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they are close to the property.
MS. ROBESON: That's fine. Okay. With that, we've sworn Mr. Goldman in. Mr. Goldman, it's -- you are up.

MR. GOLDMAN: Thank you, so much. My name is Neil Goldman and I live with my wife, Vicki Cramm at 11010 Dobbins Drive. My email address is NGoldman@GoldmanVanBeek. I ama lawyer in private practice focused on real estate and litigation, but I'm here on my own behalf today. While our property does not abut the site of the application, we are across the street from properties that do and we will be affected by the proposed development if it is approved. It will be visible from our property and will be affected by the lights fromit, the development and the vehicles that service in, and sirens from ambulances that will be visiting the facilities at all hours.

It will change the character of the neighborhood profoundly. I understand the others will address these issues in more detail. And I'm not going to dwell on them now. I submitted as Exhibit 114A -- I don't know if -- am I able to share exhibits?

MS. ROBESON: Let me just -- are you seeing it?
MR. GOLDMAN: It's there. A number of the neighbors were involved in working together to oppose the application. And I -- I was the one doing the administrative work of collecting the signed opposition, some of which are
detailed, some of which appear to be on a form On the -- on 114 A , I've identified those people whose properties abut the project and who -- it's the fourth column from the left. And the yes indicates that they are abutting neighbors.

The right hand column, just because there are -the time it took to do this and our uncertainty as to how to present them, late in the game last week we tried to encourage people to submit the opposition statements themselves. And many did. And I didn't want to create 10 confusion and clutter the record with duplicates. So the far right column indicates those people who sent in oppositions directly to OZHA that I was aware of. Maybe others have, but I did not submit the signed statements from those who had submitted them directly.

I would like to pull up, if I may, Exhibit 114B.
This is a map of the property and there is in, I guess a sort
of blue-green, highlighted properties of folks who own
property abutting the project who oppose it. And you can see
19 it's the vast majority of them. The -- in 114, which was an
20 email that I submitted, I listed 13 of 20 adjacent
21 properties, signed statements opposing it. There are two
22 properties that are significant and different in character
23 than the others. One is the B'nai Tzadek Synagogue which is
24 an institutional property that is on -- that your cursor is
25 over it. The other --

MS. ROBESON: Okay. Can I -- just one thing I forgot to say quickly. If this goes up to -- on appeal on a written transcript. So you can't say -- and the transcript doesn't know where my cursor is.

MR. GOLDMAN: Okay.
MS. ROBESON: Keep your identification of B'nai Tzedek property is sufficient. But we've been using north -there is the north arrow. So this is west, north, east, and south. No --
MR. GOLDMAN: It's the center property on the east. And it's the only one of the properties on that side of the project that is not in blue-green indicating in opposition. It's the only property --

MS. ROBESON: I think (inaudible) been identified. I just wanted to point that out for the witnesses that are 16 going to testify next. But go ahead.

MR. GOLDMAN: Okay. There is a property on the 18 other side that is identified as Heritage -- it's more or less the center one on the west side. That property is owned by what we understand to be -- it's Heritage Potomac South Glen Properties Trust. And we understand that to be affiliated with the Applicant. There was a meeting among the neighbors and Mr. Wormald. And we inquired about that 4 because a number of us have concerns about the potential for 5 that property to later, assuming that this is approved, and
we obviously don't want it approved, but if it is we are concerned about the potential for that property to become another access point to the project.

When we -- there was one neighbor who asked Mr.
Wormald about it and he indicated in response to the question, as best I recall, that that property was owned by a different entity than the Applicant. That may be the case, but again, it's our understanding that it's an affiliate and is under common control and to the extent that this project is approved, which we hope and believe it should not be, it should be a condition that that property can't be used to access the project. It appears to me and other neighbors with whom I've spoken that the application is not driven by a perceived need to provide housing for seniors. Just know that I'm 69. It appears to be a naked real estate --

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: You look (inaudible).

MR. GOLDMAN: Pardon?
MS. ROBESON: Never mind. I said you look great though.

MR. GOLDMAN: Oh. Well that's kind of you. Thank you. It appears to be a naked real estate play to put 45
townhomes that they call cottages to make them appear more quaint, I believe, in an RE2 zone that would not permit more
5 than roughly 8 residences when one considers the buffers and
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MR. GOLDMAN: Yes, I --
MS. ROBESON: For the benefit of the parties, there was some testimony. For the Applicants there was testimony that -- a couple of days ago that the application meets all the minimum requirements. And you know, the standard isn't whether it meets the minimum. Well, it is, but it's also whether it's compatible. So what we do, is if there are legitimate concerns, we do have the ability to try and address those concerns even if it's not the minimum.

For the -- those in opposition, I just wanted to say zoning is not a plebiscite. So the number of neighbors -- which means it's not a poll of how many people oppose it. The criteria for approval are set out in the staff report and it's whether it meets those criteria. So your weightiest testimony will be whether it meets the criteria that is set out in the zoning ordinance, which is also set out in the staff report. So I wanted to make those two points. Now I have -- next up we're going to have Ms. Weisbroth and then Ms. Baker, correct? Ms. Weisbroth, please raise your right hand.
Do you solemnly affirm under penalties of perjury that the statements you're about to make are the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? MS. WEISBROTH: I do. MS. ROBESON: Please state your name, address,
street address, and email address for the record.
MS. WEISBROTH: Good morning. My name is Nina Weisbroth. I live at 10800 South Glen Rd. with my spouse, Lance Kaline, and one of my adult children, River Kaline. We are located almost directly across the street from the planned project. My email address is NWeisbroth@gmail.com. I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak.

The West Montgomery County Citizens' Association, Mr. Brown, and my neighbors who directly abut the development have spoken and will continue to speak in detail as to the myriad of issues and concerns this project raises. I want to speak to a few aspects that really concern me. I want to stay in no uncertain terms that I am vehemently opposed to the Heritage Gardens plan because this product is 100 percent antithetical to the nature of the community where the 6 developer seeks to build.
We are comprised of essentially, 2-acre single18 family homes, many with backyard gardens and chicken coops. It has a rural, pastoral, quiet feel even on South Glen Rd..
There are exactly two streetlights on of all of the roads
running by the property. I fear that this peaceful and at night, dark neighborhood, is about to be pierced by a bustling and bright development that is in stark contrast to its potential setting.
I am concerned about the lighting, even more
concerned given the lack of detail regarding the lighting. And I thank you for asking for the lighting plan. Regardless of the detail however, there's no turning away from the fact that the property will light up the neighborhood all night long to meet code. What is now a dark forest will be lit up kind of like having a baseball field pop up in your backyard. It is unimaginable.

Whatever restrictions can be placed to reduce the amount of outdoor lighting will be greatly appreciated. More
10 tragic than the light issue is the notion that this project
11 will put a huge number of cars and commercial vehicles onto a
two lane road with no sidewalks and no shoulders which is already burdened by volume during commute hours. I literally have traffic backing up to my driveway, and I am past the development, from the intersection of Falls Rd. on some days. It is ludicrous for the developer to hold out that there will be no traffic impacts from the development.
18 I believe the townhouse section alone is 48 units, 19 which at two cars apiece is likely to add an additional 100
20 trips a day, not including their employees, their guests, or
21 anyone associated with memory care and assisted living
22 building. It is incomprehensible that a neighborhood can be
23 assaulted with that level of additional traffic. Reducing
24 the overall density of this project is key to reducing the
25 traffic impacts we will be forced to bear if it goes forward

| 17 | 19 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ```at its current levels. HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. Weisbroth -- just may I interrupt for a moment? MS. WEISBROTH: Of course. MS. ROBESON: I'm pulling up -- I'm hoping you can see on the screen a picture of the surrounding area. MS. WEISBROTH: Yes. MS. ROBESON: Is there any way you can describe where your property is? MS. WEISBROTH: Certainly. I am essentially two driveways further south on South Glen Rd. than the proposed development. MS. ROBESON: Two driveways further south. I'm trying to figure out south. So would you be between Lockland Rd. and the -- MS. WEISBROTH: No. MS. ROBESON: No. MS. WEISBROTH: I'm before you get to Edison. I'm between the development and Edison. MS. ROBESON: Okay. So Edison is -- MS. WEISBROTH: Edison intersects with South Glen Rd.. MS. ROBESON: Oh, I see. And where are you? MS. WEISBROTH: I'm just -- I am slightly further east, closer to Falls Rd. than Edison.``` | That's -- no worries. Not only do I worry about the potentially untenable increase in traffic for general driving, but I'm extremely concerned about the staff at the facility who rely on public transportation. There is no bus service to this property and there undoubtably never will be. Those riding the bus will need to walk down South Glen on the side of a road with no shoulders, at all hours of the day and night with little lighting, posing an extremely hazardous situation for the employees and the drivers. <br> I have no suggestions for ameliorating this and will only say that it is reflective of the completely inappropriate use of this property. I'malso concerned about the strategy at play for this development. It is essentially 14 a two-part development, a building focused on offering 15 housing to those with memory care and in need of assistance, 6 being used it to leverage a townhouse section for people 65 17 and older with very unusual ownership requirements that are 18 going to be hard to follow that really seems incredulous to the marketability to that project. <br> Further, these independent living residents have <br> no way to access service other than to get into a car and drive. This is important to raise because a similar age restrictive project went up in the Potomac prosperous town center with simple ownership and within walking distance of services. That development found it was unable to sell to |
| 1 MS. ROBESON: Okay. <br> 2 MS. WEISBROTH: I'm between -- yeah. <br> 3 MR. BROWN: Perhaps you could bring -- <br> 4 (Crosstalk) <br> 5 MR. BROWN: -- Exhibit 114B. That would be <br> 6 easier. <br> 7 MS. ROBESON: Okay. Ms. Weisbroth, does your <br> 8 property appear on this Exhibit 114B? <br> 9 MS. WEISBROTH: I believe it's the property -- <br> 10 yeah. Yes. Well, is that Edison Rd. that I'm looking at on <br> 11 the --  <br> 12 MS. ROBESON: The very top of -- or just below the <br> 13 north arrow there is a road. And I think that's Edison. <br> 14 MS. WEISBROTH: So where Edison intersects, if you <br> 15 just hop across the street, just that next -- just down --  <br> 16 not that one. The next one down. That one I believe is my  <br> 17 property.  <br> 18 MS. ROBESON: So you are on the southeast <br> 19 intersection? <br> 20 MS. WEISBROTH: Correct. <br> 21 MS. ROBESON: Southeast? <br> 22 MS. WEISBROTH: Yes. <br> 23 MS. ROBESON: Okay. You are the lot. Okay, thank <br> 24 you. Sorry to interrupt. Go ahead. <br> 25 MS. WEISBROTH: Oh, no. No problem at all.  | the intended age group and then asked to be released from that form of requirements so that they could sell the homes. <br> I implore you to set in place restrictions that <br> would not allow the developer to be released from the requirements allowing use as a special exception. Lastly and most importantly, this development is not one by right. A development by right, a single family home on 2 acre parcels would be welcomed by everyone in the neighborhood. So this is not a NIMBY issue. It's not an anti-development issue. <br> 10 We would welcome development of that property. This is not that. <br> This request is for a special exception to build <br> the equivalent square footage of an IKEA warehouse store in the middle of our neighborhood. It in no way fits the character of where we live. It's like shoving a square peg into a round hole and it is not like the developer is building something in short supply. Potomac is now drowning in senior housing of all varieties. This developer has spent no time with this community save attending two town meetings that he was asked to attend to explain what was happening. They have faced resistance every step of the way. <br> The fact is the developer withdrew the original plan, which was -- which looked like it was not going to be 24 approved, finagled a change in the zoning to better fit their 25 plans, and then resubmitted the request for a special |

## Conducted on March 2, 2022

exception is simply repugnant and an affront to everyday
citizens who simply cannot fight that kind of scheming. In
closing, I do not believe this project fulfills the
intentions for special exception.
And if the project goes forward, I asked for as
much care and thoughtfuiness of the existing neighborhood as
you can bring in your deliberations. I think you very much.
MS. ROBESON: Thank you. Ms. Harris, any
questions?
MS. HARRIS: No questions, thank you.
MS. ROBESON: Ms. Weisbroth, if you can, can you
lower your hand please?
MS. WEISBROTH: Of course.
MS. ROBESON: Ms. Baker, you are up next.
MS. BAKER: Thank you.
MS. ROBESON: Okay. Just a second. I'm going
to -- are you raising your right hand?
MS. BAKER: I am.
Do you solemnly affirmunder penalties of perjury
that the statements you're about to make are the truth, the
whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
MS. ROBESON: And can you state your street
address and email address for the record?
MS. BAKER: I can. I'mRenata Baker. I'm the
current homeowner together with my husband, of the property
21
1

1
As you've already heard, and I'm mindfiul that I don't necessarily want to repeat everything that others have already testified to, that there are undeniable traffic problems on South Glen Rd.. As has already been noted, this is a historic two-lane road that is already suffering from overuse and more development than it can handle. There are no sidewalks. That has been mentioned on this.

And many people use this road to access as an alternative route (inaudible) as people further out in the county we have experienced increased traffic problems from people using South Glen Rd. as an alternative access to other commercial developments at Montgomery Mall which are expanding, and corporate offices and residential communities that are growing all around the Democracy Boulevard area.

When I leave my property in the morning to take my son to school I have to sit to exit out of Lockland Rd. for far more time than should be reasonable. And any additional development and use of this road will highly impact me personally on a daily basis. It is unsafe to try to pull out every morning with the volume of traffic that already exists on that road.

I understand that a traffic survey or study has been requested. But the timing of that survey is unfathomable to me. To think that we are living in normal times in a pandemic and that we have normal traffic patterns occurring today is unbelievable and not supportable. As I mentioned, I work for a Fortune 50 company that employs thousands of employees.

I know people that live in these communities. My company has not required people to come back to the office fully. People are working from home. And any study that's done currently will be skewed to a lower traffic pattern then we experienced shortly before the pandemic. So there is no way to judge, at this particular time, the full impact. And even today there is significant impact already on South Glen Rd..

As has been testified to, the facility will
increase safety hazards for all of the neighborhood residential pedestrians including children that routinely walk or bike to surrounding areas and must use South Glen Rd. 16 to reach other neighborhoods, access the village shopping center services, or access Great Falls Park if you want to actually walk to those areas. South Glen Rd. has no sidewalks, bike lanes, and pedestrians would encounter hundreds of additional vehicles attempting to access the proposed facility on a daily basis including emergency and commercial vehicles that substantially increase the risk of injury.

This facility proposes noise levels that are incompatible with the surrounding residential neighborhood
22
located at 10828 Lockland Rd., Potomac, Maryland. My email
address is NataB8840@gmail.com. I will note that I also have
an 84 -year-old uncle who suffered a stroke that lives with
us, and a teenage son that resides at our property. I also
work for a Fortune 50 company for 25 years and have lived in
Potomac for 25 years, with my company being located within 5
miles of this proposed facility near Montgomery Mall.

My husband is a lawyer that works in Washington,
9 DC and my (inaudible) attends the Cibola (phonetic) which is
10 located within a mile of this property, of this proposed
11 project. As a result we commute to work and school, shop,
dine, seek medical care, and entertainment all in the
vicinity of the proposed facility. And as a result I believe
I'mhighly informed with respect to the traffic patterns and
the ordinary course activities and use of this area by
residents in the surrounding community.
17 Because I'minformed with respect to this
18 community, I'm highly opposed to the requested construction
19 of a commercial residential care facility deeply embedded
20 within a residential neighborhood. I oppose this application
21 not only because it will directly impact the quiet enjoyment
22 of my own property, but because the requested development
23 would be highly incompatible with the neighborhoods in the
24 immediate facility [sic] and adversely impact the surrounding
25 area at all levels.

MS. ROBESON: I should've asked since -- Mr.
Brown, do you have any questions? None --
MR. BROWN: I have no questions. Thank you.
MS. ROBESON: Okay, thank you. Thank you Ms.
Baker. You may be excused from testifying, but you may stay
around of course. I see a hand from a Catherine Scafide.
Maybe I said that wrong.
MS. SCAFIDE: It's okay. It's Scafide. I have a
meeting at 11:00. I was wondering if I could testify between
now and then.
MS. ROBESON: (Inaudible). Please raised your
right hand.
Do you solemnly affirm under penalties of perjury
that the statements you're about to make are the truth, the
whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
MS. ROBESON: Please state your street address,
your name, street address, and email address for the record.
MS. SCAFIDE: Sure. Catherine Scafide. I live at
10820 Edison Rd.. My property doesn't abut the development,
but is across the street fromit. And my email --
MS. ROBESON: Wait. Let me stop you for a moment.
MS. SCAFIDE: Okay.
MS. ROBESON: Is your property show -- is your
4 property shown on this map?
MS. SCAFIDE: Yes, it is. It looks like it's --
yes, it is the -- I'm sorry. Is that the -- what are we
calling that? The northwest? Oh, no, no. It's not shown on
here. It's across the street. So it's not shown on here.

MS. ROBESON: So a few lots across the street?
MS. SCAFIDE: No, no. It's across the other side of Edison. You don't have the properties on the other side of Edison showing.

MS. ROBESON: Okay. Let me just do one thing quickly. Is there any way you can describe it roughly on this map?

MS. SCAFIDE: Sure. Can you zoom in, please? Thank you. So yes, it is on Edison Rd., first of all. And it is the second property in from the intersection of Edison and South Glen.

MS. ROBESON: Okay.
MS. SCAFIDE: That one.
MS. ROBESON: That's helpful. Okay, thank you.
MS. SCAFIDE: No problem. And you need my email?
MS. ROBESON: Yes.
MS. SCAFIDE: My email is KScafide@gmu.edu.
MS. ROBESON: Thank you. Go ahead.
MS. SCAFIDE: So thank you. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony. I'm not a lawyer. I ama 4 nurse and a professor. And my husband of over 20 years is an 25 analyst for the County police. We've both lived in

Montgomery County our entire lives. We previously lived in a much denser area of Georgetown Village located across Roger Johnson on quarter acre lots up until 2019.

And I grew up on a farm. So I want our kids to really enjoy the many benefits of a more rural life without sacrificing a lot of our commute time. So we worked very hard to save our money and bought, in 2019, the two-acre property on Edison. We fell in love with the quiet neighborhood. It's very quiet and has this old Potomac charm of these various houses that don't look alike and some ramblers. We bought a rambler. And established old trees, which I find so characteristic of this area.

My husband and I , we -- my husband is a big guy. We can't even touch our hands around some of the trees in our yard. We love our house and the neighborhood. Our kids ride bikes in the street. We have chickens, a huge vegetable garden. Our kids camp in the backyard and we have a telescope. We do stargazing because there is really very little light pollution. And we love the wildlife. We see hawks and eagles, fox, deer, coyote. And it's part of what we enjoy about living in a more rural environment.

I have very significant concerns about the impact of the noise and the light pollution that will really disrupt this quality of life that we really bought into with his neighborhood. I mean, we are recently living -- chose to
save our money and purchase this house in this neighborhood because of its quiet life. And we also very concerned about how the noise and the light pollution will impact the willife of the area.

We've talked about trees, but I don't think there's been much discussion about the wildifie. The architect mentioned that there will be a four-story property with lights on patios on the third and fourth floor. There are no four-story properties anywhere near this neighborhood. I can't understand why this Lodge has to be -- can't be two stories or three stories, which is more consistent to the height of the cottages that they plan to build and is more consistent with the height of buildings in our neighborhood.

Our property, we live in a rambler. So our house is one-story. Every morning I take my kids to school and commute to work. I have kids who are in grade school. I have been shocked by the traffic and dangers of South Glen. It wasn't something I anticipated when I moved into the neighborhood. It's not something you sometimes think about
when you pick a house. But South Glen is a really dangerous
road. It is very narrow. There are no sidewalks, as
everybody has already testified to.
There's not even really space to go around cars.
It -- I mean there is no -- and so if somebody is turning you
can't even go around the car, it's that narrow. And there
have been numerous fatal and near fatal accidents on South Glen just west of our street. We actually heard one of those fatal accidents while we've been residing at our property. There is a sharp turn right down the street from us and it's very dangerous. There are stuffed animals that are all tied up on the tree and stuff because of the fatal accidents that have happened there.

And like so many have testified to, people dangerously walk on South Glen. Like I said, you can't even
10 go around the car that's turning because there is not.
There's not enough space to build sidewalks. I'm constantly
terrified that I'm going to hit somebody while I'm trying to
drive my kids to school because people are walking on South
Glen, dodging around vehicles, jumping onto the grass to
5 hopefully not get hit. It's -- that road is a complete
16 overhaul if it's going to sustain the traffic and the
17 pedestrians that are going to come with a major build like this.

And then finally, I echo what so many people have
20 said. Having lived now here for a couple of years, I saw the
21 traffic pre-COVID. And it was on unusual for the traffic
22 from Falls and South Glen to back up all the way to Norton.
23 Because that intersection is not made for vehicles -- the
24 amount of traffic coming off of South Glen. You can only
25 turn left and straight in one lane and right on the other.

1 And a whole bunch of people always turn left to go down
Falls. And so the traffic will stay there. And we will wait multiple rounds of lights to even attempt to get to the intersection. And so people dangerously go around cars to try to get through that intersection. It's really dangerous.

So I just can't imagine the impact of -- this
volume of people and cars will have on the safety of the 8 residents, both the new residents who would live there and 9 the existing residence in our neighborhood. And it 10 completely detracts from the character of this neighborhood, 11 which is why we moved here, to have a huge building in 2 facility and residents and lights and light pollution. And I 13 finally -- I mean, I was driving past -- I think it's the 14 Brandywine nursing home. There are signs that say there are 15 units available. So I just -- I find it surprising that
16 there is this need for additional facilities to support these 17 senior citizens in this kind of type of facility. So anyway, 18 that's it. Thank you, very much for letting me testify. I 19 appreciate it.
20 MS. ROBESON: Thank you, very much. Are there 21 questions from either Ms. Harris or Mr. Brown? Ms. Harris?
22 MS. HARRIS: No, no questions. Thank you.
23 MS. ROBESON: Mr. Brown?
24 MR. BROWN: No questions.
25 MS. ROBESON: Ms. Scafide?

|  | 33 | 35 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MS. SCAFIDE: Scafide. | 1 school. It was a school and the property will be developed |
|  | MS. ROBESON: I'm sorry. | 2 into something. And the proposed use for this property would |
|  | MS. SCAFIDE: It's okay. | 3 bring far less tra |
|  | MS. ROBESON: You may be excused. | 4 Seniors don't tend to go very often to many |
|  | 5 MS. SCAFIDE: Thank you | 5 places, than a school would. Less light pollution and less |
|  | 6 MS. ROBESON: Thank you for your testimony. Okay. | 6 traffic. And I would just like to add that as a realtor |
|  | 7 I see some hands, but they are phone numbers. So I don't | 7 the community, there is a high level of need for such |
|  | 8 know who -- I don't know a name to call. I see a phone | 8 housing. As the president of the Homeowner's Association for |
|  | 9 number. Amy Embrey has her hand up. Ms. Embrey, are | 9 the community called Tara we have -- a huge percentage of our |
|  | 10 here? | 10 residents are retirees. And they are probably 70s or late |
|  | 11 MS. EMBREY: Yes, I am. Can you hear me? | 11 And they are living in these huge houses that don't suit them |
|  | 12 MS. ROBESON: I can hear you. Do you have a | 12 anymore, but they have a desire to stay in the community and |
|  | 13 camera? | 13 there isn't a great alternative for them. |
|  | 14 MS. EMBREY: I | 14 And these houses don't tend to have first level |
|  | 15 MS. ROBESON: Will you please turn it on? | 15 primary suites that are conducive to aging in place. And so |
|  | 16 MS. EMBREY: I would prefer not to. | 16 I do see a need in the community for such a development. And |
|  | 17 MS. ROBESON: But this is a quasi-judicial hearing | 17 I feel that the proposed use is low density. It's very |
|  | 18 and we need to see your face, please, if possible. | 18 smart. It's aesthetically pleasing. It gives dignity to our |
|  | 19 MS. EMBREY: For the entire duration? I only as | 19 seniors and offers new and different options for seniors who |
|  | 20 because I have COVID issues | 20 may not want to go into assisted living or retirement or CCRC |
|  | 21 MS. ROBESON: Just while you speak. | 21 communit |
|  | 22 pajamas on, we won't tel | 22 Because of COVID situations the desires have |
|  | 23 MS. EMBREY: Okay. All right. I am- | 23 changed as I see them, as I talk to my clients. We also have |
|  | 24 unfortunately I'm down with COVID. So I'munfor | 24 just have an incredible housing shortage and that's |
|  | 25 with COVID so I'mjust not pulled together today. | 25 unprecedented and it continues to cause prices to go up in |
|  | 34 | 36 |
|  | 1 MS. ROBESON: (Inaudible) we are kind and | 1 the community. And as I see it from my profession, this |
|  | 2 compassionate and I hope you (inaudible). But we would like | 2 allows an opportunity for the seniors who are taking up these |
|  | 3 you to turn your camera | 3 big houses that could be homes for growing families, a place |
|  | 4 MS. EMBREY: Hello | 4 to go and free up some of the housing stock. |
|  | 5 MS. ROBESON: I'm sorry that | 5 So I was also incidentally part of the community |
|  | 6 (Inaudible) okay. I won't make any more editorial comments. | 6 push to install a sidewalk along the bend in River Rd. years |
|  | 7 (Inaudible). | 7 ago, that took forever. And it was vehemently opposed by the |
|  | 8 MS. EMBR | 8 neighbors abutting that sidewalk. And, you know, I would |
|  | 9 MS. ROBESON: Wait. First I | 9 just say that it neither impacted their property values in |
|  | 10 Please raise your right hand | 10 any way and it also added value to their houses in the form |
|  | 11 Do you solemnly affirm under penalties of perjury | 11 of being able to get places like the canal. |
|  | 12 that the statements you're about to make are the truth, the | 12 And so the concerns that often arise out of change |
|  | 13 whole truth, and nothing but the truth? | 13 are fear of the unknown. And I hear those fears and |
|  | 14 MS. EMBRY: Yes, I do. | 14 understand them and I would like to underscore from the real |
|  | 15 MS. ROBESON: And would you please state your | 15 estate perspective it neither diminishes the values of the |
|  | 16 name, street address, and email address for the record? | 16 abutting properties. On the contrary, it will help them if |
|  | 17 MS. EMBREY: Amy Embrey, 10905 Ballin Tree Lane, | 17 done well, which the proposed development does seem to be |
|  | 18 Potomac, Maryland. | 18 done very well, can add to the value of our community, the |
|  | 19 MS. ROBESON: And yo | 19 surrounding houses, a great and a lot of great solutions for |
|  | 20 MS.EMBREY: ADEmbrey@gmail.com | 20 the community. |
|  | 21 MS. ROBESON: Okay, thank you. Go ahead. | 21 And I live here in Potomac. I commute South Glen |
|  | 22 MS. EMBREY: So I definitely am aware of the | 22 almost every day, maybe two or three times a day. I don't |
|  | 23 surrounding property owners' concerns. And my principal | 23 want traffic either. And as I mentioned, I feel like of all |
|  | 24 thoughts surrounding all of this is that this property was | 24 the solutions, of all the proposed developments out there |
|  | 25 zoned for a school the whole time. It's been zoned for a |  |
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that it could be developed in terms of impacting the traffic
in our area.
MS. BAKER: Really? You really think so? Oh
my --
MS. ROBESON: Okay, just a second. Whoever is talking, there is -- this is not your time to talk. There is no crosstalk in this hearing.
MS. BAKER: Is there the opportunity to crossexamine this witness?
MS. ROBESON: Yes. Who is speaking? Is this Ms. Baker?
MS. BAKER: It is.
MS. ROBESON: It is. You will get an opportunity to ask questions. But first, Ms. Embrey, are you finished with your testimony?
MS. EMBREY: I think so, yeah.
MS. ROBESON: Okay. Ms. Harris, do you have questions?
MS. HARRIS: No, I have a procedural question, however. And that is, individuals that are testifying without representation, I want to just clarify that they have a right to cross-examine other individuals that are testifying who aren't represented?
MS. ROBESON: They do have a right to do that, but there -- so Ms. -- I'm sorry. For Ms. Baker benefit, there
```

are rules governing what kind of questions you can ask. So
I'm going let you have -- begin to ask questions. First let
me ask, Ms. Harris, did you have questions?
MS. HARRIS: No, I don't. Thank you.
MS. ROBESON: Okay. Mr. Brown, did you have questions?

MR. BROWN: Yes, just one or two. I was wondering, you mentioned that you believe a number of the homeowners in Potomac that own large homes in their 70s would be interested in moving into one of these, one of these cottage units; is that correct?

MS. EMBREY: Absolutely.
MS. ROBESON: Just a second. Can somebody silence -- I hear phones going off and I can't hear the witness. So if you have phones in the background, can you unplug them or something? Okay. Go ahead, Mr. Brown. I couldn't hear what you said.
18 MR. BROWN: I'll start over.
19 Are you a -- you testified that you believe that
20 there are senior people in their 70s who own large homes in
21 Potomac that would be interested in staying in the Potomac
22 area, but relocating to a smaller house such as the ones that
23 are going to be provided in the cottage units; is that
24 correct?
25 MS. EMBREY: Absolutely. I have first-hand
experience with that.
MR. BROWN: All right. So let me ask you on the basis of your first-hand experience if any one of them has expressed a strong preference to continue to be a homeowner, a landowner in the smaller properties as opposed to being a renter?

MS. EMBREY: Yes. In fact, he may be on here today. He's very interested in this particular community. And he's not the only one.

MR. BROWN: Are you aware that the -- that if someone buys one of these units they can only be sold to someone over 62 years of age?

MS. EMBREY: I am, yes.
MR. BROWN: Do you believe that -- based upon your dealings with other people who might be interested, have you -- do you have any information to suggest that that would not concerned -- that particular limitation would not concern those people about the salability of their property?

MS. EMBREY: Not at all. I have no concern about that. And in fact, I can tell you that I just put on the
market a house in the Courts of Clarksburg that's a 55 plus community that restricts any residents under 19. And I sold the house, or it's pending, in under seven days for well above list price. I have zero concerns about the salability of these properties in the future. We know that with the --
the baby boomers are one of our largest population groups.
And only about 10 percent of the houses in the greater DMV
have first level primary suites. We don't have situations
that allow them to live independently. So it is scarcity.
MR. BROWN: Well, congratulations on your sale.

MS. ROBESON: All right. I am going to point out, to my knowledge need is not a criteria for approval. So I let that go through because Ms. Embrey did raise it. And I let you cross-examine on it. But just for everyone here, to my knowledge, market need -- there are some conditional uses where market need is a criteria for approval. This is not

MS. EMBREY: Okay. Can I ask a question?
MS. EMBREY: This is Amy Embrey.
MS. ROBESON: Wait. Let's -- wait. Wait. I

MS. ROBESON: I'm sorry. Go ahead. No, it's not

It will sell.

No further questions.
MS. EMBREY: Thank you. one of them.

MS. ROBESON: Is this Ms. Baker?
MS. BAKER: No, I --
can't understand who is speaking.
MS. EMBREY: Amy Embrey.
your time. Is it a procedural question?

more chance to answer. But I think she did answer it. But, go ahead Ms. Embrey. How would --
(Crosstalk)
MS. HARRIS: I'm going to object to the question if I could.

MS. ROBESON: Yes.
MS. HARRIS: I think that that was a total mischaracterization of the proposed development. I believe I heard a commercialized high-rise development.

MS. ROBESON: (Inaudible)
MR. HARRIS: So on this basis, I don't know how
Ms. Embrey could even answer the question.

I think that there are so many things that can be done. And over the years, for instance, the old farm house on River Rd. that had the Orthodox Church pop up next to it, they put up trees. It was painful in the beginning to those
property owners and it was zoned for such a thing. And when
we buy properties we do our due diligence to understand what
property lies behind us, around us, and conceptualize how that could change over time. So --

MS. BAKER: So just separately then, is it your testimony that a residential sale with a forest conservation area behind it is not more valuable than a residential home with a five story facility that will be leased with 24 hour medical care? I would deem that to be commercial, but I'm happy to describe exactly what it is.

> MS. ROBESON: Well --

MS. BAKER: With 24 hour --
MS. ROBESON: No.
MS. BAKER: So you're trying to say that --
MS. ROBESON: Just a second, Ms. Baker. Just a second.
MS. BAKER: Yes.
18 MS. ROBESON: We are going into hypotheticals
19 here. She is not qualified as an expert to deal in
20 hypothetical situations. So --
21 MS. BAKER: But she gave testimony to suggest that 22 our property values would not be impacted. And I agree, she 23 is not an expert and she should not be testifying to whether 24 our property values would be impacted. But she was allowed 25 to testify as a realtor that our property values surrounding
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this community would not be impacted. And she was permitted
to --
MS. ROBESON: Well I'm not sure -- I didn't hear
her say property values. I heard her say --
    MS. BAKER: She did say --
    MS. ROBESON: Okay. Well, I don't -- because she
is not an expert, I don't give her testimony on property
values weight. Now if you want to continue on this, I guess
the simple thing --
    (Crosstalk)
    MS. BAKER: I'm fine if that's acknowledged, that
she is not an expert in property values.
    MS. ROBESON: Okay. Any questions based on my
questions, Ms. Harris or Mr. Brown?
    MS. EMBRY: I'mjust curious if a local realtor
isn't an expert on local property values, who is.
    MS. ROBESON: Well, do you want to be qualified as
an expert?
    (Crosstalk)
    MS. EMBREY: I'mjust asking the question. Just
asking the question because -- so --
    MR. BROWN: I'm happy to volunteer an answer to
that. The homeowner under Maryland law is qualified as an
expert in the value of his own home and the possible change
in that value due to adjacent development. this community would not be impacted. And she was permitted her say property values. I heard her say --
MS. BAKER: She did say --
MS. ROBESON: Okay. Well, I don't -- because she is not an expert, I don't give her testimony on property
values weight. Now if you want to continue on this, I guess
the simple thing --
(Crosstalk)
MS. BAKER: I'm fine if that's acknowledged, that she is not an expert in property values.
MS. ROBESON: Okay. Any questions based on my questions, Ms. Harris or Mr. Brown?
MS. EMBRY: I'mjust curious if a local realtor
isn't an expert on local property values, who is.
MS. ROBESON: Well, do you want to be qualified as an expert?
(Crosstalk)
MS. EMBREY: I'mjust asking the question. Just
asking the question because -- so --
MR. BROWN: I'm happy to volunteer an answer to
that. The homeowner under Maryland law is qualified as an
expert in the value of his own home and the possible change
in that value due to adjacent development.
```

MS. ROBESON: And have you reviewed this plan and
the location of the surrounding properties, Ms. Embrey?
MS. EMBREY: Yes ma'am, I have.
MS. BAKER: Have you looked at 10828 Lockland Rd.?
MS. EMBREY: Lockland? I'm familiar with the
road, the street, the recent listings in the neighborhood.
MS. ROBESON: So, I just -- hold on a second.
Backup. I'm having a problem with this because she was not
disclosed. Ms. Embrey was not disclosed as an expert. And
she is not required to file a prehearing statement because
she is not represented by counsel, but no one has had the
opportunity to look at her resume or voir dire. So Mr.
Brown, do you have objections to qualify her as an expert?
MR. BROWN: I have complete objection.
MS. ROBESON: So Ms. Harris, do you want to
qualify her as an expert?
MS. HARRIS: No, I don't think it's necessary. We
put our expert on yesterday. And I don't think it is
necessary. I think Ms. Embrey's testimony has spoken for
itself as a -- not as an expert.
MS. ROBESON: Well, I'm not going to qualify her
as an expert because she was not disclosed. Now, you didn't
have to disclose, but it would be highly unusual to qualify
someone as an expert even though you may consider yourself to
be an expert. So I will give your testimony the weight it --
the location of the surrounding properties, Ms. Embrey?
MS. EMBREY: Yes ma'am, I have.
MS. BAKER: Have you looked at 10828 Lockland Rd.?
MS. EMBREY: Lockland? I'm familiar with the road, the street, the recent listings in the neighborhood.

MS. ROBESON: So, I just -- hold on a second.
Backup. I'm having a problem with this because she was not disclosed. Ms. Embrey was not disclosed as an expert. And she is not required to file a prehearing statement because she is not represented by counsel, but no one has had the opportunity to look at her resume or voir dire. So Mr. Brown, do you have objections to qualify her as an expert?

MS. ROBESON: So Ms. Harris, do you want to qualify her as an expert?

MS. HARRIS: No, I don't think it's necessary. We put our expert on yesterday. And I don't think it is
19 necessary. I think Ms. Embrey's testimony has spoken for 20 itself as a -- not as an expert.
21 MS. ROBESON: Well, I'm not going to qualify her
22 as an expert because she was not disclosed. Now, you didn't
23 have to disclose, but it would be highly unusual to qualify
24 someone as an expert even though you may consider yourself to 25 be an expert. So I will give your testimony the weight it --
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I will let your testimony in and give it the weight it --
sorry -- weight it deserves. But I'm not going to qualify you as an expert.

MS. EMBREY: And you know, in full clarity I wasn't asking to be qualified as an expert. I simply asked the question of who was an expert if not a local realtor.

MS. ROBESON: Well, experts legally and local realtors are in a quasi-judicial trial, are two different things.

MS. EMBREY: Got it.
MS. ROBESON: So Ms. Baker, do you have any other questions? I'm not qualifying her as an expert.

MS. BAKER: Yeah. My only other question is
whether she has any connection to the developer as a realtor in her official capacity.

MS. EMBREY: I do.
MS. ROBESON: And what --
MS. BAKER: And what is the (inaudible) relationship?

MS. EMBREY: Pardon?
MS. BAKER: Can you tell me what the nature of 2 that relationship is?

MS. EMBREY: Yeah, he -- the developers are
4 related to my husband.
5 MS. ROBESON: Anything else?

MS. BAKER: No. I don't have any further questions. Thank you.

MS. ROBESON: Ms. Harris or Mr. Brown, any
questions based on those questions?
MR. BROWN: No questions.
MS. HARRIS: No questions.
MS. ROBESON: Ms. Embrey, I hope you feel better.
And you may be excused --
MS. EMBREY: Thank you.
10 MS. ROBESON: As a witness. You can stay around, 1 but you may be excused.
12 MS. ROBESON: Thank you. All right. Anyone else? 13 I don't see hands raised. Is there anyone else that wishes 4 to -- okay, now I do. I see Mr. Chaudhray and Ms. Finger. 5 Mr . Chaudhray, you want to go first, please?

MR. CHAUDHRAY: Yes, I do.
MS. ROBESON: Okay. I'm not seeing you on the camera. Can you turn on the camera, please?
19 MR. CHAUDHRAY: I just, I just did, but I don't 20 see it myself.
21 MS. ROBESON: Oh, I see -- I see something, but
22 not your face. You may have to -- you may have to adjust the
23 camera. There you are.
24 MR. CHAUDHRAY: Okay. Can you see me now?
25 MS. ROBESON: I do. Would you please raise your
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right hand?
    Do you solemnly affirm under penalties of perjury
that the statements you're about to make are the truth, the
whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
    MR. CHAUDHRAY: I do.
    MS. ROBESON: Please state your street address,
email, and name for the record.
    MR. CHAUDHRAY: My name is Abdul Chaudhray, and I
live on 11005 Allen Tree Lane, Potomac, Maryland. My email
address is ASChaudhray43@gmail.com
    MS. ROBESON: Thank you. Go ahead.
    MR. CHAUDHRAY: I have -- I am retired. I am an
executive. Lived in Montgomery area about 30 years. And I
am one of those people who Embrey was talking about, Amy was
talking about, lives on Tara. And I'm in a big house. It's
just me and wife are living that now. My house is 94,000
square -- 900 -- 9400 square feet. And I would like to move
down to a smaller area. But we still love the outdoors that
people talk about in Potomac, a rural area. We like the
greenery and we walk out and sit on the patio and enjoy that
as long as we can. I do not -- we do not wish to stay in
multistory buildings. We would like the fact that we have a
cottage that we can live in and enjoy our last days while we
have time to do it. So that's basically what it is. And
that's what interests me in this community. Because we don't
```

want to move out of the area. We love this area.
MS. ROBESON: Okay, thank you. Ms. Harris, do you
have any questions?
MS. HARRIS: I do not, thank you.
MS. ROBESON: Mr. Brown, questions?
MR. BROWN: Yes, I do. Just give me a moment
please.
MS. ROBESON: Let me just point out,
enforceability is an issue in this case, in my opinion. Need
is not one of the criteria.
MR. BROWN: Ms. Robeson, let me assure you that
when I asked about the resell potential of these homes I was
not addressing any issue relating to a traditional zoning
requirement of having to show evidence of need, which was in
fact in the zoning ordinance a couple of decades ago with
relation to facilities of this type.
17 MS. ROBESON: Mr. Brown, you have a paper that
keeps covering your face. It's a paper between you and the
camera.
MR. BROWN: I'm sorry.
MS. ROBESON: Thank you.
MR. BROWN: Did you understand my point?
MS. ROBESON: I did, yes. It used it to be in
there.
MR. BROWN: All right. We will be -- we will be
49

| 49 | 51 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 right hand? | 1 discussing the resell potential of these properties as |
| 2 Do you solemnly affirm under penalties of perjury | 2 testimony from my clients unfolds and the relevance of that |
| 3 that the statements you're about to make are the truth, the | 3 potential to your decision in this case. |
| 4 whole truth, and nothing but the truth? | 4 MS. ROBESON: All right. I will take that as a |
| 5 MR. CHAUDHRAY: I do. | 5 proper. Do you have any questions of Mr. Chaudhray? |
| 6 MS. ROBESON: Please state your street address, | 6 MR. BROWN: Yes, if you will, just bear with me |
| 7 email, and name for the record. | 7 one moment. Mr. Chaudhray, you had expressed a potential |
| 8 MR. CHAUDHRAY: My name is Abdul Chaudhray, and I | 8 interest in becoming, I guess, a purchaser of one of the |
| 9 live on 11005 Allen Tree Lane, Potomac, Maryland. My email | 9 cottage units and downsizing that way; is that correct? |
| 10 address is ASChaudhray43@gmail.com | 10 MR. GOLDMAN: Correct. |
| 11 MS. ROBESON: Thank you. Go ahead | 11 MR. BROWN: Would your interest be in any way |
| 12 MR. CHAUDHRAY: I have -- I am retired. I am an | 12 diminished if you were told that in order to occupy the |
| 13 executive. Lived in Montgomery area about 30 years. And I | 13 premises you had to be a person in need of personal |
| 14 amone of those people who Embrey was talking about, Amy was | 14 supervision of personal services, supervision, or assistance |
| 15 talking about, lives on Tara. And I'm in a big house. It's | 15 essential to sustaining the activities of daily living? |
| 16 just me and wife are living that now. My house is 94,000 | 16 MR. CHAUDHRAY: That would definitely impact my |
| 17 square -- 900 -- 9400 square feet. And I would like to move | 17 decision because we would like to be independent and live |
| 18 down to a smaller area. But we still love the outdoors that | 18 there as an independent in cottages. |
| 19 people talk about in Potomac, a rural area. We like th | 19 MR. BROWN: That's all I have. Thank you. |
| 20 greenery and we walk out and sit on the patio and enjoy that | 20 MS. ROBESON: All right. Any other questions? |
| 21 as long as we can. I do not -- we do not wish to stay in | 21 Mr . Chaudhray, thank you for appearing. You may be excused. |
| 22 multistory buildings. We would like the fact that we have a | 22 MR. CHAUDHRAY: Thank you. |
| 23 cottage that we can live in and enjoy our last days while we | 23 MS. ROBESON: I see Ms. Finger |
| 24 have time to do it. So that's basically what it is. And | 24 MS. FINGER: I'm trying to turn my camera on. |
| 25 that's what interests me in this community. Because we don't | 25 (Crosstalk) |
| 50 | 52 |
| 1 want to move out of the area. We love this area. | 1 MS. FINGER: On, but is not turning on. I don't |
| 2 MS. ROBESON: Okay, thank you. Ms. Harris, do you | 2 know what to do |
| 3 have any questions? | 3 MS. ROBESON: Okay. Well, does anyone have an |
| 4 MS. HARRIS: I do not, thank | 4 objection to Ms. Finger not having a camera on? |
| 5 MS. ROBESON: Mr. Brown, questions? | 5 MR. BROWN: No objection. |
| 6 MR. BROWN: Yes, I do. Just give me a moment | 6 MS. ROBESON: Ms. Finger, are you going to the |
| 7 please. | 7 icon in the top of the screen? |
| 8 MS. ROB | 8 MS. FINGER: Well, I have something in the middle |
| 9 enforceability is an issue in this case, in my opinion. Need | 9 of the screen where I raised my hand. And I see the |
| 10 is not one of the criteria | 10 microphone there. And then next to it is the turn camera on |
| 11 MR. BROWN: Ms. Robeson, let me assure you that | 11 And when I click on it I'm getting all sorts of possible |
| 12 when I asked about the resell potential of these homes I was | 12 instruction |
| 13 not addressing any issue relating to a traditional zoning | 13 MS. ROBESON: There should be a video camera icon |
| 14 requirement of having to show evidence of need, which was in | 14 next to the audio microphone icon. |
| 15 fact in the zoning ordinance a couple of decades ago with | 15 MS. FINGER: I see that. And I'm trying to turn |
| 16 relation to facilities of this type. | 16 it on and nothing happens. |
| 17 MS. ROBESON: Mr. Brown, you have a paper that | 17 MR. CHAUDHRAY: Are you connected to a monitor, |
| 18 keeps covering your face. It's a paper between you and the | 18 ma'am? |
| 19 camera. | 19 MS. FINGER: WebCam access has been denied by |
| 20 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry | 20 Norton. So that may be my security is not allowing the |
| 21 MS. ROBESON: Thank you. | 21 camera. |
| 22 MR. BROWN: Did you understand my point? | 22 MS. ROBESON: Okay. Let me see. |
| 23 MS. ROBESON: I did, yes. It used it to be in | 23 MS. FINGER: I do have Microsoft -- |
| 24 there. | 24 MS. ROBESON: What browser are you using? |
| 25 MR. BROWN: All right. We will be -- we will be | 25 MS. FINGER: I'm not sure. I'm sorry. I'm very |

not technological, I guess. But I have Microsoft Office, but I don't think that's the browser.

MS. ROBESON: Are you on Internet Edge or Google Chrome?

MS. FINGER: Yes, Edge.
MS. ROBESON: Edge. Do you have Google Chrome?
MS. FINGER: I do on my -- I've not tried to use
it, but I do have it on my screen, my initial screen as a
choice. But I would have to exit out of this and get onto Google Chrome, I guess.

MS. ROBESON: Well, that's what I was going to suggest, is if you want to try that, we can take another witness while you're trying that.

MS. FINGER: That would be fine. I will try that.
MS. ROBESON: Okay, thank you.
MS. FINGER: Okay.
MS. ROBESON: Is there anyone else that would like 18 to testify? Seeing none, or hearing none, Mr. Brown, do you want to take one of your witnesses?

MR. BROWN: Yes, I have Susan Lee standing by in Nairobi. It's past dinnertime and she would like to get started.

MS. HARRIS: But Ms. Robeson, if I could, I'm a little concerned because I think we fully expected Ms. Lee's testimony may take more than 5 or 10 minutes. And I would
hate for Ms. Finger to have to wait for --
MS. ROBESON: I'm, I'm -- well, with Mr. Brown's permission, I'm going to let Ms. Finger interrupt Ms. Lee's testimony. Mr. Brown, do you have an objection to doing that?

MR. BROWN: Not at all.
MS. ROBESON: The only other option is to let Ms. Finger testify without video. Do I hear any objections to that?

MS. HARRIS: I have no objection.
MR. BROWN: No objection.
MS. ROBESON: Well, we will wait until -- let's
13 see, it's 11:54-- 10:54. Let's do this. Let's take a 10
14 minute break and we will see if Ms. Lee -- I'm sorry -- Ms.
15 Finger can get back on. If not, we're going to proceed with 16 Ms. Lee, but I will interrupt the testimony when Ms. Finger 17 is back on. Any objections?
18 MS. HARRIS: (Inaudible 01:23:09). No. 10 minutes?
20 MS. ROBESON: Yes.
21 MS. HARRIS: Thank you.
22 (Off the record at 10:55 a.m., resuming at 11:06
23 a.m.)
24 MS. ROBESON: -- the camera. We appreciate your
25 efforts to try that. So Ms. Finger, are you raising your
right hand?
MS. FINGER: I am
Do you solemnly affirm under penalties of perjury that the statements you're about to make are the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. ROBESON: Please state your street address, your name, street address, and email address for the record.

MS. FINGER: My name is Heidi Finger. My street address is 10125 Glen Rd. in Potomac, Maryland. My email is Fingers-3@Verizon.net.

MS. ROBESON: Thank you. And what you like to say?
13
141
15 record here now. I just wanted to respond to some of the
6 previous testimony. I live on Glen Rd. very close to where
17 this proposed Heritage Gardens will be built. Like Mr.
Chaudhray, I'm an interested person in purchasing a cottage there.

I have followed the development of Heritage Gardens since it first made a presentation to the West
Montgomery Citizens -- West Montgomery County Citizen's
Association. And have remained interested in it. I drive on
4 South Glen Rd. all the time in order to get to the village in 5 Potomac. I have not driven at rush hour and I don't normally

1 drive at rush hour. My husband and I have one car. And I have not encountered terrible traffic on South Glen Rd. the times I am traveling and driving there.

I -- also my location on Glen Rd. is right next to Wayside Elementary School. And if there were a school instead of Heritage Gardens at the proposed site, I can tell you that they have to light up the school for security all night long and the lights are much brighter from a school than they would be for this senior development, and assisted10 living, and memory care proposed development. I would never 11 dream of walking on South Glen Rd.. I think the beauty of 12 this development is that it has its own sidewalks and trails 13 and safe area within the development and it's taken into 14 consideration that we might have pets that we want to walk, 15 and that's where we do it.
16 In addition, as far as traffic is concerned, my 17 experience with my mother who lived in a very similar 18 development, but much, much larger in Florida, in Naples, 19 Florida, they had cottages, a 14 story high-rise, apartment 20 building, and a similar large, administrative buildings for
21 assisted living and dining as well as a swimming pool. In
22 the times that I visit her which were quite frequent. She
23 died three years ago, but in the last 2011 through 2018, they
24 had caregivers there, gardeners, kitchen help, nursing staff, 25 and so forth.

| 57 | 59 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 And the development itself never had any traffic | 1 interested in Brandywine or any other assisted living. |
| 2 to speak of. I often was the only person in a car exiting | 2 MR. BROWN: And you would not be interested in |
| 3 the development to go out, whether it's shopping to grocery | 3 this particular property if they were a requirement to enter, |
| 4 store or some other errand. We -- my mother had around-the- | 4 |
| 5 clock caregivers in her apartment. They came every eight | 5 |
| 6 hours. They came by car. They parked in a certain reserved | 6 MR. BROWN: Thank you. I have nothing further. |
| 7 area for them. And It think it would be that's what | 7 MS. HARRIS: I have a question of Ms. Finger |
| 8 experienced it there would be much less imposing at this | 8 please. |
| 9 Heritage Garde | 9 MS. ROBESON: Okay. |
| 10 It seems to me that is very tastefully designed | 10 MS. FINGER: Sorry. I think there is a phone in |
| 11 that it's -- would blend into the area. It wouldn't be | 11 the background. Well, I can turn it off. There. |
| 12 visible from the main road. I don't think the neighbors | 12 MS. HARRIS: Ms. Finger, but you did say that you |
| 13 would be impacted. Of course, I'm not an expert on any of | 13 would be interested in the independent living component of |
| 14 these things. I don't think the neighbors would be severely | 14 the property; is that correct? |
| 15 impacted. I think if you had individual single-family homes, | 15 MS. FINGER: That's correct. |
| 16 each on 2 acres, you could have much more traffic, much more | 16 MS. HARRIS: And the -- and are you aware that the |
| 17 noise. | 17 application as a residential care facility include senior |
| 18 I see it in my own neighborhood. Although I have | 18 care communities, which include independent living and |
| 19 an acre and a half, and I think the next-door neighbor is a | 19 therefore that service component that Mr. Brown just |
| 20 new house with three quarters of an acre, I can see right | 20 mentioned, while that's attributable and a requirement of |
| 21 into their house now and see their TV on and I don't think | 21 assisted living, it's not required of an independent living? |
| 22 there would be a similar situation in Heritage Gardens. And | 22 MR. BROWN: I object to the (inaudible). |
| 23 so it sounds very appealing to me. I care tremendously about | 23 MS. FINGER: That's correct. |
| 24 the environment, trees, gardens, wildlife. I have | 24 MR. BROWN: That's argumentative. |
| 25 those where I live and I would like to have something as | 25 MR. GOLDMAN: Yeah, just a minute, Ms. Finger. |
| 58 | 60 |
| 1 close as possible. | 1 Mr . Brown, go ahead. |
| 2 So I echo the testimony of Mr. Chaudhray and Ms. | 2 MR. BROWN: I object to the question as |
| 3 Embry. And I'm hoping that this will be approved so that I | 3 argumentative. Ms. Harris and I can have a disagreement |
| 4 have an option of somewhere to move where we could have some | 4 about what the requirements are. I simply asked -- I simply |
| 5 assistance available on the property. And my experience is, | 5 asked the witness whether she would -- whether she would fin |
| 6 my husband and I both had surgery last summer. We needed to | 6 it agreeable or disagreeable if that requirement were there. |
| 7 have a caregiver. And it would be much more convenient to go | 7 Whether or not that requirement is there is an issue of law |
| 8 through the aging process where there is some medical staff | 8 that Ms. Harris and I can discuss at a later, more convenient |
| 9 available, but you still have independence. So that's my | 9 time. But there is no point in getting to -- |
| 10 testimony. | 10 MS. ROBESON: Right. I do -- |
| 11 MS. ROBESON: Thank you. Mr. Brown, any | 11 MR. BROWN: An argument with the witness about it. |
| 12 questions? | 12 MS. ROBESON: I'm going to sustain that. Do you |
| 13 MR. BROWN: Yes, very briefly. Ms. Finger, I | 13 have any other questions, Ms. Harris? |
| 14 gather that you would be a potential purchaser among the | 14 MS. HARRIS: No I don't, thank you. |
| 15 cottage units at the property because you find them-- if on | 15 MS. ROBESON: Anyone else?. None, thank you for |
| 16 the concept attractive; is that right? | 16 appearing and working so hard at seeing you, Ms. Finger. You |
| 17 MS. FINGER: Yes, that's correct. | 17 can be excused, but you're welcome to hang around. |
| 18 MR. BROWN: Is either you or your husband over 62 | 18 MS. FINGER: Thank you. |
| 19 years of age? | 19 MS. ROBESON: Is there anyone else that wishes to |
| 20 MS. FINGER: We are 77 and 79 | 20 testify that's not going to be called by Ms. Harris or Mr. |
| 21 MR. BROWN: Well, that very much well qualifies. | 21 Brown? Okay, hearing none, Mr. Brown, I think we have Ms. |
| 22 Is either of you a person in need of personal, services, | 22 Lee. |
| 23 supervision or assistance essential for sustaining the | 23 MR. BROWN: Yes, we do. Just -- |
| 24 activities of daily living? | 24 MS. ROBESON: Ms. Lee? |
| 25 MS. FINGER: Not at this time. So we are not | 25 MR. BROWN: Would you please -- go ahead and swear |

her in.
MS. ROBESON: I don't see her. Oh, there she is. I have you. Please raise your right hand.

Do you solemnly affirm under penalties of perjury that the statements you're about to make are the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?

MS. LEE:
MS. ROBESON: Ms. Lee, I think you are on mute.
MS. LEE: I certainly am. I do. Thank you.
10 MS. ROBESON: Okay, thank you. Please state your 11 name, address, and email address for the record. And then I will turn it over to Mr. Brown.

MS. LEE: My name is Susanne Lee. I live it 12900 Circle Drive, Rockville, Maryland, 20850. My email address is SusanneLee1@hotmail.com.

MS. ROBESON: Okay, Mr. Brown.
MR. BROWN: Ms. Lee, could you please describe for the hearing examiner your educational background and experience that leads you to provide the testimony that you're going to provide today?

MS. LEE: Well, I'm not appearing here as an attorney. I'm appearing as a vice president of West
Montgomery County Citizens' Association. I've lived in the area about 30 years and have been involved multiple times with regard to the master plan, with regard to zoning, and
land-use issues within the area. In my professional life I
was 15 years in the General Counsel's office at EPA as an attorney working on regulations primarily related to water law issues.

And then following my service at EPA I served in the Western Pacific working again as the environmental counsel in a small Pacific Island nation. Again, often times many water issues. So I come with an interest, a personal interest and years of experience of volunteering with the local citizens association on local matters.
11 MR. BROWN: Have you studied this particular application in detail?

MS. LEE: I have.
MR. BROWN: What are your concerns about it?
MS. LEE: If I may, I may just go ahead and read 16 my testimony, if that's all right with you, Mr. Brown.

MR. BROWN: Absolutely.
MS. LEE: And then if you have particular 19 questions -- is that okay? And I do apologize, I'm here in
20 Nairobi. I'm very happy. My daughter works and lives here
21 and I haven't been able to visit because of COVID and we
22 tried to save this date up so knowing the January 28th. And
23 I really appreciate you being willing to listen to me. And
24 if I cut off, I will try to get back on. But I think it
25 should be fine today. But as a result, I'm just going to

1 read it and make sure I get it in, if that's okay with you.
2 My name is Susanne Lee. I'm the current vice
president of the West Montgomery County Citizens'
Association. West Montgomery was founded in 1947 and has as
its major goals the preservation of the unique and
substantial environmental resources of the Potomac subregion and the maintenance of orderly planning and zoning consummate with the needs and desires of this community.

West Montgomery opposes this application. We concur with the multiple legal and factual reasons presented by others in opposition. In my testimony I will describe the three major reasons why we oppose. First, the placement and construction of the Lodge complex will violate the 4 environmental protection and building requirements contained 15 in state and federal laws and regulations and summarized in
Montgomery County's environmental guidelines for the
management of development in the county. The Lodge complex
construction will also violate the forest preservation
requirements regarding the site in the Potomac subregion master plan.

Second, the construction of a facility the size at this location is inconsistent with the basic framework of the 3 master plan, including the elderly housing and special 4 exception provisions. Third, the ownership structure of the facility is so bizarre that coupled with the stringent age restrictions dooms it to failure and guarantees an enforcement nightmare, all of which would have to be addressed through significant and extraordinarily stringent covenants, staging, and reporting requirements.

First with regard to the environmental issues, OZHA must reject the conditional use that at this density, with this site plan, cannot be constructed without violating multiple local, state, and federal environmental requirements in the master plan. In particular we submit that you must 10 reject a use that proposes and requires construction of the 11 Lodge complex, the most intense use on the site, in protected 12 streams, stream valley buffers, and adjacent steep slopes on
13 erodible soils on slopes over 15 percent in the floodplain, 14 in the floodplain buffer, and in the protected forest stand.

The site is 30 acres, the majority of which is
6 made up of open meadows with scattered forest stands.
17 However, approximately 10 acres of the site is composed of
18 stream valley buffers. Those 10 acres are in the far
19 northern portion of the property and are composed almost
20 entirely of prized riparian forest buffer, two streams, three
21 valley buffers, and their adjacent steep slopes, slopes with
22 highly erodible soils, floodplains, floodplain buffers,
23 wetlands, and the protected priority forest stand delineated
24 for protection in the master plan.
25 The current proposal is to construct a Lodge
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could go in just a little bit further, especially just to be able to see -- especially down -- if you could focus in a little bit. Thank you, very much.

So the stream valley buffer is in blue. The gym is -- basically has a 6A on it. And as you can see, the stream valley buffer, it -- the stream valley buffer is to the south of that. So it appears, about three quarters of it in the stream valley buffer. The areas surrounding it are within the limits of -- limits of -- not destruction, sorry, 10 disturbance. And as well, the area over where the road is 11 going to be and also towards the wetlands to the right.
12 So there is a major area that is -- it's
13 undisputed, will be involved in the stream valley buffer.
14 It's about an acre according to what the planning report -15 planning staff report said it's about an acre. And there is 16 no restrictions on that. They are just going to be allowed 17 to do it. The second thing is that the -- there is also a floodplain on the site.
19 And if you didn't mind focusing in on 6A, there is 20 both a floodplain and a floodplain buffer. And on the corner
21 of the -- and you can see where the stream is and all that.
22 But as you can see on the corner of 6 A , just down from 6A,
23 the yellow line, the yellow line is the floodplain buffer.
24 And the pink line is actually the floodplain. And you will
25 see that even a small portion of the floodplain that falls
within the limits of disturbance, that's the black line goes over.

And that an additional amount of the floodplain buffer will be within the limits of disturbance. That's one of the -- one of our big areas is stream valley buffer because they are protected under the environmental guidelines. The second issue has to do with the steep, erodible slopes on the property. And looking to those, they are basically at 116 D .116 D on the map is right where it 10 will be constructed. And the definition of 116D is the soil type at that spot. And on their natural resource inventory 12 they describe that as slope of 15 to 25 percent and highly 13 erodible soils. So they will be placing this right in the 4 middle of that area.
15 Then the other environmental feature that I wanted 16 to indicate, I don't think it's as clear on this. If you 7 wouldn't mind going up just a little bit, I think I need to 8 bring up another exhibit to be able to show you this aspect. 9 Would you mind just scrolling to the top a little bit? Just 0 a little bit more. I think it does show it, but I think it 1 might be a better area. And this has to do with the forest 2 conservation requirements. So I think I would ask you to go 3 then from this exhibit to $50-$ let's see -- 53, I think that 4 the forest conservation plan. 53A probably shows it. And 5 these are all undisputed. So I just wanted to point it out.

MS. ROBESON: I only have 53B.
MS. LEE: 53A, do you have? I'm sorry. There. That's good. And unfortunately I think it only has this sheet as an exhibit. But what I really wanted to focus on what the right hand side, which is sheet 4 . And then to zoom in especially to the area in the top of it and the shaded, very dark areas that's just above the phrase, supplemental tree planting area. And that's the area that Mr. Park described yesterday.

The entire area, which is that sort of cone-shaped thing, is the piece that -- it's undisputed. It's indicated in the master plan. It's to be preserved. And the shaded area is the amount that they will destroy in order to build the lodge. You can see the outline of the lodge, it will be right there. So those are the main areas of concern that we have because we think they are in blatant violation of both the master plan and the environmental guidelines.

With regard -- and excuse me. The other thing is 9 that when you are deciding under the environmental guidelines 20 how much stream valley buffer is to be included you have sort 21 of a basic amount that you do. And it's under table -- it's 22 called table number 1. And it's on page -- this table number 231 is on page 8 of the environmental guidelines. And it 24 refers -- and it's used because it delineates how wide the 25 basic stream valley buffer should be.
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| 69 | 71 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 So the Applicant has said that they've done their | 1 when the -- when the stream valley buffer touches the toe of |
| 2 calculations and that it turns out to be 100 feet wide | 2 a steep slope, then it must be extended up and being -- and |
| 3100 -- yeah, 100 feet wide. So when you take that, then you | 3 the rest of that steep slope must be included as part of the |
| 4 turn to the other page in the guidelines, that's not the end | 4 stream valley buffer. That's very important bec |
| 5 when you have steep slopes nearby. So the guidelines then on | 5 right exactly where the -- where it's going to be -- |
| 6 page 7 state specifically that if the stream buffer | 6 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: So that's the |
| 7 encompasses the toe of a steep slope, the buffer w | 7 (indiscernible). |
| 8 expanded | 8 MS. LEE: The -- excu |
| 9 slope. | 9 That's on the left-hand side of the lodge looking at the |
| 10 So I wanted to use another exhibit to show where | 10 left-hand side. So that's important. So that -- and I must |
| 11 that occurs. And I did discuss it a bit with Mr. Stem | 11 say that Mr. Stemann objected that. He said that it -- and I |
| 12 during his testimony. And that would have -- that is on | 12 don't know whether he is an expert in that area. He was not |
| 13 Exhibit 51A, which is the natural resource inventory. Now I | 13 the one who did the national [sic] resource inventory. He |
| 14 might point out that Exhibit 26 was the original one that | 14 stated something like, it doesn't have to be sent up there |
| 15 they submitted, which had no slopes delineated at all. It | 15 because it's not -- that slope isn't connected to the stream. |
| 16 was done by Mr. Markovich. He signed it. And then it was | 16 Well, that's not what the basis is. That's what |
| 17 only just before the hearing that this additional one was | 17 he looked at. You look at the stream that's set forth in the |
| 18 submitted that actually has -- I hope I have the right one - | 18 guidelines, very straightforward. You look at the 200 feet |
| 19 actually has the steep slopes that are on | 19 on either side of the stream and then you look at what |
| 20 You can see to the far right and then down on the | 20 actually drains to the stream to determine what the stream |
| 21 key it actually shows where the -- based on shading, where | 21 buffer is. But once you've determined that, then you take |
| 22 the steep slopes are on the site. So if you could, if you | 22 the provisions in the -- and you decide whether it goes over |
| 23 wouldn't mind focusing in about -- if you -- let's see. I | 23 a toe of the slope and then it expands. |
| 24 think I had done the best numbers to be able to show you -- | 24 So we would say that that's a real straightforward |
| 25 it's right about there. That's good. And then if you would | 25 area where the stream valley buffer should be expanded even |
| 70 | 72 |
| 1 focus in straight on from that, straight in. It's near tree | 1 more. The other is that the -- as you go to the right, say |
| 2 150. And if you could go in a little bit further, sorry. A | 2 over near number five, this is -- this area, all of the |
| 3 little bit to the -- it's between -- there is 149 and 147 | 3 shaded areas are a mix of steep slopes and slopes that aren't |
| 4 I 'm looking to see if there is some language. If you could | 4 quite so steep that would be 15 to 25 percent on erodible |
| 5 come and go there. Your cursor was just about there. Yes. | 5 soils. So he said that they had expanded the stream valley |
| 6 If you could see 150 a little bit -- go over to your -- to | 6 buffer to include some of those steep slopes. |
| 7 the right. Sorry. | 7 Well, we would submit, and I will go on with -- |
| 8 MS. ROBESON: I find (inaudible) but I can't fin | 8 when I describe the master plan provisions. The master plan |
| $9 \quad 150$. | 9 provisions state that that entire area, which we looked at in |
| 10 MS. LEE: How about 147? 147, does that | 10 the last exhibit, is to be protected. And if it can't be |
| 11 MS. ROBESON: There is 147. | 11 protected under the -- if it's -- and it should be protected |
| 12 MS. LEE: Okay. So you've got - | 12 as part of the stream valley stream buffer because most of |
| 13 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (Indiscernible) | 13 these are riparian forests. And if it cannot -- that either |
| 14 marked on the exhibit. | 14 the development should be clustered in order to avoid the |
| 15 MS. LEE: Sorry. Excuse me. So tree -- that's | 15 development on the forest stand, or that the existing buffers |
| 16 tree 147. And - | 16 and the environmental guidelines should be expanded to |
| MS. ROBESON: 150 is also marked | 17 include the entire forest stand. |
| 18 MS. LEE: And 150 is there. So 150 is a little | 18 So I point that out only because that's another |
| 19 bit closer to what I wanted to point out, which is that the | 19 area where we believe that the Applicant has not provided the |
| 20 shaded area are slopes that are steep slopes. They are over | 20 amount of buffer that should be provided. And Mr. Stemann |
| 2125 percent. And that's sort of an arch right there unde | 21 really didn't speak to that. Mr. Park did. He admitted |
| 22 147. And just to the left of it is the line that says S | 22 those provisions were in the master plan, but no changes were |
| 23 stream valley buffer. And there is a spot where that stre | 23 made. And I don't know why they -- when Mr. Markovich did |
| 24 valley buffer goes right across that slope, that steep slop | 24 the first natural resource inventory, he delineated exactly |
| 25 And we would assert that because the guidelines require that | 25 these same stream valley buffers, but he did not have any of |
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the steep slopes indicated on the site plan.
So I have no idea whether if -- and the most recent one, the one you're looking at now, is not signed by Mr. Markovich, it's not dated in any way. So I have no idea whether he that semi won't know because he is not here. He is not here. He is not testifying. So whether he would change it based on, for example, the master plan requirements. But it certainly isn't -- hasn't been changed based on the master plan requirements.

I think one -- just one other thing is 94I, which is just to show you sort of what this -- what the stream -excuse me -- what the steep slopes look like on the site.
It's just a -- it's a good -- it's a little bit easier to see than the shaded areas.
15 MS. ROBESON: I'm sorry. What exhibit did you say?
MS. LEE: 94I.
MS. ROBESON: Thank you. I'm sorry. Give me the -- I was writing. What is the --

MS. LEE: No problem. 94I.
MS. ROBESON: Oh, I -- I, okay.
MS. LEE: I as in igloo I guess. And I apologize because it's sideways. But it's a GIS of the site. The blue -- there you go, thank you. Just around. The blue is the steep slopes and the green is the slopes that are 15 to

25 percent with erodible soil. Both of these are highly protected under the environmental guidelines. So I guess that's --

I just sort of wanted to lay the framework because I don't think any of us have disagreed with that except for the fact that we have disagreed on whether or not those calculations of the stream valley buffers are correct. And faced with that, the Planning Board staff admitted that over 1 acre of stream valley buffer will be developed as part of 10 this proposal. And the -- as well as the -- that forest plan 11 provision.
12 And their response to that was not to make them 13 conform to the guidelines or the master plan, but all they 14 are having to do is put in some supplemental plantings and 15 mitigation. And I don't think there is anything that would 16 permit that to be -- to be able to get around -- there is no 17 reason why -- there is no basis for just allowing this go 18 forward with that kind of planting.
19 And I also point out too, these issues are
20 important. And I know the Planning Board staff looks of
21 them, but I really admire the fact that in the past OZHA
22 looks at them independently. And for example, on the
23 Brandywine site, which is a pretty concentrated site, there
24 was a small amount of either wetlands and/or stream that was
25 up near the golf course. And Katherine Nelson at Park and

Planning figured out a way how to make sure that that was
protected. There was never any question that it wouldn't be protected, but they just had to rearrange the configurations to do it.

And in the Spectrum case, which I know you Ms. Hannan, just recently worked on, there was a delineated area in there that was a federally recognized wetlands provision -- wetlands area. And that was important enough that the Applicant went and got the Corps of Engineers to come out and examine the site. She did what I guess is called a shovel test, and found that in fact it had been paved over by a previous owner. And so she determined that there was no need -- there was no longer a wetland that 4 needed to be regulated.
15 But I just -- I cannot -- I cannot remember any 16 situation where the environmental requirements have been so 17 ignored as in this case and what it would require to have 18 them do -- have it done. So I'm going to get back just to my 9 written testimony.

21 Why -- are you saying that the supplemental planting isn't a
22 sufficient mitigation for the loss of the stream valley
3 buffer? Is that what -- and if so, why?
MS. LEE: Well, I don't think -- I don't think it's -- I think those are protected. They're just protected
by statute. And you can't just going to say you're going to this and I will plant something over there. I just don't think you can -- it's not -- is not even close. I just -there are certain -- yeah, it's just -- you can't just go in and say I'm going to plant a few trees and get around the guidelines because the guidelines, although they are called guidelines, and Mr. Stemann says they are just guidelines that they are advising, they are not.

The construction will violate the plain language of the county's environmental guidelines that govern all development in the county and the forest preservation requirements in the Potomac subregion master plan. Although they are called balance, the guideline is a compilation of state, local, and federal statutory and regulatory requirements and is made further binding incorporation by reference in the county's forest conservation strategy. As required by state --

MS. ROBESON: (Inaudible) what are you reading?
MS. LEE: Excuse me.
MS. ROBESON: Are you reading from something?
MS. LEE: Yes, from my testimony. I'm sorry. Yes.
23 MS. ROBESON: Oh, I thought you were quoting 4 something. I'm sorry.
5 MS. LEE: I will in a minute. I'm sorry. Yeah.

No, no. They -- and it includes both state and local and
federal regulations including federal statutory requirements
for wetlands and floodplains are included as well. As
required by state statute, the primary objective of the
guidelines is the regulation of development in sensitive
areas in particular streams and their buffers, 100 year
floodplains, and steep slopes. For example, you can't
just -- you can't just give away -- you can't violate a
federal wetlands statute by saying if you plant a few more
trees -- these are statutory and regulatory.
MS. ROBESON: I get what you're saying.
MS. LEE: Yeah. I'm sorry ifI wasn't clear.
They are based on sound science and provide the detailed
methods necessary for protection against development in areas
prone to flooding and on -- where soils are unstable. That's
it to try to protect structures, but also to prevent erosion,
runoff, and sedimentation especially with regard to
preserving water quality, especially as a source of our
drinking water. I'm sorry. Got a little dry.
This is particularly important here because of the
streams in the lodge complex portion of the site are
7
1 grading will be permitted in stream buffers except for infrastructure uses, bikeways, and trails found to be necessary, unavoidable, and minimized by the park and planning department environmental staff working closely with the utility or lead agency. Thus with the exception of the sewer line and the proposed bike trail and perhaps the road itself, the other construction of buildings, structures, or impervious surfaces like parking lots proposed for the stream valleys are prohibited.

What the proposed location for construction of the lodge complex must also be rejected because it violates the plain language of the Potomac subregion master plan requirements for forest conservation. Maryland land-use law requires that the grant of a special exception, now conditional use, must be consistent with the relevant master plan as well as compatible with the existing neighborhood. Likewise, the zoning code requires that a conditional use substantially conforms with the recommendation of applicable master plan. The master plan itself states, at page 13 , that a special exception may be denied if it is inconsistent with master plan recommendations. The master plan is not merely advisory.

The forest in the northern portion of the site, which I showed -- which we looked at on that mat number four where the lodge complex will be built, was studied as part of
the preparation of the master plan process and was specifically addressed in the master plan. And I don't think that they are objecting to that. I think they agree with that.

The master plan at page 13 specifically states under forest resources, preserve properties containing forested areas, see foldout map $F$, to prevent fragmentation or to maintain stream valley buffers. It is undisputed that the forest stand in that northern portion of the site is listed for protection on map F. And I believe you looked at that the other day Ms. Hannan when you pulled the -- they pulled it up and sort of circled it.

It is likewise undisputed that this proposed use does not preserve it, but in fact a portion of the forest including on the steep slopes will be destroyed in order to construct the lodge. And in addition to its designation on foldout map F, Exhibit 94E consists of the documents that accompany the master plan and contain additional explanatory information about the preservation requirements including forest categories and the methods to be used to protect each. The forest stands are divided into five categories. The first three are the largest stands. If you want to bring up that, it's Exhibit 94E. It's that document there. Yeah.

And I think I have most of the pages outlined if I can -- the forest stands are divided into five categories.
to 4.3 million residents of Montgomery and Prince George's
County. All of that water comes from the Potomac and most of it from the Watts branch watershed.

Sediment and runoff from Watts branch has historically been a huge problem, but especially during increasingly --doing local storm events, which have been increasing in severity in the last several years which cause the source water quality to change dramatically and affect the water treatment plant operation. It has reached such a critical situation that there is a proposal to construct a new intake pipe way out into the Potomac away from the Watts Branch.

A major focus of environmental protection in the county and is reflected in the master plan has been to ensure the Watts Branch stream valley is protected by an increase in stormwater management and the headwaters in Rockville in stringent adherence to the environmental guidelines in the watershed. The construction of the lodge complex, building on steep slopes and in stream valley buffers, forest stands
and floodplain buffers will result in just the opposite,
increased runoff, degradation, and sediment in the Watts branch.

The guidelines state specifically that quote, and
this is from the guidelines, no building, structures,
impervious services, or activities requiring clearing or

| 81 | 83 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 The first three are the largest stands and all are partly or | 1 subdivision. |
| 2 entirely within public parkland. As a result, the | 2 MS. LEE: Yeah. Yes. |
| 3 preservation techniques focus on regulation of park | 3 MS. ROBESON: So we have the right document. |
| 4 activities and park expansion. That's Exhibit 94 at pages 2- | 4 MS. LEE: Yes. No, no. We are definitely there. |
| 5 3. The Heritage Garden site is in Category 4, which is | 5 And the only concern I have is that I've written down page |
| 6 described as, quote, forest stands which are within riparian | 6 numbers and I don't have it right in front of me. So I don't |
| 7 corridors of 350 feet or less and which are also considered | 7 know whether the page number -- |
| 8 high priority for preservation. That's Exhibit 94, page 2 | 8 MS. ROBESON: Never mind, just continue to testify |
| 9 again. | 9 and we will -- I will read the whole -- I will find them. |
| 10 The need for and methods for preserving Category 4 | 10 MS. LEE: Okay. It's only that when you put it in |
| 11 stands at such as Heritage Gardens are described as follows. | 11 a digital format, it may say a different number at the top of |
| 12 So on page 5 it states, the narrow riparian areas, Category | 12 the exhibit than it does on the actual page of the document. |
| 13 4, are all high priority for retention and will likely be | 13 So |
| 14 protected by application of existing guidelines and | 14 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (Indiscernible). |
| 15 regulations as part of the county's normal development and | 15 MS. LEE: Exhibit 94, page 13 states, within |
| 16 regulatory review process. That's at page 5 . | 16 Category 4, all of the stands are very high priority for |
| 17 And then the exhibit at page 13, quote, within | 17 preservation since they usually represent minimum stream |
| 18 Category 4, all the stands are very high priority for | 18 buffers and all the last defense between the streams and the |
| 19 preservation. Since the -- | 19 development that has already occurred. The buffers must be |
| 20 (Crosstalk) | 20 saved when properties are developed. So most of these stands |
| 21 MS. LEE: I'm sorry. Excuse me. | 21 will be preserved. |
| 22 MS. ROBESON: Just some on the -- which -- is it | 22 In a few instances, category forest stands have |
| 23 94E? | 23 been delineated which contain forest area that extends beyond |
| 24 MS. LEE: 94E, yes. I think you had the document | 24 the minimum stream buffers but doesn't really fit into the |
| 25 up -- | 25 higher category. When these instances occur on developable |
| 82 | 84 |
| 1 (Crosstalk) | 1 property, attempts should be made to save all of the stand. |
| 2 MS. ROBESON: I'm on page -- now what page are we | 2 And then the last quote is from Exhibit 94 and it's at the |
| 3 on? | 3 very end of the exhibit. It's an October 18, '99 memo from |
| 4 MS. LEE: Let's see. I'mat 13. I'm sorry if I'm | 4 Callum Murray to Cassie Conlon further describing |
| 5 going -- I didn't realize you were trying to | 5 preservation Category 4 forest. |
| 6 (Crosstalk) | 6 Quote, Category 4 forest stands minimum riparian |
| 7 MS. ROBESON: I'm sorry. Go ahead. | 7 buffers should all be considered high priority for |
| 8 MS. LEE: That's okay. So on page 13 it further | 8 preservation. This should be possible through application of |
| 9 states, within category for all of the stands are very hig | 9 stream buffers for the Planning Boards guidelines for |
| 10 priority for preservation since they usually are -- present | 10 environmental management of development in Montgomery County. |
| 11 minimum stream buffers and are the last best defense between | 11 In instances where buffers would be insufficient to protect |
| 12 the streams and the development that has already occurred. | 12 the entirety of the stand, cluster development, and/or park |
| 13 The buffers -- | 13 acquisition should be considered. The master plan requires a |
| 14 MS. ROBESON: I'm sorry. One second. I don't see | 14 preservation of Category 4 stands on the Heritage Garden |
| 15 that on page -- | 15 sit |
| 16 MS. LEE: Okay | 16 The method for doing that was to protect it so |
| 17 MS. ROBESON: 13 of 94E. | 17 application of the requirements contained in the |
| 18 MS. LEE: I tell you what. So if you | 18 environmental guidelines. If they had been followed, the |
| 19 don't -- I can't pull it up right now. So if you look up | 19 forest sustained would be preserved. If the Applicant had |
| 20 the page number up at the top, whether -- I don't know | 20 calculated the streambuffers is required, taking into |
| 21 whether it's the page number that's listed in the exhibit. | 21 consideration the adjacent slope and the required extension |
| 22 You know, when it's page of something of a certain number of | 22 of the steep slopes and slopes with highly erodible soil and |
| 23 pages -- | 23 avoided building on steep erodible soils the forest stand |
| 24 MS. ROBESON: (Inaudible) recommendations for | 24 would be entirely protected. To the extent there is any |
| 25 protection and enhancement of forest in the Potomac | 25 portion that is still not protected, the buffers are to be |


| 85 | 87 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 extended to include them. | 1 stream valley buffer goes to about the third data goes to up |
| 2 And finally with regard to the buffers and the | 2 about the third window on the left when you look. |
| 3 environmental issues, if you could, pull up Exhibit 94G. | 3 So all -- and this whole area to the side of it is |
| 4 These are several pictures that I took on the site. And | 4 within the limits of disturbance. I don't know what they're |
| 5 want if you could go to the next one. I think they are | 5 going to be doing there, but those are all listed. And |
| 6 little bit out of order. But if you could just go to the | 6 again, that downspout on the right hand corner is in the -- |
| 7 next one, this actually shows you the tributary that's on the | 7 is going to be coming right into the floodplain buffer. |
| 8 site and shows you the condition of it basically there | 8 Now, I just wanted to speak a little bit -- that's |
| 9 What's happening is there is severe erosion already going | 9 fine with the exhibits, thank you |
| 10 on the site. You can see trees are falling in all along the | 10 I wanted to point out -- one of our neighbors |
| 11 stream. It's that way all the way on its part of the stream | 11 asked if I could speak for her just to give her -- a bit of a |
| 12 as well as the abutting neighbors as well | 12 statement of the issue that she's had with it. Well, first |
| 13 So if you could, go back to the first picture that | 13 of all, it's clear that there is water everywhere there. |
| 14 was there. The one just above it. This is actually | 14 It 's a stream valley buffer. You start to go up the slope |
| 15 picture of the old gym. And as you can see in the -- it's - | 15 where they're going to put the lodge, it's -- some of it is |
| 16 three quarters of it sits in the stream valley buffer. And | 16 very steep slopes, other steep slopes with erodible soil. |
| 17 as you can see, the stream valley buffer continues -- the | 17 And the representative of the owner who met with us on the |
| 18 stream actually continues. And you can see in the | 18 site. It was -- they were good enough to allow Mr. Brown |
| 19 foreground, the erosion that so happened recently from the | 19 myself to go to the site, indicated that she had worked at |
| 20 site and how it -- how close it is. The downspout on that 21 back corner is where the floodplain buffer is, is located. | 20 the school before it closed and flooding from the <br> 21 intermittent stream, that's the one that Ms. Harris had |
| 22 Just to show you, it's basically all in and around the stream | 22 provided a picture of, not the Kilgore Branch, but the one |
| 23 valley buffers in this area. There's 10 acres on the site, | 23 that I showed this picture of. |
| 24 our stream valley buffer. And they're basically right here. | 24 MS. HARRIS: Objection, I -- I think that's |
| 25 And the next picture, if you could. I think it | 25 hearsay. |
| 86 | 88 |
| 1 should be down just a little bit further. This is a -- this | 1 MS. ROBESON: Just a second. Just a second, Ms. |
| 2 is a picture from the wetlands. There is a small area of | 2 Lee. |
| 3 wetlands. I meant to tell you as well they did not -- the | 3 MS. LEE: Su |
| 4 wetlands require expansion of the buffer when they are | 4 MS. ROBESON: Ms. Harris, did you want to say |
| 5 adjacent to steep slopes. And Mr. Malkovich did not have the | 5 something? |
| 6 steep slopes located on the map. And as a result there was | 6 MS. HARRIS: Yes, that sounds like you say to me. |
| 7 never any expansion of that. It's a small area though and I | 7 I mean, she is quoting someone who is not here and saying |
| 8 don't think -- with the exception of the sewer line, it's not | 8 what she heard. |
| 9 going to be impacted. | 9 MS. ROBESON: Hearsay is admissible if it's -- I |
| 10 However, we see in front of you in the background | 10 will lay in for the weight it deserves. We don't give it as |
| 11 is the old gym. And what you see is what's there now. They | 11 much weight. It is admissible in administrative hearings. |
| 12 have a lot of sort of temporary buildings that were left over | 12 MR. BROWN: There is an exception to the hearsay |
| 13 from the school, the abandoned school. Much of that is in | 13 rule when it comes from and when is an admission against the |
| 14 the stream valley buffer because the buffer comes up -- you | 14 interest of the Applicant. As far I can tell, the people |
| 15 know, it's up to the right on that gym structure and it | 15 that allowed us on the property are aligned with the |
| 16 continues along over to here where the wetlands are. You can | 16 Applicant. |
| 17 see it's a vernal pool during the winter. | 17 MS. ROBESON: Well, I don't think we need to go |
| 18 And then the construction will continue | 18 into that. I will give it the weight that it deserves |
| 19 will be that's not quite sure what's going to be built there, | 19 because it is testimony, it is hearsay. So go ahead. |
| 20 with it's going to be, I don't know, kind of recreational | 20 MS. LEE: I thought of it when I saw the picture |
| 21 structures or the parking lot. But the steep slopes and | 21 that Ms. Harris had submitted of the other stream, the |
| 22 start to the right of that. I don't have a picture of those, | 22 intermittent stream and the idea that somehow that was not a |
| 23 but you'll see that they will go up to the right of that. | 23 problem on the site. Because then I remembered what she had 24 said, that when she worked to the school before closed and |
| 25 show you. This just gives you an idea again of the gym. The | 25 flooding from the intermittent stream, which comes down |
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through the buildings and the parking lot at a much greater
impact on their operations than the other larger Kilgore
tributary.
And in fact, when I looked at that picture, I
wondered because other neighbors had pointed out to me, which
I think I remember seeing when I was on site, is that the
ground -- there is a brown footbridge that goes over that
stream, has been totally washed away by the water that's a been coming down over the site, and I believe that's what she turned and sort of pointed to me. But I can't be sure.
And also, for example, Lynn Blithe who lives at Dobson is an abutting property owner whose property extends across the northern boundary of the property, including through the stream itself, as it leaves the Heritage Gardens site. She has some hearing difficulties trying to use the Zoom and Teams platforms, and asked that I express her outrage that even more intense development proposal for the stream buffer, and steep slopes, given the battle that she has waged over the last 10 years of living at that site, to lessen the current impact on her property. Today, she says she has spent approximately \(\$ 60,000\) to stabilize our property and mitigate the current impacts.
So turning from the Lodge portion, as to the rest of the site there's another 20 acres outside this northern area of stream valley buffers that can be developed. And
``` those are 20 acres of Meadows with three much smaller forest stands and some very big old trees. The site, as currently proposed, the use will result in clearcutting the trees and moonscaping the rest of that lot. All the trees will be removed from two of the three forest stands in the 20 acres.

And even though many trees on the site will be saved because they are already in an existing forest conservation easement on the remaining land in the north outside the Lodge complex, 42 , that's one-third of the 10 remaining 128 largest trees on the side, statutorily 11 protected and requiring a variance will be cut down. The proposed use is so intense that as you heard during our last days of testimony, 10 other large specimen trees that are on abutting neighborhood properties, not even on the Heritage site will be impacted through destruction of these critical root zones.
The critical root zones of three of the specimen trees, and one tree of significance, is, as we heard the other day, on Mr. Maggin's lot on Edison. Their entire buffer will be impacted by construction. The limits of disturbance occurring right up to their property line. Also impacted are seven other large specimen trees on other neighbors abutting properties along the opposite side of the property. Again, we discussed that it includes the destruction of 40 percent of the critical root zone of a
neighbors in giant of a tree, a northern red oak, with a circumference of 50 inches, 20 inches larger than the inches of that trigger qualifying as a specimen.

And this is what the Applicant's land use report has to say about this. There are 10 off-site trees being impacted by the construction activities within the limited disturbance of the project. The off-site trees with more than 30 percent critical root zone impacts our proposed to be preserved with extra treat measures. All efforts shall be made to coordinate with the adjoining property to save these trees. End of quote.

A conditional use site plan for a 30 acre property
13 that is so dense it can't even ensure the protection of
14 specimen trees in neighbors yards should be rejected.
15 Could I just take just a quick minute to get a
16 glass of water?
17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes.
18 MS. LEE: I'll be right back. Is that okay?
19 Thanks.
20 I think I'm okay. I apologize. I think it's the
21 jet lag. I'll go ahead. (inaudible).
22 MR. BROWN: Ms. Lee, I want to ask you a
23 clarifying question if I could before we switch?
24 MS. LEE: Sure.
25 MR. BROWN: Looking at Exhibit 94E, I see the
first 15 pages are one report. Within the next 14 pages are another report followed by a figure 2 , followed by a Planning Board memorandum.

MS. LEE: Yes.
MR. BROWN: Were you reading from the second document?

MS. LEE: I was reading from all three. And that's why I -- I will try to clarify the page numbers and submit them to you. I think what I was trying -- I was 10 provided that in the digital -- you know, the electronic 1 version. And so I think I was -- in order to try to clarify, I was just trying to use the numbers that are up on the lefthand corner of the documents.
14 MR. BROWN: All right. Go ahead.
15 MS. LEE: Which I think means it's a consecutive 16 page numbering.
17 MR. BROWN: Okay. Go ahead.
18 MS. LEE: Okay. Second, the construction of a
19 facility of this size at this location is inconsistent with
20 the basic framework of the master plan, including the elderly
21 housing and special exception provisions. Much is made of
22 the master plan a statement on page 38 that senior housing is
23 appropriate throughout the subregion by right, or as a
24 special exception. But it doesn't stop there. It goes on to 25 state that projects must meet zoning ordinance standards for
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 93 & 95 \\
\hline 1 this use, and impacts on the surrounding neighborhood must be & 1 sites, and in 5 potential sites as appropriate for elderly \\
\hline 2 minimized. & 2 housing. Master plan at page 38. \\
\hline 3 When significant impacts cannot be mitigated, & 3 The Quarry on River Rd. is one of the five \\
\hline 4 projects should be located elsewhere in the subregion. Where & 4 specifically targeted as a site for senior housing, and a \\
\hline 5 it is a special exception, the project must also meet the & 5 zoning amendment to permit it. In fact, senior housing was \\
\hline 6 special exception guidelines in the master plan. The zoning & 6 never built on the site, and instead, Wormald, the Applicant \\
\hline 7 code requires that it substantially conforms with the & 7 here, is a constructing 45 luxury townhouses without age \\
\hline 8 recommendations of the applicable master plan and is & 8 restrictions on the Quarry site \\
\hline 9 harmonious with and will not alter the character of the & \(9 \quad\) While there are small group homes for the elderly \\
\hline 10 surrounding neighborhood in a manner inconsistent with the & 10 and handicapped throughout the subregion, the larger \\
\hline 11 plan. & 11 facilities are located in a manner consistent with the \\
\hline 12 The objective is to, quote, protect residential & 12 subregions low in density residential areas, and green wedge \\
\hline 13 areas while also attempting to meet important policy goals. & 13 structure in the master plan. On the perimeter, and on a \\
\hline 14 The entire structure of the master plan was crafted to & 14 major thoroughfares. While the Applicant is correct that no \\
\hline 15 protect large swaths of low density areas, to serve as a & 15 large independent living facilities have been constructed in \\
\hline 16 green wedge. More intense development was to occur on the & 16 the heart of the residential areas, as is proposed here, \\
\hline 17 perimeter of the subregion, such as Fortune Park, now Park & 17 there has been an explosion in the number of senior living \\
\hline 18 Potomac, and establish centers such as Cabin John shopping & 18 facilities built in a manner consistent with the overall \\
\hline 19 center at Potomac Village, and along major roads such as & 19 framework of the Master Plan, the zoning code, and the master \\
\hline 20 River Rd.. As for elderly housing, the master plan lists & 20 plan recommendations regarding growth outside the low density \\
\hline 21 specific sites that appear -- quote, appear to be appropriate & 21 \\
\hline 22 for elderly housing. Unquote. & 22 For example, since the adoption of the master plan \\
\hline 23 An earlier version of the master plan spelled out & 23 the Village at Rockville, located just across here at Scott \\
\hline 24 criteria to be used to identify locations, and similar & 24 Drive, which is the subregion boundary, has constructed 241 \\
\hline 25 criteria were listed for determining locations for affordable & 25 independent living units, 111 are cottages, and 130 apartment \\
\hline 94 & 96 \\
\hline 1 housing. And those early drafts are the very last piece of & 1 units. \\
\hline 2 the Potomac subregion master plan, the digital version, and I & 2 Fox Hill on River Rd. just across the Beltway from \\
\hline 3 don't have it right in front of me here, but I can give you & 3 the Quarry added 240 independent living units. As the \\
\hline 4 those pages. Because they show that the criteria were listed & 4 Hearing Examiner is aware, just in the last two years three \\
\hline 5 there and then they were, during the councils deliberations & 5 new major assisted living memory care facilities have either \\
\hline 6 on the master plan they did the line strike out. They struck & 6 been constructed, Brandywine with 140 beds, and Artis with 72 \\
\hline 7 them out. & 7 are approved, but not yet constructed. Spectrum with 100 \\
\hline 8 And earlier versions of the master plan spelled & 8 beds. Brandywine and Spectrum are barely a mile from the \\
\hline 9 out criteria to be used to identify locations, and similar & 9 Heritage Garden sites. \\
\hline 10 criteria were listed for determining locations for affordable & 10 What is important to note is that their \\
\hline 11 housing. In its deliberations on the master plan, the County & 11 similarities and the stark contrast with Heritage Gardens. \\
\hline 12 Council deleted the criteria for both. The legislative & 12 All were constructed outside low density neighborhoods on the \\
\hline 13 history indicates that the Council wanted to promote & 13 perimeter of the low density zone, and on major, not narrow \\
\hline 14 affordable housing and didn't want to impose criteria that & 14 rural roads, and with public transport for the workers \\
\hline 15 would, in any way, restrict those locations. Because & 15 directly in front, or nearby within walking distance. \\
\hline 16 similar list of criteria was therefore elderly housing & 16 Construction did not require violating any of the county's \\
\hline 17 whether consciously or inadvertently, they criteria were & 17 environmental requirements. \\
\hline 18 deleted for elderly housing as well. & 18 Most recently, West Montgomery joined with the \\
\hline 19 And it's Montgomery County Council resolution & 19 abutting neighbors and did not oppose the Spectrum \\
\hline 20 number 14-1170 adopted March 5th, '22 at pages 6 and 7. The & 20 application. It seemed a reasonable location within existing \\
\hline 21 resolution appears, as I say, as the last document in the & 21 commercial use on River Rd. with public transport, within \\
\hline 22 Potomac Subregion master plan. Although the language of the & 22 walking distance of the Village with shopping, doctors' \\
\hline 23 master plan no longer references the list of specific & 23 offices, churches and library. In response to neighbors \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
24 criteria, it does identify 12 sites that it states reflect \\
25 those criteria; 3 existing facilities, 4 pending or approved
\end{tabular} & 24 request, concerning impact and the neighborhood 25 compatibility, the Applicant redesigned the building, \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 101 & 103 \\
\hline 1 MS. HARRIS: Could I interrupt again and asked for & 1 has been caused by storm water damage. This would make it \\
\hline 2 the address, please? & 2 unspeakably more intense. \\
\hline 3 MS. MCGRATH: Yes. It's 11007 Edison Rd.. & 3 So thank you very much. I have to express my \\
\hline 4 MS. HARRIS: Thank you. & 4 appreciation for everyone for allowing me to speak under \\
\hline 5 MS. MCGRATH: Yeah. And it lies -- & 5 these circumstances. \\
\hline 6 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Go -- & 6 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you. Any \\
\hline 7 MS. MCGRATH: Okay & 7 questions, Ms. Harris? \\
\hline 8 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Go ahead. & 8 MS. HARRIS: Yes, please. So Ms. McGrath, if I \\
\hline 9 MS. MCGRATH: So my home depends on clean water & 9 could, I'm going to pull up Exhibit 70. And I believe -- \\
\hline 10 from a well that is 120 feet underground. The level of & 10 tell me when you can see the screen. \\
\hline 11 ground disturbance created by building a townhouse & 11 MS. MCGRATH: yes, I can see 70. \\
\hline 12 development in the midst of well water houses is completely & 12 MS. HARRIS: Okay. And I think, correct me if I'm \\
\hline 13 unacceptable and endangers my, and our, access to clean & 13 wrong, is this your property at the cul-de-sac of Edison Rd.? \\
\hline 14 water. The underground aquifers will be altered by a & 14 MS. MCGRATH: Let me see, yes, that is. That is \\
\hline 15 development this in tents, which will channel massive amounts & 15 it. \\
\hline 16 of storm water. The Applicants contend that stormwater will & 16 MS. HARRIS: Okay. \\
\hline 17 be better managed with this development. And actually, & 17 MS. MCGRATH: That is it. \\
\hline 18 there townhouse development in front of the development of a & 18 MS. HARRIS: Okay. And you can see on this plan, \\
\hline 19 nursing facility that will create massive stormwater issues & 19 Exhibit 70 that there is, looks like some kind of stream \\
\hline 20 with rooftops adding to the paved areas and creating & 20 function that runs across your property; is that correct? \\
\hline 21 stormwater runoff. & 21 MS. MCGRATH: There is. \\
\hline \(22 \quad\) All of that area is currently in fields and & 22 MS. HARRIS: Okay. \\
\hline 23 forests which it doesn't need stormwater management, but & 23 MS. MCGRATH: But what you cannot see -- \\
\hline 24 actually moderates rainfall by retaining moisture in the & 24 MS. HARRIS: Right. I'm sorry. \\
\hline 25 soil. Basically, what I am looking at from my view as a & 25 MS. MCGRATH: What you cannot see. \\
\hline 102 & 104 \\
\hline 1 neighbor, what I see is replacing a school with a nursing & 1 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. McGrath, \\
\hline 2 facility that's truly a managed living, and a townhouse & 2 you'll get to say something. Let her finish asking you -- \\
\hline 3 development in front of it, that would provide, basically, & 3 MS. MCGRATH: Oh, okay. All right. \\
\hline 4 normal townhouse living for persons presumably if the & 4 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: -- the \\
\hline 5 zoning -- if the regulations would hold, for people over 65 & 5 questions. \\
\hline 6 years of age. & 6 MS. HARRIS: Okay. So I'm going to zoom out of \\
\hline 7 I asked myself the question with the Applicant be & 7 here just a bit, and I am going to follow the stream. Can \\
\hline 8 willing to build only the main nursing facility, and I doubt & 8 you see my cursor? \\
\hline 9 it. Because it's the town houses that will make the profit & 9 MS. MCGRATH: Yes. Yes. \\
\hline 10 for the whole project. Would be we be willing, as a & 10 MS. HARRIS: And so where does that stream -- it \\
\hline 11 community, to welcome a nursing facility to replace the & 11 intersects to a larger stream right where my cursor is; would \\
\hline 12 school? Perhaps with strict environmental restrictions, I'm & 12 you agree with that? Within -- \\
\hline 13 not even sure of that myself. But certainly, the intense & 13 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (inaudible) when \\
\hline 14 development on the meadow that Susanne was describing is & 14 she -- when Ms. Harris says it right for her cursor is, that \\
\hline 15 really what is going to be extremely degrading to the whole & 15 is where the stream flows south -- no, flows north -- \\
\hline 16 watershed area. & 16 MS. HARRIS: West. \\
\hline 17 So basically, I am very much opposed to this & 17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: -- to Kilgore \\
\hline 18 development because of its intense nature and I hope that the & 18 Branch. West to Kilgore Branch (inaudible). \\
\hline 19 environmental restrictions will be enough to either totally & 19 MS. HARRIS: Would you agree with that? \\
\hline 20 turned down this proposal, or to have it go back to the & 20 MS. MCGRATH: Well, I don't know the grades, and I \\
\hline 21 drawing boards and try to have -- to live within the & 21 don't know, you know, -- but that is a stream that is on my \\
\hline 22 environmental constraints of that & 22 property, yes. \\
\hline 23 I have been directly affected by the storm water, & 23 MS. HARRIS \\
\hline 24 and as I said, it cost almost \$10,000 to have that culvert & 24 MS. MCGRATH: Flows out of my property. \\
\hline 25 replaced, to see the water running over the driveway and that & 25 MS. HARRIS: And is that leg of the stream that I \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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just identified from your property to the intersection of the
Kilgore Branch Stream, is it that in any way -- does that
stream in any way intersect with the subject property, which,
as you can see down here, is further east of the property of
that stream?
MS. MCGRATH: Well, yes it does. And all -- I
wish I had a cursor so that I could show you. If you went
from the cluster of two of those six townhouses there on that
first branch, the three and three, the first place where from
the main road to the left there's a group of three, and then
another group of three?
MS. HARRIS:Are you talking on the subject
property?
MS. MCGRATH: Basically --
MS. HARRIS: Just so I'm clear?
MS. MCGRATH: Basically --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Just a second.
You're discussing the two sets of -- the northern most sets
of town houses on the western side of that road?
MS. MCGRATH: Right. Well, actually all of those
townhouses because what you can't see is that Edison Rd.
drains into my property. And drains when I have stood in
Edison Rd. in the pouring rain and watched the water come
around Edison Rd., past Dobbins, for some reason, past
Dobbins straight down to the cul-de-sac and straight into

```
that branch.
    MS. HARRIS: Okay. And did you --
    MS. MCGRATH: And it is unbelievable how much
water --
    MS. HARRIS: Is your property a higher --
    MS. MCGRATH: How much water --
    MS. HARRIS: Would you agree that your property is
at a higher elevation than the subject property?
    MS. MCGRATH: I have no idea. What I do know --
is that the water from -- that's draining from what looks
like the east side on this drawing, that's draining from
those properties onto Edison Rd. flows literally around that
curve, down to the cul-de-sac, stops -- stops and actually
crosses the street. Crosses Edison Rd., into my property.
    MS. HARRIS: And I don't doubt that for a moment.
    MS. MCGRATH: But you can't see that.
    MS. HARRIS: But I understand what you're saying
and I wouldn't doubt that for a moment that the existing
conditions on an elevation that's higher than the subject
property is causing the existing situation.
    What I'm trying to figure out from your
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. Harris, just
limit to questions.
    MS. HARRIS: Okay.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I know she
already said she doesn't know the topo.
MS. HARRIS: Okay. I don't think I have any more questions of her.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: You can make your point on rebuttal.

MS. HARRIS: Yes.
MR. BROWN: Mr. Brown, do you have any questions?
MR. BROWN: No questions. Thank you for your testimony.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Anyone else?
Did you want to say anything else, Ms. McGrath?
MS. MCGRATH: Well, I really appreciate being
allowed to speak and my sentiment is that it would be
wonderful to have a nursing facility and it would not be
wonderful to have a townhouse development in front of it to pay for the nursing facility.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Just briefly, any questions based on that little end?

MS. HARRIS: No questions.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you very much, Ms. McGrath.

MS. MCGRATH: Thank you so much for letting me
speak. I really appreciate it.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That's what we do. All right. So it's 12:27. Ms. Harris do you mind

108
stopping sharing your screen?
MS. HARRIS: Oh, sorry.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: No, it's okay.
We're all trading back and forth.
Okay. I know that Ms. Lee is anxious for dinner.
Is -- how much longer, Mr. Brown, do you think Ms. Lee has?
Or Ms. Lee, how much longer?
MS. LEE: I think only about five minutes, if that
works. At the most.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yeah. Okay.
That's fine.
MS. LEE: I'm at my third objection.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Well, I
appreciate your allowing us to interrupt to get people in and
out. Okay. Go ahead. I think you were reading from a
narrative so I'll let you continue. Thank you.
MS. LEE: Okay. I was just finishing up the
reasons why it's inconsistent with the master plan and now,
onto our third objection, which is:
We object to approval as a conditional use, a
residential care facility, senior care community that has as
one of is core elements a bizarre fee simple ownership
structure that coupled with stringent age restrictions will
be an enforcement disaster, and most likely be doomed to
fail, as did a prior age restricted elderly housing complex
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\section*{in Potomac Village.}

The site will be owned and the conditional use held by 46 separate entities. This is a facility that is owned by 46 separate entities. The Applicant, and the 45 entities to buy the fee simple townhouses. It's entirely unclear what role Sage, the actual provider of services will have, given that they have no ownership interest and will not be holding the -- will not be a holder of the conditional use according to what the Applicant has said.

These 45 feet simple townhouses will, according to the Applicant, the price starting at around one and a quarter million, but most will be priced at close to 2 million. They will have three, maybe four bedrooms, two baths, and elevator, and a two car garage. But to qualify as a senior care community, the age restrictions are very stringent. Occupancy of any independent living unit, those in the lodge, and all of the fee simple townhouses is limited to persons 62 years of age or older, with three very limited exceptions. The spouse of a resident, regardless of age, notice, it says spouse, not significant other. Another relative of a resident 50 years and older in the resident widow, widower or other surviving relative of a resident who dies while residing at the senior care community is allowed to remain even though there resident widow, widower, or other surviving relative has not reached the age of 62 .

Furthermore, there's another provision,
separately, a minimum of 80 percent of the dwelling units, all the lodge and the townhouses taken together, must be occupied by at least one person per unit who is 55 years of age or older. And that's the language right out of this most recent zoning text amendment. These are in contrast, and much more stringent than the occupancy limitations placed on independent living facilities for seniors and persons with disabilities, which is the provision the Applicant tried to get approved under the last time they filed for a conditional use.

Under that provision, it can be occupied by a senior adult, 62 years and older, any other members of the household of a senior adult regardless of age, a resident caregiver, if needed, to assist a senior resident, or a person authorized to occupy housing provided under any federal or state program that is specifically designed and operated to assist seniors designed in that program.

The big difference is that someone in an
independent living facility for seniors can have any family
members, or a resident caregiver move in with them to help
out. This is absolutely not possible in these townhouses
unless of those persons are also 62 years of age or older.
How in the world with the age restrictions on
occupancy in each of the 45 luxury townhouses be enforced,
and by whom? There's no communal structure as there would be in the usual senior facility, such as the Lodge. How do you define occupancy versus casual sleepovers, kids, grandchildren, want to rent it out as an Airnbn. People needing houses, or housesitting.

Will there be a monthly synthesis? Should it be reported to the Board of Appeals? What happens when there are violations? What happens to the offending individual? And how is the townhouse owner held accountable? How and who will be responsible for determining that that minimum of 80
percent of the dwelling units must be occupied by at least
one person per unit who is 55 years of age or older?
Especially since Sage isn't even in charge; they're not even one of the conditional use holders.

Of equal concern is our well-founded fear that 6 these age restricted luxury townhouses won't sell. Who would 17 possibly be the first buyer, or a resale buyer of a \(\$ 2\) 18 million, four bedroom townhouse with these permanent occupancy limitations, ones that will continue forever, internally, whether sold or resold, gifted, are included in the owner's estate. In fact, the community faced at that exact situation and a site a mile away in Potomac Village next to the library.

Although it occurred many years ago and before the master plan, the issues are the same. The marketability of
high end fee simple townhouses with very stringent age restriction occupancy limitations. At the time it was called
Potomac Mews, and is now called the village of Potomac. The street addresses are 10000 to 10029 , Gable Manor Court.
Originally the land, \(3-1 / 2\) acres was zoned R200 and at most seven detached homes could be built. The developer applied
for a special exception to build 12 fee simple high end
townhouses and to detached houses, in addition to maintaining
the historic Willett house already on the site.
And he went under the existing (inaudible) for
housing for the elderly, 62 years or older. The first
application was denied because the developer did not meet the
special exceptions because it failed to provide any related
facility -- related services in addition to the housing. The
developer amended the application to convert one of the
houses, the historic Willett house, into a center for the
provision of services and the special exception was granted.
That special exception S13 (inaudible) went on sale, but
despite having been heavily marketed for four years later - -
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (inaudible)
MS. LEE: Excuse me.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: You froze for a
moment. What was the number of the -- your camera froze.
MS. LEE: Oh, I'm --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: What was the
```

number of the special exception?
MS. LEE: My worst fear that I'll freeze over
here. But the special exception number, if you can hear me
now was S-1386.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
MS. LEE: September 15, }1987
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (inaudible).
MS. LEE: All the townhouses were -- I'm sorry?
Is it okay?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes, you're
fine. Thank you.
MS. LEE:All townhouses were constructed, went on
sale, but despite being heavily marketed four years later
none, not one of these fee simple age restricted houses were
sold. The developer then went to the county and requested
and obtained a zoning map amendment allowing the houses to be
considered part of a planned unit development, a TD5. As
such, the age restriction no longer applied in all of the fee
simple houses were sold and continue to be resold.
In support of G-690, the zoning map amendment, the
developer's attorneys submitted a letter dated -- describing
the circumstances leading to, and warranting the map
amendment. The letter dated December 17, }1991\mathrm{ was from
attorney Harry Lerch to Dale Price, then chief of the
development (indiscernible) --

```
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. Lee? Oh
dear.
    Ms. Lee?
    Mr. Brown, do you happen to have a number for her?
    MR. BROWN: No, I'll text her right away. Thank
you.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thanks.
    Let's -- while Mr. Brown's texting let's take a
five-minute break, please. We'll be back at 12:41.
    (Off the record at 12:37 p.m., resuming at 12:43
p.m.)
    MS. LEE: It's not much longer and I'll go
ahead -- I think -- I hope that it was a -- I was starting to
talk about a letter that went to the review. I'll start at
the beginning of that paragraph just to make sure.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That's fine.
    MS. LEE: So in support of the G-690 zoning map
amendment the developers attorney submitted a letter dated
December 17, 1991. The letter was from attorney Harry Lerch
then chief of the development review division of the Planning
Board, and stated in relevant part, "the Applicant is
somewhat unique in that Potomac Mews has already been
developed and exist totally today virtually in its finished
form. The Board of the Appeals in case number S-1396 --
1386, granted a special exception for housing for the elderly
and handicapped.

Construction began and homes were offered for sale in 1988. In spite of nearly four full years of intensive sales efforts no units have been sold. For the past year they have been offered at prices more than \(\$ 150,000\) below our costs. More than 1200 qualified prospective purchasers have visited the site and registered. Numerous other interested parties have also toured the houses. Many thousands of hours of work have been spent by two leading real estate firms and many other brokers, all to no avail.

The zoning ordinance concept of a project in which homes would be occupied only by persons" I'm continuing to quote from the letter. "Would be occupied only by persons 62 years of age and older appears to be a failure, at least with regard to this project. The law effectively says that anyone who buys a unit will only be able to resell it in the future 7 for occupancy by someone who is 62 years of age and older.

When prospective buyers realize that they are facing this extreme on future resale they find any excuse not to buy, and sales become virtually impossible. The owners are extremely proud of their design and the appearance of the project. And in fact, it has won national awards. Their only disappointments of course, have been that these beautiful homes have been sitting vacant for nearly 3 years without any occupancy."

116
1 And that's the end of the quote. I might add that there sort of Victorian. They are still there. They are Victorian-style, some of them have elevators. They are quite high end townhouses, and quite large. And this, from the Planning Board staff report of the zoning map amendment to TD5 that would lift the age restriction.

Quote: It has become apparent that the expected market for these units as elderly housing did not exist.
9 None of the units have been sold. The current rezoning
10 request would make this project a standard market rate 11 housing development free of the restrictions imposed under 12 the conditions of the special exception. Staff concluded 13 that it makes little sense to leave the unit standing vacant 14 in limbo where they will certainly become an attractive 15 nuisance, and eventual eyesore as they deteriorate.
16 Obviously, we are very concerned about that and we 17 ask that if the decision is to approve, multiple conditions 18 have to be placed on it. I don't even know where you would 19 begin to be able to do that. I know our attorney is looking 20 into that. But I think the basic one that we are really
21 concerned about is none of those townhouses should be
22 developed, or constructed until the Lodge is constructed.
23 Because the statute requires that in order to qualify as this
24 kind of facility you must have assisted living and 25 independent living.
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 117 & 119 \\
\hline 1 So our big concern is that he will start to put & 1 MS. LEE: No, not as a confirmed science. Not as \\
\hline 2 the townhouses on the market, can't sell them, and then were & 2 an actual degree program \\
\hline 3 stuck with those. But I think at a minimum, the Lodge has to & 3 MS. HARRIS: And are you a scientist? \\
\hline 4 be constructed. Otherwise, it doesn't qualify as a senior & 4 MS. LEE: No. \\
\hline 5 living facility under the statute. And of course, then & 5 MS. HARRIS: And are you a civil engineer? \\
\hline 6 trying to figure out what happens. And then it doesn't -- if & 6 MS. LEE: No. \\
\hline 7 there's violations how do we police it? Does it revert to & 7 MS. HARRIS: And then, do you recall testifying at \\
\hline 8 the underlying zone? Will they be required to take them & 8 the Planning Aboard in the 2018 Glen Mill Rd. case, that was \\
\hline 9 down? And staging so that we are sure that it actually works & 9 preliminary plan number 1201-60180, where you were opposing \\
\hline 10 and we're not stuck with another situation like we were with & 10 at two lot subdivision for some of the same reasons that \\
\hline 11 Potomac Mews. & 11 you've raised here, actually where you said that I'm not a \\
\hline 12 That's it. Thank you very much, and thank you for & 12 scientist, I'm not a forester, I'm not an expert. Does \\
\hline 13 your patience. & 13 that -- do you recall that? \\
\hline 14 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you very & 14 MS. LEE: Yes. \\
\hline 15 much. & 15 MS. HARRIS: And is that -- would you still \\
\hline 16 MS. LEE: Thank you. & 16 classify -- would you still agree with that statement? \\
\hline 17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. Harris, do & 17 MS. LEE: Yes. \\
\hline 18 you have questions, or do you have at best you want to take & 18 MS. HARRIS: Moving on for a moment to the NRI, \\
\hline 19 a -- okay. Would you prefer to take a lunch now or would you & 19 the code of Montgomery County regulations, another code \\
\hline 20 prefer to go through -- finish Ms. Lee? & 20 section, 22.A.00.01.05 provides that the NRI is to be \\
\hline 21 MS. HARRIS: Unfortunately for Ms. Lee, I need to & 21 reviewed and approved by the planning director. And would \\
\hline 22 eat something. And so I would request that we have a lunch & 22 you agree that in this case there is an approved NRI? \\
\hline 23 break and also, obviously, I want time to get my thought & 23 MS. LEE: Well, that's interesting. I didn't get \\
\hline 24 together for effective cross. & 24 into the -- it's sort of complicated because of all the \\
\hline 25 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, do & 25 exhibits, but I did want to point out, I hope I made that \\
\hline 118 & 120 \\
\hline 1 you have an objection? & 1 clear that there was an NRI that was approved in 2019 and \\
\hline 2 MR. BROWN: No. I'm perfectly happy giving Ms. & 2 that's the one that was submitted and that we -- the only \\
\hline 3 Harris the latitude she needs. & 3 document that we had since August of when it was submitted. \\
\hline 4 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Let's -- I'm not & 4 So it was submitted with the prior application, I believe, in \\
\hline 5 like Marty. Marty wouldn't do anything until 3:00. So let's & 52019. \\
\hline 6 go to 1:30, that's about 40 minutes. So we're going to & 6 And it appears as Exhibit -- let me get my exhibit \\
\hline 7 recess until 1:30. & 7 numbers out. So that was what was in the file, and it was \\
\hline  & 8 signed by Mr. Markovich. And it did not include any of the \\
\hline 9 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: We're going to & 9 slope information. And we -- \\
\hline 10 continue with the cross-examination of Ms. Lee. & 10 MS. HARRIS: Wait. \\
\hline 11 MS. HARRIS: Thank you. & 11 MS. LEE: And I put a -- excuse me, go ahead. \\
\hline 12 (Off the record at 12:49 p.m., resuming at 1:34, & 12 Yeah. \\
\hline 13 p.m.) & 13 MS. HARRIS: Let me -- \\
\hline 14 MS. HARRIS: I think it's evening for you Ms. Lee. & 14 MS. LEE: And so -- \\
\hline 15 So good evening again. You indicated in your background that & 15 MS. HARRIS: -- bring your attention to Exhibit \\
\hline 16 you practice environmental law. I think you said for & 1651 A , which is the approved -- let me bring it up on my \\
\hline 17 about -- approximately 15 years, is that correct? & 17 screen. And as you probably recall from the earlier \\
\hline 18 MS. LEE: Yes. & 18 testimony the NRI needed to be recertified. Would you agree \\
\hline 19 MS. HARRIS: Have you ever prepared a natural & 19 that in the top left-hand corner this indicates that this NRI \\
\hline 20 resources inventory? & 20 was, in fact, approved by the Montgomery County Planning \\
\hline 21 MS. LEE: No. & 21 Department? \\
\hline 22 MS. HARRIS: And in terms of your background, do & 22 MS. LEE: It's the document that you all presented \\
\hline 23 you have a degree in water resources or hydrology? & 23 at the end of December whenever you put in your last \\
\hline 24 MS. LEE: No. & 24 exhibits. And it's -- it has Mr. Penn's name on it, and it \\
\hline 25 MS. HARRIS: Have you studied forestry? & 25 has a date back in August, but it was never in the -- that's \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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why it just seemed so bizarre to us. It was never in the
file before the Planning Board, and to the best of my
knowledge, it wasn't there before it even went to the
Planning Board. Because even looking at it that morning --
And I testified, as you know, at the Planning
Board pointing out that the person who did the NRI did not
include the steep slopes. And so it wasn't until you
submitted it again. And I know that that version right there
has no signature by a preparer. There's no indication of who
prepared that document. Mr. Penn said he approved it back --
his signed -- his piece up there says it was back in August.
But as I say, we never saw that until you folks submitted it
just before the hearing.
MS. HARRIS: But you wouldn't disagree that that
is an approved NRI, that's in the --
MS. LEE: Well, I don't know if approved means? I
mean, it's supposed to be signed by the preparer. I have no
idea if Mr. Markovich was involved. You know, you didn't
present him to talk about how he added the steep slopes. So
I don't have any idea whether it's a good one or not.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: If I may just --
I know this is cross-examination, but I will interject, Ms.
Harris, I didn't think of this. There is a requirement in
state law that a government can't rely on plans that are not
assigned and sealed by the professional that prepared them.

```
And I can't remember -- it may be in business occupations. I
can't remember, but that is one thing I was going to bring up
to make sure that the NRI SSD is something that we can rely
on.
    I can get you the citation, I just don't have it
right now.
    MS. HARRIS: And I would note, and as a matter of
practice, and especially in these COVID times the Park and
Planning has certified, but we can retroactively get this
executed -- signed, that they have approved unsigned NRIs.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, we haven't
to my knowledge. So I'm just saying. That's
    MS. LEE: May I just interject -- only to say that
I believe that the requirement in the forest conservation
statute for the NRI, not only states that you have to show
where the slopes are, but I believe it has to be signed. But
that suggests off the top of my head.
    MS. HARRIS: So staying with this document and Ms.
Robeson we -- I mean I guess at a later date we can talk
about, it does provide for Mr. Markovich's signature block
here. I acknowledge that it is not signed, we can discuss
how that should be addressed.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
    MS. HARRIS: But turning now to the soil chart
(inaudible) there are four different soils identified here,
correct?
MS. LEE: Yes.
MS. HARRIS: And I believe, if I heard you
correctly that you noted that one of them -- well, three of them, they indicate on this that it's a highly erodible, correct?

MS. LEE: Yes, and I'm going to pull up my copies just so I can see them.

MS. HARRIS: And we'll just agree that on page 67 0 of the environmental guidelines that they refer to soils as severe hazard of erosion, quote. Is that the technical term used in the environmental guidelines?

MS. LEE: On page -- there's a discussion of the 4 unsafe soils on page 11. And then you're saying, on what page are you quoting from?

MS. HARRIS: Page 67.
MS. LEE: Yes. That's the Appendix C that lists 8 specific kinds of erodible soil list. It does not include the one that's listed here because it's -- 116D is not, but at the bottom of page 11, it talks about -- first it talks -there's two categories, and I know your witness testified that it wasn't in Appendix C, and we agree with that. But at the very bottom of page 11, the discussion of unsafe and unsuitable land is soils, erodible soils on slopes over 15 percent must be delineated on the NRI and highlighted for 124 potential inclusion in the protected areas of the site.

And so I assume that's why your consultant put that down because even though it's not one of those really bad soils listed in C, it definitely qualifies for one at the bottom of page 11 because it is highly erodible soil between 15 to 25 percent.

MS. HARRIS: For a moment. Highly erodible, and then, it refers you to Exhibit C on page 67, which says, the following soils are classified as having a severe hazard of 10 erosion by NRCS based on the erodibility index of a soil map unit. These soils are severely erodible and must be incorporated in the wetland buffers according to the guidance 3 in chapters 3 and five. And then, it lists 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. It lists 10 different soils. Would you agree 5 with me that the four soils that are listed on the NRI are 16 not listed on this highly erodible soil list?
17 MS. LEE: Well, I haven't checked to see about the 18 other three. I know the one that I'm particularly concerned 19 about because it's right in the middle of where the Lodge is 20 being built. And I think the erodible soils lists, the way 21 it's written is if you're on that list you are automatically got problems and you're going to have to do something.

It doesn't even care -- it's just like that's an
24 automatic one. Whereas back on page 11 they are talking
25 about if you just -- erodible soils on slopes over 15 percent
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 125 & 127 \\
\hline 1 must be delineated. It's sort of a separate thing. Your & 1 just reading exactly what is there. What it's saying. I \\
\hline 2 automatic if you're on C, but if you're -- the other & 2 mean, he did what he was supposed to do because it is -- is \\
\hline 3 possibility is that it's just erodible on slopes over 15 & 3 protected under the guidelines, clearly. \\
\hline 4 percent must be delineated. And I would also point out that & 4 MS. HARRIS: Let's go back to page 11 for a \\
\hline 5 your consultant put it down. You know, you don't -- you're & 5 moment. And I'll read -- do you agree that at the bottom of \\
\hline 6 not required to put every soil on the map. But if you & 6 page 11 it reads, one of the most common of these \\
\hline 7 trigger it you have to do it, and he did it in 116D, it is in & 7 characteristics in Montgomery County is highly erodible \\
\hline 8 big letters, right there. & 8 soils. Highly erodible soils are those listed as having a \\
\hline 9 MS. HARRIS: On the map. & 9 severe hazard of erosion in the 1995 soil survey of \\
\hline 10 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: 116D, is that an & 10 Montgomery County (see Appendix C for the complete list of \\
\hline 11 exhibit number? & 11 highly erodible soil typ \\
\hline 12 MS. HARRIS: No. & 12 Do you agree that it says that? \\
\hline 13 MS. LEE: No, 116D is the -- when you look on the & 13 MS. LEE: Yes. \\
\hline 14 exhibit that has the -- well, on the NRI that would be -- & 14 MS. HARRIS: Okay. Thank you. Moving on to \\
\hline 15 it's right there. It's a designation of the soil and they're & 15 Exhibit -- there's -- it's Exhibit -- I believe it was the \\
\hline 16 required to place it to show the soil types & 16 exhibit you had -- the -- 94I, I'm sorry. Let me get that \\
\hline 17 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right. I & 17 up. \\
\hline 18 understand. & 18 Well, actually maybe I -- Ms. Robeson, do you \\
\hline 19 MS. HARRIS: So if I could, if you look at my & 19 recall what 94I is or would you like for me to bring it up? \\
\hline 20 screen, you see soil type 116D. & 20 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: 94I is -- \\
\hline 21 MS. LEE: Yes. & 21 (Crosstalk) \\
\hline 22 MS. HARRIS: And then, when you cross reference & 22 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (Inaudible) on \\
\hline 23 116D with page 67 of the environmental guidelines, 116D is & 23 steep slopes? \\
\hline 24 not on page 67 because it is not an erodible soil. And nor, & 24 MS. HARRIS: Correct. \\
\hline 25 if you cross reference the soil \(1 \mathrm{C}, 2 \mathrm{~B}\), or 6A. & 25 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I have it up. \\
\hline 126 & 128 \\
\hline 1 MS. LEE: Well, I would say it's not a soil that's & 1 MS. HARRIS: Okay. So -- \\
\hline 2 listed on C as a -- that has a severe hazard of erosion. & 2 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: \\
\hline 3 Okay? That's the list, and we admit that. But when you look & 3 MS. HARRIS: Ms. Lee, you acknowledge that that \\
\hline 4 at what is on the list, which is 116D it's described -- & 4 slope information came from a county-wide GIS map, is that \\
\hline 5 MS. HARRIS: Wait, 116 -- I'm sorry didn't I -- I & 5 or actually where did that information come from? \\
\hline 6 thought I just heard you say 116 D is not on the list. & 6 MS. LEE: It was -- when this came -- this was \\
\hline 7 MS. LEE: It's not on Appendix C, which is & 7 back in 2019 with your first proposal. And I just asked at \\
\hline 8 severely, whatever the, you know, sort of major language is. & 8 Park and Planning. It seemed, you know, what kinds of -- \\
\hline 9 And those ones are just well, you shouldn't be doing anything & 9 what's it look like on that site? And so -- and I don't have \\
\hline 10 kind of. I mean, I think no matter what even the slope, it & 10 access. I don't do GIS or anything like that. So they sent \\
\hline 11 looks like. But instead, there is a requirement that ones & 11 me along this. So I got fromPark and Planning because they \\
\hline 12 that are not on that list, but that are, as it says on the & 12 had it in their database. \\
\hline 13 bottom of page 11. I mean, there's a distinction, for sure. & 13 MS. HARRIS: And it was in their database and it \\
\hline 14 But the ones that -- and the one on 116D falls in the & 14 was based on a county-wide evaluation of topography, likely? \\
\hline 15 category of erodible soils on slopes over 15 percent must be & 15 MS. LEE: I think so. I don't know. They said it \\
\hline 16 delineated on the NRI and highlighted for potential inclusion & 16 was GIS, and that it was easy for them to get it, probably \\
\hline 17 in the protected areas of the site. And that's what your & 17 for hard for me to obtain and so they just sent it to me in \\
\hline 18 consultant did. & 18 that form. And then, when we submitted it to you as an \\
\hline 19 MS. HARRIS: Says Ms. Lee, are you suggesting & 19 exhibit we put down the key underneath there so that it was \\
\hline 20 though, although you previously admitted that you haven't & 20 clear what it was. \\
\hline 21 prepared an NRI or reviewed one, that you know how to do this & 21 MS. HARRIS: But you're not exactly clear on the \\
\hline 22 and staff had incorrectly approved the NRI? & 22 origins of the GIS map -- this exhibit, except to say that it \\
\hline 23 MS. LEE: I don't know whether -- look, I'm not & 23 is froma GIS; is that right? \\
\hline 24 saying that the NRI is in accurate except he didn't have the & 24 MS. LEE: And Catherine Nelson at Park and \\
\hline 25 slopes on the first time around. I'm not saying that. I'm & 25 Planning provided it to me. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 129 & 13 \\
\hline 1 MS. HARRIS: Okay. Thank you. & 1 sounded -- so would you not agree that the movement of \\
\hline 2 MS. LEE: She's the head of the master plan and & 2 providing -- well, let me back up for a second. \\
\hline 3 division and there & 3 Would you agree that relocating the existing \\
\hline 4 MS. HARRIS: And there was & 4 driveway, and I'll bring up environmental buffer. That \\
\hline 5 (Crosstalk) & 5 relocating the existing driveway that is currently adjacent \\
\hline 6 MS. HARRIS: Okay. And then, are you also aware & 6 to the perennial stream away from the perennial stream is an \\
\hline 7 that as part of the NRI and the County regulations require & 7 environmentally -- an environmental improvement? \\
\hline 8 that topography at a minimum scale of 1 inch to 200 feet with & 8 MS. LEE: I have no idea. I have no idea. I was \\
\hline 9 contour intervals not more than 5 feet must be provided in & 9 just looking at the straightforward -- is it going to be \\
\hline 10 connection with an NRI specific to an individual property? & 10 stream valley buffer that's a going to be disturbed. And \\
\hline 11 MS. LEE: I don't know what the specific & 11 under the guidelines it's not supposed to be disturbed except \\
\hline 12 requirements are. & 12 in very narrow circumstances. And I admit that when it says \\
\hline 13 MS. HARRIS: Well, let me just note that that's & 13 infrastructure, it says that bikeways and infrastructure. \\
\hline 14 Section 22A001-01.06, natural resources inventory & 14 Infrastructure includes the sewer line, and it might include \\
\hline 15 requirements. And I can show you on my screen of & 15 the road. But of course, if you're not building, you have to \\
\hline 16 Would you generally agree that I cite specific evaluation of & 16 have the road only because you're already building it in \\
\hline 17 property is a going to be more accurate than a countywide & 17 the -- in that environmentally sensitive area. \\
\hline 18 assessment done of the entire county? & 18 And I have no idea whether it was better down. It \\
\hline 19 MS. LEE: I don't have any idea. & 19 is now, or where it's going to be put. Obviously, it's going \\
\hline 20 mean, I'mjust using the documents that were provided to me & 20 to be the new disturbance because of the road already exists \\
\hline 21 I don't have any idea how your expert did his, and I don't -- & 21 in its curr \\
\hline 22 I'm not an expert on this. We just wanted to get an idea, & 22 MS. HARRIS: But it sounded to me that part of \\
\hline 23 and I thought it was good to submit it because it gives you a & 23 your argument also was that you were making a point about the \\
\hline 24 better sort of graphic than the shading. It's harder to see 25 the shading. & 24 existing gymnasium being within the floodplain buffer area; 25 is that correct? I'm sorry -- the stream valley buffer area. \\
\hline 130 & 132 \\
\hline 1 MS. HARRIS: Right. But it's a document that you & 1 MS. LEE: Well, that's undisputed. I mean when \\
\hline 2 really don't know the source of except that it was provided & 2 you look at the 6A there -- \\
\hline 3 by staff at Park and Planning; is that correct? & 3 MS. HARRIS: That's been disputed. But it's an \\
\hline \[
4 \text { MS. LEE: Yes. Yes }
\] & 4 existing condition, correct? \\
\hline 5 MS. HARRIS: I believe you said, and maybe & 5 MS. LEE: Well, it's an exist -- it's very \\
\hline 6 misunderstood you. Did you say that there is 1.02 acres of & 6 interesting because it was -- it was an abandoned use and \\
\hline 7 land that -- you mentioned 1.02 acres. Can you repeat for me & 7 it's not being used as a middle school gym going forward. So \\
\hline 8 what your point was about the 1.02 acres of land? & 8 the Applicant, I think, is going to take every other \\
\hline 9 MS. LEE: That's the amount of land that the staff & 9 structure, all of those, you know, double wide and stuff out. \\
\hline 10 report indicates is going to be developed in the stream and & 10 And I would submit that they should take this out. Why leave \\
\hline & 11 a building that's in the stream valley buffer, and as you can \\
\hline 13 staff report which I believe that it is -- & 12 see from my pictures, continues, because of the erosion 13 behind it is, it may be very soon structurally unsound. And, \\
\hline 14 MR. BROWN: 97A. & 14 they're going to be -- in order to use it you're going to \\
\hline 15 MS. HARRIS: Thank you. 97A, page 27, that says, & 15 have to put in a new paved parking lot and I don't know \\
\hline 16 the FCP shows a total of 1.20 acres of stream valley buffer, & 16 whether there's anything else planned. \\
\hline 17 not being placed into Category 1 conservation easement, that & 17 MS. HARRIS: We'll get to that in a minute. So \\
\hline 18 is necessary for driveway and sanitary line crossing and the & 18 what you're saying is, in your opinion, you do have an \\
\hline 19 existing building and functional area. & 19 opinion that taking out an existing structure is \\
\hline 20 Is that where you got the 1.02? & 20 environmentally preferrable but you don't have an opinion \\
\hline 21 MS. LEE: Yes, because I hadn't seen it. I wa & 21 about moving an existing road next to a perennial stream and \\
\hline 22 going to ask your expert if they had done a -- if he could & 22 moving it away from the perennial stream would be in \\
\hline 23 show and how much and all that. But then I found it in the & 23 environmentally beneficial? Is that right? \\
\hline 24 staff report. & 24 MS. LEE: No, I'm just -- it's just a \\
\hline 25 MS. HARRIS: So do you recall that -- so it & 25 straightforward things shouldn't be -- they should be built \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 133 & 135 \\
\hline 1 in stream valley buffers. And so it would be good if they & 1 denotes the stream valley buffer. And so if you follow my \\
\hline 2 didn't put the road there either, and they take everything & 2 cursor all around, that's in the stream valley buffer. We \\
\hline 3 out and just -- and then get it, you know, back to its normal & 3 know that this dark blue line denotes the stream bank. And \\
\hline 4 state is that it can function as a stream valley buffer and & 4 so that within the light blue lines is the stream valley \\
\hline 5 prevent erosio & 5 buf \\
\hline 6 MS. HARRIS: And (inaudible) that an impervious & 6 MS. LEE: And just to interrupt. There are two. \\
\hline 7 area within a stream valley buffer is preferable to pervious & 7 There's a stream valley buffer for the intermittent stream to \\
\hline 8 a & 8 the left, and then there's the separate stream valley buffer \\
\hline 9 MS. LEE: Oh, I assume so, yes because you & 9 for the Kilgore tributary. \\
\hline 10 shouldn't be constructing anything and the impervious woul & 10 MS. HARRIS: Right. \\
\hline 11 be the constructed pieces & 11 MS. LEE: So it's not all, you know, and the \\
\hline 12 MS. HARRIS: And s & 12 limits of disturbance are different on both -- with regard \\
\hline 13 Mr. Park -- or I'm sorry, Mr. Steeman testifying that there's & 13 bot \\
\hline 14 approximately 30,000 square feet of existing parking lot in & 14 MS. HARRIS: Looking at this again, would you \\
\hline 15 the stream valley buffer that will be removed? & 15 agree that this parking lot to be constructed is outside the \\
\hline 16 MS. LEE: Yes, which is really sad. They should & 16 stream valley buffer area? \\
\hline 17 never have put it there. So they should be rewarded for & 17 MS. LEE: I can't tell you because I can't -- I \\
\hline 18 having a site that they've already denigrated so badly by & 18 mean I'm just being honest. I don't know. It would be -- I \\
\hline 19 putting something -- & 19 don't know what's it going to be on that side of the gym, on \\
\hline 20 MS. HARRIS: Okay. Just for clarification, did & 20 either side. I can't tell that because it's within the \\
\hline 21 the -- to your knowledge, did the Applicant of th & 21 limits of disturbance. So I don't know what they're going to \\
\hline 22 application have any involv & 22 be building ther \\
\hline 23 that existing parking lot? & 23 MS. HARRIS: Okay \\
\hline 24 MS. LEE: I have no idea. I know he was & 24 MS. LEE: It might be a pickle ball court. I \\
\hline 25 associated with the prior schoo & 25 don't know. I mean that's -- you know it's going to be \\
\hline 134 & 136 \\
\hline 1 MS. HARRIS: So you would agree with me that the & 1 disturbed and it should be left preserved. \\
\hline 2 removal of the surface parking lot is an environmental & 2 MS. HARRIS: Moving on to, I think the NRI may be \\
\hline 3 benefit, correct? & 3 the best plan to show. You had indicated -- let me pull up \\
\hline 4 MS. LEE: Sure & 4 the NRIs. Sorry. You had testified that you thought that \\
\hline 5 MS. HARRIS: The removal of the existing parking & 5 the stream valley buffer should be extended around trees 147 \\
\hline 6 lot, which is located within the stream valley buffer is an & 6 and 150 because it clipped -- and again, it seems like on \\
\hline 7 environmental benefit? & 7 this, this plan you don't have a problem reading the stream \\
\hline 8 MS. LEE: Yes, and required, and it should have & 8 valley buffer line, I think. Apparently. \\
\hline 9 been done ear & 9 So here's the stream valley buffer line, correct? \\
\hline 10 MS. HARRIS: And then, moving on to, I believe I & 10 You identified that during your testimony? \\
\hline 11 heard you say, and you would be constructing parking within & 11 MS. LEE: Uh-huh. \\
\hline 12 the stream valley buffer. So on the exhibit that is & 12 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It's the dark \\
\hline 13 currently on the screen, the environmental buffer exhibit, as & 13 solid -- \\
\hline 14 you know, the blue line denotes the stream valley buffer. & 14 (Crosstalk) \\
\hline 15 And would you agree that the proposed parking lot is located & 15 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Just a second. \\
\hline 16 outside of that stream valley buffer? & 16 I'm sorry. It's the dark solid line, trees 150 and -- well, \\
\hline 17 MS. LEE: You know, it's sort of hard to see where & 17 it doesn't run through. But it runs through trees 150, and \\
\hline 18 exactly it is. I was sort of -- it's hard -- I was really & 18 it's labeled SDB. Thanks. Go ahead. \\
\hline 19 going by the limited disturbance and at that line is a little & 19 MS. HARRIS: Okay. And I believe you were \\
\hline 20 bit easier to see. And it goes all the way on both sides of & 20 focusing on this small -- the small dark area that is to the \\
\hline 21 the -- of that building. So it's hard for me to know where & 21 north of the 150 designation and right under the SVB because \\
\hline 22 they were going to build things. And what they were going to & 22 you noted that that is a steep slope within the stream valley \\
\hline 23 d & 23 buffer; is that correct? \\
\hline 24 MS. HARRIS: Let me sort of give a little primer & 24 MS. LEE: Well, this steep slope hasn't been \\
\hline 25 on this environmental buffer exhibit. So the light blue line & 25 included in the stream valley buffer. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|}
\hline 137 & 139 \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
MS. HARRIS: Right. \\
MS. LEE: And we would submit it needs to because \\
the toe of the steep slope where SVB is will be expanded beyond the width to include the entire slope. \\
MS. HARRIS: And do you agree that the \\
environmental guidelines it makes it -- makes a distinction between hydraulically adjacent and hydraulically remote areas? \\
MS. LEE: It does with regard to the definitions 10 in the back. So when you go -- so first of all you have to decide how big your stream, your basic buffer is. And that's clear from the table on page A, table 1 . Because you have to figure that out because in order to do that you have to know 14 what the slope ranges. And so you decide whether it's -5 with the slope ranges based on the -- by what's defined in 6 the hydraulically adjacent slopes. Slopes line within 200 7 feet of the bank of the stream ranges that drink directly to 18 the stream range course or its associated floodplain. \\
And so first you have to decide what's within that \\
200 feet. And I assume that that's what you folks did. I'm \\
not saying that you you're not -- that it -- that you're not supposed to look at that for determining your basic stream. Your buffer. But then, once you've got that buffer, which is what you did here, you determined your buffer and I don't \\
25 have the expertise, we don't have the experts to take you on
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
MS. LEE: No because I think the NRIs usually are pretty clear about that. It defines it. It says, you know, if it's within -- you look at 200 feet. We just using the data that has been provided. \\
MS. HARRIS: Moving on to the Potomac subregion forest analysis. I believe you said that this is effectively a statute; did I get that right? \\
MS. LEE: Well, the master plan, especially under \\
Maryland law are considered to have statutory effect. And in Montgomery county. So some states and some counties don't do that but Montgomery County has because it's incorporated by 12 reference. The master plan requirements in the zoning code 13 is considered to be a jurisdiction where they are binding. \\
MS. HARRIS: Well, the master plan -- the zoning \\
ordinance certainly requires substantial compliance with the master plan; you agree with that, right? \\
MS. LEE: Yes. \\
MS. HARRIS: But are you now suggesting that any \\
recommendation in a master plan must be strictly followed \\
because the master plan has the authority of -- statutory \\
authority? \\
MS. LEE: Yes. \\
MS. HARRIS: Okay. Turning to page 13 of that \\
document. \\
25 MS. LEE: Of the master plan?
\end{tabular} \\
\hline \begin{tabular}{l}
as to whether it should have been 100 or 150 , but we're just accepting what you put up here. \\
And it's clear that the buffer -- then you go back \\
to page 7 , if the stream buffer is determined by the steepest \\
100 feet within the hydraulically adjacent area, which is \\
table 1, it encompasses the toe of a steep slope, the buffer will be expanded beyond the width and table 1 to include the entire slope. It doesn't talk about having to be, you know, there's no reason to go into drainage at that point because you already determined the size of your buffer. \\
MS. HARRIS: But I think what I'm asking you is do \\
you know whether that area is hydraulically adjacent or hydraulically remote? \\
MS. LEE: Well, I'm saying I don't know, and it \\
doesn't make any difference because you would have made that determination when you decided where the stream valley buffer would be, how far it was from that intermittent stream, and you decided it was 100 feet. That -- and that was based on the fact that that was the drainage area to that stream. \\
But then, after that, once you've established \\
that, just the plain language says what you've established touches the toe then you go up the slope. \\
MS. HARRIS: And do you have any knowledge of -- \\
4 have you ever evaluated anything based on hydraulic adjacency 25 or hydraulic remoteness?
\end{tabular} & \begin{tabular}{l}
```None \\
MS. HARRIS: No. Of the -- no, where one removed from the master plan. We're at the technical (inaudible) of the master plan. And I'm sorry, I lost track of -- maybe Mr. Brown can tell us which exhibit this is. \\
MR. BROWN: There were two documents, at least 13 pages long in Exhibit 94E. Is it the first one or the second one? \\
MS. HARRIS: It's the one that's entitled PotomacNone
```

\end{tabular} <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}
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    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
    MS. HARRIS: I have it up. Yeah, now -- no,
that's not it. Ms. Robeson, I can pull it up.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
    MS. HARRIS: So Ms. Lee, I think, you in
discussing the fact that the apportioned of the trees on the
site are within that Category 4, I believe you read this
first paragraph, which says preservation Categories 4 and 5,
correct?
    MS. LEE: Yes. Which -- could you just tell me
what the page number is? Up at the top it has --
    MS. HARRIS: 29 out of 33.
    MS. LEE: 29/30, yeah. Yeah, go ahead. I'm
sorry. I just --
    MS. HARRIS: No, that's okay. And in that last
line of that paragraph says when these instances occur on
developable property attempts should be made to save all the
stand. So what does it -- and I want to focus on the word
attempt for a moment. Does it say require?
    MS. LEE: No.
    MS. HARRIS:And does it say shall?
    MS. LEE: No.
    MS. HARRIS: It just simply says attempts,
correct?
    MS. LEE: Yes.
```

    MS. HARRIS: And then, would you agree that in
    other areas of this document there is language such as should
    be -- on page 3. I can go to page 3 , hold on.
        I'm sorry, page 1 , sorry.
        So down at the bottom here, other important
    restoration opportunities. Is an opportunity --
        HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: What page?
        MS. HARRIS: We are on page 1.
        HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
        MS. HARRIS: It talks about opportunities for
    forest restoration, or opportunities -- important restoration
    opportunities. Would you also agree that those are -- that
    that is what one could classify as aspirational language but
    they are not requirements?
        MS. LEE: Well, that's a little bit different
    because it wasn't one that we looked into because this site
    is not a restoration area. You know, there were two kinds of
    forest areas in this whole master plan requirement. And when
    you look back on the master plan itself it starts out about
    restoring certain properties and preserving certain
    properties. And I think, just looking at it here, you're in
    the restoration group. So we didn't focus on that language
    at all because that's not our property.
        MS. HARRIS: Okay. And then going to page 2 of
    the recommendations for the forest enhancement, in the
    purpose section, they refer to that document as a memorandum, correct? Not a statute or a law or requirement but simply a memorandum; would you agree with that?

MS. LEE: No. These were the scientist who -- or the scientists and the staff members who had looked at all -they did all of the environmental impacts and all of the analysis that led to the recommendations in the master plan. And then, they recommended to the master plan writers, that they include these sites with these requirements and that's what they did.

MS. HARRIS: But my point is that in this
technical Appendix to the master plan they referred to it
simply as a memorandum, correct?
MS. LEE: Yeah. Because I think there was a memorandum from the staff to the person, maybe Cala Murray (phonetic), whoever was in charge of drafting the master plan.

MS. HARRIS: Okay.
MS. LEE: Because a master plan is very -- you
know, has just one sentence. So this laid out the details.
MS. HARRIS: So moving on. Let me go back to
the -- I think it's the NRI. So hold on one moment. No, I'm
sorry, it's the staff report again. Page 30 of the staff
report. Well, let me first say, are you aware that the tree
technical manual indicates that trees that have a critical
root zone impact of less than 30 percent are unequivocally -may be preserved?

MS. LEE: I don't know how they -- and how it defines the -- I think other - -yeah, I don't --

MS. HARRIS: So you're not aware that that 30 percent is a -- that impacts less than 30 percent are generally -- trees are generally expected to survive that -an impact. So I believe you testified that along the east -the western property line, that there were four trees on Mr. 10 Maggin's property that, I think you said, likely could be 11 destroyed, if I have that right? Something to that effect. 12 But if you look at page 30 of the staff report, would you agree that it indicates that the level of critical root zone 14 impact is 14 percent, 27 percent, 11 percent, and 10 percent 15 of those four trees?
16 MS. LEE: Yes. And that does lead me to something 17 Mr. Maggin wanted me to say the other day and I didn't -18 when I got cut off was that in addition to those specimen 19 trees and the significant tree, he has two 50-year old cedars 20 and he wondered that -- that are actually closer to the site 21 then these trees, and wondered why they weren't listed. And
22 I assume they weren't because they didn't -- they may be
23 destroyed, but they're not specimen trees. And they didn't
24 get to the 30 inches around, I just -- I have a feeling.
25 But -- so -- but no, I'm not saying one way or the other.
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|  |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| I'm just saying that when you have 30 acres and you have to |  |
|  |  |
| 3 intense that you can't figure out how to build what you want |  |
| 4 to without doing any damage whatsoever to the critical root |  |
| 5 zones of anybody does that -- it isn't even on your property, |  |
| 6 it's just too -- it's just too dense and should be modified. |  |
| 7 Especially in an area with such low density, beautiful big |  |
| 8 trees the c |  |
| MS. HARRIS: And did -- you are aware that Mr |  |
| 10 Park testified that the amount of trees that there's 42 |  |
| 11 percent of the property is forested and 42 percent of the 12 property will be forested at the end of this development? |  |
|  |  |
| 13 MS. LEE: That's primarily because of the big |  |
| 14 swath of the land that's protected in the master plan, and |  |
| 15 was already in an existing conservation easement in the back. |  |
|  |  |
| 17 conservati |  |
|  | 8 MS. LEE: Not offha |
|  | MS |
| 20 it's only 1 acre or less than 1? |  |
| 21 MS. LEE: Of what the existing one was? |  |
|  |  |
| 23 the property, are you aware of how many acres it currently |  |
| 24 protects? |  |
|  | 25 MS. LEE: |
|  |  |
| 42 percent is going to be -- the rest of it is going to be basically clear-cut. And so -- and the rest of it's back in a stream valley buffer that, you know, you folks didn't try to build in. |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 6 approximately 1 acre that is protected by forest conservation <br> 7 easement; do you agree with that? |  |
|  |  |
|  | MS. LEE. I don't know how much |
|  | I know there's an existing one, but I don't know how much. |
|  |  |
| 11 Applicant and imposing a forest conservation easement over |  |
| 12 that remainder of that forested area, the northern portion of |  |
| 13 the property, would you agree that that would provide an 14 environmental benefit? |  |
|  |  |
|  | ARRIS: Okay. I want |
|  | 17 comments about the master plan and the use itself, and the |
| 18 special exception use. And if I -- correct me if I'm wrong. |  |
| 19 What I understood you to say, I believe, is that the master |  |
| 20 plan identifies a number of properties that were appropriate |  |
| 21 for senior care use; is that right? |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  | on that should be used for senior living uses? |

I'm just saying that when you have 30 acres and you have to do -- you have to have -- and you have a site plan that's so intense that you can't figure out how to build what you want to without doing any damage whatsoever to the critical root zones of anybody does that -- it isn't even on your property, it's just too -- it's just too dense and should be modified. Especially in an area with such low density, beautiful big trees the character of the neighborhood.

Park testified that the amount of trees that there's 42
percent of the property is forested and 42 percent of the
property will be forested at the end of this development?
MS. LEE: That's primarily because of the big
swath of the land that's protected in the master plan, and was already in an existing conservation easement in the back. conservation easement?

MS. LEE: Not offhand.
MS. HARRIS: Would it surprise you to learn that it's only 1 acre or less than 1 ?

MS. LEE: Of what the existing one was?
MS. HARRIS: The existing conservation easement on the property, are you aware of how many acres it currently protects?

42 percent is going to be -- the rest of it is going to be
basically clear-cut. And so -- and the rest of it's back in
a stream valley buffer that, you know, you folks didn't try to build in.

MS. HARRIS: But there's currently only approximately 1 acre that is protected by forest conservation easement; do you agree with that?

MS. LEE: I don't know how much it is right now. I know there's an existing one, but I don't know how much. MS. HARRIS: So that if the Applicant -- and the Applicant and imposing a forest conservation easement over that remainder of that forested area, the northern portion of the property, would you agree that that would provide an environmental benefit?

MS. LEE: Certainly.
MS. HARRIS: Okay. I want to move to your 17 comments about the master plan and the use itself, and the special exception use. And if I-- correct me if Im wrong.
plan identifies a number of properties that were appropriate for senior care use; is that right?

MS. LEE: Yes.
MS. HARRIS: And it's your opinion that that -4 that those properties are the only properties in the Potomac subregion that should be used for senior living uses?

1 would have been good. But as you can see with the Quarry, Mr . Wormald decided not to put senior housing there. I mean, these are properties that are owned by private entities. Set you know, they're not required to put them there by any -MS. HARRIS: But would you agree --

MS. LEE: -- means.
MS. HARRIS: I'm sorry. I cut you off. Go ahead. MS. LEE: Go ahead.
MS. HARRIS: But would you agree that there are 12 other appropriate and suitable sites within the master plan 13 region for senior housing? 6 tried to get themplaced where they make the most sense and 17 where they affirmed the overall concept and structure of the 18 master plan, which is that there's a green wedge that protects the environmental resources, low-density 0 neighborhoods, and then you put your most extensive, 1 intensive uses on the peripheries, and on the major corridors. And so what we have the subregion is a lot of -of smaller -- you know, the sort of group homes. We have lots of disabled and senior living facilities throughout.

1 And one of our members, in fact, has been promoting the idea 2 that of people who have these very big houses and Potomac, as 3 they decide that they don't want to use those anymore that 4 they be converted into senior housing. Smaller units and because, you know, I didn't get into the concept of what you 5 because, you know, I didn't get into the concept of what you
6 all are proposing. You can propose whatever you want to as 7 far as services.

But what I see is if people want to age in place, they often times have family members come in and move in with them. Or they get a resident caregiver. They stay in their own home. That won't be permitted here in your units. And 12 also, the smart money doesn't want to be stuck on a rural the dark road where they have to drive to go to anything. So the smart money, and I'm sorry, but if you've got the money you move into Bethesda now.
Friends are moving into Bethesda, they're moving 17 into DC on the major corridors because all of the services 8 are there. They can go out at night without having to drive. I just -- that's it -- and you know, there are also other 0 ones that have facilities like pickle ball courts are indoor 1 swimming pools. Two of them at the Village at Rockville. I didn't mean to go off on that but that's the whole idea. They should be placed not -- they shouldn't put, basically a very, very intense use in a low-density zone.
25 This is -- it's an enormous development. When you
MS. LEE: No. I think the idea was that they
seemed to have the characteristics and situation where they

$$
1
$$

19
21
22

MS. LEE: Yes. But we think they're very limited. 148

-
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| 1 | think about it, there is not one other development sense of |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | the master plan, even before the master plan of this size and |
| 3 | scope that was put in as a conditional use. I just -- I just |
| 4 | can't even imagine. It's like something that would go on |
| 5 | Rockville Pike, or Park Potomac. |
| 6 | $\quad$ MS. HARRIS: Just so I'm clear, when you say this |
| 7 | size and scope, are you talking number of beds, number of |
| 8 | units, or the acreage of the property? |
| 9 | MS. LEE: Well, I mean the size of the Lodge. |
| 10 | It's as big as Brandywine, and Brandywine is on a major |
| 11 | thoroughfare. In addition to Brandywine, you've got 45 |
| 12 | houses, you know, duplexes, triplexes, and on a piece of land |
| 13 | that supposed to be RE2. If you had a small, maybe if you |
| 14 | had something small, but this is just -- and this is the most |
| 15 | intense use you could make right in the middle of a low |
| 16 | density residential zone. There's nothing -- there's nothing |
| 17 | that's been approved anywhere close to this as a special |
| 18 | exception that I can remember throughout the subregion. |
| 19 | There's not a -- there's nothing. |
| 20 | Maybe at -- the only thing I was thinking last |
| 21 | night was at Glenstone. So Glenstone is a large |
| 22 | institutional use and it was approved as an institutional |
| 23 | use, and has its own special category. But even then, the |
| 24 | buildings on that, their whole mode of operation is to have |
| 25 very low density buildings and an incredible amount of open |  |

space so the impact is -- and that's the only -- and of
course, that's not a -- that's not a special exception. It
was approved as a -- you know a different -- something special.

MS. HARRIS: So what you're saying is the density really. I mean that's an important component is what I hear you saying?

MS. LEE: Oh yes. I mean, where do you see anything, anything, not even in the village that's anywhere close to this.
11 MS. HARRIS: So low density is what you're looking for over on --

MS. LEE: Yeah. That's the whole master plan is -- yeah. That's how it's set up.

MS. HARRIS: We disagree with that.
And then finally, I believe you were talking
about -- you indicated and we recognize that need is not a requirement but I just wanted to call your attention to Exhibit 82 which identifies those facilities that have been constructed since the -- approved or constructed since the adoption of the master plan. And so that master plan, at that point, identified, I believe the number was in the 700 s. does that number sound about approximate to you that --

MS. LEE: I don't remember but it was a lot.
MS. HARRIS: Yeah. That point that a need of
approximately 700 units by, I think they said the next 20
years. Here we are the next 20 years and if you could
just -- and so we've identified Artis, Brandywine, and Spectrum and with a total units and these are not independent living units but simply assisted living, can you identify what that number is?

MS. LEE: 342 , is that the one you're pointing at? I wouldn't know what it means.

MS. HARRIS: No, the 342 , which is approximately half of what the master plan recommended for a go back and -at the time the Potomac master plan was adopted in 2002.

So would you agree that the subregion has not met
its goal for the number of recommended units?
MS. LEE: Well, I don't get into the need pieces.
It's fine -- and I always wondered when they talk about
housing places where you need extra care, I just don't know.
I don't do the needs analysis. I do know that most people
don't want to go to facilities. I mean, most of us want to
try to age in place. And I -- when I look around and see my
friends in the Potomac subregion, a lot of people try to stay at home the best they can.

And what happens is when they really needed is when there's a memory care idea. So you've got a relative who starts wandering at night, and so then you're looking at something like Artis. And so because of the got to have 24/7
sort of locked down. And also, just to bring up, Brandywine, a friend went over there for the free lunch the other day and they've been open almost a year and they are only at one third of their beds are for right now.

I mean, I think the whole idea of senior living, whether it should be really independent, because when you say senior living, that doesn't automatically mean assisted living or even independent living. It's just, housing for seniors, it could be all kinds. I'mjust saying I don't have any idea what the need is going to be. I don't hear anybody saying that they can't find a bed right now. And with the pandemic, Spectra made a big pitch that they were going to try to design their units so that they would lessen the problems of infectious diseases and nursing homes.

MS. HARRIS: But you would agree that since the adoption of the Potomac Master Plan there have been no independent living units constructed within the Potomac subregion; do you agree with that?

MS. LEE: Not in the middle of-- yeah. Not in the middle of the low density -- yeah, area. Not the residential area. They are on the perimeter, where they're -- including Cabin John, for example.

MS. HARRIS: Is that within the Potomac subregion?
MS. LEE: Yeah, Cabin John is in the Potomac
subregion. I'm not sure. You know, they went in and got a
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revision of their plan at Cabin John. And I can't -- I
didn't follow what they did with the senior housing units. So I don't know whether --

MS. HARRIS: (Inaudible) in Cabin John, correct?
MS. LEE: What's that?
MS. HARRIS: You do not know whether there is independent living within Cabin John?

MS. LEE: I'm not sure. I know it was part of
their sort of master plan but if you've driven by there
recently, they've had big changes in their -- in what they've
got at Cabin John these days. You know, they have new
restaurants and new housing and I don't know.
MS. HARRIS: I believe if you can give me a
moment, Ms. Robeson, but I think that may be all my
questions, but I just want to double check.
Hold on. Yes, that concludes my questions for Ms.
Lee.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you.
Mr. Brown, is there any redirect?
MR. BROWN: Very brief, Ms. Robeson.
Could you bring up Exhibit 51A again, please?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yeah. It should be up.

MR. BROWN: I would like you to focus in on the soils chart that Ms. Harris was talking with Ms. Lee about.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It should be on your screen.

MR. BROWN: Okay. Sorry about that. Ms. Lee, do you see the soil chart there?

MS. LEE: Yes.
MR. BROWN: I want to make sure I understand your
understanding of this chart in certain respects. In the
third row in this chart starts with map unit and symbol, and
soil type. Do you see that?
MS. LEE: Yes.
MR. BROWN: Then, it says slope, drainage class,
hydric soil, and highly erodible soil. Do you see all of
that?
MS. LEE: Yes.
MR. BROWN: Do you see that under highly erodible
soil three of them are labeled yes, and one of them is
labeled know?
MS. LEE: Yes.
MR. BROWN: And do you see that names of the soils
as well as their symbols on the left-hand side of this chart?
MS. LEE: Yes.
MR. BROWN: What is your interpretation of those
yeses on that chart in relation to what the preparer was
trying to convey?
MS. LEE: Well, I don't have the list --
MR. BROWN: I'm not asking about any list. I'm
only asking about the information on the chart.
MS. LEE: Oh. It is to indicate the soil types
that are on the site.
MR. BROWN: What does this chart tell you that the
preparer is saying about the characteristics of -- erodible
characteristics of soil type 1C?
MS. LEE: That it's highly erodible.
MR. BROWN: What about soil type 2B?
MS. LEE: Highly erodible.
MR. BROWN: And soil type 116D?
MS. LEE: Highly erodible.
MR. BROWN: Is it your understanding that those
three highly erodible soils are found somewhere on the
property?
MS. LEE: Yes.
MR. BROWN: I have nothing further.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you. Any
other questions from anyone else?
All right. Thank you very much, Ms. Lee. I don't
know if you've had dinner, or not, but --
MS. LEE: No problem. Thank you.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I hope you get a chance for that.

MS. LEE: Thank you for your patience. Thank you.
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HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown --
MR. BROWN: I have two more witnesses.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: -- do you have
another witness?
MR. BROWN: I have two more witnesses. The first
is Mr. Brigham, I believe is waiting.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brigham, are you here?

MS. BRIGHAM: It's actually Mrs. Brigham.
MR. BROWN: Oh, I'm sorry.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Good afternoon,
Mrs. Brigham. Your name on the thing says Edward, but --
MS. BRIGHAM: That's because I'm on his laptop.
And we -- and I need him for tech support.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
MS. BRIGHAM: So it's E stands for him and I don't
know how I would get an MB up there because it's his laptop.
MR. BRIGHAM: It's --
(Crosstalk)
MR. BRIGHAM: This is Mr. Brigham, if I may add, we have one computer and we're both listening and watching from the same computer.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That's fine.
Please raise your right hand, Mrs. --
Do you solemnly affirm under penalties of perjury

```
that the statements you're about to make are the truth, the
whole truth and nothing but the truth?
    MS. BRIGHAM: I do.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Pleas state your
name, street address and email address for the record.
    MS. BRIGHAM: My name is Marie Brigham,
B-R-I-G-H-A-M. My street address is 11021 Dobbins Drive and
my email is M, as in Marie, L as in Lynn, another M, Brigham
at aol.com. And that's how you know how old we are because
we still have AOL.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Go ahead,
Mr. Brown.
    MR. BROWN: Ms. Brigham, I'd like you to take a
look at the map in Exhibit 114B and point out where your
property is on that exhibit, if Ms. Robeson will bring it up.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Are you seen it
yet?
    MS. BRIGHAM: No, I'm not.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Hold on
one second. Now you should be.
    MR. BROWN: Would you identify your --
    MS. BRIGHAM: I can't see --
    MR. BROWN: -- property on here?
    MS. BRIGHAM: -- there it goes. There it is.
Okay. All right. So what do you see the end that's got the
```

point above where the Lodge would be?
MR. BROWN: Yes.
MS. BRIGHAM: Do you see that?
MR. BROWN: Yes.
MS. BRIGHAM: The thing is not on my house yet.
There. Go back down. Okay. That's --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I see a label
that say -- oh Brigham. Your name is on the lot.
MS. BRIGHAM: Okay.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: On this exhibit.
MS. BRIGHAM: And it's got like a full triangle
that goes up into my back yard.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (Inaudible).
MS. BRIGHAM: On the property. Okay.
MR. BROWN: Ms. Brigham, you are my client in this
matter because you have some concerns about this development
proposal. I wonder if you would describe your concerns to
the hearing examiner?
MS. BRIGHAM: Mr. Brown, is it okay if I just read
what I've written down?
MR. BROWN: That will be fine.
MS. BRIGHAM: I think that might be easier for all
of us, and I get through it quicker. And some of it's going
to be repetitive. And some of it will be unique to my
property. But anyway.

My names Marie Brigham. I live at 11021 Dobbins
159
2 Drive, which abuts the property seeking conditional use for Heritage Gardens. Our house is at the top of the hill above where the present gym is located, and where the Applicant seeks to build a multistory lodge.

I have lived at this address for 30 years this spring, and would like to speak to several areas of concern. We search for years before finding our home on Dobbins Drive. We were looking for a close in family neighborhood with at least 2 acres and a barn so that I could keep my horse at home. An added bonus was the Potomac Glen Riding School at the time which was on the school property behind us. My daughter spent summers at there at camp and the rest of the year in the riding program. The whole neighborhood hiked, walked their dogs, or their horses on, and helped maintain the bridle trails that followed the Kilgore Branch stream from the school property to the one lane bridge at South Glen, Glen, and Glen Mill Rds. And then, on along the Watts Branch and stream to the river. I know this property well. I was amazed that at the January 28th hearing it was remarked more than once that there were no conditional uses in this neighborhood. We have had a conditional use which was previously called a special exception for 30 years. This is to allow us to keep horses on our property. We have been paying the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services an annual fee for each of those 30 years. I am very concerned that the proposed development would prevent me from being able to keep horses on my property. It would definitely be impossible during the years of construction, and that prospect, for me, is heartbreaking. A new conditional use should not be allowed to cancel out an existing one.

I would like to also speak to the environmental impact of this proposal on the Kilgore Branch --

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Wait -- can I --
Ms. Brigham, can I interrupt for a minute? Why would
construction of this prevent you from keeping horses on your property?

MS. BRIGHAM: It is directly behind my back fence, and my whole property is devoted to horses. So I have a front yard paddock, a back yard paddock, a side paddock, a behind the barn paddock and then in front of the barn paddock. And if they are going to be bulldozing, they're going to be trees cut and drop, there's going to be a huge amount of noise and activity, and horses are animals of flight. They get very scared by sudden movements and just all this kind of noise and crashing and everything. My neighbor next door, she had a tree cut down and it took her all afternoon. I had to hand walk my horse for three hours on the other side of the property because she was terrified.
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And it took me forever to get her calmed down from that.
So -- I mean there's going to be a major stuff happening down there, and it's a very close to me. You can see from that little point that my house is a very close to
that property line. And I have a clear view of everything.
I have a clear view of what I call their big barn, which is
their gym And I can see the roof of the classroom
buildings. I can see the roof on that little building that
they're going to tear down with the six pods in the center
roof. And it's just -- it will be very dicey to have all
that going on. And that's a concern for me.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thanks.
Continue with your statement.
MS. BRIGHAM: Okay. I would also like to speak to the environmental impact of this proposal on the Kilgore
Branch Screen. From my backyard, I can view the stream as it passes the gymnasium, which by the way, does have windows, and as it passes through the property of my next-door neighbor. Over the past 30 years I have seen the stream get much wider and deeper as it flows away from the gym area.

Yesterday, my neighbor and I walked down the steep slope in her backyard to the stream. I wanted to measure its width and depth. It was approximately 25 feet wide and 8 feet deep. So I wasn't sure how the consultant on Monday came up with 3 feet. The stream is now overflowing its banks
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on a regular basis when we have heavy rain. A small bridge over the stream washed out during one of the more recent storms leaving some remnants in the stream and some in the neighbor's backyard. A huge ravine has cut across the trail path that I described earlier making it impossible to go further down the trail.

The WSSC right-of-way is impassable right now.
Based on what we are seeing, I believe that the overall quality of the stream will continue to degenerate much faster with the proposed heavy development.
11 Many trees on the school property behind me are uprooting and falling because of the erosion and deterioration of the stream valley buffer and the slopes to 14 the stream. My neighbors who are also abutting property 15 owners have spent tens of thousands of dollars trying to 16 counter and slowed the erosion on their property. The soil 17 on their property and ours is clearly highly erodible. I 18 don't understand how the experts can say that on the other side of my fence the soil is different.
20 I would be happy to show them the gullies and 21 washed out areas. I'm very concerned that cutting away the 22 slope to build the Lodge will be unsafe on both sides of the 23 property line. I share other neighbors' concerns about the 24 lights from the proposed lodge building. I can see the top 25 half of the gym sitting at my breakfast table. I can see all large number of the townhouses and large buildings.

During the time the Fourth Presbyterian School was in operation, the sewer connection -- and I don't know what you call those big round things that pop up in the sewer, like along the line, I have no idea for the technical word, but anyway, one of those overflowed sewage into the street for at least two days before it was repaired. And this is 0 the place that they are planning to hook into the sewer line 1 when if the project were built.

And then, I have a couple of miscellaneous 13 comments and questions for you. Many of the exhibits that we 4 have been looking at show the property from an airplane view. And then, they also have an artist coloring in the other 16 areas. And some of them are a mix. And when I look out for 17 my back property, I am not looking down over tree cover. I 8 am looking through the trunks of the trees. And right now, I can see everything.
20 The hilltop where the Lodge would be built is
21 going to lose a lot of trees so it's going to be even more
22 open and visible from our house. And there are a lot of 23 damage trees and when those fall then it's going to be even 24 more extensive. The only area that is completely untouched 25 is going to be on the other side of the stream. This
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property has been -- excuse me. I lost track here.
    Okay. This property -- okay. One other thing
which is kind of -- I don't know -- no, I'll skip that.
    Can you still see me?
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I can.
    MS. BRIGHAM: Okay. Where was I? This property
has been a beloved part of this neighborhood for generations.
In a perfect world it would be turned into a nature preserve,
and Arboretum, or a park. I believe that at most, it should
have single-family homes on 2 acre lots. This project should
be rejected on the grounds of incompatibility, environmental
degradation that causes harm to a neighboring property, and
to the larger stream valley.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you very
much.
    Ms. Harris, do you have questions?
    MS. HARRIS: I do not. Thank you.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, do
you have any follow-up questions?
    MR. BROWN: No. There was no cross.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Oh that's right.
I'm sorry.
    Ms. Brigham, you may be excused as a witness.
Thank you for coming.
    MS. BRIGHAM:Thank you.
```

    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, do
    you have anyone else?
MR. BROWN: My last witness is Rick Maggin.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Maggin, can
you turn your camera on? Thank you.
MR. MAGGIN: Yes, I just did.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I see you.
MR. MAGGIN: Okay.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Please raise
your right hand.
Do you solemnly affirm under the penalties of
perjury that the statements you are about to make are the
truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth?
MR. MAGGIN: I do.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right.
Please state your name, address, and email address for the
record.
MR. MAGGIN: My name's Rick Maggin. I live at
10811 Edison Rd. in Potomac, Maryland. My email address
R-I-C-K at magginconstruction.com. Construction is spelled
out.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Thank
you. Mr. Brown --
MR. BROWN: Mr. Maggin I would --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Go ahead.

| 165 | 167 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 property has been -- excuse me. I lost track here. | 1 MR. BROWN: Yes. I'd like to do like we did with |
| 2 Okay. This property -- okay. One other thing | 2 Marie Brigham, to identify your property on Exhibit 114B. |
| 3 which is kind of -- I don't know -- no, I'll skip that | 3 If you could bring that up? |
| 4 Can you still see me? | 4 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: You should be |
| 5 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I can. | 5 seeing it. |
| 6 MS. BRIGHAM: Okay. Where was I? This property | 6 MR. MAGGIN: Yes, I'm Lot 3, where it says |
| 7 has been a beloved part of this neighborhood for generations. | 7 Maggin/Tassen, which is the second house in on Edison Rd. |
| 8 In a perfect world it would be turned into a nature preserve | 8 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I see it. |
| 9 and Arboretum, or a park. I believe that at most, it should | 9 Lot -- |
| 10 have single-family homes on 2 acre lots. This project should | 10 MR. MAGGIN: Right there. |
| 11 be rejected on the grounds of incompatibility, environmental | 11 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Is it -- yeah. |
| 12 degradation that c | 12 Okay. I see it |
| 13 to the larger stream valley | 13 MR. BROWN: So Mr. Maggin, like with Ms. Brigham, |
| 14 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you very | 14 I gather that you are opposed to this project, and I would |
| 15 much. | 15 like you to explain to the hearing examiner why that is so. |
| 16 Ms. Harris, do you have question | 16 MR. MAGGIN: All right. Thank you. I am one of |
| 17 MS. HARRIS: I do not. Thank you. | 1713 abutting neighbors that is opposed to the project. To me, |
| 18 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, do | 18 it's not surprising that the neighborhood is over whelming |
| 19 you have any follow-up questions? | 19 leak opposed to the project. In 2019, and again in 2021 the |
| 20 MR. BROWN: No. There was no cross | 20 Applicant chose to pursue the design and development of a |
| 21 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Oh | 21 conditional use project, not a project by right, without any |
| 22 I'm sorry. | 22 consultation or design collaboration with the surrounding |
| 23 Ms. Brigham, you may be excused as a witness. | 23 neighborhood. |
| 24 Thank you | 24 Possibly, that could be understood if it was a |
| 25 MS. BRIGHAM: Thank you. | 25 project by right. But as a conditional use, I think there is |
| 166 | 168 |
| 1 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, do | 1 no excuse for that. The Applicant's design initially began |
| 2 you have anyone else? | 2 in 2019 with 81 townhouses without any elderly care component |
| 3 MR. BROWN: My last witness is Rick Maggin | 3 to speak of. Now, we have, two years later, after a zoning |
| 4 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Maggin, can | 4 text amendment, we have 45 townhouses with 150,000 foot, |
| 5 you turn your camera on? Thank you. | 5 approximately, square foot Lodge building. And it's obvious |
| 6 MR. MAGGIN: Yes, I just did | 6 that the intent all along was to build townhouses and |
| 7 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I see you. | 7 maximize the square footage of the developable property, |
| 8 MR. MAGGIN: Okay. | 8 without any consideration to the zoning, the current zoning, |
| 9 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Please raise | 9 the environmental issues, traffic, and the adjacent |
| 10 your right hand. | 10 neighborhood. |
| 11 Do you solemn | 11 During both application processes spanning a |
| 12 perjury that the statements you are about to make are the | 12 couple of years, the planning staff never reached out to us, |
| 13 truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth? | 13 the surrounding community, for any input on design or |
| 14 MR. MAGGIN: I do. | 14 compatibility. Conversely, a number of us requested a |
| 15 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right | 15 meeting with the planning staff in 2019 before it was |
| 16 Please state your name, address, and email address for the | 16 approved by the Planning Board, and met with Rich Weaver and |
| 17 record. | 17 three or four others from the planning staff, and expressed |
| 18 MR. MAGGIN: My name's Rick Maggin. I live | 18 our concern to a number of issues. |
| 1910811 Edison Rd. in Potomac, Maryland. My email address | 19 At that meeting, Rich Weaver actually boasted |
| 20 R-I-C-K at magginconstruction.com. Construction is spelled | 20 about his imput for the design of this project. And said, |
| 21 out. | 21 when questioned about the compatibility, he said isn't the |
| 22 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Thank | 22 design nice? Doesn't it look like a Potomac home? |
| 23 you. Mr. Brown -- | 23 After the project was withdrawn by the developer |
| 24 MR. BROWN: Mr. Maggin | 24 in 2020, I again reached out to the planning staff on behalf |
| 25 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Go ahead. | 25 of the neighbors, with no response. If you could, bring up |

5 seeing it
6 MR. MAGGIN: Yes, I'm Lot 3, where it says
Maggin/Tassen, which is the second house in on Edison Rd.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I see it.
Lot --
MR. MAGGIN: Right there.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Is it -- yeah.
Okay. I see it.
MR. BROWN: So Mr. Maggin, like with Ms. Brigham,
I gather that you are opposed to this project, and I would
like you to explain to the hearing examiner why that is so.
MR. MAGGIN: All right. Thank you. I am one of
13 abutting neighbors that is opposed to the project. To me,
it's not surprising that the neighborhood is over whelming
leak opposed to the project. In 2019, and again in 2021 the
Applicant chose to pursue the design and development of a
conditional use project, not a project by right, without any
consultation or design collaboration with the surrounding
neighborhood.
Possibly, that could be understood if it was a
project by right. But as a conditional use, I think there is
no excuse for that. The Applicant's design initially began
in 2019 with 81 townhouses without any elderly care component
to speak of. Now, we have, two years later, after a zoning
text amendment, we have 45 townhouses with 150,000 foot,
approximately, square foot Lodge building. And it's obvious
that the intent all along was to build townhouses and
maximize the square footage of the developable property,
without any consideration to the zoning, the current zoning,
the environmental issues, traffic, and the adjacent
neighborhood.
During both application processes spanning a
couple of years, the planning staff never reached out to us,
13 the surrounding community, for any input on design or
14 compatibility. Conversely, a number of us requested a
5 meeting with the planning staff in 2019 before it was
6 approved by the Planning Board, and met with Rich Weaver and
7 three or four others from the planning staff, and expressed
18 our concern to a number of issues.
At that meeting, Rich Weaver actually boasted
about his input for the design of this project. And said,
1 when questioned about the compatibility, he said isn't the
design nice? Doesn't it look like a Potomac home?
After the project was withdrawn by the developer
24 in 2020, I again reached out to the planning staff on behalf
25 of the neighbors, with no response. If you could, bring up
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Exhibit 113A, I'd like to refer to that. And I'd like to
read it to everybody.
This was after the project was withdrawn on
Friday, February 21st. and I don't know if you guys can hear
my dog in the background, but if you --
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (Inaudible).
    MR. MAGGIN: -- barking sorry about that.
    Anyhow, I sent this email to Rich Weaver and Josh
Penn and it states in regard to Heritage Gardens. Hi Rich,
I'm writing to follow up on my phone message on February 5th
regarding a withdrawal of Heritage Gardens conditional use
application }1909
    I'm writing because he never returned my call.
This is three weeks later.
    I called to discuss MNCPPC conditional use
application process and determine the best way for our
neighborhood, those affected most, to be engaged and kept
informed of any future conditional use development proposals
being considered for the property. Our objective is to
encourage the developer, and the planning staff to obtain
neighborhood and involvement in the early design process.
    Healthy discussion and feedback with the neighbors
on key issues could result in a successful shared vision and
avoid another protracted procedure costing the developer,
community, and taxpayers a substantial amount of wasted time
```

and money. We appreciate your time and welcome any thoughts
and suggestions you may have. I would be happy to coordinate
any efforts with our community.
Never heard from them
I think it was obvious from our meeting, and other
responses that they had a different agenda. Their agenda was
essentially to push this project forward. And they were
working with the developer. They really didn't address any
of our concerns.
Compatibility with the surrounding neighborhood.
Frankly, it's a very disturbing to me to hear the Applicant
tell us how the project is compatible with our neighborhood.
We are the people that live here all day, every day. Many of
us, including myself, for over 30 years. We know what's
best, we know what's compatible, and what's not. Families
chose to move to this neighborhood specifically because of
the benefits of the large lots and spaces between homes.
Many of us moved here from developments that had smaller lots
and smaller homes.
The project size, scale, and density is
inappropriate and not compatible with the surrounding
neighborhood.
I'd like to do next clarify some testimony that
was given earlier regarding the side and the former school.
I just want to -- I know it's been pointed out before, but I
want to emphasize again that the site is 30 acres; 10 acres
are not buildable. A couple of acres are dedicated to roads.
Even if they were to build single-family homes onto a lots as
allowed by right, they would be lucky to get 8 to 9 buildable
lots. So the consultants it references time and time again to 30 acres is not really relevant.

If we could turn to Exhibit 113B, the Fourth
Presbyterian School plan.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: You should be seeing it.

MR. MAGGIN: Yes, I do. Thank you. If you could
blow it up a little bit more that would be great.
Great. Thank you.
Applicant referred to likely scenarios in their
testimony. That's not relevant either. There was never a
permit issued for a likely scenario. This is a site plan of
the permit -- excuse me, that was issued. You'll note the
closest point the school building would have had from any of
the property lines on the west was 390 feet, and 450 feet
from the property line. What you see in a brown is the footprint of the school building that was approved.

Permit number 474500 was in the actual permit number, it was issued in 7 of 2008. It included a 67,000 square-foot building. Later, I believe it was 2009 , there was a 3000 foot modular building approved, and in 2010, and 8000 foot the gym building. Adding all that together, I believe that it's less than 80,000 square feet. That's what was permitted, not a likely scenario. The current site plan, with all the gross square footage of the building, as best as I can estimate, and there was limited information on the plans is closer to 450,000 square feet, almost half a million square feet, on less than 20 acres, like I said.

The two closest lots to South gland, which if you scroll a little bit towards South Glen, a little bit of the site plan is cut off.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Right. I'm trying to --

MR. MAGGIN: If you could just minimize it. Or maybe it doesn't show. Anyhow, do you see that dark line there that borders the side of the school? Those are 7 acres which constitute two other parcels. Those were never included in the permit for the school there has never been a permit issued for those 7 acres.

The other thing I wanted to point out is that the
building was a two-story building, and it did not operate 24
hours a day. The school use was abandoned and a special
exception, in my mind, and maybe I'm wrong, but my
understanding of a special exception is when a use, or a
site -- I guess it's a use is abandoned, the special
exception goes away.

| 173 | 175 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 So I might be wrong, but my understanding is in | 1 The other concern I had was that that in my mind, |
| 22014 when the school was abandoned the special exception when | 2 and again, it's my opinion, the Applicant was missing |
| 3 away. So all of this reference to the school building is | 3 information. There was no data table indicating the gr |
| 4 relevant, including the traffic. That's the way I view it | 4 square foot area of the townhouses, both the duplexes and the |
| 5 I'm not testifying as an expert on the zoning code or | 5 triplexes, or the Lodge building. There should have been |
| 6 anything else. | 6 cover sheet, it should have been mentioned in the land |
| $7 \quad$ But now that I mentioned traffic, I'd | 7 report, and it may not be a requirement but how could you |
| 8 Ms . Robeson if there is any way possible, it would b | 8 possibly evaluate a development of this size and |
| 9 extremely helpful to bring out the truth of the situation and | 9 compatibility with the neighborhood without even knowing |
| 10 the conditions surrounding this proposed development, if you | 10 these things |
| 11 could get involved in setting the criteria for the traffic | 11 It appears that that there is about, like I said, |
| 12 report. The Applicant's information on traffic today does | 12 close to half a million square feet between the Lodge, the |
| 13 not present an accurate picture. As many people have pointed | 13 gym , and the townhouses. There are no floor plans for the |
| 14 out, number one, the surveys were taken during COVID, | 14 lower level, and the second level of the townhouses. In 2019 |
| 15 extremely different than the | 15 they had full floor plans for both, including the potential |
| 16 The traffic accident report was based on a limited | 16 set up. The floor plan for the basement in 2019 included |
| 17 scope, and did not include all the accidents on South Glen. | 17 another bedroom, a fourth bedroom, a third bathroom, a media |
| 18 As somebody already testified, there was a fatality. I | 18 room, a gymnasium, and a family room This time, for some |
| 19 believe there were two fatalities between 2019 and now on | 19 reason, they were left off the submission. The same thing |
| 20 South Glen Rd. just, probably less than a quarter of a mile | 20 with the second floor. They didn't have a second floor floor |
| 21 | $21$ |
| 22 I think the fieldwork for any traffic study | 22 Now, I heard from somebody, I'mout of town and |
| 23 be done while schools, especially BOLUS (phonetic) is in full | 23 I'm not sure, but I heard from somebody they submitted |
| 24 session, and has normal class schedule, not learning from 25 home, not on flex schedule during exam weeks like they did in | 24 something, I guess it was last week. But better late than 25 never. |
| 174 | 176 |
| 1 the other prior reports, and not on vacation like they've | 1 Only on the landscape and lighting drawings d |
| 2 done when they did the study in the middle of December. The | 2 they indicate the size of the townhouse. They're n |
| 3 estimated traffic trips as other people have pointed out as | 3 indicated on the normal site plans where you would expect |
| 4 well, is very misleading. And I understand, and I'm not | 4 them. The first floor plans, by the way, initially, and I |
| 5 traffic expert, but I understand that they did report base | 5 don't know what has been submitted, did not have dimensions |
| 6 on this and being an elderly housing facility, and there's | 6 or a scale so you couldn't even tell the size of the units. |
| 7 separate classification for elderly housing facilities. | 7 There are no elevation drawings of the sides and rear of the |
| 8 What we have here is an elderly housing facility | 8 townhouses, no material selections indicated. |
| 9 contained in the Lodge, and a totally separate age restricte | $9 \quad$ The site plans say a proposed building height of |
| 10 facility being the townhouses. They have extremely different | 1050 feet on many of the triplex units, page 4 of the site |
| 11 traffic requirements. Other people have testified to the | 11 plans, while the land use report says a maximum of 40 feet. |
| 12 number of people going in and out. You have 45 townhomes, | 12 Which is correct? If we could bring up exhibit and 94 N now |
| 13 you have 130 some beds, I believe, in the facility. Somebody | 13 I'd like to talk about compatibility with my particular |
| 14 should be in charge of coming up with -- or setting a | 14 property. My property is the -- yes. Right there. |
| 15 criteria for doing an accurate traffic study to really gauge | 15 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: It's shaded in |
| 16 the full impact on this community and the roads. | 16 green. |
| 17 The roads, as a number of people have pointed out, | 17 MR. MAGGIN: Co |
| 18 the public facilities are not adequate. There is no | 18 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Just west of -- |
| 19 shoulder. There is no sidewalk. People walk on the side of | 19 MR. MAGGIN: The second house in on Edison, on the |
| 21 housekeepers and so forth and I'm just amazed that nobody | 20 west side of the Applicant s property. |
| 22 has recently been hit, especially in bad weather. There's no | 22 the spaces and the green area around the surrounding |
| 23 bus transportation, as people have pointed out. All these | 23 neighborhood versus the Applicant's proposal. And keep in |
| 24 things should be taken into consideration when a traffic | 24 mind, I have a note in the lower right-hand corner of the |
| 25 report criteria is set so that it's properly evaluated. | 25 Applicant's property, 10 of those acres, the majority of the |

green space, because 10 of the acres is 33 percent of the property is not buildable. Whereas all the other properties in the surrounding neighborhoods have significant more green space. So that really -- especially if you blow it up, it shows you the extreme density of the proposal versus the existing neighborhoods.

And for a minute, if everybody can imagine, I'm sitting on my back patio looking at the townhouses, which are located 30 feet from the property line. What I will be looking at is from left to right, a triplex of 160 feet, a 40 foot storm water pond area, a duplex of 117 feet, a 40 foot storm water area, and another triplex of 160 feet. And I guess the good news is, if you want the good and bad in the situation, the good news is I won't be able to see many of the lights from the cars that drive by because I'm going to have a 40 foot wall in my backyard.

Where in the surrounding neighborhood, the surrounding compatible neighborhood does somebody look out their back yard and see that kind of structure? Look at the other houses in the neighborhood. Look at what their views are out their backyard.

Can we switch now to aerial photo, Exhibit 56C, please? This photo as, I think a couple of people have mentioned, is and I don't know if it's enhanced or not, I can't really tell I think it is, but maybe it's not, shows
this great tree canopy behind my back yard. And when I say
tree canopy that's exactly what it is. It's a tree canopy.
It doesn't tell anything like Marie said about the understory of the trees.

I can sit in my backyard right now, and this
occurs probably five, six months out of the year because
there is no foliage back there, with the exception of some
cedar trees which we'll talk about later. But the under
canopy, I can sit in my porch in the back yard and I can see
cars driving down to the Synagogue. At night, when the
Synagogue has an event, I can see lights in the Synagogue.
So even though it looks like from the tree canopy it's very
dense, the under canopy is not dense at all, almost half the year.

If we could go to Exhibit 51, that'd be great.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Do you know if it's A or B? A probably?

MR. MAGGIN: I believe it's that one, the first one. Yeah. And if you could blow up on my backyard there?
I think Susanne Lee talked about it and we've talked about a
number of times, but I didn't know she was going to bring up
the cedar issue. But I do have a number of very nice trees
back there that do provide high canopy. There are two cedar
trees that are over 50 years old, that are closer to the
property line, I think, than any of those trees that show.
-
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25 memory. I'm out of town now, so I'm not sure. But I believe
that's correct.
Anyhow, back to the buffer plantings it's going to take 15 to 20 years for them to grow tall enough. And even 4 when they grow tall enough they aren't going to obscure a 40 foot townhouse, or a 50, depending on which number was 6 correct in the plan.
7 Another thing I should point out, if you could 8 scroll so that the bottom of the plan shows? Great. Along 9 the, I guess it would be the east property line the Applicant shows a 6 foot vinyl fence along with some screening along 1 the property line. And I'm assuming they are showing a vinyl 12 fence there because they think it's important to block the 13 lights coming down from South Glen into the synagogue from the new townhomes that that they're planning on building.

They show no fence along any of the other lines. If this project is approved in any fashion, I think it would be mandatory that they have a condition that they are to install a 10 foot high natural stone fence around the entire perimeter of the property. Not a vinyl fence.
The economic impact on my property is going to be 21 substantial. With proper design, generous setbacks, buffers 22 and so forth it wouldn't be as much of an economic impact.
23 The massive four and five-story building, the thin buffering
24 the screening elements, all around the monster duplex and 25 triplexes, and keep in mind, each one of these townhouses is
measures 31 at 3 feet above the ground. I don't know what the technical measurement is supposed to be for a specimen tree, but to me it's a specimen tree because there 50 years old and they provide more coverage year-round than any of the other trees, and they are not even shown. There's also a cedar tree, I believe, shown -- that isn't shown on the
Applicant's property. But that does beg a question, how many other trees like that throughout the neighborhood are not shown?

And to the Applicant, you know the chances of disturbing a root zone on any of those trees of mine may be minimal, and according to statistics they may live, but maybe they won't. And that will be significant because, like --

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, how --
MR. MAGGIN: -- everybody else said, when looking at the buffer plantings they'll take 20 years to mature.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well let me ask you something. Are they close -- I trees 170, 171, 168 and 167. Already cedar trees closer to the property line then those are?

MR. MAGGIN: Yes. Yes. They're actually -- I think one is to the left of 171 , and one is to the right of 171 , both closer to the property line. And I'm speaking from

10 shows
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approximately }6000\mathrm{ square feet, gross square feet. These are
no small townhouses.
    A number of the single family homes in the
neighborhood are only 2500,3000 feet.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Are you
talking -- when you say 6000, is that the (inaudible) --
    MR. MAGGIN: The gross building square footage.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I'm sorry. Is
it each townhouse or the whole stick of --
    MR. MAGGIN: No, each townhouse. So the duplexes
are roughly around 12,000 square feet. The triplexes roughly
around 18,000 square feet.
    MR. BROWN: Are you talking about the footprint or
the gross floor area?
    MR. MAGGIN: I'm not --
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. (inaudible),
before continue, there was a question from Mr. Brown. Are
you talking about footprint or the gross floor area?
    MR. MAGGIN: I'm talking about gross for area. So
you had the basement, you had the first floor, you had the
garage, you had the screen porch is, you had the second
floor, so yes.
    Economic impact. I may as well talk about the
study that was done because I have some serious concerns and
some comments on that.
```

    HEARINGEXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Not just a
    second. You're referring to the appraisal report?
MR. MAGGIN: Yes, I'm sorry. I think it's called
market conditions report dated 12/27/21.
HEARINGEXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Okay what
we don't need to --
MR. MAGGIN: If we could bring that up because we
might want to refer to that.
HEARINGEXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Do you
recall the exhibit number?
MR. MAGGIN: I do not. Dave?
MR. BROWN: Hang on.
MR. MAGGIN: I should have marked it down. I'm
sorry.
MS. HARRIS: It was 58.
MR. MAGGIN: 58.
HEARINGEXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you. I'm
getting there.
MR. MAGGIN: Okay. I can go ahead if you like?
HEARINGEXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Go ahead. And
I'll eventually get there.
MR. MAGGIN: Okay.
HEARINGEXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Here it is.
Okay. Go ahead.
MR. MAGGIN: The report says that the methodology

1 of analysis was that they examined the historical sales
price, appreciation rates between two neighborhoods over the period 2016 to 2021. This methodology provides an analysis of time. Substantially after most of the projects were developed. Consequently, it's not even relevant in most of the cases.

So if we look at senior facility number 1 , which was ProMedica, Arden Courts and Brandywine. ProMedica was built 28 years prior to the study. Arden Courts was built 22 years prior to the study. Brandywine is the only relevant case study to this situation because this situation we are talking about economic impact between my property and everyone else's property from the time the developer came out with his concept to the time the project is completed.

So it's a before and after look, a before and after window. It's not a window 10, 20, 30 years down the road. That has nothing to do with this situation.
Noteworthy, on that particular Brandywine project is 10827
Lockland is the only house adjacent to the Brandywine
facility and I believe Sam pointed this out yesterday, and is similar to the proposed Heritage Garden develop.

The zoning on that particular property, by the way, was RE2. But on three sides of the property you have a Falls Rd., so you have access off of a major corridor. You have the existing 20 to 30 -year-old elderly facility on the
other side, and then you have Falls Rd. golf course on the other. So it really only impacted that one particular property. And that one particular property ended up being discounted -- well, let me get to that one. So I can -- let me go on if I could because I can't find it right now.

But senior facility number 2 was Victory Terrace. Victory Terrace was built in 2003, that's 13 years prior to the study. Even began. Noteworthy is the existing buffering at the closest point adjacent to the properties and you can 10 look at the aerial, it's in that report, the closest point is 1282 feet to the property line from the edge of the facility 12 to the property line of the closest residence. Many of them 13 are 500 feet, 4 to 500 feet. The building is a three-level 14 building. The zoning in that was RE2, but as I said the 15 study period -- you're not even comparing before and after 16 development.
17 Senior facility number 3 was Fox Hill, which was 18 built in 2008. Again, eight years prior to the study. As
19 Sam mentioned yesterday there's no effective residential
20 neighbors. It's bordered by 495, it's bordered by Bradley
21 Boulevard, commercial across the street, River Rd., and a golf course. The zoning of that, by the way was R200.

Senior faculty number 4 , which is Brightview
24 Grosvenor was built in 2020 but it's not even close to being
25 a compatible neighborhood. Brightview is built in an urban
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setting where the largest adjacent lot size is less than 5400
square feet or a twelfth of an acre. The zoning for the
Brightview and adjacent townhomes is R60 and to the west of
Fleming -- I'm sorry, is R90 and to the west of Fleming is
R60. Not even close to being comparable to 2 acre home
sites.
The relevant and critical analysis must be to look at the value of the adjacent properties prior to the development of a senior living facility, then after the facilities were built. Only Brandywine is the relevant study and only the adjacent property which is located at 10827 Lockland Rd. is applicable. Construction began in -- for Brandywine in 2020.
10827 Lockland sits on a 2.4 acre lot. It sits on a cul-de-sac. There is 9025 feet, square feet above grade living area. There is 13,000 including the basement area. Eight bedrooms, ten baths. The average sales price in Potomac at that time was \(\$ 293\) a square foot. The listed sales price at \(9 / 17 / 2020\) was \(\$ 200,695,000\) which was \(\$ 299\) a square foot, so it's very close to the average selling price for the above grade living area, not the gross square footage.
The house sold, let's see -- four months later for \(\$ 200,050,000, \$ 227\) a square foot, 23 percent below the average square foot price. The house was on the market for
```

```
131 days. The average number of days on the market in the
fall of 2020 for a house in Potomac was }30\mathrm{ to }35\mathrm{ days. The
house was reduced }25\mathrm{ percent in order to sell.
    By the way, page 7 of the report states that the
property sold for 2695, which is not correct. That was the
listing price. The property sold for 2050. It's shown
correct in the chart but in the write up it's not shown
correctly.
    I spoke to one of the brokers involved in that
transaction. There's no question whatsoever that that
development impacted that sales price. No question. And
that's what she told me.
    MS. HARRIS: Objection. I'm going to register my
objection again as hearsay, similar to the last situation,
when I raised it.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: So I think, an
expert broker also spoke and related some hearsay from
brokers, so I'm going to let it in (inaudible) weight it
deserves.
    And I am hearing -- I am hearing an echo. Maybe
it's on my end. I will have my -- okay. Go ahead, Mr. --
    MR. MAGGIN: Do you want me to turn my volume up?
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: No. Go ahead.
    MR. MAGGIN: Okay. The -- when I had -- I had
another broker from a large company, Compass, come to my
```

home. We met in my backyard. I showed them the plans of what was going to be built and there was obviously no question, I mean, common sense will tell you, you're going to limit the number of buyers for your home because people looking at 2-acre -- for 2-acre properties in Potomac aren't going to want that situation in their backyard so it reduces the supply. It's common sense, if you don't have the demand your price is going to go down.

There obviously, are people that will buy. There
are people that will buy right on River Rd., you know, 500 or 100 feet from River Rd.. There's always going to be somebody that's going to buy, but you limit the amount of supply. And in that particular neighborhood that's not what people are looking for. I asked her about how it would affect and she's been in business over 30 years.

I asked her how it would affect my price. She said, unfortunately it's already affected your price because I knew about it. And she was speaking for herself. I knew about what was going to be developed back there and in fact, the only thing she had known about was the -- I think 50 some townhouses that were on the plan in 2019. When I showed her this plan she was blown away. She said it's significantly impacted your price already.

But there is going to be -- if this -- if this
project is built your price -- the price of your property is
going to be impacted not only now, through the construction period and after the construction period. At some point down the road it will settle out. But how far that point down the road is, who knows. And I'm not -- and she wasn't even saying it's going to come back to where the rest of the prices in the neighborhood are that aren't abutting that property.

So there's no question every single property that abuts this proposed project will be affected severely.

I'm going to be short and try and wrap this up because I know you guy have heard this for days now and -excuse me. I just made a short list of compatibility issues with the surrounding neighborhood; home designs, there's no question. Homes in the neighborhood are individual. You have designs all over, very wide range. The homes in this subdivision would all look similar.
Lot sizes in our neighborhood range from 2 to 3.4 18 acres. The ownership lots that are proposed on the townhouse developments are an eighth of an acre. Setbacks are nowhere near comparable as you saw from that green area exhibit. The lighting, and thank you very much for addressing the building lighting, because that's not taken into consideration on the photometrics, and will be substantial. But as Marie testified, and unfortunately there 25 was a doctor who lives in the neighborhood adjacent to the
entryway. I thought he was going to testify today, but I
guess he couldn't get away. He is actually in charge of a
senior living facility in Virginia.
He said -- we were on a conference call and maybe he submitted written testimony, I don't know. He said there is movement, action all day long, in and out of his facility. Whether it's ambulances, whether it's caregivers, whether it's customers, whether it's urgent calls for family, whether it's service people in and out. And lights are on and off all night long. This building is a -- some people refer to it as a four-story building, it's actually designed as a five-story building. There are five floors in certain areas.
The density, of the above grade living area, the surrounding neighborhood, if you divide the land area versus the above grade living area, there is $209-2954$ square feet of building per acre. If you look at the townhouses and the Lodge, there's 18,055 square feet per acre. And that's based on 305,000 square feet of building. Not the gross square footage, the above grade living area. And I'm guessing at that because it's very difficult to determine. That doesn't include the 450,000 gross square feet. That's an enormous difference.
The density of the people, we've gone through that. The economic impact, I've gone through that. The enjoyment of our property, I think that's obvious, the
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buffers. The sheer scale of a development, the noise, the adequate public facilities, the traffic, all these are issues.

And I'll just finish up by saying that if this
development does get approved in fashion I ask that the
hearing examiner address a phasing plan which, like, Susanne
mentioned mandates that the lodge be built and occupied
before any townhouse construction begins because that is a
component necessary for the townhouses as I understand it.
The trash dumpster service, restriction of hours.
We had requested of the school, I believe it was
2008 that they provide us with a covenant that restricts the owner and occupant of 10901 Edison Rd. from using that property for ingress and egress. That was never given.

A 10 foot minimum natural stone wall, not a vinyl
wall around the entire perimeter of the property be built.
Material selections be discussed and approved by the
surrounding neighborhood, and last but not least, enforcement
requirements. Which is a totally separate issue and as a
number of people have referred to, is extremely complicated.
And I -- and in my mind and I've seen it all over the area,
extremely difficult to enforce.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MAGGIN: And thank you for letting me say my

## piece.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you.
Ms. Harris --
MR. BROWN: Ms. Robeson, I just have a couple of additional questions for Mr. Maggin.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
MR. BROWN: And perhaps I should have asked this at the outset, Mr. Maggin. You said you're not an expert in this, and you're not an expert in that, but you provided a
lot of a detailed testimony. What is your background that
you brought to the testimony? Your background in
(inaudible)?
MR. MAGGIN: I'm a builder and developer, primarily commercial, although we've done a lot of multifamily as well.

MR. BROWN: And where does that take place?
MR. MAGGIN: We've worked all over the state of Maryland, DC, and Virginia, and currently working in South Carolina.

MR. BROWN: One last thing. You mentioned your exhibits 113 A and 113 B ; but you didn't mention your exhibit
113C. Can you tell us what that is about? Can you bring that up?

MR. MAGGIN: I can't see the top.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (Inaudible).

Yeah, I can't -- can you read it if I go back?
MR. MAGGIN: Maybe I can find -- oh, okay. I think I have a copy actually. That's the lot size and above grade living area comparison. So what I did was I took the information from the tax roll, and marked down in surrounding neighborhoods street a column, the fourth and fifth column over from the left, the surrounding neighborhood streets, the lot size and above grade living area. And then I -- in the next two columns just transferred the information over for those that were adjacent to the existing property.

And at the bottom of the page I provided an average so that over the 60 properties you have an average lot size of 94,720 square feet, and above grade living area of 5095 square feet. And that provides a 19 to 1 ratio of lot size to above grade living area. And at the bottom was Heritage Gardens, which is -- I did the same thing, I didn't summarize. I think that's the average of all their lots in the above grade living area. And there lot size to above grade living area is 2 to 1 , so the comparison is 19 to 1 versus 2 to 1 . Just a compatibility issue.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
MR. BROWN: Thank you, Mr. Maggin for your testimony. I have no further questions.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. Harris?
MS. HARRIS: Yes, just a few.
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| 193 | 195 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Hello, Mr. Maggin, how are you? | 1 because he presented it as a one-story building. And as I'm |
| 2 MR. MAGGIN: Fine, how are you. | 2 looking at the floor plan I said oh, this is a nice floor |
| 3 MS. HARRIS: I'm fine. Thank you. So your | 3 plan. I said a one-story building, but you have an elevator. |
| 4 indicated that the former school use was subject to a | 4 Oh well, you know that goes up to the second floor. |
| 5 conditional use. Were you aware that it was, in fact, a | 5 Okay. And where is the second floor plan? Oh |
| 6 religious school on the site? | 6 here's the second floor plan. Oh, you have two bedrooms and |
| 7 MR. MAGGIN: Ye | 7 two bathrooms, and how about a basement, do you have a |
| 8 MS. HARRIS: And were you aware -- are you aware | 8 basement? Oh yeah, here's the basement. So that's how that |
| 9 that religious schools, in fact, don't require specia | 9 meeting went. It wasn't here's what it'll look from your |
| 10 exceptions uses, and so therefore, there was no specia | 10 back yard. And here's what the floor plan it. It wasn't |
| 11 exception use associated with the school? | 11 we're in the initial stages of design, can we meet with you |
| 12 MR. MAGGIN: No, actu | 12 and some other neighbors and get input on this? Because I |
| 13 that the special exception -- or the religious component was | 13 told him it was very dense, very large, and it surprised me |
| 14 such that it didn't require them to do a traffic report. | 14 that they were trying to do that. And that's how he left the |
| 15 MS. HARRIS: Okay. Well, there was no special | 15 meeting. |
| 16 exception. And do you recall any special exception | 16 MS. HARRIS: When did you participate in one of |
| 17 proceeding prior to the issuance of the building permit | 17 the two meetings that the Applicant had on site in 2019 with |
| 18 the plan that you showed that indicated that it was phased? | 18 the |
| 19 MR. MAGGIN: No. | 19 MR. MAGGIN: No, I was out of to |
| 20 MS. HARRIS: And were you aware that that was, in | 20 MS. HARRIS: And then, in August of 2021 did you |
| 21 fact, the first phase of development of the overall school | 21 receive a letter from the developer, not the board of appeals |
| 22 master plan? | 22 required notice, but a letter from the developer indicating |
| 23 MR. MAGGIN: The first phase of a proposed | 23 that they were moving forward with the conditional use and to |
| 24 development, correct | 24 reach out if -- for further discussion and an opportunity to |
| 25 MS. HARRIS: Correct. Okay. Thank you. And | 25 meet? |
| 194 | 196 |
| 1 then, you indicated you're a builder and a developer, and I | 1 MR. MAGGIN: We received the obligatory letter. |
| 2 think I knew that in fact. And you're not a real estate | 2 At that point the plans were already done. The staff had |
| 3 appraiser; is that correct? | 3 already been involved. We reached out to the staff and tried |
| 4 MR. MAGGIN: Not an appraiser, I am a real estate | 4 to get their input. I've developed properties and reached |
| 5 agent. | 5 out -- |
| 6 MS. HARRIS: Thank you. And do you have an active | 6 MR. BROWN: I'm sorry |
| 7 real estate license? | 7 MR. MAGGIN: -- all over the area. |
| 8 MR. MAGGIN: Yes. | 8 MR. BROWN: It's hard to hear, yeah. No, I'm not. |
| 9 MS. HARRIS: In Montgomery County | 9 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Wait just a |
| 10 MR. MAGGIN: DC and Maryland. | 10 second. Just -- |
| 11 MS. HARRIS: And do you -- I think you indicated | 11 (Audio interference) |
| 12 that there was really no opportunity to review any design | 12 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. |
| 13 plans of this project; did I understand that correctly? | 13 Mr. MAGGIN: Ms. Harris, I have developed and |
| 14 MR. MAGGIN: No, that's not how I put it. The | 14 built properties in DC, and been part of the development |
| 15 developer came to us on a number of instances and said here's | 15 teams that have built all around various jurisdictions in |
| 16 what we are building. They presented it to us. That's far | 16 Maryland, and I've been involved in rezoning and by right |
| 17 different from asking the community for input on design and | 17 properties. And that is not how you involve a community. To |
| 18 compatibility. I've been -- if you want me to expand on that | 18 be in a position to approach a conditional use project and |
| 19 I'll expand on it. | 19 not asked to meet and have design input throughout the |
| 20 MS. HARRIS: Did you participate in -- well, I | 20 project is absurd. In DC, you wouldn't get away with it. |
| 21 believe you had a meeting with Mr. Wormald in December of | 21 MS. HARRIS: Well, Mr. Maggin, I think |
| 22 2018; do you recall that? | 22 MR. MAGGIN: You absolutely wouldn't get away with |
| 23 MR. MAGGIN: Yes, my wife and I had a meeting with | 23 it . |
| 24 him At that meeting he presented a floor plan to us, and it | 24 MS. HARRIS: -- you're surmising -- |
| 25 was the first floor plan. And it was actually laughable | 25 MR. MAGGIN: The first thing I do as a developer |

## Conducted on March 2, 2022

```
is I reach out to the community and set up a meeting with
everybody.
    MS. HARRIS: And that was, in fact the intent --
    MR. MAGGIN: And our architects. And we talk
about design.
    MS. HARRIS:And that was --
    MR. MAGGIN: We talk about compatibility, what
would you guys like to see as a community? That was never
done. I was in charge of the Association, and other people
were significantly involved, including Susanne Lee, and we
were the ones that ended up requesting meetings. And for the
planning staff not to --
    MS. HARRIS:Well --
    MR. MAGGIN: -- involve us, frankly, is criminal
on their part.
    MS. HARRIS: It is unfortunate that you
interpreted the letter that was sent at the end of August as
not a gesture to begin an open dialogue. That was the intent
of the letter and we were somewhat dismayed, frankly, that we
had not heard from the community on that.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. Harris,
you're not testifying.
    MS. HARRIS: Yes (inaudible).
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Wormald can
come on in rebuttal if he wishes.
```

MS. HARRIS: Thank you. Okay. I have no further
questions of Mr. Maggin.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown, do
you have any redirect?
MR. BROWN: No redirect. No additional witnesses
as far as I know.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay.
MR. BROWN: Unless there are perhaps some other --
there may be some other neighbors who wish to testify.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Is there --
MR. BROWN: But I'm through.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Is there
anyone else that would like to testify on this application?
Okay. Seeing no hands and hearing no volunteers.
MS. BRIGHAM: Ms. Roberson?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes.
MS. BRIGHAM: This is Marie again, Marie Brigham
who testified earlier.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes.
MS. BRIGHAM: Can I just make one other comment?
The lady who was an attorney, I mean, a realtor, who
testified earlier --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Ms. --
MS. BRIGHAM: -- she was testifying for the
developer.

```
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes.
    MS. BRIGHAM: I think her name was Embry.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes.
    MS. BRIGHAM: But anyway, she said that the
property is zoned for a school, and that's not accurate.
Before the Fourth Presbyterian School came there the school
had a conditional use -- the property had a conditional use.
But it's not zoned for a school. It's just it had a
conditional use.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Here's a --
    MS. BRIGHAM: (inaudible) before but there when
the --
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (Inaudible).
    MS. BRIGHAM: -- religious school came and they
didn't have a conditional use anymore. Before then they did.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes. A school,
I non-religious school under the zoning ordinance requires a
conditional use.
    MS. BRIGHAM: Right.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: But because it's
a religious school, it does not. So thank you for
clarifying.
    Anyone else? All right. Thank you for everyone
who testified. I'm going to ask this -- what is your plan,
Ms. Harris, as far as rebuttal?
```

    MS. HARRIS: So as you know, we are waiting for
    the traffic study to be reviewed. Well, first of all it
needs to be submitted to Park and Planning per Mr.
Bumgardner's direction. It needs to be reviewed by Park and
planning, I'm assuming, but I don't know this for a fact,
that they'll be issuing some kind of written memo responding
to the traffic study.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Right.
MS. HARRIS: And then once said that has occurred
and Mr. Brown has had an opportunity to review it then we
will need to schedule testimony for our last witness, Mr.
Kabatt. Following Mr. Kabatt's testimony, we would be
prepared to put on our rebuttal case and then moved to
closing arguments. But unfortunately I think that may end up
being -- I mean I can't predict Park and Planning staff
schedule but I think it's likely going to be three or four
weeks.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. My main
inquiry was reviewed -- what I wanted to do, just listening
to everything here, and having read the transcripts, I did
have a couple of concerns. I've already mentioned the one
several times about the ownership. And I'd like to just give
you a heads up of my concerns because I'd like you to address
them in your rebuttal. I am -- the ownership, I am confused
about. I think that the density is just -- okay.

| 201 | 203 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 If we could do this, if we could take just five | 1 The other thing is that density because even |
| 2 minutes so I can go through my notes and get my thoughts | 2 though I -- |
| 3 together and we'll come for 10 minutes if you can stay | 3 MS. HARRIS: Can I -- |
| 4 around? And then I'll probably be able to do it in a more | 4 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: -- what I -- |
| 5 coherent fashion. | 5 MS. HARRIS: -- just interrupt just one second for |
| 6 MS. HARRIS: Okay | 6 clarification? I'm sorry. |
| 7 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: So let's take a | 7 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yeah. |
| 810 minute break. So we will come back at 4:05. Thank you. | 8 MS. HARRIS: When you said you're wondering |
| $9 \quad$ (Off the record at 3:56 p.m., resuming at 4:12 | 9 whether there should be additional setbacks, can you identify |
| 10 p.m. | 10 where you're talking about just so I'm clear? |
| 11 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Giving me a | 11 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, not the |
| 12 moment. I tried to order these questions by topic, but | 12 setbacks from the northern -- the setbacks from the western |
| 13 gave up and just went through my notes as they occurred to | 13 property line, in particular. And I'm getting to that in a |
| 14 me . The first question is screening setback screening and | 14 minute. Just because I found Mr. Maggin's testimony credible |
| 15 setbacks. And I noticed what's the conditional use site plan | 15 that it's density because you've got so much of the parcel |
| 16 number? I think it's 45A. That's the cover sheet. That's | 16 constrained by forest and wetlands and stream valley buffer, |
| 17 not what I -- well, I'm not going to go find -- I'm not going | 17 you really don't have as much -- all the massing has to be on |
| 18 to go find the plans. | 18 a much smaller parcel than the entire 30 acres. |
| 19 Well, the screening and the setbacks. Okay. Mr. | 19 And just looking -- just seeing Mr. Maggin's |
| 20 Park I recall testified that there was a 40 foot overall | 20 description of looking at the face of these things, he didn't |
| 21 buffer because of all these woods, not on this property. And | 21 say how far he was from them, but I can -- just at a rough |
| 22 I have a couple of concerns because a couple of witnesses | 22 scale, he is not that far, and he is going to be looking at |
| 23 testified and I found their testimony critical that these | 23 pretty much a wall of townhouses that is atypical for that |
| 24 woods don't really screen them from the view of these | 24 zone. So even though density wise, you know, you have a low |
| 25 settings. So what you have on the top is just, I think it | 25 density per bed, and maybe number of units compared to other |
| 202 | 204 |
| 1 was option B, the 12 foot buffer, which isn't very much | 1 senior living facilities, it's that mass in a way that makes |
| 2 screening considering the proximity of these houses to these | 2 it -- I don't have the net usable acres, but certainly I |
| 3 townhouses, or the cottages | 3 think Mr. Maggin's testimony with the gross floor area over |
| 4 I'm concerned that the forested area -- well, A, | 4 the properties was significant. |
| 5 I'm never -- I'm not going to rely on the forested area on | 5 I would like to see a lighting plan with |
| 6 property outside your property because I never know whether | 6 everything shown. And that is typical. We always go -- |
| 7 they're going to maintain it, and so it sounds like it's not | 7 well, and the ones I've done, we do go into the building |
| 8 providing screening from the visual impact from the | 8 sconces and that type of thing. As far as Ms. Lee's |
| 9 neighbors. | 9 testimony, what attempts have been made -- there were a |
| 10 The second question $I$ have is are all the trees | 10 couple of things in the environmental guidelines about to the |
| 11 grown? I mean, I know the measurement for the circumferenc | 11 extent possible you should design around the stream valley, |
| 12 is taken at chest high, and I can't remember everything else, | 12 some of the environmental constraints on the site. What |
| 13 but do we have all the trees? So I would like to know if | 13 attempts were made to do that? |
| 14 that NRIFSB, it was recertified, but we need to double check | 14 And I do have a question as to why we don't |
| 15 that everything is accounted for on it, and all the off-site | 15 mitigate the gymnasium which is in the stream valley and the |
| 16 impacts are there, are accounted for. | 16 flood plain and raises the level -- if it's going to raise |
| 17 Also, the topo. The topo, I saw the second, and | 17 the level of the flood water I know it's an existing |
| 18 the topo says that the -- the topo helps visual screening | 18 condition and maybe legally you can build it. I don't know |
| 19 froma street view. And I could be wrong about this. It | 19 if you have to pay flood insurance, but it just seems like |
| 20 helps screen the high. But my question is these properties | 20 why wouldn't you mitigate the impact it's having? |
| 21 several people have mentioned they are above the bowl of the | 21 MS. HARRIS: When you say mitigate the impact, can |
| 22 stream and the floodplain, just roughly. So even if the | 22 you clarify what you mean by that? |
| 23 height may be screened from a street view, they are seeing | 23 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I mean, get |
| 24 everything. And I'm wondering if there should be additional | 24 it -- why wouldn't you get it out of the flood plain? That's |
| 25 screening, additional setbacks. | 25 what I mean. |
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| 205 | 207 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 MS. HARRIS: Okay. | 1 people's wells, but if you want to address that concern you |
| 2 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Given that, you | 2 can. |
| 3 do have acreage, it seems like your list impacted acreage is | 3 And are there elevations? I tried to go through |
| 4 on the southern side of the property. Now, you could do a | 4 the exhibits, but I was taking more time than I thought it |
| 5 small work facility perhaps for the launch in the northern | 5 was worth. Are there elevations of the cottages just the |
| 6 part of the property. But these are just things I'm throwing | 6 breadths? I guess the -- are there measurements of the |
| 7 out there because I'm not sure that the woods is going to | 7 footprints? They're on the conditional use plan, I guess. |
| 8 buffer as much as indicated. And it is -- the massing is | 8 Well, if somebody could provide the square footage |
| 9 relatively intense where it occurs | 9 of the footprint. Are the floorplans that were scaled -- |
| 10 And, I don't know if the topo does really -- you | 10 were they gross floor area or were they interior area? |
| 11 don't have to do this, these are just my --- I'm just giving | 11 MS. HARRIS: Are you asking for answers now |
| 12 you my concerns. If you feel like they don't need to be | 12 because I'm making a list of everything? |
| 13 or they aren't a concern, you know, I'm giving you some heads | 13 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: If you know, if |
| 14 up so you can say something on rebuttal. | 14 you don't could -- okay. I'll just -- |
| 15 I would also like accident data. I don't know if | 15 (Crosstalk) |
| 16 it's already been provided, but may be updated. I think it's | 16 MS. HARRIS: -- if we get back to you. I would |
| 17 on the state police -- I think it's on the state police | 17 prefer to take in information and then get back to you as |
| 18 website. Because I think some of this was done in 2019, and | 18 opposed to respond now unless you (inaudible). |
| 19 now it's back, and I don't know what's it been updated. | 19 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: No. I'm -- and |
| 20 The second thing is, is there any plan to | 20 again, if these are not issues as you see them, those are |
| 21 shuttle -- how many employees are going to use mass transit? | 21 just what I'm concerned about after the hearing today and |
| 22 Where's the nearest bus stop, and are there any plans to | 22 yesterday and it would be helpful to me if you could address |
| 23 shuttle employees to and from the bus stop to avoid, or you | 23 them. |
| 24 know, is this not an issue for some other reason? Okay. | 24 And I believe that's all the questions that I had. |
| 25 And then, how wide is South Glen Rd. and can a | 25 Well, and you might as well address and I think |
| 206 | 208 |
| 1 fre engine and an ambulance pass each other? I assume they | 1 you would do this anyway, but the -- I assume that you have |
| 2 can, but I'd just like it in the record. | 2 worked the storm water out so this doesn't exacerbate runoff |
| 3 Could you have done anything to minimize that | 3 off site. But if you could just address that in relation to, |
| 4 priority forest area? We need a signed updated NRIFSD. Are | 4 I think, it was Ms. McGrath's testimony. |
| 5 there any plans to mitigate some of the damage that has | 5 MS. HARRIS: Will do. |
| 6 already occurred on the stream? And again, I'm not saying -- | 6 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right. So |
| 7 I'mjust asking you to tell me this. I'm not saying you must | 7 with that, do you -- we don't know, I guess, what the timing |
| 8 do this. I'm just asking you whether it's a good idea. | 8 will be for the next hearing because we don't have the |
| 9 Whether it's been looked at and whether it's a bad idea, et | 9 traffic -- we don't have a deadline certain on the traffic |
| 10 cetera. | 10 report; am I correct on that one? |
| 11 The master plan recommendations for the need for | 11 MS. HARRIS: Yes. What I would suggest is once we |
| 12 senior housing is 20 years old. And you know, a lot of times | 12 have some certain dates -- once the traffic report's |
| 13 when Applicants come in and say well, you can't give weight | 13 submitted to staff and they've approved it then I can let you |
| 14 to this master plan recommendation because it's 20 years old. | 14 know and then I think that's probably the time that we can |
| 15 And so my question is is that still a relevant -- I | 15 schedule another -- schedule the final hearing date. |
| 16 understand but if this is going to be based on master plan | 16 HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. I really |
| 17 recommendations the question is how valid is that | 17 encourage you to work with the -- you do this -- I know most |
| 18 recommendation still? | 18 applicants do this anyway, but it may be helpful to meet |
| 19 And I think there's something in the very front of | 19 again if you're proposing any changes with the (inaudible) in |
| 20 every master plan that says, well, this is a snapshot now, | 20 advance and I'm sure staff will be happy to meet. I'm sure |
| 21 but it's recommendations may not be as pertinent over time. | 21 they will be happy to meet as well. |
| 22 So if we're going to rest this case on the need for senior | 22 So with that, the only thing to keep in mind is |
| 23 housing called for in 2002, is that still a valid need? | 23 that we have to -- if we don't set a hearing date today we |
| 24 I assume the traffic counts will not be done on a | 24 have to send out 15 days written notice. So whenever you're |
| 25 school holiday. I don't see this as having an impact on | 25 calling to set a hearing date give us that 15 day window or |

```
two or three days before for staff. We don't have staff in
the office every day at the moment. So just keep that in
mind when you're scheduling the hearing.
    Does anyone have any other questions?
    MR. BROWN: I do. Ms. Robson, I'd like to talk --
it would be helpful to talk for just a couple of minutes
about the end game in this process. And before I ask a
specific question, I just want to refer back to an exchange
between me and Hearing Examiner Baumgardner regarding
covenants.
    I had made the pitch to him that we felt strongly
that this application was incomplete without at least a draft
set of covenants, that among other things, addressed some of
the transfer of ownership issues associated with the age
restrictions about which you heard some testimony today.
Mr. -- Ms. Harris's response, as I understood it was that
covenants would not be forthcoming at this point and that my
request was rather unprecedented. Covenants would come out
in the course of the preliminary plan process at the Planning
Board.
    MS. HARRIS: I think if I could -- go ahead, I'm
sorry.
    MR. BROWN: Did I misstate you? Please correct me
ifI did.
    MS. HARRIS:Well, I thought -- no, I thought
two or three days before for staff. We don't have staff in the office every day at the moment. So just keep that in mind when you're scheduling the hearing.
Does anyone have any other questions?
MR. BROWN: I do. Ms. Robson, I'd like to talk -it would be helpful to talk for just a couple of minutes about the end game in this process. And before I ask a specific question, I just want to refer back to an exchange between me and Hearing Examiner Baumgardner regarding covenants.
MS. HARRIS: Well, I thought -- no, I thought
```

that -- we did have that exchange, but then I thought zoning
Hearing Examiner Baumgardner also said what would be typical
is as a condition of approval that the declarations would be
required. He certainly didn't sound like he was asking for
them in advance.
MR. BROWN: I --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, let me --
MR. BROWN: I accept that correction. May I
continue?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes.
MR. BROWN: He also made it clear to me that if we
had specific concerns about what those covenants should
contain I was free to make recommendations to you as to
conditions of conditional use approval. Or, I guess he
expressed it, recommendations to him. But now, it would be
recommendations to you, and you heard testimony today that,
in fact, I have been working on that problem.
So that leads me to the question of how we're
going to end this? Obviously, I don't like proposing
conditions that assume that the project is going to be
approved when I'm going to be advocating that it be
disapproved. Nevertheless, I feel that this is important to
look at alternatives relief scenario and provide you with our
specific recommendations as to what we would like to see
ultimately in those covenants. And that's going to be
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that -- we did have that exchange, but then I thought zoning
Hearing Examiner Baumgardner also said what would be typical
is as a condition of approval that the declarations would be
required. He certainly didn't sound like he was asking for
them in advance.
MR. BROWN: I --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, let me --
MR. BROWN: I accept that correction. May I
continue?
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yes.
MR. BROWN: He also made it clear to me that if we
had specific concerns about what those covenants should
contain I was free to make recommendations to you as to
conditions of conditional use approval. Or, I guess he
expressed it, recommendations to him. But now, it would be
recommendations to you, and you heard testimony today that,
in fact, I have been working on that problem.
So that leads me to the question of how we're going to end this? Obviously, I don't like proposing
conditions that assume that the project is going to be
approved when I'm going to be advocating that it be
disapproved. Nevertheless, I feel that this is important to
look at alternatives relief scenario and provide you with our
secific recommendations as to what we would ike to see
ultimately in those covenants. And that's going to be
something that I'm going to have to produce in writing to you
at some point down the road. I'm wondering where this fits
into your plans for closing argument, and whether or not you
would like a closing argument --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. Can I --
MR. BROWN: -- that would include --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I'm raising my
hand. Oops, I missed it. Okay. I'm raising my hand.
That's a good point because it brought up one
thing that I didn't write down and that is the legal
structure. It would be helpful for me, prior to the last
hearing, to have -- if you could do a (indiscernible) summary
of what the legal structure is going to be so I could at
least try and get my head around it before -- you know, maybe
it's a co-op. I don't know. No, it would be -- anyway. If
you could just give me written -- give me something in
writing describing the legal structure. Because I can't say
that -- how can you write covenants if you don't know what
the legal structure is? I'm going to suggest that Ms. Harris
take a stab -- I do think -- I don't know whether covenants
are inappropriate. I mean, we have them with rezoning. But
I do think having certain provisions of them, like
enforcement and transfer of units, and Ms. Harris, if you
want to take a stab at that before Mr. Brown does, or work
together with Mr. Brown he's -- but you have better access to
the legal structure than he does.
MS. HARRIS: But when you say take a stab at that,
are you looking for a draft covenant, or rather a document
that identifies those provisions that would be included within a--

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: The latter.
MS. HARRIS: Yes, okay.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: The latter.
MS. HARRIS: Yes.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: I don't want to
hear about insurance liability and all of that kind of stuff.
But it would be -- and I suggest you talk to Mr. Brown about
what his citizens think should be in there. But since you
have a better idea of, or more access to what legal structure
is going to be, it might be a good idea for you to speak with
Mr. Brown and then address some of the enforceability concerns.

MS. HARRIS: That's fine. And frankly, I would be surprised if there was a lot of distance between us in terms
of what the provisions should be. I mean, it's not as if we
weren't anticipating that all along.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Yeah.
MS. HARRIS: That's always been a part of our
structure. So what I would suggest is all come up with
something, share it with Mr. Brown and we'll work and
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hopefully we can provide you with a document that identifies
all the necessary provisions.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Now, what's a
reasonable timeframe? I really would like that summary
description, as detailed as you feel comfortable making it of
what the ownership structure is going to be. So what's a
reasonable time frame for you to provide that?
    MS. HARRIS: I would like to say two or three
weeks, but -- two weeks maybe? I need to -- I mean I'm -- so
we have someone in our office that does this all the time so
I need to make sure of his availability and such. I mean,
now I'm -- Ken made a funny face when I said three weeks.
Two weeks? I'll shoot for two weeks but I would hate to have
like a date certain when (inaudible).
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well,
(inaudible) this. Let's see, today is -- well, let's shoot
for two weeks. I leave that to you, but make a deadline
which I would like. Make a deadline of three weeks which
would be the 23rd. March 23rd.
    MS. HARRIS:That's certainly doable and if we can
get it even earlier we certainly will.
    HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Thank you so
much.
    Mr. Brown, are you okay with that?
    MR. BROWN: I would be very happy to receive a
```

submission from Ms. Harris on the 23rd and turn around a
response to it within probably two weeks of that. But I
don't think that the two of us could come up with any kind of
consensus document in three weeks.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: No, I'm just
talking -- I'm not talking about the declaration of
covenants.
MR. BROWN: No, I'm not either. I'm not either.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Well, I didn't
ask for a consensus document on that one. A consensus one is
what you want to see in these covenants.
MR. BROWN: What I'm telling you is I think that
we have some very different ideas about what these covenants
should contain than her client does. So I do not anticipate
that if she sends me something in three weeks I'm going to
say it's just fine. And I don't anticipate that we --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: But --
MR. BROWN: -- would reach agreement in any event.
This is something you're going to have to decide because I
don't believe --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: So --
MR. BROWN: -- there's any realistic chance we're
going to agree on what those terms should be.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: All right.
Well, that's not what I'm saying for in three weeks. What

I'm asking Ms. -- there's two different things going on.
Okay? One is just a description of the legal structure that
they're proposing. That's it. I just want to know that in three weeks.

MS. HARRIS: And that doesn't take -- right. That
doesn't involve Mr. Brown. That's me explaining to you how we anticipate this legal structure.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Exactly. And
then, Mr. Brown, the separate assignment is the covenants and
you can work on that together and you may not agree. Maybe
you could do a -- I just had a case that was remanded by the
Board of Appeals and the Applicant met with the citizens and
listed the areas of consensus and listed the areas of no
consensus. So you know, I don't expect consensus of the
covenants. I just -- all I'm asking for from Ms. Harris by
May [sic] 23rd is a written description of the legal
structure that they are proposing.
MS. HARRIS: March 23rd.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That, yes.
MR. BROWN: Well, I'll put it this way. If Ms.
Harris wants to give me a draft of her concept of what
should -- of key elements of the covenants that might have
some relationship to the issues in this case, I'll give her a
turnaround response within two weeks of the time she gets it to me.
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HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. We're
still talking about different things.
MR. BROWN: I'm not talking about the legal
structure. I'm talking about --
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Oh, wait.
(inaudible). Okay. So what you're saying is for the
covenants you need a two-week turnaround?
MR. BROWN: Yes.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Okay. So Ms.
Harris, do you think we can get all this done -- I have no
idea when the traffic study's coming out. I assume staff
will review it as they normally do.
MS. HARRIS: Well, let me just say, given the
timing we will try to get Mr. Brown something within the next
week. But again, I'm sort of promising something without
consulting with my partner who's going to be taking the lead
on this.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Understood.
Thank you. All right --
MR. BROWN: Whatever date she delivers I will do something within two weeks of that date.

HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: (inaudible).
Thank you. And so is there any -- can anyone think of
anything else? You can always email me.
Okay. Hearing none, I am going to continue this
case indefinitely. I'm hoping that the parties will contact
me with dates when they are ready to proceed based on the
traffic study.
MS. HARRIS: I will as soon as we know a date.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: Mr. Brown,
within two weeks that you'll get something back to Ms.
Harris?
MR. BROWN: Right. And we will then decide among
ourselves what's going to be submitted to you, either a
consensus document or two documents.
HEARING EXAMINER ROBESON HANNAN: That's fine. I
appreciate it.
All right. With this I'm going to continue it
until -- indefinitely. Please, everyone on this phone call
provide Ms. Johnson of our office -- make sure if you didn't
read it into the record, of your email and street address so
we can get the notice to you for the next hearing.
Thank you very much. It was a long hearing.
Thank you for participating.
MS. HARRIS: Thank you.
(The proceeding concluded 4:41 p.m.)
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| A | abutting | acre | actual |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| a- | 4:15, 10:4, | 20:7, 29:3, | 42:11, 83:12, |
| 212:5 | 10:18, 36:8, | 42:14, 57:19, | 109:6, 119:2, |
| abandoned | 36:16, 41:21, | 57:20, 66:14, | 171:22 |
| 65:9, 86:13, | 85:12, 89:12, | 66:15, 74:9, | actually |
| 132:6, 172:21, | 90:14, 90:23, | 91:12, 145:20, | 24:18, 31:2, |
| 172:24, 173:2 | 96:19, 97:2, | 146:6, 165:10, | 66:24, 69:18, |
| abdul | 162:14, 167:17, | 185:2, 185:5, | 69:19, 69:21, |
| 3:9, 49:8 | 188: 6 | 185:14, 188:19, | 71:20, 85:7, |
| ability | accept | 189:16, 189:17 | 85:14, 85:18, |
| $14: 8, \quad 218: 5$ | 210:8 | acreage | 98:8, 101:17, |
| able | accepting | 149:8, 205:3 | 101:24, 105:20, |
| 7:2, 9:20, | 138:2 | acres | $\begin{array}{ll} 106: 13, & 117: 9 \\ 119: 11 . & 127: 18 \end{array}$ |
| 36:11, 62:21, | access $12: 3,12: 12$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 57: 16, & 64: 15, \\ 64: 17, & 64: 18, \end{array}$ | $128: 5,144: 20,$ |
| 66:2, 67:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 3, \quad 12: 12, \\ & 19: 21, \quad 23: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $65: 1, \quad 85: 23,$ | $156: 9, \quad 168: 19,$ |
| $69: 24,74: 16,$ 115:16, 116:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 21, \\ & 23: 11, \\ & 24: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $89: 24, \quad 90: 1,$ | $179: 22,189: 2,$ |
| $160: 3, \quad 177: 14,$ | 24:17, 24:20, | 90:5, 112:5, | 189:11, 192:3, |
| 201:4 | 52:19, 98:6, | 130:6, 130:7, | 193:12, 194:25 |
| aboard | 101:13, 128:10, | 130:8, 130:16, | add |
| 119:8 | 183:24, 211:25, | 145:1, 145:23, | 16:19, 35:6, |
| above | 212:14 | 159:10, 171:1, | 36:18, 116:1, |
| 4:13, 26:19, | accessory | 171:2, 171:6, | 156:20 |
| 39:24, 68:7, | 41:21 | 172:7, 172:15, | ded |
| $77: 23,85: 14$, | accident | 172:18, 176:25, 177:1, 188:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 10, \quad 96: 3, \\ & 97: 1, \quad 121: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 158:1, 159:3, | accidents | 203:18, 204:2 | $159: 11$ |
| $185: 21,189: 13,$ | 31:1, 31:3, | across | adding |
| 189:15, 189:19, | 31:6, 173:17 | 9:10, 15:5, | 101:20, 172:1 |
| 192:3, 192:8, | accompany | 18:15, 27:20, | addition |
| 192:13, 192:15, | 80:18 | 28:3, 28:4, | 56:16, 80:16, |
| 192:18, 202:21 | according | 28:5, 29:2, | 112:8, 112:14, |
| absolutely | 66:14, 109:9, | 70:24, 89:13, | 144:18, 149:11, |
| 38:12, 38:25, | 109:10, 124:12, | 95:23, 96:2, | 163:5 |
| 62:17, 98:4, | 179:13 | 103:20, 162:4, | additional |
| 110:22, 196:22 | accountable | 184:21 | 16:19, 16:23, |
| absorption | 111:9 | action | 23:17, 24:20, |
| 100:9 | accounted | 189:6 | 32:16, 67:3, |
| absurd | 202:15, 202:16 | active | 69:17, 80:18, |
| 196:20 | accurate | 194:6 | 191:5, 198:5, |
| abut | 126:24, 129:17, | activities | 202:24, 202:25, |
| 9:9, 10:2, | 173:13, 174:15, | 22:15, 25:11, | 203:9 |
| 15:9, $27: 19$, | 199:5 | 51:15, 58:24, | address |
| $100: 21$ | acknowledge | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 78: 25, \quad 81: 4, \\ & 91: 6 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6: 18, \quad 6: 19, \\ & 9: 6.9: 17 . \quad 14: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| abuts | $122: 21,128: 3$ | activity | 9:6, 9:17, 14:9, \| 14:25, 15:1, |
| 25:16, 159:2, | acknowledged |  | $15: 6,21: 23$ |
| 188:9 | acquisition | $160: 20$ | $22: 2,27: 16$ |
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| ```27:17, 34:16, 49:6, 49:10, 55:6, 55:7, 55:9, 61:11, 61:14, 99:5, 101:2, 157:5, 157:7, 159:6, 166:16, 166:19, 170:8, 190:6, 200:23, 207:1, 207:22, 207:25, 208:3, 212:16, 217:16 addressed 26:7, 64:3, 80:2, 122:22, 209:13 addresses 112:4 addressing 50:13, 188:22 adembrey@gmail 34:20 adequate 174:18, 190:2 adherence 78:17 adjacency 138:24 adjacent 10:20, 45:25, 64:12, 64:21, 84:21, 86:5, 131:5, 137:7, 137:16, 138:5, 138:12, 168:9, 183:19, 184:9, 185:1, 185:3, 185:8, 185:11, 188:25, 192:10 adjoining 91:10 adjust 48:22 administrative 1:1, 2:3, 9:24, 56:20, 88:11 admire 74:21``` | ```admissible 88:9, 88:11 admission 88:13 admit 126:3, 131:12 admitted 72:21, 74:8, 126:20 adopted 94:20, 151:11 adoption 95:22, 150:21, 152:16 adu 41:20, 42:6 adult 15:4, 110:13, 110:14 advance 208:20, 210:5 adversely 22:24 advising 76:8 advisory 79:22 advocating 41:25, 210:21 aerial 3:22, 100:4, 177:22, 184:10 aesthetically 35:18 affect 78:8, 187:14, 187:16 affected 9:11, 9:12, 102:23, 169:17, 187:17, 188:9 affiliate 12:8 affiliated 11:22 affirm 8:4, 14:21, 21:19, 27:13,``` | ```34:11, 49:2, 55:3, 61:4, 98:25, 156:25, 166:11 affirmed 147:17 affordable 93:25, 94:10, 94:14 affront 21:1 after 138:20, 163:19, 168:3, 168:23, 169:3, 183:4, 183:15, 183:16, 184:15, 185:9, 188:2, 207:21 afternoon 156:11, 160:24 again 6:13, 12:8, 42:11, 62:6, 62:7, 81:9, 86:25, 87:6, 90:24, 101:1, 118:15, 121:8, 135:14, 136:6, 143:23, 153:21, 167:19, 168:24, 171:1, 171:5, 175:2, 184:18, 186:14, 198:17, 206:6, 207:20, 208:19, 216:15 against 77:14, 88:13 age 13:7, 19:22, 20:1, 39:12, 58:19, 63:25, 95:7, 102:6, 108:23, 108:25, 109:15, 109:18, 109:19, 109:25, 110:5, 110:14, 110:23, 110:24,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```180:2 anymore 35:12, 148:3, 199:15 anyone 6:12, 6:14, 7:15, 16:21, 48:12, 48:13, 52:3, 53:17, 60:15, 60:19, 99:19, 107:10, 115:15, 155:19, 166:2, 198:13, 199:23, 209:4, 216:23 anything 8:22, 47:25, 74:15, 107:11, 118:5, 126:9, 128:10, 132:16, 133:10, 138:24, 148:13, 150:9, 173:6, 178:3, 206:3, 216:24 anyway 5:21, 32:17, 158:25, 164:8, 199:4, 208:1, 208:18, 211:15 anywhere 30:9, 149:17, 150:9 aol 157:9, 157:10 apartment 56:19, 57:5, 95:25 apiece 16:19 apologize 62:19, 73:22, 91:20 apparent 116:7 apparently 136:8 appeal 11:2``` | ```appealing 57:23 appeals 111:7, 114:24, 195:21, 215:12 appear 10:1, 12:23, 18:8, 93:21 appearance 115:21 appearing 51:21, 60:16, 61:21, 61:22 appears 12:12, 12:15, 12:22, 65:7, 66:7, 94:21, 115:14, 120:6, 175:11 appendix 123:17, 123:22, 126:7, 127:10, 143:12 applicable 79:18, 93:8, 185:12 applicant 2:6, 5:7, 6:4, 11:22, 12:7, 13:3, 13:16, 65:14, 69:1, 72:19, 75:9, 84:19, 88:14, 88:16, 95:6, 95:14, 96:25, 102:7, 109:4, 109:9, 109:11, 110:9, 114:21, 132:8, 133:21, 146:10, 146:11, 159:4, 167:20, 170:11, 171:14, 175:2, 179:11, 180:9, 195:17, 215:12 applicant's 91:4, 168:1, 173:12, 176:20,``` | 176:23, 176:25, 179:8 applicants 14:3, 101:16, 206:13, 208:18 application 5:3, 9:9, 9:24, 12:13, 13:6, 13:12, 14:4, 22:20, 59:17, 62:12, 63:9, 81:14, 84:8, 84:17, 96:20, 112:12, 112:15, 120:4, 133:22, 168:11, 169:12, 169:16, 198:13, 209:12 applied 112:6, 113:18 apportioned 141: 6 appraisal 182:2 appraiser 194:3, 194:4 appreciate 32:19, 54:24, 62:23, 107:12, 107:23, 108:14, 170:1, 217:12 appreciated 16:9 appreciation 103:4, 183:2 approach 196:18 appropriate 92:23, 93:21, 95:1, 146:20, 147:12 approval 14:13, 40:10, 40:14, 108:20, 210:3, 210:14 approve 13:12, 116:17 approved 3:21, 9:11, |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| bathroom | 114:22, 115:4, | behalf | 183:20, 190:11, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 175:17 | 115:5, 115:9, | 2:2, 2:6, 2:13, | 194:21, 207:24, |
| bathrooms | 115:23, 115:24, | 5:7, 9:8, 168:24 | 214:20 |
| 195:7 | 116:9, 132:3, | behind | beloved |
| baths | 134:9, 136:24, | 25:21, 44:3, | 165:7 |
| 109:13, 185:17 | 138:1, 139:4, | 44:7, 132:13, | below |
| battle | 147:3, 148:1, | 159:12, 160:14, | 18:12, 115:5, |
| 89:18 | 149:17, 150:19, | 160:17, 162:11, | 185:24 |
| baumgardner | 152:3, 152:16, | 178:1 | beltway |
| 209:9, 210:2 | 159:25, 164:14, | being | 96:2 |
| bear | 165:1, 165:7, | 19:16, 22:6, | bend |
| 16:25, 51:6 | 170:25, 172:17, | 36:11, 39:5, | 36:6 |
| beautiful | 174:22, 175:5, | 41:17, 41:18, | beneficial |
| 115:24, 145:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 175: 6, \quad 176: 5, \\ & 187: 15, \quad 194: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 41:21, 62:23, | 132:23 |
| beauty | $\begin{aligned} & 187: 15, \quad 194: 18, \\ & 196: 3, \quad 196: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 2, \quad 91: 5, \\ & 100: 2, \quad 107: 12 \end{aligned}$ | benefit |
| $56: 11$ become | $196: 3,196: 14$, $196: 16, ~ 204: 9$, | $\begin{aligned} & 100: 2, \quad 107: 12, \\ & 113: 13, \quad 124: 20, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 13: 24, & 14: 2, \\ 37: 25, & 134: 3, \end{array}$ |
| 12:2, 115:20, | 205:16, 205:19, | 130:17, 131:24, | 134:7, 146:14 |
| 116:7, 116:14 | 206:9, 210:17, | 132:7, 135:18, | benefits |
| becoming | 212:23 <br> before | 160:3, 163:21, | 29:5, 170:17 |
| 51:8 | $1: 10,17: 18,$ |  | best |
| bed | $\begin{array}{ll}1: 10, & 17: 18, \\ 24: 8, & 69: 17,\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 174: 10, & 184: 3, \\ 184: 24, & 185: 5, \end{array}$ | $12: 6, \quad 43: 18,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 152:11, } 203: 25 \\ & \text { bedroom } \end{aligned}$ | 87:20, 88:24, | $200: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 69: 24, \quad 82: 11, \\ & 117: 18, \quad 121: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| 111:18, 175:17 | 91:23, 111:24, | believe | 136:3, 147:15, |
| bedrooms | $\begin{aligned} & 121: 2, \quad 121: 3, \\ & 121: 13, \quad 149: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $7: 4,12: 10$, $12: 24,16: 18$, | 151:21, 169:16, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 109: 13, \quad 185: 17, \\ & 195: 6 \end{aligned}$ | $159: 8,164: 9,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 24, \quad 16: 18, \\ & 18: 9, \quad 18: 16, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 170: 15,172: 4 \\ & 218: 5 \end{aligned}$ |
| beds | 168:15, 170:25, | 21:3, 22:13, | bethesda |
| 65:3, 96:6, | $\begin{aligned} & 181: 17, ~ 183: 15, \\ & 184: 15, ~ 190: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 26: 9, \quad 38: 8, \\ & 38: 19, \quad 39: 14, \end{aligned}$ | 2:10, 148:15, |
| 96:8, 149:7, | 199:6, 199:11, | $43: 8,65: 14,$ | 148:16 <br> better |
| 152:4, 174:13 been | 199:15, 209:1, | 72:19, 80:10, | $20: 24,48: 7,$ |
| 11:7, 11:14, | 209:7, 211:14, | 89:9, 100:10, | 67:21, 101:17, |
| $23: 4,23: 7,$ | 211:24 | 100:20, 103:9, | 129:24, 131:18, |
| $23: 23,24: 12,$ | beg | 120:4, 122:14, | 175:24, 211:25, |
| 30:6, 30:17, | 179: | 122:16, 123:3, | 212:14 |
| $31: 1,31: 3$, | began | 127:15, 130:5, | between |
| 34:25, 52:19, | $\left[\begin{array}{ll} 115: 2, & 168: 1, \\ 184: 8, & 185: 12 \end{array}\right.$ |  | 17:14, 17:19, |
| 61:24, 62:21, | begin | 141:7, 144:8, | 18:2, 27:9, |
| 73:8, 75:11, |  | $146: 19,150: 16 \text {, }$ | 50:18, 70:3, |
| 75:16, 78:5, | $197: 18$ | $150: 22,153: 13,$ | 82:11, 83:18, |
| $78: 6,78: 14$, | beginning | $156: 6, \quad 162: 8,$ | 124:5, 137:7, |
| 83:23, 84:18, | $5 \cdot 16.43 \cdot 25$ | $165: 9,171: 24,$ | 170:17, 173:19, |
| 89:8, 89:9, | 5:16, 43:25, | 165:9, 171:24, | 175:12, 183:2, |
| 95:15, 95:17, | 114:15 | $172: 2,173: 19$, $174: 13,178: 18$, | 183:12, 209:9, |
| 96:6, 102:23, | begins | 174:13, 178:18, | 212:19 |
| 103:1, 112:19, | 190:8 | 179:7, 179:25, | beyond |
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|  | 178:19 <br> blown <br> 187:22 <br> blue <br> 65:24, 66:4, <br> 73:24, 134:14, <br> 134:25, 135:3, <br> 135:4 <br> blue-green <br> 10:17, 11:12 <br> board <br> 74:8, 74:20, <br> 92:3, 111:7, <br> 114:21, 114:24, <br> 116:5, 121:2, <br> 121:4, 121:6, <br> 168:16, 195:21, <br> 209:20, 215:12 <br> boards <br> 84:9, 102:21 <br> boasted <br> 168:19 <br> bolus <br> 173:23 <br> bonus <br> 159:11 <br> boomers <br> 40:1 <br> bordered <br> 184:20 <br> borders <br> 172:15 <br> both <br> 28:25, 32:8, <br> 58:6, 66:20, <br> 68:16, 74:1, <br> 77:1, $94: 12$, <br> 134:20, 135:12, <br> 135:13, 156:21, <br> 162:22, 168:11, <br> 175:4, 175:15, <br> 179:24 <br> bottom $\begin{aligned} & 123: 20, \quad 123: 23, \\ & 124: 5, \quad 126: 13, \\ & 127: 5, \quad 142: 5, \\ & 180: 8, \\ & 192: 11, \\ & 192: 15 \end{aligned}$ | ```bought 29:7, 29:11, 29:24 boulevard 23:14, 184:21 boundary 89:13, 95:24 bowl 202:21 bradley 184:20 branch 77:22, 78:3, 78:4, 78:12, 78:15, 78:22, 87:22, 104:18, 105:2, 105:9, 106:1, 159:16, 159:19, 160:9, 161:16 brandywine 32:14, 59:1, 74:23, 96:6, 96:8, 149:10, 149:11, 151:3, 152:1, 183:8, 183:10, 183:18, 183:19, 185:10, 185:13 breadths 207:6 break 54:14, 97:25, 114:9, 117:23, 201:8 breakfast 162:25 brewer 2:8, 5:7 bridge 159:17, 162:1, 163:20 bridle 159:16 brief 153:20 briefly 55:13, 58:13,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| brought | buffering | 168:5, 171:18, | bustling |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 191:11, 211:9 | 97:1, 180:23, | 171:21, 171:24, | 15:23 |
| brown's | 184:8 | 171:25, 172:1, | busy |
| 54:2, 114:8 | buffers | 172:4, 172:20, | 7:10 |
| browser | 3:25, 12:25, | 173:3, 175:5, | button |
| 52:24, 53:2 | 64:12, 64:18, | 176:9, 180:14, | 6:7 |
| buffer | 64:21, 64:22, | 180:23, 181:7, | buy |
| 64:14, 64:20, | $72: 15,72: 25$, | 184:13, 184:14, | 44:2, 109:5, |
| 65:10, 65:12, | $74: 7,77: 6$, | 188:22, 189:10, | 115:20, 163:25, |
| 65:25, 66:4, | 78:19, 78:20, | 189:11, 189:12, | 187:9, 187:10, |
| 66:6, 66:8, | 79:1, 80:8, | 189:16, 189:18, | 187:12 |
| 66:13, 66:20, | 82:11, 82:13, | 193:17, 194:16, | buyer |
| 66:23, 67:4, | 83:18, 83:19, | 195:1, 195:3, | 111:17 |
| 67:5, 68:20, | 83:24, 84:7, | 204:7 | buyers |
| 68:25, 69:6, | 84:9, 84:11, | buildings | 115:18, 187:4 |
| 69:7, 70:23, | 84:20, 84:25, | 30:13, 49:22, | buys |
| 70:24, 71:1, | 85:2, 85:23, | 56:20, 79:7, | $39: 11,115: 16$ |
| 71:4, 71:21, | 89:25, 124:12, | 86:12, 89:1, | $\bar{C}$ |
| 71:25, 72:6, | 130:11, 133:1, | 149:24, 149:25, | cabin |
| $72: 12, \quad 72: 20,$ | $180: 21, \quad 190: 1$ | $161: 8, \quad 164: 3$ | $93: 18,152: 22,$ |
| $74: 9,75: 23,$ | bugher | built | 93:18, 152:22, 152:24, 153:1, |
| $85: 16, \quad 85: 17,$ | 1:25, 218:2, | $41: 17,41: 21,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 152: 24, ~ 153: 1, \\ & 153: 4,153: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| 85:21, 85:24, | $218: 12$ | $42: 13,42: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 153: 4,153: 7, \\ & 153: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| 86:4, 86:14, | build | $42: 20, \quad 55: 17$ | 153:11 <br> cala |
| 87:1, 87:7, | 15:16, 20:12, | $79: 25, \quad 86: 19$ | cala $143: 15$ |
| 87:14, 89:18, | 30:12, 31:11, | 95:6, 95:18, | calculated |
| 90:20, 130:16, | 31:17, 68:13, | 112:6, 124:20, | $84: 20$ |
| 131:4, 131:10, | 102:8, 112:7, | 132:25, 164:11, | calculations |
| $131: 24, ~ 131: 25$, $132: 11, ~ 133: 4$, | 134:22, 145:3, | 164:20, 183:9, | $69: 2,74: 7$ |
| $132: 11, ~ 133: 4$, $133: 7,133: 8$, | $146: 4,159: 5$, $162: 22, ~ 168: 6$, | $\begin{aligned} & 184: 7, \quad 184: 18, \\ & 184: 24, \quad 184: 25, \end{aligned}$ | call |
| 133:15, 134:6, | $162: 22, ~ 168: 6, ~$ $171: 3,204: 18$ | 185:10, 187:2, | 12:23, 33:8, |
| 134:12, 134:13, | buildable | 187:25, 190:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 8, \quad 97: 17, \\ & 150: 18, \quad 161: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| 134:14, 134:16, | 171:2, 171:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 190: 16, \quad 196: 14, \\ & 196: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 150:18, 161:6, $164: 6, \quad 169: 13,$ |
| 134:25, 135:1, | $177: 2$ | $196: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 164: 6, ~ 169: 13, \\ & 189: 4, ~ 217: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 135:2, 135:5, | builder | bulldozing | called |
| 135:7, 135:8, | $191: 13,194: 1$ | $160: 18$ | called $35: 9,41: 15$ |
| 135:16, 136:5, | building | bumgardner's | 35:9, 41:15, 60:20, 68:22 |
| 136:8, 136:9, | $16: 22,19: 14,$ | $200: 4$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 60: 20, & 68: 22, \\ 75: 11, & 76: 6, \end{array}$ |
| 136:23, 136:25, | $20: 17, \quad 32: 11,$ | bunch | 75:11, 76:6, |
| $137: 11, ~ 137: 23$, $137: 24,138: 3$, | 56:20, 63:14, | $32: 1$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 76: 13, & 112: 2, \\ 112: 3, & 140: 16, \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 137: 24, ~ 138: 3, \\ & 138: 4, \quad 138: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 78:18, 78:24, | burdened | 159:23, 169:15, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 138: 4, \quad 138: 6, \\ & 138: 10, \quad 138: 16, \end{aligned}$ | 84:23, 96:25, | $16: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 159: 23, ~ 169: 15, \\ & 182: 3,206: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| $138: 10,138: 16$, $146: 3,162: 13$, | $101: 11, ~ 130: 19$, $131: 15, ~ 131: 16$, | bus 19:4, 19:6. | calling |
| 179:17, 180:2, | 132:11, 134:21, | 174:23, 205:22, | 28:2, 208:25 |
| 201:21, 202:1, | $135: 22,161: 8 \text {, }$ | $205: 23$ | calls |
| 203:16, 205:8 | 162:24, 163:5, | business | 189:8 |
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| character | children | 204:22 | 25:23, 55:16, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9:16, 10:22, | 15:4, 24:14 | clarifying | 58:1, 76:3, |
| 20:15, 32:10, | choice | 91:23, 199:22 | 85:20, 109:12, |
| 93:9, 145:8 | 53:9 | clarity | 149:17, 150:10, |
| characteristic | chose | 47:4 | 159:9, 161:3, |
| 29:12 | 29:25, 167:20, | clarksburg | 161:4, 175:12, |
| characteristics | 170:16 | 39:21 | 179:19, 184:24, |
| 127:7, 147:2, | chrome | class | 185:5, 185:20 |
| 155:6, 155:7 | 53:4, 53:6, | 154:11, 173:24 | closed |
| characterized | 53:10 | classification | 87:20, 88:24 |
| 65:5 | chtd | 174:7 | closely |
| charge | 2:8 | classified | 79:4 |
| 111:13, 143:16, | church | 124:9 | closer |
| 174:14, 189:2, | 43:24 | classify | 17:25, 70:19, |
| 197:9 | churches | 119:16, 142:13 | 100:2, 144:20, |
| charm | 96:23 | classroom | 172:6, 178:24, |
| 29:9 | cibola | 161:7 | 179:20, 179:24 |
| chart | 22:9 | clean | closest |
| 122:24, 153:25, | circle | 101:9, 101:13 | 171:18, 172:8, |
| 154:4, 154:7, | 61:14 | clear | 184:9, 184:10, |
| 154:8, 154:20, | circled | 67:16, 77:12, | $184: 12$ |
| 154:23, 155:2, | 80:12 | 87:13, 105:15, | closing |
| 155:5, 186:7 | circumference | 120:1, 128:20, | 21:3, 200:14, |
| chat | 91:2, 179:1, | 128:21, 137:12, | 211:3, 211:4 |
| 5:24, 5:25, 6:1 | 202:11 | 138:3, 139:2, | clubhouse |
| chaudhray | circumstances | 149:6, 161:5, | 65:6 |
| 3:9, 48:14, | 103:5, 113:22, | 161:6, 203:10, | cluster |
| 48:15, 48:16, | 131:12 | 210:11 | 84:12, 105:8 |
| 48:19, 48:24, | citation | clear-cut | clustered |
| 49:5, 49:8, | 122:5 | $146: 2$ | 72:14 |
| 49:12, 51:5, | cite | clearcutting | clutter |
| 51:7, 51:16, | 129:16 | $90: 3$ | 10:10 |
| 51:21, 51:22, | citizen's | clearing | co-op |
| 52:17, 55:18, | 2:14, 55:22 | 78:25 | 211:15 |
| 58:2 | citizens | clearly | code |
| check | 5:13, 5:17, | 26:15, 127:3, | 13:2, 13:8, |
| $153: 15, \quad 202: 14$ | $15: 8, \quad 21: 2,$ | $162: 17$ | 16:5, 25:9, |
| checked | $32: 17, \quad 55: 22$ | click | 79:17, 93:7, |
| 124:17 | 61:23, 62:10, | $52: 11$ | $95: 19,119: 19,$ |
| checking | 63:3, 212:13, | client | $139: 12,173: 5$ |
| $7: 1$ | 215:12 | 158:15, 214:14 | coherent |
| chest | civil | clients | 201:5 |
| 202:12 | 119:5 | 35:23, 51:2 | cohesive |
| chicken | clarification | clipped | 13:17 |
| 15:18 | 133:20, 203:6 | 136:6 | collaboration |
| chickens | clarify | clock | $167: 22$ |
| 29:16 chief | $\begin{array}{ll} 37: 21, & 92: 8, \\ 92: 11, & 170: 23, \end{array}$ | $57: 5$ | collecting $9: 25$ |
| 113:24, 114:20 | 92:11, 170:23, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { close } \\ & 6: 15, ~ 9: 1, \end{aligned}$ | 9.25 |
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| coloring | 191:14 | comparison | comprised |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65:24, 164:15 | commercialized | 4:14, 192:4, | 15:17 |
| column | 43:9 | 192:19 | computer |
| 10:3, 10:5, | common | compass | 6:15, 156:21, |
| 10:11, 192:6 | 12:9, 127:6, | 186:25 | 156:22 |
| columns | 187:3, 187:7 | compassionate | concentrated |
| 192:9 | communal | 34:2 | 74:23 |
| com | 111:1 | compatibility | concept |
| 15:6, 22:2, | communication | 96:25, 168:14, | 58:16, 115:11, |
| 34:20, 49:10, | 5:25 | 168:21, 170:10, | 147:17, 148:5, |
| 61:15, 99:8, | communities | 175:9, 176:13, | 183:14, 215:21 |
| 157:9, 166:20 | 23:13, 24:4, | 188:12, 192:20, | conceptualize |
| combined | 35:21, 59:18 | 194:18, 197:7 | 44:3 |
| 163:8 | community | compatible | concern |
| come | 13:9, 15:15, | 14:7, 26:21, | 15:12, 39:17, |
| 24:5, 31:17, | 20:19, 22:16, | 79:16, 170:12, | 39:19, 68:15, |
| 62:8, 70:5, | 22:18, 26:17, | 170:15, 170:21, | 83:5, 111:15, |
| 75:10, 105:23, | 26:21, 35:7, | 177:18, 184:25 | 117:1, 159:7, |
| 128:5, 148:9, | 35:9, 35:12, | compilation | 161:11, 168:18, |
| 186:25, 188:5, | 35:16, 36:1, | 76:13 | 175:1, 205:13, |
| 197:25, 201:3, | 36:5, 36:18, | complete | 207:1 |
| 201:8, 206:13, | 36:20, 39:8, | 31:15, 46:14, | concerned |
| 209:18, 212:24, | 39:22, 41:16, | 127:10 | 12:2, 15:25, |
| 214:3 | 41:24, 42:1, | completed | 16:1, 19:3, |
| comes | 42:3, 42:10, | 183:14 | 19:12, 30:2, |
| 25:23, 78:2, | 42:12, 43:14, | completely | 39:17, 53:24, |
| 86:14, 88:13, | 45:1, 49:25, | 19:11, 32:10, | 56:16, 116:16, |
| 88:25 | 63:8, 65:6, | 100:7, 101:12, | 116:21, 124:18, |
| comfortable | 102:11, 108:21, | 164:24 | 160:2, 162:21, |
| 213:5 | 109:15, 109:23, | complex | 202:4, 207:21 |
| coming | 111:21, 168:13, | 13:6, 63:13, | concerning |
| 31:24, 87:7, | 169:25, 170:3, | 63:17, 64:11, | 96:24 |
| 89:9, 163:4, | 174:16, 194:17, | 65:1, 65:5, | concerns |
| 163:12, 165:24, | 196:17, 197:1, | 65:13, 71:8, | 11:24, 14:8, |
| 174:14, 180:13, | 197:8, 197:20 | 77:21, 78:18, | 14:9, 15:11, |
| 216:11 | commute | 79:11, 79:25, | 29:22, 34:23, |
| comment | 16:13, 22:11, | 90:9, 108:25 | 36:12, 39:24, |
| 198:20 | 29:6, 30:16, | compliance | 42:6, 62:14, |
| comments | $36: 21$ | 139:15 | 158:16, 158:17, |
| 34:6, 146:17, | company | complicated | 162:23, 163:23, |
| 164:13, 181:25 | 22:5, 22:6, | 119:24, 190:20 | 170:9, 181:24, |
| commercial | 24:2, 24:5, | component | 200:21, 200:23, |
| 16:11, 22:19, | 186:25 | 59:13, 59:19, | 201:22, 205:12, |
| 23:12, 24:22, | comparable | 150:6, 168:2, | 210:12, 212:17 |
| 25:4, 25:8, | 185:5, 188:20 | 190:9, 193:13 | concluded |
| 25:18, 25:20, | compared | composed | 116:12, 217:21 |
| $42: 15,44: 9$ $96: 21, \quad 184: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 203:25 } \\ & \text { comparing } \end{aligned}$ | $64: 17,64: 19$ | concludes $153: 16$ |
| 96:21, 184:21, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { comparing } \\ & \text { 184:15 } \end{aligned}$ | 98:20 | 153:16 |
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| concur | congratulations | consists | contact |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63:10 | 40:6 | 80:17 | 217:1 |
| condition | conlon | constantly | contain |
| 12:11, 85:8, | 84:4 | 31:11 | 80:18, 83:23, |
| 132:4, 180:17, | connected | constitute | 210:13, 214:14 |
| 204:18, 210:3 | 52:17, 71:15 | 172:16 | contained |
| conditional | connecting | constrained | 13:7, 63:14, |
| 40:13, 64:6, | 65:13 | 203:16 | 84:17, 174:9 |
| 79:15, 79:17, | connection | constraints | containing |
| 91:12, 108:20, | 47:14, 129:10, | 13:1, 102:22, | $80: 6$ |
| 109:2, 109:8, | 164:5 | 204:12 | contend |
| 110:10, 111:14, | consciously | construct | 101:16 |
| 149:3, 159:2, | 94:17 | 64:25, 78:10, | continuation |
| 159:21, 159:22, | consecutive | 80:16 | 5:2 |
| 160:6, 167:21, | 92:15 | constructed | continue |
| 167:25, 169:11, | consensus | 64:7, 67:10, | 15:10, 39:4, |
| 169:15, 169:18, | 214:4, 214:10, | 95:15, 95:24, | 45:8, 83:8, |
| 193:5, 195:23, | 215:13, 215:14, | 96:6, 96:7, | 86:18, 108:16, |
| 196:18, 199:7, | 217:10 | 96:12, 113:12, | 111:19, 113:19, |
| 199:9, 199:15, | consequently | 116:22, 117:4, | 118:10, 161:13, |
| 199:18, 201:15, | 183:5 | 133:11, 135:15, | 162:9, 181:17, |
| 207:7, 210:14 | conservation | 150:20, 152:17 | 210:9, 216:25, |
| conditions | $3: 20,44: 6,$ | constructing | $217: 13$ |
| 106:19, 116:12, | $67: 22,67: 24$ | $95: 7,133: 10$ | continues |
| 116:17, 173:10, | $76: 16,79: 13,$ | $134: 11$ | $35: 25,85: 17,$ |
| 182:4, 210:14, | 90:8, 122:14, | construction | 85:18, 86:16, |
| 210:20 | 130:17, 145:15, | 22:18, 63:13, | 132:12 |
| conducive | 145:17, 145:22, | 63:18, 63:21, | continuing |
| $35: 15$ | $146: 6, \quad 146: 11$ | 64:10, 65:11, | 115:12 |
| cone-shaped | consider | 76:9, 78:18, | contour |
| $68: 10$ | $46: 24$ | 79:7, 79:10, | $129: 9$ |
| conference | consideration | 86:18, 90:20, | contrary |
| $\begin{aligned} & 189: 4 \\ & \text { configurations } \end{aligned}$ | 56:14, 84:21, | $91: 6, ~ 92: 18, ~$ $96: 16, ~ 115: 2$, | $36: 16$ |
| configurations 75:3 | 168:8, 174:24, | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 16, \quad 115: 2, \\ & 133: 22, \quad 160: 4 \end{aligned}$ | contrast |
| confirm | $188: 23$ considered | 160:12, 166:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 15: 23, \quad 96: 11, \\ & 110: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $65: 16, \quad 65: 17$ | 81:7, 84:7, | $185: 12,188: 1,$ | control |
| confirmation | 84:13, 113:17, | $188: 2,190: 8$ | 12:9, 13:10 |
| 164:1 | 139:9, 139:13, | consultant | convenient |
| confirmed | 169:19 | 124:2, 125:5, | 58:7, 60:8 |
| 119:1 | considering | $126: 18,161: 24$ | conveniently |
| conform | 202:2 | consultants | $26: 12$ |
| $74: 13$ | considers | $171: 5$ | conversely |
| conforms $79: 18, \quad 93: 7$ | $12: 25$ | consultation $167: 22$ | $168: 14$ |
| confused | consistent $30: 11, \quad 30: 13,$ | consulting | convert $112: 15$ |
| $200: 24$ | $79: 15,95: 11,$ | $216: 16$ | converted |
| confusion $10: 10$ | 95:18 | consummate $63: 7$ | 148:4 |
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| convey | corridor | 172:13, 173:11, | 194:9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 154:24 | 183:24 | 175:7, 176:12, | county's |
| coops | corridors | 178:15, 178:19, | 63:16, 76:10, |
| 15:18 | 81:7, 147:22, | 180:7, 182:7, | 76:16, 81:15, |
| coordinate | 148:17 | 184:5, 201:1, | 96:16 |
| 91:10, 170:2 | cost | 202:19, 205:4, | county-wide |
| copies | 102:24 | 206:3, 207:8, | 128:4, 128:14 |
| 123:7 | costing | 207:14, 207:22, | countywide |
| copy | 169:24 | 208:3, 209:21, | 129:17 |
| 192:3 | costs | 211:12, 211:13, | couple |
| core | 115:6 | 211:16, 214:3, | 5:17, 14:4, |
| 108:22 | cottage | 215:11 | 31:20, 50:15, |
| corner | 38:11, 38:23, | couldn't | 65:17, 164:12, |
| 66:20, 66:22, | 49:23, 51:9, | 38:17, 176:6, | 168:12, 171:2, |
| 85:21, 87:6, | 55:18, 58:15 | 189:2 | 177:23, 191:4, |
| 92:13, 120:19, | cottages | council | 200:21, 201:22, |
| 176:24 | 12:23, 30:12, | 94:12, 94:13, | 204:10, 209:6 |
| corporate | 51:18, 56:19, | 94:19 | coupled |
| 23:13 | 95:25, 202:3, | councils | 63:25, 108:23 |
| corps | 207:5 | 94:5 | course |
| 75:9 | could | counsel | 17:4, 21:13, |
| correct | 7:20, 18:3, | 5:10, 46:11, | 22:15, 27:6, |
| 14:19, 18:20, | 20:2, 27:9, | 62:7, 218:6 | 57:13, 74:25, |
| 38:11, 38:24, | 36:3, 36:25, | counsel's | 115:23, 117:5, |
| 51:9, 51:10, | 37:1, 43:5, | 62:2 | 131:15, 137:18, |
| 58:17, 59:14, | 43:12, 43:17, | counter | 150:2, 184:1, |
| 59:15, 59:23, | 44:4, 53:23, | 162:16 | $184: 22,209: 19$ |
| 74:7, 95:14, | 57:16, 58:4, | counties | court |
| 103:12, 103:20, | 61:17, 65:17, | 139:10 | 2:22, 5:20, |
| 118:17, 123:1, | 66:1, 66:2, | country | 5:21, 112:4, |
| 123:6, 127:24, | 69:22, 70:2, | 97:21, 163:17, | 135:24 |
| 130:3, 131:25, | $70: 4,70: 6$, | 163:21, 163:22 | courts |
| 132:4, 134:3, | 85:3, 85:5, | counts | 39:21, 148:20, |
| 136:9, 136:23, | 85:6, 85:13, | 206:24 | 183:8, 183:9 |
| 141:9, 141:24, | 85:25, 87:11, | county | covenant |
| 143:2, 143:13, | 91:15, 91:23, | 1:2, 2:2, 5:13, | 190:12, 212:3 |
| 146:18, 153:4, | 97:19, 97:20, | 15:8, 23:10, | covenants |
| 176:12, 176:17, | 98:8, 101:1, | 28:25, 29:1, | 13:13, 64:4, |
| 180:1, 180:6, | 103:9, 105:7, | 55:22, 61:23, | 209:10, 209:13, |
| 186:5, 186:7, | 112:6, 125:19, | 63:3, 63:17, | 209:17, 209:18, |
| 193:24, 193:25, | 130:22, 141:10, | 76:11, 78:2, | 210:12, 210:25, |
| 194:3, 208:10, | 142:13, 144:10, | 78:14, 84:10, | 211:18, 211:20, |
| 209:23, 218:3 | 149:15, 151:2, | 94:11, 94:19, | 214:7, 214:11, |
| correction | 152:9, 153:21, | 113:15, 119:19, | 214:13, 215:9, |
| 210:8 | 159:10, 163:24, | 120:20, 127:7, | 215:15, 215:22, |
| correctly | 167:3, 167:24, | 127:10, 129:7, | 216:7 |
| $123: 4,186: 8 \text {, }$ | $168: 25,169: 23,$ | $129: 18,139: 10,$ | cover |
| $194: 13$ | 171:7, 171:11, | 139:11, 159:25, | 164:17, 175:6, |
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| 201:16 | 125:22, 125:25, | customers | 182: 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| coverage | 165:20 | 189:8 | dates |
| 179:5 | cross-examination | cut | 208:12, 217:2 |
| covering | 6:3, 118:10, | 62:24, 90:11, | daughter |
| 50:18 | 121:22 | 144:18, 147:9, | 62:20, 159:13 |
| covid | cross-examine | 160:19, 160:23, | dave |
| 33:20, 33:24, | 6:4, 37:22, | 162:4, 172:10 | 182:11 |
| 33:25, 34:5, | 40:12 | cutting | david |
| 35:22, 62:21, | crosses | 162:21 | 2:15, 5:10 |
| 122:8, 173:14 | 106:14 | D | day |
| coyote | crossing | daily | 1:7, 7:10, |
| 29:20 | 130:18 | 23:19, 24:21, | 16:20, 19:7, |
| crafted | crosstalk | 51:15, 58:24 | 25:8, 36:22, |
| 93:14 | 18:4, 37:7, | dale | 77:25, 80:11, |
| cramm | 42:22, 43:3, | 113:24 | 90:19, 144:17, |
| 9:5 | 45:10, 45:19, | damage | 152:2, 170:13, |
| crashing | 51:25, 81:20, | 100:6, 103:1, | 172:21, 189:6, |
| 160:22 | $\begin{aligned} & 82: 1, \quad 82: 6, \\ & 127: 21, \quad 129: 5, \end{aligned}$ | $145: 4, \quad 164: 23,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 208: 25,209: 2 \\ & \text { davs } \end{aligned}$ |
| create | $\begin{array}{ll} 127: 21, & 129: 5, \\ 136: 14, & 156: 19 \end{array}$ | $206: 5$ | days <br> 14:4, 16:15, |
| $6: 15, ~ 10: 9$, $13: 13, ~ 42: 8$, | $\begin{aligned} & 136: 14, ~ 156: 19, \\ & 207: 15 \end{aligned}$ | dangerous | $\begin{aligned} & 14: 4, \quad 16: 15, \\ & 39: 23, \quad 49: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 13: 13, \\ & 101: 19 \end{aligned}$ | Cu | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 20, \quad 31: 5 \\ & 32: 5 \end{aligned}$ | $90: 13,153: 11,$ |
| created | 1:5, 5:3 | dangerously | 164:9, 186:1, |
| 101:11 | cul-de-sac | $31: 9, \quad 32: 4$ | $\begin{array}{cc} 186: 2, & 188: 11, \\ 208 \cdot 24 & 209 \cdot 1 \end{array}$ |
| creating | 103:13, 105:25, <br> 106:13, 185:15 | dangers | 208:24, 209:1 |
| 101:20 credible | culvert | 30:17 | $22: 9,148: 17,$ |
| 203:14 | 100:6, 102:24 | dark | 191:18, 194:10, |
| criminal | curious | 68:7, 135:3, | 196:14, 196:20 |
| 197:14 | $41: 15,45: 15$ | $136: 12,136: 16,$ | deadline |
| criteria | current 17:1, 21:25, | $136: 20,148: 13,$ | $\begin{array}{\|ll} 208: 9, & 213: 17, \\ 213: 18 \end{array}$ |
| $14: 13$, $14: 16,14$, $40: 10$, | $\begin{array}{ll} 17: 1, & 21: 25, \\ 63: 2, & 64: 25, \end{array}$ | $163: 10, \quad 172: 14$ | deal |
| $\begin{array}{lll}14: 16, & 40: 10, \\ 40: 14, & 50: 10,\end{array}$ | $63: 2, ~ 64: 25$, $89: 20, ~ 89: 22, ~$ | data | $44: 19$ |
| $40: 14, ~ 50: 10$, $93: 24, ~ 93: 25$, | 89:20, $116: 9,22$, $131: 21$, | 87:1, 139:4, | dealing |
| $\begin{aligned} & 93: 24, \quad 93: 25, \\ & 94: 4, \quad 94: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 116: 9, & 131: 21, \\ 168: 8, & 172: 3 \end{array}$ | 175:3, 205:15 | $41: 20$ |
| 94:10, 94:12, | currently | database $128: 12,128: 13$ | dealings |
| 94:14, 94:16, | 24:7, 25:12, | date | 39:15 |
| 94:17, 94:24, | 41:20, 90:2, | 62:22, 120:25, | dear |
| 94:25, 173:11, | 101:22, 131:5, | 122:19, 208:15, | $114: 2$ |
| 174:15, 174:25 | $\begin{aligned} & 134: 13, \quad 145: 23, \\ & 146: 5,191: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 208:23, 208:25, | death |
| Critical ${ }^{\text {78:10, 90:15 }}$ | $146: 5,191: 18$ cursor | 213:14, 216:20, | 13:15 <br> decades |
| $90: 17, \quad 90: 25,$ | $10: 24 . \quad 11: 4$ | 216:21, 217:4, | $50: 15$ |
| $91: 8,143: 25,$ | 70:5, 104:8, | $218: 13$ <br> dated | $50: 15$ december |
| 144:13, 145:4, | 104:11, 104:14, | $73: 4,113: 21,$ | $113: 23,114: 19,$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 185: 7,201: 23 \\ & \text { cross } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 105:7, } 135: 2 \\ & \text { curve } \end{aligned}$ | 113:23, 114:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 120: 23, \quad 174: 2, \\ & 194: 21 \end{aligned}$ |
| 37:8, 117:24, | 106:13 |  |  |
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| ```decide 71:22, 137:11, 137:14, 137:19, 148:3, 214:19, 217:8 decided 138:16, 138:18, 147:4 deciding 68:19 decision 51:3, 51:17, 116:17 declaration 214:6 declarations 210:3 decorative 26:6 dedicated 171:2 deem 44:9 deep 161:24 deeper 161:20 deeply 22:19 deer 29:20 defense 82:11, 83:18 define 111:3 defined 137:15 defines 139:2, 144:4 definitely 34:22, 51:16, 83:4, 124:4, 160:4 definition 67:10 definitions 137:9 degenerate 162:9``` | ```degradation 78:21, 165:12 degrading 102:15 degree 118:23, 119:2 deleted 94:12, 94:18 deliberations 21:7, 94:5, 94:11 delineated 64:23, 69:15, 72:24, 75:6, 83:23, 123:25, 125:1, 125:4, 126:16 delineates 68:24 delivers 216:20 delivery 25:4 demand 187:7 democracy 23:14 denied 52:19, 79:20, 112:12 denigrated 133:18 denotes 134:14, 135:1, 135:3 dense 91:13, 145:6, 178:13, 195:13 denser 29:2 density 16:24, 35:17, 64:6, 93:15, 95:12, 95:20, 96:12, 96:13, 145:7, 149:16, 149:25, 150:5, 150:11, 152:20,``` | $\begin{array}{ll} 170: 20, & 177: 5, \\ 189: 13, & 189: 23, \\ 200: 25, & 203: 1, \\ 203: 15, & 203: 24, \\ 203: 25 & \end{array}$ <br> department $79: 4,120: 21,$ $159: 25$ <br> depending $180: 5$ <br> depends 101:9 depth $161: 23$ <br> describe $17: 8,28: 9,$ $44: 10,61: 17,$ $63: 11,67: 12 \text {, }$ $72: 8,158: 17$ <br> described <br> 65:25, 68:9, <br> 81:6, 81:11, <br> 126:4, 162:5 <br> describing <br> 84:4, 102:14, <br> 113:21, 211:17 <br> description <br> 3:17, 4:2, <br> 203:20, 213:5, <br> 215:2, 215:16 <br> deserves <br> 47:2, 88:10, <br> 88:18, 186:19 <br> design <br> 115:21, 152:13, <br> 167:20, 167:22, <br> 168:1, 168:13, <br> 168:20, 168:22, <br> 169:21, 180:21, <br> 194:12, 194:17, <br> 195:11, 196:19, <br> 197:5, 204:11 <br> designated <br> 163:17 <br> designation <br> 80:16, 125:15, 136:21 <br> designed <br> 57:10, 110:17, | 110:18, 189:11 designs 188:13, 188:15 desire $35: 12$ <br> desires $35: 22,63: 8$ <br> despite $112: 19,113: 13$ <br> destroy $68: 13$ <br> destroyed $80: 15, \quad 144: 11$ $144: 23$ <br> destruction $66: 9,90: 15,$ $90: 25$ <br> detached $112: 6,112: 8$ <br> detail $9: 18,15: 10,$ $16: 1,16: 3,$ $62: 12$ <br> detailed $\text { 10:1, } 77: 13 \text {, }$ 191:10, 213:5 <br> details $143: 20$ <br> deteriorate 116:15 <br> deterioration $162: 13$ <br> determination $138: 16$ <br> determine $71: 20,169: 16 \text {, }$ 189:20 <br> determined $\begin{aligned} & 71: 21, \quad 75: 12, \\ & 137: 24, \quad 138: 4, \\ & 138: 10 \end{aligned}$ <br> determining $\begin{aligned} & 93: 25, \quad 94: 10, \\ & 111: 10, \quad 137: 22 \end{aligned}$ <br> detracts $32: 10$ <br> develop <br> 183:21 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| developable | 81:15, 82:12, | 170:6, 173:15, | disabled |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 83:25, 141:17, | 83:19, 84:10, | 174:10, 194:17, | 147:25 |
| 168:7 | 84:12, 89:17, | 214:13, 215:1, | disagree |
| developed | 93:16, 97:13, | 216:2 | 121:14, 150:15 |
| 35:1, 37:1, | 100:8, 101:12, | difficult | disagreeable |
| 74:9, 83:20, | 101:15, 101:17, | 42:4, 189:20, | 60:6 |
| 89:25, 114:23, | 101:18, 102:3, | 190:22 | disagreed |
| 116:22, 130:10, | 102:14, 102:18, | difficulties | 74:5, 74:6 |
| 183:5, 187:19, | 107:15, 113:17, | 89:15 | disagreement |
| 196:4, 196:13 | 113:25, 114:20, | difficulty | 60:3 |
| developer | 116:11, 145:12, | 13:11 | disappointments |
| 15:16, 16:16, | 148:25, 149:1, | digital | 115:23 |
| 20:4, 20:16, | 158:16, 160:2, | 83:11, 92:10, | disapproved |
| 20:18, 20:22, | 162:10, 163:10, | 94:2 | $210: 22$ |
| 47:14, 112:6, | 163:24, 167:20, | dignity | disaster |
| 112:12, 112:15, | 169:18, 173:10, | 35:18 | $108: 24$ |
| 113:15, 168:23, | 175:8, 184:16, | diligence | disclose |
| 169:20, 169:24, | 185:9, 186:11, | $44: 2$ | 46:23 |
| 170:8, 183:13, | 190:1, 190:5, | dimensions | disclosed |
| 191:13, 194:1, | 193:21, 193:24, | 176:5 | 46:9, 46:22 |
| 194:15, 195:21, | $196: 14$ | diminished | discounted |
| $195: 22,196: 25,$ | developments | 51:12 | 184:4 |
| $198: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 23: 12, \quad 36: 24, \\ & 170: 18 . \\ & 188: 19 \end{aligned}$ | diminishes | discuss |
| developer's | 170:18, 188:19 <br> device | 36:15 | 60:8, 69:11, |
| $113: 21$ | device | dine | 122:21, 169:15 |
| developers | 6:12, 6:14 | 22:12 | discussed |
| 47:23, 114:18 | devoted | dining | 90:24, 190:17 |
| development | 160:15 | 25:7, 56:21, | discussing |
| 9:11, 9:13, | diagram | 65:3 | 51:1, 105:18, |
| 15:9, 15:23, | 4:9 | dinner | 141:6 |
| 16:15, 16:17, | dialogue | 108:5, 155:21 | discussion |
| 17:12, 17:19, | 197:18 | dinnertime | 30:6, 123:13, |
| 19:13, 19:14, | dicey | 53:21 | 123:23, 169:22, |
| 19:25, 20:6, | 161:10 | dire | 195:24 |
| 20:7, 20:10, | died | 46:12 | diseases |
| $\begin{array}{ll}22: 22, & 23: 6, \\ 23: 18, & 26: 20,\end{array}$ | $56: 23$ dies | direction | 152:14 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}23: 18, & 26: 20, \\ 27: 19, & 35: 16,\end{array}$ | dies | 200:4 | dismayed |
| $27: 19, ~ 35: 16$, $36: 17,41: 5$, | 109:22 | directly | 197:19 |
| 41:15, 43:8, | difference | 10:12, 10:14, | disputed |
| 43:9, 45:25, | 176:21, 189:22 | 15:5, 15:9, | 132:3 |
| 55:20, 56:9, | different | 22:21, 25:15, | disrupt |
| 56:10, 56:12, | 10:22, 12:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 21, ~ 25: 25, \\ & 96: 15, ~ 100: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $\text { \| } 29: 23$ <br> distance |
| $56: 13,56: 18$, | 13:9, 35:19, | 102:23, 137:17, | $19: 24, \quad 96: 15$ |
| $57: 1, ~ 57: 3$, $63: 17,72: 14$, | 47:8, 83:11, | 160:14 | 96:22, 100:23, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 63: 17,72: 14, \\ & 72: 15,76: 11, \end{aligned}$ | $122: 25, ~ 124: 14$, $135: 12,142: 15$, | director | 100:24, 212:19 |
| $77: 5,77: 14,$ | $135: 12,142: 15$, $150: 3,162: 19$, | 119:21 | distinction |
| 77:5, 711 , | 150:3, 162:19, | disabilities $110: 9$ | 126:13, 137:6 |
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| during | easy | 115:4, 170:3 | 107:11, 132:16, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5:22, 16:13, | 128:16 | egress | 155:19, 166:2, |
| 69:12, 78:5, | eat | 190:14 | 173:6, 179:16, |
| 86:17, 90:12, | 117:22 | eight | 198:13, 199:23, |
| 94:5, 136:10, | echo | 57:5, 184:18, | 202:12, 216:24 |
| 160:4, 162:2, | 31:19, 58:2, | 185:17 | else's |
| 164:4, 168:11, | 186:20 | eighth | 183:13 |
| 173:14, 173:25 | economic | 188:19 | elsewhere |
| dwell | 180:20, 180:22, | either | 93:4 |
| 9:18 | 181:23, 183:12, | 32:21, 36:23, | email |
| dwelling | 189:24 | 58:18, 58:22, | 4:11, 6:18, |
| 26:21, 41:21, | edge | 71:19, 72:13, | 6:25, 9:6, |
| 110:2, 111:11 | 53:3, 53:5, | 74:24, 96:5, | 10:20, 15:1, |
| E | 53:6, 184:11 | 97:10, 102:19, | 15:6, 21:23, |
| each | edison | 133:2, 135:20, | 22:1, 27:17, |
| 5:22, 8:16, | 17:18, 17:19, | 171:15, 214:8, | 27:20, 28:18, |
| 57:16, 80:20, | 17:20, 17:21, | 217:9 | 28:20, 34:16, |
| 110:25, 160:1, | 17:25, 18:10, | elderly | 34:19, 49:7, |
| 163:4, 180:25, | 18:13, 18:14, | 63:23, 92:20, | 49:9, 55:7, |
| 181:9, 181:10, | 27:19, 28:6, | 93:20, 93:22, | 55:9, 61:11, |
| 206:1 | 28:7, 28:12, | 94:16, 94:18, | 61:14, 99:5, |
| eagles | 28:13, 29:8, | 95:1, 95:9, | 99:7, 157:5, |
| 29:20 | 90:19, 97:13, | 108:25, 112:11, | 157:8, 166:16, |
| earlier | 99:7, 101:3, | 114:25, 116:8, | 166:19, 169:8, |
| 93:23, 94:8, | 103:13, 105:21, | 168:2, 174:6, | 216:24, 217:16 |
| $120: 17, \quad 134: 9,$ | 105:23, 105:24, | 174:7, 174:8, | embedded |
| 162:5, 170:24, | 106:12, 106:14, | 183:25 | 22:19 |
| 198:18, 198:22, | 163:15, 163:16, | electronic | embrey |
| 213:21 | 163:18, 166:19, | 92:10 | 33:9, 33:11, |
| early | 167:7, 176:19, | elementary | 33:14, 33:16, |
| 2:8, 5:7, 94:1, | 190:13 | 56:5 | 33:19, 33:23, |
| 169:21 | editorial | elements | $34: 4,34: 8$, $34: 17$ |
| easement | 34:6 | 26:6, 108:22, | $\begin{array}{ll} 34: 17, & 34: 20, \\ 34: 22, & 37: 14 \end{array}$ |
| 90:8, 130:17, | edu 28:20 | $180: 24, ~ 215: 22$ elevation | $\begin{array}{ll} 34: 22, & 37: 14, \\ 37: 16, & 38: 12, \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 145: 15, & 145: 17, \\ 145: 22, & 146: 7, \end{array}$ | educational | 26:4, 106:8, | $38: 25,39: 7$, |
| 146:11 | 61:18 | 106:19, 176:7 | 39:13, 39:19, |
| easier | edward | elevations | 40:8, $40: 11$, |
| $18: 6,73: 13,$ | 156:12 | 207:3, 207:5 | 40:16, 40:18, |
| $134: 20,158: 22$ | effect | elevator | 40:22, 40:25, |
| easily | 139:9, 144:11, | 109:14, 195:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 3, \quad 41: 7, \\ & 41: 19, \quad 43: 2, \end{aligned}$ |
| 13:10 | $163: 6$ effective | elevators | $43: 12,43: 13$ |
| east | effective $117: 24,184: 19$ | $\begin{aligned} & 116: 3 \\ & \text { else } \end{aligned}$ | $45: 20, \quad 46: 2$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 11: 8, \quad 11: 11, \\ & 17: 25, \quad 105: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 117:24, 184:19 effectively | $\begin{aligned} & \text { else } \\ & 8: 22,47: 25, \end{aligned}$ | $46: 3, \quad 46: 5$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 17: 25, \quad 105: 4, \\ & 106: 11, \quad 144: 8, \end{aligned}$ | effectively $115: 15,139: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 22,47: 25, \\ & 48: 12, \quad 48: 13, \end{aligned}$ | $46: 9,47: 4$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 106: 11, \quad 144: 8, \\ & 180: 9 \end{aligned}$ | efforts | $53: 17,60: 15,$ | 47:10, 47:16, |
|  | 54:25, 91:9, | 60:19, 107:10, | 47:20, 47:23, |
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| ```48:7, 48:9, 49:14 embrey's 46:19 embry 3:8, 34:14, 45:15, 58:3, 199:2 emergency 24:21, 25:1, 163:14 emphasize 171:1 employed 218:7 employees 16:20, 19:9, 24:3, 205:21, 205:23 employs 24:2 encompasses 69:7, 138:6 encounter 24:19 encountered 56:2 encourage 10:8, 169:20, 208:17 encumbering 13:13 end 69:4, 84:3, 91:11, 107:18, 112:1, 112:7, 116:1, 116:4, 120:23, 145:12, 157:25, 186:21, 197:17, 200:14, 209:7, 210:19 endanger 100:10 endangers 101:13 ended 184:3, 197:11 enforce 190:22``` | ```enforceability 50:9, 212:16 enforced 110:25 enforcement 13:7, 13:11, 13:14, 64:2, 108:24, 190:18, 211:23 engaged 169:17 engine 206:1 engineer 119:5 engineers 75:9 enhanced 177:24 enhancement 4:6, 82:25, 140:11, 142:25 enjoy 29:5, 29:21, 49:20, 49:23 enjoyment 22:21, 25:22, 189:25 enormous 148:25, 189:21 enough 31:11, 75:8, 87:18, 102:19, 180:3, 180:4 ensure 78:14, 91:13 enter 59:3 enters 77:22 entertainment 22:12, 25:10 entire 29:1, 33:19, 68:10, 69:8, 72:9, 72:17, 90:19, 93:14, 129:18, 137:4,``` | ```138:8, 180:18, 190:16, 203:18 entirely 64:20, 65:1, 81:2, 84:24, 109:5 entirety 84:12 entities 109:3, 109:4, 109:5, 147:5 entitled 140:8 entity 12:7 entrance 100:4 entryway 189:1 environment 29:21, 57:24 environmental 3:25, 13:1, 62:6, 63:6, 63:14, 63:16, 64:5, 64:8, 65:20, 67:6, 67:15, 68:17, 68:19, 68:23, 72:16, 74:2, 75:16, 76:10, 78:13, 78:17, 79:4, 84:10, 84:18, 85:3, 96:17, 102:12, 102:19, 102:22, 118:16, 123:10, 123:12, 125:23, 131:4, 131:7, 134:2, 134:7, 134:13, 134:25, 137:6, 143:6, 146:14, 147:19, 160:8, 161:15, 165:11, 168:9, 204:10, 204:12 environmentally 131:7, 131:17,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```essentially 15:17, 17:10, 19:13, 170:7 establish 93:18 established 29:11, 138:20, 138:21 estate 9:7, 12:15, 12:22, 36:15, 42:16, 111:21, 115:9, 194:2, 194:4, 194:7 estimate 172:5 estimated 174:3 et 13:16, 206:9 evaluate 175:8 evaluated 138:24, 174:25 evaluating 42:6 evaluation 128:14, 129:16 even 14:9, 15:19, 15:25, 24:10, 26:13, 26:16, 29:14, 30:23, 30:25, 31:9, 32:3, 43:12, 46:24, 66:25, 71:25, 76:3, 89:17, 90:6, 90:14, 91:13, 102:13, 109:24, 111:13, 116:18, 121:3, 121:4, 124:3, 124:23, 126:10, 145:5, 149:2, 149:4, 149:23, 150:9, 152:8, 164:21, 164:23, 171:3,``` |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | ```exiting 57:2 expand 194:18, 194:19 expanded 69:8, 71:25, 72:5, 72:16, 137:3, 138:7 expanding 23:13 expands 71:23 expansion 81:4, 86:4, 86:7 expect 176:3, 215:14 expected 53:24, 116:7, 144:7 experience 39:1, 39:3, 56:17, 58:5, 61:19, 62:9 experienced 23:10, 24:8, 57:8 expert 26:13, 26:14, 44:19, 44:23, 45:7, 45:12, 45:16, 45:18, 45:24, 46:9, 46:13, 46:16, 46:18, 46:20, 46:22, 46:24, 46:25, 47:3, 47:5, 47:6, 47:12, 57:13, 71:12, 119:12, 129:21, 129:22, 130:22, 173:5, 174:5, 186:17, 191:8, 191:9 expertise 137:25 experts 47:7, 137:25,``` | 162:18 <br> explain <br> 13:17, 20:20, <br> 167:15 <br> explaining <br> 215:6 <br> explanatory <br> 80:18 <br> explosion <br> 95:17 <br> express <br> 89:16, 103:3 <br> expressed <br> 39:4, 51:7, <br> 168:17, 210:15 <br> extended <br> 71:2, 85:1, <br> 136:5 <br> extends <br> 83:23, 89:12 <br> extension <br> 84:21 <br> extensive <br> 147:20, 164:24 <br> extent <br> 12:9, 43:16, <br> 84:24, 204:11 <br> exterior <br> 163:5 <br> extra <br> 91:9, 151:16 <br> extraordinarily <br> 64:3 <br> extreme <br> 115:19, 177:5 <br> extremely <br> 19:3, 19:8, <br> 102:15, 115:21, <br> 173:9, 173:15, <br> 174:10, 190:20, <br> 190:22 <br> eyesore <br> 116:15 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 39:20, 42:21, | 69:20, 88:14, | 205:12, 210:22, | fifth |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 49:22, 50:15, | 138:17, 148:7, | 213:5 | 192: 6 |
| 74:6, 74:21, | 188:3, 194:16, | feeling | fight |
| 75:11, 80:14, | 198:6, 199:25, | 144:24 | 21:2 |
| 89:4, 95:5, | 203:21, 203:22, | feet | figure |
| 111:21, 115:22, | 204:8 | 26:16, 49:17, | 17:14, 92:2, |
| 120:20, 138:19, | farm | 69:2, 69:3, | 106:21, 117:6, |
| 141:6, 148:1, | 29:4, 43:23 | 71:18, 81:7, | 137:13, 145:3 |
| 187:19, 193:5, | fashion | 101:10, 109:10, | figured |
| 193:9, 193:21, | 180:16, 190:5, | 129:8, 129:9, | 75:1 |
| 194:2, 197:3, | 201:5 | 133:14, 137:17, | file |
| 200:5, 210:17 | faster | 137:20, 138:5, | 46:10, 120:7, |
| facts | 162:9 | 138:18, 139:3, | 121:2 |
| 65:15 | fatal | 161:23, 161:24, | filed |
| factual | 31:1, 31:3, | 161:25, 163:2, | 110:10 |
| 63:10 | 31:6 | 171:19, 172:2, | filtration |
| faculty | fatalities | 172:6, 172:7, | 77:23 |
| 184:23 | 173:19 | 175:12, 176:10, | finagled |
| fail | fatality | 176:11, 177:9, | 20:24 |
| 108:25 | 173:18 | 177:10, 177:11, | final |
| failed | fcp | 177:12, 179:2, | 208:15 |
| 112:13 | 130:16 | 181:1, 181:4, | finally |
| failure | fear | $\text { 181:11, } 181: 12,$ | 31:19, 32:13, |
| 64:1, 115:14 | 15:21, 36:13, | 184:11, 184:13, | 85:2, 150:16 |
| fall | 111:15, 113:2 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 185: 2, & 185: 15, \\ 187: 11, & 189: 15, \end{array}\right.$ | financial |
| 164:23, 186:2 | fears | 187:11, 189:15, | 218:8 |
| falling | $36: 13$ | $\begin{aligned} & 189: 17, \\ & 189: 21, \\ & 189: 18, \end{aligned}$ | find |
| 85:10, 162:12 | feature | $\begin{aligned} & 189: 21, ~ 192: 13, \\ & 192: 14 \end{aligned}$ | 29:12, 32:15, |
| falls | 67:15 | fell | 58:15, 60:5, |
| 16:15, 17:25, | february | 29:811 | 70:8, 83:9, |
| 24:17, 31:22, | 169:4, 169:10 | felt | 115:19, 152:11, |
| 32:2, 66:25, | federal | 209:11 | 184:5, 192:2, |
| 126:14, 183:24, | 63:15, 64:8, | fence | 201:17, 201:18 |
| 184:1 | 76:14, 77:2, | fence 162.19 | finding |
| familiar | 77:9, 110:17 | 160:14, 162:19, | 159:8 |
| 46:5 | federally | 180:10, 180:12, | fine |
| families | 75:7 | $\begin{aligned} & 180: 15, \quad 180: 18, \\ & 180: 19 \end{aligned}$ | 9:2, 45:11, |
| 36:3, 170:15 | fee | few | $53: 14,62: 25$ |
| family | 108:22, 109:5, | $5: 15, \quad 15: 12,$ | $87: 9, \quad 98: 3,$ |
| 15:18, 20:7, | 109:17, 112:1, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 5: 15, & 15: 12, \\ 28: 4, & 76: 5, \end{array}\right.$ | $98: 4, \quad 108: 11,$ |
| 25:13, 110:20, | $112: 7,113: 14$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 28: 4, & 76: 5, \\ 77: 9, & 83: 22, \end{array}$ | 113:11, 114:16, |
| 148:9, 159:9, | $113: 18, \quad 160: 1$ | $192: 25$ | $151: 15,156: 23,$ |
| 175:18, 181:3, | feedback | 192:25 <br> field | $158: 21, \quad 193: 2,$ |
| 189:8 | 169:22 | field $16: 6$ | $193: 3,212: 18$ |
| far | feel | $16: 6$ <br> fields | $214: 16,217: 11$ |
| 10:10, 13:9, | $15: 19, \quad 35: 17,$ | fields <br> 101:22 | finger |
| 23:17, 35:3, | 36:23, 42:5, | 101:22 <br> fieldwork | 3:10, 48:14, |
| 56:16, 64:18, | 43:17, 48:7, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { fieldwork } \\ & \text { 173:22 } \end{aligned}$ | 51:23, 51:24, |
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| 52:1, 52:4, | 137:19, 140:6, | 77:7 | followed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52:6, 52:8, | 140:21, 141:8, | floor | 55:20, 84:18, |
| 52:15, 52:19, | 143:24, 156:5, | 30:8, 175:13, | 92:2, 139:19, |
| 52:23, 52:25, | 176:4, 178:18, | 175:15, 175:16, | 159:16 |
| 53:5, 53:7, | 181:20, 193:21, | 175:20, 176:4, | following |
| 53:14, 53:16, | 193:23, 194:25, | 181:14, 181:18, | 62:5, 124:9, |
| 54:1, 54:3, | 196:25, 200:2, | 181:20, 181:22, | 200:12 |
| 54:8, 54:15, | 201:14 | 194:24, 194:25, | follows |
| 54:16, 54:25, | first-hand | 195:2, 195:4, | 81:11 |
| 55:2, 55:8, | $38: 25,39: 3$ | 195:5, 195:6, | food |
| 55:13, 58:13, | fit | 195:10, 204:3, | 25:4 |
| 58:17, 58:20, | 20:24, 83:24 | 207:10 | foot |
| 58:25, 59:5, | fits | floorplans | 168:4, 168:5, |
| 59:7, 59:10, | 20:14, 211:2 | 207:9 | 171:25, 172:1, |
| 59:12, 59:15, | five | floors | 175:4, 177:11, |
| 59:23, 59:25, | 44:8, 72:2, | 97:1, 163:3, | 177:16, 180:5, |
| 60:16, 60:18 | 80:21, $80: 25$, | 189:12 | 180:10, 180:18, |
| fingers-3@verizon | 95:3, 108:8, | florida | 185:18, 185:20, |
| 55:10 | 124:13, 178:6, | 56:18, 56:19 | 185:24, 185:25, |
| finish | 189:12, 201:1 | flow | 190:15, 201:20, |
| 104:2, 117:20, | five-minute | 42:7 | 202:1 |
| 190:4 | 114:9 | flows | footage |
| finished | five-story | 104:15, 104:24, | 20:13, 168:7, |
| 8:13, 37:14, | 180:23, 189:12 | 106:12, 161:20 | 172:4, 181:7, |
| 114:23 | fleming | focus | 185:22, 189:19, |
| finishing | 185:4 | 65:23, 66:2, | 207:8 |
| 108:17 | flex | 68:4, 70:1, | footbridge |
| fire | 173:25 | 78:13, 81:3, | 89:7 |
| 206:1 | flight | 141:18, 142:22, | footprint |
| firm | 160:21 | 153:24 | 171:21, 181:13, |
| 2:16 | flood | focused | 181:18, 207:9 |
| firms | 100:6, 100:11, | 9:7, 19:14, | footprints |
| 115:9 | 204:16, 204:17, | 26:6 | 207:7 |
| first | 204:19, 204:24 | focusing | forced |
| 7:3, 7:12, | flooding | 66:19, 69:23, | 16:25 |
| 28:12, 34:9, | 77:15, 87:20, | 136:20 | foregoing |
| 35:14, 37:14, | 88:25 | foldout | 218:3 |
| 38:2, 40:3, | floodplain | 80:7, 80:17 | foreground |
| 48:15, 55:21, | 64:13, 64:14, | foliage | 85:19 |
| 63:12, 64:5, | 64:22, 66:18, | 178:7 | forest |
| 72:24, 80:22, | 66:20, 66:23, | folks | 3:20, 4:5, |
| 81:1, 85:13, | 66:24, 66:25, | 10:17, 121:12, | 16:5, 44:6, |
| 87:12, 92:1, | 67:3, 78:20, | 137:20, 146:3 | 63:18, 64:14, |
| 98:14, 98:16, | 85:21, 87:7, | follow | 64:16, 64:20, |
| 98:22, 105:9, | 131:24, 137:18, | 19:18, 104:7, | 64:23, 67:21, |
| 111:17, 112:11, | 202:22 | 135:1, 153:2, | 67:24, 72:15, |
| 123:20, 126:25, | floodplains | 169:10 | 72:17, 74:10, |
| 128:7, 137:10, | 64:22, 77:3, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { follow-up } \\ & \text { 165:19 } \end{aligned}$ | 76:11, 76:16, |
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| 78:19, 79:13, | 93:17 | friday | gable |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 79:23, 80:6, | forward | 169:4 | 112:4 |
| 80:9, 80:14, | 16:25, 21:5, | friend | gallons |
| 80:20, 80:21, | 74:18, 132:7, | 152:2 | 77:25 |
| 80:25, 81:6, | 170:7, 195:23 | friends | game |
| 82:25, 83:22, | found | 148:16, 151:20 | 10:7, 209:7 |
| 83:23, 84:5, | 19:25, 75:11, | front | garage |
| 84:6, 84:19, | 79:2, 130:23, | 83:6, 86:10, | 109:14, 181:21 |
| 84:23, 90:1, | 155:14, 201:23, | 94:3, 96:15, | garbage |
| 90:5, 90:7, | 203:14 | 101:18, 102:3, | 25:8, 25:17 |
| 122:14, 139:6, | founded | 107:15, 160:16, | garden |
| 140:9, 140:16, | 63:4 | 160:17, 206:19 | 29:17, 81:5, |
| 142:11, 142:18, | four | froze | 84:14, 96:9, |
| 142:25, 146:6, | 79:24, 109:13, | 112:22, 112:23 | 183:21 |
| 146:11, 203:16, | 111:18, 112:19, | fulfills | gardeners |
| 206:4 | 113:13, 115:3, | 21:3 | $56: 24$ |
| forested | 122:25, 124:15, | full | gardens |
| 80:7, 145:11, | 144:9, 144:15, | 24:9, 47:4, | 1:5, 15:14, |
| 145:12, 146:12, | 168:17, 180:23, | 115:3, 158:11, | 15:18, 55:17, |
| 202:4, 202:5 | $185: 23, \quad 200: 16$ | 173:23, 174:16, | 55:21, 56:6, |
| forester | four-story | 175:15 | 57:9, 57:22, |
| 119:12 | 30:7, 30:9, | fully | 57:24, 81:11, |
| forestry | 189:11 | 24:6, 53:24 | 89:14, 96:11, |
| 118:25 | fourth | function | 159:3, 169:9, |
| forests | 4:12, 10:3, | 103:20, 133:4 | 169:11, 192:16 |
| 72:13, 101:23, | 30:8, 164:4, | functional | gather |
| 140:11 | 171:7, 175:17, | 130:19 | $58: 14, \quad 167: 14$ |
| forever | $192: 6, \quad 199: 6$ | funny | gauge |
| 36:7, 111:19, | fox | 213:12 | 174:15 |
| $161: 1$ | 29:20, 96:2, | further | gave |
| forgot | 184:17 | 17:11, 17:13, | 44:21, 201:13 |
| $11: 2$ | fragmentation | 17:24, 19:20, | general |
| form | 80:7 | 23:9, 40:7, | 19:2, 62:2 |
| 10:1, 20:2, | frame | 48:1, 59:6, | generally |
| 36:10, 114:24, | 213:7 | $66: 1, \quad 70: 2,$ | $129: 16,144: 7$ |
| 128:18 | framework | $76: 15,82: 8,$ | generated |
| format | 63:22, 74:4, | $84: 4, \quad 86: 1,$ | $25: 12$ |
| 83:11 | 92:20, 95:19 | 105:4, 155:17, | generates |
| former | frankly | 162:6, 192:23, | 26:17 |
| $170: 24, \quad 193: 4$ | $170: 11,197: 14,$ | 195:24, 198:1 | generating |
| forth | $197: 19, \quad 212: 18$ | furthermore | 25:23 |
| 56:25, 71:17, | free | 110:1 | generations |
| 108:4, 174:21, | 36:4, 116:11, | future | $165: 7$ |
| 180:22 | 152:2, 210:13 | 39:25, 115:16, | generous |
| forthcoming | freeze | 115:19, 169:18 | 180:21 |
| $209: 17$ | 113:2 | G | george's |
| fortune $22: 5,24: 2$, | frequent $56: 22$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{g} \\ & 113: 20, \quad 114: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 78:1 georgetown 29:2 |
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| green <br> 26:12, 73:25, <br> 93:16, 95:12, <br> 147:18, 176:16, <br> 176:22, 177:1, <br> 177:3, 188:20 <br> greenery <br> 49:20 <br> grew <br> 29:4 <br> grocery <br> 57:3 <br> gross <br> 172:4, 175:3, <br> 181:1, 181:7, <br> 181:14, 181:18, <br> 181:19, 185:21, <br> 189:18, 189:21, <br> 204:3, 207:10 <br> grosvenor <br> 184:24 <br> ground <br> 89:7, 101:11, 179:2 <br> grounds <br> 165:11 <br> groundwater <br> 163:25 <br> group $\begin{aligned} & 20: 1, \quad 25: 11, \\ & 95: 9,105: 10, \\ & 105: 11,142: 22, \\ & 147: 24 \end{aligned}$ <br> groups 40:1 <br> grow <br> 180:3, 180:4 <br> growing <br> 23:14, 36:3 <br> grown <br> 202:11 <br> growth <br> 95:20 <br> guarantees <br> 64:1 <br> guess $\begin{aligned} & 10: 16, \quad 45: 8, \\ & 51: 8,53: 1, \end{aligned}$ | ```53:10, 73:22, 74:2, 75:10, 122:19, 172:24, 175:24, 177:13, 180:9, 189:2, 207:6, 207:7, 208:7, 210:14 guessing 189:19 guests 16:20 guidance 124:12 guideline 76:13 guidelines 63:16, 67:7, 68:17, 68:19, 68:23, 69:4, 69:5, 70:25, 71:18, 72:16, 74:2, 74:13, 76:6, 76:7, 76:10, 77:5, 78:17, 78:23, 78:24, 81:14, 84:9, 84:18, 93:6, 123:10, 123:12, 125:23, 127:3, 131:11, 137:6, 204:10 gullies 162:20 guy 29:13, 188:11 guys 169:4, 197:8 gym 26:2, 65:8, 65:9, 66:4, 85:15, 86:11, 86:15, 86:25, 132:7, 135:19, 159:4, 161:7, 161:20, 162:25, 163:1, 163:3, 163:8, 172:1, 175:13``` | gymnasium <br> half <br> 57:19, 151:10, <br> 162:25, 172:6, <br> 175:12, 178:13 <br> hand $\begin{aligned} & 6: 7,6: 8,7: 24, \\ & 8: 3,10: 5, \\ & 13: 25,14: 20, \\ & 21: 12,21: 17, \\ & 27: 6,27: 12, \\ & 33: 9,34: 10, \\ & 49: 1,52: 9, \\ & 55: 1,61: 3, \\ & 68: 5,87: 6, \\ & 92: 13,97: 6, \\ & 98: 22,156: 24, \\ & 160: 24,166: 10, \\ & 211: 8 \end{aligned}$ <br> handicapped <br> 95:10, 115:1 <br> handle $23: 6,164: 2$ <br> hands $\begin{aligned} & 7: 17,29: 14, \\ & 33: 7,48: 13, \\ & 198: 14 \end{aligned}$ <br> hang $60: 17,182: 12$ <br> happen $36: 25,42: 3,$ $42: 9,65: 18,$ <br> 114:4 <br> happened <br> 31:7, 43:20, 85:19 <br> happening $\begin{aligned} & 20: 20, \quad 43: 18, \\ & 65: 19, \quad 85: 9, \\ & 161: 3 \\ & \text { happens } \\ & 13: 15,52: 16, \\ & 111: 7,111: 8, \\ & 117: 6,151: 22 \end{aligned}$ | happy <br> 44:10, 45:22, <br> 62:20, 118:2, <br> 162:20, 170:2, <br> 208:20, 208:21, <br> 213:25 <br> hard <br> 19:18, 29:7, <br> 60:16, 128:17, <br> 134:17, 134:18, <br> 134:21, 196:8 <br> harder $129: 24$ <br> harm $165: 12$ <br> harmonious $93: 9$ <br> harris's $209: 16$ <br> harry <br> 113:24, 114:19 <br> hate <br> 54:1, 213:13 <br> hawks 29:20 <br> hazard 123:11, 124:9, $126: 2,127: 9$ <br> hazardous 19:8 <br> hazards $24: 13$ <br> head 122:17, 129:2, <br> 211:14 <br> headlights <br> 163:11 <br> heads $200: 23,205: 13$ <br> headwaters <br> 78:16 <br> healthy $169: 22$ <br> hear $\begin{aligned} & 5: 16, \quad 33: 11, \\ & 33: 12, \quad 36: 13, \\ & 38: 14, \quad 38: 17, \\ & 45: 3, \quad 54: 8, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```113:3, 150:6, 152:10, 169:4, 170:11, 196:8, 212:11 heard 13:16, 23:1, 25:6, 31:2, 43:9, 43:19, 45:4, 88:8, 90:12, 90:18, 123:3, 126:6, 134:11, 170:4, 175:22, 175:23, 188:11, 197:20, 209:15, 210:16 hearings \(1: 1,2: 3,5: 18\), 88:11 hearsay 87:25, 88:9, 88:12, 88:19, 186:14, 186:17 heart 95:16 heartbreaking 160:5 heavily 112:19, 113:13 heavy 162:1, 162:10 heidi 3:10, 55:8 height 26:1, 26:2, 26:5, 30:12, 30:13, 176:9, 202:23 held 1:9, 109:3, 111:9 hello 34:4, 99:15, 193:1 help 36:16, 56:24, 110:21 helped 159:15``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { helpful } \\ & 8: 25, \quad 28: 17, \\ & 173: 9, \quad 207: 22, \\ & 208: 18, \quad 209: 6, \\ & 211: 11 \\ & \text { helps } \\ & 6: 19, \quad 6: 20, \\ & 202: 18, \quad 202: 20 \\ & \text { here } \\ & 5: 7, \quad 5: 17, \\ & 7: 12, \quad 9: 8, \quad 28: 3, \\ & 31: 20, \quad 32: 11, \\ & 33: 10, \quad 36: 21, \\ & 39: 7, \quad 40: 12, \\ & 44: 19, \quad 55: 15, \\ & 61: 21, \quad 62: 19, \\ & 62: 20, \quad 73: 5, \\ & 73: 6, \\ & 85: 20, \\ & 85: 24, \\ & 88: 7, \\ & 94: 16, \\ & 95: 7, \quad 95: 16, \\ & 95: 23, \quad 97: 7, \\ & 104: 7, \quad 105: 4, \\ & 113: 3, \quad 119: 11, \\ & 122: 21, \quad 122: 25, \\ & 123: 19, \quad 137: 24, \\ & 138: 2, \\ & 142: 5, \\ & 142: 21, \\ & 148: 11, \\ & 151: 2, \\ & 156: 8, \\ & 157: 23, \\ & 1765: 1, \\ & 170: 13, \\ & 174: 8, \\ & 182: 23, \\ & 200: 20 \\ & \text { here's } \end{aligned}$ | ```90:14, 96:9, 96:11, 159:3, 169:9, 169:11, 183:21, 192:16 herself 187:18 hi 169:9 high 35:7, 81:8, 81:13, 81:18, 82:9, 83:16, 84:7, 112:1, 112:7, 116:4, 178:23, 180:18, 202:12, 202:20 high-rise 42:15, 43:9, 56:19 higher 26:4, 83:25, 106:5, 106:8, 106:19, 163:2 highlighted 10:17, 123:25, 126:16 highly 22:14, 22:18, 22:23, 23:18, 26:19, 46:23, 64:22, 67:12, 74:1, 84:22, 123:5, 124:5, 124:7, 124:16, 127:7, 127:8, 127:11, 154:12, 154:15, 155:8, 155:10, 155:12, 155:14, 162:17 hiked 159:14 hill 96:2, 159:3, 184:17 hilltop 164:20 historic 23:5, 112:9,``` | 112:16 <br> historical <br> 183:1 <br> historically <br> 78:5 <br> history <br> 94:13 <br> hit <br> 31:12, 31:15, <br> 174:22 <br> hold <br> 16:16, 46:7, 102:5, 142:3, 143:22, 153:16, 157:19 <br> holder <br> 109:8 <br> holders <br> 111:14 <br> holding <br> 109:8 <br> hole <br> 20:16 <br> holiday $206: 25$ <br> home $\begin{aligned} & 20: 7, \quad 24: 6, \\ & 25: 21, \quad 26: 16, \\ & 26: 17, \quad 32: 14, \\ & 44: 7, \quad 45: 24, \\ & 100: 1,100: 10, \\ & 101: 9,148: 11, \\ & 151: 21,159: 8, \\ & 159: 11,168: 22, \\ & 173: 25,185: 5, \\ & 187: 1,187: 4, \\ & 188: 13 \end{aligned}$ <br> homeowner $21: 25,39: 4,$ $45: 23$ <br> homeowner's $35: 8,41: 14$ <br> homeowners $38: 9$ <br> homes $\begin{aligned} & 15: 18,20: 2, \\ & 25: 13,26: 8, \\ & 36: 3,38: 9, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```38:20, 50:12, 57:15, 95:9, 112:6, 115:2, 115:12, 115:24, 147:24, 152:14, 165:10, 170:17, 170:19, 171:3, 181:3, 188:14, 188:15 honest 135:18 hook 164:10 hop 18:15 hope 12:10, 34:2, 48:7, 69:18, 102:18, 114:13, 119:25, 155:23 hopefully 31:15, 213:1 hoping 17:5, 58:3, 217:1 horse 159:10, 160:24 horses 159:15, 159:24, 160:3, 160:12, 160:15, 160:20 hotel 163:6 hour 7:16, 25:2, 44:8, 44:12, 55:25, 56:1 hours 9:15, 16:13, 19:7, 25:3, 25:22, 26:1, 57:6, 115:8, 160:24, 172:21, 190:10 house 29:15, 30:1,},\mp@code{30:14, 30:20,``` | ```39:23, 43:23, 49:15, 49:16, 57:20, 57:21, 100:25, 112:9, 112:16, 158:5, 159:3, 161:4, 163:13, 164:22, 167:7, 176:19, 183:19, 185:23, 185:25, 186:2, 186:3 household 110:14 housekeepers 174:21 houses 29:10, 35:11, 35:14, 36:3, 36:10, 36:19, 40:2, 101:12, 102:9, 105:19, 111:5, 112:8, 112:16, 113:14, 113:16, 113:19, 115:8, 148:2, 149:12, 177:20, 202:2 housesitting 111:5 housing 12:14, 19:15, 20:18, 35:8, 35:24, 36:4, 63:23, 92:21, 92:22, 93:20, 93:22, 94:1, 94:11, 94:14, 94:16, 94:18, 95:2, 95:4, 95:5, 108:25, 110:16, 112:11, 112:14, 114:25, 116:8, 116:11, 147:4, 147:13, 148:4, 151:16, 152:8, 153:2, 153:12, 174:6, 174:7, 174:8,``` | 206:12, 206:23 however <br> 16:3, 37:20, <br> 43:16, 64:17, <br> 86:10 <br> huge <br> 16:11, 29:16, <br> 32:11, 35:9, <br> 35:11, 78:5, <br> 160:19, 162:4 <br> hundreds <br> 24:20 <br> husband <br> 21:25, 22:8, <br> 28:24, 29:13, <br> 47:24, 56:1, <br> 58:6, 58:18 <br> hydraulic <br> 138:24, 138:25 hydraulically <br> 137:7, 137:16, <br> 138:5, 138:12, <br> 138:13 <br> hydric <br> 154:12 <br> hydrology <br> 118:23 <br> hypothetical <br> 44:20 <br> hypotheticals 44:18 | ```212:14, 212:15, 216:11 ideas 214:13 identification 11:6 identified 10:2, 11:14, 11:18, 105:1, 122:25, 136:10, 150:22, 151:3 identifies 146:20, 150:19, 212:4, 213:1 identify 5:5, 8:16, 93:24, 94:9, 94:24, 151:5, 157:21, 167:2, 203:9 igloo 73:22 ignored 75:17 ikea 20:13 ill-defined 65:7 illumination 26:7 imagine 32:6, 149:4, 177:7 immediate 22:24 impact 22:21, 22:24, 23:18, 24:9, 24:10, 25:15, 25:21, 25:25, 29:22, 30:3, 32:6, 41:4, 41:23, 41:24, 42:6, 42:14, 51:16, 89:2, 89:20, 96:24, 97:2, 144:1, 144:8, 144:14,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 150:1, 160:9, | impossible | incompatible | index |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 161:15, 174:16, | 43:15, 115:20, | 22:23, 24:25 | 124:10 |
| 180:20, 180:22, | 160:4, 162:5 | incomplete | indicate |
| 181:23, 183:12, | improvement | 209:12 | 67:16, 123:5, |
| 189:24, 202:8, | 131:7 | incomprehensible | 155:3, 176:2 |
| 204:20, 204:21, | inadvertently | 16:22 | indicated |
| 206:25 | 94:17 | inconsistent | 12:5, 68:11, |
| impacted | inappropriate | 63:22, 79:20, | 73:1, 87:19, |
| 36:9, 42:18, | 19:12, 170:21, | 92:19, 93:10, | 118:15, 136:3, |
| 42:20, 44:22, | 211:21 | 108:18 | 150:17, 176:3, |
| 44:24, 45:1, | inch | incorporated | 176:8, 193:4, |
| 57:13, 57:15, | 129:8 | 124:12, 139:11 | 193:18, 194:1, |
| 86:9, 90:15, | inches | incorporation | 194:11, 205:8 |
| 90:20, 90:22, | 91:2, 144:24, | $76: 15$ | indicates |
| 91:6, 184:2, | $179: 1$ | incorrectly | $10: 4, \quad 10: 11,$ |
| 186:11, 187:23, | incidentally | 126:22 | 94:13, 120:19, |
| 188:1, 205:3 | 36:5 | increase | 130:10, 143:25, |
| impacting | include | 19:2, 24:13, | 144:13 |
| 37:1 | 59:17, 59:18, | 24:22, 78:15 | indicating |
| impacts | 69:8, 72:6, | increased | 11:12, 175:3, |
| 16:17, 16:25, | 72:17, 85:1, | 23:10, 78:21 | 195:22 |
| 89:22, 91:8, | 120:8, 121:7, | increases | indication |
| 93:1, 93:3, | 123:18, 131:14, | 26:5 | 121:9 |
| 143:6, 144:6, | 137:4, 138:7, | increasing | individual |
| $202: 16$ | 143:9, 173:17, | 78:7, 100:11 | $57: 15,111: 8,$ |
| impassable | 189:21, 211:6 | increasingly | 129:10, 188:14 |
| $162: 7$ | included | 78:6 | individually |
| impervious | 68:20, 71:3, | incredible | 13:8 |
| 4:9, 42:7, | 77:3, 111:20, | 35:24, 149:25 | individuals |
| 78:25, 79:8, | 136:25, 171:23, | incredulous | 37:20, 37:22 |
| 133:6, 133:10 | 172:17, 175:16, | 19:18 | indoor |
| implore | 212:4 | indefinitely | $148: 20$ |
| $20: 3$ | includes | $217: 1, \quad 217: 14$ | infectious |
| important | 25:3, 65:1, | independence | 152:14 |
| 19:22, 71:4, | $65: 5, \quad 77: 1,$ | $58: 9$ | information |
| 71:10, 74:20, | 90:24, 131:14 | independent | 39:16, 80:19, |
| 75:8, 77:20, | including | 19:20, 51:17, | 120:9, 128:4, |
| 93:13, 96:10, | 16:20, 24:14, | 51:18, 59:13, | 128:5, 155:2, |
| 142:5, 142:11, | 24:21, 63:23, | 59:18, 59:21, | 172:5, 173:12, |
| 150:6, 180:12, | 77:2, 80:15, | $65: 2,95: 15$ | 175:3, 192:5, |
| $210: 22$ | 80:19, 89:13, | $95: 25, \quad 96: 3,$ | 192:9, 207:17 |
| importantly | 92:20, 152:22, | 109:16, 110:8, | informed |
| 20:6 | 170:14, 173:4, | 110:20, 116:25, | 22:14, 22:17, |
| impose | 175:15, 185:16, | 151:4, 152:6, | 169:18 |
| 94:14 | 197:10 | 152:8, 152:17, | infrastructure |
| imposed | inclusion | $153: 7$ | 79:2, 131:13, |
| $116: 11$ | $124: 1, \quad 126: 16$ | independently | 131:14 |
| imposing | incompatibility | $40: 4, \quad 74: 22$ | ingress |
| 57:8, 146:11 | 165:11 |  | 190:14 |
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| initial | 197:18 | 28:13, 31:23, | 62:1, 62:4, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 53:8, 195:11 | intentions | 32:4, 32:5, | 62:8, 64:5, |
| initially | 21: 4 | 105:1, 163:16 | 65:20, 74:19, |
| 168:1, 176:4 | interest | intersects | 85:3, 101:19, |
| injury | 51:8, 51:11, | 17:21, 18:14, | 111:25, 168:9, |
| 24:23 | 62:8, 62:9, | 104:11 | 168:18, 169:23, |
| input | 88:14, 109:7, | intervals | 188:12, 190:3, |
| 168:13, 168:20, | 218:8 | 129:9 | 207:20, 209:14, |
| 194:17, 195:12, | interested | intrusion | 215:23 |
| 196:4, 196:19 | 38:10, 38:21, | 26:10 | issuing |
| inquired | 39:8, 39:15, | invasive | 200:6 |
| 11:23 | 55:18, 55:23, | 36:25 | it'll |
| inquiry | 59:1, 59:2, | inventory | 195:9 |
| 200:19 | 59:13, 115:7 | 67:11, 69:13, | itself |
| install | interesting | 71:13, 72:24, | 46:20, 57:1, |
| 36:6, 180:18 | 119:23, 132:6 | 118:20, 129:14 | 79:7, 79:19, |
| instance | interests | involve | 89:14, 142:19, |
| $43: 23$ <br> instances | $42: 10,49: 25$interference | $\begin{aligned} & 196: 17,197: 14, \\ & 215: 6 \end{aligned}$ | 146:17 |
|  |  |  | J |
| $83: 22,83: 25,$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 196:11 } \\ & \text { interior } \end{aligned}$ | involved | $\begin{aligned} & \text { january } \\ & 62: 22, \quad 159: 20 \\ & \text { jefferson } \end{aligned}$ |
| 84:11, 141:16, |  | $9: 23,61: 24,$ |  |
| 194:15 | $207: 10$ | $66: 13,121: 18,$ |  |
| instead | interject | 173:11, 186:9, | 2:17 |
| 56:6, 95:6, | 121:22, 122:13 | 196:3, 196:16, | jet |
| 126:11 | intermittent | 197:10 | 91:21 |
| institutional | 87:21, 88:22, | involvement | job |
| 10:24, 149:22 | 88:25, 135:7, | 133:22, 169:21 | 1:23 |
| instructions | 138:17 | ipad | john |
| $52: 12$ | internally | 98:9 | 93:18, 152:22, |
| insufficient | $111: 20$ | island | 152:24, 153:1, |
| $84: 11$ | internet | $62: 7, \quad 163: 10$ | 153:4, 153:7, |
| insurance | $53: 3$ | issuance | 153:11 |
| 204:19, 212:11 | interpretation | 193:17 | johnson |
| intake | 154:22 | issue | 29:3, 217:15 |
| 77:23, 78:11 | interpreted | 7:4, 13:5, | joined |
| intended | 197:17 | 16:10, 20:9, | 7:21, 96:18 |
| 20:1 | interrupt | 50:9, 50:13, | josh |
| intense | 5:22, 5:23, | 60:7, 67:7, | 169:8 |
| 64:11, 89:17, | 8:12, 17:3, | 87:12, 97:25, | judge |
| 90:12, 93:16, | 18:24, 54:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 178: 22, \\ & 192: 20, \end{aligned} 205: 19,$ | $24: 9$ |
| 102:13, 102:18, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 54: 16, \quad 101: 1, \\ & 108: 14, \quad 135: 6, \end{aligned}\right.$ | 192:20, 205:24 issued | jumping |
| $103: 2,145: 3,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 108: 14, & 135: 6, \\ 160: 11, & 203: 5 \end{array}$ | issued | $31: 14$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 148: 24, ~ 149: 15 \\ & 205: 9 \end{aligned}$ | 160:11, 203:5 interruptions | $\begin{aligned} & 171: 16, \\ & 171: 23, \\ & 172: 17 \end{aligned}$ | jurisdiction |
| intensive | $6: 6$ | issues | jurisdictions |
| 115:3, 147:21 | intersect | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 9: 18, & 13: 6, \\ 13: 14, & 15: 11 \end{array}\right.$ | $196: 15$ |
| intent168:6, 197:3, | intersection <br> 16:15, 18:19, | $26: 18, \quad 33: 20,$ | K |
|  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { kabatt } \\ & 200: 12 \end{aligned}$ |
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| kabatt's | kitchen | landscape | 166:3, 175:24, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 200:12 | 56:24 | 176:1 | 186:14, 190:18, |
| kaline | knauf | lane | 191:20, 200:11, |
| 15:4 | 5:10 | 16:12, 31:25, | 211:11 |
| katherine | knew | 34:17, 49:9, | lastly |
| 74:25 | 187:18, 194:2 | 159:17, 163:20 | 20:5 |
| keep | knopf | lanes | late |
| 7:1, 11:6, | 2:16 | 24:19 | 10:7, 175:24 |
| 100:16, 159:10, | knowing | language | later |
| 159:24, 160:3, | 62:22, 175:9 | 70:4, 76:9, | 11:25, 35:10, |
| 176:23, 180:25, | knowledge | 79:12, 94:22, | 60:8, 112:19, |
| 208:22, 209:2 | 40:10, 40:13, | 110:5, 126:8, | 113:13, 122:19, |
| keeping | 121:3, 122:12, | 138:21, 142:2, | 168:3, 169:14, |
| 160:12 | 133:21, 138:23 | 142:13, 142:22 | 171:24, 178:8, |
| keeps | known | laptop | 185:23 |
| 50:18 | 187:20 | 156:13, 156:17 | latitude |
| ken | knows | large | 118:3 |
| 213:12 | 188:4 | 25:17, 38:9, | latter |
| kept | kscafide@gmu | $38: 20,42: 3,$ | $212: 6,212: 8$ |
| 169:17 | 28:20 | 42:10, 43:14, | laughable |
| key | L | 56:20, 90:13, | 194:25 |
| 16:24, 69:21, | label | $\begin{array}{ll} 90: 22, & 93: 15, \\ 95: 15, & 116: 4, \end{array}$ | launch |
| $\begin{aligned} & 128: 19,169: 23, \\ & 215: 22 \end{aligned}$ | $158: 7$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 95:15, } 116: 4, \\ & 149: 21, ~ 164: 3, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 205: 5 \\ & \text { law } \end{aligned}$ |
| kids | labeled | 170:17, 186:25, | 2:16, 45:23, |
| $29: 4,29: 15,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 136: 18, \quad 154: 16, \\ & 154: 17 \end{aligned}$ | 195:13 | 60:7, 62:4, |
| $29: 17,30: 15,$ | lack | largely | $79: 13,115: 15$ |
| 30:16, 31:13, | 16:1 | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 13 \\ & 1 \text { arcor } \end{aligned}$ | $118: 16,121: 24,$ |
| 111:3 | lady | larger | 139:9, 143:2 |
| kilgore | $198: 21$ | 56:18, 89:2, | lawn |
| $87: 22, \quad 89: 2,$ | lag | $\begin{array}{ll} 91: 2, & 95: 10, \\ 97: 2, & 104: 11 \end{array}$ | $174: 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 104: 17, \quad 104: 18, \\ & 105: 2 . \quad 135: 9 . \end{aligned}$ | $91: 21$ | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 2, \quad 104: 11, \\ & 165: 13 \end{aligned}$ | laws $63: 15$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 105: 2, \quad 135: 9, \\ & 159: 16, \quad 160: 9 \end{aligned}$ | laid | $165: 13$ largest | 63:15 <br> lawyer |
| $159: 16,160: 9$, $161: 15$ | 143:20 | 40:1, 80:22, | 9:7, 22:8, |
| kind | lance | 81:1, $90: 10$, | 28:23 |
| 12:21, 16:6, | 15:4 | 185:1 | lay |
| 21:2, 32:17, | land $1: 5, \quad 43: 14$ | last | 74:4, 88:10 |
| $34: 1,38: 1$, | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 5, \quad 43: 14, \\ & 90: 8, \quad 91: 4, \end{aligned}$ | 6:21, 10:7, | lead |
| 41:3, 74:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 90: 8, \quad 91: 4, \\ & 112: 5, \quad 123: 24, \end{aligned}$ | 49:23, 56:23, | 79:5, 144:16, |
| 86:20, 103:19, | $\begin{array}{ll} 112: 5, & 123: 24, \\ 130: 7, & 130: 8, \end{array}$ | 58:6, 72:10, | $216: 16$ |
| 116:24, 126:10, | $\begin{array}{ll} 130: 7, & 130: 8, \\ 130: 9, & 145: 14, \end{array}$ | 78:7, 82:11, | leading |
| 160:22, 165:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 130: 9, \quad 145: 14, \\ & 149: 12, \quad 175: 6, \end{aligned}$ | 83:18, 84:2, | $113: 22,115: 9$ |
| 177:19, 200:6, | $\begin{array}{ll} 149: 12, & 175: 6, \\ 176: 11, & 189: 14 \end{array}$ | $86: 24, \quad 89: 19,$ | leads |
| 212:11, 214:3 | land-use | 90:12, $94: 1$, | 61:19, 210:18 |
| kinds | $62: 1, \quad 79: 13$ | 94:21, 96:4, | leak |
| 123:18, 128:8, | landowner | \|110:10, 120:23, | 167:19 |
| 142:17, 152:9 | $39: 5$ | 141:15, 149:20, | learn |
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| learned | legislative | 24:24 | limbo |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25:24 | 94:12 | leverage | 116:14 |
| learning | legitimate | 19:16 | limit |
| 173:24 | 14:8 | liability | 106:23, 187:4, |
| leased | length | 212:11 | 187:12 |
| 44:8 | 100:25 | library | limitation |
| least | lerch | 96:23, 111:23 | 39:17 |
| 36:25, 110:4, | 2:8, 5:6, | license | limitations |
| 111:11, 115:14, | 113:24, 114:19 | 194:7 | 110:7, 111:19, |
| 140:5, 159:10, | less | lies | 112:2 |
| 163:3, 164:9, | 11:19, 35:3, | 44:3, 101:5 | limited |
| 190:18, 209:12, | 35:5, 57:8, | life | 91:6, 109:17, |
| 211:14 | 81:7, 144:1, | 29:5, 29:24, | 109:18, 134:19, |
| leave | 144:6, 145:20, | 30:2, 62:1 | 147:14, 172:5, |
| 23:15, 116:13, | 172:2, 172:7, | lift | 173:16 |
| 132:10, 213:17 | 173:20, 185:1 | 116:6 | limits |
| leaves | lessen | light | 66:9, 67:1, |
| 26:15, 89:14 | 89:20, 152:13 | 16:4, 16:10, | 67:4, 87:4, |
| leaving | let's | 29:19, 29:23, | 90:20, 135:12, |
| 162:3 | 6:13, 40:20, | 30:3, 32:12, | 135:21 |
| led | 54:12, 54:13, | 35:5, 56:7, | line |
| 143:7 | 67:23, 69:23, | 65:24, 134:25, | 66:23, 66:24, |
| lee's | 82:4, 114:8, | 135:4, 163:10 | 67:1, 70:22, |
| 53:24, 54:3, | 118:4, 118:5, | lighting | 79:6, 86:8, |
| 98:1, 204:8 | 127:4, 185:23, | 15:25, 16:1, | 90:21, 94:6, |
| left | 201:7, 213:16 | 16:2, 16:9, | 130:18, 131:14, |
| 10:3, 31:25, | letter | 19:8, 25:24, | $134: 14, \quad 134: 19,$ |
| 32:1, 65:8, | 6:22, 6:23, | 26:6, 26:10, | $134: 25,135: 3$ |
| 70:22, 86:12, | 34:8, 55:14, | 26:18, 176:1, | $136: 8,136: 9,$ |
| 87:2, 92:12, | 113:21, 113:23, | 188:21, 188:22, | 136:16, 137:16, |
| 105:10, 135:8, | 114:14, 114:18, | 204:5 | 141:16, 144:9, |
| 136:1, 175:19, | 114:19, 115:13, | lights | 161:5, 162:23, |
| 177:10, 179:23, | 195:21, 195:22, | 9:13, 30:8, | 164:1, 164:7, |
| 192:7, 195:14 | 196:1, 197:17, | 32:3, 32:12, | 164:10, 171:20, |
| left-hand | 197:19 | 56:8, 98:8, | 172:14, 177:9, |
| 71:9, 71:10, | letters | 162:24, 163:4, | 178:25, 179:20, |
| 120:19, 154:20 | 125:8 | 163:5, 163:8, | 179:24, 180:9, |
| leg | letting | 163:9, 177:15, | 180:11, 184:11, |
| 104:25 | 32:18, 107:22, | 178:11, 180:13, | 184:12, 203:13 |
| legal | 190:25 | 189:9 | lines |
| 63:10, 211:10, | level | likely | 135:4, 171:19, |
| 211:13, 211:17, | 16:23, 25:12, | 16:19, 81:13, | 180:15 |
| 211:19, 212:1, | 25:24, 35:7, | 108:24, 128:14, | list |
| 212:14, 215:2, | $35: 14,40: 3,$ | $144: 10,171: 14,$ | 4:4, 4:15, |
| 215:7, 215:16, | $101: 10,144: 13,$ | $171: 16, \quad 172: 3,$ | $39: 24, \quad 94: 16,$ |
| 216:3 | $175: 14,204: 16 \text {, }$ | $200: 16$ | $94: 23, \quad 123: 18,$ |
| legally | $204: 17$ | likewise | $124: 16, \quad 124: 21,$ |
| 47:7, 204:18 | levels | 79:17, 80:13 | $126: 3, \quad 126: 4$ |
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|  | live $\begin{aligned} & 8: 17, \quad 8: 25, \\ & 9: 5,15: 3, \\ & 20: 15, \quad 24: 4, \\ & 27: 18, \quad 30: 14, \\ & 32: 8, \quad 36: 21, \\ & 40: 4, \quad 49: 9, \\ & 49: 23, \quad 51: 17, \\ & 55: 16,57: 25, \\ & 61: 13, \quad 97: 13, \\ & 102: 21, \quad 159: 1, \\ & 166: 18, \quad 170: 13, \\ & 179: 13 \end{aligned}$ <br> lived <br> 22:5, 28:25, <br> 29:1, 31:20, <br> 49:13, 56:17, <br> 61:23, 159:6 <br> lives <br> 22:3, 29:1, <br> 49:15, 62:20, <br> 89:11, 188:25 <br> living <br> 4:4, 4:13, <br> 16:21, 19:20, <br> 23:24, 29:21, <br> 29:25, 35:11, <br> 35:20, 49:16, <br> 51:15, 56:10, <br> 56:21, 58:24, <br> 59:1, 59:13, <br> 59:18, 59:21, <br> $65: 2,65: 3$, <br> 89:19, 95:15, <br> 95:17, 95:25, <br> 96:3, 96:5, <br> 102:2, 102:4, <br> 109:16, 110:8, <br> 110:20, 116:24, <br> 116:25, 117:5, <br> 146:25, 147:25, <br> 151:5, 152:5, <br> 152:7, 152:8, <br> 152:17, 153:7, <br> 163:22, 185:9, <br> 185:16, 185:21, <br> 189:3, 189:13, <br> 189:15, 189:19, | ```192:4, 192:8, 192:13, 192:15, 192:18, 192:19, 204:1 llc 1:5 loading 25:18 local 41:16, 45:15, 45:16, 47:6, 47:7, 62:10, 64:8, 76:14, 77:1, 78:6 located 15:5, 22:1, 22:6, 22:10, 25:13, 25:19, 26:2, 26:3, 26:4, 29:2, 77:24, 85:21, 86:6, 93:4, 95:11, 95:23, 134:6, 134:15, 159:4, 177:9, 185:11 location 46:2, 56:4, 63:22, 79:10, 92:19, 96:20, 131:21 locations 93:24, 93:25, 94:9, 94:10, 94:15 locked 152:1 lockland 17:14, 22:1, 23:16, 46:4, 46:5, 183:19, 185:12, 185:14 lodge 13:4, 30:10, 63:13, 63:17, 64:11, 64:25, 65:2, 65:13, 68:14, 71:8,``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | ```192:18, 206:12, 212:19 lots 25:18, 28:4, 29:3, 65:7, 79:8, 147:25, 165:10, 170:17, 170:18, 171:3, 171:5, 172:8, 188:18, 192:17 lounge 65:4 love 29:8, 29:15, 29:19, 49:18, 50:1 low 35:17, 93:15, 95:12, 95:20, 96:12, 96:13, 145:7, 149:15, 149:25, 150:11, 152:20, 203:24 low-density 147:19, 148:24 lower 13:25, 21:12, 24:7, 175:14, 176:24 lucky 171:4 ludicrous 16:16 lunch 117:19, 117:22, 152:2 lustrous 26:13 luxury 95:7, 110:25, 111:16 lynn 1:10, 2:4, 89:11, 157:8 M ma'am 46:3, 52:18``` |  | ```magginconstructi- on 166:20 main 57:12, 68:15, 100:2, 102:8, 105:10, 200:18 maintain 80:8, 159:15, 202:7 maintaining 112: 8 maintenance 63:7 major 31:17, 63:5, 63:12, 66:12, 78:13, 93:19, 95:14, 96:5, 96:13, 126:8, 147:21, 148:17, 149:10, 161:2, 183:24 majority 10:19, 64:15, 176:25 make 8:5, 12:23, 14:17, 14:22, 21:20, 26:15, 27:14, 34:6, 34:12, 49:3, 55:4, 61:5, 63:1, 74:12, 75:1, 97:23, 99:1, 102:9, 103:1, 107:4, 114:15, 116:10, 122:3, 138:15, 147:16, 149:15, 154:6, 157:1, 166:12, 198:20, 210:13, 213:11, 213:17, 213:18, 217:15 makes 116:13, 137:6, 204:1``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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|  | media $175: 17$ medical $22: 12, \quad 25: 1$, $44: 9, \quad 58: 8$ meet $16: 5, \quad 92: 25$, $93: 5, \quad 93: 13$, $112: 12, \quad 195: 11$, $195: 25, \quad 196: 19$, $208: 18, \quad 208: 20$, $208: 21$ meeting $5: 18, \quad 11: 22$, $27: 9,168: 15$, $168: 19, \quad 170: 5$, $194: 21, \quad 194: 23$, $194: 24, \quad 195: 9$, $195: 15, \quad 197: 1$ meetings $20: 19, \quad 195: 17$, $197: 11$ meets $14: 5, \quad 14: 6$, $14: 14, \quad 14: 15$ members $110: 13, \quad 110: 21$, $143: 5, \quad 148: 1$, $148: 9$ memo $84: 3, \quad 200: 6$ memorandum $92: 3, \quad 143: 1$, $143: 3, \quad 143: 13$, $143: 15$ memory $16: 21, \quad 19: 15$, $56: 10, \quad 65: 3$, $96: 5, \quad 151: 23$, $179: 25$ mention $163: 14, \quad 191: 21$ mentioned $23: 7, \quad 24: 2$, $30: 7, \quad 36: 23$, $38: 8, \quad 41: 13$, $59: 20, \quad 130: 7$, $173: 7, \quad 175: 6$, |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```miscellaneous 164:12 mischaracterizat- ion 43: 8 misleading 174:4 missed 211:8 missing 175:2 misstate 209:23 misunderstood 130: 6 mitigate 89:22, 204:15, 204:20, 204:21, 206:5 mitigated 93:3 mitigation 74:15, 75:22 mix 72:3, 164:16 mncppc 169:15 mode 149:24 moderates 101:24 modified 145: 6 modular 171:25 moisture 100:9, 101:24 molly 1:25, 218:2, 218:12 moment 8:13, 17:3, 27:21, 50:6, 51:7, 106:15, 106:18, 112:23, 119:18, 124:7, 127:5, 141:19, 143:22, 153:14,``` |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 195: 23 \\ & \text { much } \\ & 9: 4, \quad 13: 19, \\ & 21: 6, \quad 21: 7, \\ & 29: 2, \quad 30: 6, \\ & 32: 18, \quad 32: 20, \\ & 56: 8, \quad 56: 18, \\ & 57: 8, \quad 57: 16, \\ & 58: 7, \quad 58: 21, \\ & 66: 3, \quad 68: 20, \\ & 86: 13, \quad 88: 11, \\ & 89: 1, \quad 90: 1, \\ & 92: 21, \quad 100: 1, \\ & 102: 17, \quad 103: 3, \\ & 106: 3, \quad 106: 6, \\ & 107: 21, \quad 107: 22, \\ & 108: 6, \quad 108: 7, \\ & 110: 7, \quad 114: 12, \\ & 117: 12, \quad 117: 15, \\ & 130: 23, \quad 146: 8, \\ & 146: 9, \quad 155: 20, \\ & 161: 20, \quad 162: 9, \\ & 165: 15, \quad 180: 22, \\ & 188: 21, \quad 202: 1, \\ & 203: 15, \quad 203: 17, \\ & 203: 18, \\ & 203: 23, \\ & 205: 8, \quad 213: 23, \\ & 217: 18 \\ & \text { multifamily } \\ & 191: 15 \\ & \text { multiple } \\ & 25: 3, \quad 25: 9, \\ & 32: 3, \\ & 61: 24, \\ & 63: 10, \\ & 65: 8, \\ & 65: 4, \\ & \text { multistory } \\ & 49: 22, \quad 159: 5 \\ & \text { murray } \\ & 84: 4, \quad 143: 15 \\ & \text { must } \\ & 7: 15, \quad 24: 15, \\ & 64: 6, \quad 64: 9, \\ & 71: 2, \quad 71: 3, \\ & 71: 10, \quad 79: 11, \\ & 79: 15, \quad 83: 19, \\ & 92: 25, \quad 93: 1, \\ & 93: 5, \quad 110: 3, \\ & 111: 11, \quad 116: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 123:25, 124:11, | nation | 205:12, 206:4, | 181:4, 184:25, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 125:1, 125:4, | 62:7 | 206:11, 206:22, | 187:13, 188:6, |
| 126:15, 129:9, | national | 206:23, 213:9, | 188:13, 188:14, |
| 139:19, 185:7, | 71:13, 115:22 | 213:11, 216:7 | 188:17, 188:25, |
| 206:7 | natural | needed | 189:14, 190:18, |
| mute | 67:11, 69:13, | 58:6, 75:14, | 192:7 |
| 5:8, 6:11, | 72:24, 118:19, | 110:15, 120:18, | neighborhoods |
| 13:20, 61:8 | 129:14, 180:18, | 151:22 | 22:23, 24:16, |
| mycorrhizal | 190:15 | needing | 96:12, 147:20, |
| 100:9 | nature | 111:5 | 177:3, 177:6, |
| myriad | 15:15, 42:8, | needs | 183:2, 192:6 |
| 15:11 | 47:21, 102:18, | 63:8, 118:3, | neighboring |
| myself | 165:8 | 137:2, 151:17, | 165:12 |
| 48:20, 87:19, | near | 200:3, 200:4 | neighbors |
| 102:7, 102:13, | 22:7, 30:9, | neglect | 9:23, 10:4, |
| 170:14 | 31:1, 70:1, | 8:23 | 11:23, 12:12, |
| N | 72:2, 74:25, | neighbor | 14:12, 15:9, |
| nairobi | 188:20 | 12:4, 57:19, | 36:8, 57:12, |
| 53:21, 62:20 | nearby | 97:12, 97:22, | 57:14, 85:12, |
| naked | 69:5, 96:15 | 102:1, 160:23, | 87:10, 89:5, |
| 12:15, 12:22 | nearest | 161:19, 161:21 | 90:23, 91:1, |
| name | 205:22 | neighbor's | 91:14, 96:19, |
| $6: 18,8: 9,9: 4,$ | nearly | 162:4 | 96:23, 97:3, |
| $14: 25,15: 2,$ | 115:3, 115:24 | neighborhood | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 20, \quad 162: 14, \\ & 162: 23, \quad 167: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| 27:17, 33:8, | necessarily | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 16, \quad 9: 16, \\ & 15: 22, \quad 16: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 162: 23, \\ & 168: 25, \\ & 169: 22, \end{aligned}$ |
| 34:16, 49:7, | $23: 2,25: 2$ necessary | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 15: 22, & 16: 4, \\ 16: 22, & 20: 8, \end{array}\right.$ | $184: 20,195: 12,$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll}49: 8, & 55: 7, \\ 55: 8, & 61: 11\end{array}$ | 46:17, 46:19, | 20:14, 21:6, | 198:9, 202:9 |
| 61:13, 63:2, | 77:14, 79:3, | 22:20, 24:13, | neil |
| 99:5, 99:6, | 130:18, 190:9, | 24:25, 29:9, | $3: 4, \quad 9: 4$ |
| 120:24, 156:12, | 213:2 | 29:15, 29:25, | neither $36: 9 . \quad 36: 15$ |
| $157: 5,157: 6 \text {, }$ | need | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 1, \quad 30: 9, \\ & 30: 13, \quad 30: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 36: 9, \quad 36: 15, \\ & 218: 6 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 158: 8, \quad 166: 16, \\ & 199: 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 14, ~ 13: 4, \\ & 19: 6,19: 15, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 30: 13, \quad 30: 19, \\ & 32: 9, \quad 32: 10, \end{aligned}$ | nelson |
| name's | 28:18, 32:16, | 46:6, 57:18, | 74:25, 128:24 |
| 166:18 | 33:18, 35:7, | 79:16, 90:14, | net |
| names | $35: 16,40: 10,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 93: 1, & 93: 10, \\ 96: 24, & 145: 8, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 55: 10, \quad 204: 2 \\ & \text { never } \end{aligned}$ |
| $154: 19, \quad 159: 1$ <br> naples | $\begin{aligned} & 40: 13, \quad 40: 14, \\ & 50: 9, \quad 50: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96: 24, ~ 145: 8, \\ & 159: 9, ~ 159: 14, \end{aligned}$ | never 12:19, 19:5, |
| 56:18 | 51:13, 58:22, | 159:22, 163:11, | 56:10, 57:1, |
| narrative | 67:17, 75:13, | 165:7, 167:18, | 75:2, 83:8, |
| 108:16 | 81:10, 88:17, | 167:23, 168:10, | 86:7, 95:6, |
| narrow | 97:4, 101:23, | 169:17, 169:21, | 120:25, 121:1, |
| 30:21, 30:25, | 117:21, 150:17, | 170:10, 170:12, | 121:12, 133:17, |
| 81:12, 96:13, | 150:25, 151:14, | 170:16, 170:22, <br> 175:9, 176:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 168: 12, \quad 169: 13, \\ & 170: 4, \quad 171: 15, \end{aligned}$ |
| 131:12 | 151:16, 152:10, $156: 14, \quad 182: 6,$ | 177:17, 177:18, | $172: 16,172: 17,$ |
| natab@gmail | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 156: 14, & 182: 6, \\ 200: 11, & 202: 14, \end{array}\right.$ | $177: 20,179: 9,$ | $175: 25, \quad 190: 14$ |
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| 197:8, 202:5, | noise | 34:13, 49:4, | 79:24, 82:20, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 202:6 | 6:14, 24:24, | 52:16, 55:5, | 82:21, 82:22, |
| nevertheless | 25:12, 25:24, | 59:6, 61:6, | 83:7, 83:11, |
| 210:22 | 29:23, 30:3, | 99:1, 149:16, | 94:20, 95:17, |
| new | 57:17, 160:20, | 149:19, 155:17, | 112:23, 113:1, |
| 32:8, 35:19, | 160:22, 190:1 | 157:2, 166:13, | 113:3, 114:4, |
| 57:20, 65:12, | non-religious | 183:17 | 114:24, 119:9, |
| 78:11, 96:5, | 199:17 | notice | 125:11, 141:11, |
| 131:20, 132:15, | none | 6:20, 109:19, | 146:20, 149:7, |
| 153:11, 153:12, | 27:2, 53:18, | 195:22, 208:24, | 150:22, 150:23, |
| 160:5, 180:14 | 60:15, 60:21, | 217:17 | 151:6, 151:13, |
| news | 113:14, 116:9, | noticed | 164:3, 168:14, |
| 177:13, 177:14 | 116:21, 216:25 | 201:15 | 168:18, 171:22, |
| next | normal | notion | 171:23, 173:14, |
| 7:16, 11:16, | 23:24, 23:25, | 16:10 | 174:12, 174:17, |
| 14:18, 18:15, | 81:15, 102:4, | nowhere | 178:21, 178:22, |
| 18:16, 21:14, | 133:3, 173:15, | 188:19 | 180:5, 181:3, |
| 43:24, 52:10, | 173:24, 176:3 | nrcs | 182:10, 183:7, |
| 52:14, 56:4, | normally | 124:10 | 184:6, 184:17, |
| 85:5, 85:7, | 55:25, 216:12 | nri | 184:23, 186:1, |
| 85:25, 92:1, | north | 3:19, 3:21, | 187:4, 190:20, |
| 111:23, 132:21, | 11:7, 11:8, | 119:18, 119:20, | 194:15, 201:16, |
| 151:1, 151:2, | 18:13, 90:8, | 119:22, 120:1, | 203:25 |
| 160:23, 170:23, | 104:15, 136:21 | 120:18, 120:19, | numbering |
| 192:9, 208:8, | northern | 121:6, 121:15, | 92:16 |
| 216:14, 217:17 | 64:19, 79:23, | 122:3, 122:15, | numbers |
| next-door | 80:9, 89:13, | 123:25, 124:15, | 33:7, 69:24, |
| 57:19, 161:18 | 89:24, 91:1, | 125:14, 126:16, | 83:6, 92:8, |
| ngoldman@goldman- | 105:18, 146:12, | 126:21, 126:22, | $92: 12, \quad 120: 7$ numerous |
| vanbeek | 203:12, 205:5 | 126:24, 129:7, | numerous |
| 9:6 | northwest | 129:10, 136:2, | 31:1, 115:7 |
| nice | 28:2 | 143:22 | nurse |
| 65:24, 168:22, | norton | nrifsb | 28:24 |
| 178:22, 195:2 | 31:22, 52:20 | 202:14 | nursing $32: 14,56: 24$ |
| night | note | nrifsd | $\begin{array}{ll} 32: 14, & 56: 24, \\ 100: 2, & 101: 19, \end{array}$ |
| 15:22, 16:4, | 22:2, 96:10, | 206:4 | $100: 2,101: 19,$ |
| 19:8, 56:8, | 122:7, 129:13, | nris | $\begin{aligned} & 102: 1, \quad 102: 8, \\ & 102: 11.107: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| 148:18, 149:21, | 171:17, 176:24 | $\begin{aligned} & 122: 10, \quad 136: 4 \\ & 139: 1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 102: 11, & 107: 14, \\ 107: 16, & 152: 14 \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll} 151: 24, & 163: 4, \\ 163: 12, & 178: 10, \end{array}$ | noted 23:4, 123:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 139: 1 \\ & \text { nuisance } \end{aligned}$ | 107:16, 152:14 nweisbroth@gmail |
| $189: 10$ | \|23:4, 123:4, $136: 22$ | nuisance $116: 15$ | $15: 6$ |
| nightmare | notes | number | 0 |
| 64:2 | 201:2, 201:13 | 3:17, 4:2, | oak |
| nimby | noteworthy | 7:13, 9:22, | 91:1 |
| 20:9 | 183:18, 184:8 | 11:24, 14:11, | oath |
| nina | nothing | 16:11, 33:9, | $6: 2$ |
| $3: 5, \quad 15: 2$ | $8: 6,14: 23,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 38: 8, \quad 41: 22, \\ & 68: 22, \quad 72: 2, \end{aligned}$ | object |
| 174:21 | 21.21, 27.15, |  | 43:4, 59:22, |
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| ```74:8, 75:12, 76:2, 86:12, 86:16, 89:7, 89:9, 89:19, 102:5, 102:25, 113:2, 123:24, 124:25, 125:3, 126:15, 146:11, 147:15, 150:12, 152:2, 161:19, 162:2, 164:17, 167:18, 170:14, 178:24, 183:2, 187:15, 188:15, 190:21, 191:17, 192:7, 192:9, 192:12, 196:7, 204:3, 206:21 overall 16:24, 95:18, 147:17, 162:8, 193:21, 201:20 overflowed 164:8 overflowing 161:25 overhaul 31:16 overuse 23:6 own 9:8, 10:17, 22:22, 26:13, 26:14, 38:9, 38:20, 43:17, 45:24, 56:12, 57:18, 148:11, 149:23 owned 11:19, 12:6, 13:8, 109:2, 109:4, 147:5 owner 13:10, 75:12, 87:17, 89:12, 111:9, 190:13 owner's 111:21``` | owners <br> 34:23, 44:1, 115:20, 162:15 ownership pacific 62:6, 62:7 paddock 160:16, 160:17, 160:18 page 3:2, 3:17, 4:2, 68:22, 68:23, 69:4, 69:6, 79:19, 80:5, 81:8, 81:12, 81:16, 81:17, 82:2, 82:8, 82:15, 82:20, 82:21, 82:22, 83:5, 83:7, 83:12, 83:15, 92:8, 92:16, 92:22, 95:2, 123:9, 123:13, 123:14, 123:15, 123:16, 123:20, 123:23, 124:5, 124:8, 124:24, 125:23, 125:24, 126:13, 127:4, 127:6, 130:15, 137:12, 138:4, 139:23, 140:25, 141:11, 142:3, 142:4, 142:7, 142:8, 142:24, 143:23, 144:12, 176:10, 186:4, | ```192:11 pages 1:24, 80:24, 81:4, 82:23, 92:1, 94:4, 94:20, 140:6 painful 43:25 pajamas 33:22 pandemic 23:25, 24:8, 152:12 paper 50:17, 50:18 paragraph 114:15, 141:8, 141:16 parcel 203:15, 203:18 parcels 20:7, 25:14, 172:16 pardon 12:18, 47:20 park 24:17, 68:8, 72:21, 74:25, 79:3, 81:3, 81:4, 84:12, 93:17, 122:8, 128:8, 128:11, 128:24, 130:3, 133:13, 145:10, 149:5, 165:9, 200:3, 200:4, 200:15, 201:20 parked 57:6 parking 25:4, 25:18, 65:4, 65:7, 79:8, 86:21, 89:1, 132:15, 133:14, 133:23, 134:2, 134:5, 134:11, 134:15, 135:15, 163:6``` | parkland $81: 2$ part $7: 12, \quad 29: 20$, $36: 5, \quad 71: 3$, $72: 12, \quad 74: 9$, $79: 25, \quad 81: 15$, $85: 11, \quad 113: 17$, $114: 21, \quad 129: 7$, $131: 22, \quad 140: 23$, $153: 8, \quad 165: 7$, $196: 14, \quad 197: 15$, $205: 6, \quad 212: 23$ parte $5: 25$ participate $194: 20, \quad 195: 16$ participating $217: 19$ particular $24: 9, \quad 39: 8$, $39: 17, \quad 59: 3$, $62: 11, \quad 62: 18$, $64: 9, \quad 77: 6$, $176: 13, \quad 176: 21$, $183: 18, \quad 183: 22$, $184: 2, \quad 184: 3$, $187: 13, \quad 203: 13$ particularly $77: 20, \quad 124: 18$ parties $5: 5,7: 5, \quad 14: 2$, $115: 8, \quad 217: 1$, $218: 7$ partly $81: 1$ partner $216: 16$ party $6: 3$ pass $163: 19, \quad 206: 1$ passes $161: 17, \quad 161: 18$ past $16: 14, \quad 32: 13$, $53: 21, \quad 74: 21$, $105: 24, \quad 115: 4$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 161:19 | penn's | perennial | personal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| pastoral | 120:24 | 131:6, 132:21, | 42:19, 51:13, |
| 15:19 | people | 132:22 | 51:14, 58:22, |
| pat | 7:11, 10:2, | perfect | 62:8 |
| 5:6 | 10:8, 10:11, | 165:8 | personally |
| path | 14:12, 19:16, | perfectly | 23:19 |
| 162:5 | 23:8, 23:9, | 118:2 | persons |
| patience | 23:11, 24:4, | perhaps | 102:4, 109:17, |
| 117:13, 155:25 | 24:5, 24:6, | 18:3, 79:6, | 110:8, 110:23, |
| patio | 31:8, 31:13, | 102:12, 191:7, | 115:12, 115:13 |
| $49: 20,177: 8$ | $31: 19,32: 1,$ | $198: 8, \quad 205: 5$ | perspective |
| patios | $32: 4,32: 7,$ | perimeter | $36: 15$ |
| 30:8 | $38: 20,39: 15$, | 93:17, 95:13, | pertinent |
| patricia | 39:18, 49:14, | 96:13, 152:21, | 206:21 |
| $2: 7$ | 49:19, 88:14, | $180: 19, \quad 190: 16$ | pervious |
| pattern | 102:5, 108:14, | period | $133: 7$ |
| 24:7 | 111:4, 148:2, | 183:3, 184:15, | pets |
| patterns | 148:8, 151:17, | 188:2 | 56:14 |
| $22: 14,23: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 151: 20, \\ & 170: 13, \\ & 173: 13, \\ & 174: 3, \end{aligned}$ | peripheries | phase |
| patty | $\begin{array}{ll} 173: 13, & 174: 3, \\ 174: 11 . & 174: 12 \end{array}$ | $147: 21$ | $193: 21,193: 23$ |
| $3: 12, \quad 97: 6,$ | 174:11, 174:12, 174:17, 174:19, | perjury | phased |
| 99:6 | $174: 20,174: 23$ | 8:4, 14:21, | 193:18 |
| pattymcgrath@aol | 177:23, 187:4, | 21:19, 27:13, | phasing |
| 99:8 paved | $187: 9,187: 10,$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 34: 11, \quad 49: 2, \\ & 55: 3, \quad 61: 4, \end{aligned}\right.$ | $190: 6$ <br> phone |
| 75:12, 101:20, | $\begin{aligned} & 187: 13, \\ & 189: 10, \\ & 189: 23, \end{aligned}$ | 98:25, 156:25, | 2:11, 2:19, |
| 132:15 | 190:20, 197:9, | 166:12 | $\begin{array}{lll}7: 21, & 33: 7, \\ 33: 8, & 59: 10,\end{array}$ |
| pay | $202: 21$ | permanent <br> 111:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 33: 8, \quad 59: 10, \\ & 169: 10.217: 14 \end{aligned}$ |
| $107: 16,204: 19$ paying | people's | permission | 169:10, 217:14 phones |
| 159:25 | perceived | $54: 3$ <br> permit | $38: 14, \quad 38: 15$ |
| peaceful $15: 21$ | 12:14 | $12: 24,74: 16,$ | $22: 9,143: 16,$ |
| pedestrians | percent | 95:5, 171:16, | 173:23 |
| $24: 14, \quad 24: 19,$ | $64: 13,67: 12,$ | 171:17, 171:22, | photo |
| $31: 17$ | $70: 21, \quad 72: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 172: 17,172: 18, \\ & 193: 17 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3: 22, \quad 177: 22, \\ & 177: 23 \end{aligned}$ |
| peg $20: 15$ | $74: 1, \quad 90: 25$ | permitted | 177:23 <br> photometrics |
| penalties | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 8, \quad 110: 2, \\ & 111: 11, \quad 123: 25 \end{aligned}$ | 45:1, 79:1, | 188:23 |
| 8:4, 14:21, | 124:6, 124:25, | 148:11, 172:3 | photos |
| 21:19, 27:13, | $125: 4, \quad 126: 15,$ | permitting $99: 20,159: 25$ | $4: 7$ |
| $34: 11, ~ 49: 2$, $55: 3,61: 4$, | 144:1, 144:6, | person | phrase <br> 68.7 |
| $98: 25,156: 25$ | $144: 14, ~ 145: 11$, $146: 1,177: 1$, | 51:13, 55:18, | physically |
| 166:11 | $146: 1, ~ 177: 1$, $185: 24,186: 3$ | 57:2, 58:22, | 100:2 |
| pending | percentage | 110:4, 110:16, | pick |
| 39:23, 94:25 | $35: 9$ | $\begin{aligned} & 111: 12, \quad 121: 6, \\ & 143: 15 \end{aligned}$ | 30:20 |
| penn |  | 143:15 | pickle |
| 121:10, 169:9 |  |  | 135:24, 148:20 |
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| pickup | 138:21, 204:16, | pleas | 184:9, 184:10, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25:8 | 204:24 | 157:4 | 188:2, 188:3, |
| pickups | planned | please | 196:2, 209:17, |
| 25:9 | 15:6, 25:17, | 5:22, 5:24, | 211:2, 211:9 |
| picture | 26:20, 113:17, | $6: 1,6: 8,7: 24$, | pointed |
| 17:6, 85:13, | 132:16 | 8:2, 8:8, 13:25, | 89:5, 89:10, |
| 85:15, 85:25, | planning | 14:19, 14:25, | 170:25, 173:13, |
| 86:2, 86:22, | 63:7, 66:14, | 21:12, 27:11, | 174:3, 174:17, |
| 86:24, 87:22, | 66:15, 74:8, | 27:16, 28:11, | 174:23, 183:20 |
| 87:23, 88:20, | 74:20, 75:1, | 33:15, 33:18, | pointing |
| 89:4, 99:13, | 79:4, 84:9, | 34:10, 34:15, | 121:6, 151:7 |
| 173:13 | 92:2, 97:17, | 48:15, 48:18, | points |
| pictures | 114:20, 116:5, | 48:25, 49:6, | 14:18 |
| 85:4, 132:12 | 119:8, 119:21, | 50:7, 55:6, | police |
| piece | 120:20, 121:2, | 59:8, 60:25, | 28:25, 117:7, |
| 68:11, 94:1, | 121:4, 121:5, | 61:3, 61:10, | 205:17 |
| 121:11, 149:12, | 122:9, 128:8, | 61:17, 98:17, | policy |
| 191:1 | 128:11, 128:25, | 99:4, 101:2, | 93:13 |
| pieces | 130:3, 164:10, | 103:8, 114:9, | poll |
| 133:11, 151:14 | 168:12, 168:15, | $\text { 153:21, } 156: 24,$ | 14:12 |
| pierced | $168: 16,168: 17,$ | $166: 9,166: 16$ | pollution |
| 15:22 | 168:24, 169:20, | 177:23, 209:23, | 29:19, 29:23, |
| pike | 180:14, 197:12, | 217:14 | 30:3, 32:12, |
| 149:5 | 200:3, 200:5, | pleasing | 35:5 |
| pink | 200:15, 209:19 | 35:18 | pond |
| 66:24 | plans | plebiscite | 177:11 |
| pipe | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 25, \quad 26: 12, \\ & 121: 24, \quad 172: 6 . \end{aligned}$ | 14:11 | pool |
| 77:23, 78:11 | $\begin{aligned} & 121: 24, \\ & 175: 13, \\ & 175: 15, \end{aligned}$ | plot <br> 43:14 | 56:21, 86:17 |
| pitch $152: 12,209: 11$ | $176: 3,176: 4$ | 43:14 plus | pools <br> 148.21 |
| place | 176:9, 176:11, | 39:21 | pop |
| 20:3, 35:15, | 187:1, 194:13, | pods | 16:6, 43:24, |
| $36: 3, \quad 105: 9,$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 196: 2, \quad 201: 18, \\ & 205: 22, \quad 206: 5, \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 161: 9 \\ & \text { noint } \end{aligned}$ | $164: 6$ |
| 125:16, 148:8, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 205: 22,206: 5, \\ & 211: 3 \end{aligned}\right.$ | point | population |
| $\begin{aligned} & 151: 19, \quad 164: 10, \\ & 191: 16 \end{aligned}$ | plant | $11: 15, ~ 12: 3$, $13: 23, ~ 40: 9$, | 40:1 porch |
| placed | 76:2, 76:5, | 50:8, 50:22, | 178:9, 181:21 |
| 16:8, 110:7, | 77:9, 77:24, | 60:9, 67:25, | portion |
| $116: 18,130: 17,$ | $78: 9$ | 69:14, 70:19, | $64: 19,66: 25,$ |
| $147: 16, \quad 148: 23$ | planting | 72:18, 74:19, | $77: 21,79: 23 \text {, }$ |
| placement | $\begin{aligned} & 68: 8, \quad 74: 18, \\ & 75: 21 \end{aligned}$ | 87:10, 107:5, | 80:9, 80:14, |
| 63:12 | 75:21 | 119:25, 125:4, | 84:25, 89:23, |
| places | plantings | 130:8, 131:23, | 146:12 |
| 35:5, 36:11, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 74: 14, \quad 179: 17 \\ & 180: 2 \end{aligned}\right.$ | 138:9, 143:11, $150: 22, \quad 150: 25$ | pose |
| 151:16 | platforms | $157: 14, \quad 158: 1$ | 163:24 |
| placing | $89: 16$ | 161:4, 171:18, | posing |
| $67: 13$ <br> plain | play | 172:19, 180:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 8 \\ & \text { position } \end{aligned}$ |
| 76:9, 79:12, | 12:22, 19:13 |  | 196:18 |
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| procedural | 91:7, 93:5, | 184:9, 185:8, | protect |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 37:19, 40:24 | 102:10, 115:11, | 187:5, 192:12, | 41:25, 77:16, |
| procedure | 115:15, 115:22, | 196:4, 196:14, | 80:20, 84:11, |
| 169:24 | 116:10, 164:2, | 196:17, 202:20, | 84:16, 93:12, |
| proceed | 164:11, 165:10, | 204:4 | 93:15 |
| 54:15, 99:10, | 167:14, 167:17, | proposal | protected |
| 217:2 | 167:19, 167:21, | 64:25, 74:10, | 64:11, 64:14, |
| proceeding | 167:25, 168:20, | 78:10, 89:17, | 64:23, 67:6, |
| 193:17, 217:21 | 168:23, 169:3, | 100:5, 102:20, | $72: 10,72: 11$, |
| proceedings | 170:7, 170:12, | 128:7, 158:17, | $74: 2,75: 2$, |
| 3:2, 218:4 | 170:20, 180:16, | 160:9, 161:15, | $75: 3,75: 25$, |
| process | 183:14, 183:18, | 176:23, 177:5 | 78:15, 81:14, |
| 42:5, 58:8, | 187:25, 188:9, | proposals | 84:24, 84:25, |
| 80:1, 81:16, | 194:13, 196:18, | 169:18 | 90:11, 124:1, |
| 169:16, 169:21, | 196:20, 210:20 | propose | 126:17, 127:3, |
| 209:7, 209:19 | projects | 148:6 | 145:14, 146:6 |
| processes | 92:25, 93:4, | proposed | protection |
| 168:11 | 183:4 | 9:11, 17:11, | 4:5, 26:10, |
| produce | promedica | 22:7, 22:10, | 63:14, 64:24, |
| 211:1 | 183:8 | 22:13, 24:21, | 77:14, 78:13, |
| produces | promising | 25:16, 26:1, | 80:10, 82:25, |
| 77:24 | 216:15 | 35:2, 35:17, | 91:13, 140:11 |
| product | promote | $36: 17,36: 24$, | protects |
| 15:14 | 94:13 | 43:8, 55:17, | 145:24, 147:19 |
| profession | promoting | $56: 6,56: 10$, | protracted |
| 36:1 | 148:1 | 65:11, 79:6, | 169:24 |
| professional | prone | 79:8, 79:10, | proud |
| $62: 1,121: 25$ | 77:15 | 80:13, 90:3, | 115:21 |
| professor | proper <br> 51.5, 180:21 | $\begin{array}{ll} 90: 12, & 91: 8, \\ 95: 16, & 100: 3, \end{array}$ | provide |
| $28: 24$ <br> profit | $\begin{aligned} & 51: 5, \quad 180: 21 \\ & \text { properly } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 95: 16, & 100: 3, \\ 100: 7, & 134: 15, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 12: 14, \quad 13: 3, \\ & 28: 23, \\ & 61: 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| 102:9 | 174:25 | 160:2, 162:10, | 61:20, 77:13, |
| profoundly | properties | 162:24, 163:12, | 102:3, 112:13, |
| $9: 17$ | 4:15, 9:10, | 163:23, 173:10, | 122:20, 146:13, |
| program | $10: 2, ~ 10: 17$, $10: 21, ~ 10: 22$, | $188: 9,188: 18,$ | $190: 12, \quad 207: 8,$ |
| 110:17, 110:18, | 11:11, 11:21, | 193:23 | $210: 23, \quad 213: 1,$ |
| 119:2, 159:14 <br> prohibited | $11: 11, ~ 11: 21, ~$ $25: 14, ~ 28: 6$, | proposes | 213:7, 217:15 |
| 79:9 | 30:9, 36:16, | 24:24, 64:10 | provided |
| project | $39: 5,39: 25$ | proposing 148:6, 208:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 8, \quad 38: 23, \\ & 72: 19, \quad 72: 20 \end{aligned}$ |
| 10:3, 10:18, | $\begin{aligned} & 41: 22, \quad 42: 14, \\ & 44: 2,46: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 148: 6, \quad 208: 19, \\ & 210: 19, \quad 215: 3, \end{aligned}$ | 72:19, 72:20, $87: 22, \quad 92: 10,$ |
| $11: 12, \quad 12: 3,$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 44: 2, & 46: 2, \\ 51: 1, & 80: 6, \end{array}$ | $215: 17$ | $110: 16,128: 25,$ |
| $13: 5, \quad 15: 6$ | 83:20, 90:14, | prospect | 129:9, 129:20, |
| 15:11, 16:10, | 90:23, 106:12, | 160:5 | 130:2, 139:4, |
| 16:24, 19:19, | 142:20, 142:21, | prospective | 191:9, 192:11, |
| 19:23, 21:3, | $146: 20,146: 24,$ | $115: 6,115: 18$ | $205: 16,218: 6$ |
| 21:5, 22:11, | 147:5, 177:2, | $19: 23$ | $109: 6$ |

PLANET DEPOS

Transcript of Hearing - Day 3
Conducted on March 2, 2022

| provides | 39:20, 43:25, | 40:16, 40:24, | 209:4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 119:20, 183:3, | 46:18, 74:14, | 41:19, 42:12, | quick |
| 192:14 | 83:10, 87:15, | 42:18, 42:23, | 91:15 |
| providing | 117:1, 120:11, | 43:4, 43:12, | quicker |
| 131:2, 202:8 | 120:23, 124:2, | 45:20, 45:21, | 158:23 |
| provision | 125:5, 125:6, | 47:6, 47:13, | quickly |
| 74:11, 75:8, | 128:19, 131:19, | 59:7, 60:2, | 6:21, 11:2, |
| 110:1, 110:9, | 132:15, 133:2, | 75:2, 91:23, | 13:24, 28:9 |
| 110:12, 112:17 | 133:17, 138:2, | 102:7, 140:22, | quiet |
| provisions | 147:4, 147:6, | 179:8, 181:17, | 15:19, 22:21, |
| 13:2, 63:24, | 147:20, 148:23, | 186:10, 186:11, | 25:21, 29:8, |
| 71:22, 72:8, | 149:3, 194:14, | 187:3, 188:8, | 29:9, 30:2 |
| 72:9, 72:22, | 200:13, 215:20 | 188:14, 201:14, | quite |
| 92:21, 211:22, | putting | 202:10, 202:20, | 56:22, 72:4, |
| 212:4, 212:20, | 133:19 | 204:14, 206:15, | 86:19, 116:3, |
| 213:2 | Q | 206:17, 209:8, | 116:4 |
| proximity | quaint | 210:18 | quote |
| 202:2 | 12:24 | questioned | 78:23, 81:6, |
| public | qualified | 168:21 | 81:17, 84:2, |
| 19:4, 81:2, | 42:17, 44:19, | questions | 84:6, 91:11, |
| 96:14, 96:21, | 45:17, 45:23, | 6:5, 13:20, | 93:12, 93:21, |
| $174: 18, \quad 190: 2$ | 47:5, 115:6 | $\begin{aligned} & 13: 21, \quad 13: 22, \\ & 21: 9, \quad 21: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $115: 13,116: 1,$ |
| 10:15, 23:19, | qualifies | 26:24, 26:25, | quoting |
| $82: 19, \quad 85: 3$ | 58:21, 124:4 qualify | 27:2, 27:3, | $76: 23,88: 7,$ |
| 103:9, 123:7, | 46:13, 46:16, | $32: 21, ~ 32: 22, ~$ $32: 24, ~ 37: 14$, | 123:15 |
| 136:3, 141:3 | 46:21, 46:23, | $\begin{aligned} & 32: 24,37: 14, \\ & 27.10 \end{aligned}$ | R |
| pulled | 47:2, 109:14, | $38: 2, \quad 38: 3,$ | r-i-c-k |
| 33:25, 80:11, | 116:23, 117:4 | $38: 6,40: 7,$ | 166:20 |
| pulling | qualifying | $41: 9, \quad 41: 12$ | rain |
| pulling $17: 5,65: 16,$ | $47: 12, ~ 91: 3$ quality | $45: 13, \quad 45: 14$ | 105:23, 162:1 |
| $65: 21$ | quality | 47:12, 48:2, | rainfall |
| purchase | $78: 8, \quad 162: 9$ | 48:4, 48:5, | 101:24 <br> raise |
| 30:1 | quarry | $\begin{array}{ll} 48: 6, & 50: 3, \\ 50: 5, & 51: 5, \end{array}$ | $6: 7,6: 8,7: 24,$ |
| purchaser | $95: 3, \quad 95: 8,$ | $51: 20,58: 12,$ | $8: 2,14: 20,$ |
| $51: 8,58: 14$ | 96:3, 147:3 | $60: 13,62: 19,$ | 19:22, 34:10, |
| purchasers | quarter | 103:7, 104:5, | 40:11, 48:25, |
|  | 29:3, 109:11, | 106:23, 107:3, | 61:3, 98:22, |
| purchasing | 173:20 | 107:7, 107:8, | 156:24, 166:9, |
| 55:18 | quarters | 107:18, 107:19, | 204:16 |
| purpose | 57:20, 65:9, | 117:18, 153:15, | raised |
| 143:1 | 66:7, 85:16 | 153:16, 155:19, | 27:11, 48:13, |
| pursue | quasi-judicial | $164: 13,165: 16$ | 52:9, 97:6, |
| 167:20 | 33:17, 47:8 | $165: 19, \quad 191: 5$ | 119:11, 186:15 |
| push | question | $192: 23,198: 2,$ | raises |
| $36: 6, \quad 170: 7$ | 12:6, 37:19, | $201: 12,207: 24$ | 15:11, 204:16 |
| 12:22, 16:11, |  |  |  |
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|  |  |  | ```129:14, 147:19 respect 13:8, 22:14, 22:17, 26:11 respects 154:7 respond 55:15, 207:18 responding 200:6 response 12:5, 74:12, 96:23, 168:25, 209:16, 214:2, 215:24 responses 170:6 responsible 111:10 rest 65:13, 71:3, 89:23, 90:4, 146:1, 146:2, 159:13, 188:5, 206:22 restated 4:10 restaurant 25:5, 25:6 restaurants 153:12 restoration 142:6, 142:11, 142:17, 142:22 restoring 142:20 restrict 94:15 restricted 108:25, 111:16, 113:14, 174:9 restriction 112:2, 113:18, 116:6, 190:10 restrictions 13:7, 16:8, 20:3, 64:1, 66:16, 95:8,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 102:12, 102:19, | revised | 133:2, 148:13, | route |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 108:23, 109:15, | 4:10 | 163:12, 163:17, | 23:9 |
| 110:24, 116:11, | revision | 163:18, 173:21, | routinely |
| 209:15 | 153:1 | 174:20, 183:17, | 24:14 |
| restrictive | rewarded | 188:3, 188:4, | row |
| 19:23 | 133:17 | 211:2 | 154:8 |
| restricts | rezoning | roads | rule |
| 39:22, 190:12 | 116:9, 196:16, | 15:20, 93:19, | 88:13 |
| resubmit | 211:21 | 96:14, 163:15, | rules |
| 6:24 | rich | 171:2, 174:16, | 38:1 |
| resubmitted | 168:16, 168:19, | 174:17 | run |
| 20:25 | 169:8, 169:9 | roberson | $136: 17$ |
| result | rick | 198:15 | running |
| 22:11, 22:13, | 3:14, 166:3, | robson | 15:21, 102:25 |
| 25:20, 62:25, | 166:18 | $209: 5$ | runoff |
| 78:20, 81:2, | ride | rockville | 77:17, 78:4, |
| 86:6, 90:3, | 29:15 | 1:11, 2:18, | 78:21, 101:21, |
| 169:23 | riding | 61:14, 78:16, | 208:2 |
| resume | 19:6, 159:11, | 95:23, 148:21, | runs |
| 46:12 | 159:14 | 149:5 | 103:20, 136:17 |
| resuming | right-hand | roger | rural |
| 54:22, 114:10, | $176: 24$ | 29:2 | 15:19, 29:5, |
| 118:12, 201:9 | right-of-way | role | $29: 21,49: 19,$ |
| retaining | $162: 7$ | $109: 6$ | 96:14, 148:12 |
| $101: 24$ | riparian | roll | rush |
| retention | 64:20, 72:13, | 192:5 | 55:25, 56:1 |
| 81:13 | 81:6, 81:12, | roof | rustic |
| retired | 84:6 | $161: 7,161: 8,$ | 163:18 |
| 49:12 | risk | $161: 10$ | S |
| retirees | 24:22 | rooftops | s |
| $35: 10$ <br> retirement | river | room | 113:4, 114:24 |
| $35: 20$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 15: 4, & 36: 6, \\ 43: 24, & 77: 24 \end{array}$ | $163: 4,17$ | sacrificing |
| retroactively | $93: 20, \quad 95: 3$ | rooms | 29:6 |
| 122:9 | 96:2, 96:21, | 65:4 | $133: 16$ |
| returned | 159:19, 184:21, | root | safe |
| $169: 13$ <br> revert | $\begin{aligned} & 187: 10,187: 11 \\ & \text { road } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 90: 16, & 90: 17, \\ 90: 25, & 91: 8, \end{array}$ | 56:13 |
| 117:7 | 16:12, 18:13, | 144:1, 144:13, | safety |
| review | 19:7, 23:5, | $145: 4, \quad 179: 12$ | sage |
| 81:16, 114:14, | 23:8, 23:18, | rough | $109: 6,111: 13$ |
| 114:20, 194:12, | $\begin{array}{ll} 23: 21, & 30: 21, \\ 31: 15, & 46: 6 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 203:21 } \\ & \text { roughly } \end{aligned}$ | said |
| 200:10, 216:12 reviewed | $\begin{array}{ll} 31: 15, & 46: 6, \\ 57: 12, & 65: 12, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { roughly } \\ & 12: 25,28: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 12:19, 27:7, |
| 46:1, 119:21, | 66:10, 79:6, | 181:11, 202:22 | $\begin{array}{ll} 31: 9, & 31: 20, \\ 38: 17, & 66: 15, \end{array}$ |
| $126: 21,200: 2,$ | $105: 10,105: 19,$ | round | $69: 1, \quad 71: 11,$ |
| $200: 4, \quad 200: 19$ <br> reviewing | $\begin{aligned} & 131: 15, ~ 131: 16, \\ & 131: 20, \\ & 132: 21, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 20: 16, \quad 164: 6 \\ & \text { rounds } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 69: 1, & 71: 11, \\ 72: 5, & 88: 24, \end{array}$ |
| 7:3 |  | 32:3 |  |
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| 102:24, 107:1, | 14:11, 19:11, | 126:12, 126:19, | school |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 109:9, 118:16, | 32:14, 36:9, | 127:12, 130:15, | 4:12, 22:11, |
| 119:11, 121:10, | 41:1, 41:20, | 131:12, 131:13, | 23:16, 30:15, |
| 128:15, 130:5, | 42:4, 44:14, | 138:21, 139:2, | $30: 16,31: 13$, |
| 139:6, 144:10, | 45:4, 45:5, | 141:8, 141:16, | 34:25, 35:1, |
| 151:1, 168:20, | 55:12, 59:12, | 141:23, 154:11, | 35:5, 41:5, |
| 168:21, 172:7, | 71:11, 71:24, | 156:12, 167:6, | 42:4, 43:15, |
| 175:11, 178:3, | $72: 1,73: 16$, | 176:11, 182:25, | 56:5, 56:7, |
| 179:16, 184:14, | $76: 1,76: 5$, | 202:18, 206:20 | 56:8, 65:8, |
| 187:17, 187:22, | 83:11, 88:4, | scafide | 65:9, 86:13, |
| 189:4, 189:5, | 88:6, 91:5, | 3:7, 27:6, | 87:20, 88:24, |
| 191:8, 194:15, | 94:21, 99:10, | 27:8, 27:18, | 102:1, 102:12, |
| 195:2, 195:3, | 104:2, 107:11, | 27:22, 27:25, | 132:7, 133:25, |
| 199:4, 200:9, | 121:12, 122:13, | 28:5, 28:11, | 159:11, 159:12, |
| 203:8, 210:2, | 126:1, 126:6, | 28:16, 28:18, | 159:17, 162:11, |
| 213:12, 218:4 | 128:22, 130:6, | 28:20, 28:22, | 164:4, 170:24, |
| salability | 134:11, 141:19, | 32:25, 33:1, | 171:8, 171:18, |
| 39:18, 39:24 | 141:21, 143:24, | $33: 3,33: 5$ | 171:21, 172:15, |
| sale | 144:17, 145:25, | scale | 172:17, 172:21, |
| 40:6, 44:6, | 146:19, 149:6, | 129:8, 170:20, | 173:2, 173:3, |
| 112:18, 113:13, | 152:6, 158:8, | 176:6, 190:1, | 190:11, 193:4, |
| 115:2 | 162:18, 176:9, | 203:22 | 193:6, 193:11, |
| sales | 178:1, 181:6, | scaled | 193:21, 199:5, |
| 115:4, 115:20, | 190:25, 203:21, | 207:9 | 199:6, 199:8, |
| 183:1, 185:17, | 204:21, 205:14, | scanning | 199:14, 199:16, |
| 185:19, 186:11 | 206:13, 211:17, | 6:25 | 199:17, 199:21, |
| sam | 212:2, 213:8, | scarcity | 206:25 |
| 183:20, 184:19 | 214:16, 216:13 | 40:4 | schools |
| same | saying | scared | 173:23, 193:9 |
| 26:11, 72:25, | 65:18, 75:21, | 160:21 | science |
| 111:25, 119:10, | 77:9, 77:11, | scattered | 77:13, 119:1 |
| 156:22, 175:19, | 88:7, 106:17, | 64:16 | scientist |
| 192:16 | 122:12, 123:14, | scenario | 119:3, 119:12, |
| sanitary | 126:24, 126:25, | 171:16, 172:3, | 143:4 |
| 130:18 | 127:1, 132:18, | 210:23 | scientists |
| save | 137:21, 138:14, | scenarios | 143:5 |
| 20:19, 29:7, | 144:25, 145:1, | 171:14 | sconces |
| 30:1, 62:22, | 145:25, 150:5, | schedule | 204:8 |
| 84:1, $91: 10$, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lr} 150: 7, & 152: 9, \\ 152: 11, & 155: 6 . \end{array}\right.$ | 173:24, 173:25, | scope |
| 141:17 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 152: 11, \quad 155: 6, \\ & 188: 5, \quad 190: 4, \end{aligned}\right.$ | 200:11, 200:16, | $\begin{array}{ll} 149: 3, & 149: 7, \\ 173: 17 \end{array}$ |
| saved $83: 20,90: 7$ | 206:6, 206:7, | 208:15 scheduled | scott |
| saw | 214:25, 216:6 | 5:16 | $95: 23$ |
| 31:20, 88:20, | says | schedules | screen |
| $100: 4, \quad 121: 12,$ | $\begin{array}{\|ll} 70: 22, & 76: 7, \\ 89: 20, & 104: 14, \end{array}$ | $7: 10, \quad 7: 13$ | $6: 8, \quad 17: 6,$ |
| $188: 20,202: 17$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 89: 20, & 104: 14, \\ 109: 19, & 115: 15, \end{array}\right.$ | scheduling | $52: 7,52: 9,$ |
| say $11: 2,11: 3$, | 121:11, 124:8, | $209: 3$ <br> scheming | $\begin{aligned} & 53: 8, \quad 100: 13, \\ & 103: 10, \quad 108: 1, \end{aligned}$ |
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| seven | shocked | 175:5, 175:6, | 85:8, 130:16, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 39:23, 90:22, | 30:17 | 180:7, 182:13, | 176:21, 177:5, |
| 112:6 | shoehorn | 191:7, 202:24, | 177:25, 180:8, |
| several | 13:2 | 203:9, 204:11, | 180:10 |
| 78:7, 85:4, | shoot | 210:12, 212:13, | shuttle |
| 159:7, 200:22, | 213:13, 213:16 | 212:20, 214:14, | 205:21, 205:23 |
| 202:21 | shop | 214:23, 215:22 | sic |
| severe | 22:11 | should've | 22:24, 71:13, |
| 85:9, 123:11, | shopping | 27:1 | 215:16 |
| 124:9, 126:2, | 24:16, 57:3, | shoulder | side |
| 127:9 | 93:18, 96:22 | 174:19 | 11:11, 11:18, |
| severely | short | shoulders | 11:19, 19:7, |
| 57:14, 124:11, | 20:17, 97:23, | 16:12, 19:7 | 28:5, 28:6, |
| 126:8, 188:9 | 188:10, 188:12 | shouldn't | 68:5, 71:9, |
| severity | shortage | 42:2, 126:9, | 71:10, 71:19, |
| 78:7 | 35:24 | 132:25, 133:10, | 87:3, 90:10, |
| sewage | shorter | $148: 23$ | 90:24, 105:19, |
| 164:8 | 100:24 | shovel | 106:11, 135:19, |
| sewer | shortly | 75:11 | 135:20, 154:20, |
| 79:6, 86:8, | 24:8 | shoving | 160:16, 160:25, |
| 131:14, 164:5, | shot | 20:15 | 162:19, 163:25, |
| 164:6, 164:10 | 163:13 | show | 164:25, 170:24, |
| shaded | should | 26:12, 27:23, | 172:15, 174:19, |
| 68:6, 68:12, | 12:10, 12:11, | $50: 14, \quad 67: 18,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 176: 20,184: 1, \\ & 205: 4 \end{aligned}$ |
| 70:20, 72:3, | 23:17, 41:25, | $\begin{array}{ll} 67: 20, & 69: 10, \\ 69: 24, & 73: 11, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 205: } 4 \\ & \text { sides } \end{aligned}$ |
| 73:14, 176:15 | 44:23, 52:13, | $69: 24,73: 11,$ $85: 22,86: 25$ | sides $134: 20,162: 22,$ |
| shading | 62:25, 65:22, | $85: 22,86: 25$ | 134:20, 162:22, $176: 7, \quad 183: 23$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 69:21, 129:24, } \\ & 129: 25 \end{aligned}$ | $68: 25$, $72: 11$, $72: 14$, | $\begin{aligned} & 94: 4, \quad 105: 7, \\ & 122: 15, \quad 125: 16, \end{aligned}$ | sidewalk |
| shall | 72:16, 72:20, | 129:15, 130:23, | 36:6, 36:8, |
| 91:9, 141:21 | 84:1, 84:7, | 136:3, 162:20, | 43:19, 174:19 |
| share | 84:8, 84:13, | 164:14, 172:14, | sidewalks $16: 12,23: 7$ |
| 8:18, 9:20, | 86:1, 91:14, | $178: 25,180: 15$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 16: 12, & 23: 7 \\ 24: 19, & 30: 21 \end{array}$ |
| 162:23, 212:25 | 93:4, 111:6, | showed | $\begin{array}{ll} 24: 19, & 30: 21, \\ 31: 11, & 56: 12 \end{array}$ |
| shared | 116:21, 122:22, | 79:24, 87:23, | 31:11, 56:12 |
| 169:23 | $132: 10, ~ 132: 25, ~$ $133: 16,133: 17$, | $\begin{aligned} & 187: 1, \quad 187: 21, \\ & 193: 18 \end{aligned}$ | sideways $73: 23$ |
| sharing 108:1 | $133: 16, ~ 133: 17$, $134: 8,136: 1$, | 193:18 showing | signature |
| sharp | 136:5, 138:1, | 28:7, 180:11 | 121:9, 122:20 |
| 31:4 | 140:20, 141:17, | shown | signature-5tm1q |
| sheer | 142:2, 145:6, | 27:24, 28:2, | 218:10 |
| 190:1 | 146:25, 148:23, | 28:3, 179:6, | signed |
| sheet | 152:6, 153:22, | 179:7, 179:10, | 9:25, 10:13, |
| 68:4, 68:5, | 154:1, 157:20, | 186:6, 186:7, | $10: 21,69: 16,$ |
| 175:6, 201:16 | 160:6, 165:9, | $204: 6$ <br> shows | $\begin{aligned} & 73: 3, \quad 120: 8, \\ & 121: 11,121: 17 \end{aligned}$ |
| shifts | 165:10, 167:4, | shows | 121:11, 121:17, |
| $163: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 171: 9, \quad 173: 22, \\ & 174: 14, \quad 174: 24, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 15, \\ & 69: 21 . \\ & 65: 7 \end{aligned}$ | 122:10, 122:16, \|122:21, 206:4 |
| ship | 174:14, 174:24, | $69: 21,85: 7$ | $122: 21,206: 4$ |
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|  | $123: 18, \quad 129: 10$, $129: 11, \quad 129: 16$, $209: 8, \quad 210: 12$, $210: 24$ specifically $69: 6, \quad 78: 23$, $80: 2, \quad 80: 5$, $95: 4, \quad 110: 17$, $170: 16$ specimen $90: 13, \quad 90: 17$, $90: 22, \quad 91: 3$, $91: 14, \quad 144: 18$, $144: 23, \quad 179: 3$, $179: 4$ spectra $152: 12$ spectrum $75: 5, \quad 96: 7$, $96: 8, \quad 96: 19$, $151: 4$ spelled $93: 23, \quad 94: 8$, $166: 20$ spent $20: 18, \quad 89: 21$, $115: 9, \quad 159: 13$, $162: 15$ spite $115: 3$ spoke $186: 9, \quad 186: 17$ spoken $12: 13$, $46: 15: 10$, spot $67: 11, \quad 70: 23$ spouse $15: 3, \quad 109: 19$, $109: 20$ spring $159: 7$ square $20: 13, \quad 20: 15$, $49: 17, \quad 133: 14$, $168: 5, \quad 168: 7$, $172: 2, \quad 172: 4$, $172: 6, \quad 172: 7$, |  | ```72:15, 72:17, 80:9, 84:1, 84:12, 84:23, 141:18 standard 14:6, 116:10 standards 92:25 standing 53:20, 116:13 stands 64:16, 78:19, 80:21, 80:22, 80:25, 81:1, 81:6, 81:11, 81:18, 82:9, 83:16, 83:20, 83:22, 84:6, 84:14, 90:2, 90:5, 156:16 stargazing 29:18 stark 15:23, 96:11 start 7:23, 38:18, 86:22, 87:14, 114:14, 117:1 started 53:22 starting 109:11, 114:13 starts 142:19, 151:24, 154:8 state 6:17, 8:8, 14:25, 21:22, 27:16, 34:15, 49:6, 55:6, 61:10, 63:15, 64:8, 69:6, 72:9, 76:14, 76:17, 77:1, 77:4, 78:23, 92:25, 99:5, 110:17, 121:24, 133:4, 157:4,``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

PLANET DEPOS

Transcript of Hearing - Day 3
Conducted on March 2, 2022

| ```166:16, 191:17, 205:17 stated 26:8, 26:19, 71:14, 114:21 statement 46:10, 87:12, 92:22, 97:23, 98:8, 98:19, 99:12, 99:18, 119:16, 161:13 statements 8:5, 10:8, 10:13, 10:21, 14:22, 21:20, 27:14, 34:12, 49:3, 55:4, 61:5, 98:25, 157:1, 166:12 states 79:19, 80:5, 81:12, 82:9, 83:15, 94:24, 122:15, 139:10, 169:9, 186:4 statistics 179:13 statute 76:1, 77:4, 77:9, 116:23, 117:5, 122:15, 139:7, 143:2 statutorily 90:10 statutory 76:14, 77:2, 77:10, 139:9, 139:20 stay 15:13, 27:5, 32:2, 35:12, 48:10, 49:21, 148:10, 151:20, 201:3 staying 38:21, 122:18 steeman 133:13``` | ```steep 4:8, 64:12, 64:21, 67:7, 69:5, 69:7, 69:19, 69:22, 70:20, 70:24, 71:2, 71:3, 72:3, 72:4, 72:6, 73:1, 73:12, 73:25, 77:7, 78:19, 80:15, 84:22, 84:23, 86:5, 86:6, 86:21, 87:16, 89:18, 121:7, 121:19, 127:23, 136:22, 136:24, 137:3, 138:6, 161:21 steepest 138:4 stemann 69:11, 71:11, 72:20, 76:7 step 20:21 steps 41:25 stick 181:9 still 49:18, 58:9, 84:25, 99:12, 116:2, 119:15, 119:16, 157:10, 165:4, 206:15, 206:18, 206:23, 216:2 stock 36:4 stone 180:18, 190:15 stood 105:22 stop 27:21, 92:24, 205:22, 205:23 stopping 108:1``` | ```stops 106:13 store 20:13, 57:4 stories 30:11, 65:2 storm 78:6, 101:16, 102:23, 103:1, 177:11, 177:12, 208:2 storms 162:3 stormwater 78:16, 101:16, 101:19, 101:21, 101:23 story 44:8, 56:19 straight 31:25, 70:1, 105:25, 163:13 straightforward 71:18, 71:24, 131:9, 132:25 strategy 19:13, 76:16 streams 64:12, 64:20, 65:12, 77:6, 77:21, 82:12, 83:18 street 6:18, 9:10, 15:1, 15:5, 18:15, 21:22, 27:16, 27:17, 27:20, 28:3, 28:4, 29:16, 31:2, 31:4, 34:16, 46:6, 49:6, 55:6, 55:7, 55:8, 106:14, 112:4, 157:5, 157:7, 164:8, 184:21, 192:6, 202:19, 202:23, 217:16``` | ```streetlights 15:20, 163:9, 163:15, 163:19 streets 192:7 strict 102:12 strictly 139:19 strike 94:6 stringent 63:25, 64:3, 78:17, 108:23, 109:15, 110:7, 112:1 stroke 22:3 strong 39:4 strongly 209:11 struck 94:6 structurally 132:13 structure 63:24, 86:15, 93:14, 95:13, 108:23, 111:1, 132:9, 132:19, 147:17, 177:19, 211:11, 211:13, 211:17, 211:19, 212:1, 212:14, 212:24, 213:6, 215:2, 215:7, 215:17, 216:4 structures 77:16, 78:24, 79:7, 86:21 stuck 117:3, 117:10, 148:12 studied 62:11, 79:25, 118:25 studies 41:4``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| study | 95:10, 95:24, | summarize | surgery |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 23:22, 24:6, | 139:5, 140:9, | 192:17 | 58:6 |
| 173:22, 174:2, | 146:25, 147:23, | summarized | surmising |
| 174:15, 181:24, | 149:18, 151:12, | 63:15 | 196:24 |
| 183:9, 183:10, | 151:20, 152:18, | summary | surprise |
| 183:11, 184:8, | 152:23, 152:25 | 211:12, 213:4 | 145:19 |
| 184:15, 184:18, | subregions | summer | surprised |
| 185:10, 200:2, | 95:12 | 58:6 | 195:13, 212:19 |
| 200:7, 217:3 | substantial | summers | surprising |
| study's | 25:11, 63:6, | 159:13 | 32:15, 167:18 |
| 216:11 | 139:15, 169:25, | supervision | surrounding |
| stuff | 180:21, 188:24 | 51:14, 58:23 | 8:15, 17:6, |
| 31:6, 132:9, | substantially | supplemental | 22:16, 22:24, |
| 161:2, 212:11 | 24:22, 26:5, | 68:7, 74:14, | 24:15, 24:25, |
| stuffed | 79:18, 93:7, | 75:21 | 25:14, 26:8, |
| $31: 5$ | 183:4 | supplies | 34:23, 34:24, |
| subdivision | successful | 25:5 | 36:19, 41:24, |
| 83:1, 119:10, | 169:23 | supply | 42:1, 44:25, |
| 188:16 | sudden | 20:17, 187:7, | 46:2, 66:8, |
| subject | 160:21 | 187:12 | 93:1, 93:10, |
| 6:3, 105:3, | suffered | support | 167:22, 168:13, |
| 105:12, 106:8, | 22:3, 100:5 | 6:23, 13:3, | 170:10, 170:21, |
| 106:19, 193:4 | suffering | 32:16, 113:20, | 173:10, 176:22, |
| submission | 23:5 | 114:17, 156:14 | 177:3, 177:17, |
| 175:19, 214:1 | sufficient | supportable | 177:18, 188:13, |
| submit | 11:7, 26:9, | 24:1 | 189:14, 190:18, |
| 10:8, 10:13, | 75:22 | supposed | 192:5, 192:7 |
| 26:12, 64:9, | suggest | 121:17, 127:2, | survey |
| 72:7, 92:9, | 8:14, 39:16, | 131:11, 137:22, | $23: 22,23: 23,$ |
| 129:23, 132:10, | 42:17, 44:21, | 149:13, 179:3 | $127: 9$ |
| 137:2 | 53:12, 208:11, | sure | surveys |
| submitted | 211:19, 212:12, | 27:18, 28:11, | 173:14 |
| 9:19, 10:14, | 212:24 | 40:25, 45:3, | survive |
| 10:20, 69:15, | suggesting | 52:25, 63:1, | 144:7 |
| 69:18, 88:21, | 42:12, 126:19, | 75:1, 86:19, | surviving |
| 113:21, 114:18, | 139:18 | 88:3, 89:10, | 109:22, 109:24 |
| 120:2, 120:3, | suggestions | 91:24, 97:22, | susan |
| 120:4, 121:8, | 19:10, 170:2 | 102:13, 114:15, | 53:20 |
| 121:12, 128:18, | suggests | 117:9, 122:3, | susanne |
| 175:23, 176:5, | 122:17 | 126:13, 134:4, | 3:11, 61:13, |
| 189:5, 200:3, | suit | $152: 25,153: 8,$ | $63: 2, \quad 102: 14,$ |
| 208:13, 217:9 | 35:11 | 154:6, 161:24, | 178:20, 190:6, |
| subregion | suitable | 175:23, 179:25, | 197:10 |
| 4:5, 63:6, | 147:12 | 205:7, 208:20, | susannelee1@hotm- |
| 63:19, 76:12, | suite | 213:11, 217:15 | ail |
| 79:12, 92:23, | 2:9 | surface | 61:15 |
| 93:4, 93:17, | suites | 134:2 | sustain |
| 94:2, 94:22, | 35:15, 40:3 | surfaces | 31:16, 60:12 |
|  |  | 42:7, 79:8 |  |
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| sustained | 191:16, 201:1, | tassen | tend |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 84:19 | 201:7, 207:17, | 167:7 | 35:4, 35:14 |
| sustaining | 211:20, 211:24, | tastefully | tens |
| 51:15, 58:23 | 212:2, 215:5 | 57:10 | 162:15 |
| svb | taken | tax | tents |
| 70:22, 136:21, | 7:9, 41:25, | 192:5 | 101:15 |
| 137:3 | 56:13, 110:3, | taxpayers | term |
| swath | 173:14, 174:24, | 169:25 | 123:11 |
| 145:14 | 188:22, 202:12 | td5 | terms |
| swaths | taking | 113:17, 116:6 | 15:13, 37:1, |
| 93:15 | 36:2, 84:20, | teams | 118:22, 212:19, |
| swear | 97:25, 132:19, | 5:18, 89:16, | $214: 23$ |
| 34:9, 60:25 | 207:4, 216:16 | 196:15 | terrace |
| swimming | talk | tear | 184:6, 184:7 |
| 56:21, 148:21 | 35:23, 37:6, | 161:9 | terrible |
| switch | 49:19, 114:14, | tech | 56:2 |
| 91:23, 177:22 | 121:19, 122:19, | 156:14 | terrified |
| sworn | 138:8, 151:15, | technical | 31:12, 160:25 |
| 9:3 | 176:13, 178:8, | 123:11, 140:2, | test |
| symbol | 181:23, 197:4, | 143:12, 143:25, | $75: 11$ |
| $154: 8$ | 197:7, 209:5, | $164: 7,179: 3$ | testified |
| symbols | 209:6, 212:12 | techniques | 23:3, 24:12, |
| 154:20 | talked $30: 5, \quad 178: 20$ | $81: 3$ | 26:13, 26:14, |
| synagogue | 30:5, 178:20 talking | technological | $30: 22, \quad 31: 8,$ |
| $10: 23,178: 10,$ | $37: 6,49: 14,$ | $53: 1$ | $38: 19, \quad 121: 5,$ |
| $178: 11, \quad 180: 13$ |  | teenage | $123: 21, \quad 136: 4$ |
| synthesis | $\begin{aligned} & 49: 15, \quad 105: 12, \\ & 124: 24, \quad 140: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $22: 4$ | $\begin{aligned} & 144: 8, \quad 145: 10, \\ & 173: 18, \quad 174: 11 \end{aligned}$ |
| $111: 6$ | $\begin{aligned} & 124: 24, ~ 140: 12, \\ & 140: 22, \\ & 149: 7, \end{aligned}$ | telephonically | $\begin{aligned} & 173: 18, \\ & 188: 24, \\ & 198: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| T | $150: 16, \quad 153: 25,$ | 2:21 | $\begin{aligned} & 188: 24, ~ 198: 18, \\ & 198: 22, ~ 199: 24, \end{aligned}$ |
| table | $181: 6,181: 13,$ | telescope $29: 18$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{ll} 198: 22, & 199: 24, \\ 201: 20, & 201: 23 \end{array}\right.$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 68: 21, \quad 68: 22, \\ & 69: 8, \quad 137: 12, \end{aligned}$ | 181:18, 181:19, | tell | testifiers |
| 138:6, 138:7, | $\begin{aligned} & 183: 12, \quad 203: 10, \\ & 214: 6,216: 2, \end{aligned}$ | 33:22, 39:20, | $8: 25$ |
| $162: 25,175: 3$ | $\begin{array}{lll}214: 6, & 216.2, \\ 216: 316: 4\end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 43: 16, \quad 47: 21, \\ & 56: 6, \quad 82: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { testify } \\ & 6: 7,6: 9,7: 11, \end{aligned}$ |
| take $6: 9,7: 22,$ | talks | 86:3, 88:14, | 7:14, 7:16, |
| 23:15, 30:15, | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 123:20, 142:10 } \\ & \text { tall } \end{aligned}$ | 103:10, 135:17, | 11:16, 27:9, |
| 51:4, 53:12, | $180: 3, \quad 180: 4$ | 135:20, 140:4, | 32:18, $44: 25$, |
| 53:19, 53:25, | tap | 141:10, 155:5, | 53:18, 54:8, $60: 20, \quad 83: 8$ |
| 54:13, 69:3, | 163:25 | $\begin{array}{ll} 170: 12, & 176: 6, \\ 177: 25, & 178: 3, \end{array}$ | $97: 21, \quad 97: 23,$ |
| 71:21, 91:15, | tara | $187: 3,191: 22,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 91: 21, \\ & 98: 2, ~ 99: 20, \end{aligned}$ |
| 97:4, 114:8, | 35:9, 41:15, | $206: 7$ | 189:1, 198:9, |
| 117:8, 117:18, 117:19, 132:8, | 41:18, 42:13, | telling | 198:13 |
| $132: 10,133: 2 \text {, }$ | 42:16, 42:21, | 214:12 | testifying |
| $137: 25, \quad 157: 13$ | 49:15 | temporary | 27:5, 37:20, |
| 179:17, 180:3, | targeted | 86:12 | 37:23, 42:16, |
| 179:17, 180:3, | 95:4 | ten | 44:23, 73:6, |
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| ```119:7, 133:13, 173:5, 197:22, 198:24 testimony 3:3, 5:16, 6:2, 6:5, 14:3, 14:4, 14:15, 25:6, 28:23, 33:6, 37:15, 41:9, 41:13, 44:6, \(44: 21,45: 7\), 46:19, 46:25, 47:1, 51:2, 53:25, 54:4, 54:16, 55:16, 58:2, 58:10, 61:19, 62:16, 63:11, 65:14, 69:12, 75:19, 76:21, 88:19, 90:13, 98:1, 107:9, 120:18, 136:10, 170:23, 171:15, 189:5, 191:10, 191:11, 192:23, 200:11, 200:12, 201:23, 203:14, 204:3, 204:9, 208:4, 209:15, 210:16 text 110:6, 114:5, 168:4 texting 114:8 th 62:22, 159:20 thanks 91:19, 114:7, 136:18, 161:12 that'd 178:15 themselves 5:5, 10:9 therefore 59:19, 94:16, 193:10 thin 180:23``` | $\begin{aligned} & \text { thing } \\ & 6: 17,7: 2, \\ & 11: 1,28: 8, \\ & 44: 1, \quad 45: 9, \\ & 66: 17, \quad 68: 11, \\ & 68: 18,73: 10, \\ & 122: 2,125: 1, \\ & 149: 20,156: 12, \\ & 158: 5,165: 2, \\ & 172: 19,175: 19, \\ & 180: 7,187: 20, \\ & 191: 20,192: 16, \\ & 196: 25,203: 1, \\ & 204: 8,205: 20, \\ & 208: 22,211: 10 \\ & \text { things } \\ & 5: 15,5: 17, \\ & 6: 21,13: 24, \\ & 42: 8,43: 22, \\ & 47: 9,57: 14, \\ & 132: 25,134: 22, \\ & 164: 6,174: 24, \\ & 175: 10, \quad 203: 20, \\ & 204: 10, \quad 205: 6, \\ & 209: 13, \quad 215: 1, \\ & 216: 2 \\ & \text { thinking } \\ & 149: 20 \\ & \text { third, } \\ & 30: 8,63: 24, \\ & 87: 1,87: 2, \\ & 108: 12,108: 19, \\ & 152: 4,154: 8, \\ & 175: 17 \\ & \text { thoroughfare } \\ & 149: 11 \\ & \text { thoroughfares } \\ & 95: 14 \\ & \text { thought } \\ & 8: 24, \quad 76: 23, \\ & 88: 20,126: 6, \\ & 129: 23,136: 4, \\ & 189: 1,207: 4, \\ & 209: 25,210: 1 \\ & \text { thoughtfulness } \\ & 21: 6 \\ & \text { thoughts } \\ & 34: 24,117: 23, \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| ```33:25, 110:3, 117:24, 172:1, 201:3, 211:25, 215:10 told 51:12, 97:19, 97:20, 186:12, 195:13 took 10:6, 36:7, 85:4, 160:23, 161:1, 192:4 top 6:7, 18:12, 52:7, 67:19, 68:6, 82:20, 83:11, 120:19, 122:17, 141:11, 159:3, 162:24, 163:3, 191:24, 201:25 topic 201:12 topo 107:1, 202:17, 202:18, 205:10 topography 128:14, 129:8 total 43:7, 130:16, 151:4 totaling 65:3 totally 89:8, 102:19, 114:23, 174:9, 190:19 touch 29:14 touches 71:1, 138:22 toured 115:8 towards 66:11, 172:9 town 19:23, 20:19, 102:9, 105:19,``` |  | ```31:21, 31:24, 32:2, 35:3, 35:6, 36:23, 37:1, 41:4, 56:2, 56:16, 57:1, 57:16, 168:9, 173:4, 173:7, 173:11, 173:12, 173:16, 173:22, 174:3, 174:5, 174:11, 174:15, 174:24, 190:2, 193:14, 200:2, 200:7, 206:24, 208:9, 208:12, 216:11, 217:3 tragic 16:10 trail 79:6, 162:4, 162:6 trails 56:12, 79:2, 159:16 transaction 186:10 transcribed 1:25, 218:4 transcriber 218:1 transcript 3:2, 11:3, 218:3 transcripts 200:20 transfer 209:14, 211:23 transferred 13:16, 192:9 transit 205:21 transport 96:14, 96:21 transportation 19:4, 174:23 trash 190:10``` |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| triangle | 62:24, 77:16, | 17:13, 20:19, | tzedek |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 158:11 | 92:8, 92:11, | $30: 10,36: 22$, | 11:7 |
| tributaries | 99:11, 102:21, | 38:7, 47:8, | U |
| 77:22 | 146:3, 151:19, | 64:20, 90:5, | uh-huh |
| tributary | 151:20, 152:13, | 96:4, 105:8, | 136:11 |
| 85:7, 89:3, | 188:10, 211:14, | 105:18, 109:13, | ultimately |
| 135:9 | 216:14 | 109:14, 115:9, | $210: 25$ |
| tried | trying | 119:10, 123:21, | unable |
| 10:7, 53:7, | $6: 6,17: 14$, $31: 12,44: 14$, | $\begin{aligned} & 135: 6, \quad 140: 5, \\ & 142: 17, \quad 144: 19, \end{aligned}$ | 19:25 |
| 62:22, 110:9, | $31: 12, ~ 44: 14$, $51: 24$, $52: 15$, | $\begin{aligned} & 142: 17, \\ & 1484: 19, \\ & 148: 21, \end{aligned}$ | unacceptable |
| 147:15, 147:16, | $51: 24,52: 15,$ | 148:21, 156:2, | 101:13 |
| 196:3, 201:12, | $53: 13,82: 5,$ |  | unavoidable |
| 207:3 | 89:15, 92:9, | 164:9, 168:3, | 79:3 |
| trigger | 92:12, 106:21, |  | unbelievable |
| $91: 3,125: 7$ triplex | $\begin{aligned} & 117: 6, \quad 154: 24, \\ & 162: 15, \quad 172: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 173: 19, ~ 178: 23, \\ & 183: 2,192: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 24:1, 106:3 |
| 176:10, 177:10, | 195:14 | 195:6, 195:7, | uncertain |
| $177: 12$ | turn | 195:17, 209:1, | 15:13 |
| triplexes | 31:4, 31:25, | 213:8, 213:9, | uncertainty |
| 149:12, 175:5, | $\begin{array}{ll} 32: 1, & 33: 15, \\ 34: 3, & 48: 18, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 213: 13, ~ 213: 17, \\ & 214: 2,214: 3, \end{aligned}$ | uncle |
| $180: 25,181: 11$ trips | $\begin{aligned} & 34: 3, \quad 48: 18, \\ & 51: 24, \quad 52: 10, \end{aligned}$ | 214:2, $214: 3$, $215: 1, ~ 215: 24$, | 22:3 |
| 16:20, 174:3 | 52:15, 59:11, | 216:21, 217:6, | unclear |
| true | 61:12, 69:4, | 217:10 | 109:6 |
| 218:3 | 98:7, 98:15, | two-acre | undeniable |
| truly | 166:5, 171:7, | 29:7 | 23:3 |
| 102:2 | 186:22, 214:1 | two-lane | under |
| trunks | turnaround | 23:5 | 6:2, 8:4, 12:9, |
| 164:18 | 215:24, 216:7 | two-part | 14:21, 21:19, |
| trust | turned | 19:14 | $\begin{array}{ll} 27: 13, & 34: 11, \\ 39: 22, & 39: 23, \end{array}$ |
| 11:21 | 89:10, 102:20, | two-story $172: 20$ | 45:23, 49:2, |
| truth | turning | two-week | 55:3, 61:4, |
| 8:5, 8:6, | $16: 3,30: 24,$ | 216:7 | 67:6, 68:19, |
| 14:22, 14:23, |  | ty | 68:21, 70:21, |
| 21:20, 21:21, | $89: 23,122: 24,$ | 25:2, 32:17, | 72:11, 74:2, |
| 27:14, 27:15, | $139: 23$ | $41: 17, \quad 50: 16,$ | 80:6, 98:25, |
| 34:12, 34:13, | turns |  | 103:4, 110:10, |
| 49:3, 49:4, | 69:2, 163:18 | 154:9, 155:7, | 110:12, 110:16, |
| 55:4, 55:5, | 69:2, 163:18 tv | $155: 9, \quad 155: 11,$ | 112:10, 116:11, |
| 61:5, 61:6, | 57:21 | 204:8 | 117:5, 127:3, |
| 99:1, $99: 2$, $157: 1, ~ 157: 2$, | twelfth | types | 131:11, 136:21, |
| $157: 1,157: 2$, $166: 13,173: 9$ | $185: 2$ | 125:16, 127:11, | 139:8, 154:15, |
| 166:13, 173:9 try | two | $155: 3$ | 156:25, 166:11, |
| try $6: 13, ~ 7: 14$, | 6:21, 10:21, | typical | 178:8, 178:13, |
| 14:8, 23:19, | 13:24, 14:18, | 204:6, 210:2 | 199:17 |
| 32:5, 53:12, | 15:20, 16:12, | tzadek | underground |
| 53:14, 54:25, | 16:19, 17:10, | 10:23 | 101:10, 101:14 |
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| underline | unimaginable | unstable | 146:21, 148:3, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 163:25 | 16:7 | 77:15 | 148:24, 149:3, |
| underlying | unique | unsuitable | 149:15, 149:22, |
| 117:8 | 63:5, 114:22, | 123:24 | 149:23, 159:2, |
| underneath | 158:24 | untenable | 159:22, 160:6, |
| 128:19 | unit | 19:2 | 167:21, 167:25, |
| underscore | 41:21, 109:16, | until | 169:11, 169:15, |
| 36:14 | 110:4, 111:12, | 29:3, 54:12, | 169:18, 172:21, |
| understand | 113:17, 115:16, | 100:4, 116:22, | 172:23, 172:24, |
| 9:17, 11:20, | 116:13, 124:11, | 118:5, 118:7, | 175:6, 176:11, |
| 11:21, 23:22, | 154:8 | 121:7, 121:12, | 193:4, 193:5, |
| 30:10, 36:14, | units | 163:20, 217:14 | 193:11, 195:23, |
| 40:21, 41:11, | 4:4, 13:9, | untouched | 196:18, 199:7, |
| 42:5, 42:9, | 16:18, 32:15, | 164:24 | 199:9, 199:15, |
| 44:2, 50:22, | 38:11, 38:23, | unusual | 199:18, 201:15, |
| 106:17, 125:18, | 39:11, 51:9, | 19:17, 31:21, | 205:21, 207:7, |
| 154:6, 162:18, | 58:15, 65:2, | 46:23 | 210:14 |
| 174:4, 174:5, | 65:3, 95:25, | updated | uses |
| 190:9, 194:13, | 96:1, 96:3, | 205:16, 205:19, | 40:13, 79:2, |
| 206:16 | 110:2, 111:11, | 206:4 | 146:25, 147:21, |
| understanding | 115:4, 116:8, | uprooting | 159:22, 193:10 |
| 12:8, 154:7, | 116:9, 148:4, | 162:12 | using |
| 155:13, 172:23, | 148:11, 149:8, | urban | 11:7, 23:11, |
| 173:1 | 151:1, 151:4, | 184:25 | 52:24, 129:20, |
| understood | 151:5, 151:13, | urgent | 139:3, 190:13 |
| 146:19, 167:24, | 152:13, 152:17, | 189:8 | usual |
| 209:16, 216:18 | $\begin{aligned} & 153: 2, \quad 176: 6, \\ & 176: 10, \quad 203: 25, \end{aligned}$ | usable | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 111:2 } \\ & \text { usually } \end{aligned}$ |
| understory | $\begin{aligned} & 176: 10,203: 25, \\ & 211: 23 \end{aligned}$ | $204: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { usually } \\ & 82: 10,83: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| $178: 3$ | 211:23 unknown | use | $82: 10,83: 17,$ $139: 1$ |
| undisputed | 36:13 | 5:24, 6:1, | utility |
| $\begin{aligned} & 65: 15, \\ & 67: 25, \\ & 68: 11, \end{aligned}$ | unless | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll} 19: 12, & 20: 5, \\ 22: 15, & 23: 8, \end{array}\right.$ | 79:5 |
| 80:8, 80:13, | 5:23, 110:23, | $23: 18,24: 15,$ | V |
| $\begin{aligned} & 132: 1 \\ & \text { undoubtably } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { 198:8, } 207: 18 \\ & \text { unplug } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 26: 20, & 35: 2, \\ 35: 17, & 53: 7, \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { vacant } \\ & 115: 24, \quad 116: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 19:5 | $38: 16$ | $64: 6,64: 10,$ | vacation |
| unequivocally | unprecedented | $64: 11,65: 8,$ | 174:1 |
| 144:1 | $35: 25, \quad 209: 18$ | 65:9, 69:10, | valid |
| unfathomable | unquote | 79:15, 79:17, | 206:17, 206:23 |
| 23:24 | 93:22 | 80:13, 89:15, | valley |
| unfolds | unsafe | 90:3, 90:12, | 64:12, 64:18, |
| $51: 2$ | $\begin{array}{lr} 23: 19, & 123: 14, \\ 123 \cdot 23 & 162 \cdot 22 \end{array}$ | $91: 4, \quad 91: 12,$ | $64: 21,65: 10,$ |
| unfortunate $197: 16$ | $\begin{aligned} & 123: 23, ~ 162: 22 \\ & \text { unsigned } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 92: 12, & 93: 1, \\ 96: 21, & 108: 20, \end{array}$ | $65: 25, \quad 66: 4$ |
| unfortunately | $122: 10$ | $109: 2, \quad 109: 8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 66: 6, \quad 66: 8, \\ & 66: 13, \quad 67: 5, \end{aligned}$ |
| 33:24, 68:3, | unsound | 110:11, 111:14, | 68:20, 68:25, |
| $117: 21,187: 17,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 132: 13 \\ & \text { unspeakablv } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 132: 6, \quad 132: 14, \\ & 146: 17, \quad 146: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 70:23, 70:24, |
| 188:24, 200:14 | $103: 2$ | 146.17, 146.18, |  |
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| 71:1, 71:4, | vast | 55:24, 93:19, | volunteers |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 71:25, 72:5, | 10:19 | 95:23, 96:22, | 198:14 |
| 72:12, 72:25, | vegetable | 109:1, 111:22, | W |
| 74:7, 74:9, | 29:16 | 112:3, 148:21, | waged |
| $75: 22,78: 15$, | vehemently | $150: 9$ | 89:19 |
| 78:19, 80:8, | 15:13, 36:7 | vinyl | wait |
| 85:16, 85:17, | vehicles | 180:10, 180:11, | 27:21, 32:2, |
| 85:23, 85:24, | 9:13, 16:11, | 180:19, 190:15 | 34:9, 40:20, |
| 86:14, 87:1, | 24:20, 24:22, | violate | 54:1, 54:12, |
| 87:14, 89:25, | 31:14, 31:23, | 63:13, 63:18, | 120:10, 126:5, |
| 130:11, 130:16, | 163:11, 163:14 | 76:9, 77:8 | 160:10, 196:9, |
| 131:10, 131:25, | vernal | violates | 216:5 |
| 132:11, 133:1, | 86:17 | 79:11 | waiting |
| $133: 4, ~ 133: 7$, $133: 8, ~ 133: 15$, | version | violating | 41:6, 156:6, |
| $133: 8,133: 15$, $134: 6, ~ 134: 12$, | $92: 11, ~ 93: 23, ~$ $94.2, ~ 121: 8$ | 64:7, 96:16 violation | 200:1 |
| 134:14, 134:16, | 94:2, versions | 68:16 | walk |
| 135:1, 135:2, | 94:8 | violations | $\begin{array}{ll} 19: 6, & 24: 15, \\ 24: 18 . & 31: 9 \end{array}$ |
| 135:4, 135:7, | versus | 111:8, 117:7 | $49: 20, \quad 56: 14,$ |
| 135:8, 135:16, | 41:5, 111:3, | virginia | $160: 24, \quad 174: 19$ |
| 136:5, 136:8, | 176:23, 177:5, | 189:3, 191:18 | walked |
| 136:9, 136:22, | 189:14, 192:20 | virtually | 159:15, 161:21 |
| 146:3, 162:13, | via | 114:23, 115:20 | walking |
| 165:13, 203:16, | 97:1 | visible | 19:24, 31:13, |
| 204:11, 204:15 | vice | 9:12, 26:16, | 56:11, 96:15, |
| valleys | 61:22, 63:2 | 57:12, 164:22 | 96:22 |
| 79:9 | vicinity | vision | wall |
| valuable | 22:1 | 169:23 | 177:16, 190:15, |
| 44:7 | vick | visit 62.21 | 190:16, 203:23 |
| value | \|victorian | visited | walls |
| 36:10, 36:18, | 116:2 | $115: 7$ | 97:2 <br> wandering |
| 42:1, 42:14, | victorian-style | visiting | wandering $\text { \| } 151: 24$ |
| 42:19, 43:21, | $116: 3$ | $9: 14$ | 151:24 <br> want |
| $45: 24,45: 25$ | victory | visitors | want $6: 8,11$, |
| values | 184:6, 184:7 | 163:13 | 10:9, 12:1, |
| $36: 9,36: 15$ | video | visual | 15:7, 15:11, |
| 41:18, 42:17, | 7:20, 52:13, | 7:3, 202:8, | 15:12, 23:2, |
| 44:22, 44:24, | 54:8 | 202:18 | 24:17, 29:4, |
| 44:25, 45:4, | view | voir | 35:20, 36:23, |
| 45:8, 45:12, | 41:16, 101:25, | 46:12 | 37:21, 41:1, |
| 45:16 | 161:5, 161:6, | volume | 42:25, 45:8, |
| variance | 161:16, 164:14, | 16:13, 23:20, | 45:17, 46:15, |
| 90:11 | 173:4, 201:24, | 32:7, 186:22 | 48:15, 50:1, |
| varieties | 202:19, 202:23 | volunteer | 53:12, 53:19, |
| 20:18 | views | 45:22 | 55:14, 56:14, |
| various | 177:20 | volunteering | 65:16, 80:22, |
| 29:10, 196:15 | village | 62:9 |  |
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| 85:5, $88: 4$, $91: 22, \quad 94: 14$, $97: 10, \quad 107: 11$, $111: 4, \quad 117: 18$, $117: 23, \quad 119: 25$, $130: 12, \quad 141: 18$, $145: 3, \quad 146: 16$, $148: 3, \quad 148: 6$, $148: 8, \quad 148: 12$, $151: 18, \quad 153: 15$, $154: 6, \quad 170: 25$, $171: 1, \quad 177: 13$, $182: 8, \quad 186: 22$, $187: 6, \quad 194: 18$, $207: 1, \quad 209: 8$, $211: 24, \quad 212: 10$, $214: 11, \quad 215: 3$ wanted $8: 14, \quad 11: 15$, $13: 23, \quad 14: 10$, $14: 17, \quad 55: 15$, $67: 15, \quad 67: 25$, $68: 4, \quad 69: 10$, $70: 19, \quad 74: 4$, $87: 8, \quad 87: 10$, $94: 13, \quad 129: 22$, $144: 17, \quad 150: 18$, $161: 22, \quad 172: 19$, $200: 19$ wants $215: 21$ warehouse $20: 13$ warranting $113: 22$ washed $89: 8, \quad 162: 2$, $162: 21$ washington $22: 8$ wasted $169: 25$ watched $105: 23$ watching $156: 21$ water $42: 7, \quad 62: 3$, |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| $144: 9,203: 12$ wetland $75: 13,124: 12$ wetlands $64: 23,66: 11$, $74: 24,75: 7$, $75: 8,77: 3$, $77: 9,86: 2$, $86: 3,86: 4$, $86: 16,203: 16$ whatever $16: 8,126: 8$, $148: 6,216: 20$ whatsoever $145: 4,186: 10$ whelming $167: 18$ whenever $120: 23, \quad 208: 24$ whereas $124: 24,177: 2$ whereby $42: 9$ whether $14: 6,14: 7$, $14: 14,14: 15$, $41: 16,42: 19$, $44: 23,47: 14$, $57: 3,60: 5$, $60: 7,71: 12$, $71: 22,73: 2$, $73: 5,73: 6$, $74: 6,82: 20$, $82: 21,83: 7$, $94: 17,111: 20$, $121: 20,126: 23$, $131: 18,132: 16$, $137: 14,138: 1$, $138: 12,152: 6$, $153: 3,153: 6$, $189: 7,189: 8$, $202: 6,203: 9$, $206: 8,206: 9$, $211: 3,211: 20$ whoever $37: 5,143: 16$ whole $8: 6,14: 23$, | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 21, \quad 27: 15, \\ & 32: 1, \quad 34: 13, \\ & 34: 25, \quad 49: 4, \\ & 55: 5, \quad 55: 14, \\ & 61: 6, \quad 83: 9, \\ & 87: 3, \quad 99: 1, \\ & 102: 10,102: 15, \\ & 142: 18, \quad 148: 22, \\ & 149: 24, \quad 150: 13, \\ & 152: 5, \quad 157: 2, \\ & 159: 14, \quad 160: 15, \\ & 166: 13, \quad 181: 9 \\ & \text { wide } \\ & 68: 24, \quad 69: 2, \\ & 69: 3,132: 9, \\ & 161: 23, \quad 188: 15, \\ & 205: 25 \\ & \text { wider } \\ & 161: 20 \\ & \text { widow } \\ & 109: 21, \quad 109: 24 \\ & \text { widower } \\ & 109: 21, \quad 109: 24 \\ & \text { width } \\ & 69: 8, \quad 137: 4, \\ & 138: 7, \quad 161: 23 \\ & \text { wife } \\ & 9: 5,49: 16, \\ & 194: 23 \\ & \text { wildlife } \\ & 29: 19, \quad 30: 4, \\ & 30: 6,57: 24 \\ & \text { willett } \\ & 112: 9, \quad 112: 16 \\ & \text { willing } \\ & 62: 23, \quad 102: 8, \\ & 102: 10 \\ & \text { win } \\ & 42: 9 \\ & \text { window } \\ & 87: 2,163: 4, \\ & 183: 16, \quad 208: 25 \\ & \text { windows } \\ & 161: 17 \\ & \text { winter } \\ & 86: 17 \\ & \text { wisconsin } \\ & 2: 9 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | $168: 2, \quad 168: 8$, $175: 9, \quad 209: 12$, $216: 15$ witness $8: 16, \quad 37: 9$, $38: 15, \quad 41: 10$, $48: 10, \quad 53: 13$, $60: 5, \quad 60: 11$, $97: 16, \quad 123: 21$, $156: 4, \quad 165: 23$, $166: 3, \quad 200: 11$ witnesses $3: 3, \quad 11: 15$, $53: 19, \quad 156: 2$, $156: 5, \quad 198: 5$, $201: 22$ won $115: 22$ wonder $41: 3, \quad 158: 17$ wondered $89: 5, \quad 144: 20$, $144: 21, \quad 151: 15$ wonderful $107: 14, \quad 107: 15$ wondering $27: 9, \quad 38: 8$, $202: 24, \quad 203: 8$, $211: 2$ woods $201: 21, \quad 201: 24$, $205: 7$ word $141: 18, \quad 164: 7$ work $9: 25, \quad 22: 5$, $22: 11, \quad 24: 2$, $30: 16, \quad 42: 10$, $115: 9, \quad 205: 5$, $208: 17, \quad 211: 24$, $212: 25, \quad 215: 10$ worked $29: 6, \quad 75: 6$, $87: 19, \quad 88: 24$, $191: 17, \quad 208: 2$ workers $96: 14$ working $6: 20, \quad 9: 23$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 24:6, 60:16, | 200:6, 208:24, | 28:24, 31:20, | zoned |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 62:3, 62:6, | 211:16, 215:16 | $36: 6,39: 12$, | 34:25, 42:4, |
| 79:4, 98:9, | wrong | 43:23, 49:13, | 43:15, 44:1, |
| 170:8, 191:18, | 27:7, 97:19, | 56:23, 58:19, | 112:5, 199:5, |
| 210:17 | 97:20, 103:13, | 61:24, 62:2, | 199:8 |
| works | 146:18, 172:22, | 62:9, 78:7, | zones |
| 22:8, 62:20, | 173:1, 202:19 | 89:19, 96:4, | 90:16, 90:17, |
| 98:18, 108:9, | wssc | 102:6, 109:18, | 145:5 |
| 117:9 | 77:23, 162:7 | 109:21, 110:4, | zoning |
| world | wssd | 110:13, 110:23, | 1:1, 2:2, 13:2, |
| 110:24, 165:8 | 164:1 | 111:12, 111:24, | 13:8, 14:11, |
| wormald | Y | 112:11, 112:19, | 14:16, 20:24, |
| 11:23, 12:5, | yard | $\begin{array}{ll}113: 13, & 115: 3, \\ 115: 14, & 115: 17,\end{array}$ | 50:13, $50: 15$, |
| 95:6, 147:4, | $29: 15, \quad 158: 12$ | 115:14, 115:17, | 61:25, 63:7, |
| 194:21, 197:24 | $160: 16,177: 19,$ | $115: 24, ~ 118: 17$, $147: 15,151: 2$, | 79:17, 92:25, |
| worries | $178: 1,178: 9$ | 147:15, 151:2, | 93:6, 95:5, |
| 19:1 | $195: 10$ |  | 95:19, 102:5, |
| worry | yards | $\begin{aligned} & 159: 23, ~ 160: 1, \\ & 160: 4, ~ 161: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 110: 6, \quad 113: 16, \\ & 113: 20, \quad 114: 17, \end{aligned}$ |
| 19:1 worst | 91:14 | $168: 3, \quad 168: 12,$ | $115: 11, \quad 116: 5,$ |
| 113:2 | Yeah $18.2,18: 10$, | 170:14, 178:24, | 139:12, 139:14, |
| worth | $37: 16,47: 13,$ | 179:4, 179:17, | 168:3, 168:8, |
| 207:5 | 47:23, 59:25, | 180:3, 183:9, | 173:5, 183:22, |
| wouldn't | $69: 3,76: 4,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 183: 10, \quad 183: 16, \\ & 184: 7 . \quad 184: 18 . \end{aligned}$ | 184:14, 184:22, |
| 57:11, 65:20, | 76:25, 77:12, | $\begin{aligned} & 184: 7, \quad 184: 18, \\ & 187: 15, \quad 206: 12, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 185: 2, \quad 199: 17 \\ & 210: 1 \end{aligned}$ |
| 67:17, 69:23, | 80:23, 83:2, | $206: 14$ | zoom |
| $75: 2,118: 5$, $121: 14, ~ 151: 8$, | 100:17, 101:5, | yellow | $28: 11,68: 5 \text {, }$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}121: 14, ~ & 151: 8, \\ 180: 22, ~ 196: 20,\end{array}$ | 108:10, 120:12, | 66:23 | $89: 16, \quad 97: 8,$ |
| $180: 22, ~ 196: 20$, $196: 22, ~ 204: 20$, | 141:2, 141:13, | yeses | $104: 6$ |
| 204:24 | $150: 13, \quad 150: 14$ | 154:23 | \$ |
| wouldn't | 150:25, 152:19, | yesterday | \$10,000 |
| 106:18 | 152:20, 152:24, | 46:18, 68:9, | 102:24 |
| wrap | 153:22, 167:11, | $\begin{array}{ll} 161: 21, & 183: 20, \\ 184: 19, & 207: 22 \end{array}$ | \$150,000 |
| 188:10 | 178:19, 192:1, | 184:19, 207:22 yourself | 115:5 |
| write | 195:8, 196:8, | yourself $46: 24$ | \$2 |
| 186:7, 211:10, | 203:7, 212:22 | 46:24 | 111:17 |
| 211:18 | year | Z | \$200, 050, 000 |
| writers | 77:6, 115:4, | zero | 185:24 |
| 143:8 | 144:19, 152:3, | 39:24 | \$200, 695,000 |
| writing | 159:14, 178:6, | zone | 185:19 |
| 73:19, 169:10, | 178:14 | 12:24, 90:25, | \$227 |
| 169:13, 211:1, | year-old | 91:8, 96:13, | 185:24 |
| 211:17 | 22:3, 183:25 | 117:8, 144:1, | \$293 |
| written | year-round | 144:13, 148:24, | 185:18 |
| 11:3, 75:19, | 179:5 | 149:16, 179:12, | \$299 |
| 83:5, 124:21, | years | $203: 24$ | 185:19 |
| 158:20, 189:5, | 22:5, 22:6, |  |  |
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| \$60,000 | $\begin{aligned} & 180: 18, \quad 183: 16, \\ & 190: 15, \quad 201: 3, \\ & 201: 8 \\ & 100 \end{aligned}$ | 11010$9: 5$11021$157: 7, \quad 159: 1$ | $\begin{aligned} & 80: 5, \quad 81: 17, \\ & 82: 4, \quad 82: 8, \\ & 82: 17, \quad 83: 15, \\ & 112: 18, \quad 139: 23, \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89:21 |  |  |  |
| . |  |  |  |
| . 00 |  |  |  |
| 119:20 | 15:14, 16:19, | 111 | 140:5, 140:25, |
| . 01 | 25:7, 69:2, | 95:25 | 167:17, 184:7 |
| 119:20 | 69:3, 77:6, | 113 | 13,000 |
| . 05 | 96:7, 138:1, | 4:11, 4:12, | 185:16 |
| 119:20 | 138:5, 138:18, | 4:13, 169:1, | 130 |
| 0 | 187:11 | 171:7, 191:21, | $\begin{aligned} & 4: 10, \quad 95: 25, \\ & 174: 13 \end{aligned}$ |
| 00 | 112:4 | 114 | 1300 |
| 27:9, 118:5 | 10029 | 4:15, 4:16, | 2:11 |
| 001 | 112: 4 | 9:19, 10:2, | 131 |
| 129:14 | 10125 | 10:15, 10:19, | 186:1 |
| 01 | 55:9 | 18:5, 18:8, | 1386 |
| 1:5, 54:18 | 103 | 157:14, 167:2 | 113:4, 114:25 |
| 01.06 | 3:24 | 116 | 1396 |
| 129:14 | 105 | 67:9, 67:10, | 114:24 |
| 05 | 65:3 | 123:19, 125:7, | 14 |
| 201:8 | 108 | 125:10, 125:13, | 56:19, 92:1, |
| 06 | 3:11 | 125:20, 125:23, | 94:20, 144:14 |
| 54:22 | 10800 | 126:4, 126:5, | 140 |
| 08 | 15:3 | 126:6, 126:14, | 4:5, 96:6 |
| 99:8 | 10811 | 155:11 | 147 |
| 09 | 166:19 | 117 | 70:3, 70:10, |
| 54:18 | 10820 | 177:11 | $70: 11,70: 16$, |
| 1 | $\begin{aligned} & 27: 19 \\ & 10827 \end{aligned}$ | 1170 | 70:22, 136:5 |
| 1 |  | 94:20 | 149 |
| 118:6, 118:7, | 183:18, 185:11, | 12 | 70:3 |
| 118:12 | 185:14 | 94:24, 107:25, | 15 |
| 1.02 | 10828 | 112:7, 114:9, | 3:5, 62:2, |
| $130: 6,130: 7,$ | $22: 1,46: 4$ | $114: 10,118: 12$ | $64: 13, \quad 67: 12,$ |
| $130: 8, \quad 130: 20$ | $10901$ | $182: 4,201: 9,$ | $72: 4,73: 25$ |
| $1.20$ | $190: 13$ | 202:1 | 92:1, 113:6, |
| 130:16 | $10905$ | 12,000 | 118:17, 123:24, |
| 10 | $34: 17$ | $\begin{aligned} & 181: 11 \\ & 120 \end{aligned}$ | $124: 6,124: 25,$ |
| $4: 16,40: 2$, | 11 | $120$ | 125:3, 126:15, |
| 53:25, 54:13, | 27:9, 54:13, | 101:10 | 180:3, 208:24, |
| 54:18, 54:22, | 54:22, 123:14, | 1200 | $208: 25$ |
| 64:17, 64:18, | 123:20, 123:23, | 115: 6 | 150 |
| 65:1, 85:23, | 124:5, 124:24, | 1201 | 4:3, 70:2, |
| 89:19, 90:13, | 126:13, 127:4, | 119:9 | $70: 6,70: 9$, |
| 91:5, 124:14, | 127:6, 144:14 | 128 | 70:17, 70:18, |
| 144:14, 171:1, | 11005 | 90:10 | 136:6, 136:16, |
| 176:25, 177:1, | 49:9 | 12900 | 136:17, 136:21, |
|  | 11007 | 61:13 | 138:1 |
|  | 99:7, 101:3 | 13 | 150,000 |
|  |  | 10:20, 79:19, | 168: 4 |
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| 157 | 1988 | 2018 | 44:12, 151:25, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3:13 | 115:3 | 56:23, 119:8, | 172:20 |
| 160 | 1991 | 194:22 | 240 |
| 177:10, 177:12 | 113:23, 114:19 | 2019 | 96:3 |
| 161 | 1995 | 29:3, 29:7, | 241 |
| 218:12 | 127:9 | 120:1, 120:5, | 95:24 |
| 166 | 1 c | 128:7, 167:19, | 25 |
| 3:14 | 125:25, 155:7 | 168:2, 168:15, | 22:5, 22:6, |
| 167 | 2 | 173:19, 175:14, | 67:12, 70:21, |
| 179:20 | 2 | 175:16, 187:21, | 72:4, 74:1, |
| 168 | $81: 4$ | 195:17, 205:18 | 124:6, 161:23, |
| 179:19 | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 81: 4 \\ & 2-a c r e \end{aligned}\right.$ | $2020$ | 186:3 |
| 169 | $15: 17,25: 13,$ | $168: 24,184: 24,$ | 2500 |
| 4:11 | $187: 5$ | $185: 13,185: 19,$ | $181: 4$ |
| 17 | 2.4 | $186: 2$ | $26$ |
| 3:18, 8:18, | 185:14 | 2021 | 69:14 |
| 113:23, 114:19, | 20 | 167:19, 183:3, | 2695 |
| 185:19 | 10:20, 28:24, | 195:20 | 186:5 |
| 170 | $89: 24, \quad 90: 1,$ | 2022 | 27 |
| 179:19 | $90: 5, \quad 91: 2$ | 1:12, 218:13 | 3:7, 107:25, |
| 171 | $151: 1,151: 2$ | $2050$ | 130:15, 144:14, |
| 4:12, 179:19, | 163:2, 172:7, | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 186: 6 \\ & 206 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $\begin{aligned} & 182: 4 \\ & 28 \end{aligned}$ |
| 179:23, 179:24 | $179: 17, \quad 180: 3$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & 206 \\ & 2: 17 \end{aligned}\right.$ | $28$ |
| 176 | $183: 16,183: 25$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 17 \\ & 20814 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 62: 22,159: 20, \\ & 183: 9 \end{aligned}$ |
| 4:9 | 206:12, 206:14 | $20814$ | $\begin{aligned} & 183: 9 \\ & 280 \end{aligned}$ |
| 177 | $200$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2: 10 \\ & \text { 20850 } \end{aligned}$ | $280$ |
| 3:22, 3:23 | 71:18, 112:5, | $20850$ | $77: 24$ |
| 178 | $129: 8,137: 16,$ | $2: 18,61: 14$ | $282$ |
| 3:19 | $137: 20,139: 3 \text {, }$ | $209$ | $\begin{aligned} & 184: 11 \\ & 29 \end{aligned}$ |
| 18 | 184:22 | $189: 15$ | $29$ |
| 84:3 | 2002 | 21 | 65:2, 141:12, |
| 18,000 | 151:11, 206:23 | 3:6, 169:4, | $\begin{aligned} & 141: 13,179: 1 \\ & \text { 2054 } \end{aligned}$ |
| 181:12 | 2003 | $\begin{aligned} & 182: 4 \\ & 218 \end{aligned}$ | $2954$ |
| 18,055 | 184:7 | $218$ | $\begin{aligned} & 189: 15 \\ & \text { hh } \end{aligned}$ |
| 189:17 | 2008 | $1: 24$ | 2b |
| $19$ | $171: 23,184: 18,$ | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \\ & 1: 5 . \\ & \hline 4: 20 . \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{125: 25, \quad 155: 9}{2}$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 39: 22, \quad 192: 14, \\ & 192: 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 190: 12 \\ & 2009 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1: 5, \quad 94: 20, \\ & 119: 20, \quad 129: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\qquad$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 192: 19 \\ & 1909 \end{aligned}$ | $2009$ | $\left[\begin{array}{l} 119: 20, \\ 183: 9 \end{array}\right.$ | $3$ |
| 1909 $169: 12$ | 171:24 | $2201$ | 118:5, 201:9 |
| $169: 12$ 191 | 2010 | $5: 3$ | 3-1 |
| 191 $4: 13$ | 171:25 | 23 | 112:5 |
| 4:13 1947 | 2011 | 54:18, 185:24, | 3.4 |
| 63:4 | $56: 23$ 2014 | 213:19, 214:1, | $188: 17$ 30 |
| 198 | $173: 2$ | $\begin{aligned} & 215: 16,215: 18 \\ & 24 \end{aligned}$ | $5: 16,49: 13,$ |
| 3:13 | $2016$ | 24 | $61: 24,64: 15,$ |
| $1987$ | 183:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 25: 2, \quad 25: 3, \\ & 25: 22, \quad 44: 8, \end{aligned}$ | $91: 8, \quad 91: 12$ |
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|  | $\begin{aligned} & 176: 11, \quad 177: 10, \\ & 177: 11, \quad 177: 16, \\ & 180: 4, \quad 201: 20 \\ & 401 \\ & 2: 17 \\ & 41 \\ & 114: 9, \quad 217: 21 \\ & 42 \\ & 90: 9, \quad 145: 10, \\ & 145: 11, \quad 146: 1 \\ & 43 \\ & 49: 10, \quad 114: 10 \\ & 437160 \\ & 1: 23 \\ & 45 \\ & 12: 22, \quad 95: 7, \\ & 109: 4,109: 10, \\ & 110: 25, \quad 149: 11, \\ & 168: 4,174: 12, \\ & 201: 16 \\ & 450 \\ & 171: 19 \\ & 450,000 \\ & 172: 6, \quad 189: 21 \\ & 46 \\ & 109: 3, \\ & 474500 \\ & 171: 22 \\ & 48 \\ & 16: 18 \\ & 49 \\ & 118: 12 \\ & 495 \\ & 184: 20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | ```125:23, 125:24 67,000 171:23 68 3:21 69 12:15 690 113:20, 114:17 6a 66:5, 66:19, 66:22, 125:25, 132:2 7 70 3:24, 35:10, 38:9, 38:20, 103:9, 103:11, 103:19 700 2:9, 150:22, 151:1 72 96:6 73 4:8 74 3:25, 65:20 7600 2:9 77 58:20 79 58:20, 65:4 80 110:2, 111:10 80,000 172:2 8000 172:1 81 168:2 82 4:3, 150:19 84 22:3``` |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 85 |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $4: 7$ |  |
| 87 |  |
| $65: 2$ |  |
| 8840 |  |
| $22: 2$ |  |
| 9 |  |
| 9 |  |
| $1: 13, \quad 5: 16$ |  |
| 90 |  |
| $185: 4$ |  |
| 900 |  |
| $49: 17$ |  |
| 9025 |  |
| $185: 15$ |  |
| 94 |  |
| $4: 5,4: 7,4: 8$, |  |
| $4: 9,73: 10$, |  |
| $73: 17,73: 20$, |  |
| $80: 17,80: 23$, |  |
| $81: 4,81: 8$, |  |
| $81: 23,81: 24$, |  |
| $82: 17,83: 15$, |  |
| $84: 2,85: 3$, |  |
| $91: 25,127: 16$, |  |
| $127: 19,127: 20$, |  |
| $140: 6,140: 10$, |  |
| $140: 12,140: 14$, |  |
| $140: 20,140: 21$, |  |
| $140: 23,176: 12$ |  |
| 94,000 |  |
| $49: 16$ |  |
| 94,720 |  |
| $192: 13$ |  |
| 9400 |  |
| $49: 17$ |  |
| 97 |  |
| $4: 10,130: 14$, |  |
| $130: 15$ |  |
| 986 |  |
| $2: 11$ |  |
| 99 |  |
| $3: 12,84: 3$ |  |

