1	VILLAGE OF RIDGEWOOD
Τ	PLANNING BOARD
2	WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 2016  COMMENCING AT 7:30 P.M.
3	
4	IN THE MATTER OF: : TRANSCRIPT OF "Whispering Woods" Public Hearing :
5	on Settlement and Consideration of: PROCEEDINGS a 2016 Master Plan Amendment :
)	pursuant to Remand Order entered :
6	<pre>by Honorable Lisa Perez-Friscia, :    J.S.C. on the matter known as The :</pre>
7	Valley Hospital, Inc. v. Village : of Ridgewood Planning Board, et al:
8	
9	BEFORE:
10	VILLAGE OF RIDGEWOOD PLANNING BOARD THERE BEING PRESENT:
11	CHARLES NALBANTIAN, CHAIRMAN
12	RICHARD JOEL, VICE CHAIRMAN
13	PAUL ARONSOHN, MAYOR (10:00 ARRIVAL)
14	SUSAN KNUDSEN, COUNCILWOMAN (9:45 ARRIVAL)
15	NANCY BIGOS, MEMBER
16	WENDY DOCKRAY, MEMBER
17	KEVIN REILLY, MEMBER
18	DAVID THURSTON, MEMBER
19	ISABELLA ALTANO, MEMBER
20	KHIDIR ABDALLA, MEMBER
21	DEBBIE PATIRE, MEMBER
22	
23	LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C. CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS
24	P.O. BOX 505 SADDLE BROOK, NEW JERSEY 07663
	(201) 641-1812
25	(201) 843-0515 FAX LauraACarucciLLC@gmail.com

1	А	L	S	0		P	R	E	S	Ε	N	7	Γ:														
2																					GE SE				ξ.		
3				С	ΗR		S T (	) P I						•							Ε,				C		
4				_	11 0	,																					
5																											
6	А	Р	P :	E	A	R	A	N	С	Ε	S	:															
7																											
8			PR BY																NI	Ο,	Р	. C	•				
9			50 Wo										V	Jе	r	s e	У	0 '	7 6	77							
10			Со														_										
11			ST	ΙC	ΚE	L,	· I	KOE	E N I	I G	,	SI	JL	LΙ	V	ΑN	8	. I	DR	ΙL	L,	L	LС				
12			В Y 5 7										- ,	Ε	S	υÇ	ΙF	RΕ									
13			Ce Co												_					1							
14																											
15																											
16																											
17																											
18																											
19																											
20																											
21																											
22																											
23																											
24																											
25																											

1	I N D E X										
2	WITNESS	<u>5:</u>	PAGE								
3	BT.ATS I	L. BRANCHEAU, P.P.									
4	Direct	Examination by Ms. Razin Questions	4 2 5 1								
5	Public	6 7 6 7									
6	PAUL SM	7 1									
7	TOM De	73, 88 79									
8	MATT SA MARISOI	8 0 8 9									
9	Cross E	Examination by Mr. Drill	9 5								
10	MARIA N		9 9 9 9								
11	Questic	Examination by Mr. Drill: ons by the Board:	158								
12	Questions by the Public: 204  JEFF VOIGT 204										
13	JIFFY VERMYLEN 210 MARISOL ROMERO 212 LISA BANEY 223										
14	MELANIE	E McWILLIAMS	2 2 4								
15		EXHIBITS									
16	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	IDENT./EVID.								
17	B - 1	Public Notice	2 4								
18	B <b>-</b> 2	Remand Order	2 9								
19	B <b>-</b> 3	Proposed 2014 Master Plan									
20		Amendment dated $2/28/2014$ , with revisions to $6/9/14$	3 5								
21	B <b>-</b> 4	Redline version of the proposed									
22		2014 Master Plan document, with changes up to 3/15/2016	3 6								
23	B <b>-</b> 5	Proposed 2016 Master Plan									
24		Amendment, clean version, with changes to 3/15/2016	3 6								
25											

## 1 INDEX (Continued) 2 EXHIBITS 3 NUMBER DESCRIPTION IDENT./EVID. 4 A - 12013-2014 Bird's Eye View Exhibit 97 5 A - 22016 Bird's Eye View Exhibit 97 2013-2014 Site Section D 6 A - 3(2013 Exhibit A-12 Slide 18) 97 7 2016 Site Section D 97 A - 48 2013-2014 Site Section E A - 5 9 (2013 Exhibit A-12 Slide 19)97 2016 Site Section E 97 10 A - 611 A - 72013-2014 Setback Exhibit (2013 Exhibit A-29 Slide 21) 97 12 2016 Setback Exhibit 97 A – 8 13 A - 9 Photo Simulation Long View from 14 Meadowbrook Ave 97 A - 10Photo Simulation Closer View from 15 Meadowbrook Ave 97 16 A - 11Photo Simulation View from North 17 Van Dien Ave 97 A-12 Photo Simulation View from 318 18 97 Steilen Ave 19 Photo Simulation View from 258 A - 13Steilen Ave 20 97 21 A - 14Photo Simulation View from BFMS Ball Field 97 22 A-15 2016 Reduction in Floor Area 23 Calculations 97 24 A-16 2016 Building Floor Area by Phase 97 25 A - 17List of Conditions Generated during 2013-2014 Master Plan Hearing 97

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we're about to begin.

1.5

mention, in case we have a large number of people who wish to attend tonight, what we've done is we have a life video feed that's serving the senior center downstairs. So if we meet the Fire Department capacity up here, then people can observe downstairs and they'll come back and participate during the question session when we get to that.

So why don't we begin. At this time

I'd like to call the Special Meeting of the Ridgewood

Planning Board to order this Wednesday, March 30,

2016.

VICE-CHAIRMAN JOEL: In accordance with the provisions of Section 10:4-8d of the Open Public Meetings Act, the date, location and time of the commencement of this meeting is reflected in a meeting notice, a copy of which schedule has been filed with the Village Manager and the Village Clerk, The Ridgewood News and The Record newspapers, and posted on the bulletin board in the entry lobby of the Village Municipal Offices at 131 North Maple Avenue, and on the Village website, all in accordance with the provisions of the Open Public Meetings Act.

- CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you, 1 Richard. 2 Will everyone please rise for the flag 3 4 salute. 5 (At this point in the proceeding all rise for a recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.) 6 7 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you all for coming, and welcome to tonight's meeting, which has 8 9 been convened for the purpose of commencing a proceeding hearing called a "Whispering Woods 10 11 hearing." This hearing is to consider a proposed amendment to the Village of Ridgewood Master Plan 12 pursuant to settlement terms reached with Valley 13 14 Hospital following litigation which commenced in 2014. 1.5 16 While the board's attorney, Katie 17 Razin, to my right, will be providing additional 18
  - background information, I would like to briefly set out some relevant. Please listen carefully.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

In early 2007, the Valley Hospital submitted a request for consideration of a Master Plan amendment and modifications to certain provisions of the Zoning Ordinance relative to the H-Zone. Over the course of many work sessions and then public hearings held over three years, the board

```
1 reviewed the original amendment request and made
```

- 2 changes to it. They heard testimony from Valley
- 3 | Hospital and its experts as well as from the Planning
- 4 | Board's own experts and professionals.
- 5 Michael, why don't you call the roll, I
- 6 apologize.
- 7 (At this point in the proceeding roll
- 8 | call is taken with Ms. Bigos, Chairman Nalbantian,
- 9 | Vice-Chairman Joel, Mr. Reilly, Ms. Dockray,
- 10 Mr. Thurston, Mr. Abdalla, and Ms. Patire present,
- 11 | with Mayor Aronsohn, Councilwoman Knudsen, and Ms.
- 12 | Altano absent.)
- 13 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you,
- 14 | Michael, and thank you, Kevin for reminding us.
- 15 Let me repeat. I'll begin.
- 16 In early 2007, the Valley Hospital
- 17 | submitted a request for consideration of a Master
- 18 Plan amendment and modifications for certain
- 19 provisions of the Zoning Ordinance relative to the
- 20 H-Zone. Over the course of many work sessions and
- 21 then public hearings held over three years, the board
- 22 | reviewed the original amendment request and made
- 23 | changes to it. They heard testimony from Valley
- 24 | Hospital and its experts as well as from the Planning
- 25 Board's own experts and professionals.

At the conclusion of that process in 2010, the board voted to adopt an amendment to the Master Plan relative to the H-Zone.

That 2010 action was challenged in court and the challenge subsequently resulted in a dismissal agreement whereby the Planning Board was directed to review a new amendment proposed by Valley in 2013, as an attempt to address concerns in the adopted 2010 amendment. That new amendment called for a reduction in the overall square footage of the proposed hospital buildings, as well as a number of other changes to the layout.

At the conclusion of those proceedings in 2014, the board voted against an adoption of the revised plan. Since a further amendment was not adopted by the Planning Board in 2014, the 2010 Master Plan Amendment remained in place and is currently in effect today.

Subsequent to the board's action to reject the proposed 2014 amendment, legal actions were filed, and the board engaged in a mediation process that was recommended by the court late in 2015. During that process, which occurred over several months, the terms of a settlement were reached between the Planning Board and Valley

- 1 Hospital.
- So, beginning tonight, with these
- 3 hearings, those settlement terms are now being put
- 4 forth to the public as consideration of a new 2016
- 5 Master Plan Amendment, and that's why we're all here
- 6 tonight.
- 7 Please keep in mind that the Master
- 8 Plan is a policy framework that provides a foundation
- 9 for the more detailed zoning ordinance which would be
- 10 established by the Village Council and which would
- 11 serve as a basis for site plan considerations in the
- 12 future.
- Now, after I review the procedures and
- 14 rules, I will quickly walk through the format for
- 15 | this evening's meeting, and then we will hear
- 16 important information regarding key legal elements of
- 17 | these proceedings from Katie.
- 18 It's also important to know that the
- 19 | board is acting pursuant to a remand order from the
- 20 court, and must strictly follow the schedule and
- 21 | procedure set forth in that court order. So please
- 22 listen carefully and take note of the following
- 23 | schedule for this proceedings.
- 24 After tonight, the next scheduled
- 25 | meeting on this matter will be tomorrow, March 31st,

2 2016, at 7:30 p.m., and it will be held at the
Ridgewood High School Student Center, located at 627
E. Ridgewood Avenue.

1.5

- Then next week, we expect to continue with meetings on Monday, April 4th, here in this courtroom; on Tuesday April 5th, also here in the courtroom; and on Thursday, April 7th, at Ridgewood High School again.
- All meetings will begin at 7:30. I'll also repeat this schedule at the end of tonight's meeting.
  - These schedules are also posted on the Village website and on the bulletin board in the entrance lobby here at Village Hall.
  - Planning Board hearings are conducted as dictated by the laws of the State of New Jersey, and the Planning Board is vested with the discretion to establish certain additional rules and regulations for the conduct of those hearings, and has been done for this matter pursuant to the remand order entered by the court.
- The hearings will be organized in the following manner:
- 24 After introductions from counsel for 25 both the Planning Board and Valley Hospital, we will

hear testimony from the Village Planner, Blais

Brancheau, as to the proposed 2016 Master Plan

Amendment document that has been drafted and in the

context of revisions to the previously proposed 2014

Master Plan that came about as part of the settlement

terms reached with Valley Hospital.

You will then hear testimony from Valley Hospital witnesses.

At the conclusion of each testimony, we will open the floor to questions for the witness regarding his or her testimony from the public.

Please remember, this part of the process will not be the time for public comment, which will come later, only questions to be posed relative to that particular witness' testimony and only regarding what he or she spoke about, and those questions should be directed to that witness.

As Katie will review in more detail, the remand order entered by the court specifically provides that only revisions to the 2014 Master Plan Amendment are relevant and material for purposes of questions and cross examination in this matter. So, if you have questions in this regard, when I open the floor to questions from the public after each witness, you will be asked to form a line, and I will

1 | call on you in that order.

When it's your turn, you'll be asked to slowly say and spell your name and address, before beginning with your questions.

As defined in the court's remand order, each of you will have up to five minutes to ask your questions. You must ask all of your questions together at one time and within the allotted five minutes, and then please take your seat so your questions can be answered by the witness.

Again, questions must be relevant to only the testimony that was given by that witness.

I will call on everyone who is in line only once, until everyone has had their five-minute opportunity to ask questions of that witness. Please do not ask questions that have been asked and answered by someone else before you, as repeat questions may not be entertained.

If any other party or entity presents a witness during the course of the hearing process, the same procedures would apply. We will need to know right away as to any intent to bring legal counsel and who will be represented in that regard.

Following the conclusion of all presentations and at the end of the hearing process,

the board will hear public comment. The board has established certain rules of procedure that will be followed, which I'll review now and once more at the beginning of the public comment portion of these hearings.

1.5

So, beginning tomorrow, individuals will be asked to sign up for public comment upon arrival. And we'll also have provision for that for those who may be down in the senior center for those days that we have overflow. The list will start over each night, meaning it will not carryover, to the extent possible, since we will do our best to complete the list of speakers present who signed up for that night.

This list will be used for the order of public-comment speaking. Should we get to public comment later tonight, we will have a signup sheet at that time. So, remember, if someone intends to make a statement to the board during the public comment period, they must sign in and take note of their sequence number on sign-up list.

When I announce that the hearing will be open for public comment, I will call the names in sequence from the list, in order, for that evening.

When your name is called, you'll be asked to move

immediately to the microphone and slowly say your name and street address for the record, so that the transcriber is able to receive that information. You will also be sworn in at that time, since all comments must be made under oath.

If you change your mind about speaking when your name is called, simply indicate "pass," and we'll move on to the next speaker. Please note that if you pass, your time may not be donated as extra time to another speaker.

Each speaker will be given five minutes to speak. There will be a timer indicating when one minute is left and again when each speaker's time is completed, and we ask that you respect that timer, to allow for everyone to get their chance to speak.

The five minutes time will begin only after the speaker has provided his or her name and address for the record and has been sworn in. We ask that each speaker strictly observe the time limit, so that everyone is given the opportunity to speak. You may read a written statement into the record as long as it does not extend beyond the allotted five minutes.

At the four minute notification, please finish your statement within the remaining one

minute, so that the next individual in sequence can have their turn. As directed by the court's remand order, everyone who wishes to comment will be given the same five minutes of time.

Again, we'll try to finish the list for reach night such that if people are present on one night and cannot attend the next date, they will have an opportunity to speak.

We will move along with that process with the intent to accommodate everyone's schedule, but there must be an understanding that the board has a strict schedule to keep as well. In addition, it should be understood that while the board will attempt to hear from everyone who wishes to speak, there's no obligation under the law or the remand order to entertain repetitious comments. Further, as Katie will point out in her review, the remand order provides that only provisions to the 2014 Master Plan shall be relevant and material for purposes of public comment.

Please know that petitions cannot be accepted by the board, nor any written statements by parties not present at the hearings. This is a rule established by New Jersey case law, that all parties seeking to put information before the board must be

1 available for cross examination.

It is simply improper for a board to examine or discuss a petition, and consideration of such a document is certainly outside the scope of the board's decisional process.

For everyone's reference, I'll review a summary of these instructions again when we get to public comment.

After members of the public have had an opportunity to comment on the proposed plan amendment and the matter has been concluded, the board may then take action to approve the amendment or decline adoption of the amendment. It should be kept in mind that although the board has scheduled five nights of hearings, the board will proceed to take action when public comment is concluded. The court was very clear, that it wanted this matter to proceed. Thus, if public comment is finished before the fifth hearing night, the board may move to act at an earlier date.

Regarding these hearings as a whole and how they're conducted, it's important to keep in mind that not everything that is said is likely to be agreeable to everyone. In addition, there is a level of patience, respect, and cooperation that must be

1 | maintained throughout the process by all of us.

Again, please listen carefully, as the following instructions are important, not only from a procedural standpoint but also from a point of order.

This board will not entertain shouting, applause, insults, or other disruptions. Each of us will have our turn to ask questions of witnesses and then later offer comment. So, for this process to work well, these hearings must be conducted in a manner that is orderly, organized, and respectful.

Those of us here who sit on the board

are your neighbors. We're Ridgewood residents who volunteer our time to serve our community, and deserve to be treated as you would want to be.

Furthermore, all witnesses, whether they're representing the Village or Valley Hospital or any other entity, are here to discuss their views and have the right to do so. They too deserve respect, and when questions are posed to them regarding their testimony, we need to remember that such questioning must be done in a polite manner. The speaker who is at the microphone, whether it's a board member, a witness, attorney or member of the public, has the floor, and that individual should not be interrupted by shouting, jeering, applause, or any other

1 demonstrative displays of emotion.

Now, this is also a good time for me to point out one easily misunderstood procedural aspect of these hearings. Since the Planning Board public hearing process has procedures which are akin to those used in a court of law, attorneys for any party may interject with an objection-assertion at any time, including periods of public questions or comments. Please know that such objection-assertions should not be perceived by the public to be disrespectful or rude, but, rather, a necessary procedure for allowing attorneys to promptly note objections to the record.

My hope and expectation is that these rules and procedures will be followed and the process for these hearings will proceed well in this manner.

Please note that if anyone chooses not to comply with these rules and therefore causes the hearing process to be interrupted, they may be asked to leave. Of course, I don't expect that to be necessary. So having said that, let me thank you in advance for your thoughtful cooperation throughout this process.

Remember, coming to these meetings is the best way to hear what the board hears, and to

have opportunity to participate in the process, and,

if the procedures I just outlined are followed, I

think everyone benefits.

- So tonight's meeting will run as follows: First, Katie will provide some additional legal framework on the matter. We'll then proceed to hear from Jon Drill, Valley's counsel. After that, we'll hear testimony on preliminary information regarding the amendment proposal from Blais, and then we'll proceed to hear from Valley's witnesses.
- Again, after the witnesses begin and conclude with their presentations, questions will be appropriate. I'll begin the process with the board's cross examination of the witnesses, and then move to open the questioning to the public for that witness.
- We'll probably break sometime between 9:30 and 10. At that time, I think the court reporters are going to switch positions. And then we'll begin promptly at the time that I suggest we begin.
- So this concludes my opening remarks,

  I'll now turn the microphone over to the board legal

  counsel, Katie Razin.
- MS. DOCKRAY: Hi, Charles. Can I just ask a couple of questions?

1 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Sure.

MS. DOCKRAY: On the April 7th date, if we finish on April 5th, are you saying we won't continue to the 7th? So we need to make the public know that they can't necessarily come on the 7th.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: That's what I said, that's correct.

MS. DOCKRAY: Yes, but I think we should publish that, so people know that.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: We will know that at the end of each meeting where we are in the process.

MS. DOCKRAY: Yes, but that requires people to go to all of those meetings. I think if we're not going to do the seventh, if you're not here on the fifth to sign up, then don't expect the seventh to happen.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I think that's implied. I think that's a good point. If you're interested in attending and participating in public comment, you need to be aware of what the process is, because we're going to go through the witness testimony in whatever time it takes to cross-examine the witnesses, and then when we begin public comment, it will begin that night, where it's likely to occur

```
1
    on the agenda. I can't say when that is now, because
    we haven't started, but we will update that
2
    information.
4
                   MS. DOCKRAY: I believe next week is
5
    school vacation, so you may only have people saying
    the only night I can come is April 7th, and --
6
7
                   MS. RAZIN: I think it's --
                   MALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: I think it's a
8
9
    good point.
10
                   MS. DOCKRAY: The main concern is, some
11
    people might think the only night they can come --
12
                   MS. RAZIN: Charles is making that
13
    announcement. So let's see where we are at the end
14
    of this meeting. I think we'll have a better idea at
15
    the next meeting where we are anyway, but Charles
    made the announcement and now that's where we are.
16
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: The intention is
17
    to move this according to the remand order, which is
18
    to be done in a timely fashion, and we can't define
19
20
    that until we know where we are after each session.
21
                   Our objective is to make sure you have
    the opportunity to ask questions of the witnesses
22
```

during testimony. We don't know how long that will

take. It may take one day or it may take several

23

24

25

days.

```
1
                   MALE AUDIENCE VOICE: Why can't we do
    the right thing and uphold the original decision?
2
3
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: We're not taking
4
    comments right now.
5
                   MS. DOCKRAY: My second question.
6
    husband says the only time he can come is April 7th
7
    to make his comment, he's not coming but somebody
    says I won't want them to think that the hearing was
8
9
    canceled because he didn't come on April 5th or
    April 4th. Some people may only have that one night
10
11
    and we told them that's going to be the hearing. So
12
    all I'm saying is if that may not happen, because we
    considered the hearings over before then, we need to
13
14
    put that on the web and on the notice, do whatever,
15
    so someone doesn't count on that one day.
                   MS. RAZIN: The notice actually says --
16
17
                   MS. DOCKRAY: What does it say, go
18
    ahead.
19
                   MS. RAZIN: I'm about to read it.
20
    Okay.
21
                   So the notice says that the board may
    take official action during these Special Meetings.
22
    So it doesn't say at the end of the Special Meeting,
23
24
    it just says at the end of the process.
```

25

So based on Charles' announcement and

based on the wording of the notice, the action can be taken at any of the Special Meetings, it doesn't have to wait until the termination of the meeting on the seventh.

1.5

Now, Charles and I can have a discussion on the break, if we think that an extra piece, I don't think that's objectionable, but he made the announcement, it's in the notice, official action will be taken.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I think it was -MS. RAZIN: We will have a discussion
if there will be some further notice on the website.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I think it was
implied, if it wasn't clear, I want you to know that
the intent here is to involve everyone and not to
create a problem. However, we do have strict
guidelines in the remand order we need to follow. So
as the process proceeds, we're going to do our best
to make sure people are informed, and we will find
ways on how to do that appropriately. I think let's
take it one day at a time and let's see how this
proceeds.

MS. DOCKRAY: Okay. I have one other question. This is the first I've seen of the amendment. I didn't get it by email. Can we take

```
1
    sometime to read it? What's supposed to happen here?
                   MS. RAZIN: The amendment has been on
2
    file for ten days, and I believe that Michael sent it
3
4
    to the board.
5
                   MS. DOCKRAY: I didn't see it.
6
    apologize.
7
                   MS. RAZIN: The redline and the cleanup
    version have both been on file for ten days.
8
9
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Michael, you e-mailed me
10
    this and I missed it?
11
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Yes, last week.
12
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay. I'm sorry.
                                                     Okay.
13
    Then I'll just have to go through it as we go along.
14
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Katie, sorry
1.5
    about that.
16
                   MS. RAZIN: No.
17
                   Okay. So the first thing I'd like to
    acknowledge -- good evening, everybody. The first
18
19
    thing I'd like to acknowledge is that there's a
20
    quorum of the board and that proper notice has been
21
    made by the board secretary in accordance with the
    provisions of the Municipal Land Use Law.
22
23
                   I'd like to mark that notice as exhibit
    B-1.
24
```

(Public Notice is marked as exhibit B-1

25

- 1 in evidence.)
- 2 MS. RAZIN: My intent is to provide a
- 3 | brief overview, although it won't be brief, but a
- 4 brief overview of the board's review process from a
- 5 legal perspective.
- The primary step is to review the
- 7 | status of this matter and the Valley's proposal
- 8 | before the board. First, I'd just like to review the
- 9 history which brought us here to where we are today,
- 10 | which is a Whispering Woods hearing, as Charles
- 11 mentioned.
- 12 A Whispering Woods proceeding is named
- 13 after a case, Whispering Woods at Bamm Hallow v.
- 14 Middletown Planning Board, NJ Super 161 (Law Division
- 15 1987).
- 16 Whispering Woods confirmed the
- 17 authority of local planning and zoning boards to
- 18 settle disputes with applicants and proponents that
- 19 challenged board determinations and set forth certain
- 20 procedural requirements that needed to be met as part
- 21 of that settlement process, such as issuance of
- 22 required public notice, the holding of a public
- 23 hearing, a vote taken in public, and the drafting of
- 24 a resolution.
- In that case, the board had denied a

development application, and a lawsuit was brought by the plaintiff soon after. Later, the board considered a revised version of that plan in a closed session meeting. The board agreed informally as to certain terms that would make the plan workable and developed the language of a stipulation of settlement. That stipulation was then voted on in public and filed with the court. Public notice was provided and a public hearing was held to consider the additional evidence relating to that settlement plan. The board then voted in favor of the revised plan.

Against various legal challenges, the court determined that that process was valid, primarily because courts favor settlements so long as the public interest is not disserved.

The court in Whispering Woods stated, if the settlement is made known to the public, subject to the public voice and voted upon in legal fashion, the public interest has been served. Thus, a settlement must be conditioned upon a public hearing on the agreed plan and all the statutory conditions necessary, including notice, public hearing, public vote, and a written resolution.

All of these procedural steps have been

taken here or will be taken here, as we go forward in
this process.

1.5

Now, as to how we got here, as Charles mentioned, in June 2010, the board took action and voted to adopt a proposed amendment to the Village Master Plan relative to the H-Zone. This was done after three years of work sessions and public hearings. That approved Master Plan Amendment is still in effect today.

The actions relative to that adoption were challenged by CRR, a citizen group, in Superior Court, Law Division. No decision was made by the court on that challenge. Rather, it was determined by consent order entered into by all parties that new efforts would be made to proceed outside of the courtroom and back before this board. Valley indicated that it would submit a new amendment proposal, and the board agreed to review it and CRR agreed to dismiss their lawsuit.

The board then proceeded to hear

Valley's revised proposal in 2013 and 2014. In

June 2014, the board voted to reject the Proposed

2014 Master Plan. That left the 2010 Master Plan in place, which, as I stated, is still currently effective for the H-Zone today.

Valley challenged the Planning Board's denial and simultaneously also included a count against the Village governing body as to the zoning ordinance as its application to the H-Zone.

1.5

During the course of that litigation, the Planning Board engaged in a court approved mediation process with Valley, led by former New Jersey Supreme Court Justice Virginia Long. Through the mediation, the Planning Board, after months of work, voted to proceed with a settlement of the litigation against it.

It should be clear that while the settlement proposal and Master Plan Amendment being considered by the board at these public hearings, the issues that were considered by the board during the mediation process and corresponding executive sessions are not subject to discussion or disclosure during these present hearings.

The mediation process is complete and was governed by the Rules of Evidence and a mediation agreement that was entered into by the parties.

That agreement specifically provides that nothing offered during the mediation process may be offered as evidence against any party in any proceeding.

```
1
                   That agreement further binds all
2
    parties to the mediation to keep all information,
    records and documents completely confidential and
3
4
    private. Evidence Rule 408 further addresses the
    nondisclosure and lack of admissibility of statements
5
6
    made in a settlement negotiations. The board is
7
    bound by these rules in these current proceedings.
                   What can be and will be made public
8
9
    during these proceedings is the remand order, which
10
    reflects the terms of the settlement, as well as the
11
    proposed 2016 Master Plan Amendment which is under
12
    review by the board as part of this process.
13
                   These documents have already been on
14
    file with the Board Secretary as well.
1.5
                   The remand order which was entered by
16
    the Hon. Lisa Perez Friscia is going to be marked as
    exhibit B-2.
17
18
                   (Remand Order is marked as exhibit B-2
19
    in evidence.)
20
                   MS. RAZIN: I'd like to take the public
21
    through some of the key provisions of that order.
    It's also on this PowerPoint, which I discovered is
22
    minute, so I apologize, but it's on record with the
23
```

Board Secretary and I'm going to read through some of

the provisions, so we should have a clear

24

25

understanding, and we'll get some copies as well.

So some of the key provisions and just so you know, when we get to the content of the Master Plan, which is some of the details which are also contained in the remand order, I'm going to skip over that section and I'm going to let Blais take you through that portion when he goes through the Master Plan documents, so I will sort of see where that skips over.

So the beginning of the order talks about the procedural background, and it says the plaintiff, The Valley Hospital, and defendant Planning Board reached an agreement in principle which would resolve Count 1 of the complaint and make a trial on Count 1 moot, provided that the Planning Board adopted a proposed amendment to the Master Plan pertaining to the H-Zone, as set forth below upon the conclusion of a Whispering Woods hearing.

The court hereby remands Count 1 of the complaint to the Planning Board for a hearing pursuant to Whispering Woods and N.J.S.A. 40:55D-13 for action on a 2016 Master Plan Amendment to the H-Zone (the "2016 Master Plan Amendment").

The 2010 Master Plan Amendment is the policy document currently in place for the H-Zone.

## Scheduling of the hearing and decision.

the hearing.

The hearing shall commence on March 30, 2016, and, if not completed (this alludes to what Charles was mentioning about condition of the hearings, shall continue until completed, on March 31st, 2016; April 4, 2016; April 5, 2016; and April 7, 2016. The Planning Board shall vote and take formal action on the 2016 Master Plan Amendment upon the completion of

The Planning Board shall adopt a resolution memorializing its vote within seven days of the vote, but no later than April 14, 2016.

Planning Board shall provide all interested parties with the right, through their attorneys if represented, or directly if not represented, to cross-examine witnesses that are presented by Plaintiff, The Valley Hospital, and/or Defendant Planning Board for testimony during the hearing, subject to reasonable limitations as to the amount of time allowed for such cross examination.

In accordance with  $\underline{N.J.S.A.}$  40:55D-10d, five minutes per person asking cross examination questions per witness is presumed to be a reasonable time limitation to ensure that the hearing proceeds

1 efficiently and in a timely manner that affords all interested parties the opportunity to participate. 2 All members of the public present and who wish to 3

testify during the hearings will be given the opportunity to do so, but, similarly, in accordance 5

4

9

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with N.J.S.A. 40:55D-10d, five minutes of sworn 6

7 testimony per member of the public is presumed to be

a reasonable time limitation to ensure that the

hearing proceeds in an efficient and timely manner.

10 The Planning Board shall take all steps necessary to

11 ensure that the hearings are not delayed and that

repetitious questions and comments are controlled. 12

The next section of the remand order goes through the specific provisions of the Master Plan, which will be discussed in detail through the testimony that's given by Blais.

At the end of the provisions of the Master Plan detail, there's another section called Addition of Conditions.

That section reads: The 2016 Master Plan Amendment also contemplates inclusion of a list of conditions previously generated during the 2013-2014 Master Plan hearings. Said conditions shall be included as an exhibit and made part of the record of the 2016 Master Plan Amendment process.

Only revisions to the proposed 2014

Master Plan Amendment are relevant and material for purposes of questions and cross examination and sworn comments by the public. While the technical rules of evidence are not applicable to the hearing in accordance with N.J.S.A. 40:55D-10e, only revisions to the proposed 2014 Master Plan Amendment shall be relevant and material for purposes of questions, cross examination, and sworn comments by the public.

So that takes you through the main elements and procedural elements of the remand order almost verbatim, except for parts where it says it's going to be served on another party and minute details, and Blais will take you through the rest when he goes through the Master Plan language.

As to some further procedural issues, I'd like to just summarize how we're going to proceed.

Today we'll hear, again, from John

Drill, counsel for Valley Hospital, and then from

Blais, our planner, regarding the proposed 2016

Amendment, which reflects what was set forth in the remand order. We will then hear from Valley's witnesses.

25 With regard to some of the procedural

issues that were raised by Charles, it is pivotal to point out the following:

As I stated already, this process is a Whispering Woods hearing. The relevant considerations now pursuant to the remand order are to review the modifications to the proposed 2014 Master Plan Amendment.

For public comment, all witnesses and speakers will be sworn under oath.

Just like any other public hearing, the right of cross examination exists to be posed towards any person who speaks.

Please avoid making hearsay comments, which are essentially comments made by someone other than yourself. Even though the rules of evidence that are applied in a court do not technically apply, witnesses must have personal knowledge about the statements they make and must be able to answer questions about their statements.

evidence that's personally known to you, that you have direct knowledge about, that is something that we are capable of receiving, that is something that we are capable of receiving from individuals.

It is also critical to remember that

the board cannot accept letters, petitions, or other writings in place of live testimony. That sort of material is not admissible for the hearing process, and it would be subject to cross-examination.

Parties wishing to provide comment must do so in person during the meeting. Any written submissions that provide comment on the process or amendment will be kept in the overall file but will not be reviewed by the board in consideration of the amendment.

Before hearing from Jon, I'd like to also mark exhibits B-3, which is the proposed 2014 Master Plan Amendment dated February 28, 2014, with revisions to June 9, 2014. That was the Master Plan document that was considered by the board in '13 and '14, and ultimately rejected by the board. I'm going to mark that as B-3.

(Proposed 2014 Master Plan Amendment dated February 28, 2014, with revisions to June 9, 2014 is marked as exhibit B-3 in evidence.)

MS. RAZIN: The redline version, which the board has received and which there are copies on the back table of, it's the redline version of the proposed 2014 Master Plan document with changes up to March 15, 2016, I'd like to mark that as B-4.

```
1
                   (Redline version of the proposed 2014
    Master Plan document, with changes up to 3/15/2016 is
2
    marked as exhibit B-4 in evidence.)
3
4
                   MS. RAZIN: And the proposed 2016
5
    Master Plan Amendment, clean version, with changes to
    March 15, 2016, as B-5.
6
7
                   (Proposed 2016 Master Plan Amendment,
    clean version, with changes to March 15, 2016, is
8
9
    marked as exhibit B-5 in evidence.)
10
                   MS. RAZIN: And, again, there's also
11
    copies of that document on the table.
12
                   And those documents have been on the
13
    website as well, and you can also find them there as
14
    well.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Mr. Drill.
15
                   MR. DRILL: Good evening. I'm Jon
16
    Drill from the law firm of Stickel Koenig Sullivan &
17
    Drill, representing the Valley Hospital in this
18
19
    proceeding.
20
                   We're here tonight in an attempt to
21
    settle part of an ongoing litigation between the
    Valley Hospital and the Planning Board and the
22
    Village. Specifically, we're here to attempt to
23
24
    settle that aspect of the litigation which challenges
```

the Planning Board's rejection of the proposed 2014

25

1 | Master Plan Amendment.

Through the mediation process, the

Valley Hospital has agreed to make revisions to its

proposed upgrade and modernization project that was

contemplated by the proposed 2014 Master Plan

Amendment. And the Planning Board has agreed to

consider a new proposed 2016 Master Plan Amendment,

which would accommodate such a revised project.

If the Planning Board adopts the 2016 Master Plan Amendment, a trial on the issues with a judicial decision, rather than a Planning Board decision, will be avoided.

While there are important changes that have been made to reduce the scope of the project, I will present a witness to describe those changes and will not spend time during this introductory statement on that.

I want to stress in my comments what is not being changed, and I will have our witness confirm that at the time she testifies.

So, the first thing that's not being changed is that the basements of all buildings contemplated by the 2016 Master Plan Amendment will not be increasing in size or depth from that contemplated in the 2004 Master Plan Amendment. Once

- our witness testifies, we have exhibits to show
  sections through the buildings as proposed in 2013
  and 2014, and sections through those buildings as
  proposed in 2016, and you will see that the basements
  are identical.
  - This is important, because it means that there will be no change in the geotechnical and hydrologic issues related to rock removal, excavation, and dewatering.

1.5

- The undisputed expert testimony from both the hospital and the board during the 2013-2014 hearing, was that there be no geotechnical or hydrologic problems resulting from the construction, and I stress, that was both from Valley's expert and this Planning Board's expert.
- The second thing that will not change. The overall square footage of the project contemplated by the 2016 Master Plan Amendment will actually be less than contemplated by the 2014 plan amendment.
- The same traffic intensive services that the hospital agreed to move off-site as part of the 2014 Master Plan Amendment will be moved off-site as part of the 2016 Master Plan Amendment. This is important, because there will be no change in the

traffic generation or parking, between the 2014 plan and the 2016 plan. And, again, just to refresh members who were here recollection and also there's a full record that's on your website that has copies of all the transcripts, all the reports. I just have my black notebook up on the desk, which is a four-inch or maybe even five inches of just the exhibits from that proceeding, but all the transcripts are also on your website.

The undisputed expert testimony from both the hospital and the board traffic experts was that traffic to and from the site would only not increase, it would actually decrease.

The third thing that's not changing.

The hospital presented unrefuted expert testimony

from Dr. Shannon Magari, an occupational and

environmental health and safety expert. Dr. Magari

addressed the issues of fine particulate matter and

contaminants, and she concluded that the construction

project would comply with all applicable air quality

standards, which would ensure community protection.

The hospital agreed, as part of the 2013-2014 hearing, to implement and execute an air monitoring plan which would be developed by Dr. Magari, and would include pretesting, monitoring

testing during construction, and post testing.

1.5

Again, I want to stress, the issue before the board in 2014 was not whether fine particulate matter is or is not harmful. The issue is whether the hospital would have systems in place to detect the presence of fine particulate matter and to stop any fine particulate matter from migrating to anywhere where harm would be caused.

And, again, once our witness testifies, and your counsel mentioned I believe it was paragraph possibly five in the remand order, where the hospital is required to present a list of conditions as an exhibit. We have such a list. It will be presented. It will be read into the record, and you will hear that in those conditions the hospital agrees to do all the things it said it would do during those hearings to pretest, monitor and test during construction, and post test, so that to ensure that no fine particulate matter would migrate to anywhere where harm would be caused.

The fourth and last thing that's not changing is the time of construction. The time period for construction of Phase I is not ten years. The time period for construction remains the same as contemplated in the 2014 Master Plan Amendment. Six

- years for Phase I. It's in the transcripts, it's in
  the expert reports. And that's even with the
  basement of the West Building that's now going to be
  constructed as part of Phase I instead of Phase II.
- 5 You will hear testimony about that change.

- So, to repeat, even with the construction of the basement of the West Building, that in 2014 would have been constructed as part of Phase II, even with that basement being constructed in Phase I, the duration of construction for Phase I will not exceed six years.
  - Additionally, during the 2013-2014
    hearing session, the hospital -- pardon me,
    misstatement. During the mediation, without
    revealing anything that was said in the mediation,
    but as part of that mediation, I can tell you right
    now that the hospital commits, and you can add it to
    the list of conditions, that Phase II will not be
    constructed for at least a decade after Phase I is
    completed.
  - So, again, the hospital will agree, and you can add to the conditions, that Phase II construction will not commence until at least a decade after the construction of Phase I is completed.

```
1
                   And the duration of the construction of
2
    Phase II, as contemplated by the 2016 Master Plan
    Amendment, is also going to remain the same, as the
3
4
    duration as contemplated in the 2014 Master Plan
5
    Amendment, four years. But the change is a
    commitment to not start that Phase II for a decade.
6
7
                   My final comment is to remind everyone
    of something that the board's counsel has already
8
9
    said, and that's paragraph six of the remand order
    provides that only revisions to the proposed 2014
10
11
    Master Plan Amendment shall be relevant and material
12
    for purposes of questioning and cross examination.
    And only revisions to the proposed 2014 Master Plan
13
14
    Amendment shall be relevant and material for purposes
15
    of sworn comments by the public.
                   And with that, that's my introduction.
16
17
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Mr. Drill, okay.
                   Katie, unless you have any comments,
18
    I'm going to hand this over to Blais.
19
20
                   Blais Brancheau is our Village Planner.
21
                   MS. RAZIN:
                              Blais, can I swear you in?
22
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: Yes, you may.
23
                   MS. RAZIN: Blais, do you swear that
24
    the testimony you are about to give is the truth, the
    whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
25
```

```
B. Brancheau - direct - Razin
                                                           43
1
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: Yes, I do.
                   DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MS. RAZIN:
2
3
                   And you're going to take us through the
            Q.
    provisions of the Master Plan which is, there's a
4
    redline document and a clean document, correct?
5
            Α.
6
                  Yes.
7
                   And you prepared that document?
            Q.
                   Yes, I did.
8
            Α.
9
                   And the date on the document is
    March 15, 2016. Is that correct?
10
11
            Α.
                   Yes.
12
                   And your revisions?
            Q.
13
            Α.
                   Yes.
14
                   MS. RAZIN: And, Jen, if you could just
    scroll down until you get to the redline, you can
15
16
    follow through on there as well. Again, I
    apologize --
17
18
                   MR. DRILL: The redline is exhibit B-4?
19
                   MS. RAZIN: That's correct, it's
20
    exhibit B-4, but again there are copies on the table
21
    as well.
                   What I'd like to do is just go through
22
            Α.
    page by page and comment on what's not changed and
23
24
    comment on what is changed.
25
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Blais, are you
```

```
B. Brancheau - direct - Razin
                                                    44
going to use the redline?
              THE WITNESS: I'm using the redline as
the basis for my testimony.
              So, the oath change on the cover sheet
is the date on the revision, March 13.
              The first page provides some
introduction and background. That hasn't changed.
              The second page shows the boundary of
the Hospital Zone. That's not proposed to change.
              The same page includes the permitted
land uses.
           That's not proposed to change either.
              Page three talks about lot area.
is similarly unchanged, and again that's the entire
area within the districts outside of the
right-of-way, the idea being no subdivision or
reduction of lot area for the hospital, it will
remain as it currently is.
              Under Intensity of Use, there are some
changes, some minor word changes, dealing just
typographical changes. And then a key change in the
third bullet at the bottom of that page is a
reduction in the total hospital floor area of
34,000 square feet from 900 to 866,000 square feet.
That I note does not include, nor is it included in
```

the prior version of this, the deck area or the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

rooftop equipment area.

On page 4, under <u>Building Mass and</u>

<u>Building Coverage</u>, there's a change of a reduction in the amount of floor area and roof area located at or above grade, and it's a reduction of 31,500 square feet. And it went from 1,056,400 to 1,024,900. And then there's a breakdown of each of those, and it shows the reduction of 31,500 feet for the hospital, and then the rooftop area remains the same, the parking deck remains the same, atriums and courtyards remain the same.

The next bullet indicates a change in the amount of coverage by above grade structures from 288,000 to 311,000. It's my understanding that this change was brought about by a reduction in the fifth level story, and some of that ended up becoming at grade on the first story.

The next section deals with <u>Building</u>

<u>Height</u>. And the change in building height is a reduction from 70 feet and five stories, to 56 feet and four stories, so a height reduction of one story or 14 feet.

The rest of that page is unchanged.

The next page --

MS. DOCKRAY: Blais, I just want to

```
B. Brancheau - direct - Razin
                                                          46
    confirm that 24 feet remains the same in addition to
    the --
                   THE WITNESS: For the rooftop
4
    screening, yes.
                   MS. DOCKRAY:
                                Thank you.
                   THE WITNESS: That's in the second
    bullet on that page. You'll see that that's not
    changed.
                   (Continuing) Dealing with
    Yards/Building Setbacks, beginning on page four,
    going on to page five, just a change from "shall" to
    "should."
12
13
                   Again, the Master Plan is an advisory
14
    document to the governing body, so we changed "shall"
15
    to "should." We are recommending that the governing
    body adopt an ordinance. That would then make it
16
    mandatory. But the Master Plan itself does not have
    the effect of law.
18
19
                   There's a change in the diagram
20
    reflecting the setbacks.
                   And the first diagram is to is replaced
22
    with the second diagram. I'd like to go through
    briefly some of the changes.
23
                   In order to accommodate a lower
25
    building height, there was an increase of building
```

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

17

21

area on the ground floor, still a net reduction but there was some increase that resulted in a reduced setback on the Van Dien frontage in the northerly portion of the site. Whereas, it used to be the North Building was setback 120 feet from Van Dien Avenue; under the revised proposal, the first floor would be setback 47 feet, all other floors would be setback 74 feet, and the rooftop screens would be required to be setback at least 90 feet.

Similarly, in the case of the West
Building, which is just south of the North Building
and towards the N. Van Dien Avenue portion of the
property, the original plan had the West Building at
100 feet. Now there's a ground floor two story
portion of the West Building that is setback 55 feet
from N. Van Dien. The rest of the building remains
the same as it was in the 2014 plan, that is
100 feet. And then there's a setback of the rooftop
screen which is 115 feet, which wasn't depicted in
the 2014 plan.

On page six, in the section entitled

Improvement Coverage, there is an increase of

12,400 square feet of coverage by buildings new

pavement, and again it's my understanding that this

was a result of this built that out of the ground

floor of the building to accommodate a lower building
height. I'm sure the hospital will testify in more
detail about that.

That's it on that page.

On page seven, some minor word changes in the beginning, and then three bulleted items are added. These have to do with landscaping and greenery. A paragraph was added to deal with a variety of landscape design features, for two primary purposes. One is to mitigate the mass of the buildings on the property. Second is to create a campus atmosphere throughout the property, much more greenery than currently exists.

The second bullet deals with replacement of any trees that would be lost due to the construction activity and the change in the building and pavement areas.

And there's a statement here that's requiring that any replacement trees be equivalent or better in function than the ones that are removed.

And then a new provision is added dealing with the first floor of the North Building, that it be covered with a green roof that will mitigate the visual impact of that building and its setback from N. Van Dien Avenue.

railings that are open, and this adds a provision

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

that requires that they be open when not needed for screening. And, again, the purpose of this is to reduce the inherent physical mass of the building from any solid parapet by making it open.

an open feature, that it be done in a way that provides an appearance of transparency, either through -- the design's obviously something that would be worked out either in the code or in the site plan review phase of it, but the whole intent of this bullet is to reduce the apparent height and the visual impact of the rooftop features and safety features on the roof.

The second bullet deals with variety of building materials for the rooftop features where they are required to be solid. And the intent, again, is to break up a single monolithic appearance of these things and make them more visually appealing.

On page nine, there's another bullet added, and that provided for a vegetative screen in the front of the exterior of the penthouses of the North and West Buildings, except where they're in front of air louvers. And, again, this is designed to achieve the same purpose of providing more

```
B. Brancheau - Board Questions
                                                          51
1
    attractive appearance for rooftop equipment, as
    opposed to the typical utilitarian design that we
2
    often see for rooftop equipment or rooftop screens.
3
4
                   The rest of the page dealing with Signs
5
    is unchanged.
                   The next section dealing with Traffic
6
    and Street Improvements, that is similarly unchanged.
7
                   And those are the changes that are
8
9
    proposed by this amendment.
10
            Q.
                   And it's your understanding that the
11
    terms that was in your discussion and your testimony
    is representative of the settlement that was reached?
12
13
                   Yes, it is.
            Α.
14
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Blais, why don't
    you take some water before we get any questions,
15
    first from the board for cross examination.
16
17
                   All right. I will begin at my right.
    David, if you have any questions for Blais, we will
18
    continue with Nancy.
19
20
                        THURSTON: Two things, Blais.
                   MR.
21
                   The first thing is, when it talks about
22
    trees at maturity, what is the timeframe, is that a
    small tree or some larger tree when we get to the
23
    maturity timeframe?
24
25
                   THE WITNESS: Maturity is something
```

that is a fluid concept. This would have to be

detailed in more specificity in the ordinance, but in

dealing with -- what it is essentially saying is that

getting a tree from a nursery is very difficult, if

not impossible to get a tree -- if you're removing a

30-foot tree, it's very difficult to get a tree that

is immediately 30 feet tall.

What this means is that within a reasonable period of time, the tree will function at that same height.

So I know typically maturity in the

case of trees is periods of 10 to 20 years.

Obviously, some trees live a lot longer than that and there's no precise definition of maturity, but I would say within a period of 10 to 20 years, it is expected that there would be equivalent function.

It's not just the size of the plans, but it's the design. It can be spacing and layout of trees, and it can be the grade that the trees are placed on, for example, placing a tree on a berm. So there's a number of ways in which the equivalent height and function. It's not just height, it's the density of the planting, there's a number of ways in which that can be achieved.

So that's about how I would answer

6

7

20

the same?

- that, but I would expect that if and when we get to 1 an ordinance, that the ordinance would spell that out 2 in more clear detail. 3
- 4 MR. THURSTON: On your third additional paragraph on page nine, you have some typographical errors. After the word "building," you need a space, before the parenthetical.
- THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, I didn't hear 8 9 the question.
- MR. THURSTON: In the third bullet, 10 11 which begins "A vegetated screen," after "Building," before the parenthetical, a space is needed there. 12
- THE WITNESS: Oh, yes, I agree. 13
- 14 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay. Nancy.
- 15 MS. BIGOS: Thank you.
- 16 Blais, under yards and building setback 17 on page six, you reviewed the setbacks along N. Van Dien Avenue. Can you tell me if there's an increase 18 or a decrease or that those setbacks are remaining 19
- 21 THE WITNESS: On N. Van Dien?
- 22 MS. BIGOS: Yes, the top floor.
- 23 THE WITNESS: For the North Building,
- 24 everything was 120 on the old plan. In the new plan,
- the first floor is a minimum of 47, which is a 25

19

20

21

22

23 MS. DOCKRAY: Blais, were all these

24 setbacks in the remand notice?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

25 THE WITNESS: I don't know, I haven't

```
B. Brancheau - Board Questions
                                                          55
1
    seen the remand notice.
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Even for the West
2
3
    Building?
4
                   MS. RAZIN: Yes, there's a diagram with
    an attachment at the end.
5
6
                   MS. DOCKRAY: They were in the remand
7
    notice that we were given?
8
                   MS. RAZIN: (Shakes head.)
9
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Any questions,
10
    Wendy?
11
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Not at this time.
                                                     Thank
12
    you.
13
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Debbie.
                   MS. PATIRE: Not at this time.
14
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Khidir.
15
16
                   MR. ABDALLA: No questions.
17
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I have a quick
18
    question.
19
                   With regard to rooftop screening, is it
20
    your opinion that they intend that to help buffer the
21
    visual aspect of the taller floors on the first
    floor, and will that first floor also, the visual
22
23
    impact of that be mitigated by some of the landscape
24
    provisions?
25
                   THE WITNESS: Yes. I mentioned there
```

- was a green roof on the first floor, and that was
  there to help mitigate the fact that that's now
  closer to the street.
  - CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: So from Van Dien, with a green roof, the visual aspects of the building would be reduced because of the tree growth and other items. Is that correct?
- 8 THE WITNESS: Yes. I expect there to
  9 be tree growth between the buildings and the street
  10 as well as building planting.
  - That planting on the roof will also help reduce the visual impact of the upper floors of the building, not just the first floor, because as that tree grows up, those plants grow up, they will reduce how much you see of the upper floors.
  - Obviously, that design is yet to be seen, but I would imagine that it would have some benefit.
  - CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: And the other question is: Do you believe that with only a first floor having a reduced setback, do the landscape revisions again, can an ordinance in essence require some form of treatment again that will block the visual aspect of those buildings from the road or from the neighborhood?

23

24

25

```
1
                   THE WITNESS: Yes. I think within -- I
    mean, you will need to have some clearance of the
2
    building, you'll not want to have trees right upon
3
4
    the building, but you should be able to get fairly
    dense planting within that setback area to mitigate
5
    the visual.
6
7
                   For example, today the ordinance today
    for the H-Zone requires the 40-foot setback,
8
9
    regardless of height. So this is compared with what
    exists in the ordinance today, this is actually
10
11
    requiring a greater setback for even the ground floor
12
    and a much greater setback for the upper floors.
13
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you, Blais.
14
                   Kevin.
15
                   MR. REILLY: That was in the back of my
    mind, the tree removing. I had a sense that it was
16
17
    going to be more extensive tree removing by
    discussions.
18
19
                   COURT REPORTER: I am sorry, I can't
20
    understand what you are saying.
21
                   MR. REILLY:
                                Oh, okay.
```

I see in the proposal here that the green roofing pertains to level one of the North Building. And my question is: My sense is, during some discussions I thought there was going to be more

- 1 extensive green roofing, so I'm kind of following up
- 2 on Charles' point, are there other locations that
- 3 | landscape and green roofing shrubbery, trees, could
- 4 be put in above grade on some of these setbacks or on
- 5 | the roof itself, even the parking area?
- THE WITNESS: Well, the plan always
- 7 | contained the provision for green roof for the
- 8 service areas of the building, and that's found on
- 9 page seven, and that hasn't changed.
- 10 So, yes, in that sense, it is, it's not
- 11 proposed to be changed from what it was, but there
- 12 always was a provision for green roofs in that
- 13 location.
- 14 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Blais, maybe for
- 15 | Kevin's comment, I think you discussed provisions
- 16 | around mechanicals as being capable of being
- 17 | transparent or the use of the materials to minimize
- 18 | the visual impact. That could include either living
- 19 or artificial greenery efforts?
- THE WITNESS: Right.
- 21 MR. REILLY: In a sense, the green
- 22 roofing.
- 23 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's not quite
- 24 green roofing, but it is greenery on the roof. By
- 25 | "green roofing," we basically mean that the roof is

- planted almost as if it were ground level, and you

  can often put shrubs, include even trees, on the roof

  properly designed to provide some --
  - MR. REILLY: My concern is in the proposal where's it's limited to, if it's the first level, there's other buildings, there's other setbacks?
  - THE WITNESS: Well, the thing is if you're putting trees on the roof of a four story building, my feeling is that, you could have the effect of that increasing the height of the visual impact of the building, if it's that high up in the air.
    - In addition, the higher up you go, you're dealing with other issues related to not only structural load but wind issues and so forth.
    - I'm not saying it can't be done, but

      I'm just saying is that to try to put it on the roof,

      I don't know if there's room, I think the hospital

      would have to deal with that, because you do have to

      deal with the rooftop equipment that's up there. And

      if you add trees, I don't know that that is going to

      be of much benefit to someone to have a tree up there

      as opposed to nothing.

25 MR. REILLY: Would it be feasible to

- 1 have terminology in here along the lines of, well,
- 2 where feasible additional green roofing might apply,
- 3 which leaves it open to, you say wind or climate,
- 4 conditions that make it infeasible, but I would just
- 5 like to kind of open that up a little in terms of
- 6 site plan saying would that come up?
- 7 THE WITNESS: I don't think it hurts to
- 8 | say that, but, again, I'll leave it to the hospital
- 9 to testify as to the feasibility.
- I don't know, for example, why the West
- 11 Building doesn't have a green roof, maybe there would
- 12 be a reason for that. But I can't imagine putting it
- 13 on a parking deck, because you need it for parking.
- 14 MS. RAZIN: I'm sorry, if that's
- 15 | something, I mean, that's the language that Kevin
- 16 asked about "where feasible," is that what you said,
- 17 greenery where feasible, I just want to get your
- 18 language.
- MR. REILLY: Yes.
- MS. RAZIN: So maybe that's something
- 21 | that they can address more comment in there --
- 22 THE WITNESS: If that's feasibility,
- 23 then we'll let them do it at their time.
- 24 MS. RAZIN: Maybe they can take a
- 25 | minute and they can address it now or you can address

```
B. Brancheau - Board Questions
                                                          61
1
    it with your testimony.
                   MR. DRILL: I consulted with Maria
2
    Mediago, who is the Vice President - Facilities at
3
4
    the hospital. No problem to add the language "where
5
    feasible," but we can offer upright now, it was
    intended to also have a green roof on top of that
6
7
    first floor of the West Building, so if that isn't
    there, it was an inadvertent omission.
8
9
                   THE WITNESS: That could be added, I
    would imagine.
10
11
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Then I'm confused, what's
    the vegetative screen around the exterior of the
12
13
    penthouse?
14
                   MR. DRILL: We can't hear.
15
                   MS. DOCKRAY: I'm sorry, I don't know
    what's wrong here. Either I am too loud or not loud
16
17
    enough.
                   Page nine, what is the -- it says:
18
19
                   "A vegetative screen should be
20
            incorporated in front of the exterior of the
21
            penthouse"...
                   What is that then?
22
23
                   THE WITNESS: I view that as something
24
    akin to the preceding bullet, which talks about
    building design, incorporating the use of varied
25
```

1 materials (texture and color) at the exteriors of
2 mechanical penthouses.

I view this vegetative screen as perhaps vines or similar --

MS. DOCKRAY: As what?

THE WITNESS: As perhaps vines or similar material that is, instead of paint or a hard material, using a vegetative material to improve the appearance of those screens. So I don't view it as trees, as much as I'm thinking of vinery or some type of plants.

MS. DOCKRAY: Vinery?

MS. RAZIN: Blais, something that you thought maybe was vertical but could be vertically rather than green lawn that would have horizontally?

THE WITNESS: Yes.

Duilding there that has like three different kinds of vines growing on a wall, sort of almost like an art design, and it's designed to get away from the hardscape appearance of a basically a flat building wall, and provide some variety and softness through the use of vegetation. That's what I envision this to be.

MS. DOCKRAY: Yes, but it sounds like,

```
B. Brancheau - Board Questions
                                                    63
but the only thing you can think is of is vines.
just curious.
              THE WITNESS: That's what I understand
it to be. Now, if the hospital has other ideas,
then, you know, obviously that could be discussed,
but that's my understanding, is vines. There may be
other things, there may be like, you know, sometimes
you'll see planters, but again, it's something that
needs to be able to survive, maintained, or withstand
wind and things like that, and, you know, the details
of that are unclear.
              MS. DOCKRAY: And it's all around the
exterior of the penthouse?
              THE WITNESS:
                           Well, this says --
              MS. DOCKRAY: I didn't know if it meant
the front or exterior.
              THE WITNESS: It says the front. I
think when it says the front, it means the side
facing the street.
              MS. DOCKRAY: So it's not along the
side --
              THE WITNESS: That's not what this
says.
```

MS. DOCKRAY: Along Benjamin Franklin,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

behind Steilen?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

spectrum of detail, the Master Plan is the most general, the ordinance is more specific, and the site plan is the most specific.

25 And just to caution, general principle

ultimate design.

is, when you know specifics in advance, there's no
harm in saying it, but when you don't know, you can
sometimes hurt yourself by removing flexibility by
establishing detail, when you're not sure of the

So, as a general rule, I would say when you're unsure, establish the principle guideline that you're hoping to achieve, if you can refine that in the ordinance, do it, but ultimately in the site plan is when the final detail will get worked out.

And, again, sometimes when one thing changes, something else has to change, so you want to provide a certain amount of flexibility to allow for design change without creating a variance, for example, in order to respond to something the board or the public may ask for, and if you do that, now we create a variance for something else, because we were too narrow in how we define how something can be done.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you.

Thank you, Blais.

Are there any other questions for

23 Blais?

If not, is there a motion at this time to open to the public question?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21 22 23 can in five minutes. And then sit down, allow those 24 questions to be answered.

25 So take your time, ask them slowly so

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

unchanged.

There is a 40-foot setback from minimum requirement from the North Building to the property line. I imagine there would be some planting in that area, but the Master Plan doesn't go into detail as

```
B. Brancheau - Public Questions
                                                    68
to the specifics of that.
              CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay. Thank you.
              MS. RAZIN: I think there is some
language about additional landscaping and shrubbery
in the eating area.
              THE WITNESS: Was that specific to Ben
Franklin?
              MS. RAZIN: Yes.
              MR. DRILL: Page six of the remand
order, it's 4(b)(3) on page six.
              THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, there is
something. On page seven of the redline version of
the plan, it gives examples, it says, where I had
mentioned about landscape design features to both
buffer and provide a campus atmosphere. Examples in
the Master Plan are cited, which include the addition
of landscaping and shrubbery to the outdoor eating
area along the common property line with Benjamin
Franklin Middle School and a number of other
treatments, but they aren't specific to Ben Franklin.
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But as to the main screening, the bullet above that, which remains unchanged from the last plan, says that:

"In addition to a landscaped buffer, a sound barrier fence/wall and other features,

as appropriate, should also be required adjacent to the Steilen Avenue properties and the Benjamin Franklin school property in order to mitigate the noise from loading activities, truck traffic and other activities." And it says, "Fences and/or walls should also be required in other buffer areas or locations, where necessary to provide adequate screening."

And it basically goes beyond to say that the details of that, this specific design will be determined by the board at the time of site plan review.

So, again, that was in the plan and that's not proposed to change with this amendment.

MS. DOCKRAY: Blais, I'm a little confused here. Between the North Building and Benjamin Franklin, between that 40 feet there's an outdoor eating area?

THE WITNESS: I don't know if it's in the 40-foot area.

MS. DOCKRAY: I'm just reading in the amendment, it says not limited to additional landscape to the outdoor.

25 COURT REPORTER: I'm sorry, I can't

```
B. Brancheau - Public Questions
                                                    70
hear you.
              MS. DOCKRAY: Okay.
              Page seven, you were just referencing
that, what is it, the third paragraph that there's a
change, and you said such features should generally
include but not limited to the addition of
landscaping and shrubbery to the outdoor eating area
along the common property line with the Benjamin
Franklin Middle School.
              So that reminds me there's an outdoor
eating area between the North Building and the
property line?
              THE WITNESS: I think I'd have to defer
to the hospital on that point, because I haven't seen
a specific design that shows the location.
              MS. DOCKRAY: Will you address that
later?
              MR. DRILL: This is not proposed, it's
existing, but Maria will address that later. It's
there as we sit here tonight. It's been there.
              MS. DOCKRAY: Okay, but it's within
that 40-foot setback?
              MR. DRILL: Yes.
              CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Why don't we
```

allow the public to ask. We are currently in public

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
B. Brancheau - Public Questions
                                                          71
    questions.
                   MS. DOCKRAY: No, I just got confused.
3
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Next person,
4
    state and spell your name.
                   MR. VOIGT: Jeff Voigt, V-O-I-G-T, 99
    Glenwood Road, Ridgewood.
6
                   It's actually a procedural question.
    Mr. Nalbantian, you made a comment, I wanted to kind
8
    of ask if it's possible to ask you this comment you
    made, a question related to it?
10
11
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: The questions are
    specific to the testimony, just as we have questions
12
13
    we're permitted to do that.
14
                   MR. VOIGT: Could I ask you when we
15
    could ask you a question on an introductory comment
16
    you made, because you made something that I'm a
17
    little bit curious about.
18
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Introductory
19
    comment just now or at the beginning?
20
                   MR. VOIGT: At the beginning, yes.
21
                   It was a comment relating to this being
    approved and then it would go to an ordinance to the
22
23
    council. Is that correct?
24
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Yes, I'll just
25
    interject. We're focused here on basically the
```

2

5

7

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Master Plan, which is a policy statement, if you
  will, it's broad brush. The Village Council has a
  responsibility for the laws, for the ordinance, and
  the two should match typically.
- 5 So following this process, if there is an amendment to the Master Plan that requires an 6 7 ordinance, that would be determined through a process by the Village Council, which would also include 8 9 hearings, and that would be the specific ordinance where the laws are then in concert with the overall 10 11 policy of the Master Plan. That's what I meant by that. 12
- MR. VOIGT: Okay. So, I'm going to ask another question, maybe you can't answer this, but I'm going to ask it anyway.
  - So we currently have four people who are on the council, one's been recused, so what happens if it's a 2 to 2 vote?
  - CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Let's just not go there right now. Let's allow us to continue this process. I did you a favor by clarifying my point I made earlier. I'd rather not talk about the process, we will not interrupt the process; however, later on when we get to a vote, we will have a discussion as to what that process will be from.

```
B. Brancheau - Public Questions
                                                          73
1
                   MR. VOIGT: For the Village Council,
2
    right?
3
                   MS. RAZIN: We're not going to talk
4
    about the Village Council.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: That's a
5
6
    different body.
7
                   MR. VOIGT: So I ask that question of
    the Village Council, is that what I should do?
8
9
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Yes. Absolutely.
10
                   MR. VOIGT: Okay.
11
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you,
    Mr. Voigt.
12
13
                   Next person, please.
14
                   MS. BANEY: Lisa Baney. My address is
    136 Brookside Avenue, B-A-N-E-Y.
15
16
                   So I do have one quick, again, because
17
    you were trying to give us a lot of preface to the
    evening, just I would like to respond to one of those
18
    things, which is regarding the public -- the number
19
20
    of hearings that are coming.
21
                   I really would ask if you please, it
    was not implicit that they won't go to the end.
22
    Please, they do need to be posted on the website,
23
24
    because it is not implicit they won't go to the end.
25
    Please, because I know someone, for example, who said
```

```
B. Brancheau - Public Questions
                                                          74
1
    they are taking their son on college trips and
    they'll be back next Thursday. It needs to be clear,
2
    what you said. What it says on the remand is like
3
4
    continuing, it says continuing, that's not on the
5
    notice.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I'm going to talk
6
7
    about the notice at the end of the meeting. This is
    the time where Blais is giving testimony.
8
9
                   MS. BANEY: I know, but this is my only
    chance to mention this.
10
11
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I heard your
12
    comment.
13
                   MS. RAZIN: I think if anyone has a
14
    comment, you can come to up at a break.
                   MS. BANEY: But I'd also like to be on
15
    public record, please, also. I think it should be
16
17
    clearer that it would possibly end.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Your comment was
18
19
    noted.
20
                   Do you have a question?
21
                   MS. BANEY: Thank you.
                   Yes, I actually have four questions.
22
23
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Ask your
24
    questions and then be seated.
25
                   MS. BANEY: Okay.
```

- 1 Well, one of them, one question is very 2 simple and would form my second question, so I might just -- the first question is, what is the difference 3 4 between the chart on page six and the chart on page 5 five with regard to the drawings and the setbacks? Is one before 2014 amendment and one 2016? 6 7 THE WITNESS: Yes, this was done with the tract changes featured in Word, and unfortunately 8 9 Word does not do a good job when it comes to showing a diagram that's being deleted, which is the first 10 11 diagram. MS. BANEY: Because that's not current, 12 13 that's the old one? 14 THE WITNESS: That's the old one. second one is the new one, and that's underlined in 15 16 red. 17 MS. BANEY: Okay. Then I have three 18 questions. 19 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Please proceed 20 with your question. Blais, wait for her to ask all 21 of her questions. MS. BANEY: Thank you, sir. I couldn't 22 ask question two if I didn't know which chart. 23 24 Forgive me. Thank you.
- So my first question would be, so these

- 1 setbacks, like, for example, 47 feet, is the smaller setback at Van Dien. I can't tell on these drawings, 2 is that to the street or to the sidewalk? 3 4 The second question is: As a planner, 5 if I'm looking at this chart and the coverage, if that were my home, do you think that would be 6 7 approved as an appropriate amount of footage to cover in my property? 8 9 And my third question is: So, in the changes that were made here, I know that there was a 10 11 balancing act that was also subject to the lawsuit was the detriments versus the benefits. 12 I just was 13 wondering with regard to all the detriments that the Planning Board spoke very clear about that concerned 14 15 them, in the 2014 amendment, these changes, whether and how they might reduce the detriments or on 16 17 balance increase the benefits to make this a settlement that settles some of those concerns. 18 19 Thank you. 20 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you, Ms. 21 Baney. THE WITNESS: All right. 22 23 First question is: What is the 47-foot 24 setback measured to?
- That's actually measured to the

sidewalk typically.

property line, and that is not defined by the

sidewalk, it's not defined by the curb of the street.

It's typically, but not always, on the building side

of the sidewalk, how far it varies from case to case.

So, I will tell you that it's measured from the legal

ownership limits of the property line, and it's

farther than that to the actual street or the

MS. BANEY: But in this case.

THE WITNESS: In this case, I'd have to actually look at the survey to see where the sidewalk ends and where the property line is, but I can't tell you as I sit here which one is where.

The question of whether a residential property would be permitted to have the same amount of coverage as was proposed here, I assume you meant by that, percentage of the lot area coverage, not total area of coverage. But the answer to that question is probably not, and when we write zoning standards, we write them that are appropriate to the use in question. And typically a single family home would not need the same amount of coverage as a hospital facility, and so we don't write the standards the same way.

And then as to detriments versus

- 1 | benefits, obviously this is a situation that
- 2 involves, as I have said before at the prior
- 3 | hearings, both benefits and detriments. And the
- 4 | board's decision involves a balancing of both
- 5 benefits and detriments; benefits not just to the
- 6 community but to the region, as well as detriments to
- 7 | the community, and to some extent to the region as
- 8 well.
- There is always a balancing act going
- 10 on, and that balancing is not something that is done
- 11 | via a mathematical equation, there's an element of
- 12 judgment that the board exercises in doing their
- 13 balancing.
- In this amendment, we've identified
- 15 | some of benefits of the lower building height,
- 16 increased and improved treatment of rooftop areas, as
- 17 | well as increased and improved plantings and
- 18 buffering.
- There are some detriments. We've
- 20 identified reduced setbacks for a single story in the
- 21 | case of the North and the West Buildings and some
- 22 coverage related to that, increased ground floor
- 23 portion of the building. Those are detriments, and
- 24 | we've identified as well.
- But, again, the decision both by this

- 1 board and by the council and most zoning cases
- 2 involves a balancing of benefits and detriments.
- 3 As to whether the benefits could be
- 4 | increased and the detriments could be reduced, that
- 5 | is something that I'm sure that was discussed in the
- 6 | mediation that occurred, but I was not privy to that
- 7 and it was closed, so I really won't speak more to
- 8 that.
- 9 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you, Blais.
- 10 Are those all the questions for
- 11 Mr. Brancheau?
- 12 Next person please come forward and
- 13 state your name, provide your address.
- 14 MR. DeVITA: My name is Tom DeVita,
- 15 D-E-V-I-T-A, 226 Sollas Court.
- 16 Thank you.
- Blais, a question for you. Just to get
- 18 | clarity, if not, Mr. Drill can get it in his
- 19 testimony.
- 20 With respect to the safety railings and
- 21 | the invisible parapet, do you know yet the, I'll call
- 22 | it, the perimeter footage that's going to have the
- 23 | invisible parapet versus the mechanical screening, if
- 24 you will?
- THE WITNESS: No, I do not.

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 MR. DeVITA: That's it. Thank you. 2 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Others have questions? 3 4 Please come forward. MR. SALERNO: Hi, Matt Salerno, M-A-T-T 5 S-A-L-E-R-N-O, 164 N. Van Dien Avenue, Ridgewood. 6 7 Just three questions for Blais. First is just one of clarification. 8 9 You testified earlier that the setback on the N. Van Dien and Ben Franklin side was an increase from the 10 11 current ordinance, which requires a minimum setback of 40 feet, you said? 12 13 THE WITNESS: Yes. MR. SALERNO: As I read the current 14 15 hospital ordinance, it requires a minimum rear yard

MR. SALERNO: As I read the current hospital ordinance, it requires a minimum rear yard and side yard setback of three feet per one foot of building height, which would equate to a 60-foot setback for a 20-foot tall building; 144-foot setback for a 48-foot tall building; and the new ordinance provides for a 47-foot setback for a 20-foot building, compared to a 60-foot and 74 feet for a 48-foot tall building versus 144 feet for a 48-foot tall building.

Was your testimony before inaccurate or were you comparing it to a different ordinance; i.e.,

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And my last question picks up on a question raised by one of the Planning Board members, which goes to the use of the word "at maturity" with respect to vegetative screening. It strikes me again that if the function of the screening is only

required to be equivalent to the current function at
maturity, as you said, there could be a 10 to 20-year
interval before there is equivalent function of
screening, and that the hospital could today choose
to plant a sapling, for example, that would take
20 years to reach equivalent function, why shouldn't
the hospital be required to replace with equivalent

That's it.

functional screening today?

MS. RAZIN: I just didn't hear, I think it was your second question, the "should" versus "shall," I just want to know, you said the "shall" is in the zoning ordinance, right?

MR. SALERNO: "Shall" is in the current hospital ordinance, yes.

MS. RAZIN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: When I referred to the increased setback, I was referring to the front yard setback only. You're correct in that the side and rear yard is three times the building height, and the proposal now and before was less of a setback than the current ordinance requires. But the current ordinance front yard is 40 feet, and this proposal at the very least is 47 and it increases up to 200 feet, depending upon which building we're talking about and

- 1 which floor of the building we're talking about. 2 So, when I was talking about an increase, I was only referring to the front yard 3 4 setback. 5 And the front yard setback on both Linwood and Van Dien is proposed to increase in this 6 7 plan from what is currently required in the ordinance, but not the side and rear yard. 8 9 As to "shall" versus "should," I thought I had spoken to that but I'll say it again. 10 11 This whole document is advisory. It's advising the council of what the ordinance should 12 say, not what the developer should do. 13 14 So, when I say "should" here, I'm saying that the ordinance should require, and the 15 ordinance should say "shall," not that the ordinance 16 17 should allow discretion. So when the ordinance is written, then 18 it would say "shall." 19 20 And then as to the --21 MS. DOCKRAY: Blais, given, but it may not necessarily have to say "shall." I mean, they 22 may not have to write the ordinance that way then. 23 Is that correct? 24
- THE WITNESS: No, no. I mean, I took

"shall" away because it implied that this document

had the effect of requiring it, when it fact it

doesn't. Only the ordinance can have the effect of

requiring compliance.

The whole Master Plan document, the Planning Board has no authority to impose requirements that have the effect of law, they can only recommend to the council that it adopt ordinances or other programs that have that effect.

So, the change was to avoid that confusion, that this document is in fact a parallel zoning ordinance, it's not, it's the basis for an ordinance, and we're saying that the ordinance should require this. All right.

The council may disagree and may require something else. So it's advisory and discretionary only to the council. This is what the Planning Board is, if adopted, recommending that the council's ordinance do, and that's the simple answer. It was not in intended to allow discretion.

Now, there may be some provisions where there may be more than one alternative approach that achieves the same end, and in which case you may allow discretion in that case, but if that were to happen, you should say what the end result should be;

we don't necessarily care how you get there, but this
is what we want you to have at the end. So there's a
case where you would say shall do this, but how you
shall do it is maybe left open for discretion.

But, clearly, this is not intended to provide an option to do a good thing or not, that would be mandated by the ordinance.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Blais, bottom line, by changing the word "shall" to "should," have you taken anything away from the purpose of the document?

THE WITNESS: Absolutely not. We can say "shall" or "should." We could say "mandated." We could say whatever. It wouldn't give it anymore teeth than saying "shall." It's the ordinance.

Now, if the ordinance says "shall" versus "should," then yes, then you have a point to make, that if the ordinance says "should," then that implies an option for only a suggestion as opposed to a legal requirement and not the Master Plan.

21 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you, Blais.

"at maturity," the simple answer to that is that it's practically impossible in many cases, particularly when you're dealing with older trees, to replace them

say it -- a reverse effect.

4

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- with equivalents. You could do, like I said before,
  a number of things to try to achieve immediate
  equivalence, but you can actually have a -- how do I
- They've actually done studies in the
  planting of trees, and they have found that, as is
  often the case, the larger the initial planted size,
  the greater the transplant shock.
- And by "transplant shock," I mean the larger the tree, the larger the root system.
- When a tree is dug and moved, that root system is damaged, and it takes a tree a long time to recover from that damage.
  - When you cut the roots of the tree, the top of the tree, the branches and the leaves, show that effect. And typically in a nursery, when you dig up a tree and you move it, you're cutting the roots, putting a bulb and burlap around those roots, but you're also cutting the top of the tree to compensate for that loss of root system.
  - And the bigger the tree, the more you're having to compensate for the loss of that root system.
- And what they have found in studies is,
  they planted large trees with that concurrent greater

transplant shock and smaller trees with less
transplant shock, and they found because of the
recovery period of the larger tree, within a fairly
short period of time, the smaller tree actually
caught up to and passed the larger tree in size.

So, you can try to say, well, we'll have equivalent sized trees. A, you may not be able to buy them from a nursery, because if you're taking down a 30-foot tree, most nurseries aren't stocking trees that size, because there's very little demand. And because of that higher risk of transplanting of the loss or decline of that tree, they just don't do that very much at all.

And because over time a smaller tree may actually outperform the bigger tree in its initial size, within 5 to 10 years, that smaller tree may actually be bigger than the bigger tree and you have less risk of losing it.

So although it would be nice if
equivalency could be achieved immediately, there are
a number of practical difficulties to doing so. And
that's why it says at maturity, like I said, if it
can be achieved in other ways, such as a denser
planting or using berms or things like that, then I'm
sure that's something that would be explored at the

```
B. Brancheau - Public Questions
                                                    88
time of site plan.
              The principle is laid down here, but
the details of that, obviously have to wait for site
plan and how that can be achieved.
              CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you, Blais,
and thank you.
              Other people who have questions for
Blais? Again, specific questions for Blais. You've
already asked your questions.
              MS. BANEY: I know.
              In good faith, this is not going to be
troublesome, I promise, it's just a to put closure on
the fact --
              CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Come forward, Ms.
Baney, and I am not going to allow this again.
              MS. BANEY: I'm sorry, but the answer I
got did not answer, he said I don't know.
              CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Just ask the
question, please, Ms. Baney, spell your name.
              MS. BANEY: Lisa Baney, B-A-N-E-Y, at
136 Brookside Avenue.
              I just simply wanted to ask, I think
you said you didn't know.
              If you could get back to us at maybe
```

the next hearing, whether it would be 47 feet from

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

```
B. Brancheau - Public Questions
                                                    89
the building to the street or 47 feet to where the
kids walk on the sidewalk, that's all, to the edge.
Thank you. That's a yes?
              THE WITNESS: Yes, I'll check it.
              MS. BANEY: Thank you very much, I'm so
sorry about that question.
              THE WITNESS: It may be the hospital
knows it as well and they can answer it.
              CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Are there other
questions from the public. Again, this is questions
for Blais regarding his testimony.
              MS. ROMERO: Oh, I'm sorry, I have
questions about this document. Would that be --
              CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: If it's a redline
section that he spoke about, the answer is yes. If
it's something that's existing, no.
              Come forward, we'll tell you if it's
appropriate.
              Please state and spell your name.
              MS. ROMERO: Marisol Romero,
M-A-R-I-S-O-L R-O-M-E-R-O, 258 Steilen Avenue.
              And I'm sorry I'm late to the game, I
had to put my kids to bed. Forgive me.
              And obviously living on Steilen Avenue,
```

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I have a lot of questions.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: You have five minutes to ask your questions, so what I would suggest is just go through them, allow Blais to take note, and then he'll answer them.

MS. ROMERO: Okay.

On page seven, this is under the title Buffers - Site Landscaping, you know, I see, I circled adjacent to Steilen Avenue properties 20 feet, and then I looked at the details, I quess my question is: When it talks about a sound barrier, fence wall, are we talking about a cement wall? What do we consider a sound barrier fence wall? I quess that would be my one question, how would that look. Especially because with the way I'm looking at the diagram on page six and where my house sits, because I do backup to the hospital, I think, if I'm gauging this right, my house would backup to the Cheel Building, I don't know if I'm saying that right, and actually it's one of the houses that would have the shortest distance to the proposed buildings. So it would only be 70 feet, if I'm reading this right. And again, forgive me, I'm not used to reading diagrams.

So I have obviously a concern about and questions regarding the sound barrier wall and how

```
B. Brancheau - Public Questions
                                                          91
1
    would that look. And I know it says mitigating noise
    from loading activities, truck traffic and other
2
    stuff.
3
4
                   And I also had a question about on page
5
    eight, the Illumination, it says, I'm just
    underlining here quickly:
6
7
                   "If necessary to ensure adequate
            protection of surrounding residential areas,
8
9
            the top levels of decks should not be used
            during nighttime hours and the illumination of
10
11
            such levels turned off."
                   And one of the questions I have is:
12
    Who determines this, if necessary?
13
14
                   I guess I just have concerns, like when
    we use language "if necessary, if applicable," who
15
16
    really -- in my eyes or my mind it's not firm
17
    designated verbiage that strictly says yes or no.
    quess my big question is: Who determines whether the
18
    lights go on or off and at what time?
19
20
                   And then also on page nine --
21
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Two minutes remaining.
                   MS. ROMERO: Sorry.
22
23
                   Page nine, talking about Traffic and
24
    Street Improvements:
25
                   "Synchronization of the signal timing
```

at the intersections of Linwood Avenue and Van 1 Dien and Linwood Avenue and N. Pleasant 2 Avenue". 3 I guess I'm just curious how that would 4 5 affect or, I mean, would you have additional -because I'm thinking about my children walk to 6 school. Even with the synchronization, et cetera, of 7 signal timing, they should have additional crossing 8 9 quards in those areas, especially because, you know, we see all the traffic from the children walking, not 10 11 just BF, but Travel, and also coming back from the high school. 12 13 That was it. 14 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you. 15 MS. RAZIN: I'm going to try and address a couple of your issues, because I don't know 16 17 if you were here at the beginning of the hearings. MS. ROMERO: No, I was putting my 18 19 children to bed. 20 MS. RAZIN: One of the issues we went 21 over is the document that -- you have the redline version? 22

23 MS. ROMERO: Yes.

24

25

MS. RAZIN: So the redline version,

we're here to discuss the changes to the 2014

document that have now been revised to the 2016
proposed Master Plan.

MS. ROMERO: Okay.

MS. RAZIN: So the document that has the redline, if you see the redline, what's that issue and what's the ordinance and what Blais testified about.

I think, unfortunately, all the things that you asked about are not redlined, but I think you can probably get your questions answered if you either go to Michael, the Board Secretary, or look online, you can probably get a better idea of what all the barriers and the buffers along Steilen Avenue will look like based on, because there's no change.

So whatever was proposed in 2014 is still in effect, and that will continue to be in effect or continue to be part of the record.

So the record is on file and part of the file is still available online. And if you have any trouble with that, Michael can contact me.

With regard to the top level, the issue about the "if necessary," that can maybe be addressed in conditions that Valley is going to be forwarding or whether that's necessary language as to whether the illumination can be turned off.

And the traffic and street improvements were all part of the '13 and '14 amendment and no testimony about traffic and street improvements was provided. In fact, in the very beginning, Mr. Drill said that this witness will confirm that there's been no changes, so there's going to be no inquiry on traffic testimony this evening.

But you can read, as I think

Mr. Brancheau said, that all the traffic reports and all the transcripts are still available from the '13 and '14 hearings and are available for any review.

So certainly you can get a good scope of what that testimony and all the reports said at that time, but that should answer your questions.

To the extent that those details were worked out at the time, because with respect to traffic, there's county road issues and some of those details are not yet finalized at all.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Just to also clarify, the information is available, Michael can help you find it, if you have difficulty online.

We're just not permitted to get into that detail during this process. We're actually restricted from getting into that, so that's the reason why we're not answering your questions.

```
Α.
                  I have a degree in landscape architect.
1
2
    For many years, I maintained a license as a landscape
3
    architect.
4
                   MR. DRILL: That's all.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you.
5
                   Katie, do you have any questions for
6
7
    Blais?
                   MS. RAZIN: No.
9
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you very
10
    much.
11
                   Is there a motion to close public?
12
                   VICE-CHAIRMAN JOEL: Motion to close
    public.
13
14
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Is there a
    second, please.
15
                   MS. BIGOS: I'll second.
16
17
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Michael, will you
    call the roll.
18
19
                   (At this point in the proceeding roll
20
    call is taken and the motion is passed by a vote of
21
    seven in favor, with Ms. Patire not voting, and Mayor
    Aronsohn, Councilwoman Knudsen, and Ms. Altano
22
23
    absent.)
24
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: So we're now
    closed for public questions for Blais. We're going
25
```

```
1
    to take a ten and a half minute break, at 9:45 we'll
2
    reconvene. During that time, Laura is going to
    resume as the court reporter and Kim is leaving.
4
    Let's start again in ten minutes.
                   (Whereupon, a brief recess is taken.)
5
6
                   (Exhibits A-1 through A-17 are
7
           premarked for identification.)
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay.
                                                Ladies and
8
9
    gentlemen, we're going to begin to take our seats.
10
    It's ten minutes to ten almost.
11
                   Okay, let us begin. I will just note
    that Councilwoman Knudsen has joined us in addition
12
13
    since we started the meeting.
                   MR. DRILL: The mic's not on.
14
1.5
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I will just note
    that Councilwoman Knudsen has joined us in addition
16
17
    since we started the meeting.
18
                   Michael, roll, please.
19
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Ms. Bigos?
                   MS. BIGOS: Here.
20
21
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Councilwoman Knudsen?
22
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Here.
23
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Nalbantian?
24
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Here.
25
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Joel?
```

```
1
                   VICE CHAIRMAN JOEL: Here.
2
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Reilly?
3
                   MR. REILLY: Here.
4
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Ms. Dockray?
5
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Here.
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Thurston?
6
7
                   MR. THURSTON: Here.
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Abdalla?
8
9
                   MR. ABDALLA: Here.
10
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Ms. Patire?
                   MS. PATIRE: Here.
11
12
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you,
13
    Michael. Okay.
14
                   Before the break we concluded the
15
    testimony and cross-examine and questions for Blais
    with regard to his presentation. And at this time we
16
17
    will proceed with Valley Hospital and their call of
18
    witnesses.
19
                   Jon?
                   MR. DRILL: Yes. I'd like to call
20
21
    Maria Mediago as my witness, next witness.
22
                   THE COURT REPORTER: Please raise your
23
    right hand.
24
                   Do you swear or affirm the testimony
25
    you're about to give will be the truth, the whole
```

- 1 truth and nothing but the truth?
- MS. MEDIAGO: I do.
- 3 MARIA MEDIAGO,
- 4 | Having been duly sworn, testifies as follows:
- 5 THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you. Please
- 6 state your name and just spell it for the record.
- 7 MS. MEDIAGO: Maria Mediago, M-a-r-i-a
- $8 \mid M-e-d-i-a-g-o.$
- 9 DIRECT EXAMINATION
- 10 BY MR. DRILL:
- 11 Q. Can you identify yourself for the board
- 12 and your relationship to Valley Hospital?
- 13 A. I serve as the vice president of
- 14 facilities management at Valley Hospital.
- 15 Q. And what is your area of expertise?
- A. Primarily there are two areas that are
- 17 | relevant here; the first one has to do with health
- 18 care facilities management and construction, and the
- 19 second is health care construction, project planning
- 20 and management.
- 21 Q. And how do you come to the task that
- 22 you acquire this expertise?
- 23 A. Primarily through on-the-job training.
- 24 | I graduated from Columbia University in 1974 with a
- 25 | Bachelor of Science Degree in electrical engineering

- and have served in construction management and
  planning, project management, facilities planning and
  maintenance positions since that time.
  - I have primarily served at an executive level in facilities positions at a variety of hospitals.

1.5

- My first job was at Exxon Research and Engineering in Florham Park, New Jersey, where I worked from 1974 to 1983 as a project controls engineer. My career in construction started there as I served as the owner's representative on many of the projects that I designed during their construction.
- From 1984 to 1988 I worked for the Mountainside Hospital in Montclair, New Jersey, where I acted as the director of construction and the owner's representative, responsible for the design and construction of their new North building.
- From 1988 to 1995, I worked for Cathedral Health Care System in Newark, New Jersey, as the corporate vice president of facilities development.
- In addition to operational responsibilities of the day-to-day running of the hospital facilities, I was in charge of the design and construction of a new project at the St.

on the campus.

- From 1995 to 1997 I worked for Jersey

  City Medical Center in Jersey City as vice president

  of construction, and was responsible for the planning

  and design of the new relocated medical center.
  - From 1997 to 2002, I worked for St.

    Joseph's Regional Medical Center in Paterson, New

    Jersey, as the assistant vice president of

    facilities. I was completely responsible for the

    planning, design and construction of the new St.

    Vincent's Nursing Home that was built in Cedar Grove,

    New Jersey. And I was also responsible for the

development of an eight-phased Facilities Master Plan

And since 2002, I have worked for The Valley Hospital here in Ridgewood as vice president of facilities management.

for the Medical Center at St. Joseph's.

- Q. And what are your job responsibilities as vice president of facilities management for the hospital?
- A. I have a broad scope for the exercise of independent initiative and judgment and have

- direct oversight and fiscal responsibility for the
  departments of facilities development, plant
  operations, engineering, environmental services -otherwise known as housekeeping -- materials
  management, food and nutrition, property management,
  park safety, security and traffic guards. In that
- park safety, security and traffic guards. In that regard, I report directly to the chief operating officer at The Valley Hospital.

1.5

- In addition, I have complete responsibility for the planning, design and construction of all capital facility projects for the hospital system. All architects, engineers, planners, contractors and vendors working for the hospital in the areas of planning, design, construction and construction management all report to me. For these efforts, including for this project, I report directly to the president and chief executive officer.
- Q. Now, with specific reference to the proposed upgrade and modernization project, which was the subject of the 2013 to 2014 Master Plan Amendment hearing which is the subject of this 2016 Master Plan Amendment, what responsibilities do you have?
- A. I am responsible for overseeing the development of the plans and designs for the proposed

project. Again, all architects, engineers, planners,

contracts -- contractors and vendors working on this

project report directly to me.

- Q. Have you ever testified before a planning board or a board of adjustment in the State of New Jersey?
- A. I believe that I have participated in one working session here at the Ridgewood Planning Board that was conducted during the development of the 2010 Master Plan, but I did not testify during those public hearings. I attended all of the public hearing sessions on the proposed 2013-2014 Master Plan Amendment, but I did not testify during that hearing. This is my first time to testify during a board proceeding.
- MR. DRILL: I would like to say there's always a first time.
  - So at this point I want to ask the board to accept Ms. Mediago as an expert in healthcare facilities management and construction, and as an expert in construction project planning and management.
- CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Does the board have any questions with regard to this?
- MS. DOCKRAY: Just one quick question,

```
1
    I assume this is not something that would be a
    license -- for which you would get a license?
2
3
                   THE WITNESS: No, it is not.
4
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay, just want to make
5
    sure.
                   Thank you.
6
7
                   THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
                   MS. RAZIN: Maria, did we swear you in?
8
9
                   MR. DRILL:
                              Yes.
10
                   MS. RAZIN:
                              We did?
11
                   MR. DRILL:
                              Yes.
12
                   MS. RAZIN: Sorry, just double
13
    checking.
14
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: The board accepts
    her as the witness.
15
                   BY MR. DRILL:
16
                   Okay. Can you summarize for the board,
17
            Q.
    before you get into the details of your presentation
18
19
    and for members of the public, the purpose of the
20
    proposed project and the reason the hospital is
21
    seeking this 2016 Master Plan Amendment?
22
                   The major purpose of this project is to
23
    replace the outdated Phillips building which contains
24
    two-bedded patient rooms with single patient rooms,
```

to construct new operating theatres, to accommodate

new technology and the mechanical infrastructure to support all of the above.

We need to do this in a code compliant manner and within health care standards.

Q. Can you describe the differences in the project as contemplated by the 2016 Master Plan

Amendment now being considered by the board as compared to the project that was contemplated by the failed 2014 Master Plan Amendment?

A. Yes, I can.

The best way for me to do this is to first describe the project contemplated by the 2014 Master Plan Amendment.

I ask that you put the 2013-2014 Master Plan bird's-eye view exhibit up on the screen, which we have marked as Exhibit A-1 in these proceedings -
MR. DRILL: And just for the record, so there's a thumb drive which has all 17 of our exhibits that we're going to be showing.

I made hard copies of all these exhibits and premarked them and gave them to Michael before the hearing commenced, and once the hearing is over that thumb drive is the property of the Planning Board, you could put it up on your website or whatever. Every single individual 17 files on the

thumb drive, I have done it by, it says "2016, A-1,"

"2016, A-2," and then there's a description after it

and the file names so you can just post them right on

the website and anyone who's interested could then

click on any exhibit and not have to hunt around and

see what they are.

## BY MR. DRILL:

- Q. Okay. So A-1 is up there on the screen, Maria.
- A. Okay. This visual slide, as you can see, is page -- slide 28 from Exhibit A-2 that was entered into evidence on April 2nd, 2013.

Exhibit A-1 reflects the fact that the only building that would remain on this site after both phases of the project are complete is the Cheel building.

- Q. And you're indicating with your laser pointer the Cheel building which is in the dark color?
- A. Yes, I am.

It also shows the new proposed North building -- again, this was the 2013-14 -- as a five-story building with a mechanical penthouse.

The new North building at that time

```
1
    would have a height of 80 feet with a 24-foot high
    mechanical penthouse on top, for a total of 94 feet.
2
3
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Maria, excuse me.
4
                   Let the record show that Mayor Aronsohn
5
    has joined the board.
                   (Whereupon, Mayor Aronsohn is now
6
7
           present at the hearing.)
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you.
8
9
                   THE WITNESS: Now I ask that you
    proceed to the new 2016 Master Plan bird's-eye view.
10
11
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Maria, may I ask,
12
    if you could, just for the public's sake, if you
13
    could delineate the locations of the roads because it
    is difficult to see on there.
14
                   MR. DRILL: Okay. We'll do that with
1.5
    this new exhibit. We've labeled this exhibit.
16
17
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: It's hard to see.
18
                   MR. DRILL: Okay.
19
                   THE WITNESS: So this exhibit shows the
20
    proposed 2016 Master Plan bird's-eye view. This is
    North Van Dien Avenue (indicating).
21
22
                   By MR. DRILL:
23
                   Again, when you say "this," you're
            Q.
24
    taking the laser pointer --
25
           Α.
                I am pointing to --
```

```
1
            Q. -- and you're pointing to the image
    that's up on the screen; correct?
2
3
            Α.
                  Correct. I am now pointing to North
4
    Van Dien Avenue now on the exhibit (indicating).
                   This is Meadowbrook Avenue
5
6
     (indicating).
7
                   To the north is the Ben Franklin Middle
    School driveway and property (indicating).
8
9
                   To the east is Steilen Avenue
10
     (indicating).
11
                   And to the west is Linwood Avenue
12
     (indicating).
13
            Q.
                  To the south?
                   To the south is Linwood Avenue.
14
            Α.
15
            Q.
                  Right?
            Α.
                  Excuse me.
16
17
            Q.
                  Right.
18
            Α.
                  You can see that the North building --
    well, it will now have a height of 56 feet with a
19
20
    24-foot mechanical penthouse on top, for a total
21
    building height from grade to mechanical of 80 feet.
```

A. That is correct.

And some of the eliminated square

And is that because the fifth patient

22

23

Ο.

floor was eliminated?

- footage would be placed in a wedding cake style

  stacking on the North Van Dien side of the building.
  - Q. Again indicating with the laser pointer?

A. Right here, grade, levels two through four, and the mechanical penthouse set back even further (indicating).

And I want to point out that the same holds true for the West building which I am now indicating with the pointer (indicating).

The grade level of the West building, step back levels two, three and four, and further step back the mechanical penthouse (indicating).

I also want to point out that the basement levels of both the North and the West building remain exactly the same as they did in 2013 and '14. And the basement of the West building, which is under grade level, I am indicating here with the pointer (indicating), is being built now in Phase I instead of Phase II as proposed in the 2013 and 2014 Master Plan.

Q. And that's just the basement, the rest of the West building from the first floor up to the top floor is going to be built as part of Phase II; correct?

- A. That is correct.
- I ask that you please put up the

  2013-2014 Master Plan site section exhibit up on the
- 4 screen.

5

14

15

- Q. And that would be Exhibit A-3?
- A. That is correct.
- Okay. This is the 2013-2014 site

  8 sections. This visual slide is actually a slide 18

  9 from Exhibit A-12 that was entered into evidence on

  10 May 29th, 2013.
- Exhibit A-3 shows the West building,

  which I'm pointing out right now with my laser

  pointer, on the bottom section of this slide --
  - Q. Could you point to the garage of the West building also, let me describe it, with the -- with the basement of that West building --
- 17 A. Yes.
- 18 Q. -- with the laser pointer?
- A. Now, again, that reference point of grade, I am pointing out right here (indicating) with the laser pointer. I'm sorry my hand is shaking.
- 22 The basement level is shown in white, and that's the
- 23 basement level of the West building (indicating).
- MS. DOCKRAY: Excuse me. Is this --
- 25 the top is existing and the bottom is 2016?

```
MR. DRILL: No, no.
1
                   THE WITNESS: There is no West building
2
3
    in the existing site.
4
                  MS. DOCKRAY: That's what I mean so the
    top is?
5
                   MR. DRILL: This is all 2014. We
6
7
    haven't gotten to 2016 yet. This is --
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay.
9
                   MR. DRILL: This is --
10
                  MS. DOCKRAY: So 2014 is the bottom.
11
                  MR. DRILL: Yes.
12
                   THE WITNESS: The bottom --
13
                  MS. DOCKRAY: Okay.
14
                   THE WITNESS: -- existing is on the top.
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay. And you have the
15
    basement extending out from the building?
16
17
                   THE WITNESS: Correct.
18
                  MR. DRILL: And it's been that way
19
    since --
20
                   THE WITNESS: And it's not -- and it
21
    has not changed.
22
                  MS. DOCKRAY: And so it's just
23
    underground and there's no -- it's just underground?
24
                   THE WITNESS: Yes.
25
                  MS. DOCKRAY: You just have basement?
```

```
1
                   THE WITNESS: Yes. It's a lower level
    that in 2013 and 2014 was proposed, it was an area
2
    that was proposed to be built below grade.
3
4
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay. Thank you.
5
                   THE WITNESS: And the rest of the
    floors, grade through four, were shown on top with
6
7
    the penthouse on top of the entire floor.
                   The upper floors were at a setback back
8
9
    in 2013-14 at 100 feet from the property line. And
10
    the lower level was 47 feet from the property line
11
    (indicating). This was the 2013-2014 Master Plan
12
    Amendment.
13
                   If we can now move to the next slide...
    BY MR. DRILL:
14
                   The next slide, the next slide is going
15
            Q.
    to be the 2016 Master Plan site Section D exhibit,
16
17
    which we've marked as Exhibit A-4?
18
           Α.
                  That's correct.
19
                   You'll now see that the West building
20
    still has a lower level that's projected below grade
21
    to be within 47 feet of the North Van Dien property
22
    line.
23
                   Our proposal is to build the first
24
    grade level with a setback of 55 feet to North Van
25
    Dien.
```

- Levels two, three and four remain as
  they did in 2013-2014 at 100 feet from the North Van
  Dien property line.
- And the penthouse is set back even

  further at 115 feet from the North Van Dien property

  line.
  - Q. And did we just stipulate and agree before that we would add a green roof on top of that first floor level of the West building?

8

9

16

17

18

19

20

21

- 10 A. Yes, we did. And that is planned right 11 here (indicating).
- I will now move on to the next slide
  which is Exhibit A-5 in this presentation.
- Q. And is that the 2013-2014 Master Plan site Section E exhibit?
  - A. That is correct. And it is the visual slide 19 from Exhibit A-12, that was entered into evidence on May 29th, 2013.
    - Here we show that the North building then was contemplated to have its basement, lower level, within 47 feet of the North Van Dien property line.
- Levels one through five, grade through
  five, were going to be stacked right on top of it, at
  a setback of 120 square feet with the mechanical

```
1 penthouse on top of the whole building.
```

- 2 If we now proceed to the 2016 proposed 3 site section --
- Q. That is the 2016 Master Plan Site

  Section D exhibit which we've marked as Exhibit A-6;

  correct?
- 7 A. This is Section D, Section E.
- 8 O. Section E?
- 9 A. Right.
- 10 Q. If I said "A" I misspoke.
- 11 A. Okay.
- Yes, this is what we're now proposing
- 13 in the 2016 Master Plan Amendment.
- 14 Again, the proposed North building,
- 15 | lower level remains exactly as it did in the
- 16 | 2013-2014 proposed Master Plan Amendment. It's
- 17 | setback from the North Van Dien property line
- 18 | 47 feet.
- 19 However, levels two, three and four are
- 20 now set back at 75-feet from the North Van Dien
- 21 | property line. And the penthouse is set back 90 feet
- 22 from the North Van Dien property line.
- 23 Q. And, again, just to reiterate, there is
- 24 a -- there is proposed to be a green roof on top of
- 25 | the first floor of that proposed North building; is

1 that correct?

- A. That's correct. And it would be built in this section (indicating).
  - I also want to point out that the building roof, which is in the back of the property, has always had a green roof on top of it, and that is not changing in this proposed 2016 Master Plan.
  - Q. And could you just point out one other thing that's not changing, the wall on that rear property line?
  - A. Correct. In answer -- back in 2013-2014 the hospital was asked to include in its Master Plan, and of course this is a slice across the property (indicating), a 20-foot high wall, which is shown by this vertical straight line (indicating), that then sloped back -- this is all on the hospital property -- sloped back towards the Steilen Avenue backyards to provide a high-planted buffer so that the residents who live in houses along Steilen Avenue would have an even greater, even a higher buffer of the back of the North building.
    - O. And to answer --
  - A. Of the property actually.
- Q. And to answer Marisol Romero's question about what would that wall look like and whether --

- and if there's a buffer, in fact, so she doesn't have
- 2 to ask Michael tomorrow, isn't Exhibit A-12, slide
- 3 | 10, of Exhibit A-12, show the wall and the
- 4 | landscaping on that sloped area?
- 5 A. That's correct.

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. You don't have this exhibit, Maria and I were just talking about.
- All right. So let's move on to the next exhibit, let's deal with the setbacks.
- So I ask that the next exhibit now be

  put up, which should be the 2013-2014 Master Plan

  Setback exhibit, and that's been marked as Exhibit

  A-7?
- A. Correct. This is also the visual slide

  21 from Exhibit A-29 that was entered into evidence

  on July 16th, 2013.
  - The only changes to the setbacks that will change from Exhibit A-7 are along the westerly sides of the North Van Dien property line in front of the North building and the West building and --
  - Q. And we'll show that on the next exhibit and Blais has been through this, so why don't we just go to the next exhibit instead of us being duplicative.
- So can you go to the next exhibit which

1 should be --

- A. That's it.
  - Q. -- Exhibit A-8, which is the 2016 setback exhibit, and that's actually a -- that's from the proposed 2016 Master Plan; correct?
    - A. That is correct.
  - Q. And, again, unless you feel a burning desire to talk about it, since it's already been discussed, don't feel compelled to talk about it.

If you have anything you want to say about it, say it, maybe people will have questions for you, but do you want to say anything or not?

A. Yes, I do.

I think this is an opportune time to point out what's happening within this 40-foot buffer on the northern side of the North Van Dien -- of the North building. Within this 40-foot buffer, in addition to a heavily landscaped buffer right along the property line, there is also a fire lane that employs the use of vegetative hard surface so the grass can grow up in between these hard surface bricks, so to speak, that provide enough support for a fire truck if it needs to.

Q. So these are something that some people refer to as planted pavers?

A. Correct, correct. And right now there's a gate between the Ben Franklin driveway and the hospital property to allow emergency vehicles access to the hospital property in order to fight fires or respond to other emergencies.

1.5

And this whole wing, after -- inside of the heavily landscaped buffer, not at the gate, is planted in that manner.

Also, the curb ramp of the grade above level four of the North building called for our Kurth Cottage and visitors dining to be in this area of the North building (indicating). And there is a potential for some tables to be out around this corner, in good weather only.

- Q. And, again, you're indicating with the laser pointer --
- A. The northwest corner of the site with the 47-foot buffer along North Van Dien and slightly turning the corner within the 40-foot buffer on the northern side.
- Q. So what did the hospital agree to do to mitigate the changes in those westerly setbacks along North Van Dien by virtue of a westerly side of the North building, which will be constructed in Phase I, and the westerly side of the West building that's

going to be constructed in Phase II, being closer to North Van Dien than in the 2014 plan?

1.5

A. The key to mitigating these decreased setbacks along the westerly side of the North and West building is additional landscaping and varied building materials as provided for in paragraph 4B of the remand order.

I will read from the remand order in this regard, because the additional landscaping and varied building materials are not limited only to the westerly sides of the West and the North buildings.

The remand order provides, in paragraph 4B, that:

"In order to create more of a campus feel and appearance, and to further enhance the aesthetics of new construction and to mitigate visible mass, the 2016 Master Plan shall provide for the following: Addition of pathways for use by patients, visitors and employees; addition of existing landscaping design such as water features and outdoor gardens and patios, with the inclusion in other areas of the property; addition of landscaping and shrubbery to the outdoor dining area along the common property line

1 between the Benjamin Franklin Middle School."

1.5

- Q. And not to cut you off at this point, I am going to start you up again, but can you take the laser pointer and point out where that area is because there was a board member question about that?
  - A. It's right at this corner (indicating).
  - Q. You're pointing to the?
- A. The northwest corner of the property and the northwest corner of the North building. It doesn't extend fully down this buffer (indicating).
- Q. And that's an existing condition proposed to continue; correct?
  - A. Existing condition in the 2013-2014

    Master Plan. And it's proposed to continue into the 2016 Master Plan.
    - Q. All right. Can you continue on the -
      MS. DOCKRAY: At the same physical

      location within that buffer, the 47 feet, that's

      where the outdoor dining was.

THE WITNESS: It was going -- it is -it was proposed to turn this corner (indicating). So
there is an exit door out of Kurth Cottage that was
proposed, in order to provide an opportunity -- an
opportunity for outdoor dining when the weather is
good.

```
MS. DOCKRAY: But it was 120 feet back,
1
    not 47.
2
3
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 That's correct.
4
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Thank you.
5
                               MR. DRILL: Just putting it
6
    out there, if the board wants us to get rid of that,
7
    we'll get rid of it.
    We thought it would be, you know, nice for the
9
    hospital staff and everything, but if you don't think
10
    that it should be there because it somehow takes away
11
    from landscaping, we will eliminate it, just let us
12
    know.
13
                   THE WITNESS:
                                Right.
                   BY MR. DRILL:
14
15
                   Can you keep on going?
            Q.
                   On the addition of landscaping and -- -
16
            Α.
17
    oh, I just did that one.
18
            0.
                   Yes.
19
                   Provisions for mandatory replacement of
            Α.
    all trees eliminated in the Linwood and/or North Van
20
21
    Dien right-of-way due to off-street improvements.
22
                   Provision for the use of "invisible"
23
    parapets, where safety features are required and
24
    parapets are not needed for screening.
25
                  And we're not going to go into details
            Q.
```

1 | about that because Blais did it.

2 A. Correct.

1.5

Provision for the use of varied building materials, texture and color, at the exterior of the mechanical penthouses, including but not limited to the mechanical penthouses of the North building and to be used in the construction of any parapets that cannot be constructed as "invisible" parapets necessary for screening of rooftop mechanical equipment of a "green screen" shall be installed in front of the exterior of the North building and the West building mechanical penthouses, only with the exception of areas that are not directly in front of air louvres.

- Q. Again, just to -- we had a board member question about that, we gave a little answer, but could you give a more detailed answer about exactly what is a green screen?
  - A. Surely.
- Q. And what areas around the mechanical penthouse facade it would be?
- A. A green screen usually provides for a mesh or strings of metal offset from the building structure, in the area of two to four feet, upon which growing vines, ivy, crawling, creeping

1 plantings can grow.

- It is proposed that those vegetative

  screens, green screens, would be placed wherever

  there are not louvres along the mechanical penthouse

  perimeter, so as not to impede the intake and exhaust

  of air from the mechanical room.
  - Q. Okay. You can go back to the -- I think you just have one more point to hit on that remand order.
    - A. "In addition, an addition of a green roof with planting in addition to grass on the one story of the western elevation of the proposed North building" --
    - Q. And we also --
  - A. -- but we also tonight, we talked about we never intended not to plant a green roof on the one-story addition in the West building.
  - Q. Okay. Changing topics, were photo simulations of the new buildings prepared under your supervision and control?
  - A. Yes, I directed Steve Evers, the project architect, to prepare photo simulations.
- Q. And can you briefly describe to the board and the public how the photo simulations were created?

- 1 A. It's okay.
- Q. Give the preparation before we go into
- 3 | the first one.
- A. Sure. The base photographs were taken
- 5 in 2010 using a digital camera at each location.
- Now, for this, I'd like to go back to
- 7 | slide -- is it A-1? Yes.
  - 0. It's --
- 9 A. Correct. Thank you very, very much.
- 10 So there were six locations that I'll
- 11 point out right now on this full color bird's-eye
- 12 view. There was --
- Q. Actually, let's use, if you don't mind,
- 14 Exhibit A-2 instead of A-1, the next one. This is
- 15 | the 2016 bird's eye.
- A. Correct.
- So photo simulations were done from the
- 18 ball field at Ben Franklin Middle School to the
- 19 northern side of the North building. They were also
- 20 taken from the intersection of Meadowbrook Avenue,
- 21 one house west of Van Dien, as well as at the
- 22 intersection which is off --
- Q. Off the chart.
- A. -- off this chart at the intersection
- 25 of Meadowbrook and Bogert Avenue.

Photo simulation was done in the
approximate location of the existing southerly
driveway into the hospital campus. That driveway in
the proposed 2013 and continuing into the 2016 Master
Plan Amendment was moved north. The view is in front
of the garage.

- Q. So the view the photo simulation is going to show is what the Phillips garage would look like from that area?
  - A. Correct.

1.5

- Q. And not to backtrack, but the photo sims from the Ben Franklin Middle School ball field and the two points along Meadowbrook would show the North building; correct?
  - A. Correct.

There are two other points where photo simulations were taken. They were taken from the rear yard of 258 Steilen Avenue, as well as in front of 318 Steilen Avenue.

- Q. Okay. So now can we go into the photo simulations, so I guess the first one would be Exhibit A-9.
- 23 A. A-9.
- FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can we turn
  the lights out so we can maybe see the contrast a

```
1
    little better in the photos?
                   THE WITNESS: Sure.
2
3
                   FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Is that all
4
    right?
5
                               There we go.
                   MR. DRILL:
6
                   FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Oh, yeah,
7
    thank you.
                Much better.
                   THE WITNESS: All right.
9
                   So here we are taking a long view
10
    shooting eastward from the intersection of
11
    Meadowbrook and Bogert Avenue towards the new North
    building (indicating).
12
13
                   Here we tried to depict a change in
14
    material; instead of it being all brick as it was in
    2013-2014, the change in texture and color.
15
                   Again, it's not definitive at this
16
    point but the intent --
17
18
                   BY MR. DRILL:
19
            0.
                   Hold on. Well, let me put it this way:
20
    These photo simulations, you've obviously depicted
21
    colors or materials for the photo simulations?
22
                   Correct.
            Α.
23
                   So when you're saying it's not
            Q.
24
    definitive, it's not like Valley's saying whatever
25
    color we want we get. What you're saying is whatever
```

- 1 color when we get to the site plan application that 2 the board wants --
  - A. Right.

- Q. -- the board would get; is that correct?
  - A. That is correct.
  - Q. So can you specify, when you're looking at this exhibit, the long view from Meadowbrook Avenue, what portion of the North building is in brick and what is the portion that to me at least, appears to be green, or when people look at this exhibit on their own computer it might be blue?
  - A. The portion of the structure of the North building that's in brick represents level -- grades, level one on grade through level four, and the area depicted in the light green is the mechanical penthouse.
    - Q. Okay.
  - A. Again, the intent is to have the top of the building be a texture and color so as to give the appearance that it blends into the sky, thereby diminishing the overall appearance of the building.
  - Q. And the design of the building 2014 had brick all the way up, and can you explain why the -- why there is a mechanical penthouse? Why don't you

just have mechanical equipment on top of the roof
with screening?

Why is it enclosed with a penthouse?

- A. The mechanical room is enclosed in the penthouse to offer visual -- to, A, to block it from view and also for sound attenuation, so as to keep the workings of what's in the penthouse quiet to the neighbors and also blocking it from the view of the neighbors.
- Q. Would you move to the next slide which should be Exhibit A-10.
  - A. Correct.

1.5

And this gives you a better close-up view of what we were just talking about on the long view. This is taken again on Meadowbrook, looking east towards the North building. And we're one house back from the intersection of Meadowbrook and North Van Dien.

Here you can see a more -- in better detail the brick stops at the level four patient level and then the textured material used on the penthouse, again in a color that will aid in making the bulk of the building appear less imposing.

Q. And, again, not to lock -- not to lock the value of the board into any material, but does

- that happen to be metal panels that are either like
  green, blue or grayish in that exhibit?
  - A. That would be a material that we would consider because if we're going to add some green screen in these areas, you're going to need a substantial backing in order to anchor the green screen, of some strength.
    - Q. But, again, if the board, when they get to site plan approval, wanted some different color, that would be acceptable to the hospital; correct?
      - A. That is correct.

1.5

- Q. And I just noted from looking at this photo simulation, it looks like the mechanical penthouse is on the same plain with the brick of the first floor -- the first four of the stories; is that mechanical penthouse in the same plain or is the mechanical penthouse set back a little?
- A. The patient tower is set back at 74 feet, the face of the penthouse is set back 90 feet, so there's a difference of 16 feet.
- Q. Okay. Can we go to the next exhibit?

  COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Excuse me, I

  just have a question.

THE WITNESS: Oh, sure. Sure.

25 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Sorry. Maria,

```
1
    just real quick, when I am looking at this mechanical
    penthouse it has kind of a bluish green color, to the
2
    left of that I see what appears to be brick building
3
4
    on top of the trees; is that --
5
                   THE WITNESS: What you're seeing is the
6
    stair tower that is at the back of the building.
7
                   It's an egress stair tower and it's
    depicted on some of the elevation sections.
                                                   It's not
8
9
    close to the street at all, it's at the back of the
10
    North building.
11
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: And what is the
    -- the setback from Van Dien from where we have been
12
    working all along from Van Dien to that particular
13
14
    structure, that particular part of the mass?
15
                   MR. DRILL: You're talking about what's
    the setback from the stair tower to Van Dien?
16
17
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Yeah, exactly.
    Like, if I took a -- just a sight line from the top
18
19
    of that brick to Van Dien, how far is -- what's the
20
    distance from the -- from the property line to that
21
    particular brick work, roughly?
                   THE WITNESS: It's roughly 200 feet.
22
23
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay.
24
    that --
```

MR. DRILL: And, again, if the board

- wanted the stair tower in a different material,

  Valley would make the stair tower in a different
- If you think, because it's a stair

  tower, brick looks more prominent and you want it to

  blend in more, then again, at site plan, if the board

  chose and said, yes, you know what, we want the top

  of that stair tower, or the whole stair tower for

  that matter, to be other than brick, different

  material, different color, what would Valley say?

  THE WITNESS: Of course. That would be
- COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. Thank you.
- BY MR. DRILL:
- Q. Can we go to the next exhibit, which I believe should be Exhibit A-11.
- A. Correct.

fine, of course.

3

12

19

20

21

22

material.

- Now, you may recall that I discussed the fact that the existing hospital driveway is in this exhibit location that it will no longer be in when this project, if it should be built, is built.
- 23 This has not changed from 2013-14 to
  24 the 2016 proposed Master Plan Amendment. So I can
  25 tell you that this part of the simulation and to the

- 1 | right, as well as the foreground, about up to this
- 2 point, and then all of this into the left
- 3 (indicating), is actually taken from a photograph.
- 4 And in order to depict what the Phillips garage would
- 5 look like, we -- I felt --
- 6 Q. With -- with landscaping?
- A. With landscaping, which is part of what
- 8 we would be doing, mature landscaping.
- 9 Q. And you simulated the landscaping?
- 10 A. We simulated the landscaping from this
- 11 point over to this point (indicating).
- 12 Again, this is the southerly entrance
- 13 | into the campus in front of Kurth Cottage as it
- 14 exists today.
- 15 Q. So now can we go to the next slide,
- 16 | which should be Exhibit A-12?
- 17 A. Okay. We prepared the simulation of
- 18 | the North building from Steilen Avenue in the
- 19 street --
- 20 O. This is the front of 318 Steilen?
- 21 A. The front of 318 Steilen.
- 22 Q. Can you take the laser pointer and
- 23 | identify, you know, point to the North building.
- A. Absolutely.
- It's sitting in between the trees right

- 1 here (indicating).
- Q. And what is that, that looks like it's
- 3 like grayish parallel lines?
- A. Those are louvres at the back of the mechanical penthouse so on the eastern side of the
- 6 mechanical penthouse.
- Q. Okay. And could you go to the next slide, which should be Exhibit 13?
- 9 A. This is the photo simulation taken from the rear yard of 258 Steilen Avenue.
- 11 Q. Just again, for the record, these 12 photos were taken in 2010; correct?
- 13 A. That is correct.
- Q. And in 2010, the property owner gave consent for your photographer to go on the property and take the picture?
- 17 A. That is correct.
- And in order to access this backyard we needed permission to be accompanied by the owner to

And the entire photo, the photograph

- 20 travel through their house to get to the backyard.
- includes all of the existing vegetation that was in
- 23 the backyard at that time.

- What you're looking at is the
- 25 | southernmost, southern face of the North building,

```
1 | cooling towers in this area with louvres
```

- 2 (indicating), the smokestack of the central power
- 3 | plant (indicating), the closed area of mechanical
- 4 equipment screen --
- 5 Q. Is that actually a screen for
- 6 mechanical equipment that actually --
- 7 A. Right.
- Q. -- cannot be enclosed because those are
- 9 chillers?
- 10 A. Yes, yes. Air handlers and chillers,
- 11 and then the start of the enclosed mechanical
- 12 penthouse, and these window sections, again, are
- 13 louvres (indicating).
- 14 O. I don't know if I could -- that's
- 15 | Exhibit 13?
- 16 A. That is correct.
- Q. Okay. So let's go to the last photo
- 18 simulation.
- 19 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Could I just go
- 20 over that -- I have one more question please go back,
- 21 Maria.
- So again now to the left --
- 23 THE WITNESS: This is the Cheel
- 24 building (indicating).
- MR. DRILL: Cheel.

```
1
                   THE WITNESS: That's our existing
2
    building now --
3
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN:
                                          Okay.
4
                   THE WITNESS: And that does not change
    either FOR Phase I or Phase II.
5
6
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Maria, just for
7
    perspective, what is the height of the Cheel building
    presently --
8
9
                   THE WITNESS: The Cheel building --
10
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: With
11
    mechanicals, what I'm seeing there, what would that
12
    height be?
13
                   THE WITNESS: Yes, the building is 48
14
    feet tall with a 17-foot mechanical penthouse so the
15
    overall height is 65 feet.
16
                  COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. Great.
17
    Thank you.
18
                   BY MR. DRILL:
19
                  Can we go to the last photo simulation,
            Ο.
    which should be Exhibit A-14?
20
21
           Α.
                  Remember these pictures were taken in
    2010, so the running track that currently exists at
22
    the Ben Franklin Middle School was not there;
23
24
    however, the ball field, you could see the end of the
25
    infield as it proceeds (indicating) into the
```

- outfield. And, again, the second baseball diamond in this section (indicating).
- This depicts the northern side of the

  North building and the eastern side of the North

  building.

- Susan, this is the stairwell

  (indicating) that you saw off in the distance when we were looking at it from the street, from North Van Dien Avenue.
  - And, again, there is some screening of rooftop mechanicals. The smokestack is enclosed in a section next to the stairwell. And then, again, louvres of the mechanical penthouse (indicating).
  - Q. And, again, this mechanical screening looks, for lack of a better word, color of silver or gray, but again, if the Planning Board in the site plan process wanted it some other color, I assume that the hospital is fine with that?
    - A. The hospital is fine with that.
  - And that's why we show the silver on this side and the green on the northern side (indicating) so as to give you the ability to understand that once you go by the color it actually fades or moves into the sky and diminishes the appearance.

```
COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: So, Maria, in
1
    order for -- for me to have seen that on that other
2
    perspective, from that other vantage point, is that
3
4
    actually closer to the property line or is that the
    same setback from BF?
5
                   THE WITNESS: It's within the 40-foot
6
7
    setback.
8
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. Is that
9
    the stairwell?
10
                   THE WITNESS: Correct.
11
                   MR. DRILL: I mean, is it fair to say
12
    that these perspectives all depend on where you're
    taking the photograph from, the further back you
13
14
    are --
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Yes.
15
    understand, I just wanted to be clear on that.
16
17
                   And just one more time, because you
    said those -- did you call them chillers? What did
18
    you call those things that can't be enclosed?
19
20
                   THE WITNESS: These (indicating)?
21
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Yes.
                   THE WITNESS: The chillers can't be
22
    enclosed, they need to evaporate water --
23
24
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: I just wanted to
25
    get the word -- the term that you used.
```

```
MR. DRILL: Is a chiller an air
1
2
    conditioning type, piece of equipment?
3
                   THE WITNESS: Well, it's -- there are
4
    two pieces of equipment. There's the air handler
5
    that chills the water from the cooling towers to
6
    create chilled air that's then run through the
7
    buildings.
                   The chillers are enclosed, the...
9
                   MR. DRILL: The air handler.
10
                   THE WITNESS: The air handlers are
11
    enclosed --
12
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN:
                                          Oh, okay.
13
                   THE WITNESS: The chillers are not.
14
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: -- I can't hear,
15
    if you're not using the microphone.
                   THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. The air
16
    handlers are enclosed. The chillers need to be open
17
    to the atmosphere.
18
19
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: So, now, when --
20
    when we're talking about the enclosures and the
21
    penthouse, the penthouse is designed for sound
22
    attenuation?
23
                   THE WITNESS: Yes.
24
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: So the question
25
    then is on the -- that -- those chillers, now those
```

```
1
    produce noise. What is -- because that sound is not
    enclosed, so there's no sound attenuation material to
2
    diminish --
4
                   THE WITNESS: Actually these screens
5
    are made (indicating) with sound attenuation
6
    insulation. And they come in various thicknesses and
7
    sound tempering, so we would design those enclosures
    to be appropriate to meet the New Jersey noise codes.
8
9
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay, but they
    would have essentially the same effect as the
10
11
    enclosure that has the sound attenuation material, so
    it would be the same --
12
13
                   THE WITNESS: Correct. So --
```

COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: -- noise

15 reduction?

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: So, for example, things that would be enclosed within the enclosed penthouse, are things like pumps, the air handlers that require daily checking, maintenance, you know, in order to make sure that things are functioning properly.

The chillers have to be, by engineering principles, exposed to the atmosphere, water needs to evaporate.

BY MR. DRILL:

Q. Some of the pumps and the other things

```
1
    that need more constant maintenance, I assume that
    those are a little noisier and --
2
3
           Α.
                   Well, sure, they're whirring and --
4
            0.
                   The board doesn't know that.
5
           Α.
                   Okay.
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: So -- and
6
7
    typically what is the materials that the chillers
    are --
9
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Excuse me, Susan.
10
    I know you missed the first part. We're going
11
    through a process, I know it's difficult with the
    images. But we're allowing testimony to be given, as
12
13
    we did with Blais --
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay.
14
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: -- and then when
15
    we're done then all the board members will be have an
16
    opportunity to ask questions. I know it's awkward
17
    but let's try to stick to the rules.
18
19
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Do you mind if I
20
    just follow with my last two little pieces?
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Last piece.
21
22
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. Good.
23
    Thanks, because Maria is being so nice to me.
24
                   What is the material that those are
```

typically made of?

```
MR. DRILL: Which are the "those", the
1
    chillers?
2
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Of the chillers.
3
4
                   THE WITNESS: The chiller enclosures?
5
    Metal.
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: And then are
6
7
    they also the same 24 foot height.
8
                   MR. DRILL: Say again.
9
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Are they the
10
    same height as the rest of the mechanicals.
11
                   MR. DRILL: Are they the same height as
12
    the rest of the mechanical penthouses?
13
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: As the rest --
14
    right, the penthouses.
15
                   MR. DRILL: Are they 24 feet high, you
    want to know.
16
17
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Yes.
18
                   THE WITNESS: At this point, they're
19
    depicted to be 24-foot high.
20
                   Chillers are not small pieces of
21
    equipment.
                So we don't want to go above 24 feet, we
22
    want to make sure that they're blocked.
23
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay.
24
                   THE WITNESS: That could be tweaked as
```

we move into further design.

- 1 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. Now
- 2 Charles won't let me ask any more questions until
- 3 you're done.
- 4 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you very
- 5 much.
- BY MR. DRILL:
- 7 Q. Okay. So, Maria, listen very
- 8 carefully, without revealing any of the conversations
- 9 that took place during the mediation, is it correct
- 10 | that the photo simulation locations were chosen as a
- 11 result of the mediation process?
- 12 A. That is correct.
- 13 Q. Okay. So did I ask you to put together
- 14 | an exhibit that would show how the hospital intended
- 15 to comply with paragraph 4(a) of the remand order,
- 16 which provides for the reduction in building floor
- 17 area from the project contemplated in the 2013-14
- 18 | Master Plan Amendment to the current 2016 Master Plan
- 19 Amendment?
- A. Yes, you did.
- 21 Q. Is that up on the screen right now as
- 22 | Exhibit A-16?
- A. Yes, it is up on the screen. And it is
- 24 our Exhibit A-15, which shows exactly how the
- 25 hospital will reduce the floor area as required by

1 | the remand order.

So let's -- if we're doing this in a comparative way, we'll start with the 2014 building components. The total hospital above-grade square footage was 685,000 square feet, the rooftop floor space was 95,000 square feet and the lower levels floor space, below grade, was 215,000 square feet, for a 2014 proposed building floor area at the completion of Phase II of 995,000 square feet.

In 2016, in order to...

- Q. Eliminate?
- A. Eliminate the uppermost patient room floor, we added 31,600 square feet, which is depicted on the wedding cake stacking diagram, the elimination of patient floor above grade eliminated 58,100 square feet, the entire level. We agreed to find and reduce the North building above grade floor area by 5,000 square feet and the North or West building below grade square footage of 2,500 square feet, for a total floor area reduction of 34,000 square feet.

  MR. DRILL: Could you move that exhibit up a little because we have like a ta-da on the bottom.

FEMALE ASSISTANT: That's as high as it goes.

```
MR. DRILL: Can you --
```

- THE WITNESS: Can you, on the
- 3 | right-hand side can you scroll down?
- 4 MR. DRILL: -- enlarge it?
- 5 THE WITNESS: No, no, she needs to
- 6 scroll down.
- 7 MR. DRILL: There we go. Now push it
- 8 up a little.
- 9 THE WITNESS: And now scroll down. And
- 10 scroll to the right. Thank you.
- So the total 2016 proposed building
- 12 floor area will be 961,000 square feet.
- 13 BY MR. DRILL:
- 14 Q. Okay. Did I also ask you to put
- 15 together an additional exhibit that would show the
- 16 building floor area by phase of the project?
- A. Yes, you did.
- Q. Can we go to the next exhibit, which
- 19 should be Exhibit A-16?
- 20 A. That is correct.
- 21 Q. Would you walk the board through this
- 22 | exhibit?
- 23 A. Yes. Sure, I will. In Phase I, the
- 24 | North building, building square footage is 448,500
- 25 | square feet. That's above grade and below grade.

The Cheel building as it exists today

is 280,000 square feet.

The Bergen building as it exists today and will remain during Phase I is 215,000 square feet. Going to build the lower level of the West building --

- Q. You mean the basement; correct, when you say "lower level" --
- A. The lower level, the level below grade, we'll call it basement, the lower level, of that West building that was going to be constructed as part of Phase II is being constructed now in Phase I.

So the total site area after --

- Q. The total building floor area, right?
- A. Correct. At the completion of Phase I will be 980,500 square feet.
  - Q. Now walk us through Phase II.
  - A. In Phase II, the North building already exists at 448,500 square feet. The Cheel building will be reduced down to 193,000 square feet. The Bergen building will be dismantled so it will not exist after Phase II. The rest of the West -- well, the entirety of the West building will now be built out for a total of 135,000 square feet. And the South building, which does not exist now, nor will it

- exist during Phase I, will be built in Phase II, for a total of 184,000 square feet. So that the proposed building floor area at the end of Phase II would be 961,000 square feet.
  - Q. I know it says it up there, but at the end of Phase I, the building floor area is 908,500 square feet; correct?
    - A. Correct.

- Q. At the end of Phase II, it is 961,000 square feet in increase from Phase I to Phase II, because you're eliminating one building and eliminating a piece of another, is an increase of 45,800 square feet. That's a question?
  - A. That's correct.
- Q. Okay. Now, switching topics again, are you aware of paragraph five of the remand order which provides that a list of conditions previously generated during the 2013-2014 Master Plan hearing must be included as an exhibit and be made part of the record of the 2016 Master Plan Amendment process?
  - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. And has the hospital put together such a list? And if so, can you read it into the record and make it part of the record of this process that the remand order required?

1 A. Yes, I will.

1.5

- 2 Can we please go to the next exhibit.
  - Q. And just for the record, this is the list of conditions generated during the 2013-2014 Master Plan hearing and this is now being made an exhibit as Exhibit A-17.

And can you -- I need you to read each one of those conditions. And at certain points, if it addresses a question that's been asked, I'm going to want you to comment on that.

- A. Okay. There are seven pages here so please bear with me and they are grouped into certain categories so...
  - Q. Let's just get the categories first.
- A. The categories are general and design related Master Plan conditions, general construction process related conditions, construction related conditions for specific inclusion in future developer's agreement with specifics to be determined post-site approval, traffic related conditions to be further detailed at site plan and/or for specific inclusion in the developer's agreement, the Board of Education recommended condition not covered elsewhere herein, and I think that's it.
  - Q. Right. Now, could you go back to the

- 1 beginning and before you, you know, when you go through the list, first give the category of 2 condition. 4 Α. Uh-huh. So the first category are the 5 general and design related Master Plan conditions. "No. 1, The construction timeframe for 6 7 Phase I of the development is reduced to six years with approximately 45 percent of the 8 9 construction to be interior to the buildings. 10 "No. 2, Installation of approximately 11 20-foot high wall along Steilen Avenue border 12 with landscaped buffer consistent with slide 13 10 of Exhibit A-12 presented during the 2013-2014 14 Master Plan hearings. And that was the exhibit I referenced 1.5 Q. before? 16 17 Α. From Ms. Banyra (phonetic), yes. 18 "No. 3, Provision of firefighting and
  - "No. 3, Provision of firefighting and emergency apparatus deemed required by emergency service departments to handle emergency and fire related emergencies that may occur in the parking garage.
  - "4, Loading bays to be sealed to mitigate acoustical impacts.

20

21

22

23

24

25

"5, Compliance with the New Jersey

1 State Noise Coding.

1.5

"6, The top level of the Phillips

parking garage not to be used at all, no

parking on the top level of the Phillips

parking garage from dusk to dawn. Security

lighting only on the top level to be used dusk

to dawn."

Q. So in answer to another question that was asked about why does the "if necessary" language I believe in the Master Plan have to be there, since we've agreed to this as a condition, if the Planning Board wanted they could take out that "if necessary" language out of the Master Plan Amendment; is that correct?

A. That is correct.

Continuing, "No. 7, Trash and recycling compactors to be internally fed.

"8, No parking stalls facing the 20-foot landscape buffer along Steilen Avenue."

Now proceed to the next category of general construction process related conditions.

"Dewatering is not to exceed 300,000 gallons per day during construction with the average daily being 200,000 gallons per day.

"No use of structural tiebacks outside the boundaries of the hospital property.

1.5

"No. 3, Subject to County of Bergen,
Village and New Jersey Department of
Transportation approval, The Valley Hospital
shall install, at its sole cost and expense,
new traffic signal equipment at affected
intersections, including video detection
systems to add additional green time in the
proper directions, not video cameras, and
countdown timers including ADA hearing
impaired timers.

"4, Subject to County of Bergen,
Village and New Jersey Department of
Transportation approval, The Valley Hospital,
at its sole cost and expense, shall complete
all traffic improvements along Linwood Avenue,
including at the intersection of Van Dien,
North Pleasant and John Street. This work
shall include, but not be limited to,
widening, installation of improvements to the
intersection and possible signal retiming, and
shall be completed prior to the commencement
of Phase I unless, otherwise approved by the
Village Engineer.

1.5

"6, The project shall comply with all applicable air quality standards which will ensure community protection.

"7, The Valley Hospital shall monitor noise, sediment and vibration throughout the construction process."

Moving on to the next set of conditions, these are construction related conditions for specific inclusion in the future developer's agreement with specifics to be determined post-site plan approval.

"No. 1, Any blasting shall be controlled blasting".

"No. 2, Prior to any blasting and/or dewatering, The Valley Hospital shall conduct structural assessments of every home which grants access and permission within the circular rings depicted in the cone of depression drawings contained in Exhibit A-11 presented during the 2013-2014 Master Plan hearings. Valley Hospital shall take photographs and videos of existing conditions

1 and then return after blasting for 2 post-blasting survey. The Valley Hospital 3 and/or its contractors and/or subcontractors 4 shall provide insurance coverage to cover any 5 damage. "No. 3, Dewatering noise shall comply 6 7 with the New Jersey State Noise Code. "No. 4, Prior to construction, The 8 9 Valley Hospital shall generate a site specific 10 air monitoring plan covering interior building 11 locations and exterior locations on the 12 property. 13 "No. 5, As part of the monitoring plan, 14 The Valley Hospital shall have a system in 1.5 place to monitor absolute contaminants and markers, tracers of contaminants. 16 17 "No. 6, The monitoring system shall 18 review data in realtime on a continuous 19 24-hour basis to ensure all air levels are 20 acceptable. Reports of same shall be provided 21 to the Village Engineer on a schedule to be determined by him or her. 22 23 "No. 7, The contaminant monitoring 24 shall occur at the interior work zone at the

property lines with weather and wind impact

checks.

1.5

"No. 8, There shall be oversight of The Valley Hospital construction process by an independent village consultant to be paid for from The Valley Hospital escrow pursuant to law.

"The Valley Hospital shall establish and provide a chain of command for all responsible personnel" and means -- I'm sorry, "and methods of communication including e-mail addresses, cell phone numbers and any other relevant contact information. The list shall include both on-site personnel and off-site Valley Hospital representatives and shall be provided to the Village Engineer. The on-site construction consultant, the Village Manager and any other village representatives designated in the developer's agreement.

"No. 9, Prior to construction, The

Valley Hospital shall develop a safety program

to include contractor screening and background

checking, and implementation of a worker

identification badging system, which program

shall be subject to the review and the

approval of the Village Engineer.

"No. 10, The construction site shall be secured with fencing and with gated entrance.

1.5

"No. 11, Noise abatement technology shall be used during construction, including sound blankets and sound deafening material on the inside of the fence surrounding the property.

"No. 12, Prior to any construction and as an exhibit to any developer's agreement,

The Valley Hospital shall establish a list of construction related issues or items addressed and agreed upon with the Ridgewood Board of Education, including but not limited to any additional pedestrian safety measures, crossing guards, walking patterns, sidewalk modifications that are to be implemented.

"No. 13, Except in the case of an emergency, no Sunday construction shall be permitted.

"No. 14, The Valley Hospital shall provide a standby generator for use in case of dewatering shut off or power failure.

Moving on to the fourth set of conditions, these are traffic related conditions to be further detailed at site plan and/or for specific

1	inclusion in the developer's agreement.
2	"No. 1, All construction workers shall
3	be shuttled to the site by bus or by shuttle.
4	Contractor parking shall not be permitted on
5	village streets.
6	"No. 2, Employees shall be shuttled to
7	the site during construction with
8	implementation of a system using swipe card
9	assignment.
10	"No. 3, Preparation of a parking
11	management plan prior to the commencement of
12	construction.
13	"No. 4, Developing construction
14	trucking routes inclusive of truck and
15	delivery access times to and from the site
16	with coordination of the village professional
17	and the Board of Education.
18	"5, There shall be no idling of
19	construction trucks.
20	"6, Jake brake on trucks shall be
21	prohibited.
22	"7, Prior to construction, preparation
23	of an off-site staging location plan for
24	trucks to be filed with the Village Engineer.
25	Moving along, the fifth set of

conditions, the Board of Education recommended conditions not covered elsewhere herein.

1.5

"No. 1, Preparation of an environmental baseline study performed at the Benjamin

Franklin Middle School property line prior to the commencement of any construction.

"No. 2, Continuous monitoring system for contaminants with signal when levels of dirt, dust and pollutants become higher than acceptable based upon guidelines established by independent experts. Action levels defined for each contaminant which if exceeded will trigger immediate investigation of work practices, modified work practices and work stoppage until concentrations have returned to below action levels.

"No. 3, To the extent feasible, building demolition shall be completed in the summer months or alternatively, use dust reduction demolition techniques to be employed when summer demolition is not possible.

"No. 4, Control dirt and dust in the air and if dust or dust leave the property and migrate to the Benjamin Franklin or Travell schools, clean those schools of the dust and

dirt.

field events.

"5, Adjustments to construction,

traffic schedule, based upon school events and

And "6, Retention of security guards on a 24-hour basis on The Valley Hospital site."

BY MR. DRILL:

Q. Okay. My last question is whether you could -- my last question is whether you can confirm the fact that other than the elimination of the fifth floor in the North building, the decrease in the building floor area of the project, the revisions to the setbacks of the North and West buildings along North Van Dien, and the construction of the West building basement in Phase I instead of Phase II, could you confirm that there are no other changes in the project from that contemplated in the 2014 Master Plan Amendment?

- A. Yes, I confirm that.
- Q. And I'm not going to ask you to repeat the four items that I mentioned in my introduction,
  I'm just going to ask you to confirm that what I said was correct?

MR. DRILL: Unless the board wants to hear Maria repeat what I said about the four thing

- 1 | that weren't changing.
- 2 Anyone want to hear Maria --
- 3 BY MR. DRILL:

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

- Q. Can you just confirm that those four things I said, which was basements in the buildings not increasing the size or depth, overall square footage of the project decreasing, the expert testimony from Dr. Shannon Magari regarding the issues of fine particulate matter and contaminants and how it will be dealt with so it won't result in any adverse harm or health impacts, and fourth, the
- Everything I said in my introduction is correct?
- 15 A. Everything you said in your 16 introduction is correct.

time period for construction.

- MR. DRILL: So I have no further questions for Ms. Mediago.
  - Before I turn her over for questioning,
    I would want to -- I want to reiterate something that
    was already said, and just -- I want to place like a
    prophylactic objection on the record. I don't want
    to object to any cross examination of Maria by
    anybody. So I'm just asking that everyone respect
    the remand order and keep the questions to what she

- testified to and keep the questions, if at all
  possible, and I am pleading, to changes from the 2014
  to the 2016 Master Plan.
- I don't want to interrupt the flow of cross-examination, and so I'm just stating that,

  hopefully, this will prevent any of those questions being asked. I just want to make it clear, if I choose not to object I don't want that held against me, I don't want to be deemed to have waived any objection if I just sit idly by and say nothing if that stuff happens.
- So Ms. Mediago is ready for questioning.
- 14 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: You want to
  15 comment or should we proceed with questions?
- MS. RAZIN: Yes, we've tried to repeat
  that throughout the evening and so we will continue
  to try and work on those efforts and hopefully
  everybody will be cooperative.
- 20 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay. We'll 21 continue again as we did with --
- MS. RAZIN: Can I just have, just to

  clarify -- I'm sorry. The clarifying condition, I

  just want to double check, the conditions -- these

  were conditions that were generated from the --

primarily from the transcript of the -- -

that picked up these conditions.

2 MR. DRILL: Very good point. Right.

MS. RAZIN: -- of the 2013-14 hearing.

MR. DRILL: Right. These conditions were generated during the 2013-2014 hearing process. The way they were generated was going through all the transcripts and going through all these exhibits in the notebook. The combination of going through all

And as I said before, the -- we missed -- it wasn't a condition and it wasn't in the consent order, but we've agreed to add as a condition or add it to the Master Plan Amendment, whatever the green roof over the West building, and there was something else that wasn't picked up that we said before we would do. And it's just escaping me.

MS. RAZIN: So to that end these were stipulations by potentially various other experts that have already testified in those proceedings, and they're not necessarily -- they're not changes, they're just -- you're just re-asserting them as a list of conditions and confirming them for the record this evening and will be part of what we carry forward if this -- if this was ultimately approved.

MR. DRILL: That's correct.

```
1
                   MS. RAZIN: Okay.
                   MR. DRILL: Yes, we're not just doing
2
3
    it for that reason. We're also doing it, hopefully,
4
    so people who maybe weren't here won't ask those
5
    questions because we dealt with them.
6
                   MS. RAZIN: These are not changes.
7
                   MR. DRILL: That's absolutely correct.
8
    This --
9
                   MS. RAZIN: These are not changes.
10
    These are --
11
                   MR. DRILL: These are not changes.
    These are things that we agreed to over the course
12
13
    of --
14
                   MS. RAZIN: The 28 hearings.
15
                   MR. DRILL: -- 28 hearings over two
16
    years.
17
                   I mean, it was painstaking for the
    people involved to have to go through and pull these
18
19
    conditions out of all those transcripts and reports,
20
    but this is the right way to do it.
21
                   MS. PATIRE: Can I ask a question?
22
    those -- are those new as of today or have those been
23
    submitted.
24
                   MR. DRILL: No, I'm saying, these
25
    conditions --
```

```
1
                   MS. PATIRE: No, no, no, this, this
2
    document (indicating).
3
                   MR. DRILL: Yeah, this is an exhibit
4
    because the remand order said --
                  CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: The document is
5
6
    on the record.
7
                   MS. PATIRE: This is on the record.
                   MR. DRILL: This is -- yes, this is
8
9
    brand new. And this is Exhibit A-17, and this
10
    exhibit is on the memory stick. And so this exhibit
11
    will be -- presumably all these exhibits will be --
12
                   MS. RAZIN: We'll put them up on the
13
    website.
14
                   MR. DRILL: -- on the village website.
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Yes, but we never
15
    discussed these.
16
17
                   MS. RAZIN: What -- what Jon -- I'll
    let Jon answer, go ahead.
18
19
                   MR. DRILL: Yes. These are conditions
20
    that, quite frankly, had the board approved the 2014
21
    Master Plan Amendment, the board would have imposed
    these conditions, because these conditions were
22
    generated from one of three places; either, A, a
23
24
    board member asked for it; B, one of our experts
25
    offered it; or C, one of the Planning Board experts
```

```
1
    suggested it.
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Yeah, but we didn't all
2
3
    agree on it.
4
                   MR. DRILL: Well, because you rejected
5
    the plan.
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Right, okay. So that's
6
7
8
                   MR. DRILL: Right.
9
                   MS. DOCKRAY: -- that's still up for us
10
    to decide on these conditions. Since we didn't all
11
    agree on them since they weren't brought to our
    attention specifically.
12
13
                   MR. DRILL: Well, they were absolutely
14
15
                   MS. DOCKRAY: You might have one board
    member who said --
16
17
                   MS. RAZIN: Yes.
18
                   MS. DOCKRAY: -- let's have this
19
    condition, but we didn't all say, Uh-huh, let's agree
    on that condition.
20
21
                   MR. DRILL:
                              There were --
22
                   MS. RAZIN: Well, the testimony is I
23
    think what it is. I mean, I don't -- I mean I think
24
    that the -- they're not changes, so I think whatever
25
    stands in the documents that go back to 2013 and 2014
```

```
-- that's why I asked that question, because the
1
    various witnesses testified to them or they were
2
    stipulations that were placed on the record at
3
4
    various points in the proceeding in 2013 -- they
    didn't come out of thin air or were never discussed
5
6
7
                  MS. DOCKRAY: I just --
                   MR. DRILL: We prepared this with the
8
9
    transcripts, they were mentioned by various --
10
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Right. I don't think we
11
    all decided. Let's -- on those various conditions.
12
    Some of those are, you know, things that I thought we
13
    would discuss at a later date. So prior to the
14
    developer's --
                   MS. RAZIN: Yes, well, I think what you
15
    -- well, that's why if you go to the list of the
16
17
    headings, and most of -- I would say after the first
    heading, most of the conditions are being addressed
18
    with any kind -- with any kind of specificity at a
19
20
    later date. I think the only ones are the first set
21
    which talks about construction in six years which
    was, I think, one of the first things we talked
22
23
    about. So --
24
                   MR. DRILL: Right. But we wanted to
25
    make clear --
```

```
1
                   MS. RAZIN: So --
2
                   MR. DRILL: -- that we were standing
3
    behind the testimony and the representations that
4
    were made.
5
                   That's why we -- that's why the remand
6
    order required us to do this. And we are offering
7
    them up as conditions against ourselves because these
    are representations --
9
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: We can keep track
10
    of them.
11
                   MR. DRILL: -- that we tell you.
12
                   MS. RAZIN:
                               Right.
13
                   MS. DOCKRAY: I understand.
14
                   MS. RAZIN: One second, one second, one
    second.
1.5
16
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay.
17
                   MS. RAZIN: Not only did the -- not
    only did the remand order request it, but the board
18
19
    requested it as to become part of the settlement
20
    process earlier, that's how it became in the remand
21
    order, so then that carried forward in the remand
    order language and that's why there was a generated
22
    list of conditions.
23
24
                   Ultimately, I would probably agree with
```

you, Wendy, that the exact specifications of some of

```
1
    those conditions when you get to a developer's
2
    agreement and when you got the site plan, if that day
    -- if that day ever comes, they might be different or
3
4
    something might be slightly different. I mean that's
5
    why I think in the language is general and some of it
    kept open and that's why there's categories -- I
6
7
    think the attempt was, I assume the attempt was to
    keep it categorized to show that there are things
9
    that just can't be decided at a Master Plan level
    with such specificity.
10
11
                   But the stipulations that were placed
    on the record are being carried forward without
12
13
    change to this process. That was the intent.
14
    Because there was a specified provision in the remand
15
    order to carry forward a list of conditions that
    Valley had agreed to. That's it. That wasn't --
16
    that was the only intent by -- by that process.
17
                   MS. DOCKRAY: I just need to think
18
    about it some more, if that's okay.
19
20
                   MS. RAZIN: Well, we are going to keep
21
    going --
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Yeah, I'm just saying, I
22
23
    need to think about it, because there were a couple
24
    things in here I'm not sure that we all -- a couple
25
    things that we all thought were a great idea and
```

```
1
    there are a couple things that I thought might be
    tweaked, so -- and I want to go back to the Board of
2
    Ed letter because that was incorporated and I
4
    remember something from there and I want to make sure
    it makes sense basically what you put forth here, I
5
    thought the Board of Ed letter said they didn't want
6
7
    trucks ever going around the corner of Van Dien and
    Linwood -- I'm sorry, Van Dien and Glen, ever.
9
    don't see that in here, but you're incorporating the
10
    letter. So I want to go back and read it and then
11
    see where we, you know, where we are on that. I just
    think it's a lot to absorb at 11:10 at night.
12
13
                   MS. BIGOS: Mr. Drill, can -- can you
14
    tell me please if the seven pages --
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Yeah.
15
                   MS. BIGOS: -- of conditions have been
16
17
    reviewed by the professional staff?
18
                   MR. DRILL: Yes, they have.
19
                   MS. BIGOS:
                              Okay. So then --
20
                   MR. DRILL: The professional staff
21
    obviously cannot agree to anything on behalf of the
    board because the board has to review it.
22
23
                   MS. RAZIN: I don't know if Chris --
    and Chris hasn't looked at it. I don't know if Chris
24
25
    has looked at it, but I mean --
```

```
1
                   MR. DRILL:
                              Right.
                   MS. BIGOS: Chris and Blais.
2
                   MR. DRILL: The board counsel reviewed
3
4
    it to make sure there were accurate. In other words,
    that we weren't making stuff up or that we hadn't
5
6
    left anything out.
7
                   MS. BIGOS: All right.
8
                   MS. DOCKRAY: We sat through all this
9
10
                   MS. RAZIN: But certainly, I mean, I --
11
    understanding that it's 11:10 at night, but this is
12
    not -- what I meant by my question is this is not the
13
    first time you're agreeing that in a sense they came
14
    from a prior --
15
                   MR. DRILL: Right.
16
                   MS. RAZIN: Prior -- prior proceedings
17
    and --
18
                  MR. DRILL: And --
19
                   MS. RAZIN: -- they were generated then
20
21
                   MS. DOCKRAY: But I'm just saying I'm
    not sure we agreed to all those things so...
22
                   MS. RAZIN: I understand. I
23
    understand.
24
25
                   MS. DOCKRAY: So that's my --
```

```
1
                   MR. DRILL: And, again, we're not --
                   MS. DOCKRAY: We all had some different
2
3
    perspectives on a few of those.
4
                   MR. DRILL: Without revealing any
5
    confidences from the mediation, all I'm going to say,
    this wasn't my idea.
6
7
                  MS. RAZIN: Let's move forward.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: All right.
8
9
                  MS. DOCKRAY: Charles, do you think --
10
    it's 11:10? This is kind of a lot to absorb.
11
    there any chance that --
12
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: What I would like
13
    to is while we have this fresh, I would like to
    continue with the board in terms of its cross
14
    examination of the witness. It's 11:10, it's still
1.5
    not that late, we have a lot of ground to cover later
16
17
    with the public who might have questions.
18
                   So why don't we begin cross-examination
19
    and we can continue that at the next meeting.
                   Davie?
20
21
                   MR. THURSTON:
                                  I will pass for now.
22
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Nancy?
23
                   MS. BIGOS: Yes, I'm fine. Thank you
24
    for your testimony.
25
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Susan?
```

```
COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Well, I have to
1
    go back to the chillers, because I'm fascinated by
2
    chillers. I don't know.
3
4
                   Do those get blocked with the green
             Is that -- what is the -- on the exterior of
5
    screen?
6
    that? I know we had a discussion about green screen
7
    and that was to mitigate the effects of visual.
                   THE WITNESS: The efficiency of the
8
9
    evaporation of the water coming from the cooling
    towers, I would not recommend that the screen around
10
11
    the cooling towers be blocked with green screening.
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. So if you
12
13
    were to define the measurements, if I were, say, on
14
    the -- let me just get this right, the east side of
15
    the North building, the north side of the North
    building and the south side of the North building,
16
17
    what would the measurements be around those? Like,
    how big is that? What's the size of the chiller?
18
19
                   THE WITNESS: Of the chiller or the
20
    building.
21
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN:
                                          Well, no, the
```

actual piece, that the -- the metal mechanical that

answer for you tomorrow.

we're seeing that can't be covered with green screen.

THE WITNESS: I'll have to get that

22

23

24

```
1
                   MR. DRILL: Are you asking if any part
    of the chiller can be visible with that screen in
2
    front of there --
                   THE WITNESS: No, she's asking --
4
5
                   MR. DRILL: -- or are you asking --
                   THE WITNESS: -- for the dimensions
6
7
    around the --
                   MR. DRILL: Excuse me, did we measure
8
9
    the screening the --
10
                   THE WITNESS: -- cooling towers.
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: I'm looking for
11
12
    the size of the chiller.
13
                   THE WITNESS: Right.
14
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Right.
15
    understood.
                 She's got it.
16
                  MR. DRILL: Okay.
17
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: And then just
    you mentioned the dewatering, I just want to go back
18
19
    to that for a second. What was the number of the
20
    dewatering, how many gallons per day?
21
                   THE WITNESS: 300,000 gallons a day,
    but on average it would be running about 200,000
22
23
    gallons per day.
24
                   The gallons per day would be dependent
25
    upon rainfall and precipitation and the length of
```

```
1
    time and the quantity of water that falls and then
2
    percolates into the ground.
3
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN:
                                          Right.
                                                   So you
4
    don't know the amount, you just know that it would be
    the amount of --
5
6
                   THE WITNESS: Right.
7
                   MR. DRILL: We didn't hear what you
                 She heard what you asked but we didn't.
8
    just asked.
9
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Sorry.
10
                   Okay. I'm just going to let someone
11
    else go. And then I have a couple more questions.
12
                   Wait, let me ask one more question.
13
                   When you're talking about visual mass,
14
    you kept mentioning 95,000 square feet of rooftop
    mechanical, and those are 24 feet high?
15
16
                   THE WITNESS: Correct.
17
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: So that's 95,000
    square feet of rooftop mechanicals is maybe like
18
19
    58,000 square feet on the North building; is that
20
    roughly -- could you tell me the breakdown of that on
21
    each of those buildings?
22
                   THE WITNESS: Ok.
23
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Let's start --
24
    start there. Okay, and --
25
                   THE WITNESS: No, I'll -- you want an
```

- answer, I want to give you as precise an answer as I can.
- COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. So you're going to get back to me.
- 5 THE WITNESS: Yes.

14

15

16

17

20

21

22

23

24

- COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: And then so my

  -- while your calculating that in terms of square

  footage if we were doing this ans an exercise in

  floor area ratio, would you -- because floor area

  ratio gives you the essence of visual mass; would

  that be accurate? Like floor area ratio gives you an

  idea of what the visual mass is.
  - MR. DRILL: Floor area ratio was included below grade floor. When you do a floor area ratio, it's not just above grade.
  - COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: I understand, I understand. But the above -- okay, let's rephrase.
- The above grade floor area ratio.
- 19 Okay. Thank you. Thank you. That was helpful.
  - So when you talk about above grade

    floor area ratio, it gives you like a sense of the

    visual mass, do you think -- is that an appropriate

    -- just to count that 95,000 square feet because it's

    24 feet high. It is essentially two stories, is that

    like if you would calculate the floor area ratio,

```
1
    would that necessarily be counted twice, you went
    through the exercise about the atrium --
2
3
                   THE WITNESS: All right.
4
                   MR. DRILL: Are you asking --
5
                   THE WITNESS: So it depends -- it
    depends --
6
7
                   MR. DRILL: -- what's -- if there was
    no roof on it, and it was screening, it wouldn't
8
9
    count. So the board is saying that you'd rather have
10
    the roof removed from the rooftop so it's not --
11
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Well, no, no, I
12
    think Maria understood what I was asking.
                                                 I think --
13
                   THE WITNESS: Well, it also depends on
14
    your definition of floor area ratio.
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: I can't hear you
1.5
16
    because somebody else is speaking.
17
                   THE WITNESS: It depends on the
18
    definition of floor area ratio, but in Ridgewood the
19
    mechanical penthouse would be included in the floor
    area ratio calculation.
20
21
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN:
                                          Thank you.
22
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: I don't -- I don't
23
    agree.
24
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. Oh, Blais
25
    is disagreeing with something.
```

- MR. BRANCHEAU: You know, when we -- in
- 2 | the Master Plan we actually have --
- MR. DRILL: You're not on. Your
- 4 speaker is not on.
- 5 MR. BRANCHEAU: Sorry. In the Master
- 6 Plan we actually have two different sections. One
- 7 section deals with intensity of use and the other one
- 8 deals with building mass. And in the intensity use
- 9 we talk about floor area ratio. And we talk about
- 10 | the total floor area of the hospital includes below
- 11 grade floor area. But we exclude the rooftop area.
- 12 And we exclude the parking deck. The reason for that
- 13 | is when we're talking about intensity of use, it's a
- 14 different concept than mass.
- 15 You could have a big empty warehouse
- 16 with very few employees, very few visitors, very
- 17 | little traffic, but lots of mass.
- On the other hand, you could have an
- 19 office building of the same size with lots of
- 20 | employees, lots of activity, and that's much more
- 21 | intensive, but has the same building mass. So we
- 22 make a distinction between -- and floor area ratio
- 23 | is, at least for non-residential uses, is typically a
- 24 measurement of intensity of use.
- 25 You'll note that we don't use the term

```
floor area ratio in here, we just use --
```

2 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Right.

MR. BRANCHEAU: -- because we're only talking about one lot. We basically use an absolute number. And it equates to a floor area ratio number. You could -- you could calculate a percentage based upon the floor area here.

On the other hand, when we talk about building mass and building coverage in the plan, we only are looking at above grade area because that's all that really contributes to mass, although below grade contributes to intensity of use; whereas some above grade doesn't contribute to intensity of use like a parking deck, the people are there already, the structure is not contributing to the intensity, it's just where they park.

And the same thing with rooftop equipment, that's not contributing to the intensity of the use, that contributes to mass and bulk.

So we're really treating them separately and that's why I said we wouldn't really count the rooftop equipment within the intensity of use, the floor area ratio regulation.

COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Got it, okay.

25 Thank you.

1.5

```
1
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: We don't say, they're
2
    not covered anywhere.
3
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN:
                                          Right.
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: In fact, they exclude
4
5
    mechanical space in an attic or in a basement that's
6
    not used as work area.
7
                   MR. DRILL: Just so you know, we don't
    think it would be the right thing to do, but if the
8
9
    board wanted the roof taken off the mechanical
10
    penthouse so it's no longer a penthouse and if you
11
    wanted screening, we would do it. We don't think
    it's the right thing to do, but we would do it --
12
13
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: No, no, and I
14
    wasn't asking that question, I was asking...
                   THE WITNESS: And that's why I started
1.5
    my answer with it depends on how you define floor
16
    area ratio.
17
18
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: And I understand
    you. I appreciate it. Thank you, Maria.
19
20
                   THE WITNESS: Different towns define it
21
    differently.
22
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN:
                                          Thank you.
23
    That's my questions. Thank you.
24
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Paul?
```

MAYOR ARONSOHN: Thank you for your

```
1
    testimony. I don't have any questions.
2
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I have a
    follow-up question.
3
4
                   So for the mechanicals, other than the
5
    screening around the various sizes --around the
6
    varies sides, does that change at all, does that
7
    change at all in terms of the size overall since
    2014?
9
                   THE WITNESS: No, it did not.
10
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: It was identical,
11
    so just the screening that happens to be outside?
12
                   THE WITNESS: It was always screened,
13
    it was now a different color, texture and the
14
    addition of the potential green screen where
15
    possible.
16
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay. And also
17
    to follow along with the question with regard that
    screening where the baffles are on the shutters --
18
19
                   THE WITNESS: The louver.
20
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: The louvers,
21
    thank you, is there any way of visually reducing the
```

visual impact of that, even though -- and still allow

THE WITNESS: In my opinion you would

also the air flow through there?

use a different color, I think.

22

23

24

```
CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: So color would
1
2
    blend with the sky is that it?
3
                   THE WITNESS: That's correct.
4
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay. And then
5
    on one of the charts that you have that talks about
    the overall size, are you able to -- would you be
6
7
    able to provide, what is it, above grade versus below
    grade in terms of the change from 2016 and 2014? I
8
9
    don't recall the exhibit number particularly, it's
10
    the chart.
11
                   MR. DRILL: It's either Exhibit 14 --
    it's either Exhibit 15 or Exhibit 16 or A-15 or A-16.
12
13
                   THE WITNESS: Right.
14
                   MR. DRILL: I guess it's A-15, that's
    -- that's A-16, that is up there. But we'll go back
15
    one exhibit? Yes, could you -- yes, move it up a
16
17
    little. There you go.
                   MS. RAZIN: Is there -- I think -- I
18
19
    think we're talking about -- what Charles is asking,
20
    I don't want to speak for him, but I think what
21
    Charles is asking is there a difference from 2014 and
    2016, in terms of what's above grade and then
22
    although -- is there any difference whatsoever -- is
23
    there any difference between what's below -- and also
24
25
    is there a difference between '14 and '16 below
```

- grade, below grade to below below grade in '14 and
  '16, above grade to above grade '14 to '16? I know
  this is -- I know this number, but it's not depicted
  numerically on this chart. I think that's what

Charles wants.

THE WITNESS: Okay. So the below grade

floor area in 2013 and '14 is being reduced by 2,500

grade

grade

Here with the 2016 Master Plan Amendment.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN:

Yes.

- The rest of the change in the building

  floor area calculations are taken from the above

  grade structures.
  - So the North building loped off a level at 58,000. We did a wedding cake that came closer to Van Dien that added square footage, and then we agreed to take an additional 5,000 square feet off the North building above grade, and then the only below grade that we agreed to was the 2,500 square feet in this go-round.
  - So out of the 34,000 square feet difference between 2013 and 2014 to 2016 is 31,500 square feet is attributable to above grade structures and 2,500 square feet is attributable to below grade structures.
- 25 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you.

```
1
                   Richard?
2
                   VICE CHAIRMAN JOEL: No questions,
    thanks.
3
4
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Kevin?
5
                   MR. REILLY: No questions.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Wendy?
6
7
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay. I do have a few.
    Somehow I always end up asking my questions in the
8
9
    middle of the night. I don't know why that always
10
    happens, but here we go.
11
                   Can we go back to the slide that has
    the simulation from Meadowbrook?
12
                   THE WITNESS: Sure, that's A-9 and
13
    A - 10.
14
15
                  MR. DRILL: The long view or the short
16
17
                  MS. DOCKRAY: No, the closer one, the
18
    close-up one. I'm sorry.
19
                   THE WITNESS: A-10.
20
                  MS. DOCKRAY: Yes, that's it.
                                                   That's
21
    it.
22
                   THE WITNESS: A-10.
23
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay. It's hard for me
24
    to see here, but what are those slats on the top of
25
    the penthouse? You know I see -- is that -- I see
```

```
1
    the gray frame, and the blue frame what is -- what is
    that, the gray slats that I'm looking at there?
2
                   THE WITNESS: Oh, it's an architectural
3
4
    feature to provide an eyebrow or shadow effect to
5
    define the top of the building.
6
                   Again -- this is all up to --
7
                   MS. DOCKRAY: They're not the louvers?
                   THE WITNESS: You're talking about this
8
9
    line right here (indicating).
10
                   MS. DOCKRAY: No, well, come down.
11
    Those lines. Are those the louvers?
12
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 These?
13
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Yes.
                   THE WITNESS:
                                Yes.
14
                   MS. DOCKRAY: That's louvers?
15
                   THE WITNESS: And again the vertical
16
17
    representation was in line with keeping the window
    mullions of the patient floors below.
18
19
                   Again, this is an architectural feature
20
    that can be discussed at site plan application.
                   MS. DOCKRAY: But it's not something
21
22
    you could put green screen over.
23
                   THE WITNESS: No.
24
                   MR. DRILL: She's correct.
25
                   THE WITNESS: The green -- the green
```

```
screen is intended to go in between the louvers.
1
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay.
2
                   So, in general, can you tell me then
3
4
    what percent of the penthouse will be green-screened?
5
    It would seem very, very small as a -- as a percent
    of an area that is presented.
6
7
                   THE WITNESS: I would guess on the east
    -- on the westerly side of the North building you're
8
9
    probably talking about 15 to 20 percent.
10
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Is that true all the way
11
    around.
                   THE WITNESS: No. Because if you go to
12
    the northern elevation which is -- yes, A-14, yes,
13
14
    A-14, you can see that most of that side is louvered.
15
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Oh, my goodness. Okay.
    So there would be really no green screen there or
16
17
    very, very little.
18
                   THE WITNESS: Very little.
19
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay. While you have
20
    that picture up, you said that this was a simulation
21
    on a photograph taken in 2010?
                   THE WITNESS: That's correct.
22
23
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Okay. So is there any
24
    chance you have the original picture of what is
25
    exactly, what is there from 2010 so we can --
```

THE WITNESS: Yes. These pictures were taken with a digital camera. I have the jpeg on my computer in the office.

MS. DOCKRAY: Pardon?

THE WITNESS: These pictures were taken in 2010 with a digital camera, they are jpeg files, they're on my computer in my office. I sent them to the architect, Steve Evers, his firm designed this building, asked him to reduce the height of the building by eliminating the fifth floor and then superimpose the two scale version of the buildings in each one of these digital images.

MS. DOCKRAY: Right.

THE WITNESS: This is not unlike some of the images you may or may not have seen of the depiction of the parking garage. Again, a digital photograph upon which an architect superimposed the proposed --

MS. DOCKRAY: Right. I was just trying to figure out, okay, as I look at this, where am I standing compared to if I were standing there now, where am I? And how is what I see now compared to what I would see in this picture?

24 THE WITNESS: This fence (indicating)
25 is the fence that separates the parking area which is

```
to the left of this picture, from the field. The
track is running around the perimeter of the whole
field. Right now there is a series of red wood
colored sheds or utility buildings in this location
(indicating).

MR. DRILL: On the school property.

THE WITNESS: On the school property.
```

And at that time there was a ball field in the foreground and also another ball field in the southeast corner of the Benjamin Franklin Middle School. So this is infield clay or sand, grass in the outfield, and on this ball field, this is the end of the infield and beginning of the outfield (indicating).

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Before the running tracks were installed.

MS. DOCKRAY: Right, right, I
understand. I just -- I cannot grab the -- it looks
pretty immense to me, but I don't know I'm going to
go back over to Benjamin Franklin and see how it
looks now to get the sense of -- I was like, oh, it
would be nice to -- because it looks so immense to
me, you can see how it looks compared to what's there
now.

But if you don't have it, that's okay.

```
1
                   And I know we're not supposed to
2
    compare things to what exists now, but just in terms
    of visual, sometimes that happens, it makes it
3
4
    easier.
5
                   The last thing is under the simulation,
6
    did you do any without trees -- tree and leaves, you
7
    know, without leaves on the trees?
                   THE WITNESS: Did I do any simulations
8
9
    without the landscaping?
10
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Yeah, without -- well,
11
    without the leaves on the trees? Just, you know,
    December or January as opposed to midsummer.
12
13
                   THE WITNESS: We took the pictures in
    June of 2010.
14
15
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Yeah, so you didn't do
    any when the leaves were off the trees. Okay.
16
17
                   So -- and let's see, I have a -- I'll
    ask Blais later, I think.
18
19
                   I have questions about the conditions,
20
    but I really would like to think about them some more
21
    and go back to the letter of the Board of Education
    and if you don't mind, okay. That was a lot to
22
23
    absorb all at once, to be really honest.
24
                   So, thank you.
```

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN:

Thank you.

- 1 Debbie?
- MS. PATIRE: Everyone asked the
- 3 questions I had so.
- 4 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Khadir, any
- 5 questions?
- 6 MR. ABDALLA: Just a quick
- 7 clarification about the green screens and the colored
- 8 green walls which you described.
- 9 It's my assumption, and correct me if I
- 10 am wrong, that whatever green wall or green screen
- 11 that its going to be installed, it's going to be a
- 12 | full grown green wall; correct? Meaning that the
- 13 vegetation, we're not -- we're not expecting some
- 14 | gray structure with some ivy waiting to grow in a
- 15 month or is it going to be a fully grown system that
- 16 is going to be installed to look green for the entire
- 17 time?
- 18 THE WITNESS: There are various systems
- 19 that are manufactured, some of the sub-structures are
- 20 a green pattern, they're usually a heavy gauge metal
- 21 wire. Some of them are vertical wires that look like
- 22 strings upon which the individual greenery grows in a
- 23 vertical fashion.
- This is certainly open to a site plan
- 25 application where we can present different types of

```
1
    green screen walls. And we can discuss the
2
    preferences at that time.
3
                   MR. ABDALLA: Thank you.
4
                   MS. PATIRE: Charles, can I ask a
5
    question.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Yes.
6
7
                   MS. PATIRE: Sorry. I recognized that
    you asked a lot of them but I'm just curious, Maria,
9
    it sounds like you have wonderful experience and
    you've been a lot of places.
10
11
                   But a couple of things you had
12
    mentioned about, you know, the outdated Phillips
13
    building, the new operating rooms, the new
14
    technology, can you talk a little bit about some of
15
    the technology and things that we have at The Valley
    Hospital should this happen? Can you talk a little
16
17
    bit about that?
18
                   MR. DRILL: She can if you want her to.
19
                   MS. PATIRE: Are we not allowed to.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I think it's in
20
21
    the testimony --
22
                   MS. RAZIN: Yes, it's --
23
                   MS. PATIRE: Yeah, I read some of that.
    I just -- I kind of understood --
24
25
                   MS. RAZIN: Let me see if I -- I will
```

```
1 try to find out for you.
```

MS. PATIRE: I read the bible, as I call it.

MS. RAZIN: Yes, I will try to narrow it down where it and if there's anything that's really specific.

MS. PATIRE: I'm just saying that when that was submitted, technology changes in the course of a day so I am curious based on her experience and what she's been doing if anything has been, you know, updated from --

MS. RAZIN: You know --

MS. PATIRE: -- since that -- so --

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Some of the

questions were answered in the past so Mike can --

I am going to tell you that in order to accommodate things like a biplane neurointerventional suite, in our current ORs we had to take two ORs and three bays out of the recovery space in order to do that. And as you know we're a designated stroke center. And in order to do that our -- there isn't enough room in our operating rooms to accommodate that nor are there the appropriate mechanical air systems that needed to be changed out in order to do that, which require

- greater floor to ceiling heights so the duct work can be above that technology.
- You know we would continue to have MRIs

  and CAT scans. It's a matter of accommodating the

  technology for which we do not have appropriate floor

  to ceiling heights, as we move forward, most of it to

improve and increase our equipment for what we have.

- MS. PATIRE: Okay, thank you.
- 9 MS. RAZIN: Can I say --

7

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- 10 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Can I just ask
  11 -- I had another question.
- MS. RAZIN: Go ahead. I had a question on the slide, but go ahead.
  - COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. I wanted to ask a question too on the slide.
    - So, Maria, just so I understand, so we had a conversation about these green screens, green screens are essentially to mitigate the visual appearance of this mass.
    - But we're understanding now that there can be no green screening along the north side of the North building now; is that correct? Based on this image and your statement that that whole side of the 24-foot high mechanicals is all louver, so then what I'm to understand is that along the north side of the

- 1 North building there can be no green screen up there? Just I mean it's --2
- 3 THE WITNESS: As depicted in this
- 4 exhibit, yes.

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Can we challenge the engineers to come up with larger areas or defined areas of louvers and place equipment within the penthouse so that we can reduce the surface area for louvers? I think that that's a challenge we should give to the engineers.

COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: So then if I were standing, I guess in the southeast corner on Steilen towards the southeast location of the North building then that side too, is that all louvers as well, the opposite side.

THE WITNESS: No. There is some of the enclosed penthouse and there is where the cooling tower area begins. Then the lower there is a smaller area of mechanical equipment and that view you saw in Exhibit A-13 from the back of --

COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: So if you --

THE WITNESS: A-13 --

- COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: If you could go
- back, I would like to just scoot back to that one --23
- 24 THE WITNESS: Sure.
- 25 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: For a moment.

```
1
                   THE WITNESS: It's only one exhibit
    back. It's A-13.
2
3
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay.
4
                   THE WITNESS: So you got -- that's the
5
    southeast -- south elevation facing you east on the
    side, here's the mechanical penthouse which ends and
6
7
    the cooling tower location begins.
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN:
8
                                          Okay.
9
                   THE WITNESS: And down on the lower
    floor, at the end of level four, there's a small area
10
    here of mechanical equipment (indicating).
11
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: And so, going
12
13
    back to that area that we saw, let's look at the --
14
    the lower right part of the mechanicals. That seems
    to be with the bricks around it.
1.5
                   Now, what is -- what would that
16
17
    material be? Because we're actually -- we're kind of
    not seeing that because presumably those shrubbery
18
    was Photoshopped in there. Is that what you've added
19
20
    just to give it --
21
                   THE WITNESS:
                                Right.
                                         In here,
    actually, it was part of the shrubbery that was in
22
    the back yard at that time.
23
24
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Oh, that's
25
    existing.
```

```
THE WITNESS: However -- however --
1
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay.
2
3
                   THE WITNESS: Again, I would venture to
4
    quess that some of this is architectural in nature in
    order to repeat the rhythm, and we can look at --
5
6
    again, the placement of the louvers and where to
7
    create areas to either change the material of the
    brick at this level. It's a solid base. Or, you
9
    know, to do something else architecturally in texture
10
    and color.
11
                  COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. And
    again, that's just -- that's mechanical there?
12
13
                   THE WITNESS: From what we know today,
14
    as the building's designed today.
1.5
                  COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. So now,
    could you just go back one more time to the other
16
17
    slide, the north side of the North building.
18
                   THE WITNESS: So go down to 14.
19
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: You know the
    numbers? I know direction.
20
21
                   THE WITNESS: So, from the previous
    slide, this is the wraparound that we saw
22
23
    (indicating).
24
                  COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay.
25
                   THE WITNESS: Well, this level's the
```

```
1 patient rooms actually. This is level four coming
```

- 2 around here, so those are windows. And then this is
- 3 --
- 4 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Where can I see
- 5 that? That's --
- 6 THE WITNESS: The material change. The
- 7 material change.
- 8 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. Then on
- 9 the very northeast corner of that North building,
- 10 | that -- those -- that's a smokestack sticking out?
- 11 Is that what that is?
- 12 THE WITNESS: Correct.
- 13 The power plant is a two-story space,
- 14 in the area on the back side of the stair towers.
- 15 | See these windows, these are in the stairs
- 16 (indicating).
- 17 And in order to avoid a freestanding
- 18 | smokestack, as you visualize that --
- 19 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: We had that
- 20 whole conversation, right.
- 21 THE WITNESS: Right. You've extended
- 22 the enclosure around the smokestack so as to be
- 23 continuous as it's always been. That you see is what
- 24 protrudes from the top.
- 25 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: And do you know

```
1 | the height of that? What that --
```

- THE WITNESS: The height depends upon
- 3 | the DEP telling us what the wind direction on a
- 4 normal day is and the dispersion of the flue gas that
- 5 comes out of the boilers, so...
- 6 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Right. Now you
- 7 | don't have them?
- 8 THE WITNESS: Typically -- typically,
- 9 your house should have a chimney that extends 4 feet
- 10 above the roof of your house.
- 11 | So, by nature, it's going to be at
- 12 least 4 feet above the highest point in this
- 13 building.
- But then again, the height will be
- determined by the New Jersey Department of
- 16 | Environmental Protection. We have no recourse to
- 17 make it any shorter.
- 18 | COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. Thank
- 19 you.
- THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
- 21 | MR. THURSTON: Maria, staying -- just
- 22 for a moment, staying on the louvers, the color could
- 23 be akin to what a green screen, would be; is that
- 24 correct?
- THE WITNESS: Absolutely. Absolutely.

```
1
                   MR. THURSTON:
                                  So, you don't get the
2
    actual vine, but you get the same coloring of it?
3
                   THE WITNESS: Correct.
4
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: I mean, I've
5
    always been one that -- I mean I've seen vines on top
    of a tall building, I mean unless it's a brownstone,
6
7
    you know, it's like one of those crazy things that
    just doesn't seem right to me.
8
9
                   But just to that point, I mean you're
    just talking about changing the color. You're not
10
11
    getting the spirit of, like, what we kind of agreed
12
    to --
13
                   THE WITNESS:
                                Right.
                                        That all can be
    determined at the site plan application.
14
15
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: If I can
16
    interject on that point, I think the intention of the
17
    language that Blais went through about -- the
    language was there predominantly to allow, during
18
    site plan, the ability to scrutinize and to maximum
19
20
    the effectiveness of making the rooftop mechanically
21
    blend with the sky to reduce the height factor.
22
                   THE WITNESS: That is correct.
23
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: So, at site plan,
24
    there can be a great deal of debate in architectural
    emphasis from the board or from --
25
```

```
1
                   THE WITNESS: The materials, texture,
    color.
2
3
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN:
                                         Right.
4
                   So, this is one concept to display that
5
    material might blend with the sky, but green screens,
6
    other materials, et cetera, would then occur at site
7
    plan.
                   THE WITNESS: Yes.
9
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN:
                                        Okay.
10
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Wait. I'm not
11
    just missing that, I certainly know that.
                                                I think
    it's an important conversation to have because it was
12
13
    an essential part of mitigating the effect that to
14
    understand that that entire north wall of the North
15
    building, the 24 foot high mechanicals is -- has to
    be louvers whether the front of it -- essentially,
16
17
    you'd have 50 percent green screen covering. Is a --
    is a -- it's significant, it's not insignificant or
18
19
    inconsequential. So that's -- I -- I appreciate your
20
    point, but I think that that's not inconsequential.
21
                   THE WITNESS:
                                 We appreciate that --
22
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I'm just saying,
    we put a lot of time into that point at site plan.
23
24
                   MS. DOCKRAY: But it might not work.
25
    It might not help.
```

```
1
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: That's actually
2
    my point, thank you.
3
                   MS. DOCKRAY: It may not help.
4
    would have been, you know, I think we have to make
5
    our judgement based on what we see.
6
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Okay. Thank
7
    you, Maria.
                   THE WITNESS: You're welcome.
9
                   MS. RAZIN: Can I ask a question?
10
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Yes.
11
                   MS. RAZIN: Looking at this visually
    are the mechanical penthouse, when you look at it
12
13
    from this vantage point, it doesn't look like it's
14
    setback, when you -- because of the rendering -- do
    you want to call it rendering?
15
16
                   MR. DRILL: The sections.
                   MS. RAZIN: The sections.
17
18
                   If you look at it this way, it doesn't
    look like it's setback, is it -- can you just confirm
19
20
    if it's setback from -- from this vantage point, what
21
    the setbacks would be?
22
                   THE WITNESS: Confirm what a setback
23
    is.
24
                   MS. RAZIN: I'm sorry.
25
                   THE WITNESS: I will confirm what that
```

```
1
    setback is.
                  MS. RAZIN: Okay. The setback from the
2
3
    -- I'm not saying distance from here (indicating).
4
                   THE WITNESS: No. Right.
5
                   MS. RAZIN: I'm saying from the
6
    building, the edge of the building.
7
                   THE WITNESS: Yes. Exactly, I will
8
    confirm that.
9
                  MS. RAZIN: Thank you so much.
10
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Other questions
11
    from the board?
12
                   (No response.)
13
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay. So...
14
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: Mr. Chairman, I have a
15
    question.
16
                  CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Yes, please,
17
    Blais. Sorry.
18
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: Maria, could you put up
19
    the exhibit that compared the before and after floor
20
    area.
           There was a couple of them.
21
                   THE WITNESS: A-17.
22
                  MR. DRILL: A-16.
23
                   THE WITNESS: A-16 starts the --
                  MR. BRANCHEAU: Yes. I think that's
24
    the one.
25
```

```
1
                   THE WITNESS: Okay.
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: And I was a little
2
3
    confused by the numbers, particularly with the
4
    indication that the Phase I to Phase II there was a
    change of 458 and the right column. Whereas, if I
5
6
    look at 961 in Phase II, and I compare that with
7
    908,5 in Phase I, I get a difference of about,
    53,500, I think it is. 525, I think. There's a
9
    difference in there of about 7,000 square feet that I
10
    don't know where --
                  MR. DRILL: The arithmetic's wrong, the
11
    961 minus 908?
12
13
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: Minus 908 isn't 45,8.
14
    It's something higher than that. And I don't know
    where the mistake is.
1.5
16
                  MR. DRILL: There's obviously a
17
    mistake. So, we're coming back in any event, we're
    going to have to correct that.
18
19
                   Thank you.
20
                   MR. BRANCHEAU: Thank you.
21
                   THE WITNESS: So it's 53.
                                              Okay.
22
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you, Blais.
23
                  MR. BRANCHEAU: You're welcome.
24
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay. So, I
25
    think what we'll do is wrap up now -- wrap up now and
```

```
1
    continue tomorrow with any follow up questions from
    the board and then have the public questions for
2
    these issues -- for the witnesses tomorrow. Is that
3
4
    good for everyone? Is anyone not going to be here
    tomorrow?
5
                   FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Can we just
6
7
    find out how many people have questions right now?
                   FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm not going
8
9
    to be here.
10
                   MR. VOIGT: Yeah, I -- I --
11
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Yes.
12
                   FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Because if
    it's, like, only three people so I'm sure we can get
13
    them done.
14
15
                   MR. VOIGT: So -- so supposing you're
    -- you're not around to address these particular
16
17
    witnesses --
18
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I'll allow you to
    ask tonight --
19
20
                   MR. VOIGT: -- can you ask the questions
21
    at a later time or no?
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: As long as the
22
23
    witness --
24
                   MR. VOIGT: You know, because, you
25
    know, I may not be around tomorrow to ask these
```

```
people questions.
1
2
                   FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: Right.
3
                   MR. VOIGT: I'd like to ask -- I have
4
    several questions for these people. I'm not going to
5
    be here early tomorrow evening. I'll be here later.
    I want to ask -- you know, are you going to let
6
7
    people ask these questions, but I'd like to ask some
    questions.
8
9
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: So --
10
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Does the board
11
    think it's okay if we continue a little bit and open
    to the public and allow public to --
12
13
                   MR. VOIGT: Yeah.
                   MR. DRILL: That's fine with us. We'll
14
    stay as long as you want.
15
16
                  CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Why don't we
17
    continue so people in the audience can ask questions
```

actually -- sorry, Jon.

21

We could actually have Maria come back
on -- not tomorrow.

MR. DRILL: No, no.

25 FEMALE AUDIENCE MEMBER: How many

```
1
    people -- how many people have questions?
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Well, let's not
2
3
    -- I think we should continue. Thanks for bringing
4
    that up.
5
                   All right. So, is there a motion to
6
    open to public questioning for the witness?
7
                  VICE CHAIRMAN JOEL: Motion to open to
8
    public questioning.
9
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Is there a
10
    second, please?
11
                   MR. THURSTON: Second.
12
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Mike, please call
13
    the roll. All in favor?
14
                   (Whereupon, all Board Members respond
            in the affirmative.)
1.5
16
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Anyone opposed?
17
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mayor Aronsohn?
18
                   MAYOR ARONSOHN: Yes.
19
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Ms. Bigos?
                   MS. BIGOS: Yes.
20
21
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Councilwoman Knudsen?
22
                   COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Yes.
23
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Nalbantian?
24
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Yes.
25
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Joel?
```

```
1
                   MR. JOEL: Yes.
2
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Reilly?
3
                   MR. REILLY: Yes.
4
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Ms. Dockray?
5
                   MS. DOCKRAY: Yes.
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Thurston?
6
7
                   MR. THURSTON: Yes.
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Mr. Abdalla?
8
9
                   MR. ABDALLA: Yes.
10
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Ms. Patire?
11
                   MS. PATIRE: Yes.
12
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Mr. Voigt, again,
13
    you have five minutes to ask your questions. So ask
    them --
14
15
                   MR. VOIT: My questions are going to be
16
    in rapid order.
17
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Great.
18
    Excellent. Thank you.
19
                   Before you begin, please state and
20
    spell your name and provide your address for the
21
    record.
22
                   MR. VOIGT: Jeffrey Voigt, V-o-i-g-t,
23
    99 Glenwood Road, Ridgewood, New Jersey.
24
                   This -- this relates to your initial
25
    comments, it relates to the two lawsuits.
                                                 I ' m
```

```
1
    assuming there's two different lawsuits or does this
    particular -- this particular forum address the two
2
    lawsuits, one against the Planning Board and the one
3
4
    against the Village Council. I'm not sure about
5
    that.
                   MS. RAZIN: I don't -- well, Mr.
6
7
    Drill's going to object, but I don't think Maria's --
    I don't think Maria's the appropriate witness to
9
    answer --
10
                   MR. VOIGT: No, yeah. But you -- but I
11
    wasn't allowed to ask this guy questions. You told
12
    me to wait.
13
                   MS. RAZIN: You're not allowed to --
                   MR. VOIGT: You told me to wait.
14
                   MS. RAZIN:
15
                              I --
                   MR. VOIGT: You told me to wait until
16
17
    this time, so you got to let me do that.
18
                  MS. RAZIN: Sir, excuse me. There's no
19
    reason -- we just extended the meeting. Everyone's a
20
    little edgy because it's quarter to twelve, but let's
21
    -- if we could just, let's keep it relaxed.
22
                   MR. VOIGT: Okay. Mr. Nalbantian,
23
    remember you said I could not ask this question
```

MS. RAZIN: Sir, right what I'm going

until --

```
1
    to explain to you --
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: But we are --
2
3
                   MR. VOIGT: -- until it was --
4
                   MS. RAZIN: What I am trying to explain
5
    to you is that if you ask a procedural question, we
    will try our best, I'm sure, Mr. Nalbantian, myself,
6
7
    Mr. Drill, would be happy to do our best to try to
    answer a procedural question for you.
8
9
                   But for Maria's sake, let's try and get
10
11
                   MR. VOIGT: Okay. So, sir, can we put
    this question saying okay for now --
12
13
                   MS. RAZIN: -- let's -- no --
14
                   MR. DRILL: With all due respect we're
    not going --
15
16
                   MR. VOIGT: No, no, no.
17
                   MR. DRILL: -- the court reporter
    cannot take down all these speakers at one time.
18
19
                   MS. RAZIN: Sir?
20
                   THE COURT REPORTER: No, I cannot.
21
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Please let
22
    counsel --
23
                   MS. RAZIN: Let's try and be --
24
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: -- respond to the
25
    question.
```

```
1
                   MS. RAZIN: I'm happy to answer any
2
    legal questions you have.
3
                   Mr. Drill can answer a legal question,
4
    but I'm not going to do it while there's people
5
    waiting to ask Ms. Mediago questions.
                   MR. VOIGT: Got it. Okay. That's fair
6
7
    enough.
                   Your, your, your rendition in A-14, I
8
9
    think is a bit deceiving to be honest with you. It
10
    looks like the City of Oz from three miles away.
11
                   I would respectfully ask that -- and
    this is a request, that you take an actual more
12
13
    recent photo of that, probably closer to the building
14
    so we can actually see what it looks like. Because
15
    I'll tell ya, that is really deceiving.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: What are your
16
17
    questions, please?
18
                   MR. VOIGT: That's my -- my question
    is: Can you take another picture that actually looks
19
    realistic?
20
21
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN:
                                        Next question,
22
    please.
23
                   MR. VOIGT: Got it.
24
                   The question on dewatering, does that
```

mean less watering or more watering? Can you talk

```
1
    about dewatering?
2
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Next question.
                   MR. VOIGT: Got it.
3
4
                   You talk about blasting being
5
    controlled, and then you mention that you're going to
6
    have -- you're going to gain permission from the
7
    households around the area; is that correct? That's
    a question. Okay.
8
9
                   My next question is: Supposing the
    houses do not want to have blasting happen, what do
10
11
    you do?
12
                   My last question is: Continuous
13
    monitoring of air containment systems, where will
14
    these systems reside, in what locations? That will
15
    be helpful to know.
16
                   Thank you.
                   MS. RAZIN: Can I just comment very
17
    quickly, I think the first question is that the --
18
    the first question is up to Maria and Mr. Drill.
19
20
                   The last three on dewatering, blasting,
21
    and continuous monitoring are all conditions that
22
    were stipulated to. Whether or not, ultimately,
    that's -- we're going to have further discussion on
23
```

them is another issue, but there are conditions that

have not changed since 2013 and 2014. So they're not

24

```
1 part of Maria's testimony.
```

- One is Maria's testimony, that's why I
- 3 asked Mr. Drill where they -- did it come from the
- 4 | transcripts and were they potential stipulations or
- 5 testimony from other witnesses during those
- 6 proceedings or come from exhibits during those
- 7 proceedings from other witnesses, not necessarily
- 8 Maria during this proceeding.
- 9 So those are -- and they were not
- 10 changes, so I don't --
- 11 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: And they're in
- 12 the record?
- 13 MS. RAZIN: And they're in the record.
- 14 | So, as to question one --
- MR. DRILL: Yes, I can answer question
- 16 one. The others, I agree, are inappropriate
- 17 questions. There's one lawsuit. I filed a complaint
- 18 | in lieu of prerogative writ.
- 19 COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Can you speak
- 20 into the microphone.
- 21 MR. DRILL: It had two counts.
- 22 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Jon, can you say
- 23 | it in the mic?
- 24 | COUNCILWOMAN KNUDSEN: Can you speak
- 25 | into the microphone? I would can't hear you.

```
1
                   MR. DRILL: You can't?
2
                   MS. RAZIN: That was not the question.
    The question was that was -- that was not question
3
4
    one. Question one was about the request for
5
    additional pictures. Let's deal the legal issues
    off.
6
7
                   MR. VOIGT:
                              Okay.
8
                   MR. DRILL: We can't get the picture
9
    done with the -- with the simulation done in time
    with respect to the remand order, so we have to
10
11
    respectfully turn down your request.
12
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay.
13
                   Now, please come forward. State your
14
    name, spell your name, and your address.
1.5
                   MS. VERMYLEN: Hello. My name is Jiffy
    Vermylen. That's spelled J-I-F-F-Y. Last name, "V"
16
17
    as in Victor, E-R, "M" as in Mary, Y-L-E, "N" as in
    Nancy, 241 North Walnut Street, Ridgewood, New
18
19
    Jersey.
20
                   Question pertaining to qualifications
21
    discussed by the witness. First question is:
    you a LEED accredited professional?
22
23
                   Second question would be: Is anyone on
24
    the your Valley staff or involved in the project a
25
    LEED accredited professional?
```

```
1
                   And I'm wondering if you can describe
2
    prior experience of yourself and/or Valley with
    respect to sustainable design and construction,
3
4
    specifically implementation, experience with the
    conditions listed with respect to air quantity
5
6
    monitoring.
7
                   MS. RAZIN: Thank you.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Did you get that,
8
9
    Laura?
10
                   MS. VERMYLEN: I know I speak quickly.
11
                   MS. RAZIN: It's okay. I just couldn't
    get all of them.
12
13
                   THE WITNESS: Regarding my -- whether
14
    I'm a LEED accredited professional, no I, am not.
15
                   However, there are four people on my
16
    staff that are. And every single member of the
17
    Torcon Construction team is currently on site and
    would be part of this project construction are.
18
19
                   The architects for this project
    maintain a full staff of LEED accredited
20
21
    professionals. And the engineers are as well, our
22
    engineers.
23
                   And to the extent that we can employ --
24
    a goal of this project, is to have -- to obtain the
25
    most LEED credits that are possible. There are some
```

```
1
    elements of green that cannot because of our site and
    or location in Ridgewood that are thing we couldn't
2
    change.
3
                   But Valley Hospital -- I don't know if
4
5
    you saw it in The Record today, we are committed to
    sustainability in everything we do.
6
7
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you for
    your question.
8
9
                   MS. ROMERO: Marisol Romero,
10
    M-A-R-I-S-O-L, R-O-M-E-R-O, 258 Steilen Avenue,
11
    Ridgewood, New Jersey.
12
                   Basically, all my questions relate to
13
    the redline of landscape and design features. And
14
    especially after seeing the pictures, I have a lot of
15
    questions. So, I'll just go down them quickly.
                   Will the existing -- excuse me -- will
16
17
    the existing cement wall that's along Steilen Avenue,
    you know, be removed and replace them with a 20-foot
18
19
    wall?
20
```

Who will determine the types of

vegetation that will be planted? And the reason I

ask that, are seasonal allergies taken into

consideration when selecting the vegetation? A lot

of people, including my son, has extremely severe

seasonal allergies.

21

22

23

24

Will the trees be evergreen and mature in height? Can it by required that they be at least a minimum number of feet in height? Like, for example, I don't want a Charlie Brown Christmas tree in my backyard along the Steilen Avenue border especially.

Said you can't, but I was disappointed that visual pictures were only in the summer because six months out of the year -- and I know this because I stare at the hospital from my backyard -- it's a big difference. When you see, you know, vegetation, the trees in the back with leaves on it and then without. So, I am disappointed that all these renderings are during the summertime and not during the winter because then, especially with a max building, you're going to see a lot more of the height of the hospital.

Are the 20-feet high chillers included in the final heights of the buildings or would it be on top of the height of the buildings? So I know, for example, I think the final height of the Cheel building, which I don't know if it has chillers on it, is 65. So if it has a chiller on it, are we saying it's 65 plus 24?

```
1
                   With a green roof -- because I've been
2
    hearing about a green roof, a green screen, would a
    green roof even be visible from the street if the
3
    building is so high, and is that vegetation also
4
    evergreen? Is the setback on Steilen Avenue -- and
5
    again, I'm going to use the example the Cheel
6
7
    building, of 70 feet, taken from the property line or
    the existing cement wall because --
8
9
                   MR. DRILL: Repeat that one.
10
                   MS. ROMERO: Okay. Is the setback on
11
    Steilen Avenue -- and I'm using the example of the
    Cheel building, which is going to be 70 feet, is it
12
13
    taken from the property line or the existing cement
14
    wall?
                   Because technically, the cement wall
15
    which is currently there, sits on the hospital
16
17
    property line.
                   So then, if I'm assuming it's really
18
19
    not 70 feet from the cement wall, it's really before
20
    that. And I just want to confirm that.
21
                   And then the other two, like you said,
    if it has to do with the blast question, it's not
22
    appropriate right now, correct?
23
24
                   MS. RAZIN: Yes.
25
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: If it's regarding
```

```
1
    the previous testimony, no.
                   MS. ROMERO: It was will houses --
2
3
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Ask the question
4
    -- you have to ask the questions and if they can be
    answered they will be answered today.
5
                   MS. ROMERO: Okay. I'll ask it, okay.
6
7
    I'm sorry. Thank you.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: If it's not, they
8
9
    will not answer it.
10
                   MS. ROMERO: Will houses on Steilen
11
    Avenue also be checked for damage in regards to
12
    blasting?
13
                   And then, again, I don't know if this
14
    is appropriate, but why would you build up the Cheel
    building in Phase I to 208,000 square feet to then
15
    lower it to 193,000 square feet in Phase II?
16
17
                   That's it.
                   MS. RAZIN: Thank you.
18
19
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you for
20
    your questions.
21
                   Was everybody able to get those okay?
22
                   THE WITNESS: All right. I think the
23
    first question has to do with the wall along Steilen
24
    Avenue. The existing concrete wall that exists along
25
    Steilen Avenue adjoining properties would be removed.
```

- 1 There is a section of the northeast corner of the
- 2 | site that has the 20-foot high wall with the
- 3 landscape buffer.
- And then the remainder of the property
- 5 | line has a fence, and we talked about material in all
- 6 of the Master Plan Amendments.
- 7 So whether it's a vinyl fence or some
- 8 other structure, that was to be determined during
- 9 | site plan application.
- MR. DRILL: The next question was: Who
- 11 | will determine the vegetation. Her son has
- 12 allergies.
- 13 THE WITNESS: The project team consists
- 14 of landscape architects who will propose the types of
- 15 | vegetation that will be in conjunction with what the
- 16 ordinance is asking for us to plant.
- 17 And I'm sure we can direct the
- 18 | landscape architects to look at the types of
- 19 plantings in order to minimize the effect of those
- 20 plantings on seasonal allergies.
- 21 | Again, there's a whole cadre of
- 22 | plantings. I'm sure Blais will help us out in
- 23 reviewing what we plant.
- MR. DRILL: Will they include
- 25 evergreens?

```
1
                   THE WITNESS: Yes, they will.
2
                   MR. DRILL: Are they going to be
3
    planted at a certain minimum height?
4
                   THE WITNESS: The intent along the
5
    20-foot high wall section along the Steilen Avenue
6
    wall property was to block the view of residents on
7
    their second floor looking towards the hospital.
                   So it's a sloped berm. Actually, it's,
8
9
    you know, two walls, one is 20-feet closest to the
10
    whole hospital and a lower wall which --
11
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Can you speak
    into the microphone.
12
13
                   MR. DRILL: Again, are you referring to
14
    Slide 10 on Exhibit A-12?
                   THE WITNESS: Yes, I am. A 6 or 8 foot
15
    wall on the lower side, with a berm planted in the
16
17
    middle and then evergreens, you know, on top of that.
    Again, that was proposed.
18
19
                   MR. DRILL: Does this section show that
20
    the top of the evergreens exceeds the top of the
21
    wall?
22
                   THE WITNESS: Yes, it does.
23
                   MR. DRILL: You took pictures only
24
    during the summer, can you do winter simulations
25
    without the trees?
```

```
1
                   Again, I answered the same question,
    respectfully, we can't. The remand order is on a
2
    tight, tight timeframe and we can't do the additional
3
4
    simulations to comply with the order.
5
                   The next one -- her question was:
    the 20-foot chillers included within the screening or
6
7
    do the 20-foot chillers extend above --
                   MS. RAZIN: Are they included in the
8
9
    height calculation.
10
                   THE WITNESS: Okay. So, I don't
11
    believe I said the chillers are 20-feet tall.
12
                   The area that they sit in would be
13
    screened at the same height or slightly shorter than
14
    the 24 feet depending upon the mechanical absorption
    rate that needs to be achieved with chillers.
15
                   They are included within the 24 feet of
16
17
    the penthouse height, so there's the four floors of
18
    56, plus 24 feet of mechanical penthouse.
19
    includes the chiller area.
                   So, for an overall, 80 feet. It's not
20
21
    another 24 feet on top of the 80.
22
                   MS. DOCKRAY: It's not 20 feet above
23
    the 80?
```

THE WITNESS:

 $N \circ .$ 

MS. DOCKRAY: It's not.

24

```
THE WITNESS: Nothing will be above

80 feet, with the exception of the smokestacks that I

cannot -- they're going to be at least 84 feet, but I

guarantee you the DEP's going to make them a little

bit taller.
```

MR. DRILL: The next question was:
Would the green roofs be visible from the streets
since they'll be up so high? The question implies
that they're going to green roofs higher than the
first level buildings.

THE WITNESS: The green roofs would be on the roof of the first floor projections and on the westerly side of the North building. On the westerly side of the West building. There is currently a green roof between the Bergen building and the Phillips building which will be reinstated after the garage is built. There is a green roof on the loading dock canopy. And wherever else there is an ability to add green roofs, I think Blais testified that depending upon structural concerns, whether or not it's a full planted green roof, or some green screen wall, it needs to be calculated as to its place.

MR. DRILL: The next question was --

MS. RAZIN: But, just -- but, you'll --

```
1
    but they're not -- so would they be visible? I think
    the question would be: Are they going to be visible
2
    as green? You would see them as green? I think
3
    that's the question, would you see them as green.
4
                   THE WITNESS: I can't opine on the ones
5
    that are taller than the first floor roofs.
6
7
                   MS. RAZIN: No, correct. But that's --
    I think that's the question. The first floor -- the
8
9
    ones that were testified to this evening at first
    floor, you'll see them as green because they're at
10
11
    the first floor level.
12
                   THE WITNESS: Absolutely, absolutely.
13
                   MS. RAZIN: Okay. I think that's the
14
    question.
15
                   MR. DRILL: Right. I was saying, the
16
    question assumed it was higher. I was trying to --
17
                   MS. RAZIN: Right. So they're not
    going to be ones that are -- so the question, I
18
    think, right is sort of -- not the ones that are
19
20
    higher, if they're not higher than the first floor
21
    which means the ones on the first floor will be
    visible, but they're not going to be placed higher
22
23
    than the first floor, right?
24
                   THE WITNESS: The loading dock canopy
25
    because of the --
```

```
1
                  MS. RAZIN: Loading dock.
                   THE WITNESS: -- the slope on the back
2
    -- on the eastern side of the site would be taller
3
4
    than the first floor.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: So I would assume
5
6
    that that would be --
7
                   THE WITNESS: In between the first and
8
    second --
9
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: -- visible to the
10
    homes on Steilen Avenue?
11
                   THE WITNESS: Absolutely. On the
    Steilen Avenue, from the ball field, from our own
12
13
    site as well.
                   MR. DRILL: Okay. The next question
14
    was: Are the setbacks on Steilen Avenue measured
15
16
    from the property line or the concrete wall?
17
                   THE WITNESS: From the property line.
18
                   MR. DRILL: The ninth question was --
    oh, are the houses on Steilen going to be -- have to
19
20
    survey. And so the question really is: Are the
21
    houses on Steilen within that...
22
                   THE WITNESS: Cone of depression?
23
                   MR. DRILL: Yes, the cone of
    depression.
24
```

THE WITNESS: Not all of them are.

```
1
                   MR. DRILL: But I believe that we said
    during the 2013-2014 -- I'm just thinking about this
2
    now, it's not in the conditions, that if anyone else
3
4
    wanted their house checked, we would add them onto
    the list.
5
                   THE WITNESS: Correct.
6
7
                   MR. DRILL: So, we said it. And I did
    not purposely not put it in that list of conditions,
8
9
    but it's just -- I just realized it now.
10
                   And the last question was -- oh, it was
11
    about the Cheel building. I think there's a
    misunderstanding but I'm going to let you answer
12
13
    that.
14
                   THE WITNESS: Correct.
15
                   The Cheel building exists today, and it
    will exist throughout the phases.
16
17
                   However, during the second phase, there
    are areas within the Cheel building on the first
18
    floor levels that will be eliminated and, therefore,
19
20
    the reduction in square feet of the Cheel building.
21
                   MR. DRILL: And the only remaining
    items, I guess, the most number of questions within
22
    five minutes by far, winning the award.
23
24
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Also, Ms. Romero,
```

there is a lot of information from the 2014 that

```
1
    relates to the wall, the landscaping, that you'll be
2
    able to read if you go online.
3
                   MS. ROMERO: Okay. Thank you.
4
                   MS. BANEY: May I ask, are we having
5
    questions tonight from anybody with questions for the
    hospital experts or can just the people who have to
6
7
    go today -- can some of us come back?
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Do you have a
8
9
    question?
10
                   MS. BANEY: I do, but I respectfully
11
    would rather the people who can't come back ask
    theirs and perhaps utilize the additional nights --
12
13
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay.
                                                Is there
14
    anyone else this evening that is not intending to
15
    come back that would like to ask their questions?
                   MS. BANEY: No. I would rather ask
16
17
    tomorrow.
              Next -- tomorrow.
18
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: We can continue.
19
                   MR. DRILL: We're coming back tomorrow.
20
                   MS. BANEY:
                              Okay. That's what I wanted
21
    to know.
                              We have agreed to stay as
22
                   MR. DRILL:
    long as you want. If you want to cut off at
23
24
    midnight, we're not going to object. We'll stay as
25
    long as you want.
```

```
1
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: I think if there
2
    aren't -- is there anyone else that has a question
    for Maria tonight?
3
4
                   Please come forward. Let's state your
5
    name, provide your address.
                   MS. McWILLIAMS: Hi, Melanie
6
7
    McWilliams, M-c W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S, 431 Bogert Ave.
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Can you say that
8
9
    again, slowly please.
10
                   MS. RAZIN: I know it's late.
11
                   MR. DRILL: We didn't even get your
12
    first name.
13
                   MS. McWILLIAMS: That's fine.
                                                   Melanie
14
    McWilliams, M-C-W-I-L-L-I-A-M-S, 431 Bogert Ave.
15
                   My question -- it's like an -- it's an
    observation, sort of, mixed with a question regarding
16
    the -- the -- some verbiage and your safety -- some
17
    of the safety stuff you had brought up.
18
19
                   You've referred to the change to Valley
20
    it's going to be a campus feel, more of a campus
21
    feel. And I look at it, and I see that. I worked at
    Hackensack Medical Center for eight years and it's
22
    very similar.
23
24
                   We pulled in to a -- to a driveway on
25
    Prospect, I think was the street, Prospect, off of
```

```
Essex Street, and entered into a parking garage off to the right. Basically, every employee did this.
```

And it looks like, if I'm reading this correctly, that's what's going to happen here.

I have concerns about traffic backing up doing that during change of shift times, the 7 to 3 shift, the 3 to 11 shift, 11 to 7 shift.

At the change of shift times, you know, a half an hour before, it gets -- you have every employee for that shift entering the hospital.

They're all entering to park in one location at that point and there's only one entrance to that garage, which is what I thought I saw.

How -- I know you said you'll be implementing some new traffic signals, which brought me to another point and another question.

How -- will that -- will -- will you be able to mitigate the traffic in that area which is already backed up at 3 o'clock for school and 7 o'clock for school drop off and pick up, to the point where you can't get down the street.

Which brings me to the point that on January 11th, the Council interviewed and hired a traffic --

25 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Ms. McWilliams,

1 | if you could focus on your question.

1.5

MS. McWILLIAMS: I am going to focus on it because he actually referenced Valley. And Gordon Meth was his name. He was interviewed at Ben Franklin middle school. And he found that traffic -- you had mentioned the traffic reports here were about three years old. He said that -- and we hired him within our village, so I assume we think he's an expert.

So, he said that traffic reports are -after about three years, are outdated. He also said
he found discrepancies within your traffic studies
that were presented, and that was his exact word,
"discrepancies."

So I'm curious if, in that vein, and given that traffic studies can be outdated, would you be doing new ones before any of this commenced?

My last questions was about the louvers and the building, some of the photos of the building, or the renderings here. They're shiny. They're very shiny, that one from the field at BF, it looks really bright and shiny. So, I'm wondering sun glaring onto that reflecting, you know, into that driveway where the school is, where, you know, into the school building, I -- you know, I don't want to go so far as

```
1
    to say it would create heat or issues like that, but
    is that something -- and I noticed that they'll be
2
    metal.
            It'll be metal facades where the green
    screens are attached --
                   MR. CAFARELLI: Two minutes.
5
6
                   MS. McWILLIAMS: Where the green
7
    screens will be attached to it.
                   So, I'm curious if there's any concern
8
9
    about the shine or the heat or anything like that.
10
                   But by my main question is regarding
11
    that traffic area because there is no other entrance
12
    there, so any way, thank you.
13
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN:
                                         Thank you, Ms.
14
    McWilliams.
15
                   MR. DRILL: So I think the first one by
16
    the campus feel, was -- I think the campus feel was
17
    an editorial comment.
                   The change of shift, she's asking
18
    questions about what's going to happen with the
19
20
    change of shift, will traffic back up?
21
                   THE WITNESS: Well, it's not shown
    here, but it's always a part of this plan, is that
22
```

there is an entrance and exit to the Phillips garage

off of North Van Dien and there is an exit from the

Phillips garage into the driveway on the -- on the

23

24

- easterly side of the garage that allows people to exit into the Linwood Avenue driveway to the hospital.
- So that was done on purpose to reduce
  the traffic that can only enter and exit on the north
  Van Dien side. That's always been a part of the 2010
  and 2013-2014 and it continues to be and it will be a
  part of the 2016 Phillips garage.
- 9 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: No charge to any 10 of that?
- THE WITNESS: No change to any of that.

  And I think there was traffic testimony regarding the fact that that would reduce the number of cars entering on to North Van Dien Avenue.
  - MR. DRILL: That also takes care of the next question: How many entrances will there be to the garage.

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Question four: Will you be able to mitigate the existing traffic conditions on the street?
  - And I can just make a representation again. This is no change. But part of the testimony we put in, was that since we were reducing the number of trips, I believe by 430 trips per day, that we didn't have to do any off-site traffic. But we --

```
1 but we're proposing to do off-site traffic
```

- 2 | improvements as part of the plan, because even though
- 3 | Valley's not responsible for that traffic, our
- 4 | employees, our patients, our visitors have to sit in
- 5 | the same traffic everyone else does. So it's to our
- 6 benefit to do that and that's part of our plan. That
- 7 hasn't changed.
- 8 Maria, next one? Well, this one, I was
- 9 unclear if the Village or the Board of Education
- 10 hired a traffic expert, but that's, I mean, far
- 11 | afield, that guy would have to be brought in here to
- 12 testify. That's hearsay. And we don't even know his
- 13 name. So, on that one, this is the only time I'm
- 14 going to object tonight, specifically.
- MS. RAZIN: Okay. Well, to the -- but
- 16 | if you went -- if you went forward and if there was a
- 17 further process and if, at that point, the Village
- 18 | Planning Board asked for a -- Village Planning Board
- 19 | experts asked for an updated traffic report, you
- 20 would produce that?
- MR. DRILL: Absolutely.
- THE WITNESS: Absolutely. Yes.
- 23 MS. RAZIN: The ending part of that
- 24 question --
- MR. DRILL: Yes.

Thank

```
1
                  CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Ms. McWilliams,
    there's a lot of information on the traffic study
2
    going back to 2014 and beyond. And the testimony
3
4
    just now was that in the future during site plan,
    additional traffic studies would be addressed.
5
                  MR. DRILL: And then the last question
6
7
    is: The louvers look shiny. Will they reflect on
    the school? So I'm going to -- that's the first
9
    question.
10
                  The second question is: Are you wedded
    to metal, silver metal as a material?
11
12
                   THE WITNESS: Louvers would be metal,
13
    I'm not wedded to silver, shiny. It could be a matte
14
    finish. It could be green.
                                 It could be blue.
15
    not wedded to shiny silver.
                  CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Again, that
16
    detail would occur during site plan at some point.
17
18
                  MS. RAZIN: So, to further answer the
    question, do you have -- is there a concern about sun
19
20
    glare or heat or anything like that? Is there,
21
    that's the question. I think that was the second
22
    part of the question.
23
                   THE WITNESS: That could be mitigated
24
    in texture and color.
```

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Thank you.

```
1 you, Ms. McWilliams for your questions.
```

2 Are there others who want to ask their

3 questions now because they will not be here tomorrow.

(No response.)

5 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Okay. So we're

6 going to continue this tomorrow.

7 MR. BRANCHEAU: We're already there.

CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Tomorrow -- later

9 today.

4

8

14

MR. DRILL: Right.

11 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: So before we

12 | adjourn, I wanted to, again, reiterate the schedule.

13 | The next meeting is tomorrow. It will be at the high

school student center at 7:30 p.m., 627 East

15 Ridgewood Avenue.

16 Again, April the 4th at 7:30 p.m. here

17 | in the courtroom. Tuesday, April the 5th here at the

18 | court room. And also April the 7th here in the court

19 room -- at the high school -- sorry. April 7th at

20 the high school.

21 MS. RAZIN: So, tomorrow being

22 | March 31st and the April 7th meeting will be at the

23 | high school and April 4th and April 5th meetings will

24 be here.

25 CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: That's correct.

```
1
    Okay. And so if there is --
2
                   MS. RAZIN: To the -- and to reiterate
3
    what Charles said before. The meetings will be held
4
    only as needed. So, we will post that if we full
    it's necessary further on the website. But we're
5
6
    making an announcement, this is the second
7
    announcement that the hearings will only go until
    they are necessary, until public comment and then the
8
9
    board concludes all its comments and everybody's
10
    finished with the proceedings and then the board will
11
    -- once the proceedings are concluded, the board will
    proceed to take action on the matter.
12
13
                   VICE CHAIRMAN JOEL: Motion to adjourn.
14
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Is there a
    second, please?
15
16
                   MR. THURSTON: Second.
17
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN: Everybody in
    favor to adjourn?
18
19
                   (Whereupon, all Board Members respond
            in the affirmative.)
20
21
                   CHAIRMAN NALBANTIAN:
                                        Anybody opposed?
22
                   (No response.)
23
                   (Whereupon, this matter will be
            continuing at a future date. Time noted 12:15
24
25
            a.m.)
```

## CERTIFICATE

I, LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.C.R., R.P.R., a Notary Public of the State of New Jersey, Notary ID. #15855, Certified Court Reporter of the State of New Jersey, and a Registered Professional Reporter, hereby certify that the foregoing is a verbatim record of the testimony provided under oath before any court, referee, board, commission or other body created by statute of the State of New Jersey.

I am not related to the parties involved in this action; I have no financial interest, nor am I related to an agent of or employed by anyone with a financial interest in the outcome of this action.

This transcript complies with regulation 13:43-5.9 of the New Jersey Administrative Code.

LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.C.R., R.P.R. License #XI02050, and Notary Public

of New Jersey #15855, Notary
Expiration Date March 1, 2019

17 Dated:

2.4