



CITY OF NEW BRUNSWICK
PLANNING BOARD
OCTOBER 19, 2020
MINUTES

Meeting Location
Remote Teleconferencing
City Hall, Third Floor
78 Bayard Street
7:00 PM

I. ROLL CALL

	Jeff Crum (Chairperson)
	Manuel Castaneda (Vice Chairperson)
	George Chedid
X	John Petrolino
X	Robert Cartica
	Diana Lopez
X	Ryan Berger (Class I)
	Chris Stelatella (Class II)
X	Suzanne Sicora-Ludwig (Class III)
X	Dale Vickers (Alternate #1)
X	Yelitssa Checo (Alternate #2)

II. PUBLIC ANNOUNCEMENT

Dan Dominguez (Director, Department of Planning, Community and Economic Development): Please be advised that the notice requirements of the Open Public Meetings Act has been complied with and satisfied, and that the annual notice which gave sufficient notice of the time, place and conduct of all public meetings of the Planning Board of the City of New Brunswick has been filed with the City Clerk and it has been placed on the appropriate bulletin board and posted in the back vestibule of City Hall, visible to the public and through the windows of the lobby to City Hall in New Brunswick, New Jersey and has been transmitted to the official newspaper for the City of New Brunswick, namely the Home News Tribune and Star Ledger. Additionally, a change of location and special meeting notice of the time, place and manner of conducting this meeting has been made by the Board Secretary as required by law and is also posted in the back vestibule of City Hall visible to the public through the windows of the lobby of City Hall in New Brunswick, New Jersey and has been transmitted to the official newspaper for the City of New Brunswick, namely the Home News Tribune and Star Ledger.

New Jersey Governor Phil Murphy has issued executive orders limiting the size of public gatherings of individuals until further notice. Furthermore, the CDC has issued guidelines to limit gatherings of groups. The City's Planning Board intends to meet on a regular schedule, will meet using the guidelines of the Open Public Meetings Act by utilizing teleconferencing and video systems. Public participation at public meetings has been revised, and the public may participate through a conference call-in system or video. The public is encouraged to call in to the conference call or video system through the phone numbers and access code transmitted in the above notice to the Home News Tribune and Star Ledger and posted in the back vestibule of City Hall visible to the public through the windows. Board professionals will also be

available via conference call and video during the meeting. All parties on the conference call will have the opportunity to hear the Planning Board meeting. During the portions of the meeting that are not open for public comment, all calls from the public will be muted and the Board will not be able to hear any public comments through the conference call system. During the public comment periods, I will first read written comments issued to the Board and then those on the conference call-in lines who have an interest in addressing the Board will be organized by last name and then called upon to speak. After all organized members of the public speak, the process will happen again until all the public has had an opportunity to speak once and for no more than five minutes in any given public meeting portion. The timer will time at the completion of each five-minute period and I'll notify you that your time has expired. Public needing assistance accessing the call number should call Planning Department at 732-745-5050.

III. SALUTE TO THE FLAG

IV. MINUTES

None

V. RESOLUTIONS OF MEMORIALIZATION

None

VI. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. CANCER PAVILION REDEVELOPMENT ASSOCIATES LLC / 165 SOMERSET STREET / BLOCK 51, LOT 2.01 (PB-2020-11)

Preliminary and final major site plan application to construct an 11-story, 519,500 gross square foot building ("Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey Cancer Pavilion") to house outpatient and inpatient care, research facilities and administrative space associated with RWJBarnabas Health and Rutgers. No variances are requested. The site is located in the Healthcare Research Pavilion Redevelopment Plan area. (*Charles B. Liebling, Esq.*)

Suzanne Sicora Ludwig (Acting Board Chairperson): - before I turn it over to the attorney for the applicant, I have a few questions for the Board Attorney, if you wouldn't mind indulging, Mr. Aithal? After reviewing some of the documents that were submitted for this application, I, uh, want to know if you have any concerns regarding the deed and eminent domain that would preclude us from rendering a decision on this tonight?

Aravind Aithal (Board Attorney): Uh, Madame Chair, the, uh, the issue of eminent domain, which was brought up also on a statement that was submitted for the Board's consideration is not one that is before the Board. This is a non-condemnation project. Uh, the City did not authorize condemnation on this, uh, property and no condemnation is, uh, anticipated for this property. Uh, we can't speak yet (inaudible) properties, so this - this Board does have, in fact, has jurisdiction to consider this application and cannot consider property outside of this application. Now, in terms of condemnation, also, there may be some public misunderstanding about what, uh, this involves. There is a deed restriction, uh, that is involved in this property and that is for the applicant to, uh, to settle up with the, you know, with the proper authorities.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay. And then, so, is it correct that this Board has no jurisdiction over the contract and/or agreements of the redevelopment entities as a matter of land use law and will you please, uh, assert the charge of this Board here tonight.

Mr. Aithal: That's correct. This Board does not have jurisdiction to consider, uh, tax abatements or, uh, uh, contracts for purchase or sale of property. What it is simply here for is - and limited by the municipal

land use law is to consider this site plan application that is before the Board for a proposed development on this site. Um, off site, any potential impact that it may have off site, is limited to the curtilage, not necessarily based upon what some individual have brought in prior meetings, which is how this application will impact, uh, a proposed school that is off site or - will result in a proposed school off site. This Board has no jurisdiction to even consider that. What you have to look at is municipal land use law, the zoning and make a determination whether the applicant, who bears the burden of proof the entire time, has, in fact, made out a case - this application should either be approved or denied by this Board based upon, uh, it's charge under the Municipal Land Use Law and the local ordinance.

Ms. Ludwig: Thank you. And to that end, is there an alternative to be considered by Board members who aren't comfortable without seeing because there - there are other pieces of this project, such as, uh, the parking deck and the (inaudible) plant. Is there an alternative for Board members to consider who - who aren't comfortable voting on final site plan approval without seeing those plans?

Mr. Aithal: Uh, prior to hearing any, uh, testimony, I believe it might not be timely to discuss any alternatives, but during discussions, if the Board members have any specific questions, we can address it at that time.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay. And one - one other thing I wanted to ask of you is that there was a question of, uh, conflict of interest with certain members of the Board and I believe perhaps yourself. I didn't know if you wanted to speak to any of those.

Mr. Aithal: I did, Madame Chair. Thank you. Um, as the Board members are aware that are present here today, there are a number of Board members that are not present. I've had an opportunity to colloquy every Board member to make sure there was, in fact, no conflict of interest, uh, that would preclude them from hearing or considering this application. The standards, uh, that are utilized in determining whether a Board member has a conflict of interest, uh, is under New Jersey Statute Annotated, 40:55B23 and to summarize it, it would be that no one member of a planning board shall be permitted to act on, in any manner, uh, on - I'm sorry - on any matter in which he has either directly or indirectly a personal or financial interest. Now, under NJSA 40: - I'm sorry, 40A:9-22.5D, uh, the - the pertinent language there being that no local government officer or employee shall act in his official capacity in any matter where he, a member of his immediate family or a business organization in which he has an interest has a direct or indirect financial or personal involvement that might reasonably be expected to impair his objectivity or independent of judgment. Those are the standards with which we colloquy the Board members and when I spoke with each Board member, based on my conversations with each Board members, uh, Mr. Crum, Jeff Crum was, uh, uh, uh, conflicted out because his wife is a member of the Board of Education. Manuel Castaneda indicated that he was a part-time employee of Rutgers University and in an abundance of caution, using the objectivity of independence of judgment, uh, and what might reasonably expect that he would chair, although there may not be any actual impairment, in an abundance of caution, Mr. Castaneda was also recused. Mr. Chedid also indicated that his wife was a full-time fellow at Rutgers University and in not in any way related to this applicant or the application, but received benefits from Rutgers University in her position as a teaching fellow, uh, which is essentially a student. Uh, based on the - again, using an abundance of caution and the perception that there may reasonably be some, uh, impairment to his objectivity, Mr. Chedid also was recused from participation this evening. Diana Lopez is an employee of the New Brunswick Schools, uh, and based on her employment and the applicant, uh, the owner of the property being the, uh, Board of Education, Ms. Lopez was recused from her participation this evening. And finally, Mr. Stellatella's wife is also a full-time employee of Rutgers University. Again, no direct conflict or financial interest, however using the standard that there may be, uh, reasonably, uh, be perceived to be an impairment to his objectivity, he was recused from participation this evening, as well. There was a comment by an objector who noted that my, uh, employment, uh, and my partnership with Bob Smith and Associates and specifically with Robert Smith, who was a State Senator, would preclude me from hearing this application because of a conflict of interest. I note that, uh, I did some research on that issue specifically. New Jersey Statutes Annotated 52:13D-16C Paragraph 9 specifically permits a member of the

State Legislature, whether it's Senate or House, uh, or any of his law partners from representing a municipality in an action such as this so long as there is no adverse, uh, uh, just one moment. Uh, so long as there is no conflicting or adverse, uh, interests and they're not an adverse party. In this case, uh, Rutgers University is not an applicant here and is not an adverse party and, uh, to the Board - to the Planning Board. And therefore, there is no recusal that is required in my situation either. Madame Chair, based on that analysis, the at the Chair's prerogative, uh, there is jurisdiction with the Board. I've had an opportunity to review the notices that were presented. Uh, the notices are proper, and the applicant is, uh, uh, this Board does, in fact, have jurisdiction to hear the applications before the Board this evening with the members that are present.

Ms. Ludwig: Thank you very much for your explanations. And just one more matter of procedure, I want to ask all Board members and professionals to be recognized by the Chair before you speak and also I want to allow each witness to complete their testimony in full, at which time I'll ask the Board members if they have questions relevant to that specific testimony and then I will also open it up to the public relevant to that specific testimony. At the conclusion of the applicant's presentation, we'll go through the same process and then I will open up the floor to the - to the Board, and then, again to the Public for, uh, questions on the application's entirety and I just firmly want to ask that all parties conduct themselves in a professional manner this evening. One of mutual respect, refraining from personal attacks in an effort to facilitate the calm through the night. And with that, I turn it over to the applicant's attorney.

Mr. Charlie Kratovil: Madame Chair, I'd like to raise an objection at this time. So, I appreciate the attorney going through some of the, uh, objections that I've already raised, I - but, uh, this is Charlie Kratovil, by the way. Uh, I did want to object to the mayor's representative participating tonight. I understand that Mr. Berger is - is not conflicted out?

Ms. Ludwig: Correct. Your objection is noted.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. Well, I did want to note for the record that, uh, he recused himself at a prior meeting because the mayor rents property from Whitt Companies, which is owned by Robert Paulus and the mayor has advocated for this specific project, which would result in a displacement of the Lincoln Annex School, which would then be moved to 40 Van Dyke, the, uh (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may? If Mr. Kratovil can perhaps state the basis of his objection rather than making it a speaking objection, we can certainly rule on it and move on.

Ms. Ludwig: Yeah, that's - that's what I - your objection is noted, and do we have - can you give us some direction, Mr. Aithal?

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, as I indicated earlier, I have had an opportunity to colloquy every Board member including Mr. Berger - Mr. Berger. There is no grounds for recusal or disqualification of Mr. Berger.

Ms. Ludwig: Do we need a vote on this or is it by -

Mr. Aithal: No, we do not.

Ms. Ludwig: Then, we'll move on, I'd like (inaudible)

Mr. Kratovil: With all due respect, I'd just like to state the basis -

Ms. Ludwig: No. Your objection is noted, Mr. Kratovil.

Mr. Kratovil: Well, can I cite the case? H.D. Summerhill, LLC vs. East Brunswick Planning Board. Uh, this is a case last year - just last year out of East Brunswick where the mayor had to give up his vote on the

Planning Board and could not have a representative there because he had, uh, uh, you know, making state – statements that revealed he had, you know, decided his - his vote already. So, if the mayor is, uh, you know, on the record perhaps the number one supporter of this project, made a whole series of propaganda videos in favor of it, he should not get a vote tonight. Thank you.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay. Now, I'd like to hear from the applicant, please.

Charles Liebling (Applicant's Attorney): Thank you, Madame Chair. This is Charles Liebling from Windels Marx, New Brunswick, representing Cancer Pavilion Development Associates, LLC. The applicant is seeking preliminary and final site plan approval of the new cancer pavilion, uh, in its expansion of the existing RCINJ Rutgers Cancer Institute of New Jersey. And as was noted at the start, no variances are being sought. Uh, the new space will be used for science and research, inpatient and outpatient care, as well as administrative space. Um, it will be a hugely significant addition to New Brunswick's role as the state's leading healthcare center. Um, the application also includes pedestrian bridges to the Robert Wood Johnson Hospital and the existing RCINJ Legacy Building, as well as the proposed garage. As the Board knows, a parking garage for the pavilion is proposed for an adjacent site, which is the subject of a subsequent application. Just to make it clear from the outset, the applicant agrees to making approval of the garage a condition of the approval of this application. Hopefully, that puts a number of concerns to rest and I just want to say as a practical matter, there really was no way for us to present, uh, both of the applications simultaneously. And so, as a result at the City's suggestion, we split them up and we anticipate being back before you on November 9th with that application. With that said, we, of course, understand how the pavilion is accessed is important to this Board as part of this application, but we have submitted a track impact plan and we'll be providing testimony on this topic to the Board. Um, as the Board also knows, the governing land use document for the application is the healthcare and research pavilion redevelopment plan. Uh, we're fully compliant and you'll hear testimony from our civil engineer, our architect and our traffic engineer establishing that further. Uh, Mr. Aravind did a great job, um, outlining the scope of the Board's review tonight, um, and, um, I think after you hear the testimony of our witnesses, you'll be able to conclude that, in fact, the application does conform with the redevelopment plan. If no one has any questions for me, then, I'd like to just, bring our first witness. Our exhibits have been submitted. We'll be able to refer to those on the screen. Chris Roche from Langan is our civil engineer. He'll be followed by our architect from HOK, Ken Drucker and our traffic engineer from Langan, uh, Dan Disario.

Ms. Ludwig: Great. Thank you. Can you please call Mr. Roche?

Mr. Christian Roche, sworn

Mr. Liebling: Thank you. Um, Chris, uh, can you, uh, first identify your role in the project before - and then, we'll get into your qualifications to testify, uh, with respect to that role?

Mr. Christian Roche (Applicant's Engineer): I served as the civil engineering design lead on the Cancer Pavilion project.

Mr. Liebling: Okay. And your qualifications to serve in that role are?

Mr. Roche: I have a Bachelor of Science degree in civil engineering, a Bachelor of Science degree in business from Lehigh University, as well as a master's degree in Civil Engineering from North Carolina State. Um, professionally licensed in the state of New Jersey as well as several other states. I've been practicing land development engineering for approximately 15 years and I have been qualified as an expert in testimony at numerous boards across the state. (inaudible) I probably also have been qualified in front of this Board 10 to 15 times in recent memory.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may interrupt just momentarily. I'm sorry, Mr. Liebling. Madame Chair, Mr. Roche, have your credentials changed in any way since the last time you were actually qualified before this Board as an expert in the field of engineering?

Mr. Roche: They have not. Just a little bit more experience and a little gray hair.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, he's being proffered as an expert in the field of engineering, uh, I believe his credentials are in order.

Ms. Ludwig: So, accepted. Thank you.

Mr. Liebling: Thank you. Thanks to both of you. Um, Mr. Dominguez, do you have the exhibits?

Mr. Dominguez: Yeah, sorry. I had to unmute myself. Uh, yes. Is there anything in particular that you want me to pull up?

Mr. Liebling: The first two, A1 and A2 are, um, are the ones that Mr. Roche will be testifying to. Just give me one second to share my screen. All right. Chris, could you, this is Exhibit A1, dated today. Could you identify what it is before you, um, testify to it?

Mr. Roche: Sure. It's a site aerial photograph. The projects that we're here to talk about tonight is identified as Block 51, Lot 2.01 on the City of New Brunswick tax map. It's approximately 1.67 acres and it's bound by Hardenberg Street to the east, Somerset Street to the south, Division Street to the west and primarily residential uses to the north. Besides currently occupied by the Lincoln Annex School and vehicular access to the property is provided off of Hardenberg Street and Division Street, the property is entirely within the healthcare Research Pavilion redevelopment plan and as noted by Mr. Liebling, our application is fully conforming with that redevelopment plan here tonight. And Mr. Dominguez, if you could transition over to Exhibit A2. Exhibit A2 is just a rendered site plan or it's also a colored version of the site plan that was submitted with our initial site plan application document. So, what the applicant is proposing to construct on the property is an 11-story Cancer Pavilion which will include outpatient care, inpatient care and research facilities. The building will have a (inaudible) footprint of approximately 69,700 square feet and will provide a total of approximately 519,500 gross square feet. The new cancer pavilion will be connected back to the existing hospital and the existing RCINJ building via two pedestrian bridges over Somerset Street and we'll also be providing a third pedestrian bridge, which will connect the pavilion back to the parking garage, which is proposed as part of a separate application. With regards to the pedestrian bridges over Somerset Street, we anticipate that the western pedestrian bridge or the bridge on the left portion of this page will be primarily utilized by hospital staff or administrative purposes. The eastern bridge or the bridge shown on the right side of the page over Somerset Street, which will connect back to the existing hospital and into the existing RCINJ building will be utilized not only by hospital staff, it can be utilized by patients, their families and members of the general public. I will also note that all three pedestrian bridges will have a minimum clearance of 15 feet, um, and this meets the requirements of the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials, or ASHTO, which requires minimal vertical clearance of pedestrian bridges in urban areas of 15 feet, but we are meeting that requirement. Further redevelopment plan requirements relative to parking, the plan requires 1.2 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of building area. Based on that criteria and our total building area of 519,500, this application is required to provide 624 parking stalls. The applicant is proposing to provide these stalls in the garage to the north of this project, which again is proposed as part of a separate application. The redevelopment plan also requires bicycle parking at a rate of 0.1 bike parking stalls per 1,000 square feet. Using that same building area used to calculate the parking demand, we do require to provide 52 bicycle parking stalls. Um, we're proposing to provide 10 of those bicycle parking stalls at the northeast corner of the building, exterior adjacent to Hardenberg Street and the remaining 42 bike parking stalls would be provided in the aforementioned garage on the ground floor level. From a site circulation perspective, we are proposing a one-way drive between Division Street and Hardenberg Street. This drive is to serve two

purposes; the first purpose is that it will be the primary drop off area for the new cancer pavilion and the second purpose is that it'll provide access to the proposed garage as part of the separate application. From a drop off perspective, we felt that it was very important to make sure we were handling all of our drop off operations onsite and not having any spillover at the adjacent roadways. So, this drop off area has been designed to accommodate 12 cars in a single drop off lane with the potential to accommodate 10 additional cars in the overflow drop off lane for a total of 22 car accommodation. We're also proposing a secondary drop off, which we anticipate will be utilized by Uber or Rideshare type vehicles or (inaudible) people coming to the cancer center for the first time. The secondary drop off area is located off of Somerset Street. There will be a one-way drop off area with a width of approximately 22 feet and the ability to stage approximately 8 to 10 cars in that area. Lastly, we're closing an ambulette drop off area off of Hardenberg Street and the purpose of this area will be utilized very infrequently. We anticipate the ambulette type vehicles dropping off patients will frequent this area three to maybe five times per day, but we felt it was important to remove the ambulette traffic from a typical passenger vehicle traffic at the other drop off. So, that drop off area, again is proposed at the northeast corner of the building along the west side of Hardenberg Street. From a loading and unloading perspective, the applicant is proposing to handle all of the loading operations at the lowest level of the proposed parking garage to the north. I'll note that the redevelopment plan requires four loading bays, where we're proposing five loading bays meeting the requirements. The loading area will be accessible off of Division Street and it's been designed to accommodate truck sizes up to WB67-size trucks or tractor trailers. However, I'll note the vast majority of truck utilizing this loading area will be significantly smaller trucks. We anticipate these to be FedEx trucks, garbage trucks, box trucks, and we're thinking of the typical volume we'll see on a daily basis for this loading area, is approximately 10 to 12 trucks out of those and we anticipate 10 being the smaller vehicle size and potentially one to two larger trucks utilizing this loading area. I'll just clarify that this below grade loading area is connected below grade to the cancer pavilion so you can easily go back and forth between the loading area and the new pavilion. From a streetscape perspective, we're proposing significant enhancements to the surrounding sidewalks along Hardenberg, Somerset and Division Street. Um, this would be all new light fixtures, LED light fixtures (inaudible) 14 foot high black pole fixtures, which have been located and designed to meet city lighting level requirements on the sidewalks. We'll be proposing street trees on the entire perimeter, which will include red maples and a mix of ginkgo biloba trees mixed in on site, as well as providing all new concrete sidewalk and paver areas around the perimeter. I'll note that a small plaza area is also proposed at the southeast corner of the building near the Somerset/Hardenberg intersection and we anticipate that this plaza could be used for outdoor seating, um, or small gathering at that location. Also, in that vicinity, we will be proposing significant upgrades to the pedestrian crossings located at the Somerset/Hardenberg intersection. This will include replacement of non-conforming ADA ramps as well as the installation of additional signal head or two to ensure that motorists using this area are able to see the existing traffic signals or new traffic signals once the pedestrian bridge is installed within that area. Um, from a stormwater management perspective, this application is actually going to reduce stormwater runoff leaving the site because we are reducing the amount of the pervious coverage on site compared to existing conditions. As a result of that, we're not required to provide water quality or water quantity treatment on the site. However, we are installing completely new stormwater conveyance systems, which will convey stormwater runoff from the northern drop off area, as well as from the new cancer pavilion through the existing (inaudible) system within Somerset Street, which is an existing 24-inch diameter pipe. Utility service for the new building will be primarily fed off of Somerset Street. We'll be providing new sanitary sewer, laterals, new water lines, as well as a new gas line from the Somerset Street systems. Electric service right now is anticipated to be provided via new central utility plant which is proposed at the lowest level of the parking garage. Of course, we will talk about this in much more detail at the future parking garage hearing. So, I'll wrap up my (inaudible) overview by just stating we did receive some comments from the City Engineer and the city engineer and consultant, and the city planning consultant and we have no problem complying with those comments.

Mr. Liebling: Does, uh, Madame Chair, certainly Mr. Roche is available for questions from the Board and from the public.

Ms. Ludwig: Uh, do any of the Board members have any questions?

Bob Cartica (Board Member): This is Bob Cartica. I have a question for Mr. Liebling. Uh, you tried to explain this, I'm not sure if I got it. Why, uh, is the cancer pavilion and the associated parking deck and utilities and other associated, uh, structures and function being submitted under a separate application and just as a correlate to that question, um, why are you requesting both, uh, preliminary and final approval for this site plan?

Ms. Ludwig: Can - I just want to step in for a second. When we're going through these witnesses, the questioning period after is specific to the testimony that the witness just gave, so those questions that you're asking, Bob, you can ask at the end of the, um, the end of the presentation.

Mr. Cartica: That's fine.

Ms. Ludwig: This is just relevant to Mr. Roche's testimony.

Mr. Cartica: That's fine.

Ms. Ludwig: I just don't want to go down what path and have everything start steering off. So, does anybody have - does anybody from the Board have questions that are relevant to the testimony just given? Does anybody from the - any of our professionals have any questions? Hearing none, uh, Dan, do you want to take a list if there's any public that has questions?

Mr. Dominguez: Certainly. All right. So, just bear with me because this might take a while. Um, we have a lot of callers, too.

Ms. Ludwig: All right. Uh, Aravind, would it be reasonable to go with the same language of the public comments, uh, for this section?

Mr. Aithal: This is strictly for cross examination purposes, so as you're reading the, uh, you're cueing up the people for questions, uh, as the chairwoman had indicated earlier, this is strictly for cross-examining Mr. Roche, the engineer. The members of the public who wish to ask any questions on cross-examination of, uh, regarding the testimony of this engineer related to this application?

Mr. Dominguez: All right. Thank you. Um, all right. So, just give me a - I'm going to have to unmute, uh, oh, I'm going to unmute all the public callers, at which point uh, I'm going to ask - go letter by letter to see who would like to have questions for Mr. Roche. So, just bear with me.

Mr. Aithal: Dan, if I may? Through the chair, if I can just if that - if you're - prior to unmuting, if you can advise members of the public if they have televisions or radios or barking dogs, maybe they can, uh, they can remove those things from the room so that we don't start to get massive amounts of feedback.

Mr. Dominguez: Yes, that would be appreciated. All right.

Mr. Liebling: Madame Chair, before this starts, if I could just inquire whether there are any of the individuals who wish to speak are an attorney or represented by an attorney? Or are these all members of the public?

Mr. Dominguez: One thing I would say, uh, Mr. Liebling is that there are several folks on the call who are strictly on the phone. And so, they would not be able to answer without me unmuting them.

Mr. Aithal: And Mr. Liebling, to the best of my knowledge, the Board, uh, I'm sorry, the Board Secretary did not receive any correspondence from any individuals purporting to be an attorney, that they're

representing the individuals, nor, um, in the beginning of the, uh obviously, you were here, for the beginning of the – the meeting itself, no one identified themselves as being here representing as an attorney representing - any party.

Mr. Dominguez: Yes. I did not receive anything to that effect, as well.

Mr. Liebling: Okay. All right.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. So, let us proceed. All right. So, everyone who is on the call, who is on a phone number, has been unmuted. Everyone else is on a computer and has the mechanism to be able unmute themselves. Uh, so, at this time, we are opening for anyone who would like to cross-examine or ask questions directly of Mr. Roche and his engineering (inaudible) letter by letter. So, anyone with the last name with the letter - would like to cross-examine, Mr. Roche.

Mr. Dominguez reads through the alphabet. John Luc Borjay, Elizabeth Ciccone, Nishad Datta, Melanie Doren, Rachel Forante, Viriyah Hodges, Juan Gonzalez, Ming Jia, _____ Juarez, Ed Knittel, Charlie Kratoivil, Jessica Kratoivil, Brian Kulas, Laura Merz, Christo Makropoulos, Kate McGaffney, Matthew Meoni, Danielle Moore, Michael Pedersen, Arly Rubens, Amber Saravia, Jennie Shih, Linda Stork, and Herb Tarbous are placed on the list of speakers.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may. This is Aravind Aithal, the Board Attorney. Based on the number of witnesses we have, if I may, through the chair, advise the members of the public, that they are cross-examining, that is asking questions of this engineer based on his testimony that is provided. So, it would be limited on his testimony as an engineer. Um, and I can't imagine that the 20-something people here all have unique questions, but if they don't, if they could be respectful and not ask the same question that was just answered in different words, uh, so that there would be no repetition and we can get through everyone and everyone will have an opportunity to cross-examine.

Ms. Ludwig: Yes, agreed. Hopefully, everybody can respect that.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. Wonderful. So, the first up, uh, in alphabetical order is Ms. Ciccone, Elizabeth Ciccone. So, let me, uh, find her on the list and we will unmute Ms. Ciccone. Ms. Ciccone, are you there?

Ms. Elizabeth Ciccone: I am here, but I believe there's a gentleman with the letter B ahead of me.

Mr. Aithal: Mr. Borjay.

Mr. Dominguez: Oh, I had him down as Porjay, I am so sorry. I will go find him now. I apologize. There it is. I did have him as Porjay. Mr. Borjay, are you there?

Mr. Jean Luc Borjay: Yes, sir.

Mr. Dominguez: I apologize for skipping over you.

Mr. Borjay: That's quite all right.

Mr. Jean Luc Borjay, sworn

Mr. Dominguez: All right, Mr. Borjay. I am going to start the timer.

Mr. Borjay: And how much time do I have again?

Mr. Dominguez: You get five minutes, I'll warn you at one-minute.

Mr. Borjay: All right. Thank you. Okay. This is something that I've been following for, uh, a great deal of time. Tonight's meeting is the first time I've heard of talk of also developing a parking deck -

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I can just interrupt Mr. Borjay?

Ms. Ludwig: I would like to just interrupt for a second. This is specifically questions that go to the testimony of the engineer, Mr. Roche. This is not for general comment on the application.

Mr. Borjay: Right. Sorry.

Ms. Ludwig: That will come at a later part of the meeting.

Mr. Borjay: Yes. My point is, um, what exactly, um, where exactly will the parking deck and this power plant go? What are the technical details of this?

Mr. Liebling: Okay. Yes. The plan that was shown by the engineer showed specifically the footprint of the future garage. It is not - it is not the subject of this application.

Mr. Borjay: Thank you. What about the power plant?

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, the basis of the objection would be that it's irrelevant and I believe that it would be, in fact, irrelevant to this application.

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have any other questions for the witness, sir?

Mr. Borjay: No, tech- I would like to know the location of, um, the power plant project if that is relevant to this current discussion. Forgive me of my confusion - if I have (inaudible)

Ms. Ludwig: No, it's not relevant to the application before us tonight. Do you have any other questions for the witness?

Mr. Borjay: That would be relevant? I do not think so. Uh, I would like to apologize.

Ms. Ludwig: No, that's quite all right. And there's opportunity later in the hearing for general comments on the application, as well. This is just specifically to witnesses at this point.

Mr. Borjay: Yes. I'm sorry. I guess I misunderstood the - points of the cross-examination for this. I thought my comments would be relevant here. All right. Thank you. I will speak again later at the end of the meeting.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you, Mr. Borjay. Okay. Next up is, uh, Ms. - it's Ciccone, so let me go find her again. So, there you go. Ms. Ciccone, are you there?

Ms. Elizabeth Ciccone, sworn

Ms. Elizabeth Ciccone: Um, I would just like to ask about, uh, the environmental impact statement of this, uh, site if the - I would like the engineer or their representative to speak about the various levels of environmental impact that are caused by the ground coverage.

Mr. Roche: Sure, I'll answer that two ways and, Section 106 issues you're referring to?

Ms. Ciccone: Well, I mean, a Section 106 is required when public funds are being used for this sort of development. Uh, do you have grant funds for this project?

Mr. Roche: I think that would be a better answer by the attorney. I don't know the financial backing of the project.

Ms. Ciccone: Well, normally, part of environmental impact statement includes the Section 106 review. Are you familiar?

Mr. Roche: No, I'm not familiar with that. I don't believe we included a Section 106 review as part of this environmental impact statement, and I don't think it's something we've included in numerous previous environmental impact statements (inaudible) to the project applications in the city.

Ms. Ciccone: So, I would suggest that that environmental statement is incomplete. Do you have any experts on your staff that deal with this sort of property?

Mr. Roche: I'm still a little confused why you consider the application incomplete by that. When you say historic properties, I mean, we can go down - we're talking SHPO, registration of historic properties, are we talking about former uses on the site?

Ms. Ciccone: Have you received clearance from the State Historic Preservation Office for your plans? Especially because they're grant funded. You should have a Section 106 review that passes through the state of Historical Preservation Office, which is an arm of the environmental protection office. Have you done that?

Mr. Roche: No, we have the threatened and endangered species letter including the appendix of the environmental impact statement. We have not done anything with this Section 106 review.

Ms. Ciccone: Well, that certainly sounds like your paperwork is incomplete to me because normally when grant funds are used, especially federal funds (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is an opportunity to ask questions of the witness not to make statements.

Mr. Liebling: Ms. Ciccone, this is Charles Liebling, the attorney. There is no historic property on this site. It's not subject to Section 106 review. Nonetheless our approval will, if granted, be conditioned on us require obtaining all necessary approvals from all governmental bodies and if it turns out that Section 106 review is required, as unlikely as that might be, we'll be required to obtain it.

Ms. Ciccone: But you don't even have anyone on your engineering staff that's capable of doing so. He didn't even know what it was.

Mr. Liebling: He's a civil engineer. I can tell you that as representative of the applicant, we haven't identified anything on this site that would render it historic. It's a 60 year-old school building.

Ms. Ciccone: Well, (inaudible) determine what's historical? Why would I trust your assessment of what's historical and it sounds like you haven't even checked. So, if you haven't checked, it's plausible that there is a historical, uh, distinction there that you just have (inaudible). That's the whole point of the 106 review in the first place is to make sure that you're not impacting anything that -

Ms. Ludwig: Mr. Aithal, is this relevant to Mr. Roche's testimony?

Mr. Aithal: It appears he's already answered the question. Mr. Liebling has provided further clarification and if we could perhaps have Ms. Ciccone limit her testimony to the public comment portion and perhaps just focus on asking cross-examination questions of the engineer.

Ms. Ciccone: Well, (inaudible) engineer (inaudible) protection statute (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: If there are no other questions, Ms. Ciccone -

Ms. Ciccone: Well, I'd like to know why you're not answering the questions I have.

Ms. Ludwig: I believe they did answer your questions. Do you have any other questions?

Ms. Ciccone: I don't think they did. No, no. No, not at this time. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: I believe it's a Mr. Datta.

Mr. Nishad Datta, sworn

Mr. Nishad Datta: Yeah. My question for Mr. Roche is, um, has he visited the site personally himself and would he be willing to live next to what he's going - what he proposes to build?

Mr. Liebling: Mr. Roche, can answer the first question? The second one is completely irrelevant.

Mr. Roche: Yes, I have visited the site several times.

Mr. Datta: I mean, I do, but I'm assuming they're going to be deemed irrelevant anyway, so I'll just wait until public comment.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Datta. Uh, next up is, uh, Doren. I believe Ms. Doren.

Ms. Melanie Doren, sworn

Ms. Melanie Doren: Um, okay. Thank you. I know previously there's been a question regarding runoff and, uh, hopefully I'm not repeating it. But, uh, I'm just wondering considering, um, I believe I did see in the - when I was watching the presentation, the presence of a parking garage. I know that you guys said that there would be, um, that you would introduce like smaller patches of grasses, but with the influx of the use of cars that are using fossil fuels considering not all cars are electric quite yet, what would you say about the fossil fuel run offs that will come as a result of this in terms of the environmental factors, if you can give that perspective on it, please.

Mr. Roche: Sure. So, on the regulatory perspective, we would not be required to provide water quality type treatment, which is I believe what you're talking about. It's typically utilized to treat individual parking areas or areas that are exposed to potential vehicles driving over them, but I will note though is that we are going to be installing a completely new stormwater conveyance system and convey runoff to that area and I certainly don't have any objection to looking at the potential installation of water quality measures, where they see it's reasonable. So, for example, if we have a (inaudible) traffic, if we're able to put a water quality device in there for sustainability purposes, we'd have no objection to that.

Ms. Doren: Um, okay. Thank you. Also, I just have another question about just like the materials in terms that are being used. I'm sorry. I did join a bit late. I am a student. Um, but the materials being used for the building themselves, what's being focused on being used for the building?

Mr. Roche: There will be an architect who will describe that much more eloquently than I can in about 20 minutes or once we wrap up the questions.

Ms. Doren: All right. Then, in which case, um, I will allow the panel to absorb the rest of the time.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Um, next up is Forante. I know I'm butchering the name and I apologize. Apparently, uh, I don't actually have to swear in for cross-examination. I apologize for, uh, that. Um, your five minutes begin now.

Ms. Rachel Forante: Okay. Um, so, I guess, um, I don't want to - I don't want to give any testimony, but I do understand, um, this, uh, this pitch and I also, um, and am personally empathetic towards the previous historical argument. However, I really want to focus on the fact that this is in - in some ways public land and I do have a question -

Mr. Liebling: That's not a question.

Ms. Forante: - I do - so my question is this, sorry. I got a little confused, but my question is this, um, to, uh, Mr. Roche, what is the, um, complications with the fact that it is school zoning, and it was a school zone? Is Rutgers taking advantage of the fact that it is an educational institution to use the Lincoln Annex space? Is that kind of what's happening, or do you have a better explanation for that?

Mr. Roche: (inaudible) design of this building. We're in this process. The zoning went under (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Mr. Liebling, I'm sorry to interrupt. Mr. Roche?

Ms. Forante: Well, so the zoning happened prior?

Mr. Liebling: Let me handle that question. It's not a civil engineering question. Um, Ms. Forante, this - this - the city - the city adopted a redevelopment plan, which includes zoning for this site, um - last April and that is how the zoning was established. The same way zoning is established for any parcel in the city.

Ms. Forante: Okay. So, that was - that was my question because, um, I think a lot of - a lot of the questions may come from the idea that - that, um, this is not properly zoned and, uh, the zoning question occurred, uh, years ago. And my - my other question, um, was about title, intent and purpose and I actually do think it was answered because, um, he answered it prior. So, thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you. Um, so next, uh, we have, uh, I believe Ms. Hodges?

Mr. Viriyah Hodges: Ms.? Actually, my pronoun is he/him, so, it's Mr.

Mr. Dominguez: I apologize. I was trying to remember off the top of my head. I apologize. Your five minutes begin now.

Mr. Hodges: All right. Something is going to tell me that you're going to say it's irrelevant, but the about the construction and the construction site, the site is right next to a hospital and a church, both of which (inaudible) people are going about very delicate tasks that require (inaudible) testi- oh, wait. You forgot to swear me in. I just realized that.

Mr. Dominguez: No, I realized that I don't have to swear in for, uh, cross-examination. So, uh, just proceed.

Mr. Hodges: Okay. Continuing on. I know from personal experience, um, out on that street that people have - that there's an expectation for not a lot of noise to be made for patients recovering in the hospital. So, I must ask, how exactly are you going to prevent, uh, noise that would disrupt patient recovery while you're doing active construction work on the facility?

Mr. Roche: Uh, first answer to that is just all construction operations would be performed during normal hours, which are allowable by the current city ordinances. Um, it's not our intention at this point to do

any type of night work or weekend work. If for some reason we needed to or requested to do that, we would have to go through city council, apply for whatever work we're seeking, whether it's at night or on the weekends. We wouldn't be able to perform work during those time periods without getting those approvals down the line.

Mr. Hodges: So, long story short, uh, you're not taking - you're basically saying that you're not - you're not taking it into consideration.

Mr. Roche: I'm sorry. I didn't hear the comment.

Mr. Hodges: Basically, the long story short is, um, basically, it is not - none of your concern? Basically - basically, the noise pollution generated would affect us, but it's none of your concern.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may? This is not a public comment portion. I'm sure that Mr. Hodges has public comments that he'd like to make (inaudible) as well as other individuals. This is cross-examination of the civil engineer based on the testimony that he's provided.

Mr. Hodges: How do I say this comment? Well, there you go. I - something tells me that anything else I bring up will probably be deemed irrelevant, so in that case, how about you move on to Mr. Gonzalez.

Mr. Dominguez: Yes. Thank you. Apparently, I don't know the order of my letters. So, H goes after G, not before. So, Mr. Gonzalez, your five minutes begin -

Mr. Juan Gonzalez: Okay. Thank you. I have a couple of questions for Mr. Roche. Um, first of all, Mr. Roche, in looking at the documents for - that was submitted on the website. It seems to me, correct me if I'm wrong, that in the building of the cancer pavilion, there is historic fill underneath Lincoln Annex that the Catholic Church - that is contaminated that the Catholic Church covered over with a impermeable, uh, concrete cap. My understanding of the documents is that Robert Wood Johnson intends to dig up all of the historic fill and take it out of the site. If that's so, why was that decision made to remove all the historic fill from underneath the current Lincoln Annex site?

Mr. Roche: Your statements are correct, Mr. Gonzalez. There is historic fill present on site. The reason that we are proposing to remove and properly dispose of all the historic fill according to the state regulations is because we are going to be constructing, uh, 17-foot, uh, basement area and we'll be excavating 17-feet below grade and by doing that, we'll be needing to remove all of that historic fill from the property to accommodate the basement blueprint.

Mr. Gonzalez: Uh, okay. Thank you for the answer to that. I have a second question. I'm sure, uh, because as the planning board attorney mentioned, you have been, uh, certified previously for - as an expert in civil engineering. So, I assume that you have built a lot of buildings or have been involved in the construction of a lot of buildings and come before public authorities in the past. Is that correct or not?

Mr. Roche: I've been involved in - yes, I have several, uh, construction projects in the past. I would not say I've done a - many public projects. You said public authorities, that's not projects I typically get involved with, but yes, I've been involved in numerous construction projects previously.

Mr. Gonzalez: Okay. Have you ever come before a public authority like this or an agency and - and sought approval to build a building that does not include the plans for its power supply, uh, that does not include the plans for how trucks will come in and out of the cancer facility and it does include plans for how the 600 new jobs, employees, and the patients will be parking to go to the authority. Have you ever built a building like that? If you can just give me the name of the building and the date, uh, roughly? It doesn't have to be the exact date, but like two years ago, five years ago? Can you tell me, have you ever done plans like that where you can have them approved without these critical components of a project included?

Mr. Roche: It's a little unique, but yes, we have, you know, the example I'll use most recently was the, uh, Somerset medical office building, uh, which was approved by the City of New Brunswick, maybe four or five months ago. At that point in time, we were required to have certain parking demand and what they agreed to, condition of approval, was that prior to issuing that building at TCO, the parking supply had to be - remain available, uh, adjacent to the project site. There's been other projects that we've worked on where the electrical service conditions were still being coordinated at the time the site plan approval. And the way they typically handle these are they're listed as conditions of approval, um, on the resolution. So, meaning if you're unable to meet the conditions of approval. For example, if we testify tonight that we're going to have 600 (inaudible) parking stalls in that garage (inaudible) or that our electrical service is going to be coming from the central utility plant in the building and then, we're unable to do that, we're unable to construct the cancer pavilion if we're able to meet those conditions (inaudible) but we would have to come back if those plans change to the Board for modified site planning approval, describe what those changes are and how the new modified design that would accommodate those.

Mr. Gonzalez: All right. But in this case, you're talking about a 5 to 7 megawatt power plant that is not only going to power the hos- the new facility, but it's going to power the entire campus of Robert Wood Johnson and you're saying that - that it's appropriate to approve the cancer pavilion without first getting a sense of it's power source and how that fits into the general community? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Roche: I think another way I could word it, I would say is that the construction of the cancer pavilion should not begin until those issues are vetted and that the garage would have the final site plan approval in place.

Mr. Gonzalez: Okay. But I'm asking about the power plant.

Mr. Roche: Right. When I was saying garage, I was including power plant in the garage.

Mr. Gonzalez: The power plant belongs to the hospital. The garage I can see being separate, but I'm asking about the power plant and the loading docks for the for the new pavilion. Why is it necessary to separate them?

Mr. Liebling: Mr. Gonzalez, they're - they're part of - they're part of the same application. The g- the garage, the power plant and the loading dock are all part of the same application that would be back before the Board. They're in a - they're in a single building and it will be -

Mr. Gonzalez: Okay, Mr. Liebling. Yes. I understand that you have constructed separate financial arrangements for different pro- parts of this project, but the building - you cannot operate a cancer pavilion without its power. You cannot operate it without its loading docks. What is the reason for having separated them - put them into separate proposals?

Mr. Liebling: Uh, as I said at the beginning, we can't get through all of this simultaneously. We can't have split screens with dealing with one and dealing with the other. So, that is the reason we agreed to make it a condition of this approval because that's the closest you can get to approximating that. We can't - we can't move forward with both on the exact - at the exact same time. One is following - in two weeks. So, it's a condition.

Mr. Gonzalez: But how is the public supposed to access the environmental impact of a whole project when you've split the project in two?

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may? If the witness has - I'm sorry. If the, uh, if the -

Mr. Gonzalez: That's fine, Mr. Lawyer. I've made my points.

Mr. Dominguez: (inaudible) unmute myself. Okay. So, after Mr. Gonzalez, we have, uh, I believe Ming Ja, Ming Ji, Ming Ja?

Mr. Ming Jia: Yeah, Ming Jia. Um, my question got answered. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Thank you. All right. Uh, I believe, then, next up is Ms. Suarez? Let me see if that was on the phone, Sua- no, not Suarez. Juerez. I apologize. There it is. Unmute. Okay. Ms. Juerez?

Ms. Juerez: Okay. Yes. I was just wanting to find out if the, uh, if the architect, I think you said, if he knows the school that is currently there or the 11-story hospital that they're planning to build there would lead to more traffic? Which one would lead to more traffic?

Mr. Roche: We have a separate traffic professional, um, it's going to be the architect who gives his presentation next, and then, our traffic engineer will provide an overview of traffic and be happy to answer any traffic related questions.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Thank you. Next up is Mr. Charlie Kratovil. Are you here, Mr. Kratovil?

Mr. Ed Knittel: I think you skipped me. I'm really sorry to do this, but I think you skipped me.

Mr. Dominguez: What's your name?

Mr. Knittel: Knittel, K-n-i-t-t-e-l.

Mr. Dominguez: Yeah, it was one of those weird letter things where I forgot what letters were in - you were here, I just had you in the wrong -

Mr. Dominguez: Sorry, Mr. Kratovil. Mr. Knittel can - can, uh, proceed. I apologize. Mr. Knittel?

Mr. Knittel: Um, yeah. I just had a few questions I guess as far as, um, (inaudible) parking lot itself. Is that - is it strictly for the - the people who are going to be working at the new cancer institute or Robert Wood Johnson employees in general or do members of the public have access to that - to that, as well?

Mr. Liebling: Mr. Knittel, when we're before the Board with the parking garage application, which includes the power plant and the loading dock we will have that information - we'll have it before the hearing and we'll be able to respond to all that. It's not - the parking is not part of this application.

Mr. Knittel: Oh, okay. I misunderstood because I thought the - the lot and the power plant and the loading dock are all the same one so it's not the specifics of the parking lot aren't a part of this? Just to confirm, like it - or is it like - is it the dimensions of it or just like not like the specific use of it is a part of it?

Mr. Liebling: All aspects of it will be - will be presented and testified to the same way that is happening right now with the pavilion.

Mr. Knittel: Okay. So, I'm really sorry, I just wanted - then, it's just a loading dock and the power plant for this, then? The use of those then?

Mr. Liebling: No, again, those - none of those are part of this application. They are on a separate block and lot. This is for the pavilion exclusively and the pavilion - an approval is given, it will be conditioned on an approval also being given for the loading dock, the power plant and the parking deck.

Mr. Knittel: Okay. So, if it's passed, then those all will be in the pavilion, but this is just for the pavilion itself?

Mr. Liebling: If it's passed, the condition will be that the pavilion cannot be constructed and opened unless there is an approval granted also for the parking, the loading dock and the power plant. So, the public will have the identical opportunity they're having tonight to question - to hear about and question the experts with respect to those components.

Mr. Knittel: Okay. So, this is essentially - so, we're talking about like the building before the building, then of it, then.

Mr. Liebling: Yeah. Right, we're talking about the tall building now that we'll have the research and the patients.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you, Mr. Knittel. All right. Now, it's Mr. Charlie Kratovil's turn. Are you there?

Mr. Kratovil: Yes, I am. Thank you. Uh, just a few questions. I wanted to hear from Mr. Liebling. Why can't both, uh, projects proceed simultaneously? You said that, you know, we can't have split screens, but of course projects all the time get approved with a parking deck and, uh, uh, a building as one. Why - why is that not possible this time?

Mr. Liebling: It's a separate application; it's a separate applicant.

Mr. Kratovil: Right, and that's your - you made that choice. I'm asking why?

Mr. Liebling: Just for ownership and structuring reason. It has nothing to do with land use reasons, it's not - it's not - if what you're implying is that it's - it's to avoid having - having the - the garage vetted, which is what I'm guessing you're implying, I'm telling you, that's why we agreed and the first words out of my mouth, it's conditioned. That's the only other - that's the - that's the identical situation.

Mr. Kratovil: Yeah. No, I just was asking because I'm curious what the reason is. I mean, you know, I've heard - I've heard a lot of things about the parking deck. Um, you know, I've heard that the parking authority was going to do it. Uh, are they still -

Ms. Ludwig: Mr. Kratovil, if I may for a second. Do you have any questions for Mr. Roche regarding the engineering? That's what this is - that's what this portion is for?

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. Well, I do, uh, want to ask him if he can give any insight as to the, uh, capacity of the garage. He did mention the garage. He mentioned that there's a requirement for 675 spaces. Is the, you know, is the application going to be for 675 or is it going to be for much more? Can he give us any insight into that?

Mr. Liebling: I don't think we're testifying as to the garage. He can tell and he did tell you that the garage will come with the required parking for this building.

Mr. Kratovil: So, at least 675?

Mr. Liebling: I don't have the number. I'll let Mr. Roche answer the - the exact number.

Mr. Aithal: Actually, Madame Chair, this is Aravind Aithal the Board Attorney. It's, um, you can advise Mr. Kratovil that this would be cross-examination of the testimony that he's provided, which is for the application for the cancer center pavilion. The - specifically, the civil engineering testimony that was provided by Mr. Roche.

Mr. Kratovil: Sure, and did that testimony clear statements about the garage?

Mr. Roche: Charlie, the number that you're asking for that I did state is that a minimum of the garage will provide 624 parking stalls. That is what was required for the redevelopment plan parking (inaudible)

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. And is the parking authority involved in the project?

Mr. Liebling: It's not relevant to this application.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, that would be irrelevant to the application.

Ms. Ludwig: Any more questions, Charlie - Mr. Kratovil?

Mr. Kratovil: Yeah, um, so, if you're not able to answer that one, I only have, uh, questions about the turning movement counts. I know Langan did those. I know there's another witness from Langan. Can Mr. Roche tell me anything about the turning movement counts on April of 2019, was he involved in that part of it or should I ask the other witness?

Mr. Roche: I can tell you right now, the counts were performed in April of 2019.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. And they were done by who? By Langan?

Mr. Roche: We have a subcontractor who performs the counts for us, but they were arranged by Langan, yes.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. And are those the - the first counts that were made, this - or is there (inaudible)

Mr. Roche: Correct. We had only done one set of counts and we took an original approach as we were just studying the entire vicinity. We counted 8 intersections and the reason we did it in April of 2019 is when you're doing traffic counts in New Brunswick, um, oftentimes you need to do them before the spring semester ends or before the fall semester ends because if you do them on winter break or spring break or summer session, the traffic volumes tend to go way down. So, that's what motivated us to hit that date, that was in '19.

Mr. Kratovil: Sure, and indeed a lot of things have changed since then. Um, you know, not just the, uh, uh, the closures and the pandemic, but also some new developments have been built. So, you know, if, uh, the reports that Langan issued, the - I guess the traffic impact, uh, report, and the traffic statement, do those account for the new 9 story building called The Verve. Maybe you were a witness for them. Uh, the, uh, yeah, the 88 Easton Avenue project. Is that accounted for in the - in the Langan, uh, paperwork?

Mr. Roche: So, we had - yes, we were the engineers on that, The Verve project. Um, we do do a buildout analysis on comparing whether to (inaudible) building rebuilt and then we call a no-build scenario just for normal growth in the area, but I will let our traffic engineer, Mr. Disario, more eloquently describe that than I am right now.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. And, um, I guess - well, bear with me, I did want to just make sure - yeah. On the environmental impact statement, I was intrigued by some of the, uh, some of the, uh, uh, testimony that was invoked on that. Um, I understand the reason that, uh, historic fill is going to be removed, do you have any estimate of, you know, how many truck loads that's going to be and how that's going to impact traffic?

Mr. Roche: Uh, I don't have an estimate on the amount of truckloads that that will be. It will likely be removed over the course of two to three weeks, but no, we do not do traffic projections on the trucks leaving the site during construction.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. And then, finally, I know it's the other application, but in the same way as you were able to give me a little bit more on the parking garage. Can you tell me, uh, the sort of capacity or the size of the power plant that's proposed? I've seen, you know, again, I've heard a lot of things. I've seen slides that say 5 megawatts, 7.5 megawatts in an emergency. Do you have any gauges on how many megawatts? How big of a power plant is proposed or will be?

Mr. Roche: I don't at this time, Charlie. I do understand the public concern over the power plant. We're fully willing to answer those questions at the garage hearing.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. Well, that's all I have for questions. I'm going to have a lot of comments. Thank you, Mr. Roche.

Mr. Dominguez: Next up I believe we have a Ms. Jessica Kratovil, if I remember correctly?

Ms. Jessica Kratovil: Thank you. Um, Mr. Roche, I have a question about - I know it came up a lot in the Board of Education meetings how it was unsafe for the children to be attending the school there because they might get hit by an ambulance. How about the cancer patients getting hit by an ambulance? I was really interested to hear about that.

Mr. Roche: You know, one of the main driving factors that we have with the, uh, proposed pedestrian bridges is to limit the amount of vehicular pedestrian potential conflict points. That's why we're proposing pedestrian bridges from the parking garage where we anticipate most patients will park with their loved ones, they'll have the ability to walk through the pedestrian bridges to the cancer pavilion and if they had to get back to the existing RCINJ Building or the hospital, they would be able to do that walking above grade in the pedestrian bridges, not at the roadway surface. We're also, as I mentioned during initial testimony, looking to do some signal upgrades at the Somerset Street/Hardenberg intersection, which include new ADA ramps, new striping and likely an installation of the new signal heads.

Ms. Kratovil: Okay. Um, I did have another question. Um, I looked through your environmental impact statement and I did a Control F to look for air quality and nothing came up. Anything you have to add - talk about the impact of the cancer research center or the adjoining garage or the power plant in regards to affecting the air quality in the area?

Mr. Roche: So, with the garage, we issue a final submission document. There will be an updated environmental impact statement, which touches on air quality for the power plant associated with the garage application. Um, the only thing I will note on air quality relative to the cancer pavilion project, um, we will be performing full air monitoring, perimeter air monitoring, throughout construction. Um, it's something we do on all our projects, something DEVCO likes to do on all their projects, just to make sure if there's any significant dust or air particles leaving the site, um, we immediately get alerted and we shut down the contractor if we're causing any air quality issues immediately.

Ms. Kratovil: Okay. But there's no proposed, uh, um, air quality standards for the building? I, uh, maybe this is a question for the architect, but, uh, LEED certification. How environmentally friendly is this building that's going to get built going to be or is that something you can answer for us as an engineer?

Mr. Roche: I think the architect is probably best to answer that. I will say I know there's some green roofs going into the building from a stormwater management perspective, um, but our architect will describe that in more detail.

Ms. Kratovil: Okay. But you don't have anything to add on the air quality?

Mr. Roche: Not at this time.

Ms. Kratovil: Okay. Thank you for the time. I appreciate your answers.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you, Ms. Kratovil. Next up, Mr. Kulas.

Mr. Brian Kulas: All right. Thank you very much. Okay. Thanks. My name is Brian Kulas. Um, I have a couple of questions. First off, uh, I would like to address just some, uh, traffic concerns. I understand that's going to be discussed later, but I have some - one question I have is with the timing of the lights. Uh, from Albany Street to Somerset Street, which is basically coming from Route 18 to Somerset Street, you have four traffic lights. A manual -

Mr. Liebling: Mr. Kulas, I can just - I can just tell you, it's best saved for the traffic engineer.

Mr. Kulas: Okay. Sure. Not an issue. All right. Um, is - with the development of this, even considering the construction process, is there going to be any, um, any impact on the train station. Are they going to have to move, uh, certain parts of the train station at all? Anything like that having to be sent, you know, move - any infliction on the train station during the construction process or once the building is built, as far as like the - the structure of the train station at all?

Mr. Roche: No, not as far as this project. There's no impacts or (inaudible) to the train station.

Mr. Kulas: Okay. All right. Um, because one of my concerns is, uh, there's this street called (inaudible) that, um, carries the - that is maintain - that is utilized by the cabs and the (inaudible) and other things right on that wedge where Somerset Street, Easton Avenue is, and then, Wall Street kind of comes up the train station. I'm trying to figure out in this project how it is you're going to manage to keep that intersection flowing when you have power - when you have ambulances followed by paramedics. You have emergency vehicles coming in and out. During the construction process you have, you know, tractor trailers bringing bulldozers and dump trucks. How do you plan to configure the construction of this project with this very narrow intersection?

Mr. Roche: I'm trying to, uh, confirm the intersection you're talking about. Are you talking about all the way down almost by George Street where Wall Street meets (inaudible)

Mr. Kulas: Actually, no. I'm sorry. It's Easton Avenue, Somerset and Wall Street. It's Easton Avenue. So, Easton Avenue and Somerset. And then, there's Wall Street that runs along the train station. How do you plan to keep all this traffic flowing during the construction of the building and when it's raised? Because that's your primary intersection, Easton Avenue and Somerset, how do you plan to make that work?

Mr. Roche: That intersection is significantly further off site from where our construction operations are being taken place. Um, one thing we deal with the contractors during most projects and something we work with the city as we put together construction logistics plans, if there's preferred routes that we'd like to send construction traffic to avoid congested intersections, that's certainly something that we would look at as we're planning those exercises with the city, but I will note that that intersection is two or three blocks away from where this project is being built.

Mr. Kulas: Not that I know of, but okay. We will look into that. Have you consulted at all with the New Jersey Department of Transportation?

Mr. Roche: We have not, no.

Mr. Kulas: Are you required to consult with the New Jersey Department of Transportation?

Mr. Roche: At this point, we are not.

Mr. Kulas: You're not?

Mr. Roche: At this point, we're not required because we're not fronting on any - on state owned roads.

Mr. Kulas: Okay. But isn't Route 27 a state owned road. I mean, to that extent, some portion of the hospital. Uh, Robert Wood Johnson is connected to Route 27, so that is a state highway.

Mr. Roche: It is, um, but the way they delineate whether or not you need to go in front of the NJDOT is whether or not your project site runs on a state highway and our property is not. It fronts on Somerset Street, Hardenberg Street and Division Street.

Mr. Kulas: Okay. My next question includes the heliport. Now, this hospital is going to be 11 stories. Is that correct?

Mr. Roche: Correct.

Mr. Kulas: Is an - can you give any information as far as how high the parking deck will be?

Mr. Roche: Uh, I believe - on the preliminary applications and this is subject to change, uh, I believe there's 9 stories.

Mr. Kulas: Nine stories. Okay. So, you've got 11 stories and 9 stories and how tall is the actual Robert Wood Johnson standing hospital right now?

Mr. Roche: It varies throughout the hospital, but I believe its similar heights to that (inaudible)

Mr. Kulas: What floor is - what floor is - the heliport on? Is it on the roof?

Mr. Roche: It is.

Mr. Kulas: On the highest floor? What floor is that?

Mr. Roche: I believe that's somewhere between 10 and 12 stories and just to be clear for the record, I don't know that for a fact. I am just stating an assumption from working on campus previously, but I will say as I'm getting to your question, all of this building, the garage, the new RCINJ building, all of this gets approved by the FAA. So, if for some reason the FAA came back and had issues, uh, we know there's certain warning measures we have to put on the building to accommodate the helicopter traffic, flashing red lights and a host of other potential measures.

Mr. Kulas: (inaudible) about, you know, having another building, you know, kind of gets in the way of the heliport, it really does. You're almost cutting off a route that the - that the helicopters can take, which are carrying every - which are holding patients in urgent need, immediate need. Sometimes heliports bring organs right away for transplants. Um, what hap - in 2000 - in 1999, we had a major, uh, hurricane. Uh, 2011, there was another hurricane that caused drastic flooding in New Brunswick. What happens when you just have a major storm and now you're cutting off another route for the heliport? How - how - is this - can this really be a serious matter for the helicopters coming in? And have you consu- and has the FAA reached out to you and have you reached out to the FAA? Has there been any communication with the FAA?

Mr. Roche: Yes. We have an application pending with the FAA right now.

Mr. Kulas: Pending? When did you file it?

Mr. Roche: Um, approximately two or three weeks ago.

Mr. Kulas: Two or three weeks ago? You have this plan for the hospital and you only contacted the FAA two or three weeks ago.

Mr. Roche: Yes, that's typically when we contact FAA is when we (inaudible) up the design.

Mr. Kulas: How long do you think you might be before you hear back from them?

Mr. Roche: Typically, the review time is 45 days.

Mr. Kulas: 45 days. Okay. Are we going to get that complete report that you get from the FAA regarding that application that will be made public?

Mr. Roche: That's a question for the attorney. I have no objection to it.

Mr. Liebling: Yeah. I mean, it's a - it's a public document. An approval issued by the FAA is a public document. If the city asks -

Mr. Kulas: Will it be posted on the city website?

Mr. Liebling: That's a question for the city.

Mr. Kulas: If the - once the report comes back, will there be a separate meeting for the public to address the heliport issue, if anyone has a discrepancy with the report, has questions, anything of that nature?

Mr. Liebling: That's - that's not a requirement of this Board's approval. The Board will - I'm assuming, will approve this, subject to all additional required permits and approvals and to the extent that's one of them, we'll have to obtain it.

Mr. Kulas: Okay. Has there been any public steering committee put together about this project and, you know, bringing in people from the public, not related to the city, not working for the city, any type of public steering committee?

Mr. Liebling: I can answer. This is not - this is not something Mr. Roche either testified to or does necessarily know.

Mr. Kulas: Correct.

Mr. Liebling: I don't know.

Mr. Kulas: Um, all right. Just one last question, I guess this is okay to ask as far as the redevelopment plan. Have you consulted any of the other, uh, municipal governments, mayors at all, about this project and the impact it might have on traffic on their neighborhoods?

Mr. Liebling: That would be something that the traffic engineer should answer or is that something you can answer?

Mr. Roche: I'll let our traffic engineer answer that. I have not personally been involved in any contact with any adjacent mayors or any adjacent municipalities.

Mr. Kulas: Okay. Thank you. Uh, I think that concludes my time. Thank you very much.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Our next speaker is Ms. Merz.

Ms. Laura Merz: Thank you. All right. Um, so, just to clarify, will - Mr. Roche, will you be here in two weeks' time for questions related to the parking garage?

Mr. Roche: I absolutely will, yep.

Ms. Merz: Okay. All right. Um, then I will skip all my questions related to the parking garage. Uh, uh. All right. So, the cancer pavilion, can that run and be fully operational without the proposed power plants or does it require the proposed power plant in order to be operational?

Mr. Roche: The pavilion can be operational without the central utility plant. There would be a host of significant design revisions. There'd be a host of relocation of mechanical, but from an electrical perspective, (inaudible) could provide service to the - to the pavilion without having the central utility plant.

Ms. Merz: Okay. Uh, have - has your firm required the - or gotten the required, um, DEP environmental justice assessment, uh, that is now by law required in all of New Jersey for any proposed power plants, uh, for communities of color to assess the cumulative impact on (inaudible) has your firm acquired that yet? Has there been DEP assessment on that?

Mr. Liebling: Ms. Merz, this is Charles Liebling. We're well aware - we'll well aware of the new law and we'll be addressing it at the hearing within which the central utility plant is included. There's nothing on the pavilion for that.

Ms. Merz: Okay. And so, the other thing was that there was no air quality assessment as mentioned before by Jessica Kratovil. So, will we get the air quality assessments, um, at the next hearing in two weeks?

Mr. Roche: Uh, yes. We'll provide an updated environmental impact statement. I'm not sure whether it will be a stand-alone environmental impact statement for the parking garage, but there will be some additional air quality data submitted.

Ms. Merz: Okay. All right. That's all I had. Thank you so much.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you. Mr. Roche.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. So, next up is Ms. Danielle Moore. Let me be sure Ms. Moore is not - actually, I - that's yeah, that's out of order. It's Mr. Makropoulos. I apologize, Ms. Moore. Mr. Makropoulos, are you there?

Mr. Christo Makropoulos: Oh, so the expert witness is Mr. Roche, civil engineering?

Mr. Dominguez: That's who you're asking questions to.

Mr. Makropoulos: Yeah, I'm asking. We're speaking to Mr. Roche right now with civil engineering?

Mr. Dominguez: You are.

Mr. Makropoulos: Okay. Uh, Mr. Roche, um, how can you as an expert, you know, in civil engineering, can you promise - have you seen the location at Jersey Avenue?

Mr. Liebling: This application is not about Jersey Avenue.

Mr. Makropoulos: Okay. The pavilion across from Robert Wood Johnson, the Lincoln Annex site?

Mr. Liebling: That's - that's the site we're- that's the site that this application is.

Mr. Makropoulos: Okay. As an expert in civil engineering, how - how can he promise when they remove the cap from the, um, like the one gentleman previously spoke to - the cap at New Brunswick and St. Peters that they used to, um, cement fill what they said was contaminated. When you go and remove that - that whole thing, as was said earlier, um, how - how can you promise that, uh, later on the contamination is going to be completely gone. Can you promise that?

Mr. Roche: Yeah, and the reason we can, um, we're referring to a contamination of historic fill on our property is because that contamination is related to soil and all that soil is going to be taken up and removed and disposed of offsite.

Mr. Makropoulos: What's it - what's it contaminated with? Uh, what's inside the soil?

Mr. Roche: There were a few isolated areas of PCB and then the rest of the historic fill generally, um, just consists of construction type debris.

Mr. Makropoulos: Would you say there's carcinogens in this soil?

Mr. Roche: Uh, I wouldn't say there's carcinogens, no.

Mr. Makropoulos: But there are in small percentages.

Mr. Roche: Yes, and what I'm saying is, those areas of contamination are going to be properly disposed of through protocols to get those offsite and to the proper facilities for the disposal.

Mr. Makropoulos: But you're - you're an expert in civil engineering, you're not - you're not an expert in in waste, um, contamination, so how can you tell me that there, uh, uh, the lower percentages or whatnot. There are carcinogens - basically, the moral of the story, there are carcinogens present in the soil and you want to - where it was completely blocked off, cemented and everything, and now you just want to bring it all back up again and possibly, uh, create more contamination in the area.

Mr. Roche: Uh, I understand what you're saying, and you are correct. I am not a certified expert in environmental engineering. My expertise lies in civil engineering, site design, stormwater management. So, that's a perfectly fair statement. I was trying to keep this, uh, at a very high level meaning that the DP has certain rules that you have to deal with when you're disturbing caps and disturbing of soil in this situation and we'll follow all those rules as we're disturbing the cap and removing the soil offsite.

Mr. Makropoulos: Okay. Um, well, I'm going - it looks like - how many minutes do I have left right now?

Mr. Dominguez: Uh, you have about two - a little over two and a half minutes.

Mr. Makropoulos: A little over two and a half minutes. So, Mr. Roche, are you aware about the - the other site, uh, on Jersey Avenue happens to be massive contamination and that's where they want to send the kids because they have no (inaudible)

Ms. Ludwig: Excuse me for one minute. Let's - yeah. This is - questions need to be directed towards Mr. Roche pertaining to this application only, which is the cancer pavilion on Somerset Street - so any questions relating to that.

Mr. Makropoulos: Mr. Roche, if, uh, if you were a member on the New Brunswick Planning Board, uh, would you be vote - voting for it even after you know all the students and parents have been advocating for months now to keep their school (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is Aravind Aithal - the Board Attorney. I believe this would be an improper question to be asking this witness.

Mr. Makropoulos: Why not? Why not? (inaudible) he's a - he's an expert in civil engineering and I want to know in his expertise, an expert in civil engineering that had he had a seat on the board, would he vote yes or no. I mean, me as a member of the public, I would really love to hear, uh -

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have any additional questions, sir?

Mr. Makropoulos: Mr. Roche, where did you get your, uh, you say you're an expert, where did you get your expertise? Uh, uh, what, uh, diplomas do you have?

Ms. Ludwig: He answered all those questions in the beginning (inaudible)

Mr. Makropoulos: I wasn't here before. I wasn't here earlier. I'd like to hear for myself right now. Mr. Roche, I still have my time on the clock, Mr. Roche, um, what qualifies you as an expert?

Mr. Roche: I have bachelor's degrees in civil engineering and business from Lehigh University and a master's degree in civil engineering from North Carolina State. I'm professionally licensed in the State of New Jersey and I've been practicing land development engineering now for over 15 years.

Mr. Makropoulos: That's fine. I just wanted to use as much of my five minutes as possible. I'll yield my time and wait for the public comments. Have a nice day.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you, Mr. Makropoulos. Next up is Ms. McGaffney.

Kate McGaffney: It's okay. You can just say McGaffney. I don't need a gender.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. That's fine.

McGaffney: So, I live on Hardenberg Street, so I'm heavily affected by this project. I have a skyscraper in my backyard, which means I've lost half of my sunlight and another skyscraper in my front yard, means I'm going to be living my entire life in shadows. Has your team considered the quality of life on the residents surrounding this project and like our gardens and things?

Mr. Liebling: Let - this is Charles Liebling. I'm the attorney. Let me just - let me just, um, respond that the zoning that the city adopts is a decision of the governing body of the city to which then property owners respond. It - and so, that question is really one for the city council who a- permits this building to be built on this site. Um, once that decision is made, then this process - this process is undertaking of seeking site plan approval. Um, I know that's probably not a very satisfactory answer to you, but that is how process - this process goes.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is Aravind Aithal, the Board Attorney. This is a conforming application in regards to the zoning and the bulk standards in the zone. The - and Mr. Liebling is absolutely correct. Any questions regarding why the zoning occurred would be more appropriate to another body.

McGaffney: Okay. Then, I'll ask another body. Um, so my next question would just be some clarification. You said earlier that you're not required to report on the effective ground water on the buildings?

Mr. Roche: Um, let me clarify that statement. What I was saying had nothing to do with ground water. I think one of the members of the public had asked a question about potentially providing water quality treatment from a stormwater management perspective, nothing to do with ground water, but sometimes when you have runoff leaving parking areas or vehicular traverse ways, you can potentially provide water quality treatment. Sometimes they're mechanical treatment devices, sometimes there's filtration devices and I stated although we're not required to do that, we don't meet the threshold in order to be classified as a major development, without getting too technical here, but although we're not required to provide water quality treatment for the stormwater, I say we are willing to look at that and potentially add it to the project.

McGaffney: Um, I also work in the community and like most of the service community we work alternative hours, so I'm not at all comforted by your, uh, kind of dismissal about the effect that the construction is going to have on the community. Um, so, can you tell me how long you expect construction to go on for and how long I'm going to have to go without sleep?

Mr. Roche: I can give you an anticipated construction schedule. Uh, the construction, I think, you know, depending on how the next weeks and meetings go into the future, um, if we're able to start construction, uh, say early 2021, the building will be planned to open in the summer of 2024.

McGaffney: And so, uh, many people who are doing construction around this area should be aware of, there was a terrible accident, which I found myself under a crane that had fallen last summer. Uh, what safety precautions are you going to be taking during this project?

Mr. Roche: That would generally be a question for the yet to be named contractor.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is Aravind Aithal, the Board Attorney. In regards to construction protocol, safety sequencing, not only, uh, if this application is approved by the Board and if they're able to get their outside agency approvals and if they get a construction permit, there will be a pre-construction meeting and following that, they will not only be required to follow the guidelines of the uniform construction code, but they would also be required to follow a myriad of outside agencies including OSHA in terms of how they will go about sequencing construction and how it's done. Um, but in terms of whether that's an appropriate question for this Board to consider would be inappropriate.

McGaffney: Well, I guess it wouldn't be the first time I've been called inappropriate.

Mr. Aithal: No, ma'am. I was not calling you inappropriate at all. If that's what you took away, I apologize. That's not what I meant at all.

McGaffney: All right. Those are my questions for Mr. Roche.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you. Um, next up, Matthew Meoni.

Mr. Matthew Meoni: Okay. Thank you so much and, uh, for Mr. Roche. Um, so, regarding a question earlier, I kind of have a branch off question. When you said that more patches of grass will actually be, uh, like there after construction, so it actually will be able to help the environment. How do patches of grass help the environment if no trees are being planted, you know, for example?

Mr. Roche: No, we are planting a significant amount of trees around the perimeter of the site, Division, Hardenberg and Somerset, as well as mixing in some trees into the internal development. Um, what I was

referring to specifically with the patches of grass was the, uh, ability for water to infiltrate on the site and I was making a comparison between how much stormwater runoff is produced when it rains and runoff hits a parking lot area compared to when it hits a grassed area. When you have a grassed area, you have the potential for the water to infiltrate. When you have a parking lot area, all of that water goes offsite.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. Okay. That makes a lot of sense. Thank you for clarifying that and is it - do you have the answer for what trees, like what type of trees are going to be planted?

Mr. Roche: Yeah, I believe it is and if you give me a second I can also give the exact numbers on it. It is red maple trees are primarily going to be the street trees and there's 14 of those going in, and then, we have 15 ginkgo biloba trees on the - they're going to be onsite.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. Thank you. And I have a couple more questions. Um, in regards - kind of in passing in pre-previous questions you mentioned that the power plant isn't necessarily needed to power the pavilion and the parking deck, it actually could be done (inaudible). So, why is the power plant necessary?

Mr. Roche: We'll certainly talk about this in a lot more detail at the next hearing, but the power plant does provide the ability for resiliency, redundant services to the hospital and the new cancer building, which is advantageous to us. It's also more efficient because we're able to place larger size equipment in that area, um, as opposed to placing it into the pavilion building. And again, we'll talk about this in much more detail in, uh, in the next meeting.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. I'll look forward to it. And another question, you mentioned as well that this contaminated soil will be moved offsite, so, where is this contaminated soil being moved to?

Mr. Roche: Um, there are disposal facilities all across the state of New Jersey, um, depending on what the material characteristics are. Some of these are landfill type facilities and that's typically arranged with the, uh, contractor once we move into the construction procedures on the exact location the material will be headed.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And will the contract - for the contractor as well or is it a better question to ask them about how much soil is going to be removed (inaudible)

Mr. Roche: Um, yeah, the contractor will probably provide you with a more exact value, I just don't have an estimate on me right now.

Mr. Meoni: Do you have an estimate?

Mr. Roche: I'm sure I could calculate an estimate. I don't have one currently.

Mr. Meoni: Oh, you - you don't need to calculate an estimate while drawing up the plans?

Mr. Roche: No, not for offsite disposal. It's not part of a site plan application requirement. Typically, we do it as we're finalizing, you know, signing the construction documents and prior to the full start of contraction.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. Okay. Um, and sorry if I'm asking redundant questions. It's my, you know, first time ever calling into a city meeting. I'm, you know, a little nervous on the phone so - I appreciate you bearing with me. How much time do I have left? It seems like I've been on for 10 minutes already.

Mr. Dominguez: You have, I just paused it, you have 3 minutes and 10 seconds.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. Thank you. Um, I believe that's all my questions for the civil engineer as of now, so thank you, Roche.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. So, next up is Danielle Moore. Are you there?

Ms. Danielle Moore: Hi. Yes. First question I have for the engineer. It was about two or three months ago; Mr. Chuck O'Donnell wrote a story in Tap New Brunswick that's saying that DEVCO was not allowed to build Ferren Mall- do the project for Ferren Mall because of COVID19. Could you please tell me how DEVCO is going to be able to do this project without dealing with COVID-19?

Ms. Ludwig: Mr. Aithal, is this relevant to Mr. Roche's testimony?

Mr. Aithal: I was hoping that Mr. Roche would be able to determine whether there was an engineering issue there. I'm sorry, I couldn't - I couldn't see one. Mr. Liebling, Mr. Roche, is there an engineering issue that you feel, um, that's a - question you can answer?

Mr. Liebling: - the member of the public is simply asking about - about safety protocols, which I thought Mr. Roche perhaps could provide her with assurances.

Mr. Aithal: Ms. Moore, I'm not sure if this witness can speak, obviously, he's not selected to answer that question, but I would - I'm not sure that that's really an engineering question, regardless. Uh, perhaps you have another engineering questions for Mr. Roche?

Ms. Moore: Oh, I have plenty, but like I said, it, uh, Mr. Chuck O'Donnell president of DEVCO stating that they could not do the project for Serin Mall because of COVID-19, so how are you going to do this - build this?

Mr. Roche: Maybe a more specific question, because I'm not sure I - I can understand the engineering implications within that question?

Ms. Moore: I'm pretty sure you can understand what I'm saying, you just don't want to give me an answer on it.

Mr. Aithal: This is Aravind Aithal, the Board Attorney. I'm not answering your question, ma'am, because I shouldn't be answering questions that you have that the witness should be answering, but I'm trying to understand what the question is to make a determination as to whether it's relevant to his engineering testimony and as far as I can tell, it doesn't appear to be relevant. So, I'm asking politely if there's another question that you have or if you can perhaps clarify this question.

Ms. Moore: I'll - I will move on. Uh, so, we're not talking about the school being knocked down. Could you tell me how many houses will have to be knocked down, as well? How far down towards Hamilton Street this building will take?

Mr. Roche: Yeah, I believe on Hardenberg side, it goes to - up to 30 Hardenberg and I believe there's two structures on Division Street, but if you bear with me, I'll confirm that. You can ask another question though while I'm pulling up the document.

Mr. Liebling: Just - we're just talking about - about the school site right now. There's no -

Ms. Moore: No, you keep talking about how big it - with the floors and with the parking. I would like to know how much more space is this going to take along? How many more houses is going to be take away because all this is not going to be set on just the school's property. I hope you get to pause the clock.

Mr. Liebling: Let me - I think, the question you're asking - the application that's before the Board tonight for the cancer pavilion is exclusively on the site that the existing Lincoln Annex School is on. The garage/power plant/loading dock is across the street on an additional site. We will address that at that hearing. I don't know and I don't know if Mr. Roche knows about - about the count of buildings on that site. It's not before this Board.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is Aravind Aithal. I'm sorry, Ms. Moore. If I could just clarify that question. So, the - Mr. Liebling, the lot that you're talking about is Lot 2.01 and block 51. Is that correct? That's the application - before the Board. I don't see that there are any residential structures on here. Mr. Roche, if you see otherwise.

Mr. Roche: No, to clarify my previous response included the parking garage. We're just talking about the pavilion (inaudible) Lot 2.01. It's just the Lincoln Annex building.

Ms. Moore: I have to say I think, uh, I think something is being hid because I don't see having this big building, 11 floors, this and that is going to be built this - on the - on the - on this school. But okay. I'd like to move along. Getting back to the traffic that the gentleman was saying with the ambulance. This is going to create a big issue due to where I just, uh, resolved a situation with the Middlesex County Freeholders as on Somerset Street due to where - how they fixed the road by - by the creek there to make it smooth for the ambulance to pass through there so they can get to the hospital quicker. Now, once you shut off Somerset Street, as the gentleman was saying, the ambulance is going to go - have to go all the way through Front Street through every traffic light and come back around Easton Avenue to go up a side street just to get someone to the emergency room (pause) where you will be putting many people's lives at risk due to where, how like I said, I recently just resolved a case with the county and I just (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may? I'm sorry, Ms. Moore. Madame Chair, if Ms. Moore has any specific questions on cross-examination related to civil engineering, uh, perhaps this - certainly her comments are more than welcome in the public portion.

Ms. Moore: You can answer everyone else's question.

Ms. Ludwig: Ms. Moore, I just want to clarify with you also that there is going to be someone testifying to traffic. Is that correct, Mr. Liebling? Do we have a traffic engineer who's going to speak?

Mr. Liebling: We do.

Ms. Ludwig: Right. So, Danielle, you can ask your questions about traffic after the traffic engineer speaks. This is - Mr. Roche is giving testimony regarding civil engineering. So, that's what these questions would be directed toward now.

Ms. Moore: Well, I will still say even with this building that you're putting there, another situation you're putting at risk due to where Robert Wood Johnson just put their new helicopter station in the front - in the front of Robert Wood Johnson. They took it from Front Street now due to where all these high rise buildings that they're putting in. It's been a difficult situation for the helicopter to even get through. I live on Somerset Street. I see what goes on.

Mr. Liebling: Madame Chair, we did answer a question about the helicopters. If Ms. Moore could pose this as a question, perhaps Mr. Roche could - could answer it. And just for the record, Somerset Street will not be closed.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay. Ms. Moore, do you have a specific question regarding the helicopter?

Ms. Moore: Once you put an 11 story building up, would Robert Wood Johnson have to change the location again for a helicopter to land?

Mr. Roche: No, our understanding at this time is that the helipad location would not be changed. If something that we hear back from FAA during the next 45 days changes that, we'll certainly let the City know.

Ms. Moore: Because with all these high-rise buildings coming up, it's going to be a situation due to where you have another high-rise building being put on (inaudible) Somerset Street. You're going to cause a big issue as far as saving someone's life. But the last question I do have about three weeks ago, I don't know if that was you, the engineer, over to Lincoln Annex School where they were drilling holes in the building, discover what type of material that was behind the brick to see how they were going to not take the building down.

Mr. Roche: That's true. There was an asbestos or abatement investigation and it's my understanding that based on (inaudible) work done five or six years ago, all of the asbestos containing material was removed from the interior -

Ms. Moore: I can't hear you. You're breaking up.

Mr. Roche: Okay. I'll start over and let me know if I break up again. (inaudible) your statement is true. There was some HAZMAT abatement work going on the exterior of the building. We were testing for any potential asbestos containing materials behind the brick veneer. It's my understanding that all of the interior materials, um, within the school building had previously been abated and (inaudible) as part of the previous renovation project on the school several years ago.

Ms. Moore: So, would that just be how you were going to knock down - to take down the building other than asbestos is being tested?

Mr. Roche: Correct. The purpose of investigation like that is if you do find asbestos, there are certain demolition procedures you need to follow prior to taking down a building.

Ms. Moore: So, have you gotten the tests results back saying it's asbestos, will that cause cancer, have you gotten the results back?

Mr. Roche: We have gotten the results back. There were limited areas that showed potential asbestos containing material. They were located on the exterior of the building, not the interior.

Ms. Moore: Like I said, I was there. I have pictures, like I said, I saw what was going on and if anyone really wants to know, if you go around the Lincoln Annex School, you will see that every red brick that is on the Lincoln Annex School, that's where they replaced it, that's where they drilled it at. And obviously, you're making a big dec- trying to make a big decision before you're even getting the evidence of everything.

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have any more questions, Ms. Moore for the witness?

Ms. Moore: I'm - maybe I'll go to the comments, but like I said, due to where you're still miss - doing a little get too much guessing before you have the proper test results of anything, the proper paperwork, you're doing too much guessing to be an engineer. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you, Ms. Moore. Um, so next up, okay. I believe it's Pedersen.

Mr. Michael Pedersen: Mr. Roche, how long has the planning has, um, been going on for this building?

Mr. Roche: The design of the new building?

Mr. Pedersen: Yes.

Mr. Roche: Approximately anywhere - 8 months, 8 to 10 months, somewhere in that ballpark.

Mr. Pedersen: Got you. And has the Board seen the full plans of the building?

Mr. Roche: When you say full plans, they've seen the plans that you guys have seen on the website, the formal site plan application drawings.

Mr. Pedersen: Um, what do you mean by that?

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may interject? This is Aravind Aithal, the Board Attorney. Madame Chair, if I may? Um, just so that the witness is clear, all of the submissions that are made are currently on the website, those are the submissions and the only submissions, uh, that this Board ought to consider.

Mr. Pedersen: So, you - so they - so the Board doesn't have to see everything before they vote on it? Is that what you're saying?

Mr. Liebling: Sir, uh, Mr. Pedersen, this is Charles Liebling, attorney for the applicant. I'm not sure what you mean by everything. A full site plan application as required by the site plan ordinance has been submitted. So, they have everything they're supposed to have in order to hold this hearing.

Mr. Pedersen: Okay. Now, um, Mr. Roche, have there been other sites, um, considered to build this building on besides the school?

Mr. Roche: I don't know the answer to that. We were brought involved - we knew they were considering several sites in the area when we decided to do the traffic counts in April and May. You know, details on those sites, I don't have. I don't know how many sites they would have considered. When we were engaged to start doing formal design documents, um, earlier this year, earlier in 2020, it was for this site.

Mr. Pedersen: Um, who made the decision to build on the school?

Mr. Roche: I don't know the answer to that.

Mr. Pedersen: Does anyone or -

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have questions for Mr. Roche regarding his civil engineering testimony that he made tonight? You'll have plenty of opportunity (inaudible) - to ask more questions.

Mr. Pedersen: Uh, Mr. Roche, um, when you demolish things, um, especially an older school, um, what kind of hazardous materials do you plan to, um, encounter when you're demolishing the school?

Mr. Roche: In this particular incident, we're not anticipating a large amount of hazardous material, asbestos contained material, because as I was mentioning before, um, the interior of the building had been fully abated previously. Um, if we are to encounter any type of asbestos or hazardous material, I would anticipate it would be beneath the brick veneer or potentially below grade, um, on the exterior foundation walls.

Mr. Pedersen: And is there a contingency plan set up if accidents do happen in terms of hazardous material or something like that?

Mr. Roche: Yeah, certainly we will be providing full site over site with, uh, additional on the construction site to observe the contractors work every day. We will be performing full term air monitoring to make sure we're not generating any significant dust leaving the site. We'll also be performing vibration monitoring around the perimeter site to make sure we're not impacting any of the neighboring existing structures to remain and then there's certainly procedures that are documented for the demolition contractor prior to starting work on the site. If you were to discover an unknown environmental condition, we outlined the steps that they need to follow, of course, it is to notify potentially the NJDP, New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, notify the owner, notify the engineer and then stop work right away until those environmental issues are addressed.

Mr. Pedersen: All right. And in terms of vibration, um, uh, obviously, it's a residential area. Um, what are the, um, um, acceptable areas of vibration allowed in construction in this downtown area?

Mr. Roche: Um, typically we try and limit any vibration impact from leaving the site. Um, there are some thresholds that we can establish outside the site with the geotechnical engineers. I don't want to throw out a specific acceleration or velocity relative to the vibration limit that we would consider acceptable. We're not here - I'll just say we're limit that to the extent practical and certainly keeping it below any type of levels that could cause any damage to adjacent structures, sidewalks, or site features.

Mr. Pedersen: Have, um, adjacent structures been looked at in terms of any potential vibration damage? Will that ever be done?

Mr. Roche: It will be done. It has not been done yet. Typically, we require our contractor to do a pre-demolition site survey, where we go around photographing certain structures to remain, um, just so there's a clear record of what was in place prior, any type of demolition work, um, and then, depending on the adjacent structures or adjacent owners, if they are willing or if they want us to potentially survey the existing structures, we've done that in the past previously, too. Meaning, we would put survey monitoring points on those adjacent structures. And then, if during construction we felt that the vibration levels were high, we'd go back out and survey those monitoring points and ensure that the structure hadn't settled or there was any movement in that basic structure.

Mr. Pedersen: And do have any rough idea of how you would demolish the school if this passes?

Mr. Roche: No, that's something that the contractor would decide as far as means and methods on how they're going to take down the building.

Mr. Pedersen: Okay. And, um, in terms of removing the rubble, do you have any information on that?

Mr. Roche: That would primarily be the contractor's decision.

Mr. Pedersen: All right. I yield my time.

Mr. Dominguez: Yes, I had to unmute myself. Rubens?

Ms. Arly Rubens: Hello. So, my first question is about how much disruption to the surrounding homes and businesses are you anticipating from, uh, demolition and construction?

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may. I believe that question was asked in terms of vibrations. I realize that this is slightly different, but maybe she can clarify that question.

Ms. Rubens: Uh, vibrations are very different. I'm just asking about general disruption to the area, uh, to either just traffic, general construction.

Mr. Roche: Sure. So, when we develop construction logistics, it's not something that the civil engineer does by himself. Typically, we work with the selected contractor, whoever that will be, as well as the city professionals, the city engineer to develop construction logistic plans. And there's two main priorities we have when we're putting these plans together. The first priority is the safety of the workers and the adjacent community. And then, the second priority is to try and limit disruption to the, uh, surrounding community. So, what I can say is at this point in time, we are not planning to close any of the surrounding roadways. Um, we will likely have some pedestrian alterations whether it's some midblock crosswalks to get pedestrians away from the construction site and have them use the alternate sidewalk. That's certainly something that's possible. Um, but we do realize how heavily traveled this area is which is what's driving our desire to make sure we're not having any long-term roadway closures.

Ms. Rubens: Right. And, uh, on the note that this is a very high pedestrian traffic area, uh, can I just ask - you might not have the answer to this, why such a high traffic area that a structure already exists on was chosen as a building site?

Mr. Roche: I don't have the answer to that.

Ms. Rubens: All right. Thank you. I yield my time.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you. Uh, next is, I believe Saravia.

Ms. Amber Saravia: I want to start off by saying, I'm sorry if I ask a question that's been answered in the presentation. I came in a little late due to an exam. Um, my first question is, is there an estimated timeline for each project and if there is - if there is, is there a favorable starting period?

Mr. Roche: Oh, I apologize. My computer cut out for the first half of your question. I heard the end about the, uh, the timeline. Can you repeat the first part?

Ms. Saravia: Yeah, so, um, I asked is there's an estimated timeline for each project and, um, if there is, is there a favorable starting period?

Mr. Roche: Yeah, if all went to - according to what we hold relative to schedules, planning board approval, outside agency, uh, approvals, we would like to get into the ground in early 2021. By getting into the ground, I mean, starting, um, excavation work potentially for the new buildings. And then, we anticipate that it'll be about a three-and-a-half-year build which will be the completion of both buildings, um, into the summer of 2024.

Ms. Saravia: Okay. All right. Thank you so much. My second question is, is there an area that could be better for the development of this project? Um, and then, yeah, that's my first question for that section.

Mr. Liebling: Can you clarify your question?

Ms. Saravia: Yeah, so my question is, is there an area that may be better for the development of the project?

Mr. Liebling: This is the area that is the subject of the application. That's really all that Mr. Roche can testify to.

Ms. Saravia: Um, and then, currently, what is your main concern for the construction of the project? Is there any main concerns when you think about development in the area?

Mr. Liebling: First, I mean, do you have any concerns related - I'm just trying to channel the question whether or not there's - you have any - any particular concerns - related to this project.

Mr. Roche: Sure. I wouldn't necessarily call it a concern, but, you know, once design is complete, our number one priority is working with the contractor and developing a safe worksite for not only their work, but also the community. So, once the design process would be complete, my main concern would be working with everyone on the team to figure out the best way to handle construction logistics while building the project.

Ms. Saravia: Okay. All right. Thank you so much. I yield my time.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you. Um, next is. If I can remember how to pronounce this. Shih?

Ms. Jennie Shih: Hi, I'm here. Okay. So, I mainly have some clarify- sorry. I'm kind of nervous. Um, I kind of just have some clarification questions because I'm also not too familiar with this type of proceeding. Um, so, I've noticed that a lot of us have environmental, safety concerns, etcetera, moral concerns, concerns for, uh, the well-being of the children in the local community. So, I - as far as I can tell, this is not the forum to be speaking about those?

Ms. Ludwig: Correct. Yeah, this portion of the meeting is to ask questions of the civil engineer and testimony that he gave regarding this piece of the application.

Ms. Shih: So, is that - does that apply, like, to the whole meeting that these questions are - won't be relevant or is it just for this particular section of meeting?

Ms. Ludwig: No, there will be - there will be an opportunity - after each witness speaks, you have an opportunity to question them, and then, at the end, there is also a public comment portion for the project overall to voice any concerns. But these - this specific piece right now is just to question the witness on the testimony that they gave, but there will be opportunity later to speak, you know, to your concerns about the entire project.

Ms. Shih: Right. Okay. So, um, by the project, you mean, the cancer pavilion specifically and still not - not the garage, not, you know, the power plant?

Ms. Ludwig: Correct. This evening, yes. That's what's before the Board this evening.

Ms. Shih: Okay. So, I'm also just wondering how the questions and the comments from the members of the public will be taken into consideration?

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may? It appears that Ms. Shih - is asking just general questions.

Ms. Ludwig: - that's what I was just going to say. Do you have any questions for the engineer at this point? If not, you can address your concerns in the public portion of the meeting. But specifically, you have to have if you don't have, you know, do you have a specific question for the (inaudible)

Ms. Shih: No, I yield my time. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: It's Ms. Linda Stork.

Ms. Linda Stork: Okay. Hi. Um, Mr. Roche, did I understand you to say that I might've - I might've heard this wrong. I'm having a little bit of a hard time hearing. Um, you - that the plans were started a year and eight months ago, but the site-specific plan was started early 2020? (inaudible)

Mr. Roche: No, I think I stated that the plans were started 8 to 10 months ago.

Ms. Stork: The site-specific plan?

Mr. Roche: Correct. Were started 8 to 10 months ago. And then, the other statement I made was relative to the traffic counts back in May or April of 2019.

Ms. Stork: Oh, okay.

Mr. Roche: At that point in time, we knew the cancer center was under consideration. We didn't know the site location at that point, which is why we counted so many intersections in the surrounding areas.

Ms. Stork: I didn't see the intersection of, um, I saw Easton Avenue mentioned a lot, but coming Easton the other way, people would cut across on Lewis or Suydam Street or Lewis Street - well, actually Ray Street, well whatever you know what I'm talking about? The cross street? The intersection is Somerset. So, then, the intersection, if they come across on that, then they come into Somerset Street at Lewis Street. That is a horrendous light to sit through at traffic. You can sit through the light three or four times without moving through. It gets gridlocked and that's now. We have - we really have gridlock at rush hour. I don't know how the count was done and apparently that intersection wasn't included, but it's going to really be a terrible problem. I know you spoke a lot about the internal, uh, you know, drop off place. But the thing is, everybody has to get in there. How many lanes will be entering because I saw one study that says during the peak time, there will be a car entering every two seconds. But a car can't (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Mr. Liebling, would this be an appropriate question for the traffic engineer?

Ms. Stork: (inaudible) take into account (inaudible) would this be a more appropriate question for the traffic engineer?

Mr. Liebling: Chris, I kept hoping that the member of the public would get to the question on it. Chris, is this something that you can - you think you can respond to or is the - is the study of the various intersections really a question for Mr. Disario?

Mr. Roche: Mr. Disario could better answer the question.

Ms. Stork: Oh, okay. I'm sorry. I'll wait with the traffic related then. Um, I had really wanted to know about the timeline of when a site specific plan was started because, you know, we were still being told for a long time that, you know, the site was up in the air and, you know, nothing was definite and -

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may, if Ms. Stork has any additional questions?

Ms. Stork: Well, yeah, I'm asking, uh, (inaudible) you said 8 to 10 months, can you narrow it down? When was the site-specific plan started?

Mr. Aithal: I believe that was answered already.

Ms. Stork: Yeah, the answer was 8 to 10 months ago. And I'm asking if you can narrow it down.

Mr. Aithal: I guess that's a yes or no question, Mr. Roche.

Mr. Roche: Yeah, maybe 8 to 10 months ago, we started doing some site concept plans on various plans and this was one of those sites. As far as, you know, when we began to start put together detailed drawings, I think that would probably be somewhere in the - I'm approximating here, March/April 2020 time period.

Ms. Stork: The site-specific plan?

Mr. Roche: Yes. And again, I'm approximating. I don't have an exact date in my head.

Ms. Stork: Do you know anything about previous plans that have been drawn up that were in the lobby of the hospital like years ago showing a cancer center across the street?

Mr. Roche: No, I'm not aware of any of those.

Ms. Stork: Okay. Um, and my last question is about the solar panels from the building that you're tearing down. Um, what happens to, like four-year-old solar panels?

Mr. Roche: I'll let Mr. Liebling, our attorney, answer that (inaudible)

Mr. Liebling: It's not, yeah, I can just help you out here. They're being relocated to a - to another property owned by the Board of Education.

Ms. Stork: So, they will still be used?

Mr. Liebling: That's my understanding (inaudible).

Ms. Stork: Because you see solar panels going down and a gas power plant going up, like that's not good planning, that's, you know, like going backwards.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Um, last speaker for cross examination. We have Mr. Tarbous?

Mr. Herb Tarbous: Hi. Thanks, Mr. Dominguez. Um, hi, Mr. Roche. You clearly know your trade and thanks for your patience tonight in ensuring these questions. Um, you spoke earlier to - or answered a question that there were other sites involved or being considered. Can you tell us what those other sites were - where they were?

Mr. Roche: Approximately. I can throw out one other site location. We have been looking at a, uh, another site to the east of where this site is.

Mr. Liebling: Regardless and I'm not sure it's relevant for this application. This is the one that was selected.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is Aravind Aithal. It appears that it would be limited to - that would be irrelevant. If we could just ask Mr. Tarbous to perhaps ask civil engineering questions - related to his testimony.

Mr. Tarbous: That's fine, but he had testified to that. He had provided that information to us.

Mr. Aithal: I understand. I just wanted to clarify that issue.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Um, in your testimony, which I was here for several hours ago, I believe you talked about the pedestrian bridges, right, over Somerset Street and you did mention there was going to be a clearance of 15 feet, uh, which is, I believe, in the civil engineering discipline, but you also talked about the, uh, the - sort of which parts the bridges had different traffic of types of pedestrians. You said that you knew that one of the bridges was going to have staff only, I believe, and the other bridge was going to be more of a general use bridge. But that's - that's not really part of civil engineering, though, is it?

Mr. Roche: No, it's not. And I'm sure the architect will testify to something similar, but you're right, it's not part of civil engineering. I was just providing some general (inaudible)

Mr. Tarbous: But - and related to that, you also talked about some, um, I forgot - I didn't get the terminology, but pedestrian vehicle interactions, is that something that a civil engineer is genuinely concerned with?

Mr. Roche: It is if we have the ability to limit pedestrian and vehicular interaction. So, by providing a pedestrian overpass if you're able to have pedestrians crossing the street at - at an overpass, you eliminate the potential for pedestrian vehicular conflict, so that's something that traffic engineers look at. It's something that we as civil engineers take into consideration.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. And does that include the building egress and ingress points, is that part of the scope of civil engineering?

Mr. Roche: Um, not as much, you know, we look at the vehicular interaction with pedestrians. Really the ingress and egress and where those points are required, um, it's something that that architect will be better suited to address.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Thank you. Um, during the during the cross-examination, I believe, I learned about something called historic fill and there was some and I don't mean to duplicate, but did you cover the existence of the contaminates in your testimony?

Mr. Roche: I believe I did briefly and I believe I also put the caveat on just the - I can talk at a high level on environmental issues, but I'm a site civil and land development engineer via training, so I'm able enough to describe some of the issues, but not going to into any detail technical environmental backgrounds.

Mr. Tarbous: Right. But was that part of your initial testimony, though, or was that in response to questions under cross-examination?

Mr. Roche: It was in response to questions on a cross-examination.

Mr. Tarbous: Right. So, you - you did not include a very significant issue pertaining to civil engineering during your testimony, but you did include details about - that are really an architect's purview. Is that right?

Mr. Roche: I don't know if I'd phrase it like that, but I did not include historic fill from a factual perspective in my initial testimony.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Thank you. You - you've become somewhat familiar, it seems, with the existing structure on the site?

Mr. Roche: I have limited knowledge of it, yes.

Mr. Tarbous: Do you think that, uh, from your perspective, are there any deficiencies with the current site?

Mr. Liebling: Deficiencies in what sense?

Mr. Tarbous: From a civil engineering perspective. Are there any improvements that would be needed? Like if - in order to continue using this site, are there major renovations or improvements from a civil engineering perspective that would be needed?

Mr. Liebling: Madame Chair, I don't believe that's a relevant question. It's not being proposed (inaudible) use.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is the Board Attorney. Yeah, I believe that would be irrelevant.

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have another question, Mr. Tarbous?

Mr. Tarbous: Yeah, I'd like to try and rephrase that one, actually because, you know, the testimony did talk about the removal of the school. So, the removal of that school is clearly in the scope of this application, right? I mean, that's - I'm assuming - is that part of the application, the actual removal of this current building?

Mr. Liebling: Yes, that is. There's a demolition plan.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Thank you. So, is the demolition of that building due to any type of structural deficiencies or is it just being done for - because there's - basically an arbitrary decision being made?

Mr. Liebling: It's being done to - for a different use, which the redevelopment plan was adopted for, to permit. So, you can't leave what was there and also construct the new building that the redevelopment plan calls for. So, it has to be demolished.

Mr. Tarbous: So, the answer is that it was done for basic - nothing related to the current condition of the of the school that's there now?

Mr. Liebling: I can't speak to - I can't speak to what findings were made when the redevelopment plan was adopted.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Now, um, we also heard about the conditions set, um, with the power plant and a parking garage. Um, was that part of your - I believe that was part of your original testimony, right, that it was conditional? That it was a separate application and conditional, right? Is that right?

Mr. Liebling: Yes. It wasn't my testimony I'm not testifying, but I did make that statement on behalf of the applicant.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. That's fine. Are there any other conditions, uh, that have not been disclosed yet tonight that are, you know, there are other things in addition to the power plant and the parking garage, are any other conditions either environmental of any type - on this application?

Ms. Ludwig: (inaudible) question (inaudible) I don't believe that would be a question for this witness.

Mr. Tarbous: Oh, who - which witness would it be for? I think that would come (inaudible) civil engineer.

Mr. Aithal: No, I said. I believe this witness is a civil engineer. Well, I know this is a civil engineer, so the testimony that's presented before, uh, by this witness is subject to cross-examination, so we can't really answer Mr. Tarbous' question at this point. If he has any more civil engineering questions, we can certainly address those and he's certainly free to make comments during public portion.

Mr. Tarbous: Is the power plant, you know, the condition on the power plant, is that part of the civil engineering scope or domain?

Mr. Roche: Uh, this is the application for the pavilion only, Mr. Tarbous. That's all this Board is considering this evening.

Mr. Tarbous: So, the condition but there is a condition on this other application of some sort, right? Mr. Roche was testifying about it. I'm sorry?

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chairman, I'm sorry. This is Aravind Aithal again. So, if I may. There are no conditions that the Board has imposed because it has not opined about this application yet. It has not rendered a decision.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. But Mr. Roche did talk about a condition of some sort. Is that condition - I mean, where does that condition exist? I have a question, yeah. He spoke about a condition. Where - where does that condition exist in the - in the documentation or the - or the application of this project?

Mr. Aithal: So, the - the answer to the question, Madame Chair, if I may, would be that this Board can certainly attach conditions to approval. I believe Mr. Liebling's indicated, and the engineer has indicated, that that would be conditioned on their, uh, their approvals and that's something this Board would consider. We have not opined on that yet.

Mr. Tarbous: So, is the answer to that that this idea of a condition is just something that's anticipated? It's not actually documented? Is that - is that my understanding, then?

Mr. Aithal: That would be fair, Madame Chair.

Mr. Tarbous: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Ludwig: Uh, yes. We haven't - we haven't heard the complete testimony from the applicant yet. So - we have to take everything into consideration and that would be made towards the end of the you know, at the end before we took a vote or during our discussion. As are all conditions. All conditions are set forth at the end of the application process with this Board.

Mr. Tarbous: So, the Board becomes the source of the conditions for the approval. Is that right? (inaudible)

Ms. Ludwig: Is that the legal process, Mr. Aithal?

Mr. Aithal: No. I want to be very careful because I'm not sure how Mr. Tarbous is - is using those words, but this Board - renders a decision based upon the municipal land use law and the application that's provided and on the ordinances, the city ordinances that are applicable on this application.

Mr. Tarbous: And that would - so and the approval would come with or without conditions, right? Is that - I'm just trying to clarify. I've never been through this process.

Mr. Aithal: I understand, Mr. Tarbous. I'm not trying to be difficult; I just want to make sure that you're not cheated out of an opportunity to ask Mr. Roche questions. (inaudible) you have questions about this hearing process that have nothing to do with Mr. Roche.

Mr. Tarbous: Well, that's - well, that's fine, but he - he did testify about the conditions, so I was just asking what - what, you know, I was asking him about the - I didn't know about the condition before his testimony so that's why I was asking. So, it was related to his testimony. Thank you. I yield my time.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you. We have no more, uh, members of the public for, uh, cross-examination of Mr. Roche.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay. At this time, I'd like to ask the - it's 10:00. Our normal time is - I think we normally don't go past 10:30, but I would like to ask the Board, the profess - any applicant if there are any objections about extending the time tonight and continuing with this process? Are there any objections?

Mr. John Petrolino (Board Member): Madame Chairperson, this is -

Ms. Ludwig: Are there any objection?

Mr. Petrolino: - well, this is John Petrolino. What time are you suggesting we extend it to?

Ms. Ludwig: Not any specific time. I - we're just going to continue to with the hearing.

Mr. Petrolino: No, I'm sorry. I can't commit to an indefinite period of testimony tonight (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, perhaps we can ask Mr. Liebling how many more witnesses we have?

Ms. Ludwig: I believe you said you have two more?

Mr. Liebling: Yes - yes, we have our - yes, we have our architect, and we have our traffic engineer. I would - I would surmise that the architectural testimony would be less detailed and - and trigger less - fewer questions given - given just the nature - the content of it, but that's - that's just me, uh, surmising.

Ms. Ludwig: Uh, would it be acceptable to hear the testimony of the architect and the comments that follow from the Board and the public pertaining to that witness?

Mr. Petrolino: Madame Chairperson, we've gone beyond 10:30 this evening. Uh, this is Mr. Petrolino again. I apologize, but I've got other things that unfortunately require me to be up extremely early tomorrow so that's all I can give you.

Ms. Ludwig: Well, we have - we still have a half hour. Mr. Aithal, what do you, uh, suggest we just go until 10:30?

Mr. Aithal: I would suggest that we call the next witness and, uh, perhaps if the Board is inclined, maybe have the public comment period following, uh, the - the next two witnesses.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay.

Mr. Aithal: If we can get through to two witnesses.

Ms. Ludwig: Yeah. And that - and that's acceptable procedure wise?

Mr. Aithal: If the Board is okay with that, we should - yeah, if the Board is okay with that, we should probably go ahead and at least get the next witness on.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay. Do I have any objections from the members of the Board to hearing both witnesses and then questions to follow?

Mr. Cartica: No objection. This is Bob Cartica.

Mr. Petrolino: John Petrolino here -

Ms. Ludwig: Do I have any objections from the applicant's attorney?

Mr. Petrolino: I'm sorry, Madame Chairperson. John Petrolino here. I just want to make sure that we're making appropriate plans to hear public testimony. Uh, when will that take place? If we're cutting off at 10:30, listening to the two, uh, remaining witnesses, when will we then have an opportunity to, uh, accept public questioning of the experts (inaudible)

Ms. Ludwig: As with any other time when this happens, it would pick up at the next - at the next meeting. It would just be a continuance of this hearing.

Mr. Petrolino: Thank you.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay. Can we hear your next two witnesses then and we'll reserve questions until after both have testified?

Mr. Liebling: Yeah. Um, my next witness is the - is our - our architect. Ken Drucker from HOK. Oh, there you are. I see - I see your picture. Um, Mr. Dominguez, you want to swear him in.

Mr. Dominguez: Sure. Uh, Mr. Drucker, are you there? You're - you're muted.

Mr. Kenneth Drucker (Applicant's Architect): I'm here.

Mr. Kenneth Drucker, sworn

Mr. Dominguez: You have the floor.

Mr. Liebling: Mr. Drucker, could you describe your involvement in this project? Your role in this project?

Mr. Drucker: Yes, I'm the design director of HOK's northeast practice and I'm the design principal (inaudible) for the design of this project architecturally.

Mr. Liebling: Okay. Great. And could you provide your professional qualifications?

Mr. Drucker: Yes, I have my Bachelor of Architecture from Cornell University and my Master of Architecture from Harvard Graduate School of Design. I'm a registered architect in the state of New Jersey. I have 40 years of experience and a fellow member of the (inaudible) institute of architects and I'm a LEED certified professional and I presented, uh, expert testimony in front of many municipalities in the state of New Jersey.

Ms. Ludwig: The witness is accepted as an expert for the Board.

Mr. Liebling: Thank you, Madame Chair. Um, Dan, we'll be looking at the - at the remaining exhibits that were posted with you.

Mr. Drucker: So, Dan, I'll just say next as we go through each of the exhibits and you can advance them for us. So, I'm going to be going through the floor plans and the building section and the building elevations and walk you through what's happening on each floor, um, as a follow up to Chris's testimony. So, on the first floor plan, you can see the Somerset entrance to the south and the drop off to the north entrance to the north and you can see represented in yellow is the main lobby space where there's a three-story atrium and upgrade and one floor below grade with the (inaudible) immediately to its left to the west. Around the perimeter of the project, you can see at the south corner on Division Street, a retail food service space which would be for patients, staffs and visitors with access from the atrium and access from Somerset. Moving around, uh, the building from west, you can see the PT gym with views to the outdoors, admin space and then moving along the drop off, you can see where there's collection for incoming patients, registration intake, and then, the conference center on the corner of Somerset and Hardenberg. Uh, the bike racks are located on Hardenberg, just to the right of the registration intake and the ambulance will also be, um, placed at curbside on Hardenberg if I'm approaching. You can also see the locations of the three bridges. Uh, pedestrian walkway A is the second-floor connection that connects to the existing hospital and the existing legacy building of CINJ. Pedestrian walkway C is the administration connection to the western portion of the hospital building, and then, between the, uh, garage to the north and the face of our building

along the north entry drive, you can see, uh, a third bridge location, for walk - which we call walkway D. Next.(pause) So, this is the building chec- section that represents the overall uses of the building and you can see from the bottom of the drawing, I'm going to work my way up, that the lower areas are used for radiation and imaging equipment, that's where the heavy equipment needs to be. The atrium connects you from the ground floor down to that level so you can get natural daylight down to that level. On the righthand side is the south entry off of Somerset on the left-hand side of the drawing is the, uh, passageway underneath the bridge connection to the garage, which is the north atrium building entrance. The lobby level is on the main ground floor, and then, we have research labs and all (inaudible) the second floor. We have clinical program on the third and fourth floor. Infusion on the fifth floor and then on MEP, an intermittent MEP area in gray that you see halfway up the building. Uh, that provides for fresh air and circulation and ventilation to the surgical floor above, you see in green. And then, in the three floors above, you see basically where we will have patient rooms, 96 (inaudible) patient rooms with major setback on that floor for a respite room. The building is less than the 225 feet that's allowed. The building height is 212 feet to the top of the screening wall and when you include the screening wall, it's 218 feet. It's an 11-story building and the setbacks allow for light and air to hit Somerset Street and also provides for light and air to, um, to get to the passageway, entry passageway. In terms of employees, the question was asked, um, what the population count is of the building. Um, RCNJ currently has approximately 650 daily employees and over the next 10 years approximately 500 employees could be added. At the maximum build out approximately 50 percent of the employees working in the building could be new employees compared to the existing employee count in the current building. RCNJ currently see, it's approximately 500 patients daily and we anticipate that the new facility, this number could increase by 200 to 300 new patients or an increase of 40 to 60 percent. Uh, next slide, please. I'm going to quickly go through the floor plans. Uh, this is the basement level that shows that we're building out to the, uh, entirety of the property line on the north, south, east and west sides of the site. The yellow represents the ground floor of the lobby with the passenger elevators to the west of that yellow area and this is also where we'll be having our connection below grade to the parcel to the north. Next. On the second floor, this is the primary circulation floor to connect to the existing legacy building, the hospital in two locations and to the parking garage and this is our research floor. This is an inpatient and outpatient building, but research is critical so there is real time learning for records, faculty and staff for the, uh, researchers (inaudible) positions. Next. The third floor represents where the clinics are and you can begin to see the void that's created in the atrium itself that provides for a visual connection from the Somerset drop off to the vehicle drop off on Northside with bridges connecting both sides of the atrium, and then, there's a portion for clinical trials on the angular piece, which is focused on (inaudible) connection to the Legacy building. The next floor, the fourth floor, this is similar in terms of the clinics that will appear on this floor and, uh, the focal point will be the pediatric clinic on the fourth floor, as well. The fifth-floor plan, please. The fifth floor is the infusion floor with also an opportunity for an extended outpatient on the east side. So, this is where most of the infusion occurs for all the cancer patients. Sixth floor. This is our intermittent mechanical floor that provides for ventilation up and down through the building, through this level. We also have a pharmacy on this level. This pharmacy is not a retail pharmacy, it's for the staff and for the patients and they'll be faculty offices at this location. The seventh floor. The seventh floor is our primary surgical floor. There are nine surgical units with central sterile located on this floor to provide the service and a series of pre-op and post-op beds for basically providing preoperative procedures and post-operative procedures for the suites. The eighth floor. The eighth floor is our first patient floor and there's an opportunity for a lot of green space on the setback. You can see the footprint of the base of the building where floor seven below is much larger than the footprint. We call that the diagnostic chassis, the base of the building. And the typical bed tower floor is much narrow to provide daylight into the units themselves, and then, facing the corner of Little Albany, Hardenberg and Somerset where are where the lounges are (inaudible). And then, we also have a healing garden (inaudible). The ninth floor and tenth floor are similar in terms of the layout without the gardens (inaudible) and then the eleventh floor, which is drawing 816 illustrates the size of the mechanical space at the top of the building and you can see how that portion of the building is also narrowed down to reinforce the setbacks of the building to get light and air down to the street, and then, the cranked portion you see on the southeast corner becomes basically a beacon through the project, an iconic beacon, which you'll see in the final exhibit in terms of the rendering. So, next I'm going to go through the elevations and

according to the redevelopment plan, um, the building needs to be contextual. Uh, we believe that using terra cotta in two different colors, uh, will allow us to relate to the brick vernacular found primarily throughout New Brunswick. Uh, there are several other terra cotta buildings within the area, but most of the existing hospitals are brick. And terra cotta is a unitized system that allows you to create a very modern building out of the same organic materials that you can find in brick. Uh, the window fenestration patterns relate directly to the program and the building that's happening beyond. This is the Somerset façade so you can see the glass entrance, which is underneath what's called the overhang, they'll be an entry canopy. And then, the building sort of floats over the ground. We want to promote pedestrian activity, although we're not a community building. You can see the amount of extensive landscaping and there's a cross section that you can see on the left side, which is the administrative bridge (inaudible) clearance and on the righthand side you can see a cross section through the patient, staff, uh, (inaudible) to the Legacy building (inaudible) the hospital. You can also see the glass beacon at the corner of this elevation. We'll go to the next slide. Basically, we're going to drive around the building and we're going to go to the east elevation next. This is the Hardenberg elevation. You can see how the - where all the amenities are on the (inaudible) as far as the lounges (inaudible) on this southeast corner. You can see the bridge connection to the hospital (inaudible) and to the Legacy building to the left and the terra cotta on the facades to the right and you can see the connection to the parcel to the north with the second (inaudible) for the convenience of people coming from a garage and to, uh, the pavilion - the cancer pavilion. So, the base of the building is primarily glass and we've trade - we've played with the scale of the masonry openings to create a combination of bevel and quadruple height openings within the masonry. Uh, to deal with both the urban scale and the pedestrian scale. The next elevation, the next exhibit is the north façade, which is the north entry drive. Once again, you can see a three-story atrium in the middle. They'll be an entry canopy and they'll be a canopy along the edge of the building from the atrium all the way to Division to allow for cueing under the canopy, that's protected from the weather. This connection will be landscaped, um, so that we basically have street trees all the way around the perimeter of the building and you can see the fold in the upper three floors of the building and the mechanical space and the setbacks that represent that diagonal shift towards the southeast at the top of (inaudible). And then, finally in terms of the elevations we have the west elevation, Division Street elevation, once again the retail is on the lower right-hand corner. On the glazed side, we've got street trees to buffer having the building against the ground and you can see the stepping of the building, which is probably - on the side that relates mostly to the height of the hospital to the south and you can see the major setbacks of each (inaudible). There's basically four setbacks along this elevation. And then, on the setback on the upper left, you can see that's where our wellness garden will be. And then, finally the last exhibit is the view, um, from the corner of Hardenberg and Somerset. I'm showing the view from the Legacy building (inaudible) grade. At the ground floor at the corner, we have meeting spaces, conference spaces with a potential breakout area onto that corner area that's screened by trees. And then, all of our lounge and shared functions are programmed along this glass side facing the southeast. In terms of the façade itself, it's a high-performance facade. This building is not a LEED building, but we pride ourselves on sustainability being part of our DNA at HOK and we are selecting materials that promote wellness and well-being with very little off gassing from the materials themselves. We look into locally sourced materials and then we've got green all the way around the base of the building and harvesting daylight even to the building through the atrium and we're providing a wellness garden (inaudible) setback on the first floor (inaudible). And we believe that the architecture is in full compliance with these elements.

Mr. Liebling: Thanks, Ken. And, uh, Mr. Drucker is available for questions at this point.

Ms. Ludwig: Aravind, we were going to question this witness now or were we going to move forward with the next witness?

Mr. Liebling: I meant the Board, Madame Chair, and, uh, but that's - it's - that's obviously your call.

Mr. Dominguez: I think Aravind - hey, you were muted.

Mr. Aithal: I'm sorry. I'm unmuted now.

Mr. Dominguez: Yeah.

Mr. Aithal: I apologize. This is Aravind Aithal, the Board attorney. Madame Chair, I believe it would be appropriate for the Board to ask questions, and then we can (inaudible) to the applicant's attorney and see if he wants to number one, he's got the right to continue with five members, if he wishes to continue with five or if he wishes to put in this case, but not go to a vote tonight, and then, we could come back in two weeks when this would be, uh, the next planning board hearing and we could go to a vote and Mr. Petrolino would be able to review the transcript of the testimony that was presented after he had to, uh, to leave. But I would leave that (inaudible)

Ms. Ludwig: And what is your preference, sir?

Mr. Liebling: Yeah, I think our preference would be to have the Board and the public question, uh, Mr. Drucker and then - and then present our final witness, um, and con- and repeat that process and obviously - obviously, you know, depending on - on how late you're - you're willing to continue and also, uh, uh, Board Member Petrolino's agreement that he will be willing to review the transcript or - or view this taped - this taped Webex or however it's presented.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay. Yeah, it would be his duty as a Board member to review that. Is - are the other Board members willing to continue with the application?

Ms. Ludwig: I don't hear any objections from anybody, so I am - so I'm going to proceed. When Mr. Petrolino leaves, he can get the, uh, I don't know if it's on CD or how they - how they put it, but he can listen to the hearing - the rest of the hearing that he is not participating in this evening before the final vote that'll take place at the next - at the next time. So, now I want to open up questions to the architect for the Board members. Do any of the Board members have any questions of the architect.

Mr. Petrolino: Petrolino here. Just a quick question. So, if I review the testimony in transcript form, uh, will I have any way to, uh, ask questions of any of the members of the, um, any of the witnesses or would I simply be expected to vote based upon the record?

Ms. Ludwig: No, we will be back. If I understand correctly, we will all be back and there will be an opportunity for you to question before we - we render a vote.

Mr. Petrolino: Perfect. Thank you.

Ms. Ludwig: That's my understanding. Is that correct, Mr. Aithal?

Mr. Aithal: That's my understanding, as well, but I want to clarify what Mr. Liebling - you wish to proceed with six members and you do not wish to go to a vote tonight, you think?

Mr. Liebling: Well, I honestly, I think, if - if the questioning is as long as it was the first time or even close to that long, um, and then, and then we have another witness and more questions, um, I think - I think I would just evaluate at that point, but that seems like that would be a, you know, that would be quite an accomplishment, so.

Mr. Aithal: Understood.

Mr. Liebling: Okay.

Mr. Aithal: So, we'll put on the witnesses tonight and to answer Mr. Petrolino's question, the witnesses will be back at the next scheduled meeting and Mr. Petrolino, if you had any questions to follow up, they would be available for your follow-up questions.

Mr. Petrolino: All right. Thank you.

Ms. Ludwig: Did you hear that?

Mr. Petrolino: I did. Thank you.

Ms. Ludwig: Okay. Now so, do any Board members have questions for the architect? I'm hearing - I'm hearing none. Do any of the professionals have questions for the architect? Again, hearing none, um, I think we are finished with this witness. If you have your next one, sir? Oh, I'm sorry. We have a - are we doing the public portion now?

Mr. Aithal: We are, Madame Chair.

Mr. Liebling: Yes.

Ms. Ludwig: So, now we are going to open it up to members of the public with questions for the architect relevant to his testimony only, the same as we did last time with the civil engineer (inaudible) alphabetically.

Unknown Female: Excuse me. Is the full Board even present right now?

Ms. Ludwig: Yes, they are.

Mr. Dominguez: We have a quorum, even if John has left, we have a quorum. So, I (inaudible) speaker registration process.

Unknown Male: Hello? Are you taking questions from the public?

Ms. Ludwig: We're working - we're going to be putting together a list.

Mr. Dominguez: (inaudible) is unmuted. So, if there are any members of the public. One, let's go through this first. Anyone who would like to speak. Christian Roche did not get to cross-examine him because they were unable to get through the noise at that juncture. If they would like to question him through cross-examination of Christian Roche and I would like you to announce yourself and I will add you to a list to deal with that, if there's anyone who wants to cross that.

Ms. Hunt: Yes, sir.

Mr. Dominguez: Yes, who is that? Your name?

Ms. Catherine Hunt: Hi, Catherine Hunt. I did put my hand up there. I don't know if it was (inaudible) effective.

Mr. Dominguez: Uh, are you on the phone or are you on computer?

Ms. Hunt: Oh, I'm on computer. Let me see (inaudible)

Mr. Dominguez: Oh, I have to make sure because the people who are on a phone call (inaudible)

Ms. Hunt: Here we are.

Mr. Dominguez: So, I've noted Ms. Hunt. Is there anyone else who would like to cross-examine Mr. Roche who did not get a chance last time because of the confusion? Okay. Seeing none, we'll just mark off Ms. Hunt here for a second. And now, I'm opening it up for those who want to cross-examine Mr. Drucker. I'm going to go alphabetically.

Mr. Dominguez reads through the alphabet. Jean Luc Borjay, Lindsay Bushong, Nishad Datta, Juan Gonzalez, Ming Jia, Charlie Kratovil, Elizabeth Ciccone, Viriyah Hodges, Catherine Hunt, Ed Knittel, Jessica Kratovil, Brian Kulas, Christo Makropoulos, Matthew Meoni, Laura Merz, Danielle Moore, Michael Pedersen, Brian Rak, Arly Rubens, Linda Stork, Herb Tarbous are placed on the list of speakers.

Mr. Dominguez: Seeing no additional members of the public, do we want to, uh, Mr. Liebling, would you like to start with the one person who would like to cross-examine Christian Roche before we jump into the architect cross examinations?

Mr. Liebling: That makes sense. If it makes sense to the chair.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. So, I'm going to go ahead and, uh, mute everyone. Actually, I need to make one note here. Mr. Brian Rak, are you on the phone or by computer?

Mr. Brian Rak: I'm on the computer.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. All right. So, I'm going to mute everyone. And then, Ms. Hunt, you'll have your chance to cross-examine Mr. Roche. Hold on. Okay. Ms. Hunt, are you - are you there? You'll need to unmute yourself.

Ms. Hunt: I think this it. Does this work?

Mr. Dominguez: Yes, it did. All right, Ms. Hunt. You have - your five minutes begin now for you to, uh, cross-examine, Mr. Roche.

Ms. Hunt: Okay. Great. I just want to be able to understand, um, what about the structure that we're talking about? Is the part that Mr. Roche would talk about versus, um, the part that the architect would talk about?

Mr. Roche: I can give an answer. The civil engineering side, my area of expertise really focuses outside the building. Anything dealing with the building would be the architect. I would talk about anything relative to on-site circulation, utilities and stormwater management on the other topic we've covered tonight.

Ms. Hunt: Okay. So, got it. All right. Well, um, I'm thinking that one of the things that was talking about the application and that there were conditions that the application would be conditioned on approval of the power plant. Is that correct?

Mr. Aithal: Okay. This is Aravind (inaudible)

Ms. Hunt: Or did I understand that correctly?

Mr. Aithal: Can you hear me?

Ms. Hunt: Yes, I do.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, if I may? This is Aravind Aithal, the Board attorney. And Ms. Hunt, perhaps you weren't here when we had a discussion about the conditions of approval. There is no (inaudible) approval

Ms. Hunt: Yeah.

Mr. Aithal: - so, there are no conditions at this point. Mr. Liebling, the applicant's attorney and Mr. Roche, uh, certainly made representations as to conditions that they would, uh, I guess agree to or approve upon if there was an approval by this Board. But this Board has not rendered its decision yet. So, this is your - so, this is your chance to ask Mr. Roche questions about his testimony, which hopefully you heard, uh, regarding - civil engineering.

Ms. Hunt: Since I'm not, you know, I'm not real familiar with that, so that's why I was asking for that, um, you know, guidance on that. I remember there was a discussion about conditions that had to be decided by the Board and I was wondering if Mr. Roche knows about any agreement to approve, um, to approve this or in other words, if he can - he testified about the condition, but the conditions decided by the Board in the approval process and has - was there a pre-agreement, for example, because it's a big project and it seems like, you know, I thought I should ask, was there a pre-agreement made?

Mr. Aithal: So, Ms. Hunt, so, we've addressed your question about the issue of this Board rendering any conditions. The Board has not rendered an opinion yet. So, there are no conditions because there's been no approval. There can't be conditions unless there's an approval. There certainly - it would be meaningless to have conditions if there's a denial, but, you know, in terms of approval, I think I've - I've tried to answer your question. Um, if you have any specific questions related to civil engineering - based on Mr. Roche's testimony, this would be your opportunity to ask those questions.

Ms. Hunt: Okay. I think I understand that - that part. I think I understand what you're saying is that it's not a - there's no pre-agreement as far as the planning part of it goes, um, as far as the planning part of, you know, like the conditions that have to happen before you can finalize the plan. I think I got that. Is that about right?

Mr. Aithal: This Board has not rendered an opinion about this application. We haven't approved it. We haven't denied it and we haven't conditioned it. So whatever discussion there were about conditions that they would agree to, that's something the Board will consider when the Board deliberates and it will be done openly, but this is not - this is your opportunity to ask Mr. Roche questions about civil engineering testimony that he's provided.

Ms. Hunt: Okay. And you're saying that it has mostly to do about maybe the location of the building and the - and the outside part of the structure of the building?

Mr. Aithal: Right. Did you hear Mr. Roche's testimony?

Ms. Hunt: I heard a good part of it. And I didn't come in - on the exact beginning, but I heard a lot of it. And so, I just want to clarify that. And then, I just want to ask him about - he said something about the storm water drainage. Is that correct? Um, what about the structure, would be part of that stormwater drainage planning, say from the top, which from the top floor? Suppose you have a big storm and you have the stormwater coming off, what is the actual flow that you envision of the stormwater, what is the flow and the pattern of the flow of this stormwater to that, that you envision?

Mr. Roche: The pattern of the flow is maintaining the existing drainage pattern in that all new rainwater that hits within the project site will be transported (inaudible) via roof leaders, meaning drains on top of the roof or via catch basins at the ground level into a surrounding stormwater management system, which will direct the flow into the existing Somerset Street system. There's a 24-inch diameter storm line in

Somerset Street. It's owned by the City right now and that's where we're going to discharge our storm water. I don't have the exact flow number. If it's critical I can certainly look it up while some of the other witnesses are testifying, but what I will say is the flow that's going there as part of this proposed application is actually less than the flow that's going there currently with the school and the asphalt pavement there and the reason for that is I imagine previously (inaudible) because we are increasing the amount of grassed areas so we're slightly reducing the runoff.

Ms. Hunt: Yeah, about - about what percentage would you say it has been decreased?

Mr. Roche: Um, I'd go one to two percent. It's not a massive reduction, but it is a reduction (inaudible) coverage.

Ms. Hunt: How could that be increased?

Mr. Roche: I'm not sure I understand your question. How could the reduction of pervious coverage be (inaudible)?

Ms. Hunt: Yes, that's what I mean. How could the reduction be increased?

Mr. Roche: In ways that, not that we're currently proposing this, but ways that we could increase that reduction of pervious coverage is if we were to add more tree pits around the site or potentially some small landscape beds. I'd also (inaudible) though it's part of stormwater management design to (inaudible) conservative. This building is proposing some green roofs that the architect can talk about. Um, which they had themselves will also reduce the amount of the amount of run off leaving the site.

Ms. Hunt: Yeah, I could - I could see that. Um, and I'm thinking of - can you think of ways to green the site and to, you know, to increase the amount of water that soaks in rather than, you know, in proportion of what runs off?

Mr. Roche: Um, certainly, we did put some thought into that as we were developing the (inaudible) site plan. Uh, it's always a tradeoff when you're doing this about making sure you're providing adequate space for pedestrian movement, adequate sidewalk widths while also trying to provide a balance of appropriate green space and we think we did that with the significant amount of new street trees that were being planted, a significant amount of landscape beds, um, specifically in the southwest corner of the site working your way around the building. On the west end portion of the site and into the northwestern portion of the site. Um, since we weren't able to provide a, you know, vast amount of grassed area within the site to fit the building (inaudible) where we wanted, that's when we were left with the decision that we would have some green roofs as part of the building to help aid in that process.

Ms. Hunt: And do you think that you could increase the, um, you could increase the, um, amount of - of greening in the site, but like you say, it would maybe decrease pedestrian movement a little bit -

Mr. Roche: Yeah, I think what we're proposing is appropriate for the whole landscaping for an urban environment. As I stated before from a stormwater management regulatory perspective - we wouldn't be required to enhance that green space any more. Um, we chose just as a design team, we thought it made more sense rather than taking up more space at the ground level where we already have a significant amount of landscape area to consider the green roof. That was the rationale behind our thinking.

Ms. Hunt: Thank you. So, okay. I wanted to know something about that, and then, in terms of the power plant, what would be the energy source?

Mr. Liebling: Again, like the other power plant questions, they'll be addressed at the application on the - on the building that includes that facility.

Ms. Hunt: Oh, I see. And the need for it would be, you know, I guess in terms of power outage. You said redundancy? Is that what you were thinking to, uh, keep that - basically the whole facility running even if there was a power outage or were you thinking of it in terms not of just emergency but in terms of day to day?

Mr. Liebling: We'll have a full presentation on that at the hearing (inaudible)

Ms. Hunt: Oh, okay. Because he mentioned the power source, so as part of what his purview is so I thought I should ask about that. Um, and then, what about the structure do you feel is really makes, you know, is really appropriate is special to a research facility? It looks like a patient treatment facility actually quite a bit more than a research facility, but both?

Mr. Liebling: Ms. Hunt, I think that's a question for the architect, who I know you've put your name on the list for.

Ms. Hunt: Oh, okay. All right. Because I - he said it was a structure so I was trying to, you know, not - not understanding the differences between the boundaries of civil engineering and the architecture, I was trying to get it, what is the difference here. Yeah. So, is there anything about the structure in part- that would pertain specifically to the mission of the building that that you have addressed?

Mr. Dominguez: Just to cut in, I apologize for everybody. Ms. Hunt, I'm just giving you your one-minute warning. Please continue.

Ms. Hunt: Oh, okay. That's - I just wanted to know about that. Is there - is there anything that you feel is, you know, pertains specifically to the mission of that building?

Mr. Roche: I think the architect is much better suited to answer that question.

Ms. Hunt: Okay. I wasn't quite sure how that affected your - your work and, you know, in your purview there. But if there is anything that does, you know, pertain in that particular mission, I was interested in knowing how what your point of view was? That wasn't a part of your considerations?

Mr. Roche: Uh, no, generally with the engineering design elements, we're given the, uh, the building footprint by the architect showing us where the proposed door locations are and we work with them a little bit as far as laying out where the hardscape areas are going to go, where the pedestrian routes are going to go, but as far as what was driving the building design and the structure, uh, the architect will handle that question in a few minutes.

Ms. Hunt: All right. And that kind of lays it out for me. I just didn't really know how that would affect what you do and, uh, you know, what affect that would have on your point of view and design of your building. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. So, now we'll slide over to the cross-examination of the architect, uh, and our first, uh, speaker is Mr. Borjay.

Mr. Borjay: Yes, I am present.

Mr. Aithal: This is Mr. Aithal, our Board Attorney. It may bear repeating. Uh, just so the - the folks that have lined up - to cross-examine the architect - Mr. Borjay, if I may just finish. This is Aravind Aithal, the Board attorney. Uh, just so that the folks that are lined up to cross-examine the architect are aware, this is just related to cross-examination of the testimony that Mr. Drucker provided as an expert in the field of architecture related to this site. So, the pavilion application, which is the only application before the Board

this evening, it would be related to this site and to Mr. Drucker's expertise as an architect related to that application.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Mr. Borjay, we apologize for that. You may begin whenever you're ready.

Mr. Borjay: Yes, understood. Thank you, Counselman. Um, I hope, um, uh, the questions I had earlier may be more applicable to the architect. Um, where exactly would this build be happening? The power plant? Where, like, what sort of, like, municipal resources would have to go to this? Like would any sort of additional, uh, new additions to the power grid, any sort of like new municipal, uh, underground lines (inaudible)

Mr. Liebling: Sir, again, this is about the building - this is about the building that Mr. Drucker testified to. He didn't mention power plants. This is about the building on the exhibits that he showed you the floor plans and the - and the, uh, the stacking and the elevations.

Mr. Borjay: Oh, yes. I'm terribly sorry. So, then, would any sort of new municipal underground lines, like water, sewage, etcetera, what would that look like and what cost to the town would that take?

Mr. Aithal: I'm not sure if the architect has testified to the infrastructure, but maybe Mr. Drucker you had, and I just missed it?

Mr. Drucker: No, I did not testify to the point of entries to the (inaudible) perimeter of the site.

Mr. Borjay: Yeah, so what sort of new infrastructure would have to be constructed for this new, uh, facility?

Mr. Drucker: I can't answer that question.

Mr. Liebling: I think that was entirely in - Mr. Roche's testimony on all of the - all of the improvements, you know, on the ground and below the ground.

Mr. Borjay: Oh, it was?

Mr. Liebling: Yes, yes. It was.

Mr. Borjay: Oh, I'm terribly sorry. I don't recall the - hearing that information.

Mr. Aithal: So, Madame Chair, if I may, uh, if the witness has any other questions for Mr. Drucker the architect, otherwise we're going to have to move on to Ms. Bushong.

Mr. Borjay: Once again, I'm terribly sorry. It appears that I've misunderstood this once again. I will keep this in mind for further cross-examinations. Once again, thank you, councilmembers for your time. I appreciate it and your service to the great city of New Brunswick. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. Next up is Lindsay Bushong.

Ms. Lindsay Bushong: Before I ask my question, just there seems to be a lot of confusion in the chat like how late this meeting is going. I don't know if anybody can offer any clarity, like what - like are we going to finish the questioning here and that's the end of the (inaudible) It seems like there's some confusion.

Mr. Aithal: Ms. Bushong, this is Aravind Aithal, the Board Attorney. Madame Chair, if I may. As I understand it, this is cross-examination, we'll - we'll put on the next witness if we're able to, so I don't have a time, but Ms. Bushong if you have some questions that you'd like to ask Mr. Drucker, the architect

related to this site and his testimony regarding this application. (inaudible) other members of the public are waiting patiently for you.

Ms. Bushong: Yeah, okay. I got it. Thank you. So, my question is, you were LEED certified as an architect and also that you value sustainability in this project, is this building going to be LEED certified?

Mr. Drucker: No, it will not be LEED certified, but it will include a lot of the same items that are in the typical LEED certified checklist.

Ms. Bushong: So, could you maybe elaborate on maybe some of the ones that I don't know, you're most passionate about or you think are going to be the kind of highlight of the building?

Mr. Drucker: Sure. So, the exterior wall that will be a high-performance wall, which means there will be very little heat gain or heat loss going through the exterior wall. The green roofs that we talked about will be extensive setbacks and those green roofs will limit the amount of storm runoff and will calm that storm runoff (inaudible) uh, we have daylight penetration going deep into the building for the wellness of its occupants. We have daylight going deep into the lobby of both the north and south sides so that will have a little impact on sort of how dark the space is. This is a very large site and so the idea is to get daylight into deep of a space as possible. And then, all the materials that we select will be, uh, of low emitting materials so there won't be any off gassing from the materials (inaudible) and the material that we select meet the guidelines of the (inaudible) designing hospitals.

Ms. Bushong: In terms of materials, are you guys thinking about your sourcing at all, are there like any intentions to locally source materials or to tap into, you know, like the east coast area for that or -

Mr. Drucker: We would optimize the selection materials to hopefully be within a 500-mile radius of the site. Like I said, we're following the principals of LEED, we're just not going after LEED certification.

Ms. Bushong: Is there a reason you're not going after certification?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, just that some clients are more concerned about the performance of the building than necessarily putting a plaque on the building. So, um, you know, we follow a standard of procedures within our practice talking to all of our clients about water use, energy use, material selections, when we're dealing with the contractor on how to separate all the trash so that it's all recycled. We care about the recycled content of the steel and we care about the use of low emitting materials and able to reduce the amount of carbon footprint.

Ms. Bushong: And this sort of relates to you, you sort of touched on this already, um, but just thinking about that it is a cancer center and kind of like what, um, Catherine was saying earlier, thinking about how to make those patients feel like more comfortable, sort of like what features are you adding to the building for that?

Mr. Drucker: Well, you know, most of the people coming to this building don't want to be there. So, what we try to do is eliminate as much stress as possible. So, their whole arrival to the building, the reason why we have (inaudible) entry is that a lot of people will be coming for the first with their family members and we want basically whisk the cars away quickly into the project to the north and all the wayfinding will be very intuitive with the new building and the atrium will be very clear in terms of how you maneuver between the different floors. So, wayfinding is very important, but it's all about reducing stress. And so, we'll be selecting carbon materials, natural materials and once again, um, you know, daylight is incredibly important, access to daylight (inaudible)

Mr. Dominguez: Next up is Datta.

Mr. Datta: Okay. So, my first question for you is, um, Mr. Drucker, what is your design philosophy going into a building and project like this?

Mr. Drucker: My design philosophy is basically to design a building from the inside out and from the outside in, but I have to respond to the context and as to response to the typology of this particular building, uh, and it's really all about creating an environment for wellness. Uh, my philosophy is to do basically a building that adds value to the client and is a long-term solution to the client so their investment in architecture, basically relates to the community and relates to a sense of place.

Mr. Datta: So, have you worked on similar projects before and can you give me examples?

Mr. Drucker: Yes. I designed, uh, the \$1 billion Coats Center in New York City in Manhattan, uh, which is an 18-story building that basically is an outpatient building. In New Jersey, I designed the Princeton, uh, Community Hospital in Princeton, which is now part of Penn Medicine and in Harlem, I designed the Harlem Hospital (inaudible) African American (inaudible)

Mr. Datta: My next question has to do with (inaudible) because someone previously asked when it was Mr. Roche's time for questions, uh, what you were going to do to mitigate the fact that it was going to literally be blocking out the sun for many of the residents in town.

Mr. Drucker: The building has significant setbacks. Uh, the base of the building where I described as the diagnostic chassis requires a lot of adjacencies to operate efficiently. And so, we build basically street wall building to bend - as soon as we can, we break out from that street wall and create as many setbacks as we can. Some would call it a wedding cake building. So, we've created as many setbacks as we can, especially on the southside. And the north entry - drive provides a nice setback to the residents (inaudible)

Mr. Datta: Okay. Um, and I believe this might be my last question for you, Mr. Drucker. Um, what is the expected timetable for the, uh, the, uh, I guess just what you just gave testimony on thus far?

Mr. Drucker: I think my colleague described when we anticipate starting construction and completing construction.

Mr. Datta: Okay. Um, I don't know, Mr. Drucker, if you're the most appropriate person to ask this question to, but for the, um, for the people that's going to be working on this project, are you going to be using union contractors?

Mr. Drucker: I'm not the appropriate person to answer that question.

Mr. Datta: I see. Um, and, uh, I think that about does it for me, but thanks so much for taking your time, uh, to answer my questions. I'm very impressed with your credentials and I hope you have a great night.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. Next up is, uh, Juan Gonzalez.

Mr. Gonzalez: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Drucker, uh, I have a few questions for you based on your testimony and I'm sure you haven't been in too many meetings that have gone this length because there is so much public concern over what is happening here. I hope you appreciate that. Okay. My first question to you is, in your drawings, you mentioned that the basement area, because it will house all of the radiation facilities and obviously they need to have much more protection, the radiation facilities, it extends up to the property line. I want to - can you elaborate on that? Is the basement area - because I can see from the drawings that Mr. Paladino presented back in July, it was really quite extensive and also it goes underneath this set in for the cars where the cars will be able to cut in. I'm sorry, the cut in for the cars. Are you going all the way underneath the sidewalk on Somerset Street, uh, with the basement - your - your basement configurations?

Mr. Drucker: No, we're going to the property line on Somerset Street side and we're going to the property line on the northside and we're probably around, um, the site slightly tapers on the Division Street side. I would say that we're about 10 feet, 15 feet away from the property line on the west and 10 or 15 feet away from the property line on the eastside. (inaudible) about 67,000 square feet and most of our radion-radiation oncology equipment is in the southeast corner. There is no equipment underneath the drive, north access drive, the kitchen is underneath that area and some other offices.

Mr. Gonzalez: Okay. And how deep is the basement because the - the civil engineer talked about the need to remove, uh, a historic spill because the basement is, uh, are you - are you going to have a sub-basement or just one basement and how deep down does it go below the grade level?

Mr. Drucker: It'll be one basement. Seventeen feet deep and the elevator pits for the four passenger elevators and three elevators will have elevator pits, uh, that are slightly deeper than 17 feet.

Mr. Gonzalez: Okay. Um, now, another question. You mentioned that there are going to be considerable outpatient facilities. It's not just a 96-bed hospital, but clearly there's all kinds of treatment facilities are outpatients. I think I heard you say that there would be 200 to 300 (inaudible) in terms of, there's 96 beds, but 200 to 300 patients. Are those the inpatients that's 200 to 300? Because I have to assume that the outpatients on any given day will be considerably more. Do you have any estimates about what the capacity is for outpatients, you know, in the - in the floors that you have outpatient services?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, the number of existing daily patients are 500. Uh, the number of new daily patients within the new facility will be 200 to 300 and that changes with the daily patient volume. Will be the number of existing, uh, the new change in daily patient (inaudible) will be 200 to 300. Patients - uh, the totaling (inaudible) new daily employees (inaudible)

Mr. Gonzalez: (inaudible) the net gain. Are you talking about the net gain? Because the Cancer Institute has already an existing facility. Are you saying that there are going to be (phone ringing in background) What will the new facility generate in terms of actual outpatients and inpatients?

Mr. Drucker: The total number will be 700 to 800 throughout the day.

Mr. Gonzalez: 700 to 800 throughout the day. Okay. And you also mentioned that you believed that you're building a building that will have - that will result in a net increase over several years of 500, uh, workers, right? And although understanding that some of the workers will come from the old cancer center into the new one, but that they'll be a net increase of 500 employees, right?

Mr. Drucker: Yes, that's a 10-year projection.

Mr. Gonzalez: That's a 10-year projection and that's about a hundred less than Mr. Paladino has (inaudible) has been trumpeting in all his previous announcements because they were saying 600 permanent jobs and you're saying 500 jobs. I appreciate the correct - the, uh, better information on that. Another issue, uh, there is a - will there be proton therapy rooms in this new facility?

Mr. Drucker: No.

Mr. Gonzalez: They'll be no - no proton therapy. Okay. Just to (inaudible)

Mr. Drucker: No, I don't believe so.

Mr. Gonzalez: I'm sorry. What?

Mr. Drucker: I don't believe so, no. They'll be MRIs, uh, they'll be (inaudible)

Mr. Gonzalez: And then, one last question, uh, someone else has asked you previously about the issue of shadows. Um, have you done any in your architectural drawings, uh, any, uh, any extrapolations or what the shadows will be like, not only from the building, that's one thing, but I'm sure there's not going to be a whole lot of setbacks with the garage, in terms of the shadows that this entire project will create for a neighborhood that is three - which is residential on three sides, by Division, by Hardenberg side and on the back side. It's all one and two-story houses around there. Have you done any sha- uh, any renderings of shadows created by the buildings, the entire buildings that are going to be erected?

Mr. Drucker: Yes, when we do our sign analysis, we always do shadow studies but this actually falls within, uh, the guidelines of the redevelopment plan and we can (inaudible) the redevelopment plan.

Mr. Gonzalez: I'm sorry? Within the guidelines? What do you mean by the guidelines of the redevelopment plan? The shadows were - there were guidelines for shadows in the redevelopment plan?

Mr. Drucker: There were guidelines for building height, the entire site. We could've (inaudible) the entire - we could've extruded the entire project, uh, 220 feet - 225 feet high, uh, around the perimeter of the entire site. So, we feel like the setbacks that we provide at the eighth floor and above the patient rooms have provided a lot more light and air down to the street level.

Mr. Gonzalez: Okay. All right. Well, those were all my questions. Thank you for your, uh, for your responses.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you, Mr. Gonzalez. Next up is Jia.

Mr. Jia: Yes, it's Ming Jia. Thank you. I would also like to reemphasize the fact that it is now 11:10 and this is outrageous for all public members, but in any case, um, the only question I have regarding the architecture of this building, I guess, is an individual and community member with disabled fam- as a community member with disabled family members, what (inaudible) immediately relevant to me is kind of how accessibility is going to be involved in the production of this building, so I was just wondering for you, Mr. Drucker, as an architect, how does accessibility centers, if at all, in your planning and execution?

Mr. Drucker: We believe wholeheartedly in making sure that the - the plan is accessible to everyone. Uh, the north entry provides for immediate access for wheelchairs directly into the lobby, as does the south entry and we believe that the circulation system provides for convenient, uh, movement between levels horizontally and vertically for all individuals. So, we agree that it's very important.

Mr. Jia: All right. Um, that's all the questions I have. It's many thanks to you, Mr. Drucker and the wonderful outstanding members of this counsel and making the members of the public stay up this late, outstanding.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. Um, next up is Knittel.

Mr. Aithal: It appears that he's left the meeting. Maybe we could recall him, maybe he just got disconnected.

Mr. Dominguez: But if he - well, if he left and he comes back (inaudible) I have him still marked.

Mr. Aithal: At the end maybe. Why don't we go onto (inaudible)?

Mr. Dominguez: Yeah, of course. Mr. Charlie Kratovil. Are you there?

Mr. Kratovil: Can you see me? Can you hear me? Sure. So, uh, Mr. Architect, I would like to ask you which, uh, you know, street or which part of the building do you view as the main entrance or the front of the building, would that be the Somerset Street side?

Mr. Drucker: I think the building address is on the Somerset Street side, but we want to encourage people to use the north entry drive.

Mr. Kratovil: The north one would be the new road that would be built?

Mr. Drucker: The new entry drive that extends from Division to Hardenberg. Yes. We were wanting those people who are repeat visitors to the hospital to the cancer pavilion to come to.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. And would that road be a public road or a private road?

Mr. Drucker: Mmm, I don't know the answer to that question.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. I think it's an important one. Um, but the reason I asked, I know that, you know, a lot of buildings, uh, when they build them they try to at least set the upper floors back a little bit from the street. Um, now, I understand that if you look at it from the - that driveway or that new road, there are setbacks as you go higher up, I think, starting at the sixth floor you have, you know, less and less of a - sort of imposing towering building because it's purposely set back to - to allow people to still see the sky. Um, yet on the Somerset Street side at that corner, you're going right up to the corner, all the way up. And for the record, how tall would the building be?

Mr. Drucker: It's about 218 feet tall.

Mr. Kratovil: 218 feet and no setbacks at all on the, uh, on the Somerset Street side, it just goes right up to the (inaudible)

Mr. Drucker: That's correct. That's correct.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. And - and why - why did you design it that way?

Mr. Drucker: We felt that there needed to be a - an iconic element to the building that announced this cancer pavilion as a major landmark in Brunswick and we felt like it was responsible to go (inaudible) to the street walls on the other side as we do in many of our urban project, yet when the building hits the ground, it's slightly setback so that we could allow for some greater width as the building (inaudible). Uh, and we wanted to create a component that expressed the verticality of the building at the corner facing the existing - CINJ building.

Mr. Kratovil: And do you feel it's really necessary to have both, you know, uh, walkways overtop of Somerset Street just maybe, what, a hundred feet apart from one another? Why is it necessary to have, you know, two walkways so close to one another? Can't - wouldn't one suffice?

Mr. Drucker: When we do hospitals, especially when we add bridges, typically we want a behind the scenes connection, and we want a public connection. So, (inaudible) back of house connection, which is what the western bridge is for and then there's a front of house connection where patients and staff can (inaudible) uh, (inaudible) back and forth between hospital and the legacy building and the cancer pavilion.

Mr. Kratovil: All right. And, uh, I'm not sure how much you know about it but I have retrieved some of the testimony from the last witness that came up after, uh, my turn and, uh, did you look at any other

potential sites for this building? Uh, it was mentioned there was a site to the east of the building that was, uh, considered? Were you - did you look at any other sites or were just involved with the one?

Mr. Drucker: Before we, uh, were retained, we understood that they were looking at the site to the east of our site. We did some studies for the east of that site during this election process when we were selected and there were other types that we looked at, as well, to the south of the hospital.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. Can you tell me - was one of those sites the, uh, large vacant property across from the train station?

Mr. Drucker: No.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. I'm not sure why that wasn't considered. It's certainly an area that's much more in need of development than a - than a school. Do you have any, uh, do you have any concerns about taking the school away, uh, and building on this site?

Mr. Drucker: Um, that's not for me to answer.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. Um, I guess do you feel that the - the 200 and I guess 218 feet, uh, you know, height, do you feel like that's in character with the neighborhood, this is, uh, you know, it'd be replacing a three-story building that's immediately right now next to some two-story, three-story homes, two-and-a-half story homes. Um, do you feel like that this building is at all out of place or out of character with the neighborhood that it's in?

Mr. Drucker: No, I do not. I think it's adjacent to the main university hospital to the south. There are taller condominiums to the east. Uh, some of the other sites are too small. If we had gone to some of the other sites, we would've had to have gone taller in building.

Mr. Kratovil: Hmmm. And, uh, for the record, would this be the tallest building in the - the hospital campus?

Mr. Drucker: I believe it would be close to the size of the university hospital. I don't recall the elevation of the hospital to the south. But it would be amongst the family of tallest buildings for the hospital.

Mr. Kratovil: Uh-huh. And, uh, I guess I'd like to know why you arranged or if it was your call to arrange the certain floors for certain purposes. I know, obviously, you mentioned you have experience building medical facilities, cancer centers and I know those are some of the most complex buildings that exist. Can you just tell us a little bit about why you chose, uh, certain functions to be on certain floors? For instance, I see a mechanical floor midway through the building. You know, what - what led you to do that and - and what about some of the other services that hospitals need like, uh, environmental services, specifically house, you know, um, um, linens and those kinds of things. Where would that be located and, you know, tell me about the strategy of why you put things where?

Mr. Drucker: Well, I went through all the floor plans, but with strategy of placing all of our heavy equipment in the basement, it makes a lot of sense and also to screen and all of that. The reason for the mechanical floor halfway up the building is that it sits above the surgical floors and usually when you've got surgical suites, it's important, there's a lot of air movement. There's a lot of fresh air changes that are required. So, typically, you put that mechanical floor above those surgical floors to provide for that fresh air ventilation. Uh, the clinical floors, I want to be close the atrium and the research floor and the second floor was a place where leadership, uh, wanted the signs to be on display so people could see that research was being done in this building and then, of course the floor plates for the bed floors are smaller. We have to fit x number of patient rooms around the linear feet of (inaudible) bed tower. And so, that's usually a skinnier floor plate. We call that more or less like a bar building, a double loaded corridor, an extra wide

corridor of support. And so, the stacking of the building is very logical, based on over 60 meetings with different user groups, uh, four or five user group meetings during the course of the programming (inaudible) and that's what developed into the current (inaudible)

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. And so, uh, you know, one of the main reasons that I've taken time out of my day to be here and to study up on this is because I am concerned about the - the school being displaced and I wanted to ask was there ever any consideration to including a component that could replace the school, you know, public education on - on the first couple of floors of this building? Was that, uh, an idea that, uh, that you the architect ever entertained? Was that something that you, uh, you know, would be open to, um, because this neighborhood needs a school. We can't afford to lose a school.

Mr. Drucker: We placed the conference center on the ground floor with potential access to the community at the corner of Hardenberg and Somerset, but not an entire school.

Mr. Kratovil: Thank you. If you could explain a little bit more about the community - is it a community center or community room?

Mr. Drucker: It's a conference - it's a conference center with potential access to the community.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. So, as the leader of the fifth and sixth neighborhood association, I could just, uh, reach out to, uh, you know, Jack Morris or Barry Astroski and, uh, book the - book the room?

Mr. Drucker: I think you'd have to make an arrangement with CINJ and Rutgers, but the potential is there for that to happen.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. Because, yeah, I do feel like the community is getting shortchanged. Um, you know, I know you probably didn't make the decision (inaudible) site they're using, but, uh, this is a site that's served an education purpose for over a century and, uh, while, uh, the cancer institute is a noble goal, I don't see, uh, it being a proper replacement for the school and the school really needs, uh, to be replaced first. Uh, is there any - any insight you could give into alternatives or - or ways that that, uh, the projects could coexist and that the - the students of Lincoln Annex could not lose their school?

Mr. Drucker: I don't think I can answer that question. This is the site for the cancer pavilion.

Mr. Kratovil: Okay. We'll see. Thank you very much.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you, Mr. Kratovil. Next up is -

Ms. Hunt: Hello? Did you skip over me? I'm Catherine Hunt. Uh, just think of the order of the alphabet.

Mr. Dominguez: Yeah, you know what, because I had it over here off to the side. I did. And I missed Hodges, as well.

Mr. Hodges: I had technical difficulties, as well. So, I need to (inaudible) just to let you know.

Mr. Kratovil: Yeah, I think Mr. Knittel is back and I apologize. I meant to note, Ms. Ciccone was trying to get on this list, and she was unable I don't know if she was muted or not, but I thought it'd pass that along. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: Let me see if she - if she happens to be still on. I can - I can get her on and we can - uh, we can get her on. Uh, where is she?

Ms. Ciccone: I'm still here.

Mr. Domínguez: Would you like to take your five minutes to cross-examine the architect?

Mr. Hodges: So, uh, which one of us is going?

Mr. Domínguez: Ms. Ciccone, she would be C. So, if we missed her, she would've gone ahead of everybody.

Mr. Ciccone: I would like to question the architect, but I would also like to protest how late this is. Uh, uh, I'm willing to allow the other people to go ahead of me, but I think this is all gone way too far already. When do you plan to adjourn?

Mr. Aithal: This is Aravind, (inaudible) Board Attorney. I think we've answered this once before. I think we're going to get as many witnesses and the members of the public, uh, on record as we can. I don't know that there's a time certain and I appreciate that the Board members, um, who are volunteers here, are staying late to hear this testimony because there is such a public interest and there are many members of the public who are still (inaudible). So, with all due respect, Ms. Ciccone, if you wish to ask questions, this is the time. I don't want to hold people up and take (inaudible)

Ms. Ciccone: Yeah, if you - if I can do my section of questions now, I would like to then.

Mr. Domínguez: Ms. Ciccone, you can proceed whenever you'd like.

Ms. Ciccone: Thank you. In terms of the design aesthetic, um, you've selected terra cotta because you feel that, uh, it goes along with the brick of the neighborhood, but, in fact, it's a modernist building when the majority of the homes in the neighborhood are, uh, late Victorian or early 20th century, uh, arts and crafts. So, I want to understand how you think a terra cotta box fits in with an arts and crafts home?

Mr. Drucker: Yes. I'm here. It's - it's a different scale. I mean, it's - you can't compare the scale and domestic residential architecture with institutional healthcare architecture.

Ms. Ciccone: Yet you're still going to wedge that building in amongst these residential homes, but yet no tip of the hat whatsoever to the fact that you are doing so. I don't understand how that's a suitable design aesthetic for our neighborhood.

Mr. Drucker: Well, we believe it's a - a very good aesthetic for a - a civic-minded institution, uh, that wants to sort of celebrate optimism about one, uh, treats cancer and we believe that it's a very modern building, uh, made out of, uh, very organic material. It's not cottage style, it's not Victorian style, it's not Colonial style. I agree. Um, but the building is about texture; it's about reflecting light. The terra cotta will have three different textures. It'll have two different colors, uh, to break down the scale of the building. But, you know, the floor to floor height of domestic architecture is 8 or 9 feet. The floor to floor height for a medical pavilion is anywhere from 15 to 17 feet (inaudible) so there will be scale difference and by creating terra cotta pieces that are handmade and are handcrafted, um, hopefully locally sourced within 500 miles, uh, we believe very strongly that it's a suitable material for this site.

Ms. Ciccone: Can you talk to the - to the cost of the site? Can you talk to how much this building is expected to cost and where the funding is coming from?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, no. As the architect, I can't define that for you.

Ms. Ciccone: Who can define that? Uh, the engineer couldn't tell anything about that, either. Is there anyone on your panel that can talk about the cost and the funding sources?

Mr. Liebling: I can say that it's not relevant to a site plan review.

Ms. Ciccone: Humph! In your opinion.

Mr. Liebling: Well, in opinion - in New Jersey law's opinion.

Ms. Ciccone: Well, it's certainly relevant to me as a tax payer in the city who's going to have to foot the bill for this multi-million dollar thing unless someone tells me it's grant funded, in which case, I want to see the (inaudible). So, you see that there's kind of a Catch-22 there, what I don't understand. So, can you clarify the funding for me or not?

Mr. Aithal: Do you have any other questions for the architect?

Ms. Ciccone: How many million dollars is the plan scheduled for right now regardless of the source? What is the cost of the building?

Mr. Aithal: Ms. Ciccone, I don't know that those questions can be answered by this witness. Do you have any questions related to architecture and his testimony on cross (inaudible)?

Ms. Ciccone: How can the architect don't understand the cost of the building he designed? That's (inaudible) He obviously specs all the materials including the terra cotta, so how much does it cost?

Mr. Aithal: I understand that you want an answer to your question, but this is not the witness as he's indicated he cannot answer that question, so, um, (inaudible)

Ms. Ciccone: (inaudible) up here that will be able to answer? (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Ms. Ciccone, I don't - think any of the witnesses that are going to be put on are going to answer - are going to be able to answer your question.

Ms. Ciccone: Well, how late do I have to stay up until someone shows up that can answer?

Mr. Aithal: Do you have any questions for the architect?

Ms. Ciccone: Yes, what is the cost of the building? Oh, my goodness. All right. Very well, then.

Mr. Datta: I don't understand (inaudible) architect the building cannot know the costs of the design. (inaudible) you went to Harvard, after all, they don't teach you how to assess the cost of the (inaudible) and you went to Harvard (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is the second time that Mr. Datta has interjected out of order. It would be appropriate at this point to admonish him, perhaps and if - if he continues to do that, as the Board rules permit, we can - we can remove him from the meeting. But in order to have an orderly meeting perhaps Mr. Datta should refrain from interjecting when, uh, he's not called upon. Ms. Ciccone, did you have any other questions for the architect, or did you want to save for public comment?

Ms. Ciccone: Um, I will (inaudible) the rest of my time for the public comment later, you know, at 4 a.m. when we finally get to that part. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: So, going back. Now we are at Hodges.

Mr. Hodges: Okay. Finally, I would like an answer to my previous question of this whole point of creating - making this campus facility and the whole argument behind it is that it's supposed to be like be beneficial (inaudible) patients and such, but at the same time, you're going to make the facility and the construction

and such is right next to the hospital, which will probably interrupt the patient care and you mentioned you have no precautions for that and you seem to be very dismissive of that. So, can you give an answer for that?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, you know as the previous - as Chris described in earlier testimony, ideally construction will happen between like 7 a.m. and between 3:30 and 4:00 p.m. We've designed hospitals where there's been vertical expansion on top of a functioning hospital. We've done urban, uh healthcare campuses in New York City and Chicago and Los Angeles, and, um, contractor response (inaudible) means and methods, but there are requirements in terms of decibel levels and how construction is completed and done, uh, adjacent to existing inhabited buildings. So, um, it happens all the time and there's not going to be any blasting on the site, and so, you know, usually blasting becomes an issue. During this particular site, that's not going to be an issue and even with New York City with the Manhattan (inaudible) sometimes there's blasting right next to very sensitive buildings or other healthy institutions and these tall buildings get built.

Mr. Hodges: Mmm, well, I'll remember that the next time someone tells us - tells us that we can't make too much noise when we're protesting (inaudible) but I'll remember that next time. Let's see, moving on. I guess (inaudible) I would (inaudible) related to everyone else, why can't you make - basically, why is it so important that this spot particular be chosen for the construction (inaudible) on top of the school?

Mr. Liebling: In the past, you've indicated when - when you're able to not - to answer a question or not answer a question. I don't think that this is one that you've testified to or were involved in the - in the selection process.

Mr. Drucker: Correct.

Mr. Hodges: I see. It seems to be a common theme. (inaudible) question able to be answered. Let's see. What else is on my little wish list of things to ask? I guess, uh, outside - outside of that, uh, I suppose its sort of - I just have, like, one comment to make before I end. Um, and this is sort of directed to the Board as a whole, I'm going to dis- I know you guys don't actually care about all the - these legalities or care about the fate of the city or care about the well-being of the citizens, but I can imagine that you do care about your careers and there's going to be an election in like a few weeks so, and (inaudible)

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is not a question for Mr. Drucker.

Ms. Ludwig: Mr. Aithal, this just seems out of line to me.

Mr. Hodges: It is. Now suck it!

Mr. Aithal: Limit his questioning to architectural questions. If he has any additional questions, and I saw that - when you preface a question with, "I've just got a comment to make." I'm not a smart man, but I know that it's not going to lead to a question. If you have questions to ask the architect, this is your chance. If not, perhaps some of the other folks that have been waiting, if we can address their questions.

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have any other questions for the architect?

Mr. Hodges: Not at this time. No.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. So, next is, uh, Ms. Hunt. Are you still there, Ms. Hunt?

Ms. Hunt: Thank you very much. And I just wanted to - I was looking at the map and was trying to figure out what the actual parameters are of the hospital or I guess it's called a hospital, a cancer center. Somerset I can see and the other side, does it go all the way to, um, Hardenberg Street?

Mr. Drucker: Yes.

Ms. Hunt: It goes all the way to Hardenberg Street like right where the Ronald McDonald House is, for example? It goes, um (inaudible)

Mr. Drucker: Our side is bound by Somerset, Division and Hardenberg.

Ms. Hunt: Oh, okay. So, it does go over the Ronald McDonald House. Then, I guess there's a – and then, East End Avenue is the other side. Does it go all the way to Condict Street or does it go just halfway down the block?

Mr. Drucker: No, not for the cancer pavilion.

Ms. Hunt: Not for the cancer pavilion. Just for like halfway? Because I think there's a church there, um, if you go from Somerset down to Hardenberg Street. Um, I think there are about four buildings there, um, that border - well, that are on Hardenberg Street and one of them, I think, is a church if I'm not mistaken. Am I correct?

Mr. Drucker: The church is on the other side of Division Street. West. Ms. Hunt, this building is exclusively on the site of the Lincoln Annex school. There's no other property involved.

Ms. Hunt: Okay. So, over there. I gotcha. Okay. So, I had the wrong, um, wrong area. So, it's actually Hardenberg. Oh, okay. So, it doesn't go as far as the New Brunswick Spanish SDA Church. So, it goes down like, you know, a third of the block maybe, and, um, are you going to have a rear access road back there?

Mr. Drucker: We have an access road on the north side of the cancer pavilion that basically connects Division and Hardenberg on the northside of our building.

Ms. Hunt: Oh, okay. Great. Now, I see, I have the right picture. Okay. Great. So, um, and then, I would - I just wanted to note - and what - what was the purpose of the setbacks that you were describing? Was there any structural purpose?

Mr. Drucker: No, there is no structural purpose. There is a (inaudible) purpose.

Ms. Hunt: Oh, okay. And then, I was thinking - one thing I was wondering on the inside. One of the things that I realized, um, in, you know, patient care is that there's been a lack of lateral airflow opportunities within structures, um, within healthcare structures and we used - we did have some lateral airflow rooms, but they were very minimal and pretty much only used for TB, uh, (inaudible) and in other instances and I was wondering what are the opportunities for increasing, uh, lateral air flow rooms, uh, within the cancer - within the cancer pavilion?

Mr. Drucker: So, when we're dealing with airflow in the rooms, we're talking about exchanges and the make up of fresh air and, uh, this building will meet all the code requirements with fresh air and make up air and building circulation - all of the medical spaces.

Ms. Hunt: Oh, okay. What I'm thinking of expanding - you're familiar with lateral airflow, right?

Mr. Drucker: Yes.

Ms. Hunt: As a respiratory precaution and I'm wondering, is there any way to expand the number of lateral air flow opportunities, you know, of rooms within this structure?

Mr. Drucker: We're completing the (inaudible) of design. We're about finished with the design development and we'll be looking at all the mechanical systems at the end of this (inaudible)

Ms. Hunt: Yes. What does it take to install lateral airflow rooms?

Mr. Drucker: Fans and ductwork.

Ms. Hunt: And ductwork, so basically, you could - you could, uh, expand - yeah, you could probably expand the number of lateral air flow rooms. What's the what has been the limiting factor because, um, it just seems like it's been very difficult within existing structures to increase the number of lateral airflow rooms.

Mr. Drucker: Well, this is a new building, but in existing structures, you have a lot of pertinent partitions that are difficult to pass large ducts through. Most of these ducts have to be very large so that the air movement is slow. So, in existing buildings, there are a lot of physical barriers (inaudible)

Ms. Hunt: Oh, okay. So, you mostly structure those for surgical suites or the theatres?

Mr. Drucker: Yeah, the surgical suites have the highest requirements for fresh air and that's usually done in (inaudible) above the surgical rooms. That's why we have the mechanical equipment, the air handling units -directly above the surgical rooms.

Ms. Hunt: Got it. Okay. And then, um, usually, the MRIs and the proton machines and so forth are all in the basement, um, but it seems like you have structured it that way. Um, I'm thinking in terms of chemo waste, as well. Um, what is the - what opportunities are there for, um, for disposal of waste, of chemo waste and other, um, medical waste?

Mr. Drucker: Um, we have - yeah, we have separate systems for that. Um, we have separate rooms for medical waste, and we have (inaudible) and separate elevators for waste (inaudible)

Ms. Hunt: Uh-huh. Okay. I was wondering about that. It's been a - that's been an issue at different places that I've seen. And I see that, um, there - are there going to be inpatient facilities or is this all outpatient?

Mr. Drucker: It's both.

Ms. Hunt: Both. Okay. So, about how many inpatient, um, rooms or how many inpatients do you feel could be accommodated by the building?

Mr. Drucker: We have 96 beds.

Ms. Hunt: 96 inpatient?

Mr. Drucker: Yep. 96 inpatient.

Ms. Hunt: Yep, that's a fair amount for inpatient. Um, and it looks like we have a fairly large area for the, uh, for the infusion, which people just come in and get an infusion and go back out, you know, walk back out.

Mr. Drucker: That's correct.

Ms. Hunt: Yeah. So, for this pretty significant movement of people, uh, back and forth there. Um, and then, it looks like most of this is about treatment not about research, but it looks like there's a fairly small amount of research, uh, floors available, right?

Mr. Drucker: Well, there will be clinical trials throughout the building. The actual research laboratories will be on the second floor.

Ms. Hunt: Oh, okay. Yeah. I wanted to know about the research facilities. And, um, are there any, uh, specific types of research, um, that – that are being accommodated by the research facilities? Any particular accommodations?

Mr. Drucker: Well, we're providing for flexibility in the labs and the research that the investigators who have offices on that floor and Dr. Libuti who heads the program is a leader in research and in studying, you know, oncology treatment and that – research will continue. It's funded and there's a different source of funding for that type of research, but we've accommodated flexibility based on the variety of funding that they can achieve.

Ms. Hunt: Uh-huh. Petri dishes and so forth. Um, and how did you – how do you spell that doctor's name?

Mr. Drucker: Libuti? Um, L-i-b-u-t-i. You can look it up on the CINJ website.

Ms. Hunt: Okay. That's fine. Good. That's good to know. So, these were – these were some things that I was just, you know, interested in how it works. Again, I wish there were more educational facilities as this has been an issue in the community. Um, in replacing the school with the – with the medical facility.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Um, so, going back, uh, we were with Eric Knittel.

Mr. Knittel: Yeah. (inaudible) because it's so late, I don't want to wake anybody up in my house. (inaudible) I can't even remember (inaudible) so before I go, I just want to say, you're all (inaudible) and have a good night.

Mr. Dominguez: Right, we were at, uh, is it Jessica Kratovil?

Ms. Kratovil: Yes, that's correct. Uh, good evening, Mr. Drucker. Thank you for sticking with us here at, uh, 12 minutes to midnight here. Uh, I had a couple of questions for you as to the architecture of the proposed building. Um, there are over 1 billion bird strikes per year. Has there been any provision for mitigation of bird striking windows, especially migratory birds?

Mr. Drucker: Well, you've actually hit a sensitive spot. My son is an ornithologist who studies migratory patterns of birds. All the buildings that I do incorporate ceramic grip and bird safe technology in the glazing, uh, as a principle. So, yes, this design will incorporate bird-safe technology in the glazing.

Ms. Kratovil: Okay. And I had another question as to the green spaces on the roofs and around the structure. Um, are those going to be native type of plants or are they going to be, uh, ornamental plants that are not native to the area and have the possibility of causing infiltration of invasive species?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, no. They will be all indigenous plants found in Jersey and the region.

Ms. Kratovil: Okay. And I'm also aware of a, um, a landscape architectural practice of using primarily male plants to prevent the falling of any seed pods or other types of (inaudible) from a female plant that has increased, uh, seasonal allergies that people may experience. Do you have a plan to – to follow this practice or are you going to balance the plants more evenly?

Mr. Drucker: I'm not a landscape architect, but we can look into that. I'm aware that when selecting ginkgo trees, you want to make sure you're picking (inaudible) not the female ginkgo trees, but I don't think we specified any ginkgo trees for this particular site.

Ms. Kratovil: I thought I did hear somebody mention that there were going to be ginkgo trees on this site?

Mr. Drucker: Well, then they'll be male, so they don't drop pods.

Ms. Kratovil: Okay. And there's no concern that this would exacerbate people's allergies?

Mr. Drucker: I don't believe so. They certainly won't smell. Um, which is (inaudible)

Ms. Kratovil: (inaudible) the pollen that gives people allergies rather than an odor. But I do thank you for - that was - those were all the questions that I had. I did have one question for the Board, is this meeting going to continue until tomorrow, which is going to be in about nine minutes here?

Ms. Ludwig: We are continuing the meeting right now. Do you have any other questions for the architect?

Ms. Kratovil: Oh. No. Thank you. Have a good evening.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. Next is Kulas? Brian Kulas?

Mr. Kulas: Okay. So, you hear me now. Okay. Good. Hello, Mr. Drucker. I feel - starting to begin with, do you feel Robert Wood Johnson is definitely building the maximum state of the art facility here that could be presented?

Mr. Drucker: I do.

Mr. Kulas: Okay. So, you mentioned that there's going to be no proton therapy rooms. Is that correct? I think you mentioned that earlier. Okay. So, uh, on the Mayo Clinic website, it says, "Proton therapy has shown promise in treating several kinds of cancer. Studies have suggested that proton therapy may cause fewer side effects than traditional radiation since doctors can (inaudible)"

Mr. Liebling: Chair? Madame Chair, Mr. Drucker is not a designer of the building. (inaudible) program (inaudible)

Mr. Kulas: Sure. I accept your answer. Okay. I would just like to state that the Mayo clinic website does state, "Proton therapy isn't widely available in the United States." So, asking the architect of the building, do you feel Robert Wood Johnson, should be considering - I mean, do you feel the building - to be state of the art - to be state of the art technology, do you feel your design in Mr. Drucker should include proton therapy to be truly state of the art?

Mr. Drucker: We (inaudible) in our building, in the basement and we believe that that's the proper, uh, equipment for this particular building. I don't know where the nearest, uh, proton (inaudible) therapy.

Mr. Liebling: It's down the street. I don't think this question is relevant, but (inaudible)

Mr. Kulas: Sure. I'm continuing. All right. Back to patient being (inaudible) your rooms are on the eighth, ninth and tenth floor (inaudible) patient floors are on the eighth (inaudible) Okay. The patient floors, they're on eighth, ninth and tenth. Do you feel at all and you have 96 beds? Is that correct? So, that would be 33 beds per floor?

Mr. Drucker: Approximately, yeah.

Mr. Kulas: Are these rooms single beds? Single treatment rooms for the patients or are they double beds?

Mr. Drucker: They're all single.

Mr. Kulas: Single rooms. Okay. Now, you mentioned earlier that, I believe, the leadership of the hospital preferred having the more research and advertisement for the hospital on the lower floors, first and floor – first and second. Do you believe it's wise to have all the patients on the top floors? I mean, what if the hospital had to be evacuated? Shouldn't the patients come first before research and design and community space?

Mr. Drucker: All of life safety (inaudible) meets code. We believe that the patients need to be at the upper floors because it's a smaller floor plate and we believe all of the diagnostic functions and clinical functions need to be where the larger floor plates are. With modern vertical conveyances, the floor that the patients are on is less of an issue.

Mr. Kulas: Okay. So, what would be the evacuation plan then, as an architect, how do you have – if there's ever a situation where the patients have to be evacuated, what is the process? How long would it take to get patients from top floors to the bottom floors and also being that it's so congested in that area, where would an evacuation look like? With people coming out of the buildings and being exited to the street, what would an evacuation plan look like? How long would it take and how long would it take to get patients down the stairs or the elevators to the bottom floor?

Mr. Drucker: I don't have those calculations. The building exiting both horizontally and vertically meets current building code. Certainly, in vertical buildings, you've seen, uh, bed units on higher floors. Uh, so we have the appropriate stair widths. Uh, so, those who are mobile can be taken down, uh, by stair, they can walk down the stairs and those who have that inability to do that will be going in our elevators which have the capability of the stretchers and beds.

Mr. Kulas: Do the elevators it - if the elevators went down and had an issue, there's a backup energy plan for that to make sure that those patients can get down the elevators who cannot take the exit - the emergency exit stairs?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, there's an emergency generator and there's a light safety plan so that all the light safety, uh, components are still energized - (inaudible) power distribution.

Mr. Kulas: The next question is the signage on the building, it says, "Rutgers" uh, big red – big red letters, I'm assuming. Uh, is there - does it have any could that have any interaction, as well, any patient rooms that have their lights on, is there any potential interaction with the helicopters coming in to the heliport, that that could be a distraction to the pilots?

Mr. Drucker: The signage is not a part of this application, but typically, uh, signage is just dimly illuminated at that elevation, uh, and it's also usually timed to go off at a certain time at night.

Mr. Kulas: So, the red Rutgers sign will go off at some point (inaudible) to not distract any - the signage is not part of the application for this (inaudible)

Mr. Kulas: Okay. We should look into that, then. Um, what else? Uh, I had a lot of stuff written down here. Okay. So, we're looking at, um, 500 patients, possibly additional 300 more within the next 10 years would be 800 patients. You're talking 650 employees with the possibility of up to 500 more. I calculated that's 2,450 people. What is the maximum capacity of this hospital? Per floor? What is the maximum amount of people per floor on the hospital?

Mr. Drucker: I don't those - I don't have those exact calculations handy, but when you do a building like this, you typically count the population of the floor, and you then, calculate the amount of exit widths to make sure you've got the proper number of exit widths for the people who reside on that floor and the

proper plumbing calculation counts for the population of that floor. I don't have the statistics in front of me.

Mr. Kulas: Now, we brought up an interesting point about the, uh, birds coming into the windows. Do you feel that if a bird flew into a window on the eighth, ninth, and tenth floor, that that could make a patient uncomfortable? Even heights? Being that high, but not having - if a patient can't be brought down to the second floor, third floor, for a patient has anxiety of heights, do you feel that this floor plan of having the patients on eighth, ninth, and tenth floor is a little bit not respecting the patients who might have anxiety issues or anything like that. I mean, some patients prefer to be lower and they should have that availability. They shouldn't have to go all the way up to the eighth, ninth, and tenth floor. Do you agree with that in your professional opinion?

Mr. Drucker: The, uh, beds that are on the eighth floor have access to a terrace. And so, that their view of the horizon line is somewhat limited (inaudible) if I was on the eighth floor, I would not feel like I was in a tall building. It's surrounded by landscaping, parapet and you really when you're in the bed, you won't be able to see the horizon line. So, I'm not concerned about it.

Mr. Kulas: So, you're not concerned about a patient having anxiety who might want to be lower to the ground.

Mr. Drucker: No.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. That's time. So, next up is Mr. Makropoulos.

Mr. Makropoulos: Hello? Yeah, um, are we going to be able to - are we going to also get into public comments tonight?

Mr. Aithal: Uh, if I may interject. Mr. Makropoulos, this is your opportunity to ask the architect questions. Uh, this - the sooner we can get to your questions, other members of the public that have been signed up and patiently waiting to be heard, they can be heard, uh, and we can move along. But we can't answer that question if everyone asks that same question, it takes up more time.

Mr. Makropoulos: That's the only thing I'm going to be asking, are we going to also get to public comments tonight because it's (inaudible) public comments and a vote tonight, this whole meeting is illegal. You can't just restart it up on another date.

Mr. Aithal: Right. So, do you have any other questions for the architect?

Mr. Makropoulos: Um, yeah. I have some questions for the architect. Um, now, the, uh, architect, what's your name?

Mr. Drucker: Ken.

Mr. Makropoulos: Do you live in Middlesex County?

Mr. Drucker: No.

Mr. Liebling: Madame Chair, these aren't relevant questions. We should ask - it should really be limited to questions about his testimony.

Mr. Makropoulos: One last question, are you friends with Jack Morris?

Mr. Liebling: I object.

Ms. Ludwig: That's not relevant to this testimony. Do you have any other questions for this witness?

Mr. Makropoulos: I'll yield my time and I'll wait for public comments. If we don't get to public comments or a vote today, this whole meeting is illegal, and it has to be struck from the record.

Mr. Dominguez: Uh, next is, uh, Meoni? Matthew Meoni?

Mr. Meoni: Yes, I'm here.

Mr. Dominguez: You can - you can go. The floor is yours.

Mr. Meoni: No, I have questions. I have important questions. This is important.

Mr. Dominguez: No, no. That's what I mean. No, your - the floor is yours; you can go.

Mr. Meoni: Thank you. I appreciate that. So, I have a question for - we can call you Ken? Awesome, Ken. Now, do you work for a firm? Like did your firm accept the job for this, uh, construction or did you accept it directly yourself?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, I'm the principal of a large architectural practice.

Mr. Meoni: Gotcha. Okay. And did you know that this building would be knocking down one of the highest performing schools in New Jersey and displacing 750 kids to a warehouse when you accepted the job?

Mr. Drucker: I can't answer that.

Mr. Meoni: Is there any reason why you can't answer that?

Mr. Drucker: It's not relevant to this application.

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, this is Aravind Aithal, the Board Attorney. That clearly is not relevant, nor is it the area that Mr. Drucker (inaudible)

Mr. Meoni: Oh, I'm sorry. I thought it was about the construction of the pavilion. I apologize. I'm just trying to keep it as relevant as I can in this, uh, you know, kind of mixed up mind of 12 (inaudible), you know, on a Tuesday morning. Okay. I've got another question for you. Um, what are the specific materials used to build the pavilion?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, to build the pavilion? Uh, it's a steel frame building with concrete floors, a concrete perimeter wall around the perimeter of the retaining wall and foundations for the excavation and a concrete slab under the basement and then the exterior of the wall is a unitized exterior wall system, uh, terra cotta, metal and glass. The interior is, uh, metal studs and sheetrock and concrete block. And the interior is finished with different fabrics and woods and plasters.

Mr. Meoni: And those are?

Mr. Drucker: The interior finishes are wood - Is that the type of answer you were looking for?

Mr. Meoni: You said fabrics and types of wood. Correct? And I was asking what kinds of fabric and types of wood.

Mr. Drucker: The interior design is still underway, uh, but all the wood would be certified and the type of fabrics that we select for our healthcare projects deal with basic cleanliness and ease of cleaning and also what the embodied content of that material is to prevent off gassing.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And how much would those materials cost?

Mr. Drucker: I'm not at liberty to tell you the cost of the project in this meeting.

Mr. Meoni: You're not at liberty or you just don't want to?

Mr. Drucker: It's not part of this application.

Mr. Meoni: Oh, okay. Stick to the application. I'm sorry if, you know, it's literally way past my bedtime (inaudible) everyone here. So, I'm getting a little confused about what is relevant use since you are the architect. Correct?

Mr. Drucker: Correct. Cost is relevant to me. We want to provide as much of a building as we can to our clients.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And since cost is relevant, why can't you tell us the cost of the building or the building materials?

Mr. Aithal: Madame Chair, that's been asked and answered.

Mr. Meoni: I do. I got plenty, don't worry. Um, how much time do I have left?

Mr. Dominguez: Uh, you got 3:46.

Mr. Meoni: Beautiful. I've got plenty of time, no worries then. And so, I did remember you said before, this is to Ken, um, that, you know, sunlight access to the patients is very important. You said that before. Correct?

Mr. Drucker: Correct.

Mr. Meoni: Awesome. And, um, previous comment and I know it wasn't to you, but a previous comment or a question really, it was talking about how residents would potentially, because of this building, be in perpetual shadows in their back and front lawns because of another high rise in their neighborhood. So, how do you justify taking away sunlight from the actual residents in the neighborhood?

Mr. Drucker: Um, we are allowed to build the buildings 225 feet tall on this entire parcel, from property line to property line to property line to property line. We believe by setting the building back, uh, we have provided ample daylight at street level on all sides of the building.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And what makes you believe that you provide ample streetlight? I'm just wondering if there's like a metric - or of course sunlight, I mean, not streetlight. Is there a metric or is it just your judgment because you're the expert?

Mr. Drucker: It's my judgment.

Mr. Meoni: Because you're the expert?

Mr. Drucker: Because we do sun shadow studies for all of our projects and taller buildings do cast larger shadows than shorter buildings, but we believe we've mitigated it by creating the setbacks

Mr. Meoni: Awesome. Well, I really hope that's true that you did mitigate that because obviously every single person (inaudible) access to sunlight (inaudible). And so, I have another question, are you interested enough in this project to make it a priority?

Mr. Drucker: It's definitely a priority in our practice.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And I think it might've been answered before or asked before, so I do apologize, but what are the, like, biggest kind of challenges you foresee in this project?

Mr. Drucker: Um, well, I think during this time of COVID, there are challenges, uh, you know, actually completing the project on time, budget on schedule. Um, I think that's - I think obviously COVID is our biggest challenge, but we've all risen to that challenge and it hasn't slowed down the process of the team, of our client, or all the user groups and we feel like it's important to stick to the schedule, uh, because it's certainly a demand and need for a new cancer pavilion in New Brunswick.

Mr. Meoni: Thank you. And so, since you say you have - you believe you have met those precautions for COVID, what are you specifically doing to ensure the safety of the workers?

Mr. Drucker: Because this is a healthcare project, we are providing air isolation rooms. We're providing natural ventilation. Uh, we're providing modern HVAC system and I can't go into issues (inaudible) it's (inaudible) not really in my domain, but we're taking every precaution that we can to make sure that the building can handle the kind of ventilation systems required for that type of isolation.

Mr. Meoni: Awesome. And so, what role do you have during this construction, specifically? Like, are you expected to work with the contractor directly?

Mr. Drucker: Yes.

Mr. Meoni: And so, what is your specific role in that dynamic?

Mr. Drucker: The architect's role during construction is to provide design documents and to clarify those documents. Right now, our client is CINJ and DEVCO and the contractor will be (inaudible) and our job is to help interpret our documents and to help them build the building.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. Gotcha. Awesome. And just generally speaking, obviously, specifically for this project, but in your, you know, in your career and stuff, do you regularly integrate low or no cost sustainable design strategies into projects?

Mr. Drucker: We don't think it costs any more to integrate sustainable design into our projects.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. Because I just remember earlier one of the questions was about meeting certain standards and you didn't think it was necessary to meet all the standards. Correct?

Mr. Drucker: No, what I said is some clients care about getting a certification placard certificate (inaudible) and following the LEED guidelines and others care about the performance of the building. They want to save energy; they want to save and understand the life cycle costs (inaudible) Rutgers CINJ understand those life cycle costs and that's part of the LEED process. So, we're not actually doing the paperwork, but we are implementing a lot of sustainable design concepts into this building.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And what is your track record of completing a project within the original budget?

Mr. Drucker: It's very good. Uh, I would say most of our projects are within two to three percent of the overall budget.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And what is your fee for this project?

Mr. Drucker: That's not relevant.

Mr. Meoni: Oh, it's not relevant at all?

Mr. Drucker: It's not relevant for this application.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. Gotcha. No problem. And how many architects on your firm will be working on this project?

Mr. Drucker: Right now, we have a team of about 35 or 40 architects (inaudible) working on the project.

Mr. Meoni: And do you expect that number to increase?

Mr. Drucker: It will increase about 20 percent during the construction document phase.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And what means will you use to collect information about the needs of the clients?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, we've gone through extensive user group meetings and programming meetings with all of the departments of the CINJ and also with hospital operations. Uh, up to six interviews per department, over 60 interviews to date, all done during COVID online.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And what are the steps in the design process and, like, how do you organize them?

Mr. Drucker: The design process starts with programming, and then, (inaudible) design, which is about 15 percent of the work, and then, design development, and construction documents fitting and construction (inaudible) each of those phases, uh, at, you know, the design takes about a year and a half and the construction for a complex building like this takes about three to three and a half years. So, we're involved from, sort of, conception all the way through to completion.

Mr. Meoni: And what criteria will be used to establish priorities and make design decisions?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, we have a steering committee, uh, which is a combination of Rutgers and BEVCO and (inaudible) New Jersey and we have an approval process at the (inaudible) level. Those are signed off by the representative of the steering committee (inaudible) steering committee.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And do you have experience with green with sustainable design?

Mr. Drucker: Yes. Our firm, HOK, which I'm a principal of and on the Board of Directors and chair the design board has won more AIA (inaudible) environment awards than any other large firm.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And I believe it was asked before, but I would like a little clarification. How disruptive is this going to be for the neighborhood?

Mr. Drucker: I don't think it will be disruptive at all. I think there are much tighter sites in New York City and major urban areas and there's been construction in New Brunswick on very tight sites and this one - the site will have, you know, on time demand for delivery of construction materials and it will all be controlled by the (inaudible)

Mr. Meoni: Okay. And did you listen to Mr. Roche's testimony before?

Mr. Drucker: I did.

Mr. Meoni: Okay. Because there was a lot of concern raised about the (inaudible) of this project, but did you hear the public comments and take those into consideration.

Mr. Dominguez: Time.

Mr. Meoni: I got the question in, he can answer.

Mr. Drucker: I think, you know, there are construction in urban areas that the entire country (inaudible) in New Brunswick. It's reasonable to expect that every contractor understands, uh, requirements for decibel levels, for airborne pollution, with congestion around the site it can all be very carefully managed and controlled.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. Next up is, I don't know the first name, but last name Merz.

Ms. Merz: Thank you. So, you said that you had, um, experience with green design and that the building was going to be, um, environmentally friendly. Are you planning to use low carbon concrete? You mentioned a lot of concrete was going to be used in the construction. Low carbon concrete is better for the environment than regular concrete.

Mr. Drucker: Uh, we're working on our specifications now. Our goal is to incorporate into our specifications as many of these specification items as possible (inaudible) the recycled content of the steel and the amount of (inaudible) and concrete. Uh, we would have to work with our concrete suppliers to limit the amount of fly ash. So, we're going to be going through (inaudible) building, as we prepare our specifications (inaudible).

Ms. Merz: When will those specifications be available to the public for us to determine whether or not you're using low carbon concrete?

Mr. Drucker: I don't know if there's a requirement for the community - the public, frankly.

Ms. Merz: Um, so the building uses a lot of glass. It has a very large glass façade. Is that glass energy efficient windows, um, in terms of -

Mr. Drucker: So, it's all, uh, double pane glass with, uh, low e-coating on the second surface. It's insulated glass. And then, it will have a bird friendly (inaudible)

Ms. Merz: Um, you had mentioned the air filtration system within, um, within the building. Obviously, you've got like a large atrium there. Cancer patients have, uh, significant health concerns. Their immune systems are very low. Will you have, uh, air filtration systems such that it can withstand, um, COVID, so HEPA filters, that kind of air filtration to protect the patient's health?

Mr. Drucker: We will have HEPA filters. I'm not a mechanical engineer. I can't tell you precisely what everything is in the mechanical equipment, but we will have HEPA filters and the HVAC itself. We'll basically have an exhaust system with air intake at the lower levels in the event that anything is (inaudible) in the atrium.

Ms. Merz: Okay. You had mentioned that there were pedestrian walkways. Uh, which floor does the pedestrian walkway attach to, from the parking garage to, uh, to the building, to the pavilion?

Mr. Drucker: The second floor.

Ms. Merz: The second floor. And will that be ADA compliant?

Mr. Drucker: Yes.

Ms. Merz: Okay. What's the entryway like of those? Are those going to be automatic doors from the entryways or those going to be push bar?

Mr. Drucker: Oh, they'll be automatic. They'll be handicapped and ADA accessible.

Ms. Merz: Okay.

Mr. Drucker: They'll either be sliding, or they'll be double opening doors.

Ms. Merz: Okay. And you had mentioned four-person elevators, uh, in the pavilion. Uh, those four person elevators, are those large enough to encompass hospital beds, as well, or wheelchairs or is that four standing humans?

Mr. Drucker: Yes. No, no, no. I said four passenger elevators. Although they can handle ADA, people in wheelchairs and on stretchers. The service elevators they are (inaudible) and larger on the service side behind the passenger elevators. So, they're all – they can all be used for (inaudible)

Ms. Merz: Okay. So, you said that you were - had a good track record for bringing projects in, um, around the proper budget. Does that include bringing projects in and having projects completed in the time allotted as well?

Mr. Drucker: Yes. You know, time is money, so anytime we can save in general conditions and overhead costs, it's in everybody's interest to stick to the original schedule. And in many projects, we fast-track that construction, so we stay on schedule.

Ms. Merz: Okay. What is the – the projected timeline of this building? If you break ground in early 2021, as hoped, what would be the projected completion date?

Mr. Drucker: Three and a half years later, the summer of 2024.

Ms. Merz: Okay. Um, and has your firm been approached about building or designing a new school to replace the, uh, the Lincoln Annex School?

Mr. Drucker: No.

Ms. Merz: Okay. Those are all my questions. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: Thank you. Uh, next up is Ms. Danielle Moore.

Ms. Moore: (inaudible) I know. You wouldn't answer, but please tell me that you did say after this one, that the meeting would be continued in two weeks or is this meeting going to go all the way to the end because people do have to go to work and go to school in the morning.

Ms. Ludwig: Right now, we're continuing with this meeting, so if you have questions for the architect, please ask them now.

Ms. Moore: Oh. So, you're going to continue with the traffic safety, and then, the public meeting, as well?

Ms. Ludwig: We're continuing right now with this witness, so if you have questions, please ask them now.

Ms. Moore: So, would you please just so I know - after I want to know so after I get finished with this, what - is the meeting going to be continued or to hang up and (inaudible) continue until two weeks, like you said?

Ms. Ludwig: There is - there is another witness that is going to be called tonight, but right now there is questions for the architect only.

Ms. Moore: I know what it is. Like please, please, I - you - oh, I'm trying to stay calm with you because I just don't appreciate how the way you really talk instead of just answering my question. You said that this meeting was going to continue to the next meeting in two weeks. Did you not say that?

Ms. Ludwig: Ms. Moore, I'm not trying - I'm not trying to be difficult at all. I said to you, there the questions right now are for this - of the architect. There is another witness tonight that is going to be heard. He is the traffic expert and then the meeting will continue. I'm not - I don't have a date. I did not say two - that was not me who said that. But the meeting, there will be a continuation of this meeting.

Ms. Moore: I know good and well you said it (inaudible) because you said you said when the man gets the paperwork, he'll have a chance to in-investigate it and go over everything and then it will continue in the next two weeks.

Mr. Aithal: Ms. Moore, you might want to - questions of this architect, but it was me who suggested to the Board that the applicant's attorney would have an opportunity to determine whether he wanted (inaudible) the application or not. We're trying to get two witnesses in, and I think we've spent many - much time going over the same question.

Ms. Moore: Well, good. Maybe if someone would just go ahead and explain the whole thing (inaudible) detail (inaudible) saying that okay, you're going to go through, but that's not what Ms. Sicora Ludwig said.

Mr. Aithal: Yes. Ms. Sicora Ludwig said exactly the same thing that I've just said. This witness is going on and the next witness is going on after that and the public cross-examination will be had of both witnesses.

That's what's been said. After that, Mr. Liebling, the Board's - the applicant's attorney will have an opportunity to make a decision to whether he wants to carry this to the next meeting though -

Ms. Moore: Well, see, that was what you said, you said it was going to continue until the next meeting.

Mr. Aithal: Sure, Ms. Moore (inaudible)

Ms. Moore: Okay. I can move along now. For people who really want to know, the cost of this project. It was listed at \$750 million to do this project.

Mr. Aithal: Ms. Moore, do you have any questions for the witness? The architect?

Ms. Moore: Oh, yes. I will get to it. Please, let me start the way that I want, and I will get to my questions to the architect. Thank you. Now, I would like to ask you, would this cost had been cheaper if it wasn't for the glass windows, these beautiful glass windows. Would this project have been much cheaper?

Mr. Drucker: No, you need windows and actually the windows are not the expensive part of the building.

Ms. Moore: Because really, I (inaudible) the way I look at the way this is built, this doesn't look nothing like a cancer center. It looks like more - this is about beauty than it - because that doesn't even look like a hospital, nowhere near a hospital. A hospital doesn't have windows like - like that. I'd say this is just more about beauty than anything, making Rutgers and Robert Wood Johnson look good throughout the state of New Jersey being the biggest cancer place throughout New Jersey.

Mr. Liebling: Madame Chair, I'm struggling to connect these questions, these comments, to Mr. Drucker's testimony.

Ms. Ludwig: Yes, do you have any questions for the architect?

Ms. Moore: He answered my question. I asked would it have been cheaper, which he answered my question.

Mr. Aithal: Ms. Moore (inaudible) do you have any other questions for the architect?

Ms. Moore: Yes, I do. Like I said, I don't know why you guys always do this to me, how you would answer. The question that I ask, you wouldn't - you wouldn't let me answer, then wow, someone else asks the question, you answer. Out of this whole building, will there be a place in the building for education for the students?

Mr. Drucker: Yes, there will - there will be a place for every patient in this building, regardless if they're inpatient or outpatient, plus, visitors and their family.

Ms. Moore: Well, then, my concern is, where I'm wondering how much of this will be (inaudible) where there will be (inaudible) Would it be a school, like a big class school inside where the county is putting \$25 million dollars there they said, uh, for Middlesex Vo Tech or one of the Middlesex County schools that they would be learning in there. So, I'm wondering, what, are there going to be classrooms in there, uh, to make sure or can you explain how that would be?

Mr. Drucker: On the ground floor, there is a there is a conference center, uh, for education, uh, based on the research that is happening within the building itself. There is an opportunity potentially for that space to be opened up, uh, at the request of the community to, uh, outside organizations to be coordinated with CINJ and Rutgers.

Ms. Moore: Did you say between Rutgers students and Middlesex Vo Tech, how many students would be included in this?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, no students are currently included, uh, at from the K-12 level or at the collegiate level within this building.

Ms. Moore: Well, like I said, the county said they donated \$25 million, uh, so (inaudible) - go to school, as well, learning in the cancer center.

Mr. Dominguez: Next up is Pedersen.

Mr. Pedersen: Um, just real quick for the Board, uh, who can we ask about the cost of this project? I have questions for the architect, but real quick, who can we ask for the cost?

Mr. Aithal: Uh, Mr. Liebling can put on the witnesses that he believes will make out the case. Uh, if he does not put on a witness that answers a certain question that you would like to have him answer or that you would like the applicant to answer, you can certainly, uh, highlight that in your summation or your - the public portion -

Mr. Pedersen: Well, I think everybody wants to - wants to know the cost. I mean, that's what -

Mr. Aithal: Well, Mr. Liebling, as the applicant's attorney, (inaudible) responsibility, but he bears the burden of proof, well at least the applicant does. Um, so, if those witnesses put (inaudible) if they can't answer a specific question you have, you can certainly comment on it, but, uh, he's - he's got to make out his case.

Mr. Pedersen: So, can the attorney tell us the cost now or at a later date (inaudible)

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have any questions for the architect?

Mr. Pedersen: Questions. Everybody just everybody wants that question answered, though. It's a reoccurring theme here.

Ms. Ludwig: I think the attorney addressed this before. They're not answering that question and if you have any other questions for the architect, please ask them now.

Mr. Pedersen: I mean, it's pretty relevant, but, um, Mr. Drucker, in terms of the walkway, uh, have you considered adverse wind conditions that might be, um, taken into account like, uh, if it could damage the walkway at any point?

Mr. Drucker: Uh, I think it would be structurally sufficient and sound, so it wouldn't be disturbed by any wind conditions. Uh, we will be doing, uh, wind studies for the entire building, uh, but I don't believe that walkways will be impacted by any wind. We do wind studies so that we can understand, uh, air entrenchment (inaudible) adequate separation between intakes and the outtakes of the building and also just to study the pressures of the wind against the exterior wall.

Mr. Pedersen: Okay. Um, in terms of fire safety, um, what reactionary and preventive systems, uh, will you put in place?

Mr. Drucker: They'll be sprinklers throughout the building, and they'll be (inaudible) They'll be smoke detectors, carbon dioxide monitors, uh, they'll be life safety systems. There's (inaudible) and the building will be (inaudible) sprinklers.

Mr. Pedersen: Awesome. Um, in terms of workers actually building the building, what protections will you give to them or can you guarantee (inaudible) COVID?

Mr. Drucker: Um, that's really means and methods as part of the contractor's responsibility, but there are OSHA requirements for building the building and there other, um, LEED requirements and New Jersey state requirements. It's really the contractor's responsibility to control the site during construction.

Mr. Pedersen: All right. No problem. Um, on average, how wide are the hallways going to be?

Mr. Drucker: The hallways or the walkways?

Mr. Pedersen: Hallways, please.

Mr. Drucker: The hallways are (inaudible) wide typically, depending on the floor.

Mr. Pedersen: Okay. Um, uh, before you said, um, because (inaudible) you said if you fall behind, uh, you can fast track construction, what does that mean?

Mr. Drucker: It means that we begin to release, uh, packages, uh, early packages. So, perhaps, we could basically purchase the steel (inaudible) all quickly and start the foundation sooner than when the documents are completed so as to fast track construction where you have multiple bid packages that allows you to accelerate construction.

Mr. Pedersen: So, um, just so I understand, um, when you say multiple bid packages, you mean you're bidding on -

Mr. Drucker: No, no, no. There's a general contractor who will be hired for the project, and then, they will basically package smaller packages of drawings to subcontractors. So, the sooner they can get those drawings out to the subcontractors, the sooner you can start the early work, the demolition, the foundations. It usually takes some time to get down into the ground and back out of the ground, you need about six months. So, sometimes we release that package earlier so that you can start the work earlier.

Mr. Pedersen: Gotcha. If your child's school was destroyed to expand a hospital, would you be okay with that?

Mr. Liebling: I'll object the same way I did the last time, Mr. Pedersen, asked a similar question.

Mr. Pedersen: Can you tell me the cost of the building, please?

Mr. Liebling: The cost of the building is well publicized. It's not relevant to a site plan application.

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have any other questions?

Mr. Liebling: We have no requirement to make it part of the record.

Mr. Pedersen: Well, I mean, as a taxpayer, I feel like it's required.

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have any other questions for the architect?

Mr. Pedersen: I yield my time. Thank you.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Next is Brian Rak.

Mr. Brian Rak: Sure, uh, I've never really gotten to look at an architectural plan like this. Uh, is it normal to have a loading dock for a hospital on a different building than the hospital itself? I can't say I've ever seen something like that before.

Mr. Drucker: It's normal to have loading. It's normal to have parking, it just happens to be on the site to the north of this particular site plan application.

Mr. Liebling: Maybe you can - maybe you can clarify, Mr. Drucker, that it's connected to the - that it's connected below grade.

Mr. Rak: Yes, I don't see it anywhere on the plans and I've been scrolling them all the last five hours and I haven't seen anything on it, but -

Mr. Liebling: Well, that's why it's a condition. That's why it's a condition of the approval of this, uh, building.

Mr. Drucker: The connection will be near the kitchen and the basement (inaudible) And they'll be circulation from the building dock to the passenger and the staff elevators to the west of the atrium and they'll be a pathway that connects to the loading dock, (inaudible) grade (inaudible) north, uh, access drive. On the future loading dock on the site to the north to our vertical circulation (inaudible)

Mr. Rak: Okay. Um, do you have any sort of insight on what kind of trees are going to survive on a rooftop eight stories in the air? Like I can't imagine that's a native environment to any of the trees.

Mr. Drucker: It is. We provide adequate space for root balls and tie downs while the trees are maturing. We plan on using seedling on the roof and some grass areas and (inaudible) and the trees will be irrigated, and they'll be (inaudible) and there are success stories throughout the region of green roofs. We just completed a, uh, project for LG and (inaudible) over two acres of green roofs with native species on the green roofs.

Mr. Rak: Does planting all those trees outweigh the cost of building the building stronger to support all that water and soil and trees?

Mr. Drucker: Well, there is adequate, um, structure and capacity to handle the extra weight and the water retention (inaudible). Uh, we think it's important to create an area of respite for the occupants of that floor and the floor - the floors above and a place, uh, that they can go outdoors and get some fresh air. Uh, so, you know, we've done green roofs all over the country and there are systems in place that are light weight.

Mr. Rak: Okay. Is the eighth floor - so is the garden going to have any sort of screening? When I've been up on the eighth floor of other buildings in New Brunswick, it's pretty windy and unpleasant there. Is that going to be mitigated by walls or something or is it just the trees are going to provide enough screen from the wind?

Mr. Drucker: They'll be a parapet on that floor, um, probably about four feet high to block the wind for the people on the terrace.

Mr. Rak: Okay. Um, I noticed on the basement you have male and female changing rooms. Do you have any plans to introduce other rooms for people that don't identify as either male or female?

Mr. Drucker: Yes, they'll be gender neutral facilities throughout the entire project.

Mr. Rak: Okay. I just don't see them on the plan, so. I mean, maybe they're called something else.

Mr. Drucker: They may be identified on the plans as family restrooms, which can also be labeled as gender neutral restrooms.

Mr. Rak: Oh, okay. Um, what's the image recovery room on the - I think it's the third floor?

Mr. Drucker: That's a medical programming question. I don't have that plan in front of me.

Mr. Rak: I mean, okay. I thought it was part of the plan, but, um, I guess I'll move on. Uh, is there any going - is there going to any impact on the surrounding residential buildings from the constructing an 11-story building there? Are they going to get hotter because of heat island effects?

Mr. Drucker: I don't anticipate any heat island effect. Um, you know, if you look at the existing building site, it's really a building with a sea of asphalt around it and we work really hard to make sure that there's

a nice soft edge around the base of the building with our tree planting (inaudible) using (inaudible) and other green areas and the grass areas adjacent to the sidewalks and, uh, with the green roofs, we can clearly reduce the amount of heat island effect. We'll also be using a light-colored rubber membrane roof that will reflect the sun and not absorb the heat.

Mr. Rak: Okay. Is the building taking advantage of any of the state clean energy programs? I mean, they seem to offer millions of dollars in rebates to commercial buildings that build energy efficiently, but I know you said it wasn't going to be LEED certified.

Mr. Drucker: No, but we'll still be going after as many opportunities as we can to get rebates from the SNJ from the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Rak: Okay. Is there any plans for solar panels on the roof? I know you said it was going to be white, but is that a missed opportunity there?

Mr. Drucker: No, there's not that much surface area for photovoltaics if you look at the mechanical space on the top of the building, um, there's air (inaudible) equipment. Basically, I have to keep that all screened. Uh, typically, once again, the project (inaudible) New Jersey, we generated about 30 percent of our energy that it'll take, but in this particular project, um, unless we integrate it vertically into the glass walls, it's not going to generate enough energy to make it worthwhile.

Mr. Rak: Okay. Uh, thanks for your time this morning. I think that's all I had for now.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Rak. I believe next is Rubens.

Ms. Rubens: Hi, good morning, everybody. So, I was just wondering, between displacing a fully functional public school, uh, all of the work arounds you have to do, uh, for the sunlight that the structure will be blocking, and the traffic concerns folks brought up, it seems like this is a pretty challenging inconvenient site on which to build, uh, and you mentioned other sites were being scouted.

Mr. Liebling: This Charles Liebling, attorney for the applicant. This is the site that is the subject of the redevelopment plan that the City selected for the development of this project. Uh, it's - and we are responding to that, to the adoption of that plan by programming a new building on this site.

Ms. Rubens: I would like to finish my question, please. Considering the challenges that this site presents, uh, what were the challenges presented by those other sites that were scouted and, uh, why were they so 24: severe to necessitate building on this particular site?

Mr. Liebling: This application is about this site.

Ms. Rubens: Correct. I'm asking about the site - why this site had to be chosen.

Mr. Liebling: It's not relevant because (inaudible)

Ms. Rubens: I disagree.

Mr. Liebling: It's not the subject of this application.

Ms. Rubens: Are you being purposely obtuse right now? It's very clearly relevant.

Mr. Liebling: No, there are millions of sites in - on the planet for a building. This is the one that the City Council selected for this use.

Ms. Rubens: Correct. I'm asking why.

Mr. Liebling: I don't know why. You'll have to ask the City Council.

Ms. Rubens: You don't know why? Are people usually this detached in the process of a building that they're directly involved in? I'm very confused right now.

Mr. Liebling: This - it's not - it's not a matter for this Board.

Ms. Ludwig: (inaudible) do you have any other questions?

Ms. Rubens: Oh, yeah. I asked a question, and it wasn't answered. I guess it's not going to be answered. Uh, (inaudible) we'll be here all night if we have to.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. Next is Linda Stork.

Ms. Stork: Okay. All right. I have a several questions here for the architect. Um, to start with this whole question about it not being LEED certified because that wasn't important to the - to, um, is it (inaudible) I mean, it could've been in the specifications (inaudible) they wanted it LEED certified, but, uh, what I gathered was that it was just more important - more concerned with the performance than with the actually getting all the paperwork filed and - and you said that you do, in fact, a lot of it, uh, (inaudible) oh, I can't read my own notes. (inaudible) it's getting really late or early or something. The design features - a lot of the design features that would be for new certification are, in fact, included, but not apparently all of them. I mean, it's hard for me to believe that if it's really all of them were included, it seems it would be worth filing the paperwork to get the certification.

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have a question, Ms. Stork?

Ms. Stork: Nope. That was the question. Um, so, is it, in fact, that not enough of them are included -

Mr. Drucker: No. If you'll - let me answer your question.

Ms. Stork: Just the paperwork question.

Mr. Drucker: We have many clients who are emotionally attached to doing sustainable architecture for the purpose of doing sustainable architecture. We have other clients, like developers who want a plaque on their wall so they can mark their space as a LEED certified space. If you look at the major components of LEED certification, it deals with water; it deals with energy. It deals with reuse of construction materials; it deals with the materials of the building; it deals with, uh, access to mass transit and bike racks and other amenities that you get points for based on investments you put in the building. Every client is interested in the savings and lifecycle cost. We do the cost of that analysis of what goes into our buildings. And if you - if you look at the list that's on LEED and you look at the prerequisites (inaudible) categories, all of our projects incorporate them, it's just an administrative issue in terms of doing the LEED certification. LEED is about raising everybody's awareness about sustainability as much as it is about tracking that sustainability. So, there are social aspects in sustainability; there are environmental aspects. They're ecological aspects and there are cost aspects and you balance that out to provide a sustainable project and we've done that on this project. The energy performance will be excellent. We will save energy on this project. Water impact to the storm sewers, as Chris described, will be reduced by reducing the amount of asphalt on the site. Um, in terms of water and clean air, they'll be HEPA filters; they'll be filtration systems for fresh air and in terms of access for daylight and providing what we call daylight (inaudible) deep into the spaces. So, we'll following all the principles of LEED, we're just not filling out the paperwork for LEED.

Ms. Stork: I know. That's what that's what seems strange to me. If really all the principles are followed, um, it seems like it would be worth it to fill out the paperwork and get the - are there certain things that would not qualify?

Mr. Drucker: No.

Ms. Stork: No? Yeah, that doesn't really make sense to me. And, um, when you - when you're thinking about (inaudible) I noticed you compared the asphalt to what's there now. So, there will be less, so that's a good thing. They'll be more permeable surface area?

Mr. Drucker: Correct.

Ms. Stork: Yes. That's a good thing. But then, you don't want to compare the fact that there's all those solar panels now that won't be there.

Mr. Drucker: No (inaudible)

Ms. Stork: So, that's a negative. That's, you know, that's, you know, that goes the other way. So, yeah. It just seems like if you're going to talk about, you know, compare one to what's there now, you should, you know, compare that, also. Um, as well the HVAC, when you were talking about how, you know, it has to be, um, you know, such a high quality because, obviously, these patients are very vulnerable and I - and I agree, certainly. But, um, also it's kind of ironic because the school we'll losing has a good new HVAC system that taxpayers put in there four years ago and our kids are still going to old schools with horrible, horrible ventilation systems. Um, but the one the one that has a good ventilation system is being torn down to build a hospital (inaudible)

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have a question, Ms. Stork?

Ms. Stork: I do. My next question is about the - the relative small size of the lab area that you referred to. When you - when you were planning that, did you know that, uh, that high school and college students would be coming there to plan this - that's what we were told. High school and college classes are coming to use that lab. They put that \$25 million in from the County Vo Tech system instead of building a lab on their campus, so that their students could come there. (inaudible)

Mr. Liebling: Ken, are you familiar - Ken, are you familiar with the County grant?

Mr. Drucker: No, I'm not.

Mr. Liebling: Yeah, I didn't think so. I could tell by your earlier - earlier question. Yeah, that's - if he can't answer the question, then, I would just say that.

Ms. Ludwig: Do you have another question?

Ms. Stork: Well, he designed it. If he wasn't told that - that (inaudible) that should have been in the specifications, it seems to me.

Mr. Liebling: No, the programming of the building - can - as is, can accommodate the programming that - that these - these county students will need. That's - that's my understanding of this. There - no specific design for them is necessary.

Ms. Stork: Well, it just seems like it would need to be a little bigger, but okay. So, and my other question is about the -

Mr. Dominguez: Time.

Ms. Stork: - when you were picking the terra cotta, did you -

Ms. Ludwig: Time, Ms. Stork.

Ms. Stork: - consider ultra-high -

Ms. Ludwig: Your time is up, Ms. Stork.

Ms. Stork: No, I (inaudible) ultra-high performance concrete --did you consider that as opposed to the, um, terra cotta façade?

Mr. Drucker: No.

Mr. Dominguez: So, our last speaker is Mr. Tarbous if he's still on. Yes, he is.

Mr. Tarbous: Oh, hi, Mr. Drucker. Nice to meet you. Sorry it's under such circumstances. Um, the design aesthetics of the building obviously, you considered the geometry of the space, um, and you're talking about it being a major landmark. Are there any other, uh, significant things or dimensions that you considered with respect to the - how the building fit into the neighborhood?

Mr. Drucker: Well, you know, the - the large floor plates allows for an operational efficiency of the building. Uh, we think that, uh, the atrium becomes - uh, or the (inaudible) that can be seen from Somerset, uh, that creates a beacon for (inaudible) people to come (inaudible) building. Uh, we're providing retail at the perimeter of the building, that will be accessible to both people within the building and people outside the building to promote some activity along the sidewalks. Um, we provided for the walkways, provide for a safe connection to the second floor between the garage and the pavilion and (inaudible) hospital and the cancer center (inaudible) and I think that the setbacks diminish the scale of the program of the building, uh, by stepping back at multiple floors.

Mr. Tarbous: Sure. Um, so you didn't consider the history of the site. I mean, this used to be a Catholic high school for 90 years, the history of the site was not considered in the physical design?

Mr. Drucker: No, it was not.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Um, going back to the to the walkways, uh, is there going to be or is there - was it - was the design taken it - was it taken into consideration for people accessing the bridge from the street level in order to cross the street or if someone wanted to get from, you know, the sidewalk on one side to the second floor on the other side, was that considered? Is there going to be a convenient way to do that?

Mr. Drucker: No, you'll have to enter the buildings in a secure environment and then walk through the secure (inaudible) There was no desire to have people come up from one sidewalk, walk over the bridge and come down to another sidewalk.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. That make sense because of the security issue, right? Uh, so I had a question about the below grade passageway, but I think Linda went into that, or Lindsey did that. But there is a passageway. Is that going to be for freight only? The passageway between the, uh, other site and this site?

Mr. Drucker: Yes. It's merely a service access below grade. They'll be no patients or staff.

Mr. Tarbous: Right. Okay. And just one other thing about the LEED certification, I think you did answer this. If the paperwork was filed, do you believe that the building would qualify?

Mr. Drucker: Yes.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Sorry, excuse me. Okay. About the, uh, the areas of the building where radiation is going to be performed, I know you mentioned that the weight of the machines was a consideration, but how about the, uh, you know, the protection from radiation from, I guess, radiation escaping from the - from the machines? Do you have specs on what type of equipment will be used and what the radiation protection, uh, requirements are?

Mr. Drucker: Yes, we do. That's in our specifications. All the equipment will be shielded with concrete and lead, uh, so no radiation will escape from those floors.

Mr. Tarbous: So, that's done on the entire floor as a - as a (inaudible)

Mr. Drucker: Not the entire floor, but around each of the units - each of the (inaudible)

Mr. Tarbous: So, basically, you just set up the space to be secure and then get whatever equipment goes in there, you expect to be shielded?

Mr. Drucker: Correct.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Now, you talked about the height, uh, that was available was 225 feet and this building is 218, I believe you said and with the setbacks, obviously, the volume, you're not using the full volume of the, uh, of the building. Was the aesthetic component and the - the desire for the light on the upper floors internal to the floors, was that the only consideration or was there any other considerations with respect to only using a portion of the volume that was available?

Mr. Drucker: Well, you know, bed tower, the bed floors where the 96 beds are, are typically narrower than diagnostic floors. Uh, so those diagnostic floors are, you know, 50,000 to 60,000 square feet. You want large floor plates. You don't need such large floor plates (inaudible) floor plates for the bed tower itself. So, it nested nicely on top of the points below, if you will, and we created those setbacks as a result.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Do you know what the percentage is that you used versus what was available or how much was left over?

Mr. Drucker: If you extruded a volume, um, around the perimeter of the site, (inaudible) 25-foot tall. I don't have the mathematical calculation but if you just extrude, you know, about 50,000 square feet, um, vertically, (inaudible) floors, you'd be at 550,000 to 600,000 square feet. Um, and we're close to that number with the setbacks. So, I think it might be, you know, you could've created a 100,000 to 200,000 square foot larger building if one wanted to, you filled that volume, you extruded back the print all the way up to the height level.

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. So, there was another 100 or 200,000 cubic feet that's available.

Mr. Drucker: That was just a calculation off the top of my head.

Mr. Tarbous: Well, I'm not going to hold you to the number, obviously.

Mr. Drucker: Yeah.

Mr. Tarbous: Um, and just to revisit, I guess this was answered too by Lindsay was very thorough. This idea of the county college having facilities in the building. So, when you say there's a public space, uh,

conference center you called it, are there actual classrooms there in addition to laboratories or rooms that could be converted to classrooms?

Mr. Drucker: No, I assume the conference rooms could be (inaudible) it could be converted to classrooms, but there are no specific classrooms?

Mr. Tarbous: Okay. Um, well, thank you. It's - it's actually a nice building. You did a great job. It's just a shame that it's going to be a monument to this racist, um, racist justification that's happening. I'm very sorry for that part of it. Thank you.

Ms. Ludwig: Dan, do we have any other public comment on our list?

Mr. Dominguez: I didn't realize I was muted. I apologize. Uh, yeah, we have no more speakers to cross examine the architect. If the Board and the members want and Chuck wants, we can proceed to the last, uh, expert.

Mr. Liebling: Madame Chair, with, your permission, we - we would, uh, you know, wait until our next meeting to call that next witness in order, you know, just given the hour. Um, if - if that's - it's obviously, you know, up to you. We'll do whatever you suggest.

Ms. Ludwig: No, upon your preference, we are definitely able to do that. We can, uh, continue this to the next - to the next meeting and you will work out the date, Dan?

Mr. Dominguez: It will - it sounds like it's probably going to be the next regular meeting. Uh, we'll, uh, we'll try to sort something out.

Mr. Liebling: Madame, we need to announce it.

Mr. Aithal: Yeah, we do need to announce it. So, Dan, we need - to make sure that that date is announced today, um, and this would serve as the public announcement. Um, we'd also have to indicate that the call in information will be available and if you could give the, uh, the web address for the City so that members of the public would be on notice and be able to join the meeting at the next, uh, scheduled date.

Mr. Dominguez: Sure. So, I - I think and, you know, you can all correct me if I'm wrong or give me different thoughts. I think the most prudent thing is in three weeks, we have the regularly scheduled meeting, and we reconvene for - for that meeting. Unless otherwise.

Mr. Liebling: Okay. So, let's - let's use calendar dates. So, you're talking about continuing this on the 9th?

Mr. Dominguez: Yes.

Mr. Liebling: Okay. On November 9th? Okay. Same time? 7 p.m. Yeah, you should make the announcement, not me.

Mr. Dominguez: All right. Um, I wanted to float it if anybody thought maybe we should start at 6:00, if that's viable or something. I'm just putting it out there.

Mr. Aithal: We'd have to leave at 7:00.

Mr. Dominguez: You would have to leave it at 7:00? Okay. Then, just regular scheduled meeting and that's that. And then, we'll finish it off then.

Mr. Liebling: Okay. Could you just please state the date -

Mr. Dominguez: We will finish this meeting at 7:00 p.m. on November 9th. It will have the same call in numbers. Uh, you can find the information on cityofnewbrunswick.org's website, which is the cityofnewbrunswick.org, and uh, our, uh, documents will be available as they were, the cityofnewbrunswick.org/planningboarddocuments

Ms. Ludwig: And this will be a continuation. We will pick up with the first witness for the app - last witness for the applicant. Correct?

Mr. Liebling: Correct. Thank you.

Mr. Aithal: That's correct. And Madame Chair, if I (inaudible) to make sure that the record is clear on this. The members of the public in attendance, this will serve as your notice that the meeting will be continued to the regularly scheduled planning board meeting, November the 9th beginning at 7:00 p.m. The conclusion of this application, there will be no further notice given to the public. The application is not going to be required to publish or notice to the public. Uh, the call in information will remain the same, but will also be available on the New Brunswick website and Dan, if you could just give the New Brunswick website address, please.

Mr. Dominguez: Yeah, that's cityofnewbrunswick.org - cityofnewbrunswick.org.

Mr. Aithal: And any questions regarding application materials, Dan if you could just give out the number for the planning office.

Mr. Dominguez: 732-745-5050.

Ms. Ludwig: Thank you. And thank you all for your patience and your presentation and for the most part, everybody was professional and polite tonight, so I thank all of you who participated from the public, as well. And we will reconvene on November 9th and is there a motion to adjourn.

VII. DISCUSSION ITEMS

None

VIII. OTHER MATTERS OF INTEREST TO THE PUBLIC

Mr. Dominguez: Hold on. Don't we have to do the regular public comment?

Mr. Aithal: Yes, you need to do regular public comment.

Ms. Ludwig: Even if we are continuing?

Mr. Aithal: Yes. The meeting itself has a public comment component outside of this application for members of the public to be able to comment about anything in general.

Ms. Ludwig: I apologize.

Mr. Dominguez: Okay. So again, we'll open the meeting to public comment for anyone who would wish to make general public comments. You'll have five minutes per person. And I will begin the unmuting process and then we will register, by name A to Z. So, I'm beginning to unmute and - making sure there's nobody here - all right, we believe that's everyone so let's - we're opening it to public comment and we'll start with registration with letter A.

Mr. Dominguez reads through the alphabet. Amna Ahmed, Jean Luc Borjay, Nishad Datta, Viriyah Hodges, Christian Gonzalez, Charlie Kratovil, Danielle Moore, Matthew Meoni, Ming Jia, Andres Morera, Lavender McCaffrey, Arly Rubens, Linda Stork, and Ed Tarbous are placed on the list of speakers.

Mr. Gonzalez: One quick question, Mr. Dominguez, is there going to be another public comment section at the conclusion of the testimony before the vote?

Mr. Dominguez: Yes, November 9th. So, this is the general public comment, that'll be public comment for the application. Um. All right, so is there anyone that we missed who wants to be on this list of public comment speakers. Last call. Seeing none, last name, Ahmed, you are up.

Ms. Amna Ahmed: Hi, good evening, I guess. Good morning, I don't know what the heck it is right now. Um, okay first of all, I thought there was a thing where it's like, can't like, why did this meeting not end at 10:30? Um, it's 1:00. Ah, I mean I'm sure most of you have jobs. Um, I don't know why anyone would want to stay up this late. This is just ridiculous. Like this is honestly ridiculous. And I just also think it's ridiculous that literally, we're even looking at you know this issue has been going on with the Lincoln Annex School, almost, for a while now I don't even remember how many months it's been, um, I just think it's still ridiculous that we have to still continue to fight, you know, for this. I also just don't understand that, why these public officials, why you can't say anything about when a replacement school will open. Why is it that people have to argue about the fact that these kids are being replaced to a warehouse. Why is this acceptable?

I'm sorry, honestly my thoughts are very scattered right now, because I really didn't think I was gonna still be here. Um, but I just want to say this is really disappointing. This is extremely disappointing to see that this is how things are in New Brunswick right now. Um, I am, I'm actually I'm a Rutgers student, I actually am from South Jersey. But, um, you know the reason why I'm still here at 1:09 am is because I think what's happening is just wrong. And it's absurd. And it's reckless, and it's stupid. Um, and just - okay, I'm sorry I just needed one second. Um - yeah, I'm still there sorry just one second. Yeah. Um, yeah, I honestly, um, I'm just really extremely upset, everything that I saw tonight. Um, you know I just also want to just point out, you know this idea of decorum and respect, you know that was established at the beginning, I don't know how, possibly you would expect that from the public, when, you know, certain people have spoken today clearly didn't get the same, so that's just also really upsetting. And, yeah, that's all I really have to say, I'm, I'm here, 1:00 am literally just disgusted by this patriarchal hierarchy that obviously we still continue to instill. So that's all I have to say. Thank you. Have a good night.

Mr. Borjay: All right. Yes, I'm present. Well, to begin, I would like to reiterate the points that the previous caller made. I can't believe that we are still here at one in the morning. This is unacceptable. I have prepared a whole statement that I was reading throughout the whole night, through the whole meeting. And yes, I've been here through the whole meeting. So, I shall begin. Now, in the interest of the quorum, my language will be kept civil.

Mr. Aithal: Just one moment. This is the board attorney. Unlike what we've been saying during the entire meeting, that the questioning and comments have to be restricted to just the application and the application site, during the public comment portion for general public comment, since the applicant is not here, and because the witnesses are not here, your comments are limited to any comments but the application, so you're not to discuss the application.

Mr. Borjay: Oh, well, I called in twice and I was on the call twice, and both times my question for you, deemed inappropriate for the current section. So, here we are now.

Mr. Aithal: I know it's not comfort to you to say that you're batting 1,000, but that's -

Mr. Borjay: Oh, I don't care if I am. I know it's David versus Goliath -

Mr. Aithal: It's the public comment about anything that you'd like to discuss. But the applicant is not here, so the board ought not to hear public comments -

Mr. Borjay: Yes, I'm quite aware. So, shall I begin, has this been digging into my five minutes, by the way?

Mr. Dominguez: Well, you've been going back and forth with him so you have three minutes left.

Mr. Borjay: Cool, thanks I'm going to start. The first applicant comments did nothing to allay fears or confusion. I still fully hold all of my concerns, and they are only increased with the talk of conditional plans of parking decks and power plants. Specifically, is that the power plants -

Mr. Aithal: Public comment ought to be about anything about the application at this point, that's what the public comment portion of the public meetings (inaudible) if you have anything else you'd like to discuss, this would be the time to do that.

Mr. Borjay: Well, don't I have the option right now to speak my piece?

Mr. Aithal: But anything that you'd like to discuss, except for the application.

Mr. Borjay: Well I'm confused about the application, frankly, and I called in twice, and my voice was heard twice on this call, and apparently it wasn't the appropriate time, so, sir, when is the appropriate time, if not now?

Mr. Aithal: There'll be a public portion after the conclusion -

Mr. Borjay: Is this not the public portion, sir?

Ms. Ludwig: Not for the application, this is the public portion of the meeting. The public portion for the application will be heard after the completion of testimony by the applicant.

Mr. Borjay: Well, I thought this was just the general public comments section.

Ms. Ludwig: It is the general public comment, not to be confused -

Mr. Borjay: Well then this is what I have to say for the public comment section. Treat it as such, if you will, if you can. I don't know if you can, but I would appreciate it. I've been waiting say this all night.

Ms. Ludwig: Aravind, should not the applicant be present to hear this comment? We should not be hearing this now.

Mr. Aithal: It would be unfair to the applicant and the other members who decided not to stay for public comment. So, Madam Chair, it's at your discretion, but I would advise you that if Mr. Borjay does not have any other public comments, I'd like to move on to the next -

Mr. Borjay: But no, this is my whole public comment. Are you kidding me?

Ms. Ludwig: You can make public comments, but it can't pertain to the application we were hearing tonight.

Mr. Aithal: That application still pending.

Mr. Borjay: Nothing I can say can pertain to, to the applications that were proposed tonight?

Ms. Ludwig: Correct. There will be public comments for that after the -

Mr. Borjay: I see, for the extended nature of this meeting, this meeting was not able to fully conclude. So, this is not technically the public comment section? Is that what it is.

Ms. Ludwig: I don't know how to say, well, it's the general public comment portion of the meeting outside of the application.

Mr. Dominguez: Can I try this, I apologize. Let me try to interject. I hope I'll give him the benefit of doubt and try to actually explain this. Um, so we are in the general public comment portion of the meeting. Right, the hearings themselves have, for each application, their own public comment portion, but since we have not concluded that portion, we're not at that hearing entirely, that public comment period hasn't happened yet. And if you were to comment during this public comment period on things regarding that application, you're essentially continuing the meeting in some regard and making statements in front of the board, without the applicant -

Mr. Borjay: I was just trying to speak my general piece.

Mr. Dominguez: I understand that you can say your piece but you can't because we haven't concluded that business, it cannot include -

Mr. Borjay: I can't speak my piece? What am I allowed to speak on? I have a whole script prepared, but I guess I can't speak from that, um, um, I would like to speak to the general insanity of this whole plan of the power plant of the parking deck of the whole demolition plan for the Lincoln Annex School, this is all insanity. I would like to let the City Council know that you all sound like super villains.

Mr. Dominguez: Our next speaker is Datta.

Mr. Datta: I just want to ask if it is, I'm not lawyer, so I don't know if it's ethical, if it's legal, to have a meeting like this go on so long, but I want to know if everyone involved thinks it's ethical?

Mr. Aithal: This is your opportunity to make public comments.

Mr. Datta: All right, I yield my time.

Mr. Dominguez: Hodges? All right, Cristian Gonzalez.

Mr. Christian Gonzales: I just wanted to voice my opposition on the whole plan to demolish Lincoln Annex, and I'm (inaudible)

Mr. Hodges: I'm actually going to make giving some charitable comments about ending the meeting, meaning when you did not actually pushing for a vote. I wasn't going to apologize for my harsh language earlier, but you kind of ruin that and ruin any goodwill when you shut down that guy. So, instead let's just talk about you. Now, to be honest, I will be civil, but I will be honest, maybe somebody will surprise me on this, but none of you actually care about the well-being of the patients, or the students, or the citizens of New Brunswick, or the or the law or any of that, but I can imagine you care about one thing and that's your careers. So here the thing, the election is going to be in two weeks and how many of you have position, or your positions elected? Or if your boss's positions elected? If there's any of those, yes, then you should be wary, because generally local elections is determined by those who have a lot of determination. There's a lot of people who really don't like you, so I hope have some sort of plan to get yourself in the good graces of the public in the next few days, just want to remind you of that. Well, I guess that's all for now. Have a lovely evening.

Mr. Dominguez: All right, Ming Jia?

Mr. Jia: Wow, this is laughable. The whole framework that were working with, and um, it's a test of the application, whatever, a testament to man's arrogance, ridiculous and utterly laughable, I yield my time.

Mr. Kratovil: Good evening, members of the board, I'll be brief, I just want to confirm who was present on the board, so I know that there was a list of people that were conflicted out that was given. But I want to know who was and still is present, as Mr. Petrolino said he left at some point, is that correct?

Mr. Dominguez: Yeah, I jotted down that he left probably about 10:24.

Mr. Kratovil: Ms. Sicora-Ludwig is of course running meeting. I saw Mr. Vickers and Ms. Checo on the call. Who else is, you know on the board and actually present?

Mr. Dominguez: Ryan Berger and Bob Cartica should still be present. Hopefully they're still present.

Mr. Cartica: I'm here.

Mr. Ryan Berger (Board Member): I'm also here.

Mr. Kratovil: Well, I just wanted to say that I'm really proud of the people of New Brunswick who spoke up tonight and I know that this is an unusual situation for all of us, with pandemic and this application, and at the end of the day, you know, I do appreciate the time to be able to question (inaudible), and I think that the more discussion we have about big plans like this, the better. So, I thank everyone for their time sincerely members the board, the professionals, the applicant and their witnesses, and of course the members of the public, proud to be a New Brunswicker, have a good night.

Mr. Lavender McCaffrey: Oh yeah, that's me. I mean, yeah, this public comment section has been pretty wild and pretty (inaudible), but I get like whoever's here, I feel this is relevant like regardless of the way you format and segment yourself in order to obscure public opinion, like just the government employees, but as human beings, you have the ability to influence each other. So, insofar as you are (inaudible) I ask you to push back on this plan, or at least attempt to get people choose a different site, because you don't have to directly oriented back against the people of New Brunswick to do what you're posturing. It's the wrong thing in every regard, and regardless of whether you're part of the application, to the plan or what have you, you have influence -

Mr. Aithal: That's probably the third time at Mr. Hodges has inappropriately cut in. Mr. McCaffrey, this is a public portion for any comments that you may have about anything but the application, so if you wish to make a comment about anything else, you're certainly welcome to do that, but the board ought not to consider, in the absence of the applicant, any testimony or any comments.

Mr. McCaffrey: Just have no illusions, I guess, in the long run, doing the wrong thing does not work. This is not going to work. You have influence. This is not going to work. Doesn't matter how much you say you're not the applicant or you're not the people like positing this part of the plan, you can talk to the people positing the part of a plan, like you're not, you're not -

Mr. Aithal: You can't discuss, it's still pending -

Mr. Dominguez: Next is Meoni.

Mr. Meoni: All right, I think everyone that pretty much before me had the major point about how absurd this is and how you obviously members of the board seem like you don't really care about what the public has to say. But as we move towards Bob and I believe the other lawyer, his name was Charlie, I forget but

whoever the other gentleman was, I just can't believe how dismissive and inappropriate you both talk to a number of different women callers, and it's absolutely absurd, and to be perfectly honest (inaudible) careers. It's pretty ridiculous. And I would say to you really should take a look at that and examine how you allow and have conversations with women in this kind of setting, because it's really really really absurd. And it's pretty disgusting. And I mean it comes as no surprise, because you're obviously taking the case. And backing the case, which clearly is the wrong thing to do. So, on that note, everyone from the public who called in, have a great night.

Ms. Moore: Ms. Sicora-Ludwig, wow, what a horrible job, you didn't answer my question when I asked you about. Wow. Are you going to continue to need any, and then how we're going to do this after you announce it and then you finally announced that, oh we're going to continue the meeting, in two to three weeks. Wow, have you waited till everyone hung up, and then said okay, do the public meeting. Wow, that wasn't like I said, you didn't want to hear anybody anymore. I'm talking now, thank you -

Ms. Ludwig: Excuse me, if you're going to make a comment about something I said -

Ms. Moore: Let me finish my comments before you do. Then that instead of just answering the question, where a lot of times when, while something honestly comes up. Oh, this is so long gone and go on, and tell you this well simply don't you just had to say that, okay, we were gonna continue, how you waited until, okay, we're gonna continue, then people hung up. And then didn't say publicly, why you don't want to hear anybody. I can tell you now how going the same way of the board meeting, 25 people there and what's going to be the same three people who vote yes, because they don't care. Don't care at all, it's the same, but one thing I've been keeping records and making sure I've been putting the planning board. Well, that was the day right (inaudible) 50 Jersey Avenue. So again, I trying to put the school. Wow, (inaudible) can last, while you had so many, that almost had an overdose well on all on the sidewalk and off what two times a day? A school is not supposed to go there and how they say they lie and say the city is not going to pay for anything, that's crazy, the city is going to have to come out of their pocketbook. More crossing guards, plenty more signs, to have to people on duty to make sure that people don't go over there (inaudible) the police would have been investigated, and what they don't care either, Robert Wood Johnson keep records of how many people that keep picking up next to 50 Jersey Avenue per day. And like I said, the last time I said you don't care about no one else, only words that come out of your mouth yes, yes, before you even investigate of what goes on, it's really shameful to see it. I guess said well because if any of you even take the time to see what it's like over there, this is not an area for a school. Like I said, the Lord (inaudible) you will regret, you will feel the hurt when you see what goes on when you've looked over time regretting this one time. Yes, and then also I think one last thing the board, no taxes for you and then it goes to the board, because you vote yes. And like I said, Wow, like the gentleman said it is time to vote, people chose not care of what we build on safety or not. Thank you.

Ms. Ludwig: Hi Dan, I would just like to say for the record I was misquoted or misconstrued what I said again, obviously, it was our intention to continue with the last witness, or the public portion of that witness as well, and the attorney for the applicant asked us if we could postpone it and continue the hearing, so that is why it was continued, I was not misleading anybody when I said we were going to do the third testimony tonight.

Mr. Andres Morera: Okay, I understand that any discussion about Lincoln Annex is not really what you guys want to hear it for, you know, we can't talk about the application. So, I'll save my statement for the next meeting then in the interest of actually getting my message across. I mean, I don't know. But anyway, I do want to say this in general, that whatever, however I can appeal to you know, higher ideals that anybody in the board might have about how democracy is supposed to be. This is not, this kind of... I think this is an example of what happens when, I mean, this is a pretty tame example of what happens when people don't have real, real ability in a community to make meaningful decisions about things that affect them, and in their community, and the people that most people that are talking here, this is our only way to really get any sort of input into the decision making process. And, and I just hope that you guys are

fighting the good fight, and trying to change this, and trying to make it so that this is a bottom up approach decision to how cities are managed instead of the way it is now, it's top down, and absolutely terrible for the community's displacement, and hurt and destroyed. That's all I wanted to say right now, I'm just whatever. I appreciate your time and patience, and just know that the fact that there's a lot of testiness, and intentional time wasting and combativeness on the part of people here, you should expect that when this is the kind of crap that was handed to us people. So, and I don't think anybody here behaved out of line that was talking in that combative and testy way, whatever. But anyway, thanks for your time. Good night.

Mr. Pedersen: I want to start off by thanking all the people who came out tonight. Obviously, you can tell that no one wants this to pass, and you should really consider that, because I understand what you're gonna say we're gonna move on. This it's just the way you guys conduct yourself is absolutely horrible, horrible, and you should really think about, dig deep, soul search, because this is not how elected officials are supposed to represent the people that vote for them. It's absolutely disgusting. Thank you.

Ms. Rubens: It's very clear to me and I think all of us got this project has only gotten as far as it has because you don't think anyone's looking, and I hope that this evening has been a wake-up call for you. Nobody buys into your kids versus cancer patients, which is a ridiculous false narrative and thankfully, I'm speaking, no one is intimidated by your obvious shows of contempt to the people that you're supposed to be serving. This is just the beginning. We'll be back in three weeks and we will very happily keep you up until 3:00 am next time. Good night.

Ms. Stork: I just want to make a plea for - and this has been always been my thing, like the broader planning issues in New Brunswick, I feel are neglected in the neighborhood. And I say that as a resident of a neighborhood and a walker, I've walked through a lot of neighborhoods, and I have friends in a lot of different neighborhoods and all the focus seems to be on downtown. I want to see it, and you know it ties in tangentially, I'm not going to speak about the application. But when I'm assuming the reason they're gonna make the school so large is that this really old school that really probably does need to be torn down over here, probably those kids are going to go to it, also, which means there will not be a single public school in the Fifth and Sixth Wards, well how are you making neighborhoods attractive families with no school, public or private? So, you know what, I love my neighborhood, but honestly one of the reasons I moved over here because the school was so close. And the park of course. And this is like, neighborhood, but I feel like you're not planning to, planning for the built-up neighborhoods and the neighborhood kind of city. I feel like people are going on with the big developers and all these guys that don't even live in the city. That just like they want to use New Brunswick for their cash cow. And, and just extract whatever they can out and make a big beautiful downtown and lots of skyscrapers for, I don't know who to live in. Not people that would be displaced by some of the projects, that's for sure. And so, I just really think that we should go in with a plan for development, should include the community, and should include developing our neighborhoods and to begin to construct more family-friendly city, and definitely having public schools in the neighborhood by anybody who's familiar with the neighborhood knows that, you know, Walgreens, isn't really in our neighborhood. And the school that, you know, was in the neighborhood was sold, and now this one was sold and Lincoln's gonna fall down probably, (inaudible) sell it, you know. Meanwhile, a big abandoned school just at the end of my street has been abandoned for the 25 years I've been in this side of town. And I think it was probably abandoned before that, I don't remember, but yeah it just doesn't seem like an efficient use, and then we're you know we're tearing down something somewhere, when we've got a big giant hole in the ground. And I think that hole was more than 17 feet deep, you wouldn't even need to remediate all kinds of dangerous things underneath the concrete but if they already dug it way down over there the big, ugly, pit just sits in the middle of downtown. But we have to tear down the neighborhood school, to build a cancer center. Okay, but I'm done. But also, it's not inclusive to participation to go so late, like if I had to work, I would have had to get off. You know, I'm retired so I'll just get up later in the morning but, yeah, this isn't really I know the parents have to get up and some of them had a hard time getting on also. They were texting me but I asked the question, what is

going on, and now I get to sleep so the next time maybe a less confusing system that everybody on. That's all. And thank you for all of you that did patiently yourself to the end.

Mr. Tarbous: I struggle sometimes with whether or not you folks don't understand. Or you understand and don't care. I really struggle with that. Well, I don't think you do realize the role you folks are currently playing in this world, in an increasingly dangerous world we live in. We have a political system that is not answerable to people, that there's folks at all levels that care only about what the folks above them think, and never hold the people above them accountable, irrespective of what title 52 13 B 16 C paragraph nine says, it was an absolute insult in a conflict of interest that Bob Smith and Associates is somehow, you know, profiting from this meeting, it's unconscionable, totally unconscionable, Bob Smith controls the entire membership of the planning board in Piscataway, and practically the council and the politics of Piscataway, New Brunswick, have been joined at the hip for decades, it's absolutely unconscionable that Bob Smith Associates is involved in any way shape or form with this meeting. And the corruption that that accepting that that is okay and the corruption, that is at this level, at the community level that prevents the community from engaging meaningfully at any level of government, or her entire world, the folks that are here in protecting your careers. It just, it just, I have no idea why, what motivates you folks just to have your name on it, to be a planning board member or zoning board member, that's bull. Do you realize what you're doing? You are blocking the grassroots people of this country from it from getting involved, and building a better world, and you're doing it for selfish reasons, I don't know another explanation. Right. It's a very dangerous world and this corruption that starts right here, right in this room with these kind of decisions, is what is what enabled the corruption at the county level, which enabled the corruption at the state level and enables the corruption of the national and global levels, and at the global level, you guys are complicit in a dangerous world that we had out there today. It's absolutely disgusting.

Ms. Ciccone: Oh no I fell asleep for a second because you know I have a job in the morning. But I woke up in time to hear a lot of the comments and now I'm hoping I can still get my two minutes and if you can. I think, calling you as public servants supposedly in service to the people calling in, would maintain this meeting regardless of the fact that the public thought it was way too long. Beyond that, you stymied different people at different times. And then at the end, you wouldn't let them talk anyway, which I don't understand how that public comment, you kowtow to the applicants. You fawn over their lawyer, you coach them in order to make them do better testimony on their own behalf. If they do a shoddy job let them, that's their problem. It's not for the board's lawyer to explain to them how better to testify. It's not for the board's lawyer to block the public, the public are in charge of the board, your city appointees. Why are we less important than you, in fact were more important, you wouldn't be there without us. Why is this board doing everything in its power to block what the community actually wants on every level, not just this project, every project I've ever seen before the board. How is it possible that you actually think that you're allowing public comment when you shut everyone down all the time. You know you're doing an appalling job. It's sad and disturbing. You should be ashamed of yourself and I hope you are, especially your lawyer. You know, we all have to sit until two in the morning, to railroad some nonsense that nobody wants. Beyond that, since I'm not gonna talk about next meeting. How are you gonna railroad a parking deck through that is unattached anything. You're gonna put through a power plant without actually doing any research, where's your section 106 review, how much of this project is being funded by grant funds, how many times I got to ask the same question about every single project, and yet you still don't know the answers, and you still are surprised when someone comes up with the same question over and over again. How about if everybody does your due diligence from now on, then I'm gonna keep asking the same questions over and over again. I'm really just disgusted with all of you. I think you should feel ashamed about how you're growing our city. I've had enough of you people tonight. But I'll be back next time (inaudible) because the best anyone can do here is shut you down, the same way you're trying to shut everyone else down. You're disgusting. I hope you can't sleep the rest of the sad story night you cooked up.

IX. ADJOURNMENT