

COUNTY OF BERGEN
TOWNSHIP OF WYCKOFF

CHRISTIAN HEALTH CARE CENTER)
(CHCC) Block 443 Lots 49.03,)
52.01, 51(RA-25); 301)
Sicomac Avenue Amended) TRANSCRIPT OF
Site Plan,) HEARING
Applicant.)
-----)

Memorial Town Hall, Scott Plaza
340 Franklin Avenue
Wyckoff, New Jersey
Wednesday, May 30, 2018, 7:30 p.m.

B E F O R E:

THE ZONING BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT
OF THE TOWNSHIP OF WYCKOFF

BOARD MEMBERS:

CARL FRY, Chairman
ERIK RUEBENACKER, Vice Chairman
BRIAN HUBERT
SUSAN YUDIN
ED KALPAGIAN
ROBERT EBEL
RICH DELEO

HAROLD P. COOK, III, ESQ., Counsel for the Zoning
Board of Adjustment
MARK A. DiGENNARO, Borough Engineer
GARY M. ASCOLESE, P.E., Boswell Engineering
SUSAN McQUAID, Board Secretary

LYNANN DRAGONE
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTER
54 STIRLING TERRACE
TOTOWA, NEW JERSEY 07512
(973) 904-1421

ALSO PRESENT:

JEFFER, HOPKINSON & VOGEL, ESQS.
BY: JEROME A. VOGEL, ESQ.
Counsel for the Applicant

DOUGLAS A. STRUYK, President and CEO of Christian
Health Care Center

ALBERT W. ROUGHGARDEN, PE, CME, Env, SP
Principal of Stantec Consulting Services,
Incorporated

MATTHEW MAHER, PE, PTOE
Traffic Engineer & Transportation Planner for
Stantec Consulting Services, Incorporated

I N D E X

| | <u>PAGE NO.</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------|
| DOUGLAS A. STRUYK | 44 |
| ALBERT ROUGHGARDEN | 51 |
| MATTHEW MAHER | 126 |

1 CHAIRMAN FRY: Let's get started. A
2 couple of things to read.
3 Open Public Meetings Act statement.
4 This special meeting of Wyckoff Board of
5 Adjustment dated Wednesday, May 30th, 2018, is now
6 in session.
7 In accordance with Section 8 of the Open
8 Public Meetings Act. I wish to advise that notice
9 of this meeting has been posted in the main level
10 of Memorial Town Hall since Wednesday, May 23rd,
11 2018. A copy of the notice has been filed with
12 the Township Clerk and copies were sent to the
13 Ridgewood News, Bergen Record, and North Jersey
14 Herald & News, and all papers with general
15 circulation throughout the Township of Wyckoff.
16 This notice establishes a special meeting for the
17 Christian Health Care Center application. Formal
18 action may be taken at this meeting. All
19 applicants are hereby reminded that your
20 application, if approved, may be subject to the
21 terms, conditions, and payment of the Affordable
22 Housing Development Fee requirements of the
23 Township. Information can be obtained from the
24 Code of the Township of Wyckoff Chapter 113-8 on
25 the Township's website www.wyckoff-nj.com.

1 This meeting is a judicial proceeding.
2 Any questions or comments must be limited to
3 issues that are relevant to what the Board may
4 legally consider in reaching a decision and
5 decorum appropriate to a judicial hearing must be
6 maintained at all times.

7 Sue, roll call, please.

8
9 (Roll call was taken, all Board members
10 present respond in the affirmative)

11
12 CHAIRMAN FRY: Let's stand for the flag
13 salute.

14 Mr. Ruebenacker, if you would.

15
16 (Pledge of Allegiance)

17
18 CHAIRMAN FRY: Thank you.

19 Again, welcome, everyone.

20 So I have a couple of just housekeeping
21 announcements.

22 If everyone would just please as a
23 reminder turn off your phones, put it on vibrate,
24 silent, turn it off so you don't interrupt the
25 meeting.

1 Also as a reminder from the previous
2 application, the previous applications, which we
3 heard tons of testimony for, those were previously
4 approved for the Vista. This application that's
5 before us is for the proposed intersection of
6 signalization. There are also a couple of other
7 components to it. There are modifications to two
8 of the existing structures, some civil work, some
9 architectural and parking spaces that have
10 proposed changes. But the comments that we're
11 going to go through for this application is going
12 to be specifically for what this agenda is for.
13 It will not be to go back to the previous
14 application that is already approved.

15 As far as the format, Mr. Vogel.

16 MR. VOGEL: Yes, sir.

17 CHAIRMAN FRY: The gang is all here. It's
18 the gift that keeps on giving.

19 MR. VOGEL: The bad penny that keeps
20 showing up.

21 MR. RUEBENACKER: That's more like it.

22 CHAIRMAN FRY: So here's what I'd like to
23 do, just to kind of go through formatting that I
24 have in my mind.

25 I want to go through the intersection, the

1 We have as the board attorney, Mr. Harold
2 Cook. Our board attorney, Mr. Becker, had a, what
3 he thought might be a slight conflict so he erred
4 on the side of caution and has decided to recuse
5 himself from the application as have two members
6 of the board as well.

7 We also have Gary Ascolese. He'll be
8 representing Boswell Engineering. So when we get
9 into testimony, we have a whole report that came
10 from Boswell. Mr. Ascolese will be able to answer
11 any questions.

12 Also, at the last meeting, Sue, correct me
13 if I'm wrong, with the health care center, we
14 approved an extension of another year on the
15 application. Is that correct?

16 MS. McQUAID: Correct.

17 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. So they're good till
18 2019 now because they're about to come to an end
19 this June.

20 MS. McQUAID: Correct.

21 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. Good.

22 Just as we get going, I'm sure it's going
23 to be a lengthy discussion. I want to put a soft
24 finish for the meeting at 10:30; hard stop at
25 11:00. I don't think we need to go beyond 11:00.

1 traffic study, the signalization, everything that
2 went on history wise from when we left off because
3 the board heard several months of testimony and we
4 felt that really an intersection wasn't warranted.
5 So if you would, kind of take us up from there and
6 get through to where we are, the board's decision
7 from Bergen County as well.

8 So for tonight I'd really like to get into
9 the intersection; what the history was leading up
10 to where we are now; why the county has made the
11 decision that they have, and I'm sure they'll be
12 plenty of dialogue on that; and what is being
13 proposed, because the more I started to get into
14 the drawings, I have a bunch of questions as well
15 and I know you're always thorough and you have
16 your own expert, so we'll get to that and then
17 maybe timeline.

18 Once we get through that, then I want to
19 shift focus to the other elements of the
20 application with the buildings and anything else
21 you have.

22 MR. VOGEL: As a matter of fact, in
23 preparation for this evening, I had the same view
24 you had that what's driving this application is
25 really the intersection and it needs some

1 historical perspective. And in that regard,
2 having gone back through the file to reacquaint
3 myself with all that occurred so to be in a
4 position to reacquaint you with all that occurred,
5 it became starkly evident to me that I have spent
6 a good portion of my life doing this.

7 My file, the original application, the
8 original application for the Vista on February 6,
9 2007. That's the application. We held 21
10 hearings in this room before the original approval
11 was given and that was on May 13th of 2013.

12 So if you'll recall, we started out with
13 258 units. We reduced it to 199. And our
14 original application did have a driveway with an
15 intersection improved at the corner of Sicomac and
16 Cedar Hill. And if you'll recall what I had
17 indicated at the time of our application was that
18 we had gone to the county before we filed with the
19 township, because the county, over a period of
20 years, had indicated its desire to improve the
21 intersection.

22 As you would be aware from applications we
23 filed and from some historical perspective, the
24 Christian Health Care Center has been before the
25 county on any number of occasions because of its

1 period of years, it became readily apparent that
2 there were a number of people who resided within
3 the Township of Wyckoff who did not want to have
4 the intersection improved. And one of the basic
5 factors was that when you put in a traffic light,
6 there are requirements with respect to a design
7 criteria that are imposed by the Institute of
8 Traffic Engineers, the State of New Jersey,
9 various design criteria, which would require not
10 just putting up a light, but putting in various
11 other improvements, including curbing. And that
12 curbing would have occurred on the opposite side
13 of the street which would have affected Sicomac
14 Village, the Market Basket, the motor vehicle
15 service station on the corner, and they would have
16 all been encumbered by various improvements, as
17 the county would call it, but they would have been
18 hindrances with respect to the way traffic flow
19 goes. And so people were opposed to it.

20 There were also some comments that people
21 felt that it was a highway. There were too many
22 aisles. It was too wide. It was not consistent
23 with what they believed the Township of Wyckoff
24 really represents.

25 And so as a result hearing that and having

1 80-acre campus to improve buildings, to construct
2 various different aspects of the facility. And
3 every time that I went to the county, they pressed
4 to improve the intersection and to have the health
5 care center pay for the improvements to the
6 intersection and I always resisted and I resisted
7 because the nature of the development on the
8 campus was never enough to get to the point where
9 the county could twist our arm to make us do it.

10 When we proposed the Vista, we knew that
11 that was going to be a requirement of the county.
12 We knew that they were going to push for it. And
13 so we went to the county first and tried to work
14 out what the intersection would look like. And in
15 doing so, we had many meetings, not with just the
16 county, but with the township as well. We had
17 many meetings here. We brought the county here
18 before we filed. We had the police chief. We had
19 Mr. DiGennaro. We had representatives of the
20 administration, Mr. Shannon. And we went through
21 it. There was never an agreement, but we came to
22 what we thought would be something that the county
23 would approve and we filed an application with
24 that intersection.

25 In the 21 hearings that we had over the

1 kind of informal interplay with the members of the
2 board, we decided to retrench. And since the
3 board had indicated it was listening to the
4 neighbors, we amended our application to excise
5 the intersection improvement and to utilize our
6 existing access and that was the site plan that
7 was the subject matter of the approval.

8 But I had said I don't know on how many
9 occasions, and I think I was very clear about it
10 and the board understood, that we had to go back
11 to the county because it's a county road. The
12 county had ultimate jurisdiction. And that I had
13 made a commitment to the board that we would go
14 back with the idea that what we wanted was what
15 was approved by Wyckoff and that we were opposed
16 to the intersection.

17 In the resolution that you adopted, and I
18 pulled it out, the resolution of May 13, 2013,
19 paragraph 59 of that resolution addressed this
20 very issue and I thought it would be instructive
21 and helpful to everyone if I just read it. It's a
22 rather short paragraph.

23 It says, "The board understands that the
24 Christian Health Care Center's initial plan with
25 respect to the providing of access at the

1 intersection of Cedar Hill Avenue and Sicomac
2 Avenue, by the dedication of additional lands on
3 the Christian Health Care Center side of the
4 roadway to widen it, to curb it, et cetera, as
5 required by the County of Bergen met with
6 substantial opposition from almost a hundred
7 percent of the witnesses who testified before the
8 board as concerned citizens as well as Save
9 Wyckoff. As a result of these concerns, the board
10 recognizes that the Christian Health Care Center
11 has abandoned that program unless mandatorily
12 required by the county, which is not the consent
13 of the board".

14 So that's the operative part what was in
15 your resolution. And I think that accurately
16 depicts it because what I had said is, my
17 expectation is I'm going to be caught between a
18 rock and a hard place. I'm going to be caught
19 between what I know the county has asked for in
20 the beginning and I know what occurred here with
21 respect to it.

22 Well, that was the resolution.

23 I wrote to the county and asked to have a
24 meeting after that. And the county did over a
25 period of almost two years, sit with us, meet with

1 Care Center side of the roadway so that there
2 would be no taking of the property across from
3 Sicomac Village. They said well, they still
4 wanted to have the improvements over there, the
5 curbs. Our position adamantly was, if you improve
6 that, there is no way that this solution to the
7 intersection is going to come about because you're
8 going to adversely affect the other side.

9 So we continued our discussions and we
10 finally came to the point where what we have
11 before you now is an approval for what is called a
12 temporary traffic light. And the temporary
13 traffic light only includes improvements on the
14 Christian Health Care Center side of the roadway.
15 No improvements on the other.

16 And in the letter that the county wrote,
17 which is a letter of August 4th to me and it's
18 referenced in the approval that you have of
19 January 18 of this year, and I think I ought to
20 read this because it's important. It said, and
21 this is paragraph 6 of that letter.

22 "Bergen County will design the electrical
23 component of the traffic signal, temporary and
24 permanent. Bergen County will also prepare final
25 signage striking plans. Bergen County will

1 us. And we attempted to get ourselves out of this
2 conundrum that we were involved in and tried to
3 resolve it, but the county was refusing. As it
4 said, it saw it as its opportunity to finally
5 signalize this intersection.

6 And as a result of that, it wrote to the
7 township and it in fact held meetings with
8 representatives of the township. I know there's
9 several letters they wrote to Mr. Shannon on
10 August 8th of 2016 and, again, in October of 2016,
11 but no action was taken. It was really a matter
12 for the Board of Adjustment as a function of this
13 application.

14 Well, over the period of these last
15 several years since the approval and you've given
16 us extensions, if you recall, you gave us an
17 extension to 2019 last week, but I got extensions
18 from you for the last several years, each time I
19 came to you I said we're trying to negotiate our
20 way out of this problem we have with the county.
21 Please give us an extension to work it out.

22 All of that eventuated finally in a
23 discussion with the county whereby we indicated
24 that we were prepared, that we were prepared to
25 dedicate any road widening on the Christian Health

1 install temporary and eventually a permanent
2 traffic signal at the intersection. Bergen County
3 will be responsible for the improvements on the
4 northerly side of Sicomac Avenue, Cedar Hill
5 Avenue. The temporary signal", and this is the
6 operative portion, "will remain in place until the
7 permanent signal project advances with township
8 cooperation through the execution of a shared
9 services agreement with the township".

10 So the county's commitment is that
11 Christian Health Care Center widen the roadway;
12 they'll put in a temporary traffic light; they
13 will not widen the other side of the road until
14 there is township cooperation through the
15 execution of a shared services agreement with the
16 township.

17 So what have we done? I brought this I
18 think to a place where the county didn't simply
19 say, I give up. It's going to get the traffic
20 light. I brought it to the place where the county
21 didn't say to the township, we're going to do it,
22 which we have a right to do legally, and impose
23 it. We'll just do the traffic light and we don't
24 need your approval. I got them to say they'll
25 only do it with cooperation of the township and

1 execute a shared services agreement. And I also
2 got it to the point where there are no
3 improvements across the street until the township
4 cooperation and the shared services agreement is
5 signed between the township and the county.

6 So it seems to me there is something for
7 everyone in this. The county gets a traffic
8 light. It is a temporary one. It is not that
9 expansive intersection that was designed. It
10 doesn't have all the curbing constraints. It
11 doesn't have all the widened islands. But it does
12 have the ability to direct the traffic through a
13 traffic light.

14 And in that regard, you may recall, and
15 the record will reflect, that the township hired
16 Gary Dean as your traffic consultant. And Mr.
17 Dean, I went over his testimony again today, it
18 was one of those long 21 meetings we had. Mr.
19 Dean's comment was that the traffic that goes in
20 and out of the health care center now is at a
21 level of service F, but that if the intersection
22 has a light at it, traffic will be such that it
23 would be either a C or a D. It will go from F to
24 C or D. Now, that was not Mr. Roughgarden, who is
25 our traffic consultant, that was the township's

1 effects on all the businesses.

2 So if the board decides after hearing
3 everything they're still not convinced and they
4 say, no, we're not for the intersection, we're not
5 for the light, will the county then say, okay,
6 fine, we're going to do whatever we want. And can
7 they then build any intersection that they want?

8 MR. VOGEL: The county can do it tomorrow.

9 CHAIRMAN FRY: They're both county roads.

10 MR. VOGEL: Both county roads.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: So they're both in their
12 control?

13 MR. VOGEL: Yes. And I can also say this,
14 the county can require us to contribute to the
15 cost. We're willing to do it by giving up land.
16 The value of the land that we're giving up is in
17 excess of what we would have to pay. It would be
18 cheaper for us to simply sit back, leave what you
19 approve where it is and pay them a sum of money
20 rather than widening the road. The county has the
21 absolute right, it is the county road, to widen,
22 improve, and signalize that intersection.

23 CHAIRMAN FRY: So the county could, on
24 their own, take part of the health center property
25 for the widening and the businesses on the

1 traffic consultant.

2 So I think what we have here now is an
3 ability to create a more orderly flow of traffic
4 at that intersection, not to create what was found
5 to be an egregious improvement. And it gives the
6 township some control for the future. It gives
7 the county the light. And it gives us the
8 opportunity to move a project which the Christian
9 Health Care Center in trying to fulfill it's tasks
10 and it's been pursuing for now 11 years, an
11 opportunity, hopefully, where we can now have a
12 meeting of the minds, or at least an accommodation
13 between the township and the County of Bergen.

14 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. Thank you for going
15 through the history.

16 So I'm going to ask a million dollar
17 question just to get it right on the table.

18 So it sounds like an agreement has been
19 made. The county has approved the application
20 subject to certain terms and conditions with the
21 intersection and you feel that there is a little
22 give and take that's taking place. So rather
23 than, as the board did not seem, after hearing all
24 the testimony that it was warranted. And then the
25 second concern was all the curb cuts and the

1 opposite side to do whatever widening they wanted
2 to.

3 MR. VOGEL: And to curb the other side.

4 CHAIRMAN FRY: And to curb the other side.

5 MR. VOGEL: Which was the original desire
6 that they had. That was a strong position I took,
7 not because I probably go to the Market Basket
8 four of the five days a week to get my lunch, but
9 because the comment was it works and why attempt
10 to fix something that already works.

11 I mean, the whole idea of traffic, I don't
12 know if you go out, you can go out in the back of
13 the service station and come out on Cedar Hill.
14 You can back out even though there's no curbs.
15 You can back in; back out. People are courteous,
16 they wait. It works.

17 The county's position was, when you put in
18 a light, you've got to meet all the design
19 criteria and those design criteria included
20 curbing and restriction of movement. They're
21 willing at this point to give up that if we can
22 work this out. If we don't, they'll go ahead on
23 their own.

24 This is on their list. They have this on
25 their list, this improvement for this intersection

1 for a long time. I would say for at least 15
2 years. And it's going to be improved.

3 So my suggestion is, and I took two years
4 after we got your approval to argue with them. It
5 took the third year to get it to a point where it
6 is now. I spent a year and a half before we filed
7 the application talking to them and, quite
8 frankly, this is the best that we've been able to
9 do.

10 And I have letters and I could put them on
11 the record, I could put the county's letters on
12 the record, which would indicate we were very
13 firm. We wanted to stay with what had been
14 approved, but they were absolutely adamant. And
15 if you read any of those letters that went to the
16 township, those letters indicated that the county
17 was immovable with respect to improving the
18 intersection.

19 CHAIRMAN FRY: Right. I did go back in
20 time and research some of the correspondence when
21 they came before the county committee.

22 So one comment on that that I saw. So in
23 reading through the approval from the county, I
24 think it actually confused me more than helped me,
25 to be honest. But in going through all the bullet

1 points, one of the bullet points, item number 11,
2 which is on 2 of 5, it says: The county and
3 applicant have an agreement as outlined in the
4 county letter dated 8/4/17. And the attorney for
5 the applicant, Mr. Jerome Vogel's response letter
6 of 11/2 both attached to this report.

7 MR. VOGEL: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: I didn't see those --

9 MR. VOGEL: You know --

10 CHAIRMAN FRY: -- in here.

11 MR. VOGEL: You didn't see those and I
12 re-read it last night and the first thing I did
13 this morning was call Sue and I said, Sue, were
14 those attached to the report. And she said she
15 didn't think so. So what I did is I made copies
16 and I have 15 copies here and I can hand them out
17 right now.

18 CHAIRMAN FRY: If you would.

19 MR. VOGEL: Yes.

20 CHAIRMAN FRY: So I'll just continue what
21 this line says.

22 Both attached to this report the final
23 responsibilities of each party relative to the
24 improvements to and future signalization of the
25 Sicomac Avenue and Cedar Hill Avenue intersection.

1 So I thought that was a key component just
2 to see what the dialogue was and what the
3 agreement was so we can see it.

4 Then as I started to research all the
5 drawings, and one of the questions I have is the
6 drawings are prepared in a couple of different
7 sections. You have an interim and it looks like
8 that is what the health care center is proposing,
9 it's taking the land on the health care center
10 side, making the road improvements and then a
11 temporary signal set up.

12 As you follow through, then you have what
13 the county is proposing as "Phasing". That's the
14 title of the drawing.

15 So you've sort of answered the question,
16 but I just want to be clear and have something
17 documented on record that what you've agreed to
18 and what the county has agreed to is the interim
19 proposal.

20 And then as you mentioned, the phasing
21 would come in later on but it's subject to the
22 township's approval and coordination so that they
23 couldn't just come in. Because if you look at the
24 phasing, that's where I think we have the biggest
25 issue. The phasing then takes call the curbing.

1 It modifies all the access to the strip mall
2 across the street. And I think that's where we
3 have a lot of difficulty.

4 So I just wanted to be clear, that's not
5 what's definitely going through. That is another
6 aspect of it.

7 MR. VOGEL: That is what I read to you
8 previously. If you look at the August 4, 2017,
9 letter, if you look at paragraph 6 and if you look
10 at the last sentence in paragraph 6, "The
11 temporary signal remain in place until the
12 permanent signal project advances with township
13 cooperation through the execution of a shared
14 services agreement with the township".

15 So while they demanded that we do a
16 complete design of the intersection, and I don't
17 know wether it was on the record or off the
18 record, but I think it was on, they wanted a
19 design that showed compliance with the
20 specifications that there are for an intersection
21 fully improved. They asked us to do that design.
22 But the intention is not to do it until there's
23 the cooperation with the township.

24 CHAIRMAN FRY: And that's memorialized.
25 That is rock solid.

1 MR. VOGEL: Well, it's in that report.
2 The report refers to the letter and then I gave
3 you both that letter and if you look at my
4 response, I don't know if I kept a copy when I
5 handed them up, but in my response I indicated
6 that it was subject to the approval by the Board
7 of Adjustment of the Township of Wyckoff.

8 So my agreement was not based upon what
9 they simply wrote, but it would come back here and
10 have concurrence.

11 MR. RUEBENACKER: Is there a copy of the
12 August 2017 letter down there, please? I have the
13 January 2018 letter from the county and then your
14 letter from November 2nd, 2017. I don't have a
15 copy --

16 MS. YUDIN: That's what we just --

17 MR. RUEBENACKER: I must have just missed
18 it. Sorry.

19 Thank you, sir.

20 MR. VOGEL: While you're looking, I'd just
21 like to read if I could also because I think it's
22 helpful, there's a letter of August 8, 2016, from
23 the County of Bergen to the Township of Wyckoff.
24 And it says, "As you're aware, the County
25 Department of Planning and Engineering has been

1 intersection at their cost. However, the approval
2 by the township Board of Adjustment eliminated
3 this driveway. All traffic for the Vista
4 development will now be funneled through the CHCC
5 complex. This seems to be a puzzling decision to
6 us from a circulation perspective for the proposed
7 development as well as the existing Christian
8 Health Care Center.

9 The letter states, you know, as it did
10 then, our position continues to remain and the
11 intersection needs to be signalized and improve
12 with widening and curbing.

13 On October 13, 2016, the county again
14 wrote to the township and said:

15 This letter serves as a followup to our
16 meeting with the township representatives on
17 September 27th where we continued to outline our
18 position relative to the improvement and
19 signalization of the intersection of Sicomac
20 Avenue and Cedar Hill Avenue. As previously
21 stated, our position has and continues to remain
22 that the intersection needs to be signalized,
23 improved with widening and curbing.

24 That was what we were confronted with.
25 And, quite frankly, after I guess the colloquial

1 reviewing the site plan application for the Vista
2 project at the Christian Health Care Center. A
3 number of meetings were held and various
4 stakeholders, including representatives of the
5 township."

6 We had meetings down there and there were
7 representatives of the township.

8 And this is the important part, "Our
9 position has and continues to remain that the
10 intersection needs to be signalized and improved
11 with widening and curbing. The intersection
12 currently meets at least two of the warrants for
13 signalization according to the Manual on Uniform
14 Traffic Control Devices. The existing volumes of
15 traffic safety warrant one eight-hour vehicular
16 volume and warrant two four-hour vehicular volume
17 which are the warrants that are initially checked
18 to determine if the signal is warranted at an
19 intersection. We, of course, can provide you with
20 our data to support this position. Say the
21 applicant and its representative took the initial
22 position that they wanted a new driveway
23 introduced in the intersection that would service
24 the Vista development and were willing to install
25 a signal and install road improvements at the

1 term is banging heads for several years, this is
2 where we are. And absent what we have before you,
3 I suspect in order to get this project done, I'm
4 going to be caught between the two and my offer to
5 the county will be: We'll give you the money that
6 you're entitled to as based on the formula and
7 they'll take the money and they'll go ahead and
8 improve it the way they see fit as opposed to what
9 we have before us this evening.

10 CHAIRMAN FRY: Have you ever been either
11 involved or do you know of a case where two
12 entities could not come to an agreement and the
13 county then took over and made modifications as
14 they saw fit?

15 MR. VOGEL: It almost always works out. I
16 mean, I suppose what you could do and what I
17 thought of doing is you go to court and say to a
18 judge: I have a dog in this fight, but I don't
19 have a position. I have the county telling me I
20 must do this; I have the municipality telling me I
21 must do that. I have a project which is viable.
22 But I think that would be a noncombative position
23 to take. That's not something that usually
24 happens. It always seems to work out by a give
25 and take.

1 Don't forget, what's involved here is not
2 the Christian Health Care Center's desire with
3 respect to the intersection, it's the desires of
4 two governmental entities and governmental
5 entities generally come to some kind of
6 conclusion. We happen to be the catalyst because
7 we want to develop the Vista project, but we don't
8 have the ability to make the determination.

9 I can only suggest to you that what this
10 solution is that we have before you now seems to
11 have something in it for everyone. There was more
12 give from the county than I really expected when
13 we started the process and this idea of a - quote
14 - temporary light and how long it would remain to
15 a great extent, but based upon the letter you have
16 in front of you, how long that remains temporary
17 without the curbing is something which the
18 township has its ability to intercede because of
19 the letter and what it says, whereas, if the
20 county came along and decided to improve it, it
21 could do whatever it desired. Would it do it that
22 way? You know, it's still the county and
23 Wyckoff's part of the county.

24 As I say, people tend to work things out,
25 especially two governmental agencies.

1 CHAIRMAN FRY: Mr. Ascolese, just because
2 you do have some history with the county and have
3 some expertise, is there anything maybe you can
4 shed some light on for the board? Maybe a
5 circumstance you dealt with in the past or any
6 information you might have?

7 MR. ASCOLESE: I do recall some concern
8 about a lack of control at this intersection in
9 the past. What I have not been able to come up or
10 determine through the files is what the crash
11 history is here. We see reports going back by
12 Stantec, going back to 2006, certain levels of
13 service. But I don't see any actual crash
14 history. I don't see any patterns. And that's
15 something I would normally ask for or look into to
16 try to see if we can ameliorate some of these
17 issues without going the next step.

18 A temporary signal, I mean, if the
19 warrants are met, the county may feel that there
20 is a need from perhaps a liability standpoint to
21 somehow put in another traffic control device at
22 that location and I guess that's why they feel
23 that they would work with the applicant to get
24 this device in. And from what I understand in
25 looking at the Planning Board's recommendation,

1 the county is paying for that signal, not the
2 applicant, not the township. They're just asking
3 you to make some physical improvements.

4 Again, I would feel a little bit more
5 comfortable having some crash history just to see
6 how serious it is. I mean, if the thing flows
7 somewhat well and if there's not too much
8 pedestrian activity, does it need a light here
9 now? I wouldn't be able to make that
10 determination.

11 I use the thing rather frequently. At
12 times of the day it is a little bit vicarious
13 coming out of Cedar Hill Avenue. But, again,
14 looking at the traffic report that was done by
15 Stantec in the past, I see that there are severe
16 issues down at Sicomac and Mountain and perhaps
17 the county is thinking that a signalized device
18 here may relieve some of the pressure down at
19 Sicomac and Mountain.

20 CHAIRMAN FRY: There was significant
21 testimony about all of the egress out and the
22 impact it would have turning left onto Mountain
23 exiting the facility; turning right onto Mountain,
24 adding more cars in queue coming down to Mountain
25 and then the light would back up, now people

1 making a right on Sicomac off Mountain, if it
2 would add more cars into queue with that system.

3 There was some discussion, I cannot off
4 the top of my head remember if there was a crash
5 analysis, but it did come up at one point and it
6 might have been the chief of police that had some
7 knowledge of it as well for the township. I'm not
8 quite sure. Really what the focus was: How many
9 cars are in queue. How many are added now due to
10 this application.

11 And I recall, as Mr. Vogel had mentioned,
12 the intersection is declared an F right now prior
13 to the application. So our expert, I believe his
14 testimony proved, going back to the minutes it
15 showed that between two to two and a half percent
16 increase would be caused by the health care
17 center. So where we thought you're going to
18 double, triple, quadruple the traffic, that really
19 wasn't the case.

20 So we really got into how many cars were
21 in queue; what's the impact. It's an F right now
22 so the county wants it and that was one of the
23 reasons why. I think there was a lot of testimony
24 that the county wants it period. Because it's
25 failing. It's in an F position now and the

1 improvement would be to add this light.

2 But a specific data and you have somebody
3 from Stantec here tonight?

4 MR. VOGEL: Yes, Mr. Roughgarden.

5 CHAIRMAN FRY: And see if he can answer
6 that question and see if there's any crash data.

7 Before we do that, any other questions
8 from the board real quick for Mr. Vogel?

9 MR. RUEBENACKER: I'm a little confused.
10 Maybe it's just me. It seems like there's a lot
11 of reference to letters between the county, the
12 township, and Christian Health Care Center and I
13 just can't go from A to B to C to D all the way
14 down to Z. I'm having a hard time. I know what
15 the Zoning Board did because I sat through all
16 those 21 meetings from when we talked about the
17 metal design to the wood design and everything
18 else. But I'm not following all the references.
19 Like, I'm still looking at all these letters
20 between the county and the Christian Health Care
21 Center and I don't see a single letter to the
22 Township of Wyckoff from either the Christian
23 Health Care Center or the county.

24 I would love to see the full packet in
25 chronological order of who talked to who, when and

1 when did these meetings occur.

2 MR. VOGEL: Well, number one, in that
3 letter -- I do have letters, the two letters that
4 went from the county to the township and there are
5 only two letters in the whole litany of several
6 years.

7 MR. RUEBENACKER: Okay. So we have no
8 letters from the county to the township. We only
9 have letters --

10 MR. VOGEL: All those letters indicated
11 were what I just read to you and I'll certainly
12 supply them.

13 MR. RUEBENACKER: I don't have them. I
14 need to see those, please.

15 MR. VOGEL: All right. Fine. But what
16 those letters indicated that the county continues
17 to remain. The intersection needs to be
18 signalized and improved with the widening and
19 curbing. That's their un-authorable position.

20 MR. RUEBENACKER: Which I think is a
21 fairly important piece of evidence that I think we
22 should see as a board that we don't have
23 currently.

24 MR. VOGEL: Well, I will submit two
25 letters to the borough or to the township. One

1 dated August 8th, 2016, to the township of Wyckoff
2 from the County Department of Planning and
3 Engineering and one dated October 13, 2016. And
4 both of those indicate the county's position and
5 indicates that there was interaction between the
6 county and the township.

7 MR. RUEBENACKER: Okay. Thank you.

8 But I think we also need from the
9 township, county, whoever, was there
10 correspondence back, to get the whole... Again,
11 they held their position, they continue to hold
12 their position, but was there dialogue from the
13 township back to the county.

14 MR. VOGEL: Okay. I was in a curious
15 position. Number one, I didn't want to intrude on
16 the decision that the township would make or
17 interaction. I only have copies of those two
18 letters because the county sent them to me. I do
19 not have any correspondence or communication that
20 may have existed between the township and the
21 county.

22 MR. RUEBENACKER: So we can take care of
23 that internally, whether that be through Mr.
24 DiGennaro --

25 MR. VOGEL: Yes. I would not have been

1 privy to that.

2 MR. RUEBENACKER: Can we request from Mr.
3 Shannon's office any and all communications
4 between the Township of Wyckoff and Bergen County
5 regarding this matter.

6 MS. McQUAID: Yes.

7 MR. RUEBENACKER: Not e-mails or phone
8 conversations, anything regarding official
9 memorandums back and forth.

10 MS. McQUAID: Yes.

11 MR. KALPAGIAN: Mr. Vogel, I want to
12 clarify something, for the record, just utilizing
13 these two letters and your testimony as to the
14 events between you and the county going back and
15 forth and I want to clarify something.

16 The county is urging you, forcing you,
17 however you want to verbalize it, to signalize and
18 widen the intersection. Is the county also
19 forcing you to put an entranceway making that in
20 essence such as like a four-way intersection for
21 entrance and exit way for Christian Health Care
22 Center? Is that element something there?

23 MR. VOGEL: No. That would have been
24 provided the opportunity then to take the traffic
25 away from Mountain Avenue by providing a four-way

1 intersection and making our current access to only
2 a right turn in and a right turn out, no left
3 turns out of the current. So that would take that
4 situation where traffic backs up in the middle of
5 the block and that was the reason for signaling
6 it and making it a four-way intersection and
7 taking away the left-hand turns in and out.

8 MR. KALPAGIAN: So the county is forcing
9 you to do it?

10 MR. VOGEL: Are they forcing us, no. It
11 just made sense to do it that way once you put the
12 light in. It makes more sense for the traffic
13 flow for Wyckoff. I mean, the driveway doesn't --
14 we didn't go back there and say we need to change
15 the driveway to come out.

16 MR. KALPAGIAN: No, but these
17 correspondences you're having back, this is what,
18 I'm like piggybacking off of Erik's point. I'm
19 trying to figure out the county -- all I'm seeing
20 is widening and signaling.

21 MR. VOGEL: Right.

22 MR. KALPAGIAN: In other words, to me
23 you're to a layman, forget the traffic pattern,
24 that's something we're going to have to hear
25 testimony on. To a layman looking at this, I want

1 CHAIRMAN FRY: So we had designs before
2 and it sounds like what took place at that time is
3 they tasked you with, okay, now come up with a
4 design for it.

5 MR. VOGEL: Right.

6 CHAIRMAN FRY: So maybe the question is,
7 was a design ever considered to not put the
8 entrance at that intersection and leave it as is
9 and did maybe you come up with a study that said,
10 wait a minute, it's not going to work. We really
11 don't have a choice.

12 MR. VOGEL: I think you're going to have
13 to talk the traffic people, but it doesn't make
14 any sense. Why would you put a traffic light at
15 the intersection without that driveway and then
16 you have the left turns in and out and people
17 backing up, waiting at the light and waiting to
18 make the turns in, when you can take all of that
19 traffic, including traffic that would go around
20 Mountain Avenue, now put it directly into the
21 campus and go all the way up to the top, you take
22 all that traffic away. I mean, that's one of the
23 benefits of that driveway is the traffic on
24 Mountain Avenue and the traffic on Sicomac Avenue.

25 MR. HUBERT: But, Mr. Vogel, the existing

1 to know if the county is forcing to signalize and
2 widen, not necessarily make it a four-way.
3 Because to simplify it just selfishly looking at
4 that intersection alone, it's a T-intersection now
5 and it's so bad that it requires a traffic signal,
6 then why put a traffic signal and add another
7 roadway or access roadway in and out.

8 So I want to know what exactly the county
9 is, what they're kind of handcuffing you into.

10 MR. VOGEL: Well, part and parcel of the
11 whole design, because if you signalize it then you
12 would regulate the traffic in and out of the
13 Christian Health Care Center, you would no longer
14 have left-hand turns into the Christian Health
15 Care Center and you would no longer have left-hand
16 turns out, which is what backs traffic up on
17 Sicomac Avenue currently. So it's a function, if
18 you put the light in --

19 MR. KALPAGIAN: I understand it's a
20 function. I just want to know --

21 MR. VOGEL: -- it creates a better traffic
22 flow.

23 MR. KALPAGIAN: I want to know if it's
24 something the county imposed along with widening
25 and signaling.

1 Sicomac entrance and exits still exists. That
2 doesn't go away.

3 MR. VOGEL: It becomes right in/right out.

4 CHAIRMAN FRY: There are restrictions that
5 are applied to it.

6 MR. VOGEL: If you look in the letter, it
7 says that will become right in/right out. So
8 there will be no waiting people coming in; no
9 waiting people going out.

10 MR. HUBERT: I got you.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: Real quick, so maybe what
12 we'll do is, we can ask Dave that when they come
13 up, that same question: What was the
14 consideration; what was the impact.

15 MS. YUDIN: I think that the county might
16 have myopia in this instance. They're just
17 looking at one intersection but they're not
18 looking at the whole picture.

19 We have unattended consequences, which we
20 discussed, I don't know whether it was Stantec's
21 testimony or the testimony of the people that the
22 Board of Adjustment hired, what was their name,
23 the traffic --

24 MR. VOGEL: Gary Dean from Dolan & Dolan.

25 MS. YUDIN: Dean.

1 I remember discussing the problems with
2 Mountain and Sicomac and there was testimony that
3 that's where the car crashes are, not on Cedar
4 Hill and Sicomac, but on Mountain and Sicomac.
5 There's lots of car crashes. And I remember
6 testifying that I knew that because my husband's a
7 fireman and he gets called all the time to go to
8 those MVAs, as they call it.

9 I'm wondering if in any of your
10 discussions, the county considered the problem
11 with the traffic light backing up cars onto
12 Mountain Avenue. There was testimony from
13 residents that taking their children to school was
14 difficult in the morning coming down Mountain
15 Avenue and it was backed up all the way past the
16 Christian Health Care Center exit that's on
17 Mountain Avenue.

18 So did the county take that into
19 consideration?

20 MR. VOGEL: Yeah, I guess part of the
21 design. One of the ideas was that none of the
22 traffic coming out of the Christian Health Care
23 Center campus would now have to go out Mountain
24 Avenue, it could go from the campus out into the
25 signalized intersection through the driveway that

1 go to North Haledon, they would go out to Mountain
2 Avenue.

3 MR. RUEBENACKER: Right, and hang a left.

4 MR. VOGEL: If they're going in the
5 opposite direction. The question was about
6 Mountain Avenue and Sicomac and I said no one
7 would then be coming out of the Christian Health
8 Care Center campus to make a right to go down to
9 that intersection, they wouldn't have to.

10 MR. RUEBENACKER: They wouldn't do that
11 today.

12 MR. VOGEL: Pardon me?

13 MR. RUEBENACKER: They wouldn't do that
14 today.

15 MR. VOGEL: Well, they do it from the
16 upper campus, sure, they do. I've done it. I do
17 it.

18 MR. RUEBENACKER: Why not just go around
19 to the left. That's the flow of the road. You
20 just go around, come out the front entrance.

21 MS. YUDIN: It depends on which building
22 you're in.

23 MR. RUEBENACKER: It doesn't matter. All
24 the roads are connected.

25 CHAIRMAN FRY: They're going to find a

1 I was just asked about. It would take traffic off
2 of Mountain Avenue and take it away from that
3 intersection.

4 MS. YUDIN: How do you tell people which
5 way to go out?

6 MR. VOGEL: Well, it's the obvious
7 roadway. It's the quickest way out. Why wouldn't
8 you come straight down in the campus to a
9 signalized intersection rather than run into the
10 problem that you've just described at Mountain
11 Avenue and Sicomac.

12 MR. RUEBENACKER: You lost me, Mr. Vogel.

13 MR. VOGEL: Pardon me?

14 MR. RUEBENACKER: You lost me on your
15 response.

16 MR. VOGEL: Okay.

17 MR. RUEBENACKER: Your response is vague.

18 MR. VOGEL: No, I didn't think it was but
19 let me try and --

20 MR. RUEBENACKER: They just come out of
21 the exit and make a right, why would they even go
22 to Mountain Avenue.

23 MR. VOGEL: No.

24 MS. YUDIN: The traffic from the Christian
25 Health Care Center coming out if somebody wants to

1 path with the least resistance.

2 MR. RUEBENACKER: Somebody on the upper
3 campus would never go out the Mountain Avenue exit
4 and go down to Sicomac Avenue to hang a right.
5 They would never do that. They would go through
6 the existing inner roadways of the Christian
7 Health Care Center to go out, to go exit the exit
8 across the street from Abbies. That's why I found
9 your answer vague.

10 MR. VOGEL: All right.

11 MS. YUDIN: They're making a no left turn
12 now according to this.

13 MR. RUEBENACKER: I'm talking about
14 current. I'm just talking about current.

15 CHAIRMAN FRY: All right. Any other
16 questions for Mr. Vogel?

17 All right. So why don't we...

18 MR. VOGEL: I'd like to start with Doug
19 Struyk, if I could.

20 CHAIRMAN FRY: Sure.

21 MR. COOK: Mr. Struyk, raise your right
22 hand.

23
24 (Whereupon, **DOUGLAS A. STRUYK** was duly
25 sworn by Mr. Cook)

1 MR. COOK: Just state your name.

2 MR. STRUYK: Douglas A. Struyk. I've
3 given the stenographer my business card for the
4 spelling of my name.

5 I'm the President and CEO of Christian
6 Health Care Center at 301 Sicomac Avenue in
7 Wyckoff.

8 Thank you.

9 Thank you very much for making time. When
10 Mr. Vogel referenced the 21 hearings back in 2007,
11 I did what maybe many of you do when you think of
12 time, you put it in the context of your children's
13 lives. In 2007 my oldest daughter was I think in
14 first grade and next year she's graduating from
15 college. So I could literally say this has been a
16 lifetime and I already know what I would like her
17 graduation present to her father to be. But thank
18 you very much for your time.

19 If I go back to those hearings, at the
20 very first hearing one of the things that I
21 stated, which was an underlying goal of this
22 project, was that where we had the opportunity, I
23 would like to leave things better than they were
24 when we found them, where we had the opportunity
25 to do that. And there was no question that

1 entrance in that kind of a sequence.

2 So in looking at that T-intersection and
3 realizing where all the traffic comes, to me it
4 became a door number one or door number two
5 opportunity. Do we want to have all of that
6 traffic make one of those two lefts and be on
7 Sicomac Avenue or in many cases go through
8 Mountain Avenue, which I agree with you, Mrs.
9 Yudin, to some extent that's a worse intersection
10 than Sicomac and Cedar Hill. Do we want to pull
11 that traffic off together, not just the two
12 percent that we're talking about with the Vista,
13 but any other traffic existing as well and have
14 that go straight on the campus, not just for the
15 Vista, but for any existing program and have the
16 way find be very simple and easy whether you are a
17 first time visitor or a 30th time visitor, that
18 you're able to not to go through the campus and
19 find your way to where we are.

20 And so from that perspective and seeing
21 that as better than where we were when we -- that
22 would be an improvement over just the
23 T-intersection.

24 Then in our discussions with the county, I
25 then brought up if we were to have that kind of an

1 traffic was one of those.

2 And, Mr. Kalpagian, actually, your
3 question gets to the heart of that to some extent
4 because as Mr. Vogel has shared the back and
5 forth, our attempt to want to work with all
6 parties to find a solution, and in the end, you
7 could look at it as a glass half empty or half
8 full.

9 And from my perspective from looking at it
10 as a half full, with that T-intersection, that
11 that was the county's position, them wanting the
12 light, realizing the traffic that comes in and out
13 of the health care center, most of it comes off of
14 Route 208 up Cedar Hill Avenue, turns right, and
15 then makes two lefts, either at that point right
16 across from Abbies or it goes town to Mountain
17 Avenue and makes a left. Because the majority of
18 our visitor traffic, especially in residents and
19 employees now, to a great extent is on our upper
20 campus. There are some who do come in the lower
21 campus. But unless you are a family member who
22 has been on campus several times, to find your way
23 through the campus, you need a map. But to the
24 path of least resistance as it is currently now is
25 to go down to Mountain Avenue and come up that

1 access, could we use that for construction
2 activity for the Vista initially, and once we had
3 the certificate of occupancy for the Vista, could
4 that then become a permanent entrance for all the
5 traffic coming onto our campus.

6 And so the reason anyone would go in any
7 one of the other directions is if someone was
8 coming out of the campus and wanted to go to
9 Franklin Lakes, then they would come out and they
10 would want to make that left turn. And as with
11 what Mr. Vogel mentioned, the existing entrance
12 now on Sicomac Avenue won't provide that
13 opportunity. So you'll have then two choices: Do
14 you want to go to Mountain and Sicomac or do you
15 want to go to the traffic light and go that way.

16 The traffic that's going towards Franklin
17 Lakes is nominal. That's basically going to be
18 families from the upper portion of Wyckoff or
19 Franklin Lakes who have family members that we're
20 caring for, they're going back and forth and
21 they're going to time themselves.

22 Those coming out of the Mountain Avenue
23 entrance, which could include Vista residents,
24 they're primarily going to use that if they want
25 to then turn left and go to North Haledon. But

1 for them, especially if they're a little bit
 2 older, to come out and make a right turn, go down
 3 to Mountain Avenue and Sicomac and, again, deal
 4 with that intersection, I think it won't take them
 5 more than one or two opportunities of that to
 6 realize it's much more direct, much easier to just
 7 go down to the traffic signal and make that left
 8 if that's in fact where they're going. Most, and
 9 I think Stantec will talk about this later, is
 10 that most will go out to Cedar Hill Avenue.

11 But, again, we've got experts here that
 12 can testify.

13 One of the things that's happened since we
 14 left here last is that we have had the opportunity
 15 to meet people from this community and others
 16 nearby that are anxious for the Vista to be part
 17 of their life plan. Well over a hundred
 18 individuals that have already made a significant
 19 commitment to do that and they're anxious. And
 20 this whole process with the county has had an
 21 impact on our ability to move to the next step.
 22 And now that we are that much closer, hopefully,
 23 we're seeing an even greater level of interest and
 24 we're anxious to have an opportunity to bring that
 25 to fruition.

1 My background, just to bring that to your
 2 attention, 21 years I've been involved with mainly
 3 transportation projects. Leading designs varying
 4 in size from intersections to major highway
 5 improvement projects for the New Jersey Department
 6 of Transportation.

7 I sat as the engineering advisor to the
 8 Planning Board and Zoning Board of the Borough of
 9 Glen Rock for ten years.

10 And I testified before this board in
 11 connection with the original application for site
 12 plan approval with respect to the intersection
 13 improvements.

14 MR. COOK: You're licensed --

15 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: That is correct, yes.

16 MR. COOK: Would you raise your right
 17 hand, please.

18
 19 (Whereupon, **ALBERT W. ROUGHGARDEN** was duly
 20 sworn by Mr. Cook)

21
 22 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Mr. Vogel provided and
 23 Mr. Struyk provided some background. The
 24 testimony that I'm going to provide for the
 25 traffic and related to the intersection will be in

1 Because, again, going back to why we did
 2 this, it wasn't because we wanted to build a Vista
 3 and create a need, but because we knew before we
 4 started, even back in 2007 that there was a need
 5 in the community for this and we wanted to
 6 respond. So we're excited to have the opportunity
 7 to do that.

8 I appreciate your making time tonight and
 9 I'm anxious for the experts that we have retained
 10 to give you the answers to some very good
 11 questions that you've asked tonight.

12 CHAIRMAN FRY: Thank you.

13 MR. VOGEL: Al.

14 Would you state your name, for the record,
 15 and reacquaint the board with your professional
 16 relationship.

17 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Sure.

18 My name is Albert Roughgarden. I am a
 19 licensed engineer in the State of New Jersey. I
 20 have a bachelors of science from NJIT. I've been
 21 practicing in engineering in the State of New
 22 Jersey for 21 years. I'm employed with Stantec
 23 Consulting Services, Incorporated out of our
 24 Rochelle Park office. The address is 365 West
 25 Passaic Street in Rochelle Park.

1 two parts, myself and then if those of you who
 2 were involved previously may remember there was a
 3 gentleman with me, bald head like myself, Mr.
 4 Luglio (Phonetic) --

5 CHAIRMAN FRY: Bow tie.

6 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Yes, bow tie. Very good
 7 memory.

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: Can't forget it.

9 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Mr. Luglio is no longer
 10 with the firm, so I do have his predecessor, Mr.
 11 Matt Maher, who is --

12 CHAIRMAN FRY: No bow tie?

13 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: No bow tie, who has
 14 worked on this project subsequent to Mr. Luglio's
 15 leaving. He will be able to provide information
 16 on the actual traffic operations of the signal.
 17 So there'll be opportunities to ask questions of
 18 both of us. I will be able to answer some;
 19 hopefully, Matt will be able to answer the rest.
 20 What I'd like to do is set the table by
 21 discussing what the actual improvements are that
 22 have been discussed with the county over the past,
 23 about the last year or so.

24 And then I'd like to go through the
 25 engineer's report, your engineer's report of

1 May 24th to hopefully address the comments that
2 were raised or the questions that were raised
3 there in connection with the intersection design.

4 And I know that there were also some
5 reports that I received today from your police
6 chief. I don't know if it was the police chief or
7 in your police department and your fire department
8 and I can touch on those.

9 And, hopefully, some of the information I
10 present to you will help answer some of your
11 questions. But then, obviously, feel free to ask
12 me anything you would like and I'll answer as much
13 as I can.

14 So the plans that were submitted, there
15 were 12 plan sheets that were provided titled:
16 The Interim Sicomac Avenue Widening Intersection
17 Improvements. The presentation information that I
18 have here is based on those plans that were
19 presented or provided previously.

20 So there are two aspects of the plans that
21 were provided and Mr. Fry, you touched on this
22 earlier, that there are interim roadway
23 improvements and there are future roadway
24 improvements, or what you termed and what's
25 identified in the plans as the phasing plans.

1 The interim roadway improvements, which
2 are really the subject of what the Christian
3 Health Care Center is seeking to obtain approval
4 for is the widening of Sicomac Avenue in the
5 eastbound direction and also includes the
6 driveway, the new driveway to the campus.

7 Bergen County, as part of this
8 improvement, will be installing a temporary, what
9 we would term a temporary span-wire traffic
10 signal.

11 The future roadway improvements shown on
12 the phasing plans is all work being done by the
13 county, that includes curbing, sidewalks,
14 driveways along Sicomac Avenue on the westbound
15 side or the north side of Sicomac Avenue. That
16 would also include improvements on Cedar Hill
17 Avenue, curb, sidewalks, and driveways again. The
18 county at that time or at some point in the future
19 would then remove the temporary span-wire signal
20 and replace that with a full signalized
21 intersection.

22 And Mr. Vogel touched on this, recent
23 stakeholder coordination that at least Stantec is
24 aware of and it was directly involved with was a
25 March 2017 meeting between the Christian Health

1 Care Center and Bergen County to discuss moving
2 forward with some sort of plan to signalize the
3 intersection.

4 There was a July 2017 meeting where
5 Stantec was personally present that included
6 Christian Health Care Center, Bergen County, and
7 Wyckoff officials.

8 And then, obviously, I think we're all
9 aware of the fact that Bergen County provided site
10 plan approval in January 2018 with various
11 conditions.

12 I know everyone is very well familiar, but
13 just for the sake of my own fun, Cedar Hill Avenue
14 is located here. Sicomac Avenue is across this
15 way. The service station on the corner. Market
16 Basket's here.

17 This is an image taken from Google. North
18 is directly up and down. For the purpose of our
19 presentation, we've considered Sicomac Avenue to
20 travel in an east/west direction and Cedar Hill
21 Avenue travels in the north/south direction.

22 These are a little faded out. Everyone, I
23 believe, has the plans, so please feel free to
24 refer to those if you'd like to see things a
25 little more clearly.

1 But just in general, like I said, the
2 intent of the Christian Health Care Center's
3 improvements are to widen the eastbound side of
4 Sicomac Avenue. The widening begins at the
5 existing Christian Health Care Center driveway
6 located west of the Cedar Hill intersection and
7 then it extends to the east side of the Cedar Hill
8 Avenue intersection to Wellesley Lane. These are,
9 as the testimony that was provided many years ago,
10 the same limits of the project when previous
11 testimony was provided showing the full build out
12 of the intersection.

13 The width of the widening varies through
14 the section. On the west side of Cedar Hill
15 Avenue, roadway's are pretty well defined. There
16 is a shoulder area. There's some curbing along
17 the Christian Health Care Center frontage. So in
18 order to accommodate the widening for the lane
19 configurations required at the signalized
20 intersection, the widening on the left side of
21 Cedar Hill Avenue varies from zero to 12 feet. On
22 average it's about 12 feet. The zero part is very
23 minimal. When you cross over to the east side of
24 Cedar Hill Avenue, there are some very steep
25 slopes. There are no shoulders or lack of very

1 minimal shoulders and so the widening on that side
2 is much greater. In fact, it's as wide as 32 feet
3 east of Cedar Hill Avenue.

4 MS. YUDIN: Can you point where that is?

5 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Yeah, I can do that.
6 They'll be future slides that I'll show where I'll
7 point to those locations.

8 The intersection improvements will afford
9 and the widening will afford for dedicated turning
10 lanes at the intersection which will improve
11 operations.

12 And, again, Mr. Maher will testify to the
13 future operations of the traffic signal.

14 The improvements will afford for full
15 width right shoulders, essentially, replacing the
16 existing tiger striped area that's adjacent to the
17 travel lanes today. The improvements or the
18 widening will afford for some cross slope
19 improvements to help for drainage conditions.
20 And, obviously, touched on earlier, there'll be a
21 span-wire signal that the county will install.

22 And one thing that we tried to accomplish
23 here with this design is to ensure that if and
24 when the county ever came through with their
25 future improvements, that all of the work that was

1 information, the notes that are off to the left of
2 each of these slides are identical. They're meant
3 to just be able to give you a reference to
4 understand what the improvements are on each
5 slide.

6 So, again, beginning here at the existing
7 Christian Health Care Center driveway on Sicomac
8 Avenue, the widening will begin heading in an
9 eastbound direction. The widening essentially
10 goes to 12 feet nearly immediately as the existing
11 curb line is rather uniform and it affords a
12 uniformed widening between the existing Christian
13 Health Care Center and the intersection of Cedar
14 Hill Avenue.

15 Again, same colors, moving to the east,
16 you can see here that the yellow area, the
17 widening here is pretty uniform until you get to
18 almost to the intersection corner where then, as I
19 said earlier, the width of the roadway or the
20 alignment of the roadway in the eastbound
21 direction shifts towards the north and follows
22 this gray area here, okay, as you travel in the
23 eastbound direction.

24 So as you get to where the existing
25 un-signalized intersection is, in order to provide

1 done on the eastbound side of Sicomac Avenue, that
2 widening, the curb, the sidewalk, any utility
3 relocations that are associated with that would
4 not have to be reconstructed, that the county's
5 improvements could tie into what the Christian
6 Health Care Center would construct as part of this
7 application.

8 So what I did here just to help illustrate
9 what the different areas of improvements are. The
10 exhibit you see here is identical to the
11 construction plans or the interim roadway plans
12 that are provided. I simply added some colors to
13 try to enhance what those improvements are, and I
14 know it's a little washed out, but if you can see
15 the green area here represents the soil
16 disturbance and stabilization that will occur as
17 part of the widening. There's a faded out yellow,
18 I should have made that a little different color,
19 but that yellow area here represents the area of
20 widening. So where there isn't pavement today,
21 that will become pavement in the future. And then
22 the gray shade here denotes existing pavement that
23 will be resurfaced as part of the roadway
24 improvements.

25 And, again, just for everyone's

1 the turning lanes that are needed to make this
2 signalized intersection operate at an acceptable
3 level of service, the widening east of Cedar Hill
4 Avenue increases to its widest point and that's
5 about a hundred feet east of the intersection
6 where the widening required would be about
7 32 feet.

8 So, Miss Yudin, that was the area, to
9 answer your question, just east of the Cedar Hill
10 Avenue intersection is that widest point.

11 The improvements along Sicomac Avenue will
12 include new curbing, new sidewalk, obviously, the
13 signal, I'll touch on that in a minute. The
14 widening will afford for a dedicated left-turn
15 lane from Sicomac Avenue eastbound to Cedar Hill
16 Avenue northbound. The widening will also afford
17 for a dedicated left-turn lane, Sicomac Avenue
18 westbound into the Christian Health Care Center
19 campus. It affords a dedicated through lane in
20 the westbound direction of Sicomac Avenue and a
21 dedicated right-turn lane from Sicomac Avenue
22 westbound to Cedar Hill Avenue northbound.

23 In the eastbound direction, Sicomac Avenue
24 as you continue to the east, there will be no
25 dedicated right-turn lane into the campus. It

1 will be a shared through right.

2 The traffic signal: Bergen County will
3 design and install that traffic signal. That's
4 not something that the Christian Health Care
5 Center will do. And to Mr. Vogel's point, the
6 county could go out there at their whim and just
7 put up the temporary traffic signal. So we're
8 trying to coordinate, I guess, is the best way to
9 say that. The goal of the Christian Health Care
10 Center, which is to be able to operate their
11 campus with the goal of the county, which is to
12 signalize the intersection.

13 Again, as I said, the area that is shaded
14 in yellow west of the Cedar Hill Avenue
15 intersection will be striped with a crosshatch to
16 indicate that there should be no travel, there
17 should be no use of that lane as travel. And all
18 of this sets the table. You might ask yourself,
19 well, why are we widening, why are we doing all
20 this widening to provide a shoulder.

21 Well, first, I would say that shoulders
22 enhance safety of the roadway.

23 But secondly, as I said earlier, the goal
24 we're trying to accomplish is to avoid
25 reconstruction whenever the county may come along

1 right turn onto Sicomac Avenue and then either
2 making a left into the existing driveway on
3 Sicomac or making a left into, I'm sorry, onto
4 Mountain Avenue and then continuing to the upper
5 part of the campus.

6 Providing this direct connection removes
7 all that traffic. It removes all that traffic
8 from what is already a heavy right turn from Cedar
9 Hill Avenue to Sicomac Avenue northbound. It
10 removes that traffic from the westbound Sicomac
11 Avenue through lane, right, because now no longer
12 will you need to have cars queuing at that
13 existing driveway on Sicomac Avenue waiting to
14 make a left turn.

15 I think also the fact of adding a traffic
16 signal and having, currently today if you're
17 traveling eastbound on Sicomac Avenue, there's no
18 stop. You have a free move to continue through.
19 With a traffic signal, now every however many
20 seconds, and Mr. Maher will talk to you about how
21 long the traffic signal timing, the phasing of the
22 signal and timing of the signal will operate,
23 traffic will be stopped. It's a traffic light.
24 When it's red, everyone stops. The queue will
25 extend back not quite to the existing campus

1 and finish off this intersection.

2 So the curbing that will be constructed
3 along the eastbound side of Sicomac Avenue is the
4 curbing that will remain and will not need to be
5 reconstructed if and when the county ever comes
6 through with the remainder of their improvements.

7 Mr. Maher will touch on and provide
8 testimony on the operation of the signal, how that
9 signal will function, how it will help traffic.

10 And, you know, to go back to answer a
11 question that was brought up a few moments ago,
12 the question of well, why build the Christian
13 Health Care Center driveway. And it's a function
14 of, the honest answer is, is that as Mr. Vogel
15 pointed out and Mr. Struyk pointed out, it's a
16 path of least resistance. By providing this
17 direct connection to the campus at the
18 intersection, it will remove traffic from the
19 Mountain Avenue/Sicomac Avenue intersection.

20 Mr. Maher will testify about some of the
21 origin and destination information that was
22 gathered previously with the help of the Christian
23 Health Care Center that shows that the majority of
24 their campus visitors are coming from, through 208
25 traveling south on Cedar Hill Avenue making a

1 intersection or campus driveway on Sicomac Avenue,
2 but generally close enough to complicate traffic
3 operations on Sicomac Avenue.

4 So I would think that by not introducing
5 the campus driveway at what the county already
6 intends to signalize in creating a four-way
7 intersection will actually complicate traffic
8 operations on Sicomac Avenue, particularly, at the
9 existing campus driveway. And also, as I said
10 earlier, it will not achieve the benefit of
11 removing traffic from Mountain Avenue from that
12 intersection which there was discussion earlier
13 about how it's recognized that that is a problem
14 intersection.

15 So while this project does not have a
16 physical improvement at Mountain and Sicomac,
17 there will be an operational improvement to some
18 extent. It may not be something that is, wow,
19 there's such a difference, but in traffic numbers,
20 there will be a difference at that location.

21 Just continuing on.

22 As we move further to the east, again, the
23 area in yellow is the widening. And if you can
24 bear with me and see this, but it does start to
25 narrow to the point where when you get to the

1 intersection of Wellesley Lane, that widening
2 essentially becomes zero and then the area of gray
3 shading. So by the time the improvements get to
4 Wellesley Lane, it matches and ties in with the
5 existing alignment and roadway section of Sicomac
6 Avenue.

7 Okay. One of the questions that your
8 engineer raised in the letter of May 24th, 2018,
9 was with respect to site triangles. This was not
10 something that was included in the original
11 submission but I wanted to present this exhibit as
12 a way to respond to the question that was raised.

13 So I'm referring to comments number 38 and
14 39 of the May 24th, 2018, letter from Boswell
15 Engineering to the Zoning Board of Adjustment. So
16 reference in the comments was made to the
17 Residential Site Improvement Standards with
18 respect to the site triangles at the roadway
19 intersection. And the residential site
20 improvement standards refer to the need for site
21 triangles according to AASHTO.

22 Now, AASHTO, the policy that governs
23 street design is a policy on geometric design of
24 highways and streets. The latest editions is
25 dated 2011. That guidance document provides

1 guidance for the need for and how to apply site
2 triangles at an intersection.

3 There are various cases. The case that
4 governs this location is case D, which discusses
5 intersections with traffic signal control.

6 Generally, site triangles are not required
7 at signalized intersections because the
8 intersection is stop controlled in all directions.

9 It suggests that at a minimum you make sure that
10 there is inter-visibility of all vehicles or the
11 first vehicle stopped at all the approaches and
12 this intersection affords that. However, the
13 exception is when right turns on red are allowed.
14 So when a right turn on red is allowed, you have
15 to afford an opportunity to provide adequate site
16 distance to see vehicles approaching from the
17 left.

18 So in response to your engineer's
19 comments, I prepared this exhibit which depicts a
20 vehicle positioned at the exit driveway facing
21 north towards Cedar Hill Avenue.

22 One point to note is that on the drawings
23 that you received, the location of the stop bar is
24 not correctly indicated. That stop bar as shown
25 on the drawings that were previously provided is

1 further away from the crosswalk than really it
2 needs to be. General guidance is to place it four
3 feet behind the back of the crosswalk. And that
4 guidance is also supported by how AASHTO suggests
5 where to place the position of the driver's eye
6 when measuring site distance.

7 So the position of the driver's eye is
8 measured 14 and a half feet back from the curb
9 line or what would be the future curb line of
10 Sicomac Avenue. You go six and a half feet back
11 from the curb line to the front of the vehicle,
12 eight feet from the front of the vehicle to the
13 position of the driver's eye and that's how we get
14 the 14 and a half feet. You then plot a point to
15 the left. There are two different requirements
16 for site distance. One is Bergen County; the
17 other is the guidance provided in the AASHTO
18 publication.

19 Bergen County's site distance requirement
20 is based on the speed of the roadway. In this
21 case it's 40 miles an hour. And based on their
22 documentation, the required site distance is
23 400 feet. Aashto is a little more conservative at
24 430 feet. So the graphic that I prepared depicts
25 the more conservative AASHTO requirement of

1 430 feet.

2 So, again, just to quickly surmise here.
3 Based on the position of the driver's eye looking
4 to the left, the site triangle at no point does it
5 fall within what would be the Christian Health
6 Care Center's property after any acquisition or
7 any dedication of a roadway easement. So on the
8 plans, the depiction of the proposed right-of-way
9 line is shown essentially along the curb line and
10 then there's a secondary dash line which shows a
11 proposed easement. That would be a roadway
12 easement dedicated to and reserved by the county.
13 So the site triangle line does not fall within,
14 I'm sorry, falls outside of any property that the
15 Christian Health Care Center would retain.

16 So what I'm saying is there would be no
17 need, I believe there would be no need to acquire
18 any additional site triangle easement rights.

19 Also, there was a question later on in
20 your engineer's report, item number 68 of the same
21 letter, which talks about the location of the
22 proposed entrance sign. That was not depicted on
23 the previous plans that were submitted but is
24 depicted on this graphic. And I can testify that
25 the proposed entrance sign is not within the site

1 triangle, so it would not be an obstruction to
2 site distance.

3 I know these are difficult to see, but
4 again, please refer to the plans that were
5 previously submitted if you need to.

6 What has been provided so far I would term
7 preliminary cross-sections. These cross-sections
8 depict the limits of excavation that would be
9 required to accommodate the widening. These
10 cross-sections are plotted at every 100 feet along
11 Sicomac Avenue. As we move to construction,
12 should this move to construction, I don't want to
13 presume anything, more detailed design drawings
14 would be completed. These cross-sections would
15 actually be plotted at every 50 feet so that the
16 earthwork quantities can be more accurately
17 calculated.

18 And, again, I hope that the testimony I
19 can provide now will address the comments that
20 were brought to your attention by your engineer.

21 The maximum cut slope that's being
22 proposed is a two horizontal to one vertical.
23 Doing so will minimize the amount of excavation
24 that's required; the amount of disturbance that
25 would be required. It is considered a traversable

1 slope in a cut section, so it would not
2 necessarily need to be protected by the use of
3 guide rail. And it's generally considered stable.
4 For the soil types in North Jersey, a two on one
5 slope is considered stable without the need for
6 retaining walls. And the intent would be to
7 stabilize it with grass, topsoil, and seed. And,
8 again, a two on one slope is something that grass
9 can very easily grow on. It's not necessarily a
10 concern with erosion, particularly, during or
11 after a rainstorm.

12 And one point to note is as I was driving
13 through the intersection tonight, there are
14 existing slopes out there that currently today are
15 steeper than two to one. And if you look at the
16 cross-sections that are provided in your plans,
17 I'm not going to read that from here, but there
18 are some sections where I think it would be
19 obvious for you to note that the existing side
20 slopes, the existing side slope grading is in fact
21 steeper than two to one. So I would say if that's
22 not an issue now, flattening the slope to create a
23 two on one would certainly not be an issue in the
24 future.

25 CHAIRMAN FRY: So just to kind of clear

1 that up. What you're saying now is the grass
2 comes right down to Sicomac?

3 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

4 CHAIRMAN FRY: Essentially, what's going
5 to happen is you're going to take some of that
6 land, remove it, expand the roadway and in essence
7 what will take its place is the same thing, slopes
8 down no more than two to one.

9 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

10 CHAIRMAN FRY: Grass right down to the
11 curb line. Again, no need for retaining wall.

12 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: No need for retaining
13 wall. But just to clarify, Mr. Fry, on the west
14 side of Cedar Hill Avenue there will be a sidewalk
15 installed. So this is directly in front of the
16 main campus where then you will have a curb, a
17 grass strip, a sidewalk, and then the slope will
18 come down to that sidewalk.

19 But as you go onto the east side of Cedar
20 Hill Avenue, the roadway section will change.

21 There was no proposed sidewalk on the south side
22 of Sicomac Avenue. There already is a sidewalk on
23 the north side that can be used by pedestrians.

24 So the plan does not include the construction of a
25 sidewalk east of Sicomac Avenue. But you are

1 correct, it will be a two on one slope that will
2 come down to either the curb line or to the back
3 of the sidewalk depending on which side of Cedar
4 Hill Avenue you're on.

5 I know that your engineer had provided
6 some comments on this. If I can just touch on
7 those since we're talking about cut and fill and
8 side slope grading.

9 Comment number 56 of the May 24th letter
10 requesting that the applicant provide cut and fill
11 calculations for the proposed cross-sections and
12 improvements, I would testify tonight that
13 preliminary estimates based on these initial
14 cross-sections, it's about a little over a 5,500
15 cubic yards of excavation. It essentially is all
16 excavation or to accommodate the widening. As we
17 get into the more detailed design and are able to
18 reduce the spacing between these cross-sections,
19 we'll be able to better refine those calculations.
20 That number will change. But those final numbers
21 will be provided to your engineer prior to the
22 completion of the final construction plans.

23 Item number 57. The applicant shall
24 provide testimony regarding the proposed two on
25 one slope and whether retaining wall is required.

1 And I think I testified to that just a few
2 moments ago in my discussion of the proposed cut
3 slope of a two to one ratio.

4 Item number 58. If a retaining wall is
5 not planned, the applicant shall provide testimony
6 regarding the stabilization methods being
7 proposed.

8 Again, I think I addressed that by
9 indicating the side slope would be stabilized with
10 topsoil and seeding, obviously, conforming to all
11 the requirements of the soil erosion sediment
12 control standards as governed by Bergen County
13 Soil Conservation District.

14 Okay. Lastly, Mr. Fry, to answer your
15 question. There were additional plans provided in
16 the packet that you received. The intent of those
17 plans was to show how the interim improvements
18 that are part of this amended site plan
19 application would interface with future
20 improvements that the county may or may not move
21 ahead with.

22 The county has indicated to us that it is
23 their desire to move forward with the ultimate
24 plan that was presented several years ago that
25 this board and the public had numerous objections

1 shown on red here would be work to be advanced by
2 the county subject to future discussions between
3 the township and the county.

4 So what are those improvements? Just to
5 touch on them quickly. As Mr. Vogel indicated it
6 would be providing curb, sidewalk, and formalizing
7 access to the service station to the Market Basket
8 on the north side of Sicomac Avenue. It will be
9 formalizing access in and out of the service
10 station on the west side of Cedar Hill Avenue.
11 And then it would be completing the signalization
12 of the intersection. So the temporary span-wire
13 signal would be removed, a permanent signal would
14 be installed fully MUTCD compliant, fully
15 compliant with NJDOT design criteria, the county
16 criteria. It would provide for full ADA
17 compliance, curb ramps, pedestrian push buttons,
18 pedestrian signal heads. But, again, that is not
19 what the Christian Health Care Center intends to
20 seek approval for. These are just giving you an
21 idea of what might happen in the future and how
22 the Christian Health Care Center is planning for
23 that by at a minimum proposing improvements that
24 would not have to be reconstructed in the future.

25 CHAIRMAN FRY: One quick thing on the

1 to. It is not my testimony nor is it the intent
2 of our client to try to persuade the board that
3 this is something, well, if you like this, maybe
4 we should do something bigger. The idea here is
5 to show you that we're being thoughtful and we're
6 thinking forward and we're recognizing, or the
7 Christian Health Care Center is recognizing that
8 they want to make sure they do their part to set
9 the table for any future improvements. But those
10 future improvements would be solely advanced by
11 the county.

12 So there are phasing plans. There are
13 three phasing plans sheets which provide the same
14 coverage as the interim roadway plans that were
15 previously shown. And, again, there are
16 cross-sections that are shown in there. Again,
17 and like I said, the point I'd like to make there
18 is as you observe those plans you see that
19 everything that had been constructed on the south
20 side of Sicomac Avenue would not be re-disturbed
21 as a result of the county moving forward with
22 their improvements. What the county ultimately
23 does on the north side of Sicomac Avenue, it could
24 be the phasing plans that were presented. Again,
25 everything's shown in red on those plans, which is

1 interim plan.

2 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN FRY: Coming up from Cedar Hill
4 there's no straight arrow going in or proposed
5 coming into the complex. You have a right and a
6 left.

7 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: That would need to be
8 changed. That would be changed to, I believe --

9 CHAIRMAN FRY: A left.

10 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: I believe it's shown on
11 the, yeah, I believe it's shown on this plan and
12 that striping would have to be updated. Since
13 there is a very heavy right turn movement, and
14 that would be a right turn on red. If I go back
15 to the interim plan. So the existing striping
16 affords for a right turn and a left turn,
17 obviously, a T-intersection. We would not want to
18 introduce that through movement in the right-turn
19 lane. You want to allow right turn on red because
20 of the heavy volume of traffic. So we do note,
21 and Mr. Maher can testify to, that the existing
22 traffic at that intersection is much heavier
23 turning right from Cedar Hill Avenue to Sicomac
24 Avenue than it is turning left. So the striping
25 would be updated and as part of providing a

1 revised plan that addresses your engineer's
2 comments, we would update that striping. So the
3 way it would be striped is a shared through left
4 and an exclusive right.

5 I'd just like to make sure I touched on
6 all of the what I thought were the applicable
7 comments that your engineer provided in the
8 May 24th letter. If you can just bear with me for
9 one second.

10 CHAIRMAN FRY: In the meantime, Mr.
11 Ascolese, do you have any questions?

12 Really what Mr. Roughgarden is going
13 through is the Boswell report and kind of cherry
14 picking, rather than following suit to this, kind
15 of jumping all over the place, getting into the
16 traffic study and intersection but he's not kind
17 of circling the ones that you're addressing.

18 If you have any questions, by all means.

19 MR. ASCOLESE: I do.

20 The Traffic Impact Statement that is dated
21 December of 2008. That is the latest report?

22 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Mr. Maher will testify
23 to that, but, Gary, I can answer your question.
24 No, that's not the latest report. There was an
25 addendum to that report prepared and dated. I

1 answer that for you. I think that Mr. Maher can
2 testify to the trip generation and how that was
3 documented and maybe Mr. Karle or Mr. Struyk could
4 testify to the intensity or I'm sorry the need for
5 that number of parking spaces.

6 MR. ASCOLESE: Okay.

7 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: So maybe we can answer
8 your question with sort of like a multi-prong
9 attack, but I, unfortunately, am not prepared to
10 answer that question for you tonight.

11 MR. ASCOLESE: That's fine.

12 The other question is the interim plan,
13 were you guided on that design by the county? And
14 my other question is, was there any give and take?
15 You know, the thought is maybe we can narrow down
16 some of the lanes and narrow down a little bit
17 here and there and perhaps lower the speed limit
18 so that the transitions don't have to go as far
19 and maybe lessen the overall impacts along
20 Sicomac.

21 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: I would say from an
22 engineering perspective that's certainly a
23 possibility. The lane widths that are being
24 proposed, the dedicated left-turn lanes are
25 11 feet; the through lane is 12 feet wide. Those

1 don't have the exact date, but it was February
2 of 2013, February 4th, I do it have here.
3 February 4th, 2013. There was an addendum
4 prepared to that traffic impact report. The
5 addendum did two things: It accounted for the
6 reduced number of units. The original Traffic
7 Impact Study accounted for 258. The addendum
8 accounted for impacts of a reduced nature of 199.
9 The addendum in that time also documented traffic
10 operations at the existing campus driveway on
11 Sicomac Avenue with the removal of any
12 signalization at the intersection of Cedar Hill
13 and Sicomac.

14 MR. ASCOLESE: Okay. The other comment or
15 question that I had, from what I understand
16 there's a proposal to have over a thousand parking
17 spaces in this complex if this were to be
18 approved. And I'm looking at the numbers entering
19 in the morning and the total entering from all
20 driveways I think was about 200. I'm just
21 wondering why is there like a disconnect between
22 the entering volumes in the morning and the number
23 of parking spaces that you have in the campus?
24 Can you just kind of fill me --

25 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: I don't know if I can

1 are generally considered to be the desirable lane
2 widths, certainly not the minimum lane widths.

3 The shoulder that would be striped out is
4 12 feet wide. Again, that is not necessarily the
5 minimum.

6 The intent at this point is to -- let me
7 say that the intent of the preparation of those
8 plans was to provide more of a very detailed
9 concept, which could be further refined in
10 coordination with the county to do the best we can
11 to minimize some of those lane widths, to minimize
12 the disturbance as best we can. I don't think
13 that that would mean wholesale changes to reducing
14 the number of lanes or the lane configurations,
15 but lane widths certainly is something that I
16 think could be a continued discussion with the
17 county.

18 Should the board accept the plans and
19 there is an agreement to move forward, just so
20 you're all aware, the next phase would be for
21 Stantec to develop detailed engineering designs
22 which would be submitted to and reviewed by both
23 Bergen County and the Township of Wyckoff seeking
24 opportunity for input and comment on the designs.
25 Certainly, I'm not going to stand here before you

1 and say I know best. I'm going to follow the
2 desirable standards. We certainly want to make
3 sure, as Mr. Struyk said, to make sure we're
4 leaving behind, you know, we're not making things
5 worse, we're actually leaving something behind
6 that's better than what it was. And so those
7 conversations can be continued as we move forward
8 with a more detailed design for the roadway
9 improvements.

10 MR. ASCOLESE: If you don't mind, Mr.
11 Chairman, just a few more questions.

12 CHAIRMAN FRY: Sure.

13 MR. ASCOLESE: Right now there are single
14 family homes on the southeast quadrant of the
15 intersection. Are those houses going to remain
16 and what effect will the cutting of this slope,
17 the proposed cutting of slope, have on those
18 houses and driveways?

19 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Sure.

20 The driveways will have to be
21 reconstructed and regraded. The driveway further
22 to the west, which is this one here, okay, that
23 limited reconstruction will extend up to, nearly
24 up to the end of the driveway. Again, that is
25 dictated by the cut and this is an area in here

1 MR. DiGENNARO: Any consideration to left
2 turn limitation coming out of Christian Health
3 Care and to forcing traffic to the right or
4 straight?

5 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: No, there was no
6 consideration nor do I think there would need to
7 be. And maybe Mr. Maher can testify a little more
8 about the traffic operations and why that might
9 not be the case.

10 But if you were to do that then -- the
11 county also has testified earlier or information
12 provided earlier with this improvement to the
13 signalized intersection, the county will mandate
14 that the existing driveway on Sicomac Avenue be
15 reconfigured to a right in and right out. And so
16 I think that anyone who wants to then continue
17 west onto Sicomac Avenue with the intent of this
18 driveway becoming the main point of entrance and
19 exit, you're going to send traffic in a direction
20 where it's going to take people out of their way.
21 It's a bit of an inconvenience. And
22 operationally, I don't think it's needed. I think
23 that all of the turning movements can very easily
24 be accommodated at this intersection and Mr. Maher
25 will testify to the operations here and maybe

1 where, as I mentioned earlier in previous
2 testimony, the side slope, existing roadway side
3 slope, is already very steep, so to provide a two
4 on one grade requires that cut, but you can't
5 provide a two on one grade for a driveway. You
6 have to provide somewhat of a driveway that's
7 traversable. So because of the grading on the
8 driveway, in order to tie the existing driveway
9 into the widening section of Sicomac Avenue,
10 nearly the entire driveway would have to be
11 reconstructed. As you move further to the east,
12 you can see that those driveway reconstruction
13 limits begin to narrow down and then once we get
14 to Wellesley Lane, no more driveways heading to
15 the east would require reconstruction.

16 MR. STRUYK: Where it says Sicomac Avenue,
17 that's actually Goffle Hill Road in Hawthorne.

18 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: It becomes Goffle Hill
19 Road when it goes into Hawthorne, yes.

20 MR. DiGENNARO: Are those two properties
21 owned by Christian Health Care?

22 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Yes.

23 MR. DiGENNARO: Question. Back to the
24 previous slide.

25 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Sure.

1 better answer your question.

2 MR. ASCOLESE: One other question.

3 In your discussions with the county for
4 the last several years, was there any indication
5 that there's going to be more or less like a built
6 in circuit breaker. For example, like, if the
7 number of accidents exceeded this number or the
8 amount of delay exceeded this number, that the
9 future improvements had to have been completed or
10 will need to be completed? So there's no circuit
11 breakers built into Bergen County approval?

12 MR. VOGEL: No.

13 CHAIRMAN FRY: And the phasing cannot
14 proceed until an agreement is made with the town
15 and the county.

16 MR. VOGEL: You've got the letter. That's
17 what it said.

18 MR. DiGENNARO: We have gone back and
19 forth with those properties and the service
20 station and the mountable island, the curb for the
21 tractor trailer deliveries of fuel, how is all
22 this sitting? Has anybody spoken to them?

23 MR. VOGEL: Well, what happened
24 originally, if you recall, the improvements that
25 the intersection had because of the change in the

1 access to Sicomac Village and the Market Basket
 2 and the service station had those mountable curbs,
 3 had all of that. We took the position that if
 4 that was part of the design, it was never going to
 5 fly. And so what we did was, we said we'll create
 6 a circumstance. Instead of contributing money to
 7 you, we'll contribute as much land as you
 8 rationally need to widen the road just on our side
 9 so that if and when you improve across on the
 10 other side, if that ever came about, you wouldn't
 11 have to take anything from them. And that was the
 12 way the design was put together.

13 We're giving up land so that in the event
 14 that they ever did come and do it, I don't know if
 15 they will or if they ever would, but if they
 16 would, they would not have to take land from the
 17 other side of the street because we will have
 18 given it up front.

19 And as Mr. Roughgarden said, we'll put in
 20 the curbs and all the improvements on our side so
 21 it would be accommodating for whatever they would
 22 do on the other side without widening on the other
 23 side.

24 MR. DiGENNARO: So the future contemplates
 25 the shift in the centerline?

1 presented this plan about those concerns, about
 2 how will tankers access the service station to
 3 refuel and the formalization of driveways. And
 4 that was a major concern of not only the board,
 5 but, obviously, the residents who came to voice
 6 their opinion.

7 MR. RUEBENACKER: Mr. Roughgarden, could
 8 you speak to questions regarding the addendum that
 9 you mentioned earlier or would that be your
 10 partner?

11 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: That would be my partner
 12 could speak to that because that spoke on traffic
 13 operations, the trip generation of the proposed
 14 Vista and he'll provide some background and
 15 testimony on that. He'll also talk to you about
 16 the traffic signal operations and show you some
 17 graphics and some videos showing how the traffic
 18 signal or the intersection will operate when it
 19 becomes, if it becomes, I should say, signalized
 20 with the interim plan. Okay.

21 MS. YUDIN: Could you tell us if there's
 22 any difference between the interim signal and the
 23 permanent signal? In other words, can you do
 24 everything with that signal that you could do with
 25 the permanent signal?

1 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

2 MR. DiGENNARO: So you can pull the curb
 3 line into the center more away from property
 4 lines?

5 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct. If I can go
 6 back quickly to that phasing plan. Mark, that's
 7 exactly what would happen. I'm going to flip back
 8 and forth real quick.

9 So in the interim plan, again, I mentioned
 10 this hatched area would be identified as a
 11 shoulder or a hatched area for not allowing
 12 travel. That hatched area would, under the
 13 county's plan, become the shared through right.
 14 What was or what would be under the interim plan,
 15 the through movement on Sicomac Avenue would
 16 become the left turn.

17 And so, Mark, you're correct that under
 18 the county's plan, the centerline of Sicomac
 19 Avenue would shift to the south and what that
 20 affords is the opportunity for the county to build
 21 curbs and sidewalks and formalized driveways
 22 entirely within the county right-of-way without
 23 taking away any property from those property
 24 owners. Because if you recall, there was
 25 extensive testimony many years ago when we

1 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: The short answer is no.
 2 The temporary signal would be, I'm sure most of
 3 you have seen it, it would be two wood utility
 4 poles on either side.

5 And we'll actually go back to that
 6 graphic.

7 So there would be a wood utility pole
 8 installed on the northeast corner of the
 9 intersection and a second utility pole, wood pole,
 10 installed on the southwest corner of the
 11 intersection. A span-wire, a supporting wire
 12 would cross between the two poles. The traffic
 13 signal head would be hung from that wire. It
 14 would be powered, all the wires that power that
 15 signal would be run overhead. They will be run to
 16 a controller box which would be next to the wood
 17 pole at the southwest corner. And it's a fixed
 18 cycle length.

19 And Mr. Maher can talk about this a little
 20 more, but I'll set the table for him.

21 The traffic signal is green and red.
 22 There are no left turn arrows. There are no lead
 23 lefts. There are no protected phases. It's going
 24 on green; stop on red.

25 So while the interim plan provides for

1 dedicated turning lanes, the purpose of those is
2 to get that queuing traffic out of the through
3 move. Okay. But that traffic will, when the
4 light turns green, they will wait for a gap in the
5 opposing traffic and make their left turn
6 maneuver.

7 If the county ever came through with the
8 ultimate plan, their future plans, the span-wire
9 would go away. You would have the aluminum
10 traffic signal poles placed at various locations.
11 You would have multiple traffic signal heads. You
12 would have lead left, protected left turn phasing
13 and so you have a lot more functionality and a lot
14 more ability to fine tune traffic operations. You
15 can have variable timing and phasing depending on
16 the traffic demands for different peak hours. So
17 you can do more with a permanent signal. But Mr.
18 Maher will provide some testimony that the interim
19 signal in itself, regardless of whether you have
20 all of those fancy bells and whistles that a
21 permanent signal would afford, does create an
22 improvement at this intersection.

23 MS. YUDIN: Can you make the interim
24 signal flashing? Like, could the police do that
25 whenever they want to?

1 information or for the installation of a signal,
2 but they will do that work. They control the
3 operations.

4 So I would think, and this goes back to
5 Mr. Ascolese's point, is that moving forward from
6 here, as we get into what I would call the final
7 design phase of the intersection improvements, I
8 think those details can be worked out.

9 As I started to say, the Manual on Uniform
10 Traffic Control Devices, the 2009 edition does
11 provide some guidance on what they term to be
12 intersection controlled deacons, which is
13 essentially the flashing red/yellow. In this case
14 you would have the flashing yellow on the Cedar
15 Hill Christian Health Care Center approach, the
16 major through move being based on traffic volumes.
17 It would be Sicomac Avenue that would be -- I'm
18 sorry, the flashing yellow would be on Sicomac
19 Avenue. The red would be on Cedar Hill and the
20 Christian Health Care Center driveway.

21 Typically that would be put in place when
22 there might not be warrants for a traffic signal.
23 I would surmise that because the traffic signal
24 warrants are based on volumes that maybe in the
25 overnight hours when those volumes are lower than

1 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: That is something I
2 think that I can't say yes or no on that. There
3 is guidance in the Manual on Uniform Traffic
4 Control Devices that talks about, and this is a
5 comment that was raised in the --

6 MS. YUDIN: In the police.

7 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Yes, thank you. In the
8 memo from the police department. So we'll touch
9 on that now.

10 The short answer is Bergen County controls
11 the operation of that signal. So any discussion
12 to do flashing red/yellow, whether it's, you know,
13 your police department suggested maybe in the
14 overnight hours, weekend hours, would be something
15 that would be discussed with the county.

16 The county will prepare the traffic signal
17 design. They made that very clear to us in the
18 previous meetings that the county's traffic
19 engineer and then I think Mr. Ascolese could
20 testify or, I'm sorry, could respond to this, that
21 the county will do the traffic signal design and
22 they will provide us the information needed to be
23 put on the plans so the contractor should, you
24 know, this plan move forward, could accommodate
25 and coordinate with the county for that

1 what the warrants would typically require to
2 justify a traffic signal, that could be an
3 opportunity. I don't know if a Saturday would be
4 something, daytime Saturday would be something
5 that would work. But, again, these are things
6 that can be discussed with the county.

7 So I don't really have an answer for you
8 but I can say it would be a continued point of
9 conversation.

10 MS. YUDIN: One more related question.

11 Pedestrians, there's a right-hand turn
12 from Cedar Hill onto Sicomac. Could you show us
13 on the screen where the pedestrians would be
14 crossing in relation to the light?

15 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Sure.

16 In the interim plan there would be a
17 striped crosswalk on the east side of the
18 intersection. So crossing Sicomac Avenue north to
19 south direction east of Cedar Hill Avenue where
20 there already is an existing sidewalk that turns
21 the corner, from Sicomac Avenue down to Cedar
22 Hill, they would cross to a curb ramp, a landing
23 area where they would have some refuge to remove
24 themselves from the roadway and then wait for the
25 light for them to be able to cross the Christian

1 Health Care Center driveway and they would cross
2 the driveway and then be able to continue on the
3 sidewalk on the south side of Cedar Hill Avenue.

4 CHAIRMAN FRY: No peds?

5 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: No ped heads. No
6 pedestrian signal heads, no push buttons. The
7 temporary traffic signal would not afford that
8 based on what the design or the concept that we've
9 been provided by Bergen County, which is, as I
10 indicated earlier, that temporary span-wire on two
11 wood poles.

12 MR. RUEBENACKER: If you go back to
13 followup on that question which I thought was good
14 regarding the sidewalk, if you go back forward one
15 slide, that sidewalk just dead ends there?

16 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

17 MR. RUEBENACKER: Prior to the entrance or
18 the existing entrance to the Christian Health Care
19 Center, it does not tie into the existing sidewalk
20 that's on the opposite side?

21 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: On the opposite side?

22 MR. RUEBENACKER: Of Sicomac Avenue. As
23 you pass Abbies, a sidewalk starts there. At no
24 time does the proposed new sidewalk tie cross
25 again with Cedar Hill?

1 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Not as part of the
2 interim plan, but based on what the county's
3 future improvements are, remember, the county's
4 future improvements, should they move forward with
5 them, are all focused on the north side of
6 Sicomac. And at that point, and the phasing plans
7 show this, and I don't have this as part of the
8 presentation, but the first of the three phasing
9 plans show the continuation of that sidewalk as it
10 ties into that macadam walk that's just west of
11 Abbies.

12 The focus of the interim improvements is
13 to address the needs on the south side or the
14 eastbound side of Sicomac Avenue.

15 MR. RUEBENACKER: Okay. Mr. Roughgarden,
16 are you familiar or do you partake in any of the
17 conversations with the county related to the gas
18 service station and their rear exit or entrance in
19 the Market Basket shopping center, I'll call it,
20 will really become a mess if the service station
21 ever denied exit to the rear of their property.

22 Was the county aware of that or do you have any
23 knowledge of communications regarding that?

24 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: My recollection, and
25 this goes back to meetings that were, and

1 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Okay. The sidewalk
2 you're referring to is on the south side of
3 Sicomac?

4 MR. RUEBENACKER: Correct. It doesn't tie
5 into the north side sidewalk, does it? There's
6 not another crosswalk?

7 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: No, there's no crosswalk
8 that gets you to the north side.

9 MR. RUEBENACKER: Okay. So once you
10 basically get --

11 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: But I would say that
12 that could be looked at if there is an existing
13 sidewalk that continues, although at one point
14 when you get further to the left --

15 MR. RUEBENACKER: You can see the macadam
16 walk up there, see?

17 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Up here?

18 MR. RUEBENACKER: Yeah.

19 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Oh, that's on the north
20 side. I'm sorry, I was looking at the south side
21 where this sidewalk ends.

22 MR. RUEBENACKER: That one just ends.

23 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: This one ends, right.

24 MR. RUEBENACKER: There's no cross Sicomac
25 Avenue proposed to tie back into north --

1 communication with the county from several years
2 ago, 2010, '11, my recollection is there were
3 conversations. The county was aware of the issues
4 that could occur as a result of curbing along the
5 north side of Sicomac Avenue. Those issues were
6 discussed at previous hearings. I don't recall
7 exactly what was stated, but general terms, that
8 is my recollection.

9 But, again, I'll point out that the
10 purpose of my testimony, the purpose of the plans
11 that were presented, are to demonstrate that the
12 interim improvements are what is or what may be
13 advanced by the Christian Health Care Center in
14 connection with their approval or their site plan
15 approval with Bergen County. Anything that
16 happens, as Mr. Vogel said earlier, anything that
17 happens on the north side would be subject to
18 conversations between Wyckoff and the county, and
19 those issues certainly would be brought to the
20 table again. Those concerns would be discussed at
21 length and I'm sure that the property owners would
22 be brought in to be part of those conversations
23 and a resolution will result. Will it be a
24 resolution that everyone likes, probably not.
25 But, hopefully, there's some middle ground that

1 satisfies most, not all.

2 MR. VOGEL: We did have that conversation.

3 MR. RUEBENACKER: As I kind of recall
4 going back in my memory, I believe the service
5 station was not too happy with it.

6 MR. VOGEL: No, and what happened was, we
7 had a meeting with the then chief and we went
8 through the reports with respect to accidents and
9 it was determined that the traffic coming out onto
10 Cedar Hill from that driveway really had no
11 accidents. I know I used it probably three, four
12 times a week. And the agreement was, off the
13 record, the agreement was that if ain't broke,
14 don't fix it then leave it alone.

15 MR. RUEBENACKER: We should have said that
16 at the start of this meeting.

17 MS. YUDIN: Tell that to the county,
18 right.

19 MR. RUEBENACKER: So, anyway, I guess from
20 my personal perspective, you know, I understand
21 the interim and the phasing plans and however --

22 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Okay.

23 MR. RUEBENACKER: -- I think myself as
24 well as this board should look at it as one entire
25 package, because, you know, if we approve part one

1 locations that location. And then we learned
2 about the history, 15 years they've wanted to put
3 a light there.

4 So I agree a hundred percent, Mr.
5 Ruebenacker, I think we have to look at it in its
6 entirety, because the one thing I can say is the
7 interim proposal is really what the applicant is
8 proposing to us for consideration.

9 MR. RUEBENACKER: To that end, should we,
10 the board, deem or amend this proposal to remove
11 some of the these buffer lanes in the interim
12 plan, you know, that then knocks the county's
13 phasing plan, you know, back to square one?

14 MS. YUDIN: But then the county could come
15 back to the Christian Health Care Center and say
16 now you have to put these things in, which would
17 be a hardship for them.

18 MR. RUEBENACKER: That would be their
19 future.

20 MS. YUDIN: The county is taking advantage
21 of the opportunity.

22 MR. RUEBENACKER: So why should we appease
23 the county?

24 MS. YUDIN: The Christian Health Care
25 Center is being built to save themselves a little

1 or whatever we do for part one, it's going to lead
2 to part two.

3 So we have to be aware and cognizant as a
4 board, anything we do in the interim could then
5 lead to future phasing by the county. So I'm just
6 as interested in the north side of the
7 intersection as I am the south side.

8 MR. VOGEL: Was that a subject to what the
9 county said in the letter, subject to the
10 agreement with the township and subject to
11 entering into an agreement.

12 MR. RUEBENACKER: A lot of "ifs" there.

13 MR. VOGEL: It doesn't say "if".

14 MR. RUEBENACKER: Okay. "Subject to".

15 CHAIRMAN FRY: Well, I think the if
16 becomes if there is conflict and there isn't a
17 resolution to it, then the county says, okay, it's
18 my intersection, then I'm going to do whatever I
19 want. And will they?

20 Again, the first question that I think
21 ever came up: Why that intersection, of all the
22 places, because they put a full signal, it's more
23 maintenance for them. It really doesn't make much
24 sense. I think that's what we struggled with
25 through all of the other testimony, why of all

1 money. So they have no interest right now since
2 nothing is being developed across the street.
3 They don't want to spend the money to do this. So
4 I think we just have to figure that it could be a
5 long, long time before the second phase or
6 whatever goes.

7 MR. HUBERT: Again, this is my biggest
8 concern. All I've heard from testimony is that it
9 was interim. Based on the plan we received today,
10 this is not interim. Putting wood poles up and
11 hanging a light, doing all this site work for
12 optimizing what you want to do to have a light so
13 you can have delays, you can have right on reds,
14 you can have, you know, right only or left only
15 turns. To Erik's concern, I mean, my concern is
16 all we hear is interim.

17 The real question is how much control do
18 we have on this? It doesn't really seem we have a
19 lot of control on this as a body, as a Zoning
20 Board. My concern is that once we do whatever we
21 do, whatever we deem is appropriate as a board,
22 individually, my concern is, there's two ways we
23 can do this. Okay. Either we can tell you what
24 we think we need or I can tell you what you need.
25 And if I tell you what you need, it might not be,

1 basically, what's in the best interest of
2 everyone.

3 So it's a balancing act here. I think we
4 as a body, right, we have to work independent from
5 the Township of Wyckoff, remember, we're an
6 independent body. I'm just not sure how much say
7 we have in this. Because, again, whether we
8 approve this or not, even if we don't approve it
9 because we disagree with it, I'm not sure, you
10 know, I defer to our attorney, what that means. I
11 don't think it means anything. It's just that the
12 lawyers get richer and just extends it further.

13 So I think we have to think long and hard
14 where we're going to go with this because I'm not
15 sure how much say we have on this. And it's more
16 than just this body, this Zoning Board, more with
17 what has happened with the history prior to this
18 and what needs to go forward on how do we remedy
19 this with concerns of a lot of people in the
20 community.

21 MR. RUEBENACKER: Going back to Mr. Cook,
22 right, we can amend the site plan or not approve
23 the site plan with this intersection on the
24 Christian Health Care Center side, that's within
25 the jurisdiction of the Zoning Board.

1 MR. COOK: That's correct.

2 MR. RUEBENACKER: So let the county do
3 with what they want to do at the T-intersection.

4 MR. HUBERT: Do you want to let the county
5 say, if I tell you this is what we're going to do,
6 we might not like it. Again, that's the challenge
7 and that's, you know, we roll the dice.

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: That's exactly what it
9 becomes, a roll of the dice.

10 So it sounds like the door is open to
11 discuss things, certain things maybe from an
12 engineering standpoint; slowing down at the
13 intersection, reducing some of the widths. It
14 doesn't seem like you're coming into Grand Central
15 Terminal. Maybe those options are on the table
16 and it sounds like the county is open to that.

17 The other side is we say no and the county
18 then says, okay, well then we're going to do as we
19 see fit. And it may not be in the best interest
20 of the location, the neighbors, the residents, the
21 health care center or anybody.

22 MR. HUBERT: But, Mr. Chairman, also, if
23 they come back and say these are the changes we as
24 the Zoning Board want, the county could come back
25 and say no. Again, that's --

1 MR. KALPAGIAN: Either way the county can
2 do whatever they want. It's a good point.

3 MR. HUBERT: They can come back and say,
4 no, this is how it's going to be.

5 CHAIRMAN FRY: But if you remain silent
6 about it, then you get nothing --

7 MR. HUBERT: No, no, I got you.

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: -- out of it.

9 So what I think what we need to do is
10 maybe hear more testimony from your associate.

11 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

12 MR. COOK: It appears to me that this
13 project is not necessitating a light. Whether or
14 not this project is going to be built, the county
15 wanted a light here and the county is taking an
16 opportunity to use this project that they required
17 a light, plain and simple.

18 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

19 MR. COOK: And this project is really
20 driving because the county is using this as an
21 opportunity to hold up the approval and to get
22 payment or consideration towards the light. And
23 we can say no, we want these changes. And the
24 county can say, no, put the traffic light in
25 regardless. And it will be their design, whatever

1 they want to do.

2 So I think it's in everybody's best
3 interest to come up with some type of solution.
4 If you push the county too hard, you may get
5 resistance and they're going to say we're going to
6 do what we want.

7 MR. DiGENNARO: Mr. Cook, in that vein, if
8 that were the case and the county decides that
9 they want to do what they want, and they want to
10 put a signal here, couldn't they put the signal
11 and have it a three-way intersection and Christian
12 Health Care Center still builds it the way they
13 got approved five years ago?

14 MR. COOK: But would that be a good plan
15 with a signal there and then an entrance down...
16 I think it would be disjointed.

17 MR. DiGENNARO: That was a question that I
18 always asked at the beginning, at the onset of
19 this. The fact that Christian Health Care's
20 coming back to the Board of Adjustment for
21 something that was in a resolution subject to a
22 county approval went unanswered, in my mind, you
23 know. So this seems like there's no control over
24 this because it's a county determination, county
25 jurisdiction, but yet the applicant's back here

1 trying to accommodate a desire for, and as Mr.
2 Struyk said, was, you know, better than what they
3 were. Well, service levels are being impacted.
4 One would think things are being improved. So I
5 don't know. I mean, they can go ahead and build
6 it just the way it was approved and the county
7 wants to put an intersection in with a light,
8 nothing is accomplished.

9 MR. COOK: It would be a mess.

10 MR. DIGENNARO: Yes.

11 MR. RUEBENACKER: We should get testimony
12 on that because what we heard four years ago is
13 that the actual increase in traffic is minimal.

14 MR. HUBERT: But, again, once again, the
15 county, maybe I don't know, has the county done
16 any traffic study?

17 MR. VOGEL: Sure.

18 MR. HUBERT: Lately?

19 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Stantec itself has done
20 a traffic study.

21 MR. HUBERT: At the county or on behalf of
22 the county or for your client?

23 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: For our client.

24 MR. HUBERT: Okay. But has the county
25 done an independent study on it?

1 view this as an opportunity now to get that done.
2 So they have imposed that as a requirement. All
3 right.

4 It is accurate. The amount of traffic
5 contributed by the Vista to that intersection is
6 in the range of two percent. It was 2.2 percent
7 in the morning, 2.5 in the afternoon when we were
8 at 258 units, so it's probably two percent or a
9 little bit less at the current point.

10 So is the introduction of that much more
11 traffic to the intersection enough to warrant the
12 light; probably in and of itself, no. But the
13 county's position is, and it's in the letters that
14 I now put into evidence, is that there's
15 sufficient traffic at the intersection for
16 warrants to issue for this intersection and since
17 you're contributing something two percent, we want
18 this opportunity to improve the intersection.
19 That's their position, un-authorable, in all
20 correspondence to us, in all correspondence to the
21 township. So we're caught with that.

22 With respect to whether or not the
23 driveway comes out to make a T-intersection, if
24 you're going to have a traffic light, it only
25 makes sense to have that driveway there because if

1 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Not to my personal
2 knowledge. My guess would be, maybe Mr. Vogel
3 could correct me if I'm wrong, my guess is that
4 they are relying on the traffic data and studies
5 that Stantec has prepared on behalf of the
6 Christian Health Care Center in connection with
7 any improvement at that intersection. You know,
8 why do their own study when we're doing it for
9 them.

10 But, obviously, we're sharing that
11 information because it is their intersection and
12 that study needed to be done as part of the
13 application for site plan approval with the
14 county. So they have all that data and they're
15 making use of it. But have they done anything
16 independent, I don't know.

17 MR. VOGEL: Just let me address.

18 The county's position with respect to
19 signaling this intersection precedes the Vista.
20 All right. As I said previously, on all prior
21 applications they always attempted to have the
22 intersection improved as a result of an
23 application by the Christian Health Care Center,
24 but they were minor applications. This is a more
25 major application. So as Mr. Cook has said, they

1 you have a traffic light there and you still have
2 the right and left turns in and out of our current
3 driveway, traffic is just going to be a mess. So
4 the idea is that if they want to put the traffic
5 light in, that we now have an opportunity, as Mr.
6 Struyk said, of taking traffic off of Mountain
7 Road and having a direct access in and out. We're
8 taking advantage of what the county wants to get
9 done and there's some benefit to the traffic flow
10 on Sicomac and Mountain Avenue as a result of
11 that.

12 I stand here before you, I'm caught in
13 between. I'm between what has happened here and
14 what has happened before the county. And I
15 admitted that when we first filed the application
16 back in 2007. I said to you, I knew what the
17 county wants. And I went there first to find out
18 what they wanted. And then we sat down with... I
19 don't believe we could have engaged the township
20 and the county on a higher level than we did from
21 day one. We've always tried to engage both of
22 them to reach an accommodation. And we have now
23 spent what's going on 11 years trying to come to
24 that conclusion.

25 I don't believe there's anybody at this

1 board, I don't believe anybody who ever came in
2 the public has ever been opposed to the Vista as a
3 project on that 79-acre campus. It fits. It's
4 not overburdening the property. It's something
5 that there is a need for in the community. I
6 don't think anybody ever objected to it. As a
7 matter of fact, I can remember all the people with
8 interest who showed up, the neighbors, almost
9 every one of them said, I don't object to the
10 project, but I have a problem with, and they would
11 then identify what that problem was. And a good
12 majority was whether or not there should be an
13 intersection improved inconsistent with what we
14 understand the Township of Wyckoff to be.

15 That's where we are. I've looked for a
16 solution. This is the only solution that we've
17 been able to come up with to come back to you. I
18 didn't want to come back to you. I went to the
19 county and I said, here's the site plan we got.
20 We have an approval. We want to build it and here
21 we are that much later.

22 MR. RUEBENACKER: Mr. Vogel, and we
23 understand, I understand, I wouldn't be so
24 passionate about this if I didn't grow up in
25 Sicomac and lived there for the last 31 years.

1 expert, but it's simple to me. That backup that
2 occurs on Mountain Avenue trying to get onto
3 Sicomac, and I don't know if there's a study out
4 there that reports this, but if there were, it
5 would be great, how much of that backup is just
6 from localized traffic and how much is it from
7 people coming in and out of Christian Health Care
8 Center?

9 MR. RUEBENACKER: We even talked about
10 that.

11 MR. KALPAGIAN: Because if it's not --

12 MR. RUEBENACKER: People at Christian
13 Health Care Center are smart enough not to get on
14 Mountain Avenue during rush hour.

15 MR. KALPAGIAN: Here's my question, Mr.
16 Roughgarden, you made a statement that I totally
17 disagree with.

18 South on 208 to Cedar Hill to make a right
19 only to make a left on Mountain. You just get off
20 of Russell. You get off Russell, left, right, you
21 get right, you can get into Christian Health Care,
22 no problem. That's where most people are.
23 There's no other way to get to 208 in between
24 Russell and Cedar Hill. So to me it comes back to
25 that intersection of Sicomac and Mountain. And if

1 And now I drop my kids off at Sicomac and I
2 literally come out of Sicomac, hang a left, and go
3 right to Cedar Hill Avenue. I don't wait. I
4 don't stop. I don't hit a red light. And I hang
5 a left and I get onto Cedar Hill Avenue and
6 there's no traffic. And I look to my left and
7 there's about three or four cars in queue to come
8 up Cedar Hill and I just can't believe this data
9 of, you know, there's so much traffic congestion.
10 And this is at 8:30, five days a week, you know, I
11 come down and take that road and I turn left onto
12 Cedar Hill Avenue. If I didn't do it everyday
13 myself, I wouldn't believe it based on the data.
14 But I don't see it. I don't foresee an issue.
15 Maybe once or twice. I don't know. I just don't
16 know when this backup occurs that everybody talks
17 about because I do it everyday at 8:30 and it's
18 not bad.

19 MR. KALPAGIAN: I think the issue for me,
20 personally, is how this light impacts and whether
21 it stays a three-way intersection or a four way.
22 Really, I agree with Erik. I never had a problem
23 at the intersection at different times of the day
24 but it's where Mountain and Sicomac intersects.
25 And here's the big, to me, I'm not a traffic study

1 the study shows that, well, that backup that
2 occurs there on Mountain Avenue really isn't
3 contributed by Christian Health Care, now you put
4 a light here, you're stopping these people.
5 You're having normal traffic backing up there.
6 You're going to create a bigger disaster of backup
7 that would not normally be there for somebody like
8 Erik at 8:30 in the morning.

9 I'm just being honest. This is where my
10 mind is at at this point. I don't know if the
11 other gentleman can shed some light on this. I've
12 done accident reconstruction studies in the past
13 for the insurance business, so I have some idea of
14 intersection issues and traffic. That to me is
15 the key is how much is it really Christian Health
16 Care contributing to the Mountain Avenue backup on
17 Sicomac. If you have a study like that, I'd love
18 to see it.

19 MR. VOGEL: Well, I don't know if you can
20 ever do a study. You'd have to interview
21 everybody who sits at the intersection.

22 MR. KALPAGIAN: Films can easily tell.

23 CHAIRMAN FRY: Well, what I think we can
24 do is two things on the same point. So one, to
25 the point if we were to just say, we're leaving

1 the application as is. We're leaving the drive as
 2 is. We'll roll the dice with the county. I think
 3 it's worth doing research to show an impact if the
 4 county then says, okay, fine, no problem. The day
 5 you open up, they start an intersection, they put
 6 a signal right there, now your entrance isn't
 7 straight in line with Cedar Hill. It's over to
 8 the side. So I'd like to see an impact study to
 9 see what would happen if that's the case. If the
 10 board says, you know what we're not doing it. We
 11 disagree with it and we're going to roll the dice
 12 and maybe we'll think 20 years down the road
 13 they'll do it, they might do it in a year. We
 14 don't know. But I do want to see the impact if we
 15 were to make that decision because that might help
 16 us in the overall assessment. So however we can
 17 accommodate that, I'd like to see that.

18 The other one is, I think it's also a
 19 valid point. I want to see the study to show, I
 20 don't necessarily think that the Mountain
 21 Avenue -- Mountain Avenue is not the topic of this
 22 whole thing. It's coming up because, well, what
 23 is the impact of putting this going to do that.
 24 And I think what we heard so far is it should
 25 relieve some of that because people can then come

1 through the campus to come down a main road and go
 2 right out Cedar Hill rather than doing anything on
 3 Mountain. That's what I think I've already heard.

4 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

5 CHAIRMAN FRY: But what I want to see is,
 6 if there's a light there, could there be a
 7 potential that all the traffic that builds up on
 8 Mountain making a right onto Sicomac, could that
 9 eventually back up all the way to that same
 10 intersection from the traffic light, because then
 11 we've defeated the whole purpose. Then, yeah,
 12 okay, you wait in line to come down Mountain
 13 Avenue to make a right to stand still because the
 14 light's red.

15 MR. VOGEL: You know, in line with what
 16 you said and what Mr. Ruebenacker said, I'm not
 17 here, and maybe we portrayed it in the wrong way,
 18 we're not here as an advocate for the traffic
 19 light. We're here --

20 CHAIRMAN FRY: I don't think anybody on
 21 the board really thinks that you are. You made
 22 that very clear six years ago.

23 MR. VOGEL: How did we come to this
 24 amendment to the site plan to put the driveway out
 25 by the traffic light. The county says we must

1 have a traffic light and to have a traffic light,
 2 we take a look at the traffic light and then we
 3 look at our entrance which you approved as part of
 4 our site plan and all of a sudden there's a
 5 conflict and it doesn't work.

6 So now we say, okay, we're talking to the
 7 county, what do we do. Okay, we'll put the
 8 driveway here and make our current right in and
 9 right out that's compatible with the light that
 10 the county wants. And now we also say there's
 11 some benefit because from what Mr. Roughgarden
 12 said about how the traffic will flow and the
 13 study, you, Mr. Chairman, have asked for what
 14 effect that will be is something we should do and
 15 we will do.

16 So as I say, we're caught between the rock
 17 and the hard place. We walked out of here with
 18 approval in 2013. We were happy. We were ready
 19 to go.

20 We went back to the county and they said
 21 they want the traffic light. We look at the
 22 traffic light. They say they're going to put it
 23 in, if we don't contribute to it, if it's not part
 24 of it, then they're going to put it in at some
 25 point. When they put it in at some point, we got

1 a whole new campus we built with a driveway that
 2 doesn't work based on the site plan we have. The
 3 only way it works is if we put this in. So we
 4 say, all right, we'll put it in.

5 So the fact of the matter is that we're a
 6 captive of a situation where we don't control it.
 7 And so what we said to the county is, and as I
 8 say, look, it's been -- we have our approval from
 9 you and in 2013 we came back two years later for
 10 the construction issue, but so maybe it isn't five
 11 years, maybe it's three years. But in those three
 12 years I've been trying to find common ground. And
 13 what we came up with is this common ground. And
 14 the fact of the matter is we're the captive of
 15 that circumstance. What I'm saying to you is,
 16 maybe I didn't do good enough, but this is the
 17 best I was able to do when I went to the county.

18 CHAIRMAN FRY: Right. And I think that
 19 the board would agree that you've done everything
 20 you possibly can. You are bearing the burden. We
 21 understand, I think everybody pretty much
 22 understands.

23 Mr. Cook hit it right on the head with
 24 what's going on and how the county is approaching
 25 this application. I think for us, the best move

1 for us is to be as educated as possible to be able
 2 to answer every question and to ask every
 3 question. And I think that if we can at least
 4 say, you know what, we turned over every rock,
 5 yeah, they came back with a great proposal. The
 6 interim, okay, it could be fantastic. But if we
 7 don't exhaust everything, and that's why I think
 8 those two points that I just made, those are two
 9 critical components that we can at least say, the
 10 other way isn't going to work. Or maybe we say,
 11 you know what, whoever you have to provide that
 12 testimony will say, you know what, it could work.
 13 But it will help us make that decision. And I
 14 think we've at least asked the right questions and
 15 done everything we possibly can.

16 Because, again, as much as I can
 17 appreciate it, no good deed goes unpunished and
 18 that's what you're stuck with. You're trying to
 19 help the cause but now you're getting deeper in
 20 and it's really not your fault. You're stuck in
 21 the middle. But now you have an entity and a
 22 township that is really not a favor of what is
 23 being proposed, as great of a job as it may have
 24 been done. So we then have to say, okay, what are
 25 we up against, what could we possibly do before we

1 just say, okay, let the county take over.

2 So we totally appreciate your position and
 3 we're not looking to make it more burdensome than
 4 anything else. We are trying to get all the facts
 5 and say we exhausted everything we possibly could,
 6 as I know you have done as well and we appreciate
 7 that.

8 All right. So how are we on time?

9 So you have your associate that can answer
 10 some other questions.

11 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: I believe so, yes. He
 12 was here to answer some of your traffic operation
 13 questions. If I could just for a matter of
 14 closing my loop here. I know we touched on I
 15 think one or two comments that came from the
 16 police department. I'd just like to make sure
 17 that at least in my testimony tonight that we've
 18 gone through them.

19 CHAIRMAN FRY: So to that point, I just
 20 want to go on record because we did receive two
 21 documents in the packet. One I've requested a
 22 report from the Wyckoff Police Department, which
 23 we did receive, and the Wyckoff Fire Department.

24 And the Wyckoff Police Department, I'll
 25 read it. Wyckoff Police Department Traffic Study

1 Bureau. This is dated May 1st, 2018. "Believes
 2 the installation of a traffic control signal at
 3 the intersection of Cedar Hill Avenue and Sicomac
 4 Avenue would be beneficial to an otherwise
 5 congested intersection. The traffic control
 6 signal will enhance overall safety and/or
 7 operation for motorists, pedestrians, and
 8 bicyclists that travel through that intersection
 9 daily. With the possibility of a traffic control
 10 signal being installed, there's some other
 11 considerations that should be looked at closely".

12 So you've been hitting these bullet
 13 points. Let's get them all on so we can...

14 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Certainly, go ahead.

15 CHAIRMAN FRY: With the current posted 40
 16 mile-an-hour speed limit through the approaching
 17 intersection remains.

18 So that question did come up and we can
 19 discuss that a little bit.

20 Program the signal to flash red and amber
 21 during the overnight hours and weekends, to be
 22 determined.

23 You said the county controls that.

24 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

25 CHAIRMAN FRY: Will keeping the existing

1 entrance at 301 Sicomac Avenue with no proposed
 2 improvements create a backup for vehicles wanting
 3 to make a left turn to enter the complex via
 4 westbound Sicomac Avenue.

5 So I think that's actually one of the ones
 6 we're discussing right now.

7 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Yes. And my question
 8 there would be, and I'm not sure how you interpret
 9 this, but when it says with no improvements, are
 10 they indicating no improvements meaning as if the
 11 intersection was not signalized?

12 CHAIRMAN FRY: No, I think it's actually
 13 as if it is. They're looking at these plans.

14 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Right, yeah. I just
 15 want to make sure I understand.

16 Will keeping the existing entrance with no
 17 improvements.

18 I'm not sure where the no improvements
 19 are. Is it at the intersection of Sicomac and
 20 Cedar Hill?

21 MS. YUDIN: The current.

22 MR. HUBERT: The current.

23 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: No, I understand.

24 MR. HUBERT: Talking about the triangle in
 25 there so you can't make a left turn. There's

1 signs but sometimes people don't read signs and
2 they would make a left turn, if there's some type
3 of --

4 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Oh, that would be --
5 okay. So, yeah, this goes back to --

6 MR. HUBERT: Right now --

7 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: -- a condition of the
8 county's approval where that becomes reconfigured
9 to formalize the right in and right out.

10 MR. HUBERT: So there's no way to make a
11 left.

12 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct, correct.

13 CHAIRMAN FRY: So that answers that
14 question.

15 And then allowing right turns on red.

16 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: And that would be the
17 signal operation.

18 CHAIRMAN FRY: Right.

19 Working with the property manager of Cedar
20 Hill Medical Center to reconfigure their
21 entrance/exit.

22 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: My interpretation of
23 that is it would be more applicable to the
24 county's future plans. The interim plan, I don't
25 believe, because there are no proposed

1 improvements on the north side or on Cedar Hill
2 that, and Mr. Maher can maybe testify or Mr.
3 Maher's testimony and his presentation talk about
4 traffic operations and maybe that becomes more
5 relevant in terms of how that driveway operates
6 with the signal in the interim condition, but
7 there are no physical improvements as part of the
8 interim plans.

9 CHAIRMAN FRY: Right. And anything beyond
10 the interim would be opened up to the town. I'm
11 sure --

12 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

13 CHAIRMAN FRY: -- they engaged all the
14 business owners over there --

15 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct, correct.

16 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay.

17 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: And just to go back, I
18 don't know if you touched on the reduction of the
19 speed limit. Mr. Ascolese touched on that.
20 Again, I would just say that the county has
21 jurisdiction over that roadway. So whether or not
22 there's justification to reduce the speed limits,
23 again, those would be discussions that would be
24 held with the county and I would assume that they
25 would include the township professionals as well

1 as the appropriate evaluations are done to
2 determine whether or not that's an appropriate
3 improvement or appropriate course of action with
4 any improvement at this intersection.

5 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay.

6 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: So, Chairman Fry, I
7 believe we've gone through all those points. I
8 believe I, at least I hope I've satisfactorily
9 addressed the comments from Boswell Engineering,
10 from your police department, I don't believe there
11 were any other review comments that I've been made
12 aware of. I hope that in my testimony so far I've
13 been able to answer many of your questions. I
14 know that there are others that Mr. Maher will
15 stand up here before you and do his best to
16 answer. If there are any questions which have not
17 been addressed to your satisfaction, we'll
18 certainly do our homework and come back with more
19 answers.

20 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay.

21 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: So I believe this gets
22 me off the hook and Mr. Maher will come up and --

23 CHAIRMAN FRY: So real quick.

24 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN FRY: Fire department also had

1 their report, so just to read that. This is dated
2 May 25, 2018.

3 "A signalized intersection provides a more
4 controlled and thereby safer access for responding
5 fire apparatus. I am comfortable being guided by
6 the Wyckoff Police Department report since they
7 are the traffic and safety experts in the
8 above-sited application approve road widening and
9 signalization".

10 That's from Chief Tim Brock.

11 Okay.

12 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Based on the review of
13 his memo there are no comments to address.

14 CHAIRMAN FRY: Right, right.

15 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Okay. All right. Thank
16 you.

17 CHAIRMAN FRY: Thank you.

18 So what I'd like to do is for the next
19 half hour let's go through the next testimony and
20 then I want to have some questions and then before
21 the end of the night as a courtesy to the those
22 from the public that did show up, I'll open it up
23 to the public if they have any comments to those
24 that did provide testimony tonight only on what
25 has been testified on or any questions for

1 tonight.

2 Okay.

3 MR. VOGEL: My only question is whether or
4 not the reporter needs a break. That's the only
5 question I have.

6 Would you state your full name?

7 MR. MAHER: Sure.

8 Matthew Maher, last name spelled
9 M-a-h-e-r. I'm a traffic engineer with Stantec.

10 MR. VOGEL: Would you give the board a
11 brief description of your educational/professional
12 background.

13 MR. MAHER: Yes.

14 I'm licensed as a professional engineer in
15 the State of New Jersey. I also have a
16 professional traffic operations engineer
17 licensure, which is nationally allotted by the
18 Institute of Transportation Engineers. I have a
19 bachelor's of science from Rutgers University in
20 civil engineering specializing in transportation.

21 I'm very familiar with this project. I
22 worked on it over my past ten-year tenure at
23 Stantec and I'm very familiar with the industry
24 standards of MUTCD and ITE and can speak to the
25 methodology used to prepare this report.

1 So why did we have to do this analysis all
2 over again? What has changed since we last did
3 the 2013 addendum?

4 Well, first of all, we have our new signal
5 commission by the county. We also updated the
6 traffic volumes according to counts that we did in
7 2017. Also, the trip generation manual has
8 changed from the ninth edition to the tenth
9 edition. I cover that below. We see only an
10 increase of one trip during the p.m. peak hour as
11 compared to the previous trip generation manual
12 rate. So that's a negligible impact.

13 MR. HUBERT: What's the time period?

14 MR. MAHER: Sure.

15 A.m. is 7:30 to 8:30 a.m. and p.m. is
16 during school dismissal. That's 3:00 p.m. to
17 4:00 p.m. And we also took a look at Saturday.

18 I'll skip to the next slide. It covers
19 that.

20 So data collection was in May 2017 while
21 all the local schools in the school district were
22 in session. And just to cover how volumes have
23 changed because we did previous traffic counts
24 back in 2006, back in 2011, ADT on Cedar Hill
25 Avenue was 6,000 in 2006; 5,200 in 2011, and

1 MR. COOK: Raise your right hand.

2

3 (Whereupon, **MATTHEW MAHER** was duly sworn
4 by Mr. Cook)

5

6 MR. COOK: Just for the record, will the
7 board accept him?

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: Yes.

9 MR. MAHER: All right. So I'd be remiss
10 if I didn't address the sole comment from the
11 May 24th, 2018, comment letter from the board.
12 That's on page 13, comment number 53, which
13 basically asks us what has changed since we last
14 did our traffic study.

15 Just to go through the history of all the
16 reports that we've prepared and addendums, all of
17 which I worked on, we originally submitted a
18 Traffic Impact Study back in 2008 with the
19 four-leg signal at Sicomac and Cedar Hill.

20 Then in 2013 we did an addendum without
21 the signal just existing access. Both reports
22 stated that there would be no significant traffic
23 impact with the construction of the development
24 and we have the same conclusion for our 2018 TIS
25 report.

1 5,900. And this fluctuation is well within the
2 tolerance that you see week in week out. Some
3 weeks are higher; some weeks are lower, but all
4 these weeks were while schools were in session.

5 And as we saw in our traffic model and
6 documented in the traffic impact study, we have
7 failing operations and queuing on Cedar Hill
8 Avenue southbound approach to Sicomac.

9 I also want to touch on the fact that the
10 trip generation was distributed according to the
11 zip code data from the Christian Health Care
12 Center. It was contributed on the network. What
13 we saw according to the zip code data was most
14 traffic coming from and going to Route 208.

15 So what are we proposing here or what is
16 the county proposing here?

17 It's going to be a two-phase signal that's
18 pre-timed at a 90 second cycle length.
19 Approximately, a 60 second green time split, 60/30
20 green time split between Sicomac Avenue and the
21 side street of Christian Health Care Center
22 driveway and Cedar Hill Avenue.

23 MR. RUEBENACKER: I'm sorry, just clarify.

24 MR. MAHER: Sure.

25 MR. RUEBENACKER: Sicomac Avenue would be

1 green for 60 seconds and then it would go red for
2 30?

3 MR. MAHER: Well, yes. Green for around
4 60 seconds; red for around 30.

5 MR. RUEBENACKER: Thank you.

6 MR. MAHER: And it's pre-timed, meaning
7 there's no detection. It's always going to be the
8 same allotment of green time on both approaches.
9 So normally at a signal you'll have
10 detectors that will change the green time that's
11 metered according to what approaches vehicles are
12 sitting on.

13 MR. RUEBENACKER: Correct. Okay. Thank
14 you.

15 MR. MAHER: So here's just a comparison of
16 2017 existing conditions versus 2020 built
17 condition with the signal in place. Just taking a
18 look at the intersection of Sicomac and Cedar
19 Hill, as previously stated and documented, we have
20 failing conditions on the southbound approach and
21 those are alleviated to level of service D or
22 better movements at the intersection with an
23 overall level of service B for the intersection
24 with the signal in place.

25 CHAIRMAN FRY: Can you just, like, what

1 makes it an F? So Mr. Ruebenacker testified, I go
2 there everyday, I'm never hung up. How is it
3 failing?

4 MR. MAHER: Well, we documented with
5 traffic observations in the field that there is
6 queuing that is taking place at the intersection
7 as noted by your police department as well that
8 there is congestion that's going on in the field.
9 So this is a representation of what we saw out in
10 the field. It may vary based on day-to-day.

11 MR. HUBERT: Just for those two time
12 frames, right? A.m. and p.m.? Or is this a full?
13 I will tell you that when I'm there at 5:30, 6:00
14 some days, it's pretty crowded there, Cedar Hill.

15 MR. MAHER: And what really bogs down the
16 delay on that southbound approach is the left
17 turn. The left turn is waiting there for that gap
18 in Sicomac Avenue traffic.

19 MR. HUBERT: Yeah.

20 MR. MAHER: Waiting for a safe gap.
21 Sometimes people accept shorter gaps. And therein
22 lies the issue of the delay at the intersection.

23 So it's a weighted average between the
24 left turn and the right turn.

25 MR. HUBERT: But the time frame that this

1 is measured?

2 MR. MAHER: The time frame this is
3 measured off of is just during the peak hours. So
4 it's 7:30 to 8:30 during the a.m. and 3:00 to 4:00
5 during the p.m. peak hours.

6 MR. VOGEL: 7:30 to 8:30, so Mr.
7 Ruebenacker gets there just after the peak hour.

8 MR. RUEBENACKER: Drop off is at 8:30. My
9 son gets to school at 8:30.

10 MR. VOGEL: I'm sorry, I couldn't resist.

11 MR. RUEBENACKER: I'm telling you, I'm
12 sitting at the red light I know who I'm going to
13 blame. And there's nobody in front of me and
14 nobody turning anywhere else.

15 MR. MAHER: And just to show the board a
16 video of traffic operations during the two
17 heaviest congested peak hours a.m. and p.m. with
18 the signal in place.

19 So this first video is during the a.m.
20 peak hour. And this is with the light with
21 two-phase operation, the interim condition.

22 MR. DiGENNARO: This is a model based on
23 the data that the guideline tells you to use.
24 Right?

25 MR. MAHER: That's right.

1 And we have ways to collaborate the model.
2 We measure a queue out in the field and we go back
3 to our model and we adjust the model based on the
4 queuing in the field. We try to make the model
5 fit what we observe in real life to a T.

6 MR. ASCOLESE: Can you play that again,
7 please?

8 MR. MAHER: Sure.

9 MR. DiGENNARO: So with that said, did you
10 ever go the other way around, use the model and go
11 out and check and prove the model?

12 MR. MAHER: We've done before and after
13 studies before. So you can followup on a project
14 that was constructed theoretically.

15 MR. DiGENNARO: What does it look like?
16 It's spot on?

17 MR. MAHER: It's usually a tolerance of,
18 what I found what we've done before and after
19 studies, it's usually on a tolerance of five
20 percent of delay. And we try to be as accurate as
21 possible. This is the year 2020. We grew volumes
22 from 2017 to 2020 based on growth rates provided
23 by NJDOT. So there's always standards we're
24 working off of just to ensure that this data is
25 high quality and low tolerance.

1 Let me show you the p.m., which is the
2 heaviest peak hour. I should note that the
3 simulation is being run at four times the speed so
4 that's why you're seeing the vehicles whizzing by.

5 MR. ASCOLESE: And the timing is based on
6 the 60/30 split?

7 MR. MAHER: Yes, we're modeling the
8 volumes at the intersection. There's a way to
9 zoom in. It's red for the main road now; now it's
10 green for the main road now.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: So traffic headed east on
12 Sicomac.

13 MR. MAHER: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN FRY: Is hugging the right-hand
15 side and then slowly merging over towards the
16 center to make a left. Is that what I'm seeing?

17 MR. MAHER: Yes. Vehicles are actually
18 moving over to the left-turn bay to prepare to
19 make a left turn which actually improves traffic
20 operations for the through movement. Now you're
21 getting that left turn traffic out of the stream
22 of through traffic, which is particularly helpful
23 when the left turn has to yield to oncoming
24 traffic. It has its own turning bay to wait and
25 makes a left turn when there is a sufficient gap

1 go left; how many cars go right?

2 MR. MAHER: That was done with turning
3 movement counts at all of the intersections.

4 MR. RUEBENACKER: Which we haven't seen
5 yet?

6 MR. MAHER: No, I don't have the volumes
7 on the PowerPoint slide, but I do have them in our
8 Traffic Impact Study.

9 If you have a question about a certain
10 turning, I can give you the answer now.

11 MR. RUEBENACKER: I'm just curious. I
12 think what Carl was getting to and now all of a
13 sudden you have a car that wants to make a left
14 turn into the Market Basket or Abbies or the gas
15 station, what does that do to that left-turn lane
16 on Sicomac Avenue? Cars have to weave around it?

17 MR. MAHER: They would --

18 MR. RUEBENACKER: Stay in the right lane?

19 MR. MAHER: I believe they would wait for
20 a sufficient gap into the oncoming flow of traffic
21 to make a left turn much like you would if you
22 were at the intersection itself.

23 MR. RUEBENACKER: We might cause a
24 dangerous situation. You're behind somebody, all
25 of a sudden puts on his or her blinker at the last

1 to do so.

2 MR. ASCOLESE: Mr. Chairman, if I could
3 ask a question.

4 The totals that you just showed on the
5 previous slide in 2006, 6,000 vehicles; 2011,
6 5,200; 2017, 5,900, were those intersection
7 volumes?

8 MR. MAHER: Those were roadway volumes.
9 Specifically, Cedar Hill Avenue.

10 MR. ASCOLESE: Cedar Hill?

11 MR. MAHER: Yes.

12 MR. ASCOLESE: Was that done with a manual
13 traffic camera or road tubes?

14 MR. MAHER: That was done with a road
15 tube.

16 MR. ASCOLESE: Okay.

17 MR. MAHER: I'm sorry, I'm sorry. It was
18 done across Goffle Hill Road.

19 MR. ASCOLESE: East of the intersection?

20 MR. MAHER: East of the intersection, yes.

21 MR. RUEBENACKER: Hold on, now I'm
22 confused.

23 MR. MAHER: Okay.

24 MR. RUEBENACKER: How do we compare how
25 many cars come up Cedar Hill Ave.? How many cars

1 second to turn left, you're behind that person in
2 the left lane, they're going into the Market
3 Basket, you now weave out to the right to get
4 around him, you got a car coming by you on your
5 right 40 miles-an-hour.

6 MR. MAHER: I would submit that the
7 proposed condition, however, has the signal in
8 place to periodically stop oncoming traffic, which
9 is a luxury that is not currently afforded. So
10 people would find more gaps for that left turn.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: The hatched area between
12 east and west, anybody coming down Sicomac from
13 Sicomac School is going to go in that hatched area
14 to make a left into Abbies. They won't be in the
15 right and then make a hard left. I think
16 everybody's going to go into that hatched space to
17 make a left.

18 MS. YUDIN: I have a question. I don't
19 know if you took it into consideration. But at
20 certain times of the year the sun if you're going
21 east on Sicomac Avenue, the sun comes directly on
22 Sicomac Avenue and blinds you. Will you be able
23 to see that light?

24 MR. MAHER: Yes, you will. Most signals
25 that are installed on an east/west approach that's

1 angling the sun have back plates so you can more
2 easily see the signal. And the back plates kind
3 of shade you from the sun so you can more easily
4 see what's going on on the signal indicators.

5 MR. RUEBENACKER: Do we have the 2017 TIS
6 report? Do we have that as part of our
7 application, Mr. Vogel?

8 MR. MAHER: We prepared it, but we're
9 ready to submit as the board requests, but...

10 CHAIRMAN FRY: I would say we want that
11 included in the packet.

12 MR. MAHER: We could definitely submit
13 that, yes.

14 MR. RUEBENACKER: Maybe with like a
15 summary cover sheet for the layperson with the
16 supporting data in the back.

17 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: That's fine.
18 Just to respond to that question. The
19 Traffic Impact Study is related to the trip
20 generation that resulted from the development and
21 because, as Mr. Maher testified to, the number of
22 trips hadn't change, that the impact, that the
23 development would have on the street network would
24 not change. But we updated the traffic study to
25 be able to analyze the signalized intersection.

1 So that analysis we could provide to help support
2 or provide the information you're looking for. It
3 would be a second addendum, essentially, to the
4 2008 impact study.

5 MR. VOGEL: What does that show, Al, if
6 there's no change in the volume and nothing new
7 has been built?

8 MR. RUEBENACKER: Can we at least get that
9 summary PowerPoint? I don't have the file from
10 five years ago that I can reference.

11 I guess what I'm trying to show is a piece
12 of paper in front of me that can show what the
13 traffic study showed originally, what the addendum
14 showed, where we are today, and how you net it all
15 out, there's no significant increase.

16 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Mr. Ruebenacker, I think
17 the way we can simplify this and I think Mr. Fry,
18 you alluded to this, I believe it was you, to put
19 something in laymen's terms, so maybe that was
20 you, to put a package together. If, Gary, I'll
21 ask you, you can say yes or no, but we can go back
22 to the previous reports and kind of gather those
23 summary documents, maybe not provide you with
24 copies of every page of every document, but take
25 the relevant graphs and charts and traffic volumes

1 and bring all that together with updated analysis
2 that was done and try to provide you that.

3 CHAIRMAN FRY: Yeah, a roll up page that
4 shows a history of it on a spread sheet.

5 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Right. And try to
6 provide you that summary document you were asking
7 for.

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: Especially, Mr. Vogel, you
9 said it yourself, 99 percent of the commentary
10 from the public was related to traffic and that
11 light. So I think we need to, it would behoove us
12 to refresh our memories on all that traffic data.

13 MR. MAHER: I've worked on all previous
14 iterations of the study so I can definitely
15 provide you with a compendium of everything that's
16 been prepared along with a list of when and what
17 was delivered.

18 MR. VOGEL: What I don't understand, if
19 the volume hasn't increased from 2015 to 2017,
20 what does the study show that's any different?

21 MR. RUEBENACKER: I don't want the whole
22 study, I just want the summary.

23 MR. HUBERT: Just to say it hasn't
24 changed.

25 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: To Mr. Vogel's point.

1 MR. VOGEL: My only point was, I'm not
2 saying we won't give it to you, I'm saying do it,
3 but if it was 6,000 in 2015 and it's 5,900 in
4 2017, what changes there? It's all the same.

5 MR. RUEBENACKER: But I'm trying to get to
6 that two percent we referenced earlier. It's two
7 percent of what? The trips? Maybe that one
8 spreadsheet had the trips on it or average cars
9 per hour. Is that on which road. I'm trying to
10 get down to that summary data so we can
11 understand, you know, if the entire Christian
12 Health Care Center was estimated to have, you
13 know, 150 trips a day or how we documented it five
14 years ago and now we think it's going to be an
15 extra five cars an hour, which is I think what it
16 was when we talked, maybe it was eight cars in an
17 hour or something or eight trips, you know. For
18 some reason number eight is in my head. Just
19 something, some summary document like that, what's
20 the added volume or traffic from Vista.

21 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Mr. Ruebenacker, just to
22 respond to that. I think our approach to
23 presenting testimony tonight as was discussed
24 earlier was all of that traffic study had been
25 previously provided in connection with the

1 application. I think our intent here was to
 2 demonstrate to you in response to the Boswell
 3 letter that nothing really as changed. So we
 4 didn't want to rehash all of the testimony that
 5 had been given many, many years ago about the
 6 number of trips at each intersection and what gets
 7 reduced where with the redistribution. I think we
 8 wanted to just reassure the board that based on
 9 the current version of the ITE trip generation
 10 manual that the Vista, as currently proposed, as
 11 it was previously proposed, presents no increased
 12 impact over previous testimony provided.

13 But I can understand your request for some
 14 sort of summary document because there was a lot
 15 of testimony, a lot of documentation. To Jerry's
 16 point, to Mr. Vogel's point, it's not going to
 17 change anything. There is no additional impact or
 18 there is no change in the impact. In fact, from
 19 Mr. Maher's testimony, and I'll stop talking and
 20 let him finish, but you could see from the
 21 information he presented that 2011 to, I'm sorry,
 22 from 2008 to 2017 there was only I think a 100
 23 vehicle increase and it fluctuated over that time.

24 MR. MAHER: Actually it decreased.

25 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: I'm sorry, decreased?

1 MR. MAHER: Yes.

2 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: I'm sorry, I apologize.
 3 See he's got it right.

4 So I don't think you're going to see a
 5 change in the impact but certainly we can provide
 6 those summaries for you.

7 MR. RUEBENACKER: Well, especially since
 8 that was the crux of our argument, you know, back
 9 in 2013. There's no increase in traffic and we
 10 disagreed with the county and I think we should
 11 revisit the numbers, at least in a summary basis,
 12 to, you know, refresh our memories if we're going
 13 to make a decision here based on your revised
 14 application and site plan.

15 MR. MAHER: We can certainly do that.

16 CHAIRMAN FRY: Just a summary. We don't
 17 need all the other backup reports. I agree we
 18 don't have to go back on a lot of the testimony.

19 Okay.

20 MR. MAHER: So that was it for my slides.

21 Mr. Chairman, I remembered awhile ago you
 22 said why did the county decide to put a signal
 23 here, like, why a signal here. And I believe the
 24 county has a legitimate interest in this
 25 intersection from a safety and congestion

1 standpoint.

2 There was a question about safety earlier.
 3 I did look back at our Traffic Signal Warrant
 4 Analysis that was submitted to the board back in
 5 2007 and it is over the five crash per year
 6 threshold of five preventable crashes occurring at
 7 the intersection. That would be preventable with
 8 the installation of a signal. So that's an
 9 industry standard that was met. It didn't meet
 10 the crash warrant, but it met that threshold,
 11 which is something that is of no, and, of course,
 12 it meets the eight hour and four hour signal
 13 warrants. So they do have a legitimate issue with
 14 this intersection.

15 CHAIRMAN FRY: So if that's the case,
 16 they're getting data from the town.

17 MR. MAHER: That would be the -- you mean
 18 the traffic data?

19 CHAIRMAN FRY: Yeah, any crash study,
 20 anything else --

21 MR. MAHER: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN FRY: The county doesn't get that
 23 report right off the bat.

24 MR. MAHER: Those were the police
 25 investigation reports recorded by your police

1 department, yes.

2 MR. ASCOLESE: Was that data provided by
 3 the Wyckoff Police to either you or to the county?

4 MR. MAHER: That was provided to us
 5 approximately ten years ago.

6 MR. ASCOLESE: So you've had crash data
 7 from ten years ago?

8 MR. MAHER: Yes.

9 MR. ASCOLESE: Do you recall any of those
 10 numbers?

11 MR. MAHER: Yes.

12 MR. ASCOLESE: Five crashes a year? Five
 13 right angle accidents a year? Five left turn
 14 accidents? Five --

15 CHAIRMAN FRY: And has a more current
 16 study been done?

17 MR. ASCOLESE: It should be easy enough
 18 for them to dump that information over the last
 19 ten years which would lend credence if this device
 20 were truly needed.

21 MR. MAHER: Here it is.

22 So going to the crash data that was
 23 recorded. In 2003, they recorded nine crashes.
 24 Three of which were deemed preventable by a signal
 25 and a total of four injuries.

1 In 2004, there were seven crashes. Five
2 of which were deemed preventable by a signal.
3 Zero injuries.

4 And then in 2005, a lot of crashes.
5 Thirteen crashes, 11 of which would have been
6 prevented by a signal and four injuries.

7 MR. DiGENNARO: Who makes that
8 determination whether the accident is preventable
9 by a signal?

10 MR. MAHER: There's different crash types.
11 Obviously, if there's a rear end collision, that
12 can't be prevented by a signal because there's
13 still going to be rear end collisions at a signal.

14 But more severe collisions such as a right angle
15 collision, a side swipe or head on collision could
16 be prevented by a signal. So that's how we flag
17 which crashes are preventable and which aren't.

18 MR. HUBERT: So you're making that
19 determination, you've taken a police report and
20 reviewing it saying this is a rear end crash or is
21 it head on. You're making that determination?

22 MR. MAHER: That's correct.

23 MR. ASCOLESE: And that study is dated
24 what?

25 MR. MAHER: The study is dated July 2006,

1 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. Thank you.

2 MR. DELEO: Can you get more current data?

3 MR. MAHER: I believe we can.

4 MR. DELEO: We'd like to see that.

5 CHAIRMAN FRY: Yeah, so just do the same
6 thing. 2003 up to whatever data you have
7 something current.

8 MR. MAHER: Certainly.

9 CHAIRMAN FRY: So we can gauge it.

10 MR. MAHER: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. Were you able to
12 answer questions about is it going to be a left
13 directional? Are they going to be flashing?

14 MR. MAHER: Yes, so as I previously
15 stated, flashing, the duration of flashing is up
16 to engineering judgment. There is guidance in the
17 MUTCD based on certain volume thresholds, but that
18 would be at the discretion of the county.

19 MR. VOGEL: That could be a subject of
20 discussion between the township and the county.

21 MR. MAHER: Yes.

22 MS. YUDIN: Can we make a request that
23 they put in the ability to flash the signal?

24 MR. ASCOLESE: I can probably answer that,
25 Mr. Chairman.

1 Traffic Signal Warrant Analysis.

2 MS. YUDIN: These were at the intersection
3 or were they within a certain number of feet of
4 the intersection.

5 MR. MAHER: Typically we take 500 feet
6 back from the stop bar.

7 MS. YUDIN: So it could have been some of
8 these were from the shopping center across the
9 street?

10 MR. MAHER: It's potential, yes.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: So that takes into
12 consideration everything in that area?

13 MR. MAHER: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN FRY: So you couldn't narrow it
15 down there were four from Cedar Hill turning onto
16 Sicomac; six from Sicomac turning to Cedar Hill?

17 MR. MAHER: Through a detailed
18 determination or through a detailed review of the
19 crash investigation reports and they have sketches
20 on each one, we could determine exactly where it
21 occurred.

22 CHAIRMAN FRY: That would have been in the
23 parking lot --

24 MR. MAHER: Yeah, like something like that
25 was flagged parking we threw out.

1 The devices come with a computer that
2 literally can do anything that's programmed into
3 it.

4 MS. YUDIN: But this is an interim light?

5 MR. ASCOLESE: The interim lights as well
6 as the permanent light. They all run off the same
7 timer. They have different protocols
8 automatically built in. Time of day plan, how
9 much green time allotted to each phase, whether
10 the signal goes into a flashing mode or not, that
11 determination would be made by the county, if they
12 chose to flash it at night or if they chose to go
13 to the abbreviated cycle.

14 MS. YUDIN: So the determination of
15 whether it would go to flash would not up to the
16 Wyckoff Police?

17 MR. ASCOLESE: Absolutely not. But the
18 police do have the ability through the police
19 door. They have keys to get into the police door
20 to manually advance the device if there was a
21 special situation in need. If there was a
22 graduation at Sicomac. If they wanted more green
23 time. The officer can actually control it. But
24 technically or primarily, the county doesn't put
25 in any type of wire control for the officer to

1 operate any longer, which was something that used
2 to be years ago.

3 But, again, anything that requires any
4 type of timing, warning time periods might be
5 needed, green can be increased in certain
6 directions more than the afternoon, I would think
7 even on a fixed time device, the county, if they
8 were petitioned, they could give you the leading
9 left-turn phase in the eastbound direction even
10 though it works on fixed time. It's just a matter
11 of adding another signal indication. And, again,
12 the timer's automatically built in to have that
13 capability.

14 MS. YUDIN: I must have misunderstood
15 because I thought that there was testimony before
16 that indicated that it would be up to the county
17 whether they would put a light in like that or not
18 and did I misunderstand you?

19 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: No, I don't believe you
20 did. I would clarify that if I did mislead you in
21 any way. I would just say that the traffic signal
22 would be designed by the county.

23 MS. YUDIN: Right.

24 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: We've been told by the
25 county that it would a fixed cycle length. But

1 the design of the signal and how it operates as to
2 Mr. Ascolese described to you would be subject to
3 the county. There is some flexibility in what the
4 county will do. My testimony would be that the
5 county has informed us preliminarily that it would
6 be established at affixed cycle length.

7 MS. YUDIN: So can we establish or can we
8 request that the county put in a signal that would
9 allow for flashing?

10 MR. ASCOLESE: At night they would need to
11 check out the site distance, the traffic volumes
12 at night. What they normally would do is do it on
13 a three-month trial period where they would have
14 this thing say flash 11:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. Look
15 to see over a three-month period if there are any
16 crashes at night that would be correctable by
17 keeping the thing in an abbreviated mode. And,
18 again, if they choose to go to say a 90-second
19 cycle where each cycle would be serviced for a
20 total of 90 seconds, at night they can decrease
21 that, say a 50-second cycle so people aren't
22 waiting as long on the side streets.

23 I personally don't think the flashing
24 operation would make or break this installation.
25 It's just a matter whether the device is really

1 necessary at this point.

2 MS. YUDIN: So it is programable?

3 MR. ASCOLESE: Yes, fully programable
4 by --

5 MS. YUDIN: So anything they put in will
6 be programmable?

7 MR. ASCOLESE: Yes.

8 MS. YUDIN: Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN FRY: So it sounds like we have
10 an opportunity to fine tune it a little bit to
11 maybe a preference that we would have. It has the
12 capabilities to do anything. Again, it would be a
13 suggestion. It could be overruled. They can say
14 absolutely not, it's going to be a fixed 90 second
15 cycle, 60/30, that's it.

16 MR. ASCOLESE: Being that the timer comes
17 from the factory with all these capabilities built
18 in, the only thing we're talking about is maybe an
19 additional left-turn arrow, two left-turn arrows
20 facing eastbound traffic. But I don't think
21 there's any problem being that we have a dedicated
22 left-turn lane being proposed here to run an
23 eastbound left-turn phase on Cedar Hill Avenue
24 with the interim signal, get a little bit more
25 life out of the device, get a little bit better

1 operation, diminish the possibility that things
2 might back up coming in an eastbound direction,
3 help free up the activity in front of the Market
4 Basket. I think they would be remiss not to
5 consider putting in a left-turn phase if this
6 project goes forward and they put in a temporary
7 device.

8 MR. MAHER: And then working off of that,
9 if you do add that eastbound left-turn phase,
10 traffic operations would definitely improve.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: So just thinking about your
12 videos.

13 MR. MAHER: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN FRY: Do you have one for the
15 current, because I want to see Mr. Ruebenacker fly
16 through that intersection.

17 MR. RUEBENACKER: I'm going to put my
18 iPhone on my dashboard tomorrow and send it to
19 you, Mr. Vogel.

20 CHAIRMAN FRY: But what I want to see is,
21 there are obviously other times that we're not
22 seeing that it does back up and create a
23 condition. Can we see a current condition?
24 Because it would really I think help me. Because
25 if what's coming up in the queue is on Cedar Hill

1 coming up to Sicomac waiting to make a right,
2 whatever it is, to see those cars in a current
3 scenario backing up compared to here's the flow
4 once you have the signal, I think it would, for me
5 it would probably help to say, oh, okay, I see
6 what's happening now and this is what's it's going
7 to be afterwards, okay, it makes more sense.

8 MR. MAHER: And we don't have that video
9 with us right now but it's definitely something
10 that we can be prepared.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: Again, I'm not trying to
12 make it more burdensome. I'm just trying to make
13 it as simple as possible for everybody to make a
14 decision.

15 MR. MAHER: Yes.

16 CHAIRMAN FRY: Any other questions for Mr.
17 Maher?

18 MR. KALPAGIAN: I have one quick question.

19 MR. MAHER: Sure.

20 MR. KALPAGIAN: Simulation, cars going on
21 Cedar Hill to what would have been the driveway,
22 would be the driveway for Christian Health Care
23 Center, how do you determine how many were going
24 up into there versus right or left on Cedar Hill?

25 MR. MAHER: We had a turning movement

1 count at that driveway location. So people were
2 there to count the left turns, the through
3 movements, the left and rights coming out of the
4 driveway. So we were able to figure out the split
5 between the vehicles.

6 MR. KALPAGIAN: I get the left/right. I'm
7 just curious straight. There's no road there yet.

8 MR. VOGEL: Counting the driveway --

9 MR. MAHER: Precisely, now, I'm sorry, I
10 misunderstood the question.

11 Yeah, we counted the existing driveway and
12 redistributed the volumes based on where
13 everybody's coming from.

14 MR. KALPAGIAN: I was just curious.
15 Thanks.

16 MR. MAHER: You're welcome.

17 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. Seeing that the
18 board does not have any other questions, what I'll
19 do, as I said, I wanted to go to 10:30 and then
20 we'll spend a little bit of time opening up to the
21 public. If the public does have any questions,
22 this would be an opportunity to approach the mic.
23 And, again, it would be to ask questions for the
24 testimony that was provided tonight by the people
25 that provided testimony tonight and that would be

1 it.

2 So at this time I'll open it up to anybody
3 to the public if you care to make a comment.

4 MS. MAHON: Mary Mahon, 64 Emeline Drive,
5 Hawthorne.

6 CHAIRMAN FRY: Can you spell your name?

7 MS. MAHON: M-a-h-o-n.

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: And what was your address?

9 MS. MAHON: 64 Emeline, E-m-e-l-i-n-e,
10 Drive, Hawthorne.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay.

12 MS. MAHON: Presently, it's probably
13 illegal, across from the Market Basket, the...

14 MR. COOK: It has to be a question.

15 MS. MAHON: Okay. Will there be able
16 parking if they improve the intersection for the
17 trailers and trucks that currently park now to run
18 into the Market Basket?

19 CHAIRMAN FRY: So I won't be able to
20 answer that question. Mr. Roughgarden possibly
21 will be able to, but I remember there was
22 testimony on that as well and it was I think
23 another condition just leave well enough alone
24 where there was ample room to leave the trucks to
25 be able to park there.

1 So, Mr. Roughgarden, I know you have all
2 the dimensions on what's going to be proposed,
3 hopefully, you can answer that question.

4 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Sure. Let me see what I
5 can do here.

6 So as I had testified to earlier, under
7 the interim improvements, there would be an
8 approximately 12-foot wide striped area on the
9 south side of Sicomac Avenue in the eastbound
10 direction that would essentially replicate that
11 existing hatched striped area.

12 CHAIRMAN FRY: Do you know how wide that
13 space is existing?

14 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: The existing I do not
15 know offhand, but I can tell you that the 12-foot
16 wide that's proposed is larger than what would be
17 required as a minimum for a shoulder. It's larger
18 than what would be required for a parallel parking
19 space. So I would think that if a truck with a
20 trailer parked in that striped area, it would
21 sufficiently and safely be able to be off the
22 through traffic.

23 I would caution, though, that, and this
24 goes to the site triangle that I prepared in
25 response to the comment from your engineer that

1 any parking in that area would create an
2 obstruction for vehicles choosing to make a right
3 turn on red coming out of the Christian Health
4 Care Center. I don't know offhand if there are
5 formal parking restrictions there. It's not
6 striped today as a place to park, so that may be
7 an enforcement issue. But physically under the
8 interim plan there would be a space for a vehicle
9 to park and pull off of the roadway.

10 CHAIRMAN FRY: I think that's probably all
11 we can answer right now. I don't believe you can
12 park there as it is. I think it's sort of an
13 unwritten rule that --

14 MS. MAHON: I go by there all the time and
15 that's where they are. You wonder if it is still
16 going to be safe.

17 CHAIRMAN FRY: Yeah. So I think to answer
18 your question, though, space is going to be
19 available similar to what exists today. So if
20 they choose to do it, they're taking their own
21 risk but there may be an impact now because you
22 have site line concerns.

23 But to answer your question, there will be
24 that space on the side as proposed.

25 MR. HUBERT: I believe only in the

1 you coming? Because this is going to be the
2 acreage property that you're going back.

3 MR. STRUYK: They're all our homes.

4 MS. LAIOSA: Well, those are homes, I
5 know.

6 MR. STRUYK: They're all our homes.

7 MS. LAIOSA: Yes, I understand that. I
8 just want to know how many homes, because the big
9 retention coming down is sitting here, but I just
10 want to know how far back are you going?

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: Are you saying how far back
12 off the curb line are they going?

13 MS. LAIOSA: Yes, yes.

14 CHAIRMAN FRY: Or how far down east?

15 MS. LAIOSA: Well, how far coming in and
16 how far east? Like, how far are you going down?
17 And I think I understand there's going to be no
18 sidewalk on that side. Correct?

19 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct.

20 MS. LAIOSA: Okay.

21 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: So I think this plan is
22 the best and I know it's a little faded. So if
23 you'd like to look. I'm referring to sheet 5 of
24 12 of the Roadway Improvement Plan prepared by
25 Stantec. And the driveway and widening affects

1 interim. Correct?

2 CHAIRMAN FRY: Only for the interim,
3 that's correct.

4 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: That is correct, Mr.
5 Hubert, only in the interim.

6 That's all.

7 CHAIRMAN FRY: Good evening.

8 MS. LAIOSA: Hi. Rayna, R-a-y-n-a,
9 Laiosa, L-a-i-o-s-a, 89 Minerva, M-i-n-e-r-v-a,
10 Avenue, Hawthorne.

11 Just a question. Can you go back to that
12 previous site?

13 My question is about lining in Hawthorne
14 on Goffle Road. I just want to know, when you're
15 in Hawthorne going down Goffle Road, you're
16 widening on your property, so how many homes are
17 you going down? Because you own the four homes in
18 Hawthorne, so how many homes are you going down to
19 widen, because you're taking the aprons in front
20 of those front homes?

21 I think the previous one. That one. That
22 one.

23 So you have, over in this corner you have
24 that automobile box, right, and there's all trees
25 and house and house, house. So how far down are

1 two of the homes.

2 MS. LAIOSA: Okay.

3 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Both on the outer side
4 of the spillway. The westerly property, the
5 widening there is, it's not on the plan, based on
6 what I know it's approximately, it varies anywhere
7 from about 12 feet to probably 24 feet as you move
8 further to the west.

9 The second property to the east of that or
10 the east side of the spillway, the widening then
11 begins to diminish. It varies from about 12 feet
12 down to I think this is about three feet in front
13 of the driveway.

14 MS. LAIOSA: Okay. So it's the automobile
15 and the two homes are going to the east --

16 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Correct, to the east.

17 MS. LAIOSA: Okay. That's what I wanted
18 to know.

19 Thank you.

20 CHAIRMAN FRY: You're welcome.

21 MR. MELFI: Gentlemen, good to see a lot
22 of familiar faces.

23 CHAIRMAN FRY: Long time no see.

24 MR. MELFI: Good times for everybody. Mr.
25 Vogel's still here. He always has his tan, which

1 is always a nice thing. Winter or summer.
 2 Actually, I have a question.
 3 Dan Melfi, M-e-l-f-i, Emeline Drive in
 4 Hawthorne.

5 CHAIRMAN FRY: What's the address?

6 MR. MELFI: 84. Actually, I don't have to
 7 give the numbers of the street anymore, but that's
 8 okay.

9 This is a Zoning Board and what we're
 10 doing is we're getting a lot of testimony in
 11 regards to what the county wants which is a lot of
 12 third-party testimony. And it's been politely
 13 contentious in regards to this going on for 11
 14 years mainly because of the traffic light. Why
 15 can't the board get somebody from the county here
 16 and directly ask somebody from the county, one of
 17 the engineers. I think that would help
 18 tremendously because it's he said/she said/they
 19 said. There's a lot of documentation here, which
 20 is great. There's a lot of reports. But the
 21 board has the right to ask directly the person
 22 who's writing the reports and I think it would
 23 help you guys out a lot and maybe solve some of
 24 the questions.

25 MR. COOK: Actually, the board doesn't

1 but I know this was based on one engineer's
 2 report.

3 MR. COOK: They can't testify
 4 individually. The board acts as a whole.

5 MR. MELFI: Okay. Thank you.

6 MR. COOK: Mr. Vogel, do you want to add
 7 anything to that?

8 MR. MELFI: Come on, Jer, you're good for
 9 a comment.

10 MR. VOGEL: Sorry, Dan.

11 They just wouldn't come. And they would
 12 have to get authorization from the Freeholders and
 13 the Freeholders would never give it because then
 14 every board all through the county would be
 15 subpoenaing them for every hearing on which they
 16 had any jurisdiction.

17 MR. COOK: Mr. Vogel has been doing this
 18 longer than I have. I've been doing this for 38
 19 years and never heard of it, never seen it.

20 MR. MELFI: I do have one question for the
 21 traffic guy.

22 You said in just one year, there was 13
 23 accidents in one year. What year was that?

24 MR. MAHER: That was 2005.

25 MR. MELFI: Thirteen accidents out of how

1 have that right.

2 MR. MELFI: You can subpoena them, though.

3 MR. COOK: The board in rare instances has
 4 subpoena power normally through the applicant.

5 MR. MELFI: Right.

6 MR. COOK: But in this particular case the
 7 document that's driving this the resolution
 8 approval from the Bergen County Planning Board,
 9 that's the document that we have to go off of.

10 MR. MELFI: Right.

11 MR. COOK: An individual employee, an
 12 engineer or something within the county is not the
 13 one that approved it. It's actually an official
 14 active board.

15 MR. MELFI: Right.

16 MR. COOK: So that resolution is what we
 17 have to go off of. It's not the specific engineer
 18 of the board. It's a board just like this board.

19 MR. MELFI: But it was based on an
 20 engineer's report.

21 MR. COOK: It would be like saying if the
 22 county wanted to know what was going on they would
 23 subpoena different members of this board. You
 24 can't do it.

25 MR. MELFI: Nobody would subpoena them,

1 many cars that went through that intersection in a
 2 year?

3 MR. MAHER: Ballpark... In a year?

4 MR. MELFI: In a year. It's 13 accidents
 5 per year. How many cars came through that
 6 intersection?

7 MR. VOGEL: Who knows. We only --

8 MR. MELFI: Well, what I'm saying is if
 9 it's 13 accidents and there's 50,000 cars, I'm
 10 sure it's even more than that that goes through
 11 there, I'm trying to help you reason out why do we
 12 need a traffic light.

13 MR. MAHER: There's certainly a crash rate
 14 I can develop based on calculations of how many
 15 vehicles travel through the intersection.

16 MR. MELFI: Okay. Well, what's your count
 17 a day?

18 MR. MAHER: Count a day... Once again, I
 19 don't want to throw a random ballpark figure out.

20 MR. MELFI: Low ball, high ball.

21 MR. MAHER: But what I can tell you is we
 22 can develop a crash rate and compare it to the
 23 state average crash rate and say if it's higher or
 24 lower.

25 MR. MELFI: Well, I don't want Mr. Struyk

1 to spend any more money.

2 If you had a traffic number for everyday,
3 I just wanted to figure out how many cars go
4 through that intersection a day for 13 accidents.
5 It doesn't seem --

6 MR. VOGEL: Thirteen doesn't seem like a
7 lot unless you're one of them --

8 MR. MELFI: No. I mean, I drive through
9 that intersection everyday --

10 MR. VOGEL: -- it's a hundred percent.

11 MR. MELFI: Of course.

12 MR. MAHER: Just to give you some
13 perspective, crash rates are calculated on crashes
14 per million entering vehicles. So crashes are
15 very notable occurrences and the crash rates are
16 geared towards that. So even if it's three crash
17 rates per million entering vehicles, that's still
18 a significantly high crash rate.

19 MR. MELFI: Thank you, gentlemen. Good
20 seeing, everyone.

21 CHAIRMAN FRY: Nice seeing you as well.

22 MR. BENEDIK: Good evening. My name is
23 John Benedik, B-e-n-e-d-i-k.

24 I'm on the board of Cedar Hill Condo
25 Association across the street and as I'm sure most

1 whether any of you were on the board then, but we
2 spoke with Chief Fox, because we had one bad
3 accident, nonresident cut through and smashed a
4 car, hurt one of our residents. So we said can
5 you put an officer or car there to give tickets
6 because these are private roads. We pay to
7 asphalt them; we pay to plow them. He said we
8 can't do that. He said if you can get license
9 numbers, we'll try and get a warrant. We can't
10 have somebody sit there and copy down license
11 numbers. So he said the only answer was a gate.

12 So we spent some money. We got a lawyer
13 involved. We came before the Planning Board and
14 after a bunch of meetings, we were told at the
15 final meeting that there was a letter from the
16 police chief and fire chief recommending no gate
17 for some very silly reasons. And we weren't
18 trying to have a gated community. We just wanted
19 to put a gate at Wellesley, not a gate at the
20 major entrance, to stop nonresidents from cutting
21 through.

22 So we still have that problem of people
23 cutting through, particularly, in the morning and
24 when school's out in the afternoon. So I was
25 curious as to whether the traffic light with the

1 of you know, we're boarded by both these major
2 roads, Sicomac and Cedar Hill. So the reason I
3 came tonight and actually, one request, please get
4 more comfortable chairs in the future,
5 particularly, a guy my size. Sitting here for
6 three hours has really taken a toll.

7 But first, we got great relationships with
8 Doug and the Cedar Hill Christian Health Care
9 Center. During the Hurricane Sandy, we have a
10 number of elderly people in our community, single
11 widows, and Doug offered to accommodate those
12 folks no charge for the eight days that we were
13 out of power. So they're great neighbors and we
14 try to be great neighbors.

15 The reason I came tonight was to find out
16 whether if the light is put in, it would either
17 ameliorate or worsen situations that we have right
18 now and we've had for a number of years.

19 First of all, one of the reasons why your
20 traffic count for people making a left turn at
21 Cedar Hill heading towards Hawthorne, the reason
22 the left turn count is low is because there's
23 dozens of people who cut through our private
24 roads. Dozens. And we've done our own traffic
25 counts and what was very frustrating, I'm not sure

1 left-turn signal might ameliorate that problem.

2 And the second problem is, for any of our
3 residents who try and get out of our main exit on
4 Cedar Hill, they take their life in their hands
5 making that right turn because people come
6 speeding down 50 miles an hour. I think I'm a
7 pretty good driver and I've had some really close
8 calls.

9 So what I was trying to find out tonight
10 was, if the light is put in, will both of those
11 problems be somewhat mitigated? I'm not sure I
12 have an answer because I'm hearing that this
13 temporary light situation is not going to have a
14 left-turn signal. So if the only thing they do is
15 put a red, I'm not sure that's going to help
16 because the people who want to make the left turn
17 at the intersection coming up Cedar Hill to head
18 towards Hawthorne, the only way during the peak
19 periods that they can make that left turn is some
20 kind person from Franklin Lakes stops before they
21 make the left turn and let them go. Obviously, a
22 light with a left-turn signal, I think, I think
23 would help that situation. I'm not sure a
24 red/yellow light would.

25 But, anyhow, that's the... I'm not sure.

1 I think I got some indication. Maybe you
2 gentlemen with the traffic studies could comment
3 on that.

4 MR. MAHER: Yes.

5 CHAIRMAN FRY: Come on up.

6 MR. MAHER: With the traffic light in
7 place, you're going to be stopping the cross
8 traffic on Sicomac Avenue thereby forcing traffic
9 to stop on Sicomac Avenue giving people that are
10 on that Cedar Hill Avenue approach gaps to make
11 the left turn. So it's going to be easier for
12 traffic on Cedar Hill.

13 MR. BENEDIK: How long would the delay be
14 before they get the left turn, assuming a
15 permanent light is put in, how long would the
16 delay be before they would have the left-turn
17 signal to make a left turn?

18 MR. MAHER: Average delay for that
19 movement is around 40 seconds. So that's going to
20 be significantly improved from the level of
21 service that you currently see.

22 MR. BENEDIK: All right. Thank you.

23 Will the light in any way stop the
24 speeding coming down Cedar Hill?

25 MR. MAHER: No.

1 point where it would be more acceptable than
2 what's being proposed now?

3 CHAIRMAN FRY: So I think if you've heard,
4 what we want to see is what would the impact of
5 doing that be, because that is something that the
6 board questioned.

7 MS. LONSKI: Yes, okay.

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: So we'll know if it becomes
9 a safety issue, if it's not feasible, if the
10 studies would indicate, no, you can absolutely not
11 do that without creating a more hazardous
12 condition.

13 So we will be able to, hopefully, get that
14 part of an answer.

15 The other part of it is, I think it's
16 unknown right now. We don't know what the county
17 could do. The county could come in and make the
18 cuts on the other side of the road and do whatever
19 they want to do. So I think that's the risk that
20 we take. We just don't know what they will do.
21 We know right now there are certain things that
22 they're willing to accept. We don't go in that
23 direction and compromise what they could do. So I
24 don't know if we can really answer that question.
25 Worst case scenario, they can put the curb cuts

1 CHAIRMAN FRY: But if nothing else, it may
2 afford a sizable gap between traffic flow so
3 people can wait for everybody that just had the
4 light to clear.

5 MR. MAHER: That's correct. The traffic
6 light's going to formalize the gaps. It's not an
7 official traffic calming device. But cross street
8 traffic on Sicomac will have to stop occasionally
9 to let the side street traffic go.

10 MR. BENEDIK: Thank you very much.

11 MR. MAHER: You're welcome.

12 CHAIRMAN FRY: Thank you, Mr. Benedik.

13 MS. LONSKI: Hi, I'm Maryann Lonski. I
14 live on Birchwood Drive, 679 Birchwood Drive.

15 CHAIRMAN FRY: Can you spell your name?

16 MS. LONSKI: M-a-r-y-a-n-n, no gap, one
17 word, Lonski L-o-n-s-k-i.

18 And I agree with you. I never have this
19 problem with this intersection. The question is
20 do we really need it? And the other question is
21 if the Christian Health Care Center entrance was
22 not moved to make it a four-way intersection, is
23 it fair to assume that the light would be a lot
24 less complex, curbing would be a lot less complex,
25 and it might simplify the entire project to the

1 in, I suppose, at the intersection once they put
2 the light there and do all the curb cuts around
3 the businesses that we didn't want. We just don't
4 know. We'd like to think as a good neighbor and
5 knowing the sensitivity of it they wouldn't. But
6 right now, I don't think that's clear.

7 MS. LONSKI: Okay. Thanks.

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: Thank you.

9 MR. LONSKI: Hi, my name is Walter Lonski.

10 I'm married to Maryann. We've been
11 residents for over 40 years. We're on Birchwood
12 Drive right now but for 11 years we lived at the
13 corner of Sicomac and Mountain. And one of the
14 reasons we left was because of the frequency of
15 the serious accidents on that corner. I've
16 replaced a few mailboxes there over the years.
17 And my question is how much consideration is given
18 to the effect that that traffic light is going to
19 have on the Mountain and Sicomac intersection,
20 because I think anybody going through there now
21 realizes you really have to be cautious. It's a
22 nightmare making a left onto Sicomac from Mountain
23 and vice versa going the other way and there's
24 been several serious accidents there.

25 And I'm also interested about the

1 comparison crash studies between those two
2 intersections and how one might impact the other.
3 And, finally, does the Township of Wyckoff
4 have any mechanism to go petition the county and
5 say, listen, if there's going to be dollars spent
6 on traffic signals here, can we improve a
7 dangerous situation as opposed to improving one
8 that everyone kind of agrees works without it.

9 CHAIRMAN FRY: A dangerous situation at
10 Mountain and Sicomac?

11 MR. LONSKI: At Mountain and Sicomac.

12 CHAIRMAN FRY: Mr. Cook, do you have an
13 answer for that?

14 MR. COOK: This came about because of this
15 application. The county makes a determination
16 based on their studies whether or not they feel a
17 traffic light is necessary. There's certain
18 criteria.

19 The only reason we're here tonight talking
20 about this is they're looking to have Christian
21 Health Care Center pay for it.

22 MR. LONSKI: Exactly.

23 MR. COOK: This application and the amount
24 of traffic the project has generated really has
25 nothing to do with the intersection.

1 think one of the things that we requested is the
2 study to show that there won't be backup impacting
3 that intersection. They're going to provide that.

4 What was your other point?

5 MR. LONSKI: That was it.

6 CHAIRMAN FRY: That was it. Okay.

7 So we're going to get that information
8 just showing that there won't be any further
9 impact to the Mountain turn onto Sicomac by
10 installing the left-turn signal.

11 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: That's correct. It
12 would really be an expansion of the video that we
13 had showed to extend, to cover those limits. The
14 image or the video that was shown tonight is just
15 a focused snapshot of the intersection, but our
16 traffic model actually looks at more of the
17 regional movements, Cedar Hill Avenue to Sicomac.
18 It includes movements from Mountain Avenue onto,
19 to and from Sicomac Avenue. So that broader
20 picture can be presented at a future meeting to
21 answer those questions.

22 CHAIRMAN FRY: All right. And it will
23 reflect the proposal with the Vista project. So
24 any added traffic, it will represent what will be
25 proposed?

1 CHAIRMAN FRY: If I remember correctly,
2 there was a lot of dialogue back in the day about
3 that intersection and I think what's been proposed
4 is, if anything, what they're proposing will
5 relieve some of that congestion that's there.

6 As far as making it safer, I don't recall
7 that there was any discussion about signalize that
8 intersection, can you do something with that.

9 MR. VOGEL: There was some discussion
10 about that intersection and the problems and the
11 comments are that you could not improve that
12 intersection at all unless you condemn the
13 properties because the houses are right up against
14 it. There's the visual problem around where you
15 can't see it. And the only way to do it is if you
16 condemn property and took it to widen the
17 intersection and the county doesn't have it in
18 their plan or doesn't have the money in any
19 program to do that at this point.

20 MR. LONSKI: So will there ever be a light
21 there?

22 CHAIRMAN FRY: Not without condemning a
23 lot of land.

24 MR. LONSKI: Interesting.

25 CHAIRMAN FRY: To your other point, I

1 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Yes, yes.

2 MR. RUEBENACKER: During peak hours.

3 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: During peak hours, yes.

4 CHAIRMAN FRY: Thank you.

5 Anybody else from the public?

6 Seeing no one else. Very good. I've
7 given everyone an opportunity. That's perfect.

8 All right. So why don't we recap.

9 MR. VOGEL: Yes, I'd like to understand,
10 there's several things been asked for. I want to
11 make sure we know what it is that the board is
12 looking for so we that can prepare it.

13 CHAIRMAN FRY: All right. So let's start
14 with the meeting.

15 So the police report we went through. We
16 identified everything. We addressed everything.
17 The one that is still open can the current posted
18 speed limit of 40 maybe be reduced. It sounds
19 like we can maybe have some discussion about that.

20 Fire report we had no issue with.

21 Okay. So the notes that I had that we're
22 looking for and I may not have everything so,
23 hopefully, the board took good notes.

24 The one was an illustration showing any
25 impact that might take place backing up to

1 Mountain Avenue, we just discussed.
2 We're looking for the 2017 Traffic Impact
3 Study, just a synopsis. Put together a
4 spreadsheet show the addendum and then the latest
5 data that you have.

6 MR. VOGEL: I wrote that down as
7 compendium of the traffic --

8 CHAIRMAN FRY: Yes.

9 MR. RUEBENACKER: The original, addendum,
10 and then the 2017.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: Any correspondence from the
12 township to the county and vice versa.

13 MR. VOGEL: That will have to go through
14 Miss McQuaid.

15 CHAIRMAN FRY: We're going to have to
16 request that from the township.

17 Then I have we're looking for an impact if
18 we were to leave the application that was approved
19 as is with the entrance as is, assuming that we're
20 leaving it and then what if the county were to
21 come in and put a traffic signal there, what
22 impact would that have rather than having your
23 drive come right down to the intersection. Does
24 that make sense?

25 MR. STRUYK: Signal by our existing

1 know what that data would really tell us. We know
2 it's kind of a tricky intersection as it is. But
3 it's not really coming into play with this --

4 MR. HUBERT: If you look at --

5 MS. YUDIN: At Mountain and Sicomac?

6 MR. HUBERT: If you put a T instead of a
7 four-way, that does have an impact? I mean,
8 that's the whole crux of why we had this major
9 concern and why what was approved was approved
10 because of the backup.

11 CHAIRMAN FRY: I don't think I understand.

12 MR. HUBERT: When we talked about the
13 issues of a light backing up into Sicomac and
14 Mountain, right, that's one of the concerns we
15 had.

16 CHAIRMAN FRY: Right.

17 MR. HUBERT: So, again, a light we're not
18 in favor of.

19 MS. YUDIN: They're going to show us.

20 MR. HUBERT: Okay. I think I'm satisfied.

21 CHAIRMAN FRY: So I think your original
22 question was can we get a crash study at Mountain
23 and Sicomac?

24 MR. HUBERT: Yes.

25 CHAIRMAN FRY: I just don't know if that

1 driveway?

2 CHAIRMAN FRY: No, say we're not doing
3 anything. We're not accepting the traffic signal.
4 The county can do whatever they want. So what we
5 have approved already, the entrance 301 Sicomac
6 coming down stays as is, and then if county comes
7 in and puts a signal, what impact would that have
8 on the traffic flow.

9 Then also updated information on the
10 number of crashes.

11 MR. HUBERT: Just to the gentleman that
12 came before, I would like to see for Sicomac and
13 Mountain.

14 MS. YUDIN: The simulation.

15 CHAIRMAN FRY: Right. They're going to
16 provide --

17 MR. HUBERT: No, no. The accidents. The
18 simulation I want to see, but can we get some
19 information on the accidents?

20 MR. KALPAGIAN: Didn't the research data
21 from the intersection from 2006 on.

22 CHAIRMAN FRY: You know what the problem,
23 I don't know what that data would really tell us.
24 If they come back and they say there's going to be
25 less of a burden at that intersection, I don't

1 would have much of a bearing. If it's something
2 you can provide, terrific. I don't know if --

3 MR. VOGEL: The crash analysis information
4 I'm told is only available for back three years.

5 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. That's fine. We'll
6 take it.

7 MR. VOGEL: And then when we ask for it,
8 we'll see if we can ask for Mountain Avenue as
9 well.

10 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. Perfect. Good.
11 Thank you.

12 MR. HUBERT: The reason why I bring it up
13 and I don't want to belabor, I'm making things up,
14 if there's 20 accidents on Mountain and there's
15 five or six on, what are we doing, you know.

16 CHAIRMAN FRY: Well, unfortunately...

17 MR. HUBERT: But, again, I know what
18 you're saying.

19 CHAIRMAN FRY: Yeah, that intersection,
20 completely different dynamic.

21 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Mr. Fry, can I just
22 respond to that?

23 CHAIRMAN FRY: Sure.

24 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: The answer to your
25 question is, by virtue of installing the traffic

1 signal with the driveway, creating the
 2 T-intersection making it a four-way, we are and I
 3 said this earlier, we're removing vehicles. That
 4 improvement will reduce traffic volumes at the
 5 Mountain and Sicomac.
 6 MR. HUBERT: I agree with you with the X,
 7 but with the T, that's one of the concerns.
 8 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Oh, with the T. Oh,
 9 with the T, I mean, that's part of the analysis
 10 that Mr. Fry was referring to.
 11 MR. HUBERT: If you can get it, that's
 12 fine.
 13 CHAIRMAN FRY: I think that will flush
 14 itself out because we're going to see what the
 15 analysis is going to show if it backs up towards
 16 Mountain.
 17 MR. ROUGHGARDEN: Okay. Great. Thank
 18 you.
 19 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. Board members
 20 anything else that we're looking for?
 21 MR. RUEBENACKER: No.
 22 CHAIRMAN FRY: Mr. Vogel?
 23 MR. VOGEL: I got it.
 24 CHAIRMAN FRY: Okay. Sue, next meeting?
 25 MS. McQUAID: Tuesday, June 12th.

C E R T I F I C A T E

1
 2
 3
 4
 5 I, LYNANN DRAGONE, License No. XIO1388, a
 6 Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public of the State
 7 of New Jersey, certify that the foregoing is a true and
 8 accurate transcript of the hearing at the time and the
 9 date hereinbefore set forth.
 10 I further certify that I am neither attorney
 11 nor Counsel for, nor employed by any of the parties to
 12 the action in which this hearing was taken.
 13 I further certify that I am not an employee of
 14 anyone employed in this case, nor am I financially
 15 interested in this action.
 16
 17
 18 _____
 19 LYNANN DRAGONE, CCR
 20 Certified Court Reporter
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25

1 MR. VOGEL: June 12th.
 2 CHAIRMAN FRY: 7:30. We'll pick up with
 3 the traffic study intersection and I'm going to be
 4 optimistic that we're going to get into the
 5 structural portion. Is that crazy?
 6 MR. STRUYK: Not at all.
 7 CHAIRMAN FRY: Not at all. I like it.
 8 MR. VOGEL: June 12th at?
 9 MS. McQUAID: 7:30.
 10 CHAIRMAN FRY: We'll do the same thing.
 11 It won't be a work session. We're going to go
 12 right to the public. Time frame will be the same.
 13 MR. VOGEL: Okay. Thank you for your
 14 patience and see you on the 12th.
 15 CHAIRMAN FRY: Can I get motion to close.
 16 All in favor.
 17
 18 (Whereupon, the proceedings concluded at
 19 11:05 p.m.)
 20
 21
 22
 23
 24
 25