The meeting was called to order by Chairman Paul Boisvert and the opening statement was read by the Board Secretary.

ROLL CALL: Showed the following members were present: Brian Greenfield, Nicholas Huszar, John Leggio, Robert Seaman, Megan Talente, Brian Tannenhaus, Councilman Fred Gasior, Christopher Mercer, Jacqueline Pike and Chairman Paul Boisvert. Joseph Cristiano was excused.

Also in attendance were Anne Marie Rizzuto, Board Attorney, Jordan Rizzo, Board Engineer, Jennifer Beahm, Board Planner, Shari Spero, Board Licensed Tree Expert, Kevin Chen, Board Traffic Engineer and Eileen Rubano, Board Secretary.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: There were no minutes to approve.

## VOUCHERS: None

CORRESPONDENCE: The Board Secretary said she had a letter from Todd Cohen, Attorney for Avet Brothers LLC, which is on tonight's agenda. Mr. Cohen would like the application carried to the Board's August 3, 2023 meeting with no further notice. Board Attorney Rizzuto made the announcement for members of the public.

She also said she sent Ordinance O-23-22 to the members for review, discussion and comments at tonight's meeting. After Ms. Beahm explained the ordinance Mr. Tannenhaus made a motion that the ordinance was substantially consistent with the master plan. Motion was seconded by Ms. Talente and carried with Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, Mr. Leggio, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Tannenhaus, Councilman Gasior, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting for the motion.

## RESOLUTIONS:

a. Proposed Ordinance No. O-23-18 / Apiary Practices and Bee Keeping

Mr. Tannenhaus made a motion to memorialize the resolution finding Ordinance O-23-18 substantially consistent with the master plan. Motion was seconded by Councilman Gasior and carried with Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Leggio, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Tannenhaus, Councilman Gasior, Mr. Mercer, Ms. Pike and Chairman Boisvert voting to memorialize.
b. Case No. SP-1114 / Lowe's Home Centers, Inc.

Mr. Leggio made a motion to memorialize the resolution granting submission waivers to Lowe's Home Centers. Motion was seconded by Mr. Tannenhaus and carried with Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Leggio, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Tannenhaus, Councilman Gasior, Mr. Mercer, Ms. Pike and Chairman Boisvert voting to memorialize.
c. Case No. SD-3006 / Benzion Yungreis

Mr. Huszar made a motion to memorialize the resolution granting Preliminary and Final Major Subdivision approval with Ancillary Variance and Design Waiver Relief to Benzion Yungreis. Motion was seconded by Mr. Greenfield and carried with Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, r. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Tannenhaus, Councilman Gasior, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting to memorialize.

SUBMISSION WAIVERS BEFORE THE BOARD: There were no applications for submission waivers at this meeting.

## MASTER PLAN HEARING: Farmland Preservation Plan Element

Ms. Beahm, Board Planner, explained that the Farmland Preservation Plan is required by the State and County for grant programs. They will pay you for your development rights and you deed restrict your property for farmland preservation. Sixty percent is paid by the state, $\mathbf{2 4 \%}$ by the County and $16 \%$ by the municipality out of the Open Space Farmland Preservation Fund.

She explained that the town adopted the Farmland Preservation Plan in 2005 and then it was updated in 2011. This will supersede that preservation of farms and the Farmers Advisory Committee has been working diligently on this project. She also said that in 2018 there were 597 Farm Assessed Properties but not all are farmland preserved. There are 5,645 acres of farmland, about 14 percent of the total acres in town. Agriculture has declined over the last thirty-five years by about 17 percent. There are currently 750 acres under preserved farmland and the goal is to have 1200 acres within the next ten years.

Ms. Beahm explained that there are requirements based on land area and soil type and you need to be in the town or county ADA and have a minimum number of acres.

The Chairman opened the hearing up to members of the public and the following appeared:
Lawrence White, 15 Wren Way, wanted to hear more about plans for the future and thought the average was less than adequate. He also asked if this was a voluntary program.

Elaine Taylor, 1055 Maxim Southard Road, said she is a member of the Farmers Advisory Committee and the Farmland Preservation Committee. She wanted to thank the Board and encouraged the public to get active in the community.

Seeing no other members of the public wanting to speak, the Chairman closed the public portion of the hearing.

Mr. Tannenhaus made a motion to approve the Farmland Preservation Plan Element of the Master Plan. Motion was seconded by Mr. Huszar and carried with Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, Mr. Leggio, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Tannenhaus, Councilman Gasior, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting for the motion.
a. Case No. SD-2998 / Wadsworth Development LLC - Ramtown Estates

Attorney Michael Herbert appeared and said this is just a settlement hearing and they would be coming back with fully engineered plans. He gave the history of the project saying the application was for homes entering on Michele Boulevard, the application was denied, they entered litigation with the town and are now coming back with a cul-de-sac concept, fully contained with ten lots.

Board Attorney Rizzuto said they are here tonight solely for the Board to approve the settlement hearing and set a hearing date for the new concept.

Mr. Herbert said the revised plans would have no driveways on Michele Boulevard and the only access would be from Ramtown Greenville Road into the cul-de-sac and the revised stormwater management plans were reviewed by Ms. Neumann, Board Engineer and it is compliant with both New Jersey and the Township requirements.

Mr. Tannenhaus made a motion to authorize the settlement agreement with Wadsworth Development. Motion was seconded by Councilman Gasior and carried with Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, Mr. Leggio, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Tannenhaus, Councilman Gasior, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting for the motion.

It was also decided that the applicant would come back to the Board for a Whispering Woods Hearing on August 3, 2023. Board Attorney Rizzuto made an announcement for members of the public that this application would be carried to the August 3, 2023 meeting at Town Hall with no further notice.

## b. Case No. SP-1082 / Richard Sieb

Nicholas Montenegro, Attorney for the Applicant, appeared and said the applicant is Seashore Amusements and they are seeking site plan approved for the storage of shipping containers

Jeff Carr, PE, PP, was duly sworn, gave his credentials to the Board and was accepted as an expert witness. Richard Sieb, Owner, was also duly sworn.

Mr. Carr testified that the site is 4.8 acres and fronts on Lakewood Farmingdale Road. It is two lots combined ( 24 and 24.01) and is long and narrow with wetlands at the rear of the lots. There is a tavern and residence on either side of this property and across the road is open space owned by the State of New Jersey. They are looking to redevelop the site by reconfiguring the driveway, widening Lakewood Farmingdale Road, installing curbing and using the building on the right as an office building for three people. They would have parking on either side of the driveway including ADA parking.

He explained that Seaside Amusements rents out equipment, such as dunk tanks, blow up slides, and bouncy jump houses. The storage containers on site are rented out but there is no retail on site. All deliveries to the site are with box trucks or trailers and this is a permitted use.

REGULAR MEETING HELD AT HOWELL MIDDLE SCHOOL SOUTH
JUNE 1, 2023
Ms. Beahm stated that there is a residential zone or a residence adjacent to this site so a 50 foot buffer is required or they need variance relief. She also said the outdoor storage is not screened and they need side yard variance relief as well and the applicant was informed of this at the tech meeting.

Mr. Carr stated that they are eliminating two existing non-conforming uses and replacing them with a very low intensity use; namely pickup up and delivering equipment of a seasonal nature.

Jordan Rizzo, Board Engineer, asked if Mr. Carr could testify on the parking and storage and Mr. Carr stated that the trailers will be stored with rides on them, they have reduced the limit of the outdoor storage and added some fencing. Mr. Rizzo said they have room to do a buffer so it is not too much to ask.

Ms. Beahm stated that the basin needs relief for being in the front yard and both Ms. Neumann and Ms. Beahm had stressed this at the tech meeting. She thinks they need to rethink the site plan and try to comply with some of the items in the review letters and those discussed at the tech meeting and come back.

Attorney Montenegro asked for the application to be carried to another date and the Board Attorney made an announcement for members of the public that this application would be carried to September 21, 2023 with no further notice and the meeting would be held in the main meeting room at the Township Municipal Building. Mr. Montenegro also granted the Board an extension of time to hear the application through September 30, 2023 on the record.
c. Case No. SP-1105 / AAVRHW Property LLC - Victory Road

SEE TRANSCRIPT ATTACHED.
MASTER PLAN STATUS REPORT: There was no update at this meeting.
Mr. Greenfield made a motion to adjourn. Motion was seconded by Councilman Gasior and carried with all members voting to adjourn.

The meeting adjourned at 10:15 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,


Eileen Rubano
Recording Secretary
NOTE: A CD or DVD of this meeting is available on request.
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SECRETARY RUBANO: Now call the Howell
Planning Board meeting, Thursday, June 15, 2023. I hereby declare this meeting of the Howell Township Planning Board to be opened. Adequate notice has been given pursuant to the New Jersey Open Public Meetings Act in the following manner:

First, on March 31st, 2023, a copy of said notice was mailed to the Asbury Park Press and The Star Ledger;

Second, on March 31st, 2023, a copy of said notice was hand-delivered to the clerk of the Township of Howell;

Third, on March 31st, 2023, said notice was posted in the office of the planning board and on the bulletin board in the Howell Township Municipal Building, 4567 Route 9, Howell Township, New Jersey.

On May 31st, 2023 a change of venue was mailed to The Asbury Park Press and The Star Ledger and was hand-delivered to the clerk, and placed on the bulletin board and in the planning board, and on the main bulletin board at the township.

Please be advised we have emergency exits on the right and also on the left we have a ramp over there on the left should you need it.

Further, no smoking is permitted near the school. Please take note this meeting is being videotaped for future broadcast on Howell Township TV-77.

Restrooms are on your right, our left, up the ramp and down the hall.

And tonight board members will have the mike offs, make sure you turn them on when you want to comment.

Thank you.

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: May I beg your pardon, can you turn on the $P A ?$

BOARD PLANNER: Can you hear me? MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Now we can. SECRETARY RUBANO: Sorry.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Can we have a roll call, please?

SECRETARY RUBANO: Roll call. Mr.

Cristiano has been excused.

Mr. Greenfield?

MEMBER GREENFIELD: Here.

SECRETARY RUBANO: Mr. Huszar?

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Here.

SECRETARY RUBANO: Mr. Leggio?

MEMBER LEGGIO: Here.

SECRETARY RUBANO: Mr. Seaman?
MEMBER SEAMAN: Here.
SECRETARY RUBANO: Ms. Talente?
MEMBER TALENTE: Here.
SECRETARY RUBANO: Mr. Tannenhaus?
MEMBER TANNENHAUS: Here.
SECRETARY RUBANO: Councilman Gasior?
COUNCILMAN GASIOR: Here.
SECRETARY RUBANO: Mr. Mercer?
MEMBER MERCER: Here.
BOARD PLANNER: Ms. Pike?
MEMBER PIKE: Here.
SECRETARY RUBANO: And Chairman
Boisvert?
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Here.
SECRETARY RUBANO: You have a quorum.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Thank you.
All right. So if we could rise for
the Pledge of Allegiance and a moment of silence for the troops serving here and abroad.
(Pledge of Allegiance.)
(Whereupon, the board continues with posted agenda.)
(Application commences at 8:32 p.m.)
ATTORNEY SIMON: So members of the
board, good evening, Rob Simon from Herold Law. I'm here on behalf of the applicant. It's good to be here in person before all of you.

With regard to tonight's hearing, adequate notice was provided. We did provide separate notice and provided an Affidavit of Service to Eileen, so $I$ believe the board has jurisdiction to proceed tonight with regard to the application.

Just to remind you all sort of where we are at this point, we have provided testimony from our variance witness, including Jeromie Lange; Tung-To Lam, our engineer; Sean Naeger, our architect; Kerry Pehnke, traffic; Michael Morris, who is our environment consultant; and Christine Cofone, our professional planner.

Mr. Lieberman on behalf of various clients that he is representing before this board with regard to this application, presented the testimony of Jeff gall, one of his experts. And my recollection is that we are in the middle of Mr. Goll's direct testimony, when we adjourned at the last meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: I believe that's correct.

ATtORNEY LIEBERMAN: Mr. Chair, you're ready?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Go for it.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Okay, thank you.
Stuart Lieberman on behalf of the clients that $I$ identified before, from the firm Lieberman, Blecher \& Sinkevich.

Mr. Goll is next to me.

D I R E C T E X A M I N A T I O N

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: And, Mr. Goll, you're still under oath; you understand that, yes?

THE WITNESS: I do, I understand.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: All right, very good.

Mr. Goll, you did some reviews of the stormwater system and some other environmental reviews, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Okay.
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Can't hear you.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: What $I$ want you
to do for me is as follows. Would you be so kind as
to very briefly -- and $I$ mean in four minutes -summarize what you talked about at the last time you were here just to refresh everybody's recollection. And then to the extent that you have additional comments kindly provide them to the board, okay. Don't spend a lot of time with that, there's a transcript, but a lot of time passed. So why don't you take it from there.

Okay?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Okay, very quickly.
From my prior testimony I talked about the amount of fill that actually has to be imported to the site. The applicant's engineer testified prior that they needed to elevate the site in order to make the stormwater work, because groundwater elevations are relatively high, seasonal high groundwater. And so I completed a rough calculation that about 87,000 cubic yards of material will actually need to be imported to the site, which equates to on the order of 5,500 trucks, just under 5,500 dump trucks that would have to come in.

They will also have to remove about 15,000 -- just under 15,000 cubic yards of topsoil.

And as $I$ had pointed out at that last meeting that anything over 600 cubic yards will need to have approval; it's not allowed to leave the township regardless of its state or whether you break it up and sell it or do anything. It's not supposed to leave the township. And that was also --

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: And that's
pursuant to a local ordinance?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: That's pursuant to a Howell ordinance; isn't that correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes. It's 188-26. The township engineer or the planning board engineer pointed that out as well in his comment letter.

And what $I$ really ended up getting to last time we were kind of getting a little bit into the weeds because there was a stormwater pipe that runs from Manhole 10 down to Manhole Number 9, which is actually placed below the seasonal high groundwater, which means it's going to -- when you line gravel or sand, it's going to end up draining the seasonal high groundwater. And that's sort of counterintuitive to the purpose for the stormwater management regulations.
It's not implicitly implied or it's
stated, but it is a concern because it's going to basically counteract all the infiltration that they're trying to achieve on this site.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Would you explain why that counteracts the infiltration so everybody understands what that means.

THE WITNESS: What it does is it adds another hydraulic load. Actually this, the one I'm talking about actually leaves the site without, so it will drain.

In the winter, when the groundwater elevates it comes up because it's, you know, there's no trees -- actually, the trees don't have leaves on them, the groundwater will rise, and it will be intercepted by this pipe at its liner, and then it will be taken off. This pipe actually would intercept groundwater and then it would run out and off the site to the stormwater system on Victory Road.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman, can $I$ just interrupt for one second?

I see -- and for you too, Mr. Lieberman -- it seems that Mr. Goll is referencing some plans. I don't know if it's better if you want to put them up on the screen?

I just thought he's starting to point
at something, just so $I$ can follow and the board and the public can follow where he's talking.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: That's a good
idea. Who puts them up on the screen?
SECRETARY RUBANO: I'm putting them up. But I have to know which exhibit you're using.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Okay, thank you. Can you describe what exhibit that you're using so that this could be placed on the screen?

Mr. Simon, do you know which exhibit this is identified as?

ATTORNEY SIMON: Stu, I apologize, but I have no idea what exhibit your witness...

THE WITNESS: This is not -- this is the list from the -- this is 1082.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: This is the one we just did. That's okay.

SECRETARY RUBANO: Sorry, too many papers on my desk.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: That's why we couldn't find the exhibit number. Thank you.

Would you please look through there and identify the exhibits so everybody can follow along. THE WITNESS: Yes. It's Exhibit A-3.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Sheet C402.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Why don't you
wait one second for that to come up and then finish up, okay.

And show everybody where that pipe is when it does come up so that they can follow you through a visual depiction. Okay?

THE WITNESS: Do you want me to walk up there or reach?

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: That was --
sorry.
What sheet is it?
THE WITNESS: It's sheet 402, C402.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: C402. There you go.

MEMBER LEGGIO: Sir, before you start?
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Yes.
MEMBER LEGGIO: I'm over here.
Is it absolutely necessary that you have to walk him through everything like this?

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Well, what would you rather I have him do?

MEMBER LEGGIO: Well, I'm just saying he's one of your professionals, he knows what he's
doing, right?
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Yes.
MEMBER LEGGIO: I feel like I'm in,
like, a kindergarten class right now. You're coaching him. You know, I don't understand what's going on here. Actually, it's very annoying to, you know -- I don't understand why you have to coach him.

Is he prepared; is he prepared with whatever we need here tonight?

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: He is.
MEMBER LEGGIO: So let him talk.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: I shall.
You know some boards like to ask
questions back and forth, and some like witnesses to talk. It's just a preference thing.

MEMBER LEGGIO: All right.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Sometimes you get
-- they say don't do that, but if that's the preference --

MEMBER LEGGIO: That's my preference. I'm not speaking for the rest of the board but that's my preference.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Understood.
MEMBER LEGGIO: Okay?

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: I get what you're saying.

Proceed how you want to proceed.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: That's fine. But Mr. Goll is capable of going on his own and that's actually what he did.

Why don't you take it from there and we'll proceed and if $I$ need to ask you anything I will.

Okay, thank you, we'll do that.
THE WITNESS: Okay. So, again, I can't really identify it and point it out, but in the lower center there's a pipe that runs from the bottom center, up and off the site.

Actually to the right a little bit.
And then if you can go down, down -- if you can take the mouse and -- this isn't going to work. So I'll just state -- you know, $I$ can identify it by structure number and $I$ think the town -- the planning board engineer will also understand, but I really just wanted to kind of get the points across so that I'm not taking up too much time.

But one of the issues is there's a pipe length here that is actually below seasonal high
groundwater, which means it will intercept groundwater and along the outside of the pipe can drain that seasonal high groundwater.

One of the other things $I$ pointed out was there's a proposed yard inlet, 104 to yard inlet 110, all the way at the bottom. It's actually just off the screen on the bottom there; there's a black line on the bottom of the property line. The applicant's engineer had identified that as a trench drain or a toe drain. It essentially meets the definition of an infiltration basin; it's perforated.

One of the things to note on the plan $I$ just wanted to point out, is just above it where you see that hatching right there -- thank you -- that is a subsurface detention basin that is identified by the applicant. It's higher in elevation than that trench drain. So what is going to happen is when you're going to get groundwater infiltration, it's going to go into the ground and then go right over to the trench drain, and then be discharged over to the basin all the way on the right, which is identified as basin number -- I think that's Basin Number 2 -- no, excuse me, Basin Number 3. Wait, four, Basin Number 4, which is on the right.

And so what that's going to do is it's supposed to just infiltrate into the ground. So now it's going to end up overloading Basin Number 4 .

The other thing is that drain, that toe drain is actually also below seasonal high groundwater based on the test pits that are the closest to it. And so that's going to also intercept seasonal high groundwater; it's going to artificially lower the groundwater and then also discharge that additional hydraulic load to the basins.

So they're not really going to -they're going to be receiving much more water during the winter months than anticipated in the design. And what that does is it will overwhelm the basins in terms of its hydraulic load and potentially fail, so it won't drain in the 72 hours.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: I do have a question for you, okay?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: All right. So in your opinion, okay, does this property, you know, with the new inland regulations that are coming in with the DEP, with the floodplain issue, does this property fall into that?

THE WITNESS: I don't believe there's a floodplain near the property, no.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: But with the new inland flood protection rules is this property considered in that area?

THE WITNESS: I don't -- I don't think so. I don't think so, unless it's -- unless Squankum Brook is actually in the floodplain. I didn't do any kind of analysis.

What will affect it is in the stormwater rainfall, that does affect the stormwater rules where they're going to be required to use additional rainfall.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: And this new inland flood protection rule goes into effect July 1st, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct. I just don't
know if this was already deemed administratively complete; $I$ 'm not sure it falls under that new rule.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Well it's a DEP rule.

THE WITNESS: But they have to comply with the stormwater management rules.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Correct. Thank you.

THE WITNESS: Thank you for that
question.
So, in any event, I wanted to -- so
that was really where we got to last time. There was a concern for me about like intercepting groundwater and the natural flow regime before. So I'll continue on.

We talked about the soil removal. The other item $I$ wanted to -- and I'm going to come back to stormwater management in a second but -- actually, I'm going to stay on stormwater so that we can -- and then I'll move on to woodland management.

One of the things is $I$ went through the permeability mounding recharge calculations that were prepared for the site. And one of the things that you have to understand, and this is important, is that the reason they're elevating, they're importing all that fill, is because -- the simple fact is that there must be a separation between seasonal high groundwater and the infiltrative surface elevation of 24 inches minimum.

And right now groundwater on this site, seasonal high, is sometimes a little bit lower than that, sometimes it's higher. In the areas of the
basins it's about at where the infiltration surfaces or just below it; so they are either raising it a little bit or just putting it right at the surface.

But in order to get the gravity to get the stormwater there, that's why they're filling up seven, eight feet, to bring that -- the building up to grade so that they can then put the stormwater pipes in, keep them underground in the parking lot and get them to the basins. So that's why the applicant needs to bring in all that fill to the site.

But there is a number of issues that we did point out, or that $I$ did identify. For example, Basin 1, they used a permeability rate of a half an inch an hour. But this was calculated below the seasonal high groundwater table. That's not allowed by Chapter 12 of the BMP manual; they're not allowed to do that. So they have to actually use the infiltration rate above it.

Basin Number 2 they did use a recharge rate of. 8 inches per hour as the actual rate. Of course, in the design they divide it in half. And they did that for the mounding and recharge design. However, there is a rate of less than . 06 inches per hour and . 56 inches per hour that should have been
used. They are also talking about that they're going to excavate to get through those layers, but if that area, if that impermeable, relatively restrictive horizon were to extend outside of the basin, the manual says you have to find a different location to reconfigure the basin, so they really should be finding the extent of where that restrictive horizon is and then determine whether or not they can move their basin or remove the entire area of low permeability -- lower permeability material.

Basin Number 3, they assume 20 inches per hour, except all three pits revealed infiltration rates were one inch an hour or less. Same thing as in Basin 2 the soil infiltration rate extends beyond the area of the proposed basin. So as per Chapter 12, you know, a new location of that basin really should be investigated.

Basin Number 4, the engineer based the recharge rate on a permeability of one inch per hour for the recharge design and mounting calculations. However, one of their test pits, TP-206, has a permeability rate of .7 at 2 feet in depth, and that's the one that probably should have been used. The engineer based the recharge rate on
permeability on Basin Number 5 of 1 . 1 inches per hour for their -- actually the field-calculated recharge rate, and they could use them both for the recharge design and the mounding calculations. And this rate was from Test Pit 28 , except that rate was from 9 feet below grade, so it was really pretty far below. That's not allowed per the DEP BMP Manual Chapter 12.

So none of the basins really exactly comply with the New Jersey BMP manual. Why this is important because if the basins don't function water is going to simply sit in there. It's going to sit in there for more than 72 hours and become a potential mosquito issue and also not be able to comply with the stormwater regulations.

So the other thing that you will
notice in the plans on the right you will see how there's three detention basins on the eastern side. And the reason they made three in one location is because there's in the green infrastructure standards it's the maximum area that is allowed to discharge to a single infiltration basin is 2.5 acres. So, obviously, they're more than 2.5 acres that are draining to these basins. And so what they did is they simply put berms between each
basin -- or in the basin, separated them, gave them separate discharges.

However, the training back in, there's actually an example of it, but there was a training back from DEP on -- what was the date of that -- I think it was in November of 2022, they did their training Module Number 4, and they basically showed an illustration of three basins right next to each other and said that doesn't meet the requirements of green infrastructure because green infrastructure in the intent is to also provide dispersed stormwater. So, in other words, those basins should be really more spread apart and further apart to comply with the rules.

MEMBER LEGGIO: I have a question for him.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes.
MEMBER LEGGIO: Now in the chance that these basins over fill, okay, which you said -- I know you have your calculations and we have the DEP numbers and test pits and all that stuff, but in the chance that these over fill, okay, and where is the water going to run off then, it's going to head off to Victory Road?
THE WITNESS: If they over top they
have emergency spillways around the perimeter; they're all on different sides. They will definitely discharge somewhere to the south, the east and potentially to the north based on where the emergency spillways are. But they're not all just going to go right to Victory Road immediately. I didn't find that.

But the issue is -- and they also have their, you know, inlet -- they have outlet structures that have spillways so as they rise up. I think my concern is not necessarily the capacity of the basins for larger storms, it's the ability to meet the BMP manual in terms of the recharge and standing water which could be above --

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: What is the BMP manual?

THE WITNESS: Oh, I'm sorry, the stormwater Best Management Practices is what they call it, and that's the BMP manual which is a reference for the stormwater regulations.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: So what is the seasonal high groundwater table at this site?

THE WITNESS: In accordance to the GZA investigation, it's all over the place. I mean it's -- it varies from, you know --

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: It can't vary, it's seasonal high. It has to be something.

THE WITNESS: Well, I'm just telling you what $I$ saw on the test pit, the results.

So there was an instance where on, if you go to the west side, right there, that basin, there is a test pit on the east side and a test pit on the west side. That underground basin it seems to have a seasonal high and it is higher than the seasonal high that was found inside, where they did the test pit inside the basin. And so it did seem a little odd that there is sort of a trough of groundwater there, so that was sort of -- it was pretty variable around the site.

MEMBER LEGGIO: So you understand our concern, right?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
MEMBER LEGGIO: With overflow out to
Victory Road?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
MEMBER LEGGIO: And it causing a safety
issue.
THE WITNESS: Correct.
MEMBER LEGGIO: On top of other issues.

THE WITNESS: And that was actually one of the points $I$ was going to bring up. And I think one of our clients' people, or somebody who was going to speak, maybe not our client but somebody who was going to speak on -- specific to the Victory Road, the flooding around that inlet. One of my concerns was that there is no evidence at least, maybe the applicant can provide testimony on whether the pipe that actually goes up to the north away from Victory Road, actually functions as it's supposed to, has it been videotaped, has it been video-inspected; have they figured that out or do they need to fix that?

According to one of the neighbors who filmed it during April $29 t h$ and 30 th there was a big rain event that flooded that section, that low area of the street. I did check some local rainfall records and it was about three inches over a little over 24 hours. So maybe a two-year, maybe just under a five-year storm event so not really a lot of -- not really a high, big event that actually could flood that street. So that's why it led me to the question, does that pipe even have the ability to carry the flow that is there now.

Did I answer that question?

Okay, so another one of the things I'm going to -- and I did talk about the seasonal high concerns on the basin to the west. But one of the other concerns that we have on the stormwater basin is in the landscaping plan on sheet -- I don't know the sheet number of that landscaping plan, but they show they have 25 trees proposed on the embankment, on the inside of the embankment on the exterior of the basins. I am assuming this for both tree replacement requirements but also maybe buffering from the adjacent properties. I'm not sure if that's -- you know, I'm not a landscape architect expert so I'm not exactly sure what the purpose is. But what $I$ can tell you is putting trees and shrubs with deep roots on embankments is not a great idea. Those embankments and the reason they're raising the site, those embankments are not excavated into the ground on one side, they're actually building up embankments so they have to hold the stormwater back. But now you're going to have trees on them and when you're -- and now these are technically not regulated dams but they act as dams because they hold the water back because they're not over five feet in height.

But in my work with the Army Corps of

Engineers doing levy inspections, dam inspections, stormwater basin inspections, you never put trees and shrubs on an embankment because the roots, number one, can penetrate, they can actually threaten the structural integrity of the embankment. And also if they were to fall they would rip out the embankment and then the water can spill out from that side. And it also makes it very difficult to inspect the integrity of the basin when they have to go and do their stormwater inspections.

So that was -- that's an issue that, you know, $I$ would strongly recommend regardless of, you know, how the application moves forward, that those trees are removed from anywhere within the embankment.

As a matter of fact the Army Corp of Engineers recommends a 50 -foot vegetative clearance on either side of embankments so that the roots can't reach the embankment.

So that's pretty much most of my
testimony on the stormwater. There's, like I said, there were really there's a few topics that I covered but they're pretty significant because they'll have a major impact on the functioning of this system.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Geoff, before you go to the next issues, do you have an opinion, within a reasonable degree of engineering certainty, as to whether the stormwater system as proposed and reviewed by you meets the DEP volumes?

THE WITNESS: It's my professional opinion that within a degree of engineering certainty that the basin right now does not comply with the New Jersey Best Management Practices manual, especially Chapter 12 , which is a reference that is used to guide the New Jersey stormwater management regulations.

So I know $I$ have had this argument, is the BMP manual a regulation? Well, it's reference. It's part and parcel to the rule. You can't apply the regulation without having the BMP manual which is referenced.

Oh, one other thing that $I$ wanted to bring up that $I$ didn't is the time of concentrations and this is, again, I'm going way into the weeds on this, but the calculations. This site is very up and down. You've heard talk about vernal pools and, you know, one of the permits they're getting is to fill a couple of vernal pools there and there are isolated wetlands with a GP6.

Because the topography here is very undulating, and so what happened is though I don't -- the time of concentration is how an engineer calculates water running across a property. And how it runs across a property, that slope and distance dictates and impacts the peak flows that you're going to be calculating. And it's supposed to follow essentially reality; in other words, water flows from uphill to downhill. Except while the applicant's engineer had used one of the depressions and modeled it as a pond, there are still a number of ponds that the time of concentration runs through that really defy gravity in terms that they went down and up, they just went through it, and they really should have modeled those as ponds as well and that would have lowered the predevelopment peak flow runoff and required larger basins, in my professional opinion.

So the other items that $I$ was going to talk about is on the woodlands management plan. I think this was talked about before. I think the applicant was asked a question. There were two locations of. 19 acres where they did the sampling for the trees, to calculate their tree replacement requirements. Except when you look at it they're
disturbing about 12.9 acres of land, which would leave -- require . 645 acres of survey and they provide $I$ believe it's . 4 acres of $2.4--2.2--2$. 2-acre plots. And so they are very much below what they're supposed to be doing for this, the appropriate sampling of trees to determine the tree replacement plan.

I have driven by the site. I have stopped in front of the site before. It's a pretty dense forest, $I$ mean from the street, anyway. It looks like a pretty healthy, dense forest. And so you want to make sure that calculation is correct and you have a good sampling of the property to make sure that you're getting the tree replacement that you need.

BOARD TREE EXPERT: Mr. Chair, can I just jump in on that? The tree replacement, because they've reached a maximum, it doesn't exactly matter if they have the exact acreage that you're talking about because since they've already met the maximum amount that they'll have to pay. So it just becomes a $\$ 35,000$ per acre is what they'll be paying.

THE WITNESS: Okay, I was just
looking, $I$ mean that certainly doesn't comply with the ordinance but that's --

BOARD PLANNER: It does.
BOARD TREE EXPERT: It is in our
ordinance, you have to keep reading below that. And there is a waiver they could ask to pay to the tree fund. And in that section it does mention that not more than $\$ 35,000$ per acre.

THE WITNESS: But it does state that they have to survey 5 percent of the property, correct?

BOARD TREE EXPERT: It does. But there's no need to survey 5 percent if it's just going to go to the maximum number. They are agreeing to pay the maximum, they could do that survey, but $I$ can assure you that they will get more than that $\$ 35,000$ per acre.

Every forest is --
THE WITNESS: I understand the logic. I'm just looking at compliance with what they were supposed to measure.

BOARD TREE EXPERT: But the measurements don't apply after they've reached the $\$ 35,000$ per acre.

THE WITNESS: Well don't they have to do the calculation first?

BOARD TREE EXPERT: The calculation
always goes over $\$ 35,000$ per acre, always. If it's a forested plot of land it always meets the maximum.

THE WITNESS: Okay. Like I didn't get that far into the actual financial value. I am just telling you what $I$ read in the ordinance and the ordinance states you're supposed to survey 5 percent of the property and they didn't.

CERTIFIED TREE EXPERT: It doesn't apply. It doesn't apply since they're meeting the maximum amount of contribution.

THE WITNESS: Okay, I understand.
The other thing is the environmental impact report, this is my final point. The environmental impact report mentions nothing about the import of fill at the site and how much that fill may impact, you know, the health, safety and welfare, basically of what the environmental impact report is supposed to be looking at.

They also require under the ordinance that -- under the environmental impact report that a description of the project shall specify what is to be done and how it is to be done curing construction, operations, as well as alternative plans deemed practicable and achievable for the objective. They mention that, yeah, they evaluated
alternatives, but this is what they picked. But they're not letting you know what those alternatives were and why they decided to get to this configuration and whether or not there was a configuration that might have less of an environmental impact for the township.

So, you know, it could be just resolved by them completing and making the report more robust and letting you know where -- how they came to the specific alternative, but we don't know.

They're reporting a lot of fill.
They're exporting a lot of topsoil and is
200,000 square feet the minimum they need for a warehouse? I'm not an expert in that. But the environmental impact report didn't cover that. Could they get away with 100,000 square feet? I don't know. Is there another property that they could have looked at to utilize that might have been better and it's not mentioned in the report? Again, I'm not an expert on the location or the viability or the economics of the use, proposed use, it's just not described in the environmental impact report. So that's what I have.

Thank you.
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: I do have a
question for you, okay, and $I$ don't mean to beat a dead horse, all right.

The July 1st rules that go into effect at DEP, all right, this is exactly how it reads from the DEP's website:
"The new rules require all new major developments to address stormwater runoff which can contribute to flooding and water pollution using up-to-date rainfall data forecasts.
"Developers must design stormwater management systems, such as retention basins, green infrastructure and other measures, not to only account for the rainfall we currently experience but also the future rainfall projections.
"Currently the state uses out-of-date precipitation data from 20-plus years ago. The new rules seek to prevent developers from flooding communities and businesses downstream. from their new buildings."

Opinion?

THE WITNESS: I mean it's refreshing
that they're updating the rules because, you're correct, we are using rainfall data that is very --
you know, it's old. I mean some of it goes back to the early '90s, the latest one.

Now, like I said, $I$ believe if they have a complete application with DEP and with the township and it's administratively complete, I am not sure that they have to, you know, comply.

It doesn't mean -- the reality of the situation is there's just more rain. I mean that's just the reality of the situation. There's more rain now than what the models will show simply because, like you said approximately, they're outdated. And so that is what the state is trying to do, is update that and predict the future to reduce flooding impacts.

So, you know, I have to, you know, speak to the -- I think it's up to the Planning Board to...

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: I mean, Jen, how does this work?

BOARD PLANNER: I mean this is more of a -- I mean, I would be happy to answer it, but it's more your area.

BOARD ENGINEER: The regs would apply to future projects. So because this one was deemed complete and it's a current application before the
board, they would use the current regs pre-July ist hearing. So if this were to be a new application submitted after that they would follow the new regs.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: May I be heard?
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Sure.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: So there is a line
of - -
(Stenographer requests clarification.)

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: I'm sorry. When regulations are made for health, safety and welfare purposes, the rule about they have been declared complete and we cannot require compliance with new regulations may be overruled. There are certain aspects where that happens so it would behoove the applicant to look at this. And if there is a legal argument, like I'm suggesting, we would need to look into it and do a little bit of research about it and certainly their expert would want to opine on the ability to meet these regulations.

I understand they have been declared complete but these regulations are for, I would assume they're for health, safety and welfare because they're talking about flooding of communities and looking to prevent that.

Anyway Mr. Simon, I'm sure, understands
what I'm saying. And there should be an opportunity for the applicant to address it when necessary.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: So, yeah, that's a
little bit above my pay grade in determining whether or not that applies at this point in time. But, in any event, you know, that's essentially my testimony.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Thank you.
So, board, I don't have any other expert witnesses to present to you.

I do have two witnesses who are clients
who $I$ know are going to want to give a comment during the comment period. Mr. Simon said he didn't have a problem if they just went up when everybody else goes up, but if it's the board's determination that because they're my client I have to call them I'll do that.

I would request that you just let them go up and just adhere to the same time limits as everybody else, but we'll do it the way you want to do it.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay. May I?
Okay, good.
I'm sorry, I don't remember your last
name, Lieberman?

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Yes.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Mr. Lieberman, let me just address the first comment you said was that you don't have any more witnesses; expert witnesses, you're done with your expert witness case?

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: That's exactly correct.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay. So then Mr. Simon is going to be given an opportunity to cross-examine your expert.

With respect to the two witnesses that are members of your client group, they should be presented by you for testimony. But $I$ don't really think that there's a rule preventing it either way.

The question $I$ have is whether or not that video is going to be used in some way or introduced because it will need to have a foundation and a proffer made, especially if they're going to show that. And Mr. Simon needs to --

ATTORNEY SIMON: May I? I think, I know you just referenced a video and maybe a couple of people may be aware of what you're referring to, but $I$ think, so the record is clear, if you could just describe what you're referring to when you talk
about the video?
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay. So today
Mr. Lieberman's office sent a video with an email indicating that a -- one of their clients took a video on April 30th. The expert witness spoke about that, as well, which has not been introduced, but he testified about rainfall, checking rainfall records. I don't quite remember what he said, but he said the records were 2 to 5-year rainfall at that time.

So there is a video, a very short video that shows rainfall on a road, which $I$ presume is near to the property.

So our clerk also indicated but did not get a response, that she could not open the video. I was able to open and view it on my office computer, but the clerk could not. We don't have -- we are not sure we have the mechanism to show that.

So these are things that you as
the -- as the proffer of this evidence, if you plan on having them testify about that, you need to clear up how you plan on doing that.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Great. I
understand. I know that there was an issue today.
I do believe they have it maybe on a thumb drive.

Oh, we did turn it over on a thumb drive and that might correct it. So it seems like it could be -- it could be used.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay. So, Mr. Simon, what's your position as to the testimony of the lay witnesses?

ATTORNEY SIMON: So, look,
Mr. Lieberman certainly has the right to present any or all of his fact witnesses at the appropriate time to provide testimony with regard to this application.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And certainly, and I'm speaking, putting on my board attorney hat for just a moment, that $I$ usually find that it's better for the process if an interested party presents as a fact witness during the public comment session. I think it's a little bit more seamless, it's more efficient for the board.

And $I$ think further, in fairness to Mr. Lieberman's clients, who may have had an issue in terms of downloading and in terms of the technology and the videoing, that this gives them a sufficient time to get what information they need, to your point, Ms. Rizzuto, which is the right one,
so to provide a proper foundation for their benefit at the proper time.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay.

So, Mr. Chair, with respect to the presentation of the testimony of two -- I think at least one or maybe two of his client group, Mr. Simon has no objection. I do not have an objection. So he can do it during public session. But we do need a proffer on that, whether from you or from the witness $I$ think it doesn't really matter, but we need a proffer.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: So I'll make sure that there's a proffer.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay. So then the next order of business, I believe, would be cross-examination of the witness before we go to anything else.

ATTORNEY SIMON: I think right now where we are is that $I$ would have the opportunity to ask Mr. Goll some questions, yes, which I intend to.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay.
ATTORNEY SIMON: Thanks, Ms. Rizzuto.

C R O S S - E X A M I N A T I O N

ATTORNEY SIMON: Actually, before I even forget, $I$ want to clear one thing up, Geoff. You had mentioned this training in November of 2022 with regard to $I$ think it was berms and a basin.

Is that what you were referring to?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: Okay. Can you
just -- I didn't get all of that, so if you could just repeat what your objection is with regard to the subject matter to which you were referring and then specifically the bases for your objection referencing some training.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So, well, it was simply what the presenters at the DEP stormwater engineers had presented at this training.

So what happens is there's these periodic trainings that the DEP offers. It's actually for certification for municipal reviewers.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So is it, like, what; a continuing education program?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, similar. It's provided by the state so that for municipal engineers to basically review plans to make sure that the plans conform with the stormwater management regulations.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Is it for
professional engineer accreditation?
THE WITNESS: Do you know what, I
don't recall. I think it might be.
BOARD PLANNER: I don't think so. I
think that it's a continuation of the stormwater regs that were approved a couple of years ago.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
BOARD PLANNER: And the municipal
engineers are responsible for overall township
compliance with the stormwater management regulations with respect to -- I mean, Nick, you know about this, right?

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Correct.
BOARD PLANNER: So they're responsible to make sure that any and all development within the community, even if the basins or the stormwater management system is maintained by private entity, is designed and maintained in accordance with the regulations so there's continuing requirements the state requires, $I$ don't think it's a CEU issue --

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: It's not.
BOARD PLANNER: I think it's if you
are going to be a municipal engineer, you have to have this training in order to certify that the
stormwater management systems that are being designed and maintained are in accordance with the state regulations; is that correct?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.

BOARD ENGINEER: The training is
offered once or twice a year and the requirement is that you take it once every five years. So every five years you will expire, take the training again.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So it is a form of continuing education?

BOARD PLANNER: Yeah, but it doesn't count towards CEU units --

BOARD ENGINEER: You could get
credits. You have to submit it.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: I could.

Engineers may, geologists don't.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Got it.

So with regard to this, so this is
training, Geoff, that you attended?

THE WITNESS: No, I didn't attend this one. This was provided to me by one of my colleagues in my office and the slides and videos, I understand, are offered online as well.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So, in other words, your opinion with regard to this topic is based on
these slides and not the BMP's or any type of other authoritative manual, correct?

I just want to know what it is.
THE WITNESS: It was basically the DEP providing an example slide of three basins immediately adjacent to each other and collecting the area from the larger site and putting it into these three basins and saying that that is not -- they would not consider that -- they would not consider that green infrastructure.

Now, I will clarify or I will -- to be completely transparent, it is not a black-and-white issue in terms of whether or not that is acceptable, but DEP's reviewers said that they would look to reject an application if they were reviewing the stormwater systems.

But again, you know, several -- as I understand from the meeting, several of the engineers were contesting that determination because there is -- as engineers we like things to be black and white and, you know, this is exactly what you do and this is what you don't. And we talk about dispersed stormwater systems. That is, I'll call it, $a$ little bit more of a gray area, and so --

ATTORNEY SIMON: I guess the point
being is that you weren't present for this presentation, and you didn't review any written materials with regard to this presentation?

THE WITNESS: Oh, I did. I have the slides.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Oh, you have the

```
slides?
```

THE WITNESS: Yeah. They're available online.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Okay.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY SIMON: You haven't submitted
them to the board, correct?
THE WITNESS: I did not, no.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And with regard to
submitting to the board do you submit a report to the board in connection with your testimony?

THE WITNESS: I have not.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And I have noticed
that you were reading from some notes.
Have those notes ever been put into the
form of a report?
THE WITNESS: They're just written
notes for myself.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And when you were
retained by Mr. Lieberman's office -- or let me ask it this way.

Who retained you for this job, was it Mr. Lieberman or was it one or more of his clients. THE WITNESS: No, one of his clients. ATTORNEY SIMON: And how long ago was that?

THE WITNESS: I believe it was March, maybe February. End of February, beginning of March.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So your retention was directly with one of the clients?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: Okay. And which
client was that?

THE WITNESS: Ms. Santori.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And what was the purpose of your engagement?

THE WITNESS: To review the stormwater management plan for the site, engineering calculations and any applicable environmental ordinances.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Did you look at -- so when you say you looked at environmental ordinances, what ordinances did you review?

THE WITNESS: As I testified to, the woodlands management ordinance and the environmental impact report.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Well the
environmental impact, when you say Environmental
Impact Report, are you talking about the ordinance that governs the submission of an environmental impact report? Or are you talking about the environmental impact report itself?

THE WITNESS: Both.
ATTORNEY SIMON: So other than the ordinance that deals with the submission of an environmental impact report and the ordinance which, I believe, you referred to at the last hearing dealing with exporting of soils --

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, three not two.

ATTORNEY SIMON: -- right; any other ordinances that you reviewed?

THE WITNESS: That was it.
ATTORNEY SIMON: That was it. So other
than the --
THE WITNESS: And the stormwater management, you know, ordinance as well.

ATTORNEY SIMON: The municipality
stormwater management ordinance?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So other than those
ordinances have you reviewed any other ordinance
pertaining to this application?
THE WITNESS: No.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And with regard to
the client who engaged you, are you aware of where she lives relative to this property?

THE WITNESS: I don't know the
address, no.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Do you know how far away your client lives from this property?

THE WITNESS: No.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And have you actually walked the site?

THE WITNESS: No. That would be trespassing.

I have been on the edge; I have walked along the street, Victory Road.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And so you didn't submit a report or -- did you conduct any type of study with regard to this, other than taking notes as you've just described.

THE WITNESS: I just I did some
calculations on the fill, which was basically because the -- it's in PDF. If the plans were not, quote, "flattened," they still retain their AutoCAD features, $I$ could potentially convert them back and do it backwards to figure out what the fill is; so when it's flat it's just like having a digital piece of paper.

So I went through and I sketched what I believe were the various fills in the area. That's why the last time we testified I said my fill -- the fill calculations $I$ said were very plus or minus because of the fact that $I$ didn't have the actual AutoCAD drawings to do that, but if you would like to share them with me $I$ would be more than happy to do that analysis.

ATTORNEY SIMON: You understand that this proposed use is a permitted use, correct?

THE WITNESS: As I understand, yes.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And you understand that there's no variance relief that is required in connection with this application, correct?

THE WITNESS: I don't know. I'm not aware of variances that are required.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And other than any relief that may be required to make a tree
contribution that was discussed earlier, you're not aware of any waivers or exceptions that are required of the applicant in connection with this application, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I didn't focus on that portion of the application.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And you talked at the last meeting about the trucks bringing fill onto the site, potentially impacting the conditions of Victory Road; do you recall that?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And when you -- are you talking about just truck traffic on the roadway itself?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And have you been involved in construction projects for -- on behalf of clients in the past?

THE WITNESS: Yes, I actually got my start sitting with a new gauge and -- you know, a Troxler gauge and sitting on construction sites for six or seven years.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Right, and sitting on construction sites for six or seven years I'm sure you had occasion to attend your fair share of
pre-construction meetings once projects are approved, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And isn't it true that as part of any pre-construction meeting, there would be a discussion about how construction materials were getting to the site and obligations of the developer to certainly repair any damages caused to the local roadway as a result, if any, as a result of any of that activity?

THE WITNESS: Actually, no, my role on those projects was simply for geotechnical monitoring and fill. So if there was an issue of a geotechnical information or paving and things like that, that's what they would call me in for.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So you weren't even part of those discussions in terms of pre-construction and ensuring that the surrounding properties are protected by virtue of any of those --

THE WITNESS: Well $I$ was part of the pre-construction meetings on the geotechnical aspects, but not invited to any of the other items of discussion, no.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Now you talked about
one of the ordinances you looked at, I believe you referenced Ordinance Section 188-26 stating, in essence, that no topsoil is to be removed from the township, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Are you aware based on your review of the plans and materials for this application that topsoil is being removed from the township as part of this case?

THE WITNESS: From the township?
ATTORNEY SIMON: Yes.

THE WITNESS: NO.
ATTORNEY SIMON: Are you aware of
topsoil being removed from the site?
THE WITNESS: Based on the calculation
of the -- so you have an area that is, let's say, I said 12, 13 acres of disturbance, the geotechnical report said, you know, I think it was an average of, I forget, nine inches of topsoil, like $I$ would have to look at the specific calculation based on the average. And then they're only required to put so much topsoil back in so much landscaped area, so you do the math and can back-calculate the volume.

> ATTORNEY SIMON: So you
back-calculated the volume based on your notes,
correct?
THE WITNESS: Correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And do you believe, based on your review of Section 188-26, that the applicant will violate that ordinances provision?

THE WITNESS: No, only if they need approval to take it off-site and it needs to stay within the township.

I was just pointing it out simply for the Planning Board's understanding of what needs to be done.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So you're not aware of any municipal ordinance that the applicant is violating currently, based on your review of the application, correct?

THE WITNESS: No, of course not, no. ATTORNEY SIMON: And then, you know, with regard to some of your comments, and I do appreciate, for one, you providing the brief summary as to what you testified to the last time, that was helpful. You occasionally the last time used the phrase during your testimony, well, they'll be able to engineer around that or engineer around it for purposes of a couple of comments that you made in connection with the application.

Do you recall that?
THE WITNESS: I don't. No, not specifically.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So if you had said for my edification let's assume that the transcript does reflect, in fact, that you said on a couple of occasions at least, oh, "Well they would be or should be able to engineer around that;" what does that mean to you, that phrase?

THE WITNESS: Well, if it's -- if it's, for example, if there's a pipe slope that is out of, you know -- that doesn't seem to match or if there's an issue with, you know -- you know, surcharging of a stormwater, like a manhole or an inlet or something like that, and they need to fix it, that's something I'm not exactly sure what I specifically testified to; there's an engineering aspect around it. So I'm not exactly sure what you're, $I$ guess, trying to ask.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Well, no, you used the phrase, I didn't, that's why I'm asking.

THE WITNESS: Yeah, I mean, it had nothing do with where seasonal high groundwater is and things like that. I mean they can elevate the site even more, they can bring in more fill, I
guess.
ATTORNEY SIMON: So I guess the question is for some of the criticisms that you've made in connection with the application, are those susceptible to engineering revisions to correct, if applicable, what you allege to be issues?

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: I just want to note an objection. I think, to be fair, Rob, and as you know I'm not doing too much objecting here, but if you give him some specifics, it would just make this a much better process.

ATTORNEY SIMON: No, no, no. Stuart, I'm not trying to hide anything.

During the last meeting -- just a
little bit of colloquy here for foundation. During the last meeting, during Geoff's testimony, he was just talking just generally about the site and talking about, just generally, certain issues regarding stormwater and $I$ couldn't follow it, that's why I'm, frankly, asking it. And he said a couple of times, well, yeah, they'll probably be able to engineer around that. And the reason why I asked the question because $I$ just want to know what he meant by that phrase, "engineering around it," that's all.

That's it, nothing more than that. I'm not trying to...

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Well, that's fine. My only point is, is that when you ask what you mean, $I$ think you need context. Because he didn't just say, you know, out of nowhere, he was responding to particulars.

So my only criticism of the question, that's up to the Chair or counsel to determine whether the objection is valid. I think if you say what did you mean about it, you should indicate what the issue was in which he responded that way, and then he can tell you what he meant; in the abstract I don't know. But that's my...

ATTORNEY SIMON: Look, I got my
answer, $I$ can move on. You made your point.
THE WITNESS: I mean I can clarify
that you can't change groundwater elevations and you can't change --

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: There's no question pending.

MEMBER LEGGIO: Bob -- what is your last name, sir?

ATTORNEY SIMON: Mr. Simon.

MEMBER LEGGIO: Mr. Simon. I'm sorry,
but you guys were referring to each other by name. ATTORNEY SIMON: That's fine.

MEMBER LEGGIO: If you are referring to their attorney -- you know, the witness. As far as, you know, we can make this simple right, we're clearing all this land, it's being raised; where is the water going? Okay.

We don't need to have a college degree or an engineering degree to know that if it's lower than what the building is going to be, then it's going to waddle out in the road eventually.

And since we don't have accurate rainfall numbers since from 1990 or whenever the numbers are from, okay, that's the concern. That's my concern too. Okay?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Mr. Leggio.
MEMBER LEGGIO: I don't want to add more to the roadway.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Mr. Leggio, he has a right to --

MEMBER LEGGIO: Sure.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: So just let him, like we let them complete, let him complete his cross-examination. We'll have plenty of time to...

MEMBER LEGGIO: Yeah, well.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
ATTORNEY SIMON: You talked, during
your last time you were before us, about wetlands, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And wetlands are under the exclusive jurisdiction of the DEP, Department of Environmental Protection, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And the DEP also has exclusive jurisdiction as to determinations of state threatened and endangered species, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And you also talked a little bit about vernal pools on the property, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: Right. And the jurisdiction with regard to the vernal pools you referenced in your testimony, similarly lie with the DEP, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And are you aware
that a vernal pool plan was developed for this site with a DEP vernal pool specialist?

THE WITNESS: What, if -- I don't
know if it was -- a DEP vernal pool specialist helped design it.

ATTORNEY SIMON: You just don't know either way?

THE WITNESS: An employee of the DEP helped them design the mitigation? I have never seen that happen.

ATTORNEY SIMON: I'm just asking you, are you aware of any interactions with the DEP with regard to the vernal pool plan?

THE WITNESS: Well, not interactions, but that's different than them designing it or having a hand in designing it.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And the new vernal pool as proposed on the plans is closer to the wetlands than currently, correct?

THE WITNESS: Well, which wetlands?
ATTORNEY SIMON: The wetlands to the
-- I guess that's to the east.
THE WITNESS: You're saying the vernal pools are closer to the wetlands?

ATTORNEY SIMON: So there's a vernal pool plan, correct, in connection with this application?

THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY SIMON: Right? And the
vernal pool plan shows a new vernal pool three times larger than what's existing, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yeah, where that
mouse -- where the hand mouse is there on the pointer on the screen, it's about the location, maybe a little east of it.

But yes, they're proposing a vernal pool in that area, whether the size of it or not in relation to the wetland, I'm not aware of it.

ATTORNEY SIMON: You didn't take a look at that, correct?

THE WITNESS: Not for the Planning Board application, no.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Just give me a minute.

Other than you referencing the EIR that you were looking for some information regarding fill that you could import to the site, correct?

THE WITNESS: I did look at that, that's correct.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Right. Other than
that issue was there any other aspect of the EIR that you took issue with?

THE WITNESS: No, well not that $I$ didn't take issue with, but that's where I was looking for whether or not once I realized that the import of fill was much more extreme than simply importing some fill to comply with the ordinance, I felt it was -- it's pretty excessive volume that even the GZA report mentions that it's an excessive volume of fill.

And so I went to the EIS report and it, you know, importing that much fill, it's an excessive volume of fill. And so $I$ went to the EIS report and, you know, importing that much fill is a pretty big element of a project. It's probably as important as placing the concrete for a slab and, you know, clearing the site, as well as fill that's got to be imported.

For example, an environmental impact report, does it impact emissions from vehicles and noise and things of that nature. So none of that was -- none of that was described nor discussed regarding fill being imported.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Is there any ordinance regulation that addresses the import of fill to the project?

THE WITNESS: Not that I'm aware of.

But, you know, when you're trying to get an approval for a regulatory body and they're required to provide -- the purpose of an Environmental Impact Statement or an Environmental Impact Report is to provide a broad picture of what is being done on the site and how that development and -- not only the post-development, you know, the use, but also the construction of it is going to impact the community and the environment. And, you know, I think that's a pretty big omission.

ATTORNEY SIMON: But other than that you didn't notice any other omission or any other aspect of the EIR that you take issue with, right? THE WITNESS: I didn't focus on some of the lack of description of what is being imported to the site, that's what $I$ focused on. ATTORNEY SIMON: I have nothing further for this witness. Thank you.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Can I have a redirect of this witness and ask two questions? CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes. ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Thank you.
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ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Regarding the vernal pool, $I$ have some questions for you.

Do you know whether the vernal pool
that is there can actually be recreated; is that something that can be done?

THE WITNESS: I don't -- you know, I guess it could be if it was designed correctly.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: And do you know whether or not the southern vernal pool is going to be drained; and if so, what the impacts are of that are?

THE WITNESS: You mean are you talking about the southern pools that are partially on the site and off the site?

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Yes.
THE WITNESS: Well my opinion, I
stated it last time, is there was a concern about the interception of seasonal high groundwater from the piping systems and toe drains that would redirect groundwater, and if it were -- if the groundwater regime were moving in that direction it would deplete it.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: I don't have any other questions on redirect.

Thank you for the opportunity.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Sure, sure.
The board can ask questions now? ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Yeah, sure.

Absolutely.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: All right,
Mr. Leggio. If anybody from the board has any questions.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: I have one. Working with the DEP for $25-\mathrm{plus}$ years -- sorry.

Working with DEP for 25-plus years, I don't work for the DEP but work with the individuals in Trenton, vernal pools are they -- like when you install a vernal pool or develop a vernal pool on a property, are they -- they approve it?

Are they involved with it?
I thought you just got a vernal pool, you installed a vernal pool and that was it. I didn't know that the DEP actually has to approve it or regulate it or anything like that.

THE WITNESS: Yes, you have to prove that it works. So there's -- the way wetlands and, you know, wetland mitigation, you have to recreate essentially the hydrology and the conditions that would allow for a wetland to be essentially recreated in a location.

Vernal pools are probably one of the most difficult habitats to create as a matter of fact. The DEP doesn't necessarily -- I'm not stating what the individuals at the DEP are reviewing this specific application, but they're also generally discouraged from putting wetland mitigation in existing forest plants because you're taking one resource, you know, that the forest is essentially regulated, but they don't normally like to do that.

Doesn't mean it doesn't happen but there's -- it's vernal pools are really very extremely sensitive to --

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Can you tell them what they are?

THE WITNESS: Oh. Does everybody know what a vernal pool is?

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Just explain. Just explain what it is.

This gentleman knows.
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: I do.

THE WITNESS: So a vernal pool is
basically it's a fancy term for a temporary wetland that only is inundated for a portion of the year. So, for example, in Southern New Jersey, the coastal
plain, vernal pools normally happen in the winter when seasonal high groundwater tends to rise. You can also get some surface runoff, as well. And what DEP finds important about vernal pools -- and so basically it's a temporary ponding and in the summer, mid-summer, these pools will be dry.

And what the importance of that is, is there's certain specific species of animals that use -- that use those vernal pools. And the only reason they can exist is because of those pools ironically dry up.

In other words, because they dry up in the summer, fish can never get established. So these amphibians, which are, you know, frogs and salamanders, they'll go in in the spring, mate, lay eggs, and then those eggs will hatch. And hopefully, before the vernal pool dries out, they mature and then they could into the woodland to their upland habitat, and then the pool dries up.

So that happens every year. And so what will happen is that there are species that are endemic to those types of habitats that require them. Some are endangered, some are not. So it depends on the species.

And obviously we talked -- we had a
conversation about this last time, about whether the DEP knows -- feels that they exist or not, and -- or there's optimal habitat if, in fact, they return.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: So does the DEP
-- does the DEP require, like, a monitoring program for these things, like into the future?

THE WITNESS: Yes. It's usually about
five years.
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Five years.

Like a wetland restoration?
THE WITNESS: Exactly.
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Got it.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Anybody from the board have any questions?

MEMBER LEGGIO: Oh, you want me to reiterate what $I$ said before?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yeah, I was going to say now if...

MEMBER LEGGIO: All of this talk back and forth with testimony and cross-examination, it's just -- as far as are the pools going to be able to hold the water, the pipes, filling up, emptying out; is it going to affect Victory Road at the end of the day?

This vernal pool, if it's there or not,
is it going to be monitored? That's fine, too. But that's, you know, as far as I'm concerned even their professionals, when they spoke, couldn't give us a straight answer about are the pools going to be able to hold the water or not hold the water. And that's what the residents are concerned about. I'm concerned about being a resident. Is it going to get out to Victory Road and cause a hazardous condition.

Is that okay?
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yeah. No, no, no.

MEMBER LEGGIO: Because I don't want to get yelled at or, you know...

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Well, again, they were testifying. There's a time and place.

MEMBER LEGGIO: Well...

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: So you're finished with your testimony?

THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: You're finished
with your testimony?
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Yes. Thank you. THE WITNESS: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Do you have anybody
to bring up?

ATTORNEY SIMON: So if Mr. Goll is done and other than the couple of fact witnesses, Mr. Lieberman doesn't have any more witnesses, at this point $I$ think that what $I$ would like to do is to recall our traffic consultant, Kerry Pehnke, just to introduce a couple of exhibits and talk about those that we have previously submitted to the board. I think that would be the right time for that.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And then we can talk about next steps after that.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes, because we've got, you know, about 15 minutes.

ATtORNEY SIMON: Well, that's what I'm saying, $I$ think $I$ can do it in -- that's why it's going to work out.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Excuse me,
Mr. Chair, would you mind if we just took a two-minute break?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Two-minute break?
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: That's all I need.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Absolutely. Take a two-minute recess.
(A recess is taken at 9:42 p.m.)
(The record resumes at 9:48 p.m.)

SECRETARY RUBANO: The planning board will now reconvene.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Mr. Chair, so I have here next to me Kerry Pehnke.
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ATTORNEY SIMON: Ms. Pehnke, you were previously sworn, right?

KERRY PEHNKE: Yes.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And your license
remains in good standing?
THE WITNESS: Yes.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And so we have up on
the screen an exhibit.
Eileen, what are we up to here?
SECRETARY RUBANO: This is A-45, the
Intersection Improvement Concept Plan. Should be on the sheet already.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So, Kerry, first of
all let's lay a foundation. What is this on the screen that has been identified as $A-45$; when was it created and by whom?

THE WITNESS: Yes, of course. So A-45
is a new intersection concept for the Lakewood Farmingdale Road and Victory Road intersection. It's dated June 13th, 2023.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And so why
don't -- why don't you, in essence, take over and walk the board through what we are seeing on $A-45$.

THE WITNESS: So since the last
hearing we heard the concerns by the board professionals about this intersection, specifically the right turn movement from Victory Road onto Lakewood Farmingdale Road. So a lot of work was done behind the scenes to actually bring this concept to you tonight.

The applicant approached the property owner on the southwest corner. He actually was able to obtain an easement. It's an easement that is official; it exists now, it's not in the works.

So that easement also has the rights to be able to transferred to either county or township, depending on how the design process works out in the review.

So what we were able to do with the easement and the easement area, if you look at the top right corner, that hatched area is the area
we've established that has an easement area with that southwest property owner.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So that triangle that is cross-hatched represents the easement area that was obtained from the property owner, correct?

THE WITNESS: That is correct.
So we established that area. By going to that south portion of the report, we're on the bottom on the page. What we did is we took the largest design vehicle in New Jersey, the WB-67, the Title 39, and we determined what it would take for that truck to be able to make that movement without encroaching over either the departing or the receiving centerline.

We then added a buffer area to that, so for design purposes to be able to contain it fully within the easement area.

ATTORNEY SIMON: So although this is well off-site, that this is something that the applicant wasn't required by law to do this, this is something that the applicant on their own decided to do in response to some of the comments from some of the board members?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And what is the -- so
the shaded area, $I$ guess with regard to A-45 within the easement, represents what?

THE WITNESS: So that shaded area is what we're proposing the concept as the extent of the pavement to accommodate the largest design vehicle.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And what will, if, in fact, the easement is I'll use the word effectuated and ultimately, you know, dedicated to county - -

BOARD PLANNER: They can't hear you in the back.

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Speak into the mike, please.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Thank you. I'm sorry.

If the easement is ultimately dedicated with an appropriate right-of-way to the county and/or the township, what is the upshot of that in terms of the day-to-day for vehicles?

What is going to happen as a result?
THE WITNESS: So all vehicles,
including existing buses that make that movement and encroach over both centerlines, will be able to make those movements more efficiently, both the right turn onto Victory Road and the right turn off

Victory Road, which will generally improve the safety of the intersection.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Can I ask one
question?
THE WITNESS: Of course.
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Was the Howell
Police Department ever contacted about the acquisition of this, as far as, like, you know sight distance and all that stuff?

ATTORNEY SIMON: If you know?
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Was there any type of police...

THE WITNESS: I am not aware. I wasn't part of the acquisition process.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Thank you.
ATTORNEY SIMON: So you talked about the easement in the area that was cross-hatched in the triangle.

There's also a shaded area on the other side of the intersection. Just explain what that is, please.

THE WITNESS: Of course. So previous exhibits for this intersection actually had already shown this improvement. That's what we're showing for the right turn onto Victory Road to also
accommodate the largest design vehicle.
ATTORNEY SIMON: So these right-hand turn movements will allow all vehicles, including school buses, cars, trucks, to make those right-hand turns without having to encroach over the centerlines, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And you wanted to show the other -- just explain what the other -- maybe the top left-hand corner, what that represents.

THE WITNESS: The top left-hand corner includes more than labeling, as well as dimensioning of the pavement area, the easement line itself, as well as the utilities that we're aware of on that corner.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And it's your
understanding that the applicant received site plan approval from this board and receives approval from the county that it would make those improvements at its cost, and then ultimately dedicate the improvements to the appropriate governmental agency, correct?

THE WITNESS: That's my understanding, correct.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And with these improvements as proposed, as set forth on this exhibit, $A-45$, those intersections will continue to operate or will operate at acceptable levels of service, correct?

THE WITNESS: That's correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And those proposed intersection improvements will also enhance the intersection's safety, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: And those road
improvements will improve conditions for all types of drivers and make those conditions safer as well, correct?

THE WITNESS: Yes, correct.
ATTORNEY SIMON: I have nothing
further, Mr. Chairman, regarding this exhibit and this witness.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Mr. Chair, can I just ask something?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Sure.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Just, I'm sorry,
did you say the easement exists or the applicant went out and met with the property owner and discussed it?

ATTORNEY SIMON: No, the easement actually exists.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: It exists right
now?
ATTORNEY SIMON: It exists right now.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: And who is it in
favor of?
ATTORNEY SIMON: It's in favor of the
applicant.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay.
ATTORNEY SIMON: But with the ability
for it to be assigned to the county and/or the municipality as appropriate.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay. I
understand.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Can I ask, is
this recorded?
ATTORNEY SIMON: I believe it is in the process of being recorded.

I don't know who asked me.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Mr. Lieberman.
ATTORNEY SIMON: Oh, okay.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Lieberman asked.
ATTORNEY SIMON: I was like someone over there.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: I'm a good lawyer, but not that good.

ATTORNEY SIMON: You deserve that credit.

ATtORNEY LIEBERMAN: That's very nice.
Can I ask one or two questions? Sorry to interrupt.
Do you want me to go and does anybody else? Sir, you want to go?

BOARD TRAFFIC EXPERT: I have several questions with regard to this exhibit, if you don't mind.

First of all before --
(Stenographer clarification.)
BOARD TRAFFIC EXPERT: Can you hear me now? I'm sorry.

Before I ask a question, is it possible to zoom in on this view in the top left corner, to adjust -- okay, thank you.

Ms. Pehnke, in the top left corner I noticed, $I$ received this exhibit this afternoon, I noticed that there is a label on the top section with the little raised lever that says utility pole to be relocated.

Do you see that, do you see that part for the southbound right turn?

THE WITNESS: On the northwest corner? ATTORNEY SIMON: No, no, no. He's referring to --

THE WITNESS: Oh, on the northwest corner. Yes.

BOARD TRAFFIC EXPERT: Yes, the northwest corner. Yes, that's right.

Okay. I notice that there is a utility pole on the southwest corner and it's labeled as an existing utility pole to remain.

THE WITNESS: That's correct. You
know, obviously this has to go through review and we have to design plans but we are going to look to try to maintain that. We think we might have the area to be able to do it, but, of course, we'll have to go through that whole process. And if it needs to be relocated, you know, we'll, of course, relocate it if that's what the design shows that has to be done, but currently --
(Stenographer requests clarification.)

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: You have to speak up. We can't hear you.

BOARD PLANNER: You have to speak up,
she can't hear you.
THE WITNESS: My apologies.
ATTORNEY SIMON: As they say, eat the mike.

THE WITNESS: So in its concept stage because of the area that is to remain there and because it's a right turn out and not a right turn in at that location, we feel that we could potentially maintain that existing utility pole location pending review by both the county and the township, of course.

BOARD TRAFFIC EXPERT: All right. It seems, Ms. Pehnke, that -- now granted this is going to be under, definitely under township and county review because this is a county intersection. It seems, however, that leaving the -- leaving the existing utility pole to remain could leave a potential intersection sight distance issue where a vehicle -- car, truck, bus, et cetera -- when they could presumably they have a stop gap within that proposed pavement area before they complete the turn onto Lakewood-Farmingdale Road. It seems -- it seems that leaving the existing utility pole to remain could interfere with the ability of the drivers of the multiple vehicles to see traffic
coming from the north corner, coming from the north along Lakewood-Farmingdale Road.

It seems that it would be far
better -- it would be far better to remove -- not remove, $I$ mean relocate the utility pole in question.

And $I$ was wondering if you've reviewed the intersection sight distance triangle at this intersection to see if that utility pole -- where that utility pole is in relation to your proposed -how, do I want to say this -- the proposed pavement area for the right, for the new right turn area.

THE WITNESS: So this was a concept level, so we actually haven't looked at that. But we'll, of course, look at it with the design and do what is appropriate with regards to that utility pole to make sure we're meeting the standards and safety of that intersection.

ATTORNEY SIMON: And those standards will be including, to Mr. Chen's --

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: Microphone, please.

ATTORNEY SIMON: -- and those standards include, to Mr. Chen's point, that there be adequate sight distance for purposes of those turns?

THE WITNESS: That's correct, yes. BOARD TRAFFIC EXPERT: And as this is concept level I notice that -- I notice that there weren't any other - that there weren't any other signs or markings proposed at this time because this is concept level.

But, Ms. Pehnke, I guess for the future, as the intersection -- as you develop this, are you going to design so that -- design, recommend, et cetera, the necessary signs, striping, markings that would be necessary for the proposed modifications to this intersection?

THE WITNESS: Of course. We'll make sure to follow the design standards.

BOARD TRAFFIC EXPERT: Mr. Chair, I
have no further questions at this time.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay, thank you. BOARD ENGINEER: Mr. Chair, I have a couple of questions, if you don't mind.

Ms. Pehnke, did you review a truck on
Lakewood Farmingdale Road heading in the southbound direction, making a right onto Victory Road?

There's only one truck shown --
ATTORNEY SIMON: I'm sorry, Mr. Rizzo,
I missed a little bit of that and I'm sure the
public did as well.
Can you just repeat that?
BOARD ENGINEER: Sure. In the bottom exhibit, this one, there's a truck shown making the right turn onto Lakewood Farmingdale Road; did you review a truck making a right from Lakewood Farmingdale Road onto Victory Road?

THE WITNESS: We did. There was actually a prior exhibit, A-43.

BOARD ENGINEER: So is that how you determined the pavement area --

THE WITNESS: Not A-43. It was in the first hearing actually, we had a prior exhibit.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Mr. Rizzo, we can find that exhibit and provide that to you for sure.

BOARD ENGINEER: Okay. So the pavement area shown here is based on the pavement area that you have?

THE WITNESS: Yes, the $W-67$. But we can find that exhibit number.

BOARD ENGINEER: All right. And how do you foresee this right-turn movement from Victory Road onto Lakewood Farmingdale Road as far as stop controlled, or is it going to be yielded?

And where would you foresee that being
located?
THE WITNESS: It will be located where the standards require, most likely it's going to be a stop controlled approach though.

BOARD ENGINEER: Stop controlled after you pull all the way up and basically make most of the turn is where you would turn, or stop further back?

THE WITNESS: The stop bar would be located somewhere within that slip ramp. We'll do the proper setbacks; we will do the roadway following design standards.

BOARD ENGINEER: Thank you.
THE WITNESS: Of course. Thank you
for the questions.
SECRETARY RUBANO: Is the exhibit you're looking for $A-35$ ?

THE WITNESS: Yes, A-35 is most likely it because A-43 was updated, one of the turns off Victory Road.

Yes, that should be it. Is there a second page to that?

There it is.
BOARD PLANNER: Mr. Chair, I just have one question.

So understanding this is totally conceptual, is this something that you have not yet broached with the county; it hasn't gotten to the county yet and it's something you, obviously, will do but it has not happened at this time?

THE WITNESS: To my understanding, correct.

BOARD PLANNER: Okay. So the county may have an opinion on the position of the location of the utility pole as well, correct?

THE WITNESS: Correct.

BOARD PLANNER: Okay, thank you.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Can I follow up on
that; the testimony was that the county would make the improvements, not the applicant?

THE WITNESS: No, the applicant.
BOARD PLANNER: They would do it then dedicate it to the county afterwards.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay.

BOARD PLANNER: Right?

ATTORNEY SIMON: Yes.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: So this is a few
steps for the future.
THE WITNESS: Yes, the county,
reviewed by the county.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: You guys are all set?

BOARD PLANNER: Yes.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Thanks.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Now the planner asked a question $I$ was going to ask, that was -BOARD PLANNER: Sorry.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: No, no, no. As long as it's asked it's a good question. And that is what is the extent of the county involvement because it's a county extension, and that's what I wanted to know; and $I$ think we have an answer to that.

Thank you for your good testimony.
One second please. I mean, we do reserve the right to have a planner, a traffic planner take a look at this proposal and come back the next time and give some testimony, if that's deemed appropriate.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Of course.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Thank you very
much.
ATTORNEY SIMON: As long as it's
understood that that traffic testimony, since Mr. Lieberman rested, would be limited to tonight's
testimony with regard to Ms. Pehnke.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Are you finished
with your...
ATTORNEY SIMON: With Ms. Pehnke, yes.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay. So I guess
we've got to get you a new date?
ATTORNEY SIMON: Yes.
Mr. Chairman, I had spoken to Eileen
and I think we talked about August 17 th was the date when $I$ think all of my witnesses would be available.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
ATTORNEY SIMON: Is that acceptable?
SECRETARY RUBANO: Extension.
ATTORNEY SIMON: So we would certainly provide an Extension of Time through the end of August of 2023.

We would also ask, has it been confirmed yet as to the location of that August 17th meeting?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Probably just keep it in town hall.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Town hall?
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: That's my
assumption, yeah.

ATTORNEY SIMON: Okay. So if that's
the case $I$ would just ask, Ms. Rizzuto, if an announcement can be made that the matter is carried without further notice and to provide tonight the members of the public the actual location of the town hall address and the time of the hearing.

ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Yes. So for members of the public we are definitely -MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: We can't hear you.

MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE: No mike.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Thank you. Hello?
Okay.
Members of the public, with Mr. Chair's permission and at the request of the applicant, we have a continue date for August 17 th at the 7:00 o'clock meeting, which will be at the municipal building, 4567 Route 9 North, second floor, in Howell; the Howell Township Municipal Building. There will be no further notice so that is when the continuation will happen.

And I believe we're expecting to open to the public during that meeting.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Okay.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Can I just understand what else Mr. Simon is planning on doing -- sorry, $I$ keep forgetting.

Mr. Simon, what else do you plan on doing that day so we can be prepared?

ATTORNEY SIMON: Sure. I mean, I have to, first of all, $I$ have to speak to my client to find out based on what happened this evening, including the continued testimony of your witness.

My expectation is that all of my witnesses will certainly be available for questions by members of the public because $I$ don't believe that that has happened yet.

Additionally, we certainly reserve the right to provide some additional testimony by way of rebuttal or otherwise by some of those witnesses.

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Is there any way you can tell us in advance so we know; you know, would you let us know in advance through the board?

ATTORNEY SIMON: I certainly can let the board know as we get closer, you know --

ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: That's not what I asked.

ATTORNEY SIMON: -- ten days prior as to the expectation as to who is going to be
presenting at that hearing.
ATtORNEY LIEBERMAN: And please just
copy me on that.
ATTORNEY SIMON: I will, of course.
ATTORNEY LIEBERMAN: Thank you.
ATTORNEY RIZZUTO: Have you been
providing the transcript to the board secretary?
ATTORNEY SIMON: To be honest, I don't know. I certainly can. I have no problem doing so.

BOARD PLANNER: I would appreciate it. ATTORNEY SIMON: Of course.

BOARD PLANNER: At least for us anyway to prepare for the hearing especially given there's going to be a couple of months between now and then, just to kind of make sure we're all up to speed.

I know you have done it, $I$ know it was attached to prior minutes, right, Eileen; in the past transcripts have been attached to prior minutes?

So I would appreciate it.
ATTORNEY SIMON: Of course.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay, that being said we have no further business, so I will entertain a motion to adjourn.

MEMBER TALENTE: So moved.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: All in favor? BOARD MEMBERS IN UNISON: Aye. CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Good night.
(Whereupon, the application was adjourned and the hearing was concluded.) _ _ -
(Time noted, 10:10 p.m.)
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