

**New Milford Zoning Board of Adjustment  
Special Meeting  
February 28, 2013**

Ms. DeBari called the Public Session of the New Milford Zoning Board of Adjustment to order at 7:40 pm and read the Open Public Meeting Act.

**ROLL CALL**

Mr. Binetti	Present
Ms. DeBari	Present
Mr. Denis	Present
Father Hadodo	recused
Mr. Ix	Present
Mr. Loonam	Present
Mr. Rebsch	Present
Mr. Stokes Vice Chairman	Present
Mr. Schaffenberger-Chairman	recused
Ms. Batistic- Engineer	Present
Mr. Sproviero – Board Attorney	Present

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**

**12-01 New Milford Redevelopment Associates, LLC- Block 1309 Lot 1.02- Mixed Use Development- Supermarket, Bank and Residential Multifamily Housing**

Mr. Del Vecchio member of the firm of Beattie Padovano on behalf of the applicant requested special meetings. The Board scheduled a special meeting for Thursday, March 28, 2013 at 7:30 and a tentative for Thursday April 18, 2013.

Mr. Del Vecchio recalled Ms. Dolan who was previously qualified and remained under oath for additional questions that remained from the public. Mr. Sproviero stated before they proceed to Ms. Dolan's conclusion he wanted to deal with an issue regarding Mr. Loonam's son being coached by one of the objectors attorney and asked the Board Member if this would affect his ability to fairly and impartially judge the application. Mr. Loonam answered no but he wanted it on the record that Mr. Alonso would be communicating through email regarding practices.

Mr. Del Vecchio said they have submitted drawings from Thomas Ashbahian to comply with requests from the Board on elevations on the Shop Rite.

Miriam Pickett 222 Baldwin Avenue, asked Ms. Dolan if they took into consideration when the Bridge reopened and the Shop Rite completed that there would be additional traffic from Elm Street to get to the supermarket. Ms. Dolan said they did not have actual

traffic counts but they did make some estimates. Ms. Pickett thought Madison and Main Street would have an increase in traffic. Ms. Dolan said they have not studied Elm Street volumes other than routing some traffic. The Traffic Engineer added they have looked at the intersection of Madison/Main and the amount of traffic that would be generated to and from the Kinderkamack corridor. Ms. Pickett asked if they took into account Sunday parishioners from St. Joseph's Church. Ms. Dolan said they have not done any specific study on St. Joseph's traffic or the affiliated school but did Sunday traffic counts to see how the volumes compare on River Road. Ms. Pickett asked if a traffic signal would be necessary because of students crossing at Elm Street with the increase of vehicular traffic. Ms. Dolan said that would be subject to a study to determine if the pedestrian volumes and /or traffic warrant a signal. Ms. Pickett asked Ms. Dolan if she was aware of an application for a proposed 14 unit multifamily dwelling on Madison Avenue and questioned if that would add to the increase of traffic at rush hour. Ms. Dolan had heard about it but did not think the 14 units would generate a substantial amount of traffic. Ms. Pickett asked if they were aware the Jewish Center was being sold to a Church which was located one block from the Madison/ River Road intersection. Ms. Dolan did not know the specifics of the application. Mr. Sproviero stated for the record there was no application at this time pending before the zoning or planning board. Ms. Pickett asked if she would agree that her current traffic patterns with the proposed apartment building, the possible sale of the Jewish Center to a Korean Church and the opening of Elm Street Bridge would not reflect the traffic of a typical Sunday. Ms. Dolan did not agree with that because without Elm Street volumes they could not study the patterns but have make estimates. The Traffic Engineer added that Sunday had not been the specific focus of the study.

Ms. Pickett asked why they did not use automatic counters. Ms. Dolan said automatic counters do not pick up left and right hand turns. Ms. Pickett asked if they were 100% accurate. Ms. Dolan said they were very accurate and representative of what was happening. The resident questioned why the County used automatic counters. Ms. Dolan responded they use them if they were looking for 24 hour volumes or certain patterns. Ms. Pickett asked if they would consider using both automatic and manual counters for a more accurate count. Ms. Dolan stated it was not a standard operating procedure and said it would be supplemental not more accurate for this type of study. Ms. Dolan added if the Board Engineer had requested that level of activity they would have provided it.

Michael Gadaleta 270 Demarest Avenue, asked if the ITE established roads to be labeled as a primary or secondary road. Ms. Dolan answered it was defined in the Master Plan and RSIS provided for residential streets but it was not an ITE issue . Mr. Gadaleta asked what Demarest, Madison and River Road would be. Ms. Dolan would consider River Road a minor arterial and major collector and Madison a collector. She thought the majority of them were minor arterials or major collectors. Mr. Gadaleta asked if that was based on the substandard width of 50'. Ms. Dolan was basing it on their function in terms of distributing traffic through the area. Mr. Gadaleta asked if she was aware that the majority of Madison Avenue that bordered the development had no curbs or sidewalks. Ms. Dolan agreed. Mr. Gadaleta asked if she would consider that an unimproved road. Ms. Dolan said it was paved to provide for two way traffic. The resident asked if the

absent of sidewalks and curbs created a dangerous situation. Ms. Dolan said unless there was proven accident history or conditions that occurred it could not be classified as dangerous.

Mr. Gadaleta asked if they were aware that the existing Shop Rite frequently maxed out with the parking. Ms. Dolan said they counted the parking demand that exists and calculated a demand of 2.72 spaces per 1,000 sq ft at the existing Shop Rite. Mr. Gadaleta asked what the definition was for a full movement driveway. Ms. Dolan said full movement meant left turns and right turns in and out would be accommodated. Mr. Gadaleta had a concern how someone was getting from the Shop Rite to Demarest Avenue when there were left and right hand turns. Ms. Dolan said they modeled it with the potential for someone to use Demarest Avenue and go straight across. They estimated the volumes would max out at 15-20 cars per hour.

In regard to the assessment of the existing roadway infrastructure, Mr. Gadaleta questioned why there was no mention of a train. Ms. Dolan replied that it could have been included but it has not been. Mr. Gadaleta stated Milford Avenue had sidewalks only on the high school side and questioned Ms. Dolan's report referencing Milford Avenue having sidewalks on both sides. Ms. Dolan would look at that again. The resident felt that should be noted in the report that Madison Avenue had no sidewalks and curbs. When Mr. Gadaleta asked if sidewalks and curbs were warranted for pedestrian safety in the vicinity of the High School, Ms. Dolan replied they did not ignore pedestrians because they included counts of the school activity.

There was a maximum of 12 pedestrians crossing River Road at Demarest Avenue according to Ms. Dolan's report and Mr. Gadaleta questioned how the pedestrians would cross. According to Ms. Dolan, a traffic signal was not warranted and if appropriate a mid block crossing would be provided by the applicant. Mr. Gadaleta questioned if it should be in the report as something off the checklist. Ms. Dolan said the report was the basis for the traffic analysis and items discussed would be included in a vote. She added there would be a checklist at that time as to how it would be designed and approved. Mr. Sproviero clarified that the checklist she referred to was conditions. Ms. Dolan agreed. Mr. Del Vecchio stated if the professionals or Board requested a crosswalk the applicant would provide it.

Mr. Gadaleta asked for clarification on the supermarket trip generation comparisons. Ms. Dolan explained the Shop Rite data was an estimate based on rates derived at the existing Shop Rite. They provided the Shop Rite Data for comparison and use the higher ITE numbers in the analysis. The resident asked about transactions on Tuesday that he believed was testified to be a busy day. Ms. Dolan looked at the various weekday and weekend volumes and noted there were 264 transactions during the weekday afternoon and evenings that were lower than the average transactions for weekend hours. Mr. Sproviero questioned that weekends were busier than Tuesday. Ms. Dolan testified that on the September 2012 data, there was an average of 319 peak hour transactions on Sunday, 286 on Saturday and 264 during weekday afternoon and evening. The resident questioned supermarket trip estimates and wanted clarification on the existing and the

proposed Shop Rite. Ms. Dolan explained if they used existing Shop Rite transaction data or actual driveway counts they come with estimates lower than the ITE estimates. They were using the higher trip estimates and prorating the existing Shop Rite activity based on the increase in building size. Mr. Gadaleta asked again if they were basing counts using the existing Shop Rite as opposed to a 70,500 sf shopping center. Mr. Del Vecchio interrupted stating the witness has answered this question many times and added that the applicant has taken an extra step to get data from the existing Shop Rite for purposes of comparison. The analysis and extra data was used nowhere in the report, Mr. Del Vecchio explained to calculate the worst case condition. Mr. Sproviero understood they had the counts from the existing Shop Rite and it was prorated to reflect the proposed Shop Rite and asked if they use the original data, prorated data or the ITE estimates for the analysis in the report. Ms. Dolan answered they use ITE estimates because they were higher than the prorated estimates.

Mr. Gadaleta asked what internal credits were. Ms. Dolan explained with the original proposal they were able to credit some of the trip generation but when the study was revised to reflect the 24 units, Ms. Dolan testified that they lost some of that credit but the shared credits were internal trips between uses. The Traffic Engineer stated when preparing a traffic study for a multi use retail setting they used the shopping center category and they generate estimates separate for the supermarket and separate for the bank with some interaction between the two. Mr. Gadaleta questioned how they could make a statement in their report regarding no substantial amount of traffic was assigned to Demarest Avenue because it was a lower volume road and no cars were counted coming into Demarest Avenue. Ms. Dolan said they counted the inbound and outbound cars at River Road. The resident questioned what the minus sign was next to some of numbers on the charts. The traffic engineer said the minus sign was representative of pass-by trips. The resident said the ITE manual had information on safety for schools and questioned why that was not in the report. According to Ms. Dolan, they did not conduct a school route study but performed a traffic impact study. Mr. Gadaleta asked what provisions were made for bicycle safety. Ms. Dolan had not studied bicycle activity. Mr. Gadaleta asked if they analyzed what would happen to the traffic count with a train. Ms. Dolan said the traffic would stop, it was a function of Main Street and it was something that existed and would not change whether or not the property was developed. The resident questioned if there should be signalized intersections in the vicinity of the train. Ms. Dolan said that would be a study by the municipality. Mr. Gadaleta asked if her client asked her to limit her review. Ms. Dolan answered they have not been restricted in anyway by the applicant.

## RECESS

Betty Verdejo 24 South William Street, Bergenfield asked what the peak hours were for Monday thru Friday and Saturday and Sunday. Ms. Dolan said traffic hours were 7-9am, 4-6pm and a school peak hour of 3-4 pm on weekdays and 11-2 Saturday and Sunday. Ms. Verdejo asked if she personally did the count. Ms. Dolan said the staff did the count. Ms. Verdejo asked if the counters would appear before the Board to verify the information. Mr. Sproviero said that was not required. The resident asked what date and

hour did they count the 12 pedestrians crossing River Road at Demarest Avenue. On Tuesday April 26, 2011, Monday December 22, 2012, Thursday April 19, 2012 and Tuesday February 14, 2012, Ms. Dolan said they did the count from 2-4pm at River Road in the vicinity of Demarest Avenue. The resident questioned if the additional traffic from students driving and parents picking up students to and from school were counted. Ms. Dolan said all traffic on the roadways was counted on the days they counted. Ms. Verdejo asked if they counted the traffic from the senior center. Ms. Dolan said that all traffic was counted at the various intersections but no specific counts from the senior center activity.

Lori Barton 399 Roslyn Avenue, questioned who would pay for signals for the driveways at Madison and Main if the counts prove to be inaccurate. If there was an identification of volumes that needed a signal, Ms. Dolan testified it would be subject to completion of a full signal warrant analysis. Ms. Barton has concerns the Borough could be left to pay for the signal. Ms. Dolan said the Boswell letter concurred with their trip generation estimates and that traffic signals were not warranted. The resident questioned the testimony that they calculated the expected trip generation based on the new 70,500 sf supermarket and the existing supermarket of 62,000 sf. Ms. Dolan answered the ITE was based on the 70,500 sf and also used to prorate the existing Shop Rite data for comparison. The resident questioned if the retail space would have an impact on the proposed trip generation. Ms. Dolan answered no because they used the ITE trip generation. Ms. Barton asked if it would still be necessary to widen River Road to accommodate the turn lane. Based on the left turn warrant analysis, Ms. Dolan agreed. Ms. Barton questioned if the Sycamore trees would have to be removed. Ms. Dolan said the additional width would require widening and impact the trees. The resident questioned if the Shade Tree Commission did not give their approval would they widen the road. Ms. Dolan did not know. Ms. Barton questioned if their method of counting was certified by the State. Ms. Dolan said it was the accepted traffic engineering procedure. Ms. Barton asked if the report was prepared for the State would they have to use the wires in the road. Ms. Dolan said it depended on the development but the access code for large generators required that manual codes be supplemented with an ATR. Ms. Barton said that a lot of people use Boulevard instead of River Road to avoid lights and questioned people cutting through Demarest to Boulevard. Ms. Dolan did not do a study of Boulevard but expected similar volumes and said based on the distribution report it would be easier to use Main Street than Demarest. Ms. Barton asked if she was aware that Demarest did not have sidewalks. Ms. Dolan was not aware of it. Ms. Barton questioned with past applications if she ever concluded that additional traffic would be a problem. Ms. Dolan said with this application they proposed a left turn lane and that was the types of mitigation that come with a larger development.

Anna Leone 505 Boulevard, referred to the traffic count locations and times and questioned why they did not use the same date for counts. Ms. Dolan said there were dates from 2011 and 2012 and they scheduled counts based on count staff availability, school calendar and weather. The traffic engineer added they did not have the count staff to send all in one day and they sampled traffic over several days. Ms. Barton questioned that they did not have the proper staff and why they did not pick at least one or two dates

for an intersection. Ms. Dolan disagreed that they did not have sufficient staff and said there was nothing wrong with the count dates or times they included in the study. Ms. Barton asked if they factored in a percentage for error for the count of vehicles. Ms. Dolan said they use the counts as counted and applied a background growth rate.

Donna Tomasini 411 Charles Street, questioned that the Chief of Police recommended a crossing guard at the intersection. Mr. Dolan thought he said a crossing guard might be needed at the location of Demarest.

Gene Murray 425 Madison Avenue, commented at the last hearing Mr. Del Vecchio said they would have a clarification at the next meeting on a count of the Sycamore trees that would be removed on River Road. Ms. Dolan was not prepared to answer that and Mr. Del Vecchio said it was not a topic for this meeting. Mr. Murray asked Ms. Dolan if she took into consideration the number of trees to be removed for widening River Road. Ms. Dolan was aware of it but she had not studied the tree issue and did not know how many trees would be affected. Mr. Murray clarified the report stated an average of 319 peak hour transactions were recorded on a Sunday and asked what was the maximum number recorded. Ms. Dolan recalled they were close but she did not have the information. Mr. Murray asked if they counted for the 40 employees or 40 vehicles in the store at a weekend shift in the transaction count. Ms. Dolan said they were already there and that would be a parking demand not a trip generation. Mr. Murray questioned if one would correlate to the other. Ms. Dolan said not necessarily. The resident questioned if trip generation thru the driveways at the site would not indicate a demand for parking. Ms. Dolan answered no because the vehicles were continuously coming and going and explained that was why they do parking demand studies which was addressed in her report. Mr. Murray clarified that in the report a transaction equated to a vehicle so he would assume the vehicle would park and would relate to parking demand. According to Ms. Dolan's opinion, the 319 transactions from her analysis did not correlate to the parking.

Mr. Murray asked the Traffic Engineer if she would be surprised that the existing Shop Rite had 222 parking spaces and with a parking requirement of 1 space for every 150 sq ft and it would correlate to a building size of 33,000 sf. The resident questioned that they were prorating their data based on a 62,000 sf building vs a 33,000 sf building. Ms. Dolan said her methodology was to use the gross building area and applied the gross building area to the parking demand and trip generation. Mr. Murray said if they used her projection of 319 transactions for a building of 33,000 sf vs one that was 62,100 sf, would she be surprised that the prorated data would exceed the ITE data used in the report. Ms. Dolan said if a smaller building was used the prorated number would be greater.

Mr. Murray asked if they did any traffic movement observations on the Boulevard. Ms. Dolan said they did not count Boulevard traffic. The resident felt a motorist had the option to take the Boulevard to Demarest to avoid lights. Ms. Dolan answered they developed a distribution pattern for site traffic that was based on the estimated traffic volumes on Demarest combined with the various turning movements. Mr. Murray

thought motorists coming from the east side of town could avoid two to three lights by using Demarest Avenue. Ms. Dolan said they could do that but they would have to wait for a gap in the traffic flow northbound and southbound on River Road to cross and based on the traffic volume levels the signals were operating at accepted levels of service. Mr. Murray said there were no sidewalks on the western portion of Demarest Avenue and questioned what pedestrians would do in the situation of no sidewalks. Ms. Dolan said they would probably walk in the street the way they were now. Mr. Murray questioned if there was any impact to pedestrian safety by directing more traffic onto a roadway without sidewalks. The traffic engineer said the vehicle pedestrian interaction was happening today and if there was an accident history that suggested there was a situation than it should be addressed. Ms. Dolan added that the school exists and was currently generating pedestrians.

Mr. Murray asked if she was aware there were over 1300 Brookchester apartment units and 200 Dorchester residential units surrounding the existing supermarket and asked why they were not factoring in any additional trip load from the 1500 residents that would have to go north to the supermarket. Ms. Dolan said they did not take any credit for existing supermarket activity so it was assuming a new supermarket with all new customers driving to the supermarket. She noted the internal credit reduced the trip generation. She said they used the total vehicular trip generation from the ITE data to account for a new stand alone supermarket and did not take any pedestrian trip credits.

Mr. Murray said Mr. Pagano's testimony was 3-5 tractor trailers with a wheel base of 50' visit the existing supermarket and expected the same volume for the proposed supermarket with an additional 20-30 smaller vans/trucks visiting the site. Mr. Murray wanted to review the traffic pattern for trucks. Mr. Del Vecchio objected and requested additional special meetings be scheduled starting next month if the Board allowed repetitive questions. Mr. Murray understood but said this was a question not asked. Mr. Murray questioned the testimony that trucks would exit the site at the north exit onto Main Street and make a left. Ms. Dolan agreed. Mr. Murray asked if trucks proceed to the current Shop Rite by River Road and return by River Road. Ms. Dolan understood that was Mr. Pagano's testimony. Mr. Murray asked if it was her understanding that Mr. Pagano testified that trucks would not use Kinderkamack Road. Ms. Dolan did not recall a specific reference to Kinderkamack Road but recalled the drivers would be given a route to follow. Mr. Murray asked if the drivers would return by River Road as they exit the site. Ms. Dolan did not know the specifics of the intended Wakefern routing but she knew the site was designed to accommodate the movements left out to Main. Mr. Murray asked what was the minimum radius required for a 50' tractor trailer to make a turn into more than a 90 degree intersection. Ms. Dolan said that would have to be studied with a turning template. Mr. Murray asked if 47' was correct for a radius for a 50' tractor trailer. Mr. Dolan agreed for the inside turning radius of a vehicle. Mr. Murray asked if she was not concerned about the inability of tractor trailers for Shop Rite being able to make the left turn. Ms. Dolan replied that if the path was to use Madison turning left from Main, she had not studied that and if it needed to be looked at it would have to be evaluated. Mr. Murray clarified that drivers only had that option or proceed up Main Street to Kinderkamack. Ms. Dolan said in her review she did not see a prohibition on

Kinderkamack and she thought that would be the direction they would be going based upon the routing. Mr. Murray thought there was conflicting testimony. Mr. Murray asked if the traffic engineer did any studies of the turning radius at Main and Washington. Mr. Dolan said no specific studies of existing intersections have been made because currently vehicles were using the intersections. Mr. Murray said these were proposed intersections that did not exist. Mr. Dolan said Mr. Dipple had shown on his truck circulation exhibit the ability to get the tractor trailers into and out to the proposed driveway locations. Mr. Murray was questioning if she was confident that there would be no problems once the trucks get onto the county road at Main Street or Madison. Ms. Dolan had not studied the skewed intersections for turning movements for vehicles but agreed there might be some encroachment into another lane. Mr. Murray said in Mr. Tombalakian's letter there was a recommendation regarding a driveway width exiting onto Madison Avenue. Ms. Dolan said there was a 15' width suggestion as opposed to 13' and she felt it was an excessive design standard. Mr. Murray stated there was a conflict of testimony between her testimony and Mr. Pagano's who testified all current trucks used River Road southbound. Mr. Del Vecchio interjected that Mr. Pagano never testified to that but testified they would use Kinderkamack Road. Mr. Murray asked if she could describe how trucks would reach the site from any location south of the existing site. Ms. Dolan understood they would use Kinderkamack road and turn right from Main onto Madison travel southbound turn into the site and exit back to Main Street. She added the existing store uses River Road. Mr. Murray clarified in the analysis there were capacity projections for the existing roadway based on a no build vs build scenario and factored in a growth rate of 2% per year under the existing conditions until the site was developed. Ms. Dolan agreed. Mr. Murray asked how they would know the true impact of traffic on this community over time with no projections. Ms. Dolan said they were projecting to a period when the store would be open and operating. She added the 2% growth rate was an over projection because they have been doing counts since 2011 and have not seen any growth. The Traffic Engineer said they were looking at what was happens when the store was operating and if there were subsequent applications for development those studies would count and analyze for another design year. Mr. Murray asked what the average daily traffic was on River Road. Ms. Dolan said she had not done anything with 24 hour volumes. The resident stated in the Highway Capacity Manual a roadway at level E was defined as one that had excess capacity. Ms. Dolan agreed and they were at level A,B,C,D with one movement at one peak hour dropping to level E. Mr. Murray thought they deserved more data. Ms. Dolan said they continue to provide additional data.

Sam Tripsas 327 Maple Avenue, Oradell asked if they were aware that the Elm Street bridge was scheduled to be completed at the end of March. Ms. Dolan answered no. The resident said Ms. Dolan testified that they could not do counts on a road that didn't exist and asked how they dealt with anticipated traffic for a new road. Ms. Dolan said it was based on the trip generation of the anticipated use and for Elm Street they would not estimate volumes for that roadway. When the road opens again, Ms. Dolan explained traffic counts could be performed. Mr. Tripsas asked what would prevent trucks coming down Oradell Avenue and continuing down to Elm Street. Ms. Dolan understood the drivers would be given an assigned route to follow. Mr. Tripsas asked if there was a

future bus route for senior citizens. Ms. Dolan thought Mr. Pagano mentioned they would provide a bus.

John Rutledge 335 River Road, asked if there was a training program provided for the people who do the counts. Ms. Dolan answered they train them and described the training program. Mr. Rutledge asked if there was any certification test required. Ms. Dolan was not aware of one. Mr. Rutledge questioned what would happen if a counter ran into traffic and arrived late. The traffic engineer added that if a counter came late they would mark it on their sheet and if they felt they needed to make up the time they would repeat the count. Mr. Rutledge said they did not have any indication on what a 24 hour traffic scenario would be or what the total amount of traffic was thru the town. Mr. Del Vecchio objected that the witness testified to this. Mr. Rutledge asked if they were aware that on February 22, 2005 the NJDOT approved River Road improvements from Cleveland Street to Oradell border and that the current ADT from River Road to the Oradell border was 6,114 vehicles and approximately 1,000 trucks over 5 tons and did it have any impact on their calculations. Ms. Dolan was not aware of it and it did not have any impact of her calculations. Mr. Rutledge asked if she was aware of the national bridge inventory. Ms. Dolan answered no. Mr. Rutledge asked if she was familiar with New Milford's 2004 Master Plan. The Traffic Engineer had already testified she was not. Mr. Rutledge asked if they had answers regarding Mr. Loonam's request for the trip destinations by using the information from Shop Rite's price plus cards. Ms. Dolan answered they did not get that data. Mr. Rutledge said in the traffic survey sheet in the report on March 6, 2012 for the intersection of River Road/ Madison Avenue there was 1,370 counts. He commented in a document on traffic counts from Department of Public Work's Engineering Division for Madison/ River Road on May 24, 2012 from 7-9 am the total calculated traffic was 2,770 and questioned why there was such a difference in the counts between the two reports. Ms. Dolan explained the 2,770 was a two hour count and the 1,370 was an isolated peak hour that occurred from 7:30-8:30 am. The resident asked if this data analyzed for the third time would require additional data analysis. Ms. Dolan stated the latest revision was based on a change to the plan with a reduction in the number of residential units so the trip generation changed and magnitude of the impact needed to be remeasured.

John DeSantis 190 Powell Drive, asked how far north and south on River Road did they do their traffic study. Ms. Dolan answered Main Street and Madison Street. Mr. DeSantis asked if they should do a study for the length of River Road. Based on the scope of the project and the analysis to date, Ms. Dolan thought it would be additional information but would not have any significant change in operational levels.

Daniel Ferretti, 163 River Road, questioned the direction for inbound truck traffic. Ms. Dolan said they would come from Main to Madison and enter the Madison driveway. Mr. Ferretti asked if there was any engineering study done on the infrastructure at the railroad tracks to see if the tracks would accommodate 53' trucks. Ms. Dolan said not to her knowledge. Mr. Ferretti asked in what other direction could trucks be diverted to. Ms. Dolan said they could go River to Madison but that was not the plan. The resident asked if there was a traffic study done between Henley and Cedar to see if the curb could

accommodate 53' trailers and to see if the bend could accommodate two trucks passing. Ms. Dolan said no such study had been done. The resident questioned severe weather and truck activity at Madison/Main as well as the other roads that could flood. Ms. Dolan said she understood that Mr. Pagano's testimony was if there was flooding the trucks would be sent back or told not to distribute to this location. Mr. Ferretti asked if there have been any study regarding emergency vehicles on the roadway. Ms. Dolan said they looked at the requirements for fire truck circulation relative to onsite circulation and access but no specific studies of those emergency vehicles on the corridor. The resident clarified there would be approximately 50 inbound trucks a day for the site. Ms. Dolan agreed. Mr. Ferretti asked if there were any commercial inbound/outbound trucks expected for the bank and residential units. Ms. Dolan answered no except for maybe a FedEx truck. Mr. Ferretti asked if they figured on a daily basis how many cars for the residents in the condominiums and apartments would go north to the site. Ms. Dolan did not calculate that but they looked at the total traffic generation for a supermarket of this size without regard to relocation or people who walk to the current site but might drive to the new site. The traffic engineer added that the total traffic generation estimate accounts for all vehicles and it was not broken down by vehicle type and no credit for pedestrian activity. Mr. Ferretti had concerns regarding Cooper Street which was directly across the street from the High School and asked if they researched that to determine if the cars exiting or entering off of River Road would be a concern in that location. Ms. Dolan answered they did not do a count of pedestrians or vehicles at that location and did not study the existing bend in the road. The resident asked if it would be beneficial to do a study on the emergency vehicles backing out of their site being that it could be a hazard. Ms. Dolan never performed a hazard type analysis. The resident questioned the number of cars or customers expected between 7-9 am to the site. Ms. Dolan said approximately 150 entering and 100 exiting.

Mr. Sproviero stated there might be more questions from the audience and from Board Members but they would not be able to finish questioning Ms. Dolan tonight. Mr. Del Vecchio answered that Ms. Dolan might not be available for March 12<sup>th</sup> and he was renewing his request for a second special meeting. The Board Attorney said they would deal with that at the next meeting. Mr. Del Vecchio stated the application would be carried to March 12, 2013 without any further notice.

Mr. Loonam asked about visiting the site. Mr. Sproviero said the access agreement needed to be signed by the Mayor and Council.

As there was no further business to discuss, a motion to close was made by Mr. Binetti, seconded by Mr. Rebsch and carried by all.

Respectfully submitted,  
Maureen Oppelaar