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I don't usually ask people to repeat testimony. I'm
going to see if Mr. Baker is here. I do not see her. I
apologize for the delay. I'm just going through the
attendance list. I do not see her on the attendance
list. So, we will see if she shows up, but what I'd like
to do is have Mr. Park just summarize, and maybe bring up
the pictures he showed yesterday of the view from Ms.
Baker's property. So, if she does show up, I don't like
to delay cases, but just in case.
    So, what we're doing now is having the
parties -- those in opposition or whether they're -- who
want to comment on any of the applicant's testimony that
was introduced yesterday, this is your time to do it.
    Mr. Brown, I'm going to -- I forgot to ask you
to identify -- both parties to identify yourselves for
the record. Mr. -- do you -- can you do that briefly?
    MS. HARRIS: Certainly. For the record,
Patricia Harris with Lerch, Early and Brewer, on behalf
of the applicant.
    MR. BROWN:And David Brown of Knopf and Brown
for the Greater South Glen Neighborhood Association and
the West Montgomery County Citizens Association.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay, thank
you.
    Mr. Brown, I'm going to start with you. Is
```

there anybody that you wish to call as a witness?
MR. BROWN: Yes. Mr. Rick Maggin will testify,
and I believe he will be the only witness I'll be
calling.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Mr.
Maggin?
MR. MAGGIN: Yes, I'm here.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Can
you turn your camera on, please?
MR. MAGGIN: I'm turning it on, but I'm having
problems with my laptop this morning, and it doesn't seem
to be working properly.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Do the
parties have any objection if he testifies without being
visible?
MS. HARRIS: We don't have any objection. I
mean it's not like -- I will say --
MR. BROWN: No objection.
MS. HARRIS: -- it's not ideal. But I don't
know how we get around it.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ahh. Well,
it's a moot point. For the record, Mr. Maggin has
appeared.
MS. HARRIS: And then he disappeared.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: But he
disappeared.
MR. MAGGIN: Yeah. For some reason it keeps
going in and out.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Well,
you're appeared for now. Mr. Maggin, you're still under
oath.
MR. MAGGIN: Right.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: So, let's --
let's go with your testimony while you're visible.
MR. MAGGIN: All right.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: And go ahead.
MR. MAGGIN: All right. If we could bring up Exhibit 167 ?

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I will do so.
Just a second. Why isn't this coming out. Okay, let me
try this one more time. I apologize.
Okay. You should be viewing it now.
MR. MAGGIN: Yes, I see it.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Now, Mr.
Maggin, you've disappeared again.
MR. MAGGIN: Let's try again. I keep flicking
it and it keeps going off.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: : There,
good job, thank you. Okay. So, you should be seeing Exhibit --

MR. MAGGIN: But I don't see the exhibit. For some reason, the app is not working correctly today.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: How's that.
MR. MAGGIN: Okay.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay, go ahead.
(The witness' microphone malfunctioned throughout his following testimony.)

MR. MAGGIN: All right. I just want to take a few minutes to point out some important issues on the exhibit. If you look at the Heritage Gardens Site Plan, you'll note that the properties that are being developed are extremely close to the existing property line, and much of this all (inaudible) around the south end of the property.

You'll also notice there are 17 two-acre
adjacent home sites, which is extremely different from
any other projects that are compared to in Mr. Kagan's
report, I believe? If you go down to the Brandywine Home
Site in the lower lefthand -- I'm sorry Brandywine
(inaudible) project in the lower left corner, you'll note
that the manager, All Services, was still the borders of
property on one side. Falls Road Golf Course borders two
other sides. And there's a single home on (inaudible)
Drive that's (inaudible) borders it, as well.

| 9 | 11 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 If you go onto the Spectrum site, the Spectrum | 1 MR. MAGGIN: Yeah, I have tried. For some |
| 2 sites to (inaudible) River, a major thoroughfare. You | 2 reason I'm having problems with the application. First, |
| 3 have (inaudible) acre properties, a couple of them, to | 3 I couldn't get internet connection from my laptop. It |
| 4 the -- I guess it's west. And then you have 3-acre | 4 seems to have shut off this morning when I tried to open |
| 5 properties joining (inaudible). If you (inaudible) and | 5 it. And now I'm having a very difficult time because |
| 6 other homesites adjoin that property. | 6 when I'm listening to you all, all I hear is echoes. |
| 7 If we move to the -- I'm sorry, exhibit 169 -- | 7 MS. HARRIS: Would it help at all if you did |
| 8 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay, you | 8 turn off your camera? |
| 9 should be seeing it. | 9 MR. MAGGIN: It is off now. |
| 10 MR. MAGGIN: I'm sorry. 169 will be next, but | 10 MS. HARRIS: Well, we can see you. |
| 11 if we move to 172, that's what I -- I'm still trying to | 11 MR. MAGGIN: That's a still shot. |
| 12 get my camera to work (inaudible) but anyhow Exhibit 172 | 12 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That's |
| 13 clearly shows that the elderly housing facility has | 13 frozen. Would it help -- what I find sometimes, have you |
| 14 stream buffers all around the perimeter and is also | 14 tried rebooting? |
| 15 adjacent to 2-acre sites. | 15 MR. MAGGIN: I did. I did that this morning. |
| 16 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. | 16 That's the only way I even got this to come up at all. |
| 17 MR. MAGGIN: And now, if you go to Exhibit 169. | 17 MS. HARRIS: Is there a call-in number? It's |
| 18169 shows a summary of 10827 Lockhart Road, which again, | 18 just really hard to follow him. |
| 19 and I seem to be repeating myself, but it did come up | 19 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: There is a |
| 20 again in testimony yesterday by Mr. Kagan. It showed the | 20 call-in number on our website. Let me just share -- |
| 21 single property that was adjacent to Brandywine, and | 21 Mr. MAGGIN: Okay. |
| 22 was very much impacted by the close proximity. | 22 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. If you |
| 23 Mr. Kagan said he spoke with Marcia Shuman, who | 23 -- do you see my screen? |
| 24 is the selling agent. I spoke to the buyer's agent, and | 24 Mr. MAGGIN: I see it. Let me try that. |
| 25 in fact I had her over to my house to give me an | 25 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: There is a |
| 10 | 12 |
| 1 evaluation of what she thought the pending development | 1 call-in number right where my curser is pointing. I can |
| 2 would do. The buyer's agent told me explicitly the client | 2 leave the screen up if you want to try calling into the |
| 3 represented discounted the purchase price because the | 3 meeting. |
| 4 close proximity to the Brandywine development. And so, | 4 MR. MAGGIN: Yeah, I'm doing that right now. |
| 5 because the house had been sitting on the market for an | $5 \quad 5768$. |
| 6 extreme amount of time, based on comparable properties in | 6 (Pause) |
| 7 the area, as you can see, the sales price per square foot | 7 MR. MAGGIN: Could somebody read that |
| 8 was discounted by about 23 percent from average sales | 8 conference number to me? For some reason it says -- |
| 9 price of Potomac Home. That's significant. | 9 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I will. It's |
| 10 What Mr. Kagan failed to point out was that | 10 -- it's -- you ready? It's 770-990-843 pound. You need me |
| 11 (inaudible) major factors influencing value. Those | 11 to read that again? |
| 12 (inaudible) two-acre lots do not live near adjacent | 12 THE REPORTER: Also, did you want me to go off |
| 13 multi-family housing. The demand for homes will be | 13 the record? |
| 14 severely impacted and limited, and we have already felt | 14 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: No, let's -- |
| 15 the economic impact of pending project by -- | 15 there's some issues here I'd like to stay on the record, |
| 16 MS. HARRIS: May I interrupt for one second? I | 16 please. |
| 17 don't know if it's just me, but I am having a very | 17 THE REPORTER: Okay. No problem. |
| 18 difficult time understanding Mr. Maggin. It's like it | 18 (Pause) |
| 19 fades in and out. It's hard to comprehend everything | 19 MR. MAGGIN: It keeps telling me they can't |
| 20 he's saying. | 20 find the meeting with that number. |
| 21 THE REPORTER: This is Joe, the court reporter. | 21 MS. HARRIS: We can hear you. |
| 22 I 'm also having that issue. I was just about to ask about | 22 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, your |
| 23 that issue. If there's any way that we can get -- maybe | 23 voice quality -- your voice quality -- your picture is |
| 24 Mr . Maggin like, if he can like fix his mike or | 24 frozen, but your voice quality is better. Do you want to |
| 25 something, because it's coming in and out. | 25 try and proceed? |
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pointing out that they're very different, that the
homesites are much larger and that those are single-
family homes, not multi-family.
    If we could next turn Exhibit 1 --
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: When you say
homesites, you mean the lot sizes.
    MR. MAGGIN: I mean existing properties, sorry.
    Yes.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes. Okay.
    Go ahead.
    MR. MAGGIN: If we could turn to Exhibit 171 --
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Now you
should be seeing it.
    MR. MAGGIN: I see it, but you need to scroll
down to get the full impact. That -- that gives you a
scaled version of a comparison between a single-family
lot adjacent property, which happens to be mine, versus
the five lots below, both showing a duplex and a triplex,
and the amount of green space surrounding. Just to give
you a visual of the relationships and open space
comparison between the two.
    And I'll just wrap it up because I know it's
very difficult to hear, and I'm hearing all kinds of
echoes as well, and I'm sorry about that. The engineers
have done a very good job of following the program laid
```

out by the applicant. They have succeeded in cramming out
as much gross square footage --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Wait. You're
breaking up. Can -- can you stop for a minute? And
maybe we can slow down your speech just so we can hear
it. Is your cell phone turned off?
MR. MAGGIN: It is.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right.
You started to say something about the engineer, and I
couldn't -- I couldn't understand it.
MR. MAGGIN: Okay. Is this any better?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes.
MR. MAGGIN: Okay. I was just saying that I
think the engineers have done a good job of following the
program laid out by the applicant. They've succeeded in
cramming out as much gross square footage into the
buildable area as possible. However, this is not a
(inaudible). This is a conditional use, subject to review
by the Hearing Examiner to ensure the compatibility with
the adjacent neighborhood and adjacent neighbors, who
overwhelmingly oppose the project as it's currently
designed.
Elderly housing is not objectionable to the
neighbors. It was said numerous times yesterday that we
objected to elderly housing. That's just completely

```
false
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Wait. You're
breaking up again. Just -- just back up. You were
saying something about elderly housing, and I didn't
catch -- I didn't understand it.
    MR. MAGGIN: I'm saying yesterday's testimony a
number of people pointed out that the neighbors object to
elderly housing.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Oh, I see.
    MR. MAGGIN: I want to make it clear that the
neighbors do not object to elderly housing as it
(inaudible).
    It's unfortunate that the applicant chose to
spend an enormous amount of time and resources trying to
find a way to hide their development from the adjacent
properties. Clearly lacking compatible open space
relationships. Those resources would have served
everybody (inaudible) with the neighbors to fix the site
plan, which in my opinion and the neighbors' opinion is -
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Wait. I
couldn't, I'm sorry I couldn't hear you. Slow down
again. Can you repeat that? I've got -- what I've got is
the applicant spent a lot of time trying to hide the
development rather than create compatible relationships.
    MR. MAGGIN: Right. And I'm just pointing out
```

that the resources would have been better served by
(inaudible) discussions with the neighbors to fix the
site plan which, in our opinion, is the source of the
problem.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
MR. MAGGIN: And that's all I have to say, and
I'm sorry about the microphone and camera issue.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Now, do you
have any comment on the landscaping that was presented?
MR. MAGGIN: The landscaping that was
presented, as I mentioned yesterday, is an improvement
over what was previously presented. The -- there is no
substitute for a masonry wall, as a masonry wall --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Wait.
There -- just -- I'm sorry to keep interrupting. You
said there is no substitute for what?
MR. MAGGIN: For a masonry wall ten-feet high
because of the immediate (inaudible) of blocking
visibility from all the multi-family units, lights and so
forth. The plants, the additional planting Mr. Park
proposed, require years to grow and fill in. They
require an enormous amount of maintenance to keep them
healthy and to keep the deer away from them for years and
years and years. And my feeling is had the property been
designed properly to begin with --

17
1
2 -
3 grow and a lot of maintenance because of deer damag
What were you going to say after that?
MR. MAGGIN: I'm just saying it's my feeling if
the property were properly designed, that type of
screening wouldn't be necessary.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I understand.
MR. MAGGIN: As you see throughout the rest of the community.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. I'm sorry, I'm just taking these notes.

Ms. Harris, do you have any questions of Mr. Maggin?

MS. HARRIS: I do not. Thank you.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, do you have any redirect?

MS. HARRIS: How could -- how can there be
redirect if there was no cross?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Oh, good point.

Mr. Maggin, what would be the -- the spacial relationship -- yesterday there was talk about
eliminating the loop area to bring the houses further
from the property line. They're 30 feet, I think. What
is the spacial relationship that you're looking for?
MR. MAGGIN: I think somebody suggested a
single stem road going --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Wait, I'm
sorry. I couldn't hear you. A what?
MR. MAGGIN: Somebody had suggested a single
road going from south to north on the property toward the
lodges, and having the resident units located close to
the road to provide for buffering between the residential neighbors.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
MR. MAGGIN: And (inaudible) it would
eliminate --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It would be a
what? I -- I -- it keeps cutting out. It would be what?
MR. MAGGIN: It would eliminate a number of
units, but would make a significant improvement in the
site plan. Reducing the height of the lodge by one story
would also make a significant improvement to the
neighbors that are close to that area, and frankly to me,
because I won't see that building (inaudible) as well.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Now I
am going to ask Ms. Harris, do you have any questions
based on my questions?
MS. HARRIS: I do not, thank you.

| 21 | 23 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Thank | 1 not visual like Mr. Maggin, but a direct connection to |
| 2 you for your testimony, Mr. Maggin. | 2 the building of the lodge and the townhouses. And I'm |
| 3 Mr. MAGGIN: Thank you. And I'm sorry about | 3 basically testifying in opposition to the Heritage |
| 4 that, the condition of the microphone. | 4 Gardens proposal. |
| 5 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right. | 5 MS. HARRIS: I'm going to object to this. |
| 6 So, Mr. Brown -- you may be excused Mr. Maggin, although | 6 MS. MC GRATH: Oh, okay. |
| 7 you're more than welcome to continue to, you know, | 7 MS. HARRIS: This certainly seems like it |
| 8 monitor the hearing. | 8 should have been in during the opponent's section of the |
| 9 Mr. Brown, do you have any other witnesses? | 9 case. This isn't rebuttal testimony or sur-rebuttal. I |
| 10 MS. HARRIS: You're on mute. | 10 think it's outside the scope. |
| 11 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry. No other witnesses | 11 MS. MC GRATH: Okay. Then I will limit it to |
| 12 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Is | 12 the comments by Mr. Park on landscaping yesterday. Is |
| 13 there anyone else present that -- in the hearing that is | 13 that |
| 14 not called by either Mr. Harris or Mr. Brown that would | 14 MS. HARRIS: That's fine. |
| 15 like to say something? Okay, I see no hands raised. Oh, | 15 MS. MC GRATH: Okay. So, from an environmen |
| 16 Ms . McGrath. | 16 impact viewpoint, for over ten years Dr. Suzanne Simard |
| 17 MS. MC GRATH: Yes, thank you. | 17 has shown research that trees communicate and share |
| 18 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. | 18 nutrients under the ground, and water, and information. |
| 19 MS. MC GRATH: Now, I'm not clear if this a | 19 And the networking of trees for roots through mycelium |
| 20 time for a general statement on the whole proposal or | 20 networks, fungi, have a huge -- are a huge part of what a |
| 21 just related to statements that were made yesterday, | 21 forest is. There's a lot more going on under the ground |
| 22 testimony that was done yesterday. | 22 than we can see. And this is what keeps a forest alive. |
| 23 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Done | 23 Clearcutting a forest is one level of |
| 24 yesterday. The testimony that was said yesterday. | 24 destruction of a forest. But regrading, which Mr. Park |
| 25 MS. MC GRATH: Okay. All right -- So -- | 25 said would be done for the building of the lodge, |
| 22 | 4 |
| 1 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: And Ms. | 1 regrading removes the entire mycelium network and makes |
| 2 McGrath, did you -- sorry. Did you testify at the first | 2 the damage all the more severe, and it will harm any and |
| 3 hearing? | 3 all trees that were connected via the mycelial networks. |
| 4 MS. MC GRATH: I did. I spoke at the first | 4 So, this goes to the building of the lodge and the |
| 5 hearing, but I was in Italy on an iPad and I couldn't - | 5 building of townhomes within 30 feet of neighbors' |
| 6 I don't know if I was actually sworn in, or if I just | 6 properties. And all of the mature trees that will be |
| 7 made a comment. | 7 removed from the network are responsible for water |
| 8 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, let's | 8 infiltration and aquafer replenishment. And that aquafer |
| 9 just swear you in. Can you please turn on your camera | 9 replenishment area is far beyond the limits of the |
| 10 and -- okay. Thank you. Can you raise your right hand? | 10 property. |
| 11 Do you solemnly affirm under penalties of perjury that | 11 So, the regrading and the forest removal will |
| 12 the statements you're about to make are the truth, the | 12 impact all of the neighbors' properties and the general |
| 13 whole truth, and nothing but the truth? | 13 hydrology of the entire region, including my home. |
| 14 MS. MC GRATH: I do. | 14 While the justification for mature tree removal |
| 15 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: And can you | 15 and cutting out forest floor by regrading on the basis of |
| 16 just state your name, address and email address for the | 16 invasive species is not sensible. Invasive species are |
| 17 record please? | 17 ephemeral and do not have root systems comparable to 100- |
| 18 MS. MC GRATH: Yes. My name is Patty McGrath, | 18 year-old trees. So, the effect of damage of building the |
| 19 I live at 11007 Edison Road in Potomac. My email address | 19 row of townhouses against neighbors' properties, 30 -feet |
| 20 is pattymcgrath08@aol.com. | 20 away from their property, is going to have an effect on |
| 21 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you. | 21 all of the forest systems and the trees that are |
| 22 MS. MC GRATH: Okay. I have lived in this home | 22 connected underground. So, this effect relates to the |
| 23 for 42 years, and my home is physically closer to the | 23 lodge and as well as to the townhomes. |
| 24 nursing facility than the nursing facility is to South | 24 And to your point about the question about what |
| 25 Glen Road. So, I have a direct interest and an impact, | 25 would be the effect of eliminating the central loop of |


| 25 | 27 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 townhouses, I think the further away from existing forest | 1 in the same alignment that it is now, and a controlled |
| 2 the construction is, the less damage there will be | 2 intersection was put there, that would be the safest |
| 3 However, if the entire property -- if the revised plan | 3 alternative. And I don't know if that means, you know, |
| $4 \quad$ with fewer townhomes was approved and the clearcutting | 4 fewer townhomes, but I think the safest alternative is a |
| 5 and regrading extends to the edges of the property, the | 5 controlled intersection where everyone can see where |
| 6 environmental damage would be similar. The recovery of | 6 everyone else is going. |
| 7 trees that have been planted in totally regraded land | 7 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. |
| 8 far less effective than if a tree is cut down and the | 8 MS. MC GRATH: Thank you. That was the other |
| 9 existing mycelium network is still intact, and a new tre | 9 thing that was mentioned yesterday. I could not believe |
| 10 is put in its place. So, the mycelium networks have to | 10 that the Traffic Report stated, Number 11, that it was an |
| 11 be protected as well as the root systems for a new | 11 elimination of conflict of turn -- of turning by putting |
| 12 forest, in essence, to regrow. | 12 in a new driveway. It's the exact opposite of what I |
| 13 So, that is my testimony related to the | 13 would see as a driver, as a person who has driven that |
| 14 environmental issues that were discussed yesterday. | 14 road for 42 years. |
| 15 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Thank | 15 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. |
| 16 you. | 16 MS. MC GRATH: Thank you. |
| 17 MS. MC GRATH: Thank you. | 17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. Harris, |
| 18 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Is there | 18 any questions? |
| 19 anything else? | 19 MS. HARRIS: No questions. Thank you. |
| 20 MS. MC GRATH: I don't know at what point we | 20 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. I see |
| 21 would be permitted to give any testimony about th | 21 a hand up from Mr. Wank. Mr. Wank, can you turn your |
| 22 project as a whole. But this relates to what wa | 22 camera on please? |
| 23 discussed yesterday. The other thing -- oh, I'm sorry, I | 23 MR. WANK: Sure. I'm clicking my camera |
| 24 forgot. | 24 button, but it doesn't want to go on. My microphone |
| 25 The other thing related to yesterday's | 25 seems to go on and off; but my video, it says it isn't |
| 26 | 28 |
| 1 testimony is the proposal to move the entrance and exit | 1 supported in your browser. |
| 2 from an alignment with Norton Road and beside the B'nai | 2 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Do the |
| 3 Tzedek Temple driveway to -- I believe it's 50 feet | 3 parties have an objection -- are you in Safari? |
| 4 further west. This would create a nightmare, absolute | 4 Mr. WANK: Yes, I am, in fact. |
| 5 nightmare intersection, and I have no idea how a traffic | 5 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yeah, you |
| 6 expert would allow a multi-family driveway to be offset | 6 have to use Chrome. Do you have Chrome? |
| 7 from an existing uncontrolled intersection. It is an | 7 MR. WANK: I do have Chrome, if you want to |
| 8 absolute invitation to disaster. I have a hard time | 8 wait for me to reboot and go into Chrome. |
| 9 getting out of South Glen Road, and I have a decent line | 9 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I would do |
| 10 of sight both ways. The people coming out of -- but I | 10 that, and then let's see if there's any -- is there |
| 11 cannot see Norton Road. If -- the people coming out 50 | 11 anyone else here -- Mr. Wank, while you're doing that -- |
| 12 feet west of that intersection will not be able to see or | 12 is there anyone else that wishes to testify? Okay. I |
| 13 judge someone coming through Norton Road, as well as | 13 see none other. |
| 14 people zipping down South Glen from the other direction. | 14 While Mr. Wank reboots and uses Chrome, let's |
| 15 People would be able to get into the development easily | 15 take a ten-minute break and we'll be -- well, just -- |
| 16 from that driveway. It would be impossible and life- | 16 we'll be back at 10:30. Thank you. |
| 17 threatening to get out of it. And that -- I'm not a | 17 (Off the record from 10:16 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.) |
| 18 traffic expert, but I have driven that corner for many, | 18 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. -- I see |
| 19 many years. I'm scared to death when I have to make a | 19 Mr . Wank, so I assume that Chrome worked. |
| 20 lefthand turn from Norton Road onto South Glen because of | 20 Is Mr. Brown here? |
| 21 the line-of-sight issues that Ms. Brigham talked about | 21 MR. BROWN: I am. |
| 22 yesterday. But adding another major in and out | 22 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: And the court |
| 23 intersection between Norton and South Glen is absolutely | 23 reporter. And the court reporter? |
| 24 a dangerous and ill-fated idea. | 24 THE REPORTER: Yes, I'm here. |
| 25 If -- in my opinion, if the driveway were kept | 25 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Thank |


| 29 | 31 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 you. Mr. Wank, if you would please raise your -- you did | 1 So, the whole predication for this project was |
| 2 not appear at the first hearing, correct | 2 for providing a need for elder living, in |
| MR. WANK: That's correct | 3 independent living, she was commenting on. And I just |
| 4 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Please | 4 don't see that her argument is consistent with the actual |
| 5 raise your right hand. Do you solemnly affirm under | 5 planned project, and that the planned project does not |
| 6 penalties of perjury that the statements you're about | 6 meet the need that she described. |
| 7 make are the truth, the whole truth and nothing but th | 7 I will also make the comment that if you look |
| 8 truth? | 8 at the average age of all the people who live around this |
| 9 MR. WANK: I do. | 9 property, I haven't done an analysis, so I will say that |
| 10 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Please state | 10 up front, as this is sworn testimony. But most people |
| 11 | 11 living around it are over 70 , and they're aging in place, |
| 12 MR. WANK: Steven Wank, 10921 Edison Road | 12 and they have -- that doesn't mean there's no need, but |
| 13 Potomac, Maryland 20854. stevew@mail.nih.gov | 13 it isn't clear to me that this project satisfies the need |
| 14 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I'm sorry, | 14 that she described. And that's all I have to say. Thank |
| 15 stevew@ what? | 15 you. |
| 16 Mr. WANK: Mail, M-a | 16 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you. |
| 17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Oh. | 17 Ms . Harris, any questions? |
| 18 MR. WANK: -- .gov. | 18 MS. HARRIS: No, thank you. |
| 19 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Thank | 19 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, |
| 20 you. What | 20 any questions? |
| 21 MR. WANK: I would like to comment regardin | 21 MR. BROWN: No questions. Thank you for your |
| 22 the testimony given yesterday by the guest, labeled | 22 testimony, Mr. Wan |
| 23 Soltesd, S-o-l-t-e-s-d. I understand she goes by anothe | 23 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you. |
| 24 name, but I have never | 24 You may be excused as a witness. You're welcome to hang |
| 25 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Prekajkki, | 25 around. |
| 30 | 32 |
| 1 Ms. Prekajski? | 1 MR. WANK: Thank you. |
| 2 MR. WANK: Yes. In her testimony, and I may | 2 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Is |
| 3 not have it exactly right, but the tenor of her -- part | 3 there anyone else in this hearing that would like to |
| 4 of her testimony was in regard to the justification for a | 4 testify? Okay, I see no hands raised, and I hear no |
| 5 special exemption for this project, Heritage Gardens. | 5 request; so with that, Ms. Harris, do you have any |
| 6 And she gave a nice background about the need for | 6 witnesses you'd like to say just to -- or bring on just |
| 7 independent living in Montgomery County, and in Potomac | 7 to address some of the concerns raised? |
| 8 in particular. And she commented on the Master Plan and | 8 MS. HARRIS: No. I think we can adequately |
| 9 how the plan can change over time. It's sort of a | 9 address those in our closing remarks. Thank you. |
| 10 living document. And one of the justifications was that | 10 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Oh wait. I |
| 11 there wasn't sufficient independent living for elderly in | 11 just saw Mr. Brig -- or is it Ms. or Mr. Brigham -- hand |
| 12 the age of 75 to 83 -years old. | 12 is raised? |
| 13 And so, my comment, or contesting of her | 13 MS. BRIGHAM: It's Mrs. Brigham. We have the |
| 14 argument, is that the 74 units have an age requirement of | 14 same laptop. |
| 1562 or older. They are also extremely expensive. And | 15 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I figured. |
| 16 it's unclear to me logically how units that could be | 16 MS. BRIGHAM: I just had a couple of things I |
| 17 purchased by someone $62-$ it will take 13 years un | 17 would like to say, and it's kind of off the top of my |
| 18 they become 75 and beyond, to 83 -- how that solves the | 18 head after listening to everybody else. But I did want to |
| 19 problem. She said there were 754 unit planned, but less | 19 thank the crew that came through and talked about |
| 20 than half of those, 20 years later, actually exist. So, | 20 planting trees along our property line. I appreciate |
| 21 the need of a 75- to 83-year-old won't be addressed for | 21 that very much. |
| 2213 years if someone who's 62 buys it now. | 22 I still have a concern about my special |
| 23 And it's only 74 units. She said there's | 23 exception. And I don't know if you remember this, but I |
| 24 something like 370 -odd units that are needed based on the | 24 have an active special exception for keeping horses at my |
| 25 plan, and probably more. |  |
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 because I am very concerned about the noise from the | 1 question. |
| 2 construction and the chaos and the trees being cut down, | 2 MS. MC GRATH: Item No. 6 talks about the owner |
| 3 and I just feel like it's not going to be safe. And I | 3 of the cottage ownership lot must enter into a service |
| 4 just feel like my special exception is being totally | 4 contract with Sage Life, or its successor operator of the |
| 5 neglected and basically it doesn't exist because I wil | 5 lodge, for the provision of independent living services |
| 6 not be able to use it during the construction period | 6 to the occupants of the cottage ownership lot, and this |
| 7 So, that's still a very big concern for me and I haven't | 7 obligation will run with title to the cottage ownership |
| 8 heard anybody say how that could be remedied. | 8 lot. |
| $9 \quad$ And then, I also wanted to say something about | 9 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. From |
| 10 the last person who spoke yesterday about planting along | 10 what are you -- from what are you reading? |
| 11 the stream and the stream valley. And I haven't heard | 11 MS. MC GRATH: I'm reading from one of the |
| 12 anybody mention about where the WSSC Pipeline goes along | 12 exhibits from Lerch, Early, Brewer, Exhibit 126A. |
| 13 there, because it seems like if you're planting along | 13 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. |
| 14 there, and then WSSC comes along and has to make | 14 MS. MC GRATH: I should have said that at the |
| 15 repair, or hook in, or whatever, that's all going to b | 15 beginning. |
| 16 totally demolished again. | 16 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That's fine. |
| 17 works. So, I think that's something that they need | 17 Okay. It should be on your screen. |
| 18 consider, as well. | 18 MS. MC GRATH: Yes. Okay. |
| 19 And then one of my neighbors called | 19 Page 3, it's the very last point. |
| 20 this morning and she said: Would you please ask if th | 20 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. A |
| 21 road will handle two fire tru | 21 what is your question on that? |
| 22 fire in the property. So -- and I don't know who would | 22 MS. MC GRATH: So, yesterday I thought there was |
| 23 answer that, but anyway. So, that's what I have at the | 23 a comment that someone said that the townhomes would be |
| 24 moment. | 24 occupied by the owner and their own personal caregiver. |
| 25 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay, thank | 25 And it wasn't necessarily clear to me whether that |
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| 1 you. Ms. Harris, any questions? | 1 personal caregiver could be someone that the owne |
| 2 MS. HARRIS: No, thank you | 2 contracted with separately, or would that only be someone |
| 3 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, | 3 who came through the nursing authority, or whatever, of |
| 4 any questions? | 4 the lodge, through Sage. |
| MR. BROWN: No que | 5 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I did hear |
| 6 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Ms | 6 that comment. |
| 7 Harris, do you have a Fire Access Plan in the record | 7 Ms. Harris, do you have anybody that can clar |
| 8 MS. HARRIS: Yes. We have an approved Fire | 8 I guess -- do you have anybody - |
| 9 Access Plan, and as Mr. Stemann -- Stemann testifie | 9 MS. HARRIS: Yeah. And I'm sorry, I am not |
| 10 yesterday, I think we answered the question that Ms. | 10 clear on the question, so if it could be repeated, or if |
| 11 Brigham just raised about the width of the road, which | 11 you could summarize, Ms. Robeson, and then I can direct |
| 12 more than 20 feet. | 12 it to the appropriate person? |
| 13 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. All | 13 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I think it's |
| 14 right. I see Ms. McGrath again | 14 the lady fromSage Life -- I apologize. Her name is |
| 15 MS. MC GRATH: I had a question | 15 escaping me. |
| 16 don't know at what point, or if it's too late, to | 16 MS. HARRIS: Ms. Andress. |
| 17 question about the property ownership statement, about | 17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes. The |
| 18 the Master HOA, Item 6 - | 18 question is can these lot owners have their own private |
| 19 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Why don't you | 19 caretakers outside of Sage's caretakers? |
| 20 -- okay. F | 20 MS. HARRIS: And I can answer that, as well, or |
| 21 MS. MC GRATH: Oh, okay. I'm sorry | 21 maybe Mr. Wormald can. I can see that Ms. Andress is not |
| 22 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: And, Ms. | 22 on the line right now. |
| 23 Brigham, can you put your hand down please? Mrs. | 23 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Right. |
| 24 Brigham? She must not be able to hear m | 24 MS. HARRIS: So, certainly there are services |
| 25 Okay, go ahead, Ms. McGrath. What is your | 25 provided in connection with independent living and the |

```
assisted living. And so, the first line of defense, or
approach, if you will, would be that the services are
provided with -- from within the Sage operation. But
like any other independent living facility that we are
aware of, and as reflected actually in the ITE numbers as
well, it's not uncommon for people to have outside
support care. That's been contemplated. I think Mr.
Brown even noted that. I mean, he made the point that,
well, those caretakers obviously can't be live-ins, and
he recognize that the ordinance doesn't provide for that.
But -- so, to answer the question, yes there could be an
additional caretaker that is not Sage-related. And I
would ask Mr. Wormald if he has any other color on that
that he would like to add.
    MR. WORMALD: No, I agree. There might be some
level of -- likely some level of coordination with Sage,
but yeah, you know, it would be whatever is in the best
interest of the residents relative to their needs. So --
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, I had --
I do see Mr. Kabatt on. Mr. Kabatt, can you turn your
camera on for a moment please? He may be just
monitoring.
    MR. KABATT: I was muted there. So, what -- I'm
sorry, you had a question?
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Can you turn
```

your camera on, please?
MR. KABATT: Yes, hold on. Okay, is that good?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That's good,
thank you. For the -- yesterday, I think you testified
that you -- would the trip generation count account for
privately independent caretakers outside of Sage Life?
Would those traffic counts include the IT -- the trip
generation rates include those for the independent
living?
MR. KABATT: Yes. It doesn't -- again, it
counts all trips coming in and out, so it doesn't
discriminate against any -- any trips, whether they be
visitors, or independent caregivers, or family, or staff
by Sage.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Did
that answer your question, Ms. McGrath?
MS. MC GRATH: Well, partially. I didn't have
the traffic consideration. My consideration -- my
question is about the relationship between the owner and
the lodge, and Sage.
1 My own personal prediction is that these homes
are not going to sell to people with more than a million
dollars to buy a townhome, and who have lived long enough
to figure out what's a good deal and what isn't. And so,
if these homes are occupied by someone 62 years old or
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1 older, who has no intention of using nursing facilities,
that they would not be inclined to enter into a binding
service contract with Sage Life. And apparently, they're
not under any -- are they still under an obligation to
enter that service contract with Sage Life that will run
with the title to this ownership lot, is my question. If
they don't have any intention, or desire, to use that,
that would be another encumbrance on the title of a home
that I would -- I should be able to feel free to sell to
someone else who meets the minimum requirements. You
have to be 62 years old or over.
MS. HARRIS: There will be a service component
that every owner of the IL cottages is obligated to sign
and participate in. I mean, so there's going to be a
level of services that are provided.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, this --
as I read No. 6, it says they have to sign-up for the services.

MS. HARRIS: That's what I was trying to say inarticulately.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. So, they're going to have to sign-up for the services, whether they want to use them or not.

MS. HARRIS: Correct. And as we testified, we know very few people that move into communities that
provide a level of services if you don't need to avail
yourselves of the services, either presently or
anticipatorily in the very near future. And Ms. -- I
think Ms. Andress testified to that MS. effect.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. McGrath, does that answer your question?

MS. MC GRATH: Well, the way I understand the response is that someone must sign this agreement, but
the agreement is not an exclusive right by Sage to
provide any services that are desired. The homeowner is
free to contract those services with anyone they please.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: And what is your -- you know, how does that relate to the conditional use?

MS. MC GRATH: How it relates to the conditional use is that, my take is that the townhomes will be purchased by persons who do not have a need, or a desire to have a permanent relationship with a continuing care nursing facility. The nursing facility has no obligation to admit someone who then requires nursing care. They can just say that well, they require hospitalization so we're not qualified. So, depending on
their occupancy or what -- so the entire structure of the
conditional use justification for building townhomes in
front of a nursing faciility is -- for me is tenuous, and

```
so, this condition just illustrates the fact that it's a
very thin connection between -- if the homes -- if the
townhomes were owned by one entity, one solid entity,
that was responsible and liable for all of the property,
then it would be a completely different relationship.
But this unique homeownership plan allows the financial
risk to be completely separated from the nursing
facility, and all the cost of even -- the cost of
building, as Mr. Wormald said yesterday, would be in
advance if possible, so that building the whole operation
and then maintaining it is the responsibility of not the
lodge, of the individual homeowners. And so, that
1 3 \text { really gets at -- it's the uniqueness of this home}
1 4 \text { ownership nursing facility relationship that for me is}
15 very thin. It's a very thin connection.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Is your
concern that the maintenance isn't going to occur? Or
that it is not going to operate as a -- essentially a --
some level of CC -- Continuing Care --
20 MS. MC GRATH: My concern is that ultimately
21 these homes will not be able to be sold to people only }6
22 years of age and older, that they will be occupied --
even the document itself says a minimum of 80 percent of
the dwelling units must be occupied by at least one
25 person who is 55 years of age or older. And when the
```

houses don't sell -- when the townhomes don't sell, and
this has happened in many other --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I see what
you're saying.
MS. MC GRATH: -- townhouse developments of --
that are built specially for aging, and then they don't
sell, and then the special exception for that house has
to be eliminated or someone will go bankrupt, or
whatever. So --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: So, you're
saying you will -- and I'm not taking the position, I'm
just phrasing what you're saying -- rephrasing what
you're saying. You're concerned that this is going to
end up just being luxury townhomes in the RE-2 Zone. Is
that what your concern is?
MS. MC GRATH: Yes, yes. I have no concern
about the nursing facility, except for the fact that it's
going to destroy the forest, the mature forest behind it.
But having a nursing facility where there was an empty
school is a wonderful plus for the community. But
putting 45 townhouses in front of it is not either
environmentally sustainable or sustainable economically
under the conditions which have been designed for, that
are the justification for building them in the first
place.
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| :---: | :---: |
| so, this condition just illustrates the fact that it's a very thin connection between -- if the homes -- if the townhomes were owned by one entity, one solid entity, that was responsible and liable for all of the property, then it would be a completely different relationship. But this unique homeownership plan allows the financial risk to be completely separated from the nursing facility, and all the cost of even -- the cost of building, as Mr. Wormald said yesterday, would be in advance if possible, so that building the whole operation and then maintaining it is the responsibility of not the lodge, of the individual homeowners. And so, that really gets at -- it's the uniqueness of this home ownership nursing facility relationship that for me is very thin. It's a very thin connection. <br> HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Is your concern that the maintenance isn't going to occur? Or that it is not going to operate as a -- essentially a -some level of CC -- Continuing Care -- <br> MS. MC GRATH: My concern is that ultimately <br> these homes will not be able to be sold to people only 62 years of age and older, that they will be occupied -even the document itself says a minimum of 80 percent of 24 the dwelling units must be occupied by at least one 25 person who is 55 years of age or older. And when the | HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Wormald, <br> do you want to just address that concern? Not the environmental stuff, but the, you know, concern that it's not a workable project. <br> MR. WORMALD: Yeah, I mean, I think we've <br> testified to this extensively, but -- you know, both on multiple levels, both the need that we have gotten -- not only the need that is expressed demographically, but also our -- all of the expressions of interest we have received for this specific community have been significant. <br> You know, Sage Life are one of the top <br> operators in the country. They do a fantastic job. <br> Their product is always in high demand. You know, as I testified previously, too, the way we're selling these is we're putting the weight on pre-selling the majority of the homes. So -- and that's really what people prefer, as well, so they can appoint their homes exactly the way they want them. And so, yeah, this is not an area of concern that we have. It really gets to the topic of demand. <br> She's -- they're basically positing that there is not enough demand for what we're proposing, and I think, you know -- again from the abundance of testimony and everything we've heard through this |
| houses don't sell -- when the townhomes don't sell, and this has happened in many other -- <br> HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I see what you're saying. <br> MS. MC GRATH: -- townhouse developments of -that are built specially for aging, and then they don't sell, and then the special exception for that house has to be eliminated or someone will go bankrupt, or whatever. So -- <br> HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: So, you're <br> saying you will -- and I'm not taking the position, I'm <br> just phrasing what you're saying -- rephrasing what <br> you're saying. You're concerned that this is going to <br> end up just being luxury townhomes in the RE-2 Zone. Is <br> that what your concern is? <br> MS. MC GRATH: Yes, yes. I have no concern <br> about the nursing facility, except for the fact that it's <br> going to destroy the forest, the mature forest behind it. <br> But having a nursing facility where there was an empty <br> school is a wonderful plus for the community. But <br> putting 45 townhouses in front of it is not either <br> environmentally sustainable or sustainable economically <br> under the conditions which have been designed for, that <br> are the justification for building them in the first <br> place. | hearing, I think it's pretty -- yeah, it's pretty <br> clear to me anyway. I mean we're very confident <br> Sage, Wormald. You know, we've been in business <br> over a half century, we know what we're doing, you <br> know. So, I think -- I think it will be highly <br> successful, and we'll do a beautiful job for the neighborhood. <br> MS. HARRIS: I would also point out the levels <br> of independent living services that are provided that Ms. <br> Andress testified to that will be provided in the <br> independent living units. <br> HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right. <br> Ms. McGrath, you have heard the response. Anything else you would like to say? <br> MS. MC GRATH: No, thank you. That was the total thing. Thank you very much. <br> HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Is there <br> anyone else that would like to testify? Seeing and <br> hearing none, I just -- I did have a question for Mr. <br> Wormald. <br> Did you ever consider reducing the density of this project? <br> MR. WORMALD: Well, as you know, we've been at <br> this for -- is my mike on? <br> HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes, I know. |

want to just address that concen? Not the
environmental stuff, but the, you know, concern that it's
not a workable project.
MR. WORMALD: Yeah, I mean, I think we've
testified to this extensively, but -- you know, both on
multiple levels, both the need that we have gotten -- not
only the need that is expressed demographically, but also
our -- all of the expressions of interest we have
received for this specific community have been
significant.
You know, Sage Life are one of the top
operators in the country. They do a fantastic job.
Their product is always in high demand. You know, as I
testified previously, too, the way we're selling these is
we're putting the weight on pre-selling the majority of
mere putting the weight on pre-seling the majority of
the homes. So -- and that's really what people prefer,
as well, so they can appoint their homes exactly the way
they want them. And so, yeah, this is not an area of
concern that we have. It really gets to the topic of
demand.
She's -- they're basically positing that there
is not enough demand for what we're proposing, and I
think, you know -- again from the abundance of
testimony and everything we've heard through this
hearing, I think it's pretty -- yeah, it's pretty
clear to me anyway. I mean we're very confident
Sage, Wormald. You know, we've been in business
over a half century, we know what we're doing, you
know. So, I think -- I think it will be highly
successful, and we'll do a beautiful job for the
neighborhood.
MS. HARRIS: I would also point out the levels
of independent living services that are provided that Ms.
Andress testified to that will be provided in the
independent living units.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right.
Ms. McGrath, you have heard the response. Anything else
you would like to say?
MS. MC GRATH: No, thank you. That was the
total thing. Thank you very much.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Is there
anyone else that would like to testify? Seeing and
hearing none, I just -- I did have a question for Mr .
Wormald.
Did you ever consider reducing the density of
this project?
MR. WORMALD: Well, as you know, we've been at
this for -- is my mike on?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes, I know


| 49 | 51 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 see this compared to this. Can you clarify what you | 1 the massing of these structures along the western |
| 2 mean by this? | 2 property line are not similar at all to the adjacent |
| 3 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I'm sorry. | 3 property. |
| 4 MS. HARRIS: That's okay. | 4 MS. HARRIS: But, Ms. Robeson, when you have a |
| 5 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I apologize. | 5 multi-family-story assisted living facility next to a |
| 6 I don't see the relationship between the R-200 and the | 6 single-family home and you found compatibility, and |
| 7 RE-2 as a justification for the relationship along that | 7 there's probably 20 cases in the county where they have |
| 8 western property line | 8 compatibility, we know that the single-family homes don't |
| 9 MS. HARRIS: And can you articulate why you | 9 look like that multi-family structure. And so, what I'm |
| 10 don't? Because when we -- when our land planner looked | 10 struggling with is, yes, there will be more massing |
| 11 at that and we looked at that, we saw quite the opposite. | 11 there. Mr. Park testified about the level of landscaping |
| 12 But if I could, let me j | 12 buffer which will conceal a considerable amount from Day |
| 13 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I understand. | 13 1. What adverse impact is being created? |
| 14 But what I'm looking at, can you back out? No, back out. | 14 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I have fewer |
| 15 MS. HARRIS: I am backing out. You mean zoom | 15 problems with the lodge than I do with the proximity of |
| 16 in or back out? | 16 the massing of these homes 30 feet. And I worked on |
| 17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Zoom into the | 17 Friends House. I did their major modification, and they |
| 18 subject property. See, this -- I don't know how big the | 18 have cottages, or I think the call them lodges, too. But |
| 19 homes are on those R200 lots, but I don't see them as | 19 it wasn't -- it's just this -- there is more spacing and |
| 20 being 8,000 square feet, or maybe even 5,000 square feet. | 20 less mass. And I also did Graves Hewitt Grosvenor. |
| 21 And the thin | 21 MS. HARRIS: Yes. As did |
| 22 this wall. | 22 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That was just |
| 23 MS. HARRIS: Well, I would say, if you look at | 23 the assisted living -- it was -- I think it was memory |
| 24 these -- the R-200 lots and you look at the setbacks and | 24 care. |
| 25 just, for instance, compare this unit to that unit, and | 25 MS. HARRIS: It was assisted living. But you |
| 50 | 52 |
| 1 then go to the distance between our -- the cottage units, | 1 had assisted living within 20 or 30 feet of million- |
| 2 it's not dissimilar. I mean I -- we haven't measured it, | 2 dollar townhouses. And there was a compatibility -- |
| 3 but -- | 3 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes, but they |
| 4 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: But it's the | 4 were townhouses. They weren't in an RE-2 Zone. And they |
| 5 massing. You've got a lot of massing. Well, all I'm | 5 had small -- I think it was R-60. |
| 6 saying is this -- this is the relationship that I'm | 6 MS. HARRIS: It was. |
| 7 struggling with, right along this western property line | 7 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: And -- and |
| 8 It is much different -- I don't care RE-2, but when you | 8 so, you know, that's -- this is not R-60. |
| 9 look at the houses on -- that are adjacent, on the | 9 MR. WORMALD: If I could make a couple quick |
| 10 property line, they are not 30 feet from the setback | 10 little -- |
| 11 line. And I'm going to pull it up now. | 11 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I haven't |
| 12 MR. WORMALD: If I could just say, too, if we | 12 decided. I'm just -- after seeing Mr. Maggin's exhibits, |
| 13 were to build this as a single-family -- I wish we could | 13 that kind of quantified -- or -- yeah, quantified, I |
| 14 bring up our single-family land plan that we did, but -- | 14 guess, or articulated my own concerns. |
| 15 just the geometry of it, but what would sell -- | 15 MS. HARRIS: But I think -- if I could, and I |
| 16 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It's not | 16 want Mr. Wormald to chime in, that exhibit -- to use Mr. |
| 17 the -- | 17 Maggin's analogy, was apples and bananas. He was |
| 18 MR. WORMALD: Oh, I'm sorry. | 18 comparing an ownership lot to a record lot. The |
| 19 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It's not the | 19 ownership lot of which is . 5 percent of the entire record |
| 20 sing -- it's not -- I'm not saying it should be single | 20 lot. |
| 21 family. I'm just saying, I guess the thing I keep | 21 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That's not |
| 22 thinking of is just these are big structures when you | 22 what I'm doing. I'm not -- forget the ownership lots |
| 23 compare the RE-2 structures. You're going to have more | 23 because you can't -- I agree with you, that you can't use |
| 24 density with townhouses. That's true. I mean, and I'm | 24 the ownership lots, and the lot coverage and all that |
| 25 not saying townhouses shouldn't be here. I'm just saying | 25 kind of stuff because this is -- you know, I don't |


| 53 | 55 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 know -- I still don't understand if this is going to be a | 1 MS. HARRIS: Ms. Robeson, if I could put up -- |
| 2 condo or what. But a condo is one plat with percentage | 2 just because I think it may be helpful, and then -- |
| 3 ownerships. | 3 sorry, hit the wrong one. And then I want -- this is |
| $4 \quad$ But as I said, you know, | 4 Exhibit 43, I believe. And then It think Mr. Wormald |
| 5 with -- I have less trouble with the lodge. I think | 5 wanted |
| 6 the grade and the relationship is -- and the surrounding | 6 MR. WORMALD: Yeah. |
| 7 woods are -- are a good buffer. I thought your lighting | 7 MS. HARRIS: I mean, again, from Planning |
| 8 was excellent response to some of the neighbors' | 8 Staff's view of this, the Planning Board, our expert land |
| 9 concern | 9 planner, and looking in the context of the entire area, |
| 10 | 10 we thought it's a compatible layout that weaves in with |
| 11 landscaping proposal is a huge improvement. I guess I'm | 11 the rest of the surrounding area. |
| 12 just saying that, did you ever consider moving thes | 12 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, you |
| 13 further from the lot line and eliminating these units? | 13 know, I guess just 'cause they decided that, I guess |
| 14 MS. HARRIS: And I guess I would say a couple | 14 you're saying their expert testimony outweighs -- |
| 15 things. One is, the relationship of the back-to-back | 15 MS. HARRIS: No, no, I don't. Because I |
| 16 structure, as the land planner testified, 154 feet, and | 16 know -- I wouldn't be so naïve as to think that. |
| 17 we already indicated that that relationship exists | 17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: You know, the |
| 18 elsewhere in the neighborhood. So, that's not unique | 18 Planning Board, they haven't -- well -- |
| 19 the 154 at | 19 MS. HARRIS: But if you look at the -- I mean, |
| 20 To do as you suggested, which is put a center | 20 except for one duplex, the relationship here is |
| 21 spine -- or someone suggested, sorry -- and move all the | 21 unit-to-unit. |
| 22 properties in, you would probably end up with a setback | 22 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: But I mean |
| 23 of approximately 60 feet, which is 300 times the | 23 just looking at this -- well, we can argue. I |
| 24 requirement. And think | 24 understand where you're coming from. Okay? |
| 25 question is something that is very similar to a single- | 25 MS. HARRIS: Mr. Wormald, did you want to make |
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| 1 family home. It's not a multi-family home that -- I mean | 1 any comments? |
| 2 a multi-family structure. | 2 MR. WORMALD: Just -- I mean, just a couple if |
| 3 Now, what I would say, and I don't -- you know, | 3 I could. I mean the project's, you know, at the edge of |
| 4 could there be a surgical removal of one unit or so, an | 4 economic feasibility, in terms of, you know, we hire all |
| 5 provide more space along that western property line? | 5 these staff to service the independent living units. |
| 6 That probably could happen. But to think that we should | 6 That's just one variable that we have to factor in. We |
| 7 reconfigure to put a center street and then move all | 7 feel like we've minimized the project. |
| 8 units in, we end up eliminating the open space that Staf | 8 The other thing that I've experienced over the |
| 9 made us go back and refine because they wanted to make it | 9 four years is that the site plan is somewhat deceiving |
| 10 larger, and they wanted it centrally located. So then | 10 because the site is so large, you know, things can appear |
| 11 suddenly, you've taken away the amenity to the community | 11 -- and there's all these lines and everything. This |
| 12 simply so that the -- that there could be even greater | 12 exhibit is actually much more helpful, but things can |
| 13 setbacks along the western property line. And - | 13 appear much more compressed than they really are. I mean |
| 14 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well | 14 the distance between Mr. Maggin's house, for example, and |
| 15 that's -- that's a good point, and maybe the answer to my | 15 the cottage is about a half a football field away, just |
| 16 concern is surgically -- surgically, you know, reducing | 16 to give you some concept. And maybe actually stand out |
| 17 the number of triplexes | 17 there and look at it. It feels more reasonable than |
| 18 MS. HARRIS: I would need to consult with the | 18 perhaps, you know, we can experience on paper, looking at |
| 19 applicant about that. | 19 this |
| 20 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I understand, | 20 The other thing I just wanted to say too is |
| 21 and as I said, I haven't made up my mind. I -- but | 21 we were to come in here and build a single-family |
| 22 think it only fair to tell you what my concerns are. And | 22 project, what's really getting built in Potomac these |
| 23 I guess Mr. Maggin's testimony kind of -- on rebuttal -- | 23 days? I mean I was born and bred and raised in |
| 24 kind of gelled those concerns. I'm far less concerned | 24 Potomac -- are large, very large mansions. And there |
|  | 25 probably would be eleven very large mansions of a width |
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much larger than even our triplex. And I wish I could
show our single-family land plan to demonstrate how that
would come together, but it's actually a very similar
placement to our western wall properties.
    So, that's a couple things I just wanted to
express.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
    MS. HARRIS: Ms. Robeson, before we get into --
I assume that the next stage is closing argument.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It is
    MS. HARRIS: But could we have -- give us ten
minutes?
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Certainly.
Certainly. Do you need 'til -- let's do 'til 11:30
    MS. HARRIS: Perfect.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
    (Off the record from 11:16 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.)
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Lorete,
are you ready?
    THE REPORTER: Yes, ma'am.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you.
    Okay. So, I guess I've said about what -- you
know, all I can do and express my concerns. So, we can
proceed to closing statements.
    MS. HARRIS: Thank you, Ms. Robeson. Before we
much larger than even our triplex. And I wish I could
show our single-family land plan to demonstrate how that placement to our western wall properties.
So, that's a couple things I just wanted to express.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
MS. HARRIS: Ms. Robeson, before we get into --
I assume that the next stage is closing argument.
MS. HARRIS: But could we have -- give us ten
minutes?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Certainly.
Certainly. Do you need 'til -- let's do 'til 11:30.
HARRIS: Perfect
(Off the record from 11:16 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.)
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Lorete,
are you ready?
THE REPORTER: Yes, ma'am.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you
ow, all I can do and express my concerns. So, we can proceed to closing statements.
MS. HARRIS: Thank you, Ms. Robeson. Before we
```

do so, I just wanted to note that we would like to make
sure that all the exhibits 1 through -- I believe we're
up to 176 are entered into the record, with the exception
of Exhibit 116, which was Mr. Rosenthal's Power Point
that the Hearing Examiner determined would not be entered
into the record.
With that, I'll proceed with my closing
statement. I will say in advance, I think I'm over your
15 minute -- 15-20 minute suggest, but by not --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It's fine.
MS. HARRIS: Okay, thank you.
So, through the testimony of our witnesses,
plus the information in the record, including all of the
applicant's expert reports, the Staff Report, the
Planning Board's recommendations --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. Harris,
I'm really sorry to interrupt you. Can you stop sharing
your screen?
MS. HARRIS: Oh, I'm sorry.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Or somebody's
sharing their screen.
MS. HARRIS: That was me.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. It
just -- it's a little distracting. Go ahead.
MS. HARRIS: I definitely agree.
do so, I just wanted to note that we would like to make
sure that all the exhibits 1 through -- I believe we're
up to 176 are entered into the record, with the exception
of Exhibit 116, which was Mr. Rosenthal's Power Point
that the Hearing Examiner determined would not be entered
into the record.
With that, I'll proceed with my closing
statement. I will say in advance, I think I'm over your
15 minute -- 15-20 minute suggest, but by not --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It's fine.
MS. HARRIS: Okay, thank you.
So, through the testimony of our witnesses,
plus the information in the record, including all of the
applicant's expert reports, the Staff Report, the
Planning Board's recommendations --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. Harris,
I'm really sorry to interrupt you. Can you stop sharing
your screen?
MS. HARRIS: Oh, I'm sorry.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Or somebody's
sharing their screen.
MS. HARRIS: That was me
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. It
just -- it's a little distracting. Go ahead.
MS. HARRIS: I definitely agree.
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Through all of these items and all the exhibits, the applicant has demonstrated that the 3 proposed conditional use application satisfies the zoning ordinance requirements, including the conditional use
5 requirements of 59:7.3.1(e) for the redevelopment of the 6 property with a residential care facility. This truly is an excellent project, particularly given its proximity to 8 the Potomac Village.
9 In considering the subject conditional use, it's important to remember the history of the project. 11 For over 50 years, it has been a school from Pre-K to 12 Eighth Grade, and the school was on the cusp, as you have 13 heard, of expending to a 400 student Pre-K through high 14 school facility. With this comes noise, traffic, and 15 light. And there can be no doubt that those improvements 16 from the school would have been far more intense than the 17 proposed use. And it's for this reason that there are, 18 in fact, several members of the neighborhood who have 19 indicated they thought that this was an appropriate use 20 for this site.
21 I first want to start with noting the obvious, 22 and actually Mr. Maggin did allude to this in his
23 testimony this morning. This is a large property; it's
2430 acres. And in comparison, many recent conditional
25 uses were 4 or 5 acres. And with a property of 30 acres

1 comes more adjacent property owners. It's not uncommon
2 for immediate neighbors to object to a conditional use.
3 No one likes change. We get that. But the larger the 4 parcel, the more adjacent neighbors. And, in fact, we've
5 thought throughout this hearing that if we had 6 consolidated this onto four or seven acres, we would have 7 had less adjacent neighbors, and you likely would have
8 heard from less -- less surrounding neighbors. But in 9 any event, we know that a plebiscite of the neighborhood 10 does not determine zoning.
11 Throughout the case, the opposition has 12 repeatedly attempted to create issues when, in fact, no 13 issues exist. I'm going to hit these categorically, but 14 I'm first going to start with the issue of compatibility.
14 I'm first going to start with the issue of compatibility. 16 had, that that's probably the most important issue in
17 this case. The opposition appears to contort 18 compatibility with comparability. The zoning ordinance 19 does not require the development standards for a 20 residential care facility to be equal or comparable to 21 those of an RE-2 -- of the underlying zone, in this case
22 the RE-2 Zone. We know this because we can compare the
23 various development standards and see that they allow for 24 significant differences. An obvious example is when you 25 look at density. In the RE-2 Zone, the limits allows
1
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| 1 only one single-family per two acres; where, with a <br> 2 residential care facility, it allows 15 dwelling units <br> 3 per acre and 36 beds per acre. Thus, the mere fact that <br> 4 there are differences between the standards of the <br> 5 project and the surrounding neighborhood is not relevant. <br> 6 Similarly, the fact that this project will be <br> 7 visible from adjacent uses is also not relevant. Nowhere <br> 8 in the code does it suggest that a conditional use, or <br> 9 any use for that matter, cannot be visible from an <br> 10 adjacent or surrounding property. What the zoning <br> 11 ordinance does want to ensure and requires is that the <br> 12 conditional use will be compatible with the surrounding <br> 13 area. And this can be achieved through lots of different <br> 14 approaches, including those that this project <br> 15 incorporates. These things include items such as <br> 16 locating the lodge at the lowest elevation of the <br> 17 property, providing very low density compared to what is <br> 18 permitted, providing residentially styled independent <br> 19 living cottages that are comparable in size to many of <br> 20 the surrounding homes in the area, and the preservation <br> 21 of a significant number of trees. <br> 22 I think we would all agree that the <br> 23 compatibility provision is, in fact, quite subjective. <br> 24 The ordinance provides that mere compliance with the <br> 25 zoning ordinance standards does not demonstrate |
| :--- |

1
1 low-density development. But any way you slice this
2 project, by unit count, by square footage and $F A R$, by
3 omitting the 13 acres, the project is low density and
4 well below the standard. And by way of comparison, the
Brandywine project was 34 beds per acre versus this project, which is 8 beds per acre.

However, because compliance with the development standards is not necessarily a measure of compatibility, it's important to emphasize a number of
10 other factors. And in this regard, I do want to focus on
11 the compatibility of the independent living cottages.
12 We'll start with the fact -- and I mentioned this just a
13 moment ago -- that both the Planning Board and the
14 Planning Staff determined that the project was compatible
15 with the surrounding neighborhood. The Staff Report
16 notes that the cottages are of comparable scale to the
17 surrounding neighborhood, and that the architecture and 18 site layout will blend well with the area.
19 Height is often a factor when you're evaluating 20 compatibility. Certainly, this is not the case here.
21 The height of the cottages is less than many of the
22 houses in the surrounding area and well below the zoning
23 ordinance. The architecture and size of the duplexes and
24 triplexes is comparable to many of the homes in the area.
25 And in this regard, Mr. Wormald testified that the
1 starting point for the design of this entire project was to make sure that it was context sensitive. In fact, when we first presented this project to Planning Staff, their comment was, this is a brilliant solution to providing independent living in a non-institutional type about any quantifiable impact from the cottages -impacts that could be the basis of an incompatibility 12 odors. The only thing you heard with respect to the 13 cottages is that the structure will be visible from an 14 adjacent house, a home that the closest distance is half 15 a football field away, 154 feet. And as the Land Planner 16 testified, this relationship is not uncommon throughout 19 height, massing, and architectural standpoint very 22 ask that you think about the conditional use residential

24 the focus was on the compatibility of a multi-story
25 building with a single-family home. In those cases,
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compatibility in and of itself, and the Hearing Examiner
alluded to this during yesterday's hearing. We accept
this. But compliance with the zoning ordinance does
serve as a starting point, if you will, for providing
sort of a quantifiable starting point for evaluating compatibility. And by all measures, this conditional use
is significantly lower than the zoning ordinance's
requirements where there are maximum development
9 standards, land in those cases where the zoning ordinance
10 requires a minimum development standard, the project is
11 significantly higher. Our Land Planner testified to this 12 extensively, so I'm not going to go into those details 13 again.
14 It is, however, worth mentioning the density 15 issue. Critically, even when you eliminate 13 acres of 16 the site that are environmentally reserved, which is in
17 and of itself an unprecedented approach, the project
18 still is well below the development standards. I mean,
19 think about this. When you take out approximately
20 one-third of the property, take it out of the equation,
21 the project still is providing only a fraction, less than
22 one-third, of the density allowed by the zoning
23 ordinance. And on this note, Ms. Lee erroneously
24 testified that the project was more intensive than the
25 Brandywine Senior Living Project, and she was looking for
64

| 1 | those are two very dissimilar structures. And yet, in |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | all cases they were deemed to be compatible. And not |
| 3 | because the size and the massing was similar, we know |
| 4 | that that certainly wasn't the case. But instead, |
| 5 | because in those cases the multi-family building was |
| 6 | residential in character, or it's height stepped down to |
| 7 | a height closer to the single-family residential height, |
| 8 | or because landscaping was provided. |
| 9 | And in this case, the proposed independent |
| 10 | living cottages and the adjacent homes are already |
| 11 | like-to-like structures in terms of height, massing, and |
| 12 | architecture. And while we recognize that the plan |
| 13 | clearly shows that the layout of the cottages will be |
| 14 | more concentrated than the layout of adjacent single- |
| 15 | family area, as the discussion that we had immediately |
| 16 | before the break indicated, that difference pales in |
| 17 | comparison to all the other cases where a multi-family |
| 18 | building was being evaluated against a single-family home |
| 19 | in an effort to find compatibility. |
| 20 | As Mr. Park testified, the landscape buffer |
| 21 | from Day 1 will conceal a good portion of the cottages. |
| 22 | And certainly, by Year 7, the vast majority of the |
| 23 | cottages will be concealed. And it's hard to make a case |
| 24 that something is incompatible when it is hardly visible. |  |
| 25 | Now having said all that and based on the |

1 discussion that we just had before the break, I would
2 suggest in an effort to get the Hearing Examiner
3 comfortable with this project, a condition -- and I am
4 going to share my screen for a moment and put up Exhibit 5 144a.
6 We believe that -- first of all, as I just
testified, we believe that this project is wholly
8 compatible. But if the Hearing Examiner does not, we
9 would suggest a surgical approach to achieving that 10 compatibility. And how we think that could be done is by 11 the elimination of Ownership Lot 31 . We would be willing 12 to take that property and instead, put it into HOA 13 control, make a little pocket park in that area. That 14 would increase the openness of the project -- of the 15 relationship of the house to what seemed to be the 16 primary concern, which is Lot 3 , and we would agree, 17 given a number of things, including the angle of the 18 house on Lot 4, and then the angling of the remaining 19 triplexes along -- as you move further up north in the 20 property.
21 Now in suggesting that condition, I would also 22 suggest to the Hearing Examiner, given that the applicant
23 has been at this process for four years, a condition that
24 -- that requires that lot to be eliminated at the time of
25 preliminary plan, and get an approved preliminary plan

1 approval, and then provide to the Hearing Examiner, in 2 order that the record is updated, revised plans to show 3 the elimination of the lot. What we don't want to have 4 to do is go around a cycle and have yet another hearing 5 before the Hearing Examiner simply to eliminate a lot a 6 lot that would create a considerable amount more of open space along that westerly property line.

In regard to the lighting standards, the
9 ordinance requires .1 foot-candles at the property line,
10 as Mr. Park testified, and the lighting exhibit
11 confirmed, along the entire property line we're providing
12 zero foot-candles. In some instances, they reach into
13 the property more than 350 feet and, actually, in some
14 instances, they extend all the way from the east property
15 line to the west property line, where the measurement is
16 zero foot-candles.
17 Just touching briefly on this issue, lighting,
18 as we know, is an inherent characteristic. It's an
19 accepted characteristic of a senior housing project. The
20 opponents tried to create the impression that in this
21 area of Potomac, one mile from the center, that it's a
22 dark sky area and that the project will adversely affect
23 their ability to stargaze. We know from the exhibits
24 that that simply is not the case. There's no shortage of
25 lights in this area. And as Mr. Park and Mr. Skyhart

1 (phonetic) testified, the applicant, in response to the
2 concerns the community addressed, and in an effort to be
3 a good neighbor, hired a lighting consultant during this
4 hearing in February, worked closely with them, and have come up with a number of revisions to make sure that the lighting will not be an issue on this project.

In terms of property values, Kevin Kagan, an 8 appraiser and an expert in real estate development, land 9 valuation and appraisals, testified that it was his 10 expert opinion that the use would not have an adverse 11 impact on the surrounding property values. Mr. Kagan 12 evaluated four senior projects and concluded that their 13 presence did not adversely impact the surrounding 14 property values. This included Brightview Grove 15 residential care facility, which was -- where the 16 facility was in very close proximity, and highly visible, 17 to the adjacent and high-end one million-plus townhomes. 18 I need to emphasize that the potential economic impact 19 analysis only comes into play if the conditional use has 20 non-inherent adverse effects. And we believe that the 21 applicant has demonstrated that there are no non-adverse 22 effects as a result of the conditional use, and thus this 23 analysis should not even be required. However, in the 24 event the Hearing Examiner feels differently, we do want 25 to address this.
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| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Second of all, I would note that if, in fact, | 1 private educational institution re-establishes itself on |
| 2 the section is relevant, the test is whether the project | 2 this property, or, in fact, whether 11 Potomac mansions |
| 3 will cause undue harm. Mr. Rosenthal, the opponent' | 3 get developed on the property, that the property is going |
| 4 witness, who is neither an appraiser nor an expe | 4 to redevelop, and there's going to be construction on the |
| 5 land valuation, testified that the use would adversely | 5 property. And so, to the extent that the horses may be |
| 6 impact his future property values. And I believe we | 6 upset, that's an issue that's going to exist irrespective |
| 7 heard similar testimony from Mr. Maggin and Ms. Bake | 7 of this project. Ms. Brigham did just indicate, and we |
| cally, in Maryland, | 8 knew from previous discussions with her, that her horses |
| 9 Mayor and City Council of Baltimore, a homeowner | 9 are currently offsite, boarded elsewhere for different |
| 10 qualified to testify about the c | 10 reasons, and thus, there are solutions available |
| 11 property, but not about how future development might | 11 addres |
| 12 affect property values. Accordingly, ne | 12 In terms of the ownership issue, the opp |
| 13 Rosenthal, nor Ms. Baker, nor Mr. Maggin is compet | 13 has repeatedly attempted to make the legal structure of |
| 14 testify on the future value of his or her property or | 14 Heritage Potomac and the ownership aspects of independent |
| 15 other properties. In Ray, the Maryland Court of Appeal <br> 16 held that a property owner can testify as a lay witness | 15 living cottages a cause of concern, as if a conditional 16 use -- I'm sorry, my pages got mixed up. Sorry. Okay. |
| 17 about their | 17 As if a conditional use in a multi-family ownership |
| 18 testimony is required for testimony about whether the | 18 project cannot co-exist. However, we know this is |
| 19 value of property will increase or decrease because of | 19 incorrect. The zoning ordinance not only contemplates |
| 20 future development. | 20 that, there's precedent. And in that regard, we ask the |
| 21 In terms of need, | 21 Hearing Examiner to take administrative notice of |
| 22 questioned whether there would be a need for Heritage | 22 Conditional Use Case 16-11, that was the application of |
| 23 Potomac Senior Care Community, and then we jus | 23 Garrett Gateway Partners. In that case, the condition |
| 24 more testimony about that this morning. There should not 25 be any discussion of this issue given that need is not a | 24 use was approved for 19 fee ownership designed for life 25 townhouses. The conditional use in that case reflected |
| 25 be any discussion of this issue given that need is not a 70 | 25 townhouses. The conditional use in that case reflected |
| 1 requirement in the zoning ordinance. How | 1 the fact that there would be 19 separate |
| 2 raised, and so I want to briefly address | 2 conditional use. Multiple holders of a conditional use |
| 3 Ms. Lee testified that there's been, quote | 3 and enforcement thereof is neither complicated nor |
| 4 explosion of senior living facilities in Potomac", when | 4 unprecedented. Moreover, the County Council specifically |
| 5 in fact only one half of the target has been reached | 5 contemplated that some independent living senior units |
| 6 and, as we know, none of those have been independent | 6 may be owned individually, and has noted -- that I noted |
| 7 living units. The applicant's Land Planner's testimony | 7 yesterday, the MPDU Law actually requires that for-sale |
| 8 speaks for itself in respect to this issue. First of | 8 independent living units need to make a donation to the |
| 9 all, as the census data indicates, the senior population | 9 Housing Initiative Fund. And that provision was |
| 10 in this area has exploded. There's 104 percent increase | 10 specifically adopted by the Council in recognition that |
| 11 from 2000 to 2019 in the senior population. The senior | 11 yes, senior living -- independent living units could be |
| 12 housing goals of the 2002 Master Plan were established | 12 owned in fee simple. The applicant's legal structure |
| 13 based on prior lower projections of the senior | 13 memo cogently explains the legal structure and controls |
| 14 population; and again, even then, only half of the units | 14 for the community. Importantly -- and I think this is |
| 15 have materialize | 15 very important, because DPS is the agency charged with |
| 16 And then finally, we now, as a matter policy | 16 the enforcement of the conditional use, it was their |
| 17 from the county's housing overpopulation study, and the | 17 opinion after reviewing the proposed legal structure, |
| 18 County Council's adoption of the Zoning Text Amendment | 18 quote: 'DPS doesn't foresee any difficulty in its ability |
| 19 that allowed for this property -- this project, that the | 19 to enforce any conditions associated with Conditional Us |
| 20 county is trying to encourage senior housing of this | 20 22-01. Our only recommendation would be that one of the |
| 22 Ms. Brigham testified | 22 responsible for adherence of all conditions, as well as |
| 23 about her conditional use and the horses on her property, | 23 remitting the yearly Conditional Use Fee." Unquote. |
| 24 and that they'll be upset by construction. I think it' | 24 In terms of the legal documentation, opposition |
| 25 fair to say whether this project is approved, whether a | 25 has stated that if approved, a condition of approval |
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| 1 should be that the applicant must provide draft HOA | 1 violates the environmental laws or regulations. All they |
| 2 documents and declarations of covenants to demonstrate | 2 allege is that certain approaches appear to be contrary |
| 3 compliance with the Housing of Older Persons Act. This | 3 to their interpretation of some of the strategies and |
| 4 is unnecessary and premature. The applicant fully | 4 suggestions that appear in a document that describes |
| 5 acknowledges and testified that prior to the issuance of | 5 itself as a memorandu |
| 6 the first Use and Occupancy Permit, the HOA will be | 6 First, our experts have testified that the |
| 7 established, and the Declarations of Covenants will be | 7 project is consistent with these documents. But we |
| 8 recorded in the land records. Requiring drafts of th | 8 also point out that these supp |
| 9 documents now serves no purpose and is unprecedented. | 9 laws and they're not regulations. They are documents |
| 10 These controlling documents are prepared much later in | 10 that are technical appendices to the Potomac Subregion |
| 11 the process. As provided by proposed conditional | 11 Master Plan, which is in itself a guiding document. |
| 12 Condition No. 15, they will be prepared and recorded | 12 The opponents presented no expert |
| 13 prior to the issuance of the first Use and Occupancy | 13 environmental matters. In contrast, three of the |
| 14 Permit | 14 applicant's expert witnesses testified about |
| 15 Mr. Brown also expressed an issue -- I'm sorry | 15 environmental issues, and there were reports or plans in |
| 16 I'm going to move on to traffic. In almost every single | 16 the record from two others. In addition, the |
| 17 zoning case, opponents argue that the traffic impact from | 17 environmental staff of both Park and Planning and DPS |
| 18 the proposed use will be unacceptable and burden the | 18 have thoroughly reviewed and approved the NRI, including |
| 19 community. This likely occurs because any new use will, | 19 the delineation of the stream valley buffer, the flood |
| 20 in fact, generate traffic. But that's not the test. Mr. <br> 21 Kabatt testified that even when this use is evaluated | 20 plain and wetlands, and the classification of the slopes 21 and soils. Staff has also approved the Storm Water |
| 22 using the most stringent criteria, meaning applying a | 22 Management Concept and the Preliminary Forest |
| 23 higher trip rate for the independent living cottages, not | 23 Conservation Pla |
| 24 taking credit for the prior school years, and using pre- <br> 25 Covid trip counts, all intersections pass, and they pass | 24 While we respect Ms. Lee and her passion, she <br> 25 admitted that she is not a scientist, she's not a |
|  |  |
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| 1 comfortably below the maximum 14-50 trip threshold. | 1 forester, and she's not an expert on environmental |
| 2 Opponents expressed concern regarding the | 2 matters. Despite not being an expert, Ms. Lee attempted |
| 3 morning Eastbound Q on South Glen Road; however, as Mr. | 3 to re-delineate the stream valley buffer based on her lay |
| 4 Kabatt testified, the use will be generating minimal | 4 opinion as to what constitutes hydraulically adjacent |
| 5 trips during this period of time, given that the 11-7 | 5 soils. |
| 6 shift, which has only five employees anyway, is generally | 6 She first attempted this argument at the |
| 7 leaving before these Qs even develop. Traffic simply is | 7 Planning Board and was rebuffed by both the Planning |
| 8 not an issue in this ca | 8 Board and the Environmental Staff. Petitioner further |
| 9 Now, turning -- and I'm sure you'll be glad to | 9 testified that no priority forest within the stream |
| 10 hear -- turning to our last substantive issue, which is | 10 valley buffer would be removed. Further, petitioner |
| 11 environment. The opposition has expressed concern about | 11 testified to the attempts that have been made to minimiz |
| 12 the environment. We respect this, and we said at the | 12 the removal of the priority forest located outside the |
| 13 beginning, one of the driving forces for the design of | 13 stream valley buffer. These attempts, which included |
| 14 this project was to preserve the environment. You heard | 14 clustering the development, adjusting the building form, |
| 15 Mr . Park testify that it is quite unusual that a project | 15 and tucking the foundation walls into the grade, have, in |
| 16 does not trigger a forest conservation requirement. And | 16 fact, been successful in that only . 58 acres of the |
| 17 yet, this project does not because the applicant is | 17 priority forest will be removed. And as Mr. Park |
| 18 preserving a significant amount of trees above the | 18 testified, that portion which will be removed is |
| 19 threshold that triggers forest conservation. | 19 seriously overgrown with invasives, and as such, is of |
| 20 Further, you heard that while there is a | 20 compromised quality. |
| 21 maximum lot occupancy of 25 percent, in this case the lot | 21 While there's no code or regulation requiring |
| 22 occupancy is going to be almost half of this, at 13.9 | 22 any compensation for the removal of this . 58 acres, the |
| 23 percent. | 23 petitioner, nonetheless, is taking such compensatory |
| 24 In trying to make their case, the opp | 24 actions. First, the replanting the .5 acres next to the |
| 25 does not say, and nor can they say, that the applicant | 25 existing Priority Forest that Mr. Park testified would |

ultimately be an environmental benefit. And second, they're providing an additional 2.1 acres of supplemental plantings.

Ms. Lee also attempted to discredit the county's findings with respects to slopes and soils based on her lay interpretation of the environmental guidelines. Staff, however, disagreed with this, as did the Planning Board.

In contrast, petitioner's expert concluded that there were not highly erodible soils in the area of the development and Mr. Steiman, in his testimony, provided references to two separate documents, which were county environmental documents, that make it clear that the soils are not highly erodible steep slopes in the area of the development.
16 In terms of trees, there is minimal impact to 17 the critical root zone of the offsite trees along the western property line, and Mr. Park testified that it is expected that all these trees will remain.

Finally, we'll close with the fact that 13
acres of this project, almost one-half of the site, is
environmentally protected and will not be developed. And
even when you exclude these 13 acres from any density calculation, the project is still well below the density standards of the zoning ordinance, and less dense than
the other three relatively recent senior projects,
Brandywine, Artis and Spectrum.
In conclusion, we're very proud of this
application and how we arrived here today. It's the applicant's goal to be a good neighbor. We believe that the design solution that this project presents provides an innovative way to address the county's increasing need for senior housing in the context sensitive manner. The applicant has taken extensive measures to ensure that the 10 project is context sensitive.
11 The project complies with the county zoning 12 ordinance development standards and environmental 13 regulations, it's compatible with the surrounding 14 neighborhood, and addresses an increasing need for 15 diverse senior housing.
16 As I mentioned yesterday, and we hope that the 17 Hearing Examiner will give this significant
18 consideration, we think it would be helpful if we had the 19 opportunity to proffer conditions of approval, obviously
20 the same for Mr. Brown, that could be used in the event
21 the Hearing Examiner decides to approve this case. Based
22 on our discussion earlier, we obviously have some
23 insights as to what Hearing Examiner's lingering concerns
24 are, but if there are any others that could be shared
25 with the applicant -- as we went through the hearing, we
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2
3 anything else that comes to mind that could be shared, I
think that would be helpful for that exercise.
So, with that, we very much appreciate the
Hearing Examiner's time, Mr. Brown's time, the
neighborhood's time, and again, I just want to re-
emphasize, our goal is to be a good neighbor, and that
when this project is constructed, it will weave
seamlessly into the surrounding area to the enjoyment of
all -- the entire area. Thank you.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you.
Mr. Brown? I hear an echo. Does someone have a cellular
device on? Does anybody else hear an echo? Now it's
gone. I don't hear it. So go ahead, Mr. Brown.
MR. BROWN: This project is the product of an
untested, unproven alliance between a real estate
developer, Wormald, and a provider of senior care
services, Safe Life. Untested because despite repeated
opportunities to show how the concept, quasi-independent
living homeownership for younger seniors linked to
assisted living and memory care for older seniors on the
same property, has no track record of popular acceptance
anywhere in the nation outside of the continuing care
retirement community, which this project most surely is
not.

This project began with an effort to create a
3 paper mache senior living facility out of a closed school 4 campus where all senior services were optional and would 5 be provided mostly offsite. For the real estate 6 developer, that held out the prospect for density of 7 development triple what could be done under RE-2. It 8 never got off the ground thanks to a fair amount of 9 skepticism presented to Osau (phonetic) that this was not 10 the real thing in senior care. But visions of 11 sugarplums, selling townhouses in the RE- 2 zone at this 12 site, still danced in their heads. The original 13 application was withdrawn and redesigned adding a real 13 application was withdrawn and redesigned adding a real
14 independent living/assisted living/memory care building 15 and significantly more density in the townhouses. All 16 this was packaged with a ZTA to match. This found 17 receptive ears at the Planning Board and the District 18 Council for both the ZTA and for the matching project. 19 And so it was done without the applicant first ever 20 constructively engaging with the adjacent neighborhood 21 with a view toward achieving a project acceptable to all. 22 And that is why we are here today evaluating this unique, 23 unproven amalgam of senior living. 24 Just ask yourself, as our expert, Susan Brecht,
25 pointed out, how appealing to seniors is the notion that 24 Just ask yourself, as our expert, Susan Brecht,
25 pointed out, how appealing to seniors is the notion that

| 1 | if you want to join the community for life, and not have |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | to leave, short of, of course, need for a nursing home, |
| 3 | you must buy your way into home ownership, maybe with a |
| 4 | mortgage, only to likely need to later sell the home so |
| 5 | you can afford to move up to the next care level, from |
| 6 | independent living to assisted living, or perhaps all the |
| 7 | way to memory care. |
| 8 | $\quad$ No evidence was presented, other than the |
| 9 | unrestrained enthusiasm of Ms. Andress and Mr. Wormald, |
| 10 that the age-restricted units would sell like the |  |
| 11 proverbial hot cakes in this framework. The |  |
| 12 uncontradicted evidence that was presented was that |  |
| 13 | selling in fee simple to the 62 and over set, where the |
| 14 minimum age restriction continues indefinitely, the |  |
| 15 | owner's death being no impediment, is a hard sale to |
| 16 | make. I summarized Ms. Lee's research and testimony on |
| 17 this problem in Exhibit 173, our phase-in plan |  |
| 18 | recommendation. The Lerch Early experience at Potomac |
| 19 | Mews confirms the need for a phase-in plan that requires |
| 20 | completion of at least some occupancy of the lodge before |
| 21 | the cottage units are built. |
| 22 | The zoning ordinance requires a senior care |
| 23 | community to provide a continuing of residential |
| 24 | occupancy and health care services for seniors. This |
| 25 | community must include both assisted living and |

residential independent dwelling units. Assisted living
must be available from the start. Therefore, the lodge
must be built before, or at the same time, as the first
townhouse. The applicant's explanation sounds as if it
will be just the opposite. Clear the land and sell the
townhouses on spec before the lodge is built.
Turning to the issue of compliance with the zoning ordinance, it's hardly surprising that the project 9 comes fairly close to checking all the boxes for 10 approval. After all, the applicant wrote the ZTA to suit 11 its needs. But in the rush to legal authenticity, one 12 key mistake was made. As detailed in our Exhibit 93, 13 Senior Care Community, the term, is quite explicitly a 14 subset of the larger class of conditional uses called 15 Residential Care Facility. A simple Venn Diagram makes 16 clear that when $S$ as a subset of R, S for Senior Care and 17 R for Residential Care, as here, then S must by 18 definition have all of the attributes of R. One of those 19 attributes is that all R's, all residential care
20 facilities, serve persons in need of personal service,
21 assistance in daily living, or special protection.
22 But the applicant does not want to comply with
23 this constraint. Among the few people it found to
24 testify how anxious they were to buy and move into one of
25 the cottage units were a couple of prospects who said
they did not need and did not want any such services imposed upon them. Just one more example of the shakiness of this untested alliance.

The applicant's response to this is that there is no requirement for determination of such personal need upon the sale of a cottage unit. Maybe so, but if you're not in the need group, you're outside the definition of residential care facility, and necessarily outside the definition of senior care community, even if you meet all the specific requirements otherwise established for inclusion in the subset senior care community.
12 So, just imagine one of the enthusiasts who testified in favor of the project coming along ready to 4 buy, but not ready to admit any need for personal 15 services. This owner, and other such owners, would be 6 welcomed by the applicant and take the facility further and further away from the requirement of being persons in 18 need, and further and further into it being nothing more than an age-restricted community of individual homeowners where there is no longer any rationale for the increased density in housing types that come with various types of residential care facilities.

Now, even if this definitional problem were to
somehow go away, it is certainly the case that the
24 somehow go away, it is certainly the case that the
25 complicated ownership and management structure

1 contemplated by the applicant is a noninherent feature of 2 this facility. It has a fee simple ownership requirement 3 that is not inherent in any other community of senior 4 citizens residents anywhere so far as the record in this 5 case reveals. Our expert, Susan Brecht, knew of none, 6 and found that the examples offered by Ms. Andress were 7 quite different. Now, I emphasize, this is not a claim $\begin{array}{ll}8 & \text { that there is no need for more senior facilities in the } \\ 9 & \text { Potomac subregion. It is a claim that what is being }\end{array}$ 8 that there is no need for more senior facilities in the
9 Potomac subregion. It is a claim that what is being 10 provided is not what is needed.
11 Now, what adverse effects flow from this 12 noninherent feature of the project? You have 45 duplex 13 or triplex units where a conventional RE-2 zone would 14 have produced under 15 . The cottage units do not emulate 15 the surrounding neighborhood in terms of bulk and size, 16 or in terms of open space around each home. Their close 16 or in terms of open space around each home. Their close
17 proximity to each other produces a much more crowded 18 together living arrangement than in the neighborhood, so 18 together living arrangement than in the neighborhood, so
19 much so, that compatibility depends on walling them off 20 from site, the unending procession of closely spaced
21 duplexes and triplexes on the western side of the 21 duplexes and triplexes on the western side of the
22 property by adding vegetative screening walls. Such
23 walls are not characteristic of the rest of the 24 neighborhood where every home is on a two-acre lot that 25 is at least three-quarters open space. So, while

1 vegetative walls might alleviate incompatibility
2 somewhat, it will still leave the character of the 3 neighborhood irreversibly changed, and not for the better.

Looking at compatibility from above, rather than at ground level, you will see that the dense packing together of townhomes here is not to be found anywhere else in a much wider sweep of the Potomac subregion. We find you, Ms. Robeson, to be right on the mark in 0 expressing that you are not convinced, as the applicant apparently is, that an appropriate framework for compatibility analysis is to consider the R-200 developed lots in the surrounding area which are adjacent to RE-2 4 development.
15 It is important to remember that in both the 6 RE-2 and the R-200 zones the lot coverage requirement is 25 percent maximum. This means that when an RE-2 developed lot is abutting an R-200 developed lot both will have open space of about 75 percent. Now on an absolute basis, since the RE-2 lot is typically four times the size of the R-200 lot, there's four times as much open space. But if an RE-2 lot abuts four R-200 lots, and that's a likely scenario -- you could just look at the maps -- that adds up to an acre and a half of open space on the four R-200 lots, much of it in the rear,
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1 senior care community unless the person happens to meet
2 the restrictions on age and affiliation spelled out in
the zoning ordinance. In the lodge, all needs for
residents are included in a single package. In the cottage units, nothing more than a meal plan appears officially mandated via the service contract, so far as we have been able to determine. Unit maintenance and housekeeping are a given in the lodge, but not in the cottage units. In the lodge, everything is under one 10 roof; in the cottage units, one provides for oneself, or 11 travels to the lodge, or to the Potomac Village for 12 needs.
13 On the issue of adverse impact on property 14 values, it defies common sense to suppose that in an open 15 area such as this, a four-story lodge and a closely 16 spaced collection of 45 townhomes will not have a greater 17 negative effect on property values than would RE-2
18 including the zoning of single-family homes instead.
19 Also, little credence should be given to Mr. 20 Kagan's presentation of home appreciation rates elsewhere 21 where four other senior facilities have been built in
22 Potomac. This facility is unlike any of those in many 23 ways. Even if it is true that the other areas studied 24 showed no adverse impact on home appreciation rates due 25 to the introduction of a senior living facility in the
facing the RE-2 lot, or on the side. That is much more open space than you will find on the site plan between the row of closely spaced duplexes and triplexes that abut any of the western side RE-2 properties, such as Mr. Maggin's.

If you are inclined to salvage a less dense,
but more compatible fit at this location, we have suggested a quite plausible option, a little more aggressive than the loss of the single lot, as has just 10 now been suggested by Ms. Harris. The only reason there 11 is a loop in the main roadway is to squeeze in more 12 townhouse units. It wasn't put there to add more open 13 space in a single small area inside that loop. By 14 changing the design to a single spine drive from South 15 Glen to the lodge, nine townhomes would be lost, but much 16 compatibility would be gained. Rear yards facing the 17 project boundary could easily be 50 feet or more on all 18 sides.
19 Now the applicant also touts the highly 20 integrated, interconnected nature of the entire project,
21 when in reality that attribute applies to the lodge
22 alone. There, help for residents is omnipresent. In the
23 cottage units there can be no live-in help, no live-in
24 help at all. That seems to be -- has sort of been
25 forgotten in the process. That's a requirement for the

| 1 | and it simply will not work as intended unless there is a |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | climate of rigorous enforcement of the rules. Instead, |
| 3 | we see the rules simply buried away in a recorded |
| 4 | covenant document that likely soon will be forgotten |
| 5 | unless beefed up considerably. The senior care community |
| 6 | rules on occupancy and age restriction are intentionally |
| 7 | more onerous than those for other kinds of residential |
| 8 | care facilities and merit an enforcement program sturdier |
| 9 | than the one once every two years look required under |
| 10 HOPA. |  |
| 11 | For example, the applicant rebels at the |
| 12 requirement that ownership of the cottage units be |  |
| 13 limited to natural persons, as we suggested. Perhaps it |  |
| 14 | is okay to expand ownership beyond individuals to a trust |
| 15 controlled by the trustee who is the occupant. Okay. |  |
| 16 | But if ownership is extended beyond that, to an LLC or a |
| 17 corporation, such an entity could buy up the lion's share |  |
| 18 | of the cottage units and turn it into a rental community, |
| 19 which is typically high in turnover. The applicant may |  |
| 20 | not care about this. After all, he's sold the units. |
| 21 | But what about the owners? Who would pay a million |
| 22 | dollars plus to own and live in a triplex unit where |
| 23 | there are renters on both sides that come and go every |
| 24 year or so? In the same vein, a unit should be the |  |
| 25 owner's Maryland domicile, which means an intention to |  |

live there permanently for at least 130 days a year under
2 Maryland law. What kind of community would you have if owners were invariably gone more than half a year every year?

Lastly, I note that where the applicant agrees or disagrees with our eight proposed covenants terms in the cottage units as was set forth at Pages 6 and 7 of Exhibit 165, the applicant's response was submitted last 9 Friday afternoon in Exhibit 174. I haven't had time to 10 write out a response. I note that we accept the 11 applicant's proposed change to Covenant No. 7, allowing no impact home occupations. The applicant appears to accept our Covenants No. 1 and 2, and doesn't really disagree with our Covenants No. 5 and 6. That leaves 3,4 and 8.
16 Three is about certifying compliance with 17 mortgage obligations. The community, as should be the 18 lodge owner, has an interest in seeing that these 19 expensive units not fall into abandonment due to default 20 on mortgage payments.
21 No. 4 is a prohibition on accessory structures.
22 If the applicant wants to allow accessory structures on
23 the ownership lots, it should explain what it has in 24 mind.

No. 8 is a prohibition on leasing. This is in
furtherance of avoiding the cottage units becoming rental community. The lodge owner should closely regulate and control who is occupying each unit.

In conclusion, much of what I have discussed is oriented toward improving the project into something workable and practicable. If you were to adopt all of these recommendations, perhaps one could hope that would be the end result. But our overall impression of this project, with an amalgam of features borrowed from other concepts in senior living but never put together quite
like this, is that it is doomed to failure. There are ample noninherent adverse effects, enough that the right decision is to save everyone a lot more time and trouble and expense by deciding now that this project at this location does not merit a test drive for such feasibility and should be put mercifilly to rest before its defects become reality.

But if you do decide to let the applicant go forward with its self-invented senior care community, all of the conditions and restrictions that Greater South Glen Neighborhood Association and West Montgomery County Civic Association have recommended should be implemented.

As a final word, I would say when Ms. Harris pointed out at the very beginning of her closing argument that this property was used more intensively before, and
it could be worse, even under single-family development under the RE-2 Zone, those are irrelevant considerations. This project must rise or fall on its own merit as a conditional use. And for all those reasons, we say that the conditional use should be denied.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you.
All right. Ms. Harris, you have a rebuttal.
I think you're on mute.
MS. HARRIS: My apologies. HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: No worries. MS. HARRIS: Thank you. So, very briefly, in terms of the ownership of the independent living units, ownership of an independent living unit is not unique. One need only go a mile or two down Rive Road to Fox Hill to see condominium units that are independent living units that are owned by seniors. There are other similar projects in the neighborhood -- I mean, in the county. Mr. Brown gives us way too much credit for creating some very unique senior project. It's not that unique. And as our witnesses pointed out, there are examples of similar type structures, maybe not in Montgomery County, which is exactly what the County Council recognized when they adopted the Zoning Text Amendment, but in other areas, including counties right across the river. And one of the reasons for adopting this Zoning Test

| 1 | Amendment was to try to make sure that the seniors, the |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | aging seniors in the Potomac area will in fact stay in |
| 3 | the county. |
| 4 | I feel like I need to address, because Mr. |
| 5 | Maggin raised it and then Mr. Brown raised it, this issue |
| 6 | of the applicant not engaging the community. And that |
| 7 | just certainly is not correct. When we first started |
| 8 | this project, we had several on-site open houses, on |
| 9 | site. Mr. Wormald had individual meetings with the |
| 10 | residents, he had coffee with several of them to discuss |
| 11 the project. It was clear after those discussions and as |  |
| 12 we saw from, I'll call it Round 1, that the community |  |
| 13 wasn't happy with the project. |  |
| 14 | When we came to Round 2, which is the current |
| 15 conditional us, we again went beyond the notice |  |
| 16 | requirements. We sent individual letters to all adjacent |
| 17 and confronting property owners and said: hey, we want to |  |
| 18 | talk to you. Contact us and we would be more than happy |
| 19 | to re-engage and have a discussion about this. Not a one |
| 20 | took us up on that. So, to suggest that the property |
| 21 | owner, the applicant -- excuse me -- has not reached out |
| 22 | to the community is just false, and tries to set --- |
| 23 create an impression, a negative impression, which just |  |
| 24 | certainly isn't the case. |
| 25 | In terms of the suggestion that this community |

1 should go above and beyond any other residential care
2 facility to require showings of need versus simply a
requirement of 62 -plus, is unprecedented. Now the reality is that most people that move into an independent living community do so because they know that their needs are starting to become -- are increasing and that their abilities are being compromised. And in fact, for those 8 of us that have gone through this process we know that 9 often it's -- those individuals do so kicking and
10 screaming. But there are some seniors who, for whatever 11 reason, are more prepared. And as an anticipation of knowing, oh, I can't drive at night; I need reminders 13 about my meds; or whatever the case may be, and that 14 those needs re increasing, that they're going to move 15 into an independent living facility in anticipation of 16 meeting those needs very soon.
17 So, I would say that this community should not 18 -- no additional requirements should be imposed upon this 19 project that have not been imposed on any other senior 20 project within the entire county.
21 The suggestion that a compromised design which
22 would eliminate the nine cottage units within the circle
23 is Draconian. That would result in a 20 percent decrease
24 in the cottage independent living units. There is simply
25 no need for that. As we said, if the Hearing Examiner
feels that there needs to be a surgical removal of a townhouse to create more open space along the western property line, we don't think that's needed, that's probably the appropriate solution.

As Mr. Wormald said, there are economies of scale to providing, you know, whether it's assisted living or the independent living units, and we re closely reaching that minimum threshold. When we first started this project, while I don't have the number in front of 10 me , I think there were 80 or so independent living units on the property. And that his decreased now to almost 50 percent of that, 45 . And I would submit that a 20 percent reduction -- a 20 percent reduction, which would 4 also result in a setback 300 times the requirement, 5 there's been no testimony as to why that's needed.

Finally, in terms of the legal structure, 17 unfortunately I feel like this is another example where 18 issues are being created where the issues just simply 9 don't exist. Mr. Brown has raised a number of speculative issues. Well, this could happen, or that could happen. DPS is charged with enforcing and inspecting all conditional uses. This one would be no different. There would also be additional controls, as we have set forth in our legal structure memo, and we would submit that those are more than adequate to ensure
that this project works and functions and operates in
accordance with the conditional use, in accordance with
all county, state, and federal laws, and that whatever
requirements are imposed to ensure compatibility, that
those are continually maintained. And so, with that, we conclude our remarks. Thank you.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you.
Let me just get to -- you had mentioned conditions.
MS. HARRIS: Yes.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: There's a
typical condition that we usually put on that says, all
development is subject to the approved conditional use
and site plan -- that doesn't include the height. Do you
have a problem with a condition maxing -- capping height
at 40 feet?
MS. HARRIS: For the independent living
cottages, no.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes. I'm sorry, yes.

MS. HARRIS: Yes. That is fine.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Now, I've got
DPS saying this is enforceable. Do you have a problem
with a condition stating that the legal structure will be
-- and I haven't -- this is not taking a position on Mr.
Brown's arguments. It's just -- I want to get these out

| 97 | 99 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 of the way. Do you have a problem with a condition | 1 MS. HARRIS: But no other -- |
| 2 stating that the legal structure would be substantially | 2 (Crosstalk) |
| 3 the same as set out in whatever -- I can't remember the | 3 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I agree with |
| 4 exhibit, but there's an exhibit where you set out your | 4 you. |
| 5 legal structure? | 5 MS. HARRIS: Okay. So, within two weeks, is |
| 6 MS. HARRIS: Yes. We are fine with that, and | 6 that possible, and I'm looking at the Soltez Team. Or -- |
| 7 then I believe actually, there was an initial memo on | 7 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Do you mean |
| 8 March 23rd, and then a response to -- | 8 Mr. -- is Mr. Steven here? |
| 9 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Right. | 9 MS. HARRIS: He's in the back room with Mr. |
| 10 MS. HARRIS: -- questions, and then we further | 10 Park -- |
| 11 elaborated last Friday. So, no issue with that | 11 MR. PARK: Yes, Pat, can you give us a second? |
| 12 condition. | 12 I want to talk to Mr. Steven about the MPS update for the |
| 13 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Now, what I | 13 storm water concept. That's outside of the Park and |
| 14 would like you -- on the lot -- was it Lot 31? | 14 Planning approval, so give us a second here. |
| 15 MS. HARRIS: Yes. | 15 MS. HARRIS: Yes. |
| 16 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That you were | 16 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Do you need |
| 17 going to -- I want -- this is the deal. I referred it | 17 to do that if you're removing impervious area? |
| 18 back to Planning's desk, the revised landscaping. I | 18 MS. HARRIS: I actually think -- |
| 19 haven't heard from them, and maybe I need to be clearer, | 19 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, I'll |
| 20 I have to leave the record open for a minimum of $30-\mathrm{a}$ | 20 let -- I'll let them discuss it. |
| 21 maximum of 30 days | 21 My other question is, we had talked yesterday |
| 22 Also, there are cases that say I can't approve | 22 about perhaps a condition requiring maintenance and |
| 23 a conditional use plan that -- and defer, you know, the | 23 replacement of the revised landscaping by the -- I don't |
| 24 final aspects of the plan to a future approval. Is it | 24 know which -- |
| 25 possible for you to get a revised -- if you're simply | 25 MS. HARRIS: The HOA. |
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| 1 emptying out a lot and putting landscaping in, is it | 1 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: -- HOA. |
| 2 possible for you to submit -- and it should go to | 2 Which HOA would it be, the overall? The umbrella HOA. |
| 3 Planning and myself at the same time -- a revised | 3 Do you have an issue with that? |
| 4 conditional use plan, without that lot, and what would be | 4 MS. HARRIS: No. And Mr. Wormald, if I say -- |
| 5 the timing of that? How fast -- and I don't want to | 5 if you disagree with any of my responses, scratch your |
| 6 delay the case. The bottom line is there's a delay | 6 nose or something. |
| 7 already until I hear from Planning Staff, I don't know | 7 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Or you can |
| 8 how long that delay is going to be. But -- and frankly, | 8 just answer. |
| 9 well, I don't want to delay -- as you may know, we're | 9 MR. PARK: Ms. Harris, Daniel Park. For the |
| 10 short staffed, and I am going to try my best not to have | 10 Soltaz Team, we believe we can get a revised Conditional |
| 11 to extend the time for the decision. But I can be | 11 Use Plan, Landscaping Lighting Plan and Stormwater |
| 12 writing a decision, you know, while these reviews are | 12 Management updates by the 17th of June. |
| 13 taking place because the reviews are relatively, you know | 13 MS. HARRIS: Thank you. |
| 14 -- any further comments would be limited to the changes | 14 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: What is that, |
| 15 on the plan. So -- | 15 the 17th of June? Okay, today's the first. Okay. |
| 16 MS. HARRIS: So -- okay. | 16 Well, what we can do is this. Well, I need to |
| 17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Go ahead. | 17 give Planning at least two weeks to review it. And then |
| 18 MS. HARRIS: Well, what -- I think we could do | 18 what we typically do is have them provide comments and |
| 19 that in relatively short order, and I need to defer to | 19 then give everyone else the opportunity to comment on |
| 20 our engineers, but let me just clarify. Obviously, there | 20 Planning's comments. But I do think it's faster -- I |
| 21 are a lot of plans in the record, so what I would submit | 21 can't leave it for Preliminary Plan. I could make a |
| 22 is that it's a change to the Conditional Use Plan, and a | 22 requirement to do it as a minor modification after |
| 23 change to the Landscape and Lighting Plan. | 23 Preliminary Plan, but then you're subject to a whole |
| 24 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yeah, that | 24 hearing again. So, I think it's the most efficient to do |
| 25 was -- that's what I was -- | 25 it in this proceeding. So, if you can submit it by |

```
6/17/22, I'm going to contact Planning today and see if
they can review it within two weeks. So, two weeks would
be -- I guess it would have -- would it have to go to DEP
too?
    MS. HARRIS: So --
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Park,
does it have to go to DEP, too, for the stormwater?
    MR. PARK: DPS.
    (Crosstalk)
    MS. HARRIS: If I could comment on that?
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes.
    MS. HARRIS: So, the stormwater management --
we have an approved Stormwater Management Concept. As
you pointed out, wait a minute, why do you have to revise
the concept if you're creating more pervious. But we do
because that's the requirement.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Impervious.
    MS. HARRIS: We wouldn't be increasing the
pervious.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN:Oh, you're
right. You're right.
    MS. HARRIS: So, we know -- and an approved
storm water management concept while you like them, it's
not a -- it's my understanding it's not a requirement.
So, is there any --
```

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, it
is of a conditional use because this substitutes as site
plan, but maybe I'm wrong. Hold on a second. If you can
just bear with me a moment. Okay. All I do need is the
concept. You're right. So that's fine.
MS. HARRIS: Okay.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right.
So, let's do this, I'll expect a revised Conditional Use
Plan and Landscape Plan on 6/17, and you submit that --
you're supposed to submit amendments to the Planning
Staff directly, but submit them to both of us, and then I
will leave the record open, and Mr. Brown, you can weigh
in on this if you if you wish, I will leave the record
open until July first for Planning Staff to receive
comments -- to provide comments, and then I can leave the
record open to July 8th to provide comments on Planning
Staff's comments.
Now, Mr. Brown -- and that's, you know,
assuming I can get in to catch -- you know, that I can
get Planning Staff to agree to this.
MS. HARRIS: And within that period --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown --
MS. HARRIS: Oh, I'm sorry.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: -- do you
have an objection to that?
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during this time, I will be working on my decision. So,
hopefully, you know, this will not be -- it won't --
technically I have 30 days from the 15th to write my
decision. Hopefully, I will not need that much time
because I know this has been a long project for you.
MS. HARRIS: Will we have the opportunity, Ms.
Robeson, to submit draft conditions for your
consideration? And if so, by when would you like those?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I would --
well, why don't we do it, the draft conditions -- how
long do you think you'd need to do that?
MS. HARRIS: Well, unfortunately we are running
into another vacation schedule conflict, so I think --
and it's not -- by the, I think July -- I mean, I'm
sorry. June 17th, is that correct, Ken? Would that
work?

MR. WORMALD: Sure.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: So, both the
Amended Conditional Use Plan and Landscape Plan will be in by June 17th

MS. HARRIS: Yes.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: And then comments on the condition -- you can always do these
MR. BROWN: I have no -- what is the -- what is
the -- what is the issue?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: The issue --
the finalized -- I'm asking the applicant for a revised
Conditional Use and Landscape Plan showing ownership Lot
31. Am I correct on that, Ms. Harris? Ownership Lot 31

MS. HARRIS: Correct.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: -- as a
pocket park. I am asking them -- or open space, whatever
you want to call it, but we're moving that cottage. And
I'm asking them to submit that plan by June 17th. I am
proposing to give the Planning Staff two weeks to review
it, which would be July 1st. Then I'm proposing the
comments, any comments on Planning Staff's comments and
the revised plan, by July 8th.
MR. BROWN: I have no problem with that scheduling.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Now that would leave the record open -- no, we'll have the
transcript anyway by that time. So, what I'm going to
do, just to give a fudge factor, is we're going to stick
with those dates, but because I haven't talked to
Planning Staff, I'm going to leave the record open until
July 15th, just because I haven't -- in case we need to
during this time, I will be working on my decision. So,
hopefully, you know, this will not be -- it won't --
technically I have 30 days from the 15th to write my
decision. Hopefully, I will not need that much time
because I know this has been a long project for you.
MS. HARRIS: Will we have the opportunity, Ms.
Robeson, to submit draft conditions for your
consideration? And if so, by when would you like those?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I would --
well, why don't we do it, the draft conditions -- how
long do you think you'd need to do that?
MS. HARRIS: Well, unfortunately we are running
into another vacation schedule conflict, so I think --
and it's not -- by the, I think July -- I mean, I'm
sorry. June 17th, is that correct, Ken? Would that work?

```
ahead of time -- but they will be due on 7/8, as well.
    MS. HARRIS: July 8?
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes. July
```

8th, as well.
MS. HARRIS: Okay.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, do
you have any comments on the way that we're proposing to
proceed?
MR. BROWN: I'm afraid that I have a question
that may be regarded as impertinence, but I feel I must
ask it in order to properly advise my clients. Spending
time on conditions is something that I might recommend to
them if it has already -- if I should be under the
impression that the decision about this case has already
been made. My clients are going to ask me, based on this
discussion, if you have already made up your mind about
this case, and I really don't know how to answer that
question.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, I don't
know how to answer it either because the fact is I have
not. And --
MR. BROWN: That's a perfectly fine answer. I
am sorry to have to --have to have asked it.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I struggled
with the compatibility issue as we discussed, and I am
including -- I am asking for the revised landscape plan
so that that option is available. But I have not decided
the case.
MR. BROWN: Thank you very much. I am sorry to
have had to -- have found it necessary to ask you the
question.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It's not
impertinent. I can understand why -- I'm trying to clean
up details now during the hearing so -- so that we have a
method of proceeding.
MR. BROWN: Thank you.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: And I always
do worry about that when I start asking for conditions
and changes that people will think it's a done deal, but
it is not. And as I said, I did -- I have struggled.
So, I just want the op -- all the options available.
Does that help you?
MR. BROWN: Very much. Thank you.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
MR. BROWN: I have no problem with the
schedule.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
Anything from anybody else before -- and just remember
for those who are in the audience but are not represented
25 by Mr. Brown, whenever you communicate with me, I have
1 one -- you must communicate with every -- list of people
2 who have testified here. I have them in a group. I had
3 to get special permission to have a group outside of the
county, but I will add Mr. Wank, because I don't think
he's in it. But you must include that group on your
email, okay?
All right. With that, I am going to adjourn
this public hearing. The record will stay open 'til July
15 th, but the record is only staying open to receive an
0 Amended Landscape and Conditional Use Plan to remove the
11 ownership unit that we discussed, comments on that, and
12 proposed conditions from the applicant, and then comments
13 on all of those things from the parties. Okay. So, I'm
14 not going to receive additional opposition letters or
15 anything like that. All right?
16 Okay, with that, I do think all the parties,
17 they've spent a lot of time and a lot of analysis on this
18 case, and it was excellent -- both were excellently
19 presented, and I do appreciate that. Okay, with that,
20 I'm going to adjourn, leaving the record open 'til July
1 15th. Thank you.
MS. HARRIS: Thank you for your time.
MR. BROWN: Thank you.
(Hearing adjourned at 12:49 p.m.)
(Hearing adjourned at 12:49 p.m.)
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| 91:16, 91:25, | 15:21, 20:9, | 86:17 | 37:8, 73:15, |
| 106:23, 108:3 | 26:23, 38:19, | boxes | 78:20, 79:13, |
| began | 41:2, 45:22, | 82:9 | 79:15, 79:16, |
| 80:2 | 49:6, 50:1, | brandywine | 92:18, 93:5, |
| begin | 56:14, 61:4, | 8:19, 8:20, | $95: 19,102: 12,$ |
| $18: 25$ | 79:17, 86:2 | $9: 21, \quad 10: 4,$ | 102:18, 102:22, |
| beginning | beyond | 62:25, 63:5, | $103: 1,103: 17,$ |
| $35: 15,74: 13$ | 24:9, 30:18, | 78:2 | $105: 6,105: 9,$ |
| 91:24 | 89:14, 89:16, | break | $105: 22, \quad 106: 4,$ |
| behalf | 93:15, 94:1 | 28:15, 65:16, | $106: 11,106: 18 \text {, }$ |
| 2:2, 2:6, 2:13, | big | $66: 1$ | 106:20, 106:25, |
| 5:18 | 33:7, 45:20, | breaking | 107:23 |
| behind | 49:18, 50:22 | 16:4, 17:3 | brown's |
| 42:18 | binding | brecht | 79:6, 96:25 |
| being | 39:2 | 80:24, 84:5 | browser |
| 4:12, 6:14, | blend | bred | 28:1 |
| 8:12, 33:2, | 63:18 | $56: 23$ | buffer |
| 33:4, 42:14, | blocking | brewer | 51:12, 53:7, |
| 49:20, 51:13, | 18:18, 64:11 | $2: 8,5: 18,$ | $65: 20,75: 19,$ |
| 65:18, 76:2, | board | $35: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76: 3, \quad 76: 10, \\ & 76: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 81:15, 83:17, | 55:8, 55:18, | briefly | 76:13 <br> buffering |
| $\begin{aligned} & 83: 18, \quad 84: 9, \\ & 94: 7, \quad 95: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $63: 13,76: 7$, $76: 8,77: 8$, | $5: 16, \quad 67: 17,$ | buffering $20: 9$ |
| believe | $80: 17$ | $\text { \|llat } \begin{aligned} & 70: 2,11 \\ & \text { brig } \end{aligned}$ | buffers |
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| build | called | caregivers | 67:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 46:10, 50:13, | 21:14, 33:19, | 38:13 | central |
| 56:21 | 82:14 | caretaker | 24:25 |
| buildable | calling | 37:12 | centrally |
| 16:17 | 6:4, 12:2 | caretakers | 54:10 |
| building | came | 36:19, 37:9, | century |
| 20:21, 23:2, | 32:19, 36:3, | 38: 6 | 44:4 |
| 23:25, 24:4, | 93:14 | case | certain |
| 24:5, 24:18, | camera | 4:24, 4:25, | 75:2 |
| 40:24, 41:9, | 6:9, 9:12, | 5:9, 23:9, 31:2, | certainly |
| 41:10, 42:24, | 11:8, 18:7, | 60:11, 60:17, | 5:17, 23:7, |
| 64:25, 65:5, | 22:9, 27:22, | 60:21, 63:20, | 36:24, 47:11, |
| 65:18, 76:14, | 27:23, 34:20, | 65:4, 65:9, | 57:13, 57:14, |
| 80:14 | 37:21, 38:1 | 65:23, 67:24, | 63:20, 65:4, |
| built | campus | 71:22, 71:23, | 65:22, 83:24, |
| 42:6, 56:22, | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 4 \\ & \text { can't } \\ & 4: 10, \quad 12: 19, \\ & 13: 10, \quad 14: 16, \\ & 37: 9, \quad 52: 23, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 25, \quad 73: 17, \\ & 74: 8, \quad 74: 21, \end{aligned}$ | 88:9, 88:10, |
| 81:21, 82:3, |  |  | 93:7, 93:24 |
| 82:6, 87:21 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 74: 8, \quad 74: 21, \\ & 74: 24, \quad 78: 21, \end{aligned}$ | certificate |
| bulk |  | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 24, \quad 84: 5, \\ & 88: 2, \quad 93: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 108:1, 109:1 |
| 84:15 |  |  | $108: 2,109: 2$ |
| burden | $\begin{array}{ll} 94: 12, & 97: 3, \\ 97: 22, & 100: 21 \end{array}$ | $94: 13, \quad 98: 6,$ |  |
| 73:18 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 103: 25, \\ & 105: 14, \\ & 105: 17, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | certifying |
| buried | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 22, \quad 100: 21 \\ & \text { cannot } \end{aligned}$ |  | 90:16 |
| 89:3 | $26: 11,61: 9,$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 105: 17, & 106: 3, \\ 107: 18, & 108: 6, \end{array}$ | change |
| business | 71:18 | 109:8 | 30:9, 60:3, |
| 44:3 | capping | cases | 90:11, 98:22, |
| button | $96: 14$care | 5:9, 51:7, | 98:23, 104:1 |
| 27:24 |  | 62:9, 64:23, | changed |
| buy | $\begin{aligned} & \text { care } \\ & 37: 7,40: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 64:25, 65:2, | 85:3 |
| 38:23, 81:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 7, \quad 40: 19, \\ & 40: 21, \quad 41: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $65: 5,65: 17$, $97: 22$ | changes |
| 82:24, 83:14, | $50: 8,51: 24,$ | catch | $98: 14, \quad 106: 14$ |
| 89:17 | 59:6, 60:20, |  | $86: 14, \quad 104: 1$ |
| buyer's | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 2, \\ & 68: 15, \\ & 69: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $17: 5,102: 19$ <br> categorically |  |
| $9: 24, \quad 10: 2$ |  | $60: 13$ | chaos |
| $30: 22$ | $79: 18,79: 22$, $79: 24, ~ 80: 10$, | cause | $33: 2$ character |
| C | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 14, \quad 81: 5, \\ & 81: 7, \quad 81: 22, \end{aligned}$ | $1: 7,55: 13,$ | 65:6, 85:2 |
| cakes | $81: 24,82: 13,$ | 69:3, cc | characteristic |
| calculation | 82:15, 82:16, |  | $\begin{aligned} & 67: 18, \quad 67: 19, \\ & 84 \cdot 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| 77:24 | $83: 8, \quad 83: 9,$ | cell | 84:23 charged |
| call 51.18 | $83: 11,83: 22 \text {, }$ | $16: 6$ | $72: 15, \quad 95: 21$ |
| 6:1, 51:18, $93: 12,103: 11$ | 87:1, 89:5, | cellular $79: 13$ | chat |
| call-in | 89:8, 91:19, 84:1 | census | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 6, \quad 4: 7,4: 10 \\ & \text { checking } \end{aligned}$ |
| $11: 17,11: 20,$ | caregiver | 70:9 | 82:9 |
| 12:1 | 35:24, 36:1 | 53:20, 54:7, | 4:24, 4:25 |
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| 65:2, 66:8, | 41:17, 41:20, | 92:5, 93:15, | considerably |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 78:13, 86:7 | 42:15, 42:16, | 95:22, 96:2, | 89:5 |
| compensation | 43:2, 43:3, | 96:12, 97:23, | consideration |
| 76:22 | 43:20, 45:13, | 98:4, 98:22, | 38:18, 78:18, |
| compensatory | 45:14, 54:16, | 100:10, 102:2, | 104:10 |
| 76:23 | 66:16, 70:22, | 102:8, 103:5, | considerations |
| competent | 71:15, 74:2, | 104:21, 107:10 | 92:2 |
| 69:13 | 74:11 | conditions | considering |
| complains | concerned | 42:23, 72:19, | 59:9 |
| 88:21 | 33:1, 42:13, | 72:21, 72:22, | considers |
| completely | 54:24, 88:6 | 78:19, 91:20, | 64:21 |
| 16:25, 41:5, | concerning | 96:8, 104:9, | consistent |
| 41:7 | 45:24 | 104:12, 105:12, | 31:4, 75:7 |
| completion | concerns | 106:13, 107:12 | consolidated |
| $81: 20$ | 32:7, 52:14, | condo | $60: 6$ |
| compliance | 53:9, 54:22, | 53:2 | constitutes |
| 61:24, 62:3, | 54:24, 57:23, | condominium | $76: 4$ |
| 63:7, 73:3, | 68:2, 78:23 | $92: 15$ | constraint |
| 82:7, 90:16 | conclude | conducted | $82: 23$ |
| complicated | $96: 6$ | $1: 11$ | constructed |
| 72:3, 83:25 | concluded | conestoga | 79:9 |
| complies | $68: 12, \quad 77: 9$ | $14: 9,14: 10$ | construction |
| 78:11 | conclusion | conference | 25:2, 33:2, |
| comply | 78:3, 91:4 condition | 12:8 confident | $33: 6, \quad 70: 24$ |
| $82: 22$ | condition 21:4, 41:1, | confident $44: 2$ | $71: 4$ |
| component $39: 12$ | $66: 3, \quad 66: 21$ | confirmed | constructively |
| comprehend | $66: 23,72: 25$ | $67: 11$ | 80:20 <br> consult |
| $10: 19$ | 73:12, 79:2, | confirms | 45:3, 54:18 |
| compressed | 96:11, 96:14, | $81: 19$ | consultant |
| 56:13 | 96:23, 97:1, | conflict | 68:3 |
| compromised | 97:12, 99:22, | 27:11, 104:15 | contact |
| 76:20, 94:7, | conditional | confronting $93: 17$ | 93:18, 101:1 |
| 94:21 conceal | 16:18, 40:13, | connected | contemplated $37: 7,72: 5,$ |
| 51:12, 65:21 concealed | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 16, \quad 40: 24, \\ & 59: 3,59: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 24:3, 24:22 connection | $84: 1$ |
| $65: 23$ | 59:9, 59:24, | 11:3, 23:1, | contemplates $71: 19$ |
| concentrated | $60: 2,61: 8,$ | $36: 25,41: 2,$ | contesting |
| 65:14 | $64: 22,68: 19,$ | 41:15 | $30: 13$ |
| concept | $68: 22,70: 23,$ | conservation | context |
| 56:16, 75:22, | $71: 15,71: 17,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 74: 16, \quad 74: 19, \\ & 75: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 55:9, 64:2, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 79: 20, \quad 99: 13, \\ & 101: 13, \quad 101: 15, \end{aligned}$ | 71:22, 71:23, | consider | $78: 8, \quad 78: 10$ |
| $101: 23,102: 5$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 71: 25, & 72: 2, \\ 72: 16, & 72: 19 . \end{array}$ | $33: 18,44: 21,$ | $96: 5$ |
| concepts | $72: 23,73: 11,$ | 45:21, 53:12, | continue |
| 91:10 | $82: 14, \quad 92: 4,$ | 85:12, 88:13 | 21:7 |
| concern | 82.14, 92.4, | considerable | continues |
| 32:22, 33:7, |  | 51:12, 67:6 | 81:14 |

PLANET DEPOS

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on June 1, 2022


PLANET DEPOS

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on June 1, 2022


PLANET DEPOS

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on June 1, 2022

| difficulty | diverse | draconian | 33:19, 35:12, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 72:18 | 78:15 | 94:23 | 81:18 |
| direct | document | draft | ears |
| 22:25, 23:1, | 30:10, 41:23, | 73:1, 104:9, | 80:17 |
| 36:11 | 75:4, 75:11, | 104:12 | easily |
| direction | 89:4 | drafts | 26:15, 86:17 |
| 26:14 | documentation | 73:8 | east |
| directly | 72:24 | drive | 67:14 |
| 102:11 | documents | 8:25, 86:14, | eastbound |
| disagree | 73:2, 73:9, | 91:15, 94:12 | 74:3 |
| 90:14, 100:5 | 73:10, 75:7, | driven | eastern |
| disagreed | 75:8, 75:9, | 26:18, 27:13 | 54:25 |
| 77:7 | 77:12, 77:13 | driver | echo |
| disagrees | doing | 27:13 | 79:13, 79:14 |
| 90:6 | 4:5, 5:10, | driveway | echoes |
| disappeared | 12:4, 28:11, | 26:3, 26:6, | 11:6, 15:24 |
| 6:24, 7:1, 7:20 | 44:4, 52:22 | 26:16, 26:25, | economic |
| disaster | dollar | 27:12 | 10:15, 56:4, |
| 26:8 | 52:2 | driving | 68:18 |
| discounted | dollars | 74:13 | economically |
| $10: 3,10: 8,$ | $38: 23, \quad 89: 22$ | due | $42: 22$ |
| $13: 7$ | domicile | $87: 24, \quad 88: 20,$ | economies |
| discredit | $89: 25$ | $90: 19, \quad 105: 1$ | 95:5 |
| 77:4 | donation | duplex | edge |
| discriminate | 72:8 | 15:18, 55:20, | 56:3 |
| 38:12 | done | 84:12 | edges |
| discuss | 15:25, 16:14, | duplexes | 25:5 |
| $93: 10, \quad 99: 20$ | 21:22, 21:23, | 47:19, 63:23, | edison |
| discussed | 23:25, 31:9, | 84:21, 86:3 | $22: 19,29: 12$ |
| $25: 14, \quad 25: 23,$ | 45:10, 46:14, | during | educational |
| 91:4, 105:25, | 66:10, 80:7, | $23: 8,33: 6,$ | $71: 1$ |
| 107:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 19, \quad 106: 14 \\ & \text { doomed } \end{aligned}$ | 62:2, 68:3, | effect |
| discussion | doomed | $74: 5,104: 3$ | 24:18, 24:20, |
| 60:15, 65:15, | $91: 11$ | $106: 9$ | 24:22, 24:25, |
| 66:1, 69:25, | doubt | dwelling | $40: 4, \quad 87: 17$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 78: 22, \quad 93: 19, \\ & 105: 16 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 15 \\ & \text { down } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 24, \quad 47: 18, \\ & 61: 2,82: 1 \end{aligned}$ | effective $25: 8$ |
| discussions | 8:19, 15:15, | $\frac{61: 2,82: 1}{\mathbf{E}}$ | effects |
| $18: 2,71: 8,$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 16: 5, & 17: 21, \\ 25: 8, & 26: 14 \end{array}\right.$ | e | 68:20, 68:22, |
| $93: 11$ <br> dissimilar | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 25: 8, & 26: 14, \\ 33: 2, & 34: 23, \end{array}\right.$ | 59:5 | $84: 11, ~ 91: 12$ efficient |
| 50:2, 65:1 | 65:6, 92:14 | each $4: 17,47: 18$ | 100:24 |
| distance | dps | $84: 16, \quad 84: 17,$ | effort |
| 50:1, 56:14, | $72: 15,72: 18,$ | $91: 3$ | 65:19, 66:2, |
| 64:14 | $\begin{array}{ll} 75: 17, & 88: 10, \\ 95: 21, & 96: 22, \end{array}$ | earlier | 68:2, 80:2 |
| distracting | 95:21, 96:22, 101:8 | $78: 22$ | eight |
| 58:24 district | $\begin{aligned} & 101: 8 \\ & \text { dr } \end{aligned}$ | early | 45:3, 90:6 |
| district | $23: 16$ | 2:8, 5:18, | eighth |
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| ```either 21:14, 40:2, 42:21, 105:20 elaborated 97:11 elder 31:2 elderly 9:13, 16:23, 16:25, 17:4, 17:8, 17:11, 30:11 electronically 108:4 element 46:24 elevation 61:16 eleven 56:25 eliminate 20:13, 20:16, 62:15, 67:5, 94:22 eliminated 42:8, 66:24 eliminating 19:24, 24:25, 53:13, 54:8 elimination 27:11, 66:11, 67:3 else 21:13, 25:19, 27:6, 28:11, 28:12, 32:3, 32:18, 39:10, 44:13, 44:18, 79:3, 79:14, 85:8, 100:19, 106:23 elsewhere 53:18, 71:9, 87:20 email 22:16, 22:19, 29:11, 107:6 emphasize 63:9, 68:18,``` | ```79:8, 84:7 employed 108:6, 109:7 employees 74:6 empty 42:19 emptying 98:1 emulate 84:14 encourage 70:20 encumbrance 39:8 end 8:14, 42:14, 53:22, 54:8, 91:8 enforce 72:19, 88:16 enforceable 96:22 enforcement 72:3, 72:16, 88:11, 88:20, 89:2, 89:8 enforcing 95:21 engaging 80:20, 93:6 engineer 16:9 engineers 15:24, 16:14, 98:20 enjoyment 79:10 enormous 17:14, 18:22 enough 38:23, 43:23, 91:12 ensure 16:19, 61:11, 78:9, 95:25, 96:4 enter 35:3, 39:2,``` | ```39:5 entered 58:3, 58:5 enthusiasm 81:9 enthusiasts 83:12 entire 24:1, 24:13, 25:3, 40:23, 52:19, 55:9, 64:1, 67:11, 79:11, 86:20, 94:20 entity 41:3, 89:17 entrance 26:1 environment 74:11, 74:12, 74:14 environmental 23:15, 25:6, 25:14, 43:3, 75:1, 75:13, 75:15, 75:17, 76:1, 76:8, 77:1, 77:6, 77:13, 78:12 environmentally 42:22, 62:16, 77:22 ephemeral 24:17 equal 60:20 equation 62:20 erodible 77:10, 77:14 erroneously 62:23 escaping 36:15 esquire 2:7, 2:16 essence 25:12``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 56:11, 87:9 | 15:11, 35:12, | 75:12, 75:14, | 82:20, 83:22, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| evidence | 47:14, 48:7, | 76:1, 76:2, | 84:8, 87:21, |
| 81:8, 81:12, | 48:9, 48:12, | 77:9, 80:24, | 89:8 |
| 88:5 | 52:16, 55:4, | 84:5 | facility |
| ex | 56:12, 58:4, | experts | 9:13, 22:24, |
| 4:10 | 66:4, 67:10, | 75:6 | 37:4, 40:19, |
| exact | 81:17, 82:12, | explain | 40:25, 41:8, |
| 27:12 | 90:8, 90:9, 97:4 | 90:23 | 41:14, 42:17, |
| exactly | exhibits | explains | 42:19, 51:5, |
| 30:3, 43:18, | 35:12, 52:12, | 72:13 | 59:6, 59:14, |
| 45:5, 46:13, | 58:2, 59:2, | explanation | 60:20, 61:2, |
| 92:22 | 67:23 | 82:4 | 64:23, 68:15, |
| examiner's | exist | explicitly | 68:16, 80:3, |
| 78:23, 79:6 | 30:20, 33:5, | 10:2, 82:13 | 82:15, 83:8, |
| example | 60:13, 71:6, | exploded | 83:16, 84:2, |
| 56:14, 60:24, | 95:19 | 70:10 | 87:22, 87:25, |
| 83:2, 88:13, | existing | explosion | 88:25, 94:2, |
| 89:11, 95:17 | 8:13, 14:25, | 70:4 | 94:15 |
| examples | 15:7, 25:1, | express | facing |
| 84:6, 92:20 | $25: 9,26: 7,$ | $57: 6, \quad 57: 23$ | $86: 1, \quad 86: 16$ |
| excellent | $64: 18, \quad 76: 25$ | expressed | fact |
| 53:8, 59:7, | exists | 43:8, 73:15, | $9: 25,28: 4,$ |
| 107:18 | 53:17 | 74:2, 74:11 | 41:1, 42:17, |
| excellently | exit | expressing | 59:18, 60:4, |
| $107: 18$ | $26: 1$ | $85: 10$ | $60: 12,61: 3,$ |
| except | expand | expressions | 61:6, 61:23, |
| 42:17, 55:20 | $89: 14$ | $43: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 63: 12, \quad 64: 2, \\ & 69: 1.70: 5 . \end{aligned}$ |
| exception | expect $102: 8$ | extend | $\begin{array}{ll} 69: 1, & 70: 5, \\ 71: 2, & 72: 1, \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 32: 23,32: 24, \\ & 33: 4,42: 7,58: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 102:8 <br> expected | $\begin{aligned} & 67: 14, \quad 98: 11 \\ & \text { extended } \end{aligned}$ | $73: 20, \quad 76: 16,$ |
| exclude | 77:19 | $89: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77: 20, \quad 93: 2, \\ & 94: 7, \quad 105: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 77:23 | expending | extends | 94:7, 105:20 <br> factor |
| exclusive $40: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 59: 13 \\ & \text { expense } \end{aligned}$ | $25: 5$ extensive | $\begin{aligned} & \text { factor } \\ & 56: 6,63: 19, \end{aligned}$ |
| excuse | $91: 14$ | extensive $78: 9$ | 103:22 |
| 93:21 | expensive | extensively | factors |
| excused | 30:15, 90:19 | $43: 6,46: 5$ | 10:11, 63:10 |
| 21:6, 31:24 | experience | $62: 12$ | fades |
| exemption | 46:21, 56:18, | extent | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 19 \\ & \text { failed } \end{aligned}$ |
| 30:5 | 81:18 | $71: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { failed } \\ & 10: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| exercise | experienced $56: 8$ | extreme | failure |
| $79: 4$ exhibit | 56:8 | 10:6 | $91: 11$ |
| exhibit | expert | extremely | fair |
| 7:13, 7:25, | $\begin{array}{ll} 26: 6, & 26: 18, \\ 55: 8, & 55: 14, \end{array}$ | $8: 13,8: 17,$ | $54: 22,70: 25$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 8: 1, \quad 8: 11, \quad 9: 7, \\ & 9: 12, \quad 9: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $58: 14,68: 8,$ | $\frac{30: 15}{\mathbf{F}}$ | $80: 8$ |
| $13: 5,13: 6,$ | $68: 10, \quad 69: 4,$ | facilities | fairly |
| 13:16, 15:4, | 69:17, 69:21, | $\text { 39:1, } 70: 4,$ | 82:9 |
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| fall | 24:5, 24:19, | 58:10, 96:20, | 16:14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 90:19, 92:3 | 26:3, 26:12, | 97:6, 102:5, | foot |
| falls | 34:12, 45:14, | 105:22 | 10:7, 14:11 |
| 8:23 | 46:18, 47:20, | fine-tuned | foot-candles |
| false | 49:20, 50:10, | 45:4 | 67:9, 67:12, |
| 17:1, 93:22 | 51:16, 52:1, | finished | 67:16 |
| family | 53:16, 53:23, | 13:9, 13:15 | footage |
| 15:3, 38:13, | 64:15, 64:17, | fire | 16:2, 16:16, |
| 50:21, 54:1, | 67:13, 86:17, | 33:21, 33:22, | 63:2 |
| 65:15 | 96:15 | 34:7, 34:8 | football |
| fantastic | felt | firm | 56:15, 64:15 |
| 43:13 | 10:14 | 2:17 | for-sale |
| far | few | first | 72:7 |
| 24:9, 25:8, | 8:10, 39:25, | 11:2, 22:2, | forces |
| 54:24, 59:16, | $82: 23$ | 22:4, 29:2, | 47:11, 74:13 |
| 63:2, 84:4, 87:6 | fewer | 34:20, 37:1, | foregoing |
| fast | 25:4, 27:4, | 42:24, 45:18, | 108:3, 109:3 |
| 98:5 | 51:14 | 59:21, 60:14, | foresee |
| faster | field | 64:3, 66:6, | 72:18 |
| 100:20 | 56:15, 64:15 | 70:8, 73:6, | forest |
| favor | figure | $73: 13,75: 6$, | 23:21, 23:22, |
| 83:13 | 38:24 | 76:6, 76:24, | 23:23, 23:24, |
| feasibility | figured | 80:19, 82:3, | 24:11, 24:15, |
| 56:4, 91:15 | 32:15 | 88:25, 93:7, | 24:21, 25:1, |
| feature | fill | 95:8, 100:15, | 25:12, 42:18, |
| 84:1, 84:12, | 18:21 | 102:14 | 74:16, 74:19, |
| 88:17 | final | fit | 75:22, 76:9, |
| features | 91:23, 97:24 | 86:7 | 76:12, 76:17, |
| 91:9 | finalized | five | 76:25 |
| february | 103:4 | 13:23, 15:18, | forester |
| 68:4 | finally | 74:6 | 76:1 |
| federal | 70:16, 77:20, | fix | forget |
| 96:3 | 95:16 | 10:24, 17:18, | 52:22 |
| fee | financial | 18:2 | forgot |
| 71:24, 72:12, | 41:6, 108:7, | flicking | 5:14, 25:24 |
| 72:23, 81:13, | 109:8 | 7:21 | forgotten |
| 84:2 | find | flood | 86:25, 89:4 |
| feel | 11:13, 12:20, | 75:19 | form |
| 33:3, 33:4, | 17:15, 45:22, | floor | 76:14 |
| 39:9, 56:7, | 45:24, 46:2, | 24:15 | forth |
| 93:4, 95:17, | 47:8, 47:14, | flow | 18:20, 90:7, |
| 105:10 | 47:15, 65:19, | 84:11 | 95:24 |
| feeling | 85:9, 86:2 | focus | forward |
| 18:24, 19:5 | finding | 63:10, 64:24 | 91:19 |
| feels | 64:10 | follow | found |
| 56:17, 68:24, | findings | $11: 18$ | 51:6, 80:16, |
| 95:1 | $77: 5$ | following | 82:23, 84:6, |
| feet | fine | 8:8, 15:25, | 85:7, 106:5 |
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| ```foundation 76:15 four 45:1, 56:9, 60:6, 66:23, 68:12, 85:20, 85:21, 85:22, 85:25, 87:21, 88:4 four-story 87:15 fox 92:14 fraction 62:21 framework 81:11, 85:11 frankly 20:20, 98:8 free 39:9, 40:11 friday 90:9, 97:11 friends 51:17 front 31:10, 40:25, 42:21, 95:9 frozen 11:13, 12:24 fudge 103:22 full 15:15 fully 73:4 functions 96:1 fund 72:9 fungi 23:20 further 19:24, 25:1, 26:4, 53:13, 66:19, 74:20, 76:8, 76:10, 83:16, 83:17,``` | $\begin{aligned} & 83: 18, \quad 97: 10, \\ & 98: 14 \end{aligned}$ <br> furtherance 91:1 <br> future $\begin{aligned} & 40: 3, \quad 69: 6, \\ & 69: 11, \quad 69: 14, \\ & 69: 20, \quad 97: 24 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ <br> gained <br> 86:16 <br> garbled <br> 4:15 <br> gardens <br> 1:7, 8:11, <br> 23:4, 30:5 <br> garrett <br> 71:23 <br> gateway <br> 71:23 <br> gave <br> 30:6 <br> gelled <br> 54:24 <br> general <br> 21:20, 24:12 <br> generally <br> 74:6 <br> generate <br> 73:20 <br> generating <br> 74:4 <br> generation $38: 5, \quad 38: 8$ <br> geometry <br> 50:15 <br> getting $26: 9,47: 3$ $56: 22$ <br> give $\begin{aligned} & 9: 25, \quad 15: 19, \\ & 25: 21, \quad 56: 16, \\ & 57: 11, \quad 78: 17, \\ & 99: 11, \quad 99: 14, \\ & 100: 17, \quad 100: 19, \\ & 103: 13, \quad 103: 22, \\ & 104: 2 \end{aligned}$ | given $\begin{aligned} & 29: 22, \\ & 66: 17, \\ & 66: 22, \\ & 69: 25, \\ & 84: 5, \\ & 87: 8, \\ & \text { gives } \\ & \text { liv:19 } \\ & \text { l5:15, } \\ & \text { giving } \\ & 45: 18 \\ & \text { glad } \\ & 74: 9 \\ & \text { glen } \\ & 2: 13, \\ & 22: 21, \\ & 26: 14, \\ & 26: 9, \\ & 26: 23, \\ & 86: 20, \\ & 86: 15, \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ <br> go 7:9, 7:11, 8:5, $8: 19,9: 1,9: 17,$ $12: 12,15: 10,$ 27:24, 27:25, $28: 8,34: 25$ $35: 18,42: 8$ $48: 16,48: 22,$ $50: 1,54: 9$ $58: 24,62: 12,$ 67:4, 79:15, $83: 24,89: 23 \text {, }$ $91: 18,92: 14,$ $94: 1,98: 2 \text {, }$ $98: 17,101: 3,$ 101:7 <br> goal $\begin{aligned} & 78: 5, \quad 79: 8 \\ & \text { goals } \\ & 70: 12 \\ & \text { goes } \\ & 24: 4, \quad 29: 23, \\ & 33: 12 \\ & \text { going } \\ & 4: 25, \quad 5: 2,5: 3, \\ & 5: 14, \quad 5: 25,7: 3, \\ & 7: 22, \quad 19: 4, \\ & 20: 3,20: 7, \\ & 20: 23, \quad 23: 5, \\ & 23: 21,24: 20, \\ & 27: 6,33: 3, \end{aligned}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 35:14, 35:18, | 56:15, 64:14, | heard | hewitt |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35:22, 38:17, | 70:5, 70:14, | 33:8, 33:11, | 51:20 |
| 40:7, 40:15, | 74:22, 85:24, | 43:25, 44:13, | hey |
| 41:20, 42:5, | 90:3 | 59:13, 60:8, | 93:17 |
| 42:16, 44:15 | hand | 64:12, 69:7, | hide |
| graves | 4:19, 22:10, | 69:23, 74:14, | 17:15, 17:23 |
| 51:20 | 27:21, 29:5, | 74:20, 97:19 | high |
| greater | 32:11, 34:23, | hearings | 18:17, 43:14, |
| 2:13, 5:21, | 108:8 | 1:1, 2:3 | 59:13, 89:19 |
| 54:12, 87:16, | handle | height | high-end |
| 91:20 | 33:21 | 20:18, 63:19, | 68:17 |
| green | hands | 63:21, 64:19, | higher |
| 15:19 | 21:15, 32:4 | 65:6, 65:7, | 62:11, 73:23 |
| gross | hang | 65:11, 96:13, | highly |
| 16:2, 16:16 | $31: 24$ | 96:14 | 44:5, 68:16, |
| grosvenor | happen | held | 77:10, 77:14, |
| 51:20 | 54:6, 95:20, | $69: 16, \quad 80: 6$ | 86:19 |
| ground | 95:21 | help | hill |
| 23:18, 23:21, | happened | 11:7, 11:13, | 92:14 |
| 80:8, 85:6 | 42:2 | 48:15, 86:22, | hire |
| group | happens | 86:23, 86:24, | 56:4 |
| 83:7, 107:2, | 15:17, 87:1 | 106:17 | hired |
| 107:3, 107:5 | happy | helpful | 68:3 |
| grove | 93:13, 93:18 | 55:2, 56:12, | history |
| $68: 14$ | hard | $78: 18,79: 4$ | 59:10 |
| grovesnor | 10:19, 11:18, | here | hit |
| 13:19, 13:22 grow | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 8, \quad 65: 23, \\ & 81: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 9, \quad 5: 2,6: 7, \\ & 12: 15,13: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $55: 3, \quad 60: 13$ |
| 18:21, 19:3 | hardly | 28:11, 28:20, | 34:18, 66:12, |
| guarantee | 65:24, 82:8 | 28:24, 48:21, | $73: 1,73: 6$, |
| 88:4 | harm | 50:25, 53:24, | 99:25, 100:1, |
| guess | 24:2, 69:3 | 55:20, 56:21, | 100:2 |
| 9:4, 36:8, | head | 63:20, 78:4, | hold |
| 45:10, 45:13, | 32:18 | 80:22, 82:17, | $13: 13,38: 2 \text {, }$ |
| $47: 24, \quad 50: 21,$ | heads | 85:7, 88:2, | $102: 3$ |
| $52: 14, \quad 53: 11,$ | $80: 12$ | 99:8, 99:14, | holders |
| 53:14, 54:23, | health | 107:2 <br> hereby | $72: 1,72: 2$ |
| 55:13, 57:22, | 81:24 | hereby $108: 2,109: 2$ | home |
| $101: 3$ | heal thy | 108:2, 109:2 hereunto | $8: 17,8: 19$ |
| guest | $18: 23$ | hereunto $108: 8$ | $8: 24, \quad 10: 9,$ |
| 29:22 <br> guidelines | hear | 108:8 heritage | 22:22, 22:23, |
| $77: 7$ | $11: 6,12: 21$, $15: 23, ~ 16: 5$, | $1: 7,8: 11$, | $24: 13, ~ 32: 25$, $39: 8,41: 13$, |
| guiding | 17:21, 20:5, | 14:1, 14:12, | 46:10, 51:6, |
| 75:11 | 32:4, 34:24, | 14:24, 23:3, | 54:1, 64:14, |
| gym | $36: 5,74: 10,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 30: 5, & 69: 22, \\ 71 \cdot 14 \end{array}$ | $64: 25,65: 18,$ |
| 46:6 | 79:13, 79:14, | 71:14 | $81: 2, \quad 81: 3,$ |
| H | 79:15, 98:7 | hesitated | 81:4, 84:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { half } \\ & 30: 20,44: 4, \end{aligned}$ |  | 32:25 |  |
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| ```38:6, 38:8, 38:13, 44:9, 44:11, 56:5, 61:18, 63:11, 64:5, 65:9, 70:6, 71:14, 72:5, 72:8, 72:11, 73:23, 80:14, 81:6, 82:1, 92:12, 92:13, 92:15, 94:4, 94:15, 94:24, 95:7, 95:10, 96:16 indicate 71:7 indicated 53:17, 59:19, 65:16 indicates 70:9 individual 41:12, 83:19, 93:9, 93:16 individually 72:6 individuals 89:14, 94:9 infiltration 24:8 influencing 10:11 information 23:18, 58:13, 109:6 inherent 67:18, 84:3 initial 46:6, 97:7 initiative 72:9 innovative 78:7 inside 86:13 insights 78:23 inspecting 95:22``` | ```instance 49:25 instances 64:23, 67:12, 67:14 instead 65:4, 66:12, 87:18, 89:2 institution 71:1 intact 25:9 integrated 86:20 intended 89:1 intense 59:16 intensive 62:24 intensively 91:25 intention 39:1, 39:7, 89:25 intentionally 89:6 interconnected 86:20 interest 22:25, 37:18, 43:9, 88:17, 90:18, 108:7, 109:8 internet 11:3 interpretation 75:3, 77:6 interrupt 4:17, 10:16, 58:17 interrupting 18:15 intersection 26:5, 26:7, 26:12, 26:23, 27:2, 27:5 intersections 73:25``` | ```introduced 5:13 introduction 87:25 invariably 90:3 invasive 24:16 invasives 76:19 invest 88:3 invitation 26:8 ipad 22:5 irrelevant 92:2 irrespective 71:6 irreversibly 85:3 isolation 47:20 issuance 73:5, 73:13 issue 10:22, 10:23, 18:7, 60:14, 60:16, 62:15, 67:17, 68:6, 69:25, 70:8, 71:6, 71:11, 71:12, 73:15, 74:8, 74:10, 82:7, 87:13, 93:5, 97:11, 100:3, 103:2, 103:3, 105:25 issues 8:10, 12:15, 25:14, 26:21, 60:12, 60:13, 75:15, 95:18, 95:20 italy 22:5 ite 37:5``` | item <br> $34: 18, \quad 35: 2$ <br> items <br> $59: 1, \quad 61: 15$ <br> iteration <br> $45: 18$ <br> iterations <br> $45: 17$ <br> itself <br> $41: 23, \quad 62: 1$, <br> $62: 17, \quad 70: 8$, <br> $71: 1, \quad 75: 5$, <br> $75: 11$ <br>  <br> jefferson <br> $2: 18$ <br> job <br> $1: 23, \quad 7: 24$, <br> $15: 25, \quad 16: 14$, <br> $43: 13, \quad 44: 6$ <br> joe <br> $2: 23, \quad 10: 21$, <br> $108: 2, \quad 108: 13$ <br> join <br> $81: 1$ <br> joining <br> $9: 5$ <br> judge <br> $26: 13$ <br> july <br> $102: 14, \quad 102: 16$, <br> $103: 14, \quad 103: 16$, <br> $103: 25, \quad 104: 16$, <br> $105: 2$, <br> $107: 3$, <br> june <br> $107: 20$ <br> $1: 13, \quad 100: 12$, <br> $100: 15, \quad 103: 12$, <br> $104: 17, \quad 104: 22$, <br> $108: 9$ <br> justification <br> $24: 14, \quad 30: 4$, <br> $40: 24, \quad 42: 24$, <br> $49: 7$ <br> justifications <br> $30: 10$ <br> juxtaposition <br> $45: 22$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| K | know | lady | 90:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| kabatt | 4:8, 4:20, | 36:14 | laws |
| 37:20, 37:23, | 6:20, 10:17, | laid | 75:1, 75:9, |
| 38:2, 38:10, | 15:22, 21:7, | 15:25, 16:15 | 96:3 |
| 73:21, 74:4 | 22:6, 25:20, | land | lax |
| kagan | 27:3, 32:23, | 1:7, 25:7, | 88:20 |
| 9:20, 9:23, | 33:22, 34:16, | 49:10, 50:14, | lay |
| $10: 10,13: 19,$ | 37:17, 39:25, | 53:16, 55:8, | 69:16, 76:3, |
| 68:7, 68:11 | 40:13, 43:3, | 57:2, 62:9, | 77:6 |
| kagan's | 43:6, 43:12, | 62:11, 64:15, | layout |
| 8:18, 87:20 | 43:14, 43:24, | 68:8, 69:5, | 55:10, 63:18, |
| kathleen | $\begin{array}{ll}44: 3, & 44: 4, \\ 44: 5, & 44: 23,\end{array}$ | 70:7, 73:8, 82:5 | 65:13, 65:14 |
| $1: 25,109: 2 \text {, }$ | 44:5, 44:23, | landscape | leasing |
| $109: 14$ | 44:25, 45:4, | 46:25, 65:20, | 90:25 |
| keep | $45: 8,45: 9$, $45: 12, ~ 45: 16$, | 98:23, 102:9, | least |
| 7:21, 18:15, | $\begin{aligned} & 45: 12, \quad 45: 16, \\ & 46: 5, \quad 46: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 103:5, 104:21, | 41:24, 81:20, |
| 18:22, 18:23, | $46: 7,46: 9$ | 106:1, 107:10 | 84:25, 90:1, |
| 46:24, 48:23, | $46: 17,46: 19$ | landscaping <br> 18:9, 18:10 | $\begin{aligned} & 100: 17 \\ & \text { leave } \end{aligned}$ |
| 50:21, 88:9 | $46: 24, \quad 47: 12$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 9, \quad 18: 10, \\ & 23: 12, \quad 46: 22, \end{aligned}$ | leave $4: 9,12: 2,$ |
| keeping $32: 24$ | 47:17, 47:21, | $51: 11,53: 11$, | 81:2, 85:2, |
| keeps | 48:2, 49:18, | 65:8, 97:18, | 97:20, 100:21, |
| 7:2, 7:22, | 51:8, 52:8, | 98:1, 99:23, | 102:12, 102:13, |
| 12:19, 20:15, | $52: 25,53: 1$, $53.4,54: 3$, | 100:11 | 102:15, 103:20, |
| 23:22, 49:21 | $53: 4,54: 3$, $54.16,55: 13$, | laptop | 103:24 |
| ken | 54:16, 55:13, | 6:11, 11:3, | leaves |
| 104:17 | 55:16, 55:17, | 32:14 | 90:14 |
| kept | $56: 3,56: 4$, $56: 10,56: 18$, | large | leaving |
| 26:25 | 57:23, 60:9, | 56:10, 56:24, | 74:7, 107:20 |
| kevin | 60:22, 65:3, | larger | lee |
| 68:7 | 67:18, 67:23, | $15: 2,45: 6,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 62: 23, & 70: 3, \\ 75: 24, & 76: 2, \end{array}$ |
| key | $70: 6, \quad 71: 18,$ | $54: 10,57: 1,$ | $77: 4$ |
| 46:22, 82:12, | 94:5, 94:8, | 60:3, 82:14' | lee's |
| 88:17 | 95:6, 97:23, | largest | $81: 16$ |
| kicking | 98:7, 98:9, | 13:23 | left |
| 94:9 | 98:12, 98:13, | last | $8: 21$ |
| kind | 99:24, 101:22, | 4:4, 33:10, | lefthand |
| $32: 17, ~ 46: 23$, $49: 21,52: 13$, | 102:18, 102:19, | 35:19, 74:10, | 8:20, 26:20 |
| $49: 21, ~ 52: 13$, $52: 25,54.23$, | 104:4, 104:7, | 90:8, 97:11 | legal |
| $\begin{aligned} & 52: 25, ~ 54: 23, \\ & 54: 24, \\ & \hline 8: 25, \end{aligned}$ | 105:17, 105:20 knowing | lastly | 71:13, 72:12, |
| $90: 2$ | $94: 12$ | 90:5 | 72:13, 72:17, |
| kinds | L | late | 2:24, 82:11, |
| 15:23, 89:7 | labeled | later | 96:23, 97:2, |
| $71: 8.84$ | 29:22 | 30:20, 73:10, | 97:5 |
| knopf | lacking | 81: 4 | lerch |
| 2:17, 5:20 | 17:16 | law | 2:8, 5:18, |
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| 35:12, 81:18 | 85:23, 89:4 | live-ins | 23:25, 24:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| less | likes | 37:9 | 24:23, 35:5, |
| 14:7, 25:2, | 60:3 | lived | 36:4, 38:20, |
| 25:8, 30:19, | limit | 22:22, 38:23 | 41:12, 51:15, |
| 51:20, 53:5, | 23:11 | living | 53:5, 61:16, |
| 54:24, 60:7, | limited | 30:7, 30:10, | 72:21, 81:20, |
| 60:8, 62:21, | 10:14, 89:13, | 30:11, 31:2, | 82:2, 82:6, |
| 63:21, 77:25, | 98:14 | 31:3, 31:11, | 86:15, 86:21, |
| 86:6 | limits | 35:5, 36:25, | 87:3, 87:8, |
| let's | 24:9, 60:25 | 37:1, 37:4, | 87:9, 87:11, |
| 7:8, 7:9, 7:21, | line | 38:9, 44:9, | 87:15, 88:10, |
| 12:14, 13:1, | 8:13, 19:25, | 44:11, 51:5, | 88:15, 88:16, |
| 22:8, 28:10, | 26:9, 32:20, | 51:23, 51:25, | 90:18, 91:2 |
| 28:14, 46:9, | 36:22, 37:1, | 52:1, 56:5, | lodges |
| 57:14, 102:8 | 45:15, 45:24, | 61:19, 62:25, | 20:8, 51:18 |
| letters | 46:1, 49:8, | 63:11, 64:5, | logically |
| 93:16, 107:14 | 50:7, 50:10, | 65:10, 70:4, | 30:16 |
| level | 50:11, 51:2, | 70:7, 71:15, | long |
| 23:23, 37:16, | 53:13, 54:5, | 72:5, 72:8, | 38:23, 98:8, |
| 39:15, 40:1, | 54:13, 54:25, | 72:11, 73:23, | 104:7, 104:13 |
| 41:19, 51:11, | 67:7, 67:9, | 79:21, 79:22, | longer |
| 81:5, 85:6 | 67:11, 67:15, | 80:3, 80:14, | 83:20 |
| levels | 77:18, 95:3, | 80:23, 81:6, | look |
| 43:7, 44:8 | 98:6 | 81:25, 82:1, | 8:11, 31:7, |
| liable | line-of-sight | 82:21, 84:18, | 46:9, 46:21, |
| 41:4 | 26:21 | 87:25, 88:23, | 47:21, 48:1, |
| life | lines | 88:25, 91:10, | 48:3, 48:21, |
| 26:16, 35:4, | 56:11 | 92:12, 92:13, | 49:23, 49:24, |
| 36:14, 38:6, | lingering | 92:15, 94:5, | 50:9, 51:9, |
| 39:3, 39:5, | 78:23 | 94:15, 94:24, | 55:19, 56:17, |
| 43:12, 71:24, | linked | 95:7, 95:10, | 60:25, 85:23, |
| 79:19, 81:1 | 79:21 | 96:16 | 89:9 |
| light | lion's | 11c | looked |
| 59:15 | 89:17 | 1:7, 89:16 | 46:8, 49:10, |
| lighting | list | located | $49: 11$ |
| 53:7, 67:8, | 5:4, 5:5, 79:1, | 20:8, 54:10, | looking |
| 67:10, 67:17, | 107:1 | 76:12 | 20:1, 48:5, |
| 68:3, 68:6, | listening | locating | 48:6, 48:21, |
| 98:23, 100:11 | 11:6, 32:18 | 61:16 | 49:14, 55:9, |
| lights | little | location | 55:23, 56:18, |
| 18:19, 67:25 | 46:2, 52:10, | 45:7, 46:11, | 62:25, 85:5, |
| like-to-like | 58:24, 66:13, | 86:7, 91:15 | 99:6 |
| 65:11 | 86:8, 87:19 | locations | loop |
| likelihood | live | 45:5 | 19:24, 24:25, |
| 47:3 | 10:12, 22:19, | lockhart | 86:11, 86:13 |
| likely | $31: 8,89: 22$, | $9: 18, \quad 13: 7$ | lorete |
| $\begin{array}{ll}37: 16, & 60: 7, \\ 73.19, & 81: 4,\end{array}$ | $90: 1$ | lodge $20: 18, \quad 23: 2,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 23, \quad 57: 18, \\ & 108: 2, \quad 108: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 73:19, 81:4, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { live-in } \\ & 86: 23 \end{aligned}$ | 20:18, 23:2, | $108: 2,108: 13$ |

PLANET DEPOS

Transcript of Hearing - Day 2
Conducted on June 1, 2022

| loss | ma'am | mail | 71:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 86:9 | 57:20 | 29:16 | many |
| lost | mache | main | 26:18, 26:19, |
| 86:15 | 80:3 | 86:11 | 42:2, 45:17, |
| lot | made | maintained | 59:24, 61:19, |
| 15:6, 15:17, | 21:21, 22:7, | 96:5 | 63:21, 63:24, |
| 17:23, 19:3, | 37:8, 45:12, | maintaining | 87:22 |
| 23:21, 35:3, | 54:9, 54:21, | 41:11, 88:7 | maps |
| 35:6, 35:8, | 76:11, 82:12, | maintenance | 85:24 |
| 36:18, 39:6, | 105:15, 105:16 | 18:22, 19:3, | march |
| 50:5, 52:18, | maggin | 41:17, 87:7, | 97:8 |
| 52:19, 52:20, | 3:4, 6:2, 6:6, | 99:22 | marcia |
| 52:24, 53:13, | 6:7, 6:10, 6:22, | major | 9:23 |
| 66:11, 66:16, | $7: 2,7: 5,7: 7$, | 9:2, 10:11, | mark |
| 66:18, 66:24, | $7: 10,7: 12$, | 26:22, 51:17 | 85:9 |
| 67:3, 67:5, | $7: 18,7: 20$, | majority | market |
| 67:6, 74:21, | $7: 21,8: 1,8: 4$ | 43:16, 65:22 | 10:5 |
| 84:24, 85:16, | $8: 9,9: 10,9: 17$ | make | maryland |
| 85:18, 85:20, | 10:18, 10:24, | 17:10, 20:17, | 1:2, 29:13, |
| 85:21, 85:22, | 11:1, 11:9, | 20:19, 22:12, | 69:8, 69:15, |
| 86:1, 86:9, | 11:11, 11:15, | 26:19, 29:7, | 89:25, 90:2, |
| 91:13, 97:14, | 11:21, 11:24, | 31:7, 33:14, | 108:14 |
| 98:1, 98:4, | 12:4, 12:7, | 52:9, 54:9, | masonry |
| 98:21, 103:5, | 12:19, 13:1, | 55:25, 58:1, | 18:13, 18:17 |
| 103:6, 107:17 | 13:3, 13:8, | 64:2, 65:23, | mass |
| lots | 13:12, 13:15, | 66:13, 68:5, | 46:12, 51:20 |
| 10:12, 13:23, | 13:18, 13:22, | $71: 13,72: 8,$ | massing |
| 15:18, 47:5, | 14:4, 14:16, | $74: 24, \quad 77: 13,$ | $47: 21,48: 6,$ |
| 49:19, 49:24, | 14:20, 14:23, | $79: 1,81: 16,$ | $50: 5,51: 1$ |
| 52:22, 52:24, | 15:7, 15:11, | $93: 1,100: 21$ | $51: 10,51: 16,$ |
| 61:13, 85:13, | 15:14, 16:7, | makes | $64: 19,65: 3,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 85: 23, \quad 85: 25, \\ & 90: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $16: 11,16: 13$ | $4: 17, \quad 24: 1$ | 65:11 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 90: 23 \\ & \text { low } \end{aligned}$ | 17:6, 17:10, | $82: 15$ | master |
| 61:17, 63:3 |  | making | 30:8, 34:18, |
| low-density | 19:5, 19:9, | 79:1 | 70:12, 75:11 <br> match |
| 63:1 | 19:14, 19:22, | 8:7 | 80:16 |
| lower | 20:2, 20:6, | management | matching |
| 8:20, 8:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 12, ~ 20: 16, \\ & 21: 2, \quad 21: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $75: 22, \quad 83: 25,$ | $80: 18$ |
| 45:25, 62:7, | $\begin{array}{ll} 21: 2, & 21: 3, \\ 21: 6, & 23: 1, \end{array}$ | $100: 12, \quad 101: 12,$ | materialized |
| 70:13 lowest | $47: 22, \quad 59: 22,$ | 101:13, 101:23 | 70:15 |
| lowest $61: 16$ | $69: 7,69: 13$ | manager | matter |
| 61:16 luxury | $93: 5$ | 8:22 | 61:9, 70:16 |
| luxury | maggin's | mandated | matters |
| 42:14 lynn | $52: 12, \quad 52: 17$ | 87:6 | 75:13, 76:2 |
| lynn $1: 12, ~ 2: 4$ | $54: 23,56: 14,$ | manner $78: 8$ | mature <br> 24:6, 24:14, |
| M | 86 | mansions | $42: 18$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{m}-a-i-1 \\ & 29: 16 \end{aligned}$ |  | 56:24, 56:25, |  |
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| maximum | 43:5, 44:2, | mentioned | minimized |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 48:5, 62:8, | 46:5, 46:8, | 18:11, 27:9, | 56:7 |
| 74:1, 74:21, | 46:17, 46:22, | 63:12, 78:16, | minimum |
| 85:17, 97:21 | 49:2, 49:15, | 96:8 | 39:10, 41:23, |
| maxing | 50:2, 50:24, | mentioning | 62:10, 81:14, |
| 96:14 | 54:1, 55:7, | 62:14 | 95:8, 97:20 |
| maybe | 55:19, 55:22, | mercifully | minor |
| 5:6, 10:23, | 56:2, 56:3, | 91:16 | 100:22 |
| 16:5, 36:21, | 56:13, 56:23, | mere | minute |
| 45:3, 47:20, | 62:18, 92:17, | 61:3, 61:24 | 13:18, 16:4, |
| 49:20, 53:10, | 99:7, 104:16 | merit | 58:9, 101:14 |
| 54:15, 56:16, | meaning | 89:8, 91:15, | minutes |
| 81:3, 83:6, | 73:22 | 92:3 | 8:10, 57:12 |
| 92:21, 97:19, | means | message | mistake |
| 102:3 | 27:3, 85:17, | 4:7 | 82:12 |
| mayor | 89:25 | method | mixed |
| $69: 9$ | measure | 106:10 | 71:16 |
| mc | 63:8 | meticulously | modification |
| 21:17, 21:19, | measured | 45:4 | 51:17, 100:22 |
| 21:25, 22:4, | 50:2 | mews | moment |
| 22:14, 22:18, | measurement | 81:19 | 33:24, 37:21, |
| 22:22, 23:6, | 67:15 | microphone | $48: 12,63: 13,$ |
| 23:11, 23:15, | measures | $8: 7,18: 7,$ | $66: 4, \quad 102: 4$ |
| 25:17, 25:20, | 62:6, 78:9 | $21: 4, \quad 27: 24$ | monitor |
| 27:8, 27:16, | meds | might | $21: 8$ |
| 34:15, 34:21, | 94:13 | 37:15, 69:11, | monitoring |
| 35:2, 35:11, | meet | 85:1, 88:12, | 37:22 |
| 35:14, 35:18, | 31:6, 83:9, | 105:12 | montgomery |
| 35:22, 38:17, | 87:1 | mike | 1:2, 2:14, |
| 40:7, 40:15, | meeting | 10:24, 44:24 | 5:22, 30:7, |
| 41:20, 42:5, | 4:9, 12:3, | mile | 91:21, 92:21 |
| $42: 16,44: 15$ | 12:20, 94:16 | 67:21, 92:14 | montgomey |
| mcgann | meetings | million | $2: 2$ |
| $88: 14$ | $46: 6, \quad 93: 9$ | 38:22, 52:1, | moot |
| mcgrath | meets | 89:21 | 6:22 |
| 3:5, 21:16, | 39:10 | million-plus | more |
| $\begin{array}{rrr}22: 2, ~ 22: 18, ~ \\ 34.14, & 34.25\end{array}$ | members | 68:17 | 4:17, 7:16, |
| $34: 14$, <br> $38: 16,25$, <br> $80: 5$, | 59:18 | mimic | 21:7, 23:21, |
| $38: 16, ~ 40: 5$, $44: 13$ | memo | 46:12 | 24:2, 30:25, |
| 44:13 md | 72:13, 95:24, | mind | 34:12, 38:22, |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \mathrm{md} \\ 2.10 & 2.19 \end{array}$ | 97:7 | 46:24, 49:21, | 50:23, 51:10, |
| $\begin{array}{ll}2: 10, & 2: 19 \\ \text { meal } & \end{array}$ | memorandum | 54:21, 79:3, | 51:19, 54:5, |
| meal | 75:5 | 90:24, 105:16 | 56:12, 56:13, |
| 87:5 | memory | mine | 56:17, 59:16, |
| mean 15.6 | 51:23, 79:22, | $15: 17$ | $60: 1, \quad 60: 4,$ |
| 6:17, 15:6, | $80: 14, \quad 81: 7$ | minimal | $62: 24, \quad 65: 14,$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 15: 7, & 31: 12, \\ 37: 8, & 39: 14, \end{array}$ | mention | 74:4, 77:16 | $67: 6, \quad 67: 13,$ |
| 37:8, 39:14, | 33:12 | minimize | 69:24, 80:15, |
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| 83:2, 83:18, | 73:10, 79:5, | natural | negotiated |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 84:8, 84:17, | 84:17, 84:19, | 89:13 | 45:5 |
| 86:1, 86:7, | 85:8, 85:22, | nature | neighbor |
| 86:8, 86:11, | 85:25, 86:1, | 86:20 | 68:3, 78:5, |
| 86:12, 86:17, | 86:15, 91:4, | naive | 79:8 |
| 87:5, 88:19, | 92:18, 104:6, | 55:16 | neighborhood |
| 89:7, 90:3, | 106:4, 106:18 | near | 2:13, 5:21, |
| 91:13, 91:25, | multi-family | 10:12, 40:3 | 16:20, 44:7, |
| 93:18, 94:11, | 10:13, 14:13, | necessarily | 46:13, 53:18, |
| 95:2, 95:25, | 15:3, 18:19, | 35:25, 47:16, | 59:18, 60:9, |
| 101:15 | 26:6, 51:9, | 63:8, 83:8 | 61:5, 63:15, |
| moreover | 54:1, 54:2, | necessary | 63:17, 64:17, |
| 72:4 | 65:5, 65:17, | 19:7, 106:5 | 78:14, 80:20, |
| morning | 71:17 | need | 84:15, 84:18, |
| 6:11, 11:4, | multi-family-sto- | 12:10, 15:14, | 84:24, 85:3, |
| 11:15, 33:20, | ry | $30: 6, \quad 30: 21,$ | 88:1, 91:21, |
| 59:23, 69:24, | 51:5 | $31: 2,31: 6,$ | $92: 17$ |
| 74:3 | multi-story | $31: 12,31: 13,$ | neighborhood's |
| mortgage | 64:24 | $33: 17,34: 20$, | $79: 7$ |
| $81: 4,90: 17,$ | multiple | 40:1, 40:17, | neighboring |
| $90: 20$ | 43:7, 72:2 | 43:7, 43:8, | 88:6 |
| most | must | 54:18, 57:14, | neighbors |
| 31:10, 60:16, | 34:24, 35:3, | 68:18, 69:21, | 16:20, 16:24, |
| 73:22, 79:25, | 40:8, 41:24, | 69:22, 69:25, | 17:7, 17:11, |
| 94:4, 100:24 | 73:1, 75:7, | 72:8, 78:7, | 17:18, 17:19, |
| mostly | 81:3, 81:25, | 78:14, 81:2, | 18:2, 20:10, |
| 80:5 | 82:2, 82:3, | 81:4, 81:19, | 20:20, 24:5, |
| move | 82:17, 92:3, | 82:20, 83:1, | 24:12, 24:19, |
| 9:7, 9:11, | 105:10, 107:1, | 83:5, 83:7, | 33:19, 53:8, |
| 26:1, 39:25, | 107:5 | 83:14, 83:18, | 60:2, 60:4, |
| 53:21, 54:7, | mute | 84:8, 92:14, | 60:7, 60:8 |
| 66:19, 73:16, | 21:10, 92:8 | $93: 4, \quad 94: 2,$ | neither |
| 81:5, 82:24, | muted | $94: 12, \quad 94: 25$ | $69: 4,69: 12,$ |
| $94: 4, \quad 94: 14$ | $37: 23$ | 97:19, 98:19, | $72: 3, \quad 108: 5,$ |
| moving | mycelial | 99:16, 100:16, | 109:7 |
| 53:12, 103:11 | 24:3 | 102:4, 103:25, | network |
| mpdu | mycelium | 104:6, 104:13 | 24:1, 24:7, |
| 72:7 | 23:19, 24:1, | needed | 25:9 |
| mps | 25:9, 25:10 | 30:24, 84:10, | networking |
| $99: 12$ | myself | $\begin{aligned} & 95: 3, \quad 95: 15 \\ & \text { noedc } \end{aligned}$ | $23: 19$ |
| $4: 17 \cdot 8: 14$ |  | $37: 18,82: 11 \text {, }$ | $23: 20,24: 3$ |
| $9: 22,15: 2,$ | N | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 18, \quad 82: 11, \\ & 87: 3, \quad 87: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 20, \\ & 25: 10 \end{aligned}$ |
| $16: 2,16: 16,$ | name 14:17, 22:16, | $94: 5, \quad 94: 14,$ | never |
| $32: 21,44: 16$ | $22: 18,29: 11,$ | $94: 16, \quad 95: 1$ | $29: 24,80: 8,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 45: 25, \quad 46: 19, \\ & 50: 8, \quad 56: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $29: 24, \quad 36: 14$ | negative $87: 17,93: 23$ | 91:10 new |
| 56:13, 57:1, | 79:24 | neglected | 14:6, 25:9, |
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| 25:11, 27:12, | note | object | odors |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 73:19 | 8:12, 8:21, | 4:20, 17:7, | 64:12 |
| next | 58:1, 62:23, | 17:11, 23:5, | offensive |
| 9:10, 15:4, | 69:1, 90:5, | 60:2 | 64:11 |
| 51:5, 57:9, | 90:10 | objected | offered |
| 76:24, 81:5, | noted | 16:25 | 84:6 |
| 88:2 | 37:8, 72:6 | objection | office |
| nice | notes | 4:20, 4:21, | 1:1, 2:2 |
| 30:6 | 19:12, 63:16 | 6:14, 6:16, | officer |
| night | nothing | 6:18, 28:3, | 2:4, 108:3 |
| 94:12 | 14:2, 22:13, | 102:25 | official |
| nightmare | 29:7, 83:18, | objectionable | 4:13 |
| 26:4, 26:5 | 87:5, 88:1 | 16:23 | officially |
| nih | notice | obligated | 87:6 |
| 29:13, 29:16 | 8:16, 71:21, | 39:13 | offset |
| nine | 93:15 | obligation | 26:6 |
| 86:15, 94:22 | noting | 35:7, 39:4, | offsite |
| noise | 59:21 | 40:20 | 71:9, 77:17, |
| 33:1, 59:14, | notion | obligations | 80:5 |
| 64:11 | 80:25 | 90:17 | often |
| non-adverse | nowhere | obvious | $63: 19, \quad 94: 9$ |
| $68: 21$ | 61:7 | $59: 21, \quad 60: 24$ | oh |
| non-inherent | nri | obviously | 13:11, 17:9, |
| $68: 20$ | 75:18 | 37:9, 78:19, | 19:20, 21:15, |
| non-institutional | number | 78:22, 98:20 | 23:6, 25:23, |
| 64:5 | 11:17, 11:20, | occupancy | 29:17, 32:10, |
| none | 12:1, 12:8, | 40:23, 73:6, | 34:21, 50:18, |
| 28:13, 44:19, | 12:20, 17:7, | 73:13, 74:21, | 58:19, 94:12, |
| 70:6, 84:5 | 20:16, 27:10, | 74:22, 81:20, | 101:20, 102:23 |
| nonetheless | 54:17, 61:21, | 81:24, 89:6 | okay |
| 76:23 | 63:9, 66:17, | occupant | 5:23, 6:5, 6:8, |
| noninherent | 68:5, 95:9, | 89:15 | 6:13, 7:4, 7:15, |
| 84:1, 84:12, | $95: 19$ | occupants | $7: 17, \quad 7: 24, \quad 8: 4$ |
| 91:12 | numbers | $35: 6$ | $8: 5,9: 8,9: 16$ |
| normal | $37: 5$ | occupations | 11:21, 11:22, |
| 47:18, 88:23, | numerous | 90:12 | 12:17, 13:2, |
| 88:24 | 16:24 | occupied | 13:8, 13:13, |
| normalized | nursing | 35:24, 38:25, | 13:17, 13:21, |
| 88:19 | 22:24, 36:3, | 41:22, 41:24, | 14:3, 15:9, |
| north | 39:1, 40:19, | 88:14 | 16:11, 16:13, |
| 20:7, 66:19 | 40:20, 40:25, | occupying | 18:5, 19:11, |
| norton | 41:7, 41:14, | 91:3 | 20:11, 20:22, |
| 26:2, 26:11, | 42:17, 42:19, | occur | 21:1, 21:12, |
| 26:13, 26:20, | 45:18, 81:2 | 41:17 | 21:15, 21:18, |
| 26:23 | nutrients | occurs | 21:25, 22:10, |
| nose | 23:18 | 73:19 | 22:22, 23:6, |
| 100:6 | 0 | odd | $23: 11,23: 15,$ |
| notary | oath | 30:24 | 25:15, 27:7, |
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| out | overwhelmingly | page | passing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7:3, 7:15, | 16:21 | 3:2, 35:19 | 33:21 |
| 8:10, 10:10, | own | pages | passion |
| 10:19, 10:25, | 35:24, 36:18, | 1:24, 71:16, | 75:24 |
| 14:5, 14:7, | 38:21, 52:14, | 90:7 | pat |
| 14:20, 15:1, | 89:22, 92:3 | pales | 99:11 |
| 16:1, 16:15, | owned | 65:16 | patricia |
| 16:16, 17:7, | 41:3, 72:6, | paper | 2:7, 5:18 |
| 17:25, 19:2, | 72:12, 92:16 | 56:18, 80:3 | patty |
| 20:15, 24:15, | owner | parcel | 3:5, 22:18 |
| 26:9, 26:10, | 35:2, 35:24, | 60:4 | pattymcgrath@aol |
| 26:11, 26:17, | 36:1, 38:19, | park | 22:20 |
| 26:22, 38:11, | 39:13, 69:16, | 5:6, 18:20, | pause |
| 38:24, 44:8, | 72:21, 83:15, | 23:12, 23:24, | $12: 6, \quad 12: 18$ |
| 48:22, 49:14, | 88:10, 88:15, | $45: 5,45: 6,$ | pay |
| 49:15, 49:16, | 90:18, 91:2, | $51: 11,65: 20,$ | 89:21 |
| 56:16, 62:19, | 93:21 | 66:13, 67:10, | payments |
| 62:20, 75:8, | owner's | 67:25, 74:15, | 90:20 |
| 80:3, 80:6, | 81:15, 88:17, | 75:17, 76:17, | penalties |
| 80:25, 87:2, | 89:25 | 76:25, 77:18, | 22:11, 29:6 |
| 88:15, 90:10, | owners | 99:10, 99:11, | pending |
| 91:24, 92:20, | 36:18, 60:1, | 99:13, 100:9, | 10:1, 10:15 |
| 93:21, 96:25, | 83:15, 89:21, | 101:6, 101:8, | people |
| 97:3, 97:4, | 90:3, 93:17 | 103:10 | 5:1, 17:7, |
| 98:1, 101:14 | ownership | park's | 26:10, 26:11, |
| outcome | 34:17, 35:3, | 45:20 | 26:14, 26:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 108:7, 109:9 } \\ & \text { outside } \end{aligned}$ | 35:6, 35:7, | part | $31: 8,31: 10$, |
| $23: 10,36: 19,$ | $39: 6$, $52: 18,14$, $52: 19$, | 23:20, 30:3 | $37: 6,38: 22$, |
| 37:6, 38:6, | $52: 18,52: 19$, $52: 22,52: 24$, | parte | 39:25, 41:21, |
| $76: 12,79: 24$, | 56:11, $71: 12$, | partially | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 17, \quad 82: 23, \\ & 94: 4, \quad 106: 14, \end{aligned}$ |
| 83:7, 83:8, | 71:14, 71:17, | $38: 17$ | $107: 1$ |
| 99:13, 107:3 outweighs | 71:24, 81:3, | participate | percent |
| outweighs | 83:25, 84:2, | 39:14 | 10:8, 41:23, |
| 55:14 | 89:12, 89:14, | particular | $45: 11, \quad 52: 19,$ |
| over $9: 25,18: 12$, | 89:16, 90:23, | 14:9, 30:8, | $70: 10, \quad 74: 21,$ |
| 9:25, 18:12, | 92:12, 92:13, | $48: 7$ | $74: 23, \quad 85: 17$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}23: 16, & 30: 9, \\ 31: 11, & 39: 11,\end{array}$ | 103:5, 103:6, | particularly | 85:19, 88:13, |
| $31: 11, ~ 39: 11, ~$ $44: 4,56: 8$, | $107: 11$ | $59: 7$ | 94:23, 95:12, |
| $\begin{array}{ll}44: 4, & 56: 8, \\ 58: 8, & 59: 11,\end{array}$ | ownerships | parties | 95:13 |
| $81: 13, \quad 88: 14$ | 53:3 | 5:11, 5:15, | percentage |
| overall | P | 6:14, 28:3, | 53:2 |
| 45:25, 47:10, | package | 107:13, 107:16, | perfect |
| $91: 8, \quad 100: 2$ | 87:4 <br> packaged | partners | perfectly |
| overgrown $76: 19$ | $80: 16$ | 71:23 | 105:22 |
| overpopulation | packing | pass | perhaps |
| $70: 17$ | 85:6 | 73:25 | 56:18, 81:6, |
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| 89:13, 91:7, | 80:9 | 55:9, 62:11, | plugged |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 99:22 | phrasing | 64:15 | 46:16 |
| perimeter | 42:12 | planner's | plus |
| 9:14 | physically | 70:7 | 42:20, 58:13, |
| period | 22:23 | planning | 89:22, 94:3 |
| 33:6, 74:5, | picked | 55:7, 55:8, | pocket |
| 102:21 | 88:3 | 55:18, 58:15, | 66:13, 103:10 |
| perjury | picture | 63:13, 63:14, | point |
| 22:11, 29:6 | 12:23, 48:1 | 64:3, 75:17, | 6:22, 8:10, |
| permanent | pictures | 76:7, 77:8, | 10:10, 14:4, |
| 40:18 | 5:7, 47:13, | 80:17, 98:3, | 14:15, 19:21, |
| permanently | 47:16 | 98:7, 99:14, | 24:24, 25:20, |
| 90:1 | pipeline | 100:17, 101:1, | 34:16, 35:19, |
| permission | 33:12 | 102:10, 102:14, | 37:8, 44:8, |
| 107:3 | pitch | 102:16, 102:20, | 48:19, 54:15, |
| permit | 88:2 | 103:13, 103:15, | 58:4, 62:4, |
| 73:6, 73:14 | place | $103: 24$ | $62: 5,64: 1,75: 8$ |
| permitted | 25:10, 31:11, | planning's | pointed |
| 25:21, 61:18 | 42:25, 98:13 | 97:18, 100:20 | 14:5, 14:9, |
| person | placement | plans | 17:7, 80:25, |
| 27:13, 33:10, | 57:4 | 67:2, 75:15, | 88:15, 91:24, |
| 36:12, 41:25, | plain | 98:21 | 92:20, 101:14 |
| 87:1 | 75:20 | planted | pointing |
| personal | plan | 25:7 | 12:1, 14:7, |
| 35:24, 36:1, | 8:11, 17:19, | planting | 14:20, 15:1, |
| 38:21, 82:20, | 18:3, 20:18, | 18:20, 32:20, | $17: 25$ |
| 83:5, 83:14 | 25:3, 30:8, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 33: 10,33: 13 \\ & \text { n1antincc } \end{aligned}\right.$ | policy |
| persons | 30:9, 30:25, | plantings | $70: 16$ |
| 40:17, 73:3, | 34:7, 34:9, | $77: 3$ | popular |
| 82:20, 83:17, | 41:6, 45:6, | plants | $79: 23$ |
| $89: 13$ <br> persuaded | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 14, \quad 56: 9, \\ & 57: 2, \quad 65: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 18: 20 \\ & \text { plat } \end{aligned}$ | population $70: 9, \quad 70: 11,$ |
| persuaded ${ }^{\text {p5:11, } 47: 13,}$ | $57: 2, ~ 65: 12$, $66: 25, ~ 70: 12, ~$ | 53:2 | $70: 14$ |
| 47:16 | 75:11, 75:23, | plausible | portion |
| pervious | 81:17, 81:19, | 86:8 | 65:21, 76:18 |
| 101:15, 101:19 | 86:2, 87:5, | play | positing |
| petitioner | 96:13, 97:23, | 68:19 | 43:22 |
| 76:8, 76:10, | 97:24, 98:4, | please | position |
| $76: 23$ | $98: 15, \quad 98: 22,$ | $4: 5,4: 6,4: 16,$ | 42:11, 96:24 |
| petitioner's | $98: 23, \quad 100: 11,$ | $4: 21,6: 9,$ | possible |
| 77:9 | 100:21, 100:23, | 12:16, 22:9, | 16:17, 41:10, |
| phase-in | 102:3, 102:9, | 22:17, 27:22, | 97:25, 98:2, |
| 81:17, 81:19 | 103:5, 103:12, | $29: 1, ~ 29: 4, ~$ $29.10, ~ 33: 20, ~$ | $99: 6$ |
| phone | 103:16, 104:21, | $\begin{array}{lll} 29: 10, & 33: 20, \\ 31: 23 \end{array}$ | potential |
| $\begin{aligned} & 2: 11, \quad 2: 20 \\ & 16: 6 \end{aligned}$ | planned | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 23, \quad 37: 21, \\ & 38: 1, \quad 40: 11 \end{aligned}$ | 68:18 <br> potomac |
| phonetic | 30:19, 31:5 | plebiscite | $4: 3,10: 9$ |
| 48:16, 68:1, | planner $49: 10,53: 16 \text {, }$ | 60:9 | 14:1, 14:25, |
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| $\begin{aligned} & 22: 19, \quad 29: 13, \\ & 30: 7, \quad 56: 22, \\ & 56: 24, \quad 59: 8, \\ & 67: 21, \quad 69: 23, \\ & 70: 4, \quad 71: 2, \\ & 71: 14, \quad 75: 10, \\ & 81: 18, \quad 84: 9, \\ & 85: 8, \quad 87: 11, \\ & 87: 22, \quad 93: 2 \end{aligned}$ <br> pound <br> 12:10 <br> power <br> 58:4 <br> practicable <br> 91: 6 <br> pre <br> 73:24 <br> pre-k <br> 59:11, 59:13 <br> pre-selling <br> 43:16 <br> precedent <br> 71:20 <br> predication <br> 31:1 <br> prediction <br> 38:21 <br> prefer <br> 43:17 <br> prekajski <br> 14:18, 29:25, 30:1, 45:11, 47:6, 47:14, 48:2 <br> prekajskii <br> 14:19 <br> preliminary <br> 66:25, 75:22, <br> 100:21, 100:23 <br> premature <br> 73:4 <br> prepared <br> 73:10, 73:12, <br> 94:11 <br> presence <br> 68:13 <br> present <br> 2:22, 21:13 | presentation <br> 87:20 <br> presented <br> 18:9, 18:11, <br> 18:12, 64:3, <br> 75:12, 80:9, <br> 81:8, 81:12, <br> 107:19 <br> presently <br> 40:2 <br> presents <br> 78:6 <br> preservation <br> 61:20 <br> preserve <br> 74:14 <br> preserving <br> 74:18 <br> pretty <br> 44:1 <br> previous <br> 71:8 <br> previously <br> 18:12, 43:15 <br> price <br> 10:3, 10:7, <br> 10:9 <br> primary <br> 66:16 <br> prior <br> 70:13, 73:5, <br> 73:13, 73:24 <br> priority <br> 76:9, 76:12, <br> 76:17, 76:25 <br> private <br> 36:18, 71:1 <br> privately <br> 38:6 <br> probably <br> 30:25, 51:7, <br> 53:22, 54:6, <br> 56:25, 60:16, <br> 95:4 <br> problem <br> 12:17, 18:4, <br> 30:19, 47:9, <br> 48:5, 81:17, | 83:23, 96:14, 96:22, 97:1, 103:17, 106:20 problems $6: 11, \quad 11: 2$ $51: 15$ <br> proceed $12: 25,57: 24$ $58: 7,105: 8$ <br> proceeding $100: 25, \quad 106: 10$ <br> proceedings 108:4, 109:4 <br> process $66: 23,73: 11$ $86: 25, \quad 94: 8$ <br> procession $84: 20$ <br> produced $84: 14$ <br> produces $84: 17$ <br> product $43: 14,79: 16$ proffer <br> 78:19 <br> program $\begin{aligned} & 15: 25, \quad 16: 15, \\ & 89: 8 \\ & \text { prohibition } \\ & 90: 21, \quad 90: 25 \\ & \text { project } \\ & 8: 21, \quad 10: 15, \\ & 13: 25, \quad 14: 6, \\ & 16: 21, \quad 25: 22, \\ & 30: 5, \quad 31: 1, \\ & 31: 5, \quad 31: 13, \\ & 43: 4, \quad 44: 22, \\ & 56: 7, \quad 56: 22, \\ & 59: 7, \quad 59: 10, \\ & 61: 5, \quad 61: 6, \\ & 61: 14, \quad 62: 10, \\ & 62: 17, \quad 62: 21, \\ & 62: 24, \quad 62: 25, \\ & 63: 2, \quad 63: 3, \\ & 63: 5, \quad 63: 6, \\ & 63: 14, \quad 64: 1, \\ & 64: 3, \quad 66: 3, \end{aligned}$ | ```66:7, 66:14, 67:19, 67:22, 68:6, 69:2, 70:19, 70:25, 71:7, 71:18, 74:14, 74:15, 74:17, 75:7, 77:21, 77:24, 78:6, 78:10, 78:11, 79:9, 79:16, 79:25, 80:2, 80:18, 80:21, 82:8, 83:13, 84:12, 86:17, 86:20, 91:5, 91:9, 91:14, 92:3, 92:19, 93:8, 93:11, 93:13, 94:19, 94:20, 95:9, 96:1, 104:7 project's 56:3 projections 70:13 projects 8:18, 45:25, 68:12, 78:1, 92:17 properly 6:12, 18:25, 19:6, 105:11 properties 8:12, 9:3, 9:5, 10:6, 13:24, 14:6, 14:10, 15:7, 17:16, 24:6, 24:12, 24:19, 53:22, 57:4, 69:15, 86:4 property 5:8, 8:13, 8:15, 8:23, 9:6, 9:21, 15:17, 18:24, 19:6, 19:25, 20:7,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```24:10, 24:20, 25:3, 25:5, 31:9, 32:20, 33:22, 34:17, 41:4, 45:15, 45:24, 46:1, 48:3, 49:8, 49:18, 50:7, 50:10, 51:2, 51:3, 54:5, 54:13, 54:25, 59:6, 59:23, 59:25, 60:1, 61:10, 61:17, 62:20, 66:12, 66:20, 67:7, 67:9, 67:11, 67:13, 67:14, 67:15, 68:7, 68:11, 68:14, 69:6, 69:11, 69:12, 69:14, 69:16, 69:19, 70:19, 70:23, 71:2, 71:3, 71:5, 77:18, 79:23, 84:22, 87:13, 87:17, 88:6, 91:25, 93:17, 93:20, 95:3, 95:11 property's 69:17 proposal 21:20, 23:4, 26:1, 53:11 proposed 14:24, 18:21, 59:3, 59:17, 64:18, 65:9, 72:17, 73:11, 73:18, 90:6, 90:11, 107:12 proposing 43:23, 103:13, 103:14, 105:7 prospect 80:6``` | prospects <br> 82:25 <br> protected <br> 25:11, 77:22 <br> protection <br> 82:21 <br> proud <br> 78:3 <br> proverbial <br> 81:11 <br> provide <br> 20:9, 37:10, <br> 40:1, 40:10, <br> 54:5, 67:1, <br> 73:1, 81:23, <br> 88:18, 100:18, <br> 102:15, 102:16 <br> provided <br> 36:25, 37:3, <br> 39:15, 44:9, <br> 44:10, 65:8, <br> 73:11, 77:11, <br> 80:5, 84:10 <br> provider <br> 79:18 <br> provides <br> 61:24, 78:6, <br> 87:10 <br> providing <br> 31:2, 61:17, <br> 61:18, 62:4, <br> 62:21, 64:5, <br> 67:11, 77:2, <br> 95:6 <br> provision <br> 35:5, 61:23, <br> 72:9 <br> proximity <br> 9:22, 10:4, <br> 45:14, 51:15, <br> 59:7, 68:16, <br> 84:17 <br> public <br> 107:8, 108:1, <br> 108:13 <br> pull <br> 48:12, 50:11 <br> pulled <br> 46:17 | ```purchase 10:3 purchased 30:17, 40:17 purpose 73:9 pursuant 69:8 push 46:18 pushed 46:16 put 25:10, 27:2, 34:23, 53:20, 54:7, 55:1, 66:4, 66:12, 86:12, 91:10, 91:16, 96:11 putting 27:11, 42:21, 43:16, 98:1 qs 74:7 qualified 40:22, 69:10 quality 12:23, 12:24, 76:20 quantifiable 62:5, 64:8 quantified 52:13 quasi-independent 79:20 question 24:24, 34:10, 34:15, 34:17, 35:1, 35:21, 36:10, 36:18, 37:11, 37:24, 38:16, 38:19, 39:6, 40:6, 44:19, 45:10, 53:25, 88:7, 99:21, 105:9,``` | 105:18, 106:6 questioned 69:22 <br> questions $\begin{aligned} & 19: 13, \quad 20: 23, \\ & 20: 24, \\ & 27: 18, \\ & 27: 19, \\ & 31: 21: 17, \\ & 34: 21, \\ & 34: 1, \\ & 34: 4, \\ & \text { quick } \\ & 52: 9 \\ & \text { quite } \\ & 49: 11, \\ & 74: 15, \\ & 81: 23, \\ & 84: 7, \\ & 96: 8, \\ & 91: 10 \\ & \text { quote } \end{aligned}$  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| rather | really | recognized | reduced |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17:24, 85:5 | 11:18, 41:13, | 92:22 | 45:2 |
| rationale | 43:17, 43:20, | recommend | reducing |
| 83:20 | 45:8, 46:22, | 105:12 | 20:18, 44:21, |
| ray | 46:24, 48:24, | recommendation | 54:16 |
| 69:8, 69:15 | 56:13, 56:22, | 72:20, 81:18 | reduction |
| rd | 58:17, 90:13, | recommendations | 95:13 |
| 97:8 | 105:17 | 58:15, 91:7 | referenced |
| re-2 | rear | recommended | 13:19 |
| 42:14, 46:25, | 46:11, 46:14, | $91: 22$ | references |
| 47:5, 47:25, | 85:25, 86:16 | reconfigure | $77: 12$ |
| 48:1, 49:7, | reason | 54:7 | referred |
| 50:8, 50:23, | 7:2, 8:2, 11:2, | record | 97:17 |
| 52:4, 60:21, | 12:8, 59:17, | 4:2, 5:16, | refine |
| 60:22, 60:25, | 86:10, 88:5, | 5:17, 6:22, | 54:9 |
| 80:7, 80:11, | 94:11 | 12:13, 12:15, | reflected |
| 84:13, 85:13, | reasonable | 22:17, 28:17, | 37:5, 71:25, |
| 85:16, 85:17, | 56:17 | 29:11, 34:7, | 79:2 |
| 85:20, 85:22, | reasons | 52:18, 52:19, | regard |
| 86:1, 86:4, | 71:10, 92:4, | 57:17, 58:3, | $30: 4,63: 10,$ |
| 87:17, 92:2 | 92:25 | 58:6, 58:13, | $63: 25,67: 8$ |
| re-delineate | rebels | 67:2, 75:16, | 71:20 |
| $76: 3$ | 89:11 | 79:23, 84:4, | regarded |
| re-engage | reboot | 97:20, 98:21, | 105:10 |
| 93:19 | 28:8 | 102:12, 102:13, | regarding |
| re-establishes | rebooting | 102:16, 103:20, | $29: 21,64: 10,$ |
| 71:1 <br> reach | $\begin{aligned} & 11: 14 \\ & \text { reboots } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 103: 24, \quad 107: 8, \\ & 107: 9, \quad 107: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $74: 2$ |
| 67:12 | reboots 28:14 | $109: 3$ | region $24: 13$ |
| reached | rebuffed | recorded | regraded |
| $70: 5, \quad 93: 21$ | $76: 7$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 4: 13, & 73: 8, \\ 73: 12, & 89: 3 \end{array}$ | $25: 7$ |
| reaching | rebuttal | $\begin{array}{ll} 73: 12, & 89: 3, \\ 108: 4, & 109: 4 \end{array}$ | regrading |
| 95:8 read | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 3: 11, & 4: 25, \\ 23: 9, & 54: 23, \end{array}\right.$ | 108:4, 109:4 recording | 23:24, 24:1, |
| 12:7, 12:11, | 92:7 | 4:13, 109:6 | $25: 5$ |
| 39:17 | receive | records | regrow |
| reading | 102:14, 107:9, | 73:8 | 25:12 |
| 35:10, 35:11 | 107:14 | recovery | regulate |
| ready | received | 25:6 | $91: 2$ |
| 12:10, 57:19, | 43:10 | redesigned | regulation |
| $83: 13, \quad 83: 14$ | recent | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 13 \\ & \text { redevelop } \end{aligned}$ | $76: 21$ |
| $68: 8,79: 17,$ | receptive | $71: 4$ | regulations |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 68: 8, & 79: 17, \\ 80: 5, & 80: 10, \end{array}$ | $80: 17$ | redevelopment | $75: 1, ~ 75: 9$, $78: 13$ |
| 80:13 | recognition | 59:5 | relate |
| reality | 72:10 | redirect | 40:13 |
| 86:21, 91:17, | recognize | $19: 17,19: 19$ | related |
| 94:4 | 37:10, 65:12 | redo $45: 5, \quad 46: 19$ | 21:21, 25:13, |
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| ```25:25, 108:5, 109:7 relates 24:22, 25:22, 40:15 relationship 19:23, 20:1, 38:19, 40:18, 41:5, 41:14, 45:23, 46:1, 47:17, 49:6, 49:7, 50:6, 53:4, 53:6, 53:15, 53:17, 55:20, 64:16, 66:15 relationships 15:20, 17:17, 17:24 relative 37:18 relatively 78:1, 98:13, 98:19 relevant 61:5, 61:7, 69:2 reliable 88:1 remain 77:19, 88:19 remaining 66:18 remarks 32:9, 96:6 remedied 33:8 remember 13:11, 14:17, 32:23, 59:10, 85:15, 97:3, 106:23 reminders 94:12 remitting 72:23 removal 24:11, 24:14,``` | ```54:4, 76:12, 76:22, 95:1 remove 107:10 removed 24:7, 76:10, 76:17, 76:18 removes 24:1 removing 99:17 renderings 46:20 rental 89:18, 91:1 renters 89:23 repair 33:15 repeat 5:1, 14:15, 17:22 repeated 36:10, 79:19 repeatedly 60:12, 71:13 repeating 9:19 rephrasing 42:12 replacement 99:23 replanting 76:24 replenishment 24:8, 24:9 report 4:24, 8:19, 27:10, 58:14, 63:15 reporter 2:23, 4:14, 10:21, 12:12, 12:17, 28:23, 28:24, 57:20, 108:1, 108:2 reports 58:14, 75:15``` | ```represented 10:3, 106:24 request 32:5, 45:8 require 18:21, 18:22, 40:21, 60:19, 94:2 required 68:23, 69:18, 89:9 requirement 30:14, 46:25, 53:24, 70:1, 74:16, 83:5, 83:17, 84:2, 85:16, 86:25, 88:13, 89:12, 94:3, 95:14, 100:22, 101:16, 101:24 requirements 39:10, 59:4, 59:5, 62:8, 83:10, 88:22, 93:16, 94:18, 96:4 requires 19:2, 40:20, 61:11, 62:10, 66:24, 67:9, 72:7, 81:19, 81:22 requiring 73:8, 76:21, 99:22 research 23:17, 81:16 reserved 62:16 resident 20:8 residential 20:9, 59:6, 60:20, 61:2, 64:22, 65:6, 65:7, 68:15, 81:23, 82:1,``` | ```82:15, 82:17, 82:19, 83:8, 83:22, 89:7, 94:1 residentially 61:18 residents 37:18, 46:7, 84:4, 86:22, 87:4, 93:10 resources 17:14, 17:17, 18:1 respect 64:12, 70:8, 74:12, 75:24 respected 46:14 respects 77:5 response 40:8, 44:13, 53:8, 68:1, 83:4, 90:8, 90:10, 97:8 responses 100:5 responsibility 41:11 responsible 24:7, 41:4, 72:22 rest 19:9, 55:11, 84:23, 91:16 restriction 81:14, 89:6 restrictions 87:2, 91:20 result 68:22, 88:5, 91:8, 94:23, 95:14 retirement 79:25 reveals 84:5 review 16:18, 100:17,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 101:2, 103:13 | road | safari | saw |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| reviewed | 8:23, 9:18, | 28:3 | 32:11, 49:11, |
| 46:5, 75:18 | 14:7, 20:3, | safe | 93:12 |
| reviewing | 20:7, 20:9, | 33:3, 79:19 | say |
| 72:17 | 22:19, 22:25, | safest | 4:4, 6:17, |
| reviews | 26:2, 26:9, | 27:2, 27:4 | 15:5, 16:9, |
| 98:12, 98:13 | 26:11, 26:13, | sage | 18:6, 19:4, |
| revise | 26:20, 27:14, | 35:4, 36:4, | 21:15, 29:20, |
| 101:14 | 29:12, 33:21, | 36:14, 37:3, | 31:9, 31:14, |
| revised | 34:11, 48:16, | 37:16, 38:6, | 32:6, 32:17, |
| 25:3, 67:2, | 74:3, 92:14 | 38:14, 38:20, | 33:8, 33:9, |
| 97:18, 97:25, | roadway | 39:3, 39:5, | 39:19, 40:21, |
| 98:3, 99:23, | 86:11 | 40:9, 43:12, | 44:14, 48:25, |
| 100:10, 102:8, | rockville | 44:3 | 49:23, 50:12, |
| 103:4, 103:16, | 2:19 | sage's | 53:14, 54:3, |
| 106:1 | roof | 36:19 | 56:20, 58:8, |
| revisions | 87:10 | sage-related | 70:25, 74:25, |
| 68:5 | room | 37:12 | 91:23, 92:4, |
| rick | 99:9 | said | 94:17, 97:22, |
| 3:4, 6:2 | root | 9:23, 16:24, | 100:4 |
| right | 24:17, 25:11, | 18:16, 21:24, | saying |
| 4:23, 7:7, | 77:17 | 23:25, 30:19, | 10:20, 16:13, |
| 7:10, 7:12, 8:9, | roots | 30:23, 33:20, | 17:4, 17:6, |
| 12:1, 12:4, | 23:19 | 35:14, 35:23, | 19:5, 42:4, |
| 13:8, 14:22, | rosenthal | 41:9, 47:6, | 42:11, 42:12, |
| 16:8, 17:25, | 69:3, 69:13 | 53:4, 54:21, | 42:13, 47:25, |
| 21:5, 21:25, | rosenthal's | 57:22, 65:25, | 50:6, 50:20, |
| 22:10, 29:5, | 58:4 | 74:12, 82:25, | 50:21, 50:25, |
| 30:3, 34:14, | round | 93:17, 94:25, | 53:12, 55:14, |
| 36:22, 36:23, | 93:12, 93:14 | $95: 5,106: 15$ | $96: 22$ |
| 40:9, 44:12, | row | $108: 4, \quad 109: 4$ | says <br> 12:8, 27.25 |
| 50:7, 85:9, | $24: 19,86: 3,$ | sale | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 8, \quad 27: 25, \\ & 39: 17, \quad 41: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| 91:12, 92:7, | $88: 4$ | $81: 15,83: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 39: 17, \quad 41: 23, \\ & 88: 1, \quad 96: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| $92: 24, ~ 97: 9$, $101: 21, ~$ | rules | sales | scale |
| $\begin{aligned} & 101: 21, ~ 102: 5, \\ & 102: 7,107: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 22, \quad 89: 2, \\ & 89: 3, \quad 89: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 10:7, 10:8 salvage | $63: 16, \quad 95: 6$ |
| 107:15 | run | 86:6 | scaled |
| rigorous | $35: 7, \quad 39: 5$ | same | $15: 16$ |
| 88:11, 89:2 | running | $27: 1, \quad 32: 14$ | scared |
| rise | $104: 14$ | $46: 11, \quad 46: 21,$ | $26: 19$ |
| 92:3 | rush | $48: 24, \quad 78: 20$ | scenario |
| risk | 82:11 | 79:23, 82:3, | 85:23 |
| $41: 7$ | S | 89:24, 97:3, | schedule |
| 92:14 |  | satisfies | scheduling |
| river <br> 9:2, 14:7, | s-o-l-t-e-s-d | $31: 13,59: 3$ save | $103: 18$ <br> school |
| 92:24 | 29:23 | 91:13 | 42:20, 59:11, |
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| ```92:5, 94:1, 94:17, 94:18, 98:2, 105:13 shouldn't 50:25 show 5:8, 46:20, 57:2, 67:2, 79:20 showed 5:7, 9:20, 48:9, 87:24 showing 13:5, 13:6, 15:18, 47:17, 103:5 showings 94:2 shown 23:17 shows 5:5, 9:13, 9:18, 65:13 shuman 9:23 shut 11:4 side 8:23, 46:12, 46:14, 84:21, 86:1, 86:4 sides 8:24, 86:18, 89:23 sight 26:10 sign 39:13, 40:8 sign-up 39:17, 39:22 signature-mig2k 109:12 signature-p1kal 108:11 significant 10:9, 20:17, 20:19, 43:11, 60:24, 61:21,``` | ```74:18, 78:17 significantly 62:7, 62:11, 80:15 simard 23:16 similar 14:2, 25:6, 51:2, 53:25, 57:3, 64:20, 65:3, 69:7, 92:16, 92:21 similarity 14:23 similarly 61:6 simmons 1:25, 109:2, 109:14 simple 72:12, 81:13, 82:15, 84:2 simply 4:14, 54:12, 67:5, 67:24, 74:7, 89:1, 89:3, 94:2, 94:24, 95:18, 97:25 since 85:20 sing 50:20 single 8:24, 9:21, 15:2, 20:3, 20:6, 50:20, 53:25, 65:14, 73:16, 86:9, 86:13, 86:14, 87:4 single-family 14:12, 15:16, 46:10, 46:13, 50:13, 50:14, 51:6, 51:8, 56:21, 57:2, 61:1, 64:25,``` | ```65:7, 65:18, 87:18, 92:1 site 8:11, 8:20, 9:1, 14:12, 14:25, 17:18, 18:3, 20:18, 56:9, 56:10, 59:20, 62:16, 63:18, 77:21, 80:12, 84:20, 86:2, 93:9, 96:13, 102:2 sites 8:17, 9:2, 9:15 sitting 10:5 six 13:23 size 14:11, 61:19, 63:23, 65:3, 84:15, 85:21 sizes 15:6 skepticism 80:9 sky 67:22 skyhart 67:25 slice 63:1 slopes 75:20, 77:5, 77:14 slow 16:5, 17:21 small 52:5, 86:13 soils 75:21, 76:5, 77:5, 77:10, 77:14 sold 41:21, 89:20 solemnly 22:11, 29:5``` | ```solid 41:3 soltaz 100:10 soltesd 29:23 soltez 99:6 solution 64:4, 78:6, 95:4 solutions 71:10 solves 30:18 some 4:5, 7:2, 8:2, 8:10, 11:1, 12:8, 12:15, 14:5, 14:6, 14:21, 32:7, 37:15, 37:16, 41:19, 46:8, 53:8, 56:16, 67:12, 67:13, 72:5, 75:3, 78:22, 81:20, 92:18, 94:10 somebody 12:7, 20:2, 20:6 somebody's 58:20 somehow 83:24 someone 26:13, 30:17, 30:22, 35:23, 36:1, 36:2, 38:25, 39:10, 40:8, 40:20, 42:8, 53:21, 79:13, 88:14 something 10:25, 16:9, 17:4, 21:15, 30:24, 33:9, 33:17, 48:17,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | 86:13, 95:2, 103:10 <br> spaced <br> 84:20, 86:3, <br> 87:16 <br> spacial <br> 19:22, 20:1 <br> spacing <br> 51:19 <br> speak <br> 4:19, 13:18 <br> speaking <br> 4:22 <br> speaks <br> 70: 8 <br> spec <br> 82: 6 <br> special <br> 30:5, 32:22, <br> 32:24, 33:4, <br> 42:7, 82:21, <br> 107:3 <br> specially <br> 42: 6 <br> species <br> 24:16 <br> specific <br> 43:10, 45:7, <br> 83:10 <br> specifically <br> 72:4, 72:10 <br> spectrum <br> 9:1, 78:2 <br> speculative <br> 95:20 <br> speech <br> 16:5 <br> spelled <br> 87:2 <br> spend <br> 17:14 <br> spending <br> 105:11 <br> spent <br> 17:23, 107:17 <br> spine <br> 53:21, 86:14 <br> spoke <br> 9:23, 9:24, | ```22:4, 33:10 square 10:7, 16:2, 16:16, 47:20, 49:20, 63:2 squeeze 86:11 staff 38:13, 45:3, 45:10, 54:8, 56:5, 58:14, 63:14, 63:15, 64:3, 75:17, 75:21, 76:8, 77:7, 98:7, 102:11, 102:14, 102:20, 103:13, 103:24 staff's 45:7, 55:8, 102:17, 103:15 staffed 98:10 stage 57:9 stand 56:16 standard 62:10, 63:4 standards 48:4, 60:19, 60:23, 61:4, 61:25, 62:9, 62:18, 63:8, 67:8, 77:25, 78:12 standpoint 64:19 stargaze 67:23 start 5:25, 59:21, 60:14, 63:12, 82:2, 106:13 started 16:9, 93:7, 95:8 starting 62:4, 62:5,``` | ```64:1, 94:6 state 22:16, 29:10, 96:3, 108:14 stated 27:10, 72:25 statement 21:20, 34:17, 58:8 statements 3:8, 21:21, 22:12, 29:6, 57:24 stating 96:23, 97:2 status 88:8 stay 12:15, 93:2, 107:8 staying 107:9 steep 77:14 steiman 77:11 stem 20:3 stemann 34:9 stepped 65:6 steven 3:6, 29:12, 99:8, 99:12 stevew@ 29:15 stevew@mail 29:13 stick 103:22 still 7:5, 8:22, 9:11, 11:11, 25:9, 32:22, 33:7, 39:4, 46:2, 53:1, 62:18, 62:21,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 77:24, 80:12, | student | sufficient | 33:16, 46:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85:2 | 59:13 | 30:11 | 58:2, 64:2, |
| stock | studied | sugarplums | 68:5, 74:9, |
| 88:3 | 87:23 | 80:11 | 79:1, 93:1, |
| stockbroker | study | suggest | 104:19 |
| 88:2 | 70:17 | 58:9, 61:8, | surely |
| stop | stuff | 66:2, 66:9, | 79:25 |
| 4:21, 16:4, | 43:3, 52:25 | 66:22, 93:20 | surgical |
| 58:17 | sturdier | suggested | 54:4, 66:9, |
| storm | 89:8 | 20:2, 20:6, | 95:1 |
| 75:21, 99:13, | styled | 53:20, 53:21, | surgically |
| 101:23 | $61: 18$ | 86:8, 86:10, | 54:16 |
| stormwater | subject | $89: 13$ | surprising |
| 100:11, 101:7, | 16:18, 49:18, | suggesting | $82: 8$ |
| 101:12, 101:13 | 59:9, 96:12, | 66:21 | surrounding |
| story | 100:23 | suggestion | 14:6, 15:19, |
| 20:18 | subjective | 93:25, 94:21 | 48:8, 53:6, |
| strategies | 61:23 | suggestions | 55:11, 60:8, |
| 75:3 | submit | 75:4 | 61:5, 61:10, |
| stream | 95:12, 95:25, | suggests | 61:12, 61:20, |
| 9:14, 33:11, | 98:2, 98:21, | 88:5 | 63:15, 63:17, |
| 75:19, 76:3, | 100:25, 102:9, | suit | 63:22, 68:11, |
| 76:9, 76:13 | 102:10, 102:11, | 82:10 | 68:13, 78:13, |
| street | 103:12, 104:9 | suite | 79:10, 84:15, |
| 2:18, 13:25, | submitted | $2: 9$ | $85: 13$ |
| $54: 7$ | 90:8 | summarize | susan |
| stringent | subregion | 5:6, 36:11 | 80:24, 84:5 |
| 73:22 | 75:10, 84:9, | summarized | sustainable |
| structure | 85:8 | 81:16 | 42:22 |
| 40:23, 51:9, | subset | summary | suzanne |
| 53:16, 53:24, | $82: 14, \quad 82: 16,$ | 9:18 | 23:16 |
| $54: 2,64: 6,$ | $83: 11$ | sun | swear |
| $64: 13, \quad 71: 13,$ | substantially | $64: 11$ | $22: 9$ |
| $72: 12,72: 13,$ | $97: 2$ | supplemental | sweep |
| $72: 17,83: 25$ | substantive | $77: 2$ | $85: 8$ |
| 95:16, 95:24, | 74:10 | support | sworn |
| 96:23, 97:2, | substitute | 37:7 | 22:6, 31:10 |
| 97:5 structures | $18: 13, \quad 18: 16$ | supported | systems |
| structures | substitutes | $28: 1$ | 24:17, 24:21, |
| 46:15, 47:21, | $102: 2$ | supporting | 25:11 |
| 50:22, 50:23, | succeeded | $75: 8, \quad 109: 6$ | T |
| 51:1, 64:17, | 16:1, 16:15 | suppose | take |
| 65:1, 65:11, | successful | 87:14 | 8:9, 28:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 90: 21, \quad 90: 22, \\ & 92: 21 \end{aligned}$ | $44: 6, \quad 76: 16$ | supposed | $30: 17, \quad 40: 16,$ |
| struggled | successor | $102: 10$ | $62: 19,62: 20,$ |
| $105: 24,106: 15$ | 35:4 | sur-rebuttal | 66:12, 71:21, |
| struggling | suddenly $54: 11$ | 23:9 | 83:16 |
| 50:7, 51:10 | 54 | 13:1, 27:23, |  |
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| taken | 68:7, 69:21, | 43:25, 45:20, | thing |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 54:11, 78:9, | 71:12, 72:24, | 54:23, 55:14, | 4:4, 4:12, |
| 108: 4 | 77:16, 84:15, | 58:12, 59:23, | 4:16, 14:4, |
| taking | 84:16, 90:6, | 64:7, 64:10, | 25:23, 25:25, |
| 19:12, 42:11, | 92:12, 93:25, | 69:7, 69:18, | 27:9, 44:16, |
| 73:24, 76:23, | 95:16 | 69:24, 70:7, | 46:23, 49:21, |
| 96:24, 98:13 | test | 77:11, 81:16, | 50:21, 56:8, |
| talk | 69:2, 73:20, | 95:15 | 56:20, 64:12, |
| 19:23, 93:18, | 91:15, 92:25 | text | 80:10 |
| 99:12 | testified | 70:18, 92:23 | things |
| talked | 14:16, 14:17, | th | 4:15, 32:16, |
| 26:21, 32:19, | 34:9, 38:4, | 100:12, 100:15, | 46:8, 53:15, |
| 99:21, 103:23 | 39:24, 40:4, | 103:12, 103:25, | 56:10, 56:12, |
| talks | 43:6, 43:15, | 104:5, 104:17, | 57:5, 61:15, |
| 35:2 | 44:10, 48:2, | 104:22, 107:9, | 66:17, 79:1, |
| target | 51:11, 53:16, | 107:21 | 107:13 |
| 70:5 | 62:11, 62:24, | thank | think |
| team | 63:25, 64:16, | 5:23, 7:24, | 13:3, 13:4, |
| 99:6, 100:10 | 65:20, 66:7, | 19:15, 20:25, | 13:8, 16:14, |
| teams | 67:10, 68:1, | 21:1, 21:3, | 19:25, 20:2, |
| 4:16 | 68:9, 69:5, | 21:17, 22:10, | 23:10, 25:1, |
| technical | 70:3, 70:22, | 22:21, 25:15, | 27:4, 32:8, |
| 75:10 | 73:5, 73:21, | 25:17, 27:8, | 33:17, 34:10, |
| technically | 74:4, 75:6, | 27:16, 27:19, | 36:13, 37:7, |
| 104:5 | 75:14, 76:9, | 28:16, 28:25, | 38:4, 40:4, |
| telephonically | $76: 11,76: 18$, | 29:19, 31:14, | 43:5, 43:24, |
| 2:22 | 76:25, 77:18, | $31: 16,31: 18$, | 44:1, 44:5, |
| tell | 83:13, 107:2 | $31: 21,31: 23$, | 45:20, 45:21, |
| 48:11, 54:22 | testifies | $32: 1,32: 9$, | 46:23, 47:9, |
| telling | $6: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 19, \quad 33: 25, \\ & 34: 2.38: 4 . \end{aligned}$ | $47: 10, \quad 48: 8,$ |
| 12:19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { testify } \\ & 6: 2,22: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 34:2, 38:4, $44: 15, \quad 44: 16,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 48: 18, \quad 51: 18, \\ & 51: 23,52: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| temple | 6:2, 28:12, 32: | $57: 21, \quad 57: 25$ | $52: 15,53: 5,$ |
| $26: 3$ ten | 44:18, 69:10, | 58:11, 79:11, | 53:24, 54:6, |
| $23: 16, \quad 57: 1$ | 69:14, 69:16, | 79:12, 92:6, | 54:22, 55:2, |
| ten-feet | $74: 15, \quad 82: 24$ | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 11, \quad 96: 6, \\ & 96: 7, \quad 100: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 55: 4, & 55: 16, \\ 58: 8, & 61: 22, \end{array}$ |
| 18:17 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { testifying } \\ & 13: 6,23: 3 \end{aligned}$ | 106:4, 106:11, | $62: 19,64: 22,$ |
| ten-minute | testimony | 106:18, 107:21, | 66:10, $70: 24$, |
| tend | 3:3, 5:1, 5:12, | 107:22, 107:23 | 72:14, 78:18, |
| 47:22 | 7:9, 8:8, 9:20, | thanks | 79:4, 92:8, |
| tenor | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 14: 5, & 17: 6, \\ 21: 2, & 21: 22, \end{array}\right.$ | $80: 8$ therefore | $98: 18,99: 18,$ |
| 30:3 | 21:24, 23:9, | 82:2 | 100:20, 100:24, |
| tenuous | 25:13, 25:21, | thereof | 104:13, 104:15, |
| $40: 25$ | 26:1, 29:22, | $72: 3$ | 104:16, 106:14, |
| term | $30: 2,30: 4$, | thin | 107:4, 107:16 |
| 82:13 terms | $31: 10,31: 22$, | 41:2, 41:15 | thinking $\text { \| } 50: 22$ |
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| thoroughfare | timeframe | 68:17, 85:7, | trip |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9:2 | 104:2 | 86:15, 87:16 | 38:5, 38:7, |
| thoroughly | times | townhouse | 73:23, 73:25, |
| 75:18 | 16:24, 45:3, | 42:5, 82:4, | 74:1 |
| thought | 53:23, 85:21, | 86:12, 95:2 | triple |
| 10:1, 35:22, | 95:14 | townhouses | 80:7 |
| 53:7, 55:10, | timing | 23:2, 24:19, | triplex |
| 59:19, 60:5 | 98:5 | 25:1, 42:21, | 15:18, 57:1, |
| thousand-foot | title | 50:24, 50:25, | 84:13, 89:22 |
| 13:23 | 35:7, 39:6, | $52: 2,52: 4$, | triplexes |
| threatening | 39:8 | 71:25, 80:11, | 47:19, 54:17, |
| 26:17 | today | 80:15, 82:6 | 63:24, 66:19, |
| three | 4:9, 4:23, 8:2, | track | 84:21, 86:3 |
| 75:13, 78:1, | 78:4, 80:22, | 79:23 | trips |
| 90:16 | 101:1 | traffic | 38:11, 38:12, |
| three-quarters | today's | 4:24, 26:5, | 74:5 |
| 84:25 | 100:15 | 26:18, 27:10, | trouble |
| threshold | together | 38:7, 38:18, | 53:5, 91:13 |
| 74:1, 74:19, | 57:3, 84:18, | 59:14, 73:16, | trucks |
| 95:8 | 85:7, 91:10 | 73:17, 73:20, | 33:21 |
| through | told | 74:7 | true |
| 4:23, 5:3, | 10:2 | transcribed | 50:24, 87:23, |
| 23:19, 26:13, | took | 1:25, 109:5 | 109:3 |
| 32:19, 36:3, | 93:20 | transcriber | truly |
| 36:4, 43:25, | top | 109:1 | $59: 6$ |
| 45:16, 58:2, | 32:17, 43:12 | transcript | trust |
| 58:12, 59:1, | topic | 103:21, 109:3 | 89:14 |
| 59:13, 61:13, | 43:20 | travels | trustee |
| 78:25, 94:8 | total | 87:11 | 89:15 |
| throughout | 44:16 | tree | truth |
| 8:8, 19:9, | totally | 24:14, 25:8, | 22:12, 22:13, |
| 60:5, 60:11, | 25:7, 33:4, | 25:9 | 29:7, 29:8 |
| 64:16 | 33:16 | trees | try |
| time | touching | 23:17, 23:19, | 7:16, 7:21, |
| 4:4, 5:13, | 67:17 | $24: 3,24: 6$ | 11:24, 12:2, |
| $7: 16,10: 6$, | touts | $24: 18,24: 21,$ | 12:25, 13:1, |
| $10: 18,11: 5 \text {, }$ | 86:19 | $\begin{array}{ll} 25: 7, & 32: 20, \\ 33 \cdot 2 & 61 \cdot 21 \end{array}$ | 93:1, 98:10 |
| 17:14, 17:23, | toward | 33:2, 61:21, | trying |
| 21:20, 26:8, | 20:7, 80:21, | $74: 18,77: 16$, | 9:11, 13:3, |
| 30:9, 66:24, | 91:5 | 77:17, 77:19 | 13:25, 14:1, |
| 74:5, 79:6, | townhome | tried | 14:23, 17:14, |
| 79:7, 82:3, | 38:23 | 11:1, 11:4, | 17:23, 39:19, |
| 90:9, 91:13, | townhomes | 11:14, 67:20 | 47:13, 70:20, |
| 98:3, 98:11, | $24: 5,24: 23$ | tries | 74:24, 106:8 |
| 103:21, 104:3, | $25: 4,27: 4,$ | $93: 22$ | tucking |
| $\begin{aligned} & 104: 6, \quad 105: 1, \\ & 105: 12, \quad 107: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $35: 23,40: 16,$ | trigger <br> 74:16 | $76: 15$ |
| $107: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 24, ~ 41: 3, \\ & 42: 1,42: 14, \end{aligned}$ | triggers | $\begin{aligned} & \text { turn } \\ & 6: 9,11: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
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| using | viewing | 29:1, 29:3, | 88:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39:1, 73:22, | 7:17 | 29:9, 29:12, | we'll |
| 73:24 | viewpoint | 29:16, 29:18, | 28:15, 28:16, |
| usually | 23:16 | 29:21, 30:2, | 44:6, 63:12, |
| 5:1, 96:11 | village | $31: 22,32: 1$, | 77:20, 103:20 |
| V | 59:8, 87:11 | 107: 4 | we're |
| vacation | violates | want | 5:10, 40:22, |
| 104:15 | 75:1 | 4:19, 5:12, | 43:15, 43:16, |
| valley | virtually | 8:9, 12:2, | 43:23, 44:2, |
| 33:11, 75:19, | 1:11, 4:6 | 12:12, 12:24, | 44:4, 58:2, |
| $76: 3,76: 10$ | visibility | 17:10, 27:24, | 67:11, 78:3, |
| $76: 13$ | 18:19 | 28:7, 32:18, | 88:22, 98:9, |
| valuation | visible | 39:23, 43:2, | 103:11, 103:22, |
| 68:9, 69:5 | 6:15, 7:9, | 43:19, 52:16, | 105:7 |
| value | 61:7, 61:9, | $55: 3,55: 25$, | we ' ve |
| 10:11, 13:7, | 64:13, 65:24, | 59:21, 61:11, | 43:5, 43:25, |
| $69: 10,69: 14$ | 68:16 | 63:10, 67:3, | 44:3, 44:23, |
| $69: 17, \quad 69: 19$ | visions | 68:24, 70:2, | 45:1, 45:4, |
| values | 80:10 | 79:7, 81:1, | 45:7, 45:8, |
| 68:7, 68:11, | visitors | $93: 17, \quad 96: 25,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 46: 5, & 46: 14, \\ 46: 16, & 56: 7 \end{array}$ |
| 68:14, 69:6, | 38:13 | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 11, \\ & 97: 17, \\ & 98: 56, \end{aligned}$ | $60: 4$ |
| 69:12, 87:14, | visual <br> 15.20, 23:1 | 98:9, 99:12, | weave |
| $\begin{aligned} & 87: 17, \quad 88: 6 \\ & \text { variable } \end{aligned}$ | voice | 103:11, 106:16 | 79:9 |
| $56: 6$ | 12:23, 12:24 | wanted | weaves |
| various | vs | 14:4, 33:9, | 55:10 |
| 60:23, 83:21 | 69:8 | $45: 6,54: 9$, $54: 10,55: 5$ | website |
| vast | W | 56:20, 57:5, | wednesday |
| 65:22 | wait | 58:1, 79:1 | $1: 13$ |
| vegetative | 14:14, 16:3, | wants | weeks |
| 84:22, 85:1 | 17:2, 17:20, | 90:22 | 99:5, 100:17, |
| vein | 18:14, 19:1, | water | 101:2, 103:13 |
| 89:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 4, \quad 28: 8, \\ & 32: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 23:18, 24:7, | weigh |
|  | wall | 75:21, 99:13, | 102:12 |
| version | wall $18: 13,18: 17$, | 101:23 | weight |
| $15: 16$ | $49: 22, \quad 57: 4$ | way | 43:16 |
| 15:16 | 49:22, $57: 4$ | 10:23, 11:16, | welcome |
| versus | walling | 14:9, 14:10, | 21:7, 31:24 |
| 15:17, 48:1, | 84:19 | 17:15, 40:7, | welcomed |
| 63:5, 94:2 | walls | 43:15, 43:18, | 83:16 |
| via | 76:15, 84:22, | 46:6, 63:1, | went |
| 24:3, 87:6 | 84:23, 85:1 | 63:4, 67:14, | 78:25, 93:15 |
| video | wank | $78: 7,81: 3,$ | weren't |
| 27:25 | 3:6, 27:21, | $81: 7,88: 9,$ | $52: 4$ |
| view | 27:23, 28:4, | $92: 18, \quad 97: 1$ | west |
| 5:7, 55:8, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lr} 28: 7, & 28: 11, \\ 28 \cdot 14 & 28 \cdot 19 \end{array}\right.$ | $105: 7$ | 2:14, 5:22, |
| 80:21 | 28:14, 28:19, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ways } \\ & 26: 10,87: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 9:4, 26:4, |
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| 26:12, 67:15, | wisconsin | wormald | 47:17, 48:10, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 91:21 | 2:9 | 36:21, 37:13, | 48:14, 52:13, |
| westerly | wish | 37:15, 41:9, | 55:6, 98:24 |
| 67:7 | 6:1, 50:13, | 43:1, 43:5, | year |
| western | 57:1, 102:13 | 44:3, 44:20, | 65:22, 89:24, |
| 45:15, 45:23, | wishes | 44:23, 45:1, | 90:1, 90:3, 90:4 |
| 46:1, 49:8, | 28:12 | 46:4, 47:7, | year-old |
| 50:7, 51:1, | withdrawn | 50:12, 50:18, | 24:18, 30:21 |
| 54:5, 54:13, | 80:13 | 52:9, 52:16, | yearly |
| 57:4, 77:18, | within | 55:4, 55:6, | 72:23 |
| 84:21, 86:4, | 24:5, 37:3, | 55:25, 56:2, | years |
| 95:2 | 52:1, 76:9, | 63:25, 79:18, | 18:21, 18:23, |
| wetlands | 94:20, 94:22, | 81:9, 93:9, | 18:24, 19:2, |
| 75:20 | 99:5, 101:2, | 95:5, 100:4, | 22:23, 23:16, |
| whatever | 102:21 | 104:19 | 26:19, 27:14, |
| 33:15, 36:3, | without | worries | $30: 12,30: 17$, |
| 37:17, 42:9, | 6:14, 80:19, | 92:10 | 30:20, 30:22, |
| 45:2, 94:10, | 98:4 | worry | 38:25, 39:11, |
| 94:13, 96:3, | witness | 106:13 | 41:22, 41:25, |
| 97:3, 103:10 | 6:1, 6:3, 8:7, | worse | 45:2, 56:9, |
| whenever | 31:24, 69:4, | 92:1 | 59:11, 66:23, |
| 106:25 | 69:16, 69:21, | worth | 73:24, 89:9 |
| whereof | 108:8 | 62:14 | yesterday |
| 108:8 | witnesses | wouldn't | 4:8, 5:7, 5:13, |
| whether | 21:9, 21:11, | 19:7, 55:16, | 9:20, 13:20, |
| 5:11, 35:25, | 32:6, 58:12, | 101:18 | 14:5, 16:24, |
| 38:12, 39:23, | 75:14, 92:20 | wrap | 18:11, 19:23, |
| 69:2, 69:18, | wondered | 15:22 | 21:21, 21:22, |
| 69:22, 70:25, | 45:13 | write | 21:24, 23:12, |
| 71:2, 95:6 | wonderful | 90:10, 104:5 | 25:14, 25:23, |
| whoever | 42:20 | writing | 26:22, 27:9, |
| 14:16 | woods | 98:12 | 29:22, 33:10, |
| whole | 53:7 | wrong | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 10, \quad 35: 22, \\ & 38 \cdot 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 21:20, 22:13, | word | 55:3, 102:3 | $\begin{array}{ll} 38: 4, & 41: 9, \\ 47: 6, & 48: 1, \end{array}$ |
| 25:22, 29:7, | $91: 23$ | wrote | $\begin{array}{ll} 47: 6, & 48: 1, \\ 72: 7, & 78: 16, \end{array}$ |
| 31:1, 41:10, | work | $82: 10$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 72: 7, & 78: 16, \\ 99: 21 \end{array}\right.$ |
| $48: 3,48: 6,$ | 9:12, 89:1, | wssc | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 21 \\ & \text { yesterday's } \end{aligned}$ |
| wholly | 104:18 workable | $\frac{33: 12,33: 14}{Y}$ | 17:6, 25:25, |
| $66: 7$ <br> wider | 43:4, 91:6 worked | yards | $62: 2$ younger |
| 85:8 | ed | 86:16 | 79:21 |
| width | $68: 4$ | yeah $7: 2, \quad 11: 1$ | yourself |
| 34:11, 56:25 | working | $12: 4,28: 5,$ | 80:24 |
| willing | 6:12, 8:2, | 36:9, $37: 17$, | yourselves $5: 15, \quad 40: 2$ |
| 66:11 winners | $\begin{aligned} & 104: 3 \\ & \text { works } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 5, \quad 43: 19, \\ & 44: 1, \quad 46: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r}5: 15, ~ 40: 2 \\ \hline \mathbf{Z}\end{array}$ |
| 88:4 | 33:17, 96:1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { zero } \\ & 67: 12, \quad 67: 16 \end{aligned}$ |
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| 97:14, 103:6 | 58 | 83 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 32 | 3:9 | $30: 12,30: 18$, |
| 3:7 | 59 | 30:21 |
| 34 | 59:5 | 843 |
| 63:5 | 6 | 12:10 |
| 350 | 6,000 | 8th |
| 67:13 | 14:11 | 102:16, 103:16, |
| 36 | $60$ | 105:4 |
| 61:3 | 52:5, 52:8, | 9 |
| 370 | 53:23 | 9 |
| 30:24 | 6100 | 1:14, 4:2 |
| 4 | 2:20 | 92 |
| 40 | 62 | 3:12 |
| 96:15 | 30:15, 30:17, | 93 |
| 400 | 30:22, 38:25, | 82:12 |
| 59:13 | 39:11, 41:21, | 986 |
| 401 | 81:13, 94:3 | 2:11 |
| 2:18 | 7 | 990 |
| 42 | 7 | 12:10 |
| 22:23, 27:14 | 74:5 | 9th |
| 43 | 7.3 | 108:9 |
| 55:4 | 59:5 |  |
| 447897 | 70 |  |
| $1: 23$ | 31:11, 48:12 |  |
| $45$ | 700 |  |
| 42:21, 84:12, | 2:9 |  |
| 87:16, 95:12 | 74 |  |
| 49 | 30:14, 30:23 |  |
| 107:24 | 75 ( 75 |  |
| 5 | 30:12, 30:18, |  |
| 5,000 | 30:21, 85:19 |  |
| 49:20 | 754 |  |
| 5-to | 30:19 |  |
| 47:19 | 7600 |  |
| 50 | 2:9 |  |
| 26:3, 26:11, | 770 |  |
| 59:11, 74:1, | 12:10 |  |
| 86:17, 95:11 | 79 |  |
| 54 | 3:10 |  |
| 53:16 | 8 |  |
| 545 | 8,000 |  |
| 2:20 | 47:19, 49:20 |  |
| 55 | $80$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 41: 25, \quad 88: 14 \\ & 5768 \end{aligned}$ | $41: 23, \quad 88: 13,$ |  |
| 12:5 | 95:10 |  |
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