> <p>17 great if you could widow down Mr. O'Brien's report from</p> <p>18 40 pages down to something much more manageable to</p> <p>19 address a lot of the things that he's indicated are</p> <p>20 open items? And if you can't do that within 30 days</p> <p>21 and give him opportunity to reply to it in sufficient</p> <p>22 time to advise the Board, maybe April 13th is -- 17th</p> <p>23 is ambitious.</p> <p>24 MR. COSTA: Yeah, that was exactly what we</p> <p>25 were talking about. Can we be put on the May agenda?</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">152</p> <p>1 make that announcement.</p> <p>2 MR. GRUENBERG: Listen, if it's normal</p> <p>3 practice. I'm not gonna -- yeah, I'm not gonna. No,</p> <p>4 it's normal.</p> <p>5 CHAIR: Yeah.</p> <p>6 MR. GRUENBERG: I'm not gonna break any</p> <p>7 standard operating laws here or whatever. It is within</p> <p>8 the Board's discretion, but it is common --</p> <p>9 CHAIR: Okay.</p> <p>10 MR. GRUENBERG: -- courtesy to extend the</p> <p>11 time period by making this announcement, which I will</p> <p>12 do now.</p> <p>13 This will advise the public that the</p> <p>14 hearing on this matter is being continued to May 15th,</p> <p>15 2024 at 7:00 p.m. in this room. You will not receive</p> <p>16 any further notice of hearing.</p> <p>17 CHAIR: Great. All right. Thank you all</p> <p>18 for your attention tonight.</p> <p>19 MS. SCHOCKO: Thank you.</p> <p>20 MR. BOYLE: Thank you.</p> <p>21 CHAIR: We got five minutes left. Do we</p> <p>22 have any old business? Great. Do you have any new</p> <p>23 business? Also great. Any correspondents? Any -- you</p> <p>24 know, we can open it up to public comment for about</p> <p>25 four more minutes. Just so everybody's aware, we do</p>
<p style="text-align: right;">151</p> <p>1 And --</p> <p>2 MR. GRUENBERG: That would be May 15th.</p> <p>3 MR. COSTA: Okay. So we've be asked to be</p> <p>4 carried to that agenda -- or to that date without the</p> <p>5 necessity of further notice.</p> <p>6 MR. GRUENBERG: Yeah. And you'll put on</p> <p>7 the record that you're extending the time period for</p> <p>8 the Board to act through the end of June, just so that</p> <p>9 we're covered.</p> <p>10 MR. COSTA: Yes, we'll extend that.</p> <p>11 MR. GRUENBERG: Natural disasters.</p> <p>12 MR. COSTA: Yep. Do you need me to send</p> <p>13 you a letter to that effect?</p> <p>14 MR. GRUENBERG: That'd be great if you</p> <p>15 could, but it's just you're acknowledging it on the</p> <p>16 record.</p> <p>17 MR. COSTA: Yes. We're extending to the</p> <p>18 end of June.</p> <p>19 CHAIR: You're not -- you're not</p> <p>20 (inaudible) to make the announcement right now.</p> <p>21 MR. GRUENBERG: Okay. This will advise</p> <p>22 the -- you know, if you're okay with that.</p> <p>23 CHAIR: Wow. Good. I mean, we're</p> <p>24 skipping a month here. It's gonna be two months down</p> <p>25 the road. It's kind of normal practice to be able to</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">153</p> <p>1 have to end by 10 o'clock. So that's --</p> <p>2 MR. GRUENBERG: And the item it's not on</p> <p>3 the agenda.</p> <p>4 CHAIR: Right. So if anybody from the</p> <p>5 public has anything to bring up that is not about this</p> <p>6 application, anything else, now's your time to do it.</p> <p>7 Great. All right. We don't need an executive session.</p> <p>8 Our next meeting, which this will not be brought up in</p> <p>9 April, but our next meeting is April 17th.</p> <p>10 And I need a motion to adjourn.</p> <p>11 MR. BOYLE: So moved.</p> <p>12 VICE CHAIR: So moved.</p> <p>13 CHAIR: (Inaudible). Mr. Boyle and --</p> <p>14 MR. GRUENBERG: All in favor, aye. There</p> <p>15 you go.</p> <p>16 CHAIR: All in favor? Aye.</p> <p>17 VICE CHAIR: Aye.</p> <p>18 MR. GRUENBERG: Aye.</p> <p>19 MS. SCHOCKO: Aye.</p> <p>20 CHAIR: Meeting is adjourned, 9:56 p.m.</p> <p>21 (Meeting concluded)</p> <p>22</p> <p>23</p> <p>24</p> <p>25</p>

1 CERTIFICATE

2
3 I, Avi Noam Taub, do hereby certify that
4 the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the
5 testimonies at the time, place and on the date
6 hereinbefore set forth, to the best of my ability.

7 I do further certify that the transcriber
8 and editor who worked on this transcript are neither a
9 relative nor employee nor attorney nor counsel of any
10 of the parties to this action, and none are a relative
11 or employee of such attorney or counsel, and that I'm
12 not financially interested in the action.

13
14
15 

16
17 AVI NOAM TAUB

18
19
20 Date: April 8, 2024
21
22
23
24
25