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: Joseph Cristiano, Brian Greenfield, Nicholas Huszar, Robert Seaman, Megan Talente, Matthew Kyle, Christopher Mercer and Chairman Paul Boisvert. Brian Tannenhaus was absent and John Leggio and Councilman Fred Gasior were excused.

Also in attendance were Ron Cucchiaro, Board Attorney, Laura Neumann, Board Engineer, Jennifer Beahm, Board Planner, Shari Spero, Board Licensed Tree Expert, Kevin Chen, Traffic Engineer and Eileen Rubano, Board Secretary.

## PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

APPROVAL OF MINUTES: There were no minutes to approve at this meeting.
VOUCHERS: None
CORRESPONDENCE: The Board Secretary said she had a letter from Robert Simon, Attorney for AAVRHW Property LLC - Victory Road, asking for the Board to carry to April 13, 2023 with no further notice and he granted an extension of time through April 13, 2023.. Board Attorney Cucchiaro made an announcement that the application would be carried to April 13, 2023 with no further notice.

The Board Secretary said she sent two Ordinances out to the Board Members that need to be reviewed for consistency with the Master Plan. Ms. Beahm explained the ordinances and said they are absolutely consistent with the Master Plan

Ms. Talente made a motion that ordinance $\mathbf{O - 2 3 - 6}$ and $\mathbf{O - 2 3 - 7}$ are substantially consistent with the Master Plan. Motion was seconded by Mr. Cristiano and carried with Mr. Cristiano, Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Kyle, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting for the motion.

## RESOLUTIONS:

a. Review of Ordinance O-23-5

Mr. Huszar made a motion to memorialize the resolution for the review of Ordinance 0-23-5. Motion was seconded by Mr. Cristiano and carried with Mr. Cristiano, Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Kyle and Chairman Boisvert voting for the motion.
b. Case No. SP-1111 / Kmetz, Inc.

Mr. Cristiano made a motion to memorialize the resolution granting Submission Waivers to Kmetz, Inc. Motion was seconded by Ms. Talente and carried with Mr. Cristiano, Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Kyle and Chairman Boisvert voting for the motion.
c. Case No. SP-1096 / Three Puglisi Brothers, Inc.

Mr. Seaman made a motion to memorialize the resolution granting Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan to Three Puglisi Brothers, Inc. Motion was seconded by Mr. Cristiano and carried with Mr. Cristiano, Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Seaman, Mr. Kyle, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting to memorialize.
d. Case No. SP-1078A / New Horizon Property, LLC

Mr. Huszar made a motion to memorialize the resolution granting Submission Waivers to New Horizon. Motion was seconded by Mr. Seaman and carried with Mr. Cristiano, Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting to memorialize.
e. Case No. SP-1098 / 90 Industrial Court, LLC

Mr. Cristiano made a motion to memorialize the resolution granting Preliminary Site Plan Approval with Ancillary Variance and Design Waiver Relief to 90 Industrial Court, LLC. Motion was seconded by Ms. Talente and carried with Mr. Cristiano, Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Kyle, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting for the motion.

SUBMISSION WAIVERS BEFORE THE BOARD:
a. Case No. SP-1107 / NJ Ruckle Realty, LLC
W. Lane Miller, Attorney for the Applicant, appeared and Ms. Neumann, Board Engineer, stated that the waivers are listed in Item 3 of her December 3, 2022 review letter. Ms. Neumann said there are a few items she wants to see on a subsequent submittal such as signed and sealed drawings and the planning designation but she took no exception to the granting of the remaining waivers for the purposes of deeming the application complete.

Mr. Greenfield made a motion to grant the submission waivers for NJ Ruckle Realty, LLC. Motion was seconded by Mr. Cristiano and carried with Mr. Cristiano, Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Kyle, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting for the motion.

## b. Case No. SP-1108 / Howell Crossing, LLC

Salvatore J. Alfieri, Attorney for the Applicant, appeared and requested submission waivers. Ms. Neumann said those waivers are listed in her February 27, 2023 review letter. She said she spoke to the Applicant's Engineer and items 14, 45, 46 and 60 have been supplied and they will provide items 43 and 47 so based on the nature of the application and the balance of the items she took no exception to the granting of the waivers for the purposes of deeming the application complete.

Mr. Huszar made a motion to grant the submission waivers for Howell Crossing. Motion was seconded by Mr. Cristiano and carried with Mr. Cristiano, Mr. Greenfield, Mr. Huszar, Mr. Seaman, Ms. Talente, Mr. Kyle, Mr. Mercer and Chairman Boisvert voting for the motion.
a. Case No. SP-1095 / AAFRHW Property, LLC - Frisa

## SEE TRANSCRIPT ATTACHED

MASTER PLAN STATUS REPORT: Ms. Beahm said she has almost finished the final draft of the Farmland Preservation Element and will be sending it to the subcommittee in the next few weeks. It should probably be before the Board next month.

Mr. Seaman made a motion to adjourn. Motion was seconded by Ms. Talente and carried with all Board members voting for the motion.

The meeting adjourned at 10:36 p.m.


Eileen Rubano
Recording Secretary
NOTE: A CD or DVD of this meeting is available on request.
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BOARD SECRETARY: Planning Board
meeting, Thursday, March 16, 2023. I hereby declare this meeting of the Howell Township Planning Board to be open, adequate notice having been given pursuant to the New Jersey Open Public Meeting Act in the following manner:

First on January 6, 2023, a copy of said notice was mailed to the Asbury Park Press and the Star Ledger;

Second, on January 6, 2023, a copy of said notice was hand-delivered to the clerk of the Township of Howell;

Third, on January 6, 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.

Members of the public will have a chance to ask questions and comment on applications once the Chairman opens the hearing up to members of the public. If you wish to ask questions or comment on an application, you will need to use the Raise Your Hand feature and we will bring you into the meeting one at a time. You will need to have audio and video capability. You will be sworn in and you
will need to provide your name and address. For anyone calling in, you can press $* 9$ to raise or lower your hand and *6 to mute or unmute yourself. This meeting is being videotaped for possible future broadcast on Howell Township TV-77. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Thank you. Can I have a roll-call, please?

BOARD SECRETARY: Yes, you may. Mr. Cristiano?

MEMBER CRISTIANO: Present.
BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Greenfield?

MEMBER GREENFIELD: Here.

BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Huszar?

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Here.

BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Leggio was
excused.

Mr. Seaman?

MEMBER SEAMAN: Here.

BOARD SECRETARY: Ms. Talente?

MEMBER TALENTE: Here.
BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Tannenhaus I
think is going to be late, so we'll catch him later. Councilman Gasior has been excused.

Mr. Kyle?

MEMBER KYLE: Present.

BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Mercer?

MEMBER MERCER: Here.

BOARD SECRETARY: And

Chairman Boisvert?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Here.

BOARD SECRETARY: You have a quorum.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: All righty, thank
you. Okay, we're going to 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.)

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Next up is case number SP-1095, AAFRHW Property, LLC, Frisa, Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan with design waiver relief. Eligible voters: Cristiano, Greenfield, Huszar, Seaman, Talente, Tannenhaus, Mercer and myself.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay,
Mr. Gianetti, we'll turn it over to you.
BOARD SECRETARY: I'm just getting
everybody. I think everybody. I have Sean Naeger,
Paul Latham. Jeromie Lange.
Do you need Thomas Effindor[phonetic]? ATtORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gianetti,
that was a question for you.
BOARD SECRETARY: We can't hear you. JEROMIE LANGE: Can you hear me? ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yes.

JEROMIE LANGE: This is Jeromie Lange.
Yes, we do need Tom.
BOARD SECRETARY: Okay.
JEROMIE LANGE: And also Mike Morris.
BOARD SECRETARY: Okay, hold on.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Can you hear me
now.
BOARD SECRETARY: And $I$ have Tung-To
Lam.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yeah, we can hear you now, Craig.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: All right. Sorry, about that.

BOARD SECRETARY: Anybody else,
Jeromie?
AtTORNEY GIANETTI: Dan Disario will
be coming on so $I$ told him to text me when he's on it, and then $I$ will let you know to bring him on.

BOARD SECRETARY: Perfect.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: But I think this is our cast of players for now. Thank you.

BOARD SECRETARY: Thank you.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: So, good evening, Chairman, Members of the Board. Craig Gianetti of the law firm Day Pitney, on behalf of the applicant, AAFRHW Property, LLC. This is a continued application for Preliminary and Final Major Site Plan approval for property located on Fairfield Road, Block 177, Lot 8.01. The subject property is in the SED, Special Economic District zone, approximately 45 acres in size.

As the board may recall we presented before you on February 2 nd and it was carried to tonight without further notice.

The application is proposing to construct two one-story warehouse buildings on the subject property, with office space in each.

As we presented at the last meeting the application is fully conforming to the township land use ordinance and does not require any variance or waiver relief. Although we did note, particularly
with the lighting, we had an alternative plan that if the board deemed appropriate and a better lighting alternative, we would seek that waiver. At the last meeting we presented the direct testimony of Jeromie Lange from the applicant, as well as Tung-To Lam, the civil engineer, with Bohler Engineering. And we presented the traffic testimony of Dan Disario to address, you know, the application and the proposed operations on the site.

At the conclusion of the meeting it was not yet opened up to the public for questioning and comment. Most of our witnesses, if you recall, we presented all of our witnesses as one, and then we would be subject to public questioning.

At that meeting the board had some questions related to internal site circulation. So since that time we did submit a revised Truck-Turning Exhibit, which has been marked A-66, which we have Jeromie Lange here to testify this evening. And also will be prepared to address the updated review letter received from the board engineer, dated March 10th, 2023 .

So unless there's any housekeeping questions of me, $I$ would like to call my first
witness, Jeromie Lange.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Lange, you
were previously sworn. I remind you, you remain under oath.

JEROMIE LANGE: Yes. Can you hear me okay?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yes.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yes, we can,
Jeromie. Thank you.
$J \quad \mathrm{E} R \mathrm{R} \quad \mathrm{O} \quad \mathrm{M} \quad \mathrm{I} \quad \mathrm{E} \quad \mathrm{L} A \mathrm{~N}$ G E,
previously sworn, continues as follows:

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: So, Mr. Lange, if you can, since the last meeting based upon some of the questions we received from the board, if you could just identify, you know, what we looked at and the updated exhibit we submitted?

JEROMIE LANGE: Certainly. So we're going to share that exhibit. Do we have Paul -here we go, Paul is doing it now. Perfect.

> And, Paul, if you can zoom in, maybe we'll start in the northwest corner. Yeah, in that area there. Just zoom in so we can kind of read
that text.
All right, so we did a couple of things
here. At the northwest driveway, we added some signage, both outward facing towards fairfield and internally facing.

The outward-facing signage is meant to direct trucks to the appropriate warehouse. So it's wayfinding signage for trucks that are coming to the site.

And then the inside facing, or internal-facing signage, is a turn prohibition for semi tractor-trailers requiring them, or prohibiting them, really, from turning left, which then requires them to turn right, which makes complete sense in that the Route 33 Interchange is only about a thousand feet north of this driveway.

So that was the first change we made.
Why don't we, then, slide to the east, Paul. One of the things we had talked about -- and we'll stop right here, Paul, in the middle -- is the concern that a truck might go to the wrong driveway, you know, depending on which warehouse they were intending to.

So there was a concern if the truck went to the southerly driveway, would they still be
able to navigate safely and efficiently to the rear warehouse. So, you know, if they went to the driveway that's supposed to Service A, but they were really headed to $B$, you know, what do you do. So this is showing that.

So the truck can -- I'm going to show you the southerly movements in a minute, but at this movement here you can see that the island is being pulled back.

So we're basically proposing to reduce the trailer storage by three stalls, pull the island back and gore stripe it. That's that red area you see. And that way if an errant truck that's meaning to go to B, they can come up through the truck court and make that right turn and it does not involve interfering with any other truck movements that may be occurring at that time, whether that be an exiting movement from $A$, coming from south to north or from east to west. In either case that truck can make a movement without in any way interfering with the other trucks.

Just keep heading east, then, Paul -or, actually, we'll stay on this exhibit. I'm sorry, we'll stay on this sheet, we'll go south instead.

So this is now the southerly driveway.
And it's really a mirror image of what we did for the northerly driveway, the only difference, of course, is the wayfinding signage accurately reflects that we should use this for Building $A$, where the north driveway was for Building B.

And then we have the identical signage prohibiting the left turn for the semi tractor-trailers, again forcing them to go right to the Route 33 interchange.

And then, Paul, let's just flip to that second page here -- oh, no, sorry, good call. No, stay where you're at, you're right, $I$ forgot about this one.

We also, Ms. Neumann, had brought up a concern about trucks being able to pass each other on this curve. And she was correct, that the curve was a little too tight to allow two-way traffic for tractor-trailers for the design vehicle.

So we went ahead and widened that driveway out at the curb. So the red lines that you see on the south and north side are that expanded driveway that allows two trucks, the $W B-67$, New Jersey statute version, which has a slightly shorter wheel base by statute, regardless, this
allows those trucks to pass two ways.
You will see that although the
driveway's expanded, it does not interfere at all with the 50 -foot buffers that are required to the south and to the east. So there's no interference with those whatsoever. It does clip one of the existing stormwater bays, so that will be adjusted as a condition of approval. And we did verify there's plenty of available area left on the site in order to deal with that stormwater and still meet all the requirements of the Howell Township ordinance and the state code.

So now we're going to go to the other exhibit page, and $I$ will show you the last change we made. And this is over in the northeasterly corner of Building B. Similar to what we just looked at at the southwesterly -- or excuse me, southeasterly corner of Building $A$, we're now looking at a similar situation here.

So, again, we are widening the driveway curbs and enlarging the radii to make this work. So we relocated one of the proposed retaining walls that's what you see in red here in the upper right, the parallel lines. And then on the other side of the road we are relocating or shifting down really
three of the parking stalls. So the parking, it's going to stay like it is; it's just going to slide south by the width of three stalls.

So you can kind of see where the
handicap and charging stations are there. That will now move down and then the parking at the southerly end will also slide down as shown with that red outline. In doing that we can once again can get those two semi tractor-trailers to pass each other with no problem to and from the warehouse.

So that is the biggest change on the site. Really, the only changes on the site.

There was a couple of other questions having to do with the trees that were near the fire tank, so we consulted with our engineering firm here and they're going to be five different species: it's going to be a black gum tree, that's going to be 30 to 50 feet at maturity; a bass wood, 50 to 80 feet at maturity; a pin oak, 50 to 70 feet at maturity; a red maple, 40 feet to 70 feet at maturity; and American hornbeam at 20 to 35 feet at maturity. So those are the trees that are --

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: I just want to identify -- I just want to identify the exhibit we have up on the screen now. It's Exhibit -- I'm just
looking for --
JEROMIE LANGE: A-58, I believe.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Correct, A-58.
JEROMIE LANGE: Yep. So that's on
Exhibit A-58.
You can see the fire tank and the pump house building in red there, and then those trees that are around it, the species are what $I$ just testified to.

Just continuing on a couple other cleanup things. There was a question in the most recent review letter about clean building practices. The building will be solar-ready. So both roofs will be designed to be solar-ready, which essentially means they are able to take on five additional panels per square foot for solar equipment.

There was also a question about HVAC units. The units are set back at least 60 feet from the edge of the roofline. And in doing so, that and the parapets and just the height of the buildings, it makes them impossible to see from the ground level. So you would not see those from Fairfield or anywhere else around the site for that matter.

And then there was a question regarding
the performance standards, Article IV, Standards of Performance in the ordinance, and it is the applicant's intent to comply with the ordinance in terms of things like noise, glare, pollutants, waste, all hazardous materials, et cetera. So, you know, the applicant is not seeking relief in that regard.

So that concludes my direct testimony. And, Craig, I'll turn it back over to you.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Sure. Thank you, Jeromie.

I guess if any of the board's professionals have any questions with respect to Mr. Lange's testimony or the updated exhibit?

BOARD ENGINEER: Yeah, looking at it,
I just wanted to clarify, there were three minor things in our report that $I$ couldn't remember if we had confirmed last time, so maybe more for the board members.

We've talked about the lighting plan. One being fully compliant, and then the alternate complying with IES standards. Again, it is my recommendation, we can certainly ask Shari, but that we go with the plan that complies with IES and grant the design waiver from 188-22.

As was noted by Mr. Lange, as a result of these modifications to the turnings -- and that was specifically, $I$ think, why we had carried them, we asked them to look at it, we had concern about vehicular mobility specifically for trucks -- there are some minor modifications that were needed to be made to the plan.

And then the other item is actually the foundation landscaping, I'll call it. And again, I think, if you remember last time, they had a fully compliant plan which showed it, I believe I had concerns at the last hearing, I know Jen has echoed them on similar cases that we really don't want to put landscaping against the building; there's no good way to maintain it.

So again, should the board see fit to go with those recommendations to actually remove it, there would be waiver relief required from 188-106(9).

And the only other thing $I$ would ask -and, Jeromie, $I$ think you could answer it, $I$ don't think I need Tung to answer it -- we had some very minor technical comments, $I$ think it was like six or seven comments; $I^{\prime} m$ assuming you guys agree to comply with those?

JEROMIE LANGE: Yes, I have reviewed
those with Tung-To and we are able to comply.
BOARD ENGINEER: That's all I have at
this time, Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay, thank you.
It looks like Mr. Chen has a...
BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: Yes, I do. I
do have a question about the turning template.
There was something written on the top that $I$
couldn't see, so $I$ would like to ask a question about that.

JEROMIE LANGE: Sure.
Paul, maybe we can put that back up.
This is $A-66$.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: And again, we're looking at $A-66$.

BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: You mentioned that there were signs that were facing outward and facing inward.

JEROMIE LANGE: Yes.
BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: Could you zoom
in on that to verify that?
JEROMIE LANGE: Yep.
BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: Okay, so the
No Left Turn is facing inward, and the Trucks Enter

Here, is facing outward.
Okay. It was hard to see that little dot of the sign post, that's why.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
JEROMIE LANGE: Very good.
BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: And can $I$ ask
one more question? It's the same thing on the southern side where you have the other entrance? I think it was on the other sheet.

JEROMIE LANGE: Yes. The only difference is these signs on the southerly side would direct you to Building $A$, which is the front building, the signs on the north side would direct you to Building $B$, which is the rear building.

BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: Okay. Thank you for answering my questions.

I have no further questions,
Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay. Thank you.
Does anybody from the board have any
questions?
BOARD ENGINEER: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to note the other thing that $I$ think was unresolved but $I$ think has since resolved, is the applicant will also need that waiver to contribute
into the tree fund, 188-25F.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Right. Thank you.
Okay, seeing that nobody from the board
has any questions, are you finished with your
testimony?
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yes. We have
nothing further from our direct presentation.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: We do have all of our witnesses that testified at the last meeting available for any questioning.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay, fantastic.
All right, with that being said we're going to open it up to the public for questions of the applicant and the professionals.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I think,
Mr. Chairman, questions and comments, since they don't have anymore.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes, questions and comments, please.

BOARD SECRETARY: Okay, at this time the Chairman has opened the hearing up for members of the public for questions and comments.

Just to remind you, you will need to be sworn in and give your name and address. Anyone
calling in use $* 9$ to raise or lower your hand, $* 6$ to mute or unmute yourself.

And $I$ have Joan Osborne coming in.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

JOAN OSBORNE: I'm sorry, I did not
know that my hand had hit that button. I don't have any questions so $I$ don't need to be sworn.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: No questions or testimony.

JOAN OSBORNE: No, that was a mistake.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
BOARD SECRETARY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Have a nice night.
BOARD SECRETARY: The next person is MJG.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I need to swear you in first. Okay, Ms. Sepulveda, do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Yes, I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, if you
could just speak up a little bit and if you could state and spell your name and give us your address.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Sure. My name is
Mary Jean Sepulveda. I'm on Desai Court, not very far from Fairfield Road, actually on the opposite side.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Can you just spell your last name for us.

BOARD SECRETARY: Please.
MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA:
$S-E-P-U-L-V-E-D-A$.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, go ahead, ma'am.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: I actually have a number of questions. I'll start, I know that they talked about waivers for the trees. I'll start with asking how many acres of trees will be knocked down to make this project, out of the 42 acres of land. ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay,

Mr. Gianetti, who would be the correct witness to answer that?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: That would be either Jeromie Lange or Tung-To.

JEROMIE LANGE: Have Tung-To answer that one, Craig.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Sure.
AtTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, Mr. Lam, I just remind you that you remain under oath, sir. Go ahead.

TUNG-TO LAM: Yes, sir. I'm just looking up that information right now.
12.21 acres of trees to be removed. MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: 12.21. So my other question, this might be more to the board, and I apologize, I actually didn't -- I didn't say hello to everyone on the board.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, just, ma'am, the questions are for those who have testified. So it's either for the applicant's professionals or the board's professionals.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Okay. So my other question -- I have a number of questions.

My other question would be what are the hours of operation that are intended for this site?

JEROMIE LANGE: So this is Jeromie Lange, director of operations of Active Acquisitions; this may be a 24-hour a day operation, seven days a week. We don't have an end tenant yet so we don't know exactly for sure what their operations will be but it is designed to be a $24 / 7$
operation.
I will tell you, though, typically it is the first shift that is most intense and then the second or third shift is usually just a maintenance crew, but it is $24 / 7$ operation.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Wow. Okay, so that makes a huge difference on how the site is -and $I$ don't know if the board was aware of hours of operations.

Now my other question would be if
-- now so you're part of Active Acquisition. This question actually might be to the legal counsel on the board. Being that Active Acquisitions has multiple projects and warehouses to be built in this same vicinity, you know, feet from each other, how can these projects be considered as one versus individual applications and being seen more as -- in isolation because $I$ think when we look at the Traffic Impact Study, that Traffic Impact Study is only relevant to the site, however, if we look at the projects that are in Active Acquisitions for Howell we are looking at a total of 1.7 million square feet of building space. We're looking at over about 1,000 cars in the area, immediate in the Fairfield/Howell Road area.

So when the fellow talked about the Traffic Impact Study for that particular land or project, $I$ don't think it's fair to say that that Traffic Impact Study is representative of the project at large, because these are multiple warehouses in the same location.

Now the fact that you just said it's 24/7, now that really impacts the residents because that means that 1,000 vehicles are going back and forth on Route 33 and, you know, not just the traffic, the noise, the air quality. And as per that particular location, $I$ would also like to ask --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, why don't you --

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yeah, one at a time.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: -- let the first question be answered, and then we can move on. ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Sure.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gianetti?
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yes, can you hear
me?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yes.
ATtORNEY GIANETTI: So I think
initially, $I$ don't know if you were on for the last hearing or presentation but we presented extensive traffic testimony from our traffic engineer who also was the same traffic engineer who provided traffic testimony on the other Active applications, and all those traffic studies factored in the other developments that were being proposed. And that was his testimony at the last meeting.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Okay. I do
recall it being, $I$ think it was October 2021 or November 2021. Back in 2021, you know, we were still in pretty much in pandemic. So the fact that there were not many people --

BOARD PLANNER: It wasn't. It was more recent than that. I'm sorry, but it was like a month ago.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: A month ago?
Okay, well, $I$ didn't see that in the records.
Is that on the -- are those documents available to the public? Because I didn't see that in any of the documents. I only saw the Traffic Impact Study from 2021 .

BOARD PLANNER: Craig?
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yeah, it should be in the record. I'm looking for the exhibit number.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: It might help, Dan, do you have the date of your traffic study, Dan?

DAN DISARIO: For the record, Dan
Disario. The traffic study for this application is dated November 1st, 2021 .

And just so the record is clear, we did account for the Active 29 Howell Road application, the Black Rock Enterprises application, the Rock Solid application, and the New Jersey Natural Gas application as part of this traffic study. As the board is aware you have approved the stavola tract at your last meeting, and that Stavola traffic study also included the Frisa application that is before you this evening.

So all the traffic studies that have been prepared for the Active Acquisition applications within this township have accounted for all the Active applications, as well as other applications that are non-Active Acquisitions.

So we have provided comprehensive traffic studies for all the Active Acquisitions that account for all the developments particularly along Fairfield Road.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: If I recall the
last meeting's numbers, $I$ think -- I don't remember what exactly it was, but you said it was no more than 86 vehicles at one time. I can't see how that can happen with almost 1,000 vehicles possible in the locations.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: And maybe that's for you, Dan, but maybe those vehicles we're talking about were Levels of Service and leaving the site.

DAN DISARIO: Just so the record is clear as it relates to the application that is before the board this evening, during a single hour, between 7 and 9:00 in the morning, 70 vehicles would come in and 35 would exit, for a total two-way of 105 trips.

In the single hour between 4 and 6:00 in the evening, 28 would come in, 88 would exit for a total two-way of 116 two-way trips.

And again, as $I$ testified to previously, most jurisdictions consider applications or land development proposals that generate 100 or less trips as insignificant traffic generators. Admittedly, we are slightly above that. But as our traffic study, again dated November 1st, 2021, points out, all the intersections that we have analyzed along the Fairfield Road corridor operate
efficiently and will continue to do so with this application, if the board so chooses to approve it.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Okay, so I still
feel like that's a lot of vehicles in the site. I don't see how 100 vehicles in an hour, it sounds like a whole lot. And we're talking about trucks, now you're saying it's 24/7.

So I would imagine that a lot of the vehicles will be -- you know, there's going to be a lot of traffic all over at all times. May be heavier at certain times, but there is going to be traffic all over.

So I am also wondering, you know, knowing how loading and unloading of trucks, you know, where are people -- where are these trucks supposed to be waiting while they are waiting for their turn, you know, to dock or undock?

You know, and then you're going to have idling of all of these trucks as they're waiting. So I think, you know, to me there's a whole lot of concerns here, never mind the noise, but a lot of concerns on all that traffic. And that's really only one of my concerns, one of my questions.

So I would ask the board to really reconsider approval of anything related to this at
the moment because $I$ don't think that it's really representative of everything. You know, if it's a 24/7 operation with trucks going in and out is that the same; you know, like, for example, Environmental Impact Study is it the same for a business that has a 9 to 5 versus a $24 / 7$ operation where constant traffic is moving back and forth?

And then $I$ think -- so that's a
question to the board. I mean, honestly, I don't think it's right and fair for the board to look at these projects in isolation. These projects should be viewed in totality and really look at the impact of the residential areas. Because, you know, right now trying to come -- get across to my neighborhood from Fairfield Road is sometimes impossible because that road -- that traffic light takes forever to change. And there's also -- it's also a very dangerous area there to cross and make a left whether you're going to 33 towards the cabin or Route 33 towards Wawa. From Fairfield Road it's a dangerous little intersection there.

So $I$ can't even imagine what that traffic is going to be like with all of those warehouses, all of those trucks coming in and out. I think it's very unfair. And I would ask,
respectfully, that the board reconsider.
My other question $I$ have, are these all
connected and will there be some kind of
distribution center with one owner in mind?
JEROMIE LANGE: The answer to that is no, these are not distribution centers.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: And what exactly
are they, then?
JEROMIE LANGE: They're warehouses.
MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Okay. And
they're warehouses for?
I mean, you have $24 / 7$ going back and forth, so what kind of businesses are running $24 / 7$ traffic?

JEROMIE LANGE: The vast warehousing is $24 / 7$ operation. That is not at all uncommon or remarkable.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Right, but I guess I'm trying to understand what is the intended use of these warehouses.

BOARD PLANNER: They're warehouses, that's the use. I mean, there is no other explanation.

> MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: That's fine.

That's fine, okay.

Now, on this particular property
there's wetlands. I don't think I saw on the site plans anywhere that shows the wetlands delineations.

Also, is there permits from the
Department of Environmental Protection agency to -for construction?

I imagine there must be some kind of conversation easement in that area.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Again, yeah, it was testified to at the last meeting. They were identified in the plans. We walked through all the wetlands between Jeromie and Mr. Lam.

But, Mr. Lange, if you want to address that again?

JEROMIE LANGE: So just real quick in summary, the DEP, the Department of Environmental Protection of the state, has issued a Letter of Interpretation verifying the wetlands delineation which is, in fact, shown on the site plan set.

The required permitting from the DEP is pending. And, in fact, we're pretty close to getting that; we have gotten, you know, rounds of comments from them. So we are expecting those in the near future.
MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: It also does say
on the Letter of Interpretation that the fresh water wetlands and the lines as determined in the letter should be shown on any future site development plan.

I don't think $I$ saw that on what you guys showed earlier on the site.

JEROMIE LANGE: They are on the site plans that are filed.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: They are
delineated.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Okay. So what about air and noise pollution as a result of the trucks? What kind of studies are being conducted that these are safe for whatever business is there for the trucks, you know, the fumes and from the constant traffic?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Well, I guess,
Mr. Lange can address some of that, but from, you know, a noise standpoint we have to comply with the state requirements on noise emanating from the property, just like any other business.

JEROMIE LANGE: In a similar vein, the
trucks are regulated, you know, as far as their
emissions and so forth, so they again will have to comply with all state and federal emission requirements.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Okay. So how could -- I mean, because $I$ hear from my neighborhood tons of trucks from Route 33, and that's just every once in a while. If we have a $24 / 7$ operation with trucks going, this is going to be a whole lot more disruption there.

I mean, I guess I would ask in terms of the town, what kind of ordinances are there for a 24/7 operation?

BOARD PLANNER: So, I'll answer you. There's a noise ordinance. It's actually the state noise ordinance that is enforced by the county. And it's perpetual noise at a certain decibel level depending upon the time of day.

So if there's concerns about noise in a particular location and a perpetual noise you need to report it, and then people will come out and monitor it. And if there is a habitual issue, they will be issued a violation.

But there is a noise ordinance. It's 65 decibels in the day, 50 decibels at night depending on where it's located. And they're going to have to comply, as is every other person including yourself in the town, throughout the course of the day.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: And $I$ thought I saw, and $I$ don't know, it might have been the Environmental Impact Study, that it was somewhere around 85 decibels.

BOARD PLANNER: And if they're in violation they will be cited.

And it's 65 decibels perpetually. It's not in an instant, it has to be for a prolonged period of time. Same at night, 50 decibels for a prolonged period of time. So if it's for five seconds that does not violate the noise ordinance.

But they're going to have to comply with the noise ordinance as would any other property owner within the township.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Okay. So then I guess in terms of -- this is more a question to the town in terms of like your Master Plan for conservation, 12 acres of woodlands and wetlands doesn't really sound like --

BOARD PLANNER: So the township has done multiple master plans. This particular piece of property has not been identified as being preserved. It's privately owned. It's being presented tonight for development.

And, therefore, you know, we're -- we
as a planning board are, you know, obligated to review applications that come before us. We do not have the opportunity to say, nope, we don't like this, we would rather have it be preserved. That is not our -- that is not our jurisdiction.

So this is a piece of property that is available for development and we're here to review the development application.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And also there was a reference to not only to the trees but to wetlands. There is no proposal here tonight - correct me if I'm wrong, Mr. Gianetti -- to do anything with the wetlands; the wetlands are being preserved and there's a buffer beyond the wetlands.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Correct. And with respect to the tree clearing, you know, as testified to at the last meeting, we've discussed with the town and our -- seeking a waiver but complying with the ordinance of planting the trees elsewhere in the town on town property.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well you're
seeking a financial contribution, I believe.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: After everything was said and done -- after everything was said and
done and we followed up with all parties, there hasn't been an area, $I$ don't think, that's been delineated where you're going to be planting trees, so $I$ think it's a financial contribution.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: No, I believe we even got a letter from the zoning officer.

BOARD PLANNER: I think Ron is
correct.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Got it.
MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: And that
contribution, was that -- $\quad$ believe 12 acres of land is a contribution to the tree fund, and how does the town -- does the town actually plant trees, or do they just kind of hold on to that for other things or --

BOARD PLANNER: Well, we're not really -- we're not in the business of determining how the town manages the money, but the money is based upon the ordinance, it gets contributed to the tree fund and the town, you know, deals with how to spend it at their discretion.

And so if you're questioning that, then
I would suggest that you go to the council meeting and ask them.
MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: I mean to me all
of this just doesn't sound consistent with our Master Plan for conservation or woodlands or wetlands. I mean it kind of just sounds, okay, contribute to the fund and we're good.

So it's a shame, it's -- I think our environment should be really preserved.

I guess my last question, considering that it's a $24 / 7$ hours of operation, and there will be lots of noise, while $I$ know that you said that there is ordinances, wouldn't there be offers to help with noise reduction, being that you're cutting down so many trees and those can typically be used as buffers for noise reduction?

BOARD PLANNER: So buffers are not for noise reduction; buffers are for separation of uses. And, you know, land area for a buffer is 50 feet here and 50 feet there, they're not for noise attenuation, it's for separation of uses.

So they're not seeking relief from any of our buffer requirements so, therefore, there's no discussion regarding buffers associated with noise attenuation.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Can $I$ ask the board to consider noise attenuation measures, considering that you have eight warehouses and 1,000
vehicles in the area?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gianetti, do you have a response to that?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Sure. I mean, again the noise requirement deals with compliance with your property. And there has to be a complaint from another property owner, and they measure it from that property, wherever that property owner is.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: The question is are you willing to put in additional buffer? That was the question.

MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Yes, thank you.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: No, not beyond the buffer we're already proposing as part of this application.

Again, just a reminder that the use we're proposing is fully permitted in the zone. We're not seeking any relief -- we're not seeking any relief, period, but we're not seeking any relief for the size of the structure or the intensity of the structure. Everything we're doing is in conformance with the zoning.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: You're seeking some design waiver relief; you're not seeking variance relief.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Well the waiver relief, we have alternatives that can comply, but if the board prefers we can do the alternative.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Did you have any
more questions or --
MARY JEAN SEPULVEDA: Yeah. Just really this will be a comment, really. And I apologize for this. I'm very disappointed in how Howell is allowing such warehousing in this area and destroying farmland, destroying wetlands and, you know, woodlands. And I'm just really disappointed.

I moved here as a resident years ago, and it's going to be definitely something that is not going to -- it's not going to increase our property values, $I$ can guarantee that.

Thank you.
BOARD SECRETARY: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Have a good night.
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Hey, Paul, can

I comment here real quick?
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Please.
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Ron, I know I
probably asked you this a hundred times over the years, but can these warehouse applications, the one we're seeing tonight, the ones we're seeing in the
future, we all know well that every -- well, I don't want to say every, members of the public, which I respect their opinions completely, and they have a right to speak on behalf, we're going to keep hearing this ongoing issue of traffic, okay.

And can you just please, for the public, any input from the public and, you know, blaming the planning board, yada, yada, yada, can you clarify what the planning board role is to traffic on applications.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Sure. So we begin with the fact that at a planning board, unlike at a zoning board, at the planning board you're always dealing with applications that are for uses that are permitted by ordinance.

So there's been a legislative
determination at the governing body to permit these uses in these zones. So with that said our courts -- the New Jersey courts, not Howell Township but the New Jersey courts, and we have to listen to them -- have held that increases in traffic alone are not a justifiable reason to deny an application. What the courts say is that it's a legislative decision, and it's assumed that the governing body that exercises that legislative decision is aware
that there's going to be a traffic impact associated with the uses that it deems to be permitted.

So the fact that there's going to be increased traffic in and of itself is not a determining factor.

A board can, however, look at ingress and egress, that's how you get in and out of a site, to determine whether that is safe or not. And certainly that is something, even if a use is permitted, that a board can deny an application based upon.

But even in that instance there are situations where applications or sites are located on county roads or state highways where those jurisdictions have primary ability to weigh in on those issues.

But, generally speaking, the traffic helps to -- the overall traffic impact helps to understand where there may be a need for a town to engage in off-site improvements, where an applicant may need to dedicate some right-of-way. And also the impact that it has on the safety of ingress and egress.

The fact that it's going to generate traffic in and of itself is not a reason that the
courts have identified as being valid for denying an application for a permitted use.

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Thanks, Ron. CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Thank you, Ron. Okay, do you want to let the next one
in, Eileen?
BOARD SECRETARY: Yes. I have Stephen
Mirabello.
I don't know why he's not coming in. I'm going to go to the next person, Mike.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, you just have to unmute yourself.

Mike, you need to unmute yourself, okay.

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

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

MIKE ATTANASIO: Mike Attanasio, M-I-K-E, A-T-T-A-N-A-S-I-O, 19 Woodstown Drive. ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Go ahead, sir.

MIKE ATTANASIO: Okay, so in just
listening, I'm kind of a newbie on this and I'm just listening to what's going on here at the last couple of meetings. I have a few concerns living in the area. Obviously, traffic is one of them.

But what we failed to hear in the last two meetings about this is not only the effect of some of the biggest probably tractor-trailers that are on roads these days, but now we're also talking about railroad cars coming through here at any given time. And I'm looking to find out some information, if any of the railroad traffic is used in conjunction with any type of traffic studies regarding these projects. If anybody can help me with that?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: I guess it's a question -- I'm not sure $I$ fully understand the question, if there's an increase in railroad traffic in Howell?

MIKE ATTANASIO: So, yeah, if you're on Howell Road that passes from Fairfield Road there's obviously railroad tracks that are being built for railroad traffic. I don't know, you know, when that's supposed to be done, but that will also affect traffic that comes off Route 33 and goes up

Howell Road, and how it affects people coming on and off the roads in this particular area.

So you're talking about two significant changes in traffic happening at about the same time in an area where, you know, you have roads here that, number one, are not meant for 50 miles an hour. And Number 2, now you're talking about - - I think the number was 500 tractor-trailers a day, and who knows how many railroad cars coming through here a day.

So are those two things taken into consideration when a traffic study is being done for these warehouses?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: I think

Mr. Disario, as to the -- I mean as to the truck traffic, that's, obviously, considered, and he has testified at length to the study and analysis as to the truck traffic. You know, as to rail, I'm not sure how that's factored in.

But, Mr. Disario, do you have any
thoughts?
DAN DISARIO: No, we did not factor into our analysis any influence in terms of nearby railroad lines, none of the warehouse buildings and, in particular the one that is before this evening,
is going to rely on rail service to serve it. ATtORNEY CUCCHIARO: I guess, Mr. Disario, part of that question would also be are there any grade crossings for the railroads and would it impact your traffic analysis, and is it customary in the traffic analysis to take into account grade crossing for railroads?

DAN DISARIO: It is not customary to take into account at-grade railroad crossings as part of a traffic study.

And as I testified to earlier, the majority of the traffic associated with this application will be relegated to a short section of Fairfield Road between Route 33 and this site.

JEROMIE LANGE: And, Dan, just to piggyback on that, 100 percent of the truck traffic would be headed toward Route 33. In fact, I just testified earlier about the signage prohibiting the left turns out.

And the rail crossing on Fairfield is south of us so it is not located between Route 33 and our site driveways.

DAN DISARIO: That is correct.
MIKE ATTANASIO: Okay. So what I'm guessing is these two are not -- I guess I'm asking
the board to take into consideration the impact of both of these potential issues in regards to voting on this particular project and others that are coming up.

Is that -- is that a viable question to ask or a suggestion?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, I mean, it's not outside the bounds to ask it.

I guess I would ask Mr. Chen, though, to confirm Mr. Disario's testimony about the impact of any grade crossings for railroads and how it would or would not be factored into this particular application.

BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: Okay. So I listened to Mr. Disario's testimony a few minutes ago, and I did not find anything that $I$ disagreed with him on with regard to railroad crossings.

Typically railroad crossings are not usually factored into most of the traffic studies that $I$ have seen or written. And since the grade crossing in question $I$ believe is south of this application, $I$ don't see how the grade crossing there would be affected, if none of the trucks are permitted to go in that direction.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Sir, so we
have testimony from the board's expert, the applicant's expert. The board will certainly take your comments into account when it's deliberating. It's not rejecting anything.

MIKE ATTANASIO: Okay. I'm okay with that.

So again, along with that you're having noise, you know, obviously being produced by two of these very large entities happening. And in this area we hear traffic at all hours of the day and especially at night when it comes to the traffic that is happening just now.

So that increasing obviously with
tractor-trailers and trains is a concern. I think the board needs to take a look at that as well.

My other question is this, and this is at a lack of my own knowledge. Maybe somebody could educate myself and the public on in light of what's happening in other areas of Howell with containers and storage; can you tell us what is going to be allowed to be stored in these facilities?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Lange, why don't you -- I think probably the easiest way would be to say if there are things that are excluded from storage.

JEROMIE LANGE: The things that would be excluded would be hazardous materials, and there may be like some cleaning supplies to keep the warehouse clean. But as far as the actual, you know, commercial nature of it, there's not going to be a hazardous material storage or something like that. This building is not designed for that.

It's not designed for cold storage at the moment, you know, that's possible, I guess that that can be converted, but really it is going to be -- it's going to be things like dry goods, can electronics, can be white goods, things of that nature.

But I would say just not hazardous materials would be the exclusion.

MIKE ATTANASIO: Okay. So I think you can understand the concern there based upon happenings around, in terms of what is being stored in there, number one, the quantity that is being stored in a million square feet of warehousing. And, then, on top of that, whatever is being rolled through here on a railroad at the same time.

So I hope the board will take a look at that as well as a potential issue for people who live in this area.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well I think it's fair to say that there's no option for the applicant in terms of complying with all of the -- and these are things that are basically regulated at county, state and federal level, but they're going to have to comply with all of those prohibitions and limitations. There's no choices that they have in that regard.

MIKE ATTANASIO: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Would that be a correct statement, Mr. Gianetti?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yeah, we'll have to comply with all state, county and federal requirements as to, you know, storage and things of that nature.

And again, the testimony too was there's no kind of rail service, there's nothing being proposed with respect to rail for these projects.

MIKE ATTANASIO: Okay. I guess my only other question is why? Why do we want these structures and the quantity of them in this area of Howell?

What is it going to do for Howell and the residents that live in the area? Why should we
have these?
I think that would be the question. I don't know if $I^{\prime} m$ looking for an answer but $I$ think, again, it needs to be talked about or thought about when there's a final decision being made about - -

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So let me provide the legal answer to what the board can do.

So, again, I always defer to the case law, which is the New Jersey courts interpreting how municipalities and planning boards have to interpret the Municipal Land Use Law, which is our governing state statute.

So what they say is that, and this is a quote from the New Jersey Supreme Court -- the jurisdiction of a Planning Board when dealing with a permitted use is tightly circumscribed; that's their words, tightly circumscribed, and it's limited to reviewing whether an applicant complies with the site plan ordinance, the design standards and the zoning ordinance.

And they're very -- the case law is very clear that a Planning Board goes well outside of its authority when it tries to determine whether a particular use should or should not be permitted because, like $I$ said before, the courts view that as
being a legislative determination.
So the limited jurisdiction that a
Planning Board has in an application like this is
does it comply with our ordinances, and if it
doesn't, should relief for those specific provisions that it does not comply with be granted.

We're not permitted under the law to engage in a determination as to whether this is a good idea for the property. That is a legislative determination, and it's, you know, it's in our ordinance.

So we can't disagree with the ordinance in terms of what's permitted. We can make sure that the ordinance is complied with, but we can't disagree with what is permitted.

MIKE ATTANASIO: Okay. That educates, an educated mind as they say.

Appreciate everybody's time and
information. Thank you.
BOARD SECRETARY: You're welcome.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Thank you. Have a good night.

BOARD SECRETARY: I have Stephen
Mirabello.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or
affirm the testimony you are about to give this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

BOARD SECRETARY: You have no volume.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: There's no audio.
BOARD SECRETARY: We can't hear you.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Let's give
Mr. Mirabello just a few moments to see if he can get his audio working.

Okay, Eileen, why don't we keep
Mr. Mirabello in the room, we can go on to --
BOARD SECRETARY: Go on to someone
else?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: -- the next member
of the pubic, but keep him in the room. Let's see if he can get his audio going.

BOARD SECRETARY: Okay. I'm bringing
in Sabrina.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Mirabello, if your audio starts working, feel free to interrupt us so we know.

Okay, who did we bring in, Sabrina?
BOARD SECRETARY: Sabrina.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, Sabrina, can you just unmute yourself.

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

SABRINA REUTTER: I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Now please state and spell your name and give us your address.

SABRINA REUTTER: Sabrina Reutter, $S-A-B-R-I-N-A, ~ R e u t t e r, ~ R-E-U-T-T-E-R, 276$ Fairfield Road.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, go ahead, ma'am.

SABRINA REUTTER: Good evening, everybody. We've lived in Howell for quite a while now. We think Howell's a great town with a wonderful sense of community.

As homeowners we're entitled to quiet enjoyment. The last year has been anything but quiet around here.

I was listening tonight. I heard that you guys mentioned that you wanted -- that there would be a possibility that the trucks coming out of the warehouses would be forced to turn left. And my question is, how do they plan to enforce that?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gianetti?
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yeah, the
testimony was there was signage as to the no left turn and being directed towards 33.

As to enforcement, just like any other zoning provision, enforcement is through the township. Obviously, the signs will be clear for the tenant and operator and for the drivers as to what they can and can't do.

Any violation would be subject to enforcement, whether it be the police, zoning or otherwise.

SABRINA REUTTER: Okay. So they're not going to be putting in wide sweeping curbs to the north, wide angle curbs to the south, and, you know, making that if they did turn the other way they would be hitting curbs or landscaping; nothing like that is going to be done?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Correct. That's not proposed.

SABRINA REUTTER: Okay. So are they planning to put -- the police are going to be patrolling the road almost constantly?

I'm just concerned because $I$ know signs are one thing, but we all know that, you know, people don't always follow the rules.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Mr. Lange, maybe
if you can address the question again as to -- oh, there we go.

JEROMIE LANGE: Yeah. So the applicant has agreed and will agree to permit Title 39 enforcement, which makes those traffic signs fully enforceable so your police department can issue tickets with fines. So these are real penalties that go with it.

SABRINA REUTTER: Okay.
JEROMIE LANGE: And there's just kind of the common sense aspect, we're so close to the Interchange of Route 33 it really doesn't make logical sense to go anywhere else, and that's why we were happy to grant the prohibition.

SABRINA REUTTER: I understand that.
Some people don't have common sense these days.
Also, one other thing, with a
24/7 hour a day operation, has anyone considered that there's two schools a couple of miles away? It doesn't seem like that was thought out for the families that live on this road, bringing all the extra traffic, noise.

The other day I witnessed a tractor-trailer blow past a bus, that the bus clearly had its stop sign out picking up the kids
and it went right past them.
So my concern is the safety of the residents on this road, and how it will affect our two schools at the end of the road. And the children waiting outside and getting dropped off from school.

I beg the Howell board to vote no on the warehouses, on any more warehouses on this road because there is already many -- we have a lot of traffic and there's already many -- we have Verizon, New Jersey Natural Gas, the approved warehouse, plus other industrial or whatever it is considered sites bringing traffic in.

And has anybody thought about the schools being a quarter of a mile away? I mean that's just -- my main concern is I just don't want there to be a horrific accident on this road of some sort that could harm any of our families.

So I guess the question would be to one of the board members about the schools?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: No, the questions are to the applicant's professionals or board's professionals.

Mr. Gianetti, do you have anybody that can discuss what generally was taken into account
when selecting this site?
ATtORNEY GIANETTI: I guess Mr. Lange can, but, obviously, the zoning was factored into the site, as well as its location near 33. And that there was direct, easy access to Route 33 from the site, as was previously testified to, and also why they were agreeable to putting the no left turn signage, so that they would not go in the opposite direction.

SABRINA REUTTER: All right, that's
all I have to say. I would just ask that the board, respectfully, vote no, please for the safety of our families, vote no to any more warehouses on this road.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Have a nice night.
SABRINA REUTTER: You, too. Thank you.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay,
Mr. Mirabello, it looks like you're good?
STEPHEN MIRABELLO: Can you hear me
now?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yes, we can.
Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give this board is the truth, the
whole truth, and nothing but the truth.
STEPHEN MIRABELLO: Yes, I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: If you could just state and spell your name and give us your address.

STEPHEN MIRABELLO: My name is Stephen Mirabello, $S-T-E-P-H-E-N, \quad$ last name M-I-R-A-B-E-L-L-O. I live at 2 Flint Lock Drive.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, go ahead, sir.

STEPHEN MIRABELLO: My questions are regarding any environmental investigations or assessments that have occurred at the site.

In reviewing the documentations that were publicly available, the last report $I$ saw was a preliminary assessment in September of 2021 .

Is that the last environmental report
that has been issued for the property?
JEROMIE LANGE: It's not --
STEPHEN MIRABELLO: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: -- or Mr. Lange,
whoever.
JEROMIE LANGE: So we did do a limited site investigation as well, long story short, there's a couple UST filings that are very old actually, they're close to 30 years old, I believe,
and they're just going to require us to do a Response Action Outcome, which we will engage our LSRP to do, you know, once we hopefully get approval for the project.

But other than that there's really no other issues on the site after the full on-site investigation.

STEPHEN MIRABELLO: All right. So also, as part of that, a preliminary assessment, there was another AOC that was included was for the presence of some drums that were emptying or -- that were found on the property.

Were those drums and their contents also evaluated as part of that environmental investigation, Mr. Lange?

JEROMIE LANGE: They weren't. They were plastic drums, they were emptied. They were actually used for floats for an irrigation pond purposes. There is a state open water on the site, on the north part of the site that was used for irrigation, and the drums were flotation for the intake.

STEPHEN MIRABELLO: Were those -- okay.
So those drums were originally used as flotation from there. Were they recycled from some
other purpose? Do we even know what the original contents were? Or were they moved from some other property to there?

JEROMIE LANGE: They were used by the farmers's flotation. They have been properly disposed of since then.

STEPHEN MIRABELLO: All right. JEROMIE LANGE: They're no longer on the site.

STEPHEN MIRABELLO: So everything has been characterized and properly disposed of, it sounds like.

Where can, that other report where the RAO would be, would be based upon, is that publicly available for us to review?

JEROMIE LANGE: The RAO would have to be done yet. That's not done yet, we would have to file.

STEPHEN MIRABELLO: Right. Yes, I'm talking about the environmental investigation that showed the extent of whatever Number 2 fuel oil may have been on the property.

JEROMIE LANGE: Well nothing was found on the property with all the investigations.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, Mr. Lange,
was there anything that you had to file with DEP regarding the removal of --

JEROMIE LANGE: We will have to file.
Yes, we will have to make a filing to get a Response Action Outcome.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And are those --
and all DEP filings are public documents?
JEROMIE LANGE: Correct.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yeah.

So, Mr. Mirabello, they're in the process of complying with all the DEP requirements as they file with DEP.

There are, you know, there are files that are open for the project, and you would just need to file an OPRA request with the DEP to get them.

STEPHEN MIRABELLO: I would have to ask for the documents to view them?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yes.
STEPHEN MIRABELLO: They wouldn't be made -- they're not made available through this application?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: No, they're public documents. But we have an Open Public records act in New Jersey, so there's a process
where they just document who wants them and that they have given them to people who want them.

There's not any impediment to getting them; there's just a process to requesting them. But they're not closed or anything like that; it's just there's a paper that you have to, you know fill out, that's all.

STEPHEN MIRABELLO: Okay. All right, yeah, I just wanted to make sure that those things were followed up on. Necessarily hear lots of things about the news lately in town with drums, I want to make sure they're all properly handled. All right, thank you very much. CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Have a good night. STEPHEN MIRABELLO: All right, good night.

BOARD SECRETARY: I'm bringing in
Homero Orduna.

JULIANA ORDUNA: Good evening.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, let me - - I
just need to swear you in first.
Do you swear or affirm the testimony
you are about to give this board will be the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth? JULIANNA ORDUNA: Yes.

HOMERO ORDUNA: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Please state and spell your name and give us your address. JULIANA ORDUNA: Sure. It's Juliana and Homero Orduna, $J-U-L-I-A-N-A, \quad H-O-M-E-R-O$. Orduna, $O$ R D U N A. And we are at 353 Fairfield Road.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead, ma'am. JULIANA ORDUNA: Yes, we are right next to Baker Road, right on south of where this warehouse is being built.

We are literally 20 feet from the road.
Our girls are on -- they go to Adelphia Road so their school hours are 7:45 to 8:00 a.m. they get picked up from the bus. Every time we go out and wait for this bus, there's literally ten cars from each side waiting for them to pass to get on the bus. It's a very high traffic road.

And, you know, just the noise we start hearing cars, trucks from 5:00 a.m. to 6:00 a.m. and having the trucks right literally next to our house it's -- we are very concerned.

You know, we really don't have questions, it's just we're worried about this, you know, our girls are only five years old and seven
years old; we have another baby coming in April. So, you know, this is our forever home and having to have this warehouse literally next to us is very concerning.

We run a farm business. We have beehives. We have a small shop in the property. It's a four-acre farm that we run. And, you know, since ever, the company, Natural -- the New Jersey Natural Gas Company started, we have had a lot of deer, a lot of moles on the farm.

We've actually thought about fencing the whole farm because of all these animals coming into our farm and we're not able to -- you know, to have our vegetation, you know, we have fruit trees, our flowers. And we're really trying to, you know, live from the farm and having all these animals here, this is only our fourth year being here. So it's very concerning just seeing how much traffic it's on the road, and then having to have more cars, more trucks, you know, I am with Sabrina, she talked about the schools and the kids and, you know, all these cars and trucks, you know, just over-speeding. So yes, we're really asking to consider this approval. You know, ever since it started in 2021, you know the first notice that we got we were
very worried, you know, that this was going to be approved.

Yes, we have had a few -- work done on the road, so it's been very -- it's very rough. You know, they patch the road and it really doesn't help just driving to the school, you know. We run the shop from on Fairfield Road, so whenever one side is closed we get no customers, crazy traffic. So, yes, it's very concerning.

You know, $I$ know Ron said that it's not -- you know, having traffic it's not enough reason for you guys to take as to deny an approval of this kind but, yeah, you know, we live on the road. We are the ones that see this trucks and the cars and -- so it's very rough.

You know, it's hard to be -- to be just standing outside waiting for the bus and seeing all these trucks and cars drop by, so yes --

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Was there anything more?

JULIANA ORDUNA: No, it was just that we have been here four years, you know, we're just starting our family, our kids are little, are very young, they're just starting elementary school. So yes, yeah, it's the impact, it has been huge since
whenever we arrived.
So just hoping that the planning board takes our testimony as a consideration of, you know, getting this approved.

Thank you very much for listening to us.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Have a good night. JULIANA ORDUNA: Good night.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Eileen, I guess before we go to the next, check, Jeromie is also, I think signed in from a computer just because his audio was a little bit garbled, and there might be another Jeromie Lange, if you could add him.

BOARD SECRETARY: Add him in?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yes, please.
BOARD SECRETARY: And I just brought

Janice Romisoukas in.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: I'm here. My husband would like to speak, too.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: We'll take you one at a time.

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

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Yes, it is.

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

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Janice Romisoukas, J-A-N-I-C-E, Romisoukas, R-O-M-I-S-O-U-K-A-S, my address is 314 Baker Road, right off of Fairfield. ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, go ahead, ma'am.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: I would like to follow up with what my front neighbor was saying and what the lawyer has said that he isn't going to do any other sound considerations.

I mean if we take it a step further, why couldn't more barriers and sound barriers be put up?

If this is going to happen, wouldn't it be fair to us who have lived here 40 years, plus her four years, that we get some more sound barriers and buffers than what is just going to be there that they proposed? That's one of my questions.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gianetti, do you want to restate --

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yeah, I think
Mr. Lange, if we can check Mr. Lange's audio, but related to that, again, we have indicated we would comply, you know, with the noise requirements and
ensuring that, you know, we don't violate the town or the state requirements with respect to noise, you know the operational level.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: But can't it be
better than? I mean I listened to all the ones on Howell Road and they're doing all kind of stuff for them to get extra sound barriers and everything.

So our neighbor who has 4, 5 and a baby
and us, it should be considerate to at least give us
a better sound barrier; wouldn't you kind of agree?
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Again, as part of the application, we're in an Industrial Zone, our jobs conform to the town zoning requirements, the town's noise requirements and their buffer requirements, what we're doing as part of the design and layout of this project.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Well, I think -BOARD PLANNER: Excuse me,

Mr. Gianetti, and I'm sorry, Ms. Rome --
JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Romisoukas.
BOARD PLANNER: Sorry, sorry.
JANICE ROMISOUKAS: That's all right.
BOARD PLANNER: On her behalf, there
was an application on Howell Road that again was conforming, it was a permitted use, and the
residents were concerned about the noise and the applicant in that particular instance opted to put up a noise barrier so it's not that we're requiring it and we cannot require it, but it was requested by the adjacent neighbor in the conforming application, and the applicant in that particular instance opted to provide it.

So again, I'm not saying it's required, but it's something that your applicant would be willing to entertain.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: I hope they are because we would --

BOARD PLANNER: I understand.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Let's let them
answer.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Let's let them answer.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: I have to consult with my client before $I$ can answer that. I can't answer that right now.

BOARD PLANNER: Okay. Mr. Chair, we're going to take a five-minute break?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Sure.

BOARD PLANNER: Great.

JEROMIE LANGE: That would be great,
thank you.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: All right.
BOARD SECRETARY: The board will now
take a five-minute recess and be back at 8:50.
(Whereupon, a recess is taken at 8:42 p.m.) - - -
(The proceeding continues at 8:50 p.m.)

BOARD SECRETARY: At this point the planning board will reconvene.

BOARD ENGINEER: All right, Craig, we last left with you getting asked whether or not you would be willing to do a sound wall, and we went to a break so you could speak to your client.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: If Paul could bring up Exhibit A-58, and Mr. Lange can discuss what can be proposed in connection with a wall, though certain variance or waiver relief may be required in connection with it, but Mr. Lange can explain.

JEROMIE LANGE: So thank you for the opportunity to review the plan. I didn't want to answer that question willy-nilly without having reviewed the potential impacts.

So the short answer is, yes, we would be willing to put in a sound wall that would have a combined height, between berm and sound wall, of 15 feet. We would locate that along our southerly property line, along the driveway here that runs into the site. And then it would go around the curb and it would come up, keep going up until the curb that is just to the south, I guess would that be east of the truck court.

Now what that would require, though, is some grading and potentially the sound wall itself to be within the required buffers. And I believe that would -- and I will defer to the board's professionals, but $I$ believe that might require relief to do that, to put the grading and/or the sound wall in the buffer.

So to the extent --
BOARD PLANNER: Jeromie --
JEROMIE LANGE: Yes?
BOARD PLANNER: -- if that is the
case, what $I$ would recommend is that you submit a detail to my office and Laura's office. But I would submit to the board, given the concern of the residents surrounding it, that if that requires relief from our buffer requirements, that the board
act in the affirmative on that relief given the fact that the board -- or the residents have requested that buffer enhancement, which we have done in the past.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And, Mr. Lange,
also, just to be clear, that essentially matches what you did in the Howell Road application, correct?

JEROMIE LANGE: That's correct.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay. Thank you.
JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Thank you.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Why don't you
take the exhibit down so we can see everybody again.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, ma'am, did you have any other questions?

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Yeah, I do, actually.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
JANICE ROMISOUKAS: I hate asking this one after, but is there fencing around any of this?

The buffer wall is that considered a fence?

I mean I'm only thinking from my front
neighbors with young children, my back neighbors with young children, and a $24 / 7$ operation and people wandering and my grandchildren.

BOARD PLANNER: So I don't think
there's fencing -- Jeromie, you can correct me if I'm wrong --

JEROMIE LANGE: You're correct.
BOARD PLANNER: -- proposed. However,
is there fencing on these residential properties that we're concerned about?

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Oh, you mean my residential property?

BOARD PLANNER: Yes.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: No. No, actually
because it's been so --

BOARD PLANNER: I understand that. So they're not proposing any fencing --

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Okay.
BOARD PLANNER: -- but you have the ability as a residential applicant to put up a fence around your property if you are concerned about that, but they're not proposing any fencing at this time.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Okay.
Now, my next question is going to the
lights; so that we're -- we can work with you to make sure the lights aren't shining into our windows at night, right?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well I think the requirement is that there is no spillage onto neighboring properties. Correct?

JEROMIE LANGE: And that is the design, is not to have spillage. And that's in both cases, by the way, just to be clear, whether the board choses the ordinance compliant or the IES compliant version, both of them do not have spillage.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Okay. My last thing is a comment. And $I$ am working on it; $I$ have contacted the state DEP and our Howell Township environmental. There is bald eagles out here. My neighbor has pictures of three or four of them in the field.

BOARD PLANNER: I'm not going to disagree. 100 percent, you're correct. However, that is only regulated through the wetlands and the buffering.

And, Jeromie, you can correct me if I'm wrong, you guys have an application into the DEP for an LOI, correct, or you have an LOI?

JEROMIE LANGE: We actually have the

LOI. It's just the transition area waiver we're waiting for.

BOARD PLANNER: Okay. So if the DEP was concerned about the threatened and endangered species habitat for that, they would have given them 150-foot buffering; you have, what, a 50-foot buffer, Jeromie?

JEROMIE LANGE: 50-foot in the front. In the back there is a 150 -foot buffer in the rear.

BOARD PLANNER: Okay. So they have taken that into consideration in the rear. In the front they have determined that it's not an issue. But the DEP would regulate that with respect to the buffer associated with the wetlands. We, as the township, have absolutely no regulatory authority over that, but the DEP, obviously, has taken that already into consideration.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Okay. All right, that's the end of mine.

My husband is here. Thank you.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Sir, let
me just swear you in.
Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

TOM ROMISOUKAS: I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Just state and spell your name for us, please.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: 314 Baker Road. Tom Romisoukas, $R-O-M-I-S-O-U-K-A-S$.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Go ahead, sir.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Well one thing is
about the wetlands. I was out there when the guy was digging the holes and he kept telling me all he kept finding was new soil and finding how high the water level was up. He couldn't understand how they can build on this property.

BOARD PLANNER: So I'm just going to jump in. The DEP has the regulatory authority over that. And if they have an LOI, which is the Letter of Interpretation which says the boundary of the wetlands and the buffer, we don't have any jurisdiction beyond that so --

TOM ROMISOUKAS: But he told me that --
BOARD PLANNER: I understand. I
understand your concern, but we do not have regulatory authority beyond DEP.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I think, though, just to be clear what we're saying is the DEP has
delineated the wetland and then they have put a buffer beyond the wetland, so there's no proposal to construct anything in the wetland or in the buffer to protect the wetland here. And the DEP gets to tell us what the wetland is not, you know, we don't -- we can't overrule them.

Jeromie LAnge: And, Ron, $I$ just
wanted to correct my testimony, the rear of the property itself is 50 feet. I think the more sensitive features were off site to our east, but as far as the actual site, it's either zero feet in one case or the rest of it is 50 feet.

Attorney cucchiaro: But, in any event, the DEP has delineated the wetlands and the buffers, and you're not proposing any construction in either the wetlands or the wetlands buffers?

JEROMIE LANGE: There's minor construction of the north driveway. We're doing some transition averaging. But that's a by-right permit and, you know, we're well within the prescriptive requirements of that.

тOM ROMISOUKAS: Well, when we was digging these holes he was only out by Fairfield Road and he said a lot of the problems were right near where the entrance and exit is going to be on
the north side of the property.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yeah, I mean, the guy who digs the holes is not the decision-maker. He provides data, but the decision-maker is the DEP on this.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: But, I mean, if anybody has driven down Fairfield Road when it rains, you have holes out there that stays for weeks on end. So I don't understand how it's not wet.

BOARD PLANNER: So, again, that is under the jurisdiction of the DEP which has issued an LOI, which we do not have any control over. That's beyond our jurisdiction.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: All right. The other question about it, though, is what about the pond that is behind the house with the fish in it?

My kids fished in there for years. I mean there's a pond there with fish and everything. So it's not just a puddle. What is going to happen to that?

Hello? Anybody going to answer on
that?
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yes, Mr. Lange can
answer but --
JEROMIE LANGE: You caught me chewing
there.
That pond is remaining in its existing condition; it's a state open water and no disturbance is proposed as part of this application.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: So this is the pond that is behind the house?

JEROMIE LANGE: Correct.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: So that's going to stay?

JEROMIE LANGE: Correct.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: The next thing is on
the traffic.
I don't think this study is fair to the people in this town, that it was done two years ago. I mean, it definitely has changed since then. And I don't think youse are taking in consideration all the traffic that is going on.

It's not fair to us that you don't do another survey now, because all these wonderful -all these different warehouses, it's the same survey, and it's not right for the people in this town to have one from two years ago during the pandemic. Because during the pandemic you could go out on Fairfield Road, and I said, whoa, this is like 40 years ago when we lived here.

BOARD PLANNER: So I think that there was information provided earlier by the attorney regarding what our authority is with respect to off-site traffic. And $I$ am not opining whether or not the traffic study that we're reviewing is relevant, that is something that the applicant can opine on. But we can only opine on the ingress and egress.

The off-site traffic, because this is a permitted use, is not within our purview, which is what the attorney had said earlier.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Right, but you're putting our lives in danger out there.

BOARD PLANNER: We're not. It's a permitted use and we're looking at the ingress and egress and the off-site traffic is something that we are not able to review.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Because if you ever went out to our mailbox on Fairfield Road, you will see when a truck comes by it will go onto the far side of the road. All you have to do is step out there and a truck goes all the way to the other side of the road with the traffic coming in the other direction.
So, I mean, it's only going to be a
matter of time before we're going to have an accident.

And my next question is I guess youse all know that the warehouse across the street that is already being built is for sale. And I want to know who the new owner of this property is going to be because this property is already up for sale.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Ron?

TOM ROMISOUKAS: It's not even approved yet and it's for sale.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you have a legal response to that, Mr. Gianetti?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Sure. I mean the ownership of the property is not relevant to the site plan. As Mr. Lange previously indicated, it's being proposed for a warehouse, and based upon the design and the layout, and there's kind of a particular -- you know, it's not the type of distribution center warehouse, it's a more traditional warehouse, there is no particular tenant identified at this time.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chairman, I would agree with Mr. Gianetti, I mean, essentially the identity of the person or entity who owns the property is not relevant; it's what is the design
and does the design comply with our ordinance.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
TOM ROMISOUKAS: I mean, if the
property is up for sale and there's going to be a new owner, how do we know what it's going to be used for actually? I mean how --

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: It will be used for what it's approved for.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: If there's an approval, it doesn't matter who got the approval; whoever owns the property has to follow what's in the resolution.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: So, in other words, you couldn't do a high-volume warehouse out of this if the next person wants to do it; the town would stop it?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: If there's an approval, any entity or person who owns the property has to comply with the approval.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: All right.
ATtORNEY GIANETTI: And if there's any
change they would have to come back; if there's any change to the layout or design or size, they would have to come back to this Planning Board.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: That's correct.

And they would have to do a public notice when they do that.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: And now this wall they're proposing, is there still going to be a berm with trees in front of this wall so it doesn't look like we're in prison?

JEROMIE LANGE: Yes, we would still --
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: And $I$ believe the testimony was we're going to provide the wall you requested. And I think, Mr. Lange, you testified that there would be grading involved so it would be on top of a berm?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Lange was about to answer the question.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Sure.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead,
Mr. Lange.
JEROMIE LANGE: So the answer is yes, the proposed landscaping would still be there. We would have to work out the exact details as far as where the existing trees are.

So we may have a smaller berm in the back and a taller wall so that we could preserve some of the existing trees along our east, but on the south side $I$ think it's going to be more berm
but it would still be landscaping in all cases on both sides of the wall.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: This wall will stop the headlights from coming in through our windows when they make the turn?

Because our property touches this property, so I mean when these trucks come around --

BOARD PLANNER: So the berm probably would have done that in and of itself but the wall will absolutely help out that situation, yes.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: All right. And as far as like $I$ noticed that across the street they were putting in the trees today and -- for around the property, and they're putting these things that are six-foot tall, the trees are.

And $I$ know when youse made a statement when you're doing this property, showed us pictures with the trees, and you made a statement it's going to be from ten years from now. So I'm 72 years old. I don't want to wait ten years to see a tree. I don't want -- you know, can $I$ have something that is noticeable now?

I mean they do -- they planted bushes across the street, they're literally one foot in
diameter, one foot tall.
BOARD PLANNER: I mean, Shari, you
can't comment, right? We can't plant like 18-year-old trees, right; there has to be some kind of...

BOARD TREE EXPERT: Yeah. Well, I mean first off at this time of year the trees that they're installing will not have any leaves on them anyway, but, yes, it's better to plant trees smaller because they'll establish easier and, you know, then be able to start putting on growth.

If you bring in a 15, 20-foot tall evergreen tree and throw them out on the buffer no one is going to be maintaining it really, watering it, it's most likely just going to die and then you will have brown trees on the buffer.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Now is there going to be, like, evergreen-type trees that have, you know, cover all year-round?

BOARD TREE EXPERT: The buffer is a four-season buffer so there is everything in the buffer, deciduous and evergreen.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Well, I really hope -- and the other thing is why can't you just move it down further across from the other one.

The other thing when you're saying about the sound, they're right next to our houses so that truck's idling or the rear beeper coming up, it's going to keep us up all night.

And once trucks are sitting there idling it's loud enough to keep you awake. And I think it's going to be rough on us, it really is. We have been here for 50 years, I mean...

BOARD PLANNER: Again, there is a
sound ordinance, and if there is repeated noise penetration beyond 50 decibels, which is not a very high level, it could be like a vacuum cleaner, you need to report it, report it, and then they will have to address it.

But at the end of the day it's a permitted use, as we've said. However, they do have to comply with the sound.

So I understand your concern. And I'm not trying to dismiss your concern, $I$ totally understand it, but until it happens we can't address it.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Now would you consider a truck out there idling?

BOARD PLANNER: It depends on the volume. Like the backup beeping, it has to be a
consistent amount.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well also, Jen, just let me say that for idling I believe that the state has a three-minute limit on idling.

BOARD PLANNER: Correct.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So they can't keep the trucks going for more than three minutes. TOM ROMISOUKAS: So if they're out there more than three minutes, we can call the police?

BOARD PLANNER: Yes.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: And we would. If they're not going to be friendly neighbor, we are not going to be friendly neighbors.

BOARD PLANNER: What I would suggest if you're concerned, not just, like, report it but record it, right?

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Oh, I will.
BOARD PLANNER: Right? I'm just
saying that. And then the same thing with the noise, right?

So the noise has to be a consistent noise for a prolonged period of time over 50 decibels after 10:00 p.m. so -- and 50 decibels is not a high level.

So just record everything. And I get it, I understand your concern, 100 percent, but it it's a permitted use, so we are limited to what we can do here. And so what I'm encouraging you to do is if it becomes a nuisance continually record it and report it. That's all we can do from here. I'm sorry, but that's -- that's what $I$ would suggest.

And what $I$ could encourage you to do is record it and report it because just reporting it is probably not going to be enough. You have to like have the information for sure.

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Also, on these trucks leaving, I know they have to go to 33, but I think youse should demand that the driveways be set up so that they would have to drive over a curb or go over two trees or something to make a left. Because the police don't have to keep watching over this area.

BOARD PLANNER: So do you mean right out only or a left out?

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Yeah, in other words, they have to make a right.

BOARD PLANNER: So, Jeromie, are you willing to reconfigure the driveway access to right-out only?

JEROMIE LANGE: My concern with doing
that is the emergency access, we still need fire trucks to be able to come in and out.

BOARD PLANNER: That's fine. So still mountable curb but right-out only; reconfigure the driveway so that the regular traffic goes right-out only, but mountable curbs so emergency access can get in, if need be.

JEROMIE LANGE: All right. So we
wouldn't be letting employees make a left out, then, in this scenario?

BOARD PLANNER: If they're in a
passenger car that's not the issue, it's trucks right-out only.

JEROMIE LANGE: Okay. There's
probably a way to do that. I don't immediately know what that would look like but there's probably a way to do that.

BOARD PLANNER: Okay. So you're willing to work with us --

JEROMIE LANGE: Yes.

BOARD PLANNER: -- to create a
scenario where the trucks are right-out only, the passenger cars are not restricted and there's an emergency access in the event --

JEROMIE LANGE: Yes.

BOARD PLANNER: -- would you agree to
that?

JEROMIE LANGE: Yes.
BOARD PLANNER: Would that be
satisfactory to you?
TOM ROMISOUKAS: That would definitely
help, I mean because you know a sign is not going to stop it.

BOARD PLANNER: No, I understand. I see it all the time. But he has committed to working with us to come up with a way to at least restrict it from a standpoint of a regulatory issue and, therefore, it would be, you know -- we would have the ability to restrict it if the ability -- if need be.

So is that -- is that acceptable to you?

TOM ROMISOUKAS: It helps.
JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Yes.
TOM ROMISOUKAS: It definitely does.
JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Yes.
BOARD PLANNER: Okay. So, Jeromie, you will work with my office and Laura's office more specifically to come up with the ability to deal with that issue?

TOM ROMISOUKAS: Okay.
JEROMIE LANGE: Correct.
BOARD PLANNER: That's the best we can
do for now.
TOM ROMISOUKAS: All right, thank you
very much.
JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Have a good night.
JANICE ROMISOUKAS: You, too.
BOARD SECRETARY: Next, I have Phillip
Langer.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or
affirm the testimony you are about to give this
board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

PHILLIP LANGER: Yes, I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and
spell your name and give us your address.
PHILLIP LANGER: Phillip Langer,
$\mathrm{L}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{G}-\mathrm{E}-\mathrm{R}$.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And your address, sir?

PHILLIP LANGER: I live at 286 Merrick Road.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead,

Mr. Langer.
PHILLIP LANGER: I live right off the corner of Fairfield Road where $I$ have happily been quietly and peacefully living for the last 37 years. I was most fortunate when the county bought the Yellow Brook tract of land directly across the street; it is now 500 acres of permanently preserved quiet, and wetlands.

BOARD ENGINEER: Hold on one second, sir. Eileen, can you let in Craig Gianetti, please.

BOARD SECRETARY: Sure. Sorry.
BOARD PLANNER: I was just going to say I saw Craig's hand go up too.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Continue.
PHILLIP LANGER: Okay. My first question is $I$ believe that you hired a traffic expert for the Monmouth Commerce Center in South Howell, but for some reason we haven't had a traffic expert of our own, which can be done at the expense of --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Langer, that's incorrect.

AtTORNEY GIANETTI: That's a
different...
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: No, no, no,
that's incorrect. We have a traffic engineer today. Mr. Chen is the traffic engineer; he works for CME Associates. CME Associates had provided the traffic engineer for the other application as well.

The engineer who worked for CME at that time has left the company, but Mr. Chen has been evaluating the project from it being filed and he has been here and he has testified tonight.

PHILLIP LANGER: Thank you. That's on behalf of the citizens of Howell Township?

BOARD PLANNER: Yes.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, it's on
behalf of the board, yeah, and it's charged to the applicant.

PHILLIP LANGER: Very good.
Points of information $I$ have achieved
from the other people, Sabrina, down on 279
Fairfield, is a neighbor of mine. She lives down around the corner. She spoke earlier about the traffic situation that we're already dealing with on Fairfield Road.

I don't know how many of you regularly drive through our area, but in the mornings and in the afternoons when school buses are backed up to
the light at 33, far beyond the warehouse, the JennAir and the one that you are now proposing, there's school buses with morning and afternoon commutes, that traffic is already there. I just want that -- $I$ would just like that to be out there. You said that there is the only restricted use of the warehouses is what is within the confines of what is legally allowed and I appreciate that.

I would like you to know that when I first lived here the Langeveld Bulb Company was right around the corner on Fairfield Road. Those logs were in existence then. It sounded like Newark Airport out front and I called the town. The Mayor at the time was Harvey Morrell. I don't know if any of you remember him; he was also our police chief at one point. He stood here in front of my house listening to the incredible rumble out there and said those are my friends, laughed and walked away. We voted in another, Mayor. He shut it down immediately because they were using refrigerated trucks, they were running them all night long. Now you're saying that there's a three-minute restriction on how long the trucks are allowed to idle but, Ms. -- I'm sorry if I pronounce it wrong -- Beahm, Jen Beahm -- Jen Beahm said
that --
BOARD PLANNER: Yeah, I'm here.

PHILLIP LANGER: -- said that we
should not only report it but record it because - -
BOARD PLANNER: Yes.

PHILLIP LANGER: -- in her words, on the record, the reporting would not be enough.

BOARD PLANNER: No. What I'm saying
is that --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Jen, let me just chime in. I think what was trying to be conveyed was the most effective way to get an issue to be enforced. You certainly are not prohibited from, you know, reporting something, but if you want to get the most mileage out of a report, recording it would help to get results.

I mean you're certainly not required to but, just like any other violation, any other crime or whatever, the more evidence that you have of something, the better. That's all that was -- that was trying to be said.

BOARD PLANNER: I agree. Thank you,
Ron.
PHILLIP LANGER: Thank you, Jen. But all of these are ways to deal with things after the
fact.
BOARD PLANNER: Well, I understand, but at the end of the day we can't preemptively expect a violation.

So, like I said, there are requirements under the state, which is monitored by the county in Howell Township, and so, therefore, if you are anticipating an issue, that is why $I$ had made that recommendation. But we can't preemptively assume there's going to be a problem.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: What $I$ can say from a legal standpoint, again, you know, these are -- we have to live by what the courts have said. You can't deny a permitted use based upon a presumed violation of a noise ordinance that hasn't happened. The system just won't allow it.

PHILLIP LANGER: I understand. It's just like building up a curb and putting trees on so the trucks can't make a turn going south on Fairfield Road, they're not logs, but they're for the protection of the local area residents, who I would also like to state that they're already before this giant abomination is built that is sitting there right now, there is already 150 to 250,000 empty square feet of storage and warehouse space
right here on Fairfield Road.
Now, is it the town and the planning board's job as representatives of the town to just legally enforce the stated state and federal laws, or is there a way for you to step in and say, hey, these are our local residents?

These people are being overrun with wildlife, these people are getting noise abominations in their yards. It's loud at night now, you can hear everything.

Is it the town's position --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I can tell you, sir, that the courts have answered that question in unambiguous terms and they have said to planning boards, no, you can't do those things.

And these are the words that the court uses, it's arbitrary, unreasonable and capricious. They say you have one job, Planning Board, your job when an application comes, is to find whether it satisfies or does not satisfy the ordinance requirements. Issues that go beyond the ordinance the courts say, you know, are not valid.

So we don't make that law. The state has made the Municipal Land Use Law. We don't interpret it, the courts have interpreted it. We
are at the bottom of the hill. We have to follow what the state has legislated, what the town has legislated and what the courts have ruled.

PHILLIP LANGER: Okay. Not everyone has a computer. Is there a reason we don't have in-person meetings anymore and can we re-establish them?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: That was already addressed at the last meeting.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And also I just want to say that you don't need a computer to access these meetings; you can have a telephone. You have had people access via telephone previously.

PHILLIP LANGER: I couldn't find the ID for my phone, and that's why I had to come in on the computer.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: We're happy that you found your way in.

PHILLIP LANGER: Thank you. Thank you, I appreciate that.

One last thing $I$ want to say. Again, I have been here 30 -- actually May it will be 37 years. When it's quiet in the evening I can hear the train, the Jersey Shore train, 12 miles away.

In the summer on the weekends I can
hear Wall stadium cars racing around the track about eight miles away.

I can't imagine the savagery in our atmosphere that is coming our way. Is there a way to put a specific, more than 10:00 p.m., because that's really late out here. This is still farm country for a lot of us.

Is there a way to put like 8 to 8 or something like that, restriction on the operations?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: This Planning
Board does not have the ability.
(Technical interruption.)
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Sir.
PHILLIP LANGER: Yes?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Oh, I'm sorry, I wasn't speaking to you, Mr. Langer. The previous speaker we could still hear.

JANICE ROMISOUKAS: Yeah, the Romisoukases need to be taken out.

BOARD SECRETARY: I moved them, yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I'm sorry,
Mr. Langer. But to answer your question this Planning Board does not. I mean, you can bring it up to the governing body to see if they want to adopt an ordinance but, you know, they may be
limited, you know, in terms of you can't target a specific industry.

But that would be the body, the governing body, not the planning board. We don't -- we can't adopt any ordinances here.

PHILLIP LANGER: All right. The other thing $I$ wanted to let you know, just for information sake, is that those other warehouses that are currently south of the railroad tracks, those tractor-trailers are coming through here on Fairfield Road, they're here all the time. There's no make a right turn to go to Route 33 from them.

So we already have tractor-trailers on our roads. Just letting you know, if you didn't already know that.

And that's it. I'm good. I would just
like to -- I wasn't at the meeting, the last meeting, so $I$ don't know what the outcome was of having the in-person meetings. Could you just clear that for me, please?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Starting June.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: The board is
returning to live meetings June lst, Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes.
PHILLIP LANGER: Thank you. And do we
have a date on when the next Planning Board meeting that addresses this.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: It depends,
Mr. Lange, they may finish tonight; this may be the final meeting.

If it's not the final meeting we'll make an announcement at the end of the meeting to when it's being carried to.

PHILLIP LANGER: Okay. On behalf of my neighbors, everybody in North Howell, the environ and the animals in our area, I ask you please just say no.

Thank you.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Thank you.
BOARD SECRETARY: I have Mike
Greenfield.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: You have to
unmute yourself, Mr. Greenfield.
MIKE GREENFIELD: Can you hear me?

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

MIKE GREENFIELD: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: State and spell
your name and give us your address.
MIKE GREENFIELD: Mike Greenfield, M-I-K-E, G-R-E-E-N-F-I-E-L-D, 417 Brickyard Road.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead, sir.
MIKE GREENFIELD: Just a few
questions.
The Adelphia Road side of Fairfield Road, has there been any type of study that would allow two tractor-trailers to come on the end of that road? There's a house on one side with shrubbery at the street, and the other side the shrubbery is at the street also, and they can only get one tractor-trailer at that corner, including the two schools that are across the street with the school buses.

How many cars are coming in from
Adelphia Road, how many trucks?
Yeah, they're coming down Route 9 --
BOARD PLANNER: Well, let's let them
answer the first question.
MIKE GREENFIELD: Okay.
BOARD PLANNER: And then you can go beyond that.

MIKE GREENFIELD: Thank you.
Attorney GiAnetti: Mr. Disario, if
you could answer.
MIKE GREENFIELD: Thank you.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: None of that was factored into your study and your traffic impact?

DAN DISARIO: That was testified to previously, as well as other witnesses for the applicant. We anticipate all trucks to be oriented from Route 33. We did not anticipate any trucks coming south of the site.

MIKE GREENFIELD: Okay. 537 takes you
to 195. Come down Adelphia Road, cross over
Route 9, make a left into Fairfield Road. Fastest way for a tractor-trailer to get there from the Turnpike? From 195? What happens to all those trailers?

Has there been a study done how many trucks will come through that end?

DAN DISARIO: Again, $I$ testified to a moment ago, we anticipate all the trucks associated with this warehouse to be oriented to and from the Route 33 corridor.

BOARD PLANNER: So have you evaluated that route that they're asking about?

DAN DISARIO: No.
BOARD PLANNER: So you haven't --

MIKE GREENFIELD: That is a minimal road there, barely can put trucks around it, and they're going to put tractor-trailers around it.

BOARD PLANNER: No, he hasn't said that. He's not saying that, but I'm just asking have they evaluated it? He's saying that his evaluation does not anticipate them going that way.

But, Mr. Disario, can you go back through your analysis a little bit?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: But why is it that you make that presumption, Mr. Disario?

DAN DISARIO: The proximity of the Route 33 corridor to this site would provide the most convenient route for trucks to get to and from the turnpike, the Route 9 corridor as it relates to where the site is located.

I think you heard the applicant's representative, Mr. Lange, testify that one of the things that was attractive for this site, notwithstanding the fact that it's a permitted use in this zone, but that it's close to the Route 33 corridor.

MIKE GREENFIELD: If I can take one minute. 195 comes from the turnpike. You make a left onto 537, you go to Adelphia Road, the top of

Adelphia Road and 537, you make a right. It's totally legal to bring a tractor-trailer down that road.

Come all the way down, cross over

Route 9, go to the two schools that are there at the traffic light, and try to get a tractor-trailer around that intersection, 53-footer.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Greenfield, he's testified that he didn't evaluate, you know, that route. He testified as to why he did not evaluate that route.

The board will weigh whether, you know, that was appropriate or not, but that's his answer to the question.

MIKE GREENFIELD: Okay. I would just seriously would take that into account, how many tractor-trailers are going to come around that corner and somebody should really take a look -JEROMIE LANGE: I can also offer that the Port of Newark and New Jersey is located north of the site, so as you're coming to and from the Turnpike, which would be the main corridor for doing that, $33--$ you know, 18,9 , all make a lot more sense as well as, you know, 33.

So, again, you know, there's a brand
new interchange with the 133 bypass that goes right on to 33 off the Turnpike. That is going to make a lot more sense coming to and from the port.

MIKE GREENFIELD: Well, $\quad$ know,

Route 9 has quite a bit of tractor-trailer traffic and coming and going north and south, they're coming from the --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes.
MIKE GREENFIELD: $\quad-\quad$ I'm sure they're going to go onto Adelphia Road.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Greenfield, we've heard the answer, we'll take that into account, absolutely. But the applicant has provided its answers. They may not be satisfactory to everyone, but they have answered it.

MIKE GREENFIELD: Well, I would only think the board -- that they would really have them do a study, a traffic study, how many trucks would be coming down off Route 9 onto Adelphia Road and then making that left onto Fairfield. And that's all $I$ can ask you, it should be studied. Thank you.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Eileen, do we have anyone else?

BOARD SECRETARY: Yes, I have Steve Morlino. I just brought him in.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, you need to unmute. Okay, Mr. Morlino, do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

STEVEN MORLINO: I do.

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

STEVEN MORLINO: Yes. The name is
Steven, $S-T-E-V-E-N, \quad M o r l i n o, ~ M-O-R-L-I-N-O$,
38 years, 51 Peachstone Road, Howell, New Jersey.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead, sir.

STEVEN MORLINO: So I had a few
questions, one of them had to do with the USTs, or the underground storage tanks. I heard some talk about that earlier and $I$ am just curious, when -if there's an open assessment, when will that report be available?

And if the board hasn't seen it yet how can they vote on this topic? I'm just curious.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, on the first issue, $I$ would open that to the applicant as to when, you know, paperwork would be filed with the

DEP, if you know.
JEROMIE LANGE: It would be at the time of construction.

STEVEN MORLINO: So has there been any ground testing done to see if these UST's have been leaking over the years?

And, you know, did you use ground-penetrating radar to determine where they are and what the vicinity is with regard to foundations and things? I'm just curious.

You know, someone was told they have to OPRA this. This should be part of this application and I'm a little chagrined that we would be told we have to OPRA something that should be part and parcel of the application.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Sir, I'm telling you what the DEP's requirements are so.

STEVEN MORLINO: Well, again,
Mr. Cucchiaro, how can the DEP rule what the applicant is doing or not doing, and how can the board vote if they don't know what they're doing?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, I can tell
you that this was an issue in the previous
application that Active Acquisitions had, and $I$ can tell you that it was argued before Judge Acquaviva,
and Judge Acquaviva ruled that the manner in which it would be -- any environmental contamination would be handled and remediated would be determined during the construction process by an LSRP. He specifically said the board could not deny the application based on that, and that it would rather be something that would be a condition of approval that they receive all outside agency approvals.

But the board was told explicitly, in a similar situation involving the same applicant, by Judge Acquaviva, that they could not deny it based upon that.

STEVEN MORLINO: All right.
So is it my understanding that the

Licensed Site Remediation Professional will be on board throughout the construction and monitoring this site continuously throughout the construction; is that my assumption.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I'll leave that to the applicant to answer.

JEROMIE LANGE: I'll address that.
So, no is the simple answer to that last question. The LSRP will be engaged to produce an RAO for the two open tank cases.

Ground-penetrating radar was done. And
this is in the reports that our environmental consultant did. They did do soil testing and neither the tanks nor any contamination were found on the site.

So we do not believe the tanks are there any longer. We believe they were removed and just the proper paperwork wasn't done. But there's no evidence of tanks being there on the site; there's no evidence of any discharge.

However, during the time of
construction we will further evaluate that as part of when we demolish the house and we're doing the other site work to ensure that that's the case. And the LSRP will do the work that is necessary for that specific purpose to issue an RAO.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So, Mr. Lange, just as a condition of approval would the applicant object to cc'ing the board on correspondence to the DEP?

JEROMIE LANGE: No, we would not object.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. So that paperwork would be available both from the DEP as well as when it comes into the Planning Board, as a condition of approval.

STEVEN MORLINO: Okay. So if I was to OPRA something, there's really nothing to OPRA at this point; am $I$ correct in that?

AtTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, Mr. Lange, are there any open files at DEP that --

JEROMIE LANGE: There are open files. It's not work that we did, these files preexist -predate, rather, our involvement.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So then the answer is there are open files, so if there were an OPRA request made to DEP there is information that would be available regarding this site.

STEVEN MORLINO: Okay.
All right, my other question has to do with school buses. We heard a few people talk about it. At a previous meeting I asked about the traffic study with regard to school buses.

I was wondering if there's any follow-up; if someone can tell us how many school buses go up and down Fairfield Road every day and cross 33?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Mr. Disario, you can answer whether that was factored into your analysis.

> DAN DISARIO: As I testified
previously our traffic counts did include any school buses that were traveling through any of the intersections we did study, but I have not identified exactly how many of those buses were captured by those counts.

And our counts did not look at 24-hour volumes, they only looked at volumes between 6 and 10:00 in the morning, and 2 and 7:00 in the afternoon.

STEVEN MORLINO: All right. So we still don't have an accurate count; we still don't have an accurate count on the exact number of school buses that go up and down that road?

BOARD PLANNER: So my question is, like -- so here is my question; what exactly are you looking for?

If the overall traffic included those counts, and he included the traffic, including the buses in the counts, what exactly, separately, are you looking for him to do?

STEVEN MORLINO: I'm looking for a ratio of tractor-trailers to school buses to
determine --
BOARD PLANNER: Okay, So here is my thing, he counted the traffic, which included the
buses.

Right, Mr. Disario?

STEVEN MORLINO: That's not what my question is.

BOARD PLANNER: I'm not trying to -excuse me, give me a minute.

So, Mr. Disario, you counted the
traffic which included the buses, correct?

DAN DISARIO: Yes.
BOARD PLANNER: You just don't have a dissemination between cars, trucks, buses, et cetera, right?

DAN DISARIO: Correct.

BOARD PLANNER: But you counted the
buses in your traffic count?

DAN DISARIO: Yes.

BOARD PLANNER: So what exactly is it
that you are looking for?

I'm just asking because what difference
does it make --

STEVEN MORLINO: It makes a big
difference.

BOARD PLANNER: -- if it's a car, a
bus, whatever? I'm just saying --

STEVEN MORLINO: Excuse me, would you
let me testify? I was asking --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Excuse me. Both
of you -- both of you need to allow each other to
speak.
So you've asked a question,
Mr. Morlino; the answer was they didn't do it. So
now --
STEVEN MORLINO: Okay. Well, I have a
follow-up.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: -- now if you
could explain why you believe that's relevant.
STEVEN MORLINO: I believe that's
relevant because the number of tractor-trailers in
relation to the number of school buses has a direct
relationship to the safety of travel of students and
children on school buses going past these
warehouses. That's what my concern is.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
STEVEN MORLINO: Okay? And I would
think that the traffic study -- now, I'm going to
ask a follow-up question.

BOARD PLANNER: Hold on. Hold on. STEVEN MORLINO: Yeah, go ahead.

BOARD PLANNER: Mr. Disario, can you respond to that concern with respect to the number
of buses versus, quote/unquote, tractor-trailers and the safety?

DAN DISARIO: There's no direct correlation between the number of tractor-trailers and the number of buses as it relates to traffic engineering practices.

BOARD PLANNER: Thank you.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
So, Mr. Morlino, your next point?
STEVEN MORLINO: Okay. My next point is I understood that Mr. Chen, I believe is his name, that works for CME Associates, is working on behalf of the planning board; is that correct?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: That's correct, yes.

STEVEN MORLINO: Okay. So can
Mr. Chen address this issue of school buses. And is there a written report from Mr. Chen that $I$ can review? I haven't seen that; maybe $I$ haven't looked in the right place.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I think
Mr. Chen's -- Mr. Chen's analysis was included in the general engineering report, Laura.

BOARD ENGINEER: Yes, that's correct.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Mr.

Chen -- where is Mr. Chen.
BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: I'm right here.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: There he is.
Okay, Mr. Chen, can you respond to both Mr. Morlino and Mr. Disario.

BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: Yes. So in
reviewing the traffic report $I$ did not see a specific breakdown of buses versus tractor-trailers that Mr. Morlino is looking for.

I have not seen so far in any previous traffic studies that $I$ have reviewed --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, they have admitted to that. I guess the real question is what, if any, significance do you find in that?

BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: Significance in? I'm sorry.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you feel that the report is flawed or incomplete in some way because it did not break that specific ratio down individually?

BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: No. I do not believe that the traffic report is flawed.

From all the traffic reports that $I$ reviewed in the past and the traffic reports that $I$
have written, it has been very rare that $I$ have seen or done a ratio between tractor-trailers and buses as Mr. Morlino has --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So why is the analysis that was provided adequate in terms of you know, it having taken into account buses? Why is this acceptable for you?

BOARD TRAFFIC ENGINEER: The traffic
analysis is acceptable to me because Mr. Disario reviewed the -- reviewed the counts going up and down Fairfield Road in the vicinity of the -- in the vicinity of the site. The traffic data was captured within the last couple of years. I did not see any deficiencies in the data in the approach that Mr. Disario took. I didn't see any deficiencies in how Mr. Disario applied the existing volumes through the no-build volumes and took representations of the site traffic.

I didn't see any -- I didn't see or hear any deficiencies that caught my attention with regards to his traffic testimony. I do not see anything that -- out of the ordinary in this traffic study.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Morlino, do you have any other questions for Mr. Chen.

STEVEN MORLINO: Yeah, I just want to reiterate that $I$ didn't say the study was flawed; what I'm saying is maybe the study isn't as comprehensive as it should be.

We have two schools directly down the road from where those major warehouses and major truck traffic is going to be transgressing[sic] up and down Fairfield Road, and $I$ have concern about the safety of children. Children are our biggest asset in any community; they're the future and I want to watch out for them.

So I would appreciate, maybe the traffic engineers on this study should report back to the association and say that there should be some consideration for buses transporting children to and from school going down major roadways like this, especially Fairfield Road, which someone alluded to it floods all the time. I have seen that all the time and it's a very narrow road.

BOARD PLANNER: Okay, so that's it for tractor-trailers.

So, Mr. Disario, should the board act in the affirmative -- and I'm not opining whether they would or not -- if they do opine, would you be willing to take a harder look at the timing of the
tractor-trailer versus the school buses and -- as a condition of approval, and submit that to CME for their review and approval?

DAN DISARIO: Yes.
BOARD PLANNER: Okay, thank you.
STEVEN MORLINO: Okay. I guess that answers my immediate questions. I just, again, want to reiterate that the board is voting on something that $I$ don't believe they have complete information in order to make a real determination as to the safety both of the UST's and school buses going up and down this property.

So thank you very much. Have a great evening.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Good night.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, do we have anyone else, Eileen?

BOARD SECRETARY: Yes, S. Johnsen.
They're in now.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, we just need you to unmute yourself.

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

RICHARD JOHNSEN: I do.

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

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Richard Johnsen, R-I-C-H-A-R-D, J-O-H-N-S-E-N. 302 Baker Road.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Go ahead,
Mr. Johnsen.
RICHARD JOHNSEN: My first question is -- my property is right up against the proposed site here. My question is the berm height; what is going to be the height of the berm before the wall is installed on it, if you guys install the wall, which you said you might do?

JEROMIE LANGE: It's going to be total combined height of berm and wall of 15 feet.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: I got that. What is the berm height itself?

JEROMIE LANGE: That's going to vary
along the property line.
RICHARD JOHNSEN: Okay. Do you know
what the grade of slope of the berm is going to be --

JEROMIE LANGE: It will not exceed 3
to 1 .
RICHARD JOHNSEN: -- facing Baker
Road?

JEROMIE LANGE: It will not exceed 3 to 1.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Okay. And what type or erosion remediation do they have in place for that?

JEROMIE LANGE: We will meet the state soil erosion and sediment control standards.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Okay, here is my concern. Baker Road is an unpaved road. It's a sandy road. Any runoff off your berm is going to erode my road, which is a private road.

How are we going to prevent that from happening?

JEROMIE LANGE: The berm is not going to generate additional runoff.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: It won't? Okay.
All right, another question $I$ have. Our mailboxes, the three residents that live on Baker Road, are on the southern edge of your property, on the corner of Fairfield and Baker Road. They're there because the United States Postal Service demanded they were there.

Are they going to remain there?
Because $I$ see that part of your site plan is where the mailboxes are.

JEROMIE LANGE: I'm not sure exactly where your mailboxes are.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Right on your property and Baker Road.

JEROMIE LANGE: They may have to move back -- if they're on the frontage of our site, we are doing a widening of Fairfield Road from basically the southern edge of this site and the site across the street, all the way to Route 33 .

So if they're right on the edge of the existing road, depending where they are, they may have to be relocated because that widening would, you know, need to move them, obviously.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Right, they'll have to move, the postal service. That's why I'm asking that question.

Another question $I$ have, the sewers you put in down Fairfield Road to your property, the road was torn up and haphazardly patched. There's a sinkhole developing right now in front of your property from the construction.

Do you know when that will be repaved and who will repair that? Or is that going to be per the taxpayers to fix that?

JEROMIE LANGE: No, we, as a developer
of not only this project but the others, are actually bringing significant public infrastructure to this whole area at our cost. So this is a huge benefit for the township.

One of the things we have committed to do is, once all of the construction is done on Fairfield Road, we are going to repave, mill and lay over the entirety of Fairfield Road, from Adelphia all the way to 33. So at the end of the day this will be a brand new road for you.

I know I heard earlier about the drainage issues. Those are also in the process of being addressed. It's not all completed yet, but when it is the drainage will function much better in the area of Fairfield, as well.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Right, you say at the end of the day, but the problem is that temporary patching that you have done, that your contractors have done, is deteriorating quite rapidly. You have a sink hole forming. And our vehicles are taking a beating on that, and it's at our cost to fix that.

Are you going to fix our vehicles for us while your temporary patches deteriorate and nobody keeps up on that?

JEROMIE LANGE: Well, I can't speak to exactly where you're talking about. Feel free to contact the township if you believe that the road is in some way not the way it should be and they can certainly evaluate that.

But the temporary patches is done on purpose, because you want settlement and things like that to happen before you put the final asphalt in. So that's the whole reason there.

You know, if there's a significant issue and it's more like a pothole then, you know, that should be taken care of. But please, I'm not aware of that, but if that's existing out there, then definitely raise that with the township and they'll certainly have us fix that.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Well, it's right in front of your property so, you know, anybody that goes to your property sees it so.

BOARD PLANNER: Well, they're not -they're a contract purchaser so it's not their property yet.

So they have committed to addressing any issues moving forward. If there's existing issues, you need to take that up with the township.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Okay. I have another
question too. When you're in construction and you're pouring, is that pouring going to be done during the day or at night?

JEROMIE LANGE: I can't speak to that right now. We'll certainly follow all the relevant ordinances and all. And there's pre-construction meetings that happen with the town once we have selected a contractor, so all that will be worked out.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I believe there's
a local ordinance that talks about the hours that the construction can happen.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Well the reason why

I bring that up is because the warehouse that is being currently built across the street, this past summer they were pouring all night long, starting at 3:30 in the morning.

And I called the township several
times. I have several case numbers involved. And I sent several emails to the township, as well, and nobody from the township had the courtesy to even respond to emails.

BOARD PLANNER: So that's a township issue. I understand your concern and it's a valid concern, but it's not this board's. We don't have
the jurisdiction to handle it.
RICHARD JOHNSEN: I'm bringing this issue up for this current warehouse people right now.

BOARD PLANNER: I understand.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: That's why I'm asking, what is expected here; would you expect it to be hearing equipment running all night?

Because right now $I$ hear the generators running across the street right now. You know, it's all about the noise and, you know, nobody really seems to care about what everybody else has to deal with, you know, just get the warehouse built.

The driveways and signage, you know, to really stress that right-out only to 33, that would be great because we all know that truck drivers don't necessarily read signs all the time.

I see it on Howell Road, Five Points Road, you know, you have semis pulling out with multiple signs "Left-Turn Only." They don't read signs. They don't care about signs. It's all about getting to their next stop as quickly as possible.

So if that could be stressed, that would be great.

BOARD PLANNER: We will definitely
pass that onto the township for sure.
RICHARD JOHNSEN: All right.
And someone brought up before about the trucks coming down from Adelphia Road down Fairfield and, you know, the traffic study said, well, no trucks would come in that way.

How is that going to be guaranteed that no truck would come that way?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well that's -they have answered that question. And, like I said, it may not be an answer to the public's satisfaction or even the board's satisfaction, but they have answered it.

RICHARD JOHNSEN: Okay. All right, I guess that's all right now.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Johnsen.

Okay, who else do we have, Eileen? BOARD SECRETARY: KL.

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

You have to take yourself off mute.
KATHY LOSCHE: Hi. Can you hear me?

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

KATHY LOSCHE: I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Please state and spell your name and give us your address.

KATHY LOSCHE: My name is Kathy Losche, K-A-T-H-Y, L-O-S-C-H-E. I live at 1 Vicksburg Court, which my side wall is on Fairfield Road.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, go ahead, ma'am.

KATHY LOSCHE: I just wanted to just more of a statement than a question, I guess. I understand that the board is not concerned about traffic, only ingress and egress but --

AtTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, no, I wouldn't say that it's not concerned but it's limited by the law.

KATHY LOSCHE: Okay. Right, but if Mr. Disario only did his traffic study from 33 to the warehouse then the traffic study, I believe, is incomplete because being -- my window being against Fairfield Road I see the traffic.

And I'm not just concerned with
tractor-trailers, I'm also concerned with the passenger cars that is going to add to the traffic, for the people that are working at these warehouses and offices.

So I would just ask the board to please consider that the traffic study is incomplete if the entire road was not studied, just like some of my other --

BOARD PLANNER: What I think Mr. Cucchiaro reiterated was that our jurisdiction as a permitted use is only the ingress and egress.

KATHY LOSCHE: Right.
BOARD PLANNER: So if that was studied, where the trucks are coming from and we're they're going to, is not incomplete; it's ingress and egress to the site, period, is it safe. Right?

KATHY LOSCHE: Okay, but - -
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I think we -- I think we understand the comment as to why you believe that ingress and egress wasn't adequately studied or it was incompletely studied. The board will take that into consideration.

KATHY LOSCHE: Right.
And also, $I$ know you're not going to let tractor-trailers make a left out of the
warehouses, but passenger cars, it's been stated, can make a left. So, again, that increases the study going in the other direction towards Adelphia Road. And if that piece of the road has not been studied then it still is ingress and egress.

BOARD ENGINEER: That's inaccurate.

That's inaccurate.

Mr. Disario, perhaps you can talk
about how your study -- $\quad$ know you testified to this previously. I'm assuming this member of the public was not on or did not hear it.

But your study was not limited to just 33, so maybe you could just talk about the intersections specifically that were studied.

DAN DISARIO: We looked along the Fairfield Road corridor, from Adelphia all the way to Park Avenue, and everything in between along Fairfield Road. So Bennett Road; Baker Road; the proposed site driveways; both eastbound and westbound Route 33 ramps; as well as the Park Avenue and Brickyard Road intersections.

KATHY LOSCHE: Okay. But I thought it was stated before that all the tractor-trailers are going to be coming from 33 and none of them are going to be coming from Adelphia Road.

DAN DISARIO: That's --
KATHY LOSCHE: But also cars are
coming from Adelphia Road. I thought that was -wasn't that what you said earlier? I think it was to Mr. Greenfield.

DAN DISARIO: Yes, we've accounted for cars associated with this proposed warehouse coming to and from Adelphia Road in our study.

KATHY LOSCHE: Okay. But I thought
before you stated that was not studied.
DAN DISARIO: No, ma'am, it was
studied, from Adelphia all the way to Park Avenue.
KATHY LOSCHE: Okay, I guess I misheard it.

So but anyone is going to be able -so the tractor-trailers are only going to be able to egress right, but any other person that is in a passenger car or a smaller box truck will be able to make a left out of the warehouse and drive down Fairfield Road increasing traffic in that direction -DAN DISARIO: Yes.

KATHY LOSCHE: -- is that correct?
DAN DISARIO: Yes, ma'am.
KATHY LOSCHE: So my window is going
to be -- and my way out -- so as it is, sometimes
making a left out of Fairfield Road can be difficult, especially because of that curb and people going faster on that curb.

So that's going to increase by hundreds of cars per day?

BOARD PLANNER: I don't think that's
what he said, but I'll leave that to Mr. Disario.
DAN DISARIO: Just give me one minute, please.

BOARD PLANNER: And, by the way, the site is zoned, like, SED. So whether it's a warehouse or not, there is an ability -- there's an ability for them to develop it.

So regardless of whether it's a warehouse or not, traffic was anticipated in the zoning of the property. So it's not going to be nothing, just so you know.

I'm just putting that out there.
KATHY LOSCHE: Right. But, you know, it's a tiny road and it's already --

BOARD PLANNER: I understand that.
But $I$ have to warn you it's a tiny road that has a piece of property that is developable.

And if he is saying the trucks are going the other way and passenger cars are going
your way, I'm not understanding what exactly it is --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, the resident has placed her --

BOARD PLANNER: I understand.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: -- objections on the record.

BOARD PLANNER: I understand, Ron, but
I think --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: We understand you're not clear on it.

And we understand your questions; the board understands. It will take everything into account.

KATHY LOSCHE: Thank you.
I'm just asking that you could consider
us. I know a lot of people have said the same thing and I'm just trying to -- you're saying that you won't listen -- not that you won't listen to, but that ingress and egress is what you can concern yourself with. So I'm asking you to, please, think about these things and how it is affecting all of us on these roads.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, thank you. KATHY LOSCHE: Thank you.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Eileen, anyone
else?
BOARD SECRETARY: Lu Wang.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, I just need you to unmute yourself.

LU WANG: Okay. Can you hear me now?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yes, we can.
LU WANG: Okay, good.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you either swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

LU WANG: Yes, I do.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. Please
state and spell your name and give us your address.
LU WANG: My name is Lu, last name is Wang, $\mathrm{W}-\mathrm{A}-\mathrm{N}-\mathrm{G}$.

Video, how can I?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. And your address, sir?

LU WANG: Address is Number 2
Statesboro Road, Freehold.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: All right. Go ahead, Mr. Wang.

LU WANG: How can $I$ get the video? My
video has stopped looks like.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I'm sorry?
LU WANG: Okay. Can you see my -- can
you see my -- my video?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: We can hear you. CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: We can hear you. LU WANG: That's odd.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: We can hear you, so if you want to ask any questions, go ahead.

LU WANG: Yeah, I have two questions.
Yeah, but somehow you can't see my image.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: It's okay, go
ahead and ask your questions.
LU WANG: Okay, two questions, I'm going to make two points.

One is I'm living Number 2 Statesboro Road, which is on the north side of Fairfield Road. During last summer's construction we got very bad -- very bad noise. And also the vibration, when they're doing construction, they fix something on the road, on the Fairfield Road. After that they -they didn't pave that road correctly. And every day we suffered a lot of construction trucks driving on Fairfield Road and also heavy trucks. So that make my house like a minor earthquake every day. I could
see my decorations in my house, that was shaking. And also, my house got a crack.

I was trying to show you my -- the wall, but somehow the video is not showing; $I$ can't show you the crack on my wall.

So I'm technically, yeah, seeking for a solution on that. There is no reason for me to suffer that. My wall was cracking; it got it from inside and outside after the construction.

Because we move -- when we move in this address in 2021. Before that we did a full-house inspection. There was no anything like that. But during the summer, last summer, we got that.

So I'll find out a way, either township or the construction company, or somebody need to fix my house. All right? This is the first issue I'm raising that.

Because I made a -- I've got a video showing that how -- even right now --

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: ROn.

LU WANG: -- even tomorrow --
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Excuse me one
second, sir.
LU WANG: -- we have heavy trucks
driving on the road.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Excuse me one second, sir.

LU WANG: Right.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Ron, is there anything...

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: That issue doesn't have to do -- that issue doesn't have to do with this application.

LU WANG: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: To the extent
that --
LU WANG: Okay, I'm going to --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, sir, to the extent that there is something, I mean, certainly you have all legal remedies, you know -- you know, to whoever has caused, you know, potential damage to your home but that's -- this board can't help you with that.

LU WANG: Okay. Right, right, right, yes. And that's my first point, okay. I need to find solution on that. Yeah, if somebody could help me, okay, go ahead. I just need to find solution, I don't care what solution is.

My second point is the south part of Fairfield Road, if you drive on this road you can
see that the mailbox is like feet -- couple feet away from the road. And the house is like 10 feet away from that, from the road. When you finish the new construction, finish the new warehouse, and also, yeah, we have -- we can see that there's another warehouse almost finished. When they finish that and there's another one, it's annoy.

So when two warehouses is finished I don't know how many tractor-trailers, like 18-wheelers, is going to drive on this road. It's going to drive on this road.

With that traffic we have, like 10 feet away from the road, we have, you know, a lot of little kids on this road. And also there's this elementary school on the end of this road. If there's, you know, information how many traffic is going to drive on this road, and how many damage is going to cost by this traffic.

It's similar as my situation. My
situation is, you know, just last summer, you're doing the construction, damage to my house. When you finish the two warehouses, you know, I don't know how many trucks is going to drive on this road, it's going to make more damage on the houses along this road.

Have you considered about that?
If you didn't consider about that, if
you haven't, yeah, did any -- I mean, if you haven't
done any estimate, you better do this now. Okay?
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: This has been
answered a few times tonight already.
LU WANG: Okay. So how many trucks -how many more trucks are you going to drive when you finish? When you finish the two warehouses?

BOARD PLANNER: There's a traffic study associated with the application. Have you looked at it?

LU WANG: I did. And also I heard that from last meeting.

BOARD PLANNER: Okay. So you heard something about it that you're questioning?

LU WANG: Yeah, my question is for those traffic, add those traffic on this road, it's going to damage more houses along this road.

BOARD PLANNER: That's a statement not a question, right?

LU WANG: My question is --
Attorney Cucchiaro: Now, Mr. Wang, you're permitted to make a statement. But if there's a question associated with it?

LU WANG: Yeah, here's my question.
If something happens on this road, either -- my kids play on the road. We get a lot of heavy truck on this road. And the elementary school kids play somehow, yeah, the kids, you know, they may come out from school. If so many traffic, I mean so many big trucks driving on this road add more traffic on this road, what happens if that happen?

Have you think about --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: First of all,
they have testified as to the safety, but if something, you know, just like any other personal injury, if something happens, people have legal remedies against those that caused it.

LU WANG: But --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: But from an engineering standpoint they have provided the testimony; they have said that it meets all the legal criteria.

LU WANG: Right. Okay.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: And recall, too, we are improving the road, we are widening the road, and it's not going to be the same road as, you know, in the past.

LU WANG: Here is my question on this
road. Have you planned -- do any choice to get control on those heavy trucks go to the south part of Fairfield Road? I mean have you had any -- has any plan to do that?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: We've already testified and agreed to the conditions to what we're going to do with respect to trucks leaving the site going south on Fairfield Road.

LU WANG: Okay, yeah, because as I know, if you go to the Route 9 North, there's no access from --

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: We've already -we've already agreed as a condition with the trucks going --

LU WANG: Right, right.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: -- they will only be able to make a right out and going onto Route 33 .

LU WANG: Right. If somebody make a -- trying to go to Route 9 North, they probably go through the Fairfield Road south and turn on the -on the Route 524.

BOARD PLANNER: They did indicate that that's not what they're anticipating; they're anticipating pushing the trucks north to 33 .

So $I$ don't know what exactly it is you
want them to say. They've already agreed that the trucks are going to go to Route 33 .

So, like, is there something else
beyond this that you want?
LU WANG: Right, that's my -- my
questioning. Also the suggestion -
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Sir, sir, they've answered this multiple times.

LU WANG: This is the question, you have to think about the Adelphia Road. If somebody go to south of Fairfield Road --

BOARD PLANNER: Mr. Wang, hold on.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Hold on, Jen.

Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: We have gone
through this multiple times.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Again, I'm not
asking anybody to like the answer or to accept the answer, but the answer has been given.

LU WANG: The answer, I heard about the answer last time and when $I$ came to the meeting, but I didn't get a chance to speak. But I heard that somebody gave the solution on that, gave an
answer on that --

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: We have been
through this a few times tonight.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So if you want to make a statement about how you feel about the application, you know, you are certainly entitled to do that, but they've have answered that question several times now.

LU WANG: Okay. Yeah, even if you have answer on that, but $I$ don't think that their solution --

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: You may not like the answer, but the question has been answered.

LU WANG: Okay. I understand you have answered, but $I$ don't think the answer has a solution --

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Well, you've made your statement to the board. You've made your statement to the board.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gianetti --
LU WANG: Yeah, I will, I will do that because the traffic to the south part of the Fairfield Road --

BOARD PLANNER: Okay, hold on.
LU WANG: -- is going to be heavy.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Sir, please.
LU WANG: It's going to be affect our life.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Sir, we
understand. Okay, you have made your point perfectly clear and the board has heard you.

Do you have anything else that you would like to say?

LU WANG: Okay, that's two points, one is my damage. One is the future, yeah, the solution on the traffic on the south part of the Fairfield Road.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
LU WANG: Yeah, I mean the township -CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.

LU WANG: -- involved.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: I appreciate that.
ATtORNEY CUCChIARO: Sir, sir, they've
answered both of those, maybe not to your liking, but do you have any other points or any other testimony that you would like to give us?

LU WANG: No, that's the two points I give.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Thank you very
much.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Thank you.
LU WANG: Thank you.
BOARD SECRETARY: I have Marc Parisi
coming in.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, do you
swear --
MARC PARISI: How are you doing,
everybody?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Do you swear or affirm the testimony you are about to give this board is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

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

MARC PARISI: Marc Parisi, M-A-R-C, P-A-R-I-S-I, 2 Castle Court, Howell, New Jersey.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay, go ahead, Mr. Parisi.

MARC PARISI: All right. My first question is how many traffic reports were submitted by this applicant in connection with this application?

> ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Disario?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Mr. Disario?

DAN DISARIO: One.
MARC PARISI: Because on the document distribution Number 4 it lists that there's a traffic statement dated April 29th, 2022, and it appears that that pertains for another project on Victory Road.

I just want to know why is it listed in the document distributions for this application?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: That might have been by error. We don't put them up in the distribution.

MARC PARISI: Was there not another traffic statement that was provided by this applicant in connection with this application that was not made public?

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: No.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Everything that
the applicant submitted was made public.
MARC PARISI: Okay. So that was in error that a traffic study for Victory Road was included in the document distribution for this application?

BOARD SECRETARY: Can $I$ answer that?
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yes, go ahead.

BOARD SECRETARY: Yeah, that was submitted with their paperwork for that document distribution, and $I$ informed them at the time that that traffic report was not for that application, but because it was submitted I included it. That's why it's there.

ATtORNEY GIANETTI: Thanks, Eileen. BOARD SECRETARY: You're welcome.

MARC PARISI: So when I looked at the original traffic report that was submitted with this application it relies upon the traffic study or references the traffic study that was done for the Rock Solid project by McDonough \& Rea, dated December 4th, 2019 .

Mr. Disario, is that correct, that your traffic study references and relies upon the McDonough \& Rea study for Rock Solid?

DAN DISARIO: Yes.
MARC PARISI: Okay. Can you tell me how many total vehicle trips in a 24 -hour period was projected for the Rock Solid project?

DAN DISARIO: No.
MARC PARISI: But you relied upon that study. So, I mean, you don't know how many vehicle trips are projected for the Rock Solid project?

DAN DISARIO: I do not. I only know
their peak hour traffic.
MARC PARISI: Do you feel that data
would be pertinent to this?
BOARD PLANNER: Mr. Parisi, can you give me one second?

Did you anticipate the traffic associated with that application in your analysis?

DAN DISARIO: Yes.
BOARD PLANNER: So I'm not
understanding why you're having trouble answering his questions. Like, did you -- you anticipated traffic associated with that application in your analysis, so why not just answer his questions? I don't get it.

DAN DISARIO: I am answering the question. And --

ATtORNEY GIANETTI: I think he did.
DAN DISARIO: Hold on a second.
-- the Rock Solid application provided data for peak hour trip generation associated with that application.

The traffic study and analysis of intersections and operation are based on peak hour data. I have the peak hour data for the Rock Solid
application.
The question was, do you know how much
traffic the Rock Solid would generate for 24-hours --

BOARD PLANNER: Fair enough.
DAN DISARIO: -- I do not know.

BOARD PLANNER: Fair enough. Fair
enough. Fair enough.

But you took the overall traffic into
your -- into consideration in your analysis, yes?
DAN DISARIO: Absolutely, as I
testified to numerous times.

BOARD PLANNER: Fair enough. Fair
enough.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. But go
ahead, Mr. Parisi.
MARC PARISI: We don't know what the overall traffic is; we only know what the a.m. and p.m. peak is. So, obviously, traffic is a data-driven analysis so --

BOARD PLANNER: But, Mr. Parisi --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, let's just let Mr. Parisi finish, and then we can address, you know, all of his points at one time.

Go ahead, Mr. Parisi.

MARC PARISI: Well, I would just submit to the board that if this applicant is relying upon a traffic study in connection with an adjacent property in which a warehouse project, nonetheless, that's of 368,000 square feet and their -- this project is projecting that there's going to be a total of 860 daily trips, 300 of which are going to be tractor-trailers, 550 of which are going to be vehicles, and we don't know what the 24 -hour trip totals are for that adjacent property, that the data that they're providing to you for this application, cumulative with the data for the Rock Solid project, $I$ don't know how we can actually come up with the reliable estimate of the impacts on Fairfield Road and Route 33 without knowing exactly what the 24 -hour volumes are going to be for Rock Solid.

BOARD PLANNER: So, Mr. Disario, do you typically evaluate the impacts 24 hours or do you typically evaluate the impact for the peak hour?

DAN DISARIO: Peak hour.
BOARD PLANNER: Okay. So - -
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And, Jen, if I could just come in, when you say "you," you're not speaking about you, individually; you're talking
about what the normal practice is for traffic professionals, correct?

BOARD PLANNER: Yes, I apologize.
Correct.
DAN DISARIO: The standard traffic engineering practice to analyze traffic generation is based on peak hour volumes.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And that's
something we would find in the ITE also?
DAN DISARIO: ITE, NJDOT and other jurisdictions, yes.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay. I just wanted to clarify that.

Go ahead, Jen.
BOARD PLANNER: I'm sorry, Ron. So when you're opining about the peak hour impact of this particular application, you have incorporated all these other applications into your analysis in the peak hour, correct?

DAN DISARIO: Yes.
BOARD PLANNER: So, therefore, there's nothing that has been left out, quote/unquote, of your peak hour analysis of this particular application?

DANIEL DISARIO: Correct.

BOARD PLANNER: Okay. Thank you very much.

DAN DISARIO: You're welcome.
MARC PARISI: But, Mr. Disario, I mean
the peak hour volumes is just a snapshot of that particular time of day; that one hour in the morning and that one hour in the evening. If there are other projects that are all operational at a 24-hour basis and you have, you know, trucks that are going to leave, you know, your warehouse, the warehouse at Rock Solid, and the warehouse on Stavola, you know, say between 11:00 a.m. and 12:00 p.m. and, you know, there just happens to be a heavy volume during that hour, you know, or like, you know, that's not a peak hour, is it not possible that there is going to be queuing and a traffic problem that could arise if trucks from different projects were to all be leaving their sites or arriving at their sites at a time outside of a peak hour of traffic?

DAN DISARIO: No.
MARC PARISI: That's not possible?
DAN DISARIO: No.
BOARD PLANNER: If that was an issue
would that be considered the peak for that particular use? And, therefore, considering it's
not the peak for that use, that's why you didn't analyze that?

DAN DISARIO: Yes, I think that's a fair statement. And there is no question that the volumes in this area see their highest hourly totals during typical morning commute times and typical afternoon commute times.

BOARD PLANNER: And that's when you really want to evaluate the roads, right, because that's when it could potentially be impactful for other people?

DANIEL DISARIO: Correct. And we have assumed not only for our application that its highest volumes are occurring at those same peak hours, but all the other applications along Fairfield Road as well.

BOARD PLANNER: I understand. I'm just asking -- I'm just getting clarification for everyone.

DAN DISARIO: Yep.
BOARD PLANNER: So you evaluated the potential impact of all of your use, plus other uses that have the potential to put traffic on the road at that same peak time. And, therefore, your opinion is that, you know, there is no -- whatever
impact you've evaluated has incorporated those things in that peak hour, correct?

DAN DISARIO: Correct.
BOARD PLANNER: Okay, thank you.
DAN DISARIO: You're welcome.
MARC PARISI: So it's not possible that there could be any problems with ingress or egress if a higher volume of tractor-trailers were to leave all three of these warehouses at the same particular, like, you know, 10 or 15 -minute time to go north on Fairfield Road to 33; that there couldn't be any congestion or queuing that would create an unsafe condition?

DAN DISARIO: Correct.
MARC PARISI: It's your testimony that it's not possible that would ever happen?

DAN DISARIO: Yes.
MARC PARISI: Okay.
In the report for the traffic study for McDonough \& Rea, dated December 4, 2019, for Rock Solid, did they recommend any improvements to the on- or off-ramps from Fairfield Road to Route 33?

DAN DISARIO: I don't have that study with me, but $I$ am aware that there were improvements associated with that application. And there were
improvements made as part of that application to the
eastbound and westbound ramps.

BOARD PLANNER: Would that have
improved or impeded your analysis?

DAN DISARIO: It improved. And those improvements were made to facilitate truck turning at those exit ramps --

BOARD PLANNER: Thank you.
DAN DISARIO: -- both westbound -you're welcome -- and eastbound.

MARC PARISI: Okay. So I have that study up here in front of me. And I'm surprised you don't have that study since you relied upon it with your study, but on Page 5 of that study it says:
"Fairfield Road and Site Access. A preliminary geometric analysis was conducted of the Fairfield Road intersections north of the site to access the intersection geometry to accommodate large wheelbase vehicles and the analysis revealed the following:
"Number one, the Route 33 eastbound off-ramp curb return at Fairfield Road will have to be enlarged to accommodate right-turning vehicles.
"Number 2, the Fairfield Road median at

Route 33 Business intersection will have to be modified to accommodate trucks from the Route 33 Business eastbound approach turning left to Fairfield Road southbound."

So it's your testimony, Mr. Disario, that these improvements were already made; and can our board professionals confirm that?

DAN DISARIO: Yes, those improvements were made. And I have been out to the field several times and $I$ confirmed that, indeed, those improvements were made.

MARC PARISI: Can our board professionals confirm that?

BOARD ENGINEER: We are not inspecting nor are we responsible for those improvements, so I would have to follow up and confirm that with the DOT.

I have no reason to doubt Mr. Disario's word. Certainly it would be tied to any co that would be issued, because it was a requirement of the Rock Solid development, but we're not responsible for overseeing the DOT work.

MARC PARISI: So if these improvements have not yet been made --
BOARD PLANNER: That would impact
resolution compliance on a number of applications.
MARC PARISI: Okay.

BOARD PLANNER: So if they weren't made, then a number of other applications that were relying upon those improvements to have been made would not get their COs.

So if they got their CO's, then we're assuming that those improvements have been made.

But, yes, it is all, you know -- we are only able to impose restrictions locally with compliance on DOT. If the DOT made the improvements, then we're going to release it.

So, like Laura said, if the improvements were not made, then the other applications would not be able to CO. So, similar to this, if they're not there, then we wouldn't be able to sign-off on this.

MARC PARISI: Okay, thank you.
Can I ask the applicant's planner a question about any proposals for other types of projects at this site?

BOARD PLANNER: What does that mean?

MARC PARISI: Well, $I$ know that the property submitted a proposal for a residential project with affordable housing on this site.

BOARD PLANNER: So that's not what is before us.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, I can
handle that. The only thing a board can look at is this particular application, whether this particular application complies or does not comply with the ordinance.

They could have dozens of other things they looked at, but we're limited to looking at this.

MARC PARISI: Okay. All right, that's all the questions that $I$ have for you guys tonight. And I appreciate you answering my questions.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Thank you,
Mr. Parisi.
Eileen, do we have anyone else?
BOARD SECRETARY: There's two hands raised; they're both people that have spoken previously.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chairman, it's --

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: No. We have listened to -- a lot of this has been repeat testimony already so...

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: There are no new
hands, Eileen?
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: No, no new hands. ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.

So, Mr. Chairman, do you want to close the public?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yeah, we're going to close the public.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Okay.
Mr. Gianetti, do you have any closing comments?

AtTORNEY GIANETTI: Sure, just
briefly. And thank you, Chairman, Members of the Board and professionals, for your time, both at the February 2 nd meeting and this meeting to present the case.

Just to recap again, you know, the location, as previously indicated, was identified for it being a permitted use in the zone and its location to Route 33, and why they thought it was appropriate. It conforms to all zoning standards with respect to, you know, bulk, size, intensity.

There are a few minor waivers being sought, which have already been discussed and addressed at the prior meetings.

The board may recall, you know, there's
essentially a conflict in the ordinance where there was a provision that required or stated that the Planning Board may approve a driveway width over 24 feet, but then there's a separate --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, we
previously opined on that, Mr. Gianetti, that the proposed driveway complied with the ordinance requirement.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Okay. And then, again, $I$ guess for the board, there was the board professionals' comment that, I guess with respect to the loading dock and the lighting plan, we had a plan that did conform. And both the board professionals, $I$ think, agreed with our professionals that the landscaping at the loading dock did not make sense for a variety of reasons, including the maintenance and upkeep, and suggested the waiver; same with the waiver for the lighting plan, the alternative lighting plan that complies with the IES standard as opposed to the ordinance standard.

So I guess we would request the board, you know, to grant those waivers in conjunction with both our professional testimony and the board's own professional testimony. And then the waiver again
for the tree replacement and contribution to the tree fund that was previously discussed. In addition, there were several conditions that we agreed to as part of this application and can be made part of the record and part of any resolution, should the board grant in favor of it.

So we would ask, you know, the board vote in the affirmative both for the site plan approval and the relief that would be necessary to the extent they believe that would be more appropriate with the loading dock and the lighting plan.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: And $I$ think, Mr. Gianetti, and you may have said it, I apologize, but whatever relief may be necessary in conjunction with the sound wall and the conditions that you have agreed to tonight.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Correct.
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Yes, we agreed to the proposed sound wall or the --

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Did you also mention the curbs for the right turn only?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, what he said was all of the conditions that were agreed on the record tonight.

ATTORNEY GIANETTI: We agreed to the condition --

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: It was on my list, just making sure.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Chairman, if
I could?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: I just want to
reiterate, you know, we have heard -- you know, these are applications. They're important applications. They have public notice requirements. The public has come out. The public has, you know, concerns that are very valid and personal to their lives.

The board, however, has laws that strictly confine how we can look at things. And we're limited to following those laws.

So as I stated the law is that we look at whether there has been compliance with the zoning, the site plan and the design criteria ordinances.

This is a permitted use. We actually do not get the opportunity to say to the governing body you got it wrong; we don't think that there should be a warehouse, or any other type of
permitted use here. That's not our job, it's not our purview. We would get reversed in a second if that went to court.

Two, you look at what the requested relief is and make a determination as to whether they've satisfied their criteria.

Three, on traffic, I'm not going to go over it all again, but we are looking at the safety of ingress and egress for traffic. And we've heard both the board's professional traffic engineer, as well as the applicant's traffic engineer, as well as the modifications, you know, to the plan that have been proposed.

> With regard to the environmental
factors having to do with USTs, I will, again, say we went down this exact road with the other application on Howell Road, and Judge Acquaviva stated that, you know, that's something that plays itself out during the process, that we can't, as a board, deny it at this juncture, but to the extent that it may alter the plan in the future, then they have to come back. They have no right to alter the plan on their own because of any, you know, remediation on the site.

So there is going to be, if there is an
approval, a condition -- and they've stated on the record that if there are changes to the plan that they need to come back, but $I$ just want to say very recently the court opined on that with regard to our jurisdiction here.

So with that, $I$ don't know if the board
has any questions, but that's the narrow scope that we have to make a decision tonight.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So if you were to
deny, then it would just be a motion to deny.
If you wanted to give them what they're asking for, it would be a motion to grant

Preliminary and Final Site Plan approval with
ancillary variance and design waiver relief.
If you feel there's not enough information to grant both you could grant only Preliminary, if you wanted.

Those are the three options.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay. So with
that being said $I$ will take a motion.
MEMBER SEAMAN: Well, I have a quick question before we get afar, if you don't mind.

With all the modifications and different ideas that have come before the board
tonight and the things the applicant said they're willing to consider doing, is it something that we need to see as a board again, or is that something our professionals will evaluate and square away?

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: That's your discretion. They could make those changes.

We can't -- professionals can't grant new variances beyond what we've discussed tonight; that they can't do. But they, it's your discretion as to whether making it subject to the review and approval of the board's professionals is enough.

If you want to see that stuff on a revised plan, then you would just grant Preliminary at this juncture, and they would come back and show you all the changes that they made and come back for Final.

BOARD PLANNER: I just want to say that Laura and $I$ are probably good to deal with whatever so don't feel like we're nervous about reviewing and approving whatever it is you want us to approve, we're good with that, if you guys...

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: But just to be clear, you know, it does not involve granting any new relief beyond what was discussed.

BOARD PLANNER: No. 100 percent
agreed, but if you guys --
ATTORNEY GIANETTI: And that they're granting relief necessary for the sound wall.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Most of the --
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Mr. Gianetti, we're discussing amongst the board right now.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Right. The relief we're granting is for something that --

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Yes.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: -- the sound wall
that was asked for.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: That's right.
CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: That would be the only relief we're really granting.

ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: Well, that new relief beyond that they asked for.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: New relief, right.
ATTORNEY CUCCHIARO: So those are the three options. It's to the discretion of the board if you're inclined to approve, whether you're comfortable with Preliminary and Final, with allowing the board's professionals to review, or you would like to see, you know, on a plan how it looks at Final.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: All right. So,
again, $I$ entertain a motion.
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: So I'll chime in, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Okay.
VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: You know, these applications are always, you know, a hot topic in town. And I completely, you know, take into account everything that the public has said. As, you know, Ron, has said numerous times over the years, we're limited to what we can do as members of the Planning Board.

That being said, I am going to make a motion for Preliminary and Final approval on this, taking into account everything that has been discussed tonight.

The environmental, $I$ understand, will be under the jurisdiction of an LSRP from the applicant, who will receive an RAO. You know, if there is further investigation, remediation needs to be done, so be it. The applicant has said that they will get an RAO for the outstanding cases.

The relief would be for the wall that the applicant has said that they will do, you know, as something nice for the neighbors.

So I'm making a motion to approve

Preliminary and Final.
MEMBER SEAMAN: I'll second,

Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Thank you.
MEMBER TALENTE: I'll second.

BOARD SECRETARY: I have a second. I
have a motion and a second.

Mr. Cristiano?

MEMBER CRISTIANO: Yes.

BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Greenfield?

MEMBER GREENFIELD: Yes.

BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Huszar?

VICE-CHAIRMAN HUSZAR: Yes.

BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Seaman?
MEMBER SEAMAN: Yes.

BOARD SECRETARY: Ms. Talente?

MEMBER TALENTE: Yes.

BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Kyle?

MEMBER KYLE: Yes.

BOARD SECRETARY: Mr. Mercer?

MEMBER MERCER: Yes.

BOARD SECRETARY: And

Chairman Boisvert?

CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Yes.

BOARD SECRETARY: Motion carries, the

```
    application is approved.
```

    CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Thank you.
    ATTORNEY GIANETTI: Thank you, board.
    Appreciate the time.
            BOARD SECRETARY: Thank you.
                    CHAIRMAN BOISVERT: Have a good night.
                    (Whereupon, the application is
        concluded and the board continues with agenda.)
                                    - - -
                                    (Time noted, 10:35 p.m.)
                                    * * *
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