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MR. WOLFSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As I indicated, we filed the original application on this matter on January 3, 2020. We attended a Site Plan Review Committee. We received some excellent comments that led to revisions in the plans and the submission on February 7, 2020 revised plans.

We commenced our hearing before this Board on March 3, 2020, and presented testimony from a representative of the Applicant, and we commenced our civil engineering testimony with our project engineer, Patti Ruskan. Both witnesses were subject to questions from the Board and the public at this time.

Following the hearing, the Applicant made substantial modifications to the plans in response to comments from the Board Members and the public and submitted the revised plans on June 26, 2020.

The Applicant next appeared before the Board on July 7th and provided testimony from Richard Preiss, the project planner; and again from Patti Ruskan, the engineer, who discussed the substantial revisions that had been made to the plans. Following that direct testimony, Mr. Preiss and Ms. Ruskan were questioned by the Board and
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members of the public.
The Applicant appeared again before the Planning Board on July 21, at which time Ms. Ruskan completed her direct testimony and reviewed comments received from the Board's engineer, Mr. Hipolit.

Following Ms. Ruskan's testimony, this application was then carried on the record until August 4. The August 4 meeting was postponed due to severe weather, so the Applicant re-noticed for its next appearance before the Board on September 15.

At the September 15 meeting, other applications took up the agenda time, and this application was carried to October 6.

Ms. Ruskan presented two new exhibits at the October 6 meeting, both confirming changes that were advocated by the Board professionals. One was turning restrictions from the project and the addition of a sidewalk along the driveway.

Following an adjournment of the scheduled public hearing on October 26, the Applicant again re-noticed for the public hearing held on December 1. Prior to the December 1 meeting, you'll recall that the Board received correspondence from Mr. Kurshan on behalf of Summit Ridge Condominium Association, dated January 23,

2020, concerning Summit Ridge's allegations that there were D variances needed in conjunction with the application and other objections.

At the December 1 hearing, each of Summit Ridge and the Applicant presented their positions, including planning testimony with respect to Summit Ridge's objections. And Summit Ridge had the opportunity cross-examine Mr. Preiss, the Applicant's planner.

The Board did not render a final decision on the objections at that time as it sought further review and advice from its own professionals.

Following that December 1 hearing, the Applicant received memoranda from the Board Planner, Darlene Green, dated December 14 and December 22, 2020; from the Board Engineer, Andy Hipolit, dated December 16, 2020; and the Board's Attorney, Mr. Regan, dated December 22, 2020; all of whom largely agreed with the Applicant's positions.
Additionally, the Board received a memorandum dated December 17, 2020, from Peter Steck, Summit Ridge's planner, who had testified at that hearing.

The Applicant then appeared before this Board on January 5, 2021, where Summit Ridge 9
continued its jurisdictional objections by presenting testimony of Mr. Steck. Following that testimony, the Board voted to reject Summit Ridge's objections and to allow the Applicant to proceed.

The Applicant's architect, Mr. King, then presented his architectural testimony and discussed the elevations and floor plans for the Board. Mr. King was open to questions from the Board and members of the public at that time.

So thank you for indulging me. It's been a long history. I just wanted to remind everybody where we are.

And by way of further reminder, the Applicant seeks preliminary and final site plan approval to construct a multi-family active adult age-restricted 55-and-over residential community. The Applicant proposes 157 units, reduced from the original proposal of 170 units. Of the 157 units proposed, there will be 97 one-bedroom and 60 two-bedroom. And 24 of the units will be affordable restricted units.

The Applicant, as you recall, proposed to create a walking trail, and that's proposed to be accessed by both Waypoint residents and the general public, together with a gravel parking area for use
by members of the public.
In her latest report, Ms. Green opined that a variance will be necessary to permit public access on the proposed walking trail. In deference to Ms. Green, the Applicant revised its application to seek a C variance to permit public access to the proposed walking trail. Should the Board not act favorably on such a variance, the Applicant will simply remove the proposed public parking lot and prohibit public access to the proposed walking trail, restricting it only to its own residents.

I wanted to take a moment just to remind the Board, since this hearing has been conducted over such an extended period, of what we believe is the most important point of this application. That is that it is an age-restricted 55-and-up upscale rental community which could be confirmed by the recording of a deed restriction. It will not generate school children and will allow Montvale homeowners to downsize and remain in Montvale. And with the realities of affordable housing compliance in New Jersey and the next round of compliance not that far away, God forbid, coming in 2025, it will be less intensive, we believe, than what might well happen on this site if this
low-intensity development does not go forward.
Mr. Chairman, in terms of proceeding tonight, as I indicated in going over the history of what's happened here, we believe that Patti Ruskan closed her testimony and was made available to public questions. I have with me, Cory Chase, my traffic engineer; and Richard Preiss, our project planner. If for some reason the Board feels that Ms. Ruskan needs to present additional testimony, she is on the Zoom with us.

MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, could I ask
Mr. Wolfson a question?
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Sure.
MR. REGAN: Mr. Wolfson, what would be the length of time the age restriction for residents would be in effect? Is there a specific time period?

MR. WOLFSON: I did not discuss that question with my client. I can ask them if they had a limitation in mind and I can circle back here.

MR. REGAN: Well, isn't it true that a developer of this type of a project could eliminate the age restriction convenance, if you will, and convert it to non-age-restricted?

MR. WOLFSON: There was a statute some
time ago that allowed for conversions of what had been age-restricted projects. My vague recollection of that was that that had a time frame in it. And that may have sunsetted by now. In any event, this Applicant would stipulate that they would be bound by that. And believe there's case law that indicates that under those circumstances, the Applicant and successors could be bound to the 55-year restriction.

MR. REGAN: In perpetuity?
MR. WOLFSON: Well, I just got a text, which is our way of communicating with our clients during the age of Zoom, and they indicated they'd be okay with no limit on the length of that restriction and indeed would agree to a deed restriction in perpetuity.

MR. REGAN: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you. MR. KURSHAN: Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Yes. MR. KURSHAN: Just in response to what Mr. Wolfson said, I do not believe that there's been an opportunity to cross-examine Ms. Ruskan with regard to the exhibits she identified on October 6th, with regard to the turning restriction on the
new plan. And just so the record is clear, during the testimony of December 1st, my cross-examination of Mr. Preiss was not completed because the Board at that point believed that it had to address the $D$ variance jurisdictional issue.

Thank you.
MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman, if Mr.
Kurshan has questions limited to the two very narrow exhibits and he'd like to ask Patti Ruskan, I can bring her up. In terms of any questions he has for Mr. Preiss, as I indicated, he will be testifying at the end of our presentation, and he'll certainly have an opportunity to cross him at that time.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Well, before we do that, let's first discuss -- I'm going to go Mr. Hipolit.

Mr. Hipolit, your office prepared technical reviews of the plans as revised and submitted by Patti Ruskan, is that correct?

MR. HIPOLIT: That is correct.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And have those plans been entered into evidence as Board exhibits?

MR. HIPOLIT: That's a good question.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Why don't you first identify your review letters by date, and let's see
if Mr. Wolfson and Mr. Regan and Mr. Kurshan are on the same page with respect to those reviews.

MR. HIPOLIT: What I have are -- the last two letters I have are November 9, 2020, which is really a review of the project that lists in it in appendix -- Exhibit 1, all the plans we reviewed. So that's really three pages of documents. It goes all the way to comment DD, so it goes all the way through $A$ to $Z$ and then up to DD. So were they actually marked as exhibits? It's been such a while, I don't know.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Bob, do your records show in Andy's review letter of 11/9 being marked into evidence?

MR. REGAN: I'm going to look. I have the letter, but it's not shown on my copy of it as being marked.

MR. HIPOLIT: I never testified to it.
MS. HUTTER: I don't have it as marked. The last time thing I have marked is the December 16th.

MR. REGAN: Yeah, that was B-9. I have that.

MR. WOLFSON: So if I might, I think we got waylaid by the 11th hour D variance
discussion. But the November 9, 2020 memorandum from Mr. Hipolit has not been yet marked into the record. In addition, the landscape consultant review memorandum, last revised November 3, 2020, has not. And finally, the updated Fire Department review memo, dated November 16, 2020, has not. So perhaps we can mark those three Board exhibits in if it pleases the Board.

MR. REGAN: I have B-12 as the next
Board exhibit number.
MR. WOLFSON: I do as well, Bob.
MR. REGAN: So that would be B-12 would be 11/9, Mr. Hipolit's letter of 11/9.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: So we're going to mark $11 / 9$ as $\mathrm{B}-12$.
(Exhibit B-12, Review Memorandum of Mr. Hipolit, dated $11 / 9 / 20$, is marked for identification and received into evidence.)

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Now, Andy, do you have anything more recent than $11 / 9$ ?

MR. HIPOLIT: So I had the
December 16th letter, which was a review of the Summit Ridge, and I think you marked it already.
yet to be marked into the record, is that correct?
MR. REGAN: 11/9.
MR. HIPOLIT: 11/9.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I'm sorry. 11/9.
MR. REGAN: I think we just marked it as B-12.

MR. HIPOLIT: There was a letter before it, but it's irrelevant because this letter covers -- that letter and all the comments made the first revision. So this is the letter for engineering on this application.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: So we're going to mark that as B-12.

Then there's a landscape letter of $11 / 3$. Is that Agus letter?

MR. HIPOLIT: It is.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And that has not been marked into evidence, is that correct?

MR. HIPOLIT: Correct.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And, Bob, we're going mark that $B-13$ ?

MR. REGAN: B-13.
(Exhibit B-13, Agus letter, dated $11 / 3 / 21$, is marked for identification and
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received into evidence.)

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Let's move on to planning.

Ms. Green, what are your -- what are
the dates of your technical review letters? And
have they been marked into evidence?
MS. GREEN: So I'll go back to my last full technical review letter, which was dated
October 28, 2020. Then my next letter was an
analysis of the Summit Ridge objections, dated
December 14, 2020. Then I had a review of the Steck
planning memo, dated December 22, 2020, and then the
table that has been distributed tonight to Mr.
Kurshan and Mr. Wolfson.
MR. WOLFSON: The reports that Darlene
just referred to were marked as $B-8$ and $B-11$, respectively.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: That's $12 / 14$ is
$B-8 ?$
MR. REGAN: B-8 was December 14th.
B-11 was December 22nd.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And is that the last Board exhibit, Bob, B-11.

MR. REGAN: Well, the last of Darlene
is $B-11$, right.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Right. But the last Board exhibit was $B-13$ ?

MR. REGAN: B-13, that was Mr. DeBlasio's report.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Why don't we mark Darlene Green's chart as B-14?
(Exhibit B-14, Chart by Ms. Green, is marked for identification and received into evidence.)

MS. GREEN: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure that my October 28th letter, which was the last full technical review, was ever marked.

MR. WOLFSON: There was a Board Planner letter marked as B-2, I have.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Ms. Hutter, what are you showing as $B-2$ ?

MR. REGAN: I might have that. Let me take a look.

MR. WOLFSON: I don't know that we've seen an October one. The B-2 would have predated October.

MR. REGAN: Yeah, it definitely would
21
because --
MR. WOLFSON: That would have predated
October.
I don't believe that we've seen that.
MS. HUTTER: Darlene, the
October 28th, did we ever mark that?
MR. REGAN: I have B-2 as Darlene's
July 7th. That was the first planning report that
was marked. Then I have B-8, Darlene,
December 14th.
MS. HUTTER: What about October 28th?
MS. GREEN: I don't have any notes of it being marked.

MR. REGAN: I don't think that was marked.

MS. HUTTER: It was never marked.
MR. REGAN: Never marked. I mean, I
have $B-1,2,3,4,5$. Those are Hipolit, Green,
Police Department, Fire Department, Triborough;
that's B-1 through 5. B-7 is Andy Hipolit, 12/14.
I don't think it's been marked.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: So, Darlene, with your review letter of $10 / 28$, were your comments and recommendations incorporated on your letter of $12 / 14$ ?

|  | 22 |  | 24 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | THE WITNESS: No. So the two December | 1 | MR. WOLFSON: Yeah, it's an updated |
| 2 | letters were a direct response to the D variance | 2 | review memo. |
| 3 | issues raised by Summit Ridge. Both of those | 3 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And was that marked |
| 4 | letters were solely focused on the arguments put | 4 | into evidence, Mr. Wolfson? |
| 5 | forth about the supposed D variances. | 5 | MR. WOLFSON: I don't show it as being |
| 6 | MR. REGAN: And they were marked as | 6 | marked. I would propose it be marked as B-16. |
| 7 | B-8 and B-11. | 7 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Lorraine or |
| 8 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Correct. So | 8 | Bob, do you have the 11/16 Fire Department? |
| 9 | outstanding is your technical review of 10/28 which | 9 | MR. REGAN: I am looking right now. |
| 10 | was never marked into the record? | 10 | Let me see what I have. |
| 11 | MR. REGAN: I have my copy of the | 11 | MS. HUTTER: I have it, and it is not |
| 12 | October 28th report from Darlene. And normally, I | 12 | arked. |
| 13 | mark the document. It's not marked | 13 | MR. REGAN: I agree. It's not marked. |
| 14 | MS. HUTTER: It's not marked in my | 14 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Why don't we mark |
| 15 | file either | 15 | that one. And I guess that's what, B-15 now? |
| 16 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Wolfson, do you | 16 | MR. REGAN: B-16. |
| 17 | have a copy of that one? | 17 | MS. HUTTER: B-16. |
| 18 | MR. WOLFSON: I do not. | 18 |  |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Kurshan? | 19 | (Exhibit B-16, Fire Department review |
| 20 | MR. KURSHAN: I do not have it. | 20 | memo, dated $11 / 16 / 20$, is marked for |
| 21 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: You do not have | 21 | identification and received into evidence.) |
| 22 | that one either? | 22 |  |
| 23 | MR. KURSHAN: I do not -- I stand | 23 | MR. KURSHAN: May I request a copy of |
| 24 | corrected, Mr. Chairman. I do have the October 28, | 24 | B-16, please? |
| 25 | 2020 letter. | 25 | MS. HUTTER: Yes. |
|  | 23 |  | 25 |
| 1 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. | 1 | MR. KURSHAN: Thank you. |
| 2 | MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, do you want | 2 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: How about any other |
| 3 | to have that marked? | 3 | exhibits from Fire Department or Police Department? |
| 4 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: You have it, Bob? | 4 | MR. WOLFSON: There was an original |
| 5 | MR. REGAN: Yeah, October 28th. My | 5 | lice Department report which was marked as B-3 and |
| 6 | notes do not reflect it being marked. | 6 | original Fire Department as B-4, and Triborough |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Well, let's mark | 7 | mbulance was B-5. |
| 8 | that, but I would like a | 8 | MR. REGAN: Mr. Kurshan, do you have |
| 9 | Wolfson, Lorraine. | 9 | ose? |
| 10 | MS. HUTTER: I'm doing that now. | 10 | MR. KURSHAN: I have B-3. I do not |
| 11 | MR. REGAN: That would be B-15. | 11 | ave B-4 nor do I have B-5. |
| 12 |  | 12 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Lorraine, do you |
| 13 | (Exhibit B-15, Review letter of Ms. | 13 | have B-4, B-5? |
| 14 | Green, dated 10/28/2020, is marked for | 14 | MS. HUTTER: Yeah, hold on. I will |
| 15 | identification and received into evidence.) | 15 | nd them to him. They should be up in the |
| 16 |  | 16 | cuments on the Google Docs, but I'll double-check. |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I think we've | 17 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: How about you, Bob? |
| 18 | covered all planning and engineer technical reviews. | 18 | MR. REGAN: I don't have that. |
| 19 | How about other agencies and departments? What | 19 | MS. HUTTER: What don't you have, Bob? |
| 20 | exhibits do we have? | 20 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: B-4, B-5. |
| 21 | MR. WOLFSON: We have an updated Fire | 21 | MR. REGAN: Let me take a look. |
| 22 | Department review memo, dated November 16, which has | 22 | $B-4$ is Fire Department July 6th; B-5, |
| 23 | not been marked. | 23 | Triborough, July 7th. |
| 24 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I'm sorry, 11/16 | 24 | MS. HUTTER: Which has not been |
|  | from the Fire Department? | 25 | discussed. I don't remember it being discussed. |


have the Ruskan of that date?
MR. REGAN: What's the date of that letter?

MR. WOLFSON: June 26, 2020. It was a very long letter with a submission that also responded to engineering and planning issues.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Any other outstanding exhibits?

Ms. Green, have all of your documents been covered?

MS. GREEN: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Hipolit, all of your reports covered?

MR. HIPOLIT: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: How about under landscaping with Mr. DeBlasio, Mr. Hipolit?

MR. HIPOLIT: Yes. That's the one they talked which was dated -- I have a date here -dated November 3rd was his last review letter which is the most current one.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And Ms. Hutter, you have no other outstanding reports from either Triborough, Police, Fire, or other agencies?

MS. HUTTER: No.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Wolfson, where

## 31

are we with respect to submission to the county?
Was an application made to the County for site plan approval?

MR. WOLFSON: Yes, sir. It was
submitted $2 / 18 / 2020$. Ms. Ruskan can give us any status on that.

MR. KURSHAN: What date was it submitted, please?

MR. WOLFSON: 2/18/2020. We also have
a pending application before the Soil Conservation
District, the Bergen County Municipal Utilities
Authority, and the DEP.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Are any approvals back from the County?

MR. WOLFSON: Ms. Ruskan.
MS. RUSKAN: Good evening.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Good evening.
MS. RUSKAN: No, not any formal approvals. The County had reviewed, in concept, and agreed to the left turn lane that I had presented -I think it was October 6th -- to the Board. They were in agreement with that left turn lane and said that we can go ahead and make the resubmission to the County. Yet we have been making other modifications to the plan, so we have held off on
submitting anything back to the County, pending the Board's review of our latest plans.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Hipolit, have you had any contact with the County with respect to this plan?

MR. HIPOLIT: So I had direct contact, as directed by the Board, on that left turn. And the County is in agreement with the plan that Ms. Ruskan presented, in concept. We need final plans on it, but they agreed with it.

MS. RUSKAN: Mr. Hipolit, if I could, the plans that were submitted have a revision date of October 16, 2020, incorporated the left turn lane in that set of plans.

MR. HIPOLIT: That's fine.
MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman, with that comment, perhaps we should mark the 10/16 updated plans that Patti just referred to as A-35.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay.
(Exhibit A-35, Plans dated 10/16, is marked for identification and received into evidence.)

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Is Mr. Preiss still 33
with us.
MR. PREISS: Yes, I am.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Preiss, did you
receive a copy of the table that was distributed
this evening prepared by Darlene Green?
MR. PREISS: Yes, I just received it.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Have you had an opportunity to review it and to confirm the validity of her statements relative to variances needed?

MR. PREISS: Yes. There was -- I
think there's one which we disagree with.
MR. WOLFSON: The setback to the interior roadway, Richard, because it's a driveway?

MR. PREISS: Yes. There's a question on that and also with regard to the combined side yard setback and buffer area.

MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman, Richard will go through all that when we get to him for his testimony unless you need him to do something now.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: No. I ask that this chart be put together in the interest of simplifying and consolidated the review letters. We don't often have an application where we're winding up with 50 or 60 exhibits. So consequently, it becomes very confusing. And in this particular
hearing, between delays due to weather and COVID and whatever, it's challenging.

In addition to what was stated in that table, Richard, are there any other variances that Ms. Green may have overlooked?

MR. PREISS: No, not in my opinion.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: So in your opinion, it's all-encompassing, however, you do dispute two of them?

MR. PREISS: There's one I dispute. There's another that I think logic would have it be -- it's the setback from the internal -- it says
setback to an internal street; and we have a driveway, so we don't think that applies. And then the combined setback, we think with the changes we just made, we meet that requirement as to 75 feet. Those are the two. But I'll get into more detail on that when I testify.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. I guess, Mr.
Wolfson, do you want to have Ms. Ruskan give a report on her last revised plan and statement that she is in compliance with all recommendations as set forth in those plans by Maser Engineering?

MR. WOLFSON: Patti, can you speak to that?

## 35

MS. RUSKAN: I think there were a few items in the November 9, 2020 letter that we needed to review. I don't know that we can just blanketly say that we're going to agree.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Hipolit, are you prepared to respond to Ms. Ruskan as she does a review of your letter of $11 / 9$, Exhibit B-12?

MR. HIPOLIT: I am.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. And, Mr. Wolfson, if you want to move in that direction, I think that would be appropriate at this time.

MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman, thank you to all of you for your patience as we cleared up the record. It's been a long fog so I'm glad that we have that complete.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Very good.

PATTI RUSKAN, previously sworn, and testified as follows:

EXAMINATION BY MR. WOLFSON:
Q. Patti, are you able to speak to the issues in Mr. Hipolit's review memo that you believe require comment?
A. Sure. Let's start on page 5. On

## page 5 -- it's actually a continuation from the bottom of page 4, number 20. It has to do with the revised driveway and the left turn lane. I just wanted to clarify that I think there was a comment from -- it might have been one of the -- maybe the Fire Department.

MR. HIPOLIT: The Fire Department.
MS. RUSKAN: The concrete curb island is a mountable curb. And I think you agreed with that, Andy. I just wanted to get that on the record that that was what we agreed to. That's what's shown on the current plans.

MR. HIPOLIT: I do. I think it was a combination between police and fire. They were both talking about that being mountable; more fire. It's going to have to be mountable for them to get into the site.

## MS. RUSKAN: Right.

The next item I think is number -- let me double-check. Number 21, and it has to do with the revised grading at the rear of the building on the north side of the building where we have incorporated a rain garden between the building and the property line. There was, I believe, a request to connect the emergency access from the northwest
corner to the walkway on the southeast. And we don't believe that that is necessary to provide connectivity there. We have access from the rear of the building to the walking trail as well as just an emergency access. That's the paved surface that the Fire Department wanted. To put another sidewalk in through the rain garden area would be steeply sloping, and my personal opinion, I don't believe it's necessary.

MR. HIPOLIT: I agree with that.
MS. RUSKAN: The next item is number 27. And number 27 has to do with the sidewalk along Summit Avenue. We had always shown sidewalk along Summit Avenue and relocation of the sidewalk that's along the Summit Ridge frontage, and that was something that the County had requested. So I just wanted to clarify that that is something that the County requested and we are continuing to provide, and it's been shown on the plans.

MR. HIPOLIT: Can we go back to 25 ? Are you guys agreeing to put in the cameras that the Police Department's requiring?

MR. WOLFSON: Yes, we agree. The one clarification that we've made, and it was a long time ago, was that the cameras would not be designed
to read the license plate numbers. And I was told that that was vetted back to the police, and as long as they were identifiable cameras as shown on the architecturals at a number of locations, that that was acceptable to the police.

MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. I'm fine with that.

MS. RUSKAN: The next item is item number 37. And this has to do with our request for a waiver from doing a tree survey. We haven't heard whether or not that's acceptable. I know we talked about doing if it's not acceptable that we would propose a representative area tree survey. So that is, I think, more for the Board.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah, it's really for a comment, 37 is for the Board to decide if, in fact, they need a tree survey of the whole site. The site is pretty heavily wooded. In the area of the construction, they're taking down everything. If the Board wants a representative, as you've done before, they can do that, keeping in mind from the driveway all the way around the whole building, you're clearing every tree. Correct, Patti?

MS. RUSKAN: That's correct.
MR. HIPOLIT: So it's below the
retaining walls as you kind of head east and north where other than the walking path, all the trees will be preserved. Even the walking path is going to meander through trees so you're not really proposed to clear anything other than maybe that little parking.

MS. RUSKAN: Other than the gravel parking area. And, yes, the intent is that the trail would be installed in the field to meander around the trees.

MR. HIPOLIT: Right. So the Board is going to have to give them -- they're asking for a waiver from locating all the trees they're taking down in the construction area. That's up to the Board.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: We're going to poll the Board on that, but I want to hear all of the comments, Patti, on this document that you're reviewing right now.

MS. RUSKAN: Sure.
MR. HIPOLIT: Patti, if you back up to -- if you go back to comment 34. That's the guide rail. You're looking at some alternate guide rail design along the street? Or what are you actually designing to do there?

MS. RUSKAN: We had submitted on the plans the base design being a timber guide rail with an alternate for the W -beam guide rail in the event that that would be acceptable. That was something that the Applicant may want to install rather than the timber guide rail. That's why we have two details.

MR. HIPOLIT: Both are fine with us. The timber guide rail looks nicer, but both would be fine with us.

MS. RUSKAN: Okay.
MR. HIPOLIT: So this might be a longer discussion. Comment number 35 is the water service.

MS. RUSKAN: Correct. So on the current plans that we had submitted in October, we have incorporated a hotbox because that -- we are not showing the connectivity through Summit Ridge which the Fire Department prefers and SUEZ would endorse, but we've kept everything on the site itself with a booster pump and the separate services running up the driveway and into the building.

MR. HIPOLIT: Well, let me address
this to the Board first. So the issue that's come up going almost back a year ago was our Fire

Department and SUEZ Water separately identified that the innermost portions of Summit Ridge has pressure and flow problems. The identification of that comes from complaints of both the Fire Department and SUEZ over a number of years. And when you start getting to the back development, they can't provide adequate pressure and flow, not only for domestic water, but even potentially for fire-fighting services.

If the Board were to act favorably on this application, the Fire Department has discussed with me and SUEZ the ability to interconnect these mains, thereby providing a benefit and adding adequate pressure and flow to the northeastern portion of the Summit Ridge development. Obviously, it's private property. I mean, Mr. Kurshan is on here. I'm not sure if he can speak to it or agree to it, but if we're looking for a betterment of Montvale, similar to what we did when we did -- I mean, many developments in Montvale, when we moved our water mains, we're always looking out for the betterment of all of Montvale when somebody's building. We did it with the Wegman's development, with Mercedes, with Serrell Drive. We loop as much as we can. So I'm not telling the Board how they have to vote or what they have to do in this
application. But if it is to move forward, my
desire and other professionals' desire and other emergency services are to loop this main which requires agreement between both Summit Ridge and this developer. So I don't know where we take that.

Bob, do you have any comments on that?
This is more of public health and safety and trying to get a benefit for everybody out of it if there was potentially a problem in the future. We know there's a problem.

MR. REGAN: I don't think it's possible to compel an easement from Summit Ridge, an easement if Summit Ridge is unwilling to negotiate and enter into an agreement for it. It would have to be subject to condemnation, which I don't think the Borough is going to want to do.

MR. HIPOLIT: That would silly. I mean, Summit Ridge has a problem that can't be fixed unless you loop it somewhere.

MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman, I can represent that we had discussions with Summit Ridge on that possible looping, and the result of those discussions ended up with them lodging a formal objection which continues on.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Kurshan, do you

## 43

want to speak to this?
MR. KURSHAN: Mr. Wolfson is correct.
We did have some discussions. And I think that
Waypoint was trying to package an agreement by Summit Ridge as an agreement to the entire Waypoint proposal, which Summit Ridge was not prepared to give. If there is a specific betterment or improvement at Summit Ridge notwithstanding its objection, current objection to the Waypoint proposal, that's certainly something I would take back to the Summit Ridge Board for discussion and consideration. Of course, I'd have to understand and the Board would want to understand exactly what would be necessary within the Summit Ridge development to make -- Mr. Hipolit referred to a domestic water route. Are we talking about, you know, cutting a pathway through the entire development? Is it limited to one specific area? I think to -- Summit Ridge would need a better understanding of how we could work with Montvale and with Waypoint on this particular issue, notwithstanding its current objection to the Waypoint project.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Understood.
And, Mr. Hipolit, briefly, could you
explain how this connection would work?
MR. HIPOLIT: So currently, Mr.
Kurshan, you have an existing water main that comes in off of Summit Avenue and services your site, which is what we refer to as a dead-end water main. So it only has one connection, Summit Avenue, and then runs back out to Summit Avenue, the same connection. So it's dead-end. So the pressure and flow from both the domestic and the fire-fighting protection is low because once you get to the end of your development, specifically where it goes off to the cul-de-sac, it is literally really a big dead-end because it doesn't move around, back out to Summit Avenue.

Now, this is not coming from me; it's coming from the Fire Department and SUEZ who fields these complaints. They've told me that they've fielded complaints in the dozens over the last 10 or plus years from your residents that have domestic water problems with pressure in there. The only way to fix that is to put a new water main in, and they would have to loop back out to Summit Avenue and connect back out to create a flowthrough.

Both SUEZ and the Fire Department has said if you have an applicant putting in another
dead-end water main which is right next to you, it only makes sense to connect the two, and that creates a circulation between the two which raises the pressure and flow for domestic and fire. That connection at the end of your cul-de-sac at the end, the dead-end, your water main dead-ends there. They would just have them coming onto your property to connect the two, interconnect the two. That would require them to come in. Whatever they disturb, they have to repave; any roads or landscaping they would have to fix. But would make that connection, those repairs, at their cost. They would also do what any other applicant does, they have bond those improvements on your property. I'm not a lawyer, but usually there's some type of insurance guarantee and hold harmlesses that go back and forth.

But I can tell you that the details of that could be worked out later. If you guys don't agree to it, then there's no reason to work anything else out.

In my opinion -- this is just my
opinion, I'm not an attorney -- if this was approved, Summit Ridge would be foolish not to agree to this. The reason I say that is because it provides an added level of protection to your
development and provides water into your site from a secondary source in case there's a water main break. If there's a break now, you're cut off. You're dry. If you were connected, you wouldn't be dry. And, again, from a flow and fire-fighting perspective, the flow is low in there and barely meets the minimum requirements. So if you were to have a fire in a building at the end of that loop, those buildings are all in jeopardy as we sit here now.

MR. KURSHAN: If I may, Mr. Chairman, may I ask Mr. Hipolit a question?

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Sure.
MR. KURSHAN: The construction that you envision, is this digging up the water main from Summit Avenue going north? Or is this creating a connection in and around the cul-de-sac and going east to the adjacent property that we're discussing? Or is it a combination of the two?

MR. HIPOLIT: No, it's the latter. It's just a connection from where your water main ends, it would go from that point east to Waypoint.

MR. KURSHAN: So that is what you're referring to as the loop. So the Summit Ridge north to south main would then go north, loop to the east, and then the Waypoint access would be heading south
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back to Summit Avenue?
MR. HIPOLIT: Right. And if we get into more detail, and as part of that entire thing, both developments would give an easement, a more detailed easement, to SUEZ for maintenance to that line because it would be a SUEZ line, not a private line. So SUEZ would take care of it.

Right now, SUEZ tells us that they have what we call a blanket easement over your property. That blanket easement covers the whole property, but it's very nonspecific. So they'd want to make it more specific to just the main because they're not responsible for any other portions of your property. And the same would go for Waypoint; we want it specific because we want to hold SUEZ accountable for their main. I mean, it's a SUEZ main; it's not a private main.

And the same would go -- Mr. Wolfson, if I'm wrong, the same would go for you. You both would be having a main that comes in and loops. And ultimately, it's a SUEZ main, not your main.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Andy, let me ask you a question. You're saying that the pressure at Summit Ridge is inadequate, is that correct?

MR. HIPOLIT: That's correct.


CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Here, we're proposing, contiguous to this property, a much larger project and it would have the same design feature of not looping or dead-ending if, in fact, they don't get agreement with Summit Ridge to loop?

MR. HIPOLIT: Correct, but they have one difference. This development is going to propose a pumping station to raise that pressure and flow. So they're going to spend, we'll call it, a large amount of money to create a solution to that pressure and flow problem. Summit Ridge --

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: So Waypoint could get adequate supply and pressure without the loop?

MR. HIPOLIT: Correct. I'm forcing the argument to make them connect is the smarter thing to do.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And that would save expense for Waypoint if, in fact, there were connection; and it would improve the service to Summit Ridge, in your opinion?

MR. HIPOLIT: That's my opinion.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay.
Patti, do you agree with that?
MS. RUSKAN: Yes, I do.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: So we have two
engineers agreeing on that.
Mr. Kurshan, I think it would be advisable to speak to the Board in light of this information and get their position on this.

MR. KURSHAN: I will do that. Plus, I will communicate with Mr. Wolfson directly so I have a complete understanding from his professionals exactly what they are proposing, details which I'm sure they've already worked out. And, yes, I will take all of that back to the Summit Ridge Board, notwithstanding the objection that remains interposed. I understand that and I will --

MR. HIPOLIT: I just want to make this clear -- and, Patti, jump in -- I don't think they've worked the details out because SUEZ is the ultimate approver of this and the details go through SUEZ. So the steps would be for Summit Ridge and Waypoint to agree that this would happen. Then probably Patti and I would meet with SUEZ and their design engineers to find out exactly what's going to happen. Then at that point, we'd probably have a meeting with Summit Ridge and Waypoint together or separately to get you to both agree to it. And then that would then enlist us to have a meeting with everybody again, with the Mayor and Council
potentially -- I'm not sure I need them -- and then some bonding would be put in place on both sides, the insurance agreements, all the hold harmlesses. And the decision at that point would be made right there of, okay, does Waypoint construct it to the line and does SUEZ connect it? Or does Waypoint come in and connect it? Those details are not known yet. We can't do any of this unless we get an agreement that you guys want to let them do this, if it's approved. I don't know if it's going to be approved. If it's not approved, you're still in the same situation you're in now.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: We've hit our curfew hour. Is there any other open items on that technical review that we've been going over?

MS. RUSKAN: Give me one minute. I think there might be one more.

This is on page 13 of 22 . It's 57, small letter G. And this has to do with the Filttera biofiltration device.

MR. HIPOLIT: It's just the maintenance of it. You'll agree to the maintenance conditions of it, right?

MS. RUSKAN: Absolutely.
MR. HIPOLIT: Yes, so don't worry
51
about that.
MS. RUSKAN: Okay.
MR. HIPOLIT: You don't really have a choice on that.

I don't think there's anything -- I
mean, there's a lot of stuff in here for Bob, for and conditions. But as far as boring the Board with these --

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: The only open issue
that I've made a note on is the tree survey, which Patti had requested.

MR. HIPOLIT: Correct.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And whether we do a
full count of the trees on the whole property or we
take a sampling, which we've done in the past, as
well. And what is an appropriate sampling, how large an area do a sampling, Andy?

MR. HIPOLIT: I hate to say an acre, but normally we look at samplings either 100 by 100 or 200 by 200 . I mean, on this site, probably 100 by 100 because it's so dense. I think that would be fair.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Would you designate
the area where the sampling should occur?
MR. HIPOLIT: I would do it probably
back near the building.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Beyond the limits of clearance, obviously.

MR. HIPOLIT: Correct.
CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: And to the
alternative of the sampling, what else would we do?
The ordinance requires a full count, is that correct?

MR. HIPOLIT: It requires a full count of the whole property, yes.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. But the Applicant has the right to ask for the sampling, which they are asking.

How about we poll the Board with regard to that? And let me see, where am I? I guess I'm starting with Mayor Ghassali. Mayor, a full count of the trees or a sampling of a given area that the Applicant is requesting?

MAYOR GHASSALI: Mr. Chairman, we have the ordinance that requires the full count. We also have the Environment Commission. The Environmental Commission at some point needs to get involved in this. I'm going to say that we stick with the ordinance of the full count and to consider involving the Environment Commission on this, too.

MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Yes, Mr. Wolfson.
MR. WOLFSON: First of all, just a reminder, this is an inclusionary project which will provide much-needed affordable housing that the municipality will be able to take advantage of. Furthermore, we are more than a year into this application at this point. And any agencies that are going to weigh in should have weighed in already, respectfully.

MR. REGAN: If I can just respond to that, Mr. Chairman. This is not part of the Borough's housing plan.

MR. WOLFSON: You'll still be able to take advantage of the units.

MR. REGAN: That's true. But, again, it's not part of the Borough's housing plan.

MR. WOLFSON: It's in the AH6 Zone.
MR. REGAN: I understand that.
MS. GREEN: Bob, this site is in the housing plan, just not for as many units as what's being proposed.

MR. REGAN: That's what I meant.
MS. GREEN: Okay.
MR. HIPOLIT: Let me ask Patti a

|  | 54 |  | 56 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | question. | 1 | Mayor. We have the ordinance in place. I think we |
| 2 | When KHov did the other side of the | 2 | should follow what the ordinance says. |
| 3 | Swerpa (phonetic) buffer, as we called it back then, | 3 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you. |
| 4 | did they ever count all the trees? | 4 | Mr. Gruber. |
| 5 | MS. RUSKAN: No. The Board granted | 5 | MR. GRUBER: I'd follow the ordinance. |
| 6 | the waiver for representative area tree survey. | 6 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Lorraine, did you |
| 7 | MR. HIPOLIT: And how big was that | 7 | keep a tally on that? |
| 8 | representative area? | 8 | MS. HUTTER: Yes, I did. It's even. |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Let's continue with | 9 | You would be the deciding vote. |
| 10 | the polling. Mayor, you'd like to see compliance | 10 | I have Mr. Culhane for sampling, Ms. |
|  | with the code, counting of all the trees and | 11 | Curry for sampling, Litner for sampling. |
| 12 | referral to the Environmental Commission. | 12 | And then on the full, the Mayor, |
| 13 | MAYOR GHASSALI: Yes. | 13 | Zitelli, Cudequest, and Gruber. |
| 14 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Let's move on. The | 14 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. I want a |
| 15 | next Board member would be Mr. Culhane on this. | 15 | full count on it. |
| 16 | MR. CULHANE: Sampling. | 16 | Okay. Are there other open issues on |
| 17 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I'm sorry. What? | 17 | this? |
| 18 | MR. CULHANE: Sampling. | 18 | Mr. Wolfson, as I said, we've hit |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: You agree, is that | 19 | curfew on this. We're going to put you -- I'm |
| 20 | what you said? | 20 | sorry. Go ahead. |
| 21 | MR. CULHANE: I agree with a sampling, | 21 | MR. WOLFSON: Respectfully, if I can |
| 22 | not a full. | 22 | close out this witness and see if there are any |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Sampling. Okay. | 23 | questions. Mr. Kurshan said he didn't have an |
| 24 | I'm sorry. Thank you. | 24 | opportunity to question on two exhibits, which we've |
| 25 | Ms. Curry, sampling or full tree | 25 | discussed tonight. I don't know how many Board |
|  | 55 |  | 57 |
| 1 | count? | 1 | questions there might be. If we can get that done, |
| 2 | MS. CURRY: A large sampling. | 2 | don't have to bring her back |
| 3 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I'm sorry. A large | 3 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Let me go to |
| 4 | sampling? | 4 | Lorraine for one second. |
| 5 | MS. CURRY: Yes. | 5 | Lorraine, our next meeting is |
| 6 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: What do you mean by | 6 | March 2nd, is that correct? |
| 7 | a large sampling? | 7 | MS. HUTTER: That is correct. |
| 8 | MS. CURRY: Well, a hundred by a | 8 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: What do you have on |
| 9 | hundred is what in terms of an acre? | 9 | the agenda now for that date? |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: A hundred by a | 10 | MS. HUTTER: I have one homeowner, |
| 11 | hundred is a quarter of an acre. | 11 | Marion's application, and I have the 5 Paragon. |
| 12 | MR. REGAN: Quarter of an acre, right. | 12 | MR. WOLFSON: Mr. Chairman, we have |
| 13 | MS. CURRY: Okay. I would be okay | 13 | conflicts on the 2nd, which is part of the reason |
| 14 | with a quarter of an acre or a half-acre. | 14 | I'd love to close out this witness. We are all on |
| 15 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Thank you. | 15 | the same team for the 16th. |
| 16 | Mr. Zitelli? | 16 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: What do you have |
| 17 | MR. ZITELLI: I agree with the Mayor. | 17 | for the 16th, Lorraine? |
| 18 | Let's go with our ordinance, so let's count them. | 18 | MS. HUTTER: The 16th. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you. | 19 | MR. REGAN: We have Bank of America, I |
| 20 | Mr. Litner. | 20 | think. |
| 21 | MR. LITNER: I'm fine with a hundred | 21 | MS. HUTTER: Bank of America, and I |
| 22 | by a hundred sample. | 22 | think that's it. Bank of America, that's it, unless |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you. | 23 | anything is carried over. |
| 24 | Ms. Cudequest. | 24 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Have they |
| 25 | MS. CUDEQUEST: I agree with the | 25 | advertised for the 16th? |


|  | 58 |  | 60 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | MS. HUTTER: Yes. | 1 | think, Mr. Wolfson, the density, from day one we've |
| 2 | MR. REGAN: That's the lighting plan, |  | been saying it's higher than what we need there. |
| 3 | right, Lorraine? | 3 | The height is an issue. And then those two will |
| 4 | MS. HUTTER: Yes. | 4 | take care of the parking. So I agree with the |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Have we've gotten | 5 | Chairman. |
| 6 | revised plans on that? | 6 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Now, if, in fact, |
| 7 | MS. HUTTER: No, not yet. | 7 | there could be a reduction in density, I might have |
| 8 | Do you want me to ask them to carry? | 8 | a different position relative to a sampling versus a |
| 9 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Yeah. | 9 | full count on the trees. But that's for you to |
| 10 | MS. HUTTER: Okay. | 10 | determine. |
| 11 | MR. HIPOLIT: I'd say yes. They never | 11 | With that said, I want to thank you |
| 12 | get -- | 12 | very much for coming. And I agree it was good that |
| 13 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: They can continue | 13 | we were table to clear up the record. |
| 14 | with their usage of their illegal lights for another | 14 | Patti, I'm sorry I've got to drag you |
| 15 | couple of weeks beyond the 16th. So tell them they | 15 | back next month, but -- |
| 16 | can send us thank you notes | 16 | MR. ZITELLI: Mr. Chairman? |
| 17 | MR. REGAN: They'll be into daylight | 17 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Yes. |
| 18 | savings time, John, they'll save money. | 18 | MR. ZITELLI: So if you're still |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Yeah. | 19 | looking for comments -- |
| 20 | MS. HUTTER: Mr. Wolfson, you would | 20 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Oh, I'm sorry. Go |
| 21 | like to be carried to the 16th of March? | 21 | ahead. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Here's what I'd | 22 | MR. ZITELLI: That's okay. |
| 23 | like to do. I'd like to comment to giving Waypoint | 23 | My concern -- one of my concerns on |
| 24 | the entire evening, with the exception of any minor | 24 | this is the driveway and the width of the driveway. |
| 25 | use permits that come in, so that we can try to wrap | 25 | Now, I believe the reason we can't make the driveway |
|  | 59 |  | 61 |
| 1 | it up. | 1 | wider is because we might be encroaching on the |
| 2 | But, Mr. Wolfson, I would like for you | 2 | wetlands, right? |
| 3 | to convey to your client the chart that was prepared | 3 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Yes. |
| 4 | by Ms. Green points out, in my opinion, some pretty | 4 | MR. ZITELLI: My concern is that there |
| 5 | drastic elements with respect to the plan. And my | 5 | be an area for residents to walk from the residences |
| 6 | concern is the overall density. And I believe that | 6 | out onto Summit. |
| 7 | if we lessen the density, we may be able to | 7 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I believe we have |
| 8 | eliminate or lessen the severity of some of these |  | addressed that. Right, Patti? |
| 9 | variances. Whether it's 11 variances which were | 9 | MR. ZITELLI: Okay. |
| 10 | cited by Ms. Green or 10 or 9 that Mr. Preiss agrees | 10 | MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah, they're going to |
| 11 | to, and then the design waivers on top of it, that's | 11 | put a sidewalk in. |
| 12 | a lot. That's a lot to deal with. And this should | 12 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: They are putting a |
| 13 | give you the time to explore that with Mr. Preiss | 13 | sidewalk in. |
| 14 | and to thoroughly analyze Ms. Green's comments on | 14 | MR. ZITELLI: Yeah, I know we got a |
| 15 | it. | 15 | sidewalk there. I almost would like to say why |
| 16 | Any other Board members wish to comment | 16 | don't we put the sidewalk into the -- and ask for a |
| 17 | on that to offer any advice to Mr. Wolfson as to | 17 | variance, and I'm not asking to pave over, but maybe |
| 18 | where to go with this? | 18 | we could some kind of walkway that goes into wetland |
| 19 | MAYOR GHASSALI: Mr. Chairman. | 19 | area there so that -- I'm just concerned about |
| 20 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Mr. Mayor. | 20 | pedestrians walking there with the cars. Even with |
| 21 | MAYOR GHASSALI: Thank you. We've | 21 | 20 -- it's 24 feet ride, I think, right? The |
| 22 | been consistent from the beginning about the high | 22 | driveway? |
| 23 | density, the height, and the congested parking | 23 | CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: I would be totally |
| 24 | situation once this is all done. Love the idea of a | 24 | supportive of that, but I think in order to get |
| 25 | 55 and over, love the idea of the trail. But I | 25 | that, you'd have to have a real good friend at the |

DEP. And the people down there are not very friendly.

MR. ZITELLI: I'm only offering it, you know -- I would go ahead, you know, if you guys could get one, I would support it. You can tell them I think that the Board would support that. I'm not looking to really encroach too much into that wetlands. And I understand that. But we're looking at a safety issue here of people. I'm talking about somebody who's been hit by a car, so I know what it's like. I don't want anybody else to have to go through something I've been through. So I'm giving it to you through personal experience.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Okay. Got it. Thank you.

Anyone else?
With that said, I want to thank everyone for their patience this evening. We'll carry this to March 16th. No further notice will be provided to the public other than this announcement.

Mr. Wolfson, anything you want to add to this?

MR. WOLFSON: And that's 7:30, your regular time, Mr. Chairman?

## CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Yes. <br> 63

MR. WOLFSON: We thank the Board for its time. Have a good evening, and be safe.

CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you. You too. (Proceeding concluded at 11:15 p.m.)
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