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CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The next item on the agenda is the continued public hearing on Block 3201, Lot 6, SHG Montvale MB, LLC, Preliminary and Final Site Plan Approval, Amended PUD Approval; Soil Movement Approval and variances.

And with that said, this is a special
meeting.
MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry to interrupt you.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. REGAN: Just for the record, since
D variance relief is implicated, Mr. Ryan, as a Class 1 representative, is leaving the dais.

A Class 1 representative cannot -CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, very good. MR. REGAN: We have a full complement.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, John, thank you for attending. Have a good evening.
(Whereupon, Mr. Ryan recuses himself and steps off the dais.)

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Question: Do we have enough eligible members?

MR. REGAN: We have six. I believe everyone's eligible.

MR. LINTNER: Yes, they all are.

```
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Everyone is
    eligible.
    MR. REGAN: If there is a vote tonight,
    you would need five affirmative votes.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, very good.
    Mr. DelVecchio, before we get started,
    any further presentation?
As of our last meeting we asked the
    traffic expert employed by the borough to do some
    homework with respect to getting answers on different
    questions that he had in dealing with, I guess, both
        the county and the Turnpike Authority.
    And he has indicated to us prior to the
        meeting that he had information he wanted to share
        with the board members, as well as the applicant and
        the public.
```

    And with that said, I am going to ask
        Maurice, it's all yours.
    MR. REGAN: For the record, Mr. Rached
    was previously sworn --
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
    MR. REGAN: -- at the last meeting, as
        has Mr. Hipolit.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
    A N D R E W H I P O L I T, PE
331 Newman Springs Road, Suite 203, Red Bank, New Jersey, having been previously sworn, continues to testify as follows:

M A U R I C E R A C H E D, PE, PTOE
331 Newman Springs Road, Suite 203, Red Bank,
New Jersey, having been previously sworn, continues to testify as follows: MR. RACHED: Good evening,

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, so I did reach out to the Turnpike and then I realized that this is a county road which means the county would have to make the request.

So I reached out to Mr. Timsak and we had an in-depth conversation about the issues.

And he shared with me information that I thought the board would be happy to hear. He said that the county is looking to lower the speed limit on West Grand Avenue --

MS. HUTTER: John, can you just hand him this microphone so we make sure we get it. MR. RACHED: I thought I was loud

MS. HUTTER: No.
MR. RACHED: Thank you.

So Mr. Timsak shared with me that the county is looking to lower the speed limit on West Grand Avenue, which I felt would be welcome news by the board and by the community.

The speed limit today is 45 miles an hour and it would serve all of us to lower it.

So I had a conversation with him about the method, about my involvement.

I asked Mr. Timsak that $I$ would like to be involved in reviewing the data to make sure that that reduction happens. He agreed.

I also proposed to him that if there is anything we could do to help the process, such as doing a certification to comply with Title 39 and national standards, that I'll be willing to do that.

So we left it in that he is going to keep me in the loop, share with me the data, and we're going to collaborate together on lowering the speed limit.

Then we talked about changing the yield sign to a stop sign. He expressed to me that the county would be in favor of such a request, and he said we'll either do a request or you could do it and copy us and refer to this conversation.

So we need to figure this out if we --
and if the board ends up requesting that change from the Turnpike.

So I was really very pleased. I think this would add another layer of safety to the whole area, not just to this left turn.

Then I reached out to the previous police chief, Gerry Abrams, and I discussed with him what's transpiring. And he told me that he does not recall any issue with the right-turn movement when the driveway was open.

I'm referring to the proposed driveway on West Grand Avenue. He did say that he remembers that the left-turn out was an issue at some point, which in this case it is not being proposed.

And then I asked him if he remembers any accident involving the right turn and he said no.

So I wanted to bring the board up to speed with that information, and if the board is inclined to have me pursue any of these, you know, avenues, I will be more than happy to do so.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you.
Mr. Hipolit, I believe the board asked you to communicate with Chief Joe Sanfilippo with respect to his opinion of changing the yield sign off of the Parkway exit onto Grant Avenue to a full stop
sign. And also with respect to putting in a counter on that right-hand lane on Grand Avenue.

Did you have an opportunity to communicate with him?

MR. HIPOLIT: I did.
I talked to him.
As far as a counter, with doing counts, they could provide both traffic counts and/or speed counts as the board did discuss speed.

And then as far as the stop sign, they would be in favor of the stop sign change.

I haven't talked to him about the reduction in speed yet and I haven't talked to him about the accident history.

I was going to ask him about the accident history of that driveway literally almost 20 years ago, so the total history on that driveway -- see what the accidents were as a baseline.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. And,
Mr. Regan, I believe that it was said if that yield sign were to be changed to a stop sign, the Montvale governing body would have to approve it as well.

MR. REGAN: Right.
They would have to make the formal
request of the Turnpike Authority.

MR. HIPOLIT: Correct.
It would come from the Mayor and
Council.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And though I did not
communicate with the whole governing body, I did speak with Mayor Ghassali and shared with him the board's discussion with the applicant and its professionals relative to the conversion of that yield sign to a full stop sign.

He felt that the governing body would be very supportive of that, so I don't anticipate we would have any difficulty in moving in that direction.

With respect to the gaps, Maurice, with a lowering of the speed limits along Grand Avenue, what effect that would that have on the gap studies that were performed by Dolan and Dean?

MR. RACHED: It really shouldn't have much of an effect, Mr. Chair.

As I explained last week, the gap study is based on the acceptable gap, which is normally six-and-a-half seconds or so.

By lowering the speed, the gaps should remain the same and there should be -- there could be actually more opportunities for drivers to enter the
gap because the speed is lower.
Just to refresh the board in terms of
the numbers, I believe that the gap analysis revealed
that there were between 400 and 500 gaps an hour, which is a number that far exceeds the need. I believe the need was more in the range of about 50 turning movements. So the number of gaps is almost ten times as much, which is an extremely comfortable range.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, very good.
I think, Mr. DelVecchio, we had requested of you to have the author of the traffic report, Betsy Dolan, here this evening, and I understand that because of a medical emergency she is unable to attend.

Is that correct?
MR. DelVECCHIO: That is correct. We were -- we learned somewhere around 5, 6:00 this evening via a text from a relative that she was not -- well, that she was in a medical emergency and that's all we know.

We have tried to communicate back, find out hopefully that she's doing okay, but we have no word at this point at all.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And I understand you
have made arrangements to have another engineer who is a traffic expert attend the meeting to discuss with us that report.

Is that correct?
MR. DelVECCHIO: That is correct,
Mr. Chairman.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Why don't we
introduce him and have him qualified.
MR. DelVECCHIO: Okay.
For those of you who may remember,
Mr. Olivo has appeared before this board before.
This is Mr. Chuck Olivo from Stonefield Engineering.
Chuck, if you could please state your name and spell it.

MR. REGAN: He's previously been
qualified in the field of civil engineering and traffic engineering.

Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you're about to give shall be the truth, so help you God?

MR. OLIVO: I do.
CHARLESOLIVO, PE, PTOE
92 Park Avenue, Rutherford, New Jersey, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows: MR. REGAN: For the record, state your
full name, please, and spell your last name.
MR. OLIVO: Certainly.
Good evening, Mr. Chairman, nice to be here this evening.

Good evening, Members of the Board, Members of the Public, my name is Charles Olivo, and the spelling of the last name is $O-L-I, V$ as in Victor, 0 .

I am from the firm Stonefield Engineering and Design, as project counsel has mentioned.

I have a Bachelor of Science in the field of civil engineering from the University of Notre Dame.

I'm a licensed professional engineer in the State of New Jersey.

I am also a certified professional
traffic operations engineer, certified by the Institute of Transportation Engineers.

I've testified before over 300
municipalities in the State of New Jersey as an expert in the field of traffic engineering.

I also teach traffic engineering at Stevens.

And I have been before this board and
accepted.
MR. REGAN: I think, Mr. Chairman, he can be accepted based on his credentials in the field of traffic engineering. And I think he was previously qualified in that field before the board. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And the Chair will accept the recommendation of counsel, no questions from the board.

And I believe this has been marked into evidence.

MR. REGAN: Not yet.
This is the revised plan, Mr. Chairman, the original one was --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yeah, I'm looking at the one revised to June 22.

MR. DelVECCHIO: Yes.
MS. HUTTER: Yes, it was marked as A-18.

MR. DelVECCHIO: Yes, A-18.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: A-18, okay.
MR. REGAN: I have the other one.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And, Mr. Olivo, have you had an opportunity to review the plan prepared by Dolan and Dean last revised June 22 of this year?

MR. OLIVO: I have had the opportunity

```
to review the Traffic Impact Study that was last
revised June 22nd of this year, both the contents of
the report and the complete technical appendices that
are included with that report.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The board was paying
particular attention to the access point along Grand
Avenue, which I am sure your client brought to your
attention.
    Is that correct?
    MR. OLIVO: Yes, I am aware of this.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And I further
```

understand, did you have an opportunity to listen to
the tapes or any other recording relative to the
discussion that we had with the traffic experts from
Colliers?
MR. OLIVO: I read the transcript in
full.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And did you
communicate directly with Maurice?
MR. OLIVO: I did, yes.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Why don't you
give us your opinion and your analysis of that
proposed drive and the accesses that are set forth.
MR. OLIVO: Absolutely, Mr. Chairman.
Well, I would say at this point you've
had a lot of traffic engineering eyes on this driveway, in addition to the board's eyes.

I think everybody probably within the last week has checked their speed going into or out of some of these turning movements.

And I think in a lot of ways that the beauty of traffic engineering is we all do it and we all have an opinion about it and what works and what doesn't necessarily work.

I know that there is some history with regard to a driveway in this general location. And I have researched some of the accident history; the location, you can see on old aerial imagery, so it is interesting to see that there was a driveway here, and then that driveway was either blockaded or gated and it was not permissible to be used.

And I will say that practicing about 20 years working on many land use applications, you don't see that very often. You don't see many driveways that are open and then closed.

But what $I$ will say and $I$ think it's somewhat reassuring is that with all the eyes on this proposed driveway, you have had a county and county professionals that have seen the history of $a$ driveway in this location and have been attuned to
that and have reviewed it and scrutinized it over the years, and you now have -- many of that personnel is very similar to what it was 10 or 15 years ago.

And so here we are proposing a driveway in that location, but I do think it's important to note that there are significant changes to what is being proposed.

A full-movement access point is very different than what is being proposed now, which is an entrance only driveway.

A left-turn movement out of this proposed driveway on Grand Avenue I do not believe is something that $I$ would be in front of this board supporting. You're along the horizontal curb; you're on the inside of that curb which makes sight distance challenging when you're coming out of a private site.

And to make a left-turn out across a right-turn lane, two through lanes, a gore area and an additional two lanes in the opposite direction is a very challenging movement coming from a location here.

What we're speaking about is entrance only. Looking at the many commercial and retail driveways over the last 20 years, the right-turn-ingress movement tends to be your safest
movement across any driveway in any location, because there really is no conflict to that right-turn in. It's called diverging conflict in traffic engineering parlance because vehicles aren't approaching one another, they're actually moving away.

But you do decelerate into that turn, which does create a little bit of friction.

But that right-turn movement in, generally, a very save movement into an access point. Now, the left-turn movement in. One of the things that I look at most closely when determining whether a driveway can operate safely and effectively, which is really our charge as traffic engineers, when we're looking at the operation of an intersection and also at the operation of a driveway, can it operate safely being paramount, and effectively or functionally as you heard from Maurice.

And reading through the transcript, very much in keeping with the very logical progression he made, I would agree, he ended with safety and I will start with safety.

When I'm looking at the operation of a driveway and whether or not it can operate safely, one of the first things $I$ look at is sight distance.

There has to be enough sight distance for a driver, for someone who is traveling in their vehicle, to take in everything happening within the driving ecosystem, see an oncoming vehicle and make a turn.

And truth be told, I sat in the gore area today for about a minute with my hazards on. There is an existing gore area hatched in the middle, in the median of the road where the driveway is. And I waited and I watched.

I could see about what $I$ measured on a Google aerial about 900 feet towards the Parkway, past the first bridge abutment, through the guide rail section; more than enough sight distance to adequately see vehicles coming towards me and make a turn into the lane.

Now, within that, what I'll call gore area, this diagonally striped area that's there today is where we plan to put the left-turn bay. There's adequate width there, there was nobody honking their horn, what's this guy doing in the middle of the road here. There is adequate width to be able to accommodate a vehicle that stops, looks for that gap in traffic and then makes the left turn into the site driveway.

Sight distance is more than adequate
turning in for that left-turn movement and from a safety perspective, we also then look at are there enough gaps in traffic?

And as you've heard from Maurice, there are more than adequate, during the peak hours, gaps in traffic.

I watched the videos of the various peak hours that have been studied. What you'll see is that generally as cars come off the Parkway or are coming from the west/east through this intersection or this area, that they effectively line up in the proper lanes as to where they're looking to go.

So if they're looking to make the right turn to come down DePiero Drive, they line up in the right-turn lane, which is marked as a right-turn-deceleration lane. And if they're continuing through, they're in those two through lanes that are then removed from that right-most lane.

I actually think in terms of
infrastructure and having been through that intersection many times coming to this borough hall many times, living in Bergen County for the last 20 years and having been through the intersection a number of times, I would actually say that you have
great traffic infrastructure right now to accommodate the driveway movements that we're talking about.

One of the goals of driveway design is that we're not violating what $I$ call driver expectation. When we start to create new movements that are not in keeping with the typical vocabulary of traffic improvements along a roadway is where we start to see driver hesitation, and driver hesitation many times is what leads to traffic accidents and incidents.

And I think, because you have established pavement markings, lane markings within your right-of-way that have been well-traveled for many years here and people are acclimated to that.

I noticed in the transcript a lot of discussion, and I like this kind of discussion, of who is accelerating, who's decelerating, who's not, who is.

And again, I think probably over the last week we have all been attune to that a little bit more.

## Now, the industry standards tell you

 that a turning movement occurs at anywhere on average between about 15 miles per hour and 18 miles per hour.I think everybody in this room, including myself, can make that turn from Grand to DePiero at about 20 to 22 miles per hour. If you really are trying hard to go faster, you probably could get to about 25 miles per hour.

But the bottom line is these movements are occurring at reduced travel speeds from your through traffic. This is what happens when you make a turn. Left turn traffic is stopped in that bay as it makes the turn into the site, so those travel speeds, as the vehicle is turning across lanes, much lower than that, we'll call it 15 to 25 mile an hour span of right turning movement.

If we were adding a new right-turn lane into this site, I might be concerned.

As I mentioned earlier, if we were allowing a left-turn-exit movement, I don't think I'd be able to support that.

But you have entrance only movements, generally the safest of travel movements into a site, in a well-established section of road that is in keeping with driver expectation.

And as a traffic engineer practicing about 20 years now, that hits all the marks for me when I'm looking at the safety of a driveway.

Now, I will say this: The county has reviewed and approved this driveway. I suspect the County reviewed and approved the driveway some time ago in this location and later, at the behest perhaps of an earlier police chief or board members or members of the community relooked at that driveway.

You have your consultant on record, myself, you have another excellent traffic engineer in Betsy Dolan who has worked on hundreds, if not thousands, of traffic studies in commercial driveway projects.

I would say to you that should this driveway -- I don't believe that it would have operational concerns, there is an immediate open line of communication with the county which operates jurisdiction over this roadway and over this driveway to discuss the operation of the driveway and whether or not anything would need to change.

My opinion is that this driveway could operate safely and effectively in the location based on the design parameters that are before the board.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Very good.
Mr. DelVecchio, do you have anything else of Mr. Olivo?

MR. DelVECCHIO: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

1

2

Thank you.
DIRECT EXAMINATION
BY MR. DELVECCHIO:
Q. Mr. Olivo, one of the concerns that you alluded to and I'd like to just highlight and get your opinion on is we have a yield movement coming off the Garden State Parkway ramp allowing a vehicle to make a right turn at that location onto Grand Avenue, and then we have the potential of a right-turn movement into the site from either a vehicle that did not originate from the Garden State Parkway, or did, that may cause a momentary slowdown to allow that right-turn movement to occur.

Do you have an opinion or have you given any thought as to, can that right-turn movement off of a decel lane at this location operate in a safe manner?
A. I have looked at that and that's exactly where $I$ would want the right-turn movement to operate from is that already established right-turn-decel lane because vehicles, although those traveling to DePiero Drive may not yet be decelerating or braking to turn right onto that roadway, it is accepted and understood that that right-most lane is the slowest of all travel lanes as
you're moving in an easterly direction from the Parkway towards the project.

So it is my opinion, understanding that you have travel coming -- vehicles coming from both the Parkway ramp and straight through on Grand Avenue coming to that juncture, that that right-turn movement can decelerate into the site with excellent visibility.

Again, as $I$ pointed out with regard to safety, when you can't see that car well is when you run into challenges. And from all perspectives, you can clearly see a car in front of you decelerating to make that turn momentarily as it comes into the site.

And I would say, recall also that when we're talking about decelerating to make a turn at an intersection it's similar to making a turn within a commercial driveway, slightly slower.

So you're traveling and turning at speed. Same thing that you would expect downstream at the signal as you come into DePiero Drive.

So I do believe that driveway can operate safely, understanding those dynamics of traffic flow there.
Q. If you were to have undertaken the initial review of the layout of this site,
> understanding the traffic information that you have now viewed, would you have any hesitancy or issue or concern relative to locating that driveway at that particular location from a traffic engineering standpoint?
A. No, I wouldn't.

In fact, $I$ looked at the whole project and being familiar with the way the site is designed and operates now, you can see a very clear, what I call an access management plan.

Access management plan is really a fancy way of saying how we organize the driveways to get into and out of a private site. And we have come a long way in the traffic engineering industry in terms of how we look at access management and how we design sites properly.

If you think about projects of old, whether they're gas stations, retail sites or office, they tended to put as many driveways as they could along the frontage, which created a lot of friction within our roadway system.

What you see as part of this project is a very cohesive organization of driveways. I think in a way to not have a driveway along Grand Avenue to this project, going back to what $I$ was speaking

1 about, would violate driver expectation. You have about 600 feet of frontage of this site on Grand Avenue.

And it's my opinion that a driver coming down the roadway looking to enter into the site would expect that there would be a driveway somewhere along 600 feet, 60 feet, perhaps not.

But in terms of being able to maneuver properly into a site, travel into a site in a safe manner, this driveway that we are proposing along Grand Avenue is in an acceptable location from an access management perspective, and is in a logical location as it relates to drivers of passenger cars coming to and from the site location.

Now, as you come around the corner onto DePiero Drive, you encounter a right-in/right-out access point. Excellent access management; limited, curbs, and you actually, along the median of the road, you have a physical curbed median, so you cannot make a left in or a left out. Excellent practice. Eliminates certain types of traffic movements out of the site and into the site, particularly when we're about 75 feet from a major signalized intersection. So we're limiting the access movements there.

Now, as you come further south, we're all familiar with the four-leg intersections that you come to both centrally located on the project and then to the south.

And those intersections tell a little bit of a different story, because now we have textured crosswalks, we have slightly raised pavement area and we have different coloring, which, as a traffic engineer, tells me a little bit more about what's expected here, which is not just motor vehicle traffic but pedestrian, potentially bicycle traffic as well.

To pull vehicles off of Grand Avenue, a major corridor, and pull them into driveways and intersections that we have designed with intent to carry multi-modal traffic, I do not think is in keeping with the access management principles that we would seek to design at a site like this.

We have mobility along Grand Avenue for motor vehicles. Let's allow for motor vehicle traffic, safely, of course, in that area.

And as you come further down and south into DePiero, where you have public plazas that are on either side -- you have a beautifully designed project, which I would generally argue is operating
extremely well from a passive recreation standpoint and also encouraging people to walk from an office building across the street into an excellent center. Excellent project and design.

And I think what we're talking about for this northern piece, from an access management perspective, it reads with the same vocabulary that we want across this project.

So I think from an access perspective it's important that we have an access point where we have shown along Grand Avenue in the manner that it's designed.
Q. Mr. Olivo, if the left turn from Grand Avenue into the site were not available, traffic would then have to make a left onto DePiero Drive, continue to the intersection that you described as being multi-modality --
A. Multi-modal. MR. REGAN: Multi-modal. THE WITNESS: Multi-modal. That's good, that's close. BY MR. DELVECCHIO:
Q. -- enter the site, and then navigate back in a northerly direction through what essentially is another area where pedestrians,


#### Abstract

vehicles and site traffic would be anticipated to occur in order to get to that northernmost building that is now being proposed to be constructed.


From an access management standpoint, is that a preferred route of travel as compared to the left turn occurring at the location proposed?
A. It is not a preferred route of travel. I would also contend that it is -- it struggles in my mind with function as well to ask a driver, somewhere around 200 feet upstream of the intersection, to recognize that at the signal, before they can even see the building in great detail, that they would make a turning movement at that signal, then come down into the site and then navigate back north to travel into the area of the site where they would park.

And the challenge there is, $I$ know it doesn't sound like a whole lot in what's driving through a parking lot, we do it every day.

But, again, we come back to driver expectation and that is not something that you would see in many projects across the state, or across anywhere for that matter, to ask a driver to make that many upstream decisions to travel to a site that they wouldn't be able to recognize.

Now, repeat customers, of course they would recognize that.

But we can accommodate a more than sufficient left-turn lane in a median. What $I$ would say is if the left turn was occurring from an active through lane, I would not support that left turn.

I have seen that in communities in Bergen County and throughout New Jersey where you have drivers waiting in an active through lane to make a left turn into a driveway.

We have great median here that we can restripe, stage a vehicle, wait, turn into a site. That is ideal.

From a traffic engineering perspective, that is what we look for.

So, again, if the conditions were different, I'm not sure that $I$ would recommend a left turn here.

But because of the conditions that we have, not to mention that this is a corridor of road that has left-turn lanes within it. We know it. There's a vocabulary that continues down the roadway.

Again, if we didn't have that $I$ would be concerned about violating driver expectation.

But we have these elements of the road
that we can use in an efficient and functional manner and that is our charge as engineers to do so in a safe and responsible way.

So I do not think the alternative to
that would be recommended from a traffic engineering perspective, from my perspective.
Q. One final question from my end.

Based upon your review of the plan, the traffic report, the review of the testimony at the last meeting, do you believe that the proposed access point, both its right and left-turn movement into the site, comply with all applicable standards, codes or ordinances that might govern or control that particular movement?
A. I do.

And I have reviewed the traffic study
in detail. This is the rare case where, with a development project of this magnitude and the scale, you have traffic counts over the course of about ten years, which is excellent, and it's quite rare.

I would guess that the county doesn't even have that much data for this corridor for this area.

But by virtue of the fact of studying this project as intently as you have and requested of
the applicant and your own traffic engineer, you have a significant amount of data.

I have looked at the findings of the report, the trip generation analysis, the shared parking analysis, the internal capture, the level of service analyses; everything has been done in keeping with an extremely high level of standard and care with regard to traffic engineering.

I think this is an extremely well
studied project. I think that you have a number of what I like to think are authoritative traffic engineering opinions both from the public and private perspective. And I do believe that the traffic study indicates safe and effective movements throughout all areas of the site, both internal and external, but particularly I know we're focused on the driveway on Grand Avenue, but particularly that driveway, my opinion, having reviewed it, is that it would operate safely and effectively.

MR. DelVECCHIO: Thank you, Mr. Olivo.
I make Mr. Olivo available to the board and your professionals for additional questions.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
I am going to start with our professionals first.

Mr. Hipolit, do you have any questions or comments based upon the testimony you heard from Mr. Olivo?

MR. HIPOLIT: I have one question.
The -- so you had your car parked in the gore stripe area.

THE WITNESS: I did.
MR. HIPOLIT: You were looking
westbound on Grand Avenue.
THE WITNESS: I was.
MR. HIPOLIT: And you said you could
see 900 feet.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. HIPOLIT: Can you tell me where 900 feet was about?

THE WITNESS: It is -- it's past the first bridge abutment, the northbound Parkway traffic, and there is a -- I think it was by design, there's a pretty rusty section of guide rail and it's to the end and then beyond that section of guide rail.

MR. HIPOLIT: How did you come up with

```
900 feet?
```

THE WITNESS: After $I$ saw that and drove through it, I stopped down at CVS, then I swung
back around, I measured it on a Google aerial map. MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. I have no other questions.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, thank you. And, Mr. Rached.

MR. RACHED: Good evening, Chuck.
Thank you for your testimony.
We had a discussion earlier today and I
indicated to you that board members were very
concerned about this driveway, mostly the right-turn movement. And you and I discussed the operation of that right-turn movement.

And then $I$ put my thinking hat on and asked myself what else can we do to further improve that movement, and I discussed with Mr. Hipolit earlier today the benefit of installing rumble strips in that area between the end of the ramp where the yield signs are and the driveway itself. In other words, in front of the vacant wooded lot.

What is your opinion on putting rumble strips and what would be your opinion if we combined that with the lowering of the speed limit and the other things we discussed tonight?

THE WITNESS: Well, I think the purpose of rumble strips, and as long as yourself and the
borough engineer and the county who has jurisdiction over the roadway is agreeable to that, I think that my understanding and having proposed and certainly driven through rumble strips is that now we're starting to engage the sense of touch, right?

A lot of what we do when we drive is we use our eyes. We also use our ears. And now we're starting to engage tactile senses, or touch, which, in every case when we use rumble strips, is to slow vehicles down and make drivers more alert.

That, combined with speed limit
reductions potentially in the area, I think what that does is it improves driver alertness and acuity, and I certainly think that it could be something that I could get behind as a recommendation to further improve what's happening here.

And I think that it could have the added benefit of, once again, just further signaling to drivers that this is the rightmost deceleration lane, whether it's for DePiero or the driveway, and what we're looking for vehicles to do within this lane is slow down.

MR. RACHED: Thank you. That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Thank you.

Board Members, and I guess I'll start with Mr. Zitelli.

MR. ZITELLI: Really? Okay.
That's fine, Mr. Chairman.
So, Mr. Olivo, I do appreciate your credentials and your research on this. I am going to question the ten years of data that we are looking at here because we're looking at a much different site.

So I'll accept that there are ten years worth of data, but it's based on a whole different environment there. We had a farm there and we had the Mercedes property.

We've now developed this thing where we've got Wegmans, we're putting in several other businesses. You've got -- you know, the whole thing has changed.

THE WITNESS: I do.
MR. ZITELLI: So as far as I'm concerned, the ten years worth of data is fine. It's nice to start with. It's not worth anything to me in the future.

So I appreciate what you've done, but I'm going to say -- I'm going to disagree with you. You're entitled to your opinion and I'm entitled to mine. I do not want a left turn in there.

I would consider a left turn in the future after we have some -- maybe after a couple of years and we can see how this goes and we have data based on the site that is based on the environment that we have there.

But right now, that ten years worth of data doesn't mean anything to me. I think -- if this were a scientific thing, if we were to bring this in front of, you know, a physics or a chemistry board or something like this and we said, we have all this data and it's based on a different set of environment here, they'd just throw us out. And so I appreciate it, but -- okay.

So my opinion is what $I$ would like to see you do is perhaps to the east of the site, have some signs there that would point out that we've got Valley Medical and the other things that are going to be in there to alert drivers in advance that they can make that left in on DePiero Drive, I would want them to do that, and then you could have signage within the site there so people know how to navigate it to get over to that other building. That is what I would prefer.

> THE WITNESS: If I may ask,

Mr. Zitelli, what -- and I agree with you. The ten
years of data does not necessarily help us understand whether or not the left-turn lane will work.

In fact, I don't know that it helps us at all.

But what it does help us understand is have traffic volumes have changed over the course of ten years. That's a different analysis. That has to do with traffic impact and things like that.

But if I may ask, what is the concern about the left turn in at this location?

MR. ZITELLI: Safety.
THE WITNESS: And how so --
MR. ZITELLI: There's a lot of
accidents that happen there.
THE WITNESS: Is there something about the left turn, where it's being made from, that concerns you with regard to safety?

MR. ZITELLI: Yes, right -- making that
left turn into that new driveway that we're -- and I know it was an existing driveway at one point, but making that across several lanes of traffic, I just don't see it. Okay?

So again, it's an opinion. Right? And none of us -- I mean, we're all making judgments based on what we've seen so far and, you know, we
know. And traffic is going to change over the years. The number of residences that are being put into our town here is continuing to -- we're getting more and more residents in town. Things are going to change. Our business flow has changed here. We used to have a lot of corporations. Some of them have moved out here.

Things are changing. So, you know, we can't use -- we can look at the past, but the past is not a guarantee of what the future is going to be. THE WITNESS: Well, the past -MR. ZITELLI: I don't want to debate this with you.

THE WITNESS: No, of course. Of course.

MR. ZITELLI: You heard my opinion. My opinion is $I$ don't want a left turn there. And that's it, Mr. Chairman. That's my two cents here.

THE WITNESS: Understood.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, very well.
Let's move on.
Mr. Lintner?
MR. LINTNER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Olivo, thank you for that
presentation, it was actually very enlightening. I was -- some of the things you mentioned about, you know, not having an active lane, making a left turn there I thought was very interesting and didn't -didn't think about it initially myself.

If we were to go ahead and allow these turns, what happens if it doesn't work? What happens if we have issues? What's the next step we would do?

THE WITNESS: What I've seen is that board engineers and board professionals immediately go back to -- in some cases you don't have very responsive -- I've worked all over the state, and I am sure Maurice can attest to this, you don't always have responsive jurisdictional agencies.

And if this were the Port Authority, no offense, Port Authority, it would take a while and you would have to go through many levels of bureaucracy to get an answer. You can -- Andy or Maurice could pick up the phone and call the county engineer tomorrow if there is a concern here.

And I'll just say this, I respect Mr. Zitelli's opinion completely and I -- I won't challenge it because $I$ understand where it comes from.

But I will say this, what we have seen
in the past doesn't necessarily tell us about what is coming in the future, but as a traffic engineer my charge is to remove the emotion out of it and to study how a site and a driveway could potentially operate using the whole toolbox and checklist of what we do to tell us whether or not something can operate safely.

Maurice has the same charge. Betsy has the same charge. Eric Timsak and his staff have the same charge. Because nobody has a crystal ball. What you would do is you would immediately call the county and you would even potentially look to temporarily close that driveway if it was a safety issue. And that could happen overnight. MR. LINTNER: Thank you. MR. HIPOLIT: Can I just -CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Go ahead. MR. HIPOLIT: Mr. Lintner, to kind of help with your question a little bit, we had a situation about a little less than a year ago for a left-turn lane coming west on Grand Avenue at the light with Mercedes Drive --

MR. LINTNER: Right.
MR. HIPOLIT: -- we had three serious accidents there.

On the first serious accident we notified the county there was a problem. The county came out and did some traffic counts.

On the second serious accident the county came out and changed the timing.

On the third serious accident, the county came out and changed the timing to have a protected left lane, we've had no problems since.

To answer your question, it's not our road.

MR. LINTNER: Right.
MR. HIPOLIT: If there's an accident -if we -- if there's a left-turn or a right-turn lane something created and causes an accident problem, it's not the borough's problem to solve.

The county doesn't get any good PR with accidents and deaths on the road. None. They don't get any.

So they will react pretty quickly to three accidents at the intersection probably were two too many, but making a drastic change to a signal could potentially cause it -- this is what they told me, it could cause even more problems so they want to make sure they got it right.

Unfortunately there was two accidents
within like two days that was the two and three, and then they just said we're going to protect the lane and it was protected. It's their decision to make, the borough really has no control over it. MR. LINTNER: Okay, thank you. Nothing further, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. Mr. Teagno. MR. TEAGNO: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

When you started I swore you had read my notes. That's exactly what $I$ wanted to talk about.

I don't know how to display this. I don't think we have (indicating) --

THE WITNESS: Maybe I'll try to narrate it.

MR. TEAGNO: Well, I'm going to narrate it.

THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. TEAGNO: But $I$ don't know how everybody else is going to see it.

But this is Sheet L1.00 from the landscape, it's the biggest one we got in the package.
I'd like --
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry. Dante,
what sheet are you looking at?
MR. TEAGNO: L1.00. That's it. It's just this enlargement.
So I'd just like to --
THE WITNESS: Go ahead, I'm sorry.
MR. TEAGNO: I'm sorry.
So, basically, what we have is exactly what you expressed.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. TEAGNO: And I just took -- made some notes on it, because I have some concerns, I think this is probably the best solution to the configuration of this roadway and adding turns in and out of the property.
THE WITNESS: Okay.
MR. TEAGNO: But I do have some
concerns. And they're safety concerns.
First of all, can we agree that these roads, as was testified to before, right now have a 45 mile an hour speed limit on them?
THE WITNESS: In this section, yes.
MR. TEAGNO: Okay. So you would
imagine that people are going to go -- hopefully, not
exceed 45 miles an hour, but my experience is they come out from under that overpass like (indicating).

So anyway, they're going to be going up to 45 miles an hour, I'll say 40 .

If you're coming off the Parkway, you're accelerating from the yield sign to that. And just a few feet further, if you wanted to make a turn, you're decelerating.

So what you're doing is you're merging into a lane that people behind you are going to be accelerating and you're going to be decelerating with no warning. Except maybe a right-turn signal, but I don't know.

The other two lanes there, because it's three lanes wide, people are going up to 45 miles an hour. And if this person decided they couldn't stop in time, they might try to go in the other lane. So I accept that it creates an area for potentially difficult situations. Okay?

THE WITNESS: I see.
MR. TEAGNO: The second thing is this -- I like the area this -- where you were parked with your blinkers and everything and there's a left-hand turn lane here, and $I$ know there is all kinds of controls that are going to be implemented hopefully
with this. My concern is that you've got a stopped vehicle here, you've got two lanes at least of people going up to 45 miles an hour, and this person who is going from a stop to make the left-hand turn has to cross three lanes of traffic. I don't think that's -- I think that's a dangerous situations as well.

So I guess my concern is, I think they have done a good job in presenting this and presenting a solution to the existing conditions, but I see two things that I don't know how to solve because I'm not an expert, but I think they're potentially dangerous situations that could cause problems in the future and cause bodily injury to the people involved in the cars in that area.

THE WITNESS: So if I understand, Mr. Teagno, it's the right-turn movement going into the site because it's decelerating there between the Parkway ramp and between DePiero --

MR. TEAGNO: Well, accelerating from the parking --

THE WITNESS: And then decelerating --
MR. TEAGNO: -- and then decelerating, the guy behind you, when you go up to the next exit.

THE WITNESS: Right. And then the left turn because of the crossing of the lanes.

MR. TEAGNO: Three lanes, 40 miles an
hour.
THE WITNESS: And so the way that we, when we review whether or not those movements, and the county likely uses a similar system, the DOT as well, whether those movement can be safely accepted by sight, is by looking at the exact same parameters that you have.

When you're crossing additional lanes of traffic, you think of a conventional left turn you cross one lane. Now you're crossing a second and you're crossing what we sometimes call an exit lane or a deceleration lane. Now, if you watch the video out there, you'll see the large majority of traffic is using those two through lanes.

MR. TEAGNO: Yes, but the third lane, which is the turn lane, that person could also be going straight.

THE WITNESS: They can if they're --
MR. TEAGNO: So that's another person going 45 miles an hour.

THE WITNESS: Right.
MR. TEAGNO: So that's three lanes, 45 miles an hour.

THE WITNESS: So what we do is for
every lane, we add more time to the gap.
So we look at a base gap to say if it were just one lane, you would only require a gap of about five seconds in terms of a vehicle and a successive vehicle.

So for every lane of traffic, you add another half a second. So here we have added those additional times, one full second, which I know doesn't seem like much, but you and I both know, driving cars, that's a lot of time when you're driving a car at speed. And then we look to see if there's enough gaps in traffic.

And what I could tell you at 6:00 at night during the evening peak hour, there were periods of time where I was -- and I was sitting in there momentarily, there were gaps of ten seconds in that lane.

I understand the concern about safety and this location, but we have to look at the numbers of cars, the numbers of gaps and what we're proposing. That's what we have to do as engineers. And I respect the opinion of you and other members of this board and I understand the concern.

We are the ones that have to ultimately
decide whether or not this can operate safely and we have to stand by it.

And I appreciate you sharing your opinion and that is simply mine with regard to whether or not this driveway can operate safety.

MR. TEAGNO: Now, piggybacking on Mr. Zitelli's comments, whatever data you have and whatever gaps you see are based on today's traffic situations and traffic counts and all that other stuff, and we know that in this immediate area there's probably both sides of the highway and the surrounding area, there's a couple thousand new residences that are going in, which will add an awful lot of traffic to that area because it's a main thoroughfare, plus the -- I love Wegmans and I love this whole thing, the development is very well planned, but that is going to attract people. It already does.

So this -- the traffic volume is going
to continue to increase, and I am not sure that this problem that I have just described is not going to get worse.

THE WITNESS: Well --
MR. TEAGNO: That's my opinion.
THE WITNESS: -- Dolan and Dean did
model those volumes. KPMG, Horn Rock, other development projects in the area then grew on top of that, taking 2022 volumes from earlier this year.

So besides using a crystal ball, which
we all recognize is not the authoritative and technical way to do it. We've taken every bit of info, present day, not 2011 info. We've taken 2022, with growth, with all the projects that we're talking about. And then we deliver you the results of the future study. And we've done all of that in accord with industry standards.

MR. TEAGNO: Okay.
MR. HIPOLIT: Do you know what growth factor you used.

THE WITNESS: I believe that the county required is 1.5 here; . 5 was used, along with all of the site-specific development projects.

There's hundreds of additional vehicles added into this corridor as a result of what was done in the study.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry.
Mr. Cohen, did you want to say
something?
MR. COHEN: No, I am just peaking
around.

MR. TEAGNO: So I guess in closing then I could say that I think between the speed of the vehicles, the amount of vehicles and the turning potentials for an accident of some sort, I still see these two things I've outlined as potentially dangerous situation in each case that, hopefully, is taken care of, but if not, we're in trouble.

Okay? Thank you.
MR. RACHED: May I make a comment,
Mr. Chairman?
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. RACHED: Okay. I just want to
clarify to the board a couple things. In terms of the traffic increase, if you look at the 2011, 2012, 2018 and 2022, there hasn't been any significant difference on West Grand. And in this direction, the traffic has been always between 900 and 1100, going back and forth, depending on the year and the day. So I just wanted the board to be aware of that.

The other issue that the board should also consider as you're deliberating and in view of your comment, Mr. -- is it Teagno?

MR. TEAGNO: Teagno.
MR. RACHED: Teagno, Mr. Teagno -- if the gaps were close to the demand, I'd be worried and
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I would say, well, what if traffic was up by ten
    percent, by }20\mathrm{ percent. But the gaps are ten times
    the demand. So keep that in your minds as you're
    evaluating this request, okay? That's all.
    CHAIRMAN DEPINTO: Thank you.
    Mr. Teagno, anything else?
    MR. TEAGNO: No, that's it.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
    Mr. Culhane?
    MR. CULHANE: Yeah, last week I made a
    statement so I'll make it again concerning the gaps.
    I believe most of the gaps identified in this study
    occur when the eastbound traffic on Grand Avenue has
    a red light to allow the Parkway exiting going
    westbound on Grand.
    So I believe most of those gaps occur
    during that interval of time. So the only conflict
    with the left turn then would be the exits heading
    eastbound on Grand. And if I remember the counts on
    an hourly basis on the peak, I believe it's 240 cars
        coming off the Parkway heading east, or four per
        minute.
        Last week we were told that the
    distance from the point where you complete the right
        turn, I'll say, to the driveway is about 320 feet.
```

And if you use an average speed of about 30 miles an hour, assuming it's a yield sign, that's about a seven minute travel distance.

MALE VOICE: Seven seconds.
MR. CULHANE: Seven second, sorry, seven second travel distance.

So my question is, if we put a stop sign there, would that improve the gap time available for left turns.

The other aspect, too, is if the speed limit, again, this is now dealing with the Parkway eastbound, is reduced to, say, 40 miles an hour, would that also improve the gap situation?

THE WITNESS: The stop sign that you refer to at the exit --

MR. CULHANE: The proposed stop sign.
THE WITNESS: The proposed stop sign at the exit of the ramp? Yes. Combined with what you've spoken about, the reduced speed, would improve the quality of these gaps, yes.

MR. CULHANE: I have another question which doesn't deal with this, it deals with the state and what Mr. Regan said earlier. I want to make sure. You said the Mayor and Council have to apply directly to the --

MR. REGAN: A letter request from the Mayor and Council.

MR. CULHANE: Do they have to do that with the equivalent of the county, seeing how it's a county road.

MR. REGAN: I think that would add more weight to the application, but I don't think they would necessarily need the county to send a letter.

MR. HIPOLIT: You should get concurrence with the county. It's a county road, we want concurrence from the county.

MR. CULHANE: That's what I am trying to get clarified. You have the Mayor and Council just do it themselves or they do it in conjunction --

MR. REGAN: It would be better to have a joint application or a joint request. That would add a lot more weight, I think.

MR. CULHANE: No other question at this time, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you.
Mr. Stefanelli.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Good
evening. I heard everybody's thing so I don't have too many questions, but I guess I am proposing when we originally had this site we did a traffic model
where we had modeled, you know, the car movements on Grand Avenue, and I am wondering if we should have that same model done showing the various improvements in the existing and with the new turn in showing this gap analysis. And I think seeing the visual of when we had that traffic thing would probably -MR. REGAN: The synchronization. VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Yes, yes. That whole thing. I thought that was pretty interesting and I think it convinced a lot of people. You know, seeing is -- it's better seeing something than talking about it, so I thought that that would help resolve, $I$ think, showing the gaps and all that. So I would propose that.

I am seeing, you know, with the -- I'm leaning that $I$ would -- I would look at, you know, passing the left-turn lane going in if there were certain conditions and I see, you know, the stop sign and the other things.

One of the things I have is -- I'm
still getting my hands around is how do we come up with 40 -- what's the traffic on the site? I'd like to hear that. I'd like to hear with how we came up with 40 cars per hour coming there.

Because here's my analysis. We had
improvement on Craig Road. We put in a townhouse development and we also put in a -- we put in a, what was it, a KinderCare.

MR. ZITELLI: Yes.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: And we had more traffic cutting across, making a left-hand turn cutting across, which I saw almost on an hourly basis. I bet you it was 40 cars sometimes.

But, you know, how do we know it's going to be 40 cars? What happens if it's -- was it designed for Building 3? Was it designed for the new building? What about a further phase, which I still have an issue with?

But I don't see -- what happens if you put a Chick-fil-A there? I could see 40 cars in ten minutes hanging there.

MR. RACHED: Well, let me first
clarify. Excuse me, Chuck.
THE WITNESS: Yes.
MR. RACHED: I testified briefly to the
numbers last week. I don't have the study in front of me now, but I do -- I think I remember that the right-turn in, in the traffic study was 51 in the a.m. peak and 53 in the p.m. peak, again --

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Regardless
of that --

MR. RACHED: My recollection. But that

```
    is --
```

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: -- how do you come up with 50 cars.

MR. RACHED: I'm getting to your
answer.
But then you have the left turn in which is another number; similar number, by the way.

So let's assume the left turn in is also 50, so now you have 100. So the way you come up with this number, there are national standards and they're published by the Institute of Transportation Engineers. We all use them all over the county.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: I don't disagree with that. I've heard that 100 times. MR. RACHED: Okay, all right.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Show me -MR. RACHED: I'll let Chuck do -- you know, I got the difficult part, so I'll leave it for Chuck.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: You gave me the difficult part. I want to know -THE WITNESS: Mr. Stefanelli, what I'll say --

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: -- 1100 cars
--
THE WITNESS: It's many more than 40 cars. And I think what Maurice was getting at is that it's many more than 40 cars.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Not in his traffic.

THE WITNESS: In the traffic for this project, if you look at the trip generation tables, it's -- in the p.m. peak hour, which is the highest peak hour, what's projected is about just over 500 peak hour trips. That's what the real numbers are.

Now, when you have multiple driveway access points, you have to distribute the traffic, is it going to use the southerly driveway, the one closer to Grand, or the one that we're proposing on Grand? That's how you come up with the amount of 40 or 50 that you and Maurice have talked about.

So you're right, it is many more than 40. But the site is much bigger than one driveway. The site has multiple parking fields.

And so those vehicles are then distributed across those driveways. What we have to look at is can all of the intersections, all of the parking fields, everything operate and accept and
then release that amount of vehicular traffic. That's the goal.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: So I guess
the question I have, and still I see -- I see Valley being very popular. We have a lot of seniors coming in there. You know, you're telling me 51 cars, whatever number of cars, that's what you're predicting based on your distributed -- distribution on the site.

But $I$ could see if it's mainly for this building, people going westbound are going to want to make that left-hand turn in, and $I$ just want to make sure that if you tell me it's 51 cars, but now tell me what is the maximum that you think could handle in the busiest hour. Is it 100 cars? Is it 30 cars?

Because I'd like to know now before we make a decision on what's going to go in there on what the maximum based on the gap analysis. And that's why I'd rather see the model and see what's going to prevail there.

THE WITNESS: The maximum is about ten times that 50. That's --

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Well, you say that, but $I$ want to see it on the report. I want to see it because I want to make sure that, you know,

I agree with some of the board members is that we looked at ten years, and you mentioned ten years and you just mentioned -- but we just went through COVID. There's been nobody on the road for two years.

THE WITNESS: Correct.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: And you're saying, well, that was '17/'18, but again, you know, and I -- 1.5 percent increase or whatever the increase was that $I$ thought I heard, I'm just concerned about future. And I think that we should know what it is currently per planning, what's the maximum, what that gap analysis is. And I think having a model and seeing that for the whole board could convince me that a left-hand turn is acceptable.

MR. RACHED: If I may clarify for the board, so we don't leave here with the wrong idea about traffic growth, so the trip generation theoretically will not change in one, two, three, ten years.

Of course, if the use changes then the trip generation will change.

But what I'm trying to say, if you put a housing development and we say it's going to generate 100 trips, that's the case more or less next
year or the year afterward, year after. The trips on
West Grand may increase because of other
developments.
And that's why I wanted to remind the
board that between 2011 and 2022 there hasn't been
much of an increase, it's been pretty steady over all
these years.

So I wanted to make sure that the board understands that so there is no confusion as to what is the increase.

And I'll tell you again, being that the gaps are ten times what we need, even if we have an increase on West Grand for ten percent, 20 percent, 30 percent, it's still insignificant given the number of gaps we have.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: And I see lowering the speed limit and I agree, but nobody has told me what people are driving on that road. You say it's 45, but I think they're doing 50 coming down the ramp, you know. They're trying to beat one light to the next light. 'Cause they don't want to stop at Mercedes.

MR. RACHED: I could tell you they are not driving 50 down the ramp because I -- today I did it, I tried to go fast. You cannot.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: No, I said Grand, I meant really underneath the overpass.

MR. RACHED: Okay. I got it.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: You know. Because, like you said, you could see -- you come in view and see the light at Mercedes and they're going to try to beat that light.

MR. RACHED: And again, regardless of the growth on West Grand, you still have the traffic signal that stops the traffic by the Parkway and gives you a gap. Even if the number doubles, you're still going to have gaps.

But then, like other board members said, we still have to deal with the traffic coming off the ramp. But that's a low number, so it's not a significant number.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Listen, I am fairly convinced that $I$ would look in favor if we did the model and it shows board members, I would be -- I would consider the left-hand turn.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, thank you.
With respect to that model, what would be required in order to produce a model addressing the concerns that were expressed by Mr. Stefanelli and others?

| 1 | MR. DelVECCHIO: I think the model |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | resides in Colliers archives, because if my memory |
| 3 | serves me correct -- |
| 4 | MR. HIPOLIT: We have it. |
| 5 | MR. DelVECCHIO: -- Maurice and his |
| 6 | team put together the model utilizing the data |
| 7 | collected by the applicant. |
| 8 | MR. HIPOLIT: That was around |
| 9 | 2013/2014. |
| 10 | MR. RACHED: Yes. |
| 11 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: So now the model is |
| 12 | the property of Colliers? |
| 13 | MR. RACHED: We have it, Mr. Chairman. |
| 14 | It's an old model. It has to be redone. It's not a |
| 15 | big deal. I am not sure if Betsy has an updated |
| 16 | model, she may. |
| 17 | MR. HIPOLIT: We shared it with her, |
| 18 | she had a copy of it. |
| 19 | MR. RACHED: Say that again. |
| 20 | MR. HIPOLIT: We shared the model with |
| 21 | Betsy when they were doing -- |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: When did you share |
| 23 | that with Betsy? |
| 24 | MR. HIPOLIT: Probably a few years |
| 25 | after -- when they came in for Phase II of Phase I, |

I/II, whatever that was called, that phase, Betsy updated her model, if you remember there was discrepancy with the board on whether the traffic counts were -- the projections were good or bad. Betsy had done more counts and at that time she had said their projection of traffic in the future of what they thought it would be after opening was not even close to it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Here --
MR. HIPOLIT: So she took the model and ran with it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Here's my read on this. We have a real challenge with Betsy not being here. We received from Maurice this evening, I think, some promising information with respect to lowering the speed limits along Grand Avenue, the possibility of getting a stop sign to replace the yield sign coming off of the Parkway.

I think we heard some positive things based upon the inquiries that he made during the past week.

I think other things that came to light last week was this synchronizing of the lights, the proficiency of the new synchronization relying on GPS versus mechanical methods. I think putting this all
together, speed limit, stop sign, synchronization of the lights, the projection of growth, I don't know if Betsy's report included the residential development occurring in Park Ridge right now.

THE WITNESS: It did, it did. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: It did? I think that, too, has to be put in. Plugging this all in on the model, I don't think, based upon what I heard, there's no one sitting here saying hell no, it's terrible, scrap it. But I think they need a little bit more convincing that all of this information has been taken into consideration by all of those that are experts in the field.

Am I correct, Frank?
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Yes, I
agree.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And Dante on the other side.

MR. TEAGNO: Yes.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: So I think we need a
little bit more information. I think we're close, but we need a little bit more information.

We're not looking to hold you up. One of the things that $I$ was concerned about, let's say
we approve it as shown and we are dead wrong. The left turn in, the right-turn in, the projected gaps, let's say all of that turns out, big mistake on our part; can we, in fact, shut that down if need be?

MR. REGAN: I am not as confident as Mr. Hipolit is. I hate to say it.

MR. HIPOLIT: Could we put a condition
in?
MR. REGAN: We can, but keep in mind when this board grants site plan approval it confers upon the developer certain vested rights under the Municipal Land Use Law.

Okay. Now, obviously the condition of approval is county requirements, county planning board and so on.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I think -MR. REGAN: I just don't think the borough would be in a position to shut it down. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: No, I understand. But I think --

MR. HIPOLIT: It's not our road.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I think if we were dealing with a raw piece of land with no other development around and dealing with a developer that we've never worked with before, that is not the case.

The case is we know who the developer is, we know what he has done and what he is proposing to do.

If we were to move forward with an approval and condition that approval with the understanding and acceptance of the applicant that if it doesn't work and we have measurable standards to say it doesn't work, it gets shut down.

MR. REGAN: I think you have to define in the resolution, spell it all out what those measurable standards are, with the help of Andy and Maurice.

And I think the developer would have to sign onto that, it would be within a time period -CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Now --

MR. REGAN: -- X number of years after a CO is issued, that the driveway condition could be reviewed and if it's deemed to be unacceptable to the borough, to public safety officials, the police department, the borough would have a right to -CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Let's go back to the history of that drive. We all know that there were periods of time when the drive was open and utilized by Mercedes-Benz, and there were times where it was chained off at the request or demand of the borough for whatever the reasons might have been at that
time. We were controlling that point of access.
My way of looking at this is no one is
saying stop the project, but everyone wants the assurance that if these experts are wrong, we have recourse. I don't want the applicant to say, hey, you gave it to me, tough luck, Charlie. Not that I think that he would. But we have to deal with our concerns and we have to deal with our interest. MR. TEAGNO: Can I make one more comment.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. TEAGNO: I just want to make one more comment.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. TEAGNO: If I understand this
correctly, this whole -- the success of this depends on those gaps that you say are going to be created so that it allows timing for the traffic to flow, okay.

That is something that $I$ don't know much about, but you guys are the experts. I'm just saying that $I$ don't want to approve something that $I$ see that has potentially dangerous situations, but you guys are the experts, the guys that put this to GPS, whatever system is going to create the gaps and adjust the traffic accordingly, very smart people
probably put that together.
But, you know, Teslas were supposed to drive themselves and a lot of smart guys put that stuff together and that's not working out. And I would hate to see something that we put the onus on this electronic or whatever the right explanation is for the term, this GPS is, that that's where we're really putting our money.

MR. HIPOLIT: With the system the way it is right now today, nothing was to change, you have ten times the gaps you need, when the GPS system is installed you'll be at ten times plus some number -- remember, you have a light on both sides of the driveway.

MR. TEAGNO: Like Frank said, I haven't seen that. I haven't seen one gap. MR. HIPOLIT: I think it's in the model.

MR. TEAGNO: I can't see a gap. Did you see the gap.

MR. HIPOLIT: No, but if you go out there and there's a light on both sides that turns red.

MR. TEAGNO: You have a lot of traffic, the gap -- without this electronic control.

MR. HIPOLIT: Exactly.
MR. TEAGNO: I'm just telling you --
I'm not --
MR. RACHED: To answer your question,
Mr. Chairman, to go back to your idea, there are metrics we can quantify we can put on paper.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay.
MR. RACHED: If we need to go that route.

MR. REGAN: That's what we need.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I mean, we could debate the workability of this thing forever, and that's not what we're here to do. We have our experts saying based upon the information they developed, they believe that there could be safe ingress to the property in both an eastbound and westbound direction going into the Grand Avenue drive.

Okay, I buy that. It's the what-if factor. What if, in fact, it does not work? A, if you have a measurable standard, that's the point you could pull the plug and say it ain't working, the chain goes up like it went up on Mercedes-Benz, until such time as it can work.

I mean, it's -- I'd rather we sat here
and all said oh, this is all perfect, but I am not hearing that right now. And $I$ think it's important to update that model, look at it one more time, and even with that, get the cooperation of the applicant to say here's the what-if scenario. If we're -MR. REGAN: Mr. Chairman, I would want the applicant to sign off on the metrics for those standards that would be developed, I guess, by Maurice and Andy. It would be incorporated in the Resolution.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: So Andy DelVecchio, what do you have to say about this?

MR. DelVECCHIO: I'm just listening. MR. ZITELLI: Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure, sure. MR. ZITELLI: Let me add something. I am hearing this discussion about the model, all right, and typically what the model would get updated to.

And one of my original things just before when $I$ was speaking is what data we're putting into it. Putting data into it that's ten years old doesn't buy it for me, okay? Because that site is so different.

So you can't put any data in there
that, in my mind, is more than two or three years old, because everything has changed since then. So you don't have a history that is more than two or three years old. And it's continuing to evolve as we see because now, I just heard -- Mr. Culhane testified before that we have what, 40 people -- or 40 residences have started and we've got 156 there, right? So there's going to be more. So the change is happening here.

I am not opposed -- obviously I am not opposed to this development at all, I am just opposed to the left turn. That is my key thing. I am opposed to that left turn. And, you know, we're talking about things here that are speculation. We're talking about a stop sign that doesn't exist right now, a speed limit change that doesn't exist right now, synchronization that hasn't taken place right now. So all of these things we're talking about, all speculation, we don't have any of it. So I would rather go the approach, Mr. Chairman, of no left turn initially until such time as we feel it's comfortable to make that left turn and then grant it. But $I$ would rather start out and say uh-uh, no left turn. You know, let the history show us that it's going to be a safe thing

```
that we can do.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: But I think --
    MR. ZITELLI: That's just my opinion.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: But I think we heard
    last week that if we don't allow that left turn in,
    and let's go with that --
        MR. ZITELLI: Sure.
        CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- that left-hand
turn heading south is going to occur at the
intersection of Grand and DePiero.
    MR. ZITELLI: Right.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And it's going to
direct all the traffic --
    MR. ZITELLI: Correct.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- down to that
intersection of the two sides of the street.
    MR. ZITELLI: Yes.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: What's happening
        over by Wegmans and what's happening here.
        MR. ZITELLI: Right.
        CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And I believe what
        we heard from Maurice last week, you were not -- and
        correct me if I am wrong, Maurice, you were not
        comfortable with all of the traffic going to that one
        central point.
```

Is that correct?
MR. RACHED: Yes, that is correct.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. So --
MR. ZITELLI: No, I understand that.
What I'm saying --
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: What I'm fearful of
is if we don't allow it, are we moving a problem further south and not have an opportunity to deal with it as easily?

MR. ZITELLI: Yes, I understand that, Mr. Chairman.

I am looking at it as we're not -- what we're -- we're not crossing three lanes of traffic --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: No, I got that.
MR. ZITELLI: Yeah, so I'm looking at it as -- I'm not saying that one situation -- it's like the choice of which one is the worse thing.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Here's where I disagree with you, when you're talking about data that is ten years old.

As we all know, ten years ago we had more occupied office buildings in both Montvale and Park Ridge.

The Grey Boulevard activity which primarily came out onto Mercedes Drive. You don't
have that anymore.
The activity of the Marriott, you don't
have what you had ten years ago.
So, yes, maybe we are adding more
residences at the district and the Horn Run property, but we've eliminated probably in its day, between the two Mercedes buildings on Mercedes Drive, we probably had close to 2,000 people working there. And those were the old-fashioned days where people went to work five days a week.

MR. ZITELLI: Yes, I understand.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: So if you really
want to analyze it, you can't just analyze it from a projected growth of . 5 or 1.5. I think there's a value to that ten-year analysis. Maybe those days will come back with the office buildings being occupied. I hope so.

MR. RACHED: Mr. Chairman, let me clarify something.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I think there's value in considering it.

Yes, Maurice.
MR. RACHED: Just to clarify to the board members, the data is fresh. Data was taken in 2022, specifically January 25, 2022. Data was taken

1 in 2018 and prior.

So to say that the applicant didn't provide fresh data, that would not be true. There is fresh data.

I do want to comment on the model. I'm not sure it's going to be of any use. The model is -- we're going to look at it and it's going to look good. I think we will be wasting time having someone crank a model and come back here and display it and -- it's going to look good.

I do like the Chairman's proposal is to put some metrics to protect the Borough and to protect the community and see if it works. And if it doesn't work, we have a backup plan. That is my recommendation to you as your traffic engineer.

MR. ZITELLI: Mr. Chairman, who would be responsible for enforcing those metrics and verifying that they are met or not met?

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, if --
MR. ZITELLI: Those are things we would have in our Resolution.

MR. REGAN: Whoever the borough designates.

MR. ZITELLI: Again, who might that be. MR. REGAN: It could be our experts.

MR. HIPOLIT: It's usually us.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes, it would be the borough engineer, I would believe, that would analyze it in conjunction with the police department, $I$ am sure. And there seems to be a good line of communication between the borough engineer and the police department as it relates to traffic and traffic control.

So I think we would charge both of them with respect to the enforcement.

MR. RACHED: I think maybe it's time that I tell you what the metrics are because it's pretty simple and then you could see how this could be enforced.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. RACHED: And I'm not inventing these metrics, they're published nationally. There is a national traffic standard booklet, it's called the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. For short, we call it the MUTCD. It is what we use in all states, including New Jersey.

Title 39 requires its use when we do traffic signs and traffic control.

In that manual they have a metric for the installation of a traffic signal, and $I$ know
we're not putting a traffic signal but give me a moment here. And this manual says that if we have five or more crashes a year susceptible to improvement by a traffic signal, that that justifies a traffic signal.

We can apply the same logic and say if we have five or more accidents a year susceptible to elimination by closing this driveway, we will use that metric. It's something that we've been using as traffic engineer for decades, it works, and enforcing it is straightforward and simple. Every year we go to the police department, we look at the traffic accidents if there are any. We look at whether or not there will be -- they would have been eliminated if that driveway wasn't there, and if we reach that threshold that's published in the MUTCD, then we will take the appropriate action. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: So there is a measurable standard that could be utilized -MR. RACHED: Yes. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- and not create reinventing the wheel. MR. RACHED: Yes. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry, John, you had something.

MR. CULHANE: I'm still concerned that when we're talking about the left turn, the conflict left turns are going to have is minimized because they're only going to be in conflict with Parkway exiting eastbound. That's 240 cars. The two main through lanes have a red light.

MR. RACHED: Yes.
MR. CULHANE: There's no traffic coming on the two main lanes for that period of that red light.

So there has to be a period of time, and that's why I keep saying, the gap analysis does not apply when they occurred. I think the majority occur when there is a red light for the exiting traffic heading westbound to exit.

MR. HIPOLIT: The only conflicting
traffic --
MR. CULHANE: And there's 240 cars, if
I remember correctly, coming off the Parkway during the peak hour, that's four a minute; on average, 15 second gap.

So I think the concerns which we all have, $I$ think there is a lot more safe left turn times available because there is no traffic heading eastbound for a period of time. It's only the

Parkway traffic exiting eastbound that it's in conflict with.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Now, with respect to the signal, Andy, for the left-hand turn coming off of the Parkway, the timing of that signal, do we have any control over that or is that Turnpike Authority or is it the county?

MR. HIPOLIT: It's the county. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The county. So if we felt that we needed more time to hold that red light another 10 or 15 seconds, which would, as John said, help with the gap situation, we would just have to discuss it with the county.

## Is that correct?

MR. HIPOLIT: On all county roads in Montvale and anywhere in the county, you have a -- if you want more time added to a phase, left, right, through, you ask the county and the county does one of two things: Ask you to provide a study to determine what the best method to move through that signal is and where the timing needs to be or they come out and study themselves.

In a lot of cases like that, the county would say, Borough, give me a study to show if you
changed the time, and we're going to do our own study at the same time. They use the same counters at the same time.

Just so the board understands, we deal with Bergen County all the time. Every county is a little different. Bergen County doesn't take their roads lightly.

Bergen County doesn't take their signals lightly, they don't take their accident history lightly. They're very in target and have a very big traffic bureau that deals with it.

The county has said with no uncertainly the left-turn lane is going to work. There's so many gaps it's not even an issue.

I've talked to Eric Timsak, he says I am not sure why your Board is worried about this. The -- the through traffic is stopped at the Parkway and your only conflict is the right-turn lane from off the Parkway. They don't have -- when I say no concern, they have no concern.

Because if there was a left-turn out, I think Chuck said it, he said if there was a left-turn out, it would change because we have a left and a left going on at the same time. And we're a little concerned, the sight distance may become a problem
with that left out because of where that driver sits.
He says but a one-way drive in with a left and a right in, yeah, I'm not -- he doesn't understand what the concern was.

I've tried to convey to him your concerns and he keeps coming back to me with, the through traffic on Grand is stopped. It's not going, it's under a red light. The only conflict is the left and the Parkway traffic. And that's coming down, it slows down, it speeds up. There's -- the gaps are -- you keep hearing the testimony -- ten times the amount of gaps needed.

It's not even close. It's not like we're saying there's -- you know, it's just, it's close. Like, hey, guys, it's close. If it was close the county would never approve this.

MR. TEAGNO: So the cars making a left aren't waiting for anything other than a gap.

MR. HIPOLIT: That's it.
MR. TEAGNO: They don't have a light.
MR. HIPOLIT: No, they're waiting for a gap for a Parkway car to not come off and just cut across a red light. There's no -- the double through traffic lanes are coming, they're not making a left turn, they're going to wait. They're going to wait
in that lane that -- what Eric said was he said, and I think Chuck aligns with it, if the car is waiting at a through lane heading westbound, he said we would -- the county would never approve the left turn.

MR. TEAGNO: I understand.
MR. HIPOLIT: The car's making a protected left turn.

It could stay there for 40 seconds. Who cares.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: What is the capacity
of that left-hand turn in, the stack capacity?
MR. RACHED: Mr. Chairman, I am looking
at the aerial as we speak and --
MR. HIPOLIT: It's going to be different because they're going to have to make -it's moving.

MR. RACHED: It is moving, but I would measure this one and use that as an example or at least as a starting point in the discussion.

MR. TEAGNO: It's not moving if they're waiting for the light to change.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: No, no, just it's -there's more cars.

MR. RACHED: Right now, based on the aerial, it shows approximately 160 feet, which is
approximately, let's say, 25,20 or 25 feet per car up to eight cars. It's more than what we need.

MR. TEAGNO: No. A regular car is about 16 feet long.

MR. RACHED: I'm sorry.
MR. TEAGNO: Isn't a normal car about
16 feet long?
MR. RACHED: Right, but I am being
conservative.
So, I mean, yes, if you stack them close, you could stack more than that, but I'm saying 7 to 8 feet comfortably -- I mean seven to eight cars comfortably.

MR. TEAGNO: Oh, okay.
MR. RACHED: And we do not need anywhere near that kind of queue.

MR. TEAGNO: Okay.
THE WITNESS: The left-turn bay is about 120 to 140 feet that we're proposing to go into the driveway. I believe that was the Chairman's question, how many can we fit in there. And I would agree. You can fit somewhere around seven to eight vehicles stacked.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: In your professional opinion, do you believe that that is adequate
stacking capacity given the projected counts of that point of access?

THE WITNESS: It is more than adequate.
You would not anticipate more than a vehicle or two in this lane waiting to make a left turn. Even if those volumes, if we ran a sensitivity analysis to really test it as Mr. Stefanelli asked, what if it was twice as many vehicles, not 50 , it was 100 , what it if wasn't 50, it was 150, two to three vehicles, you can still accommodate seven to eight vehicles in that bay out of the travel way waiting to make a left turn with adequate sight distance.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. Any other questions?

MR. TEAGNO: What's the name of that -let me ask Andy this -- GPS or whatever, what's the name of that system? There's got to be a name for it.

MR. RACHED: The generic name is time-based coordinator. It's a GPS-based, time-based base coordinator.

MR. TEAGNO: There's no, like, company name for that?

MR. RACHED: There are several companies that make it. It depends on what equipment
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the county is using, we'll use something compatible.
    MR. TEAGNO: Okay, thank you.
    MR. RACHED: Sure.
    VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: I just have
```

    two questions.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure, go ahead.
    VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: So what kind
    of signage -- I am concerned about people coming up
    to the site and trying to get in there, so how do we
    coordinate people getting to the site and getting to
    that left-turn lane, you know.
    THE WITNESS: Well, I believe there's
    signage proposed on the building.
    Is there corner --
    MR. REGAN: There are actually monument
    signs.
    VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Is there
    going to be a monument sign on the -- 'cause I didn't
    see that.
    Is that in the plan?
    MR. REGAN: I think you need some signs
        on the roads.
                            VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Yeah, that's
        where I was going to go. It sounds like we should
        have some signs on the road alerting the drivers
    | 2 | ahead of time that, you know, this -- <br> MR. HIPOLIT: Like we do for Sloan |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3 | Kettering. |
| 4 | VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Huh. |
| 5 | MR. HIPOLIT: Like we did for Sloan |
| 6 | Kettering. |
| 7 | VICE ChAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Yeah, I |
| 8 | mean, I would expect that we should have -- |
| 9 | MR. HIPOLIT: When you go up Summit and |
| 10 | you come up Spring Valley, I agree. |
| 11 | VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: -- there |
| 12 | should be signs to the east, right. |
| 13 | MR. HIPOLIT: I agree. Absolutely. |
| 14 | VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Advising |
| 15 | that this is coming up. |
| 16 | MR. RACHED: Even to the west, that's |
| 17 | the first driveway. |
| 18 | VICE ChAIRMAN STEFANELLI: And also at |
| 19 | the west. |
| 20 | MR. HIPOLIT: Agree. |
| 21 | VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: I think we |
| 22 | should also have signs so that cars know that, hey, |
| 23 | this is a driveway here. |
| 24 | MR. HIPOLIT: I think if you look at -- |
| 25 | MR. ZITELLI: I heard what Mr. Olivo |

said that, you know, oh, you have 600 feet, but, you know, you're going to be right there or going past the driveway before you realize, oh, my gosh, you know --

MR. HIPOLIT: I think we learned a lot from Sloan Kettering. So Sloan Kettering went in with the three driveways and it became a problem right away for them. They came back to us with this way finding project which needed county approval because county road, and once they did that wayfinding, all the problems went away. People knew which -- the deliveries went to the west driveway and the other two driveways were for patient drop-off, long-term parking. You need to do that here.

MR. ZITELLI: I'd like to see some signs on the roads advising that --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes, I think what we had planned to do was once we got through the site plan application process we would go into more detail with respect to the signage.

Is that correct?
MR. DelVECCHIO: That's correct.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. So, yes. And
I think, based on the discussions we have been having, that we all agree it is imperative that there
be directional signage --
MR. ZITELLI: Yes, correct.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- everything else
that's going to take place.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: My last
question, my last question.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI:
Synchronization, does that include the Parkway sync.
MR. HIPOLIT: Yes, so I think I was telling Dante, it was off the record but on the record, $I$ think if you were to approve this and if your deliberations, you would include the time-based coordinator system as part of your approval.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Right, but I just want -- and that will be listed on the -lights, or how are we going to do that.

MR. HIPOLIT: It's going to be -- right now it's proposed to be five lights. I had added in two more lights. Two more make it seven.

MR. REGAN: You have 125,000 for --
MR. HIPOLIT: Right. The five lights are just -- coming down the Parkway signal, coming down Grand and DePiero, Grand and Old Mercedes, then Grand and Phillips and Spring Valley and Summit. I
added in Summit and Spring Valley and Chester Ridge and Summit if the money -- the test -- because, you know, the other part is bigger development that we don't focus on now is, is the truck traffic coming from the north, coming down Chestnut Ridge Road making a left on Summit, making the right down Phillips, you know -- at all, in my opinion.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: All right.
MR. ZITELLI: Mr. Chairman, one more question for you or --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. ZITELLI: -- just in general? Do
we have agreement that, you know, if we do go forward with the Resolution here that we will have a contingency based on certain metrics about potentially closing that --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Well, I think before we do that we have to see what the applicant's position is going to be.

MR. ZITELLI: That's what $I$-- so essentially, through you, I'm asking should we ask the applicant will they agree to that.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Unless we have any other questions, but before we open it again to the applicant, $I$ do want to open it up to the public.

| 1 | Would anyone care to make a motion to |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | open the meeting to the public? |
| 3 | MR. LINTNER: So moved. |
| 4 | MR. CULHANE: Second. |
| 5 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Motion Mr. Lintner, |
| 6 | seconded Mr. Culhane. |
| 7 | All in favor? |
| 8 | (Whereupon, all present members respond |
| 9 | in the affirmative.) |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Anyone from the |
| 11 | public wish to be heard. |
| 12 | MS. KELLY: I'm the public. I'm here. |
| 13 | MR. REGAN: Could I have your full name |
| 14 | and address, please. |
| 15 | MS. KELLY: Sure. |
| 16 | Cheryl, C-H-E-R-Y-L. Kelly, K-e-l-l-y. |
| 17 | My address is Cheryl Kelly 138 Green Way, Montvale. |
| 18 | MR. REGAN: Could you raise your right |
| 19 | hand, please. |
| 20 | Do you swear or affirm that the |
| 21 | testimony you will give in this proceeding shall be |
| 22 | the truth so help you God? |
| 23 | MS. KELLY: Yes. |
| 24 | C H ER Y L K E L L Y, |
| 25 | 138 Green Way, Montvale, New Jersey, having been |

duly sworn, testifies as follows:
MR. REGAN: Thank you.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay, thank you.
MS. KELLY: My questions are, you know,
pretty similar to what Mr. Zitelli said about the traffic volume. I've lived in Montvale for 15 years. I live off of Summit. You cannot make a left-hand turn, there are no gaps in traffic.

I'd like to see data that takes into consideration if Valley Hospital is building 86,000 square feet, how many physicians, what is their business plan, what's the patient volume going to be? They're going to be drawing from all of Bergen County to put all of those patients there in Montvale. That's a really valuable spot for them, the fact that it's right off the Parkway. It's incredibly valuable to them.

There's a daycare going in there.
You're also going to have elderly and sick people who are going to be making a left-hand turn there. I almost had an accident two times today on Grand Avenue at 2:00 in the afternoon.

Traffic and the problem -- in this town
is a significant problem, and I'd like to see the data. I have to admit that I'm not really informed
about this, this is my first meeting. I'm starting to do some research.

But having lived here for 17 years...
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And we share those concerns. And as you may or may not know, we, too, are all residents of Montvale. Many of us have lived here for that period of time.

MS. KELLY: And longer, I'm sure.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: So we've been through the same thing. Many of us have served on this board for a long time. We know the traffic problems. We do share your concerns relative to the projection of vehicles that will be used.

I think Mr. Hipolit's suggestion of tying in the traffic lights on Summit Avenue would benefit your development as well to help create more gap times based upon this new -- Andy, why don't you explain how this GPS signal or synchronization works?

MR. HIPOLIT: I'd prefer if Maurice does it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. RACHED: So when we look at this particular proposal we're discussing tonight, the driveways between the signal and DePiero, which used to be Mercedes Drive, and the signal at the Parkway,
right now, because these signals are operating based on their own internal clocks, their timing would go out of synchronization --

MS. KELLY: No, conceptually I understand it.

MR. RACHED: Yeah, okay.
So when we install the new equipment, it will keep all these clocks linked to the atomic clock, which is a national clock, so it keeps them always synchronized so they would operate as intended. That's the whole idea is to have them operate as intended.

Right now, once they go out of sync, they do not operate as intended.

As intended, for example, means we would provide the red at the Parkway signal, we provide the red at DePiero, and that creates gaps in between. And we could do the same at other locations. So that's what is meant by synchronization of signals.

MS. KELLY: No, I understand. I understand.

If $I$ were a member of a committee, I
would want to see simulation software to see how it works, I think, probably --

```
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. I think
    that's consistent with what Mr. Stefanelli was
    saying.
        MS. KELLY: Like put it -- there's
```

    screens all over here. Put it up on the screens and
    let's see a simulation with the traffic patterns that
    your ten years of data represent, carving out the
    COVID years, adding in a daycare center, adding in
    Valley Hospital, adding in the thousands of new homes
    that are being developed in this community. I think
    it can't be understated.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you for your
    comments.
            Anyone else from the public?
        (No response.)
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Motion to close the
        meeting to the public?
    MR. CULHANE: So moved.
    MR. LINTNER: Second.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. Culhane.
    Mr. Lintner.
    All in favor?
    (Whereupon, all present members respond
    in the affirmative.)
        CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay.
    Mr. DelVecchio, share with us your pearls of wisdom.

MR. DelVECCHIO: What are we doing?
MR. HIPOLIT: The whole list is out.
MR. REGAN: Let's just be careful
there.
MR. DelVECCHIO: The post-construction condition is something that, if the immediate remedy to a trigger is the closing of the driveway, that's something I can't give you an answer to tonight. It has ripple effects across tenants, across leases. There are not too many tenants that I am aware of that will sign on a dotted lease with a site that could change while they're in occupancy.

For purposes of this evening, what we could agree to is that if there is a trigger that, you know, we agree on what that trigger is and the trigger occurs, you know, we would agree to immediately meet with whoever we need to meet with and come to a remedy or a solution for that condition, whatever it may be, and work towards it, very similar to what you see in, traditionally in the lighting world, where you install lighting, there is a problem, six months, you test it and you come back and you make the adjustments that need to be made to
fix it.

We're committed to fixing it. We're confident that the condition will prove itself out after installed, given the margin of safety factors that many of you have expressed will exist.

But in terms of committing tonight to shutting that exit down at some point in the further, that is not something $I$ can give you an answer to.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And with respect to having your professionals work with the borough professionals in fine-tuning the traffic study, including the growth projections from projects that we all know received within the past year or two approvals, such as the district, such as the Horn Rock properties, the Toll Brothers --

MR. REGAN: Village Springs --
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- right, taking these into consideration, are you prepared to authorize your professionals to undertake those studies and prepare the model, or a modified model? MR. DelVECCHIO: I think what we're talking about in earnest is actually just updating the model. I think what you have just said as the precursor is not factually necessary for the following reason.

Most of all of those developments were encompassed and anticipated in the reports.

And as alluded to by Mr. Rached, yes, the data goes back ten years, but it's not ten years old. Every time this applicant has appeared, whether it was for the original PUD approval for Wegmans, whether it was for Phase II of the Wegmans project, whether it was for North Market, whether it was for Phase II DePiero down below with the daycare center, every time we appear, your engineers demanded and required, and we complied, that we provide a new fresh set of study to add a layer to the base that was created ten years ago.

I hate to say this, and we're happy to do it, but $I$ am going to tell you that I'd be shocked if that model doesn't produce traffic volumes that are less than what your experts charged us to do when we were the unknown quantum and Wegmans was walking in the door. Because the Wegmans traffic was so overestimated in that model, we haven't yet realized it.

So what's going to happen is we're going to put in a couple of extra developments, we're going to account for the overestimation that never materialized and you're going to see a result that's
actually less.
And we're happy to do it. We'll go
through, you know, the process of updating the model, but I don't want you to be surprised and I don't want to be tagged with, you know, you put your hands on the scale in creating the model.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Right. And that may well be the case. But if that's the comfort --

MR. DelVECCHIO: Happy to do it.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- that the board needs in order to move forward with the application, I think it should be done. Because my sense is there is a discomfort right now that we have to overcome. MR. HIPOLIT: And, Mr. Chairman, if I can just say, when they did -- and Betsy's not here does pose a problem -- when they did these two, the lower part, the daycare and the offices --

MR. REGAN: At Dulles Parkway.
MR. HIPOLIT: -- right, we gave Betsy
that model. So she took that model and made changes to it because, again, we made a recount --

Mr. DelVecchio's right, we made a recount to traffic because Wegmans was now open, lifestyle center was now open. So she has it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: If the model that
you have is updated -- and quite frankly, I wouldn't rely on Ms. Dolan, unfortunately --

MR. HIPOLIT: You're right about that.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: We don't have the time -- I mean, I feel very sorry for whatever that problem might be, but $I$ would imagine that Mr. Olivo could adjust the model, has the capability.

MR. DelVECCHIO: Yes, I was just confirming with him what $I$ already knew, but yes. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And I believe when that model is adjusted, displaying it on the monitors to show how, in fact, the gap occur -- Mr. Olivo, if you were to adjust the model, what could the board and the public expect to see on this model?

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI:
Mr. Chairman, $I$ just -- one question.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: With all due respect, Andy, we haven't heard any testimony that we were five times over at Wegmans or any of that. This is the first time we're hearing anything. We didn't hear her testimony.

MR. HIPOLIT: Right.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: So all I am saying is that we want to be assured. And whether
it's a model or somebody giving us some testimony saying that this development, that development will add this amount of cars, we haven't heard -- has any board member heard that.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: No.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: No.
All we want to do it hear the
information so we can make a decision.
End of story.
THE WITNESS: To answer the question about the model and that question as well, Mr. Stefanelli, is that by updating the model and comparing it to, again, $I$ think what has been clarified a number of times, because we have all these data points up to fresh data from this year, we would be able to quickly compare and show you this is what we projected it to be, this is what it actually is, and you would be able to see dynamics like gap, synchronization of signals, things like that in realtime.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: And I think that's what's so important right now.

I agree with you, Frank, and the other board members that have those concerns.

Mr. DelVecchio indicated that he was
not in a position right now. Obviously, he has to speak to his clients, the what-if factor, and to see what their position would be on that.

What else?
MR. ZITELLI: Mr. Chairman, I am going to throw one more suggestion out, if I may?

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Sure.
MR. ZITELLI: Sorry to do this, but could we consider a traffic signal there with a left turn? I mean, that would make me feel so much better if there was a left-turn signal there.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Do you have the warrants? That's the problem.

MR. HIPOLIT: You can't just put a signal there.

MR. RACHED: It wouldn't meet the required warrants. To put a signal there is something called warrants, which consist of number of vehicle trips.

To give you a very quick idea what they are, at a regular intersection you need to have over 500 trips on the main road, which we do, but you need to have over 150 trips on the minor road, which we don't, for eight hours, not just for the p.m. peak and the a.m. peak. We're not even close. We're not
even a quarter of that number in this case on a daily basis.

MR. ZITELLI: You're telling me we wouldn't be allowed to put a signal there?

MR. RACHED: That's correct, yes.
MR. REGAN: The county would have to make the call on that anyway. We're not even close. MR. RACHED: Yes.

MR. REGAN: They won't go anywhere with it.

MR. ZITELLI: I'll tell you, I'm thinking of a situation in Paramus, of all places, right, because I grew up there, and fashion center on East Ridgewood Avenue there, there's a left-turn signal that allows you to get into the fashion center. There's one -- you know, they've got a stacking lane there and specifically a light that allows you to make -- exist anymore, but I thought that was, you know -- to me that -- I would feel really comfortable if we had that kind of situation there and I would have no objection at all.

Again, I am concerned about the left
turn. I am concerned about, you know, even though we've got a stacking lane there, we're still hearing, you know, that there -- I mean, I wouldn't want to be
sitting in a car there myself and having cars going eastbound at 45 miles an hour, two lanes and then where I'm sitting. I would feel like a sitting duck. You know, that's just how $I$ would feel about it.

So again, I'm approaching this from a safety concern. I mean, I'm all in favor for this development, $I$ just have one issue, which is that left turn, all right. And, you know, so if we can do -- a light would be wonderful in my mind. Eliminating or not eliminating that left turn would be my other thing.

Do the study. Do the study. Let's go see what it is. But I'm telling you what my concern is.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay.
MR. ZITELLI: Right on the table.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. DelVecchio,
where do you want to go with this.
MR. DelVECCHIO: We're happy to, you
know, advance the model if that aids in the deliberation. You know, we've obviously done it before, we're happy to do it again.

In terms of the traffic testimony this evening, I think we've reached a natural conclusion.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: With regard to the
model, Mr. Olivo, you don't have a copy of that model, I presume.

THE WITNESS: I don't, but as far as the underlying foundation of the model, you actually have it, or Colliers has it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Right.
THE WITNESS: And that can be shared and we can simply download it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: If you get the call
from Mr. DelVecchio to adjust the model, Andy, you could have Maurice forward that, too.

MR. DelVECCHIO: And we're still
engaged with Dolan and Dean, so to the extent they have it, we have no issues with being able to --

CHAIRMAN DePinto: Well, $I$ hate to schedule another meeting and not have the author of the report. If there's any doubt that we're not going to hear direct testimony from Betsy Dolan, I think we're going to have to ask for another report from someone who can stand behind whatever the report says.

I mean, this whole traffic thing, we're kind of doing backwards. Now, it's true, it's very unfortunate with Ms. Dolan, whatever -- whatever that problem might be, but I don't know how long the
applicant could tolerate this, and I know the board is losing patience because they want answers to their questions, and rightly so.

Maybe you should just send --
MR. HIPOLIT: We're going to send them.
But I have a couple of -- I just want to make sure that -- I wrote down a lot of notes, I want to make sure $I$ got the right stuff for us.

The GPS sync over the time-based coordinator, at least in my opinion and Maurice's opinion, if you were to approve this, it should be a requirement. And we will have a discussion with the county about that so we have more detail on the five versus seven.

The speed limit reduction, that's
really a Mayor and Council request. It's 45 now. I have a Mayor and Council meeting tomorrow and I will bring this up and ask them to make a request, if the board wants me to.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. We have to ask the county to make a -- so you can't just -- you're not allowed to just reduce speed, they use data that will be done and it will be supplied to Colliers --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: You have a meeting

1 tomorrow. You can certainly --

MR. HIPOLIT: Yes. They have to authorize us to do some work on that which, then we'll come up with what the speed should be reduced to.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay.
MR. HIPOLIT: Growth projections, I think Maurice and Mr. Olivo need to work a little better. Have Mr. Olivo explain what projections they're using so you'll understand what those growth projections are. And there's testimony -- I wrote that more than once.

Is rumple strips as we come off the Parkway, so you come off the Parkway, you hit the yield sign, you now make a right turn going past the vacant property, the wetland area; is the board desirous of me investigating rumble strips there or not.

MR. TEAGNO: No. I hate those.
MR. HIPOLIT: I just was mentioning that.

MALE VOICE: They wear out, nobody replaces them.

MR. HIPOLIT: The new model -- Maurice is going to coordinate with Chuck tomorrow the new
model.
The stop sign, Colliers is still
pursuing the stop sign with the Turnpike Authority. There's going to be a request from the Mayor and Council, we will ask the county as they said they would do it, the county would concur, and that request will be sent in; that's the desire of the board?

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes.
MR. HIPOLIT: Okay, that's good.
I am going to talk to the chief
tomorrow about getting a speed study done somewhere between the DePiero's light and the Parkway light about what the speed of cars either coming through traffic cars, one, and the police can only do so much, so give us some data -- it'll be a short -- and the second one would be just give a speed of cars coming off the Parkway and as they accelerate, what speed are they going between the Parkway ramp and let's say halfway up the property.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay.
MR. HIPOLIT: I mean, again, the police have limited data. If the data they get is good enough, great.

If not, you can always request the
applicant does it similar to what we did on Fox Hill Road, we put -- actually put speed monitors out there.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Right.
VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: And do we do that during the busy peak hour.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yes, that's what I'm going to tell them. Tell them to do it in the p.m. peak and -- is the way we want it.

VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Just wanted to clarify it.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yeah, it'd be right around 5:00 is when we want to sit. They'd probably sit around 295 West Grand and then get it from there.

Traffic counts for the right-turn lane, I don't know, are we doing anything with traffic counts to the right-turn lane? As far as the right turn coming off the Parkway and cars making a right, how did we come up with the projection how many cars are making that right? I don't know if I got the answer yet.

MR. RACHED: I think we have these numbers.

MR. HIPOLIT: The applicant should really present that at the next meeting so the board
can hear that.
MR. ZITELLI: You mentioned the
Parkway. Is that the one at the intersection of Grand and Chestnut Ridge? Is that where you're talking about.

MR. HIPOLIT: No, I'm saying when cars -- cars that come off the Parkway, make a right turn, how many cars are going to turn right into the site.

MR. ZITELLI: Yeah, you mentioned the Parkway light, I think, right? Did you say that, Parkway light? What light are we talking about?

MR. HIPOLIT: The light at the Parkway and Grand Avenue. So you come down the ramp, just at like -- when you come off 172, there's a light right there. That light.

MR. ZITELLI: Okay. Okay. MR. HIPOLIT: I am going to ask the chief to have the police department pull hopefully what will be a ten-year history, so ten years ago or more, when the driveway was open, the previous driveway, what was the accident history?

And if there wasn't accident history, what was the type of accident. So hopefully when the driveway was open it had a lot of lefts in, rights in, whatever. I'll
see what data they have. I don't know what data they have. I know that -- go farther back, I'll ask that question.

And then the last thing $I$ have is recent mention MUTCD test of five accidents per year, but I think the applicant is saying that they wouldn't agree to that.

MR. REGAN: That would be one of the --
MR. HIPOLIT: A metric. I don't know
if the board wants to pursue that.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: That's something for the board to decide.

But I think all the other points that you've come up with or based on your notes are accurate.

MR. HIPOLIT: Okay. Except for the
rumble strips at that --
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Correct.
MR. HIPOLIT: Good.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: You okay with that, Mr. DelVecchio?

MR. DELVECCHIO: In terms of
Mr. Hipolit's notes, I think, you know, they represent the discussion.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. We still have
a little bit of time. What else would you like to try and cover this evening?

MR. DelVECCHIO: I'd like to cover
Ms. Rodriguez's testimony, which is landscaping.
There is not a lot of testimony there, but she did travel to get here and I'd like to try to resolve that area.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Let's take a five-minute break and then we will get to her. And then with respect to Mike Dipple's letter of today, which is pretty extensive --

MR. REGAN: We just received it.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: We just received it.
MR. DELVECCHIO: Yes, we had promised, if you remember at the last meeting, that we would -we said we would comply. We wanted to put it in writing as to how and give you detailed documentation to do that.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The problem is Mr. Hipolit hasn't had an opportunity to read it. MR. DelVECCHIO: Understood. CHAIRMAN DePINTO: But let's take a five-minute break.

MR. DelVECCHIO: Sure.
(Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: This meeting will
come to order.
Mr. DelVecchio?
MR. DELVECCHIO: Yes. Thank you,
Mr. Chairman.
As I had indicated just before the break, my intention is to call Ms. Trini Rodriguez of ParkerRodriguez who is the landscape architect on this portion of the project and the entirety of the project so familiar face, I guess.

MR. REGAN: You want her swear here in?
MR. DelVECCHIO: Yes, please.
MR. REGAN: Do you swear or affirm that the testimony you will give in this proceeding shall be the truth so help you God?

MS. RODRIGUEZ: I do.
$T R I N I \quad R O D R I G U E Z, A I C P, P L A$
101 North Union Street, Suite \#320, Alexandria,
Virginia, having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:

MR. REGAN: And for the record, state your full name, please, and spell your last name.

MS. RODRIGUEZ: Good evening, my name is Trini Rodriguez with the firm of ParkerRodriguez.

MR. DelVECCHIO: Ms. Rodriguez

```
previously testified --
    MR. REGAN: She's previously been
    qualified in the field of landscape architecture on
    several occasions before the board.
    We have accepted her.
    MR. DelVECCHIO: That's correct,
    Mr. Regan.
            If the board is comfortable with her
    credentials I'll proceed.
    DIRECT EXAMINATION
    BY MR. DelVECCHIO:
```

    Q. Ms. Rodriguez, we marked prior to this
        evening as A-15 a set of drawings entitled "Landscape
        Architecture Plan" prepared by ParkerRodriguez
        consisting of four sheets and having a revision date
        through June 23, 2022.
            Those plans are on the table next for
        you and I right now.
            Were those drawings prepared by you or
        under your supervision?
            A. Yes, they were.
            Q. You had also prior to this hearing this
        evening received a -- actually you received several
        review letters from various professionals concerning
        this project.
    And those review letters contained certain comments concerning landscaping and screening, correct?
A. Correct.
Q. And in anticipation of appearing here this evening you had collaborated with Mr. Dipple who prepared a letter dated -- with today's date dated July 11, which included certain responses to landscaping comments regarding this project, correct? A. Yes.
Q. Now that we've got the formalities done, let's deal with practicality.

You were the landscape designer for this project, many of the comments that were raised were really focused on the screening nature of the landscaping for certain areas of the project that required landscaping, screening, light loading, like trash enclosures in relation to those comments your responses contained in Mr. Dipple's letter, the intent is just to essentially upsize all of the screening to a compliant height so that we fully comply with the code in those areas?

Is that correct?
A. Correct.

So what we did is we actually up-sized
the plans. We actually revised the site lighting just to make sure that it was, sort of, an intentional, sort of landscaping around the utilities created what we've kind of called a utility cord which actually kind of allowed for those utilities to sit there surrounded by this new screening not -- not new screening, it was there, it was just up-sized and then it was softened up with some additional planting in front to provide some softer textures and seasonal interest.

And those were actually the -- the plans that the planner had, sort of, requested heights, which we have actually updated on our plans.
Q. Now, you are the designer and architect of the landscape plan for Buildings 1, 2 and 3, that are either complete or virtually complete as we here today correct?
A. Correct, yes.
Q. You had an opportunity to visit the site and see the results of your planning and design in bloom so to speak?
A. Exactly, yes.
Q. Is the intent that the next phase that
is being applied for here this evening coordinating with the existing work that you've done to date?

| 1 | A. Correct. Yes, we used, you know, the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | same palette of plant material there. |
| 3 | And the idea is that it feels like a |
| 4 | seamless project. I mean I have to admit I've been |
| 5 | up at the site doing a lot of punch work and working |
| 6 | with the construction company and I just wanted to |
| 7 | congratulate all of you because I think as -- overall |
| 8 | as the place has really come to fruition and I think |
| 9 | this will be a great addition to -- to that. |
| 10 | Q. There was, I recall, a comment |
| 11 | concerning the wall material for the hardscape? |
| 12 | A. Correct. |
| 13 | Q. What is the intent? And I tread very |
| 14 | lightly into color areas, but what is the intent with |
| 15 | the -- |
| 16 | A. So |
| 17 | Q. -- the color of the wall blocks that |
| 18 | are shown in the details on your plans? |
| 19 | A. Right. |
| 20 | So the -- the details show three colors |
| 21 | which is what the manufacturer provides, manufactures |
| 22 | three different palettes. |
| 23 | And what we suggested in the documents, |
| 24 | which is spelled out, is a mix of them. It's a |
| 25 | 30 percent, I forget the name ledger/legend, 40 and |

40 I believe they're on -- in the drawings.
And it's the same palette that has been
used on all of the walls on Phase I so it's already there, yes.

It's 30 percent -- 30 percent that's
Silverado, 40 percent Lafayette and 40 percent Kodiak.

And the idea is to get a much more natural mix of colors instead of a more solid either red or gray or brown. So it's a -- it's a much more softer look.

And that's what on-site already. And I believe you may have seen those.
Q. So the intent is to match what is already been constructed and utilized in the earlier phases?
A. Correct, it's exactly the same.
Q. Okay.

Now, there are certain metrics in the Montvale Ordinance concerning having sufficient number of planting areas for the parking for each number of parking spaces on-site. The number of trees. All of that has been factored into your design?
A. Right. And we have been coordinating

question by the board.
CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay.
Mr. Hipolit, have you had an
opportunity to review the plans with respect to landscape architecture?

MR. HIPOLIT: So I didn't, but as the board knows we used Gus DeBlasio to do that --

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry. MR. HIPOLIT: We used Gus DeBlasio to do it.

CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yeah. Can you -yes.

MR. HIPOLIT: Yes, so Gus has looked at it. There was two things that happened with Gus, one, he was away initially then he got COVID, but now he's back -- he's back in action now. He did look at it. He has very few little -- literally a very few limited comments, but $I$ think Darlene covered most of them. His biggest comment centered around caliper of trees. He thought the caliper of trees could be a little larger. And I think there was a few -- and I think a very few of -- a few species he wanted changed from something to something, I'm not the expert, but I will have that for you by next week. MR. DelVECCHIO: I know Ms. Rodriguez

| 1 | and Gus have spoken in the past. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | MS. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. |
| 3 | MR. HIPOLIT: Correct. |
| 4 | MR. DelVECCHIO: If the board is okay |
| 5 | with it we're happy to have her reach out and |
| 6 | coordinate. |
| 7 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Why don't we do that |
| 8 | in the interest of time -- |
| 9 | MR. HIPOLIT: His comments were minor. |
| 10 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes. |
| 11 | Why don't you communicate directly with |
| 12 | him. |
| 13 | MS. RODRIGUEZ: I will. |
| 14 | MR. HIPOLIT: That's fine. |
| 15 | MS. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. Thank you. |
| 16 | MR. HIPOLIT: I'll tell him that |
| 17 | tomorrow. |
| 18 | MS. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, I'll call him. |
| 19 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Anyone have any |
| 20 | questions? |
| 21 | VICE Chairman Stefanelli: Yes. |
| 22 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Comments? |
| 23 | Frank? |
| 24 | VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: The only |
| 25 | comment or question I have is what are we going to do |


|  | with the Phase II future development area in the |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | meantime? How are we going to... |
| 3 | MR. DelVECCHIO: That's intended to be |
| 4 | -- |
| 5 | MS. RODRIGUEZ: Yes, it will be graded |
| 6 | and seeded. |
| 7 | MR. HIPOLIT: Grass. |
| 8 | MS. RODRIGUEZ: I mean I know that |
| 9 | probably from the planning standpoint that they would |
| 10 | love to get somebody in. |
| 11 | VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: You're going |
| 12 | to seed it? |
| 13 | MS. RODRIGUEZ: Yes. We'll stabilize |
| 14 | it and seed it, that's usually what we do. |
| 15 | VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Well, I'd |
| 16 | like to see some trees in there too, if you can. So |
| 17 | if we can consider that. |
| 18 | MR. HIPOLIT: Like perimeter trees? |
| 19 | VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: Yeah, just a |
| 20 | couple of them. |
| 21 | MR. HIPOLIT: To break it up a little |
| 22 | bit? |
| 23 | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. |
| 24 | Anyone else? |
| 25 | (No response.) |



```
    VICE CHAIRMAN STEFANELLI: The
    landscaping plan.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- there will be
    revised plan coming?
    MR. DelVECCHIO: I don't --
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: No. We're okay?
    MR. DelVECCHIO: Yes, we said we put
how we going the address that in the letter.
    I'm not sure Mr. Dipple or
Ms. Rodriguez will have an enough time the submit
plans in advance.
    MR. HIPOLIT: So, I'm not here on the
2nd, I'm going on a college tour.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I'm sorry. You're
not --
    MR. HIPOLIT: I'm at a college tour,
I'm not here on the 2nd, not that you necessarily
need me, but I'm not here.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: I think we should be
    okay.
    MR. HIPOLIT: I will have a review
    letter.
    CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Right.
    We will have Chris here --
    MR. HIPOLIT: Yup.
```

| 1 |  | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: -- and I think we're |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2 | going to need | Maurice again. |
| 3 |  | MR. HIPOLIT: Yes, I think Maurice has |
| 4 | to come again. |  |
| 5 |  | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Right, yes. |
| 6 |  | MS. HUTTER: We need the simulation |
| 7 | model. |  |
| 8 |  | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Yes, right. |
| 9 |  | MR. HIPOLIT: What? |
| 10 |  | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: The model. |
| 11 |  | MS. HUTTER: The simulation model, I |
| 12 | think Maurice | needs to be here. |
| 13 |  | MR. HIPOLIT: Yes, Maurice is coming. |
| 14 | I think Mauric | ce is planning -- I'll text him, he's |
| 15 | planning on co | ming back. Yes. |
| 16 |  | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Okay. |
| 17 |  | What else do we have, anything? |
| 18 |  | (No response.) |
| 19 |  | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Mr. DelVecchio, |
| 20 | anything else | on your side? |
| 21 |  | MR. DelVECCHIO: No, other than to |
| 22 | officially ann | nounce for the record the carry date so |
| 23 | I avoid the not | tice issue. |
| 24 |  | CHAIRMAN DePINTO: Thank you. |
| 25 |  | The meeting will be carried to |



```
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Dated:

Hearing on 07/11/2022


COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: 6..adjust
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & Absolutely & accesses & add 8:4 \\
\hline 6 & 15:24 & 15:23 & 49:1,6 \\
\hline 6 4:3 & 88:13 & accident & 50:13 \\
\hline & abutment & 8:16 9:14, & 55:6,17 \\
\hline 60 27:7 & 19:12 & \(1616: 12\) & 72:16 \\
\hline \(60027: 2,7\) & 34:17 & 43:1,4, 6, & 99:12 \\
\hline 89:1 & accelerate & 12,14 52:4 & 102:3 \\
\hline 6:00 11:18 & 109:18 & 82:9 93:21 & added 36:18 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{49:13} & & 111:21, 22 , & 49:7 51:19 \\
\hline & accelerating & 23 & 81:18 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{7} & 21:17 & & 90:19 91:1 \\
\hline & 46:6,11 & accidents & 120:11,13 \\
\hline 7 85:12 & 47:19 & 39:14 & adding 22:14 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{75 27:23} & accept 14:7 & 42:25 & 45:15 76:4 \\
\hline & 37:9 46:18 & 43:17,20, & 96:8,9 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{8} & 59:25 & 25 79:7,13 & addition \\
\hline & acceptable & 112:5 & 16:2 118:9 \\
\hline 8 85:12 & 10:21 & acclimated & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{86,000 93:10} & 27:11 & 21:14 & \begin{tabular}{l}
additional \\
17:19
\end{tabular} \\
\hline & 61:15 & accommodate & 33:22 48:9 \\
\hline 9 & acceptance & 19:22 21:1 & 49:8 51:18 \\
\hline & 68:5 & \(31: 3\) 86:10 & 117:8 \\
\hline \multirow{3}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 34: 12,15, \\
& 2352: 17
\end{aligned}
\]} & accepted & accord 51:10 & address \\
\hline & 14:1,3 & account & 92:14,17 \\
\hline & 24:24 48:6 & account & 125:8 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{92 12:23} & 115:5 & 99:24 & \\
\hline & access 15:6 & accurate & addressing \\
\hline A & 17:8 18:9 & 112:15 & 63:2 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{A-15 115:13} & 26:10,11, & action 79:17 & adequate \\
\hline & 15 27:12, & 121:16 & 19:19,21, \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(\begin{array}{cc}\text { A-18 } \\ 19 & 14: 18\end{array}\)} & 17,25 & & 25 20:5 \\
\hline & 28:17 & active 31:5, & 85:25 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { a.m. } 57: 24 \\
103: 25
\end{gathered}
\]} & 29:6, 9, 10 & & 86:3,12 \\
\hline & 30:4 32:10 & activity & adequately \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{Abrams 8:7} & 59:14 69:1 & 75:24 76:2 & 19:14 \\
\hline & 86:2 & acuity 36:13 & adjust 69:25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 101:7,13 & 45:20 61:1 & allowing & 107:2 \\
\hline 106:10 & 62:17 & 22:17 24:7 & anticipate \\
\hline adjusted & 66:17 & alluded 24:5 & 10:11 86:4 \\
\hline 101:11 & \[
85: 22
\] & 99:3 & anticipated \\
\hline adjustments & \(88: 10,13\),
\(2089: 25\) & alternative & 30:1 99:2 \\
\hline 97:25 & 91:22 & 32:4 & anticipation \\
\hline admit 93:25 & 97:16,17, & Amended 4:4 & 116:5 \\
\hline 118: 4 & 18 102:23 & amount 33:2 & anymore 76:1 \\
\hline advance & 112:7 & 52:3 59:17 & 104:18 \\
\hline 38:18 & agreeable & 60:1 83:12 & appeared \\
\hline 105:20 & 36:2 & 102:3 & 12:11 99:5 \\
\hline 125:11 & agreed 7:11 & analyses & appearing \\
\hline advising & agreement & 33: 6 & 116:5 \\
\hline 88:14 & 91:13 & analysis & \\
\hline 89:16 & ahead 41:6 & 11:3 15:22 & \[
15: 3
\] \\
\hline aerial 16:13 & 42:17 45:7 & 33: 4, 5 & \\
\hline 19:11 35:1 & \(87: 688: 1\) & 39:7 56:5, & applicable \\
\hline 84:13,25 & & 25 60:18 & 32:12 \\
\hline affirm 12:18 & AICP 114:17 & 61:12 & applicant \\
\hline 92:20 & aids 105:20 & 76:15 & 5:15 10:7 \\
\hline 114:13 & alert 36:10 & 80:12 86:6 & 33:1 64:7 \\
\hline affirmative & 38:18 & analyze & 68:5 69:5 \\
\hline 5:4 92:9 & alerting & 76:13 78:3 & 72:4,7 \\
\hline 96:24 & 87:25 & and/or 9:8 & \(77: 2\)
\(91: 22,25\) \\
\hline afternoon & alertness & Andy 41:18 & 99:5 107:1 \\
\hline 93:22 & 36:13 & 68:10 & 110:1,24 \\
\hline afterward & Alexandria & 72:9,11 & 112: 6 \\
\hline 62:1 & 114:18 & 81:4 86:16 & applicant's \\
\hline agencies & aligns 84:2 & \(94: 17\)
\(101: 19\) & 91:18 \\
\hline 41:14 & allowed & 106:10 & application \\
\hline agenda 4:2 & 104:4 & no & 55:7,16 \\
\hline agree 18:21 & 107:23 & 126:22 & 89:19 \\
\hline 38:25 & 117:5 & answers 5:10 & 100:11 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: applications..back
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline applications & area 8:5 & 12:2 & 29:11,14 \\
\hline 16:18 & 17:18 & attending & 33:17 34:9 \\
\hline applied & 19:6,7,17 & 4:18 & 42:21 \\
\hline 117:24 & 20:11 & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{attention} & 53:13 56:2 \\
\hline 117.24 & 28:8,21 & & 65:16 \\
\hline apply 54:24 & 29:25 & 15: 6, 8 & 71:17 \\
\hline 79:6 80:13 & 30:15 & attest 41:13 & 93:22 \\
\hline approach & \(32: 23\) 34:6 & attract & 94:15 \\
\hline 73:20 & 35:17 & 50:17 & 104:14 \\
\hline & 36:12 & 50.17 & 111:13 \\
\hline approaching
18:4 105:5 & 46:18, 22 & attune 21:20 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{avenues 8:20} \\
\hline 18.4 105.5 & 47:14 & attuned & \\
\hline approval & 50:10,12, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{16:25} & average \\
\hline 4:4,5 & 14 51:2 & & 21:23 54:1 \\
\hline 67:10,14 & 108:16 & August & 80:20 \\
\hline 68:4 89:9 & 113:7 & 124:13 & avoid 126:23 \\
\hline 90:14 99:6 & 123:1 & 127:1 & avoid 126.23 \\
\hline approvals & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\text { areas } 33: 15
\]} & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { author } 11: 12 \\
& 106: 16
\end{aligned}
\] & 52:19 \\
\hline 98:14 & & \[
106: 16
\] & 97:12 \\
\hline approve 9:22 & 118:14 & authoritative & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{awful 50:13} \\
\hline 67:1 69:21 & 119:21 & 33:11 51:5 & \\
\hline 83:16 84:4 & argue 28:25 & Authority & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{B} \\
\hline 90:12 & arrangements & 5:12 9:25 & \\
\hline 107:11 & 12:1 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
81: 6 \text { 109:3 }
\]} & Bachelor \\
\hline approved & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{aspect 54:10} & & 13:12 \\
\hline 23:2,3 & & authorize & back 11:22 \\
\hline approximately & assume 58:1 & 98:19 & 26:25 \\
\hline 84:25 85:1 & assuming & 108:3 & 29:24 \\
\hline architect & 54:2 & Avenue 6:19 & 30:14,20 \\
\hline 114:8 & assurance & 7:3 8:12, & 35:1 41:11 \\
\hline 117:14 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{69:4} & 25 9:2 & 52:18 \\
\hline & & 10:15 & 68:20 71:5 \\
\hline architecture & assured & 12:23 15:7 & 76:16 77:9 \\
\hline 115:3,14 & 101:25 & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
17: 12 \quad 24: 9
\]} & 83:6 89:8 \\
\hline 121:5 & \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\begin{tabular}{l}
atomic 95:8 \\
attend 11:15
\end{tabular}} & & 97:24 99:4 \\
\hline archives & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\[
\begin{aligned}
& 25: 5 \quad 26: 24 \\
& 27: 3,11 \\
& 28: 13,19
\end{aligned}
\]} & 112:2 \\
\hline 64:2 & & & 121:16 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: backup..Boulevard
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 126:15 & 86:11 & 21:21 & 82: 4,16 \\
\hline backup 77:14 & beat 62:20 & 28:6,9 & 94:11 \\
\hline backup 77.14 & 63:7 & 42:19 51:6 & 100:10 \\
\hline backwards & & 66:11, 22, & 101:13 \\
\hline 106:23 & beautifully & 23 113:1 & 102:4,24 \\
\hline bad 65:4 & 28:24 & 123:22 & 107:1,19 \\
\hline ball 42:10 & beauty 16:7 & blinkers & 108:16 \\
\hline 51:4 & behest 23:4 & 46:23 & 109:8 \\
\hline & & & 110:25 \\
\hline Bank 6:2,6 & benefit & Block 4:2 & 112:10,12 \\
\hline base 49:2 & 35:16 & blockaded & 115:4,8 \\
\hline 86:21 & 36:18 & 16:15 & 120:14 \\
\hline 99:12 & 94:16 & blocks & 121:1,7 \\
\hline based 10:21 & Bergen 20:23 & 118:17 & 122:4 \\
\hline 14:3 23:20 & 31:8 82:5, & & 124:12 \\
\hline 32:8 34:2 & 6,8 93:13 & & board's 10:7 \\
\hline 37:10 & bet 57:8 & board 5:15 & 16:2 \\
\hline 38:4,11 & Betsy 11:13 & 6:10,17 & bodily 47:13 \\
\hline 39:25 50:8 & Betsy
\(23: 942: 8\) & 7:4 8:1, & bodily 0.22 \\
\hline 60:8,18 & 23:9 42:8 & 17,18,22 & body 9:22 \\
\hline 65:20 66:9 & 64:15,21, & 9:9 11:2 & 10:5,10 \\
\hline 71:14 & 23 65:1,5, & 12:11 & booklet \\
\hline 84:24 & 13 100:19 & 13:5,25 & 78:18 \\
\hline 89:24 & 6 & 14:5,8 & \\
\hline 91:15 & Betsy's 66:3 & 15:5 17:13 & borough \\
\hline 94:17 95:1 & 100:15 & 23:5,21 & 20:22 36:1 \\
\hline 112:14 & bicycle & 33:21 35:9 & 68:18, 19 \\
\hline 120:2 & bicycle
\(28: 11\) & \(37: 1\) 38:9 & 68:18,19, \\
\hline & 28:11 & 41:10 & 24 77:12, \\
\hline baseline & big 64:15 & 49:23 & 22 78:3,6 \\
\hline 9:18 & 67:3 82:11 & 52:13,19, & 81:25 \\
\hline basically & bigger 59:20 & 20 61:1, & 98:10 \\
\hline 45:9 & 91:3 & 13,17 & borough's \\
\hline & & 62:5,8 & 43:15 \\
\hline \[
57: 8 \quad 104: 2
\] & biggest
\(44: 24\) & 63:13,19 & bottom 22:6 \\
\hline & & 65:3 & \\
\hline bay 19:18 & 121:19 & 67:10,15 & Boulevard \\
\hline 22:9 85:18 & bit 18:7 & 76:24 & 75:24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline braking & 40:5 93:12 & car 25:10, & 19 111:6, \\
\hline 24:23 & businesses & 12 34:5 & 7,8 \\
\hline break 113:9, & \(37: 15\) & 49:11 56:1 & carving 96:7 \\
\hline 23 114:7 & busy 110:6 & 83:22 84:2
\[
85: 1,3,6
\] & case 8:14 \\
\hline 123:21 & buy 71.19 & \(85: 1,3,6\)
\(105: 1\) & 32:17 36:9 \\
\hline bridge 19:12 & \[
72: 23
\] & 105:1 & 52:6 61:25 \\
\hline 34:17 & & car's 84:6 & 67:25 68:1 \\
\hline briefly & C & care 33:7 & 100:8 \\
\hline 57:20 & c & 52:7 92:1 & 104:1 \\
\hline bring 8:17 & C-H-E-R-Y-L & careful 97:5 & cases 41:11 \\
\hline 38:8 & 92:16 & cares 84:9 & 81:24 \\
\hline 107:18 & caliper & carried & center 29:3 \\
\hline Brothers & 121:19,20 & 126:25 & 96:8 99:9 \\
\hline 98:15 & call 19:16 & & 100:24 \\
\hline & 21:4 22:12 & carry 28:1 & 104:13,16 \\
\hline brought 15:7 & 26:10 & 124:7 & centered \\
\hline brown 119:10 & 41:19 & 126:22 & 121:19 \\
\hline building & 42:11 & cars 20:9 & \\
\hline 29:3 30:2, & 48:12 & 27:13 & \\
\hline 12 38:22 & 78:20 & 47:14 & \\
\hline 57:11,12 & 104:7 & 49:10,20 & centrally \\
\hline 60:11 & 106:9 & 53:20 & 28:3 \\
\hline 87:13 & 114:7 & 56:24 & cents 40:19 \\
\hline 93:10 & 122:18 & 57: 8, 10, 15 & \\
\hline & 124:9 & 58:5 59:1, & certification \\
\hline buildings & & 4,5 60:6, & 7:14 \\
\hline 75:22 & called 18:3 & 7,13,15 & certified \\
\hline 76:7,16 & 65:1 78:18 & 80:5,18 & 13:17,18 \\
\hline 117:15 & 103:18 & 83:17 & 13.17,18 \\
\hline bureau 82:11 & 117:4 & 84:23 & chain 71:23 \\
\hline & capability & 85:2,12 & chained \\
\hline bureaucracy
\[
41: 18
\] & 101:7 & 88:22 & 68:24 \\
\hline & capacity & 102:3 & Chair 10:19 \\
\hline busiest & 84:10,11 & 105:1 & 14:6 \\
\hline 60:15 & \[
86: 1
\] & 109:14,15, & Chai \\
\hline business & capture 33:5 & 17 110:18, & \[
4: 1,8,10
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: Chairman's..Cheryl
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 15,17,21 & 20 69:11, & 25 106:6, & 9:11 23:18 \\
\hline 5:1, 5, 21, & 14 71:5,7, & 9,15 & 40:1, 4 \\
\hline 24 6:10 & 11 72:6, & 107:20,25 & 43:21 \\
\hline 8:21 9:19 & 11,14,15 & 108:6 & 61:19, 22 \\
\hline 10: 4 & 73:21 & 109:9,21 & 70:10 \\
\hline 11:10,25 & 74:2,4,8, & 110:4,5,10 & 73:8,16 \\
\hline 12: 6,7 & 12,15,18, & 112:11,18, & 82:23 \\
\hline 13:3 14:2, & 21 75:3,6, & 20,25 & 84:21 \\
\hline 6,12,14, & 11,14,18 & 113:8,13, & 97:14 \\
\hline 20,22 & 76:12,18, & 19,22 & 120:8 \\
\hline 15:5,11, & 20 77:16, & 114:1,5 & changed 9:21 \\
\hline 18,21,24 & 19 78:2,15 & 120:23 & \(37: 16\) 39:6 \\
\hline 23:22,25 & 79:18,21, & 121:2,8,11 & 40:5 43:5, \\
\hline 33:23 35:4 & 24 81:3,9 & 122:7,10, & \(773: 2\) \\
\hline 36:24,25 & 84:10,12, & 19,21,22, & 82:1 \\
\hline 37: 4 & 22 85:24 & 24 123:11, & 121:23 \\
\hline 40:18, 21, & 86:13 & 15,19,23 & \\
\hline 24 42:17 & 87:4,6,7, & 124:1, 6, 8, & changing \\
\hline 44:6,7,10 & 17,23 & 14,20,24 & 7:20 8:24 \\
\hline 45:2 51:21 & 88: 4, 7, 11, & 125:1, 3, 6, & 40:8 \\
\hline 52:10,11 & 14,18,21 & 14,19,23 & charge 18:13 \\
\hline 53:5,8 & 89:17,23 & 126:1,5,8, & 32:2 42:3, \\
\hline 55:19,20, & 90:3,5,7, & 10,16,19, & 8, 9,10 \\
\hline 22 56:8 & 8,15 91:8, & 24 127:4 & 78:9 \\
\hline 57:5,25 & 9,11,17,23 & Chairman's & charged \\
\hline 58: 4, 15, & 92:5,10 & 77:11 & 99:17 \\
\hline 18,22 & 93:3 94:4, & 85:20 & 99:17 \\
\hline 59:1,6 & 9,21 96:1, & 85:20 & Charles 13:6 \\
\hline 60:3, 23 & 12,16,20, & challenge & Charlie 69:6 \\
\hline 61:6 62:16 & 25 98:9,17 & 30:17 & \\
\hline 63:1, 4, 17, & 100:7,10, & 41:23 & checked 16:4 \\
\hline 21 64:11, & 14,25 & 65:13 & checklist \\
\hline 13,22 & 101:4,10, & challenges & 42:5 \\
\hline 65:9,12 & 15,16,17, & 25:11 & chemistry \\
\hline 66:6,16, & 18,24 & & 38:9 \\
\hline 18,21 & 102:5,6,21 & challenging
\(17: 16,20\) & \\
\hline 67:16,19, & 103:5,7,12 & 17.16,20 & Cheryl \\
\hline 22 68:14, & 105:15,17, & change 8:1 & 92:16,17 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: Chester..community


Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: companies..controlling
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline companies & 47:1,7 & 67:10 & constructed \\
\hline 86:25 & 49:18, 24 & cos & 30:3 \\
\hline company & 82:20 83:4 & 67:5 98:3 & 119:15 \\
\hline 86:22 & 105:6, & configuration & construction \\
\hline 118: 6 & concerned & \[
45: 15
\] & 118: 6 \\
\hline compare & 22:15 & & consultant \\
\hline 102:16 & 31:24 & \[
101 \cdot 0
\] & 23:7 \\
\hline & 35:10 & 101:9 & \\
\hline compared & 37:19 & conflict & contained \\
\hline 30:5 & 61:10 & 18:2, 3 & 116:1,19 \\
\hline comparing & \(66: 25\) 80:1 & 53:17 & 120:20 \\
\hline 102:13 & 82:25 87:8 & 80:2,4 & contend 30:8 \\
\hline compatible & 104:22,23 & 81:2 82:18 & contents \\
\hline 87:1 & concerns & 83:8 & 15:2 \\
\hline complement & 23:14 24:4 & conflicting & contingency \\
\hline 4:16 & 39:17 & 80:16 & 91:15 \\
\hline & 45:13,19 & confusion & \\
\hline complete & 63:24 69:8 & confusion & continue \\
\hline 15:3 53:24 & 80:22 83:6 & 62:9 & 29:16 \\
\hline 117:16 & 94:5,12 & congratulate & 50:20 \\
\hline completely & 102:24 & 118:7 & continued \\
\hline 41:22 & conclusion & conjunction & 4:2 \\
\hline compliant & 105:24 & 55:14 78:4 & continues \\
\hline 116:21 & concur 109:6 & conservative & 6:4,8 \\
\hline complied & concurrence & 85:9 & 31:22 \\
\hline 99:11 & 55:10,11 & consideration & continuing \\
\hline comply 7:14 & condition & 66:13 & 20:17 40:3 \\
\hline 32:12 & condition & 93:10 & 73:4 127:7 \\
\hline 113:16 & 68: 4, 16 & 98:18 & control \\
\hline 116:22 & 97:8,21 & consist & 32:13 44:4 \\
\hline 120:3 & 98:3 & 103:18 & 70:25 \\
\hline conceptually & conditions & consistent & 78:8,19,23 \\
\hline 95:4 & 31:16,19 & 96:2 & 81:6 \\
\hline concern 26:3 & 47:9 56:18 & consisting & controlling \\
\hline 39:9 41:20 & confers & 115:15 & 69:1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: controls..created
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline controls & 64:18 & Council 10:3 & 19,24 \\
\hline 46:25 & 106:1 & 54:24 & 82:5, 6, 8, \\
\hline conventional & cord 117:4 & 55:2,13 & 12 83:16 \\
\hline 48:10 & & 107:16,17 & 84:4 87:1 \\
\hline 48:10 & corner 27:15 & 109:5 & 89:9,10 \\
\hline conversation & 87:14 & & 93:13 \\
\hline 6:15 7:7, & 120:6 & counsel & 104:6 \\
\hline 24 & corporations & 13:10 14:7 & 107:13, 22 \\
\hline conversion & 40:6 & counter 9:1, & 109:5,6 \\
\hline 10:8 & correct 10:1 & 7 & couple 38:2 \\
\hline convey 83:5 & 11:16,17 & counters & 50:12 \\
\hline convince & 12: 4,5 & 82:2 & 52:13 \\
\hline 61:14 & 15:9 61:5 & counts 9:7, & 99:23 \\
\hline & 64:3 66:15 & 8,9 32:19 & 107:6 \\
\hline convinced & 74:14,23 & 43:3 50:9 & 123:20 \\
\hline 56:10 & 75:1,2 & 53:19 & \\
\hline 63:18 & 81:15 & 65: 4, 5 & \[
3
\] \\
\hline convincing & 89:21,22 & 86:1 & \\
\hline 66:12 & 90:2 104:5 & 110:15,17 & covered \\
\hline cooperation & 112:18 & county 5:12 & 121:18 \\
\hline 72: 4 & 115:6 & 6:12,18 & Covid 61:3 \\
\hline & 116:3,4,9, & 7:2, 22 & 96:8 \\
\hline coordinate & 23,24 & 16:23 & 121:15 \\
\hline 87:10 & 117:17,18 & 20:23 & \\
\hline 108:25 & 118:1,12 & \(20: 23\)
\(23: 1,3,15\) & Craig 57:1 \\
\hline 122: 6 & 119:17 & \[
31: 8 \quad 32: 21
\] & crank 77:9 \\
\hline coordinating & 120:15,18, & \(36: 1\) 41:19 & crashes 79:3 \\
\hline 117:24 & 20,21 & 42:12 & create 18:7 \\
\hline 119:25 & 122:3 & 43:2,5,7, & 21:5 69:24 \\
\hline coordination & correctly & 16 48:5 & 79:21 \\
\hline 120:8 & 69:16 & 51:15 & 94:16 \\
\hline coordinator & 80:19 & 55: 4, 5, 8, & created \\
\hline 86:20,21 & corridor & 10,11 & 26:20 \\
\hline 90:14 & 28:14 & 58:14 & 43:14 \\
\hline 107:10 & 31:20 & & 69:17 \\
\hline & 32:22 & 81:7,8,9, & 99:13 \\
\hline copy 7: 24 & 51:19 & 14,16,17, & 117: 4 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: creates..deliberations
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline creates & 57:6,7 & 116:7 & Deblasio \\
\hline 46:18 & cVs 34:25 & 117:25 & 121:7,9 \\
\hline 95:17 & & 124:18 & decades \\
\hline creating & D & 126:22 & 79:10 \\
\hline 100:6 & & 127:7 &  \\
\hline credentials & daily 104:1 & dated 116:7 & decel 24.16 \\
\hline 14:3 37:6 & dais 4:13, & day 30:19 & decelerate \\
\hline 115:9 & 20 & 51:7 52:18 & \\
\hline cross 47:5 & Dame 13:14 & 76:6 & decelerating 21:17 \\
\hline 48:11 & dangerous & daycare & 24:23 \\
\hline crossing & 47:6,12 & 93:18 96:8 & 25:12,15 \\
\hline 47:25 & 52:6 69:22 & 99:9 & 46:8,11 \\
\hline 48:9,11,12 & Dante 45:2 & 100:17 & 47:17,21, \\
\hline 75:13 & 66:18 & days 44:1 & 22 \\
\hline crosswalks & 90:11 & 76:9,10,15 & deceleration \\
\hline 28:7 & Darlene & dead 67:1 & 36:19 \\
\hline crystal & 121:18 & deal 54:22 & 48:13 \\
\hline 42:10 51:4 & data 7:10, & 63:14 & decide 50:1 \\
\hline Culhane & 17 32:22 & 64:15 & 112:12 \\
\hline 53:9,10 & 33:2 37:7, & 69:7,8 & decided \\
\hline 54:5,16, 21 & 10,19 & 75:8 82:4 & 46:16 \\
\hline 55:3,12,18 & 38:3,7,11 & 116:12 & decision \\
\hline 73:5 80:1, & 39:1 50:7 & dealing 5:11 & 44:3 60:17 \\
\hline 8,18 92:4, & 64:6 & 54:11 & 102:8 \\
\hline 6 96:18,20 & 72:21,22 & 67:23,24 & \\
\hline curb 17:14 & 25 75:19 & deals 54:22 & decisions \\
\hline 15 & 76:24,25 & 82:11 & \\
\hline & 77:3, 4 & & deemed 68:17 \\
\hline curbed 27:19 & 93:9,25 & Dean 10:17 & \\
\hline curbs 27:18 & 96:7 99:4 & 14:24 & define 68: \\
\hline & 102:15 & 50:25 & deliberating \\
\hline customers & 107:23 & 106:13 & 52:21 \\
\hline 31:1 & 109:16,23 & deaths 43:17 & deliberation \\
\hline \[
\text { cut } 83: 22
\] & 112:1 & debate 40:12 & 105:21 \\
\hline cutting & date 115:15 & 71:12 & deliberations \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: deliver..design
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 90:13 & Delvecchio's & 21,24 8:21 & 90:3,7 \\
\hline deliver 51:9 & 100:22 & 9:19 10:4 & 91:8,11, \\
\hline & demand 52:25 & 11:10,25 & 17,23 \\
\hline deliveries
\(89: 12\) & 53:3 68:24 & 12:7 14:6, & 92:5,10 \\
\hline & & 14,20,22 & 93:3 94:4, \\
\hline Delvecchio & demanded & 15:5,11, & 9,21 96:1, \\
\hline 5:6 11:11, & 99:10 & 18,21 & 12,16,20, \\
\hline 17 12:5,9 & department & 23:22 & 25 98:9,17 \\
\hline 14:16,19 & 68:19 & 33:23 35:4 & 100:7,10, \\
\hline 23:23,25 & 78:4,7 & 36:25 & 25 101:4, \\
\hline 24:3 29:22 & 79:12 & 40:21 & 10,17 \\
\hline 33:20 & 111:18 & 42:17 44:7 & 102:5,21 \\
\hline 64:1,5 & & 45:2 51:21 & 103:7,12 \\
\hline 72:11,13 & \[
52: 18
\] & 52:11 & 105:15,17, \\
\hline 89:22 & & 53:5,8 & 25 106:6, \\
\hline 97:1,3,7 & depends & 55:20 & 9,15 \\
\hline 98:21 & 69:16 & 63:21 & 107:20,25 \\
\hline 100:9 & 86:25 & 64:11, 22 & 108: 6 \\
\hline 101:8 & Depiero & 65:9,12 & 109:9,21 \\
\hline 102:25 & 20:14 22:3 & 66:6,18,21 & 110:4 \\
\hline 105:17,19 & 24:22 & 67:16,19, & 112:11,18, \\
\hline 106:10,12 & 25:20 & 22 68:14, & 20,25 \\
\hline 112:21,22 & 27:16 & 20 69:11, & 113:8,13, \\
\hline 113:3,14, & 28:23 & 14 71:7,11 & 19,22 \\
\hline 21,24 & 29:15 & 72:11,15 & 114:1 \\
\hline 114:3,4, & 36:20 & 74:2,4,8, & 121:2,8,11 \\
\hline 12,25 & 38:19 & 12,15,18, & 122:7,10, \\
\hline 115:6,11 & 47:18 & 21 75:3,6, & 19,22 \\
\hline 120:22 & 74:10 & 14,18 & 123:23 \\
\hline 121:25 & 90:24 & 76:12,20 & 124:1,6,8, \\
\hline 122:4 & 94:24 & 77:19 & 14,20,24 \\
\hline 123:3 & 95:17 99:9 & 78:2,15 & 125:3,6, \\
\hline 124:2,10, & & 79:18,21, & 14,19,23 \\
\hline 12,22 & Depiero's
109:13 & 24 81:3,9 & 126:1,5,8, \\
\hline 125:5,7 & 109:13 & 84:10,22 & 10,16,19, \\
\hline 126:19,21 & Depinto 4:1, & 85:24 & 24 127:4 \\
\hline 127:3 & 10,15,17, & 86:13 87:6 & design 13:10 \\
\hline & 21 5:1,5, & 89:17,23 & 21:3 23:21 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: designates..documents
\begin{tabular}{|cccc|}
\hline \(26: 16\) & \(96: 10\) & \(120: 20\) & discussion \\
\(28: 18\) & \(29: 4\) & developer & \(124: 17\) \\
\(34: 18\) & \(67: 11,24\) & direct \(24: 2\) & \(21: 16 \quad 35: 8\) \\
\(117: 20\) & \(68: 1,12\) & \(74: 13\) & \(72: 17\) \\
\(119: 24\) & development & \(106: 18\) & \(84: 19\) \\
\(120: 2\) & \(32: 18\) & \(115: 10\) & \(107: 12\) \\
designates & \(50: 16\) & direction & \(112: 24\) \\
\(77: 23\) & \(51: 2,17\) & \(10: 13\) & discussions \\
designed & \(57: 261: 24\) & \(17: 19\) & \(25: 1\) \\
\(26: 8\) & \(66: 367: 24\) & \(29: 24\) & \(89: 24\) \\
\(28: 15,24\) & \(73: 1191: 3\) & \(52: 16\) & display \\
\(29: 12\) & \(94: 16\) & \(71: 17\) & \(44: 1477: 9\) \\
\(57: 11\) & \(102: 2\) & directional & displaying \\
designer & \(105: 7\) & \(90: 1\) & \(101: 11\) \\
\(116: 13\) & \(123: 1\) & directly & distance \\
\(117: 14\) & developments & \(15: 19\) & \(17: 15\) \\
desire \(109: 7\) & \(62: 399: 1\), & \(54: 25\) & \(18: 25\) \\
desirous & 23 & \(122: 11\) & \(19: 1,13,25\) \\
\(108: 17\) & Devices & \(78: 19\) & disagree
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: Dolan..effect
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 118:23 & 42:22 & 31:10 & duly 12:24 \\
\hline Dolan 10:17 & 68:21,22 & 33:16,17 & 93:1 \\
\hline 11:13 & \(70: 3\) 71:18 & 35:10,18 & 114:19 \\
\hline 14:24 23:9 & \(75: 2576: 7\) & 36:20 & dynamics \\
\hline 50:25 & 83:2 94:25 & 39:19,20 & 25:22 \\
\hline 101:2 & driven 36:4 & 42:4,13 & 102:18 \\
\hline 106:13,18, & & 50:5 53:25 & \\
\hline 24 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { driver } \\
21: 4,8
\end{gathered}
\] & \(59: 13,15\),
\(20: 68: 16\) & E \\
\hline door 99:19 & 22:22 & 70:14 & earlier \\
\hline DOT 48:5 & 27:1,4 & 79:8,15 & 22:16 23:5 \\
\hline dotted 97:13 & \(30: 9,20,23\) & 85:20 & \(35: 8,16\) \\
\hline dotted 97.13 & 31:24 & 88:17,23 & 51:3 54:23 \\
\hline double 83:23 & 36:13 83:1 & 89:3,12 & 119:15 \\
\hline doubles & drivers & 97:9 & \\
\hline 63:11 & 10:25 & 111:20,21, & earnest \\
\hline doubt 106.17 & 27:13 31:9 & 24 & :22 \\
\hline & 36:10,19 & driveways & ears 36:7 \\
\hline download & 38:18 & 16:20 & easily 75:9 \\
\hline 106:8 & 87:25 & 17:24 & \[
\text { east } 38: 1
\] \\
\hline downstream & driveway & 26:12,19, & 53:21 \\
\hline 25:19 & 8:10,11 & 23 28:14 & 88:12 \\
\hline drastic & 9:16,17 & 59:23 & 104:14 \\
\hline 43:21 & 16:2,11, & 89:7,13 & \\
\hline drawing & 14,15,23, & 94:24 & eastbound \\
\hline 93:13 & 25 17:4, & driving 19:3 & 54:12 \\
\hline & 10,12 & 30:18 & 71:16 \\
\hline drawings
115:13,19 & 18:1,12, & 49:10,11 & 80:5,25 \\
\hline \(115: 13,19\)
\(119: 1\) & 15,24 & 62:18, 24 & 81:1 105:2 \\
\hline 119:1 & 19:8,24 & drop-off & 81:1 105:2 \\
\hline drive 15:23 & 21:2, 3 & drop-off & easterly \\
\hline 20:14 & 22:25 & 89:13 & 25:1 \\
\hline 24:22 & 23:2,3,6, & drove 34:25 & ecosystem \\
\hline 25:20 & 10,13,16, & duck 105:3 & 19:4 \\
\hline 27:16 & 17,19 & & \\
\hline 29:15 36:6 & 25:17,21 & due 101:18 & effect \\
\hline 38:19 & 26:3,24 & Dulles & 10:16,19 \\
\hline & 27:6,10 & 100:18 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline effective & enclosures & engineering & 86:25 95:7 \\
\hline 33:14 & 116:18 & 12:12,16, & equivalent \\
\hline effectively & encompassed & 17 13:10, & 55:4 \\
\hline 18:13,17 & 99:2 & 13,22,23 & \\
\hline 20:11 & enc & 14:4 16:1, & \[
82: 15 \quad 84: 1
\] \\
\hline 23:20 & & 7 18:3 & \\
\hline 33:19 & 27: & 26:4,14 & essentially \\
\hline & encouraging & 31:14 32:5 & 29:25 \\
\hline effects & 29:2 & 33:8,12 & 91:21 \\
\hline 97:11 & end 32:7 & engineers & 116:20 \\
\hline efficient & 34:20 & 13:19 & established \\
\hline 32:1 & 35:17 & 18:14 32:2 & 21:12 \\
\hline elderly & 102:9 & 41:10 & 24:20 \\
\hline 93:19 & ended 18:21 & 49:21 & evaluating \\
\hline electronic & ends 8:1 & 58:14 & 53:4 \\
\hline 70:6,25 & enforced & 120:1 & evening 4:18 \\
\hline elements & 78:14 & & 6:9 11:13, \\
\hline 31:25 & enforcement & enlargement
\[
45: 5
\] & 19 13:3,4, \\
\hline eligible 4:22, 2 & 78:10 & enlightening & 49:14 \\
\hline 5:2 & enforcing & 41:1 & 55:23 \\
\hline & 77:17 & enter 10:25 & 65:14 \\
\hline eliminated & 79:10 & \[
27: 5 \quad 29: 23
\] & 97:15 \\
\hline 76:6 79:14 & & & 105:24 \\
\hline Eliminates & engage 36:5, & entirety & 113:2 \\
\hline 27:21 & 8 & 114:9 & 114:23 \\
\hline & engaged & entitled & 115:13,23 \\
\hline eliminating
\[
105: 10
\] & 106:13 & 37:24 & 116: 6 \\
\hline & engineer & 115:13 & 117:24 \\
\hline elimination & 12:1 & entrance & 124:10 \\
\hline 79:8 & 13:15,18 & 17:10,22 & everybody's \\
\hline emergency & 22:23 23:8 & 22:19 & 55:23 \\
\hline 11:14,20 & 28:9 33:1 & & \\
\hline & 36:1 41:20 & environment & everyone's \\
\hline emotion 42:3 & 42:2 77:15 & 37:11 & 4:24 \\
\hline employed 5:9 & 78:3, 6 & 38:4,11 & evidence \\
\hline & 79:10 & equipment & 14:10 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: evolve..fields
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline evolve 73:4 & expectation & 33:15 & 104:13,15 \\
\hline exact 48:7 & \[
\begin{array}{ll}
21: 5 & 22: 22 \\
27: 1 & 30: 21
\end{array}
\] & extra 99:23 & fast 62:25 \\
\hline EXAMINATION & 31:24 & extremely & faster 22:4 \\
\hline 24:2 & & 11:8 29:1 & favor 7:22 \\
\hline 115:10 & expected
\(28: 10\) & 33:7,9 & \[
9: 1163: 18
\] \\
\hline exceed 46:1 & & eyes 16:1, & 92:7 96:22 \\
\hline exceeds 11.5 & experience & 2,22 36:7 & 105: 6 \\
\hline exceeds 11:5 & 46:1 & & \\
\hline excellent & expert 5:9 & F & fearful \(75: 6\) \\
\hline 23:8 25:7 & 12:2 13:22 & & feel 73:22 \\
\hline 27:17,20 & 47:11 & face 114:10 & 101:5 \\
\hline 29:3,4 & 121:24 & fact 26:7 & 103:10 \\
\hline 32:20 & &  & 104:19 \\
\hline & experts & 32:24 39:3 & 105:3,4 \\
\hline Excuse 57:18 & 15:14 & 67:4 71:20 & \\
\hline exist 73:15, & 66:14 & 93:15 & feels 118:3 \\
\hline 16 98:5 & 69:4,20,23 & 101:12 & feet 19:11 \\
\hline 104:18 & 71:14 & factor 51:14 & 27:2,7,23 \\
\hline existing & 77:25 & 71:20 & 30:10 \\
\hline 19:7 39:20 & 99:17 & 103:2 & 34:12,15, \\
\hline 47:956:4 & explain & factored & 23 46:7 \\
\hline 117:25 & 94:18 & 119:23 & 53:25 \\
\hline & 108:9 & & 84:25 \\
\hline exit 8:25 & & factors 98:4 & 85:1, 4, 7, \\
\hline 47:23 & explained & & 12,19 89:1 \\
\hline 48:12 & 10:20 & \[
98: 24
\] & 93:11 \\
\hline \(54: 15,18\)
\(80: 1598: 7\) & explanation & fairly 63:18 & felt 7:3 \\
\hline 80:15 98:7 & 70:6 & fairly 63.18 & 10:10 \\
\hline exiting & expressed & familiar & 81:10 \\
\hline 53:14 & 7:21 45:10 & 26:8 28:2 & \\
\hline 80:5,14 & 63:24 98:5 & 114:10 & field 12:16 \\
\hline 81:1 & & fancy 26:12 & 13:13,22 \\
\hline exits 53: & extensive & & 5 \\
\hline exits 53 & 113:11 & farm 37:11 & 66:14 \\
\hline expect 25:19 & extent & farther & 115:3 \\
\hline 27:6 88:8 & 106:13 & 112:2 & fields \\
\hline 101:14 & external & fashion & 59:21,25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: figure..generate
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline figure 7:25 & forward 68:3 & 114:22 & 101:12 \\
\hline final 4:3 & 91:13 & full-movement & 102:18 \\
\hline 32:7 & 100:11 & 17:8 & gaps 10:14, \\
\hline find 11:22 & 106:11 & fully 116:21 & 23 11:4,7 \\
\hline find 11. & foundation & \[
120: 3
\] & 20:3,5 \\
\hline finding 89:9 & 106:4 & 120.3 & 49:12,16, \\
\hline findings & four-leg & function & 20 50:8 \\
\hline 33:3 & 28:2 & 30:9 & 52:25 \\
\hline fine 37:4, & & functional & 53:2,11, \\
\hline 19 122:14 & Fox 110 & 32:1 & 12,16 \\
\hline & Frank 66:15 & functionally & 54:20 \\
\hline fine-tuning & 70:15 & 18:17 & 56:13 \\
\hline 98:11 & 102:23 & & 62:12,15 \\
\hline firm 13:9 & 122:23 & future 37:21 & 63:12 67:2 \\
\hline 114:24 & & 38:2 40:10 & 69:17,24 \\
\hline 114.24 & frankly & 42:2 47:13 & 70:11 \\
\hline fit 85:21, & 101:1 & 51:10 & 82:14 \\
\hline 22 & fresh 76:24 & 61:10 65:6 & 83:11,12 \\
\hline five-minute & 77:3,4 & 123:1 & 93:8 95:17 \\
\hline 113:9,23 & 99:12 & 127:7 & \\
\hline fix 98:1 & 102:15 & & Garden 24:7, \\
\hline & friction & G & \\
\hline fixing 98:2 & 18:7 26:20 & & gas 26:18 \\
\hline flow 25:23 & front 17.13 & gap 10:16, & gated 16:15 \\
\hline 40:5 69:18 & front 17:13 & 20,21 & \\
\hline & 25:12 & 11:1,3 & gave 58:22 \\
\hline focus 91:4 & \(35: 1938: 9\) & 19:22 & 69: 6 \\
\hline focused & 57:21 & 49:1,2,3 & 100:19 \\
\hline 33:16 & 117:9 & 54:8,13 & general \\
\hline 116:15 & frontage & 56:5 60:18 & 16:11 \\
\hline forever & 26:20 27:2 & 61:12 & 91:12 \\
\hline 71:12 & fruition & 63:11 & generally \\
\hline & 118:8 & 70:16,19, & 18:9 20:9 \\
\hline forget
\(118: 25\) & & 20,25 & 22:20 \\
\hline 118:25 & full 4:16 & 80:12, 21 & \\
\hline formal 9:24 & 8:25 10:9 & 81:12 & 28:25 \\
\hline & 13:1 15:17 & 83:18, 22 & generate \\
\hline \[
116: 11
\] & 49:8 92:13 & 94:17 & 61:25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: generation..happened
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline generation & 114:23 & 59:16,17 & 32:21 37:1 \\
\hline 33:4 59:9 & 124:4 & 62:2,13 & 47:7 52:1 \\
\hline 61:18, 22 & Google 19:11 & 63:2,9 & 55:24 60:3 \\
\hline generic & 35:1 & 65:16 & 72:8 \\
\hline 86:19 & & 71:17 & 114:10 \\
\hline 86.19 & gore 17:18 & \(74: 10\) 83:7 & 120:12 \\
\hline Gerry 8:7 & 19:5,7,16 & 90:24,25 & \\
\hline Ghassali & 34: 6 & 93:21 & guide 19:12
\[
34: 19,20
\] \\
\hline 10:6 & gosh 89:3 & 110:14 & \\
\hline give 12:19 & govern 32:13 & 111: 4,13 & \begin{tabular}{l}
Gus 121:7, \\
9,13,14
\end{tabular} \\
\hline 15:22 79:1 & governing & grant 8:25 & 122:1 \\
\hline 81:25 & 9:22 10:5 & 73:23 & \\
\hline 92:21 & 10 & grants 67:10 & guy 19:20 \\
\hline 97:10 98:8 & 10 & grants 67:10 & 47:23 \\
\hline 103:20 & GPS 65:24 & Grass 123:7 & guys 69:20, \\
\hline 109:16,17 & 69:24 & gray 119:10 & 23 70:3 \\
\hline 113:17 & 70:7,11 & & 83:15 \\
\hline 114:14 & 86:16 & great 21:1 & \\
\hline giving & 94:18 & 31:11 & H \\
\hline & & 109:24 & \\
\hline goal & GPS-BASED & 118:9 & half 49:7 \\
\hline goals 21:3 & 86:20 & & halfway \\
\hline God 12:20 & graded 123:5 & Green 92:17, & 109:20 \\
\hline 92:22 & Grand 6:19 & & hall 20:22 \\
\hline 114:15 & \(7: 38: 12\) & grew 51:2 & \\
\hline good 4:15, & 9:2 10:15 & 104:1 & hand 92.19 \\
\hline 18 5:5 6:9 & 15:6 17:12 & Grey 75:24 & \\
\hline 11:10 & 22:2 24:8 & growth 51:8, & handle 60:14 \\
\hline 13:3,5 & 25:5 26:24 & 13 61:18 & hands 56:21 \\
\hline 23:22 & 27:2,11 & 63:9 66:2 & 100:5 \\
\hline 29:21 35:6 & 28:13,19 & 76:14 & hanging \\
\hline 43:16 47:8 & 29:11,13 & 98:12 & \(57: 16\) \\
\hline 55:22 65:4 & 33:17 34:9 & 108:7,10 & \\
\hline 77:8,10 & 42:21 & & happen 39:14 \\
\hline 78:5 & 52:16 & guarant & 42:14 \\
\hline 109:10,23 & :13,1 & 40: & 99:22 \\
\hline 112:19 & \(1956: 2\) & guess 5:11 & happened \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: happening..horn
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 121:14 & 55:23 & Hill 110:1 & 13 122:3, \\
\hline happening & 58:16 61:9 & Hipolit 5:23 & 9,14,16 \\
\hline 19:3 36:16 & 65:19 66:9 & 8:22 9:5 & 123:7,18, \\
\hline 73:9 & 73:5 74:4, & 10:1 34:1, & 21 124:16, \\
\hline 74:18,19 & 22 88:25 & 4,8,11,14, & 19 125:12, \\
\hline & 92:11 & 22 35:2,15 & \(16,21,25\) \\
\hline \(\begin{array}{cl}\text { happy } & 6: 17 \\ 8.20 & 99.14\end{array}\) & 101:19 & 42:16,18, & 126:3,9,13 \\
\hline \(8: 20 \quad 99: 14\)
\(100: 2,9\) & 102:3,4 & 24 43:12 & Hipolit's \\
\hline 105:19, 22 & hearing 4:2 & 51:13 55:9 & 94:14 \\
\hline 122:5 & 72:2,17 & 64:4,8,17, & 112:23 \\
\hline & 83:11 & 20,24 & history \\
\hline hard 22:4 & 101:21 & 65:10 & history
9:14,
l \\
\hline hardscape & 104:24 & 67:6,7,21 & 16:10,12, \\
\hline 118:11 & 115:22 & 70:9,17,21 & 24 68:21 \\
\hline hat 35:13 & height & 71:1 78:1 & 73:3,25 \\
\hline & 116:21 & 80:16 & 82:10 \\
\hline hatched 19:7 & & 81:8,16 & \[
111: 19,21
\] \\
\hline hate 67:6 & heights & 83:19,21 & \[
22
\] \\
\hline 70:5 99:14 & 117:13 & 84:6,14 & \\
\hline 106:15 & hell 66:10 & 88:2,5,9, & hit 108:14 \\
\hline 108:19 & helps 39:3 & 13,20,24 & hits 22:24 \\
\hline hazards 19:6 & helps 39.3 & 89:5 & hold 66:24 \\
\hline hazards 19.6 & hesitancy & 90:10,18, & \[
81: 11
\] \\
\hline heading & 26:2 & 22 94:19 & 81.11 \\
\hline 53:18, 21 & hesitation & 97: 4 & homes 96:9 \\
\hline 74:9 & 21:8 & 100:14,19 & homework \\
\hline 80:15,24 & & 101:3,23 & 5:10 \\
\hline 84:3 & hey 69:5 & 103:14 & \\
\hline & 83:15 & 107:5,21 & honking \\
\hline hear 6:17 & 88:22 & 108:2,7, & 19:19 \\
\hline 56:23 & & 108:2,7, & \\
\hline 101:22 & high 33:7 & 20,24 & hope 76:17 \\
\hline 102:7 & highest & 109:10,22 & horizontal \\
\hline 106:18 & 59:10 & 110:7,12, & 17:14 \\
\hline 111:1 & highlight & \[
24 \text { 111:6, }
\] & horn 19:20 \\
\hline heard 18:17 & 24:5 & & 51:1 76:5 \\
\hline 20:4 34:2 & highway & \[
19 \text { 113:20 }
\] & 98:14 \\
\hline 40:16 & 50:11 & 121:3,6,9, & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: Hospital..installed
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Hospital & 103:20 & improvement & 21:22 \\
\hline 93:10 96:9 & 118:3 & 57:1 79:4 & 26:14 \\
\hline hour 7:6 & 119:8 & improvements & 51:11 \\
\hline 11:4 & ideal 31:13 & 21:7 56:3 & info 51:7 \\
\hline 21:24,25 & identified & improves & information \\
\hline 22:3,5,12 & 53:12 & 36:13 & 5:14 6:16 \\
\hline 45:22 & II 64.25 & & 8:18 26:1 \\
\hline 46:1, 4, 16 & II 64:25 & in-depth & \[
65: 15
\] \\
\hline 47:3 48:2, & 99:7,9 & 6:15 & 66:12,22, \\
\hline 21,24 & 123:1 & incidents & 23 71:14 \\
\hline 49:14 & imagery & 21:10 & 102:8 \\
\hline 54:2,12 & 16:13 & inclined & \\
\hline 56:24 & & inclined & informed \\
\hline 59:10,11, & imagine & 8:19 & 93:25 \\
\hline 12 60:15 & \[
45: 25
\] & include & infrastructure \\
\hline 80:20 & 101:6 & 90:9,13 & 20:21 21:1 \\
\hline 105:2 & immediately & included & \\
\hline 110: 6 & 41:10 & 15:4 66:3 & \[
71: 16
\] \\
\hline hourly 53:20 & 42:11 & 116:8 & 11.16 \\
\hline \[
57: 7
\] & 97:19 & & initial \\
\hline hours 20:5,8 & impact 15:1 & 22:2 78:21 & 25:25 \\
\hline 103:24 & 39:8 & 98:12 & initially \\
\hline & imperative & incorporated & 41:5 73:21
\(121: 15\) \\
\hline \[
61: 24
\] & 89:25 & \[
72: 9
\] & 121:15 \\
\hline hundreds & implemented & increase & injury 47:13 \\
\hline 23:9 51:18 & 46:25 & 50:20 & inquiries \\
\hline & implicated & 52:14 & 65:20 \\
\hline HUTTER 6:20, & 4:12 & 61:8,9 & inside 17:15 \\
\hline \(2414: 17\)
\(124: 7\) & important & 62:2, 6, 10, & insignificant \\
\hline 126:6,11 & 17:5 29:10 & 13 & 62:14 \\
\hline & 72:2 & incredibly & install 95:7 \\
\hline I & 102:22 & 93:16 & 97:23 \\
\hline & improve & indicating & installation \\
\hline I/ii 65:1 & 35:14 & 44:15 46:2 & \[
78: 25
\] \\
\hline idea 61:17 & 36:16 & industry & \\
\hline 71:5 95:11 & 54:8,13,19 & & installed \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: installing..KPMG
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 70:12 98:4 & intersection & 126:23 & 41:14 \\
\hline installing & 18:15 & issued 68:16 & justifies \\
\hline 35:16 & 20:10,22, & & 79:4 \\
\hline & 24 25:16 & issues 6:15 & \\
\hline Institute & 27:24 & 41:8 & \\
\hline 13:19 & 29:16 & 106:14 & K \\
\hline 58:13 & 30:10 & item 4:1 & K-E-L-L-Y \\
\hline intended & 43:20 & & 92:16 \\
\hline 95:11, 12, & 74:10,16 & J & \\
\hline 14,15 & 103:21 & & keeping \\
\hline 123:3 & 111:3 & January & 18:20 21:6 \\
\hline & & 76:25 & 22:22 \\
\hline intent 28:15 & intersections & & 28:17 33:6 \\
\hline 116:20 & 28:2,5,15 & Jersey 6:3,7 & \\
\hline 117:23 & 59:24 & 12:23 & y 92:12, \\
\hline 118:13,14 & interval & 13:16,21 & 15,16,17, \\
\hline 119:14 & 53:17 & \(31: 878: 21\) & 94:8 95:4, \\
\hline intention & introduce & . 25 & 21 96:4 \\
\hline 114:7 & 12:8 & job 47:8 & Kettering \\
\hline intentional & inventing & Joe 8:23 & 88:3, 6 \\
\hline 117:3 & 78:16 & John 4:17 & 89:6 \\
\hline intently & investigating & 6:20 79:24 & key 73:12 \\
\hline 32:25 & 108:17 & 81:12 & kind 21:16 \\
\hline interest & involved & joint 55:16 & 42:18 \\
\hline 69:8 & \(7: 10\) 47:14 & judgments & 85:16 87:7 \\
\hline 117:10 & nvolvement & 39:24 & 104:20 \\
\hline 122:8 & \[
7: 8
\] & July 116:8 & 106:23 \\
\hline interesting & & July 116.8 & 117: 4,5 \\
\hline 16:14 41:4 & involving & juncture & Kindercare \\
\hline 56:10 & 8:16 & 25:6 & \[
57: 3
\] \\
\hline internal & issue 8:9,13 & June 14:15, & kinds 46:24 \\
\hline 33:5,15 & 26:2 42:14 & 24 15:2 & kinds 46.24 \\
\hline 95:2 & 52:20 & 115:16 & knew 89:11 \\
\hline interrupt & 57:13 & jurisdiction & 101:9 \\
\hline interrupt & 82:14 & \[
23: 16 \quad 36: 1
\] & Kodiak 119:7 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{4:9} & 105:7 & & \\
\hline & 124:15 & jurisdictional & KPMG 51:1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: L1.00..levels
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 46:10,17, & lease 97:13 & 46:23 47:4 \\
\hline L & 24 48:11, & leases 97:11 & 57:6 60:12 \\
\hline L1.00 44:23 & 12,13,16, & & 61:14 \\
\hline & 17 49:1,3, & leave 58: & 63:20 74:8 \\
\hline L1.00. 45:4 & 6,17 56:17 & 61:17 & 81:4 84:11 \\
\hline L2a 120:1 & 82:13,18 & leaving 4:13 & 93:7,20 \\
\hline Lafayette & 84:1,3 & ledger/legend & left-t \\
\hline 119:6 & 86:5 87:11 & 118:25 & 8:13 \\
\hline 119.6 & 104:17,24 & & 17:11,17 \\
\hline land 16:18 & 110:15,17 & left 7:16 & 18:10 \\
\hline 67:12,23 & lanes 17:18, & 8:5 19:23 & 19:18 20:1 \\
\hline landscape & 19 20:12, & 22:9 27:20 & 31:4,21 \\
\hline 44:24 & 18 22:11 & 29:13,15 & 32:11 39:2 \\
\hline 114:8 & 24:25 & 30:6 31:5, & 42:21 \\
\hline 115:3,13 & 31:21 & , & 43:13 \\
\hline 116:13 & 39:21 & 37:25 & 56:17 \\
\hline 117:15 & 46:14,15 & 38:1,19 & 82:13,21, \\
\hline 121:5 & 47:2,5,25 & 39:10,16, & 22 85:18 \\
\hline landscaping & 48:1,9,15, & 41:3 43:8 & 87:11 \\
\hline 113:4 & 23 75:13 & 47:24 & 103:11 \\
\hline 116:2,9, & 80:6,9 & 48:10 & 104:14 \\
\hline 16,17 & 3:2 & 53:18 54:9 & left-turn-exit \\
\hline 117:3 & 105:2 & 58:8,10 & 22:17 \\
\hline 125:2 & large 48:14 & 67:2 & lefts 111:25 \\
\hline lane 9:2 & larger & 73:12,13, & \\
\hline 17:18 & 121:21 & 21,22,24 & \\
\hline 19:15 & & 74:5 80:2, & 113:11 \\
\hline 20:15,16, & Law 67:12 & 3,23 81:18 & 116:7, \\
\hline 19 21:12 & layer 8:4 & 82:23,24 & 20:20 \\
\hline 22:14 & 99:12 & 83:1,3,9, & 124:17 \\
\hline 24:16,21, & layout 25:25 & 17,24 & 125:8, \\
\hline 25 31:4,6, & & 84:4,7 & letters \\
\hline 9 36:20,22 & leads 21:9 & 86:5,11 & 115:24 \\
\hline 39:2 41:3 & leaning & 91:6 103:9 & 116:1 \\
\hline 42:21 & 56:16 & 104:22 & level 33:5,7 \\
\hline 43:8,13 & learned & 105:8,10 & levels 41:17 \\
\hline 44:2 & 11:18 89:5 & left-hand & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: licensed..luck
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline licensed & 54:11 & loading & losing 107:2 \\
\hline 13:15 & 62:17 66:1 & 116:17 & lot 4:3 \\
\hline lifestyle & 73:16 & located 28:3 & 16:1,6 \\
\hline 100:24 & 107:15 & & 21:15 \\
\hline light 42:22 & limited & 26:3 & 26:20 \\
\hline 53:14 & 27:17 & & 30:18,19 \\
\hline 62:20, 21 & 109:23 & location & 35:19 36:6 \\
\hline 63:6,7 & 121:18 & 16:11,13, & \(39: 13\) 40:6 \\
\hline \(65: 22\) & & 25 17:5,20 & 49:10 \\
\hline \(70: 13\) & ng & 18:1 23:4, & 50:14 \\
\hline 80: 8 , 10, & 24 & 20 24:8,16 & 55:17 \\
\hline 81: & limits 10:15 & 26:4 & 56:10 60:5 \\
\hline 83: 8, 20, 23 & 65:16 & 27:11,13, & 70:3, 24 \\
\hline 83:8,20,23
\[
84: 21
\] & linked 95:8 & 14 30:6 & 80:23 \\
\hline & & 39:10 & 81:24 89:5 \\
\hline 104:17 & Lintner 4:25 & 49:19 & 107:7 \\
\hline 105:9 & 40:23,24 & & 107:7 \\
\hline 109:13 & 42:15,18, & locations & 111:25 \\
\hline 111:10,11, & 23 43:11 & 95:19 & 113:5 \\
\hline 12,14,15 & 44:5 92:3, & logic 79:6 & 118:5 \\
\hline 116:17 & 5 96:19,21 & logical & loud 6:22 \\
\hline lighting & list 97:4 & 18:20 & love 50:15 \\
\hline 97:23 & listed 90:16 & 27:12 & 123:10 \\
\hline 117:1 & 1isten 15.12 & long 26:14 & low 63:15 \\
\hline lightly & 63:17 & 35:25 & lower 6:18 \\
\hline 82:7,9,10 & & 85:4,7 & 7:2,6 11:1 \\
\hline 118:14 & listening & 94:11 & 7 \\
\hline lights 65:23 & \(72: 13\) & 106:25 & 100:17 \\
\hline 66:2 & literally & long-term & \\
\hline 90:17,19, & 9:16 & 89:14 & lowering \\
\hline 20,22 & 121:17 & 89.14 & 7:18 \\
\hline 20, 22 & & longer 94:8 & 10:15, 23 \\
\hline 94:15 & live 93:7 & & 35:22 \\
\hline limit 6:18 & lived 93:6 & 100 & 62:17 \\
\hline 7:2,5,19 & 94:3, 6 & & 65:16 \\
\hline 35:22 & living 20:23 & 121:13 & luck 69:6 \\
\hline 36:11 & living 20.23 & & \\
\hline 45:22 & LLC 4:3 & loop 7:17 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline & 43:24 44:3 & 17 28:17 & 127: 6 \\
\hline M & 46:7 47:4 & 29:6 30:4 & 5:18 \\
\hline made 12:1 & 52:9 53:11 & maneuver & 10:14 \\
\hline 18:21 & 54:23 & 27:8 & 15:19 \\
\hline 39:16 & 60:12,17, & manner 24:17 & 18:18 20:4 \\
\hline 45:12 & 25 62:8 & & 41:13,19 \\
\hline 53:10 & 69:9,12 & 29:11 32:1 & 42:8 59:4, \\
\hline 65:20 & 73:22 & 29:11 32:1 & 18 64:5 \\
\hline 97:25 & 84:15 & manual & 65:14 \\
\hline 100:20,21, & 86:5,11,25 & 78:19,24 & 68:11 72:9 \\
\hline 22 120:8 & 90:20 92: & 79:2 & 74:22,23 \\
\hline & 93:7 97:25 & manufacturer & 76:22 \\
\hline magnitude & 102:8 & 118:21 & 94:19 \\
\hline 32:18 & 103:10 & & 106:11 \\
\hline main 50:14 & 104:7,18 & manufactures & 108:8,24 \\
\hline 80:5, 9 & 107:6,7, & 118:21 & 126:2,3, \\
\hline 103:22 & 18,22 & map 35:1 & 12,13,14 \\
\hline & 108:15 & 124:22 & \\
\hline major 27:23 & 111:7 & & Maurice's \\
\hline 28:14 & 117:2 & margin 98: & 107:10 \\
\hline majority & 120:5,25 & marked 14:9, & maximum \\
\hline 48:14 & makes 17:15 & 17 20:15 & 60:14,18, \\
\hline 80:13 & \[
19: 23
\] & 115:12 & 21 61:12 \\
\hline make 6:13, & 22:10 & Market 99:8 & Mayor 10:2,6 \\
\hline 21 7:10 & making 25:16 & markings & 54:24 \\
\hline 9:24 17:17 & \[
39: 18.21
\] & 21:12 & 55:2,13 \\
\hline 19:4,14 & \[
24 \text { 41:3 }
\] & & 107:16,17 \\
\hline 20:13 & \[
43: 2157: 6
\] & marks 22:24 & 109:4 \\
\hline 22:2,8 & 83:17,24 & Marriott & MB 4:3 \\
\hline 24:8 & \[
84: 6 \quad 91: 6
\] & 76:2 & \\
\hline 25:13,15 & \[
93: 20
\] & match 119:14 & means 6:12 \\
\hline 27:20 & 93:20, \(110 \cdot 18,20\) & match 119:14 & 95:15 \\
\hline 29:15 & & material & meant 63:2 \\
\hline 30:13,23 & MALE 54:4 & 118:2,11 & \[
95: 19
\] \\
\hline 31:10 & 108:22 & materialized & \\
\hline 33:21 & management & 99:25 & meantime \\
\hline 36:10 & 26:10,11, & 30:23 & 123:2 \\
\hline 38:19 & 15 27:12, & matter 30:23 & measurable \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: measure..modeled
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 68: 6, 10 & 49:23 61:1 & metrics 71:6 & 120:9 \\
\hline 71:21 & 63:13,19 & 72:7 & min \\
\hline 79:19 & \(76: 24\) 92:8 & 77:12,17 & 57:16 \\
\hline measure & 96:23 & 78:12,17 & \\
\hline measure & 102:24 & 91:15 & missed \\
\hline & memory 64:2 & 119:19 & 120:7, \\
\hline measured & memory 64.2 & microphone & mistake 67:3 \\
\hline 19.10 & 20 & 6:21 & mix 118:24 \\
\hline mechanical & 112:5 & middle 19:7, & 119:9 \\
\hline 65:25 & 112:5 & middle 19:7, & \\
\hline median 19:8 & mentioned & 20 & mobility \\
\hline 27:18,19 & 13:11 & Mike 113:10 & 28:19 \\
\hline \(31: 4,11\) & 22:16 41:2 & mile 22:12 & model 51:1 \\
\hline & 61:2,3 & 45:22 & 55:25 56:3 \\
\hline medical & 111:2,9 & & 60:19 \\
\hline 11:14,20 & & miles 7:5 & 61:13 \\
\hline 38:17 & mentioning & 21:24 &  \\
\hline meet 97:19 & & 22:3,5 & 23 64:1,6, \\
\hline 103:16 & Mercedes & 46:1,4,15 & 11,14,16, \\
\hline & 37:12 & 47:3 48:1, & 20 65:2,10 \\
\hline meeting 4:7 & 42:22 & 21,24 & 66:8 70:18 \\
\hline \(5: 8,14,22\) & 62:22 63:6 & 54:1,12 & \\
\hline 12:2 32:10 & 75:25 76:7 & 105:2 & 72:3,18 \\
\hline 92:2 94:1 & 90:24 & & 77:5,6,9 \\
\hline 96:17 & 94:25 & mind 30:9 & 98:20,23 \\
\hline 106:16 & 94:25 & 67:9 73:1 & 99:16,20 \\
\hline 107:17, 25 & Mercedes-benz & 105:9 & 100:3, 6, \\
\hline 110:25 & 68:23 & minds 53:3 & 20,25 \\
\hline 113:15 & 71:23 & & 101:7,11, \\
\hline 114:1 & merging 46:9 & mine \(37: 2\) & 13,14 \\
\hline 126:25 & merging 46.9 & 50:4 & 102:1,11, \\
\hline & met 77:18 & minimized & 12 105:20 \\
\hline member 95:23 & method 7:8 & 80:3 & 106:1,2,4, \\
\hline 102:4 & 81:21 & minor & 10 108:24 \\
\hline members 4:22 & & \[
122: 9
\] & 109:1 \\
\hline 5:15 6:10 & 65:2 & 122 & 126:7,10, \\
\hline 13:5,6 & 65:25 & minute 19:6 & 11 \\
\hline 23:5,6 & metric 78:24 & 53:22 54:3 & \\
\hline 35:9 37:1 & 79:9 112:9 & 80:20 & 56:1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: modified..number
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline modified & 8:9 17:11, & municipalities & night 49:14 \\
\hline 98:20 & 20,25 & 13:21 & normal 85:6 \\
\hline moment 79:2 & \[
18: 1,8,9,
\] & MUTCD 78:20 & north 30:14 \\
\hline momentarily & 10 20:1
21.23 & 79:16 & 91:5 99:8 \\
\hline 25:13 & 22:13,17 & 112:5 & 114:18 \\
\hline 49:16 & 24:6,10, & & northbound \\
\hline momentary & 13,15,19 & N & 34:17 \\
\hline 24:12 & 25:7 30:13 & narrate & northerly \\
\hline money 70:8 & 32:11,14 & 44:16,18 & 29:24 \\
\hline 91:2 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 35: 11,12, \\
& 1547: 16
\end{aligned}
\] & national & northern \\
\hline monitors & 48: 6 & 7:15 58:12 & 29:6 \\
\hline 101:11 & movements & 78:18 95:9 & northernmost \\
\hline 110:2 & 11:7 16:5 & nationally & 30:2 \\
\hline months 97:24 & 21:2,5 & 78:17 & note 17:6 \\
\hline Montvale 4:3 & 22:6,19,20 & natural & noted 127:7 \\
\hline 9:21 75:22 & 27:22,25 & 105:24 & noted 127.7 \\
\hline 81:17 & 33:14 48:4 & 119:9 & notes 44:12 \\
\hline 92:17,25 & 56:1 & nature & 45:13 \\
\hline 93: 6, 14 & moving 10:12 & 116:15 & 107:7 \\
\hline 94:6 & 18:5 25:1 & & 112:14,23 \\
\hline 119:20 & 75:7 & \[
29: 23
\] & notice \\
\hline monument & 84:16,17, & 30:14 & 126:23 \\
\hline 87:15,18 & 20 & 38:21 & 127:1 \\
\hline motion 92:1, & multi-modal & necessarily & noticed \\
\hline 5 96:16 & 28:16 & 16:9 39:1 & 21:15 \\
\hline motor 28:10, & 29:18,19, & 42:1 55:8 & notified \\
\hline 20 & 20 & 125:17 & 43:2 \\
\hline move 40:22 & multi-modality & needed 81:10 & Notre 13:14 \\
\hline 68:3 81:21 & 29:17 & 83:12 89:9 & number 11:5, \\
\hline 100:11 & multiple & Newman 6:2,6 & 7 20:25 \\
\hline moved 40:6 & 59:13,21 & news 7:3 & \(33: 10 \quad 40: 2\) \\
\hline 92:3 96:18 & Municipal & & 58:9,12 \\
\hline & 67:12 & nice 13:3 & \(60: 7\) 62:14 \\
\hline movement 4:5 & & 37:20 & 63:11,15, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: numbers..order
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 16 68:15 & 97:18 & onus 70:5 & 23:19 \\
\hline 70:13 & offense & open 8:10 & 24:6,14 \\
\hline 102:14 & 41:16 & 16:20 & 25:3 27:4 \\
\hline 103:18 & & 23:14 & 33:18 \\
\hline 104:1 & office 26:18 & 68.22 & 35:20, 21 \\
\hline 119:21,22 & 29:2 75:22 & 91:24, 25 & 37:24 \\
\hline numbers 11:3 & 76:16 & 92:2 & 38:14 \\
\hline 49:19, 20 & offices & 100:23,24 & 39:23 \\
\hline 57:21 & 100:17 & 111:20,24 & 40:16,17 \\
\hline 59:12 & officially & & 41:22 \\
\hline 110:23 & 126:22 & opening 65:7 & 49:22 \\
\hline & & operate & 50:4,24 \\
\hline & officials & 18:12,16, & \(74: 3\) 85:25 \\
\hline 0 & 68:18 & 24 23:20 & 91:7 \\
\hline O-L-I 13:7 & old-fashioned & 24:16, 20 & 107:10,11 \\
\hline objection & 76:9 & 25:22 & opinions \\
\hline 104:21 & Olivo 12:11, & 33:18 & 33:12 \\
\hline occasions & 12,21 & 42:
\(50: 1,5\) & opportunities \\
\hline 115:4 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 13: 2,6 \\
& 14: 22,25
\end{aligned}
\] & 59:25 & 10:25 \\
\hline occupancy & 15:10,16, & 95:10, 12, & opportunity \\
\hline 97:14 & 20,24 & 14 & 9:3 14:23, \\
\hline occupied & 23:24 24:4 & operates & 5 15:1 \\
\hline 75:22 & 29:13 & 23:15 26:9 & 75:8 \\
\hline 76:17 & 33:20,21 & operating & 117:19 \\
\hline occur 24:13 & 34:3 37:5 & 28:25 95:1 & 121:4 \\
\hline 30:2 & 40:25 & operation & 124:17 \\
\hline 53:13,16 & 101:6,12 & 18:14,15, & \\
\hline 74:9 80:14 & \(101: 6,12\)
\(106: 1\) & 23 23:17 & \[
73: 10,11
\] \\
\hline 101:12 & 108:8,9 & 35:11 & 13 (10,11 \\
\hline occurred & on-site & operational & opposite \\
\hline 80:13 & 119:12,22 & 23:14 & 17:19 \\
\hline occurring & & operations & order 30:2 \\
\hline 22:7 30:6 & 19:4 & 13:18 & 63:23 \\
\hline 31:5 66:4 & 83:2 & opinion 8:24 & 100:11 \\
\hline occurs 21:23 & one-way 83.2 & 15:22 16:8 & 114:2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: Ordinance..people
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Ordinance & 127:8 & 47:18 & 89:2 98:13 \\
\hline 119:20 & package & 53:14, 21 & 108:15 \\
\hline ordinances & Package
\(44: 25\) & 54:11 & 122:1 \\
\hline 32:13 & & 63:10 & \\
\hline & palette & 65:18 & pat \\
\hline organization & 118:2 & 80:4,19 & 107:2 \\
\hline 26:23 & 119:2 & 81:1,5 & patient \\
\hline organize & palettes & 82:17,19 & 89:13 \\
\hline 26:12 & 118:22 & 83:9,22 & 93:12 \\
\hline original & paper 71:6 & 90:9, 23 & patients \\
\hline 14:13 & paper & 93:16 & 93:14 \\
\hline 72.20 99.6 & parameters & 94:25 & \\
\hline 72:20 99:6 & 23:21 48:7 & 95:16 & patterns \\
\hline originally & paramount & 100:18 & 96:6 \\
\hline 55:25 & 18:16 & 108:14 & pavement \\
\hline originate & Par & 109:13,18, & 21:12 28:7 \\
\hline 24:11 & 104:12 & 19 110:18 & paying 15:5 \\
\hline outlined & 104.12 & 111:3,7, & PE 6:1,5 \\
\hline 52:5 & \[
30: 16 \quad 66: 4
\] & 10,11,12 & 12:22 \\
\hline & \(30: 16\)
\(75: 23\) & parlance & \\
\hline overcome & 75:23 & 18:4 & peak 20:5,8 \\
\hline 100:13 & parked 34:5 & 18.4 & 49:14 \\
\hline overestimated & 46:22 & part 26:22 & 53:20 \\
\hline 99:20 & & 58:20, 23 & 57:24 \\
\hline 99.20 & Parkerrodrigue & 67:4 90:14 & 59:10,11, \\
\hline overestimation & z 114:8,24 & 91:3 & 12 80:20 \\
\hline 99:24 & 115:14 & 100:17 & 103:24,25 \\
\hline overnight & parking & 120:19 & 110: 6, 9 \\
\hline 42:14 & 30:19 33:5 & passenger & peaking \\
\hline overpass & 47:20 & 27:13 & 51:24 \\
\hline 46:2 63:2 & 59:21,25 & & \\
\hline & 89:14 & assing & pearls 97:2 \\
\hline & 119:21,22 & & pedestrian \\
\hline P & Parkway 8:25 & passive 29:1 & 28:11 \\
\hline p.m. 57:24 & 19:11 20:9 & past 19:12 & pedestrians \\
\hline 59:10 & 24:7,12 & 34:16 & 29:25 \\
\hline 103:24 & 25:2,5 & 40:9,11 & 4 \\
\hline 110:8 & 34:17 46:5 & 42:1 65:20 & people 21:14 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: percent..popular
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 29:2 38:21 & 17:2 & places & planting \\
\hline 45:25 & perspective & 104:12 & 117:8 \\
\hline 46:10,15 & 20:2 27:12 & plan 4:4 & 119:21 \\
\hline 47:2,14 & 29:7,9 & 14:12,23 & plazas 28:23 \\
\hline 50:17 & \(31: 14\) 32:6 & 19:18 & \\
\hline 56:10 & \[
33: 13
\] & \[
26: 10,11
\] & pleased 8:3 \\
\hline 60:11 & & 32:8 67:10 & plug 71:22 \\
\hline 62:18 & perspectives & \(77: 14\) & Plugging \\
\hline 69:25 73:6 & 25:11 & 87:20 & 66:8 \\
\hline 76:8,9 & phase 57:12 & 89:19 & \\
\hline 87:8,10 & \(64: 2565: 1\) & 93:12 & point 8:13 \\
\hline 89:11 & 81:18 & 115:14 & 11:24 \\
\hline 93:19 & 99:7,9 & 117:15 & 15:6, 25 \\
\hline percent 53:2 & 117:23 & 120:9 & 17:8 18:9 \\
\hline 61:8 & 119:3 & 125:2,4 & 27:17 \\
\hline 62:13,14 & 123:1 & & 29:10 \\
\hline 118:25 & phases & planned & 32:11 \\
\hline 119:5,6 & 119:16 & 50:17 & 38:16 \\
\hline perfect 72:1 & Phillips & & 53:24 69:1 \\
\hline performed & 90:25 91:7 & 117:12 & 71:21 \\
\hline 10:17 & phone 41:19 & 120:5 & 74:25 \\
\hline & & & 84:19 86:2 \\
\hline perimeter & physical & planning & 98:7 \\
\hline 123:18 & 27:19 & 61:11 & 120:22 \\
\hline period 68:13 & physicians & 67:14 & 25:9 \\
\hline 80:9,11,25 & 93:11 & 117:20 & 25:9 \\
\hline 94:7 & & 123:9 & points 59:14 \\
\hline & physics 38:9 & 126:14,15 & 102:15 \\
\hline periods & pick 41:19 & plans 115:17 & 112:13 \\
\hline \(49: 15\)
68.22 & piece 29:6 & \[
117: 1,12,
\] & olice 8:7 \\
\hline & 67:23 & 13 118:18 & 23:5 68:18 \\
\hline permissible & & 120:3,14, & 78: 4, 7 \\
\hline 16:16 & piggybacking & 17 121:4 & 79:12 \\
\hline person 46:16 & 50: & 124:20,22 & 109:15,22 \\
\hline 47:3 & PLA 114:17 & 125:11 & 111:18 \\
\hline 48:17, 20 & place 73:17 & plant 118:2 & popular 60:5 \\
\hline personnel & 90:4 118:8 & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: Port..project
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Port 41:15, & practicing & 43:19 56:9 & problems \\
\hline 16 & 16:17 & 62:6 78:13 & 43:8,23 \\
\hline portion & 22:23 & 93:5 & 47:13 \\
\hline 114:9 & precursor & 113:11 & 89:11 \\
\hline pose 100:16 & 98:24 & prevail & \(4: 12\) \\
\hline & predicting & 60:20 & proceed \\
\hline position & \[
60: 8
\] & previous 8:6 & 115:9 \\
\hline 91:19 & prefer 38:23 & 111:20 & proceeding \\
\hline 103:1,3 & 94:19 & previously & 92:21 \\
\hline positive & preference & 5:20 6:3,7 & :14 \\
\hline 65:19 & 124:13 & 12:15 14:5 & process 7:13 \\
\hline & & 115:1,2 & 89:19 \\
\hline possibility & preferred & & 100:3 \\
\hline 65:17 & 30:5,7 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { primarily } \\
75: 25
\end{gathered}
\] & produce \\
\hline post- & Preliminary & principles & 63:23 \\
\hline construction
97:7 & 4:3 & \[
28: 17
\] & 99:16 \\
\hline & prepare & prior 5:1 & professional \\
\hline potential & 98:20 & prior 7 (1) & 13:15,17 \\
\hline & prepared & 115:12, 22 & 85:24 \\
\hline potentially & 14:23 & & professionals \\
\hline 28:11 & 98:18 & private & 10:8 16:24 \\
\hline 36:12 & 115:14,19 & 17:16 & \[
33: 22,25
\] \\
\hline 42: 4, 12 & 116:7 & 26:13 & 41.10 \\
\hline 43:22 & present 51:7 & 33:12 & 98:10,11, \\
\hline 46:18 & \[
92: 8 \quad 96: 23
\] & problem & 19 115:24 \\
\hline 47:12 52:5 & 110:25 & 43:2,14,15 & \\
\hline 69:22 & 110.25 & 50:21 75:7 & proficiency \\
\hline 91:16 & presentation & 82:25 89:7 & 65:24 \\
\hline potentials & 5:7 41:1 & 93:23,24 & progression \\
\hline 52: 4 & presenting & 97:24 & 18:21 \\
\hline 43:16 & 47:8,9 & 100:16 & project \\
\hline  & presume & 101:6 & 13:10 25:2 \\
\hline practicality & 106:2 & 103:13 & 26:7,22, 25 \\
\hline 116:12 & 124:21 & 106:25 & 28:3,25 \\
\hline practice & & 113:19 & 29:4,8 \\
\hline 27:21 & pretty 34:19 & 120:7 & 32:18, 25 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: projected..quantum
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 33:10 59:9 & 37:12 & 95:16,17 & put 19:18 \\
\hline 69:3 89:9 & 45:16 & 99:11 & 26:19 \\
\hline 99:7 & 64:12 & 117:9 & 35:13 40:2 \\
\hline 114:9,10 & \(71: 1676: 5\) & provided & 54:7 57:1, \\
\hline 115:25 & 108:16 & 127:1 & 2,15 61:23 \\
\hline 116:9,14, & 109:20 & & 64:6 66:7 \\
\hline 16 118:4 & proposal & PTOE 6:5 & 67:7 69:23 \\
\hline projected & 77:11 & 12:22 & 70:1, 3, 5 \\
\hline 59:11 67:2 & 94:23 & public 4:2 & 71:6 72:25 \\
\hline 76:14 86:1 & & 5:16 13:6 & 77:12 \\
\hline \[
102: 17
\] & propose & 28:23 & 93:14 \\
\hline & 56:14 & 33:12 & 96:4,5 \\
\hline projection & proposed & 68:18 & 99:23 \\
\hline 65:6 66:2 & 7:12 8:11, & 91:25 & 100:5 \\
\hline 94:13 & 14 15:23 & 92:2,11,12 & 103:14,17 \\
\hline 110:19 & 16:23 & 96:14,17 & 104: 4 \\
\hline projections & 17:7, 9, 12 & 101:14 & 110:2 \\
\hline 65:4 98:12 & 30:3, 6 & published & 113:16 \\
\hline 108:7,9,11 & \(32: 10 \quad 36: 3\) & 58:13 & 125:7 \\
\hline projects & 54:16,17 & 78:17 & putting 9:1 \\
\hline 23:11 & 87:13 & 79:16 & 35:20 \\
\hline 26:17 & 90:19 & & 37:14 \\
\hline 30:22 & proposing & \[
99: 6
\] & 65:25 70:8 \\
\hline 51:2,8,17 & 17:4 27:10 & & 72:21,22 \\
\hline 98:12 & 49:21 & pull 28:13, & 79:1 \\
\hline & 55:24 & 14 71:22 & \\
\hline promised
113:14 & 59:16 68:2 & 111:18 & 2 \\
\hline promising & 85:19 & punch 118:5 & qualified \\
\hline 65:15 & protect 44:2 & purpose & 12:8,16 \\
\hline proper 20:12 & 77:12,13 & 35:24 & 14:5 115:3 \\
\hline & protected & purposes & \\
\hline properly & 43:8 44:3 & 97:15 & \[
54: 20
\] \\
\hline 26:16 27:9 & 84:7 & pursue 8:19 & \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
properties \\
98:15
\end{tabular} & prove 98:3 & 112:10 & quantify
\[
71: 6
\] \\
\hline & provide 9:8 & pursuing & \\
\hline property & 77:3 81:20 & 109:3 & \[
99: 18
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: quarter..recount
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline quarter & 35:5,6 & 111:13 & recall 8:9 \\
\hline 104:1 & 36:23 & 11 & 25:14 \\
\hline question & 52:9,12, 24 & 86:6 & 118:10 \\
\hline 4:21 32:7 & \(57: 17,20\) & & received \\
\hline \(34: 4 \quad 37: 7\) & 58:2,6,17, & range 11:6,9 & 65:14 \\
\hline 42:19 43:9 & 19 61:16 & rare 32:17, & 98:13 \\
\hline 54:7,21 & 62:23 & 20 & 113:12,13 \\
\hline 55:18 60:4 & 63:3,8 & raw 67:23 & 115:23 \\
\hline 71:4 85:21 & 64:10,13, & & 5 \\
\hline 90:6 91:10 & 19 71:4,8 & reach & cent 112:5 \\
\hline 101:16 & 75:2 & 79:15 & recess \\
\hline 102:10,11 & 76:18,23 & 122:5 & 113:25 \\
\hline 112:3 & 78:11,16 & reached 6:14 & recognize \\
\hline 121:1 & 79:20,23 & 8:6 105:24 & 30:11, 25 \\
\hline 122:25 & 80:7 & react 43:19 & 31:2 51:5 \\
\hline 124:11 & \[
2485: 5,8
\] & read 15:16 & recollection \\
\hline questions & 15 86:19, & 44:11 & 58:2 \\
\hline 5:11 14:7 & 24 87:3 & 65:12 & recommend \\
\hline 33:22 34:1 & 88:16 & 113:20 & 31:17 \\
\hline 35:3 55:24 & 94:22 95:6 & & \\
\hline 86:14 87:5 & 99:3 & reading & recommendation \\
\hline 91:24 93:4 & 103:16 & 18:19 & 14:7 36:15 \\
\hline 107:3 & 104:5,8 & reads 29:7 & 77:15 \\
\hline 120:23 & 110:22 & real 59:12 & recommended \\
\hline 122:20 & rail 19:13 & 65:13 & 32:5 \\
\hline queue 85:16 & 34:19,21 & realize 89:3 & record 4:11 \\
\hline quick 103:20 & raise 92:18 & realized & 5:19 12:25 \\
\hline quickly & raised 28:7 & 6:11 99:20 & 90:11, 12 \\
\hline 43:19 & 116:14 & realtime & 114:21 \\
\hline 102:16 & ramp 24:7 & 102:20 & 120:13 \\
\hline & 25:5 35:17 & reason 98:25 & 126:22 \\
\hline R & 47:18 & & recording \\
\hline Rached 5:19 & 54:18 & 68:25 & 15:13 \\
\hline 6:9,22,25 & 62: 20,24 & reassuring & recount \\
\hline 10:18 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 63: 15 \\
& 109: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
16: 22
\] & 100:21,23 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: recourse..required
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline recourse & 5:3,19, 22 & 10:8 11:19 & 108:23 \\
\hline 69:5 & 9:20, 23 & 15:13 26:3 & 3 \\
\hline recreation & 12:15,25 & 94:12 & 12:3 15:3, \\
\hline 29:1 & 14:2,11,21 & release 60:1 & 4 32:9 \\
\hline recuses 4.19 & 29:19 & relief 4:12 & 33:4 60:24 \\
\hline recuses & 54:23 & relier 4.12 & 66:3 \\
\hline red 6:2,6 & \(55: 1,6,15\) & relooked & 106:17,19, \\
\hline 53:14 & 56:7 67:5, & 23:6 & 20 \\
\hline 70:23 & 9,17 68:8, & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{rely 101:2} & \\
\hline 80: 6, 9, 14 & \(1571: 10\) & & reports 99:2 \\
\hline 81:11 & 72: 6 & relying & represent \\
\hline 83:8,23 & 77:22,25 & 65:24 & 96:7 \\
\hline 95:16,17 & 87:15,21 & remain 10:24 & 112:24 \\
\hline 119:10 & 90:21 & remaining & representative \\
\hline redone 64:14 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 92: 13,18 \\
& 93: 2 \quad 97: 5
\end{aligned}
\] & 120:25 & 4:13,14 \\
\hline reduce & 98:16 & remedy 97:8, & request 6:13 \\
\hline 107:23 & 100:18 & 20 & 7:22, 23 \\
\hline reduced 22:7 & 104:6,9 & remember & 9:25 53:4 \\
\hline 54:12,19 & 112:8 & 12:10 & 55:1,16 \\
\hline 108: 4 & 113:12 & 53:19 & 68:24 \\
\hline reduction & 114:11,13, & \(57: 22\) 65:2 & \[
107: 16,18
\] \\
\hline 7:11 9:13 & 21 115:2,7 & 70:13 & 109:4,7,25 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{107:15} & regard 16:11 & 80:19 & requested \\
\hline & 25:9 33:8 & 113:15 & 11:12 \\
\hline reductions & \[
39: 17 \quad 50: 4
\] & remembers & 32:25 \\
\hline 36:12 & \[
105: 25
\] & 8:12,15 & 117:12 \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { refer } 7: 24 \\
54: 15
\end{gathered}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { regular } 85: 3 \\
& 103: 21
\end{aligned}
\] & remind 62:4 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { requesting } \\
& 8: 1
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline referenced & reinventing & remove
removed & require 49:3 \\
\hline 124.21 & 79:22 & 20:18 & required \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{referring} & relates & 20.18 & 51:16 \\
\hline & 27:13 78:7 & repeat \(31: 1\) & 63:23 \\
\hline refresh 11:2 & & replace & 99:11 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{3}{*}{\[
\begin{gathered}
\text { Regan } 4: 8 \\
11,16,23
\end{gathered}
\]} & relation & 65:17 & 103:17 \\
\hline & & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{replaces} & 116:17 \\
\hline & relative & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: requirement..road
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline requirement & 89:20 98:9 & 116:1 & right-turn \\
\hline 107:12 & 101:19 & 121:4 & 8:9 17:18 \\
\hline requirements & 113:10 & 124:17 & 18:2,8 \\
\hline 67:14 & 121:4 & 125:21 & 20:15 \\
\hline 120:3 & respond 92:8 & reviewed & 22:14 \\
\hline requires & 96:23 & 17:1 23:2, & 24:10,13, \\
\hline 78:22 & response & 3 32:16 & 15,19 25:6 \\
\hline & 96:15 & 33:18 & 35:10,12 \\
\hline research & 96:15 & 68:17 & 43:13 \\
\hline 37:6 94:2 & 120:19 & & 46:12 \\
\hline & 123:25 & reviewing & 47:16 \\
\hline researched & 126:18 & 7:10 & 57:23 67:2 \\
\hline & responses & revised & 82:18 \\
\hline residences & 116:8,19 & 14:12,15, & 110:15,17 \\
\hline 40:2 50:13 & & 24 15:2 & \\
\hline 73:7 76:5 & \[
32: 3 \quad 77: 17
\] & \[
117: 1
\] & \[
\text { decel } 24: 21
\] \\
\hline residential & & 124:20,22 & \\
\hline 66:3 & responsive
\[
41: 12,14
\] & 125: 4 & right-turndeceleration \\
\hline residents & & revision & 20:16 \\
\hline 40:4 94:6 & restripe & 115:15 & right-turn- \\
\hline resides 64:2 & 31.12 & Ridge 66:4 & ingress \\
\hline & result 51:19 & 75:23 & 17:25 \\
\hline resolution & 99:25 & 91:1,5 & \\
\hline 68:9 72:10 & & 91.1,5 & rightly \\
\hline 77:21 & results 51:9 & 111:4 & 107:3 \\
\hline 91:14 & 117:20 & Ridgewood & rightmost \\
\hline resolve & retail 17:23 & 104:14 & 36:19 \\
\hline 56:13 & 26:18 & right-hand & rights 67:11 \\
\hline 113: 6 & returning & 9:2 & 111:25 \\
\hline respect 5:10 & 124:11 & right-in/ & ripple 97:11 \\
\hline 8:24 9:1 & revealed & right-out & \\
\hline 10:14 & 11:3 & 27:16 & road 6:2,6, \\
\hline 41:21 & & rig & 12 19:8,20 \\
\hline 49:22 & review & 20:18 & 22:21 \\
\hline 63:22 & 25:25 & 20 & 27:19 \\
\hline & 32:8, 9 & 24:25 & 31:20,25 \\
\hline \(78 \cdot 1081\) & 48:4 & right-of-way & 43:10,17 \\
\hline 78:10 81:3 & 115:24 & 21:13 & 55:5,10 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 57:1 61:4 & rumble & 25:10 & 117:9 \\
\hline 62:18 & 35:16, 20, & 39:11,17 & seconded \\
\hline 67:21 & 25 36:4,9 & 42:13 & 92:6 \\
\hline 87:25 & 108:17 & 45:19 & \\
\hline 89:10 91:5 & 112:17 & 49:18 50:5 & seconds \\
\hline 103:22,23 & rumple & 68:18 98:4 & 10:22 \\
\hline 110:2 & rumple & 105:6 & 49:4,16 \\
\hline & : 1 & & 54:4 81:11 \\
\hline roads 45:21 & run 25:11 & Sanfilippo & 84:8 \\
\hline 81:16 82:7 & 76:5 & 8:23 & \\
\hline 87:22 & 76.5 & & section \\
\hline 89:16 & rusty 34:19 & \[
71: 25
\] & 19:13 \\
\hline roadway 21:7 & Rutherford & & 22:21 \\
\hline 23:16 & 12:23 & save 18:9 & \\
\hline 24:24 & Ryan 4:12, & scale 32:18 & \\
\hline 26:21 27:5 & 19 & 100:6 & seed \\
\hline \(31: 22\) 36:2 & & scenario & 123:12,14 \\
\hline 45:15 & S & 72:5 & seeded 123:6 \\
\hline Rock 51:1 & & schedule & seek 28:18 \\
\hline 98:15 & \[
\begin{array}{r}
\text { safe } \quad 24: 17 \\
27: 9 \quad 32: 3
\end{array}
\] & 106:16 & send 55:8 \\
\hline Rodriguez & 33:14 & Science & 107: 4, 5 \\
\hline 114:7,16, & 71:15 & 13:12 & seniors 60:5 \\
\hline 23,24,25 & 73:25 & scientific &  \\
\hline 115:12 & 80:23 & scientific
\(38: 8\) & sense \(36: 5\) \\
\hline 120:24 & & 38:8 & \[
100: 12
\] \\
\hline 121:25 & safely & scrap 66:10 & senses 36:8 \\
\hline 122:2,13, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 18: 12,16, \\
& 2423: 20
\end{aligned}
\] & screening & sensitivity \\
\hline 15,18 & \(2423: 20\)
25.22 & \[
116: 3,15
\] & \[
86: 6
\] \\
\hline 123:5,8,13 & 25:22 & \[
17,21
\] & 86:6 \\
\hline 124:4 & 28:21 & 117:6,7 & serve 7:6 \\
\hline 125:10 & 33:19 42:7
\[
48: 6 \quad 50: 1
\] & screens 96:5 & served 94:10 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
Rodriguez's \\
113:4
\end{tabular} & safest 17:25 & scrutinized & serves 64:3 \\
\hline & 22:20 & 17:1 & service 33:6 \\
\hline \[
\text { room } 22: 1
\] & safety 8:4 & seamless & set 15:23 \\
\hline route \(30: 5,7\) & 18:22 20:2 & 118: 4 & 38:11 \\
\hline 71:9 & 22:25 & seasonal & 99:12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: share..site
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 115:13 & 84:25 & signal 25:20 & 25:16 48:5 \\
\hline share 5:14 & shut 67:4, & 30:11,13 & 58:9 93:5 \\
\hline 7:17 64:22 & 18 68:7 & 43:21 & 97:22 \\
\hline 94:4,12 & & 46:12 & 110:1 \\
\hline \[
97: 1
\] & shutting & 63:10 & simple 78:13 \\
\hline & 98:7 & 78:25 & \\
\hline shared 6:16 & sick 93:19 & 79:1,4,5 & \\
\hline 7:1 10:6 & & 81: 4,5,22 & simply 50:4 \\
\hline 33:4 & side 28:24 & 90:23 & 106:8 \\
\hline 64:17,20 & 66:19 & 94:18, 24 , & simulation \\
\hline 106:7 & 126:20 & 25 95:16 & simulation
95:24 96:6 \\
\hline sharing 50:3 & sides 50:11 & 103:9,11, & 126:6,11 \\
\hline sheet 44:23 & 70:13,22 & 15,17 & sit 110:13, \\
\hline 45:3 & & 104: 4, 15 & 14 117:6 \\
\hline sheets & sight 17:15 & signaling & site 4:4 \\
\hline 115:15 & \[
, 13,25
\] & 36:18 & 17:16 \\
\hline SHG 4:3 & \(48: 7\) 82:25 & signalized & 19:23 \\
\hline & \(86: 12\) & 27:24 & 22:10,15, \\
\hline shocked & 86.12 & signals 82:9 & \(2024: 10\) \\
\hline 99:15 & sign 7:21 & \[
95: 1,20
\] & 25:7,13,25 \\
\hline shop 120:16 & 8:24 9:1, & \(95: 1,20\)
\(102: 19\) & 26:8,13 \\
\hline short 78:20 & 10,11,21 & & 27:2, 6, 9, \\
\hline 109:16 & 10:9 46:6 & significant & 14,22 \\
\hline 109:16 & 54:2,8,14, & 17:6 33:2 & 28:18 \\
\hline show 58:18 & 16,17 & 52:15 & 29:14,23 \\
\hline 73:25 & 56:18 & 63:16 & 30:1,14, \\
\hline 81:25 & 65:17,18 & 93:24 & 15,24 \\
\hline 101:12 & 66:1 68:13 & signs 35:18 & 31:12 \\
\hline 102:16 & 72:7 73:15 & 38:16 & 32:12 \\
\hline 118:20 & 87:18 & 78:23 & 33:15 37:8 \\
\hline showing & 97:13 & 87:16,21, & \(38: 4,15,21\) \\
\hline \(56: 3,4,13\) & 108:15 & 25 88:12, & 42:4 47:17 \\
\hline & 109:2,3 & 22 89:16 & 55:25 \\
\hline \[
67 \cdot 1
\] & signage & Silverado & 56:22 \\
\hline 11 & 38:20 & 119:6 & 59:20, 21 \\
\hline 11 & 87:8,13 & 11 & 60:9 67:10 \\
\hline shows 63:19 & 89:20 90:1 & similar 17:3 & 72:23 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: site-specific..stand
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 87:9,10 & slowdown & 120: 6 & 109:12,14, \\
\hline 89:18 & 24:12 & 22.13 & 17,19 \\
\hline 97:13 & slower 25.17 & 22 & 110:2 \\
\hline 111:8 & slower 25:1 & speak 10:6 & \\
\hline 117:1,20 & slowest & 84:13 & s \\
\hline 118:5 & 24:25 & 103:2 & 83:10 \\
\hline 120:9 & slows 83:10 & 117:21 & spell 12:14 \\
\hline site-specific & smart 69:25 & speaking & 13:1 68:9 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{51:17} & \multirow[t]{2}{*}{\(70: 3\)} & 17:22 & 14:22 \\
\hline & & 26:25 & spelled \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{sites 26:16,
18} & softened & 72:21 & 118:24 \\
\hline & 117:8 & & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{sits 83:1} & softer 117:9 & special 4:6 & \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { spelling } \\
13: 7
\end{gathered}
\] \\
\hline & 119:11 & species
\[
121: 22
\] & \\
\hline 49:15 & software & & \[
122: 1
\] \\
\hline 66:10 & 95:24 & specifically & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{105:1,3} & \multirow[b]{2}{*}{Soil 4:4} & 76:25 & spot 93:15 \\
\hline & & 104:17 & Spring 88:10 \\
\hline 42:20 52:6 & 119:9 & speculation & 90:25 91:1 \\
\hline 54:13 & solution & 73:14,19 & Springs 6:2, \\
\hline 75:16 & 45:14 47:9 & speed 6:18 & 6 98:16 \\
\hline 81:13 & 97:20 & 7:2,5,19 & square 93:11 \\
\hline 104:12,20 & solve 43:15 & 8:18 9:8, & square 93:11 \\
\hline situations & 47:10 & 9,13 & stabilize \\
\hline 46:19 & sort 52:4 & 10:15, 23 & 123:13 \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{47:6,12} & 117:2,3,12 & 11:1 16:4 & stack 84:11 \\
\hline & 117.2,3,12 & 25:19 & 85:10,11 \\
\hline & sound 30:18 & 35:22 & stacked \\
\hline six-and-a-half & sounds & 36:11 & stacked
\(85: 23\) \\
\hline 10:22 & & 45:22 & \\
\hline slightly & south 28:1, & 49:11 52:2 & stacking \\
\hline 25:17 28:7 & 4,22 74:9 & 54:1,10,19 & 86:1 \\
\hline Sloan 88:2,5 & 75:8 & 62:17 & 104:17,24 \\
\hline 89:6 & southerly & 65:16 66:1 & staff 42:9 \\
\hline & 59:15 & 73:16 & \\
\hline \multirow[t]{2}{*}{slow 36:9,} & spaces & 107:15,23 & stage 31:12 \\
\hline & 119:22 & 108: 4 & stand 50:2 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: standard..suggested
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 106:20 & stations & 11,21 10:9 & 33:10 \\
\hline standard & 26:18 & 46:16 47:4 & studies \\
\hline 33:7 71:21 & stay 84:8 & 54:7,14, & 10:16 \\
\hline 78:18 & steady 62:6 & 16,17 & 23:10 \\
\hline 79:19 & steady 62:6 & 56:18 & 98:20 \\
\hline & Stefanelli & 62:21 & \\
\hline standards & 55:21, 22 & 65:17 66:1 & study 10:20 \\
\hline 7:15 21:22 & 56:8 57:5, & 69:3 73:15 & 15:1 32:16 \\
\hline 32:12 & 25 58:4, & 109:2,3 & 33:13 42:4 \\
\hline 51:11 & 15,18,22, & & 51:10,20 \\
\hline 58:12 & 24 59:1,6 & stopped 22:9 & 53:12 \\
\hline 68: 6, 10 & \(24059: 1,6\)
\(60: 3,23\) & 34:25 \(47: 1\) & 57:21,23 \\
\hline 72:8 & 61:6 62:16 & 82:17 83:7 & 81:20,23, \\
\hline standpoint & 63:1,4,17, & stops 19:22 & 25 82:1 \\
\hline 26:5 29:1 & 24 66:16 & 63:10 & 98:11 \\
\hline 30:4 123:9 & 86:7 87:4, & story 28:6 & 99:12 \\
\hline start 18:22 & 7,17,23 & 102:9 & 105:12 \\
\hline 21:5,8 & 88:4,7,11, & straight & 109:12 \\
\hline 33:24 & 14,18,21 & 25:5 48:18 & studying \\
\hline 37:1,20 & 90:5,8,15 & & 32:24 \\
\hline 73:23 & 96:2 & straightforwar
d 79:11 & stuff 50:10 \\
\hline started 5:6 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 101: 15,18, \\
& 24 \text { 102:6, }
\end{aligned}
\] & street 29:3 & 70:4 107:8 \\
\hline 44:11 73:7 & 12 110:5, & 74:16 & submit \\
\hline starting & 10 122:21, & 114:18 & 125:10 \\
\hline 36:5,8 & 24 123:11, & stripe 34:6 & submitted \\
\hline 84:19 94:1 & 15,19 & & 120:17 \\
\hline state 12:13, & 125:1 & striped & \\
\hline 25 13:16, & step 41:8 & & 69:16 \\
\hline 21 24:7,11 & steps 4:20 & strips & successiv \\
\hline 30:22 & steps 4.20 & 35:16,21, & successive \\
\hline 41:12 & Stevens & 25 36:4,9 & \\
\hline \(54: 22\) & 13:24 & 108:13,17 & sufficient \\
\hline 114:21 & Stonefield & 112:17 & 31:4 \\
\hline statement & 12:12 13:9 & struggles & 119:20 \\
\hline 53:11 & stop 7:21 & 30:8 & suggested \\
\hline states 78:21 & 8:25 9:10, & studied 20:8 & 118:23 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline suggestion & swore 44:11 & taking 51:3 & 83:17, 20 \\
\hline 94:14 & sworn 5:20 & 98:17 & 84:5,20 \\
\hline 103:6 & 6:3,7 & talk 44:12 & 85:3, 6, 14, \\
\hline Suite 6:2,6 & 12:24 93:1 & 109:11 & 17 86:15, \\
\hline 114:18 & 114:19 & talked 7:20 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 2287: 2 \\
& 108 \cdot 19
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline Summit 88:9 & swung 34:25 & 9:6,12,13 & \\
\hline 90:25 & & 59:18 & team 64:6 \\
\hline 91:1,2,6 & \[
95: 13
\] & 82:15 & technical \\
\hline 93:7 94:15 & 107:9 & talking 21:2 & 15:3 51:6 \\
\hline supervision & synchronizatio & 25:15 29:5 & telling 60:6 \\
\hline 115:20 & n \(56: 7\) & 51:8 56:12 & 71:2 90:11 \\
\hline supplied & 65:24 66:1 & 73:14,15, & 104:3 \\
\hline 107:24 & 73:17 90:9 & 18 75:19 & 105:13 \\
\hline support & 94:18 & \[
80: 2 \quad 98: 22
\] & tells 28:9 \\
\hline 22:18 31:6 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 95: 3,20 \\
& 102: 19
\end{aligned}
\] & \(111: 5,11\)
tapes 15:13 & temporarily \\
\hline \[
\begin{gathered}
\text { supporting } \\
17: 14
\end{gathered}
\] & synchronized
\[
95: 10
\] & target 82:10 & \(42: 13\)
ten 11:8 \\
\hline supportive 10:11 & ```
synchronizing
    65:23
``` & Teagno 44:8, & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 32: 19 \\
& 37: 7,9,19 \\
& 38: 6,25
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline supposed
\[
70: 2
\] & \[
\begin{array}{cc}
\text { system } & 26: 21 \\
48: 5 & 69: 24
\end{array}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 45: 4,8,12, \\
& 18,24
\end{aligned}
\] & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 39: 7 \quad 49: 16 \\
& 53: 1,2
\end{aligned}
\] \\
\hline surprised & 70:9,11 & 46:21 & 57:15 \\
\hline 100:4 & 86:17 & 47:16,19, & 60:21 \\
\hline surrounded & 90:14 & 22 48:1, & 61:2,19 \\
\hline 117:6 & & 16,20,23 & 62:12,13 \\
\hline & T & 50:6,24 & 70:11,12 \\
\hline surrounding
\[
50: 12
\] & & 51:12 & \(72: 22\) \\
\hline 50:1 & table 105:16 & 52:1,22, & \(75: 20,21\)
\(76: 383 \cdot 11\) \\
\hline susceptible & 115:17 & 23,24 & 76:3 83:11 \\
\hline 79:3,7 & tables 59:9 & 53: 6, 7 & 96:7 99:4, \\
\hline suspect 23:2 & tactile 36.8 & 66:20 & 13 111:19 \\
\hline & tactile 36:8 & 69:9,12,15 & ten-year \\
\hline swear 1Z: & tagged 100:5 & 70:15,19, & 76:15 \\
\hline 114:11,13 & takes 93:9 & 24 71:2 & 111:19 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: tenants..Timsak
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline tenants & 105:23 & 72:20 & 80:11, 25 \\
\hline 97:11,12 & 106:18 & 73:14,18 & 81:10,18 \\
\hline tended 26:19 & 108:11 & 77:20 & 82:1,2,3, \\
\hline & 113:4,5 & 81:20 & 5,24 88:1 \\
\hline term 70:7 & 114:14 & 102:19 & 94:7,11 \\
\hline terms 11:2 & text 11:19 & 121:14 & 99:5,10 \\
\hline 20:20 & 126:14 & thinking & 101:5,21 \\
\hline 26:15 27:8 & & 35:13 & 113:1 \\
\hline 49:4 52:13 & textured & 104:12 & 122:8 \\
\hline 98:6 & 28:7 & & 125:10 \\
\hline 105:23 & textures & thoroughfare & 127:7 \\
\hline 112:22 & 117:9 & 50: & time-based \\
\hline terrible & theoretically & thought & 86:20 \\
\hline 66:10 & 61:19 & 6:17, 22 & 90:13 \\
\hline Teslas 70:2 & thing 25:19 & \(24: 1541: 4\)
\(56: 9,12\) & 107:9 \\
\hline test 86:7 & 37:13,15 & 61:9 65:7 & times 11:8 \\
\hline 91:2 97:24 & 38:8 46:21 & 104:18 & 20:22, 23, \\
\hline 112:5 & 50:16 & 121:20 & 25 21:9 \\
\hline & 55:23 & & 49:8 53:2 \\
\hline testified & 56: 6, 9 & thousand & 58:16 \\
\hline 13:20 & 71:12 & 50:12 & 60:22 \\
\hline 45:21 & 73:12,25 & thousands & \(62: 12\) \\
\hline 57:20 73:6 & 75:17 & 23:10 96:9 & 68:23 \\
\hline 115:1 & 94:10 & threshold & 70:11,12 \\
\hline testifies & 105:11 & 79:16 & 80:24 \\
\hline 12:24 93:1 & 106:22 & & 83:12 \\
\hline 114:19 & 112: 4 & throw 38:12 & 93:21 \\
\hline & & 103:6 & 94:17 \\
\hline \[
\begin{aligned}
& \text { testify } 6: 4, \\
& 8
\end{aligned}
\] & 18:11, 25 & time 23:3 & 101:20 \\
\hline & 35:23 & 46:17 & 102:14 \\
\hline testimony & 38:17 39:8 & 49:1,10,15 & timing 43:5, \\
\hline 12:19 32:9 & 40:4,8 & 53:17 54:8 & 7 69:18 \\
\hline \(34: 2\) 35:7 & 41:2 47:10 & 55:19 65:5 & 81:5,22 \\
\hline 83:11 & 52:5,13 & 68:13, 22 & 95:2 \\
\hline 92:21 & 56:19, 20 & 69:1 71:24 & \\
\hline 101:19,22 & 65:19, 22 & 72:3 73:22 & Timsak 6:14 \\
\hline 102:1 & \(66: 25\) & 77:8 78:11 & \[
82: 15
\] \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Title 7:14 & tough 69:6 & 48:10,14 & transcript \\
\hline 78:22 & tour & 49:6,12 & 15:16 \\
\hline today 7:5 & 125:13,16 & 50:8, 9, 14, & 18:19 \\
\hline 19:6,17 & & 19 52:14, & 21:15 \\
\hline 35:8,16 & \[
93: 23
\] & 17 53:1,13 & transpiring \\
\hline 62:24 & & 55:25 & 8:8 \\
\hline 70:10 & townhouse & 56:6,22 & \\
\hline 93:21 & 57:1 & 57:6,23 & Transportation \\
\hline 113:11 & traditionally & 59:7,8,14 & 13:19 \\
\hline 117:17 & 97:22 & 60:1 61:18 & 58:13 \\
\hline & & 63:9,10,14 & trash 116:18 \\
\hline today's 50:8 & traffic 5:9 & 65:3, 6 & \\
\hline 116:7 & 9:8 11:12 & 69:18,25 & travel 22:7, \\
\hline told 8:8 & 12:2,17 & 70:24 & 0,20 \\
\hline 19:5 43:22 & 13:18,22, & 74:13, 24 & \[
27: 9 \quad 30: 5,
\] \\
\hline 53:23 & 23 14:4 & 75:13 & \[
7,15,24
\] \\
\hline 62:18 & 15:1,14 & 77:15 & 54:3,6 \\
\hline tolerate & 16:1,7 & \(78: 7,8,18\), & 86:11 \\
\hline 107:1 & \(18: 3,13\)
\(19: 23\) & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 19,23,25 \\
& 79: 1,4,5
\end{aligned}
\] & 113: 6 \\
\hline Toll 98:15 & 20:3, 6 & 10,12 & traveling \\
\hline tomorrow & 21:1,7,9 & 80:8,15, & 19:2 24:22 \\
\hline 41:20 & 22:8,9,23 & 17,24 81:1 & 25:18 \\
\hline 107:17 & 23:8,10 & 82:11,17 & tread 118:13 \\
\hline 108:1,25 & 25:23 & 83:7,9,24 & \\
\hline 109:12 & 26:1,4,14 & 91:4 93:6, & trees 119:23 \\
\hline 122:17 & 27:21 & 8,23 & 121:20 \\
\hline & 28:9,11, & 94:11,15 & 123:16,18 \\
\hline tonight 5:3 & 16,21 & 96:6 98:11 & trigger \\
\hline 35:23 & 29:14 30:1 & 99:16,19 & 97:9,16, \\
\hline 94:23 & 31:14 & 100:23 & 17,18 \\
\hline 97:10 98:6 & 32:5,9,16, & 103:9 & Trini 114:7, \\
\hline toolbox 42:5 & 19 33:1,8, & 105:23 & 24 \\
\hline top 51:2 & 11,13 & 106:22 & \\
\hline & 34:18 & 109:15 & trip 33:4 \\
\hline total 9:17 & 39:6,8,21 & 110:15,16 & 59:9 \\
\hline touch 36:5,8 & 40:1 42:2 & 124:15 & 61:18,22 \\
\hline & 43:3 47:5 & & trips 59:12 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: trouble..upstream
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline 61:25 62:1 & 81:4 83:25 & 49:25 & 40:20 \\
\hline 103:19,22, & 84:4,7,11 & unable 11:15 & 113:21 \\
\hline 23 & 86:5,12 & unable 11.15 & \\
\hline & 93:8,20 & unacceptable & undertake \\
\hline trouble 52:7 & 103:10 & 68:17 & 98:19 \\
\hline truck 91:4 & 104:23 & uncertainly & undertaken \\
\hline true 77:3 & 105:8,10 & 82:12 & 25:24 \\
\hline 106:23 & 108:15 & & unfortunate \\
\hline truth 12:19 & 110:18 & \[
106: 4
\] & 106:24 \\
\hline 19:5 92:22 & 111:7,8 & underneath & Uniform \\
\hline 114:15 & turning 11:7 &  & 78:19 \\
\hline turn 8:5,16 & \[
\begin{aligned}
& 16: 5 \quad 20: 1 \\
& 21: 23
\end{aligned}
\] & understand & Union 114:18 \\
\hline 18:6 19:4, & \(21: 23\)
\(22: 11,13\) & 11:14, 25 & University \\
\hline 15,23 & \(22: 11,13\)
25.18 & 15:12 & 13:13 \\
\hline 20:14 & 25:18 & 15.12 & \\
\hline 22:2, 9, 10 & 30:13 52:3 & 39:1,5 & unknown \\
\hline 24:8,23 & Turnpike & & 99:18 \\
\hline 25:13,15, & 5:12 6:11 & 49:18,23 & up-sized \\
\hline 16 29:13 & 8:2 9:25 & & 116:25 \\
\hline 30:6 31:5, & 81:6 109:3 & 69:15 & 117:7 \\
\hline 6,10,12,18 & turns 41:7 & 75:4,10 & update 72:3 \\
\hline \(37: 25\) 38:1 & 45:15 54:9 & 76:11 83:4 & update 72.3 \\
\hline 39:10,16, & \(67: 370: 22\) & 84:5 & updated \\
\hline 19 40:17 & 80:3 & 21,22 & 64:15 65:2 \\
\hline 41:3 46:8, & & 21,22 & 72:19 \\
\hline 24 47:4,25 & tying 94:15 & 108:10 & 101:1 \\
\hline 48:10,17 & type 111:23 & understanding & 117:13 \\
\hline 53:18, 25 & & 25:3,22 & 120:11,13 \\
\hline \(56: 4\) 57:6 & & 26:1 36:3 & updating \\
\hline 58:8,10 & typical 21:6 & 68:5 & 98:22 \\
\hline 60:12 & typically & understands & 100:3 \\
\hline 61:14 & 72:18 & 62:9 82:4 & 102:12 \\
\hline \(63: 20\) 67:2 & & understated & \\
\hline 73:12,13, & U & 96:11 & \[
116: 20
\] \\
\hline 21,23,24 & & & \\
\hline 74:5,9 & uh-uh 73:24 & understood & upstream \\
\hline 80:2,23 & ultimately & 24:24 & 30:10,24 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

COUNTY OF BERGEN
Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: utilities..watch
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline utilities & 18:4 19:14 & 19 125:1 & vote 5:3 \\
\hline 117:3,5 & 24:21 25:4 & Victor 13:8 & votes 5:4 \\
\hline utility & 28:13,20 & video 48.13 & votes 5.4 \\
\hline 117:4 & 30:1 & video 48:13 & W \\
\hline & 36:10,21 & videos 20:7 & \\
\hline utilized & 51:18 52:3 & view 52:21 & wait 31:12 \\
\hline 68:22 & 59:22 & 63:6 & 83:25 \\
\hline 79:19 & 85:23 & \(63: 6\) & \\
\hline 119:15 & 86:8, 9, 10 & viewed 26:2 & waited 19:9 \\
\hline utilizing & 94:13 & Village & waiting 31:9 \\
\hline 64:6 & vehicular & 98:16 & 83:18, 21 \\
\hline & 60:1 & violate 27:1 & 84:2,21 \\
\hline V & & & 86:5,11 \\
\hline & verifying & violating & walk 29:2 \\
\hline vacant 35:19 & 77:18 & 21:4 31:24 & walk 29.2 \\
\hline 108:16 & versus 65:25 & Virginia & walking \\
\hline Valley 38:17 & 107:14 & 114:19 & \\
\hline 60:4 88:10 & vested 67:11 & & wall \\
\hline 90:25 91:1 & & \[
117: 16
\] & 118:11,17 \\
\hline 93:10 96:9 & \[
56: 8 \quad 57: 5
\] & virtue 32:24 & walls 119:3 \\
\hline valuable & 25 58:4, & & wanted 5:14 \\
\hline 93:15,16 & 15,18,22 & visibility & 8:17 44:12 \\
\hline variance & 59:1,6 & & \(46: 752: 19\) \\
\hline 4:12 & 60:3,23 & visit 117:19 & 62: 4,8 \\
\hline & 61:6 62:16 & visual 56:5 & 110:10 \\
\hline variances & 63:1,4,17 & & 113:16 \\
\hline 4:5 & 66:16 & vocabulary & 118: 6 \\
\hline vehicle & 87:4,7,17, & 21:6 29:7 & 121:22 \\
\hline 19:2,4,22 & 23 88:4,7, & 31:22 & warning \\
\hline 22:11 & 11,14,18, & VOICE 54:4 & 46:12 \\
\hline 24:7,11 & 21 90:5,8, & 108:22 & \\
\hline 28:10,20 & 15 101:15, & volume 50:19 & warrants \\
\hline 31:12 47:2 & 18,24 & \[
93: 6,12
\] & 103:13,17, \\
\hline 49:4,5 & 102: 6 & & 18 \\
\hline 86:4 & 110:5,10 & volumes 39:6 & wasting 77:8 \\
\hline 103:19 & 122:21,24 & 51:1,3 & \\
\hline vehicles & 123:11,15, & 86:6 99:16 & atch 48:13 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Hearing on 07/11/2022
Index: watched..yield
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline watched 19:9 & 89:12 & 98:10 & \\
\hline 20:7 & 110:14 & 108:3, 8 & Y \\
\hline wayfinding & west/east & 117:25 & year 14:24 \\
\hline 89:11 & 20:10 & 118:5 & 15:2 42:20 \\
\hline ways 16:6 & westbound & workability & 51:3 52:18 \\
\hline wear 108:22 & 34:9 53:15 & 71:12 & 62:1 79:3, \\
\hline & 60:11 & worked 23:9 & 7,11 98:13 \\
\hline week 10:20 & \(71: 17\) & 41:12 & 102:15 \\
\hline 16:4 21:20 & 80:15 84:3 & 67:25 & 112:5 \\
\hline 53:10,23 & wetland & working & years 9:17 \\
\hline 57:21, & 108:16 & 16:18 70:4 & 16:18 \\
\hline 74:5,22 & what-if & \(71: 22\) 76:8 & 17:2,3,24 \\
\hline \(76: 10\) & 71:19 72:5 & 118:5 & 20:24 \\
\hline 121:24 & 103:2 & works 16:8 & 21:14 \\
\hline Wegmans & wheel 79:22 & 77:13 & 32:20 \\
\hline 37:14 & de & 79:10 & \(37: 7,9,19\) \\
\hline 50:15 & wide 46:15 & 94:18 & 38:3, 6 \\
\hline 74:19 & width 19:19, & 95:25 & 39:1,7 \\
\hline 99:6,7,18, & 21 & world 97:23 & 40:1 61:2, \\
\hline 19 100:23 & wisdom 97:2 & worried & 4,20 62:7 \\
\hline 101:20 & wonderful & 52:25 & 64:24 \\
\hline weight 55:7, & 105:9 & 82:16 & 68:15 \\
\hline 17 & & worse 50:22 & 72:22 \\
\hline & wondering & worse \(50: 22\) & 73:1,4 \\
\hline well- & 56:2 & 75:17 & 75:20,21 \\
\hline \[
22: 21
\] & wooded 35:19 & worth 37:10, & 76:3 93:6 \\
\hline & word 11:24 & 19,20 38:6 & 94:3 96:7, \\
\hline well-traveled & & wrap 124:15 & 8 99:4,13 \\
\hline 21:13 & words 35:19 & wrap 124.15 & 111:19 \\
\hline west 6:19 & work 16:9 & writing & yield 7:20 \\
\hline 7:2 8:12 & 39:2 41:7 & 113:17 & 8:24 9:20 \\
\hline 42:21 & 68: 6, 7 & wrong 61:17 & 10:9 24:6 \\
\hline 52:16 & 71:20,24 & 67:1 69:4 & 35:18 46:6 \\
\hline 62:2,13 & \(76: 977: 14\) & 74:23 & 54:2 65:18 \\
\hline 63:9 & 82:13 & wrote 107:7 & 108:15 \\
\hline 88:16,19 & 97:21 & 108:11 & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
Yup \(125: 25\)
z
zitelli
\(37: 2,3,18\)
\(38: 25\)
\(39: 11,13\),
\(18 \quad 40: 12\),
\(1657: 4\)
\(72: 14,16\)
\(74: 3,7,11\),
\(14,17,20\)
\(75: 4,10,15\)
\(76: 11\)
\(77: 16,20\),
\(2488: 25\)
\(89: 1590: 2\)
\(91: 9,12,20\)
\(93: 5\)
\(103: 5,8\)
\(104: 3,11\)
\(105: 16\)
\(111: 2,9,16\)
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