f			
	996		998
		-01:-18:-13	and I'm Mike DiDomenico, Chair.
	1 BEFORE THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS	-01:-18:-10 2	To my far left is our Township
	2 OF THE TOWNSHIP OF WESTTOWN	-01:-18:-07 <b>3</b>	Manager, Mr. Rob Pingar; and our solicitor, Mr.
	3 CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA	-01:-16:-04	Patrick McKenna, who now we will turn the
	5 VOLUME 6	-01:-18:-01 5	proceedings over so he can continue to explain
	6	-01:-17:-59 6	the process and all that goes on. Mr. McKenna.
	7 IN RE: CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION	-01:-17:-53 7	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.
	8 TOLL PA XVIII, L.P.	-01:-17:-52	Chairman. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
	9 10 Hearing was held at the Bayard	-01:-17:-50	We are here on the continued conditional use
	Rustin High School, Auditorium, 1100 Shiloh Road, West Chester, Pennsylvania, on Tuesday,	-01:-17:-47 10	hearing for the Toll Brothers application for
	July 25, 2017, beginning at 6:05 o'clock, p.m.	-01:-17:-44 11	the Crebilly tract. We were last here on June
	13	-01:-17:-41 12	20th, 2017.
	BEFORE: MICHAEL T. DIDOMENICO, Chairman	-01:-17:-39 13	We are actually going to go back
	15 CAROL R. DEWOLF THOMAS HAWS	-01:-17:-36 14	to the testimony that was begun in May. During
	17	-01:-17:-32 15	that time period the applicant had presented
	ALSO PRESENT: ROBERT R. PINGAR, Township Manager	-01:-17:-30 16	testimony from their witness, Nicole Kline.
	19	-01:-17:-27 <b>17</b>	Ms. Kline was not able to finish that night and
	20	-01:-17:-23 18	was not able to attend in June, so we started
	21 22	-01:-17:-20 19	to go a little bit out of order with the
	23 ELEANOR J. SCHWANDT, RMR	-01:-17:-18 20	presentations for efficiency sake. So Ms.
-01:-22: -01:-22:			
		-01:-17:-14 21	Kline is back this evening, so we are going to
		-01:47:41 22	hear from her.
		-01:-17:-11 23	First question, as we do with
	007	-01:-17:-09 24	every hearing, is there anyone here this
1	997 APPEARANCES:		999
	APPEARANCES:	-01:-17:-07	evening who is recording the proceedings?
1 2	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire	-01:-17:-07 <b>1</b> -01:-17:-06 <b>2</b>	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here
	APPEARANCES:		evening who is recording the proceedings?
2	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire	-01:-17:-06 2	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here
2	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors	-01:-17:-06 <b>2</b> -01:-17:-04 <b>3</b>	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling
2	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire	-01:-17:-06 <b>2</b> -01:-17:-04 <b>3</b> -01:-17:-03 <b>4</b>	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.
2 3 4 5	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township	-01:-17:-06	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton
3 4	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire	-01:-17:-06	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton.  MR. MCKENNA: And it is video,
2 3 4 5	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire	-01:-17:-06	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?
2 3 4 5	PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-00 6 -01:-16:-88 8	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-00 6 -01:-16:-89 7 -01:-16:-88 8 -01:-16:-87 9	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very
2 3 4 5 6 7	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-02 6 -01:-16:-59 7 -01:-16:-58 8 -01:-16:-57 9 10	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire	-01:-17:-06	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-00 6 -01:-16:-59 7 -01:-16:-58 8 -01:-16:-57 9 -10 -10 -10 -10 -10 -10 -10 -10 -10 -10	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton.  MR. MCKENNA: And it is video,  correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-02 6 -01:-16:-69 7 -01:-16:-69 10 -01:-16:-66 11 -12 -13	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire on behalf of Birmingham Township	-01:-17:-06	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:)
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire on behalf of Birmingham Township	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-02 6 -01:-18:-89 7 -01:-18:-88 8 -01:-16:-97 9 -10 -01:-16:-96 11 -12 -13 -01:-18:-95 14 -01:-18:-95 15	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:)  MR. MCKENNA: So, Ms. Kline, if you are ready why don't you go ahead and take
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire on behalf of Birmingham Township	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-02 6 -01:-16:-59 7 -01:-16:-58 8 -01:-16:-56 11 -12 -13 -01:-16:-56 14 -01:-16:-55 14 -01:-16:-55 15 -01:-16:-53 16	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video,  correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:)  MR. MCKENNA: So, Ms. Kline, if
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 -01:28:49 12 -01:18:49 13 -01:18:49 14 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire on behalf of Birmingham Township  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good evening, everyone, and welcome to our 6th conditional use hearing for the Crebilly tract and Toll Brothers developers. If we would	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-00 6 -01:-16:-59 7 -01:-16:-58 8 -01:-16:-51 11 -12 -13 -01:-16:-55 14 -01:-16:-53 16 -01:-16:-52 17	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:)  MR. MCKENNA: So, Ms. Kline, if you are ready why don't you go ahead and take the microphone. You are still under oath.  Quick recap. Ms. Kline did have
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 -01:28:39 12 -01:48:49 13 -01:48:49 15 -01:48:49 15 -01:48:49 15 -01:48:49 15	PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire on behalf of Birmingham Township  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good evening, everyone, and welcome to our 6th conditional use hearing for the Crebilly tract and Toll Brothers developers. If we would please rise for your Pledge of Allegiance.	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-02 6 -01:-16:-59 7 -01:-16:-58 8 -01:-16:-56 11 -12 -13 -01:-16:-56 14 -01:-16:-53 15 -01:-16:-53 16 -01:-16:-52 17 -01:-16:-49 18 -01:-16:-47 19	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton.  MR. MCKENNA: And it is video,  correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:)  MR. MCKENNA: So, Ms. Kline, if you are ready why don't you go ahead and take the microphone. You are still under oath.  Quick recap. Ms. Kline did have direct testimony by Mr. Adelman. All of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 -01:28:49 12 -01:18:49 13 -01:18:49 14 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 15 -01:18:49 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16 16	PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire on behalf of Birmingham Township  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good evening, everyone, and welcome to our 6th conditional use hearing for the Crebilly tract and Toll Brothers developers. If we would please rise for your Pledge of Allegiance.  (Pledge of Allegiance takes place.)	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-02 6 -01:-16:-69 7 -01:-16:-69 11 -12 -13 -01:-16:-69 14 -01:-16:-69 15 -01:-16:-69 15 -01:-16:-69 17 -01:-16:-69 17 -01:-16:-69 17 -01:-16:-69 17 -01:-16:-49 18 -01:-16:-47 19 -01:-16:-44 20	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video,  correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:)  MR. MCKENNA: So, Ms. Kline, if you are ready why don't you go ahead and take the microphone. You are still under oath.  Quick recap. Ms. Kline did have direct testimony by Mr. Adelman. All of the parties were then offered an opportunity for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 -01:28:99 12 -01:18:68 13 -01:18:53 15 -01:18:50 16 17 ii 18 01:58:30 19 -01:18:30 20	APPEARANCES:  PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire on behalf of Birmingham Township  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good evening, everyone, and welcome to our 6th conditional use hearing for the Crebilly tract and Toll Brothers developers. If we would please rise for your Pledge of Allegiance.  (Pledge of Allegiance takes place.)  THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you,	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-02 6 -01:-16:-59 7 -01:-16:-58 8 -01:-16:-57 9 -01:-16:-56 11 -12 -13 -01:-16:-55 14 -01:-16:-55 15 -01:-16:-53 16 -01:-16:-53 16 -01:-16:-53 17 -01:-16:-49 18 -01:-16:-47 19 -01:-16:-47 19 -01:-16:-44 20 -01:-16:-41 21	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video,  correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:)  MR. MCKENNA: So, Ms. Kline, if you are ready why don't you go ahead and take the microphone. You are still under oath.  Quick recap. Ms. Kline did have direct testimony by Mr. Adelman. All of the parties were then offered an opportunity for cross-examination. So at this point what I'm
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 -01:28:39 12 -01:48:68 13 -01:48:53 15 -01:48:50 16 17 ii 18 -01:58:30 19	PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire on behalf of Birmingham Township  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good evening, everyone, and welcome to our 6th conditional use hearing for the Crebilly tract and Toll Brothers developers. If we would please rise for your Pledge of Allegiance.  (Pledge of Allegiance takes place.)	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-02 6 -01:-16:-89 7 -01:-16:-88 8 -01:-16:-97 9 -10 -01:-16:-98 11 -12 -13 -01:-16:-98 15 -01:-16:-98 16 -01:-16:-98 17 -01:-16:-98 17 -01:-16:-98 17 -01:-16:-47 19 -01:-16:-47 19 -01:-16:-41 20 -01:-16:-41 21 -01:-16:-38 22	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton, MR. MCKENNA: And it is video, correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:)  MR. MCKENNA: So, Ms. Kline, if you are ready why don't you go ahead and take the microphone. You are still under oath.  Quick recap. Ms. Kline did have direct testimony by Mr. Adelman. All of the parties were then offered an opportunity for cross-examination. So at this point what I'm going to do is ask the Board if they have any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 -01-28-39 12 -01-68-66 13 -01-68-65 14 -01-68-65 15 -01-68-65 15 -01-68-30 15 -01-68-30 19 -01-68-30 20 -01-68-30 21	PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors  GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant  MICHAEL GILL, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township Planning Commission  KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire on behalf of Thornbury Township  MARK THOMPSON, Esquire on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC  FRONEFIELD CRAWFORD, Esquire on behalf of Birmingham Township  THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good evening, everyone, and welcome to our 6th conditional use hearing for the Crebilly tract and Toll Brothers developers. If we would please rise for your Pledge of Allegiance.  (Pledge of Allegiance takes place.)  THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you, everyone. As in the past let me introduce the	-01:-17:-06 2 -01:-17:-04 3 -01:-17:-03 4 -01:-17:-02 5 -01:-17:-02 6 -01:-16:-59 7 -01:-16:-58 8 -01:-16:-57 9 -01:-16:-56 11 -12 -13 -01:-16:-55 14 -01:-16:-55 15 -01:-16:-53 16 -01:-16:-53 16 -01:-16:-53 17 -01:-16:-49 18 -01:-16:-47 19 -01:-16:-47 19 -01:-16:-44 20 -01:-16:-41 21	evening who is recording the proceedings?  Yes, sir. I know you are here every time. If you wouldn't mind again telling me your name.  MR. BRAXTON: Sure, John Braxton.  MR. MCKENNA: And it is video,  correct?  MR. BRAXTON: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you very much.  MR. BRAXTON: Thank you.  (NICOLE R. KLINE, having been previously duly sworn, was examined and testified further as follows:)  MR. MCKENNA: So, Ms. Kline, if you are ready why don't you go ahead and take the microphone. You are still under oath.  Quick recap. Ms. Kline did have direct testimony by Mr. Adelman. All of the parties were then offered an opportunity for cross-examination. So at this point what I'm going to do is ask the Board if they have any questions that they would like to ask Ms.

	4000		1000
	1000	.	1002
-01:-16:-31	was presented, if there is any redirect by Mr.	-01:-13:-55	matter of option. As I said, I would agree
-01:-16:-27	Adelman, and/or any recross based on everything	-01:-13:-53	that their first option and primary option
-01:-16:-24	that was presented. So at this point does any	-01:-13:-51	would be 926, certainly.
21 4	member of the Board have any questions?	-01:-13:-48 4	MS. DEWOLF: And can you tell me
-01:-16:-16 5	THE CHAIRMAN: I do not. I would	-01:-13:-47 5	what the stacking is like at South New Street
-01:-16:-15	rather sit back and listen to what is coming	-01:-13:-45	and 926?
-01:-16:-13 7	forth.	-01:-13:-44 7	THE WITNESS: The stacking
-01:-16:-07	MS. DEWOLF: For all residents in	-01:-13:-41	meaning what the queues are at 926 and New
-01:-16:-03	Westtown Township who reside west of Route 202,	-01:-13:-38	Street?
-01:-15:-57 10	how are they able to make a northbound movement	-01:-13:-37 10	MS. DEWOLF: From New Street to
-01:-15:-51 11	on 202?	-01:-13:-35	926, what is the stacking at that intersection
-01:-15:-47 12	THE WITNESS: I can speak to	-01:-13:-30 12	for southbound, and you want to make any
-01:-15:-45 13	within the study area, to travel from the west	-01:-13:-28 13	movement?
-01:-15:-40 14	side of 202 and to turn left to travel	-01:-13:-27 14	THE WITNESS: At the intersection
-01:-15:-37 15	northbound on 202, 926 would be, the signalized	-01:-13:-26 15	of 926 and New Street, it is all single-lane
-01:-15:-30 16	intersection at 926 and 202 would be the way to	-01:-13:-21 16	approaches, so there are no turning lanes with
-01:-15:-27 17	do that within the study area that was required	-01:-13:-18 17	particular storage for a turning lane.
-01:-15:-24 18	for this development.	-01:-13:-13 18	MS. DEWOLF: Do you have any
-01:-15 -23 19	MS. DEWOLF: If someone lives	-01:-13:-13 19	stacking data for South New Street waiting for
-01:-15:-21 20	north on South New Street at the county line of	-01:-13:-10 20	that light at 926?
-01:-15:-17 21	Westtown Township, how do they get northbound	-01:-13:-08 21	THE WITNESS: If by stacking you
-01:-15:-13 22	on 202? Is that same route the route that you	-01:-13:-05 22	mean queues, yes, our report includes vehicular
-01:-15:-04 23	believe most of us travel?	-01:-13:-02 23	queues at the intersection.
22 24	THE WITNESS: Most of us, yes, I	-01:-13:00 24	MS. DEWOLF: And what are they?
1	1001		1003
-01:-15:-01	would expect that's the way that they would	-01:-12:-59	THE WITNESS: Let me pull up
-01:-14:-59 2	travel.	-01:-12:-55 2	those numbers. So I will refer to the numbers
-01:-14:-68 3	MS. DEWOLF: Do they have any	-01:-12:-39	in our January 20th, 2017 study which was
-01:-14:-57	other alternatives?	-01:-12:-35	entered into the record as an exhibit.
-01:-14:-54 5	THE WITNESS: Certainly there are	-01:-12:-29 5	MR. HAWS: Is that Exhibit A-33?
-01:-14:-52 6	a number of intersections along 202 that would	-01:-12:-24	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct.
-01:-14:-50 7	allow you to make a left to travel north.	-01:-12:-23 7	MR. HAWS: Thank you.
-01:-14:-45	MS. DEWOLF: Can you name one?	-01:-12:00	THE WITNESS: So referring to
-01:-14:-44 9	THE WITNESS: The intersection	-01:-11:-57	what I believe your question was, was the
-01:-14:-42 10	immediately south of 202 and 926 that comes out	-01:-11:-55 10	stacking on southbound New Street at 926; is
-01:-14:-38 11	of the residential development in Thornbury,	-01:-11:-51 <b>11</b>	that correct?
-01:-14:-93 12	and on down the corridor to the south.	-01:-11:50 <b>13</b>	MS. DEWOLF: Yes. THE WITNESS: Based on the
-01:-14:-29 13	MS. DEWOLF: So in Westtown, if a		
-01:-14:-26 14	Westtown resident on the west side of 202 would	-01:-11:-48 14	existing conditions analysis, the maximum queue
-01:-14:-22 15	like to make a northbound movement to go to	-01:-11:-43 <b>15</b>	today is about 1400 feet.  MS. DEWOLF: Can you give me an
-01:-14:-19 16	work, for emergencies, or for getting out on	-01:41:37 <b>10</b> -01:41:36 <b>17</b>	idea of where that is, how far back on New
-01:-14:-14 17	the northbound Route 202, they must go down to	-01:-11:-36 17 -01:-11:-32 18	Street that is? Is that right in front of the
-01:-14:-09 18	926 as their first option; is that correct?	-01:-11:-32 <b>10</b> -01:-11:-29 <b>19</b>	quarry access? Is it the front of the Robinson
-^-14:06 <b>19</b>	THE WITNESS: I would certainly	-01:-11:-29 <b>19</b> -01:-11:-26 <b>20</b>	driveway? Is it in front of the property
<sub>5</sub> 20	say that would be their first option.	-01:411:26 <b>20</b> -01:411:23 <b>21</b>	across? Can you give me an idea where that is?
-01:-14:-02 21	MS. DEWOLF: And your suggestion	-01:-11:-23 <b>2</b> 1	THE WITNESS: Let me pull up a
-01:-14:-02 <b>22</b> -01:-13:-58 <b>23</b>	is they go further south into Thornbury and perhaps use Bridlewood?	-01:-11:-19 ZZ -01:-11:-15 Z3	map that's also contained in the study and see
	THE WITNESS: No. It is just a	-01:-11:-12 <b>24</b>	if we can give an approximate area.
-01:-13:-56 24			yerr give on approximate wider

			4000
	1004		1006
-01:-11:-09 1	MS. DEWOLF: Or the bridge?	-01:-08:-29	possible that you must consider in respect to
-01:-11:-07 2	THE WITNESS: Pardon?	-01:-08:-26	the aspects, impacts to them for this, for the
-01:-11:-05	MS. DEWOLF: Or does it extend	-01:-08:-21 3	adjacent properties?
os <b>4</b>	over the curb at the bridge?	-01:-08:-20 4	THE WITNESS: If a property has a
-01:-10:-42 5	THE WITNESS: Yeah, I don't have	-01:-08:-15	vested plan, an application in for land
-01:-10:-42 6	a dimension plan here in front of me to tell	-01:-08:-13	development, we certainly must include that in
-01:-10:-39 7	you exactly where that 1400-foot queue is in	-01:-08:-11 7	our traffic studies.
-01:-10:-34	terms of the existing driveway or properties	-01:-08:-08	MS. DEWOLF: Okay. And so have
-01:-10-31	along that stretch of road.	-01:-08:-07	you considered the properties that are adjacent
-01:-10:-29 10	MS. DEWOLF: Well, I'm kind of	-01:-08:-05 10	to South New Street, including the Robinsons
-01:-10:-27 11	interested in that given the sight lines. If	-01:-08:-01 11	THE WITNESS: We have
-01:-10:-26 12	there were an additional egress or ingress onto	-01:-07:-58 12	MS. DEWOLF: in your plan?
-01:-10:-21 13	South New Street from this development, given	-01:-07:-57 13	THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. So we
-01:-10:-15 14	the current stacking, do you see that as an	-01:-07:-55 14	have incorporated properties in the area that
-01:-10:-12 15	issue?	-01:-07:-48 15	have active formal land development
-01:-10:-12 16	THE WITNESS: Certainly, if an	-01:-07:-43 16	applications, none of which I am aware of for
-01:-10:-09 17	access were located along New Street to this	-01:-07:-38 17	immediately adjacent properties.
-01:-10:-06 18	development, which is not currently proposed, I	-01:-07:-38 18	MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar
-01:-10:-04 19	would expect additional traffic would then	-01:-07:-33 19	with the use of South New Street from the
-01:-10:-01 20	access New Street, so it would potentially	-01:-07:-26 20	borough for bicycle and pedestrian use, and
-01:-09:-57 21	increase traffic.	-01:-07:-21 21	numbers, and as part of the Chester County
-01:-09:-55 22	MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar	-01:-07:-17 22	plan? Have you considered any of the impacts
-01:-09:-54 23	with the fatalities that have occurred at South	-01:-07:-14 23	to those users, for any of the multi-modal
51 24	New Street and 926 in the last two or three	-01:-07:-08 24	users?
_			
i —	1005		1007
-01:-09:-49 <b>1</b>		-01:-07:-07	
1	1005		THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way,
-01:-09:-49 1	1005 years? THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.	-01:-07:-07	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes,
-01:-09:-49 <b>1</b> -01:-09:-49 <b>2</b>	1005 years? THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I	-01:-07:-07 <b>1</b> -01:-07:-08 <b>2</b>	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.
-01:-09:-49 <b>1</b> -01:-09:-49 <b>2</b> -01:-09:-46 <b>3</b>	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just	-01:-07:-07 <b>1</b> -01:-07:-08 <b>2</b> -01:-07:-04 <b>3</b>	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not
-01:-09:-49 <b>1</b> -01:-09:-49 <b>2</b> -01:-09:-46 <b>3</b> -01:-09:-44 <b>4</b>	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that
-01:-09:-49 <b>1</b> -01:-09:-49 <b>2</b> -01:-09:-46 <b>3</b> -01:-09:-44 <b>4</b> -01:-09:-38 <b>5</b>	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-56 5	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the
-01:-09:-49 <b>1</b> -01:-09:-49 <b>2</b> -01:-09:-46 <b>3</b> -01:-09:-44 <b>4</b> -01:-09:-38 <b>5</b>	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-08:-58 5 -01:-08:-52 6	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera,
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-58 5 -01:-06:-51 7	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-56 5 -01:-06:-51 7 -01:-06:-47 8 -01:-06:-43 9 -01:-06:-39 10	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-47 8 -01:-06:-43 9 -01:-06:-39 10 -01:-06:-36 11	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-56 5 -01:-06:-51 7 -01:-06:-47 8 -01:-06:-43 9 -01:-06:-39 10	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-08:-58 5 -01:-08:-52 6 -01:-08:-51 7 -01:-08:-47 8 -01:-08:-43 9 -01:-08:-39 10 -01:-08:-35 11 -01:-08:-35 12 -01:-06:-32 13	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-56 5 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-51 7 -01:-06:-47 8 -01:-06:-39 10 -01:-06:-39 11 -01:-06:-35 12 -01:-06:-35 12 -01:-06:-35 14	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property itself or the property across, which is the	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-47 8 -01:-06:-43 9 -01:-06:-38 11 -01:-06:-38 12 -01:-06:-38 12 -01:-06:-38 14 -01:-06:-38 14	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there is no proposed additional facilities or change
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property itself or the property across, which is the Quarry Swim Club, or the recent ownership and	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-58 5 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-61 7 -01:-06:-43 9 -01:-06:-38 11 -01:-06:-38 12 -01:-06:-32 13 -01:-06:-32 13 -01:-06:-32 14 -01:-06:-25 15 -01:-06:-21 16	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there is no proposed additional facilities or change along New Street for this development.
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property itself or the property across, which is the Quarry Swim Club, or the recent ownership and purchase of the property immediately west of	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-08:-52 6 -01:-08:-52 6 -01:-08:-51 7 -01:-08:-47 8 -01:-08:-39 10 -01:-08:-39 11 -01:-08:-35 12 -01:-06:-32 13 -01:-06:-32 13 -01:-06:-32 15 -01:-06:-25 15 -01:-06:-21 16 -01:-08:-15 17	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there is no proposed additional facilities or change along New Street for this development.  MS. DEWOLF: And I'm interested
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property itself or the property across, which is the Quarry Swim Club, or the recent ownership and purchase of the property immediately west of South New Street?	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-58 5 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-52 7 -01:-06:-47 8 -01:-06:-43 9 -01:-06:-38 11 -01:-06:-38 12 -01:-06:-32 13 -01:-06:-32 13 -01:-06:-32 15 -01:-06:-25 15 -01:-06:-21 16 -01:-06:-11 18	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there is no proposed additional facilities or change along New Street for this development.  MS. DEWOLF: And I'm interested in a fact that you put into the record that
-01:-09:-49	THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property itself or the property across, which is the Quarry Swim Club, or the recent ownership and purchase of the property immediately west of South New Street?  THE WITNESS: In terms of the	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-08:-52 6 -01:-08:-52 6 -01:-08:-51 7 -01:-08:-47 8 -01:-08:-39 10 -01:-08:-39 11 -01:-08:-35 12 -01:-08:-35 12 -01:-08:-35 15 -01:-08:-35 15 -01:-08:-15 17 -01:-08:-15 17 -01:-08:-15 17	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there is no proposed additional facilities or change along New Street for this development.  MS. DEWOLF: And I'm interested in a fact that you put into the record that there has been a decrease in traffic numbers on
01:09:49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property itself or the property across, which is the Quarry Swim Club, or the recent ownership and purchase of the property immediately west of South New Street?  THE WITNESS: In terms of the requirements of the scope of the traffic impact	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-58 5 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-47 8 -01:-06:-43 9 -01:-06:-38 11 -01:-06:-38 12 -01:-06:-32 13 -01:-06:-32 13 -01:-06:-32 15 -01:-06:-11 18 -01:-06:-11 18 -01:-06:-11 18 -01:-06:-11 18	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there is no proposed additional facilities or change along New Street for this development.  MS. DEWOLF: And I'm interested in a fact that you put into the record that there has been a decrease in traffic numbers on Route 202. Have they changed, has DVRPC
01:09:49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property itself or the property across, which is the Quarry Swim Club, or the recent ownership and purchase of the property immediately west of South New Street?  THE WITNESS: In terms of the requirements of the scope of the traffic impact study, an assessment of adjacent properties is	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-08:-58 5 -01:-08:-52 6 -01:-08:-47 8 -01:-08:-43 9 -01:-08:-38 11 -01:-08:-38 12 -01:-08:-38 12 -01:-08:-38 12 -01:-08:-38 13 -01:-08:-38 14 -01:-08:-38 15 -01:-08:-11 18 -01:-08:-11 18 -01:-08:-15 17 -01:-08:-11 18 -01:-08:-15 20 -01:-05:-53 21	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there is no proposed additional facilities or change along New Street for this development.  MS. DEWOLF: And I'm interested in a fact that you put into the record that there has been a decrease in traffic numbers on Route 202. Have they changed, has DVRPC changed any of their mechanisms for
01:09:49	THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property itself or the property across, which is the Quarry Swim Club, or the recent ownership and purchase of the property immediately west of South New Street?  THE WITNESS: In terms of the requirements of the scope of the traffic impact study, an assessment of adjacent properties is not a part of that required scope.	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-52 6 -01:-06:-47 8 -01:-06:-43 9 -01:-06:-38 11 -01:-06:-38 12 -01:-06:-38 12 -01:-06:-38 14 -01:-06:-38 15 -01:-06:-15 17 -01:-06:-15 17 -01:-06:-15 17 -01:-06:-15 17 -01:-06:-15 17 -01:-06:-15 17 -01:-06:-15 17 -01:-06:-15 17 -01:-06:-15 17 -01:-06:-15 20 -01:-05:-59 20 -01:-05:-59 21 -01:-05:-59 22	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there is no proposed additional facilities or change along New Street for this development.  MS. DEWOLF: And I'm interested in a fact that you put into the record that there has been a decrease in traffic numbers on Route 202. Have they changed, has DVRPC changed any of their mechanisms for transportation monitoring and tracking that
-01:-09:-49	years?  THE WITNESS: I cannot say that I am familiar with those.  MS. DEWOLF: My neighbor lost his brother. There have been numerous. I just wondered if you have any accident data for that particular intersection. I don't remember hearing any.  THE WITNESS: I do not have crash data for that intersection.  MS. DEWOLF: Okay. When you are considering transportation, do you consider the impact of the other properties that are contiguous? For example, the Robinson property itself or the property across, which is the Quarry Swim Club, or the recent ownership and purchase of the property immediately west of South New Street?  THE WITNESS: In terms of the requirements of the scope of the traffic impact study, an assessment of adjacent properties is	-01:-07:-07 1 -01:-07:-08 2 -01:-07:-04 3 -01:-07:-02 4 -01:-08:-58 5 -01:-08:-52 6 -01:-08:-47 8 -01:-08:-43 9 -01:-08:-38 11 -01:-08:-38 12 -01:-08:-38 12 -01:-08:-38 12 -01:-08:-38 13 -01:-08:-38 14 -01:-08:-38 15 -01:-08:-11 18 -01:-08:-11 18 -01:-08:-15 17 -01:-08:-11 18 -01:-08:-15 20 -01:-05:-53 21	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with the use of that roadway in such a way, certainly, for the multi-modal purposes, vehicles, bikes, pedestrians.  With this project it is not proposed to change the character of that roadway. And we do have information in the study about pedestrian facilities, etcetera, but there is no proposal to change the use or facilities along that roadway that exist today.  MS. DEWOLF: So you don't have any plans for that particular user with the increase of traffic to the area?  THE WITNESS: At this time there is no proposed additional facilities or change along New Street for this development.  MS. DEWOLF: And I'm interested in a fact that you put into the record that there has been a decrease in traffic numbers on Route 202. Have they changed, has DVRPC changed any of their mechanisms for

Page 1004 to 1007 of 1187

3 of 76 sheets

08/02/2017 05:18:32 PM

	1008		1010
-01:-05:-d2 <b>1</b>	of. But it is a trend over the past several	-01:-03:-23	for the project.
	years that on a daily, 24-hour basis that	-01:-03:-23	MS. DEWOLF: I'll have a couple
	traffic volumes have decreased along a lot of	-01:-03:-10 3	more.
	roadways in the region for a variety of	-01:-03:-07	MR. HAWS: Take your time.
Ī	reasons.	-01:-03:-05	MS. DEWOLF: So I don't remember
	MS. DEWOLF: And looking at these	-01:-02:-58	you testifying that you actually have a
7	numbers, I don't see that significant drop.	-01:-02:-55	connector road down here in your plan. Is that
-01:-05:-25 <b>/</b> -01:-05:-19 <b>8</b>	Can you explain where you see that, and how?	-01:-02:-53	true?
-01:-05:-19 <b>8</b>	THE WITNESS: I don't believe	-01:-02:-52	THE WITNESS: The traffic study
-01:-05:-14	that I testified there was a significant drop.	-01:-02:-48 10	evaluated a few different plan alternatives,
-01:-05:-14	I just testified there was a drop. And if you	-01:-02:-44 11	and we have, as I believe I have testified to,
-01:-05:-12	look at the DVRPC data that was submitted, it	-01:-02:-44 11	Toll Brothers has taken a preliminary look at
-01:-05:-09 12	does show a decrease over the past ten years.	-01:-02:-37 13	some potential plan modifications based on
-01:-05:-02 14	It is a slight decrease, absolutely. But it	-01:-02:-34 14	comments received from various parties,
-01:04:59 15	does not show an increase.	-01:-02:-32 15	including the Planning Commission and
-01:04:69 16	MS. DEWOLF: So the numbers on	-01:-02:-30 16	Thornbury, and as part of that a connector road
-01:-04:-55 17	Table 2 that you referred to, and Table 1, they	-01:-02:-27 17	is, was contemplated in some of that planning
-01:-04:-50 18	are average annual daily, so many of the days	-01:-02:-22 18	work that does provide a roadway connection
-01:-04:-45 19	may be much higher than these particular	-01:-02:-20 19	between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926
-01:-04:-45 10	figures in any one day, correct?	-01:-02:-16 <b>20</b>	through the site.
-01:-04:-38 21	THE WITNESS: They certainly	-01:-02:-15 <b>21</b>	MS. DEWOLF: But your plan does
-01:-04:-37 22	could be higher. I think you would have to	-01:-02:-13 <b>22</b>	not show that road at this time, correct?
-01:-04:-33 23	look at the data to determine whether you would	-01:-02:-10 23	THE WITNESS: The conditional use
30 24	call that significant or not, and what	-01:-02:-07 <b>24</b>	application, the plan that was part of the
· —	1009		1011
-01:-04:-28	significant means.	-01:-02:-04 <b>1</b>	application, I do not believe shows that
-01:-04:-26 <b>2</b>	MS. DEWOLF: Can you capture the	-01:-02:00 2	connector road concept.
-01:-04:-25 3	data for specific dates?	-01:-01:-59 3	MS. DEWOLF: Do you know how long
-01:-04:-22	THE WITNESS: Yes. I think data	-01:-01:-58 4	it takes me I live on South New Street to
-01:-04:-19 5	could be made available, the raw data.	-01:-01:-55 5	get across the 926/202 intersection to go
-01:-04:-15	MS. DEWOLF: So dates for DVRPC	-01:-01:-50 6	eastbound to work?
-01:-04:-11 7	at certain times of the year, making sure that	-01:-01:-49 7	THE WITNESS: We have the delay
-01:-04:-09 8	school is not in process, making sure that	-01:-01:-46	information in our study. I would expect it to
-01:-04:-06 9	there is not a bridge closed or what have you,	-01:-01:-44	be significant, as shown in the study.
-01:-04:-03 10	could be captured if you wanted to look	-01:-01:-41 10	MS. DEWOLF: Takes me 20 minutes.
-01:-03:-59 11	specifically at some high points and maybe the	-01:-01:-39 11	I live a half mile north. Interesting.
-01:-03:-54 12	median, rather than the annual average?	-01:-01:-25 12	In respect to Jacqueline Drive,
-01:-03:-51 13	THE WITNESS: Well, the average	-01:-01:-22 13	it is a neighborhood, hasn't really experienced
-01:-03:-50 14	annual would be the median. But if you wanted	-01:-01:-19 14	such significant traffic as it has. Have you
-01:-03:-48 15	to look at the raw data and see some of the	-01:-01:-16 15	looked at any other alternatives for the west,
-01:-03:-46 16	fluctuations, that that data could be requested	-01:-01:-10 16	people residing in the western part of the
-01:-03:-42 17	of DVRPC to see what their range of raw data	-01:-01:-08 17	township to have any access to 202 other than
-01:-03:-38 18	actually is.	-01:-01:-03 18	926?
-^*=03:-36 <b>19</b>	MS. DEWOLF: Have you considered	-01:-01:-02 19	THE WITNESS: We were not asked
<sub>36</sub> 20	public transportation on 202 for your new	-01:-01:00 20	to do that as part of the scope of this study,
-01:-03:-32 21	residents or the future needs of our	-01:00:-58 21	no.
-01:-03:-28 22	transportation system?	-01:00:-57 22	MS. DEWOLF: Thank you. That's
-01:-03:-27 23	THE WITNESS: At this time, no	-01:00:-56 23	all I have.
-01:-03:-25 24	additional public transportation is proposed	-01:00:-53 24	THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Kline, I
08/02/2017	05:18:32 PM Page 1008 to	1011 of 118	87 4 of <b>76</b> sheets

	1012		1014
-01:00:-51	wasn't going to ask a question, but I want to	00:-58:-13	residential.
-01:00:-49 2	piggyback on something that Mrs. DeWolf came up	00:-58:-13	So in Alternative A we had the
-01:00:-46 3	with. Back when you were I believe asked, it	00:-58:-09	two existing units, 200 single-family units and
42 4	came from the January 20, 2017, study, I guess	00:-58:-04	117 carriage homes, whereas in Alternatives B
-01:00;-40 <b>5</b>	it is Exhibit A-33, you answered that the	00:-58:00 5	and C we had 152 new single families, two
-01:00:-36	maximum queue was 1400 feet. And I basically	00:-57:-55	existing units and 243 new carriage homes.
-01:00:-30 7	just did some quick math here. At 18-foot for	00:-57:-52	So we take those numbers and we
-01:00:-26	a car, 1400 feet is 77 cars on South New	00:-57:-49	utilize the ITE trip generation rates to
-01:00;-21	Street.	00:-57:-46	determine the number of trips.
-01:00:-20 10	THE WITNESS: We would typically	00:-57:-44 10	So that is the difference between
-01:00:-19 11	just as, in terms of industry methodology, we	00:-57:-42 11	the two numbers, is applying the rates to the
-01:00:-14 12	would assume 25 vehicle 25 feet per	00:-57:-39 12	different units.
-01:00:-11 13	passenger vehicle to allow vehicle spacing. So	00:-57:-38 13	MR. HAWS: And it just so happens
-01:00:-07 14	if we were to equate the length to a number of	00:-57:-35 14	that when you look at the weekly morning peak
-01:00:-03 15	vehicles, we would use 25 per vehicle.	00:-57:-32 15	hours that between both Alternative A and
00:-59:-59 16	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. So you are	00:-57:-29 16	Alternatives B and C that the number in equals
00:-59:-58 17	saying there would be 25 vehicles there, but	00:-57:-25 17	the same?
00:-59:-56 18	that comes out to 56. If I use 25, that's 56	00:-57:-24 18	THE WITNESS: It is just, yeah,
00:-59:-51 19	vehicles.	00:-57:-23 19	it is just a coincidence there.
00:-59:-50 <b>20</b>	THE WITNESS: It is a significant	00:-57:-21 20	MR. HAWS: Okay. When you look
00:-59:-49 <b>21</b>	queue today, certainly.	00:-57:-19 21	at the differences between the size of the
00:-59:-48 <b>22</b>	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Thank you.	00;-57:-12 22	units and the daily trips, and you look at that
00:-59:-45 <b>23</b>	MR. HAWS: Yes, Ms. Kline, I have	00:-57:-09 23	factor rate for Alternative A was 8.59, for
24	just a couple questions. So in your testimony	00:-57:-04 24	Alternatives B and C it was 7.44, and you are
1	1013		1015
00:-59:-37	back in May you had referred to Exhibit A-33,	00:-57:00	telling me that the difference is due to the
00:-59:-31 2	page 9, Table 2, if you wouldn't mind going to	00:-56:-57	make-up of the units on the property?
00:-59:-27 3	that for a second.	00:-56:-55 3	THE WITNESS: Yes.
00:-59:-24	THE WITNESS: Sure. Yes.	00:-56:-52	MR. HAWS: What is the daily rate
00:-59:-20 <b>5</b>	MR. HAWS: Sure. So this was the	00:-56:-49 5	for a single-family home versus a carriage
00:-59:-18	vehicular trip generation report table that you	00:-56:-46	home?
00:-59:-15 7	had generated, and you talked about	00:-56:-46 7	THE WITNESS: I don't have the
00:-59:-13	Alternatives A or Alternatives B and C.	00:-56:-44	raw ITE data with me. Let me double check
00:-59:-08	Alternative A is the applicant's plan before us	00:-56:-40	here. And we have appendices that were also
00:-59:-04 10	for 319 units. Alternatives B and C have a	00:-56:-37 10	submitted as part of the record with this
00:-59:00 11	size of 397 units.	00:-56:-35 11	study. I can double check and see. I may have
00:-58:-57 12	So my question to you is: On	00:-56:-30 12	more detailed information there.
00:-58:-53 13	your daily columns you have numbers for	00:-56:-27 13	Are you asking what the daily
00:-58:-50 14	Alternative A and Alternatives B and C, and the	00:-56:-18 14	rate difference is?
00:-58:-47 15	difference between those numbers is 213 daily	00:-56:-17 15	MR. HAWS: You are saying that
00:-58:-42 16	trips. Does that seem to equate? How did you	00:-56:-15 16	the reason why the numbers don't match up
00:-58:-38 17	calculate that number based on the size	00:-56:-13 17	statistically is because you took into account
00:-58:-35 18	difference of 78?	00:-56:-09 18	that under Alternative A it was two existing
nn=58;-32 <b>19</b>	THE WITNESS: We use industry	00:-56:-04 19	units, 200 new single-family homes, and 117
9 20	standard trip generation data that is provided	00:-56:00 20	carriage homes. What I'm asking is: What is
00:-58:-27 21	by the Institute of Transportation Engineers,	00:-55:-56 21	the trip generation value for a single-family
00:-58:-24 22	and they provide trip generation rates for a	00:-55:-51 22	home versus a carriage home on why there would
00:-58:-19 23	variety of land uses, and we calculate trips,	00:-55:-48 23	be such a discrepancy with such an increase in
00:-58:-16 24	per number of units, in this case for	00:-55:-43 24	density on property?

	1016		1018
00:-55:-42	THE WITNESS: So there are	00:-52:-46	Certainly, detached units
00:-55:-41	different trip generation rates provided for	00:-52:-44 2	generate at a higher rate, meaning that one
00-55:-37	detached residential units versus attached	00:-52:-42 3	detached unit is typically going to generate
35 4	residential units. And that is based on actual	00:-52:-38 4	more traffic than one attached unit.
00:-55:-31 5	field collected data, number of studies across	00:-52:-33 <b>5</b>	Generally, in terms of size, a detached unit is
00:-55:-28	the country that go into developing those	00:-52:-31 6	larger, there is usually more people in the
00:-55:-26 7	rates.	00:-52:-29 7	household that have vehicles, etcetera. That
00:-55:-26	So that is the difference between	00:-52:-26	all factors into the data that was collected to
00:-55:-23	the mix and the two different types of	00:-52:-24	develop those rates.
00:-55:-20 10	residential units. The data that we use is	00:-52:-22 10	MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you.
00:-55:-16 11	broken down. It is not just residential units.	00:-52:-18 11	Some additional questions. In your
00:-55-12 12	It breaks it down between detached units versus	00:-52:-14 12	Exhibit A-35, under comment No. 1b.
00:-55:-10 13	attached units versus apartments. There is a	00:-52:-05 13	THE WITNESS: We just want to
00:-55:-06 14	variety of different land uses that fall within	00:-52:-04 14	pull up that reference. Okay. So A-35 is the
00:-55:-04 15	the umbrella of residential.	00:-51:-58 15	May 19th, 2017 letter.
00:-55:-02 16	And there are different rates,	00:-51:-56 16	MR. HAWS: That is correct.
00:-55:00 17	that's why you see daily numbers, and you see	00:-51:-55 17	THE WITNESS: Okay.
00:-54:-57 18	weekday a.m. numbers and weekday p.m. numbers.	00:-51:-54 18	MR. HAWS: So my first question
00;-54:-53 19	So each period also has a different rate	00:-51:-52 19	is: Under your comment No. 1b, it states that
00:-54:-50 20	between the different uses. So there is a	00:-51:-46 20	"As directed by PennDOT, the PA 926 site access
00:-54:-47 21	variety of rates that go into these	00:-51:-43 21	to the Crebilly development must be located
00:-54:-45 <b>22</b>	calculations.	00:-51:-41 22	opposite Bridlewood Boulevard." And then it
00;-54;-45 23	MR. HAWS: Sure, no, and I	00:-51:-38 23	says, "It is our understanding that the
44 24	understand that. I was asking for what was the	00:-51:-36 24	Arborview site access is proposed to be located
	1017		1019
00:-54:-42 1	rate for a single-family home versus a carriage	00:-51:-33	along West Pleasant Grove Road, opposite the
00:-54:-38 2	home.	00:-51:-30 2	Westminster Presbyterian Church property, and
00:-54:-27 3	THE WITNESS: I'm just going to	00:-51:-27	therefore, the Crebilly site access along West
00:-54:-26	grab my calculator here to give you an example.	00:-51:-22 4	Pleasant Grove Road cannot be located opposite
00:-53:-58 5	So, for example, on the daily	00:-51:-21 5	the Arborview access."
00:-53:-43	numbers for Alternative A, there is a breakdown	00:-51:-19 6	Why is that?
00:-53:-39 7	of 117 attached units and 202 detached units.	00:-51:-18 7	THE WITNESS: Because the
00:-53:-34	So, for example, on a daily basis, the trip	00:-51:-18	applicant does not own the property opposite
00;-53;-32	generation rate for the attached units is	00:-51:-16	where the Arborview access is proposed. That is the Westminster Church property.
00:-53 -28 10	approximately 6.3 trips per unit, where on the detached units, the rate is approximately 9.9	00:-51:-14 10	MR. HAWS: Okay. And then in
00:-53:-22 11	trips per unit, per day. So that's an example.	00:-51:-08 12	that same exhibit, comment No. 3, your tables 1
00:-53:-17 12	MR. HAWS: So that's what I was	00:-51:-02 13	and 2, I know that Ms. DeWolf had asked you
00:-53:-08 14	asking. I was asking what is the industry	00:-50:-58 14	some questions about that. Can you explain the
00:-53:-08 14	standard number that you utilize for	00:-50:-57 15	difference between the raw daily traffic
00:-53:-02 16	single-family dwelling versus carriage home?	00:-50:-54 16	volumes and the adjusted AADT?
00:-53:-02 17	Are you saying that those are the two numbers	00:-50:-50	THE WITNESS: Yes. So data is
00:-52:-58 18	that you apply for the study?	00:-50:-48 18	collected throughout the year at various times,
nn 52:-55 <b>19</b>	THE WITNESS: That was for daily	00:-50:-44 19	and, as you would expect, traffic varies.
4 20	as an example. But each peak hour has a	00:-50:-41 20	Traffic is different when school is in session
00:-52:-52 21	different rate.	00:-50:-39 21	versus summer, versus winter. So an average
00:-52:-51 <b>22</b>	So there are a multitude of rates	00:-50:-35 22	annual daily traffic volume is just as the
00:-52:-49 23	that go into these calculations. That was just	00:-50:-31 23	title alludes, that it is an average over the
1		00:-50:-27 24	course of the year.

-			
	1020		1022
00:-50:-27	So if you were to look at the raw	00:-48:-15	would talk about competence intervals, median,
00:-50:-25	data you would expect to see days that are	00:-48:-11 2	you know, lots of different statistical terms.
00 -50;-23	below that and days that are above that. But	00:-48:-08	When the title is "average" it is looking at
20 4	typically what you boil the raw traffic count	00:-48:-05	the average of a set of numbers.
00:-50:-17 5	data down to for a roadway like this, for a	00:-48:-02 5	So I am just having a hard time
00:-50:-14	daily volume, is you want to talk about an	00:-47:-58 6	wrapping my head around your last statement
00:-50:-12 7	average annual daily traffic.	00:-47:-56 7	there. Can you clarify that a little bit more?
00:-50:-10	MR. HAWS: Okay. And then you	00:-47:-54	THE WITNESS: Sure. So when we
00:-50:-09	had made a comment just in response to Ms.	00:-47:-52	are talking about traffic there are other
00:-50:-06 10	DeWolf's question that median and average are	00:-47:-51 10	factors that go into calculating average annual
00:-50:-03	the same. And I just that's not	00:-47:-48 11	daily traffic, such as actual correctional
00:-49:-57 12	statistically correct. Average is the average	00:-47:-44 12	factors, seasonal adjustment factors, so there
00:-49:-54 13	of a group of numbers. Median is the middle	00:-47:-41 13	are other elements. Rather, it is not just an
00:-49:-50 14	point of a set of numbers.	00:-47:-40 14	average of a set of raw today.
00 -49:-46 15	MS. DEWOLF: It happens once.	00:-47:-36 15	What I was referring to is there
00:-49:-43 16	MR. HAWS: Yeah. So I guess the	00:-47:-35 16	is a set of other, other correction factors
00:-49:-42 17	question is: Do you have data to show median	00:-47:-31 17	that go into developing an average annual daily
00:-49:-40 18	adjusted traffic volumes per day? Because I	00:-47:-27 18	traffic volume. So those are the types of
00:-49:-36 19	think when you are looking at a set where you	00:-47:-25 19	things I was referring to. Axle correction
00:-49:-34 20	have peaks and valleys and loads, average does	00:-47:-22 20	factor, which incorporates heavy vehicles into
00:-49:-31 21	not necessarily capture the appropriate measure	00:-47:-18 21	the equation, and also seasonal adjustment
00:-49:-28 22	here, and median would be more beneficial for	00:-47:-14 22	factor.  MR. HAWS: Okay. Moving on to
00:-49:-25 23	this report.  THE WITNESS: In terms of the	00:-47:-13 23	during your testimony you had said that Toll
23 24		00:-46:-55 24	1023
	1021		
00:-49:-21	statistical definition, you are absolutely	00:-46:-52	Brothers will have to make additional roadway
00:-49:-19 2	correct, the term median and average are not the same. But in terms of how this average	00:-46:-50 2	improvements along its property frontages. I guess the question was: "Would Toll Brothers
00:-49:-17 3	annual traffic volume is developed, it is not		need to make that?" And you said: "It is
00:-49:-09 5	simply an averaging of a set of data as you	00:-46:-43 4	possible." And then Mr. Adelman asked for you
	would think of it in terms of statistics.	00:-46:-38	to expand on that. And you said: "There would
_	There is a lot of other factors.	00:-46:-36 7	be some roadway widenings needed in order to
	You know, it is looking at the long-term	00:-46:-32	satisfy township ordinance street width
00:-49:-01 8	historic trends. It is not a simple	00:-46:-28	requirements."
00:48:-56 10	calculation. It is not a simple averaging of	00:-46:-28 10	Do you have any of those details?
00:48:-53	the raw data either.	00:-46:-26 11	THE WITNESS: We do not have the
00:48:-52 12	So at this point we do not have	00:-46:-24 12	details at this time. We have not gone into a
00:-48:-50 13	the raw data. What we reported in the tables,	00:-46:-23 13	detailed design of roadway improvements,
00:-48:-47 14	Table 1 showed data from PennDOT and Table 2	00:-46:-19 14	pending the discussions here through the
00:-48:-43 15	showed data from DVRPC, but we are only privy	00:-46:-17 15	conditional use hearing.
00:-48:-40 16	to the final numbers. We do not have all of	00:-46:-15 16	MR. HAWS: Okay. And then during
00:-48:-37 17	the raw data that went into the calculations at	00:-46:-14 17	your testimony, separate question came to you
00:-48:-33 18	this time.	00:-46:-11 18	about that there may need to be right-of-ways
nn-48:-33 <b>19</b>	MR. HAWS: Okay. But, again, not	00:-46:-08 19	along some of that property frontage, and then
J 20	to hammer in on this point, but it is average	00:-46:-06 20	you said that you have not done that
00:-48 -27 <b>21</b>	daily, it is average annual daily traffic, yet	00:-46:-03 21	calculation yet, but based on your knowledge
		1	
00:-48:-23 22	you are telling me that it is not an average.	00:-46:-01 22	that there may be the requirement for some
00:-48:-23 22		00:-46:-01 22	that there may be the requirement for some right-of-ways.
	you are telling me that it is not an average.		·

Page 1020 to 1023 of 1187

7 of 76 sheets

08/02/2017 05:18:32 PM

		-	
	1024		1026
00:-45:-56	that and see what the impact of the	00:-42:-56	mentioned earlier this evening, as part of
00:-45:-54	right-of-ways would have?	00:-42:-54	evaluating some potential changes to the plan,
00 -45:-53	THE WITNESS: No. Again, until	00:-42:-51 3	but that a connector road through a residential
.31 4	we do a full detailed design, those elements	00:-42:-48 4	development such as what is proposed, and that
00:-45:-49 <b>5</b>	would not be quantified.	00:-42:-43 5	based on PennDOT requirements must connect
00:-45:-47 6	MR. HAWS: Okay. Moving on to	00:-42:-41 6	opposite Bridlewood Boulevard. Again, another
00:-45:-41 7	Exhibit, this would be Board Exhibit 19.	00:-42:-38 7	residential development that some type of
00:-45:-05	THE WITNESS: So I believe 19 is	00:-42:-34	regional connection to allow non-local traffic
00:-45:-04	an impact analysis. Is that correct?	00:-42:-30	to utilize it would not seem to be appropriate,
00:-45:-02 10	MR. HAWS: That is correct.	00:-42:-27 10	given the uses and connections based on the
00:-45:-01 11	THE WITNESS: Okay.	00:-42:-24 11	proposed plan and the requirements that are
00:-45:-01 12	MR. HAWS: During your review and	00:-42:-22 12	being dictated by PennDOT for that access.
00:-44:-59 13	preparation for this traffic study report did	00:-42:-19 13	MR. HAWS: So once having
00:-44:-56 14	you have a chance to review this document?	00:-42:-10 14	PennDOT's written letter, because that goes
00:-44:-54 15	THE WITNESS: I have not reviewed	00:-42:-08 15	directly against our Growth Management Plan and
00:-44:-53 16	this document.	00:-42:-04 16	Comprehensive Plan for that site, the site has
00:-44:-44 17	MR. HAWS: Again, I don't have it	00:-42:-02 17	always been earmarked to have a collector road,
00:-44:-42 18	right in front of me, but I believe that the	00:-41:-59 18	and based on all of our zoning and ordinances,
00:-44:-39 19	Planning Commission's attorney asked you some	00:-41:-54 19	a development of this size I feel should
00:-44:-36 20	questions regarding that, specifically around	00:-41:-51 20	require that type of connection and
00:-44:-33 21	comment No. 4, which was talking about	00:-41:-47 21	connectivity to the community.
00:-44:-23 <b>22</b>	additional roadway access between South New	00:-41:-45 22	THE WITNESS: PennDOT states in
00:-44:-21 23	Street and the development.	00:-41:-44 23	their letter the access must be located
¹ ₃ 24	And I was just wondering why that	00:-41:-42 24	opposite Bridlewood Boulevard and 926, and they
			opposite Bridiewood Bodievard und 520, and they
1	1025		1027
00:-44:-13		00:-41:-39	also state that they are supportive of a
	1025		also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove
00:-44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.	00:-41:-39 1	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go
00:-44:-13 <b>1</b> 00:-44:-10 <b>2</b>	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the	00:-41:-39 <b>1</b> 00:-41:-37 <b>2</b>	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.
00:-44:-13 <b>1</b> 00:-44:-10 <b>2</b> 00:-44:-06 <b>3</b>	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the	00:41:39 <b>1</b> 00:41:37 <b>2</b> 00:41:34 <b>3</b>	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar
00:-44:-13 <b>1</b> 00:-44:-10 <b>2</b> 00:-44:-06 <b>3</b> 00:-44:-05 <b>4</b>	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the	00:41:39 <b>1</b> 00:41:37 <b>2</b> 00:41:34 <b>3</b> 00:41:31 <b>4</b>	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer,
00:-44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at	00:41:39	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road
00:44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:34 3 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local
00:-44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:34 3 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:23 7 00:41:20 8 00:41:46 9	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other
00:-44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:34 3 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:23 7 00:41:20 8 00:41:46 9 00:41:43 10	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize
00:44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more	00:41:39	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.
00:-44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:34 3 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:23 7 00:41:20 8 00:41:46 9 00:41:41 10 00:41:41 11	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide,
00:44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove	00:41:39	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract
00:-44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:34 3 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:23 7 00:41:40 8 00:41:41 10 00:41:41 11 00:41:41 11 00:41:41 13 00:40:58 14	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through
00:44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.  Would having the collector road	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:34 3 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:28 7 00:41:20 8 00:41:41 11 00:41:41 11 00:41:04 13 00:40:55 15	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through this residential neighborhood, nor would it be
00:44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.  Would having the collector road on the plan change any of the traffic numbers	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:31 4 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:23 7 00:41:20 8 00:41:41 10 00:41:41 11 00:41:04 12 00:41:04 13 00:40:55 15 00:40:53 16	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through this residential neighborhood, nor would it be desired through the residential neighborhood to
00:44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.  Would having the collector road on the plan change any of the traffic numbers and study that you have done?	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:34 3 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:26 7 00:41:20 8 00:41:41 10 00:41:41 11 00:41:09 12 00:41:04 13 00:40:58 14 00:40:55 15 00:40:49 17	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through this residential neighborhood, nor would it be desired through the residential neighborhood to the south, in existing Thornbury.
00:44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.  Would having the collector road on the plan change any of the traffic numbers and study that you have done?  THE WITNESS: Certainly, it would	00:41:39	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through this residential neighborhood, nor would it be desired through the residential neighborhood to the south, in existing Thornbury.  MR. HAWS: That's based on your
00:-44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.  Would having the collector road on the plan change any of the traffic numbers and study that you have done?  THE WITNESS: Certainly, it would depend on the characteristics of the connector	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:34 3 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:26 6 00:41:28 7 00:41:40 8 00:41:41 11 00:41:40 12 00:41:41 13 00:40:55 15 00:40:53 16 00:40:45 18 00:40:45 18	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through this residential neighborhood, nor would it be desired through the residential neighborhood to the south, in existing Thornbury.  MR. HAWS: That's based on your opinion?
00:44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.  Would having the collector road on the plan change any of the traffic numbers and study that you have done?  THE WITNESS: Certainly, it would depend on the characteristics of the connector road. A similar comment was made by the	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:26 7 00:41:26 8 00:41:46 9 00:41:41 11 00:41:09 12 00:41:04 13 00:40:55 15 00:40:45 16 00:40:45 18 00:40:45 18	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through this residential neighborhood, nor would it be desired through the residential neighborhood to the south, in existing Thornbury.  MR. HAWS: That's based on your opinion?  THE WITNESS: That's based on my
00:-44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.  Would having the collector road on the plan change any of the traffic numbers and study that you have done?  THE WITNESS: Certainly, it would depend on the characteristics of the connector road. A similar comment was made by the traffic engineer, the township's traffic	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:31 4 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:23 7 00:41:20 8 00:41:41 10 00:41:41 11 00:41:09 12 00:41:04 13 00:40:55 15 00:40:45 16 00:40:45 18 00:40:45 18 00:40:44 19 00:40:43 20 00:40:42 21	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through this residential neighborhood, nor would it be desired through the residential neighborhood to the south, in existing Thornbury.  MR. HAWS: That's based on your opinion?  THE WITNESS: That's based on my opinion, yes.
00:44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.  Would having the collector road on the plan change any of the traffic numbers and study that you have done?  THE WITNESS: Certainly, it would depend on the characteristics of the connector road. A similar comment was made by the traffic engineer, the township's traffic engineer on this issue, and our response was	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:26 7 00:41:26 8 00:41:41 10 00:41:41 11 00:41:04 13 00:40:45 14 00:40:45 15 00:40:45 18 00:40:44 19 00:40:43 20 00:40:42 21 00:40:41 22	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through this residential neighborhood, nor would it be desired through the residential neighborhood to the south, in existing Thornbury.  MR. HAWS: That's based on your opinion?  THE WITNESS: That's based on my opinion, yes.  MR. HAWS: But you just a moment
00:-44:-13	wasn't factored in at all to any potential traffic mitigation on the other streets and throughways.  THE WITNESS: Based on the conditional use application that was filed, the proposed site accesses adequately serve the development, and that is what is proposed at this time, and so that is what we evaluated.  MR. HAWS: Okay. And then also on that same document comment No. 6 talks about the collector road, and that having a more contiguous road through that would help with traffic patterns off of West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.  Would having the collector road on the plan change any of the traffic numbers and study that you have done?  THE WITNESS: Certainly, it would depend on the characteristics of the connector road. A similar comment was made by the traffic engineer, the township's traffic	00:41:39 1 00:41:37 2 00:41:31 4 00:41:31 4 00:41:28 5 00:41:26 6 00:41:23 7 00:41:20 8 00:41:41 10 00:41:41 11 00:41:09 12 00:41:04 13 00:40:55 15 00:40:45 16 00:40:45 18 00:40:45 18 00:40:44 19 00:40:43 20 00:40:42 21	also state that they are supportive of a connection between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. But, again, it doesn't, it doesn't go any further than that into anymore detail.  But in response to similar comments from your township traffic engineer, in light of the uses here, a connector road makes sense, in terms of allowing for local traffic and not just this development, other local traffic surrounding this area to utilize that connection certainly makes sense.  But to create some type of wide, higher-speed connection here, which may attract 202 traffic, would not be desirable through this residential neighborhood, nor would it be desired through the residential neighborhood to the south, in existing Thornbury.  MR. HAWS: That's based on your opinion?  THE WITNESS: That's based on my opinion, yes.

1 PennDOT supports a connection and they state 1 a hand. 2 that in their letter. But they don't go 2 shead. 3 hand. 3 MR. HAWS: I'm saying, but that 3 was after I asked the follow-up question, Your 3 so the additional traffic would 3 was after I asked the follow-up question, Your 4 and there. As an exiting movement, if that 202 5 so the additional traffic would 5 so the additional traffic would 5 so the additional traffic would 6 first statements and the PennDOT dones 6 first statements and the PennDOT dones 7 prefer a collector road, but then now you are 8 saying that they do. 11 the stiffed that PennDOT is 12 dictating the location of the access along 926 12 be opposite Brildewood, and they stated in 13 dictating the location of the access along 926 14 poposite Brildewood, and they stated in 15 dictating the location of the access along 926 15 be opposite Brildewood, and they stated in 16 gold that they do support a 17 to that is, was what I interneed				
2 that in their letter. But they don't go 3 ahead.  MR. HAWS: I'm saying, but that 5 was after I asked the follow-up question. Your 6 first statement said that PennDOT doesn't 7 prefer a collector road, but then now you are 8 asying that they do. 7 prefer a collector road, but then now you are 8 asying that they do. 7 prefer a collector road, but then now you are 9 THE WITNESS: I don't believe I 1 destined that PennDOT does not support a 1 dictating the location of the access along 926 1 be opposite Bridlewood, and they stated in 1 connector road. I said that PennDOT is 1 be opposite Bridlewood, and they stated in 1 connector road. I said that PennDOT so 1 be opposite Bridlewood, and they stated in 1 connecton between West Pleasant Grove Road and 1 for creview letter that they do support a 1 man 16 2 man 17 3 MR. HAWS: One other question. 2 man 18 3 MR. HAWS: One other question. 3 MR. HAWS: One other question. 4 Would not bestified that the applicant would be 2 access after a was a spart of this 2 currently shown on the conditional use plan is 2 currently shown on the conditional use plan is 3 a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant 4 would consider removing that access in 5 conditional use?  THE WITNESS: Yes. What is 5 conditional use?  THE WITNESS: Certainly the 6 traffic study what does that do to the 6 traffic study that is before us as part of this 6 man 19 6 MR. HAWS: But how much more 6 dally traffic would be going off of East. 7 peasant Grove and go?c? 8 man 19 7 the ware or				
3 ahead.  MR. HAWS: I'm saying, but that  MR. HAWS: I'm saying, but the definition of first statement said that PennODT doesn't  MR. HAWS: A saying that they do.  MR. HAWS: O'A support a  Connector road. I said that PennDOT is  MR. HAWS: O'A support a  Connector road. I said that PennDOT is  MR. HAWS: O'A support a  MR.			00:-38:-42	• •
was after I asked the follow-up question. Your species of the statement said that PennDo'T doesn't prefer a collector road, but then now you are saying that they do.  THE WITNESS: I don't believe I testified that PennDo'T doesn't prefer a collector road, but then now you are saying that they do.  THE WITNESS: I don't believe I testified that PennDo'T does not support a collector to testified that PennDo'T is dictating the location of the access along 926 be opposite Bridiewood, and they stated in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and some around New Street to possible and the state of the was prefer to evide whether that it was obtained in the does not connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and some around New Street to possible and the state of the was prefer to evide whether that it was obtained intended to prefer the state of the was prefer to evide whether that is, was what I intended — MR. HAWS: One other question.  MR. HAWS: O				
5 was after I asked the follow-up question. Your 6 first statement said that PennDOT doesn't 7 prefer a collector road, but then now you are 8 saying that they do. 10 testified that PennDOT does not support a 11 connector road. I said that PennDOT is 12 dictating the location of the access soling 926 13 be opposite Bridlewood, and they stated in 14 their review letter that they do support a 15 put that is, was what I intended 16 put that is, was what I intended 17 put had testified that the applicant would be 18 put had consider removing that access in 19 THE WITNESS: to represent. 10 Willing to abandon the 202 entrance into the 10 you had testified that the applicant would be 10 you had cestified that the applicant would be 10 you had cestified that the applicant would be 10 you had cestified that the applicant would be 10 you had cestified that the applicant would be 11 THE WITNESS: Yes. What is 12 currently shown on the conditional use plan is 13 a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant 15 coordination with the township. 16 MR. HAWS: But how much more 17 access off of 202, what does that do to the 18 traffic study that is before us as part of this 19 coordination with the township. 10 MR. HAWS: But how much more 10 that access were removed, traffic wishing to exit the said travel south on 20 to the site and travel south on 20 to whether it be site and travel south on 20 to wold come out directly not on 20 to 256, or they could come out directly not on 202 and turn at 202. Those would be the 15 concention between these that they all options. 16 MR. HAWS: One other additional depotion. 17 THE WITNESS: to represent. 18 MR. HAWS: One other additional depotion. 18 MR. HAWS: One other additional depotion. 19 20 and divert traffic to tither West Pleasant Grove and and they stream at 202. Those would be the size of 202 and divert traffic to put the stream at 202 and divert traffic to put the stream at 1 timended			00:-38:-37	
6 first statement said that PennDOT doesn't prefer a collector road, but then now you are shown as a sympth text they do. THE WITNESS: I don't believe I connector road. I said that PennDOT is continue in their review letter that they do support a connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come around New Street connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come around New Street connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection of the access of of connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection of the access and gage.  In the witness what I intended come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and come and in connection of the access and gage.  In the witness what I intended come and in connection between West Pleasant Grove Road, would come and intended come and in connection from the state of the connection of the access and gage.  In the witness was a service of the state and travel south on 202. And the papicant would be come and in connection of the access and gage.  In the witness was a service of the state and travel south on 202. Those would be the conditional use gage.  In the witness was a service of the state and travel south on 202. Those would be the conditional use gage.  In the witness was a service of the state and travel south on 202. Those would be serviced and travel in popular and the final results and recommendations would not access and travel south on 202. The witness and travel south on 202.  In t	V .	. =-	00:-38:-36	
7 prefer a collector road, but then now you are soying that they do. 7 THE WITNESS: I don't believe I was 10 testified that PennDOT does not support a content of the accesses on West 10 testified that PennDOT does not support a content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access of the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access along 926 and turn at 202. Those would be the content of the access of the place and the place and the place and the access of the place and the pl	1	• •	00:-38:-32 5	
### THE WITNESS: I don't believe I ### THE WITNESS: I don't believe I ### 10 connector road. I said that PennDOT is ### 11 connector road. I said that PennDOT is ### 11 connector road. I said that PennDOT is ### 11 connector road. I said that PennDOT is ### 11 connector road. I said that PennDOT is ### 11 connector road. I said that PennDOT is ### 11 connector road. I said that PennDOT is ### 12 connector road. I said that PennDOT i			00:-38:-29	
THE WITNESS: I don't believe I connector and. I said that PennDOT is such and the connector road. I said that PennDOT is connection of the access along 926 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road would social remove access off of 20 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection of the access of or 10 connection with the applicant would be social 19 connection with the township.  1029 24 willing to abandon the 202 entrance into the social 20 confidence in the properties.  1029 25 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and social 19 connection with the township and Pleasant Grove Road and work Pleasant Grove Road wor			00:-38:-26	
10 testified that PennDOT does not support a 11 connector road. I said that PennDOT is 12 dictating the location of the access along 926 13 be opposite Bridlewood, and they stated in 14 their review letter that they do support a 15 be opposite Bridlewood, and they stated in 15 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 16 926. So I believe that's what I testified to, 16 18 MR. HAWS: Okay. 17 but that is, was what I intended			00:-38:-22	
### 10 connector road. I said that PennDOT is  ### 12 dictating the location of the access along 926  ### 13 decomposite Brildwood, and they stated in  ### 14 their review letter that they do support a  ### 15 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 16 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 16 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 16 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 16 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 18 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 18 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 18 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 18 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 18 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 18 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 18 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 18 connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that they do support a  ### 16 connection Detween West Pleasant Grove Road and their review letter that the supplicant to the review letter that the applicant the review letter that the applicant the review letter that the applicant the review letter that they do support a we have already and the review letter that the applicant the review letter that the			00:-38:-20	
22 dictating the location of the access along 926 23 one of 13 be opposite Bridlewood, and they stated in their review letter that they do support a connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and connection of the was required to put connection of the condition of the was re				926 and turn at 202. Those would be the
that review letter that they do support a  see 14 their review letter that they do support a  see 15 to connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and  26. So I believe that's what I testified to,  see 16 yes. So I believe that's what I testified to,  see 17 but that is, was what I intended  see 18 MR. HAWS: Okay.  MR. HAWS: Ohe other question.  MR. HAWS: One other question.  MR. HAWS: Willing to abandon the 202 entrance into the governore that road, because now we are increasing the amount of traffic calming measures on that road, one was a price private to put calming, traffic calming measures on that road, one was price private to put calming, traffic calming measures on that road, one was price private to put calming, traffic calming measures on that road, one was price private to put calming, traffic calming measures on that road, one was price private to put calming, traffic calming measures on that road, one was price private to put calming, traffic calming measures on that road, one was price private to put calming, traffic calming measures on that road, one was price private to put calming, traffic calming measures on that road, one was price private to put calming, traffic calming measures on that road, one was price private to put traffic on the west Pleasant Grove Road, would traffic on to west Pleasant Grove Fleasant Grove and yaca private traffic to gut was private to put traffic on to west Pleasant Grove Pleasant G				options.
14 their review letter that they do support a connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 2016 of 17 but that is, was what I intended 3		_	00:-38:-13 12	MR. HAWS: One other additional
connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926. So I believe that's what I testified to, 926. So I believe that's what I itestified to, 926. Park I it was required to put which ship from that force is a minute ago - or 926, West Pleasant Grove Road, would traffic cotto West Pleasant Grove Road, would traffic cotto West Pleasant Grove Road, would that have any impact on tyour traffic study? The WITNESS: Implementation of traffic calming measures on that road, 126. The WITNESS: Implementation of traffic calming would not have an impact on the results of the traffic study. Park I that correct? 1029 The WITNESS: Yes. What is \$0.500 The WITNESS: No. That was not 126. The WITNES			00:-38:-12 13	question. If we were to remove access off of
which 16 926. So I believe that's what I testified to, which is was what i intended which 18 MR. HAWS: Okay.  MR. HAWS: One other question.  MR. HAWS: I have a couple other results of the traffic study.  MR. HAWS: I have a couple other results of the traffic study.  MR. HAWS: One other question, analysis as part of this traffic study that was required by the township	1		00:-38:-08 14	202 and divert traffic to either West Pleasant
but that is, was what I intended	1	connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and	00:-38:-05 15	Grove I apologize, I said East there a
MR. HAWS: Okay.  THE WITNESS: — to represent.  MR. HAWS: Sync other question.  You had testified that the applicant would be elighborhood, or exit, egress or ingress. Is elighborhood, or exit, egress o	1	926. So I believe that's what I testified to,	00:-38:-03 16	minute ago or 926, West Pleasant Grove is a
THE WITNESS: to represent.  MR. HAWS: One other question.  MR. HAWS: Syres. What is  MR. HAWS: In law a couple other question of the traffic study.  MR. HAWS: In law a couple other question.  MR. HAWS: By removing that access in coordination with the township.  MR. HAWS: By removing that access off of 202, what does that do to the results of the traffic study that is before us as part of this coordination use?  MR. HAWS: Certainly the results of the traffic study would change, but we have already completed that analysis, and the final results and recommendations would not change.  MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East  Pleasant Grove and 926?  MR. HAWS: May are used to the waship and pennDOT.  MR. HAWS: Was required by the township and pennDOT.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked district handles their own transportation, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district transportation. So ince the school district transportation. So ince the school district, then also public transportation. So ince the school district, then also public transportation. So ince the school district, then also public transportation. So ince the school district, then also public transportation?  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?	1	but that is, was what I intended	00:-37:-59 17	township road, if it was required to put
MR. HAWS: One other question.  You had testified that the applicant would be neighborhood, or exit, egress or ingress. Is neighborhood or esuit each or exit, egress or ingress. Is neighborhood or esuit each or exit, egress or ingress. Is neighborhood or esuit each or exit and in the first or for the school district or for neighborhood	00:-40:-01 18	MR. HAWS: Okay.	00:-37:-54 18	calming, traffic calming measures on that road,
21 You had testified that the applicant would be willing to abandon the 202 entrance into the case of the correct?  1029 24 that correct?  1029 25 that have any impact on your traffic study?  THE WITNESS: Implementation of traffic calming would not have an impact on the results of the traffic study.  1031  THE WITNESS: Yes. What is currently shown on the conditional use plan is a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant would consider removing that access in coordination with the township.  7 access off of 202, what does that do to the staffic study that is before us as part of this results of the traffic study that is before us as part of this results of the traffic study that is before us as part of this results of the traffic study would change, but we have already completed that analysis, and the final results and recommendations would not change.  18 THE WITNESS: Yes. What is some of the traffic study would change, but we have already completed that analysis, and the final results and recommendations would not change.  19 Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: Inplementation of traffic study.  1031  MR. HAWS: I have a couple other results of the traffic study.  10 we are not privy done any sort of bus stop, whether it be for the school district or for local transportation, analysis as part of this traffic study?  10 access off of 202, what does that do to the conditional use?  10 THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study that was required by the township and PennDOT.  25 MR. HAWS: So would change, but we have already completed that analysis, and the final results and recommendations would not change.  10 THE WITNESS: Public transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  10 THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic is i		THE WITNESS: to represent.	00:-37:-51 19	because now we are increasing the amount of
willing to abandon the 202 entrance into the earlier behavior of the completed has a lighborhood, or exit, egress or ingress. Is  24 that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes. What is  THE WITNESS: What is results of the traffic study.  THE WITNESS: What is results of the traffic study that was not warring the scope of this traffic study that was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: What is was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: What is was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: Public  THE WITNESS: Public  THE WITNESS: Public  THE WITNESS: Public  THE WITNESS: What is traffic study that was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: What is traffic st	00:-39:-59 20	MR. HAWS: One other question.	00:-37:-48 20	traffic onto West Pleasant Grove Road, would
23 neighborhood, or exit, egress or ingress. Is 24 that correct?  1029  1031  THE WITNESS: Yes. What is 2 currently shown on the conditional use plan is 3 a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant would consider removing that access in 5 coordination with the township.  MR. HAWS: By removing that cocess off of 202, what does that do to the 3 traffic study?  MR. HAWS: By removing that cocess off of 202, what does that do to the 3 traffic study that is before us as part of this conditional use?  MR. HAWS: So with a development  THE WITNESS: Certainly the 3 traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study that was required by the township and PennDOT.  MR. HAWS: So with a development  THE WITNESS: Public transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school oldstrict transportation. So since the school district transportation.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation?  THE WITNESS: There would be so the impact of this development on public transportation?  THE WITNESS: The school of this size, that's not a requirement to look at the impact of local public transportation?  THE WITNESS: Public transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation. So so this in the impact of this development on public transportation.  THE WITNESS: Very school istrict	00:-39:-57 21	You had testified that the applicant would be	00:-37:-45 21	that have any impact on your traffic study?
1029 1031  THE WITNESS: Yes. What is 2 currently shown on the conditional use plan is 3 a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant 4 would consider removing that access in 5 coordination with the township. 5 coordination with the township. 6 MR. HAWS: By removing that 3 straffic study that is before us as part of this 5 conditional use? 7 part of the scope of this traffic study that was required by the township and PennDOT. 8 was required by the township and PennDOT. 9 MR. HAWS: So with a development of this size, that's not a requirement to look at the impact of local public transportation? 1 transportation on thing. The School district or for 9 was required by the township and PennDOT. 9 MR. HAWS: So with a development of this size, that's not a requirement to look at the impact of local public transportation? 1 transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation, so 4 was required by the township and PennDOT. 9 MR. HAWS: So with a development of this size, that's not a requirement to look at the impact of local public transportation? 1 transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study. 1 transportation. So since the school district transportation.	00:-39:-53 22	willing to abandon the 202 entrance into the	00:-37:-42 22	THE WITNESS: Implementation of
THE WITNESS: Yes. What is  THE WITNESS: Yes. What is  currently shown on the conditional use plan is a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant would consider removing that access in taffic study that is before us as part of this would consider removing that access in taffic study?  MR. HAWS: So with a development of this size, that's not a requirement to look at the impact of local public transportation? THE WITNESS: Public  THE WITNESS:	00:-39:-46 23	neighborhood, or exit, egress or ingress. Is	00:-37:-39 23	traffic calming would not have an impact on the
1 THE WITNESS: Yes. What is 2 currently shown on the conditional use plan is 3 a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant would consider removing that access in coordination with the township. MR. HAWS: By removing that access off of 202, what does that do to the compared to the traffic study that is before us as part of this conditional use? MR. HAWS: Certainly the conditional use? MR. HAWS: So with a development of this size, that's not a requirement to look at the final results and recommendations would not change. MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East MR. HAWS: T have a couple other questions. Have you done any sort of bus stop, whether it be for the school district or for local transportation, analysis as part of this traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study that was required by the township and PennDOT.  MR. HAWS: So with a development of this size, that's not a requirement to look at the impact of local public transportation? THE WITNESS: Public transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district transportation.	40 24	that correct?	00:-37:-37 24	results of the traffic study.
2 currently shown on the conditional use plan is 3 a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant would consider removing that access in coordination with the township.  MR. HAWS: By removing that access off of 202, what does that do to the access off of 202, what does that do to the conditional use?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study that was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: Certainly the access off the traffic study would change, but access off of 202, what does that do to the access off of				1031
3 a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant 4 would consider removing that access in 5 coordination with the township. 6 MR. HAWS: By removing that 6 access off of 202, what does that do to the 7 access off of 202, what does that do to the 7 conditional use? 8 traffic study that is before us as part of this 8 conditional use? 9 THE WITNESS: Certainly the 9 conditional use? 10 THE WITNESS: Certainly the 11 results of the traffic study would change, but 11 results of the traffic study would change, but 12 we have already completed that analysis, and 13 the final results and recommendations would not 14 change. 15 MR. HAWS: But how much more 16 daily traffic would be going off of East 17 Pleasant Grove and 926? 18 THE WITNESS: There would be 19 additional traffic, so, again, the current plan 20 shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if 21 transportation, analysis as part of this 22 traveling south on 202 coming into the 23 size of the scope of this traffic study that 24 was required by the township and PennDOT. 25 was required by the township and PennDOT. 26 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 27 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 28 to impact study. 29 THE WITNESS: Public 20 size of the traffic study would change, but 20 size of the traffic study would change, but 20 size of the traffic study would change, but 21 transportation, analysis as part of this 29 THE WITNESS: No. That was not 29 MR. HAWS: So with a development 20 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 20 size of the impact of local public transportation? 21 transportation is one thing. The school 22 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 23 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 24 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 25 transportation. 26 size of the scope of this traffic study that 26 size of the scope of this traffic study that 27 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 28 to the impact of local public transportation? 29 THE WITNESS: Public 20 size of the impact of local public transportati	00;-39;-39 1	THE WITNESS: Yes. What is	00:-37:-26	MR. HAWS: I have a couple other
would consider removing that access in coordination with the township.  MR. HAWS: By removing that access off of 202, what does that do to the access off of 202, what does that do to the traffic study that is before us as part of this conditional use?  THE WITNESS: Certainly the results of the traffic study would change, but we have already completed that analysis, and the final results and recommendations would not change.  MR. HAWS: But how much more dially traffic would be going off of East  Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic development would have to turn right onto West  THE WITNESS: There would be development would have to turn right onto West  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. That was not part of the scope of this traffic study?  THE WITNESS: No. The was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: No. The was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: No. The was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: No. The was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: No. The was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: No. The was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: No. The was required by the township and PennDOT.  THE WITNESS: Detail several to substitute the scope of this size, that's not a requirement to look at the impact of local public transportation?  THE WITNESS: Public  THE WITNESS: There would be some and some are	00:-39:-38 2	currently shown on the conditional use plan is	00:-37:-24	questions. Have you done any sort of bus stop,
5 coordination with the township. 6 MR. HAWS: By removing that 7 access off of 202, what does that do to the 8 traffic study that is before us as part of this 9 conditional use? 9 MR. HAWS: So with a development 10 THE WITNESS: Certainly the 11 results of the traffic study would change, but we have already completed that analysis, and 11 the final results and recommendations would not change. 12 WR. HAWS: But how much more dially traffic would be going off of East Pleasant Grove and 926? 13 THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic traveling south on 202 coming into the development would have to turn right onto West  15 Coordination with the township.  16 THE WITNESS: No. That was not 17 part of the scope of this traffic study that was required by the township and PennDOT.  18 Was required by the township and PennDOT.  19 MR. HAWS: So with a development 10 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 11 at the impact of local public transportation? 12 THE WITNESS: Public 13 transportation is one thing. The school 14 district handles their own transportation, so 15 We are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so 16 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 16 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 17 impact study.  18 MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked 18 MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked 19 about the school district, then also public 19 transportation. So since the school district 10 that access were removed, then traffic 10 the impact of their study?  10 THE WITNESS: No. That was not 10 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 11 transportation is one thing. The school 12 transportation is one thing. The school 13 transportation is one thing. The school 14 district handles their own transportation. 15 we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so 16 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 19 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 10 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 10 that	00:-39:-36	a right in/right out on 202. And the applicant	00:-37:-19 3	whether it be for the school district or for
6 MR. HAWS: By removing that 7 access off of 202, what does that do to the 8 traffic study that is before us as part of this 9 conditional use? 9 MR. HAWS: So with a development 10 THE WITNESS: Certainly the 11 results of the traffic study would change, but 11 results of the traffic study would change, but 12 we have already completed that analysis, and 13 the final results and recommendations would not 14 change. 15 MR. HAWS: But how much more 16 daily traffic would be going off of East 17 Pleasant Grove and 926? 18 THE WITNESS: No. That was not 10 part of the scope of this traffic study that 10 was required by the township and PennDOT. 10 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 11 at the impact of local public transportation? 11 transportation is one thing. The school 12 district handles their own transportation, so 13 we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so 14 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 15 impact study. 16 was 18 MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked 17 part of the scope of this traffic study that 18 was required by the township and PennDOT. 10 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 11 at the impact of local public transportation? 12 transportation is one thing. The school 13 district handles their own transportation, so 14 we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so 15 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 16 impact study. 17 part of the scope of this traffic study that 18 was required by the township and PennDOT. 10 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 11 at the impact of local public transportation? 12 transportation is one thing. The school 13 district handles their own transportation, so 14 we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so 15 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 16 was 18 MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked 17 part of the scope of this traffic study that 18 MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked 19 about the school district, then also public 19 transportation? 19 about the school district, then also public 19 about the school district, then also publi	00:-39:-33 4	_	00:-37:-13	
7 access off of 202, what does that do to the 8 traffic study that is before us as part of this 9 conditional use? 9 THE WITNESS: Certainly the 10 THE WITNESS: Certainly the 11 results of the traffic study would change, but 12 we have already completed that analysis, and 13 the final results and recommendations would not 14 change. 15 MR. HAWS: But how much more 16 daily traffic would be going off of East 17 Pleasant Grove and 926? 18 THE WITNESS: There would be 19 additional traffic, so, again, the current plan 19 shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if 10 30 30 19 development would have to turn right onto West 17 part of the scope of this traffic study that 18 was required by the township and PennDOT. 19 MR. HAWS: So with a development 10 00 30 30 10 of this size, that's not a requirement to look 10 at the impact of local public transportation? 11 THE WITNESS: Public 12 THE WITNESS: Public 13 transportation is one thing. The school 14 district handles their own transportation, so 15 we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so 16 that is not a scope requirement of traffic 17 impact study. 18 MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked 19 about the school district, then also public 19 about the school district, then also public 10 30 40 12 is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis 15 traveling south on 202 coming into the 16 development would have to turn right onto West	00:-39:-28 5		00:-37:-11 5	traffic study?
8 traffic study that is before us as part of this conditional use? 9	00:-39:-27	, -	00:-37:-10	
9 conditional use?  10 THE WITNESS: Certainly the  11 results of the traffic study would change, but  12 we have already completed that analysis, and  13 the final results and recommendations would not  14 change.  15 MR. HAWS: But how much more  16 daily traffic would be going off of East  17 Pleasant Grove and 926?  18 THE WITNESS: There would be  19 additional traffic, so, again, the current plan  20 shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if  21 that access were removed, then traffic  22 traveling south on 202 coming into the  23 development would have to turn right onto West  18 THE WITNESS: There would be  20 shows a diditional traffic, so, again, the current plan  23 development would have to turn right onto West  25 THE WITNESS: Public  26 shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if  27 transportation is one thing. The school  28 development to look  29 district, that's not a requirement to look  20 at the impact of local public transportation?  20 THE WITNESS: Public  20 of this size, that's not a requirement to look  20 at the impact of local public transportation?  20 of this size, that's not a requirement to look  20 of this size, that's not a requirement to look  20 at the impact of local public transportation?  21 transportation is one thing. The school  22 district handles their own transportation, so  23 we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so  24 that is not a scope requirement of traffic  25 impact study.  26 shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if  27 transportation. So since the school district  28 is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis  29 on the impact of this development on public  29 transportation?	00:-39:-26 7		00:-37:-09 7	part of the scope of this traffic study that
THE WITNESS: Certainly the results of the traffic study would change, but we have already completed that analysis, and the final results and recommendations would not change.  MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: Public transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation?  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation?  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation?  THE WITNESS: Public transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?	00:-39:-23		00:-37:-07	was required by the township and PennDOT.
11 results of the traffic study would change, but we have already completed that analysis, and the final results and recommendations would not change.  MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: Public  THE witness: Public  The ware not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I		conditional use?	00:-37:-05	MR. HAWS: So with a development
we have already completed that analysis, and the final results and recommendations would not change.  MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East  Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: Public  MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East  Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: There would be dadditional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic that access were removed, then traffic transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?			00:-37:-03 10	of this size, that's not a requirement to look
the final results and recommendations would not change.  MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic that access were removed, then traffic traveling south on 202 coming into the development would have to turn right onto West transportation is one thing. The school district handles their own transportation, so we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?			00:-37:-01 11	at the impact of local public transportation?
change.  MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East  Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic traveling south on 202 coming into the development would have to turn right onto West  Document of the weare not privy, privy to that knowledge, so that is not a scope requirement of traffic that is not a scope requirement.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked that is not a scope requirement of traffic transportation.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked to show a right in/right out on 202, so that if transportation. So since the school district is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?			00:-36:-57 12	THE WITNESS: Public
MR. HAWS: But how much more daily traffic would be going off of East Pleasant Grove and 926? THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic traveling south on 202 coming into the daily traffic would be going off of East  00-38-49 16 that is not a scope requirement of traffic that is not a scope requirement of traffic timpact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district tis in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?	00:-39:-13 13	the final results and recommendations would not		transportation is one thing. The school
daily traffic would be going off of East  Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic traveling south on 202 coming into the development would have to turn right onto West  that is not a scope requirement of traffic impact study.  MR. HAWS: Sure. So I had asked about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?			00:-36:-54 14	district handles their own transportation, so
Pleasant Grove and 926?  THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic traveling south on 202 coming into the development would have to turn right onto West  THE WITNESS: There would be madditional traffic, so, again, the current plan about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?			1	we are not privy, privy to that knowledge, so
THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic traveling south on 202 coming into the development would have to turn right onto West  THE WITNESS: There would be additional traffic, so, again, the current plan about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?	00:-39:-06 16	daily traffic would be going off of East	00:-36:-49 16	that is not a scope requirement of traffic
additional traffic, so, again, the current plan shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic traveling south on 202 coming into the development would have to turn right onto West  about the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district transportation. So since the school district, then also public transportation. So since the school district.		Pleasant Grove and 926?	00:-36:-47 17	impact study.
shows a right in/right out on 202, so that if that access were removed, then traffic traveling south on 202 coming into the development would have to turn right onto West  transportation. So since the school district is in charge of theirs, did you do an analysis on the impact of this development on public transportation?	00:-39:-01 18		00:-36:-46 18	
that access were removed, then traffic  traveling south on 202 coming into the  development would have to turn right onto West  that access were removed, then traffic  onumber of theirs, did you do an analysis  onumber on the impact of this development on public  onumber of theirs, did you do an analysis  onumber of theirs, did you do an analysis  onumber of this development on public  onumber of theirs, did you do an analysis  onumber of their of this development on public  onumber of their	Vi		00:-36:-45 19	
occidence 22 traveling south on 202 coming into the occidence 23 development would have to turn right onto West occidence 24 transportation?	D			·
00-38-47 23 development would have to turn right onto West 00-38-35 23 transportation?				
·		-		
100-38-44 24 Pleasant Grove Road, and then there are two 100-38-34 24 THE WITNESS: We provided summary			l	-
	00:-38:-44 <b>24</b>	Pleasant Grove Road, and then there are two	00:-36:-34 <b>24</b>	THE WITNESS: We provided summary

1032 1034 1 of the existing public transportation that's 00:-36:-32 1 that testimony I was asked to comment on a 2 provided in this region within our study. But 00:-36:-30 2 group of -- to give testimony on a group of 00-33-43 no additions or modifications are proposed, so 3 3 comments, and we then went through each of the 00:-33:-39 that's the extent to which it is included in comments in more detail. But I would have to 4 5 the traffic study. 5 go back and reference that exhibit to be able 00:-36:-23 00:-33:-32 MR. HAWS: So there would be no 00:-36:-22 to go through that again and specify on each 00:+33:-28 need to upgrade any of the current public comment what is acceptable in terms of our 00:-36:-21 7 7 transportation bus stops to make them ADAH 8 8 analysis. 00:-36:-19 00:-33:-20 9 compliant? 9 MR. HAWS: Sure, I mean your 00:-36:-15 00:-33:-19 00:-36:-14 10 THE WITNESS: As part of this 00:-33:-17 10 answer was: "The ones that I indicated were 00:-36:-13 11 proposed development there is no impact to 00:-33:-15 11 agreeable, yes. The others would be open to 00:-36:-11 12 public transportation. 00:-33:-11 12 continued coordination." What did you mean by 00:-36:-08 13 MR. HAWS: And how did you come 00:-33:-08 13 "open to continued coordination"? 00:-36:-06 14 to that assessment? 00:-32:-55 14 THE WITNESS: So one of the 00:-36:-03 15 THE WITNESS: Based on the comments in one, some of the language in 00:-32:-39 15 16 existing facilities and the usership at those comment No. 6 we have testified to earlier this 00:-36:00 00:-32:-36 16 00:-35:-55 17 facilities, the potential generation from this 00:-32:-32 17 evening. It speaks to the fact that the 00:-35:-51 18 development or the existing public transit, connector road should be -- the location of the 00:-32:-30 18 which is bus service, would be negligible, if 00:-35:-47 19 connector road should be immediately west of 00:-32:-27 19 00:-35:-43 **20** anything. 00:-32:-24 **20** Westminster Presbyterian Church and aligned 00:-35:-42 21 MR. HAWS: Was that provided in with the proposed access to the Orvis 00:-32:-21 21 00:-35:-41 22 any of the reports that are before us? commercial tract. 00:-32:-18 22 00:-35:-38 23 THE WITNESS: Really, all that's 00:-32:-18 23 As I testified to earlier this 36 24 included in the report is a description of the 00:-32:-16 24 evening, the Orvis tract, or Arborview, as it 1033 1035 1 existing facilities. is also called, their access is proposed 00:-35:-34 00:-32:-13 MR. HAWS: But you are testifying opposite property that the applicant doesn't 00:-35:-32 tonight that you did an analysis and that it 3 own, so that, for example, is something that 00:-35:-29 nn-32-na 4 will have no impact on that? 4 they cannot physically provide. So that would 00:-35:-28 00:-32:-05 THE WITNESS: I'm testifying that 5 5 be an example. 00:-35:-25 00:-32:-02 that is my professional opinion. 6 MR. HAWS: But I guess what I was 00:-35:-24 00:-32:00 MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you. trying to get at is what did you mean by "open 00:-35:-19 00:-31:-57 Just a couple more questions. In your to continued coordination"? So you were saying 8 00:-35:-12 testimony at the May 23rd hearing, Mr. Gill, ones that were agreeable, yes, but then the 00:-34:-39 00:-31:-46 00:-34:-32 10 for the Planning Commission, had asked you to 00:-31:-44 ones that were at disagreement that would be open to continued coordination? 00:-34:-29 11 stipulate to certain conditions, and your 00:-31:-40 11 answer was for comments 5 to 15, which are THE WITNESS: Well, many of these 00:-34:-25 12 00:-31:-37 12 00:-34:-20 13 those that are directly related to your work, comments refer to items that are under the 00:-31:-36 13 that you made reference that you were on the jurisdiction of PennDOT. So the applicant will 00:-34:-16 14 00:-31:-31 14 record with specific information and that you be under the jurisdiction of PennDOT for 00:-34:-11 15 00:-31:-26 15 00:-34:-09 16 believed that the rest were agreeable. You anything along state roadways, so they would 00:-31:-24 16 were in regards talking about whether you not be able to commit to something that PennDOT 00 -34:-06 17 00:-31:-22 17 00:-34:-04 18 agreed -- you were in agreement with the would not permit or potentially approve or not 00:-31:-19 18 nnlis4:-02 19 comments 5 through 15. 00:-31:-16 19 approve. 59 **20** And it just seemed kind of vague, So that would also be an example 00:-31:-16 20 00:-33:-56 21 and I was just wondering if there was a way of continued coordination would be needed. 00:-31:-14 21 00:-33:-53 22 that you could clearly articulate what you They can't necessarily accept something that 00:-31:-11 22 00:-33:-50 **23** meant there. they don't know if PennDOT will accept. 00:-31:-08 23 THE WITNESS: I believe during MR, HAWS: So for ones that 00:-33:-49 24 00:-31:-05 24

1036 1038 weren't under PennDOT's purview, what do you 1 00:-31:-03 1 design on that. So it would really require 00:-28:-34 2 PennDOT to weigh in on that for their, for mean by "continued coordination"? 00:-31:-01 2 00-28-31 3 THE WITNESS: In comment 12, for 00:-31:00 3 their design. 00:-28:-28 example, it speaks to coordination and approval 4 33 MR. HAWS: What is a typically 00:-28:-26 safe distance for a building to be next to a 00:-30:-30 5 by the township for a landscaping plan, for 5 00-28-23 example. So even within the comments 00:-30:-28 6 state road? 00:-28:-19 themselves it speaks to further coordination 7 00:-30:-25 THE WITNESS: There really isn't 8 would be needed for some of these items. I a standard for that. I mean, certainly you 00:-30:-22 00:-28:-17 9 mean, we can go through it line by line if you have clear zones that you like to see along 00:-28:-14 10 want to. I'm happy to do so. 00:-30:-18 10 roadways based on their classification. But 00:-30:-16 11 MR. HAWS: No. That's fine. I 00:-28:-08 11 there really isn't a standard distance in terms 12 was just trying to understand what you were of what is safe or not safe. 00:-28:-05 12 00:-30:-09 13 referencing. 00:-28:-01 13 MR. HAWS: Is there a difference 00:-30:-09 14 THE WITNESS: Those are the items between new construction, existing construction 00:-28:00 14 I was referring to. So in a broad sense, there 15 00:-27:-58 15 or historic structures? 00:-30:-07 are items within this set of comments that 00:-30:-05 16 THE WITNESS: There is certainly 00:-27:-56 16 00:-30:-03 17 refer to ongoing coordination. There are items 00:-27:-54 17 land development requirements that would talk that I think contradict some of the items that 18 about building setbacks, etcetera. 00 -30:00 00:-27:-51 18 19 PennDOT has indicated they want to see. 00:-29:-54 00:-27:-48 19 But for an historic structure, it 00:-29:-50 20 There are certainly some that 00:-27:-46 **20** is certainly not uncommon that things change 00:-29:-49 21 contradict other comments that we have heard 00:-27:-43 21 around it and things don't necessarily meet a 00:-29:-46 **22** throughout this conditional use hearing. 00:-27:-38 22 new land development standard, I would say in 00:-29:-44 23 So those are the items that I am 00:-27:-35 23 general, that as a general comment. 42 24 00:-27:-33 24 MR. HAWS: When the PennDOT TIP referring to, ongoing coordination and the 1037 1039 applicant is open to, the 202 access being an 1 or the construction phase completes, or 2 example, that there are some contradictory whatever the terminology you want to use, and 00:-29:-35 00:-27:-28 3 opinions, and so that further coordination is if the historic structure needs to be moved for 00:-29:-33 00:-27:-23 needed to determine what the township wants to 4 4 that, is that something the applicant would be 5 move forward with. 5 willing to do? 00:-29:-25 00:-27:-17 6 MR. HAWS: Okav. Just one final THE WITNESS: I can't speak to 00:-29:-24 00:-27:-16 question. Regarding the historic structure at 7 00:-27:-12 7 the historic structure. That's not a part of 8 the corner of 926 and 202, you had testified 8 my expertise. Nor was I asked to look at that 00:-29:-21 00:-27:-09 9 that PennDOT currently has a TIP for as part of this evaluation. So that would be 00:-29:-17 00:-27:-06 improvements at that intersection, and that by 10 00:-27:-04 10 up to the applicant. 11 the potential widening of that road should not 00:-27:-02 11 MR. HAWS: So then I guess just a 00:-29:-10 12 have an impact on that, and you had thought 00 -29:-06 00:-27:00 12 more general question: In your experience as a 13 that it wouldn't come as close as 12 or 14 00:-26:-58 13 traffic consultant, if additional traffic 14 feet, I can't remember what you had said, but improvements are needed due to your study, if 00:-28:-58 00:-26:-55 14 15 you said that you would need to go back and 00:-28:-56 00:-26:-51 15 historic structures were required to be moved. verify that. 16 00:-28:-55 00:-26:-47 16 would that be something that applicants 00:-28:-54 17 I was just wondering if since the 00:-26:-45 17 typically would agree to? last time you were before this Board you've had 18 00:-26:-43 18 00:-28:-52 THE WITNESS: If it is a part of nn-28:-50 **19** a chance to confirm the distance and the need 00:-26:-41 19 the requirement for the development and the <sub>5</sub> 20 or not need of potentially moving that 00:-26:-37 20 associated required improvements that historic 00:-28:-43 21 structure be moved, certainly that is something structure? 00:-26:-34 21 00:-28:-43 22 THE WITNESS: That is really 00:-26:-32 22 that has occurred on projects. within the purview of PennDOT's project. And 00:-28:-41 23 00:-26:-29 23 MR. HAWS: Okay. I'm sorry, just one additional follow-up question. I 00:-28:-37 24 they have not released any further detailed

	1040	1	4040
00:-26:-26 1	apologize. When you did the traffic study, did	00:-24:-14	1042 THE WITNESS: The road system was
00:-26:-21 2	you do it with the 202/926 intersection as it		
00:-26:-27 3	is today, or as it will be once the		designed by the site engineer, and the historic consultant would have reviewed historic
14 4	construction is completed at that intersection?		
1 -	THE WITNESS: We did it as both.		resources on the property. So it is just not a
6	MR. HAWS: What was the	00:-24:-05	part of my review or my expertise to comment on
7	difference between the two?	00:-24:-02 6	that.
00:-26:-07		00:-24:-02 7	MS. DEWOLF: Okay. In respect to
	THE WITNESS: In general terms,	00:-23:-54	the Presbyterian Church, Westminster
00:-26:-04	approximately, the PennDOT project I believe	00:-23:-50	Presbyterian Church, sorry, how are those
00:-26:-02 10	resulted in about a 20 percent decrease in	00:-23:-49 10	people exiting in your new plan? How are they
00:-26:00 11	delay.	00:-23:-45 11	going northbound?
00:-25:-59 12	MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you.	00:-23:-44 12	THE WITNESS: Their access would
00:-25:-57 13	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	00:-23:-38 13	not change from what it is today. To travel
00:-25:-56 14	MS. DEWOLF: I have some more	00:-23:-35 14	northbound today they would have to, I would
00:-25:-55 15	questions. West Pleasant Grove is this	00:-23:-32 15	assume their primary option would be to travel
00:-25:-48 16	wonderful, scenic drive, and historic. Are you	00:-23:-29 16	West Pleasant Grove to New Street, to 926, to
00:-25:-42 17	familiar with any of our regulations regarding	00:-23:-26 17	202 northbound.
00:-25:-38 18	that particular road, or the protection of our	00:-23:-23 18	MS. DEWOLF: Okay. And
00:-25:-34 19	viewsheds of our roads?	00:-23:-20 19	Bridlewood, have you done any studies on the
00:-25:-32 20	THE WITNESS: I'm familiar with	00:-23:-17 20	safety and the traffic impact on that very
00:-25:-31 21	the roadway standards within the township	00:-23:-07 21	vulnerable neighborhood immediately south and
00:-25:-29 22	ordinance.	00:-23:-04 22	the impact of the large numbers of volume that
00:-25:-28 23	MS. DEWOLF: Well, road standards	00:-22:-58 23	will be rerouted through there as a result?
25 24	are very different than I'm asking. I'll ask	00:-22:-56 24	Have you accommodated any elements to mitigate
Ì	1041		1043
00:-25:-24	the same question again. Are you familiar with	00:-22:-50 1	that?
00:-25:-22	any of our scenic or historic road pieces,	00:-22:-49 <b>2</b>	THE WITNESS: We have met with
00:-25:-17	ordinances that relate to historic or roads'	00:-22:-47 3	Thornbury and they have hired a special traffic
00:-25:-11	viewsheds with this significance?	00:-22:-44	consultant to look at the Bridlewood Boulevard
00 -25:-09 5	THE WITNESS: I'm not familiar	00:-22:-40 5	roadway and coordinate with the neighbors to
00:-25:-08	with those types of ordinances as it relates to	00:-22:-37	determine potential traffic calming master plan
00:-25:-04	roadways, no.	00:-22:-33 7	for that neighborhood. And the applicant is
00:-25:-02	MS. DEWOLF: Okay. In respect to	00:-22:-29	continuing, will continue coordination with
00:-25:-01	your road plan inside your plan, in the	00:-22:-27	Thornbury on those elements.
00:-24:-57 10	development, not the outside road systems,	00:-22:-25 10	MS. DEWOLF: Have you considered
00:-24:-53 11	given PHMC's eligibility status for this	00:-22:-24 11	any of the pedestrian elements of the children
00:-24:-49 12	particular property to be an historic structure	00:-22:-22 12	in your new development that will walk to
00:-24:-45 13	in its entirety, is your road system impacting	00:-22:-20 13	school?
00:-24:-41 14	any historic element on that property?	00:-22:-20 14	THE WITNESS: The proposed
00:-24:-36 15	THE WITNESS: That would be a	00:-22:-14 15	development will include pedestrian connections
00:-24:-35 16	question for the historic consultant. That was	00:-22:-12 16	throughout. In regards to walking to school, I
00:-24:-31 17	not a part of my review or evaluation as part	00:-22:-06 17	do not believe that this development is close,
00:-24:-27 18	of this development.	00:-22:-03 18	in close proximity. We did not I will say
00-24:-26 19	MS. DEWOLF: Are any of your	00:-21:-55 19	we did not complete an evaluation of trips to
25 20	designed roadway systems impacting any historic	00:-21:-50 20	school, walking trips to school as part of our
00:-24:-20 <b>21</b>	properties	00:-21:-47 21	traffic study evaluations.
00:-24:-19 22	THE WITNESS: The road	00:-21:-44 22	MS. DEWOLF: They have crosswalks
00:-24:-17 23	MS. DEWOLF: on top of any	00:-21:-43 23	in them, though, correct?
00:-24:-16 24		00:-21:-41 24	THE WITNESS: Crosswalks

	1044		1046
00:-21:-40	MS. DEWOLF: You haven't	00:-19:-36	MS. DEWOLF: I think that's it
00:-21:-39 <b>2</b>	mentioned or evaluated any crosswalks either	00:-19:-35 <b>2</b>	for now.
00:-21:-37 3	across 202, across 926, or across West Pleasant	00:-19:-33 3	MR. HAWS: Sorry, I just have one
32 4	Grove Road to get up to two schools which are	00:-19:-31 4	additional question. So in regards to the
00:-21:-29 5	immediately north?	00:-19:-27 <b>5</b>	intersection of 926 at Bridlewood, you had
00:-21:-24	MR. ADELMAN: Is that a question?	00:-19:-23 6	testified that all site access design
00:-21:-23 7	MS. DEWOLF: Yeah, it is. Did	00:-19:-19	construction will be the responsibility of the
00:-21:-22	you do any evaluation of pedestrian access and	00:-19:-18	applicant and has proposed that a new traffic
00:-21:-19	crossings with your existing plan that we have	00:-19:-14	signal would be installed there.
00:-21:-17 10	received?	00:-19:-11 10	Does that also include any future
00:-21:-16 11	THE WITNESS: We have not	00:-19:-09 11	escrow payments for upgrades to that traffic
00:-21:-15 12	completed a pedestrian connection and crosswalk	00:-19:-06 12	light, or timing, or backup generators for that
00:-21:-11 13	evaluation from the development to the	00:-19:-02 13	signal?
00:-21:-10 14	neighboring schools.	00:-19:-01 14	THE WITNESS: That would be
00:-21:-08 15	MS. DEWOLF: Okay. You also	00:-18:-59 15	determined during the design phase, in terms of
00:-21:-07 16	mentioned in your testimony that you would	00:-18:-55 16	provision of a generator backup, battery
00:-21:-04 17	possibly be widening roads, etcetera. Are you	00:-18:-51 17	backup, those types of elements, and you
00:-21:-02 18	familiar on South New Street that you have an	00:-18:-49 18	certainly aren't at a point where we discussed
00:-21:00 19	historic property immediately on the west side,	00:-18:-47 19	any maintenance agreements which are certainly
00:-20:-57 20	which is on the Chester County Historic	00:-18:-44 20	common with development accesses. We have not
00:-20:-55 21	Cultural Survey, site survey, and is	00:-18:-41 21	discussed any of that at this time.
00:-20:-49 <b>22</b>	THE WITNESS: Yes.	00:-18:-40 22	MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you.
00:-20:-48 23	MS. DEWOLF: Brinton Quarry	00:-18:-33 23	MR. MCKENNA: Other questions
	and Comment's a Decree	24	from the Deard's If not I have a second for
46 24	and Serpentine Barrens.	00:-18:-32 24	from the Board? If not, I have a couple for
46 24	and Serpentine Barrens.  1045	00:-18:-32 24	1047
00:-20:-44		00:-18:-32	
	1045		1047
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.
00:-20:-44 1 2 2	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on	00:-18:-30 <b>1</b> 00:-18:-29 <b>2</b>	Ms. Kline. First of all, Ms. Kline, thank
00:-20:-44 <b>1</b> 00:-20:-43 <b>2</b> 00:-20:-41 <b>3</b>	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.	00:-18:-30 <b>1</b> 00:-18:-29 <b>2</b> 00:-18:-28 <b>3</b>	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to	00:-18:-30 <b>1</b> 00:-18:-29 <b>2</b> 00:-18:-28 <b>3</b> 00:-18:-25 <b>4</b>	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it. I would like to turn your
00-20-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes,	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.
00:20:44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want
00:20:44 1 00:20:43 2 00:20:41 3 00:20:40 4 00:20:39 5 00:20:37 6 00:20:35 7 00:20:35 8 00:20:31 9 00:20:28 10 00:20:25 11	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do
00:20:44 1 00:20:43 2 00:20:41 3 00:20:40 4 00:20:39 5 00:20:37 6 00:20:35 7 00:20:35 8 00:20:31 9 00:20:28 10 00:20:25 11 00:20:21 12 00:20:19 13	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.  MS. DEWOLF: Have you looked at	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there is a provision that provides that "Andrew"
00:20:44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.  MS. DEWOLF: Have you looked at the impact to that very small bridge and very	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there is a provision that provides that "Andrew" and correct me if I'm wrong, does that refer to
00:20:44 1 00:20:43 2 00:20:41 3 00:20:40 4 00:20:39 5 00:20:37 6 00:20:35 7 00:20:35 8 00:20:31 9 00:20:31 10 00:20:21 12 00:20:11 13 00:20:11 14 00:20:15 15 00:20:13 16 00:20:09 17 00:20:06 18	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.  MS. DEWOLF: Have you looked at the impact to that very small bridge and very dangerous turn on South New Street, and the	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there is a provision that provides that "Andrew" and correct me if I'm wrong, does that refer to Andrew Semon?
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.  MS. DEWOLF: Have you looked at the impact to that very small bridge and very dangerous turn on South New Street, and the integrity and structural integrity of that bridge, and the costs that you may incur or need to invest in, given the increase in	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there is a provision that provides that "Andrew" and correct me if I'm wrong, does that refer to Andrew Semon?  THE WITNESS: Yes.
00:20:44 1 00:20:43 2 00:20:41 3 00:20:40 4 00:20:35 5 00:20:37 6 00:20:35 7 00:20:35 10 00:20:31 9 00:20:28 10 00:20:21 12 00:20:15 15 00:20:15 15 00:20:15 15 00:20:13 16 00:20:09 17 00:20:09 17	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.  MS. DEWOLF: Have you looked at the impact to that very small bridge and very dangerous turn on South New Street, and the integrity and structural integrity of that bridge, and the costs that you may incur or	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there is a provision that provides that "Andrew" and correct me if I'm wrong, does that refer to Andrew Semon?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: "indicated that
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.  MS. DEWOLF: Have you looked at the impact to that very small bridge and very dangerous turn on South New Street, and the integrity and structural integrity of that bridge, and the costs that you may incur or need to invest in, given the increase in	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there is a provision that provides that "Andrew" and correct me if I'm wrong, does that refer to Andrew Semon?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: "indicated that consideration was given to provide access along
00:20:44 1 00:20:43 2 00:20:41 3 00:20:40 4 00:20:39 5 00:20:37 6 00:20:35 7 00:20:35 8 00:20:31 9 00:20:28 10 00:20:21 12 00:20:21 12 00:20:15 15 00:20:15 15 00:20:15 15 00:20:13 16 00:20:09 17 00:20:09 17 00:20:09 17 00:20:09 17	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.  MS. DEWOLF: Have you looked at the impact to that very small bridge and very dangerous turn on South New Street, and the integrity and structural integrity of that bridge, and the costs that you may incur or need to invest in, given the increase in traffic and the increase of type of traffic?	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there is a provision that provides that "Andrew" and correct me if I'm wrong, does that refer to Andrew Semon?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: "indicated that consideration was given to provide access along New Street; however, Toll believes that PHMC,"
00:-20:-44	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.  MS. DEWOLF: Have you looked at the impact to that very small bridge and very dangerous turn on South New Street, and the integrity and structural integrity of that bridge, and the costs that you may incur or need to invest in, given the increase in traffic and the increase of type of traffic?  THE WITNESS: At this time we have not identified an impact to that	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there is a provision that provides that "Andrew" and correct me if I'm wrong, does that refer to Andrew Semon?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: "indicated that consideration was given to provide access along New Street; however, Toll believes that PHMC," which is the Pennsylvania Historic Museum Commission, "and possibly the County did not want access due to historical significance and
00:20:44 1 00:20:43 2 00:20:41 3 00:20:40 4 00:20:39 5 00:20:37 6 00:20:35 7 00:20:35 8 00:20:31 9 00:20:28 10 00:20:21 12 00:20:41 13 00:20:41 14 00:20:41 15 00:20:41 16 00:20:41 16 00:20:41 17 00:20:41 18 00:20:40 18 00:20:40 19 38 20 00:49:53 21	THE WITNESS: Yes, we are familiar with that property and its status on the registry.  MS. DEWOLF: So if you needed to widen the road, would you do that on the eastern side?  THE WITNESS: We have taken a very, very preliminary look at that, but, yes, if widening is needed in that area, we would certainly have to avoid impacts to that historic property, and would not be able to acquire right-of-way there. So, yes, widening would have to occur on the opposite side.  MS. DEWOLF: Have you looked at the impact to that very small bridge and very dangerous turn on South New Street, and the integrity and structural integrity of that bridge, and the costs that you may incur or need to invest in, given the increase in traffic and the increase of type of traffic?  THE WITNESS: At this time we have not identified an impact to that structure, and we have not completed any detailed analysis of its condition.	00:-18:-30	Ms. Kline.  First of all, Ms. Kline, thank you for coming back in July. Appreciate it.  I would like to turn your attention, I have a couple questions on Exhibit A-36, if you could get that in front of you. That was the December 2nd, 2016 minutes of the scoping meeting that you prepared.  THE WITNESS: Yes, I have A-36.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I want to follow-up on a question from Mr. Haws which was related to access out along New Street. Do you see at the bottom of the first page there is a provision that provides that "Andrew" and correct me if I'm wrong, does that refer to Andrew Semon?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: "indicated that consideration was given to provide access along New Street; however, Toll believes that PHMC," which is the Pennsylvania Historic Museum Commission, "and possibly the County did not want access due to historical significance and view sheds that exist along New Street with

	1010	1	4050
00:-17:-30	1048		1050
	mature trees."  Did I read that right?	00:-15:-32	development.
_	THE WITNESS: Yes.	00:-15:-30 2	MR. MCKENNA: And I think the township would agree with you that we don't
00 -17:-27 3	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Are you		want a high-volume road.
00:-17:-24	aware if PHMC or the County has expressed		But I don't believe, correct me
00:-17:-24 6	anything in writing about a preference not to	00:-15:-25 <b>5</b>	if I'm wrong, was Mr. Hanney asking the status
00:-17:-15 7	have any access out to New Street?	00:-15:-21 7	about a high-volume local well, put it this
00:-17:-13	THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to	00:-15:-13	way, is a local collector road a high-volume
00:-17:-13	that.	00:-15:-11	road, I guess, in your opinion?
00:-17:-12 10	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Were you	00:-15:-10 10	THE WITNESS: A local connector
00:-17:-11 11	aware of the basis of that statement during the	00:-15:-09 11	road, no, I don't believe that's a high-volume
00:-17:-07 12	meeting?	00:-15:-07 12	road.
00:-17:-07 13	THE WITNESS: No.	00:-15:-06 13	MR. MCKENNA: So if a local
00:-17:-05 14	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. If we turn	00:-15:-04 14	collector road is constructed, then that would
00:-17:-02 15	to page 2, and the top paragraph I would like	00:-15:-01 15	probably address the high-volume aspect of the
00:-16:-56 16	to talk about, which is dealing with what the	00:-14:-57 16	concern expressed by Mr. Semon at that meeting;
00:-16:-54 17	letter refers to as the connector road. And it	00:-14:-55 17	is that right?
00:-16 -51 18	talks about Fran. Is that Fran Hanney from	00:-14:-54 18	MR. ADELMAN: Objection. You
00:-16:-48 19	PennDOT?	00:-14:-53 19	would have to ask Mr. Semon.
00:-16:-47 20	THE WITNESS: Yes.	00:-14:-52 20	MR. MCKENNA: Well, I just asked
00:-16:-47 21	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you.	00:-14:-50 21	her if she knows.
00:-16:-46 22	He was asking about the connector road through	00:-14:-48 22	THE WITNESS: The applicant would
00:-16:-44 23	the site and says, according to your memo,	00:-14:-45 23	have to speak to that.
39 24	"will strongly recommend," "PennDOT will	00:-14:-44 24	MR. MCKENNA: Do you have any
1	1049		1051
00:-16:-37	strongly recommend that this connector road be	00:-14:-44	idea if Mr. Semon intends to testify?
00:-16:-35	provided." In response Mr. Semon indicated	00:-14:-40 2	THE WITNESS: I can't speak to
00:-16:-35 2	"that the connector road may be feasible with	00:-14:-40 2 00:-14:-38 3	what witnesses will be called.
00:-16:-31 <b>3</b> 00:-16:-27 <b>4</b>	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable	00:-14:-38 3	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down
00:-16:-31 <b>3</b> 00:-16:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-16:-23 <b>5</b>	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the	00:-14:-38 <b>3</b> 00:-14:-37 <b>4</b> 00:-14:-30 <b>5</b>	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that
00:-16:-21 <b>3</b> 00:-16:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-16:-23 <b>5</b> 00:-16:-21 <b>6</b>	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not	00:14:38 <b>3</b> 00:14:37 <b>4</b> 00:14:30 <b>5</b> 00:14:27 <b>6</b>	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you
00:-16:-21 <b>3</b> 00:-16:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-16:-23 <b>5</b> 00:-16:-21 <b>6</b> 00:-16:-19 <b>7</b>	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."	00:-14:-38	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?
00:-16:-21 <b>3</b> 00:-16:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-16:-23 <b>5</b> 00:-16:-21 <b>6</b> 00:-16:-19 <b>7</b> 00:-16:-18 <b>8</b>	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT	00:-14:-38	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has
00:-16:-31 <b>3</b> 00:-16:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-16:-23 <b>5</b> 00:-16:-21 <b>6</b> 00:-16:-19 <b>7</b> 00:-16:-18 <b>8</b> 00:-16:-15 <b>9</b>	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll	00:-14:-38	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni
00:-16:-21 <b>3</b> 00:-16:-27 <b>4</b> 00:-16:-23 <b>5</b> 00:-16:-21 <b>6</b> 00:-16:-19 <b>7</b> 00:-16:-18 <b>8</b> 00:-16:-15 <b>9</b>	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road	00:-14:-38	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer
00:-16:-21	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?	00:-14:-98	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.
00:-16:-31	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to	00:-14:-38	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you.
00:-16:-31	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to	00:-14:-98 3 00:-14:-97 4 00:-14:-90 5 00:-14:-27 6 00:-14:-22 8 00:-14:-21 9 00:-14:-14 11 00:-14:-14 12 00:-14:-12 13	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.
00:-16:-31	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to do in those terms.	00:-14:-38	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.  And they were discussing
00:-16:-21	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to	00:-14:-38	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.  And they were discussing re-aligning the proposed signalized site access
00:-16:-21	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to do in those terms.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. What was	00:14:38 3 00:14:37 4 00:14:30 5 00:14:27 6 00:14:23 7 00:14:22 8 00:14:21 9 00:14:17 10 00:14:14 11 00:14:14 12 00:14:11 14 00:14:11 15	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.  And they were discussing
00:-16:-21	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to do in those terms.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. What was your understanding of the meaning of that	00:-14:-38	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.  And they were discussing re-aligning the proposed signalized site access along 926 to line up opposite Bridlewood
00:-16:-31 3 00:-16:-27 4 00:-16:-23 5 00:-16:-21 6 00:-16:-19 7 00:-16:-18 8 00:-16:-15 9 00:-16:-11 10 00:-16:-05 12 00:-16:-04 13 00:-16:-01 14 00:-16:-05 15 00:-15:-59 16 00:-15:-59 17	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to do in those terms.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. What was your understanding of the meaning of that statement at the time of the meeting? You were	00:-14:-98	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.  And they were discussing re-aligning the proposed signalized site access along 926 to line up opposite Bridlewood Boulevard. "Fran added that the Department
00:-16:-21	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to do in those terms.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. What was your understanding of the meaning of that statement at the time of the meeting? You were present when Mr. Semon said that to Mr. Hanney,	00:14:38 3 00:14:37 4 00:14:30 5 00:14:27 6 00:14:23 7 00:14:22 8 00:14:21 9 00:14:17 10 00:14:14 11 00:14:14 12 00:14:11 15 00:14:08 16 00:14:08 17 00:14:01 18	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.  And they were discussing re-aligning the proposed signalized site access along 926 to line up opposite Bridlewood Boulevard. "Fran added that the Department strongly favors the alignment opposite
00:-16:-31 3 00:-16:-27 4 00:-16:-23 5 00:-16:-21 6 00:-16:-19 7 00:-16:-18 8 00:-16:-15 9 00:-16:-11 10 00:-16:-05 12 00:-16:-05 12 00:-16:-01 14 00:-16:-05 15 00:-15:-59 16 00:-15:-59 17 00:-15:-59 18 00:-15:-50 19	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to do in those terms.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. What was your understanding of the meaning of that statement at the time of the meeting? You were present when Mr. Semon said that to Mr. Hanney, I believe? Or do you not know?	00:14:38 3 00:14:37 4 00:14:30 5 00:14:27 6 00:14:23 7 00:14:22 8 00:14:21 9 00:14:17 10 00:14:14 11 00:14:14 12 00:14:14 15 00:14:11 15 00:14:08 16 00:14:08 17 00:14:01 18 00:13:59 19	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.  And they were discussing re-aligning the proposed signalized site access along 926 to line up opposite Bridlewood Boulevard. "Fran added that the Department strongly favors the alignment opposite Bridlewood Boulevard."
00:-16:-31 3 00:-16:-27 4 00:-16:-23 5 00:-16:-21 6 00:-16:-19 7 00:-16:-18 8 00:-16:-15 9 00:-16:-15 11 00:-16:-08 11 00:-16:-08 12 00:-16:-01 14 00:-16:-01 14 00:-16:-05 15 00:-15:-57 17 00:-15:-53 18 00:-15:-50 19  45 20	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to do in those terms.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. What was your understanding of the meaning of that statement at the time of the meeting? You were present when Mr. Semon said that to Mr. Hanney, I believe? Or do you not know?  THE WITNESS: I don't know. But I believe the intent of this statement, as I understood it at the meeting, was to get to the	00:14:38 3 00:14:37 4 00:14:30 5 00:14:27 6 00:14:23 7 00:14:22 8 00:14:21 9 00:14:17 10 00:14:14 11 00:14:14 12 00:14:14 13 00:14:11 15 00:14:08 16 00:14:01 18 00:14:01 18	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.  And they were discussing re-aligning the proposed signalized site access along 926 to line up opposite Bridlewood Boulevard. "Fran added that the Department strongly favors the alignment opposite Bridlewood Boulevard."  Notwithstanding the comment from
00:-16:-31 3 00:-16:-27 4 00:-16:-23 5 00:-16:-21 6 00:-16:-19 7 00:-16:-18 8 00:-16:-15 9 00:-16:-11 10 00:-16:-08 11 00:-16:-08 12 00:-16:-01 14 00:-16:-01 15 00:-15:-59 16 00:-15:-59 17 00:-15:-53 18 00:-15:-50 19	"that the connector road may be feasible with the bonus density, but it would be undesirable to have a high volume roadway through the residential development since homes could not be constructed along it."  Do you take that or did PennDOT take that or we can take that to mean that Toll is not willing to construct the connector road without a bonus density aspect?  THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to what the applicant is willing or not willing to do in those terms.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. What was your understanding of the meaning of that statement at the time of the meeting? You were present when Mr. Semon said that to Mr. Hanney, I believe? Or do you not know?  THE WITNESS: I don't know. But I believe the intent of this statement, as I	00:14:38	what witnesses will be called.  MR. MCKENNA: That's fair. Down on the fourth paragraph there is a comment that starts with "Drew asked." Who is Drew, if you don't mind identifying that?  THE WITNESS: The first page has the list of attendees in detail. Drew Sirianni works for Pennoni as the consultant reviewer for PennDOT.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you. I did not realize that.  And they were discussing re-aligning the proposed signalized site access along 926 to line up opposite Bridlewood Boulevard. "Fran added that the Department strongly favors the alignment opposite Bridlewood Boulevard."  Notwithstanding the comment from PennDOT, the plan has not been revised to

	1052	1	1054
00:-13:-46	plan does not show the access opposite	1	
	Bridlewood, that's correct.	00:-11:-40	That is not the conditional use application
	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Can I turn	00:-11:-38 2	plan.  MR. MCKENNA: And then the third
<i>y</i> .	·		
9 4	your attention to PC 3 for a couple of minutes.	00:-11:-36	paragraph Mr. Hanney goes back and again to ask
00:-13:-35	Do you have that?	00:-11:-33 5	the status of the provision of the connector
00:-13:-18 6	THE WITNESS: So it appears that	00:-11:-32 6	road, because the plan shows a circuitous
00:-13:-17	PC 3 is the minutes of the scoping meeting	00:-11:-25	connection.
00:-13:-14	dated April 17th, 2017.	00:-11:-23	And then on page 2, Mike, again,
00:-13:-12	MR. MCKENNA: That's correct.	00:-11:-21	that would be Michael Downs, indicates that the
00:-13:-11 10	Thank you.	00:-11:-18 10	plan may evolve as it goes through the
00:-13:-08 11	The first bullet in the paragraph	00:-11:-16 11	conditional use hearing.
00:-13:-06 12	refers to a gentleman named "Mike." I didn't	00:-11:-13 12	Since April, though, you would
00:-13:-04 13	see a Mike identified in the memo. Do you know	00:11:11 13	agree that the plan has not evolved on that
00:43:-02 14	who that is?	00:-11:-09 14	issue?
00:-13:-02 15	THE WITNESS: I believe that was	00:-11:-09 15	THE WITNESS: The plan that is
00:-13:00 16	revised at a later date, so I apologize. That	00:-11:-06 16	the subject of the application has not changed.
00:-12:-58 17	would being Mike Downs from Toll Brothers.	00:-11:-04 17	MR. MCKENNA: Do you have any
00:-12:-54 18	MR. MCKENNA: Mike Downs, thank	00:-11:-03 18	idea or has Mr. Downs given you any indication
00:-12:-52 19	you.	00:-11:00 19	when that evolution may occur during this
00:-12:-47 <b>20</b>	Now, at that time in paragraph 2,	00:-10:-58 20	conditional use hearing?
00:-12:-41 21	correct me if I'm wrong, it seems to suggest	00:-10:-57 21	THE WITNESS: No.
00-12:-40 22	that the current site plan would continue to	00:-10:-56 22	MR. MCKENNA: Do you have any
00:-12:-35 23	evolve and that the site access to 202 had been	00:-10:-56 23	idea if it will evolve during this conditional
32 24	removed from the plan based on feedback from	00:-10:-52 24	use hearing?
1	1053		1055
00:-12:-29 1	1053 Westtown Township, but that it could still be	00:-10:-52 1	1055 THE WITNESS: Well, I would
00:-12:-26 2	1053 Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.	00:-10:-51 2	1055 THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that
00:-12:-26 2	1053 Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided. So a revised plan of some sort	00:-10:-49 3	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the
00:-12:-26 <b>2</b> 00:-12:-26 <b>3</b> 00:-12:-22 <b>4</b>	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?	00:-10:-51 <b>2</b> 00:-10:-49 <b>3</b> 00:-10:-46 <b>4</b>	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any
00:-12:-26 <b>2</b> 00:-12:-26 <b>3</b> 00:-12:-22 <b>4</b> 00:-12:-19 <b>5</b>	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I	00:-10:-51 <b>2</b> 00:-10:-49 <b>3</b> 00:-10:-46 <b>4</b> 00:-10:-44 <b>5</b>	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.
00:-12:-26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May,	00:-10:-51 <b>2</b> 00:-10:-49 <b>3</b> 00:-10:-46 <b>4</b> 00:-10:-44 <b>5</b> 00:-10:-41 <b>6</b>	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.
00:-12:-26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-40 7	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.
00:12::26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on	00:-10:-61	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your
00:-12:-26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and	00:-10:-61	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that
00:12::26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-40 7 00:-10:-28 8 00:-10:-26 9 00:-10:-24 10	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?
00:12::26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-40 7 00:-10:-28 8 00:-10:-28 9 00:-10:-24 10 00:-10:-21 11	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.
00:-12:-26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-28 8 00:-10:-28 9 00:-10:-24 10 00:-10:-21 11 00:-10:-20 12	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury
00:12::26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback	00:-10:-61	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding
00:42:26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-44 6 00:-10:-42 7 00:-10:-28 8 00:-10:-26 9 00:-10:-24 10 00:-10:-21 11 00:-10:-20 12 00:-10:-14 13 00:-10:-12 14	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood
00:12::26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you referring to there?	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-42 8 00:-10:-26 9 00:-10:-24 10 00:-10:-21 11 00:-10:-21 11 00:-10:-21 12 00:-10:-12 14 00:-10:-12 15	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood Boulevard.
00:42:26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you referring to there?  THE WITNESS: The township	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-28 8 00:-10:-28 9 00:-10:-24 10 00:-10:-21 11 00:-10:-20 12 00:-10:-14 13 00:-10:-12 14 00:-10:-12 15 00:-10:-08 16	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood Boulevard.  And has that happened? Has there
00:12:26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you referring to there?  THE WITNESS: The township traffic engineer's review letters.	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-42 8 00:-10:-28 9 00:-10:-24 10 00:-10:-24 11 00:-10:-20 12 00:-10:-12 14 00:-10:-12 14 00:-10:-05 15	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood Boulevard.  And has that happened? Has there been any meetings with Thornbury to discuss
00:42:26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you referring to there?  THE WITNESS: The township traffic engineer's review letters.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay.	00:-10:-61	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood Boulevard.  And has that happened? Has there been any meetings with Thornbury to discuss traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood?
00:42:26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you referring to there?  THE WITNESS: The township traffic engineer's review letters.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay.  THE WITNESS: Primarily.	00:-10:-61	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood Boulevard.  And has that happened? Has there been any meetings with Thornbury to discuss traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood?  THE WITNESS: Not at this time.
00:12:26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you referring to there?  THE WITNESS: The township traffic engineer's review letters.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay.  THE WITNESS: Primarily.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. And	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-26 8 00:-10:-26 9 00:-10:-24 10 00:-10:-24 11 00:-10:-21 11 00:-10:-20 12 00:-10:-14 13 00:-10:-08 15 00:-10:-08 16 00:-10:-02 18 00:-09:-57 20	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood Boulevard.  And has that happened? Has there been any meetings with Thornbury to discuss traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood?  THE WITNESS: Not at this time.  MR. MCKENNA: Do you anticipate
00:12:26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you referring to there?  THE WITNESS: The township traffic engineer's review letters.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay.  THE WITNESS: Primarily.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. And that plan the Board has not seen because it is	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-26 9 00:-10:-26 11 00:-10:-20 12 00:-10:-14 13 00:-10:-12 14 00:-10:-08 16 00:-10:-05 17 00:-10:-02 18 00:-09:-59 19 00:-09:-56 21	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood Boulevard.  And has that happened? Has there been any meetings with Thornbury to discuss traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood?  THE WITNESS: Not at this time.  MR. MCKENNA: Do you anticipate any of those meetings occurring prior to the
00:42:26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you referring to there?  THE WITNESS: The township traffic engineer's review letters.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay.  THE WITNESS: Primarily.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. And that plan the Board has not seen because it is not in front of them for the conditional use;	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-42 8 00:-10:-28 9 00:-10:-24 10 00:-10:-24 11 00:-10:-20 12 00:-10:-24 13 00:-10:-20 15 00:-10:-02 16 00:-10:-02 17 00:-10:-02 18 00:-09:-59 19 00:-09:-56 21 00:-09:-54 22	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood Boulevard.  And has that happened? Has there been any meetings with Thornbury to discuss traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood?  THE WITNESS: Not at this time.  MR. MCKENNA: Do you anticipate any of those meetings occurring prior to the conclusion of the conditional use hearing?
00:12:26	Westtown Township, but that it could still be provided.  So a revised plan of some sort was presented to PennDOT at that meeting?  THE WITNESS: Yes, which I believe I testified to when I was here in May, that Toll Brothers had taken a preliminary look at some of the potential changes based on comments received from various entities, and that was the subject of this meeting which included PennDOT, Westtown Township, Thornbury and the applicant.  MR. MCKENNA: Based on feedback from Westtown Township, what feedback were you referring to there?  THE WITNESS: The township traffic engineer's review letters.  MR. MCKENNA: Okay.  THE WITNESS: Primarily.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. And that plan the Board has not seen because it is	00:-10:-61 2 00:-10:-49 3 00:-10:-46 4 00:-10:-44 5 00:-10:-41 6 00:-10:-26 9 00:-10:-26 11 00:-10:-20 12 00:-10:-14 13 00:-10:-12 14 00:-10:-08 16 00:-10:-05 17 00:-10:-02 18 00:-09:-59 19 00:-09:-56 21	THE WITNESS: Well, I would certainly imagine, just on my own opinion, that the applicant would want to hear all of the questions and testimony before making any formal changes and resubmission of the plan.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.  Appreciate that answer.  Turning to the last page of your memo, there were a number of action items that were noted. Do you see that on page 3?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. MCKENNA: It says: Thornbury will provide Toll with information regarding traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood Boulevard.  And has that happened? Has there been any meetings with Thornbury to discuss traffic calming improvements along Bridlewood?  THE WITNESS: Not at this time.  MR. MCKENNA: Do you anticipate any of those meetings occurring prior to the

	1056		1058
00:-09:-45	MR. MCKENNA: Do you have any	00:-07:-47	application?
00:-09:-44 2	indication that Thornbury has coordinated with	00:-07:-47 2	THE WITNESS: As part of this
00 -09:-40 3	you or did you have any conversations with them	00:-07:-46 3	application, I do not believe any additional
38 <b>4</b>	about the trail easement through the Spackman	00:-07:-41 4	information will be submitted. But as part of
5	Farm?	00:-07:-37 5	the PennDOT process, at the request of PennDOT,
00:-09:-34 6	THE WITNESS: I do not have any	00:-07:-34	the applicant will need to evaluate the
00:-09;-33 7	additional information on this at this time.	00:-07:-31 7	intersection for signal timing, retiming
00:-09:-31	MR. MCKENNA: Do you anticipate	00:-07:-28	purposes, with the additional signal proposed
00:-09 -31 9	that that will be done during the conditional	00:-07:-25	at the access at 926.
00:-09:-28 10	use hearing?	00:-07:-23 10	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't
00-09:-28 11	THE WITNESS: There is no	00:-07:-07 11	think I have any other questions. Thank you.
00:-09:-28 12	indication at this time of when that would	00:-07:-03 12	MR. PINGAR: Good evening,
00:-09:-25 13	occur.  MR. MCKENNA: Bear with me for	00:-07:-01 13	Nicole.
00:-09:-18 15		00:-07:00 14	THE WITNESS: Good evening.
00:-09:-18 15	one second, please.	00:-06:-59 15	MR. PINGAR: I just have a few
00:-09:-16	Back on page 2, the second paragraph refers to PennDOT excuse me to	00:-06:-58 16	questions. Also with respect to Exhibit PC 3,
00:-09:-12 17	Toll addressing PennDOT's traffic impact study	00:-06:-52 17	you had noted that there was a typo and
00:-09:-07 10	comments for the intersection of 926 and New	00:-06:-49 10	identified Mike, which it turns out was Mike
00:-09:-04	Street, and it states that a roundabout	00:-06:-46 19	Downs, who was not listed as one of the attendees. Is there any attendee listed that
00:-09:-01 20	checklist should be completed. Can you tell me	00:-06:-45 20	actually was not there?
00:-08:-56 22	what that's referring to, please.	00:-06:-42 21	THE WITNESS: No. Oh, I
00:-08:-54 23	THE WITNESS: PennDOT made a	00:-06:-41 22	apologize. Andrew Semon is listed here. That
24	comment that consideration should be given to	00:-06:-30 24	is where, that should have been Mike Downs
	1057	00,-00,-30	1059
00:-08:-46	providing a roundabout at that intersection.	00:-06:-28	instead of Andrew. I apologize.
00:-08:-44 2	Upon further discussions at this meeting,	00:-06:-27	MR. PINGAR: All right. Thank
00;-08:-40 3	PennDOT agreed that based on preliminary	00:-06:-25	you.
00:-08:-37 4	conversations it may not be appropriate at this	00:-06:-25	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
00:-08:-35 5	intersection. But they asked that we complete	00:-06:-24 5	MR. PINGAR: I just wanted some
00:-08:-33	the roundabout checklist and submit that to the	00:-06:-23	clarification. In the second bullet you made
00:-08:-30 7	Department for review.	00:-06:-21 7	reference to this other plan that I guess was
00:-08:-29	MR. MCKENNA: Has that been done?	00:-06:-14	presented at that meeting, and I did not attend
00:-08:-27	THE WITNESS: No, it has not.	00:-06:-12	that meeting, and our representative of the
00:-08:-26 10	MR. MCKENNA: Do you know when	00:-06:-06 10	township was at that meeting, it also noted the
00:-08:-26 11	that would be completed?	00:-06:-03 11	site access to Route 202 has been removed from
00:-08:-25 12	THE WITNESS: There is not a plan	00:-06:-01 12	the plan; is that correct?
00:-08:-23 13	or schedule at this time for that to be	00:-06:00 13	THE WITNESS: That preliminary
00:-08:-21 14	completed.	00:-05:-58 14	plan that was submitted, that was not, has not
00:-08:-20 15	MR. MCKENNA: In the next	00:-05:-56 15	been submitted but was the subject of that
00:-08:-19 16	paragraph Mr. Hanney discusses signal timing, I	00:-05:-54 16	meeting, yes, the 202 access had been removed.
00:-08:-12 17	believe. And there is a reference to Paul,	00:-05:-51 17	MR. PINGAR: Very good. Now, is
00:-08:-08 18	which I believe is Paul Lutz from PennDOT.	00:-05:-48 18	it fair to say that with that removed that the
00:-08:-05 19	Existing traffic signal at 926 and the shopping	00:-05:-45 19	distribution of traffic from the site no longer
<sub>0</sub> 20	center should be included in the discussions	00:-05:-42 20	going out to 202 would go elsewhere to or from
00:-07:-59 21	for signal timing and coordination.	00:-05:-38 21	the site to other intersections?
00:-07:-56 22	Do you know, is the applicant	00:-05:-36 22	THE WITNESS: Yes, that is
00:-07:-55 23	proposing to evaluate that traffic signal for	00:-05:-35 23	correct.
00:-07:-50 24	signal timing purposes as part of this	00:-05:-35 24	MR. PINGAR: Has there been a

	1060	l .	1062
00:-05:-33	revised impact traffic study done to account	00:-03:-32 1	MR. MCKENNA: I'm looking at
00:-05:-30 2	for that removed intersection at 202?	00:-03:-30 2	Andrew. I apologize. Any redirect, Mr.
00:-05:-28	THE WITNESS: We have completed a	00:-03:-27 3	Adelman?
28 4	revised traffic analysis. A formal study and	00:-03:-27	MR. ADELMAN: Thank you, Pat.
00:-05:-24 5	submission has not been made for review at this	00:-03:-25	RE-EXAMINATION
00:-05:-21	time.	00:-03:-25	BY MR. ADELMAN:
00:-05:-21 7	MR. PINGAR: Moving to, I think	00:-03:-25 7	Q. Just a couple of questions, Nicole.
00:-05:-17	my final question, page 2, the fifth bullet	00:-03:-23	Supervisor Haws asked you some questions about
00:-05:-10	down where it starts, "Nicole also indicated	00:-03:-19	the AADT, the average annual daily traffic; is
00:-05:-05 10	that if a connector road is provided through	00:-03:-15 10	that correct?
00:-05:-03 11	Crebilly, it could not be aligned opposite the	00:-03:-15 11	A. Yes.
00-05:00 12	Fairshare connector along West Pleasant Grove	00:-03:-15 12	Q. Is it standard engineering, traffic
00:-04:-57 13	Road, since it is located opposite the church."	00:-03:-13	engineering practice to use AADT figures in
00:-04:-51 14	Are you aware that the connector	00:-03:-10 14	your calculations?  A. Yes.
00:-04:-48 15	road for the Arborview development and the	00:-03:-09 15	
00:-04:-45 16	commercial segments of that, commercial parts	00:-03:-08 16	<b>Q.</b> I'm handing back to you what I believe has been marked as Exhibit B-19. It is the
00:-04:-43 17	of that was designed to have you seen the	00:-02:-56 17	
00:-04:-39 18	plan for Arborview and that connector road through the Arborview tract?	00:-02:-53 18	police chief's impact analysis report. I
00:-04:-36 19		00:-02:-48 19	believe it has been testified to, correct?  A. Yes.
00:-04:-34 20	THE WITNESS: Yes, I have.  MR. PINGAR: Was that provided to	00:-02:-47 20	Q. Did the police chief have a
00:-04:-33 21	you by township staff?	00:-02:-47 21	recommendation with respect to whether a
00:-04:-33 22	THE WITNESS: Yes.	00:-02:-45 22	connector road between West Pleasant Grove and
00:-04:-32 23	MR. PINGAR: And have you seen	00:-02:-44 23	926 should be provided?
		00:-02:-40	720 Siloula De providea:
31 24			
	1061	1	1063
00:-04:-29	1061 the plan dated back a number of years to the	00:-02:-38 1	1063  A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation,
00:-04:-29 <b>1</b> 00:-04:-21 <b>2</b>	1061 the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge	00:-02:-37 2	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the
00:04:29 <b>1</b> 00:04:21 <b>2</b> 00:04:19 <b>3</b>	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the	00:-02:-37 2	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West	00:-02:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-02:-34 <b>3</b> 00:-02:-31 <b>4</b>	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between
00:-04:-29	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector	00:-02:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-02:-34 <b>3</b> 00:-02:-31 <b>4</b> 00:-02:-29 <b>5</b>	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?	00:-02:-37 <b>2</b> 00:-02:-34 <b>3</b> 00:-02:-31 <b>4</b> 00:-02:-29 <b>5</b> 00:-02:-27 <b>6</b>	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have
00:-04:-29	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site? THE WITNESS: The plan that I was	00:02:37 <b>2</b> 00:02:34 <b>3</b> 00:02:31 <b>4</b> 00:02:29 <b>5</b> 00:02:27 <b>6</b> 00:02:26 <b>7</b>	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:08 8	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated	00-02-37 <b>2</b> 00-02-34 <b>3</b> 00-02-31 <b>4</b> 00-02-29 <b>5</b> 00-02-27 <b>6</b> 00-02-26 <b>7</b> 00-02-23 <b>8</b>	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:08 8 00:04:06 9	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their	00:02:37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.
00:-04:-29 1 00:-04:-21 2 00:-04:-19 3 00:-04:-16 4 00:-04:-13 5 00:-04:-12 6 00:-04:-09 7 00:-04:-08 8 00:-04:-06 9 00:-04:-01 10	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:06 8 00:04:06 9 00:04:01 10 00:03:59 11	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic
00:-04:-29 1 00:-04:-21 2 00:-04:-19 3 00:-04:-16 4 00:-04:-13 5 00:-04:-12 6 00:-04:-08 8 00:-04:-08 9 00:-04:-01 10 00:-03:-58 12	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.  Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:06 9 00:04:01 10 00:03:59 11 00:03:55 13	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:08 8 00:04:05 9 00:04:05 11 00:03:59 11 00:03:55 13 00:03:55 13	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.  Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:08 8 00:04:05 9 00:04:01 10 00:03:56 12 00:03:55 13 00:03:51 15	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:08 8 00:04:05 9 00:04:05 11 00:03:59 11 00:03:55 13 00:03:55 13	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would interconnect at West Pleasant Grove?	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can stipulate to that. Any objection to that, Mr.
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:08 8 00:04:06 9 00:04:01 10 00:03:59 11 00:03:55 13 00:03:51 15 00:03:47 16	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would interconnect at West Pleasant Grove?  THE WITNESS: No.	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.  Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can stipulate to that. Any objection to that, Mr.  Adelman?
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:08 8 00:04:05 9 00:04:01 10 00:03:56 12 00:03:55 13 00:03:51 15 00:03:43 17	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would interconnect at West Pleasant Grove?  THE WITNESS: No.  MR. PINGAR: That's all the	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can stipulate to that. Any objection to that, Mr. Adelman?  MR. ADELMAN: I'll stipulate to
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:03 7 00:04:06 9 00:04:05 9 00:04:01 10 00:03:59 11 00:03:55 13 00:03:51 15 00:03:41 15 00:03:41 17 00:03:43 17	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would interconnect at West Pleasant Grove?  THE WITNESS: No.  MR. PINGAR: That's all the questions I have. Thank you.	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.  Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can stipulate to that. Any objection to that, Mr.  Adelman?  MR. ADELMAN: I'll stipulate to that. But I don't understand why it was a
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:06 8 00:04:01 10 00:03:59 11 00:03:55 12 00:03:55 13 00:03:51 15 00:03:41 16 00:03:41 17 00:03:43 17	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would interconnect at West Pleasant Grove?  THE WITNESS: No.  MR. PINGAR: That's all the questions I have. Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Semon, any	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can stipulate to that. Any objection to that, Mr. Adelman?  MR. ADELMAN: I'll stipulate to that. But I don't understand why it was a question.
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:06 9 00:04:06 9 00:04:01 10 00:03:59 11 00:03:59 12 00:03:51 15 00:03:43 17 00:03:43 17 00:03:43 18 00:03:43 19	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would interconnect at West Pleasant Grove?  THE WITNESS: No.  MR. PINGAR: That's all the questions I have. Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Semon, any redirect?	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can stipulate to that. Any objection to that, Mr. Adelman?  MR. ADELMAN: I'll stipulate to that. But I don't understand why it was a question.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood.
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:09 7 00:04:08 8 00:04:05 9 00:04:01 10 00:03:59 11 00:03:55 13 00:03:55 13 00:03:47 16 00:03:43 17 00:03:43 18 00:03:43 17 00:03:43 18 00:03:43 19  \[ \text{\tex{\tex	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would interconnect at West Pleasant Grove?  THE WITNESS: No.  MR. PINGAR: That's all the questions I have. Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Semon, any redirect?  MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Adelman.	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can stipulate to that. Any objection to that, Mr. Adelman?  MR. ADELMAN: I'll stipulate to that. But I don't understand why it was a question.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood.  MS. DEWOLF: And her position,
00:-04:-29 1 00:-04:-21 2 00:-04:-19 3 00:-04:-16 4 00:-04:-13 5 00:-04:-16 6 00:-04:-06 9 00:-04:-06 9 00:-04:-06 11 00:-03:-59 11 00:-03:-56 12 00:-03:-56 13 00:-03:-51 15 00:-03:-41 16 00:-03:-41 17 00:-03:-41 17 00:-03:-41 18 00:-03:-43 18 00:-03:-36 21	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would interconnect at West Pleasant Grove?  THE WITNESS: No.  MR. PINGAR: That's all the questions I have. Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Semon, any redirect?  MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Adelman.	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr. Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can stipulate to that. Any objection to that, Mr. Adelman?  MR. ADELMAN: I'll stipulate to that. But I don't understand why it was a question.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood.  MS. DEWOLF: And her position,
00:04:29 1 00:04:21 2 00:04:19 3 00:04:16 4 00:04:13 5 00:04:12 6 00:04:03 7 00:04:06 9 00:04:06 9 00:04:06 11 00:03:56 12 00:03:56 13 00:03:51 15 00:03:43 17 00:03:43 17 00:03:43 18 00:03:43 18 00:03:43 19	the plan dated back a number of years to the Bozzuto development, even the Makemie Ridge development, showing how that segment of the connector road would intersect with West Pleasant Grove Road and then with the connector road through the Crebilly site?  THE WITNESS: The plan that I was provided for the Fairshare properties is dated November 23rd of 2015, and it shows their property and their proposed connector road, and it does not show anything beyond that.  MR. PINGAR: So you have never seen the plan that the township has on file that shows how those two roads would interconnect at West Pleasant Grove?  THE WITNESS: No.  MR. PINGAR: That's all the questions I have. Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Semon, any redirect?  MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Adelman.  MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm	00-02-37	A. Yes, they did. Their recommendation, as stated in the impact analysis, was that the Department strongly recommends against the inclusion of a direct connector road between the two roadways.  MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. I have nothing further.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.  Adelman.  MS. DEWOLF: Question. The police chief isn't an engineer or traffic person, correct?  MR. ADELMAN: I object.  MR. MCKENNA: I think we can stipulate to that. Any objection to that, Mr.  Adelman?  MR. ADELMAN: I'll stipulate to that. But I don't understand why it was a question.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood.  MS. DEWOLF: And her position, are you familiar with why she took that

	1064			1066
00:-01:-52	MR. ADELMAN: Again, I object.		1	(The record was read:
00:-01:-51 <b>2</b>	The document speaks for itself.	00:-01:-02	2	Ms. DeWolf: Okay. I'm going to
00:-01:-49 3	MR. MCKENNA: Understood. But I	00:-01:-01	3	ask you again, though, for the residents on the
17 4	don't know if she knows. So, Ms. Kline, if you	00:00:-59	4	west side, it is the only second option to 926
00:-01:-45 5	can answer that.	00:00:-55	5	and 202 to do a northbound traffic movement.
00:-01:-40 6	MR. HAWS: Can I ask one	00:00:-51	6	That is why it is in the Comprehensive Plan,
00:-01:-39 7	additional question?	00:00:-48	7	our Growth Management Plan. That is why it has
00:-01:-38	MR. MCKENNA: Hang on.	00:00:-45	8	been a part of every requirement for every
00:-01:-34	THE WITNESS: The recommendation	00:00:-43	9	development.)
00:-01:-33 10	does go on to say that although this would	00:00:20	10	MR. ADELMAN: So I object to the
00:-01:-31 11	reduce traffic on 202 and provide an alternate	00:00:21	11	basis of what is in the Comprehensive Plan and
00:-01:-28 12	route for motorists to use to avoid 202	00:00:23	12	why it is in the Comprehensive Plan. It is a
001-01:-26 13	back-ups, it would encourage more traffic to	00:00:25	13	document that speaks for itself.
00:-01:-23 14	cut through residential areas, a problem that	00:00:26	14	MR. MCKENNA: Fair enough. But
00:-01:-20 15	has traditionally brought complaints of traffic	00:00:27	15	since the Board adopted it, she is familiar
00:-01:-18 16	violation from Westtown Township residents.	00 00:30	16	with it, I understand the objection.
00:-01:-15 17	So I would speak to something	00 00:32	17	MR. ADELMAN: I'm objecting to
00:-01:-13 18	similar that I had testified to earlier, that a	00 00:33	18	the statement as if it is conclusive.
00:-01:-10 19	connector road providing for cut-through	00:00:35	19	MR. MCKENNA: Understood. It
00:-01:-08 20	traffic is generally not appropriate for a	00:00:36	20	will be overruled.
00:-01:-06 21	residential development and it would seem to	00:00:38	21	MS. DEWOLF: No problem. We will
00:-01:-04 22	speak to that.	00:00:39	22	have later testimony on that fact.
00:-01:-02 23	MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I'm going to	00:00:41	23	MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Kline, can you
o1 <b>24</b>	ask you again, though, for the residents on the	00:00:42	24	answer the question, please.
1	1065			1067
00:00:-59	west side, it is the only second option to 926	00:00:43	1	THE WITNESS: Certainly. So in
00:00:-55 <b>2</b>	and 202 to do a northbound traffic movement.	00:00:46	2	order to provide an alternative for traffic to
00:00:-51 3	That is why it is in the Comprehensive Plan,	00:00:48	3	turn left to travel on northbound Route 202,
00 00:-48 4	our Growth Management Plan. That is why it has	00:00:51	4	the connection that's needed is between West
00:00:-45 <b>5</b>	been a part of every requirement for every	00:00:55	5	Pleasant Grove Road and Skiles Boulevard,
00:00:-43	development.	00:00:56	6	because access to another traffic signal along
00:00:-41 7	Why do you not feel that that	00:00:59	7	202 is necessary in order to facilitate that
00:00:-39	would be an enhancement, rather than a	00:01:04	8	maneuver.
00:00:-36	detriment, to this particular traffic system in	00 01:05	9	So I would say that the
00:00:-32 10	the plan you are looking at?	00:01:08	10	connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and
00:00:-31 11	MR. ADELMAN: I'm going to object	00 01:10	11	Skiles Boulevard is what would provide that
00:00:-30 12	to the initial part of the statement made by	00:01:12	12	connection to another traffic signal on 202
00:00:-27 13	Supervisor DeWolf, but I won't object to the	00:01:16	13	that would allow the northbound left.
00:00:-25 14	question.	00:01:23	14	MR. MCKENNA: Okay?
00:00:-24 15	MR. MCKENNA: I'm sorry, which	00:01:23	15	MS. DEWOLF: It is not okay. But
00:00:-23 16	portion are you objecting to, Gregg?	00:01:25	16	I'm not asking anymore questions of her. Thank
00:00:-22 17	MR. ADELMAN: The statement prior	00:01:27	17	you.
00 00:-21 18	to the question.	00:01:27	18	MR. HAWS: I'm sorry, I just have
00:00:-19 19	MR. MCKENNA: I don't know what	00:01:29	19	one question. If a collector road were to be
<b>)</b> 20	that is.	00:01:32	20	put onto this plan, would homes be allowed to
00 00:-15 21	MR. ADELMAN: I could have the	00:01:38	21	egress off of that collector road or would it
00:00:-15 22	record be read back, please.	00:01:42	22	change the site configuration?
23	MR. MCKENNA: Please.	00:01:43	23	THE WITNESS: It would depend on
00:00:20 24		00:01:44	24	the nature of that connector road and the
	05-18-32 PM Page 1064 to	4067	- E - 1 - 1	87 18 of 76 sheets

	1068		1070
00:01:46 1	design of it.	00:04:10	Is that your testimony?
00:01:49 2	MR. HAWS: If it was a	00:04:11 2	A. That is correct. It does not provide a
00:01:50 3	continuous, as you were saying before, like	00:04:14 3	collector road, nor have I seen any request for
13 4	direct shot between East Pleasant West	00:04:18 4	a collector road. Everything in writing is
00:01:57 5	Pleasant Grove Road and 926, would	00:04:21 5	referring to a connector road that I'm familiar
00:02:02 6	single-family homes or carriage homes be	00:04:23 6	with.
00:02:04 7	allowed to have direct access off of that?	00:04:23 7	Q. Okay. So during your testimony, I want
00:02:10 8	THE WITNESS: More evaluation	00:04:26	to be sure I understand, you have drawn a
00:02:11 9	would be needed. But certainly with a	00:04:28	distinction between a connector road and a
00:02:15 10	connector road without any turns, without any	00:04:30 10	collector road. You are not using those terms
00:02:19 11	stops along the way would be less desirable for	00:04:32 11	interchangeably, correct?
00:02:22 12	direct access to driveways as opposed to a	00:04:34 12	A. No, I am not.
00:02:25 13	circuitous route which slows traffic and keeps	00:04:34 13	Q. Okay. Your testimony back in May with
00:02:28 14	the volume of traffic lower.	00:04:41 14	regard to, in response to my question about
00:02:30 15	MR. HAWS: Thank you.	00:04:50 15	your response to the Kimley Horn review letter,
00:02:32 16	MR. MCKENNA: Anything further	00:04:54 16	Exhibit A-35, was that the proposed internal
00:02:33 17	from the Board?	00:04:58 17	roadways do provide a connection between 926
00:02:35 18	All right. Any recross, back to	00:05:01 18	and West Pleasant Grove Road that is
00:02:40 19	the Planning Commission and Mr. Gill.	00:05:04 19	appropriate through a residential development
00:02:43 20	MR. GILL: Thank you. Thank you	00:05:07 20	and for use by local traffic, which is
00:02:44 21	very much.	00:05:10 21	generally consistent with the Growth Management
22	RECROSS-EXAMINATION	00:05:14 22	Plan.
23	BY MR. GILL:	00:05:15 23	Does the Growth Management Plan
45 24	Q. Ms. Kline, I want to make sure I	00:05:16 24	require or suggest a collector road or simply a
Ĭ	1069		1071
00:02:47	understand your testimony with regard to this	00:05:20 1	point, a connection between two points on West
00:02:49 2	connector road or collector road. It has been	00:05:23	Pleasant Grove and 926?
00:02:53	referred to in both ways during your testimony.	00:05:25 3	A. Based on my recollection, it calls for
00:02:57	What is your understanding of a collector road,	00:05:27	a connection.
00:03:01 5	with two Ls, in Westtown Township?	00:05:28 5	Q. Okay. So your testimony is that you do
00:03:05	A. A collector road would be a	00:05:31 6	provide a connector road, but, to your
00:03:07	classification of roadway which would	00:05:35 7	understanding, Toll Brothers does not propose
00:03:13	facilitate the collection of traffic from	00:05:39	development of a collector road?
00:03:17	multiple local roadways.	00:05:41	A. That is correct, to my knowledge, they
00:03:20 10	Q. And what is a connector road as you	00:05:42 10	are not proposing a collector road.
00:03:25 11	understand the term to be used during your	00:05:44 11	Q. Could the internal roadway shown on
00:03:26 12	testimony?	00:05:47 12	Exhibit A-6 be designed to be a collector road?
00:03:28 13	A. A connector road would, in terms of the	00:05:54 13	A. A collector road would not be
00:03:31 14	use of it in my testimony, would refer to a	00:05:56 14	appropriate through a residential development.
	roadway that is providing a connection between	00:05:59 15	So I'm not sure again, based on all of the
00:03:34 15			
00:03:37 16	two other roadways.	00:06:03 16	written comments received, a collector road has
00:03:37 16	two other roadways.  Q. Is there any minimum width in Westtown	00:06:05 17	never been requested.
00:03:37 16 00:03:41 17 00:03:47 18	two other roadways.  Q. Is there any minimum width in Westtown Township for a collector road?	00:06:05 17	never been requested.  Q. What is your understanding of what is
00:03:37 16 00:03:41 17 00:03:47 18 00:03:50 19	two other roadways.  Q. Is there any minimum width in Westtown Township for a collector road?  A. I'm not familiar with that specific	00:06:05 <b>17</b> 00:06:07 <b>18</b> 00:06:09 <b>19</b>	never been requested.  Q. What is your understanding of what is requested or required under the Growth
00:03:37 16 00:03:41 17 00:03:47 18 00:03:50 19 /2 20	two other roadways.  Q. Is there any minimum width in Westtown Township for a collector road?  A. I'm not familiar with that specific requirement within the ordinance.	00:06:05 17 00:06:07 18 00:06:09 19 00:06:12 20	never been requested.  Q. What is your understanding of what is requested or required under the Growth Management Plan?
00:03:37 16 00:03:41 17 00:03:47 18 00:03:50 19 2 20 00:03:54 21	two other roadways.  Q. Is there any minimum width in Westtown Township for a collector road?  A. I'm not familiar with that specific requirement within the ordinance.  Q. Nevertheless, is it your testimony here	00:06:05 17 00:06:07 18 00:06:09 19 00:06:12 20 00:06:12 21	never been requested.  Q. What is your understanding of what is requested or required under the Growth  Management Plan?  A. As I just said, I believe the Growth
00:03:37 16 00:03:41 17 00:03:47 18 00:03:50 19 2 20 00:03:54 21 00:03:56 22	two other roadways.  Q. Is there any minimum width in Westtown Township for a collector road?  A. I'm not familiar with that specific requirement within the ordinance.  Q. Nevertheless, is it your testimony here this evening that the plan for which the	00:06:05 17 00:06:07 18 00:06:09 19 00:06:12 20 00:06:12 21 00:06:15 22	never been requested. Q. What is your understanding of what is requested or required under the Growth Management Plan? A. As I just said, I believe the Growth Management Plan refers to a connection through
00:03:37 16 00:03:41 17 00:03:47 18 00:03:50 19 2 20 00:03:54 21 00:03:56 22 00:03:59 23	two other roadways.  Q. Is there any minimum width in Westtown Township for a collector road?  A. I'm not familiar with that specific requirement within the ordinance.  Q. Nevertheless, is it your testimony here this evening that the plan for which the applicant seeks conditional use approval,	00:06:05 17 00:06:07 18 00:06:09 19 00:06:12 20 00:06:12 21 00:06:15 22 00:06:17 23	never been requested. Q. What is your understanding of what is requested or required under the Growth Management Plan? A. As I just said, I believe the Growth Management Plan refers to a connection through this property between West Pleasant Grove Road
00:03:37 16 00:03:41 17 00:03:47 18 00:03:50 19 /2 20 00:03:54 21 00:03:56 22	two other roadways.  Q. Is there any minimum width in Westtown Township for a collector road?  A. I'm not familiar with that specific requirement within the ordinance.  Q. Nevertheless, is it your testimony here this evening that the plan for which the applicant seeks conditional use approval, Exhibit A-6, does not provide a collector road?	00:06:05 17 00:06:07 18 00:06:09 19 00:06:12 20 00:06:12 21 00:06:15 22 00:06:17 23 00:06:19 24	never been requested. Q. What is your understanding of what is requested or required under the Growth Management Plan? A. As I just said, I believe the Growth Management Plan refers to a connection through this property between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926.

		1072		1074
00:06:21	1	Q. Okay.	00:08:56	Q. Okay. So is it a surprise to you that
00:06:22	2	A. And all the written comments received	00:08:58	there are no sidewalks along any of the
00:06:24	3	to date refer to a connector road.	00:08:59	roadways of which the property has frontage?
(9	4	Q. This point has been asked of you a	00:09:02	
00:06:31	5	number of times, but I want to make sure I	00:09:05	
00:06:33	6	understand it completely. The only plan for	00:09:06	
00:06:36	7	which your client, the applicant, is seeking	00:09:10	
00:06:39	8	approval from this Board is the plan marked as	00:09:14	•
00:06:43	9	Exhibit A-6, correct?	00:09:19	
00:06:44	40	A. Correct.	00:09:25	
00:06:49		Q. I'm not sure to whom you were	00:09:26 1	•
00:06:49		responding to questions about transit. But you	00:09:29	
			00:09:29	
00:07:02		testified that you thought it would be, that		·
00:07:06		the use of transit by people residing at this	00:09:35 14	
00:07:09		development would be negligible, if existent at	00:09:38	_
00:07:12		all. Was that your testimony?	00:09:41	
00:07:14		A. Yes, in terms of the existing bus	00:09:45	
00:07:17		transit that's provided in the region.	00:09:49	
00:07:21		Q. So the residents of a future, as yet	00:09:52	
00:07:24		unbuilt development, will not use transit	00:09:53 20	
00:07:27		because people who currently live in Westtown	00:09:56 2	
00:07:30		Township don't use transit; is that correct?	00:09:59 22	,
00:07:32	23	A. That is certainly the trend.	00:10:02 23	
34	24	Q. Did you do any studies to determine	00:10:04 24	
		1073		1075
00:07:37	1	whether individuals who typically purchase	00:10:06	,
00:07:40	2	these types of homes use transit facilities?	00:10:08	A. I do not know at this time what PennDOT
00:07:43	3	A. As I spoke to earlier, it was just	00:10:12	will require in terms of pedestrian
00:07:45	4	based on my expert opinion. At this time we	00:10:13	connections.
00:07:48	5	have not completed a detailed evaluation.	00:10:14	<b>Q.</b> Have you worked on other applications
00:07:50	6	<b>Q.</b> What is that expertise?	00:10:16	which have frontage along state highways?
00:07:53	7	<ol> <li>Based on looking at the use of bus,</li> </ol>	00:10:19	7 A. Yes.
00:07:58	8	public transit in this region on many other	00:10:19	<b>Q.</b> Did PennDOT require pedestrian
00:08:00	9	projects similar to this.	00:10:21	facilities along those highways?
00:08:02	10	Q. No studies. Can you show me where the	00:10:22 10	A. In some cases they did and in some
00:08:08	11	internal, on Exhibit A-6, where the internal	00:10:24 1	cases they did not.
00:08:11	12	pedestrian facilities connect out to pedestrian	00:10:25 12	Q. Okay. If the township as part of the
00:08:18	13	facilities on New Street, Pleasant Grove Road,	00:10:27	HOP process suggested that PennDOT should
00:08:20	14	926 or 202?	00:10:29 14	require that, is that something that you would
	15	A. There are no existing pedestrian	00:10:31 1	support as the applicant's traffic consultant,
00:08:23	10			
00:08:23 00:08:26		facilities surrounding the site today, in terms	00:10:34 1	or is that something you would oppose, given
	16	facilities surrounding the site today, in terms of sidewalk, along 202, West Pleasant Grove	00:10:34 10	
00:08:26	16 17			your earlier statement about the value of
00:08:26 00:08:30	16 17 18	of sidewalk, along 202, West Pleasant Grove	00:10:37 17	your earlier statement about the value of pedestrian facilities?
00:08:26 00:08:30 00:08:34 00:08:37	16 17 18	of sidewalk, along 202, West Pleasant Grove Road or 926.	00:10:37 17	your earlier statement about the value of pedestrian facilities?  A. Certainly, if it is a requirement of
00:08:26 00:08:30 00:08:34 00:08:37	16 17 18 19 20	of sidewalk, along 202, West Pleasant Grove Road or 926. Q. Well, I'll agree with that statement.	00:10:37 <b>17</b> 00:10:39 <b>18</b> 00:10:42 <b>19</b>	your earlier statement about the value of pedestrian facilities?  A. Certainly, if it is a requirement of PennDOT along the state roadways, then that
00:08:26 00:08:30 00:08:34 00:08:37	16 17 18 19 20 21	of sidewalk, along 202, West Pleasant Grove Road or 926. Q. Well, I'll agree with that statement. But your client you would agree that the	00:10:37 17 00:10:39 18 00:10:42 19 00:10:45 20	your earlier statement about the value of pedestrian facilities?  A. Certainly, if it is a requirement of PennDOT along the state roadways, then that would be a requirement of the application.
00:08:26 00:08:30 00:08:34 00:08:37 3	16 17 18 19 20 21 22	of sidewalk, along 202, West Pleasant Grove Road or 926. Q. Well, I'll agree with that statement. But your client you would agree that the current development or use of the property is	00:10:37 17 00:10:39 18 00:10:42 19 00:10:45 20 00:10:49 2'	your earlier statement about the value of pedestrian facilities?  A. Certainly, if it is a requirement of PennDOT along the state roadways, then that would be a requirement of the application.  Q. That was not my question. My question

1076 1078 request in which you will join, given your 1 want to walk to. 00:11:00 2 earlier statement about the value of pedestrian 2 **Q.** Is one of those potentially the church? 00:11:03 00:13:41 3 connectivity, or is that a request which you 3 A. Potentially, yes. 00:11:05 00:13:44 4 would oppose? 4 Q. Okay. Given that, and given what you know about the site, and given the fact that 5 A. I would need to do a full evaluation of 5 00:11:08 00:13:47 the pedestrian needs and the ability to provide 00:13:50 West Pleasant Grove Road is a township road, if 00:11:11 those accommodations in connection. 7 the township were to at a minimum suggest the 00:11:14 inclusion of sidewalk along the West Pleasant 8 Ou typically don't want to 00:13:56 00:11:19 provide what we would call sidewalks to 9 Grove Road frontage, is that something that you 9 00:13:59 00:11:20 10 nowhere, and the applicant only has control 00:14:02 10 would recommend your client agree to? 00:11:22 00:14:10 11 A. Providing sidewalks along the property over their own property. So as I stated, there 00:11:25 11 frontage certainly have merit. But we need to 00:11:27 12 are no existing facilities along the property 00:14:13 12 00:11:31 13 frontages and even beyond in this area, along 00:14:17 13 give consideration to where they begin and end. So I would agree that providing sidewalks along many of the roadways. So we would want to do a 00:14:20 14 14 the property frontage is something that should 00:11:36 15 full evaluation of all the connections, not 00:14:23 15 be considered, but it has to be more than that. 00:11:39 16 just within the property, to determine if the 00:14:26 16 It has to be a holistic evaluation to look at. 17 facilities that were being requested by the 00:14:28 17 00:11:44 00:11:46 18 township were appropriate. So we would need to 00:14:32 18 at the connections, and where it begins and 00:11:49 19 do a full evaluation. 00:14:34 19 ends. 00:14:35 20 00:11:50 20 Q. Okay. What about if the township, if Q. Okay. We can keep going at this. 00:11:52 21 this Board were to impose a condition on 00:14:44 21 These townhouses up on the north side of the 00:11:54 22 conditional use approval requiring pedestrian 00:14:46 22 property on Exhibit A-6, the westernmost units facilities along New Street and West Pleasant 00:11:56 23 00:14:53 23 of townhomes, if an individual lives there and 24 Grove Road, is that something that you would 00:15:01 24 finds themselves desirous, desiring to go to 1077 1079 the Presbyterian Church, given what you know 1 recommend that your client agree to? 00:15:05 00:12:03 about the proposed development, given what you 2 A. Again, we need to look beyond the 00:15:09 00:12:06 property borders and determine where those 3 know about the geometry of West Pleasant Grove 3 00:15:15 00:12:08 connections go to and what they connect, to Road, given what you know about the topography 4 00:15:18 00:12:11 insure that we are not providing, like I said, 5 of the site and the post-construction 5 00:15:20 00:12:14 sidewalk to nowhere, or it ends at a point 6 condition, would you find it or would you make 6 00:15:22 7 and then where do pedestrians go. a recommendation to your client that it accept 00:15:26 00:12:21 8 a condition that the applicant provide a 8 We want to be very conscientious 00:12:23 00:15:28 of safety. So if pedestrian connections are sidewalk from that group of townhouses down to 9 00:15:32 10 requested then a full evaluation would be 00:15:35 10 the church, along West Pleasant Grove Road, 00:12:29 understanding that that sidewalk would have a 11 needed to determine where they go and where 00:15:38 11 00:12:31 00:12:34 12 they begin and end. 00:15:40 12 beginning point and an end point and, 00:12:38 13 00:15:43 13

Q. Are there any facilities nearby the Crebilly Farm property where you would expect residents to walk, destinations to which they would walk?

A. Given the lack of pedestrian facilities currently and the challenges with crossing pedestrians safely across 202, certainly the west side of 202 where this site is located is primarily residential in nature, and may not have as much of a pedestrian generation due to the difficulty in crossing 202. But certainly there are existing locations that people may

therefore, not a sidewalk to nowhere? 00:15:49 14 It is a pretty specific question, 00:15:51 15 Ms. Kline. 00:15:51 16 A. No, it is. You did reference based on 00:15:58 17 the site topography and the site design. This 00:16:02 18

site is not fully designed yet, so I can't speak to those design elements.

Certainly, if it is feasible, it would make sense, if there was a desire and a need to provide a pedestrian connection, to provide it in that way, where you have defined a clear beginning and end, and it would connect

14

15

00:12:52

00:12:55 00:13:01 16

00:13:06 17

00:13:08 18

00 13:12 19

00:13:19 21

00:13:25 22

00:13:30 23

7 20

00:16:04 19

00:16:06 20

00:16:08 21

00:16:12 22

00:16:14 23

00:16:18 24

1080 1082 1 residents directly from their homes to an A. Yes, additional information would be 00:16:23 00:18:27 2 adjacent use that may be desirable for walking. 2 needed. Certainly, detailed information and 00:16:29 00:18:28 3 Q. It may. You can't say for sure. coordination with PennDOT would be required, 00:16:32 00:18:32 4 notwithstanding your earlier statement about 4 particularly as it relates to the 202/926 00:18:34 5 the value of pedestrian connectivity? 5 intersection project, which does include 00:16:36 00:18:37 A. The value of safe pedestrian pedestrian, consideration for pedestrian 00:16:39 00:18:41 7 connectivity, absolutely. 7 facilities, which the details are unknown at 00:18:44 00:16:42 8 Q. What additional information will you 8 this time. 00:18:48 00:16:43 require in order to determine whether or not 9 Q. Okay. So other than drainage, 9 00:18:48 00:16:44 10 the sidewalk that I have suggested is safe or 00:18:50 10 topography and coordination with PennDOT on the 00:16:46 11 unsafe? Specifically, what additional 00:18:53 11 926/202 project, there is no additional 00:16:48 12 information will you require? 00:18:56 12 information required in order for you to 00:16:51 00:16:55 13 A. Detailed design of that sidewalk and 00:18:58 13 recommend a sidewalk be run to the CVS? 00:16:59 14 that connection. 00:19:01 14 A. That would --15 Q. What would have to be shown in that 00:19:02 15 Q. Correct? 00:16:59 16 detailed design that you don't know right now? 00:19:02 16 A. That would be the information that 00:17:01 17 A. Vertical geometry, for example. 00:19:05 17 would be required to assess that. 00:17:04 00:17:07 18 Q. Okav. 00:19:06 18 Q. Thank you. I don't want to belabor 00:17:07 19 A. Drainage design. 00:19:18 19 this point too much, but one of the members of 00:17:09 20 Q. Has the applicant presented any 00:19:21 20 the Board asked you -- I'm sorry, I don't 00:17:11 21 preliminary grading or stormwater plans as part 00:19:25 21 remember which at this point in time -- but 00:17:15 22 of the conditional use application? 00:19:27 22 that as a result of the elimination of the 202 00:17:16 23 A. That is not part of my testimony, nor 00:19:30 23 access, the results of the traffic study 24 is it part of my expertise or involvement in 00:19:34 24 changed, a traffic study which you have done 21 1081 1083 1 this project. 1 but you haven't submitted to anybody, correct? 00:19:38 00:17:24 A. Updated analysis has been completed, 2 Q. Assuming that the sidewalk can be run 00:17:24 00:19:41 in a relatively flat way and assuming that 3 but a formal study has not been completed and 3 00:19:43 00:17:26 there are no drainage considerations that would submitted for review. 4 00:19:45 00:17:29 prevent the safe walking from the townhouses 5 Q. It hasn't been submitted to PennDOT? 5 00:17:31 down to the church, is there any other 6 A. No. 6 00:19:49 00:17:34 7 information which you would require in order to 7 Q. It hasn't been submitted to the 00:19:49 00:17:37 8 township? 8 answer my question yes or no, Ms. Kline? 00:17:38 A. I believe that would suffice as the A. No. 9 00:19:52 00:17:42 10 information that would be necessary, along with 00:19:52 10 Q. Does it reside in your office? 00:17:45 00:19:56 11 A. Again, we completed additional 11 an assessment of the pedestrian needs for that 00:17:47 connection. 00:19:59 12 analysis, revised analysis to assess that 12 00:17:49 00:17:50 13 Q. Okay. Hopefully it won't be as painful 00:20:01 13 condition. But a formal report has not been 14 with my next line of questioning. But what if 00:20:04 14 finalized or submitted. 00:17:54 somebody who lives in this community wants to 00:20:05 15 Q. Why not? 00:17:56 15 visit CVS pharmacy at the intersection of 926 00:20:07 16 A. It is not the subject of the 00:17:58 16 and 202, given what you earlier told me about 00:20:10 17 application at this time, so it has not been 00:18:02 17 00:18:05 18 the desirability of pedestrian connectivity, 00:20:13 18 prepared for submission. 00 18:09 19 other than with regard to the vertical run or 00:20:14 19 Q. That's because the only plan for which 3 20 the topography and site drainage, is there any 00:20:15 20 the applicant seeks approval in this hearing is 21 additional information which you will require 00:20:18 21 the one marked as Exhibit A-6? 00:18:16 00:20:19 22 00:18:18 22 in order to recommend to your client whether or A. This is the plan that has been 00:18:21 23 not it run a sidewalk or pedestrian connection 00:20:21 23 submitted, correct.

00:18:24 24

out to the CVS?

00:20:23 24

MR. GILL: Thank you. I don't

	1084	1		1086
00:20:24	have any other questions on recross.	00:22:51	1	MR. CRAWFORD: Thank you. That's
00:20:26	MR. MCKENNA: Birmingham	00:22:52	2	all I have.
00:20:27	Township, Mr. Crawford, do you have any further	00:22:53	3	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.
s 4	recross?	00:22:53	4	Crawford.
5	RECROSS-EXAMINATION	00:22:54	5	Thornbury, Ms. Labrum, any
6	BY MR. CRAWFORD:	00:22:56	6	recross?
00:20:30 7	Q. A couple questions if I might just to	00:22:57	7	MS. LABRUM: Just one question.
00:20:32	revisit the connector. My understanding is	00.22.37	8	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
00:20:35	that the philosophy or the approach that you		9	BY MS. LABRUM:
00:20:37 10	would like to take is to enable local traffic	00:22:59	_	Q. Good evening, Ms. Kline. In your
00:20:41 11	to traverse through the community between	00:23:02		testimony in May you noted that if the
00:20:45 12	Street Road and West Pleasant Grove Road, but	00:23:05		continuous connector route was provided through
00:20:48 13	not in a manner that would attract traffic off	00:23:07		the site, the average daily traffic volume
00:20:52 14	of 202. Is that a fair statement?	00:23:10		would increase to 2200 vehicles at the
00:20:54 15	A. Yes, that's a fair statement, that it	00:23:12		intersection of 926 and Bridlewood. How did
00:20:56 16	would provide for a local connection rather	00:23:15		vou arrive at that number?
00:21:00 17	than a more regional connection.	00:23:23		A. We did include an evaluation of that
00:21:02 18	Q. And as far as defining local, would	00:23:32		connector road concept in our traffic impact
00:21:05 19	that include residents not within this	00:23:35		study. That was submitted as part of this
00:21:08 20	community but in proximity to the west side of	00:23:39		application. It was referred to earlier that
00:21:13 21	202 and north of 926 in other communities?	00:23:42		we had looked at three different alternative
00:21:16 22	A. Yes, it would.	00:23:44		plans, A, B and C. C included that connector
00:21:18 23	Q. Okay. Do you think that the design	00:23:48	23	road. So we do have a detailed traffic
2 24	that you proposed in A-6 would accomplish that?	00:23:52	24	evaluation of the potential additional traffic
1	1085			1087
00:21:26 1	A. The design as shown in the plan marked	00:23:56	1	that could be drawn by such a connector road.
00:21:45 2	as A-6 certainly does show a connection between	00:23:59	2	So those numbers were from the
00:21:48 3	West Pleasant Grove Road and 926 through the	00:24:00	3	study as part of the, is a subject of the
00:21:51 4	site. I would say it is more for access for	00:24:03	4	record.
00:21:54 <b>5</b>	this property than anything in that	00:24:03	5	Q. I'm sorry. What I was really asking
00:21:55	configuration.	00:24:07	6	was what assumptions were underlying that
00:21:57 7	Q. So that it is rather circuitous for	00:24:09	7	conclusion of 2200 vehicles.
00:22:02 8	someone outside of this community to use that	00:24:13	8	A. It assumes additional local traffic
00:22:04	connector as it is currently designed, fair to	00:24:15	9	will use the connection that is not generated
00:22:07 10	say?	00:24:19		specifically by this development. So as part
00:22:07 11	A. It is, yes.	00:24:21	11	of our study we evaluated intersections
00:22:08 12	Q. And would you be willing to consider	00:24:24		surrounding the site, and with that connector
00:22:13 13	lessening the circuity of that connection?	00:24:26		road we made some estimates and assumptions
00:22:17 14	A. The applicant has indicated, and we did	00:24:30		based on the existing traffic patterns and
00:22:20 15	refer to the minutes of the meeting between	00:24:32		volumes in the area of the additional traffic
00:22:25 16	PennDOT and Westtown and Thornbury, that they	00:24:35		that would be drawn to such a connection,
00:22:29 17	have looked at a potentially modified roadway	00:24:37		traffic that is generated outside of the
00:22:33 18	through the site that would provide a	00:24:39		development.
00 22:34 19	connection, although not a straight connection,	00:24:41		Q. That assumption is logical. But how do
9 20	still circuitous but less circuitous than what	00:24:46		we get the number, assign a number to the
00:22:43 21	is shown on the plan currently.  Q. And that design has not been detailed	00:24:49		people who are going to be drawn off of 202 to
00:22:44 22	at this point; is that a fair statement?	00:24:53		use this connector road? Is it just a guesstimate?
00:22:47 23	A. Yes.	00:24:56		A. It is certainly an engineering
VV.EZ.70				

				_	
		1088			1090
00.24.55	1	estimate. So we looked at the movements of	00:27:10	1	traffic study at that time and so was not
	2	existing volume that would be interested in		2	included in that evaluation.
00:25:04	3	using such a connection, and you can imagine	00:27:14	3	Q. So Alternative C was based on the
16	4	that with that connection the primary movement	00:27:17	4	access being 1400 feet back from Route 202 and
00:25:11	5	that would be drawn to it from 202 would be	00:27:21	5	intersecting 926, where cars would probably be
00:25:13	6.	traffic today that is traveling south on 202	00:27:24	6	queued up at the 926/202 intersection?
00:25:16	7	and turning right onto 926 to travel west.	00:27:29	7	A. It was located as it is located on the
00:25:20	8	That would be the most obvious traffic. And	00:27:32	8	conditional use plan, yes.
00:25:24	9	also the traffic that's currently traveling		9	MS. LABRUM: Thank you.
00:25:27	-	south on 202 and turning right onto West	00:27:40 1	10	MR. MCKENNA: Any further
00:25:31 11		Pleasant Grove Road to New Street, and then	00:27:41 1		questions, Ms. Labrum?
00:25:32 12	2	either continuing on New Street or continuing	00:27:43		MS. LABRUM: No. I'm sorry.
00:25:34 13	-	west on 926.	00:27:43		MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I just
00:25:36 14	4	Those are the movements that can	00:27:44 1		wanted to make sure.
00:25:38 15	5	be drawn by such a connection. So we looked at	00:27:46	15	Neighbors for Crebilly, Mr.
00:25:40 16	6	those particular movements and assumed a	00:27:47 1	16	Thompson, any questions?
00:25:42 17	7	percentage of that traffic would utilize this	00:27:48 1	17	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
00:25:45	8	new connection.	00:27:49 1	18	BY MR. THOMPSON:
00:25:47 19	9	They could still, some of the	00:27:49 1	19	Q. Ms. Kline, is there any particular
00:25:48 20	0	traffic could and would likely still use the	00:27:51 2	20	reason why you are not showing any access to
00:25:51 21	1	route they are using today, but some of the	00:27:53 2	21	South New Street from the development?
00:25:53 22	2	traffic would be redistributed to such a new	00:27:55 2	22	A. It was not my decision on where to put
00:25:56 23		connection.	00:27:58 2	23	accesses. We were asked to evaluate the plan
57 24	4	But the opposite traffic	00:28:01 2	24	based on the accesses that were provided, and
	_				
		1089			1091
00:26:00	1	1089 traveling east along 926 wishing to travel	00:28:03	1	1091 based on our analysis, the accesses provided
00:26:00 1	1 2	1089 traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would	00:28:03	1 2	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:06 3	1 2 3	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08	1 2 3	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:06 3 00:26:08 4	1 2 3 4	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09	1 2 3 4	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:06 3 00:26:08 4 00:26:10 5	1 2 3 4 5	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14	1 2 3 4 5	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 3 00:26:08 4 00:26:10 5	1 2 3 4 5	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17	1 2 3 4 5	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:06 3 00:26:08 4 00:26:10 5 00:26:16 6 00:26:18 7	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:10 5 00:26:15 6 00:26:18 7 00:26:21 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that,	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:10 5 00:26:16 6 00:26:18 7 00:26:21 8	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:23 00:28:25	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:10 5 00:26:15 6 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:23 00:28:25 00:28:28	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:06 3 00:26:08 4 00:26:15 6 00:26:15 7 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:23 00:28:25 00:28:28 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:10 5 00:26:15 6 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 10 00:26:27 11 00:26:32 12	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:23 00:28:25 00:28:28 1 00:28:34	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:16 5 00:26:15 6 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:27 11 00:26:32 12 00:26:32 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:23 00:28:25 00:28:28 1 00:28:34 1 00:28:34	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:16 5 00:26:15 6 00:26:21 8 00:26:21 10 00:26:22 12 00:26:32 12 00:26:36 13 00:26:38 14	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?  A. In this study we did not have the	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:23 00:28:28 1 00:28:34 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:36	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:16 5 00:26:16 7 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10 00:26:32 12 00:26:32 13 00:26:34 13	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection. Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard? A. In this study we did not have the access located along 926 opposite Bridlewood.	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:23 00:28:25 00:28:28 1 00:28:34 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is not the only consideration. As soon as you
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:10 5 00:26:16 6 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10 00:26:32 12 00:26:36 13 00:26:38 14 00:26:48 16	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?  A. In this study we did not have the access located along 926 opposite Bridlewood. So being that the access configuration along	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:23 00:28:23 00:28:28 1 00:28:34 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:41 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is not the only consideration. As soon as you introduce a new access you are introducing a
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:16 5 00:26:15 7 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10 00:26:32 12 00:26:36 13 00:26:38 14 00:26:48 16 00:26:48 16	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?  A. In this study we did not have the access located along 926 opposite Bridlewood. So being that the access configuration along 926 under that scenario was, per the	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:23 00:28:28 1 00:28:34 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:41	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is not the only consideration. As soon as you introduce a new access you are introducing a new intersection with potential vehicle
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:15 6 00:26:15 7 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10 00:26:32 12 00:26:38 13 00:26:38 14 00:26:48 16 00:26:48 16 00:26:54 18	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?  A. In this study we did not have the access located along 926 opposite Bridlewood. So being that the access configuration along 926 under that scenario was, per the conditional use plan, being offset from	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:25 00:28:25 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:43 1 00:28:48 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is not the only consideration. As soon as you introduce a new access you are introducing a new intersection with potential vehicle conflicts. So there has to be a balance, and
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:15 6 00:26:15 7 00:26:21 8 00:26:25 10 00:26:32 12 00:26:36 13 00:26:38 14 00:26:48 16 00:26:51 17 00:26:54 18 00:26:54 18	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?  A. In this study we did not have the access located along 926 opposite Bridlewood. So being that the access configuration along 926 under that scenario was, per the conditional use plan, being offset from Bridlewood, we did not feel that there would be	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:23 00:28:28 1 00:28:34 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:43 1 00:28:43 1 00:28:43 1 00:28:44 1 00:28:45 1 00:28:46 1 00:28:46 1 00:28:46 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is not the only consideration. As soon as you introduce a new access you are introducing a new intersection with potential vehicle conflicts. So there has to be a balance, and you have to look at more than just number of
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:15 6 00:26:15 7 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10 00:26:32 12 00:26:38 13 00:26:38 14 00:26:48 16 00:26:51 17 00:26:54 18 00:26:54 18	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?  A. In this study we did not have the access located along 926 opposite Bridlewood. So being that the access configuration along 926 under that scenario was, per the conditional use plan, being offset from Bridlewood, we did not feel that there would be a significant draw with that access	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:25 00:28:25 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:43 1 00:28:46 1 00:28:48 1 00:28:48 1 00:28:48 1 00:28:48 1 00:28:48 1 00:28:52 2	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is not the only consideration. As soon as you introduce a new access you are introducing a new intersection with potential vehicle conflicts. So there has to be a balance, and you have to look at more than just number of accesses to say that it is better or worse.
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:18 7 00:26:18 7 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10 00:26:32 12 00:26:36 13 00:26:38 14 00:26:38 14 00:26:43 15 00:26:43 15 00:26:51 17 00:26:54 18 00:26:57 19 00:26:57 19 00:26:57 20	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?  A. In this study we did not have the access located along 926 opposite Bridlewood. So being that the access configuration along 926 under that scenario was, per the conditional use plan, being offset from Bridlewood, we did not feel that there would be a significant draw with that access configuration to Bridlewood. But certainly if	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:09 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:23 00:28:25 00:28:28 1 00:28:34 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:43 1 00:28:43 1 00:28:44 1 00:28:45 1 00:28:46 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is not the only consideration. As soon as you introduce a new access you are introducing a new intersection with potential vehicle conflicts. So there has to be a balance, and you have to look at more than just number of accesses to say that it is better or worse.  Q. So you are saying the applicant
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:16 6 00:26:16 7 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10 00:26:36 13 00:26:36 14 00:26:38 14 00:26:38 14 00:26:38 15 00:26:54 18 00:26:57 19 9 20 00:27:02 21 00:27:04 22	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?  A. In this study we did not have the access located along 926 opposite Bridlewood. So being that the access configuration along 926 under that scenario was, per the conditional use plan, being offset from Bridlewood, we did not feel that there would be a significant draw with that access configuration to Bridlewood. But certainly if the access is located opposite that was one of	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:08 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:21 00:28:25 00:28:25 00:28:36 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:48 1 00:28:48 1 00:28:48 1 00:28:48 1 00:28:50 1 00:28:50 2	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is not the only consideration. As soon as you introduce a new access you are introducing a new intersection with potential vehicle conflicts. So there has to be a balance, and you have to look at more than just number of accesses to say that it is better or worse.  Q. So you are saying the applicant developed these accesses, and you analyzed
00:26:00 1 00:26:02 2 00:26:08 4 00:26:18 7 00:26:18 7 00:26:21 8 00:26:23 9 00:26:25 10 00:26:32 12 00:26:36 13 00:26:38 14 00:26:38 14 00:26:43 15 00:26:43 15 00:26:51 17 00:26:54 18 00:26:57 19 00:26:57 19 00:26:57 20	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3	traveling east along 926 wishing to travel north on 202, with just this connection, would not have another option because there is no additional traffic signal that would allow a left turn north on 202. That would have to be completed, that movement could be impacted should the connector road be built between West Pleasant Grove and Skiles Boulevard, but that, of course, is not a part of this application so we did not include that connection.  Q. Your Alternative C, how many cars did you anticipate going through Thornbury using Bridlewood Boulevard?  A. In this study we did not have the access located along 926 opposite Bridlewood. So being that the access configuration along 926 under that scenario was, per the conditional use plan, being offset from Bridlewood, we did not feel that there would be a significant draw with that access configuration to Bridlewood. But certainly if	00:28:03 00:28:07 00:28:09 00:28:09 00:28:14 00:28:17 00:28:23 00:28:25 00:28:28 1 00:28:34 1 00:28:36 1 00:28:41 1 00:28:43 1 00:28:43 1 00:28:44 1 00:28:45 1 00:28:46 1	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 2 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	based on our analysis, the accesses provided adequately serve the development, so that's what I can speak to.  Q. Generally, are more connections to the surrounding roadways better to serve the development? Or you are saying that the connection, the current connections are sufficient; is that correct?  A. Yes, based on our analysis, the current accesses provided to the property are adequate.  Q. Would more connections or such as a connection to South New Street provide better access to the property?  A. That certainly, number of accesses is not the only consideration. As soon as you introduce a new access you are introducing a new intersection with potential vehicle conflicts. So there has to be a balance, and you have to look at more than just number of accesses to say that it is better or worse.  Q. So you are saying the applicant

	1092		1094
00:29:03 1	accesses would be located?	00:31:17	submitted, no.
00:29:04 2	A. That's correct.	00:31:18	MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. Did A-6
00:29:05 3	MR. THOMPSON: Thank you.	00:31:20	depict the roads at intersections as discussed
17 4	MR. MCKENNA: Anything further,	00:31:22	in Exhibit 29?
UU 29:10 <b>5</b>	Mr. Thompson?	00:31:24	THE WITNESS: No.
00:29:11 6	MR. THOMPSON: No.	00:31:27	MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did A-6
00:29:12 7	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. DuFault, for	00:31:30	7 show a site access road onto State Route 926
00:29:14 8	Brandywine Thornbury HOA, any questions?	00:31:33	which was 1400 feet west of the US 202/State
00:29:16	MR. DUFAULT: Good evening. Let	00:31:37	Route 926 intersection?
00:29:36 10	me know if I'm close enough to the mike, Mr	00:31:38 10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
00:29:41 11	MR. MCKENNA: You sound okay to	00:31:39 1	1 MR. DUFAULT: Did it show any
00:29:42 12	me. Is the court reporters okay with that?	00:31:41 12	other site access roads onto 926?
00:29:43 13	Sounds okay. Go ahead, Mr. DuFault.	00:31:44	THE WITNESS: No, it did not.
00:29:46 14	MR. DUFAULT: Nicole, was	00:31:45	MR. DUFAULT: When reviewing your
00:29:47 15	Exhibit 29, which was submitted to the Board of	00:31:47	responses to my questions re the location of
00:29:49 16	Supervisors on May 23, the initial	00:31:50 10	the site access and Bridlewood Boulevard in
00:29:53 17	Transportation Impact Study that was dated	00:31:53 17	
00:29:55 18	October 13th, 2016 and prepared and reviewed by	00:31:56 18	some confusion and the distance from the
00:29:59 19	the Township Planning Commission?	00:31:58 19	
00:30:13 20	THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.	00:32:01 20	-
00:30:16 21	MR. DUFAULT: Was Exhibit A-6,	00:32:03 2*	,
00:30:19 22	which was displayed during the entire May	00:32:08 22	
00:30:24 23	testimony, the initial site plan prepared for	00:32:51 23	
	the Planning Commission hearings?	00:32:52 24	
1 .	1093		1095
00:30:28	THE WITNESS: Yes, I believe it	00:32:57	
00:30:32	Was.		<ul><li>reviewed a set of plans entitled "Roadway</li><li>Improvements to Street Road for Bridlewood</li></ul>
00:30:32	MR. DUFAULT: Was A-6 prepared by		
00:30:34 4	your firm?  THE WITNESS: No, it was not.		4 Farms, Thornbury Township," prepared for 5 Hovnanian Companies by Orth-Rodgers &
00:30:35 5	MR. DUFAULT: Which firm prepared		6 Associates, dated October, August 22nd, 1996,
7	A-6?		7 last revised 12/30/96. Note 3 on page 5 of 23
	THE WITNESS: The site engineer		8 states: "The distance from Bridlewood
	prepared the plan.		9 Centerline to the nearest intersections are -
00:30:40 9	MR. DUFAULT: Was that ESE?	00:33:26	
00:30:45 11	THE WITNESS: Correct.	00:33:33 1'	•
00:30:45 12	MR, DUFAULT: A-6 shows a	00:33:35	
00:30:49 13	connection to 202, correct?	00:33:36	3 approximate distance?
00:30:52 14	THE WITNESS: Yes, it does.	00:33:40 14	
00:30:54 15	MR. DUFAULT: But, okay, that has	00:33:41	5 reasonable, without completing the
00:30:59 16	since been removed, but a plan has not been	00:33:42	6 measurements.
00:31:03 17	submitted for it?	00:33:44	7 MR. DUFAULT: I can also refer to
00:31:04 18	THE WITNESS: A preliminary	00:33:46	8 a PennDOT letter of January 10th, 2008 by Mr.
00:31:06 19	assessment of the potential for removal of that	00:33:49	9 Hanney, who suggested that the route be that
<sub>8</sub> 20	access has been evaluated at this time. That's	00:33:55 20	the distance, in connection with an earlier
00:31:12 21	all.	00:33:58 2	1 submission by another developer, that the
	MR. DUFAULT: But no plan has	00:34:02 2	2 proposed connector road parallel, I mean,
00:31:13 22	THE BOTAGETT BUT TO PIET THE		
00:31:13 22	been prepared?	00:34:06 2	applicant must investigate relocating the

	1096		1098
00:34:11	intersection opposite Bridlewood Boulevard	00:36:12	identified anything that could not be overcome
00:34:13	approximately 2300 feet west of State Route	00:36:15 2	to locate the access opposite Bridlewood.
00:34:18	202.	00:36:18 3	MR. DUFAULT: Are you familiar
,9 4	With these two factors, would you	00:36:19 4	with the township requirements for developing
00:34:21	agree that 2300 feet is, or 2350 is a	00:36:22 5	in the areas of slopes in excess of 25 percent?
00:34:25	reasonable assumption?	00:36:25	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with
00:34:26	THE WITNESS: Yes, I would agree	00:36:27 7	that requirement.
00:34:27	that sounds, that sounds to be in the general	00:36:28	MR. DUFAULT: Are you aware that
00:34:31	range of the distance, yes.	00:36:30	there is a large amount of slope in that area
00:34:33 10	MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. Exhibit	00:36:35 10	that is graded at 25 percent or better?
00:34:37 11	29, including Exhibit A-6, were submitted to	00:36:38 11	THE WITNESS: I cannot speak to
00:34:40 12	both Kimley Horn and PennDOT, correct?	00:36:39 12	what the slope is in that area. That would be
00:34:42 13	THE WITNESS: Yes.	00:36:42 13	a determination by the site engineer.
00:34:44 14		00:36:45 14	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. On the
00:34:46 15		00:36:48 15	previously mentioned Orth-Rodgers plans for
00:34:50 16		00:36:51 16	"Roadway Improvements to Street Road," page 8
00:34:53 17		00:36:55 17	of 23 shows the center line of the intersection
00:34:53 18	THE WITNESS: Yes.	00:36:57 18	to be at elevation 320, which is 30 feet below
00:34:54		00:37:01 19	the crest of the hill, which is approximately
00:34:55 20	•	00:37:04 20	700 feet to the east. Would you consider this
00:34:59 21	·	00:37:06 21	to be a deterrent to locating the access road
00:35:00 22	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	00:37:08 22	at this location?
00:35:02 23		00:37:10 23	THE WITNESS: I can't speak to
14 24	study that was first submitted to the Board on	00:37:12 24	information in a study that I have not prepared
			4000
1	1097		1099
00:35:07	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?	00:37:14 1	nor reviewed.
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.	00:37:15 2	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In	00:37:15 2	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.
00:35:09 2 00:35:14 3 00:35:16 4	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In there you further testified that you had	00:37:15 <b>2</b> 00:37:18 <b>3</b> 00:37:22 <b>4</b>	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to	00:37:15 <b>2</b> 00:37:18 <b>3</b> 00:37:22 <b>4</b> 00:37:23 <b>5</b>	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which	00:37:15 <b>2</b> 00:37:18 <b>3</b> 00:37:22 <b>4</b> 00:37:23 <b>5</b> 00:37:27 <b>6</b>	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood,
00:35:09 2 00:35:14 3 00:35:16 4 00:35:16 5 00:35:25 7	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that	00:37:15 <b>2</b> 00:37:18 <b>3</b> 00:37:22 <b>4</b> 00:37:23 <b>5</b> 00:37:27 <b>6</b> 00:37:30 <b>7</b>	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?	00:37:15 <b>2</b> 00:37:18 <b>3</b> 00:37:22 <b>4</b> 00:37:23 <b>5</b> 00:37:27 <b>6</b> 00:37:30 <b>7</b> 00:37:32 <b>8</b>	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated	00:37:15 <b>2</b> 00:37:18 <b>3</b> 00:37:22 <b>4</b> 00:37:23 <b>5</b> 00:37:27 <b>6</b> 00:37:30 <b>7</b> 00:37:32 <b>8</b> 00:37:35 <b>9</b>	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.	00:37:15 2 00:37:18 3 00:37:22 4 00:37:23 5 00:37:27 6 00:37:30 7 00:37:32 8 00:37:35 9 00:37:35 10	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did	00:37:15	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue,
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would	00:37:15 2 00:37:18 3 00:37:22 4 00:37:23 5 00:37:27 6 00:37:30 7 00:37:32 8 00:37:35 9 00:37:35 10 00:37:35 11 00:37:34 12	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to	00:37:15	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to connect the 926 access at this location,	00:37:15 2 00:37:18 3 00:37:22 4 00:37:23 5 00:37:27 6 00:37:30 7 00:37:32 8 00:37:35 9 00:37:35 10 00:37:35 11 00:37:34 12	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. How
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to connect the 926 access at this location, meaning Bridlewood Boulevard?	00:37:15	nor reviewed.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to connect the 926 access at this location, meaning Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: At this time we	00:37:15 2 00:37:18 3 00:37:22 4 00:37:23 5 00:37:27 6 00:37:30 7 00:37:32 8 00:37:35 9 00:37:35 10 00:37:43 12 00:37:46 13 00:37:46 13 00:37:47 14 00:37:48 15	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. How long is a complete cycle for all movements at
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to connect the 926 access at this location, meaning Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: At this time we have not identified anything.	00:37:15	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. How long is a complete cycle for all movements at the 926/202 intersection?
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to connect the 926 access at this location, meaning Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: At this time we have not identified anything.  MR. DUFAULT: Would you consider	00:37:15	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. How long is a complete cycle for all movements at the 926/202 intersection?  THE WITNESS: Existing cycle
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to connect the 926 access at this location, meaning Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: At this time we have not identified anything.  MR. DUFAULT: Would you consider the presence of steep slopes, close to the	00:37:15 2 00:37:18 3 00:37:22 4 00:37:23 5 00:37:27 6 00:37:30 7 00:37:32 8 00:37:35 9 00:37:35 10 00:37:38 11 00:37:48 15 00:37:47 14 00:37:48 15 00:37:51 16 00:37:53 17 00:38:38 18	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. How long is a complete cycle for all movements at the 926/202 intersection?  THE WITNESS: Existing cycle length in the morning is 165 seconds.
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to connect the 926 access at this location, meaning Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: At this time we have not identified anything.  MR. DUFAULT: Would you consider the presence of steep slopes, close to the proposed intersection, to be a deterrent to	00:37:15 2 00:37:18 3 00:37:22 4 00:37:23 5 00:37:27 6 00:37:30 7 00:37:32 8 00:37:35 10 00:37:35 11 00:37:46 13 00:37:46 13 00:37:47 14 00:37:48 15 00:37:51 16 00:37:51 17 00:38:38 18 00:38:43 19	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. How long is a complete cycle for all movements at the 926/202 intersection?  THE WITNESS: Existing cycle length in the morning is 165 seconds.  MR. DUFAULT: 165 seconds.
00:35:09 2 00:35:14 3 00:35:16 4 00:35:16 5 00:35:22 6 00:35:27 8 00:35:27 8 00:35:28 9 00:35:31 10 00:35:34 12 00:35:34 12 00:35:40 14 00:35:46 17 00:35:46 17 00:35:48 18 00:35:49 18	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to connect the 926 access at this location, meaning Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: At this time we have not identified anything.  MR. DUFAULT: Would you consider the presence of steep slopes, close to the proposed intersection, to be a deterrent to building an access road at that location?	00:37:15 2 00:37:18 3 00:37:22 4 00:37:23 5 00:37:27 6 00:37:30 7 00:37:32 8 00:37:35 10 00:37:35 11 00:37:48 15 00:37:47 14 00:37:48 15 00:37:51 16 00:37:53 17 00:38:38 18 00:38:45 20	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. How long is a complete cycle for all movements at the 926/202 intersection?  THE WITNESS: Existing cycle length in the morning is 165 seconds.  MR. DUFAULT: 165 seconds.  THE WITNESS: And in the
00:35:09	at the May 23 meeting as Exhibit 33?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. In  there you further testified that you had analyzed relocating 926 access intersection to be located opposite Bridlewood Boulevard, which was a requirement from PennDOT. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes, we evaluated the access at both locations.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. Did your analysis indicate any obstacles that would not allow and/or would make it more costly to connect the 926 access at this location, meaning Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: At this time we have not identified anything.  MR. DUFAULT: Would you consider the presence of steep slopes, close to the proposed intersection, to be a deterrent to building an access road at that location?  THE WITNESS: We have not	00:37:15 2 00:37:18 3 00:37:22 4 00:37:23 5 00:37:27 6 00:37:30 7 00:37:32 8 00:37:35 9 00:37:35 10 00:37:46 13 00:37:46 13 00:37:47 14 00:37:48 15 00:37:51 16 00:37:53 17 00:38:38 18 00:38:43 19 00:38:46 21	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. You had testified it is understandable.  You had testified that at times the eastbound queue on State Route 926 sometimes extends as far back as Bridlewood, which I think we have now agreed upon is about 2350 feet. Is that correct?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. So that would mean approximately 100 cars in the queue, taking your standard of 25 feet per car?  THE WITNESS: Yes.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. How long is a complete cycle for all movements at the 926/202 intersection?  THE WITNESS: Existing cycle length in the morning is 165 seconds.  MR. DUFAULT: 165 seconds.  THE WITNESS: And in the afternoon as well, yes.

	1100		1102
00:38:52	THE WITNESS: Well, that phase is	00:41:14 1	MR. DUFAULT: Who represented
00:38:55 2	going to vary depending on the traffic.	00:41:16 2	Toll Brothers in those discussions?
00:39:00 3	MR. DUFAULT: Well, we have kind	00:41:17 3	THE WITNESS: We referenced the
2 4	of established that it is at a high queue at	00:41:22	minutes from the meeting that included
00:39:04 5	that point, peak hour.	00:41:25 5	Thornbury at PennDOT in April of 2017, and the
00:39:08 6	THE WITNESS: You are asking for	00:41:29 6	attendees of Toll Brothers are listed on those
00:39:08 7	the length of the phase on which approach?	00:41:32 7	meeting minutes.
00:39:12	MR. DUFAULT: Eastbound,	00:41:36	MR. DUFAULT: And with whom did
00:39:13	eastbound crossing from, from Bridlewood to	00:41:37	you have the discussion?
00:39:18 10	going east, toward, on 926.	00:41:38 10	THE WITNESS: The Township
00:39:23 11	THE WITNESS: So traveling east	00:41:40 11	Manager for Thornbury was in attendance at that
00:39:24 12	on 926 in the afternoon	00:41:44 12	meeting.
00:39:26 13	MR. DUFAULT: No, in the morning.	00:41:44 13	MR. DUFAULT: Do you know the
00:39:28 14	THE WITNESS: In the morning,	00:41:45 14	outcome of those discussions?
00:39:36 15	currently that phase is 38 seconds.	00:41:46 15	THE WITNESS: We left the meeting
00:39:38 16	MR. DUFAULT: How many cars in	00:41:48 16	and referenced the action item in the meeting
00:39:42 17	the eastbound queue would clear the	00:41:50 17	minutes earlier this evening, that Thornbury
00:39:45 18	intersection in one cycle?	00:41:54 18	was going to appoint a special traffic engineer
00:39:46 19	THE WITNESS: I can't speak to	00:41:58 19	to study that neighborhood and potential
00:39:59 20	how many vehicles would clear a cycle on that	00:42:02 20	traffic calming master plan which they would share with Toll Brothers in ongoing
00:40:04 21	approach of the intersection. It is going to	00:42:05 21	discussions.
00:40:08 22	vary each cycle how many vehicles will be able to travel through the intersection.	00:42:07 22	MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. Does
00:40:12 23	MR. DUFAULT: All right. So	00:42:08 23	the applicant accept this condition of the
4 44	MR. DOLAGET. All right. 30	00:42:11	and applicant accept this condition of the
. —	1101		1103
	1101		Planning Commission recommendation?
00:40:15 1	roughly how long do you think it would take a	00:42:14 1	Planning Commission recommendation?
00:40:17 2	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?	00:42:17 2	Planning Commission recommendation? THE WITNESS: Pending
00:40:17 2	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly	00:42:17 2	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the
00:40:17 <b>2</b> 00:40:19 <b>3</b> 00:40:20 <b>4</b>	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is	00:42:17 <b>2</b> 00:42:18 <b>3</b> 00:42:22 <b>4</b>	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will
00:40:17 <b>2</b> 00:40:19 <b>3</b> 00:40:20 <b>4</b> 00:40:23 <b>5</b>	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.	00:42:17 <b>2</b> 00:42:18 <b>3</b> 00:42:22 <b>4</b> 00:42:24 <b>5</b>	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that
00:40:17 <b>2</b> 00:40:19 <b>3</b> 00:40:20 <b>4</b> 00:40:23 <b>5</b> 00:40:24 <b>6</b>	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20	00:42:17 <b>2</b> 00:42:18 <b>3</b> 00:42:22 <b>4</b> 00:42:24 <b>5</b>	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will
00:40:17 <b>2</b> 00:40:19 <b>3</b> 00:40:20 <b>4</b> 00:40:23 <b>5</b> 00:40:24 <b>6</b>	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.	00:42:17 <b>2</b> 00:42:18 <b>3</b> 00:42:22 <b>4</b> 00:42:24 <b>5</b> 00:42:26 <b>6</b>	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During
00:40:17 <b>2</b> 00:40:19 <b>3</b> 00:40:20 <b>4</b> 00:40:23 <b>5</b> 00:40:24 <b>6</b> 00:40:25 <b>7</b> 00:40:26 <b>8</b>	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would	00:42:17 <b>2</b> 00:42:18 <b>3</b> 00:42:22 <b>4</b> 00:42:24 <b>5</b> 00:42:26 <b>6</b> 00:42:28 <b>7</b> 00:42:34 <b>8</b>	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations,
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points,
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary in terms of time, depending on the other	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points, etcetera. Did you prepare any plans or
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary in terms of time, depending on the other movements at the intersection.	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points, etcetera. Did you prepare any plans or sketches of those proposed changes?
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary in terms of time, depending on the other movements at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. At the last	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points, etcetera. Did you prepare any plans or sketches of those proposed changes?  THE WITNESS: No, we did not prepare a plan.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. So no
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary in terms of time, depending on the other movements at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. At the last meeting I asked you if the applicant had	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points, etcetera. Did you prepare any plans or sketches of those proposed changes?  THE WITNESS: No, we did not prepare a plan.
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary in terms of time, depending on the other movements at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. At the last meeting I asked you if the applicant had accepted that portion of the Planning	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points, etcetera. Did you prepare any plans or sketches of those proposed changes?  THE WITNESS: No, we did not prepare a plan.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. So no
00:40:17 2 00:40:19 3 00:40:20 4 00:40:23 5 00:40:24 6 00:40:25 7 00:40:26 8 00:40:33 9 00:40:36 10 00:40:39 11 00:40:41 12 00:40:41 12 00:40:41 13 00:40:41 15 00:40:51 15 00:40:56 16 00:40:57 17 00:40:59 18	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary in terms of time, depending on the other movements at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. At the last meeting I asked you if the applicant had accepted that portion of the Planning Commission's recommendation No. 14, dealing	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points, etcetera. Did you prepare any plans or sketches of those proposed changes?  THE WITNESS: No, we did not prepare a plan.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. So no changes were made to the site plans with respect to the alignment of the 926 access to Bridlewood Boulevard?
00:40:17 2 00:40:19 3 00:40:20 4 00:40:23 5 00:40:24 6 00:40:25 7 00:40:26 8 00:40:36 10 00:40:36 11 00:40:41 12 00:40:41 13 00:40:41 15 00:40:51 15 00:40:56 16 00:40:57 17 00:40:59 18 00:41:02 19	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary in terms of time, depending on the other movements at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. At the last meeting I asked you if the applicant had accepted that portion of the Planning Commission's recommendation No. 14, dealing with traffic calming measures for Bridlewood	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points, etcetera. Did you prepare any plans or sketches of those proposed changes?  THE WITNESS: No, we did not prepare a plan.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. So no changes were made to the site plans with respect to the alignment of the 926 access to Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: We did not prepare
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary in terms of time, depending on the other movements at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. At the last meeting I asked you if the applicant had accepted that portion of the Planning Commission's recommendation No. 14, dealing with traffic calming measures for Bridlewood Boulevard. Your response was: "The applicant is in discussion with Thornbury to discuss potential traffic calming."	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points, etcetera. Did you prepare any plans or sketches of those proposed changes?  THE WITNESS: No, we did not prepare a plan.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. So no changes were made to the site plans with respect to the alignment of the 926 access to Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: We did not prepare a plan. Our role in this project is to prepare
00:40:17	roughly how long do you think it would take a hundred cars to clear the cycle?  THE WITNESS: It will certainly take multiple cycles, and that's why there is delay at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: As much as 20 minutes?  THE WITNESS: Again, it would take multiple cycles. But it is very difficult to pinpoint to that level of specificity how many vehicles are going to clear on every cycle because each cycle, the phase is going to vary in terms of time, depending on the other movements at the intersection.  MR. DUFAULT: Okay. At the last meeting I asked you if the applicant had accepted that portion of the Planning Commission's recommendation No. 14, dealing with traffic calming measures for Bridlewood Boulevard. Your response was: "The applicant is in discussion with Thornbury to discuss	00:42:17	Planning Commission recommendation?  THE WITNESS: Pending coordination with Thornbury Township, the applicant has indicated that they will coordinate with Thornbury Township on that specific item.  MR. DUFAULT: Thank you. During your testimony in May, I'm sorry, last month, I believe you mentioned that Exhibit 33 contains several changes to the site configurations, including possible removal of the 202 ingress/egress, changes to other access points, etcetera. Did you prepare any plans or sketches of those proposed changes?  THE WITNESS: No, we did not prepare a plan.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. So no changes were made to the site plans with respect to the alignment of the 926 access to Bridlewood Boulevard?  THE WITNESS: We did not prepare

	4404		1106
4	1104	1	
00:43:21	testified a few minutes ago that with the	00:45:40 1	discussed at your April meeting?  THE WITNESS: At this time it is
00:43:27 2	elimination of the 202 access, ingress/egress,		my understanding, again, as I had testified to
00:43:33	you redid your analysis for the traffic		earlier, that the applicant wishes to hear and
8 <b>4</b>   00:43:43 <b>5</b>	turning, traffic movements through the proposed	00:45:55 4	go through this conditional use process before
	Bridlewood intersection. You referenced A, B and C.		making changes to the plan, so that they are
	THE WITNESS: I testified that	l -	being respectful of the process and the
00:43:50 7			comments received through the process.
00:43:53	with those are two separate items that I	00:46:10	
00:43:56	testified to. The A, B and C plans were	00:46:12 9	MR. DUFAULT: Okay.
00:43:59 10	included in the first iteration of the traffic	00:46:13 10	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. DuFault, I want
00:44:01 11	impact study, which included all of the	00:46:14 11	to give the court reporter a break very soon.
00:44:05 12	elements of the plan that's the subject of the	00:46:16 12	How many more minutes of questions do you think
00:44:07 13	conditional use, all of the access points.	00:46:18 13	you are going to have?
00:44:10 14	And I also testified earlier that	00:46:19 14	MR. DUFAULT: I just have a
00:44:12 15	we have completed updated traffic analysis to	00:46:20 15	couple more, maybe five more.
00:44:14 16	evaluate the conditions were the 202 access to	00:46:23 16	MR. MCKENNA: All right. Let's
00:44:20 17	be removed, but a formal study has not been	00:46:24 17	try to get through.
00:44:23 18	prepared and submitted in that regard.	00:46:25 18	MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry, Mr.
00:44:24 19	MR. DUFAULT: Okay. Thank you.	00:46:26 19	McKenna, I wanted to interject, I believe we
00:44:26 20	And A, scenario A as the plan shows, there are	00:46:28 20	are on recross. I kind of let this go. It is
00:44:30 21	319 units?	00:46:31 21	continuing to go. I had two questions on
00:44:32 22	THE WITNESS: Correct.	00:46:33 22	redirect. I believe recross has to be limited
00:44:33 23	MR. DUFAULT: Did B and C also	00:46:35 23	to my redirect, not starting anew as if we are
6 24	contain 319 units, or was that based on a bonus	00:46:38 24	starting again on cross-examination.  1107
1 .	1105		
00:44:41 <b>1</b>	configuration?	00:46:39 1	So I'm going to lodge an
00:44:42 2	THE WITNESS: B and C included	00:46:40 2	objection, to at least put it on the record, if
00:44:45 3	additional units.	1 2	noonle keen coming up and starting again with
4		00:46:43	people keep coming up and starting again with
00:44:46	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus	00:46:45	all of their questions.
00:44:48 5	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?	00:46:45 4	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since
00:44:48 <b>5</b> 00:44:49 <b>6</b>	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the	00:46:45 <b>4</b> 00:46:46 <b>5</b> 00:46:47 <b>6</b>	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional
00:44:48 <b>5</b> 00:44:49 <b>6</b> 00:44:53 <b>7</b>	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units	00:46:45 <b>4</b> 00:46:46 <b>5</b> 00:46:47 <b>6</b> 00:46:49 <b>7</b>	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional
00:44:48 <b>5</b> 00:44:49 <b>6</b> 00:44:53 <b>7</b> 00:44:56 <b>8</b>	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not	00:46:45 <b>4</b> 00:46:46 <b>5</b> 00:46:47 <b>6</b> 00:46:49 <b>7</b> 00:46:50 <b>8</b>	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just	00:46:45 <b>4</b> 00:46:46 <b>5</b> 00:46:47 <b>6</b> 00:46:49 <b>7</b> 00:46:50 <b>8</b> 00:46:53 <b>9</b>	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:02 10	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:02 10 00:45:05 11	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:02 10 00:45:05 11 00:45:08 12	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395?	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11 00:46:58 12	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:02 10 00:45:05 11 00:45:08 12 00:45:13 13	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395? I believe that's the number.	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11 00:46:58 12 00:47:00 13	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:02 10 00:45:05 11 00:45:08 12 00:45:13 13 00:45:20 14	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395? I believe that's the number.  THE WITNESS: Yes, it did include	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11 00:46:58 12 00:47:03 14	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I didn't expect it to go quite this long. Why
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:02 10 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 12 00:45:13 13 00:45:21 15	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395? I believe that's the number.  THE WITNESS: Yes, it did include 395 units.	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11 00:46:58 12 00:47:00 13 00:47:04 15	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I didn't expect it to go quite this long. Why don't you ask your five remaining questions so
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:02 10 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 12 00:45:13 13 00:45:20 14 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 16	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395?  I believe that's the number.  THE WITNESS: Yes, it did include 395 units.  MR. DUFAULT: Those plans have	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11 00:46:58 12 00:47:00 13 00:47:03 14 00:47:04 15 00:47:06 16	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I didn't expect it to go quite this long. Why don't you ask your five remaining questions so we can take our break.
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:02 10 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 12 00:45:13 13 00:45:20 14 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 16 00:45:27 17	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395?  I believe that's the number.  THE WITNESS: Yes, it did include 395 units.  MR. DUFAULT: Those plans have not been reviewed by PennDOT and/or the	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:58 12 00:47:00 13 00:47:01 14 00:47:04 15 00:47:04 15 00:47:08 17	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I didn't expect it to go quite this long. Why don't you ask your five remaining questions so we can take our break.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. I'll
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:02 10 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 12 00:45:13 13 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:23 16 00:45:27 17 00:45:30 18	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395?  I believe that's the number.  THE WITNESS: Yes, it did include 395 units.  MR. DUFAULT: Those plans have not been reviewed by PennDOT and/or the township?	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11 00:46:58 12 00:47:00 13 00:47:03 14 00:47:04 15 00:47:06 16 00:47:08 17 00:47:11 18	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I didn't expect it to go quite this long. Why don't you ask your five remaining questions so we can take our break.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. I'll cut a couple of them out then. You have stated
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 12 00:45:13 13 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395?  I believe that's the number.  THE WITNESS: Yes, it did include 395 units.  MR. DUFAULT: Those plans have not been reviewed by PennDOT and/or the township?  THE WITNESS: That is correct,	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:58 12 00:47:00 13 00:47:04 15 00:47:04 15 00:47:04 15 00:47:08 17 00:47:11 18 00:47:16 19	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I didn't expect it to go quite this long. Why don't you ask your five remaining questions so we can take our break.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. I'll cut a couple of them out then. You have stated that PennDOT has required 926 access be aligned
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 12 00:45:13 13 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395?  I believe that's the number.  THE WITNESS: Yes, it did include 395 units.  MR. DUFAULT: Those plans have not been reviewed by PennDOT and/or the township?  THE WITNESS: That is correct, they are not a part of the conditional use	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11 00:46:58 12 00:47:00 13 00:47:04 15 00:47:04 15 00:47:08 17 00:47:11 18 00:47:16 19 00:47:20 20	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I didn't expect it to go quite this long. Why don't you ask your five remaining questions so we can take our break.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. I'll cut a couple of them out then. You have stated that PennDOT has required 926 access be aligned with Bridlewood Boulevard, and you have given
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 12 00:45:11 13 00:45:20 14 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 17 00:45:31 18 00:45:31 19 2 20 00:45:34 21	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395?  I believe that's the number.  THE WITNESS: Yes, it did include 395 units.  MR. DUFAULT: Those plans have not been reviewed by PennDOT and/or the township?  THE WITNESS: That is correct, they are not a part of the conditional use  MR. DUFAULT: Okay.	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11 00:46:58 12 00:47:03 14 00:47:04 15 00:47:04 15 00:47:05 16 00:47:06 16 00:47:08 17 00:47:16 19 00:47:20 20 00:47:23 21	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I didn't expect it to go quite this long. Why don't you ask your five remaining questions so we can take our break.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. I'll cut a couple of them out then. You have stated that PennDOT has required 926 access be aligned with Bridlewood Boulevard, and you have given two reasons for that request. One was to
00:44:48 5 00:44:49 6 00:44:53 7 00:44:56 8 00:45:00 9 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 11 00:45:05 12 00:45:13 13 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15 00:45:21 15	MR. DUFAULT: Included the bonus units?  THE WITNESS: We evaluated the plans that were provided to us. Why the units and how the plan was configured is not, was not completed by me or my office. We were just asked to evaluate other plans. B and C did include some additional units.  MR. DUFAULT: Is that total 395?  I believe that's the number.  THE WITNESS: Yes, it did include 395 units.  MR. DUFAULT: Those plans have not been reviewed by PennDOT and/or the township?  THE WITNESS: That is correct, they are not a part of the conditional use	00:46:45 4 00:46:46 5 00:46:47 6 00:46:49 7 00:46:50 8 00:46:53 9 00:46:55 10 00:46:56 11 00:46:58 12 00:47:00 13 00:47:04 15 00:47:04 15 00:47:08 17 00:47:11 18 00:47:16 19 00:47:20 20	all of their questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Since that time the Board has asked additional questions and there has been additional recross. So I think based upon that, it is not just limited to your two questions. So I'll overrule the objection.  And I understand it. It is noted for the record. I want to get it done as fast as I can, Mr. DuFault, and take our break. I didn't expect it to go quite this long. Why don't you ask your five remaining questions so we can take our break.  MR. DUFAULT: All right. I'll cut a couple of them out then. You have stated that PennDOT has required 926 access be aligned with Bridlewood Boulevard, and you have given

	1108		1110
00:47:33	THE WITNESS: That was the	00:49:46	202 intersection by diverting traffic to
00:47:34 2	reasoning from PennDOT.	00:49:49 2	Bridlewood Boulevard.
00:47:37 3	MR. DUFAULT: Can you think of	00:49:51 3	Your client is Toll Brothers, who
в 4	any other reasons why it should be moved?	00:49:53	seeks to build a residential development of
00:47:40 5	THE WITNESS: No. I think those	00:49:55 5	nearly 400 up-scale homes. Do you, as a
00:47:43 6	are the primary reasons why the intersection,	00:49:59 6	licensed traffic engineer, believe it is proper
00:47:47 7	PennDOT indicated they wanted the intersection	00:50:02 7	for PennDOT to seek to impose this burden on
00:47:49	moved.	00:50:05	your client, the cost of this road, and also
00:47:49	MR. DUFAULT: All right. In the	00:50:08	subject the future residents to the ongoing
00:47:51 10	preliminary review letter from PennDOT in	00:50:10 10	problems of highway traffic being diverted
00:47:54 11	December of 2016, do you recall item 2 of that	00:50:13 11	through their neighborhood, as well as through
00:47:59 12	review letter?	00:50:16 12	adjoining neighborhood, for the purpose of
00:48:02 13	Well, I'll read you the part of	00:50:19 13	relieving PennDOT of its responsibilities to
00:48:04 14	that that I'm concerned with. Mr. Hanney, who	00:50:21 14	fix the underlying problem?
00:48:07 15	also wrote a similar letter in 2008, said: As	00:50:25 15	THE WITNESS: In my opinion, in
00:48:11 16	a regional roadway network improvement, the	00:50:27 16	my experience, PennDOT has jurisdiction over
00:48:14 17	Department has interest in the provision of a	00:50:30 17	state roadways and they do not have
00:48:17 18	connector road through the subject parcel to be	00:50:31 18	jurisdiction out of, jurisdiction outside of
00:48:21 19	constructed as part of the development. The	00:50:33 19	state roadways. That would be my response.
00:48:23 20	road should provide a direct connection between	00:50:38 20	MR. DUFAULT: I'm not sure that
00:48:25 21	Street Road and West Pleasant Grove Road. The	00:50:39 21	answers the question. Would you recommend that
00:48:28 22	Department strongly encourages the Developer	00:50:45 22	they accept or fight PennDOT's request?
00:48:31 23	and the Township to work toward this goal.	00:50:51 23	THE WITNESS: Your question is
4 24	Have you submitted a plan that	00:50:54 24	whether I would recommend that the applicant
1	1109		1111
00:48:37 1	shows that connector road as requested? You	00:50:55 1	fight PennDOT's request?
00:48:40 2	have not, correct?	00:50:57	MR. DUFAULT: To put a connector
00:48:41 3	THE WITNESS: The plan that is	00:50:59	road through an up-scale residential community.
00:48:43 4	part of the conditional use application is the	00:51:02 4	THE WITNESS: As I have testified
00:48:45 5	plan that has been submitted.	00:51:03 5	to earlier tonight, a connection through the
00:48:48 6	MR. DUFAULT: Why did you address	00:51:07 6	property could be acceptable if it is designed
00:48:53 7	and comply with relocating the 926 access but	00:51:12 7	properly, given the proposed development and
00:48:57	did not add the connector road?	00:51:15	use surrounding it.
00:48:59	THE WITNESS: At this time we	00:51:19	MR. DUFAULT: All right. That's
00:49:02 10	have shown both locations of the 926 access in	00:51:21 10	all I have.
00:49:05 11	the studies, until a final decision is reached	00:51:22 11	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.
00:49:09 12	on those elements. So it has been included to	00:51:23 12	DuFault. We are going to take a ten-minute
00:49:13 13	provide a comprehensive analysis of both	00:51:25 13	recess at this point. Thank you.
00:49:15 14	locations.	00:51:26 14	(Recess taken.)
00:49:16 15	MR. DUFAULT: All right. My last	01:07:55 15	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Adelman, are
00:49:18 16	question is a little when PennDOT issued a	01:07:59 16	you ready?
00:49:23 17	preliminary review in 2008 for this site	01:08:00 17	MR. ADELMAN: Yes.
00:49:26 18	related to a continued care retirement	01:08:00 18	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. We will
			as back on the record Me are seing to se
nn 49:28 19	community it contained the following statement,	01:08:02 19	go back on the record. We are going to go
20	which I read in a few minutes ago, about	01:08:05 20	through our list of parties.
00:49:35 21	which I read in a few minutes ago, about investigating, about relocating the connector	01:08:05 <b>20</b> 01:08:06 <b>21</b>	through our list of parties.  Radley Run 3 HOA, Mr. Bertinetti
1 20 00:49:35 21 00:49:37 22	which I read in a few minutes ago, about investigating, about relocating the connector road to create a four-leg intersection. The	01:08:05 <b>20</b> 01:08:06 <b>21</b> 01:08:09 <b>22</b>	through our list of parties.  Radley Run 3 HOA, Mr. Bertinetti or Mr. Martin?
00:49:35 21	which I read in a few minutes ago, about investigating, about relocating the connector	01:08:05 <b>20</b> 01:08:06 <b>21</b>	through our list of parties.  Radley Run 3 HOA, Mr. Bertinetti

	1112		1114
01:08:18 1	West Glen HOA, Gary Bevilacqua?	01:10:14 1	as National Historic Registry.
01:08:24 2	West Chester Area School	01:10:17 2	MR. FERYO: So if it is
01:08:28 3	District, Gary Bevilacqua or Mr. Scanlon? Not	01:10:18 3	considered an historic resource of the
1 4	present.	01:10:20 4	township, then does that count?
01:08:32 5	Westminster Presbyterian Church,	01:10:23 5	THE WITNESS: We would have to
01:08:34 6	Mr. McFalls?	01:10:25 6	discuss the specifics of that. It would not be
01:08:35 7	MR. MCFALLS: No question.	01:10:28 7	up to me, to me to determine if a resource is
01:08:37	MR. MCKENNA: The Quarry Swimming	01:10:34 8	historic or not, so
01:08:39	Association, Mr. Feryo?	01:10:36	MR. FERYO: So would it be your
01:08:49 10	MR. FERYO: Ms. Kline, I just	01:10:38 10	recommendation, knowing that the quarry
01:08:53 11	wanted to confirm can you hear me? Okay.	01:10:39 11	swimming club is an historic resource of
01:08:57 12	MR. MCKENNA: Hang on one second.	01:10:42 12	Westtown Township, would it be your
01:08:58 13	It appears that microphone is not working.	01:10:44 13	recommendation from a traffic planning
01:09:04 14	That would be why. Thank you,	01:10:45 14	standpoint that the property in no way be
01:09:10 15	Mr. Federico.	01:10:48 15	impacted?
01:09:12 16	MR. FERYO: My wife does the same	01:10:49 16	THE WITNESS: That is not
01:09:13 17	thing. Unplugs it.	01:10:53 17	something that I have evaluated at this point.
01:09:17 18	MR. MCKENNA: There we go. Go	01:10:56 18	And we would be required to follow state and
01:09:18 19	ahead, Mr. Feryo.	01:11:00 19	municipal requirements in terms of any impact
01:09:19 20	MR. FERYO: Ms. Kline, I just	01:11:03 20	to a property.
01:09:20 21	wanted to confirm your testimony in reference	01:11:05 21	MR. FERYO: Okay. I think you
01:09:22 22	to the Quarry Swimming Association and widening	01:11:08 22	have answered the question.
01:09:25 23	New Street. You said that it would be your	01:11:09 23	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.
№ 24	recommendation that if there was any widening	01:11:09 24	Feryo.
1	1113		1115
01:09:31 1		01:11:11 1	1115 Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.
	1113		1115 Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr. Spackman?
01:09:31 1	of New Street that it would be on the east	01:11:11 1	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr. Spackman? Bradley or Amy Harkins?
01:09:31 <b>1</b> 01:09:33 <b>2</b>	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in	01:11:11 <b>1</b> 01:11:12 <b>2</b>	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr. Spackman? Bradley or Amy Harkins? MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't
01:09:31 <b>1</b> 01:09:33 <b>2</b> 01:09:35 <b>3</b>	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and	01:11:11 1 01:11:12 2 01:11:13 3	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the
01:09:31 <b>1</b> 01:09:33 <b>2</b> 01:09:35 <b>3</b> 01:09:36 <b>4</b>	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to	01:11:11 <b>1</b> 01:11:12 <b>2</b> 01:11:13 <b>3</b> 01:11:20 <b>4</b>	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the
01:09:31	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.	01:11:11 1 01:11:12 2 01:11:13 3 01:11:20 4 01:11:28 5	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it
01:09:31	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not	01:11:11 1 01:11:12 2 01:11:13 3 01:11:20 4 01:11:28 5	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This
01:09:31	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a
01:09:31	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry	01:11:11 1 01:11:12 2 01:11:13 3 01:11:20 4 01:11:20 5 01:11:30 6 01:11:30 7 01:11:36 8 01:11:39 9 01:11:41 10	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have said it is a connector road. The studies says
01:09:31	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't  know what exhibit number it is, but on the  transportation, the revised study, on the  executive summary just on the first page, it  says Alternative A does not it says: This  development alternative does not provide a  public connector road. Tonight you have  testified that it is not a direct connector  between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have  said it is a connector road. The studies says  otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?  THE WITNESS: We would not be	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have said it is a connector road. The studies says otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.  THE WITNESS: What I testified to
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13 01:09:55 15 01:09:56 16	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?  THE WITNESS: We would not be if it is excuse me. If it was an historic	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't  know what exhibit number it is, but on the  transportation, the revised study, on the  executive summary just on the first page, it  says Alternative A does not it says: This  development alternative does not provide a  public connector road. Tonight you have  testified that it is not a direct connector  between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have  said it is a connector road. The studies says  otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.  THE WITNESS: What I testified to  is that it does provide a roadway connection
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13 01:09:55 15 01:09:56 16 01:10:01 17	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?  THE WITNESS: We would not be if it is excuse me. If it was an historic property we would not be able to impact it.	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have said it is a connector road. The studies says otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.  THE WITNESS: What I testified to is that it does provide a roadway connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926. So
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13 01:09:55 15 01:09:55 16 01:10:01 17 01:10:03 18	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?  THE WITNESS: We would not be if it is excuse me. If it was an historic property we would not be able to impact it. That would go for any historic property on the	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have said it is a connector road. The studies says otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.  THE WITNESS: What I testified to is that it does provide a roadway connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926. So the plan as indicated in the study Alternative
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:45 10 01:09:49 12 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13 01:09:53 14 01:09:55 15 01:09:55 16 01:10:01 17 01:10:03 18 01:01:05 19	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?  THE WITNESS: We would not be if it is excuse me. If it was an historic property we would not be able to impact it. That would go for any historic property on the register.	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have said it is a connector road. The studies says otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.  THE WITNESS: What I testified to is that it does provide a roadway connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926. So the plan as indicated in the study Alternative A, which is, which matches the plan submitted
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13 01:09:55 15 01:09:56 16 01:10:01 17 01:10:03 18 04:40:05 19	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?  THE WITNESS: We would not beif it is excuse me. If it was an historic property we would not be able to impact it. That would go for any historic property on the register.  MR. FERYO: Which register?	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have said it is a connector road. The studies says otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.  THE WITNESS: What I testified to is that it does provide a roadway connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926. So the plan as indicated in the study Alternative A, which is, which matches the plan submitted under the conditional use, I testified that it
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13 01:09:55 15 01:09:56 16 01:10:01 17 01:10:03 18 01:00:05 19	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?  THE WITNESS: We would not be if it is excuse me. If it was an historic property we would not be able to impact it. That would go for any historic property on the register.  MR. FERYO: Which register? THE WITNESS: That is designated	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have said it is a connector road. The studies says otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.  THE WITNESS: What I testified to is that it does provide a roadway connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926. So the plan as indicated in the study Alternative A, which is, which matches the plan submitted under the conditional use, I testified that it does provide a roadway connection between West
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13 01:09:55 15 01:09:56 16 01:10:01 17 01:10:03 18 01-40:05 19 3 20 01:10:09 21	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?  THE WITNESS: We would not be if it is excuse me. If it was an historic property we would not be able to impact it. That would go for any historic property on the register.  MR. FERYO: Which register? THE WITNESS: That is designated as such.	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have said it is a connector road. The studies says otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.  THE WITNESS: What I testified to is that it does provide a roadway connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926. So the plan as indicated in the study Alternative A, which is, which matches the plan submitted under the conditional use, I testified that it does provide a roadway connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926, although it is
01:09:31 1 01:09:33 2 01:09:35 3 01:09:36 4 01:09:37 5 01:09:40 6 01:09:43 7 01:09:45 8 01:09:47 9 01:09:48 10 01:09:49 11 01:09:49 12 01:09:51 13 01:09:55 15 01:09:56 16 01:10:01 17 01:10:03 18 01:00:05 19	of New Street that it would be on the east side, and it would not impact the swim club in any way; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: I was referring to the historic property at the corner of 926 and New Street in that testimony, that we would not be able to impact that property.  MR. FERYO: That is the quarry house you are referring to?  THE WITNESS: Yes, that is correct.  MR. FERYO: So what about the Quarry Swimming Association, which is also an historic property?  THE WITNESS: We would not be if it is excuse me. If it was an historic property we would not be able to impact it. That would go for any historic property on the register.  MR. FERYO: Which register? THE WITNESS: That is designated	01:11:11	Thornbury Farm Trust, Mr.  Spackman?  Bradley or Amy Harkins?  MS. HARKINS: I'm here. I don't know what exhibit number it is, but on the transportation, the revised study, on the executive summary just on the first page, it says Alternative A does not it says: This development alternative does not provide a public connector road. Tonight you have testified that it is not a direct connector between the West Pleasant and 926, but you have said it is a connector road. The studies says otherwise. I guess I'm wondering which is it.  THE WITNESS: What I testified to is that it does provide a roadway connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926. So the plan as indicated in the study Alternative A, which is, which matches the plan submitted under the conditional use, I testified that it does provide a roadway connection between West Pleasant Grove Road and 926, although it is circuitous.

	1116		1118
01:12:22 1	executive summary here, where it says: This	01:14:22 1	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am.
01:12:24 2	development alternative does not provide a	01:14:23 2	Ed Boyer?
01:12:26 3	public connector road	01:14:26 3	MS. BOYER: Not at this time.
.7 4	THE WITNESS: Yes, that's what it	01:14:27 4	MR. MCKENNA: I'm sorry, Mr.
01:12:28 5	says, and that is correct, it does not provide	01:14:28 5	Boyer?
01:12:30 6	a public connector road. It provides a	01:14:29 6	MS. BOYER: No.
01:12:33 7	connection internal through the development,	01:14:30 7	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Amy Murnane?
01:12:36	but, clearly, based on the circuitous route and	01:14:36	Kirk Wolter?
01:12:39	the design of it, it is intended to serve as	01:14:39	Mr. Corgnale?
01:12:41 10	access for the development.	01:14:42 10	Robert Daull?
01:12:42 11	MS. HARKINS: So your	01:14:46 11	MR. DAULL: I have a question.
01:12:44 12	clarification is public versus just the local	01:14:57 12	With regard to the traffic light at the
01:12:46 13	connection then?	01:14:59 13	intersection of 926 and South New Street, I
01:12:47 14	THE WITNESS: The clarification	01:15:07 14	believe it was in February before the Planning
01:12:48 15	is a connection versus what is intended to be a	01:15:09 15	Commission, I don't know if it was you that
01:12:51 16	connector road for use other than development	01:15:10 16	testified, but somebody from traffic testified
01:12:54 17	traffic.	01:15:14 17	that they actually elicited a series of
01:12:55 18	MS. HARKINS: Okay. You had also	01:15:17 18	recommendations, one of which was to change the
01:12:58 19	mentioned that in your opinion you think it is	01:15:19 19	timing of the light at 926 and South New Street
01:13:02 20	kind of inappropriate for a more direct	01:15:23 20	to facilitate the flow of traffic. Do you
01:13:05 21	connection road to go from West Pleasant to 926	01:15:26 21	recall that?
01:13:08 22	in a residential neighborhood; is that correct?	01:15:27 22	THE WITNESS: I don't recall
01:13:10 23	THE WITNESS: My testimony was	01:15:29 23	exactly. The presentation that was made to the
12 24	that it would certainly be less desirable to	01:15:32 24	Planning Commission was made by the township's
1	1117		1119
01:13:14 1	provide a direct connection that would allow	01:15:33	traffic engineer. But our study, we do
01:13:17 2	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a	01:15:36 2	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal
01:13:17 2 01:13:19 3	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.	01:15:36 <b>2</b> 01:15:39 <b>3</b>	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.
01:13:17 <b>2</b> 01:13:19 <b>3</b> 01:13:20 <b>4</b>	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower	01:15:36 <b>2</b> 01:15:39 <b>3</b> 01:15:41 <b>4</b>	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local	01:15:36 <b>2</b> 01:15:39 <b>3</b> 01:15:41 <b>4</b> 01:15:43 <b>5</b>	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Thank you.	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.  And the thought occurred to me
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms.	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.  And the thought occurred to me that let me ask it this way: Can you make a
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms. Harkins. Mr. Mammucari?	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.  And the thought occurred to me that let me ask it this way: Can you make a recommendation that the timing of the light at
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms. Harkins. Mr. Mammucari?  Mr. Gadaleto?	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.  And the thought occurred to me that let me ask it this way: Can you make a recommendation that the timing of the light at South New Street be coordinated with the timing
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms.  Harkins. Mr. Mammucari?  Mr. Gadaleto?  Phillip Jones?	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.  And the thought occurred to me that let me ask it this way: Can you make a recommendation that the timing of the light at South New Street be coordinated with the timing of the light at South Birmingham at
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms.  Harkins. Mr. Mammucari?  Mr. Gadaleto?  Phillip Jones?  MR. JONES: No questions.	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.  And the thought occurred to me that let me ask it this way: Can you make a recommendation that the timing of the light at South New Street be coordinated with the timing of the light at South Birmingham at Birmingham Road so that they are both red at
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms.  Harkins. Mr. Mammucari?  Mr. Gadaleto?  Phillip Jones?  MR. JONES: No questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Moscharis?	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.  And the thought occurred to me that let me ask it this way: Can you make a recommendation that the timing of the light at South New Street be coordinated with the timing of the light at South Birmingham at Birmingham Road so that they are both red at the same time, at least in the morning and
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms.  Harkins. Mr. Mammucari?  Mr. Gadaleto? Phillip Jones?  MR. JONES: No questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Moscharis? Allison Corcoran?	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.  And the thought occurred to me that let me ask it this way: Can you make a recommendation that the timing of the light at South New Street be coordinated with the timing of the light at South Birmingham at Birmingham Road so that they are both red at the same time, at least in the morning and evening rush? So we would have so that
01:13:17	provide a direct connection that would allow for higher speeds and higher volumes through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Okay. But a lower speed roadway just connecting the two for local traffic would not be as undesirable; is that correct?  THE WITNESS: That would be more appropriate for a residential development to provide a roadway connection that incorporates a design and intersection controls that would keep speeds and volumes at a reasonable level through a residential development.  MS. HARKINS: Thank you.  MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms.  Harkins. Mr. Mammucari?  Mr. Gadaleto?  Phillip Jones?  MR. JONES: No questions.  MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Moscharis?  Allison Corcoran?  Benjamin Skupp?	01:15:36	traffic engineer. But our study, we do recommend that the applicant retime the signal of 926 and New Street.  MR. DAULL: Okay, good. Located about four-tenths of a mile west of New Street is Birmingham Road, where there is another traffic light. Located at the halfway point between South New Street and Birmingham Road is Lake Drive. And we have it is almost impossible for us to make a left-hand turn during the prime rush in the morning and in the evening from Lake Drive onto 926 to go eastbound.  And the thought occurred to me that let me ask it this way: Can you make a recommendation that the timing of the light at South New Street be coordinated with the timing of the light at South Birmingham at Birmingham Road so that they are both red at the same time, at least in the morning and evening rush? So we would have so that would create a gap for us to make a left-hand

<u> </u>				
	1120			1122
01:16:47	926 is there is a big dip on 926, the crest of	01:18:54	1	now they are not looking at that intersection.
01:16:52 2	which crests right, about 70 feet west of Lake	01:18:56	2	MS. DEWOLF: The timing of the
01:16:58	Drive, so that traffic is out of view for	01:18:58	3	lights you can bring to the township, and we
1 4	several seconds. So between the volume of	01:18:59	4	can support you by talking with PennDOT on that
01:17:05 5	traffic coming from that's not a problem now	01:19:01	5	right away.
01:17:08 6	because the bridge is closed at Creek Road.	01:19:03	6	MR. DAULL: Okay. Understood.
01:17:11 7	But come September 1st that flow of traffic is	01:19:05	7	Thank you. Thank you, ma'am.
01:17:14 8	going to increase a thousand-fold.	01:19:06	8	MR. MCKENNA: Scott Sobers?
01:17:17 9	But my question to you is: Can a	01:19:09	9	Mr. Pavelchek?
01:17:19 10	recommendation be made to PennDOT so that the	01:19:13	10	MR. PAVELCHEK: No questions.
01:17:23 11	timing of the two lights can be changed to	01:19:14	11	MR. MCKENNA: Phillip Jaeger?
01:17:27 12	allow them to be red at the same time, which	01:19:16	12	Mr. Cahill?
01:17:31 13	would create a gap for us to make the left-hand	01:19:22		Mr. Pryze? He was here earlier,
01:17:33 14	turn?	01:19:24		but I believe he has left.
01:17:34 15	THE WITNESS: At this time in our	01:19:26		Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer?
01:17:35 16	scoping process, in our submissions to both the	01:19:30		MS. KRAMER: No questions.
01:17:37 17	township and PennDOT, we have not been asked to	01:19:31		MR. MCKENNA: Megan Bruns?
01:17:40 18	look at that intersection as part of this	01:19:33	18	Ed Skros?
01:17:41 19	project.	01:19:35	19	MR. SKROS: No questions. Thank
01:17:43 20	MR. DAULL: Well, is that a	01:19:38		you.
01:17:44 21	possibility that it can? Because it is a very	01:19:38		MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey?
01:17:46 22	dangerous situation.	01:19:41		Jim McDermott?
01:17:50 23	THE WITNESS: What you are	01:19:45		Dennis or Patricia McFadden?
1 24	referring to is an existing condition, and at	01:19:52	24	Carol Weller?
1	1121			1123
01:17:53	this time we have not been asked to look at	01:19:54	1	MS. WELLER: No questions.
01:17:55 2	that intersection as part of this development.	01:19:55	2	MR. MCKENNA: Linda and Matt
01:17:57 3	MR. DAULL: Okay. I understand.	01:19:57	3	Reichert?
01:17:59 4	But I was allowed to be a party of interest	01:20:00	4	All right. Does the Board have
01:18:03 5	because of our close proximity to the Toll	01:20:01	5	any further follow-up based on what you heard?
01:18:06 6	Brothers project. And it would just seem to me	01:20:04	6	All right. Anything further, Mr.
01:18:11 7	that it would be feasible for that to be	01:20:07	7	Adelman?
01:18:17 8	considered.	01:20:07	8	MR. ADELMAN: Nothing further.
01:18:18	And if it isn't, now my question	01:20:08	9	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you,
01:18:21 10	is: Can it be in the near future, assuming	01:20:11		Ms. Kline. Appreciate it again. Thank you for
01:18:26 11	that the Toll Brothers project is approved?	01:20:13		coming back here in July.
01:18:28 12	THE WITNESS: The applicant has	01:20:15		(Witness excused.)
01:18:28 13	to follow the requirements of the township and	01:20:16		MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Adelman,
01:18:30 14	PennDOT in terms of the evaluation for the	01:20:18		anything further from you this evening?
01:18:33 15	development.	01:20:19		MR. ADELMAN: No. I don't
01:18:34 16	MR. DAULL: Okay. All right.	01:20:21		believe it is my case at this point.
01:18:36 17	I'll address that with is that something	01:20:27		MR. GILL: Mr. McKenna, I believe under the prior discussions that the Planning
01:18:38 18	that can be addressed to the township?	01:20:32		Commission would now proceed with its case in
04148:42 19 4 20	MR. MCKENNA: Directly with them?	01:20:35		chief. Is that correct?
		01:20:37	20	cilici. 15 tilat correct?
0	MR. DAULL: Yes.		24	MD MCKENINA That was my
01:18:45 21	MR. MCKENNA: No, you have to	01:20:39		MR. MCKENNA: That was my
01:18:45 21	MR. MCKENNA: No, you have to make your request here at the hearing itself.	01:20:39	22	understanding, correct.
01:18:45 <b>21</b> 01:18:46 <b>22</b> 01:18:49 <b>23</b>	MR. MCKENNA: No, you have to make your request here at the hearing itself.  I think what you are hearing from the applicant	01:20:39 01:20:40 01:20:41	22 23	understanding, correct.  MR. GILL: Mr. Adelman, do I
01:18:45 <b>21</b> 01:18:46 <b>22</b> 01:18:49 <b>23</b> 01:18:51 <b>24</b>	MR. MCKENNA: No, you have to make your request here at the hearing itself.	01:20:39 01:20:40 01:20:41 01:20:43	22 23 24	understanding, correct.  MR. GILL: Mr. Adelman, do I understand correctly that you are resting your

	1124		1126
01:20:45	case in chief?	01:23:44 1	Q. What is the name of that business?
01:20:46 2	MR. ADELMAN: Yes, it was my	01:23:45 2	A. Kimley Horn.
01:20:48 3	final remaining portion of the last outstanding	01:23:47 3	Q. And what is Kimley Horn?
0 4	witness.	01:23:49 4	A. Kimley Horn is an engineering
01:20:51 5	MR. GILL: Okay. With the	01:23:53 5	consulting firm.
01:20:52 6	applicant having rested its case in chief, the	01:23:54 6	Q. What is your position with them?
01:20:55 7	Planning Commission is prepared to proceed	01:23:56 7	A. I'm a project manager.
01:20:58	again, I suppose. So we will call as our	01:23:59	MR. ADELMAN: Mr. Gill, are you
01:21:02	first, I guess our next witness, Al Federico.	01:24:00 9	planning to offer Mr. Federico as an expert in
01:21:16 10	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Federico, I'm	01:24:03 10	traffic engineering?
01:21:18 11	going to ask you to come on up so everybody can	01:24:04 11	MR. GILL: Yes, I am.
01:21:21 12	see you.	01:24:05 12	MR. ADELMAN: I would stipulate
01:21:32 13	MR. GILL: Mr. McKenna, members	01:24:05 13	to his qualifications as such.
01:21:33 14	of the Board, I'm going to pass up some	01:24:08 14	MR. MCKENNA: Any objection from
01:21:35 15	additional exhibits that I have pre-marked as	01:24:08 15	any other counsel or parties?
01:21:37 16	Exhibits PC-10 through PC-13 and a revised	01:24:11 16	He will be accepted as an expert
01:21:41 17	exhibit index.	01:24:12 17	in traffic engineering. Thank you, Mr.
01:21:48 18	MR. MCKENNA: Eleanor, we will go	01:24:14 18	Adelman.
01:21:49 19	off the record for a minute.	01:24:14 19	MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.
01:21:51 20	(Discussion off the record.)	01:24:16 20	BY MR. GILL:
01:22:48 21	MR. GILL: What I have handed up	01:24:16 21	Q. Al, are you presently retained by the
01:22:50 22	as PC-10, I have pre-marked, it is CV a of Mr.	01:24:20 22	township of Westtown in any capacity?
01:22:54 23	Federico.	01:24:22 23	A. Yes.
5 24	PC-11 is a copy of the	01:24:22 24	Q. What is that capacity?
l .	1125		1127
01:22:56	conditional use application.	01:24:24 1	A. For the review and consultation
01:22:57 2	PC-12 is the minutes of the	01:24:27 2	regarding the Crebilly Farm development.
01:22:59	February 13th, 2007, Planning Commission	01:24:30	Q. Okay. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been pre-marked as
01:23:02 4	meeting, Township Planning Commission meeting.	01:24:32 4	Exhibit PC-11. Do you have that there?
01:23:04 5	PC-13 I have PennDOT's letter	01:24:34 5	A. Give me a moment. I need to get some
01:23:06 6	dated March 3rd, 2017.  Mr. Federico, would you please go	7	more space here. Yes.
01:23:09 7	ahead and be sworn.		Q. Have you seen that prior to your
01:23:10	ALBERT FEDERICO,		testimony here this evening?
10	the witness herein, having first been	01:24:45 9	A. Yes.
11	duly sworn on oath, was examined and	01:24:47 10	Q. What is that?
01:23:17 12	testified as follows:	01:24:50 12	A. The conditional use application.
01:23:17 13	DIRECT EXAMINATION	01:24:53 13	Q. Do you understand that is the
01:23:17 13	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GILL:	01:24:53 13	Q. Do you understand that is the application that's the subject of this
01:23:17 <b>13</b> 01:23:20 <b>14</b> 01:23:20 <b>15</b>	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. GILL:  Q. Mr. Federico, would you please state	01:24:53 <b>13</b> 01:24:55 <b>14</b> 01:24:57 <b>15</b>	Q. Do you understand that is the
01:23:17 13 01:23:20 14 01:23:20 15 01:23:22 16	DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. GILL:	01:24:53 <b>13</b> 01:24:55 <b>14</b> 01:24:57 <b>15</b> 01:24:58 <b>16</b>	<ul><li>Q. Do you understand that is the application that's the subject of this evening's hearing?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
01:23:17 13 01:23:20 14 01:23:20 15 01:23:22 16 01:23:23 17	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. GILL:  Q. Mr. Federico, would you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.	01:24:53 <b>13</b> 01:24:55 <b>14</b> 01:24:57 <b>15</b>	Q. Do you understand that is the application that's the subject of this evening's hearing?
01:23:17 13 01:23:20 14 01:23:20 15 01:23:22 16 01:23:23 17 01:23:24 18	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. GILL:  Q. Mr. Federico, would you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.  A. Albert Federico, F-E-D-E-R-I-C-O.	01:24:53 13 01:24:55 14 01:24:57 15 01:24:58 16 01:24:58 17	<ul> <li>Q. Do you understand that is the application that's the subject of this evening's hearing?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What do you understand to be the nature</li> </ul>
01:23:17 13 01:23:20 14 01:23:20 15 01:23:22 16 01:23:23 17	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. GILL:  Q. Mr. Federico, would you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.	01:24:53 13 01:24:55 14 01:24:57 15 01:24:58 16 01:24:58 17 01:25:02 18	<ul> <li>Q. Do you understand that is the application that's the subject of this evening's hearing?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What do you understand to be the nature and scope of what it is that the applicant is</li> </ul>
01:23:17 13 01:23:20 14 01:23:20 15 01:23:22 16 01:23:23 17 01:23:24 18 04:23:31 19	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. GILL:  Q. Mr. Federico, would you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.  A. Albert Federico, F-E-D-E-R-I-C-O.  Q. And Al, are you employed so Al is	01:24:53 13 01:24:55 14 01:24:57 15 01:24:58 16 01:24:58 17 01:25:02 18 01:25:04 19	<ul> <li>Q. Do you understand that is the application that's the subject of this evening's hearing?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What do you understand to be the nature and scope of what it is that the applicant is seeking pursuant to that application?</li> </ul>
01:23:17 13 01:23:20 14 01:23:20 15 01:23:22 16 01:23:23 17 01:23:24 18 01:23:24 18 01:23:24 19	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. GILL:  Q. Mr. Federico, would you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.  A. Albert Federico, F-E-D-E-R-I-C-O. Q. And Al, are you employed so Al is ok?	01:24:53 13 01:24:55 14 01:24:57 15 01:24:58 16 01:24:58 17 01:25:02 18 01:25:04 19 01:25:06 20	<ul> <li>Q. Do you understand that is the application that's the subject of this evening's hearing?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What do you understand to be the nature and scope of what it is that the applicant is seeking pursuant to that application?</li> <li>A. Use approval for the development of 317</li> </ul>
01:23:17 13 01:23:20 14 01:23:20 15 01:23:22 16 01:23:23 17 01:23:24 18 04:23:31 19 20 01:23:39 21	DIRECT EXAMINATION  BY MR. GILL:  Q. Mr. Federico, would you please state your name and spell your last name for the record.  A. Albert Federico, F-E-D-E-R-I-C-O. Q. And Al, are you employed so Al is ok?  A. That works.	01:24:53 13 01:24:55 14 01:24:57 15 01:24:58 16 01:24:58 17 01:25:02 18 01:25:04 19 01:25:06 20 01:25:10 21	<ul> <li>Q. Do you understand that is the application that's the subject of this evening's hearing?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What do you understand to be the nature and scope of what it is that the applicant is seeking pursuant to that application?</li> <li>A. Use approval for the development of 317 new homes.</li> </ul>

	1128	T		1130
01:25:17	<b>Q.</b> Can we bring up Exhibit A-6.	01:27:29	1	Q. And during the course of that work you
01:25:29 2	Al, you have the binder there.	01:27:30	2	reviewed many applications by proposed
01:25:30 3	Would you please turn to Exhibit A-6. Have you	01:27:34	3	developers?
9 4	seen that document prior to your testimony here	01:27:35	4	A. Yes, I have.
01:25:41 5	this evening?	01:27:35	5	Q. Okay. Could you, using A-6 as you see
01:25:46	A. Yes.	01:27:43	6	necessary, describe for us your understanding
01:25:46 7	Q. And is that the property depicted on	01:27:45	7	of the roadway, I'm sorry, of the
01:25:50	Exhibit A-6 that is the subject of the	01:27:48	8	traffic-related aspects of the proposed
01:25:52	conditional use application marked as	01:27:50	9	development as you understand them to be
01:25:54 10	Exhibit PC-11?	01:27:54	10	proposed by the developer?
01:25:56 11	A. Yes, it is.	01:27:55		A. Generally I would consider those in
01:25:56 12	Q. Have you personally visited that	01:27:59		three separate aspects, access, circulation and
01:25:58 13	property?	01:28:03		impact.
01:26:00 14	A. I have observed the property. I have	01:28:04	14	If we were looking at A-6, there
01:26:03 15	not been on the site.	01:28:07	15	are four access points, primary access points
01:26:04 16	Q. When you say you have observed it, was	01:28:11	16	proposed on that plan, an intersection to US
01:26:06 17	that from the public rights-of-way adjacent to	01:28:25		202, located approximately 2,000 feet north of
01:26:08 18	it?	01:28:28		PA 926, an intersection, new intersection with
01:26:08 19	A. Yes.	01:28:33	19	PA 926 located generally between Bridlewood
01:26:09 20	Q. Are you familiar with the public	01:28:38	20	Boulevard and Caleb, and two intersections to
01:26:10 21	roadway network in the surrounding and in the	01:26:44		West Pleasant Grove Road.
01:26:14 22	vicinity of the subject property?	01:28:45		Q. Okay. Have you been present throughout
01:26:16 23	A. Yes, I am.	01:28:47	23	the entirety of this hearing, including prior
7 24	Q. Can you tell us, generally speaking,	01:28:50	24	sessions of it?
	1129			1131
01:26:19	your understanding of that roadway network?	01:28:51	1	A. Yes.
01:26:23 2	A. The property is bounded by four public	01:28:51	2	Q. Did you hear the testimony by Ms.
01:26:26 3	roadways, two state roadways, two township	01:28:54	3	Kline, the applicant's traffic consultant?
01:26:29 4	roadways, US 202 is an arterial roadway, PA 926	01:28:56	4	A. I apologize. I was present for Ms.
01:26:38 5	is also an arterial roadway, New Street is a	01:28:58	5	Kline's testimony, not the other parts of the
01:26:42	collector roadway, and West Pleasant Grove Road	01:29:01	6	hearing.
01:26:45 7	is a local distributor roadway.	01:29:01	7	Q. But you did hear Ms. Kline's testimony?
01:26:47	Other than 202, all of them are	01:29:03	8	A. Yes, I did.
01:26:49	primarily two-lane roadways. There are some	01:29:04	9	Q. Did you hear reference to alternatives
01:26:55 10	other local streets that intersect those roads,	01:29:06	10	to access to the proposed development that the
01:26:58 11	such as Dunvegan Road, Hidden Pond Way,	01:29:09		applicant has examined?
01:27:03 12	Bridlewood Road.	01:29:11		A. Yes.
01:27:05 13	<b>Q.</b> Okay. Is your understanding of that	01:29:13	13	Q. In your capacity as the township's
01:27:07 14	road network informed by anything other than	01:29:15	14	traffic consultant for this particular project,
01:27:09 15	your personal visit to the roads or your use of	01:29:20	15	have you seen any other plans other than the
01:27:13 16	the roads?	01:29:22	16	one shown as Exhibit A-6 submitted for your
01:27:15 17	A. Review of the materials submitted on	01:29:26		review and analysis?
01:27:18 18	behalf of this applicant, previous applicants,	01:29:29	18	A. Not submitted for review and analysis.
01 27:21 19	other work that I have completed on behalf of	01:29:32		The initial traffic study included an
2 20	the township.	01:29:36		illustration of something that was considered
01:27:23 21	<b>Q.</b> Okay. In that regard you served as the	01:29:39		concept or Alternatives B and C. However,
01:27:25 22	township traffic engineer of record for a	01:29:43		based on our understanding from the township is
01:27:27 23	number of years, correct?	01:29:47		that we were reviewing Alternate A.
01:27:28 24	A. Yes, I did.	01:29:51		Q. Okay. I want to come back for a moment

	1132		1134
01:29:53 1	to the existing road network before we get into	01:32:29 1	Consultants, revised December 8th, 2016.
01:29:57 2	the particulars of the development. Is it your	01:32:34 2	The second review, A-31, dated
01:30:00 3	understanding that PennDOT is considering	01:32:37 3	February 6th, 2017, reviewed resubmission
4 4	roadway improvements in the vicinity of the	01:32:42 4	correspondence prepared by McMahon Associates,
01:30:07 5	subject property?	01:32:44 5	dated January 20th, and a Transportation Impact
01:30:08 6	A. Yes.	01:32:48 6	Study revised January 20th.
01:30:09 7	Q. And what is your understanding of the	01:32:50 7	The third review, marked A-32,
01:30:11 8	nature of those improvements?	01:32:56	dated April 3rd, 2017, looked at additional
01:30:13	A. The primary improvements that is being	01:32:59	resubmission correspondence and attachments
01:30:19 10	evaluated or worked on are improvements to US	01:33:01 10	prepared by McMahon Associates, dated March
01:30:24 11	202 and PA 926 to provide a southbound right	01:33:04 11	3rd, 2017.
01:30:28 12	turn lane on US 202, and to provide another	01:33:07 12	Q. Did you also review the conditional use
01:30:32 13	eastbound lane such that the split-phasing for	01:33:14 13	site plan, Exhibit A-6?
01:30:35 14	the signal can be removed. It would also	01:33:17 14	A. Yes.
01:30:37 15	include pedestrian enhancements at the	01:33:18 15	Q. Have you participated in any meetings
01:30:39 16	intersection.	01:33:22 16	with regard to the traffic-related aspects of
01:30:41 17	There has also recently been	01:33:24 17	this development with PennDOT?
01:30:43 18	discussion of some signal enhancements along	01:33:26 18	A. Yes, I have.
01:30:46 19	the corridor that are progressing.	01:33:27 19	Q. And was one of those meetings on
01:30:50 20	Q. Okay. When you say "progressing" what	01:33:29 20	December 2nd, 2016?
01:30:53 21	is the status of that project?	01:33:31 21	A. Yes, I believe so.
01:30:56 22	A. The status of the intersection project,	01:33:32 22	Q. Are the minutes of that meeting the
01:31:00 23	at 202 and PA 926, is in preliminary	01:33:35 23	ones that are marked in the exhibit binder as
<sub>4</sub> 24	engineering. Based on my most recent	01:33:36 24	Exhibit A-36?
1	1133		1135
01:31:09 1	conversation with PennDOT's consultant project	01:33:44 1	A. Yes.
01:31:11 2	manager, they are still going through the	01:33:51 2	Q. And was another one of those meetings
01:31:14 3	environmental clearance phase and have yet to	01:33:55 3	one which occurred on April 17th, 2017?
01:31:17 4	proceed to final design.	01:34:00 4	A. Yes.
01:31:18 5	<b>Q.</b> We will come back to that in a moment.	01:34:00 5	Q. Are the minutes of that, what is marked
01:31:25 6	As part of your review of the traffic-related	01:34:02 6	as Exhibit PC-3, do you have that there?
01:31:29 7	aspects of the proposed development on A-6, did	01:34:08 7	A. I do not have that with me. But I do
01:31:33	Kimley Horn issue any comment letters?	01:34:10	see that listed as Exhibit A PC-3.
01:31:35	A. Yes, we did.	01:34:14	Q. Okay. Let me ask you to turn to what
01:31:36 10	Q. Are those what is marked in the binders	01:34:18 10	is marked as Exhibit PC-13. Do you have that
01:31:38 11	you have with you as Exhibits A-30, 31 and 32?	01:34:22 11	there?
01:31:43 12	A. Yes, they are.	01:34:22 12	A. Yes.
01:31:53 13	Q. Are there any other review letters or	01:34:23 13	Q. Have you seen that letter prior to your
01:31:55 14	memoranda other than those three which Kimley	01:34:26 14	testimony here this evening?
01:31:58 15	Horn issued with regard to this matter?	01:34:28 15	A. Yes, I have.
l	_		_
01:31:58 13 01:32:01 16 01:32:01 17	<ul><li>A. No.</li><li>Q. And can you describe for us the scope</li></ul>	01:34:28 16	<ul><li>Q. And what is that letter?</li><li>A. That is a PennDOT review of the traffic</li></ul>

01:32:21 23 13th, 2016, and conditional use subdivision 01:34:49 23 A. I believe there was an earlier review 01:32:24 24 plan for the Crebilly Farm prepared by ESE 01:34:51 24 of the scoping materials.

35 of 76 sheets Page 1132 to 1135 of 1187 08/02/2017 05:18:32 PM

01:32:03 18

01/32:06 19

01:32:19 22

01:32:16 21

of materials which you reviewed which led to

at traffic, Transportation Impact Study

A. The initial December 27 review looked

prepared by McMahon Associates, dated October

your issuance of those review letters?

01:34:35 18

01:34:38 19

01:34:40 20

01:34:43 21

01:34:47 22

study submitted by the applicant.

Q. Other than the minutes of the two

PennDOT meetings and this letter from PennDOT,

are you aware of any other comments or reviews

from PennDOT with regard to this matter?

	1136		1138
01:34:54	Q. But other than that, nothing else?	01:37:25	the point that, in my opinion, during the peak
01:34:56 2	A. Not that I'm aware of, no.	01:37:29 2	periods that were evaluated in the study
01:34:58	Q. Okay. Throughout the meetings that you	01:37:31 3	vehicles will not use that access because
0 4	have attended, the materials which you	01:37:34 4	vehicles traveling south will run into stopped
01:35:02 5	reviewed, and the prior sessions of this	01:37:38 5	traffic before they get to it, and vehicles
01:35:04	hearing, the applicant has made reference to	01:37:40 6	attempting to exit via that egress would be
01:35:08 7	different iterations of the plan, of the I'm	01:37:44 7	exiting into stopped traffic.
01:35:11	sorry of the project, correct?	01:37:48	And I would suggest that the
01:35:12	A. Yes.	01:37:50 9	majority of vehicles that are traveling to the
01:35:12 3	Q. Okay. Again, as you said, the only	01:37:54 10	site from 202 south or exiting the site to 202
01:35:13	plan which you have reviewed is the one marked	01:38:00 11	south would seek alternate routes.
01:35:17 11	Exhibit A-6, correct?	01:38:05 12	Q. Nevertheless, to your knowledge, as you
	A. I would like to amend that. The	01:38:09 13	testified a moment ago, the applicant has not
01:35:23 13		01:38:09 13	provided any analysis or update to the TIS,
01:35:26 14	revised traffic study included the concept that	01:38:12 14	Traffic Impact Study, to show you, as the
01:35:32 15	realigned one of the West Pleasant Grove Road	01:38:14 15	township's traffic consultant for this matter,
01:35:35 16	accesses, and also realigned the 926 access		
01:35:40 17	opposite of Bridlewood Boulevard.	01:38:20 17	the impact of eliminating of the 202 access,
01:35:41 18	Q. Okay. Other than your answer as	01:38:22 18	correct?
01:35:45 19	amended, have you seen any other submissions to	01:38:23 19	A. Correct.
01:35:50 20	the township or formally to PennDOT which shows	01:38:24 20	Q. Were you present, AI, at the meeting of
01:35:54 21	access other than as depicted on A-6?	01:38:36 21	the February 13th were you present at the
01:35:57 22	A. No other formal submissions to PennDOT	01:38:39 22	February 13th, 2017, meeting of the Township
01:36:00 23	or the township, no.	01:38:43 23	Planning Commission?
·o 24	Q. At the April 17th, 2017, meeting did	01:38:43 24	A. Yes, I believe so.
	1137		
			1139
•	the applicant express a willingness to	01:38:44 1	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on	01:38:46 2	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you
01:36:13 2 01:36:17 3	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?	01:38:49 3	<b>Q.</b> I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?
01:36:13 <b>2</b> 01:36:17 <b>3</b> 01:36:21 <b>4</b>	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant	01:38:46 <b>2</b> 01:38:49 <b>3</b> 01:38:50 <b>4</b>	<ul><li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li><li>A. Yes.</li></ul>
01:36:13 <b>2</b> 01:36:17 <b>3</b> 01:36:21 <b>4</b> 01:36:23 <b>5</b>	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be	01:38:46 <b>2</b> 01:38:49 <b>3</b> 01:38:50 <b>4</b> 01:38:51 <b>5</b>	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.	01:38:46 <b>2</b> 01:38:49 <b>3</b> 01:38:50 <b>4</b> 01:38:51 <b>5</b> 01:38:63 <b>6</b>	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements	01:38:46	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors	01:38:46	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. What is it?</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?	01:38:46	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. What is it?</li> <li>A. These are the minutes of the Planning</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.	01:38:46	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?  A. Yes. Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is it? A. These are the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting.
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they	01:38:46	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?  A. Yes. Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?  A. Yes, I have. Q. What is it? A. These are the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting. Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?	01:38:46	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?  A. Yes. Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is it? A. These are the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting. Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.	01:38:46	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?  A. Yes. Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?  A. Yes, I have. Q. What is it? A. These are the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting. Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?	01:38:46	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?  A. Yes. Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening? A. Yes, I have. Q. What is it? A. These are the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting. Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you support elimination of the Route 202 access?	01:38:46	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?  A. Yes. Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?  A. Yes, I have. Q. What is it? A. These are the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting. Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to disposition of this conditional use
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you support elimination of the Route 202 access?  A. Yes.	01:38:46	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?  A. Yes. Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?  A. Yes, I have. Q. What is it? A. These are the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting. Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to disposition of this conditional use application?
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you support elimination of the Route 202 access?  A. Yes.  Q. Why?	01:38:46	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. What is it?</li> <li>A. These are the minutes of the Planning</li> <li>Commission meeting.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to disposition of this conditional use application?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you support elimination of the Route 202 access?  A. Yes.  Q. Why?  A. Currently traffic traveling south along	01:38:46	Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?  A. Yes. Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?  A. Yes, I have. Q. What is it? A. These are the minutes of the Planning Commission meeting. Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to disposition of this conditional use application?  A. Yes. Q. What is that recommendation?
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you support elimination of the Route 202 access?  A. Yes.  Q. Why?  A. Currently traffic traveling south along US 202 queues back extensively to the north,	01:38:46	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. What is it?</li> <li>A. These are the minutes of the Planning</li> <li>Commission meeting.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to disposition of this conditional use application?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is that recommendation?</li> <li>A. That they approve the conditional use</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you support elimination of the Route 202 access?  A. Yes.  Q. Why?  A. Currently traffic traveling south along	01:38:46	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. What is it?</li> <li>A. These are the minutes of the Planning</li> <li>Commission meeting.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to disposition of this conditional use application?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is that recommendation?</li> <li>A. That they approve the conditional use to allow the flexible development, subject to</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you support elimination of the Route 202 access?  A. Yes.  Q. Why?  A. Currently traffic traveling south along US 202 queues back extensively to the north,	01:38:46	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. What is it?</li> <li>A. These are the minutes of the Planning</li> <li>Commission meeting.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to disposition of this conditional use application?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is that recommendation?</li> <li>A. That they approve the conditional use to allow the flexible development, subject to the applicant's compliance to conditions as</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you support elimination of the Route 202 access?  A. Yes.  Q. Why?  A. Currently traffic traveling south along US 202 queues back extensively to the north, well past, particularly in the evening, where	01:38:46 2 01:38:49 3 01:38:50 4 01:38:51 5 01:38:53 6 01:38:55 7 01:38:56 8 01:38:57 9 01:38:59 10 01:39:00 11 01:39:08 12 01:39:18 13 01:39:19 14 01:39:22 15 01:39:23 16 01:39:25 17 01:39:26 18 01:39:29 19 01:39:33 20	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. What is it?</li> <li>A. These are the minutes of the Planning</li> <li>Commission meeting.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to disposition of this conditional use application?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is that recommendation?</li> <li>A. That they approve the conditional use to allow the flexible development, subject to</li> </ul>
01:36:13	the applicant express a willingness to eliminate the 202 access that's depicted on Exhibit A-6?  A. It was my impression that the applicant was willing to discuss it further, and may be inclined to remove it, yes.  Q. Did the applicant make any statements at that meeting as to what additional factors would lead them to eliminate the access?  A. Not that I recall.  Q. Okay. It was just something that they were willing to consider?  A. Yes.  Q. Do you support elimination of the Route 202 access?  A. Yes.  Q. Why?  A. Currently traffic traveling south along US 202 queues back extensively to the north, well past, particularly in the evening, where the access is proposed to be located.	01:38:46	<ul> <li>Q. I'm going to ask you to take a look at what has been marked as Exhibit PC-12. Do you recognize that document?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. Have you had the opportunity to review it prior to your testimony here this evening?</li> <li>A. Yes, I have.</li> <li>Q. What is it?</li> <li>A. These are the minutes of the Planning</li> <li>Commission meeting.</li> <li>Q. Okay. I'll ask you to take a look at page 12. According to those minutes did the Planning Commission make a recommendation to the Board of Supervisors with regard to disposition of this conditional use application?</li> <li>A. Yes.</li> <li>Q. What is that recommendation?</li> <li>A. That they approve the conditional use to allow the flexible development, subject to the applicant's compliance to conditions as</li> </ul>

	1140		1142
01:39:51	applicant would demonstrate compliance with	01:42:24 1	connection, excuse me, between West Pleasant
	certain Zoning Ordinance standards as set forth	01:42:24 2	Grove Road and 926?
	above the recommendation?	01:42:29 3	A. Yes.
01:39:56 3	A. It is my understanding, yes.	01:42:30 4	Q. But you just testified a moment ago
01:39:59 5	Q. Okay. Are you familiar with the	01:42:31 5	that A-6 doesn't provide a connector road,
01:40:03 6	township's Zoning Ordinance?	01:42:34 6	correct?
7	A. I am.	01:42:35 7	A. I would not consider that a connector
	Q. The cited sections of the Zoning	01:42:38 8	road consistent with the Comprehensive Plan or
01:40:05 8	Ordinance on page 12 of Exhibit PC-12, do any	01:42:42 9	the Township Growth Management Plan.
01:40:12 10	one or more of those have to do with traffic?	01:42:44 10	Q. Why not?
01:40:18 11	A. Yes.	01:42:45 11	A. The Growth Management Plan presumes a
01:40:20 12	Q. Based on your review of the materials	01:42:48 12	more direct, continuous connection between
01:40:27 13	to which you made reference earlier, have you	01:42:51 13	those two roads.
01:40:29 14	formed a conclusion as to whether the applicant	01:42:54 14	Additionally, the Zoning
01:40:32 15	has, during the course of this hearing,	01;42:56 15	Ordinance for the underlying property
01:40:37 16	demonstrated compliance with the sections of	01:43:01 16	references a continuous collector road, and
01:40:40 17	the Zoning Ordinance that are referenced in the	01:43:06 17	what is provided I would not consider a
01:40:42 18	PC recommendation?	01:43:09 18	collector road.
01:40:45 19	A. Yes, I have.	01:43:11 19	Q. Okay. You would not consider. Is that
01:40:46 20	Q. And what is that conclusion?	01:43:16 20	based on your own personal preference, or is it
01:40:49 21	A. That they are not in compliance with	01:43:19 21	based on something other than, or is it based
01:40:51 22	all of them.	01:43:23 22	on your expertise, excuse me, as a traffic
01:40:51 23	Q. Would you please explain the bases for	01:43:26 23	engineer?
<sub>53</sub> 24	your conclusion?	01:43:27 24	A. A little of both. It does not appear
	4444	J	14.40
1	1141		1143
01:40:54	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance	01:43:31 1	to provide the width of a collector road as
01:40:54 <b>1</b> 01:41:02 <b>2</b>		01:43:31 <b>1</b> 01:43:34 <b>2</b>	
	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance		to provide the width of a collector road as
01:41:02 2	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the	01:43:34 2	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision
01:41:02 <b>2</b> 01:41:03 <b>3</b>	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan	01:43:34 <b>2</b> 01:43:38 <b>3</b>	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.
01:41:02 <b>2</b> 01:41:03 <b>3</b> 01:41:08 <b>4</b>	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West	01:43:34 <b>2</b> 01:43:38 <b>3</b> 01:43:38 <b>4</b>	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision  Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a
01:41:02 <b>2</b> 01:41:03 <b>3</b> 01:41:08 <b>4</b> 01:41:15 <b>5</b>	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does	01:43:34 <b>2</b> 01:43:38 <b>3</b> 01:43:38 <b>4</b> 01:43:41 <b>5</b>	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision  Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.	01:43:34	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also	01:43:34	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision  Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or	01:43:34	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:49 7 01:43:54 8 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:09 12	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:49 7 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:06 11 01:44:09 12 01:44:11 13	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:49 7 01:43:54 8 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:09 12 01:44:11 13 01:44:15 14	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:54 8 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:09 12 01:44:11 13 01:44:15 14 01:44:20 15	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.  Additionally, the previously	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:49 7 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:06 11 01:44:09 12 01:44:11 13 01:44:15 14 01:44:20 15 01:44:21 16	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the development would be required, yes.
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.  Additionally, the previously mentioned access to Route 202 does not provide,	01:43:34	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the development would be required, yes.  Q. Okay. You mentioned that the traffic
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.  Additionally, the previously mentioned access to Route 202 does not provide, in my opinion, during peak periods safe or	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:49 7 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:06 11 01:44:06 12 01:44:15 14 01:44:21 15 01:44:22 16 01:44:23 17 01:44:29 18	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the development would be required, yes.  Q. Okay. You mentioned that the traffic aspects of the plan also prevent a traffic
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.  Additionally, the previously mentioned access to Route 202 does not provide, in my opinion, during peak periods safe or efficient access.	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:49 7 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:06 11 01:44:09 12 01:44:11 13 01:44:12 15 01:44:21 15 01:44:22 16 01:44:23 17 01:44:32 19	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the development would be required, yes.  Q. Okay. You mentioned that the traffic aspects of the plan also prevent a traffic hazard, in your opinion. Would you please
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.  Additionally, the previously mentioned access to Route 202 does not provide, in my opinion, during peak periods safe or efficient access.  Q. Okay. I would like to go back and	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:49 7 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:06 11 01:44:06 11 01:44:01 12 01:44:11 13 01:44:21 15 01:44:22 16 01:44:23 17 01:44:29 18 01:44:35 20	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the development would be required, yes.  Q. Okay. You mentioned that the traffic aspects of the plan also prevent a traffic hazard, in your opinion. Would you please elaborate on that?
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.  Additionally, the previously mentioned access to Route 202 does not provide, in my opinion, during peak periods safe or efficient access.  Q. Okay. I would like to go back and unpack some of that if you don't mind, Al. Did	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:49 7 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:06 11 01:44:09 12 01:44:15 14 01:44:2 15 01:44:2 16 01:44:2 17 01:44:2 18 01:44:3 17 01:44:3 20 01:44:3 20	defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the development would be required, yes.  Q. Okay. You mentioned that the traffic aspects of the plan also prevent a traffic hazard, in your opinion. Would you please elaborate on that?  A. The traffic study references accidents
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.  Additionally, the previously mentioned access to Route 202 does not provide, in my opinion, during peak periods safe or efficient access.  Q. Okay. I would like to go back and unpack some of that if you don't mind, Al. Did you hear Ms. Kline's testimony that the	01:43:34 2 01:43:38 3 01:43:38 4 01:43:41 5 01:43:44 6 01:43:49 7 01:43:57 9 01:44:01 10 01:44:01 11 01:44:09 12 01:44:15 14 01:44:21 15 01:44:22 16 01:44:23 17 01:44:29 18 01:44:35 20 01:44:37 21 01:44:44 22	defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the development would be required, yes.  Q. Okay. You mentioned that the traffic aspects of the plan also prevent a traffic hazard, in your opinion. Would you please elaborate on that?  A. The traffic study references accidents along southbound 202 potentially associated
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.  Additionally, the previously mentioned access to Route 202 does not provide, in my opinion, during peak periods safe or efficient access.  Q. Okay. I would like to go back and unpack some of that if you don't mind, Al. Did you hear Ms. Kline's testimony that the internal drive aisle depicted on A-6 provides a	01:43:34	to provide the width of a collector road as defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the development would be required, yes.  Q. Okay. You mentioned that the traffic aspects of the plan also prevent a traffic hazard, in your opinion. Would you please elaborate on that?  A. The traffic study references accidents along southbound 202 potentially associated with the congestion. By introducing that
01:41:02	A. The ordinance has referenced compliance or development consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan specifies a connector road between 926 and West Pleasant Grove Road. The submitted A-6 does not illustrate the road that would be considered generally consistent with that.  The submitted code also references "that does not result in or substantially add to traffic hazard." The scope of improvements that have been proposed specifically to date do not include turn lanes that the applicant is adding traffic to to contribute to that congestion at those locations.  Additionally, the previously mentioned access to Route 202 does not provide, in my opinion, during peak periods safe or efficient access.  Q. Okay. I would like to go back and unpack some of that if you don't mind, Al. Did you hear Ms. Kline's testimony that the internal drive aisle depicted on A-6 provides a point of connection between or a means of	01:43:34	defined in the Township's Subdivision Ordinance.  Also, as defined in the code, a collector road provides a means of access to local minor streets to travel between neighborhoods. This would appear to be just a series of local streets connected together.  Q. The internal drive aisles that are depicted on A-6, is it your opinion that those would be required to service the development that is proposed by the applicant, regardless of whether they also provide indirect connections between Pleasant Grove and 926?  A. Some vehicular access to serve the development would be required, yes.  Q. Okay. You mentioned that the traffic aspects of the plan also prevent a traffic hazard, in your opinion. Would you please elaborate on that?  A. The traffic study references accidents along southbound 202 potentially associated with the congestion. By introducing that access at that location that could be a

	1144		1146
01:44:55	contributing factor.	01:47:11 1	development proceed in the absence of the
01:44:56 2	Additionally, there are several	01:47:14 2	improvements which are part of the so-called
01:44:59 3	locations where the traffic generated by this	01:47:17 3	PennDOT project?
6 4	site would contribute to locations where turn	01:47:19 4	A. In my opinion, and as presented in the
01:45:10 5	lanes are already warranted, further	01:47:23 5	applicant's traffic study, the traffic
01:45:14 6	perpetuating what is an undesirable situation,	01:47:25 6	associated with this project will have an
01:45:18 7	potentially unsafe.	01:47:29 7	impact at that intersection that will require
01:45:19	Q. Okay. Staying with those turn lanes,	01:47:32	mitigation.
01:45:21 9	where would those turn lanes be located?	01:47:32	If the PennDOT improvements are
01:45:24 10	A. One location would be on southbound 202	01:47:34 10	made, whether by the applicant or by PennDOT,
01:45:29 11	at West Pleasant Grove Road. Another would be	01:47:39 11	then they would satisfy the requirement for
01:45:34 12	at the intersection of New Street and 926.	01:47:42 12	mitigation at that intersection.
01:45:36 13	Q. Did you hear Ms. Kline's testimony that	01:47:44 13	Q. When you say "mitigation," the
01:45:40 14	those turn lanes are warranted under existing	01:47:47 14	improvements at the intersection would result
01:45:44 15	conditions?	01:47:53 15	in a level of service which is not degraded by
01:45:45 16	A. Yes, I did.	01:47:56 16	the development, correct?
01:45:46 17	Q. And her statement or her position that,	01:47:59 17	A. Correct. The level of service
01:45:48 18	therefore, those are not the responsibility of	01:48:03 18	following the improvements would be consistent
01:45:50 19	the applicant, did you hear that?	01:48:07 19	generally with the future condition without the
01:45:52 20	A. I did hear that.	01:48:09 20	development.
01:45:53 21	Q. What is your opinion on that point, if	01:48:10 21	Q. Okay. What is the level of service at
01:45:57 22	any?	01:48:14 22	that intersection now, if you know?
01:45:57 23	A. I would agree with her that turn lanes	01:48:17 23	A. I don't recall specifically. I'm going
10 24	at these locations are currently warranted	01:48:36 24	to look this up a moment.
4	1145		1147
	17.0		117/
01:46:02 1	under existing conditions.	01:48:38 1	Q. Take your time.
01:46:02 <b>1</b> 01:46:04 <b>2</b>		01:48:38 <b>1</b> 01:48:39 <b>2</b>	
	under existing conditions.		Q. Take your time.
01:46:04 2	under existing conditions. However, the length of the turn	01:48:39 2	<ul><li>Q. Take your time.</li><li>A. Level of service F.</li></ul>
01:46:04 2	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic	01:48:43 3	<ul><li>Q. Take your time.</li><li>A. Level of service F.</li><li>Q. What is the level of service in the</li></ul>
01:46:04 <b>2</b> 01:46:06 <b>3</b> 01:46:10 <b>4</b>	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby	01:48:39 <b>2</b> 01:48:43 <b>3</b> 01:48:45 <b>4</b>	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> </ul>
01:46:04 <b>2</b> 01:46:06 <b>3</b> 01:46:10 <b>4</b> 01:46:13 <b>5</b>	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.	01:48:43 <b>2</b> 01:48:43 <b>3</b> 01:48:45 <b>4</b> 01:48:47 <b>5</b>	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> </ul>
01:46:04 <b>2</b> 01:46:06 <b>3</b> 01:46:10 <b>4</b> 01:46:13 <b>5</b> 01:46:15 <b>6</b>	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr.	01:48:39 <b>2</b> 01:48:43 <b>3</b> 01:48:45 <b>4</b> 01:48:47 <b>5</b> 01:48:49 <b>6</b>	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the</li> </ul>
01:46:04 <b>2</b> 01:46:06 <b>3</b> 01:46:10 <b>4</b> 01:46:13 <b>5</b> 01:46:15 <b>6</b> 01:46:20 <b>7</b>	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not	01:48:39	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project</li> </ul>
01:46:04 <b>2</b> 01:46:06 <b>3</b> 01:46:10 <b>4</b> 01:46:13 <b>5</b> 01:46:15 <b>6</b> 01:46:20 <b>7</b> 01:46:23 <b>8</b>	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the	01:48:39	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the</li> </ul>
01:46:04 <b>2</b> 01:46:06 <b>3</b> 01:46:10 <b>4</b> 01:46:13 <b>5</b> 01:46:15 <b>6</b> 01:46:20 <b>7</b> 01:46:23 <b>8</b> 01:46:27 <b>9</b>	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the	01:48:39	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in</li> </ul>
01:46:04 <b>2</b> 01:46:06 <b>3</b> 01:46:10 <b>4</b> 01:46:13 <b>5</b> 01:46:20 <b>7</b> 01:46:23 <b>8</b> 01:46:27 <b>9</b> 01:46:30 <b>10</b>	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and	01:48:39 2 01:48:43 3 01:48:45 4 01:48:47 5 01:48:49 6 01:48:51 7 01:48:55 8 01:48:57 9 01:48:59 10	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:15 6 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:33 11	However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road	01:48:39 2 01:48:43 3 01:48:45 4 01:48:47 5 01:48:49 6 01:48:51 7 01:48:55 8 01:48:57 9 01:48:59 10 01:49:01 11	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:33 11 01:46:35 12	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network	01:48:39 2 01:48:43 3 01:48:45 4 01:48:47 5 01:48:49 6 01:48:55 8 01:48:55 8 01:48:57 9 01:48:59 10 01:49:01 11 01:49:02 12	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:15 6 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:33 11 01:46:35 12 01:46:36 13	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network  A. Yes.	01:48:39	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:35 12 01:46:36 13 01:46:36 14	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network  A. Yes.  Q or the road network as modified or	01:48:39 2 01:48:43 3 01:48:45 4 01:48:47 5 01:48:49 6 01:48:55 8 01:48:57 9 01:48:59 10 01:49:01 11 01:49:02 12 01:49:10 13 01:49:12 14	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the applicant is ready to proceed with the</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:15 6 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:33 11 01:46:35 12 01:46:36 13 01:46:36 14 01:46:36 14	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network  A. Yes.  Q or the road network as modified or upgraded by the applicant?	01:48:39	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the applicant is ready to proceed with the development, in your opinion, is it appropriate</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:15 6 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:33 11 01:46:36 13 01:46:36 14 01:46:41 15 01:46:42 16	under existing conditions.  However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network  A. Yes.  Q or the road network as modified or upgraded by the applicant?  A. Yes.	01:48:39 2 01:48:43 3 01:48:45 4 01:48:49 6 01:48:49 6 01:48:55 8 01:48:57 9 01:48:59 10 01:49:01 11 01:49:02 12 01:49:10 13 01:49:12 14 01:49:14 15 01:49:16 16	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the applicant is ready to proceed with the development, in your opinion, is it appropriate for the applicant to be tasked with completing</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:15 6 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:33 11 01:46:35 12 01:46:36 13 01:46:36 14 01:46:41 15 01:46:42 16 01:46:43 17	However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network  A. Yes.  Q or the road network as modified or upgraded by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Of course, you mentioned that	01:48:39	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the applicant is ready to proceed with the development, in your opinion, is it appropriate for the applicant to be tasked with completing those improvements as a condition of its</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:15 6 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:33 11 01:46:35 12 01:46:36 13 01:46:41 15 01:46:42 16 01:46:43 17 01:46:48 18	However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network  A. Yes. Q or the road network as modified or upgraded by the applicant?  A. Yes. Q. Okay. Of course, you mentioned that the access to 202 presents an unsafe or	01:48:39 2 01:48:43 3 01:48:45 4 01:48:47 5 01:48:49 6 01:48:55 8 01:48:57 9 01:48:59 10 01:49:01 11 01:49:02 12 01:49:10 13 01:49:14 15 01:49:14 15 01:49:16 16 01:49:10 18	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the applicant is ready to proceed with the development, in your opinion, is it appropriate for the applicant to be tasked with completing those improvements as a condition of its development?</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:15 6 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:33 11 01:46:35 12 01:46:36 13 01:46:36 14 01:46:41 15 01:46:41 15 01:46:43 17 01:46:43 17 01:46:43 18 01:46:52 19	However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network  A. Yes. Q or the road network as modified or upgraded by the applicant? A. Yes. Q. Okay. Of course, you mentioned that the access to 202 presents an unsafe or inefficient access, correct?	01:48:39 2 01:48:43 3 01:48:45 4 01:48:47 5 01:48:49 6 01:48:51 7 01:48:55 8 01:48:57 9 01:48:59 10 01:49:01 11 01:49:02 12 01:49:10 13 01:49:11 15 01:49:16 16 01:49:18 17 01:49:20 18 01:49:21 19	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the applicant is ready to proceed with the development, in your opinion, is it appropriate for the applicant to be tasked with completing those improvements as a condition of its development?</li> <li>A. I would expect that PennDOT will</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:33 11 01:46:35 12 01:46:36 13 01:46:41 15 01:46:41 15 01:46:42 16 01:46:43 17 01:46:48 18 01:46:52 19	However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network  A. Yes.  Q or the road network as modified or upgraded by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Of course, you mentioned that the access to 202 presents an unsafe or inefficient access, correct?  A. Yes.	01:48:39 2 01:48:43 3 01:48:45 4 01:48:45 5 01:48:49 6 01:48:51 7 01:48:55 8 01:48:57 9 01:48:59 10 01:49:01 11 01:49:02 12 01:49:10 13 01:49:12 14 01:49:14 15 01:49:16 16 01:49:16 17 01:49:20 18 01:49:21 19 01:49:23 20	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the applicant is ready to proceed with the development, in your opinion, is it appropriate for the applicant to be tasked with completing those improvements as a condition of its development?</li> <li>A. I would expect that PennDOT will require them to complete those improvements as</li> </ul>
01:46:04 2 01:46:06 3 01:46:10 4 01:46:13 5 01:46:15 6 01:46:20 7 01:46:23 8 01:46:27 9 01:46:30 10 01:46:33 11 01:46:35 12 01:46:36 13 01:46:36 14 01:46:41 15 01:46:41 15 01:46:42 16 01:46:43 17 01:46:43 17 01:46:45 18 01:46:52 19 5 20 01:46:56 21	However, the length of the turn lane required is increased by the traffic associated with the development, thereby contributing to the congested condition.  Q. Okay. So is it fair to say then, Mr. Federico, that if the applicant does not provide the turn lanes or contribute toward the turn lanes that the traffic generated by the development will not be able to be safely and efficiently managed on the existing road network  A. Yes.  Q or the road network as modified or upgraded by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Of course, you mentioned that the access to 202 presents an unsafe or inefficient access, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Okay. Staying with 202 for a moment,	01:48:39 2 01:48:43 3 01:48:45 4 01:48:47 5 01:48:49 6 01:48:51 7 01:48:55 8 01:48:57 9 01:48:59 10 01:49:01 11 01:49:02 12 01:49:10 13 01:49:11 14 01:49:12 14 01:49:14 15 01:49:16 16 01:49:18 17 01:49:20 18 01:49:21 19 01:49:23 20 01:49:25 21	<ul> <li>Q. Take your time.</li> <li>A. Level of service F.</li> <li>Q. What is the level of service in the post-development condition with the improvements?</li> <li>A. F.</li> <li>Q. So whether it is by the PennDOT project or by the applicant completing the improvements, that intersection will remain in a failing condition, correct?</li> <li>A. Yes, it will.</li> <li>Q. Okay. To be clear, if PennDOT does not complete the improvements by the time that the applicant is ready to proceed with the development, in your opinion, is it appropriate for the applicant to be tasked with completing those improvements as a condition of its development?</li> <li>A. I would expect that PennDOT will require them to complete those improvements as a condition of their access permits, yes.</li> </ul>

Page 1144 to 1147 of 1187

38 of 76 sheets

	1148		1150
01:49:35	condition regardless of what PennDOT does?	01:51:65 1	those conditions, if you want to turn to
01:49:38 2	A. Yes.	01:51:59 2	condition No. 5, I believe is the first one.
01:49:39 3	Q. And would that be necessary in order to	01:52:05	A. Yes.
3 4	satisfy the ordinance requirement, the	01:52:06 4	Q. Now, there the Planning Commission, to
01:49:45 5	ordinance requirements, excuse me, to which you	01:52:13 5	be clear, Exhibit B-21 is a letter to the Board
01:49:48 6	made reference earlier?	01:52:17 6	from my partner, Ms. Camp, correct?
01:49:48 7	A. Yes, it would.	01:52:19 7	A. Yes.
01:49:50	Q. Do you have there no, I don't think	01:52:20	Q. On behalf of the Planning Commission,
01:50:04	you do Exhibit B-21?	01:52:22	is that your understanding?
01:50:07 10	A. I don't believe so.	01:52:23 10	A. Yes, it is.
01:50:12 11	Q. I'll bring it up to you.	01:52:23 11	Q. So starting with condition No. 5, the
01:50:37 12	Would you please take a look at	01:52:29 12	Planning Commission's proposal, proposed
01:50:41 13	Exhibit B-21.	01:52:32 13	condition is that the applicant satisfactorily
01:50:42 14	A. Yes.	01:52:34 14	address comments raised in review letters dated
01:50:42 15	Q. Have you seen that letter prior to your	01:52:39 15	December 27, 2016, and February 6, 2017.
01:50:44 16	testimony here this evening?	01:52:44 16	Are those review letters the ones
01:50:46 17	A. Yes, I have.	01:52:45 17	which you previously made reference to as
01:50:47 18	Q. What is that?	01:52:47 18	pre-marked exhibits?
01:50:50 19	A. This is, these are the Planning	01:52:48 19	A. Yes.
01:50:57 20	Commission recommendations associated with this	01:52:49 20	Q. Are there any other review letters that
01:50:59 21	project.	01:52:50 21	you have issued?
01:50:59 22	Q. Okay. So earlier in reference to	01:52:53 22	A. No.
01:51:02 23	Exhibit PC-12 you said that the Planning	01:52:53 23	Q. Have you formed a conclusion as to
15 24	Commission recommended that the Board approve	01:52:59 24	whether or not the applicant has satisfactorily
	1149		1151
01:51:06	the project subject to conditions, provided	01:53:02	addressed the comments raised in your review
01:51:08 2	that the applicant can demonstrate compliance	01:53:04	letters?
01:51:10	with the Zoning Ordinance standards to which	01:53:04	A. Yes, I have.
01:51:12 4	you made reference, correct?	01:53:04	Q. What is that conclusion?
01:51:14 5	A. Yes.	01:53:05 5	A. That there are still some outstanding
01:51:15	Q. And then you testified that the	01:53:07 6	items.
01:51:16 7	applicant, in your opinion the applicant hasn't	01:53:08 7	Q. Are any of those outstanding items in
01:51:18	demonstrated compliance. Assuming that the	01:53:11	addition to the ones that you mentioned earlier
01:51:20	applicant can demonstrate compliance, is it	01:53:13	with regard to ordinance compliance?
01:51:23 10	your understanding that these, what is	01:53:29 10	A. They are ordinance compliance, yes.
01:51:26 11	reflected in Exhibit B-21, are the conditions	01:53:31 11	Q. So there is no there is overlap
01:51:29 12	that the Planning Commission recommends the	01:53:33 12	between condition No. 5 and the ordinance
01:51:31 13	Board impose?	01:53:36 13	compliance issues that you raised a moment ago?
01:51:31 14	A. Yes.	01:53:39 14	A. Yes.
01:51:32 15	Q. All right. Are some of those	01:53:39 15	Q. Okay. The next condition is with
01:51:35 16	conditions related to the traffic aspects of	01:53:44 16	regard to the connector road, correct?
01:51:38 17	the proposed development?	01:53:48 17	A. Yes, it is.
01:51:39 18	A. Yes, they are.	01:53:48 18	Q. Can I presume from your testimony a
01 51:39 19	Q. And what role, if any, did Kimley Horn	01:53:54 19	moment ago that you reached the conclusion that
20	play in developing those conditions?	01:53:57 20	the applicant has not demonstrated an ability
01:51:45 21	A. We provided consultation with the	01:54:00 21	to comply or a willingness, excuse me, to
01:51:48 22	Planning Commission as they developed the	01:54:03 22	comply with condition No. 6, at least so far as shown an Exhibit A-6?
01:51:49 23	O Okay I would like to run through		
01:51:50 24	Q. Okay. I would like to run through	01:54:14 24	A. A-6 does not comply with this

Page 1148 to 1151 of 1187

39 of 76 sheets

1	1152		1154
01:54:17 1	requirement.	01:56:36 1	along 926, given the location of the site
01:54:21 2	Q. Has the applicant expressed to you in	01:56:40 2	access on 926 as shown on Exhibit A-6?
01:54:26 3	your role as the township traffic consultant	01:56:44 3	A. There would be times when queues on
8 4	whether or not the applicant is willing to	01:56:47	eastbound 926 from 202 would extend to a point
01:54:30 5	dedicate to the township either the internal	01:56:51 5	that they would impact the functionality of
01:54:33 6	drive aisle shown on Exhibit A-6 or any	01:56:53	that access.
01:54:37 7	connector or collector road which it might	01:56:54 7	Q. Do you mean eastbound queues to 202?
01:54:38	construct at the property?	01:56:57	You said from.
01:54:40 9	A. I don't recall.	01:56:57	A. Eastbound queues from 202, along 926.
01:54:48 10	Q. I'm going to ask you to jump ahead to	01:57:02 10	<b>Q</b> . Okay, I understand. If the applicant
01:54:53 11	the condition with regard to the drive aisle at	01:57:11 11	does present a revised plan showing alignment
01:54:58 12	Route 926 and Bridlewood Boulevard. Do you see	01:57:15 12	of, alignment of the internal drive aisle with
01:55:01 13	that there?	01:57:18 13	Bridlewood Boulevard and 926, does the Planning
01:55:03 14	A. As part of condition 6?	01:57:22 14	Commission recommend signalization of that
01:55:05 15	Q. No, I'm sorry.	01:57:24 15	access?
01:55:07 16	A. Condition 8.	01:57:25 16	A. Yes, they do.
01:55:08 17	Q. This is condition 8.	01:57:25 17	Q. I'm sorry, that intersection?
01:55:10 18	A. Yes.	01:57:27 18	A. Yes, they do.
01:55:10 19	Q. As shown on Exhibit A-6, the applicant	01:57:27 19	Q. You mentioned a moment ago your opinion
01:55:14 20	is not proposing to align the internal drive	01:57:31 20	that PennDOT would not warrant that signal
01:55:19 21	aisle with Route 926 and Bridlewood Boulevard,	01:57:35 21	under, until full build-out, correct?
01:55:22 22	correct?	01:57:40 22	A. PennDOT, if I recall correctly, has
01:55:23 23	A. Correct.	01:57:43 23	indicated that there may need to be some
y 24	Q. Does the configuration of the internal	01:57:47 24	monitoring of the signal of the intersection
	1153		1155
01:55:29 1	drive aisle with 926 as offset from Bridlewood	01:57:50 1	until signal warrants are met, due to the
01:55:32	Boulevard present any traffic problems, in your	01:57:56 2	occasionally protracted build-out and
01:55:38 3			
	opinion?	01:57:59 3	associated, traffic associated with the
01:55:38 4	opinion?  A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT	01:57:59 3	residential development such as this.
01:55:38 4			residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out,
_	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT	01:58:01 4	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned
01:55:42 5	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will	01:58:03 5	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?
01:55:42 <b>5</b> 01:55:45 <b>6</b>	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location,	01:58:01 <b>4</b> 01:58:03 <b>5</b> 01:58:07 <b>6</b>	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.
01:55:42 <b>5</b> 01:55:45 <b>6</b> 01:55:48 <b>7</b> 01:55:52 <b>8</b> 01:55:53 <b>9</b>	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a
01:55:42 <b>5</b> 01:55:45 <b>6</b> 01:55:48 <b>7</b> 01:55:52 <b>8</b>	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection,	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and
01:55:42 <b>5</b> 01:55:45 <b>6</b> 01:55:46 <b>7</b> 01:55:52 <b>8</b> 01:55:53 <b>9</b> 01:55:56 <b>10</b> 01:55:58 <b>11</b>	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a
01:55:42 <b>5</b> 01:55:45 <b>6</b> 01:55:54 <b>7</b> 01:55:52 <b>8</b> 01:55:53 <b>9</b> 01:55:56 <b>10</b> 01:55:58 <b>11</b> 01:56:01 <b>12</b>	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection,	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?
01:55:42 <b>5</b> 01:55:45 <b>6</b> 01:55:48 <b>7</b> 01:55:52 <b>8</b> 01:55:53 <b>9</b> 01:55:56 <b>10</b> 01:55:58 <b>11</b> 01:56:01 <b>12</b> 01:56:04 <b>13</b>	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.
01:55:42 <b>5</b> 01:55:45 <b>6</b> 01:55:48 <b>7</b> 01:55:52 <b>8</b> 01:55:53 <b>9</b> 01:55:56 <b>10</b> 01:55:58 <b>11</b> 01:56:01 <b>12</b> 01:56:04 <b>13</b> 01:56:05 <b>14</b>	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Why is that important, in your opinion
01:55:42 <b>5</b> 01:55:45 <b>6</b> 01:55:52 <b>8</b> 01:55:53 <b>9</b> 01:55:56 <b>10</b> 01:55:58 <b>11</b> 01:56:01 <b>12</b> 01:56:04 <b>13</b> 01:56:05 <b>14</b> 01:56:10 <b>15</b>	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related problems?  A. I would say that it is undesirable. In my opinion, if it were constructed this way,	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13 01:58:27 14 01:58:29 15	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Why is that important, in your opinion as the traffic consultant for this project, if
01:55:42	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related problems?  A. I would say that it is undesirable. In my opinion, if it were constructed this way, there would still be some through traffic	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13 01:58:27 14 01:58:29 15 01:58:33 16	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Why is that important, in your opinion as the traffic consultant for this project, if it is?
01:55:42	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related problems?  A. I would say that it is undesirable. In my opinion, if it were constructed this way, there would still be some through traffic between Bridlewood and the proposed new road,	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13 01:58:27 14 01:58:29 15 01:58:33 16 01:58:36 17	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Why is that important, in your opinion as the traffic consultant for this project, if it is?  A. I just want it clear that funds for the
01:55:42	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related problems?  A. I would say that it is undesirable. In my opinion, if it were constructed this way, there would still be some through traffic	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13 01:58:27 14 01:58:29 15 01:58:31 16 01:58:36 17 01:58:42 18	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Why is that important, in your opinion as the traffic consultant for this project, if it is?  A. I just want it clear that funds for the signal should be set aside. It is one of those
01:55:42	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related problems?  A. I would say that it is undesirable. In my opinion, if it were constructed this way, there would still be some through traffic between Bridlewood and the proposed new road, and offsetting it as it is shown would introduce unnecessary left turns.	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13 01:58:27 14 01:58:29 15 01:58:33 16 01:58:36 17 01:58:42 18 01:58:45 19	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Why is that important, in your opinion as the traffic consultant for this project, if it is?  A. I just want it clear that funds for the signal should be set aside. It is one of those issues that occasionally falls through the
01:55:42	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related problems?  A. I would say that it is undesirable. In my opinion, if it were constructed this way, there would still be some through traffic between Bridlewood and the proposed new road, and offsetting it as it is shown would	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13 01:58:27 14 01:58:33 16 01:58:36 17 01:58:45 19 01:58:45 19	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Why is that important, in your opinion as the traffic consultant for this project, if it is?  A. I just want it clear that funds for the signal should be set aside. It is one of those issues that occasionally falls through the cracks when development escrows, PennDOT does
01:55:42	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related problems?  A. I would say that it is undesirable. In my opinion, if it were constructed this way, there would still be some through traffic between Bridlewood and the proposed new road, and offsetting it as it is shown would introduce unnecessary left turns.	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13 01:58:27 14 01:58:33 16 01:58:36 17 01:58:42 18 01:58:45 19 01:58:47 20 01:58:52 21	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Why is that important, in your opinion as the traffic consultant for this project, if it is?  A. I just want it clear that funds for the signal should be set aside. It is one of those issues that occasionally falls through the cracks when development escrows, PennDOT does not always collect escrows for signals.
01:55:42	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related problems?  A. I would say that it is undesirable. In my opinion, if it were constructed this way, there would still be some through traffic between Bridlewood and the proposed new road, and offsetting it as it is shown would introduce unnecessary left turns.  Q. Unnecessary left turns from 926 into	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13 01:58:27 14 01:58:29 15 01:58:33 16 01:58:42 18 01:58:45 19 01:58:47 20 01:58:54 22	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not. Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes. Q. Why is that important, in your opinion as the traffic consultant for this project, if it is?  A. I just want it clear that funds for the signal should be set aside. It is one of those issues that occasionally falls through the cracks when development escrows, PennDOT does not always collect escrows for signals.  Townships occasionally will consider that it is
01:55:42	A. Based on the coordination with PennDOT today, it is my understanding that PennDOT will not approve a traffic signal at this location, and my understanding that a traffic signal would be warranted at the full build-out.  Q. Moving, taking a step back from signalization of an aligned intersection, however, does the configuration as shown on Exhibit A-6 present any traffic-related problems?  A. I would say that it is undesirable. In my opinion, if it were constructed this way, there would still be some through traffic between Bridlewood and the proposed new road, and offsetting it as it is shown would introduce unnecessary left turns.  Q. Unnecessary left turns from 926 into the site?	01:58:01 4 01:58:03 5 01:58:07 6 01:58:10 7 01:58:13 8 01:58:14 9 01:58:17 10 01:58:20 11 01:58:24 12 01:58:26 13 01:58:27 14 01:58:33 16 01:58:36 17 01:58:42 18 01:58:45 19 01:58:47 20 01:58:52 21	residential development such as this.  Q. But to be clear, at initial build-out, initial construction, a signal at an aligned intersection would not be warranted?  A. Probably not.  Q. Okay. The Planning Commission made a recommendation with regard to monitoring and the placement of funds into escrow to pay for a traffic signal, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Why is that important, in your opinion as the traffic consultant for this project, if it is?  A. I just want it clear that funds for the signal should be set aside. It is one of those issues that occasionally falls through the cracks when development escrows, PennDOT does not always collect escrows for signals.

	1156		1158
01:59:01 1	Further, if the developer, not	02:02:08 1	A. Proposed condition No. 13, yes.
01:59:03 2	that we foresee Toll Brothers going anywhere,	02:02:10 2	Q. Okay. Would you please take a look
01:59:06 3	but if the developer did default after they had	02:02:14 3	then at proposed condition No. 14.
9 4	started, the township would want to have those	02:02:17 4	A. Yes.
01:59:12 5	funds available to provide the traffic signal.	02:02:17 5	Q. Are you familiar with that one?
01:59:16	Q. One moment. Ready?	02:02:19 6	A. Yes, I am.
01:59:59 7	A. Good.	02:02:20 7	Q. Have you formed an opinion as to
01:59:59	Q. Okay. Thanks. So moving on to	02:02:22 8	whether the Board of Supervisors should impose
02:00:04 9	condition No. 12 on Exhibit B-21 with regard to	02:02:25	a condition, impose condition No. 14 should it
02:00:10 10	the improvements to the cartway of West	02:02:28 10	grant this conditional use approval?
02:00:15 11	Pleasant Grove Road, have you formed an opinion	02:02:30 11	A. Yes.
02:00:16 12	as to whether the Board of Supervisors, should	02:02:30 12	Q. What is that conclusion?
02:00:21 13	it approve this conditional use application,	02:02:32 13	A. It should be imposed.
02:00:24 14	should impose condition No. 12 as suggested by	02:02:34 14	Q. And why is that?
02:00:27 15	the Planning Commission?	02:02:36 15	A. The traffic generated and associated by
02:00:29 16	A. Yes.	02:02:46 16	this development has the potential to increase
02:00:30 17	Q. What is that opinion?	02:02:53 17	traffic along some of the ancillary local roads
02:00:31 18	A. That they should.	02:02:57 18	in the immediate proximity of the site, as well
02:00:32 19	Q. And why is that?	02:03:02 19	as Jacqueline Drive, which is a known
02:00:34 20	A. As traffic has increased on West	02:03:04 20	cut-through in this area. And while these sort
02:00:39 21	Pleasant Grove Road, the width is not compliant	02:03:09 21	of issues are not well quantified in your
02:00:41 22	with the current code, and it would be a better	02:03:12 22	typical Transportation Impact Study, there is
02:00:47 23	condition from the mobility perspective to	02:03:15 23	general acceptance within the traffic
<sub>9</sub> 24	provide the additional width.	02:03:17 24	engineering community that these can have, this
	1157		1159
02:00:52	1157 Additionally, there have been	02:03:21	1159 additional traffic can have a potentially
02:00:52 <b>1</b> 02:00:53 <b>2</b>		02:03:21 1 02:03:23 2	
	Additionally, there have been		additional traffic can have a potentially
02:00:53 2	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township	02:03:23 2	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential
02:00:53 2	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road,	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will
02:00:53 <b>2</b> 02:00:55 <b>3</b> 02:00:58 <b>4</b>	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass,	02:03:23 <b>2</b> 02:03:26 <b>3</b> 02:03:31 <b>4</b>	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.
02:00:53 <b>2</b> 02:00:55 <b>3</b> 02:00:58 <b>4</b> 02:01:02 <b>5</b>	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its	02:03:23 <b>2</b> 02:03:26 <b>3</b> 02:03:31 <b>4</b> 02:03:36 <b>5</b>	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that
02:00:63 <b>2</b> 02:00:55 <b>3</b> 02:00:58 <b>4</b> 02:01:02 <b>5</b> 02:01:06 <b>6</b>	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the	02:03:23	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would	02:03:23	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as	02:03:23	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the
02:00:63	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:43 7 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern	02:03:23	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.	02:03:23	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:43 7 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:55 12	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:52 11 02:03:55 12 02:03:57 13	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn lanes to which you made reference earlier as in	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:43 7 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:52 11 02:03:57 13 02:03:57 14	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It calls for elimination of the
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn lanes to which you made reference earlier as in relation to Ms. Kline's testimony about	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:55 12 02:03:57 13 02:03:57 14 02:03:59 15	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It calls for elimination of the easternmost access onto West Pleasant Grove
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn lanes to which you made reference earlier as in relation to Ms. Kline's testimony about existing conditions versus development-related	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:43 7 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:52 11 02:03:57 13 02:03:57 14 02:03:59 15 02:04:03 16	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It calls for elimination of the easternmost access onto West Pleasant Grove Road, correct?
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn lanes to which you made reference earlier as in relation to Ms. Kline's testimony about existing conditions versus development-related impacts?	02:03:23	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It calls for elimination of the easternmost access onto West Pleasant Grove Road, correct?  A. Yes.
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn lanes to which you made reference earlier as in relation to Ms. Kline's testimony about existing conditions versus development-related impacts?  A. Yes. The turn lanes identified	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:43 7 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:55 12 02:03:57 13 02:03:57 14 02:03:59 15 02:04:04 17 02:04:04 18	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It calls for elimination of the easternmost access onto West Pleasant Grove Road, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that access still shown on
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn lanes to which you made reference earlier as in relation to Ms. Kline's testimony about existing conditions versus development-related impacts?  A. Yes. The turn lanes identified recommendations, A-13, the distance or length	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:43 7 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:52 11 02:03:55 12 02:03:57 14 02:03:59 15 02:04:04 17 02:04:04 18 02:04:08 19	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It calls for elimination of the easternmost access onto West Pleasant Grove Road, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that access still shown on Exhibit A-6?
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn lanes to which you made reference earlier as in relation to Ms. Kline's testimony about existing conditions versus development-related impacts?  A. Yes. The turn lanes identified recommendations, A-13, the distance or length of those turn lanes is the increased length	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:52 11 02:03:57 13 02:03:57 14 02:03:59 15 02:04:04 17 02:04:04 18 02:04:08 19 02:04:09 20	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It calls for elimination of the easternmost access onto West Pleasant Grove Road, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that access still shown on Exhibit A-6?  A. Yes, it is.
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn lanes to which you made reference earlier as in relation to Ms. Kline's testimony about existing conditions versus development-related impacts?  A. Yes. The turn lanes identified recommendations, A-13, the distance or length of those turn lanes is the increased length that is warranted over and above the existing	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:52 11 02:03:57 14 02:03:59 15 02:04:04 17 02:04:04 17 02:04:04 18 02:04:08 19 02:04:09 20 02:04:10 21	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It calls for elimination of the easternmost access onto West Pleasant Grove Road, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that access still shown on Exhibit A-6?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. Why is it important, in your opinion, if at all, for that access to be removed or relocated?
02:00:53	Additionally, there have been concerns for some time within the township about speeds along West Pleasant Grove Road, particularly when it is used as a bypass, introducing two additional accesses along its road has further conflict points, and the potential for traffic calming not only would make those accesses safer, it could be used as a means to address the sight distance deficiency that was noted for the eastern access that was illustrated in A-6.  Q. All right. Are the turn lanes that are referenced in Exhibit A-13 the same as the turn lanes to which you made reference earlier as in relation to Ms. Kline's testimony about existing conditions versus development-related impacts?  A. Yes. The turn lanes identified recommendations, A-13, the distance or length of those turn lanes is the increased length that is warranted over and above the existing conditions.	02:03:23 2 02:03:26 3 02:03:31 4 02:03:36 5 02:03:38 6 02:03:46 8 02:03:49 9 02:03:50 10 02:03:55 12 02:03:57 14 02:03:57 14 02:03:59 15 02:04:04 17 02:04:04 18 02:04:04 19 02:04:09 20 02:04:10 21 02:04:14 22 02:04:17 23 02:04:18 24	additional traffic can have a potentially negative impact on the adjacent residential areas and calming associated with this will lessen that potential impact.  Q. To be clear, it is your opinion that the traffic calming measures which are recommended under proposed condition No. 14 are related to the development proposed by the applicant?  A. Yes.  Q. Proposed condition No. 14 I'm sorry 15, do you see that there?  A. Yes.  Q. It calls for elimination of the easternmost access onto West Pleasant Grove Road, correct?  A. Yes.  Q. Is that access still shown on Exhibit A-6?  A. Yes, it is.  Q. Why is it important, in your opinion, if at all, for that access to be removed or relocated?  A. As referenced in some of the previous

	1160			1162
02:04:25 1	questions by the Township Manager, there has	02:07:05	1	A. Give me a moment.
02:04:28 2	been a concept developed to connect this	02:07:07	2	Q. Take your time.
02:04:35	section of the collector roadway through the	02:07:29	3	A. The study included Figure 1 A, which
7 4	Crebilly Farm site with the northern section	02:07:32	4	does appear to be Exhibit A-6, and 1 B, which
02:04:41 5	that's extending through another development of	02:07:37	5	was Alternatives B and C.
02:04:44 6	the Fairshare property.	02:07:39	6	Q. Okay. Alternative A is the proposal
02:04:47 7	And in order to provide a greater	02:07:44	7	for which the applicant is seeking conditional
02:04:49 8	level of continuity, having this access located	02:07:46	8	use approval, to your understanding, correct?
02:04:54	as far east as possible is desirable. It is	02:07:47	9	A. Yes.
02:04:58 10	understood that they cannot be perfectly	02:07:48	10	Q. Okay. So to your knowledge, like the
02:05:00 11	aligned without encroaching into the church	02:07:58	11	township, PennDOT has not been asked to or been
02:05:03 12	property. But the concept that the township	02:08:02	12	given the opportunity to review the
02:05:07 13	had developed previously anticipates that and	02:08:06	13	alternatives or, sorry, the modified traffic
02:05:11 14	provides it with as much continuity as	02:08:12	14	accesses and improvements that Ms. Kline
02:05:16 15	possible.	02:08:15	15	testified about, correct?
02:05:16 16	Q. So Ms. Kline's testimony that	02:08:20	16	A. The study one moment.
02:05:19 17	compliance with the condition is impossible	02:08:28	17	Q. Please, take your time.
02:05:21 18	because of the fact that the applicant doesn't	02:09:01	18	A. The study did include an alternative
02:05:25 19	own the church property, that doesn't	02:09:03	19	analysis with the 926 access aligned with
02:05:28 <b>20</b>	necessarily preclude compliance with proposed	02:09:07	20	Bridlewood.
02:05:30 21	condition No. 15, correct?	02:09:07	21	Q. But not a plan showing that alignment,
02:05:32 22	A. Correct.	02:09:10	22	correct?
02:05:33 23	Q. Turning your attention back to	02:09:11	23	A. That is correct.
<sub>5</sub> 24	Exhibit PC-13, the letter from PennDOT.	02:09:13	24	Q. Have you had the opportunity to review
	1161			1163
02:05:57	A. Yes.	02:09:19	1	Exhibit PC-13 in its entirety prior to these
02:05:57	Q. Do you have any understanding of what	02:09:24	2	questions?
02:06:00 3	it was that PennDOT was reviewing when it says:	02:09:24	3	A. Yes.
02:06:04 4	"PennDOT has reviewed your application for	02:09:26	4	Q. The requirements imposed by PennDOT in
02:06:07 <b>5</b>	completeness, consistency and compliance with	02:09:30	5	PC-13, how, if at all, do those differ from the
02:06:10 6	applicable Department Regulations"?	02:09:37	6	Planning Commission's proposed or recommended
02:06:12 7	A. Yes.	02:09:40	7	conditions?
02:06:13	Q. What is that understanding?	02:09:42	8	A. There is a good deal of overlap and
02:06:15	A. PennDOT was reviewing the traffic	02:09:48	9	consistency between the two.
02:06:18 10	impact study that was submitted on behalf of	02:09:51	10	<b>Q.</b> Is it your expectation, therefore, that
02:06:21 11	the applicant.	02:09:53	11	as a condition of the applicant obtaining
02:06:22 12	Q. Would PennDOT have also been reviewing	02:09:56	12	PennDOT approval for its project it would need
02:06:28 13	a plan of the property?	02:09:59	13	to comply in substance with the traffic-related
02:06:32 14	A. I do believe a site plan was included,	02:10:05	14	conditions suggested by the Planning
02:06:36 15	if not included with the submission, it was	02:10:08	15	Commission?
02:06:38 16	included as an appendix, as a figure in the	02:10:08	16	A. As presented in the PennDOT review
02:06:42 17	study.	02:10:15	17	letter, I would agree as it relates to the
02:06:42 18	Q. Is it your understanding that that site	02:10:18	18	PennDOT improvements within the PennDOT
02:06:45 19	plan that was submitted to PennDOT is the site	02:10:22	19	right-of-way, yes.
₃ 20	plan that we see here as Exhibit A-6?	02:10:23	20	Q. In order for you as the township's
02:06:51 21	A. I don't recall.	02:10:25	21	traffic consultant for this matter to complete
02:06:55 22	Q. Okay. So you are unable to say whether	02:10:28	22	your review of the traffic-related aspects of
				the development what if any additional

02:06:57 23 what PennDOT is reviewing is the same as what

02:07:00 **24** the township is being asked to review, correct?

02:10:36 24

02:10:32 23 the development, what, if any, additional

information would you expect the applicant, or

	1164		1166
02:10:41 1	any applicant, to present in the normal course	02:13:04	202?
	of a conditional use application?	02:13:04 2	A. I believe 202. I'm not aware of the
2:10:49 3	A. At a minimum, a revised analysis	02:13:06 3	specifics of the project.
	showing the elimination of the, or showing	02:13:08 4	Q. Is it 926 as well, or not?
	traffic operations without vehicles using the	02:13:10 5	A. I do not recall.
^	202 access during peak periods.		Q. Most of your testimony regards PennDOT
7	Q. Okay. Would you also expect a revised		controlled roadways or intersections; isn't
-	·		that correct?
^	site plan to accompany that analysis?		A. There were portions of it relative to
:11:09 9	A. I would expect a revised site plan,	1	West Pleasant Grove Road, but a lot did addres
	O Nevertheless did you have Me Kline's	02:13:26 10	-
11:12 11	Q. Nevertheless, did you hear Ms. Kline's	02:13:29 11	PennDOT roads, yes.
	testimony that at least from a traffic	02:13:30 12	Q. Specifically 202/926, that
11:18 13	perspective it is her expectation that the	02:13:33 13	intersection, that's a PennDOT-controlled
	applicant will not be submitting such material	02:13:35 14	roadway and intersection, correct?
11:23 15	as part of the conditional use hearing?	02:13:38 15	A. That is the intersection of PennDOT
1:27 16	A. I recall her saying that there has been	02:13:40 16	roads. It is also adjacent to the property
11:30 17	preliminary analysis done but not submitted.	02:13:43 17	being developed.
11:34 18	MR. GILL: Okay. Thank you.	02:13:43 18	Q. Correct. How about the intersection of
11:34 19	That's all I have for Mr. Federico on direct.	02:13:46 19	926 and South New Street, is that also a
1:41 20	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Adelman,	02:13:49 20	PennDOT intersection?
11:42 21	cross-examine.	02:13:51 21	A. That is an intersection of two state
1:43 22	CROSS-EXAMINATION	02:13:53 22	roads, yes.
11:43 23	BY MR. ADELMAN:	02:13:54 23	Q. And the proposed access, wherever it
<sup>78</sup> 24	Q. Good evening, Al.	02:13:57 24	may be along 926, whether it is aligned with
	1165		1167
11:59 1	A. Good evening.	02:14:00 1	Bridlewood or whether it is staggered, that
12:01 2	Q. I just want to clarify some of your	02:14:02 2	would also be a PennDOT intersection, correct?
2:06 3	statements in your testimony. I believe in the	02:14:05 3	A. That would be an access to a PennDOT
2:10 4	beginning of your testimony you had talked	02:14:07 4	roadway, yes.
12:13 5	about a requirement that has been discussed	02:14:08 5	Q. And how about traffic signal design and
12:16	with PennDOT regarding signal enhancement along	02:14:13 6	engineering, is that also controlled by
12:20 7	the corridor; is that correct? You had	02:14:15 7	PennDOT?
12:21 8	testified that PennDOT was considering signal	02:14:17 8	A. That area is joint jurisdiction.
12:24 9	enhancement along the corridor?	02:14:20 9	Traffic signals are currently owned and
12:27 10	A. It is my understanding that there is	02:14:22 10	maintained by the municipality. However,
	<del>-</del>	02:14:22 10	
12:30 11	A. It is my understanding that there is	1	
12:30 <b>11</b> 12:34 <b>12</b>	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected	02:14:25 11	PennDOT has review and approval authority for
12:30 <b>11</b> 12:34 <b>12</b> 12:35 <b>13</b>	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected  A VOICE: Can't hear you back	02:14:25 <b>11</b> 02:14:27 <b>12</b>	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.
12:30 11 12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected  A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.	02:14:25 <b>11</b> 02:14:27 <b>12</b> 02:14:27 <b>13</b>	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?
12:30 11 12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14 12:42 15	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.  MR. MCKENNA: Al, can you get a	02:14:25 11 02:14:27 12 02:14:27 13 02:14:28 14	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?  A. PennDOT issues the permit, but the
12:30 11 12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14 12:42 15 12:44 16	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.  MR. MCKENNA: Al, can you get a little closer to the mike, please.	02:14:25 11 02:14:27 12 02:14:27 13 02:14:28 14 02:14:31 15	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?  A. PennDOT issues the permit, but the township owns the signal.  Q. Okay. Do you know who would own, if
112:30 11 12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14 12:42 15 12:44 16 12:44 17	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected  A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.  MR. MCKENNA: Al, can you get a little closer to the mike, please.  THE WITNESS: Better?  MR. MCKENNA: A little bit	02:14:25 11 02:14:27 12 02:14:27 13 02:14:29 14 02:14:31 15 02:14:33 16	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?  A. PennDOT issues the permit, but the township owns the signal.  Q. Okay. Do you know who would own, if there is a signal warranted and constructed at
12:30 11 12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14 12:42 15 12:44 16 12:44 17 12:44 17	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected  A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.  MR. MCKENNA: Al, can you get a little closer to the mike, please.  THE WITNESS: Better?  MR. MCKENNA: A little bit closer. Get right up in there.	02:14:25 11 02:14:27 12 02:14:27 13 02:14:29 14 02:14:31 15 02:14:33 16 02:14:36 17 02:14:40 18	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?  A. PennDOT issues the permit, but the township owns the signal.  Q. Okay. Do you know who would own, if there is a signal warranted and constructed at the access along 926, do you know who would own
12:30 11 12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14 12:42 15 12:44 16 12:44 17 12:46 18 12:49 19	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected  A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.  MR. MCKENNA: Al, can you get a little closer to the mike, please.  THE WITNESS: Better?  MR. MCKENNA: A little bit closer. Get right up in there.  THE WITNESS: Is that better?	02:14:25 11 02:14:27 12 02:14:27 13 02:14:28 14 02:14:31 15 02:14:33 16 02:14:36 17 02:14:40 18 02:14:43 19	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?  A. PennDOT issues the permit, but the township owns the signal.  Q. Okay. Do you know who would own, if there is a signal warranted and constructed at the access along 926, do you know who would own that signal?
12:30 11 12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14 12:42 15 12:44 16 12:44 17 12:46 18 12:49 19 20	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.  MR. MCKENNA: Al, can you get a little closer to the mike, please.  THE WITNESS: Better?  MR. MCKENNA: A little bit closer. Get right up in there.  THE WITNESS: Is that better? I have recently been made aware	02:14:25 11 02:14:27 12 02:14:27 13 02:14:29 14 02:14:31 15 02:14:33 16 02:14:36 17 02:14:40 18 02:14:43 19 02:14:45 20	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?  A. PennDOT issues the permit, but the township owns the signal.  Q. Okay. Do you know who would own, if there is a signal warranted and constructed at the access along 926, do you know who would own that signal?  A. Specifically, no. It would either be
12:30 11 12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14 12:42 15 12:44 16 12:44 17 12:46 18 12:49 19 20 12:56 21	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected  A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.  MR. MCKENNA: Al, can you get a little closer to the mike, please.  THE WITNESS: Better?  MR. MCKENNA: A little bit closer. Get right up in there.  THE WITNESS: Is that better?  I have recently been made aware that there is a PennDOT project to do signal	02:14:25 11 02:14:27 12 02:14:27 13 02:14:28 14 02:14:31 15 02:14:33 16 02:14:36 17 02:14:40 18 02:14:43 19 02:14:45 20 02:14:50 21	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?  A. PennDOT issues the permit, but the township owns the signal.  Q. Okay. Do you know who would own, if there is a signal warranted and constructed at the access along 926, do you know who would own that signal?  A. Specifically, no. It would either be Westtown or Thornbury.
12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14 14:12:42 15 12:44 16 12:44 17 12:46 18 12:49 19 12:56 21 12:56 21	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected  A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.  MR. MCKENNA: Al, can you get a little closer to the mike, please.  THE WITNESS: Better?  MR. MCKENNA: A little bit closer. Get right up in there.  THE WITNESS: Is that better?  I have recently been made aware that there is a PennDOT project to do signal enhancements along the corridor.	02:14:25 11 02:14:27 12 02:14:27 13 02:14:29 14 02:14:31 15 02:14:33 16 02:14:36 17 02:14:40 18 02:14:43 19 02:14:45 20 02:14:50 21 02:14:53 22	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?  A. PennDOT issues the permit, but the township owns the signal.  Q. Okay. Do you know who would own, if there is a signal warranted and constructed at the access along 926, do you know who would own that signal?  A. Specifically, no. It would either be Westtown or Thornbury.  Q. Could it be a combination of both?
12:30 11 12:34 12 12:35 13 12:41 14 12:42 15 12:44 16 12:44 17 12:46 18 12:49 19 20 12:56 21	A. It is my understanding that there is signal enhancements being projected  A VOICE: Can't hear you back here.  MR. MCKENNA: Al, can you get a little closer to the mike, please.  THE WITNESS: Better?  MR. MCKENNA: A little bit closer. Get right up in there.  THE WITNESS: Is that better?  I have recently been made aware that there is a PennDOT project to do signal	02:14:25 11 02:14:27 12 02:14:27 13 02:14:28 14 02:14:31 15 02:14:33 16 02:14:36 17 02:14:40 18 02:14:43 19 02:14:45 20 02:14:50 21	PennDOT has review and approval authority for permitting.  Q. So PennDOT issues that permit?  A. PennDOT issues the permit, but the township owns the signal.  Q. Okay. Do you know who would own, if there is a signal warranted and constructed at the access along 926, do you know who would own that signal?  A. Specifically, no. It would either be Westtown or Thornbury.

	1168	Ī	1170
02:14:58 1	Q. In your testimony you stated that the	02:17:03	not be warranted for the project?
02:15:02 2	proposed conditional use plan doesn't comply	02:17:06 2	A. I'm not aware of a conflict in the
02:15:05 3	with a couple of Zoning Ordinance requirements,	02:17:08 3	ordinance for that section.
.7 4	and if I'm correct you stated, one, it doesn't	02:17:08 4	Q. It wasn't my question. If there was a
02:15:10 5	comply with the comp plan because you don't	02:17:10 5	conflict for the connector road, based upon
02:15:12	believe the connector road complies with the	02:17:13 6	your testimony with respect to the Route 202
02:15:14 7	comp plan; is that correct?	02:17:15 7	access, could that also be removed from the
02:15:16	A. Correct.	02:17:17 8	plan?
02:15:16	Q. And then the other was dealing with	02:17:18 9	MR. GILL: Objection, calling for
02:15:19 10	traffic hazard. Is your testimony that the	02:17:19 10	a legal conclusion.
02:15:22 11	proposed conditional use plan creates a traffic	02:17:21 11	MR. ADELMAN: He just testified
02:15:25 12	hazard?	02;17:22 12	that the Route 202 access could be removed from
02:15:26 13	A. The Zoning Ordinance requires the use	02:17:24 13	the plan, if there is a conflict.
02:15:31 14	will not result in or substantially add to a	02:17:26 14	MR. MCKENNA: Yeah, I agree. I'm
02:15:34 15	significant traffic hazard or significant	02:17:27 15	going to overrule that. Mr. Federico, if you
02:15:37 16	traffic congestion. I would offer that this	02:17:30 16	can answer that.
02:15:40 17	does not comply with that.	02:17:31 17	BY MR. ADELMAN:
02:15:41 18	Q. What was the basis for that opinion,	02:17:31 18	Q. So if there is a conflict with the
02:15:41 10	again?	02:17:33 19	connector road could it be removed from the
02:15:44 20	A. The impacts or the nonability to use	02:17:36 20	plan?
02:15:52 21	the 202 access during peak periods, and	02:17:37 21	A. I would expect so.
02:15:56 22	contributing to the need for turn lanes at	02:17:38 22	Q. Okay. One of your bases for stating
02:15:58 23	certain locations.	02:17:50 23	why there is a traffic hazard at the proposed
<sup>59</sup> 24	Q. Okay. And who would be the	02:17:53 24	202 access was the potential for increased
1	1169		1171
02:16:02 1	jurisdictional strike that.	02:17:57 1	accidents; is that correct?
02:16:04 2	Who would have jurisdictional	02:18:01 2	A. Yes.
02:16:05 3	authority over the design of the turn lanes	02:18:08 3	Q. Did you do any analysis at that
02:16:06 4	that you specified?	02:18:11 4	location, did you review any accident data with
02:16:09 5	A. PennDOT.	02:18:16 5	respect to accidents at the proposed location
02:16:12 6	Q. With respect to the Route 202 access,	02:18:19 6	in the existing condition?
02:16:16 7	is that shown on the Growth Management Plan for	02:18:21 7	A. I was reviewing the materials provided
02:16:20	this property?	02:18:23	in the applicant's traffic study.
02:16:21	A. It is.	02:18:26	Q. Did that have any accident data on
02:16:22 10	Q. So how do you reconcile requiring that	02:18:28 10	Route 202, at the proposed 202 access?
02:16:27 11	to be removed if the project is proposed or,	02:18:32 11	A. It did discuss accidents along that
02:16:30 12	sorry, is required to comply with the Growth	02:18:34 12	section of 202.
02:16:34 13	Management Plan?	02:18:35 13	Q. Did it have any specific data with
02:16:34 14	A. I would defer to legal counsel to	02:18:37 14	respect to where the location of the proposed
02:16:35 15	address the specifics of how that would work.	02:18:40 15	202 access is to be constructed?
02:16:38 16	Q. So you are arguing that it shouldn't	02:18:49 16	A. One moment.
02:16:41 17	comply with the Growth Management Plan?	02:19:27 17	Q. Sure.
02:16:45 18	A. We have a situation where literal	02:20:06 18	A. I would reference page 6 of the January
n2=16:50 <b>19</b>	compliance there may be in conflict with other	02:20:13 19	20 Traffic Impact Study.
20	sections of the ordinance.	02:20:16 20	Q. What does that indicate to support your
02:16:54 21	Q. So would that or could that also be	02:20:20 21	opinion?
02:16:58 22	true then with the proposed connector road that	02:20:25 22	A. The majority of midblock crashes along
02:17:00 23	is shown on the Growth Management Plan, as you	02:20:30 23	202 were rear-end incidents. Ten of the
02:17:01 24	testified to, if there is a conflict it might	02:20:32 24	rear-end incidents occurred along southbound US

Page 1168 to 1171 of 1187

44 of 76 sheets

	1172		1174
02:20:37	202, which is likely associated with the	02:22:54	Q. Isn't there currently a right out from
02:20:38 2	congestion experienced at the signalized	02:22:57	West Pleasant Grove onto southbound 202?
02:20:41 3	intersection of 202 and 926.	02:23:02 3	A. There is, yes.
. 3 4	Q. Is that further south than the proposed	02:23:05 4	Q. Are you aware of any accidents that
02:20:46 5	access to the development on 202?	02:23:08 5	have occurred at that location or any
02:20:51 6	A. They did not specify.	02:23:09 6	propensity to have accidents at that location?
02;20;53 7	Q. Okay. So you don't have any specific	02:23:14 7	A. I don't recall.
02:20:54	data at that location?	02:23:23	Q. I believe there was some testimony, and
02:20:56	A. I did not review any specific data.	02:23:45	I just want to make sure I understood it
02:20:58 10	Q. Okay. If the proposed access to 202	02:23:47 10	correctly, with respect to the Route 202 and
02:21:03 11	was permitted by PennDOT, what configuration	02:23:50 11	926 improvements, is it your testimony that all
02:21:05 12	would it likely be in?	02:23:56 12	of the improvements would have to be
02:21:07 13	A. I would expect that only right turns in	02:23:57 13	constructed in order for the applicant to
02:21:10 14	and right turns out would be permitted.	02:23:59 14	mitigate its impact, or just the ones that have
02:21:13 15	Q. Do you know if PennDOT would require	02:24:04 15	been specified in the applicant's traffic
02:21:15 16	acceleration and deceleration lanes in	02:24:07 16	studies? Because I believe the PennDOT project
02:21:18 17	connection with that access?	02:24:11 17	involves multiple improvements near that
02:21:19 18	A. I would expect a deceleration lane. I	02:24:13 18	intersection.
02:21:24 19	don't know about an acceleration lane.	02:24:17 19	A. The improvements that I'm aware that
02:21:25 20	Q. Would an acceleration lane help	02:24:20 20	are required for mitigation are the eastbound
02:21:28 21	mitigate or prevent your concern that accidents	02:24:22 21	lane and the southbound right turn lane.
02:21:32 22	could occur at that opening or intersection?	02:24:49 22	Q. I believe Mr. Gill asked you some
02:21:36 23	A. During peak periods when traffic is	02:24:52 23	questions regarding the existing levels of
a 24	queued all the way to 926, no, I don't expect	02:24:56 24	service at the 926/202 intersection and then
	1173		1175
02:21:40 1	that an acceleration lane would help.	02:24:59 1	the levels of service post-development; is that
02:21:43 2	MR. MCKENNA: Hold on, Mr.	02:25:03 2	correct?
02:21:44 3	Federico. Would you get again a little closer	02:25:03	A. Yes.
02:21:46 4	to the microphone. The Board is having a	02:25:04 4	<b>Q.</b> And your testimony was that existing it
02:21:48 5	little bit of difficulty hearing you. I	02:25:08 5	is a level of service F, and then
02:21:50 6	apologize.	02:25:10 6	post-development with the improvements it is
02:21:50 7	MR. ADELMAN: Would you like me	02:25:13 7	still a level of service F; is that correct?

		11/3
02:21:40	1	that an acceleration lane would help.
02:21:43	2	MR. MCKENNA: Hold on, Mr.
02:21:44	3	Federico. Would you get again a little closer
02:21:46	4	to the microphone. The Board is having a
02:21:48	5	little bit of difficulty hearing you. I
02:21:50	6	apologize.
02:21:50	7	MR. ADELMAN: Would you like me
02:21:51	8	to repeat the question?
02:21:54	9	THE WITNESS: During the peak
02:21:55	10	periods I don't expect that an acceleration
02:21:58	11	lane would help.
02:22:01	12	MR. ADELMAN: Hold on. I think
02:22:02	13	we are going to get some technical assistance.
02:22:09	14	THE WITNESS: Better? Have to
02:22:20	15	put the brakes on.
02:22:24	16	BY MR. ADELMAN:
02:22:24	17	Q. How about during non-peak hours when it
02:22:26	18	is not completely congested, would an
02 22:30	19	acceleration lane help mitigate your concern
الحال	20	for accidents along 202 coming from the right
02:22:36	21	out?
02:22:42	22	A. My concern is more with vehicles

02:21:40	1	that an acceleration lane would help.	02:24:59	1	the levels of service post-development; is that
02:21:43	2	MR. MCKENNA: Hold on, Mr.	02:25:03	2	correct?
02:21:44	3	Federico. Would you get again a little closer	02:25:03	3	A. Yes.
02:21:46	4	to the microphone. The Board is having a	02:25:04	4	<ol><li>Q. And your testimony was that existing it</li></ol>
02:21:48	5	little bit of difficulty hearing you. I	02:25:08	5	is a level of service F, and then
02:21:50	6	apologize.	02:25:10	6	post-development with the improvements it is
02:21:50	7	MR. ADELMAN: Would you like me	02:25:13	7	7 still a level of service F; is that correct?
02:21:51	8	to repeat the question?	02:25:15	8	A. Yes.
02:21:54	9	THE WITNESS: During the peak	02:25:16	9	Q. Notwithstanding that it is the same
02:21:55	10	periods I don't expect that an acceleration	02:25:18	10	level of service letter grade, do the
02:21:58	11	lane would help.	02:25:21	11	1 improvements actually improve the level of
02:22:01	12	MR. ADELMAN: Hold on. I think	02:25:24	12	service at the intersection?
02:22:02	13	we are going to get some technical assistance.	02:25:29	13	A. The improvements will reduce the
02:22:09	14	THE WITNESS: Better? Have to	02:25:32	14	4 overall delay at the intersection.
02:22:20	15	put the brakes on.	02:25:36	15	<b>Q.</b> Would you consider that an improvement?
02:22:24	16	BY MR. ADELMAN:	02:25:38	16	A. That would be an improvement.
02:22:24	17	Q. How about during non-peak hours when it	02:25:39	17	<b>Q.</b> But it is still the same letter grade?
02:22:26	18	is not completely congested, would an	02:25:42	18	A. It is still a level of service F.
02.52:30	19	acceleration lane help mitigate your concern	02:25:43	19	Q. Understood. Turning to the Planning
ال	20	for accidents along 202 coming from the right	02:25:56	20	Commission's conditions of approval,
02:22:36	21	out?	02:25:59	21	1 Exhibit B-21, I think you testified that there
02:22:42	22	A. My concern is more with vehicles	02:26:03	22	were two review letters. Let me see if I
02:22:48	23	approaching the site along southbound 202, not	02:26:07	23	3 can talking about item No. 5, condition No.

	1176		1178
02:26:14 1		02:28;28 1	A. My understanding of the road is to
02:26:17 2		02:28:30 2	provide a community connection for this
02:26:19 3		02:28:33	development or the development of this property
2 4		02:28:36	and the adjacent properties, to provide those
02:26:25 5		02:28:39 5	residents along the western side of the
02:26:27	A. Yes.	02:28:42	township and the adjacent township a means to
02:26:27 7	Q. Okay. Because the Planning Commission	02:28:46 7	make local trips without accessing 202.
		02:28:51	Q. Local trips from where to where?
			A. Between neighborhoods and up to the
4.0		02:28:54 9	school.
		02:28:58 11	Q. Has that been dependent on the further
02:26:39 11			connection north of West Pleasant Grove?
02:26:49 12		02:29:00 12	_
02:26:53 13	,	02:29:04 13	A. To access the school it would be, yes.
02:26:58 14		02:29:06 14	Q. Without that connection, does the
02:27:00 15		02:29:09 15	collector or connector road on this property
02:27:02 16		02:29:11 16	serve a purpose?
02:27:03 17	<b>------</b>	02:29:13 17	A. I would think it does, yes.
02:27:07 18	, ,	02:29:15 18	Q. Would that purpose be any different
02:27:10 19	,	02:29:17 19	than traveling north and south on South New
02:27:12 20	•	02:29:20 <b>20</b>	Street, if there is no connection to the
02:27:16 21	what the specific required right-of-way is.	02:29:21 21	school?
02:27:20 22	Q. 50 feet, somewhere in that range?	02:29:26 22	A. I think there would be additional
02:27:23 23	-	02:29:31 23	purpose, to promote the interconnectivity and
4 24		02:29:34 24	cohesiveness of the neighborhoods, yes.
	1177		1179
02:27:26	Q. You are familiar with the Township's	02:29:36	Q. Which neighborhoods?
02:27:28			A This are a seal a sigh heathered the
•		02:29:37 2	A. This proposed neighborhood, the
	A. Yes.	02:29:39 3	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.
	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct?	02:29:39 3	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on
02:27:30 4	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me,	02:29:39 <b>3</b> 02:29:42 <b>4</b> 02:29:45 <b>5</b>	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have
02:27:30 4	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though.	02:29:39 <b>3</b> 02:29:42 <b>4</b> 02:29:45 <b>5</b> 02:29:47 <b>6</b>	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926
02:27:30 <b>4</b> 02:27:32 <b>5</b> 02:27:34 <b>6</b> 02:27:35 <b>7</b>	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand?	02:29:39 <b>3</b> 02:29:42 <b>4</b> 02:29:45 <b>5</b> 02:29:47 <b>6</b> 02:29:50 <b>7</b>	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?
02:27:30 <b>4</b> 02:27:32 <b>5</b> 02:27:34 <b>6</b> 02:27:35 <b>7</b>	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah.	02:29:39	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so.
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a	02:29:39	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so.  Q. Why not?
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:42 10	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not?  A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:42 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development?	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function.
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that,	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not?  A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please.	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:08 14	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12 02:27:57 13 02:28:00 14	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please. Q. Sure. Is it true that your concept or	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:08 14 02:30:13 15	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of vehicles?
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12 02:27:57 13 02:28:00 14 02:28:01 15	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please. Q. Sure. Is it true that your concept or	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:08 14	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of vehicles?  A. I don't believe I ever proposed a
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12 02:27:57 13 02:28:00 14 02:28:01 15 02:28:04 16	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please. Q. Sure. Is it true that your concept or design of a connector road, collector road in this case, is specifically designed to handle	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:08 14 02:30:13 15	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of vehicles?  A. I don't believe I ever proposed a straight roadway.
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12 02:27:57 13 02:28:00 14 02:28:01 15 02:28:04 16	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please. Q. Sure. Is it true that your concept or design of a connector road, collector road in this case, is specifically designed to handle	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:08 14 02:30:13 15 02:30:15 16	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of vehicles?  A. I don't believe I ever proposed a
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12 02:27:57 13 02:28:01 15 02:28:01 16 02:28:07 17 02:28:10 18	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please. Q. Sure. Is it true that your concept or design of a connector road, collector road in this case, is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from this proposed	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:08 14 02:30:13 15 02:30:15 16 02:30:15 17	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of vehicles?  A. I don't believe I ever proposed a straight roadway.
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12 02:27:57 13 02:28:01 15 02:28:01 16 02:28:07 17 02:28:10 18	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please. Q. Sure. Is it true that your concept or design of a connector road, collector road in this case, is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from this proposed development?	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:08 14 02:30:13 15 02:30:15 16 02:30:18 17 02:30:19 18	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of vehicles?  A. I don't believe I ever proposed a straight roadway. Q. What kind of roadway have you proposed, then?  A. I'm suggesting that there should be a
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12 02:27:52 13 02:28:00 14 02:28:01 15 02:28:04 16 02:28:07 17 02:28:10 18 02:28:11 19	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please. Q. Sure. Is it true that your concept or design of a connector road, collector road in this case, is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from this proposed development? A. No, I would not agree with that.	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:55 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:08 14 02:30:13 15 02:30:15 16 02:30:18 17 02:30:19 18 02:30:21 19 02:30:22 20 02:30:26 21	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of vehicles?  A. I don't believe I ever proposed a straight roadway. Q. What kind of roadway have you proposed, then?
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12 02:27:57 13 02:28:00 14 02:28:01 15 02:28:04 16 02:28:07 17 02:28:10 18 02:28:11 19 02:28:17 21	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please. Q. Sure. Is it true that your concept or design of a connector road, collector road in this case, is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from this proposed development? A. No, I would not agree with that. Q. Is the road specifically designed to	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:59 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:15 16 02:30:15 16 02:30:18 17 02:30:19 18 02:30:21 19 02:30:22 20	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of vehicles?  A. I don't believe I ever proposed a straight roadway. Q. What kind of roadway have you proposed, then?  A. I'm suggesting that there should be a
02:27:30 4 02:27:32 5 02:27:34 6 02:27:35 7 02:27:38 8 02:27:42 9 02:27:46 10 02:27:49 11 02:27:52 12 02:27:57 13 02:28:01 15 02:28:01 15 02:28:01 17 02:28:01 18 02:28:11 18	A. Yes. Q. And the roadway standards, correct? A. Yes. I don't have them with me, though. Q. So you can't say offhand? A. No. Yeah. Q. Is it true that your concept of a connector road design is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from the proposed development? A. I'm sorry, could you repeat that, please. Q. Sure. Is it true that your concept or design of a connector road, collector road in this case, is specifically designed to handle traffic not coming from this proposed development? A. No, I would not agree with that. Q. Is the road specifically designed to handle traffic congestion on Route 202?	02:29:39 3 02:29:42 4 02:29:45 5 02:29:47 6 02:29:50 7 02:29:53 8 02:29:54 9 02:29:55 10 02:29:55 11 02:30:04 12 02:30:05 13 02:30:08 14 02:30:13 15 02:30:15 16 02:30:18 17 02:30:19 18 02:30:21 19 02:30:22 20 02:30:26 21	Bridlewood neighborhood, Arborview.  Q. With the proposed roadway network on Exhibit A-6, wouldn't this neighborhood have the same access to West Pleasant Grove and 926 that your proposed road would provide?  A. I don't believe so. Q. Why not? A. The number of separate roadway links and required turns make it less desirable to serve that function. Q. Does your proposed roadway, being a straight roadway, result in higher speeds of vehicles?  A. I don't believe I ever proposed a straight roadway. Q. What kind of roadway have you proposed, then?  A. I'm suggesting that there should be a connector designed to collector standards that

		T			
	1180		1182		
02:30:48 1	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Adelman, I want	02:32:25	Q. How does something like that get		
02:30:50 2	to give you a heads-up, we are at a five minute	02:32:27	missed, in your experience?		
02:30:53	notice. I don't know if you think you can	02:32:29 3	A. When PennDOT establishes the escrow,		
4 4	finish in that time period or if you want to	02:32:32 4	they look at the traffic signal as being owned		
02:30:56 5	continue at the next hearing.	02:32:35 5	by the municipality, so they may not collect		
02:30:57 6	MR. ADELMAN: I can't finish.	02:32:38 6	escrow for it.		
02:30:58 7	But can I finish my five minutes?	02:32:41 7	Similarly, the municipality may		
02:31:00	MR. MCKENNA: Absolutely. I just	02:32:42 8	look at the traffic signal and feel that since		
02:31:01 9	wanted to give you the heads-up of where we	02:32:46	PennDOT was responsible for the permitting,		
02:31:04 10	were.	02:32:48 10	they would have collected escrow for it.		
02:31:04 11	MR. ADELMAN: Absolutely. I	02:32:50 11	<b>Q.</b> So are you saying that potentially it		
02:31:05 12	appreciate that.	02:32:52 12	is just a miscommunication?		
02:31:05 13	MR. MCKENNA: Sure.	02:32:54 13	A. Potentially.		
02:31:06 14	BY MR. ADELMAN:	02:32:54 14	Q. So if the applicant were to include		
02:31:08 15	Q. In your concept of the connector road,	02:32:57 15	that in the overall financial security for a		
02:31:11 16	where would it intersect with 926?	02:33:00 16	project, would that resolve your concern about		
02:31:15 17	A. Opposite Bridlewood.	02:33:02 17	it being missed?		
02:31:17 18	Q. Would that then increase the amount of	02:33:03 18	A. Yes.		
02:31:20 19	traffic that would then go through Bridlewood?	02:33:04 19	Q. Okay. I just wanted to make sure. It		
02:31:24 20	A. I would expect that, yes, some traffic	02:33:06 20	doesn't have to be a separate escrow?		
02:31:27 21	from this neighborhood would travel through	02:33:09 21	A. No.		
02:31:28 22	Bridlewood, yes.	02:33:09 22	Q. No, okay. With respect to condition		
02:31:29 23	Q. Have you quantified that?	02:33:16 23	No. 12 in the Planning Commission's letter,		
1 24	A. No, I have not.	02:33:22 24	Exhibit B-21, we are dealing with the		
	1181		1183		
02:31:32 1	Q. Has the township?	02:33:25	improvements of the cartway of West Pleasant		
02:31:34 2	A. I don't believe so.	02:33:31 2	Grove Road. It refers to two sections in		
02:31:35 3	Q. But this has been part of the	02:33:34	there, comply with Section 149-903.A(2) for		
02:31:37 4	Township's Growth Management Plan for a long	02:33:39 4	width and 149-910.D for paving. Are those		
02:31:39 5	time; isn't that correct?	02:33:45 <b>5</b>	sections from the Subdivision and Land		
02:31:40 6	A. Yes, it has.	02:33:47 6	Development Ordinance in the township?		
02:31:41 7	Q. So no analysis has been done on the	02:33:48 7	A. Yes.		
02:31:43	impacts that the township is proposing with	02:33:50	Q. So wouldn't that be handled at land		
02:31:46	respect to this connector road?	02:33:52	development anyway?		
02:31:47 10	A. Which impacts are you referring to?	02:33:55 10	MR. GILL: Objection. That calls		
02:31:49 11	<b>Q.</b> Impacts to the surrounding	02:33:57 11	for a legal conclusion.		
02:31:50 12	neighborhoods.	02:34:00 12	MR. ADELMAN: He is the engineer		
02:31:53 13	A. I'm not aware of that type of analysis.	02:34:01 13	and I'm asking him a question. He is familiar		
02:31:56 14	Q. Okay. You testified with respect to	02:34:03 14	with the subdivision and land development		
02:32:03 15	the construction of a signalization, if it is	02:34:05 15	process.		
02:32:06 16	warranted at that intersection at 926,	02:34:05 16	MR. MCKENNA: Understood. I'm		
1		1			
02:32:09 17	Bridlewood, and driveway or connector road,	02:34:06 17	going to overrule and ask for that one to be		
02:32:09 17 02:32:13 18	•	02:34:06 17 02:34:09 18	going to overrule and ask for that one to be answered, please. And we are down to our last		
	Bridlewood, and driveway or connector road,		answered, please. And we are down to our last minute.		
02:32:13 18	Bridlewood, and driveway or connector road, correct?	02:34:09 18	answered, please. And we are down to our last		
02:32:13 18	Bridlewood, and driveway or connector road, correct?  A. Yes.	02:34:09 <b>18</b> 02:34:11 <b>19</b> 02:34:11 <b>20</b> 02:34:12 <b>21</b>	answered, please. And we are down to our last minute.  MR. ADELMAN: Okay. I'm pressured:		
02:32:13 18 02:32:13 19 . 20 02:32:17 21 02:32:20 22	Bridlewood, and driveway or connector road, correct?  A. Yes. Q. And you stated that money would need to	02:34:09 <b>18</b> 02:34:11 <b>19</b> 02:34:11 <b>20</b>	answered, please. And we are down to our last minute.  MR. ADELMAN: Okay. I'm pressured:  THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, was I		
02:32:13 18 02:32:13 19 3 20 02:32:17 21	Bridlewood, and driveway or connector road, correct?  A. Yes. Q. And you stated that money would need to be placed into escrow because sometimes it gets	02:34:09 <b>18</b> 02:34:11 <b>19</b> 02:34:11 <b>20</b> 02:34:12 <b>21</b>	answered, please. And we are down to our last minute.  MR. ADELMAN: Okay. I'm pressured:		

	1184		1186	
02:34:16 1	overruled the objection.	1	WITNESS DIRECT CROSS	
02:34:17 2	MR. MCKENNA: Correct.	2		
3	BY MR, ADELMAN:	3	Albert Federico	
8 4	Q. Correct. So would that be being	4	By Mr. Gill 1125	
02:34:20 5	ordinarily handled at land development anyway?	5	By Mr. Adelman 1165	
02:34:22 6	A. It would be addressed at land	6	<u>-,</u>	
02:34:24 7	development, but the applicant would have the	7	EXHIBITS	
02:34:26	opportunity to request a waiver from that	8		
02:34:27	requirement.	9	PLANNING COMMISSION	
02:34:32 10	Q. The township doesn't have to grant the	10		
02:34:34 11	waiver, correct?	11	PC-10 - Federico CV	
02:34:39 12	A. No.	12	PC-11 - Conditional Use Application	
02:34:39 13	MR. ADELMAN: Am I done, Pat?	13	PC-12 - 2/13/17 Planning Commission minutes	
02:34:39 14	MR. MCKENNA: If you don't mind,	14	PC-13 - 3/3/17 PennDOT letter	
02:34:41 15	Mr. Adelman, how about we leave it there.	15		
02:34:43 16	MR. ADELMAN: I didn't hear a	16		
02:34:44 17	bell.	17	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER PAGE 1187	
02:34:44 18	MR. MCKENNA: Trust me, it went	18		
02:34:46 19	off. We are at 10:00 o'clock so we are going	19		
02:34:48 20	to stand in recess. We are going to continue	20		
02:34:51 21	the hearing this evening until Tuesday, August	21		
02:34:54 22	29th. The hearing will be at 6:00 o'clock. It	22		
02:34:57 23	will be back here at Rustin in the auditorium.	23		
3 24	Mr. Federico, I'm hoping you are	24	К	
	1185		1187	
02:35:06 1	available on August 29th.	1	Commonwealth of Pennsylvania )	
02:35:09 2	THE WITNESS: I got to go get my	2	Chester County )	
02:35:11 3	phone. Stretching over there.		chester county )	
02:35:13 4	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Federico will	3		
02:35:14 5	be back to finish his testimony.	4		
02:35:16	The township will send out	5	CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER	
02:35:18 7	LISTSERV about any additional witnesses that	6		
02:35:22	the Planning Commission intends to present that	7	I, Eleanor J. Schwandt, Registered	
02:35:23 9	evening.  Anything else, gentlemen?	8	Merit Reporter and Notary Public, do hereby	
02:35:25 10	Hearing nothing, we will stand in continuance.	9 10	certify that the foregoing record, pages 996 to 1186 inclusive, is a true and accurate	
02:35:26 11	Thank you.	11	transcript of my stenographic notes taken on	
02:35:31 13	(Proceedings conclude at 10:00	12	July 25, 2017, in the above-captioned matter.	
02:35:34 14	p.m.)	13		
02:35:34 15	SA S PAGE	14	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto	
16	INDEX	15	set my hand and seal this 2nd day of August,	
17		16	2017.	
18	WITNESS DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS	17 18	A	
19	Nicole R. Kline	19	The Seamer	
20	By Mr. Adelman 1062	20	Eleanor J. Schwandt	
21	By MR. Gill 1068	21	· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
22	By Mr. Crawford 1084	22		
23	By Ms. Labrum 1086	23		
24	By Mr. Thompson 1090	24	10 -675	
24	•	24	37 48 of 76	

1 1	<b>1st</b> [1] - 1120:7	1077:20, 1077:23,	26th [1] - 1176:1	<b>6:05</b> [1] - 996:11
!	121/4	1081:17, 1082:22,	<b>27</b> [2] - 1133:20,	6th [3] - 997:14,
<b>1</b> [6] - 1008:17,	2	1084:14, 1084:21,	1150:15	1134:3, 1176:1
1019:12, 1021:14,		1087:21, 1088:5,	28-foot-wide [1] -	, , , , , ,
1115:24, 1162:3,	<b>2</b> [10] - 1008:17,	1088:6, 1088:10,	1179:24	7
1162:4	1013:2, 1019:13,	1089:2, 1089:5,	<b>29</b> [3] - 1092:15,	,
<b>100</b> [1] - 1099:11	1021:14, 1048:15,	1090:4, 1093:13,	1094:4, 1096:11	<b>7</b> [1] - 1176:12
	1052:20, 1054:8,	1094:17, 1095:10,	29th [2] - 1184:22,	<b>7.44</b> [1] - 1014:24
<b>1062</b> [1] - 1185:20	1056:16, 1060:8,	1096:3, 1103:11,	1185:1	<b>70</b> [1] - 1120:2
<b>1068</b> [1] - 1185:21	1108:11	1104:2, 1104:16,		
<b>1084</b> [1] - 1185:22	<b>2,000</b> [1] - 1130:17	1107:24, 1110:1,	<b>2nd</b> [3] - 1047:7,	<b>700</b> [1] - 1098:20
<b>1086</b> [1] - 1185:23			1134:20, 1187:15	77 [1] - 1012:8
<b>1090</b> [1] - 1185:24	<b>2,350</b> [1] - 1095:10	1129:4, 1129:8,		<b>78</b> [1] - 1013:18
<b>10:00</b> [2] - 1184:19,	<b>2,450</b> [1] - 1095:10	1130:17, 1132:11,	3	
1185:13	<b>2/13/17</b> [1] - 1186:13	1132:12, 1132:23,		8
10th [1] - 1095:18	<b>20</b> [5] - 1011:10,	1137:2, 1137:15,	<b>3</b> [7] - 1019:12,	
<b>1100</b> [1] - 996:10	1012:4, 1040:10,	1137:19, 1138:10,	1052:4, 1052:7,	<b>8</b> [3] - 1098:16,
<b>1125</b> [1] - 1186:4	1101:6, 1171:19	1138:17, 1141:17,	1055:10, 1058:16,	1152:16, 1152:17
<b>1165</b> [1] - 1186:5	<b>200</b> [2] - 1014:3,	1143:22, 1144:10,	1095:7, 1111:21	<b>8.59</b> [1] - 1014:23
<b>117</b> [3] - 1014:4,	1015:19	1145:18, 1145:21,	<b>3/3/17</b> [1] - 1186:14	8th [1] - 1134:1
1015:19, 1017:7	<b>2007</b> [1] - 1125:3	1154:4, 1154:7,	<b>30</b> [1] - 1098:18	
<b>1186</b> [1] - 1187:10	<b>2008</b> [3] - 1095:18,	1154:9, 1164:6,	<b>31</b> [1] - 1133:11	9
<b>1187</b> [1] - 1186:17	1108:15, 1109:17	1166:1, 1166:2,	<b>317</b> [1] - 1127:20	
<b>1167</b> [1] - 1166.17 <b>12</b> [7] - 1036:3,	<b>2015</b> [1] - 1061:9	1168:21, 1169:6,	<b>319</b> [3] - 1013:10,	<b>9</b> [1] - 1013:2
1037:13, 1139:12,	<b>2016</b> [8] - 1047:7,	1170:6, 1170:12,	1104:21, 1104:24	<b>9.9</b> [1] - 1017:11
	1092:18, 1108:11,	1170:24, 1171:10,	<b>32</b> [1] - 1133:11	<b>926</b> [107] - 1000:15,
1140:9, 1156:9,	1133:23, 1134:1,	1171:12, 1171:15,	<b>320</b> [1] - 1098:18	1000:16, 1001:10,
1156:14, 1182:23	1134:20, 1150:15,	1171:23, 1172:1,	<b>33</b> [2] - 1097:1,	1001:18, 1002:3,
<b>12/30/96</b> [1] - 1095:7	1176:1	1172:3, 1172:5,	1103:9	1002:6, 1002:8,
<b>13</b> [2] - 1157:24,	<b>2017</b> [19] - 996:11,	1172:10, 1173:20,	<b>38</b> [1] - 1100:15	1002:11, 1002:15,
1158:1	998:12, 1003:3,	1173:23, 1174:2,		1002:20, 1003:10,
<b>13th</b> [5] - 1092:18,		1174:10, 1177:22,	<b>395</b> [2] - 1105:12,	1004:24, 1010:19,
1125:3, 1133:23,	1012:4, 1018:15,	1178:7	1105:15	1011:18, 1018:20,
1138:21, 1138:22	1052:8, 1102:5,	<b>202/926</b> [4] - 1040:2,	<b>397</b> [1] - 1013:11	1025:14, 1026:24,
<b>14</b> [6] - 1037:13,	1125:6, 1134:3,	1082:4, 1094:21,	3rd [4] - 1125:6,	1027:2, 1028:12,
1101:18, 1158:3,	1134:8, 1134:11,	1166:12	1134:8, 1134:11,	1028:16, 1029:17,
1158:9, 1159:7,	1135:3, 1136:24,	202/State [1] -	1176:3	1030:9, 1030:10,
1159:11	1138:22, 1150:15,	1094:8		1030:3, 1030:10,
<b>1400</b> [5] - 1003:15,	1176:2, 1176:4,	20th [4] - 998:12,	4	
1012:6, 1012:8,	1187:12, 1187:16			1042:16, 1044:3,
1090:4, 1094:8	<b>202</b> [108] - 1000:9,	1003:3, 1134:5,	<b>4</b> [1] - 1024:21	1046:5, 1051:16, 1056:19, 1057:19,
1400-foot [1] -	1000:11, 1000:14,	1134:6	<b>400</b> [1] - 1110:5	
1004:7	1000:15, 1000:16,	<b>213</b> [1] - 1013:15		1058:9, 1062:24,
149-903.A(2 [1] -	1000:22, 1001:6,	<b>2200</b> [2] - 1086:14,	5	1065:1, 1066:4,
1183:3	1001:10, 1001:14,	1087:7		1068:5, 1070:17,
149-910.D <sub>[1]</sub> -	1001:17, 1007:20,	<b>22nd</b> [1] - 1095:6	<b>5</b> [8] - 1033:12,	1071:2, 1071:24,
1183:4	1009:20, 1011:17,	<b>23</b> [4] - 1092:16,	1033:19, 1095:7,	1073:14, 1073:18,
<b>15</b> [4] - 1033:12,	1017:7, 1027:14,	1095:7, 1097:1,	1150:2, 1150:11,	1081:16, 1084:21,
1033:19, 1159:12,	1028:22, 1029:3,	1098:17	1151:12, 1175:23,	1085:3, 1086:15,
1160:21	1029:7, 1029:20,	<b>2300</b> [2] - 1096:2,	1175:24	1088:7, 1088:13,
	1029:22, 1030:4,	1096:5	<b>50</b> [1] - 1176:22	1089:1, 1089:15,
<b>152</b> [1] - 1014:5	1030:6, 1030:10,	<b>2350</b> [2] - 1096:5,	<b>56</b> [2] - 1012:18	1089:17, 1090:5,
<b>165</b> [2] - 1099:18,	1030:14, 1037:1,	1099:8		1094:7, 1094:9,
1099:19	1037:8, 1042:17,	<b>23rd</b> [2] - 1033:9,	6	1094:12, 1097:5,
<b>17th</b> [3] - 1052:8,	1044:3, 1052:23,	1061:9		1097:14, 1099:5,
1135:3, 1136:24	1059:11, 1059:16,	<b>24-hour</b> [1] - 1008:2	<b>6</b> [8] - 996:5,	1100:10, 1100:12,
<b>18-foot</b> [1] - 1012:7	1059:20, 1060:2,	<b>243</b> [1] - 1014:6	1025:10, 1034:16,	1103:19, 1107:19,
<b>19</b> [2] - 1024:7,	1064:11, 1064:12,	<b>25</b> [10] - 996:11,	1150:15, 1151:22,	1107:22, 1109:7,
1024:8	1065:2, 1066:5,	1012:12, 1012:15,	1152:14, 1171:18,	1109:10, 1113:5,
<b>1996</b> [1] - 1095:6	1067:3, 1067:7,	1012:17, 1012:18,	1176:12	1115:12, 1115:17,
<b>19th</b> [1] ~ 1018:15	1067:12, 1073:14,	1098:5, 1098:10,	<b>6.3</b> [1] - 1017:10	1115:22, 1116:21,
<b>1b</b> [2] - 1018:12,	1073:17, 1077:19,	1098:3, 1098:10,	<b>6:00</b> [1] - 1184:22	1118:13, 1118:19,
1018:19	1010.11, 1011.19,	1000.12, 1107.12	0.00 [i] = 1 104.22	1119:3, 1119:12,
		Page 1 to 1 of 29		09/02/2017

1119:23, 1120:1, 1129:4, 1130:18, 1130:19, 1132:11, 1132:23, 1136:16, 1141:4, 1142:2, 1143:14, 1144:12, 1152:12. 1152:21. 1153:1, 1153:20, 1154:1, 1154:2, 1154:4, 1154:9, 1154:13, 1162:19, 1166:4, 1166:19, 1166:24, 1167:18, 1172:3, 1172:24, 1174:11, 1179:6, 1179:22, 1180:16, 1181:16 926/202 [5] - 1011:5, 1082:11, 1090:6, 1099:16, 1174:24 **996** [1] - 1187:9

# Α

A-13[3] - 1157:13, 1157:19, 1157:23 A-30 [1] - 1133:11 **A-31**[1] - 1134:2 **A-32** [1] - 1134:7 A-33 [3] - 1003:5, 1012:5, 1013:1 A-35 [3] - 1018:12, 1018:14, 1070:16 A-36 [3] - 1047:6, 1047:9, 1134:24 A-6 [42] - 1069:24, 1071:12, 1072:9, 1073:11, 1078:22, 1083:21, 1084:24, 1085:2, 1092:21, 1093:3, 1093:7, 1093:12, 1094:2, 1094:6, 1096:11, 1128:1, 1128:3, 1128:8, 1130:5, 1130:14, 1131:16, 1133:7, 1134:13, 1136:12, 1136:21, 1137:3, 1141:5, 1141:23, 1142:5, 1143:10, 1151:23, 1151:24, 1152:6, 1152:19, 1153:12, 1154:2, 1157:11, 1159:19, 1161:20, 1162:4, 1176:13, 1179:5 a.m [1] - 1016:18 AADT [3] - 1019:16,

1145:10 above-captioned [1] - 1187:12 absence [1] - 1146:1 absolutely [5] -1008:14, 1021:1, 1080:7, 1180:8, 1180:11 abutting [1] -1074:19 acceleration [6] -1172:16, 1172:19, 1172:20, 1173:1, 1173:10, 1173:19 accept [5] - 1035:22, 1035:23, 1079:7, 1102:24, 1110:22 acceptable [2] -1034:7, 1111:6 acceptance [1] -1158:23 accepted [2] -1101:17, 1126:16 access [112] -1003:19, 1004:17, 1004:20, 1011:17, 1018:20, 1018:24, 1019:3, 1019:5, 1019:9, 1024:22, 1026:12, 1026:23, 1028:12, 1029:4, 1029:7, 1029:21, 1030:5, 1030:13, 1034:21, 1035:1, 1037:1, 1042:12, 1044:8, 1046:6, 1047:12, 1047:19, 1047:23, 1048:7, 1051:15, 1051:22, 1052:1, 1052:23, 1058:9, 1059:11, 1059:16, 1067:6, 1068:7, 1068:12, 1082:23, 1085:4, 1089:15, 1089:16, 1089:20, 1089:22, 1090:4, 1090:20, 1091:13, 1091:16, 1093:20, 1094:7, 1094:12, 1094:16, 1097:5, 1097:10,

abandon [1] -

ability [2] - 1076:6,

able [10] - 998:17,

998:18, 1000:10,

1034:5, 1035:17,

1045:11, 1100:22,

1113:7, 1113:17,

1028:22

1151:20

1097:14, 1097:21, 1098:2, 1098:21, 1103:12, 1103:19, 1104:2, 1104:13, 1104:16, 1107:19, 1109:7, 1109:10, 1116:10, 1130:12, 1130:15, 1131:10, 1136:16, 1136:21, 1137:2, 1137:9, 1137:15, 1137:21, 1138:3, 1138:17, 1141:17, 1141:19, 1143:5, 1143:15, 1143:24, 1145:18, 1145:19, 1147:21, 1154:2, 1154:6, 1154:15, 1157:11, 1159:15, 1159:18, 1159:22, 1160:8, 1162:19, 1164:6, 1166:23, 1167:3, 1167:18, 1168:21, 1169:6, 1170:7, 1170:12, 1170:24, 1171:10, 1171:15, 1172:5, 1172:10, 1172:17, 1178:13, 1179:6 accesses [16] -1025:6, 1030:1, 1030:7, 1046:20, 1090:23, 1090:24, 1091:1, 1091:10, 1091:14, 1091:20, 1091:22, 1092:1, 1136:16, 1157:5, 1157:8, 1162:14 accessing [1] -1178:7 accident [3] -1005:6, 1171:4, 1171:9 accidents [8] -1143:21, 1171:1, 1171:5, 1171:11, 1172:21, 1173:20, 1174:4, 1174:6 accommodated [1] -1042:24 accommodations [1] - 1076:7 accompany [1] -1164:8 accomplish [1] -1084:24 according [2] -1048:23, 1139:12 account [2] -1015:17, 1060:1

accurate [1] -1187:10 acquire [1] - 1045:12 action [2] - 1055:9, 1102:16 active [1] - 1006:15 actual [2] - 1016:4, 1022:11 ADAH [1] - 1032:8 add [3] - 1109:8, 1141:10, 1168:14 added [1] - 1051:17 adding [1] - 1141:13 addition [1] - 1151:8 additional [41] -1004:12, 1004:19, 1007:15, 1009:24, 1018:11, 1023:1, 1024:22, 1029:19, 1030:3, 1030:12, 1039:13, 1039:24, 1046:4, 1056:7, 1058:3, 1058:8, 1064:7, 1080:8, 1080:11, 1081:21, 1082:1, 1082:11, 1083:11, 1086:24, 1087:8, 1087:15, 1089:4, 1105:3, 1105:11, 1107:6, 1107:7, 1109:24, 1124:15, 1134:8, 1137:8, 1156:24, 1157:5, 1159:1, 1163:23, 1178:22, 1185:7 additionally [4] -1141:16, 1142:14, 1144:2, 1157:1 additions [1] -1032:3 address [7] -1050:15, 1109:6, 1121:17, 1150:14, 1157:9, 1166:10, 1169:15 addressed [3] -1121:18, 1151:1. 1184:6 addressing [1] -1056:18 ADELMAN [41] -997:3, 1003:6, 1044:6, 1050:18, 1061:21, 1061:24, 1062:4, 1062:6, 1063:6, 1063:13, 1063:17, 1064:1, 1065:11, 1065:17, 1065:21, 1066:10,

1066:17, 1106:18, 1111:17, 1123:8, 1123:15, 1124:2, 1126:8, 1126:12, 1126:19, 1164:23, 1165:23, 1170:11, 1170:17, 1173:7, 1173:12, 1173:16, 1180:6, 1180:11, 1180:14, 1183:12, 1183:20, 1183:24, 1184:3, 1184:13, 1184:16 Adelman [17] -999:19, 1000:2, 1023:5, 1061:21, 1062:3, 1063:9, 1063:16, 1111:15, 1123:7, 1123:13, 1123:23, 1126:18, 1164:20, 1180:1, 1184:15, 1185:20, 1186:5 adequate [1] -1091:10 adequately [2] -1025:6, 1091:2 adjacent [10] -1005:21, 1006:3, 1006:9, 1006:17, 1080:2, 1128:17, 1159:2, 1166:16, 1178:4, 1178:6 adjoining [1] -1110:12 adjusted [2] -1019:16, 1020:18 adjustment [2] -1022:12, 1022:21 adopted [1] -1066:15 afternoon [2] -1099:21, 1100:12 ago [9] - 1027:23, 1030:16, 1104:1, 1109:20, 1138:13, 1142:4, 1151:13, 1151:19, 1154:19 agree [16] - 1002:1, 1039:17, 1050:3, 1054:13, 1073:19, 1073:20, 1077:1, 1078:10, 1078:14, 1095:12, 1096:5, 1096:7, 1144:23, 1163:17, 1170:14, 1177:20 agreeable [3] -1033:16, 1034:11,

1035:9

1062:9, 1062:13

agreed [4] - 1033:18, 1057:3, 1099:7, 1105:24 agreement [1] -1033:18 agreements [1] -1046:19 ahead [6] - 999:16, 1028:3, 1092:13, 1112:19, 1125:8, 1152:10 aisle [6] - 1141:23, 1152:6, 1152:11, 1152:21, 1153:1, 1154:12 aisles [1] - 1143:9 AI [10] - 1124:9, 1125:19, 1125:22, 1126:21, 1128:2, 1138:20, 1141:21, 1164:24, 1165:14 ALBERT [1] - 1125:9 Albert [2] - 1125:18, 1186:3 align [1] - 1152:20 aligned [8] -1034:20, 1060:11, 1107:19, 1153:10, 1155:6, 1160:11, 1162:19, 1166:24 aligning [1] -1051:15 alignment [5] -1051:18, 1103:19, 1154:11, 1154:12, 1162:21 Allegiance [2] -997:17, 997:18 Allison [1] - 1117:21 allow [9] - 1001:7, 1012:13, 1026:8, 1067:13, 1089:4, 1097:13, 1117:1, 1120:12, 1139:20 allowed [3] -1067:20, 1068:7, 1121:4 allowing [1] - 1027:8 alludes [1] - 1019:23 almost [1] - 1119:9 ALSO [1] - 996:17 Alternate [1] -1131:23 alternate [2] -1064:11, 1138:11 alternative [6] -1013:9, 1067:2, 1086:21, 1115:9, 1116:2, 1162:18 Alternative [11] -

1013:14, 1014:2, 1014:15, 1014:23, 1015:18, 1017:6, 1089:11, 1090:3, 1115:8, 1115:18, 1162:6 alternatives [6] -1001:4, 1010:10, 1011:15, 1013:10, 1131:9, 1162:13 Alternatives [8] -1013:8, 1013:14, 1014:4, 1014:16, 1014:24, 1131:21, 1162:5 amend [1] - 1136:13 amended [1] -1136:19 amount [3] -1030:19, 1098:9, 1180:18 Amy [2] - 1115:3, 1118:7 analyses [1] -1103:23 analysis [30] -1003:14, 1024:9, 1029:12, 1031:4, 1031:21, 1033:3, 1034:8, 1045:24, 1060:4, 1062:18, 1063:2, 1083:2, 1083:12, 1091:1, 1091:9, 1097:12, 1104:3, 1104:15, 1109:13, 1131:17, 1131:18, 1138:14, 1162:19, 1164:3, 1164:8, 1164:17, 1171:3, 1181:7, 1181:13 analyzed [2] -1091:22, 1097:5 ancillary [1] -1158:17 Andrew [5] -1047:14, 1047:16, 1058:23, 1059:1, 1062:2 anew [1] - 1106:23 annual [10] -1008:18, 1009:12, 1009:14, 1019:22, 1020:7, 1021:4, 1021:21, 1022:10, 1022:17, 1062:9 answer [9] -

1033:12, 1034:10,

1055:7, 1064:5,

1066:24, 1081:8,

1136:18, 1170:16, 1183:23 answered [5] -1012:5, 1074:20, 1114:22, 1175:24, 1183:18 answers [1] -1110:21 anticipate [3] -1055:20, 1056:8, 1089:12 anticipates [1] -1160:13 anyway [2] - 1183:9, 1184:5 apartments [1] -1016:13 apologize [8] -1030:15, 1040:1, 1052:16, 1058:23, 1059:1, 1062:2, 1131:4, 1173:6 appear [3] - 1142:24, 1143:7, 1162:4 APPEARANCES [1] -997:1 appendices [1] -1015:9 appendix [1] -1161:16 applicable [1] -1161:6 Applicant [1] - 997:4 applicant [79] -998:15, 1019:8, 1028:21, 1029:3, 1035:2, 1035:14, 1037:1, 1039:4, 1039:10, 1043:7, 1046:8, 1049:13, 1050:22, 1053:12, 1055:3, 1057:22, 1058:6, 1069:23, 1072:7, 1076:10, 1079:8, 1080:20, 1083:20, 1085:14, 1091:21, 1095:23, 1101:16, 1101:20, 1102:24, 1103:4, 1106:4, 1110:24, 1119:2, 1121:12, 1121:23, 1124:6, 1127:18, 1129:18, 1131:11, 1135:18, 1136:6, 1137:1, 1137:4, 1137:7, 1137:23, 1138:13, 1140:1, 1140:14, 1141:13, 1143:12,

1145:15, 1146:10, 1147:8, 1147:14, 1147:16, 1149:2, 1149:7, 1149:9, 1150:13, 1150:24, 1151:20, 1152:2, 1152:4, 1152:19, 1154:10, 1159:9, 1160:18, 1161:11, 1162:7, 1163:11, 1163:24, 1164:1, 1164:14, 1174:13, 1182:14, 1184:7 applicant's [8] -1013:9, 1075:15, 1131:3, 1139:21, 1145:24, 1146:5, 1171:8, 1174:15 applicants [2] -1039:16, 1129:18 Application [1] -1186:12 APPLICATION [1] -996.7 application [26] -998:10, 1006:5, 1010:24, 1011:1, 1025:5, 1054:1, 1054:16, 1058:1, 1058:3, 1075:21, 1080:22, 1083:17, 1086:20, 1089:9, 1105:22, 1109:4. 1125:1, 1127:12, 1127:14, 1127:19, 1127:23, 1128:9, 1139:16, 1156:13, 1161:4, 1164:2 applications [3] -1006:16, 1075:5, 1130.2 apply [1] - 1017:18 applying [1] -1014:11 appoint [1] - 1102:18 appreciate [4] -1047:3, 1055:7, 1123:10, 1180:12 approach [3] -1084:9, 1100:7, 1100:21 approaches [1] -1002:16 approaching [1] -1173:23 appropriate [10] -1020:21, 1026:9, 1057:4, 1064:20, 1070:19, 1071:14,

1076:18, 1117:9,

1147:15, 1147:24 approval [11] -1036:4, 1069:23, 1072:8, 1076:22, 1083:20, 1127:20, 1158:10, 1162:8, 1163:12, 1167:11, 1175:20 approve [6] -1035:18, 1035:19, 1139:19, 1148:24, 1153:6, 1156:13 approved [1] -1121:11 approximate [2] -1003:24, 1095:13 April [8] - 1052:8, 1054:12, 1102:5, 1106:1, 1134:8, 1135:3, 1136:24, 1176:3 Arborview [9] -1018:24, 1019:5, 1019:9, 1034:24, 1060:15, 1060:18, 1060:19, 1111:24, 1179:3 Area [1] - 1112:2 area [14] - 1000:13, 1000:17, 1003:24, 1006:14, 1007:13, 1027:10, 1045:9, 1076:13, 1087:15, 1097:24, 1098:9, 1098:12, 1158:20, 1167:8 areas [3] - 1064:14, 1098:5, 1159:3 arguing [1] - 1169:16 arrive [1] - 1086:16 arterial [2] - 1129:4, 1129:5 articulate [1] -1033:22 aside [1] - 1155:18 aspect [2] - 1049:11, 1050:15 aspects [9] -1005:24, 1006:2, 1130:8, 1130:12, 1133:7, 1134:16, 1143:18, 1149:16, 1163:22 assess [2] - 1082:17, 1083:12 assessment [4] -1005:21, 1032:14, 1081:11, 1093:19 assign [1] - 1087:20

1144:19, 1145:7,

assistance [1] -

1173:13 associated [10] -1039:20, 1143:22, 1145:4, 1146:6, 1148:20, 1155:3, 1158:15, 1159:3, 1172:1 Associates [4] -1095:6, 1133:22, 1134:4, 1134:10 Association [3] -1112:9, 1112:22, 1113:13 assume [2] -1012:12, 1042:15 assumed [1] -1088:16 assumes [1] -1087:8 assuming [4] -1081:2, 1081:3, 1121:10, 1149:8 assumption [3] -1087:19, 1096:6, 1139:24 assumptions [2] -1087:6, 1087:13 attached [5] -1016:3, 1016:13, 1017:7, 1017:9, 1018:4 attachments [1] -1134:9 attempting [1] -1138:6 attend [2] - 998:18, 1059:8 attendance [1] -1102:11 attended [1] - 1136:4 attendee [1] -1058:20 attendees 131 -1051:9, 1058:20, 1102:6 attention [3] -1047:5, 1052:4, 1160:23 attorney [1] -1024:19 attract [2] - 1027:13, 1084:13 auditorium [1] -1184:23 Auditorium [1] -996:10 August [4] - 1095:6, 1184:21, 1185:1, 1187:15

1167:11, 1169:3 available [3] -1009:5, 1156:5, 1185:1 average [22] -1008:18, 1009:12, 1009:13, 1019:21, 1019:23, 1020:7, 1020:10, 1020:12, 1020:20, 1021:2, 1021:3, 1021:20, 1021:21, 1021:22, 1022:3, 1022:4, 1022:10, 1022:14, 1022:17, 1062:9, 1086:13 averaging [2] -1021:5, 1021:10 avoid [2] - 1045:10, 1064:12 aware [14] - 1006:16, 1007:24, 1048:5, 1048:11, 1060:14, 1098:8, 1135:21, 1136:2, 1165:20, 1166:2, 1170:2, 1174:4, 1174:19, 1181:13 axle [1] - 1022:19

### В

B-19[1] - 1062:17

B-21 [7] - 1148:9,

1148:13, 1149:11, 1150:5, 1156:9, 1175:21, 1182:24 back-ups [1] -1064:13 backup (3) -1046:12, 1046:16, 1046:17 balance [1] -1091:18 Barrens [1] -1044:24 based [42] - 999:24, 1000:2, 1003:13, 1010:13, 1013:17, 1016:4, 1023:21, 1025:4, 1026:5, 1026:10, 1026:18, 1027:18, 1027:20, 1032:15, 1038:10, 1052:24, 1053:8, 1053:13, 1057:3, 1071:3, 1071:15, 1073:4, 1073:7, 1079:16, 1087:14, 1090:3, 1090:24,

1104:24, 1107:8, 1116:8, 1123:5, 1131:22, 1132:24, 1137:22, 1140:12, 1142:20, 1142:21, 1153:4, 1170:5 bases [2] - 1140:23, 1170:22 basis [5] - 1008:2, 1017:8, 1048:11, 1066:11, 1168:18 **battery** [1] - 1046:16 Bayard [1] - 996:10 bear [1] - 1056:14 **BEFORE** [2] - 996:1, 996:14 begin [2] - 1077:12, 1078:13 beginning [4] -996:11, 1079:12, 1079:24, 1165:4 begins [1] - 1078:18 begun [1] - 998:14 behalf [10] - 997:2, 997:4, 997:5, 997:7, 997:9, 997:10, 1129:18, 1129:19, 1150:8, 1161:10 belabor [1] - 1082:18 believes [1] -1047:20 bell [1] - 1184:17 below [2] - 1020:3, 1098:18 beneficial [1] -1020:22 Benjamin [1] -1117:22 Bertinetti [1] -1111:21 better (8) - 1091:5. 1091:12, 1091:20, 1098:10, 1156:22, 1165:16, 1165:19, 1173:14 between [45] -1010:19, 1013:15,

1091:1, 1091:9,

1085:15, 1089:7, 1108:20, 1115:12, 1115:17, 1115:21, 1119:8, 1120:4, 1130:19, 1141:4, 1141:24, 1142:1, 1142:12, 1143:6, 1143:14, 1151:12, 1153:17, 1163:9, 1178:9 Bevilacqua [2] -1112:1, 1112:3 beyond [3] -1061:11, 1076:13, 1077:2 bicycle [1] - 1006:20 big [1] - 1120:1 bikes [1] - 1007:4 binder [2] - 1128:2, 1134:23 binders [1] - 1133:10 Birmingham [6] -997:10, 1084:2, 1119:6, 1119:8, 1119:18, 1119:19 bit [4] - 998:19, 1022:7, 1165:17, 1173:5 BOARD [1] - 996:1 Board [25] - 997:2, 997:22, 999:22, 1000:4, 1024:7, 1037:18, 1046:24, 1053:21, 1066:15, 1068:17, 1072:8, 1076:21, 1082:20, 1092:15, 1096:24, 1107:6, 1123:4, 1124:14, 1139:14, 1148:24, 1149:13, 1150:5, 1156:12, 1158:8, 1173:4 boil [1] - 1020:4 bonus [4] - 1049:4, 1049:11, 1104:24, 1105:4 borders [1] - 1077:3 borough [1] -1006:20 **bottom** [1] - 1047:13 Boulevard [27] -1018:22, 1026:6, 1026:24, 1043:4, 1051:17, 1051:19, 1051:22, 1055:15, 1067:5, 1067:11, 1089:8, 1089:13, 1094:16, 1094:22, 1096:1, 1097:6, 1097:15, 1101:20,

1103:20, 1107:20, 1110:2, 1130:20, 1136:17, 1152:12, 1152:21, 1153:2, 1154:13 bounded [1] - 1129:2 Boyer [2] - 1118:2, 1118:5 **BOYER** [2] - 1118:3. 1118:6 **Bozzuto** [1] - 1061:2 Bradley [1] - 1115:3 brakes [1] - 1173:15 Brandywine [1] -1092:8 BRAXTON [3] -999:5, 999:8, 999:11 Braxton [1] - 999:5 break [3] - 1106:11, 1107:13, 1107:16 breakdown [1] -1017:6 breaks [1] - 1016:12 bridge [6] - 1004:1, 1004:4, 1009:9, 1045:15, 1045:18, 1120:6 Bridlewood [51] -1001:23, 1018:22, 1026:6, 1026:24, 1028:13, 1042:19, 1043:4, 1046:5, 1051:16, 1051:19, 1051:22, 1052:2, 1055:14, 1055:18, 1086:15, 1089:13, 1089:15, 1089:19, 1089:21, 1094:16, 1094:19, 1094:22, 1095:3, 1095:8, 1096:1, 1097:6, 1097:15, 1098:2, 1099:6, 1100:9, 1101:19, 1103:20, 1104:5, 1107:20, 1110:2, 1129:12, 1130:19, 1136:17, 1152:12, 1152:21, 1153:1, 1153:17, 1153:23, 1154:13, 1162:20, 1167:1, 1179:3, 1180:17, 1180:19, 1180:22, 1181:17 bring [3] - 1122:3, 1128:1, 1148:11 Brinton [1] - 1044:23 broad [1] - 1036:15 broken [1] - 1016:11 brother [1] - 1005:5

authority [2] -

1014:10, 1014:15,

1016:12, 1016:20,

1019:15, 1024:22,

1027:2, 1028:15,

1038:14, 1040:7,

1062:23, 1063:4,

1067:4, 1067:10,

1068:4, 1069:15,

1070:9, 1070:17,

1071:1, 1071:23,

1084:11, 1085:2,

1014:21, 1016:8,

Brothers [17] -997:16, 998:10, 1010:12, 1023:1, 1023:3, 1025:24, 1052:17, 1053:7, 1071:7, 1102:2, 1102:6, 1102:21, 1105:23, 1110:3, 1121:6, 1121:11, 1156:2 brought[1] -1064:15 **Bruns** [1] - 1122:17 build [5] - 1110:4, 1153:8, 1154:21, 1155:2, 1155:5 build-out [4] -1153:8, 1154:21, 1155:2, 1155:5 building [3] - 1038:5, 1038:18, 1097:21 built [1] - 1089:7 bullet [3] - 1052:11, 1059:6, 1060:8 burden [1] - 1110:7 bus [5] - 1031:2, 1032:8, 1032:19, 1072:17, 1073:7 business [2] -1125:22, 1126:1 BY [12] - 1062:6, 1068:23, 1086:9, 1090:18, 1125:14, 1126:20, 1164:23, 1165:23, 1170:17, 1173:16, 1180:14, 1184:3

#### C

bypass [1] - 1157:4

Cahill [1] - 1122:12 calculate [2] -1013:17, 1013:23 calculating [1] -1022:10 calculation [2] -1021:10, 1023:21 calculations [4] -1016:22, 1017:23, 1021:17, 1062:14 calculator [1] -1017:4 Caleb [1] - 1130:20 calming [12] -1030:18, 1030:23, 1043:6, 1055:14, 1055:18, 1101:19, 1101:22, 1102:20, 1157:7, 1159:3,

captured [1] -1009:10 car [2] - 1012:8, 1099:12 care [1] - 1109:18 Carey [1] - 1122:21 Carol [2] - 997:23, 1122:24 **CAROL** [1] - 996:15 carriage [8] - 1014:4, 1014:6, 1015:5, 1015:20, 1015:22, 1017:1, 1017:16, 1068:6 cars [6] - 1012:8, 1089:11, 1090:5, 1099:11, 1100:16, 1101:2 cartway [2] -1156:10, 1183:1 case [7] - 1013:24, 1021:24, 1123:16, 1123:19, 1124:1, 1124:6, 1177:17 cases [2] - 1075:10, 1075:11 center [2] - 1057:20, 1098:17 Centerline [1] -1095:9 certain [4] - 1009:7, 1033:11, 1140:2, 1168:23 certainly [37] -1001:5, 1001:19, 1002:3, 1004:16, 1006:6, 1007:3, 1008:21, 1012:21. 1018:1, 1025:18, 1027:11, 1029:10, 1036:20, 1038:8, 1038:16, 1038:20, 1039:21, 1045:10, 1046:18, 1046:19, 1055:2, 1067:1, 1068:9, 1072:23, 1074:9, 1075:19,

1159:6

camp [1] - 1150:6

1019:4, 1035:4,

1048:8, 1049:12,

1098:11, 1160:10

1126:22, 1126:24,

captioned [1] -

capture [2] - 1009:2,

capacity [3] -

1131:13

1187:12

1020:21

cannot [7] - 1005:2,

1077:19, 1077:23, 1078:12, 1079:20, 1082:2, 1085:2, 1087:24, 1089:21, 1091:14, 1101:3, 1116:24 CERTIFICATE [2] -1186:17, 1187:5 certify [1] - 1187:9 chair [1] - 997:23 Chair [1] - 998:1 Chairman [2] -996:14, 998:8 CHAIRMAN [6] -997:13, 997:20, 1000:5, 1011:24, 1012:16, 1012:22 challenges [1] -1077:18 chance [3] -1023:24, 1024:14, 1037:19 change [11] - 1007:6, 1007:9, 1007:15, 1007:23, 1025:16, 1029:11, 1029:14, 1038:20, 1042:13, 1067:22, 1118:18 changed [5] -1007:20, 1007:21, 1054:16, 1082:24, 1120:11 changes [9] -1026:2, 1053:8, 1055:5, 1103:10, 1103:12, 1103:14, 1103:18, 1105:24, 1106:6 character [1] -1007:6 characteristics [1] -1025:19 charge [1] - 1031:21 check [2] - 1015:8, 1015:11 checklist [2] -1056:21, 1057:6 **CHESTER** [1] - 996:3 **Chester** [5] - 996:11, 1006:21, 1044:20, 1112:2, 1187.2 chief [5] - 1062:21, 1063:11, 1123:20, 1124:1, 1124:6 chief's [1] - 1062:18 children [1] -1043:11 Church [7] - 1019:2, 1019:10, 1034:20,

1079:1, 1112:5 **church** [6] - 1060:13, 1078:2, 1079:10, 1081:6, 1160:11, 1160:19 circuitous [7] -1054:6, 1068:13, 1085:7, 1085:20, 1115:23, 1116:8 circuity [1] - 1085:13 circulation (1) -1130:12 cited [1] - 1140:8 clarification [3] -1059:6, 1116:12, 1116:14 clarify [2] - 1022:7, 1165:2 classification [2] -1038:10, 1069:7 clear[11] - 1038:9, 1079:24, 1100:17, 1100:20, 1101:2, 1101:11, 1147:12, 1150:5, 1155:5, 1155:17, 1159:5 clearance [1] -1133:3 clearly [2] - 1033:22, 1116.8 client [8] - 1072:7, 1073:20, 1077:1, 1078:10, 1079:7, 1081:22, 1110:3, 1110:8 close [6] - 1037:13, 1043:17, 1043:18, 1092:10, 1097:19, 1121:5 closed [2] - 1009:9, 1120:6 closer [3] - 1165:15, 1165:18, 1173:3 Club [1] - 1005:16 club [2] - 1113:2, 1114:11 code [3] - 1141:8, 1143:4, 1156:22 cohesiveness [1] -1178:24 coincidence [1] -1014:19 collect [2] - 1155:21, 1182:5 collected [4] -1016:5, 1018:8, 1019:18, 1182:10 collection [1] -1069:8

collector [33] -

1025:11, 1025:15, 1026:17, 1028:7, 1050:8, 1050:14, 1067:19, 1067:21, 1069:2, 1069:4, 1069:6, 1069:18, 1069:24, 1070:3, 1070:4, 1070:10, 1070:24, 1071:8, 1071:10, 1071:12, 1071:13, 1071:16, 1129:6, 1142:16, 1142:18, 1143:1, 1143:5. 1152:7. 1160:3, 1176:20, 1177:16, 1178:15, 1179:21 columns [1] -1013:13 combination [1] -1167:22 coming [9] - 1000:6, 1029:22, 1047:3, 1107:3, 1120:5, 1123:11, 1173:20, 1177:11, 1177:18 comment [18] -1018:12, 1018:19, 1019:12, 1020:9, 1024:21, 1025:10, 1025:20, 1034:1, 1034:7, 1034:16, 1036:3, 1038:23, 1042:5, 1051:5, 1051:20, 1056:24, 1063:23, 1133:8 comments [19] -1010:14, 1027:6, 1033:12, 1033:19, 1034:3, 1034:4, 1034:15, 1035:13, 1036:6, 1036:16, 1036:21, 1053:9, 1056:19, 1071:16, 1072:2, 1106:8, 1135:21, 1150:14, 1151:1 commercial [3] -1034:22, 1060:16 Commission [31] -997:6, 1010:15, 1033:10, 1047:22, 1068:19, 1092:19, 1092:24, 1103:1, 1118:15, 1118:24, 1123:19, 1124:7, 1125:3, 1125:4, 1138:23, 1139:10, 1139:13, 1139:22, 1148:20, 1148:24,

1042:8, 1042:9,

1149:12, 1149:22, 1150:4, 1150:8, 1154:14, 1155:9, 1156:15, 1163:15, 1176:7, 1185:8, 1186:13 COMMISSION [1] -1186:9 Commission's [6] -1024:19, 1101:18, 1150:12, 1163:6, 1175:20, 1182:23 commissioner [1] -997:24 commit [1] - 1035:17 common [1] -1046:20 Commonwealth [1] -1187:1 communities [2] -1074:9, 1084:21 community [10] -1026:21, 1074:13, 1081:15, 1084:11, 1084:20, 1085:8, 1109:19, 1111:3, 1158:24, 1178:2 comp [2] - 1168:5, 1168:7 Companies [1] -1095:5 competence [1] -1022:1 complaints [1] -1064:15 complete [6] -1043:19, 1057:5, 1099:15, 1147:13, 1147:20, 1163:21 completed [16] -1029:12, 1040:4, 1044:12, 1045:23, 1056:21, 1057:11, 1057:14, 1060:3, 1073:5, 1083:2, 1083:3, 1083:11, 1089:6, 1104:15, 1105:9. 1129:19 completely [2] -1072:6, 1173:18 completeness [1] -1161:5 completes [1] -1039:1 completing [3] -1095:15, 1147:8, 1147:16 compliance [15] -1139:21, 1140:1, 1140:16, 1140:21,

1141:1, 1149:2, 1149:8, 1149:9, 1151:9, 1151:10, 1151:13, 1160:17, 1160:20, 1161:5, 1169:19 compliant [2] -1032:9, 1156:21 complicating [1] -1119:24 complies [1] -1168:6 comply [11] - 1109:7, 1151:21, 1151:22, 1151:24, 1163:13, 1168:2, 1168:5, 1168:17, 1169:12, 1169:17, 1183:3 Comprehensive [8] -1026:16, 1065:3, 1066:6, 1066:11, 1066:12, 1141:3, 1142:8 comprehensive [1] -1109:13 concept [9] - 1011:2, 1086:18, 1131:21, 1136:14, 1160:2, 1160:12, 1177:9, 1177:15, 1180:15 concern [5] -1050:16, 1172:21, 1173:19, 1173:22, 1182:16 concerned [1] -1108:14 concerns [2] -1089:23, 1157:2 conclude [1] -1185:13 conclusion (11) -1055:22, 1087:7, 1140:14, 1140:20, 1140:24, 1150:23, 1151:4, 1151:19, 1158:12, 1170:10, 1183:11 conclusive [1] -1066:18 condition [40] -1045:24, 1076:21, 1079:6, 1079:8, 1083:13, 1102:24, 1120:24, 1145:5, 1146:19, 1147:4, 1147:10, 1147:17, 1147:21, 1148:1, 1150:2, 1150:11, 1150:13, 1151:12,

1151:15, 1151:22,

1152:11, 1152:14, 1152:16, 1152:17, 1156:9, 1156:14, 1156:23, 1157:24, 1158:1, 1158:3, 1158:9, 1159:7, 1159:11, 1160:17, 1160:21, 1163:11, 1171:6, 1175:23, 1182:22 Conditional [1] -1186:12 CONDITIONAL [1] -996:7 conditional [40] -997:15, 998:9, 1010:23, 1023:15, 1025:5, 1029:2, 1029:9, 1036:22, 1051:24, 1053:22, 1054:1, 1054:11, 1054:20, 1054:23, 1055:22, 1056:9, 1069:23, 1076:22, 1080:22, 1089:18, 1090:8, 1104:13, 1105:20, 1106:5, 1109:4, 1115:20, 1125:1, 1127:12, 1128:9, 1133:23, 1134:12, 1139:15, 1139:19, 1156:13, 1158:10, 1162:7, 1164:2, 1164:15, 1168:2, 1168:11 conditions [18] -1003:14, 1033:11, 1104:16, 1139:21, 1144:15, 1145:1, 1149:1, 1149:11, 1149:16, 1149:20, 1149:23, 1150:1, 1157:16, 1157:22, 1163:7, 1163:14, 1175:20, 1176:11 configuration [8] -1067:22, 1085:6, 1089:16, 1089:21, 1105:1, 1152:24, 1153:11, 1172:11 configurations [1] -1103:10 configured [1] -1105:8 confirm [3] -1037:19, 1112:11, 1112:21 conflict [7] - 1157:6, 1169:19, 1169:24, 1170:2, 1170:5,

1170:13, 1170:18 conflicts [1] -1091:18 confusion [1] -1094:18 congested [3] -1109:24, 1145:5, 1173:18 congestion [5] -1141:14, 1143:23, 1168:16, 1172:2, 1177:22 connect [6] - 1026:5, 1073:12, 1077:4, 1079:24, 1097:14, 1160:2 connected [1] -1143:8 connecting [1] -1117:5 connection [63] -1010:18, 1025:23, 1026:8, 1026:20, 1027:2, 1027:11, 1027:13, 1028:1, 1028:15, 1044:12, 1049:24, 1054:7, 1067:4, 1067:10, 1067:12, 1069:15, 1070:17, 1071:1, 1071:4, 1071:22, 1076:7, 1079:22, 1080:14, 1081:12, 1081:23, 1084:16, 1084:17, 1085:2. 1085:13, 1085:19, 1087:9, 1087:16, 1088:3, 1088:4, 1088:15, 1088:18, 1088:23, 1089:2, 1089:10, 1091:7, 1091:12, 1093:13, 1095:20, 1108:20, 1111:5, 1115:16, 1115:21, 1116:7, 1116:13, 1116:15, 1116:21, 1117:1, 1117:10, 1141:24, 1142:1, 1142:12, 1172:17, 1176:13, 1178:2, 1178:12, 1178:14, 1178:20 connections [12] -1026:10, 1043:15, 1074:18, 1075:4, 1076:15, 1077:4, 1077:9, 1078:18, 1091:4, 1091:7, 1091:11, 1143:14 connectivity [5] -

1026:21, 1076:3, 1080:5, 1080:7, 1081:18 connector [75] -1010:7, 1010:16, 1011:2, 1025:19, 1026:3, 1027:7, 1028:11, 1034:18, 1034:19, 1048:17, 1048:22, 1049:1, 1049:3, 1049:10, 1050:10, 1054:5, 1060:10, 1060:12, 1060:14, 1060:18, 1061:4, 1061:5, 1061:10, 1062:23, 1063:4, 1064:19, 1067:24, 1068:10, 1069:2, 1069:10, 1069:13, 1070:5, 1070:9, 1071:6, 1072:3, 1084:8, 1085:9, 1086:12, 1086:18, 1086:22, 1087:1, 1087:12, 1087:22, 1089:7, 1095:22, 1095:24, 1108:18, 1109:1, 1109:8, 1109:21, 1111:2, 1115:10, 1115:11, 1115:13, 1116:3, 1116:6, 1116:16, 1141:4, 1142:5, 1142:7, 1151:16, 1152:7. 1168:6, 1169:22, 1170:5, 1170:19, 1176:15, 1176:17, 1177:10, 1177:16, 1178:15, 1179:21, 1180:15, 1181:9, 1181:17 connects [1] -1179:22 conscientious [1] -1077:8 consider [13] -1005:12, 1006:1, 1029:4, 1085:12, 1097:18, 1098:20, 1130:11, 1137:12, 1142:7, 1142:17, 1142:19, 1155:22, 1175:15 consideration [5] -1047:19, 1056:24, 1078:13, 1082:6, 1091:15 considerations [1] -

1081:4

considered [10] -1006:9, 1006:22, 1009:19, 1043:10, 1078:16, 1114:3, 1121:8, 1131:20, 1141:7, 1176:14 considering [3] -1005:12, 1132:3, 1165:8 consistency [2] -1161:5, 1163:9 consistent [5] -1070:21, 1141:2, 1141:7, 1142:8, 1146:18 construct [2] -1049:10, 1152:8 constructed [7] -1049:7, 1050:14, 1108:19, 1153:15, 1167:17, 1171:15, 1174:13 construction [8] -1038:14, 1039:1, 1040:4, 1046:7. 1079:5, 1155:6, 1181:15 consultant [14] -1039:13, 1041:16, 1042:3, 1043:4, 1051:10, 1075:15, 1131:3, 1131:14, 1133:1, 1138:16, 1147:23, 1152:3, 1155:15, 1163:21 Consultants [1] -1134:1 consultation [2] -1127:1, 1149:21 consulting [1] -1126:5 contain [1] - 1104:24 contained [2] -1003:23, 1109:19 contains [1] - 1103:9 contemplated [1] -1010:17 contiguous [2] -1005:14, 1025:12 continuance [1] -1185:11 continue [5] - 998:5, 1043:8, 1052:22, 1180:5, 1184:20 continued [8] -998:9, 1034:12, 1034:13, 1035:8, 1035:11, 1035:21, 1036:2, 1109:18 continuing [4] -

1043:8, 1088:12, 1106:21 continuity [2] -1160:8, 1160:14 continuous [4] -1068:3, 1086:12, 1142:12, 1142:16 contradict [2] -1036:18, 1036:21 contradictory [1] -1037:2 contribute [3] -1141:14, 1144:4, 1145:8 contributing [3] -1144:1, 1145:5, 1168:22 control [1] - 1076:10 controlled [3] -1166:7, 1166:13, 1167:6 controls [1] -1117:11 conversation [1] -1133:1 conversations [2] -1056:3, 1057:4 coordinate [2] -1043:5, 1103:5 coordinated [2] -1056:2, 1119:17 coordination [18] -1029:5, 1034:12, 1034:13, 1035:8, 1035:11, 1035:21, 1036:2, 1036:4, 1036:7, 1036:17, 1036:24, 1037:3, 1043:8, 1057:21, 1082:3, 1082:10, 1103:3, 1153:4 copy [1] - 1124:24 Corcoran [1] -1117:21 Corgnale [1] -1118:9 corner [2] - 1037:8, 1113:5 Correct [7] -1072:10, 1073:24, 1138:19, 1146:17, 1152:23, 1160:22, 1168:8 correct [93] - 999:7, 1001:18, 1003:6, 1003:11, 1008:20, 1010:22, 1018:16, 1020:12, 1021:2,

1024:9, 1024:10,

1028:24, 1043:23,

1047:15, 1050:5, 1051:23, 1052:2, 1052:9, 1052:21, 1053:24, 1059:12, 1059:23, 1062:10, 1062:19, 1063:12, 1070:2, 1070:11, 1071:9, 1072:9, 1072:22, 1073:23, 1082:15, 1083:1, 1083:23, 1091:8, 1092:2, 1093:11, 1093:13, 1096:12, 1096:17, 1097:8, 1099:8, 1104:22, 1105:19, 1107:24, 1109:2, 1113:3, 1113:11, 1116:5, 1116:22, 1117:7, 1123:20, 1123:22, 1129:23, 1136:8, 1136:12, 1138:18, 1142:6, 1145:19, 1146:16, 1147:10, 1149:4, 1150:6, 1151:16, 1152:22, 1154:21, 1155:12, 1159:16, 1160:21, 1161:24, 1162:8, 1162:15, 1162:22, 1162:23, 1165:7, 1166:8, 1166:14, 1166:18, 1167:2, 1168:4, 1168:7, 1171:1, 1175:2, 1175:7, 1176:5, 1176:9, 1176:15, 1177:4, 1181:5, 1181:18, 1184:2, 1184:4, 1184:11 correction [2] -1022:16, 1022:19 correctional [1] -1022:11 correctly [4] -1123:24, 1154:22, 1174:10, 1181:22 correspondence [2] - 1134:4, 1134:9 corridor [6] -1001:12, 1132:19, 1165:7, 1165:9, 1165:22, 1165:24 cost [1] - 1110:8 costly [1] - 1097:13 costs [1] - 1045:18 counsel [2] -1126:15, 1169:14 count [2] - 1020:4, 1114:4

County [5] -1006:21, 1044:20, 1047:22, 1048:5, 1187:2 couple [12] - 1010:2, 1012:24, 1031:1, 1033:8, 1046:24, 1047:5, 1052:4, 1062:7, 1084:7, 1106:15, 1107:18, 1168:3 course [6] - 1019:24, 1089:9, 1130:1, 1140:15, 1145:17, 1164:1 court [2] - 1092:12, 1106:11 COURT [1] - 996:23 cracks [1] - 1155:20 crash [1] - 1005:9 crashes [1] -1171:22 Crawford [3] -1084:3, 1086:4, 1185:22 CRAWFORD [3] -997:10, 1084:6, 1086:1 create [5] - 1027:12, 1095:24, 1109:22, 1119:22, 1120:13 creates [1] - 1168:11 Crebilly [12] - 997:9, 997:15, 998:11, 1018:21, 1019:3, 1060:11, 1061:6, 1077:14, 1090:15, 1127:2, 1133:24, 1160:4 Creek [1] - 1120:6 crest [2] - 1098:19, 1120:1 crests [1] - 1120:2 cross [3] - 999:21, 1106:24, 1164:21 CROSS [3] -1164:22, 1185:18, 1186:1 cross-examination [2] - 999:21, 1106:24 **CROSS-**EXAMINATION [1] -1164:22 cross-examine [1] -

country [1] - 1016:6

county [1] - 1000:20

**COUNTY** [1] - 996:3

1100:9 crossings [1] -1044:9 crosswalk [1] -1044:12 crosswalks [3] -1043:22, 1043:24, 1044:2 Cultural [1] -1044:21 curb [1] - 1004:4 current [9] -1004:14, 1029:19, 1032:7, 1052:22, 1073:21, 1091:7, 1091:9, 1145:23, 1156:22 cut [4] - 1064:14, 1064:19, 1107:18, 1158:20 cut-through [2] -1064:19, 1158:20 CV [2] - 1124:22, 1186:11 CVS [3] - 1081:16, 1081:24, 1082:13 cycle [9] - 1099:15, 1099:17, 1099:23, 1100:18, 1100:20, 1100:22, 1101:2, 1101:11, 1101:12 cycles [2] - 1101:4, 1101:9

# D

daily [22] - 1008:2, 1008:18, 1013:13, 1013:15, 1014:22, 1015:4, 1015:13, 1016:17, 1017:5, 1017:8, 1017:19, 1019:15, 1019:22, 1020:6, 1020:7, 1021:21, 1022:11, 1022:17, 1029:16, 1062:9, 1086:13 dangerous [2] -1045:16, 1120:22 data [31] - 1002:19, 1005:6, 1005:10, 1008:12, 1008:23, 1009:3, 1009:4, 1009:5, 1009:15, 1009:16, 1009:17, 1013:20, 1015:8, 1016:5, 1016:10, 1018:8, 1019:17, 1020:2, 1020:5, 1020:17, 1021:5,

1164:21

crossing [3] -

1077:18, 1077:23,

1021:11, 1021:13, 1021:14, 1021:15, 1021:17, 1171:4, 1171:9, 1171:13, 1172:8, 1172:9 date [3] - 1052:16, 1072:3, 1141:12 dated [12] - 1052:8, 1061:1, 1061:8, 1092:17, 1095:6, 1125:6, 1133:22, 1134:2, 1134:5, 1134:8, 1134:10, 1150:14 dates [2] - 1009:3, 1009:6 Daull [1] - 1118:10 **DAULL** [7] - 1118:11, 1119:4, 1120:20, 1121:3, 1121:16, 1121:20, 1122:6 days [3] - 1008:18, 1020:2, 1020:3 deal [1] - 1163:8 dealing [4] -1048:16, 1101:18, 1168:9, 1182:24 deceleration [2] -1172:16, 1172:18 December [7] -1047:7, 1108:11, 1133:20, 1134:1, 1134:20, 1150:15, 1176:1 decision [2] -1090:22, 1109:11 decrease [4] -1007:19, 1008:13, 1008:14, 1040:10 decreased [1] -1008:3 dedicate [1] - 1152:5 default [1] - 1156:3 defer [1] - 1169:14 deficiency [1] -1157:10 defined [3] -1079:23, 1143:2, 1143:4 defining [1] -1084:18 definition [1] -1021:1 degraded [1] -1146:15 delay [4] - 1011:7, 1040:11, 1101:5, 1175:14 demonstrate [3] -

1149:9 demonstrated [3] -1140:16, 1149:8, 1151:20 Dennis [1] - 1122:23 density [3] -1015:24, 1049:4, 1049:11 Department [6] -1051:17, 1057:7, 1063:3, 1108:17, 1108:22, 1161:6 dependent [1] -1178:11 depict[1] - 1094:3 depicted [5] -1128:7, 1136:21, 1137:2, 1141:23, 1143:10 describe [2] -1130:6, 1133:17 description [1] -1032:24 design [23] -1023:13, 1024:4, 1038:1, 1038:3, 1046:6, 1046:15, 1068:1, 1079:17, 1079:19, 1080:13, 1080:16, 1080:19, 1084:23, 1085:1, 1085:22, 1116:9, 1117:11, 1133:4, 1167:5, 1169:3, 1176:17, 1177:10, 1177:16 designated [1] -1113:21 designed [11] -1041:20, 1042:2, 1060:17, 1071:12, 1079:18, 1085:9, 1111:6, 1177:10, , 1177:17, 1177:21, 1179:21 desirability [1] -1081:18 desirable [7] -1027:14, 1068:11, 1074:10, 1080:2, 1116:24, 1160:9, 1179:11 desire [1] - 1079:21 desired [1] - 1027:16 desiring [1] -1078:24 desirous [1] -

1078:24

1077:15

destinations [1] -

detached [7] -1016:3, 1016:12, 1017:7, 1017:11, 1018:1, 1018:3, 1018:5 detail [3] - 1027:4, 1034:4, 1051:9 detailed [11] -1015:12, 1023:13, 1024:4, 1037:24, 1045:24, 1073:5, 1080:13, 1080:16, 1082:2, 1085:22, 1086:23 details [3] - 1023:10, 1023:12, 1082:7 determination [1] -1098:13 determine [10] -1008:23, 1014:9, 1037:4, 1043:6, 1072:24, 1076:16, 1077:3, 1077:11, 1080:9, 1114:7 determined [2] -1046:15, 1091:24 deterrent [2] -1097:20, 1098:21 detriment [1] -1065:9 develop [1] - 1018:9 developed [6] -1021:4, 1091:22, 1149:22, 1160:2, 1160:13, 1166:17 developer[4] -1095:21, 1130:10, 1156:1, 1156:3 Developer [1] -1108:22 developers [2] -997:16, 1130:3 developing [4] -1016:6, 1022:17, 1098:4, 1149:20 Development [2] -1177:2, 1183:6 development [100] -1000:18, 1001:11, 1004:13, 1004:18, 1006:6, 1006:15, 1007:16, 1018:21, 1024:23, 1025:7, 1026:4, 1026:7, 1026:19, 1027:9, 1029:23, 1031:9, 1031:22, 1032:11, 1032:18, 1038:17, 1038:22, 1039:19, 1041:10, 1041:18,

1043:12, 1043:15, 1043:17, 1044:13, 1046:20, 1049:6, 1050:1, 1060:15, 1061:2, 1061:3, 1064:21, 1065:6, 1066:9, 1070:19, 1071:8, 1071:14, 1072:15, 1072:20, 1073:21, 1079:2, 1087:10, 1087:18, 1090:21, 1091:2, 1091:6, 1108:19, 1110:4, 1111:7, 1115:9, 1116:2, 1116:7, 1116:10, 1116:16, 1117:3, 1117:9, 1117:13, 1121:2, 1121:15, 1127:2, 1127:20, 1130:9, 1131:10, 1132:2, 1133:7, 1134:17, 1139:20, 1141:2, 1143:11, 1143:16, 1145:4, 1145:10, 1146:1, 1146:16, 1146:20, 1147:4, 1147:15, 1147:18, 1149:17, 1155:4, 1155:20, 1157:16, 1158:16, 1159:8, 1160:5, 1163:23, 1172:5, 1175:1, 1175:6, 1177:12, 1177:19, 1178:3, 1183:9, 1183:14, 1184:5, 1184:7 developmentrelated [1] - 1157:16 **DEWOLF** [59] -996:15, 1000:8, 1000:19, 1001:3, 1001:8, 1001:13, 1001:21, 1002:4, 1002:10, 1002:18, 1002:24, 1003:12, 1003:16, 1004:1, 1004:3, 1004:10, 1004:22, 1005:4, 1005:11, 1005:23, 1006:8, 1006:12, 1006:18, 1007:11, 1007:17, 1008:6, 1008:16, 1009:2, 1009:6, 1009:19, 1010:2, 1010:5, 1010:21, 1011:3, 1011:10, 1011:22, 1020:15, 1040:14, 1040:23, 1041:8,

1041:19, 1041:23, 1042:7, 1042:18, 1043:10, 1043:22, 1044:1, 1044:7, 1044:15, 1044:23, 1045:4, 1045:14, 1046:1, 1063:10, 1063:21, 1064:23, 1066:21, 1067:15, 1122:2 **DeWolf** [5] - 997:23, 1012:2, 1019:13, 1065:13, 1066:2 DeWolf's [1] -1020:10 Diana [1] - 1117:23 dictated [1] -1026:12 dictating [1] -1028:12 DiDomenico [1] -998:1 DIDOMENICO [1] -996:14 differ [1] - 1163:5 difference [9] -1013:15, 1013:18, 1014:10, 1015:1, 1015:14, 1016:8, 1019:15, 1038:13, 1040:7 differences [1] -1014:21 different [15] -1010:10, 1014:12, 1016:2, 1016:9, 1016:14, 1016:16, 1016:19, 1016:20, 1017:21, 1019:20, 1022:2, 1040:24, 1086:21, 1136:7, 1178:18 difficult[1] - 1101:9 difficulty [2] -1077:23, 1173:5 dimension [2] -1004:6, 1179:23 dip [1] - 1120:1 DIRECT [3] -1125:13, 1185:18, 1186:1 direct [11] - 999:19, 1063:4, 1068:4, 1068:7, 1068:12, 1108:20, 1115:11, 1116:20, 1117:1, 1142:12, 1164:19 directed [1] -1018:20 directly [5] -

1140:1, 1149:2,

1026:15, 1030:9, 1033:13, 1080:1, 1121:19 disagreement[1] -1035:10 discrepancy [1] -1015:23 discuss [5] -1055:17, 1101:21, 1114:6, 1137:5, 1171:11 discussed [6] -1046:18, 1046:21, 1094:3, 1106:1, 1139:22, 1165:5 discusses [1] -1057:16 discussing [1] -1051:14 Discussion [1] -1124:20 discussion [3] -1101:21, 1102:9, 1132:18 discussions [7] -1023:14, 1057:2, 1057:20, 1102:2, 1102:14, 1102:22, 1123:18 displayed [1] -1092:22 disposition [1] -1139:15 distance [12] -1037:19, 1038:5, 1038:11, 1094:18, 1094:21, 1094:24, 1095:8, 1095:13, 1095:20, 1096:9, 1157:9, 1157:19 distinction [1] -1070:9 distribution [1] -1059:19 distributor [1] -1129:7 district [4] - 1031:3, 1031:14, 1031:19, 1031:20 District [1] - 1112:3 divert [1] - 1030:14 diverted [1] -1110:10 diverting [1] - 1110:1 document [7] -1024:14, 1024:16, 1025:10, 1064:2, 1066:13, 1128:4, 1139:3 done [12] - 1023:20,

1025:17, 1031:2, 1042:19, 1056:9, 1057:8, 1060:1, 1082:24, 1107:12, 1164:17, 1181:7, 1184:13 double [2] - 1015:8, 1015:11 down [11] - 1001:12, 1001:17, 1010:7, 1016:11, 1016:12, 1020:5, 1051:4, 1060:9, 1079:9, 1081:6, 1183:18 Downs [5] - 1052:17, 1052:18, 1054:9, 1058:19, 1058:24 downs [1] - 1054:18 drainage [4] -1080:19, 1081:4, 1081:20, 1082:9 draw [1] - 1089:20 drawn [6] - 1070:8, 1087:1, 1087:16, 1087:21, 1088:5, 1088:15 Drew [3] - 1051:6, 1051:9 drive [8] - 1040:16, 1141:23, 1143:9, 1152:6, 1152:11, 1152:20, 1153:1, 1154:12 Drive [6] - 1011:12, 1119:9, 1119:12, 1119:23, 1120:3, 1158:19 driveway [3] -1003:20, 1004:8, 1181:17 driveways [1] -1068:12 drop [3] - 1008:7, 1008:10, 1008:11 due [5] - 1015:1, 1039:14, 1047:23, 1077:22, 1155:1 DuFault [5] - 1092:7. 1092:13, 1106:10, 1107:13, 1111:12 DUFAULT [61] -1092:9, 1092:14, 1092:21, 1093:3, 1093:6, 1093:10, 1093:12, 1093:15, 1093:22, 1094:2, 1094:6, 1094:11, 1094:14, 1095:1, 1095:17, 1096:10, 1096:14, 1096:19,

1096:23, 1097:3, 1097:11, 1097:18, 1098:3, 1098:8, 1098:14, 1099:2, 1099:10, 1099:14, 1099:19, 1099:22, 1100:3, 1100:8, 1100:13, 1100:16, 1100:24, 1101:6, 1101:15, 1102:1, 1102:8, 1102:13, 1102:23, 1103:7, 1103:17, 1103:24, 1104:19, 1104:23, 1105:4, 1105:12, 1105:16, 1105:21, 1105:23, 1106:9, 1106:14, 1107:17, 1108:3, 1108:9, 1109:6, 1109:15, 1110:20, 1111:2, 1111.9 duly [2] - 999:13, 1125:11 Dunvegan [1] -1129:11 during [26] - 998:14, 1022:24, 1023:16, 1024:12, 1033:24, 1046:15, 1048:11, 1054:19, 1054:23, 1056:9, 1069:3, 1069:11, 1070:7, 1092:22, 1099:23, 1103:7, 1119:11, 1130:1, 1138:1, 1140:15, 1141:18, 1164:6, 1168:21, 1172:23, 1173:9, 1173:17 DVRPC (5) -1007:20, 1008:12, 1009:6, 1009:17, 1021:15 dwelling [1] -1017:16

E

earmarked [1] 1026:17
easement [1] 1056:4
East [4] - 1029:16,
1030:15, 1068:4,
1095:10
east [6] - 1089:1,
1098:20, 1100:10,
1100:11, 1113:1,
1160:9

eastbound [12] -1011:6, 1099:5, 1099:23, 1100:8, 1100:9, 1100:17, 1119:13, 1132:13, 1154:4, 1154:7, 1154:9, 1174:20 eastern [2] - 1045:6, 1157:10 easternmost [1] -1159:15 Ed [2] - 1118:2, 1122:18 efficiency [1] -998:20 efficient [1] -1141:19 efficiently [1] -1145:11 egress [4] - 1004:12, 1028:23, 1067:21, 1138:6 Eileen [1] - 1122:21 either [7] - 1021:11, 1030:6. 1030:14. 1044:2, 1088:12, 1152:5, 1167:20 elaborate [1] -1143:20 Eleanor [3] -1124:18, 1187:7, 1187:20 ELEANOR [1] -996:23 element [2] -1041:14, 1041:24 elements [9] -1022:13, 1024:4, 1042:24, 1043:9, 1043:11, 1046:17, 1079:19, 1104:12, 1109:12 elevation [1] -1098:18 elicited [1] - 1118:17 eligibility [1] -1041:11 eliminate [2] -1137:2, 1137:9 eliminating [1] -1138:17 elimination [5] -1082:22, 1104:2, 1137:14, 1159:14, 1164:4 elsewhere [1] -1059:20

emergencies [1] -

employed [2] -

1001:16

1125:19, 1125:22 enable [1] - 1084:10 encourage [1] -1064:13 encourages [1] -1108:22 encroachina (1) -1160:11 end [7] - 1030:4, 1077:12, 1078:13, 1079:12, 1079:24, 1171:23, 1171:24 ends [2] - 1077:6, 1078:19 engineer [14] -1025:21, 1025:22, 1027:6, 1042:2, 1063:11, 1074:7, 1093:8, 1098:13, 1102:18, 1110:6, 1119:1, 1129:22, 1142:23, 1183:12 engineer's [1] -1053:17 engineering [9] -1062:12, 1062:13, 1087:24, 1126:4, 1126:10, 1126:17, 1132:24, 1158:24, 1167:6 Engineers [1] -1013:21 enhancement [3] -1065:8, 1165:6, 1165:9 enhancements [4] -1132:15, 1132:18, 1165:11, 1165:22 entered [1] - 1003:4 entire [1] - 1092:22 entirety [3] -1041:13, 1130:23, 1163:1 entities [1] - 1053:9 entitled [1] - 1095:2 entity [1] - 1125:23 entrance [1] -1028:22 environmental [1] -1133:3 equals [1] - 1014:16 equate [2] - 1012:14, 1013:16 equation [1] -1022:21 escrow [7] -1046:11, 1155:11, 1181:21, 1182:3, 1182:6, 1182:10,

1182:20

escrows [2] -1155:20, 1155:21 ESE [2] - 1093:10, 1133:24 Esquire [6] - 997:2, 997:3, 997:5, 997:7, 997:8, 997:10 established [2] -1094:20, 1100:4 establishes [1] -1182:3 estimate [1] - 1088:1 estimates [1] -1087:13 etcetera [5] - 1007:8, 1018:7, 1038:18, 1044:17, 1103:13 evaluate [5] -1057:23, 1058:6, 1090:23, 1104:16, 1105:10 evaluated [12] -1010:10, 1025:8, 1025:24, 1044:2, 1087:11, 1093:20, 1097:9, 1097:23, 1105:6, 1114:17, 1132:10, 1138:2 evaluating [1] -1026:2 evaluation [16] -1039:9, 1041:17, 1043:19, 1044:8, 1044:13, 1068:8, 1073:5, 1076:5, 1076:15, 1076:19, 1077:10, 1078:17, 1086:17, 1086:24, 1090:2, 1121:14 evaluations [1] -1043:21 evening [26] -997:14, 998:8, 998:21, 999:1, 1026:1, 1034:17, 1034:24, 1058:12, 1058:14, 1069:22, 1086:10, 1092:9, 1102:17, 1119:12, 1119:21, 1123:14, 1127:9, 1128:5, 1135:14, 1137:20, 1139:6, 1148:16, 1164:24, 1165:1, 1184:21, 1185:9 evening's [1] -1127:15 evolution [1] -1054:19

1054:10, 1054:23 evolved [1] - 1054:13 exactly [2] - 1004:7, 1118:23 examination [2] -999:21, 1106:24 **EXAMINATION** [7] -1062:5, 1068:22, 1084:5, 1086:8, 1090:17, 1125:13, 1164:22 examine [1] -1164:21 examined [3] -999:13, 1125:11, 1131:11 example [14] -1005:14, 1017:4, 1017:5, 1017:8, 1017:12, 1017:20, 1017:24, 1035:3, 1035:5, 1035:20, 1036:4, 1036:6, 1037:2, 1080:17 excess [1] - 1098:5 excuse [7] - 1056:17, 1061:22, 1113:16, 1142:1, 1142:22, 1148:5, 1151:21 excused [1] -1123:12 executive [2] -1115:7, 1116:1 exhibit [6] - 1003:4, 1019:12, 1034:5, 1115:5, 1124:17, 1134:23 Exhibit [58] - 1003:5, 1012:5, 1013:1, 1018:12, 1024:7, 1047:6, 1058:16, 1062:17, 1069:24, 1070:16, 1071:12, 1072:9, 1073:11, 1078:22, 1083:21, 1092:15, 1092:21, 1094:4, 1096:10, 1096:11, 1097:1, 1103:9, 1127:5, 1128:1, 1128:3, 1128:8, 1128:10, 1131:16, 1134:13, 1134:24, 1135:6, 1135:8, 1135:10, 1136:12, 1137:3, 1139:2, 1140:9, 1148:9, 1148:13, 1148:23, 1149:11, 1150:5, 1151:23,

1152:6, 1152:19,

1153:12, 1154:2, 1156:9, 1157:13, 1159:19, 1160:24, 1161:20, 1162:4, 1163:1, 1175:21, 1179:5, 1182:24 exhibits [2] -1124:15, 1150:18 Exhibits [2] -1124:16, 1133:11 exist [2] - 1007:10, 1047:24 existent [1] -1072:15 existing [32] -1003:14, 1004:8, 1014:3, 1014:6, 1015:18, 1027:17, 1032:1, 1032:16, 1032:18, 1033:1, 1038:14, 1044:9, 1057:19, 1072:17, 1073:15, 1074:14, 1074:15, 1076:12, 1077:24, 1087:14, 1088:2, 1099:17, 1120:24, 1132:1, 1144:14, 1145:1, 1145:11, 1157:16, 1157:21, 1171:6, 1174:23, 1175:4 exit [3] - 1028:23, 1030:5, 1138:6 exiting [5] - 1030:4, 1042:10, 1138:7, 1138:10, 1173:24 expand [1] - 1023:6 expect[17] - 1001:1, 1004:19, 1011:8, 1019:19, 1020:2, 1077:14, 1107:14, 1147:19, 1163:24, 1164:7, 1164:9, 1170:21, 1172:13, 1172:18, 1172:24, 1173:10, 1180:20 expectation [4] -1074:21, 1075:1, 1163:10, 1164:13 expected [1] -1137:24 experience [3] -1039:12, 1110:16, 1182:2 experienced [2] -1011:13, 1172:2 expert [3] - 1073:4, 1126:9, 1126:16 expertise [5] -

1073:6, 1080:24, 1142:22 explain [4] - 998:5, 1008:8, 1019:14, 1140:23 express [1] - 1137:1 expressed [3] -1048:5, 1050:16, 1152:2 extend [3] - 1004:3, 1074:15, 1154:4 extending [2] -1074:12, 1160:5 extends [1] - 1099:6 extensively [1] -1137:19 extent [2] - 1005:24, 1032:4

F F-E-D-E-R-I-C-O [1] -1125:18 facilitate [3] -1067:7, 1069:8, 1118:20 facilities [20] -1007:8, 1007:10, 1007:15, 1032:16, 1032:17, 1033:1, 1073:2. 1073:12. 1073:13, 1073:16, 1074:8, 1074:13, 1075:9, 1075:18, 1076:12, 1076:17, 1076:23, 1077:13, 1077:17, 1082:7 fact [5] - 1007:18, 1034:17, 1066:22, 1078:5, 1160:18 factor [4] - 1014:23, 1022:20, 1022:22, 1144:1 factored [1] - 1025:1 factors [8] - 1018:8, 1021:7, 1022:10, 1022:12, 1022:16, 1096:4, 1137:8 failing [1] - 1147:10 fair [8] - 1051:4, 1059:18, 1066:14, 1084:14, 1084:15 1085:9, 1085:23, 1145:6 Fairshare [3] -1060:12, 1061:8, 1160:6 fall [1] - 1016:14 falls [1] - 1155:19 familiar [22] -

1004:22, 1005:3, 1006:18, 1007:1, 1040:17, 1040:20, 1041:1, 1041:5, 1044:18, 1045:2, 1063:22, 1066:15, 1069:19, 1070:5, 1098:3, 1098:6, 1127:22, 1128:20, 1140:5, 1158:5, 1177:1, 1183:13 families [1] - 1014:5 family [7] - 1014:3, 1015:5, 1015:19, 1015:21, 1017:1, 1017:16, 1068:6 far [6] - 998:2, 1003:17, 1084:18, 1099:6, 1151:22, 1160:9 Farm [6] - 1056:5, 1077:14, 1115:1, 1127:2, 1133:24, 1160:4 Farms [1] - 1095:4 fast [1] - 1107:12 fatalities [1] -1004:23 favors [1] - 1051:18 feasible [3] - 1049:3, 1079:20, 1121:7 February [7] -1118:14, 1125:3, 1134:3, 1138:21, 1138:22, 1150:15, 1176:1 Federico [16] -1112:15, 1124:9, 1124:10, 1124:23, 1125:7, 1125:15, 1125:18, 1126:9, 1145:7, 1164:19, 1170:15, 1173:3, 1184:24, 1185:4, 1186:3, 1186:11 FEDERICO [1] -1125:9 feedback [3] -1052:24, 1053:13, 1053:14 feet [18] - 1003:15, 1012:6, 1012:8, 1012:12, 1037:14, 1090:4, 1094:8, 1095:10, 1095:11, 1096:2, 1096:5, 1098:18, 1098:20, 1099:8, 1099:12, 1120:2, 1130:17,

evolve [3] - 1052:23,

1039:8, 1042:5,

1176:22

Feryo [3] - 1112:9, 1112:19, 1114:24 FERYO [10] -1112:10, 1112:16, 1112:20, 1113:8, 1113:12, 1113:20, 1113:23, 1114:2, 1114:9, 1114:21 few [4] - 1010:10, 1058:15, 1104:1, 1109:20 field [1] - 1016:5 fifth [1] - 1060:8 fight [2] - 1110:22, 1111:1 figure [1] - 1161:16 Figure [1] - 1162:3 figures [2] - 1008:20, 1062:13 file [1] - 1061:13 filed [1] - 1025:5 final [7] - 1021:16, 1029:13, 1037:6, 1060:8, 1109:11, 1124:3, 1133:4 finalized [1] -1083:14 financial [1] -1182:15 fine [2] - 1036:11, 1061:24 finish [5] - 998:17, 1180:4, 1180:6, 1180:7, 1185:5 firm [3] - 1093:4, 1093:6, 1126:5 first [16] - 998:23, 1001:18, 1001:20, 1002:2, 1018:18, 1028:6, 1047:2, 1047:13, 1051:8, 1052:11, 1096:24, 1104:10, 1115:7, 1124:9, 1125:10, 1150:2 five [4] - 1106:15, 1107:15, 1180:2, 1180:7 fix [1] - 1110:14 flat [1] - 1081:3 flexible [1] - 1139:20 flow [2] - 1118:20, 1120:7 fluctuations [1] -1009:16 fold [1] - 1120:8 follow [6] - 1028:5, 1039:24, 1047:11, 1114:18, 1121:13, 1123:5

follow-up [4] -1028:5, 1039:24, 1047:11, 1123:5 following [2] -1109:19, 1146:18 follows [2] - 999:14, 1125:12 foregoing [1] -1187:9 foresee [1] - 1156:2 formal [7] - 1006:15, 1055:5, 1060:4, 1083:3, 1083:13, 1104:17, 1136:22 formally [1] -1136:20 formed [4] - 1140:14, 1150:23, 1156:11. 1158:7 forth [2] - 1000:7, 1140:2 forward [1] - 1037:5 four [5] - 1095:24, 1109:22, 1119:5, 1129:2, 1130:15 four-leg [2] -1095:24, 1109:22 four-tenths [1] -1119:5 fourth [1] - 1051:5 Fran [3] - 1048:18, 1051:17 FRONEFIELD [1] -997:10 front[7] - 1003:18, 1003:19, 1003:20, 1004:6, 1024:18, 1047:6, 1053:22 frontage [8] -1023:19, 1074:3, 1074:4, 1074:23, 1075:6, 1078:9, 1078:12, 1078:15 frontages [2] -1023:2, 1076:13 full [7] - 1024:4, 1076:5, 1076:15, 1076:19, 1077:10, 1153:8, 1154:21 fully [1] - 1079:18 function [1] -1179:12 functionality [1] -1154:5 funds [3] - 1155:11, 1155:17, 1156:5 future [6] - 1009:21, 1046:10, 1072:19, 1110:9, 1121:10,

1146:19

G Gadaleto [1] -1117:17 gap [2] - 1119:22, 1120:13 Gary [2] - 1112:1, 1112:3 general [6] -1038:23, 1039:12, 1040:8, 1096:8, 1158:23 generally [9] -1018:5, 1064:20, 1070:21, 1091:4, 1128:24, 1130:11, 1130:19, 1141:7, 1146:19 generate [2] -1018:2, 1018:3 generated [6] -1013:7, 1087:9, 1087:17, 1144:3, 1145:9, 1158:15 generation [9] -1013:6, 1013:20, 1013:22, 1014:8, 1015:21, 1016:2, 1017:9, 1032:17, 1077:22 generator [1] -1046:16 generators [1] -1046:12 gentleman [1] -1052:12 gentlemen [2] ~ 998:8, 1185:10 geometry [2] -1079:3, 1080:17 Gill [6] - 1033:9, 1068:19, 1126:8, 1174:22, 1185:21, 1186:4 GILL [15] - 997:5, 1068:20, 1068:23, 1083:24, 1123:17, 1123:23, 1124:5, 1124:13, 1124:21, 1125:14, 1126:11, 1126:20, 1164:18, 1170:9, 1183:10 gist[1] - 1181:23 given [23] - 1004:11, 1004:13, 1026:10, 1041:11, 1045:19, 1047:19, 1054:18, 1056:24, 1074:11,

1111:7, 1154:1, 1162:12 Glen [1] - 1112:1 goal [1] - 1108:23 grab [1] - 1017:4 grade [2] - 1175:10, 1175:17 graded [1] - 1098:10 grading [1] - 1080:21 grant[2] - 1158:10, 1184:10 greater [1] - 1160:7 greatest [1] -1005:24 Gregg [1] - 1065:16 **GREGG** [1] - 997:3 group [4] - 1020:13, 1034:2, 1079:9 Grove [57] - 1010:19, 1019:1, 1019:4, 1025:13, 1027:2, 1028:15, 1029:17, 1029:24, 1030:2, 1030:8, 1030:15, 1030:16, 1030:20, 1040:15, 1042:16, 1044:4, 1060:12, 1061:5, 1061:15, 1062:23, 1067:5, 1067:10, 1068:5, 1070:18, 1071:2, 1071:23, 1073:13, 1073:17, 1076:24, 1078:6, 1078:9, 1079:3, 1079:10, 1084:12, 1085:3, 1088:11, 1089:8, 1108:21, 1115:17, 1115:22, 1129:6, 1130:21, 1136:15, 1141:5, 1142:2, 1143:14, 1144:11, 1156:11, 1156:21, 1157:3, 1159:15, 1166:10, 1174:2, 1178:12, 1179:6, 1179:22, 1183:2 Growth [14] -1026:15, 1065:4, 1066:7, 1070:21, 1070:23, 1071:19, 1071:21, 1142:9, 1142:11, 1169:7, 1169:12, 1169:17, 1169:23, 1181:4 guess [9] - 1012:4,

1020:16, 1023:3,

1078:5, 1079:1,

1079:2, 1079:4,

1081:17, 1107:20,

1035:6, 1039:11, 1050:9, 1059:7, 1115:14, 1124:9 guesstimate [1] -1087:23

# н

half [1] - 1011:11 halfway [1] - 1119:7 hammer [1] -1021:20 hand [4] - 1119:10, 1119:22, 1120:13, 1187:15 handed [1] - 1124:21 handing [1] -1062:16 handle [3] - 1177:11, 1177:17, 1177:22 handled [2] - 1183:8, 1184:5 handles [1] -1031:14 hang [2] - 1064:8, 1112:12 Hanney [7] -1048:18, 1049:18, 1050:6, 1054:4, 1057:16, 1095:19, 1108:14 happy [1] - 1036:10 hard [1] - 1022:5 Harkins [2] - 1115:3, 1117:16 HARKINS [6] -1115:4, 1115:24, 1116:11, 1116:18, 1117:4, 1117:14 HAWS [61] - 996:15, 1003:5, 1003:7, 1010:4, 1012:23, 1013:5, 1014:13, 1014:20, 1015:4, 1015:15, 1016:23, 1017:13, 1018:10, 1018:16, 1018:18, 1019:11, 1020:8, 1020:16, 1021:19, 1022:23, 1023:16, 1024:6, 1024:10, 1024:12, 1024:17, 1025:9, 1026:13, 1027:18, 1027:22, 1028:4, 1028:18, 1028:20, 1029:6, 1029:15, 1030:12, 1031:1, 1031:9, 1031:18, 1032:6, 1032:13, 1032:21,

1075:16, 1076:1,

1077:17, 1078:4,

1033:2, 1033:7, 1034:9, 1035:6, 1035:24, 1036:11, 1037:6, 1038:4, 1038:13, 1038:24, 1039:11, 1039:23, 1040:6, 1040:12, 1046:3, 1046:22, 1064:6, 1067:18, 1068:2, 1068:15 Haws [3] - 997:24, 1047:11, 1062:8 hazard [6] - 1141:10, 1143:19, 1168:10, 1168:12, 1168:15, 1170:23 head [1] - 1022:6 heads [2] - 1180:2, 1180:9 heads-up [2] -1180:2, 1180:9 hear [14] - 998:22, 1055:3, 1106:4, 1112:11, 1131:2, 1131:7, 1131:9, 1141:22, 1144:13, 1144:19, 1144:20, 1164:11, 1165:12, 1184:16 heard [2] - 1036:21. 1123:5 hearing [26] -997:15, 998:10, 998:24, 1005:8, 1023:15, 1033:9, 1036:22, 1054:11, 1054:20, 1054:24, 1055:22, 1056:10, 1083:20, 1121:22, 1121:23, 1127:15, 1130:23, 1131:6, 1136:6, 1140:15, 1164:15, 1173:5, 1180:5, 1184:21, 1184:22, 1185:11 Hearing [1] - 996:10 hearings [1] -1092:24 heavy [1] - 1022:20 held [1] - 996:10 help [5] - 1025:12, 1172:20, 1173:1, 1173:11, 1173:19 hereby [1] - 1187:8 herein [1] - 1125:10 hereunto [1] -1187:14 Hidden [1] - 1129:11 high [9] - 1009:11,

1050:4, 1050:7, 1050:8, 1050:11, 1050:15, 1100:4 High [1] - 996:10 high-volume [6] -1049:24, 1050:4, 1050:7, 1050:8, 1050:11, 1050:15 higher [7] - 1008:19, 1008:22, 1018:2, 1027:13, 1117:2, 1179:14 higher-speed [1] -1027:13 highway [1] -1110:10 highways [3] -1074:23, 1075:6, 1075:9 hill [1] - 1098:19 hired [1] - 1043:3 historic [27] -1021:9, 1037:7, 1038:15, 1038:19, 1039:3. 1039:7. 1039:15, 1039:20, 1040:16, 1041:2, 1041:3, 1041:12, 1041:14, 1041:16, 1041:20, 1041:24, 1042:2, 1042:3, 1044:19, 1045:11,

1113:5, 1113:14,

1114:3, 1114:8,

1113:16, 1113:18,

1114:11 Historic [3] -1044:20, 1047:21, 1114:1 historical [1] -1047:23 HOA [4] - 1092:8, 1111:21, 1111:**24**, 1112:1 Hoffman [1] -11111:24 hold [2] - 1173:2, 1173:12 holistic [1] - 1078:17 home [7] - 1015:5, 1015:6, 1015:22, 1017:1, 1017:2, 1017:16 homes [12] - 1014:4, 1014:6, 1015:19, 1015:20, 1049:6, 1067:20, 1068:6, 1073:2, 1080:1, 1110:5, 1127:21 HOP [2] - 1075:13,

1075:23 hopefully [1] -1081:13 hoping [1] - 1184:24 Horn [9] - 1070:15, 1096:12, 1096:16, 1126:2, 1126:3, 1126:4, 1133:8, 1133:15, 1149:19 hour [3] - 1017:20, 1099:24, 1100:5 hours [2] - 1014:15, 1173:17 house [1] - 1113:9 household [1] -1018:7 Hovnanian [1] -1095:5 hundred [1] - 1101:2

idea [5] - 1003:17, 1003:21, 1051:1, 1054:18, 1054:23 identified [6] -1045:22, 1052:13, 1058:18, 1097:17, 1098:1, 1157:18 identifying [1] -1051:7 illustrate [1] - 1141:6 illustrated [1] -1157:11 illustration [1] -1131:20 imagine [2] - 1055:2, 1088:3 immediate [1] -1158:18 immediately [7] -1001:10, 1005:17, 1006:17, 1034:19, 1042:21, 1044:5, 1044:19 impact [34] -1005:13, 1005:20, 1024:1, 1024:9, 1030:21, 1030:23, 1031:11, 1031:17, 1031:22, 1032:11, 1033:4, 1037:12, 1042:20, 1042:22, 1045:15, 1045:22, 1056:18, 1060:1, 1062:18, 1063:2, 1086:18, 1104:11, 1113:2, 1113:7, 1113:17, 1114:19,

1161:10, 1174:14 Impact [6] - 1092:17, 1133:21, 1134:5, 1138:15, 1158:22, 1171:19 impacted [2] -1089:6, 1114:15 impacting [2] -1041:13, 1041:20 impacts [8] - 1006:2, 1006:22, 1045:10, 1157:17, 1168:20, 1181:8, 1181:10, 1181:11 implementation [1] -1030:22 important [2] -1155:14, 1159:21 impose [7] -1076:21, 1110:7, 1147:24, 1149:13, 1156:14, 1158:8, 1158:9 imposed [2] -1158:13, 1163:4 impossible [2] -1119:10, 1160:17 impression [1] -1137:4 improve [1] -1175:11 improvement [3] -1108:16, 1175:15, 1175:16 improvements [32] -1023:2, 1023:13, 1037:10, 1039:14, 1039:20, 1055:14, 1055:18, 1132:4, 1132:8, 1132:9, 1132:10, 1141:11, 1146:2, 1146:9, 1146:14, 1146:18, 1147:5, 1147:9, 1147:13, 1147:17, 1147:20, 1156:10, 1162:14, 1163:18, 1174:11, 1174:12, 1174:17, 1174:19, 1175:6, 1175:11, 1175:13, 1183:1 Improvements [2] -1095:3, 1098:16 **IN** [2] - 996:7, 1187:14 in/right[2] - 1029:3, 1029:20 inappropriate [1] -

1146:7, 1154:5,

1159:2, 1159:4,

1116:20 incidents [2] -1171:23, 1171:24 inclined [1] - 1137:6 include [14] - 1006:6, 1043:15, 1046:10, 1082:5, 1084:19, 1086:17, 1089:10, 1096:20, 1105:11, 1105:14, 1132:15, 1141:12, 1162:18, 1182:14 included [18] -1032:4, 1032:24, 1053:11, 1057:20, 1086:22, 1090:2, 1102:4, 1104:10, 1104:11, 1105:2, 1105:4, 1109:12, 1131:19, 1136:14, 1161:14, 1161:15, 1161:16, 1162:3 includes [1] -1002:22 including [5] -1006:10, 1010:15, 1096:11, 1103:11, 1130:23 inclusion [2] -1063:4, 1078:8 inclusive [1] -1187:10 incorporated [1] -1006:14 incorporates [2] -1022:20, 1117:10 increase [11] -1004:21, 1007:13, 1008:15, 1015:23, 1045:19, 1045:20, 1086:14, 1120:8, 1137:24, 1158:16, 1180:18 increased [4] -1145:3, 1156:20, 1157:20, 1170:24 increasing [1] -1030:19 incur[1] - 1045:18 index [1] - 1124:17 indicate [2] -1097:12, 1171:20 indicated [10] -1034:10, 1036:19 1047:18, 1049:2, 1060:9, 1085:14, 1103:4, 1108:7, 1115:18, 1154:23 indicates [1] -

1054:9

1049:5, 1049:24,

1130:13, 1138:17,

indication [3] -1054:18, 1056:2, 1056:12 indirect [1] - 1143:13 individual [1] -1078:23 individuals [1] -1073:1 industry [3] -1012:11, 1013:19, 1017:14 inefficient [1] -1145:19 information [18] -1007:7, 1011:8, 1015:12, 1033:15, 1055:13, 1056:7, 1058:4, 1080:8, 1080:12, 1081:7, 1081:10, 1081:21, 1082:1, 1082:2, 1082:12, 1082:16, 1098:24, 1163:24 informed [1] -1129:14 ingress [2] -1004:12, 1028:23 ingress/egress [2] -1103:12, 1104:2 initial [7] - 1065:12, 1092:16, 1092:23, 1131:19, 1133:20, 1155:5, 1155:6 input[1] - 1074:17 inside [1] - 1041:9 installed [1] - 1046:9 instead [1] - 1059:1 Institute [1] -1013:21 insufficient [1] -1176:13 insure [1] - 1077:5 integrity [2] -1045:17 intended [3] -1028:17, 1116:9, 1116:15 intends [2] - 1051:1, 1185:8 intensity [1] -1073:22 intent [1] - 1049:21 interchangeably [1] - 1070:11 interconnect [1] -1061:15 interconnectivity [1] - 1178:23 interest [2] -

interested [3] -1004:11, 1007:17, 1088:2 interesting [1] -1011:11 interject (1) -1106:19 internal [12] -1025:23, 1070:16, 1071:11, 1073:11, 1116:7, 1141:23, 1143:9, 1152:5, 1152:20, 1152:24, 1154:12 intersect [3] -1061:4, 1129:10, 1180:16 intersecting [1] -1090:5 intersection [76] -1000:16, 1001:9, 1002:11, 1002:14, 1002:23, 1005:7, 1005:10, 1011:5, 1037:10, 1040:2, 1040:4, 1046:5, 1056:19, 1057:1, 1057:5, 1058:7, 1060:2, 1081:16, 1082:5, 1086:15, 1090:6. 1091:17. 1094:9, 1094:17, 1094:19, 1094:21, 1096:1, 1097:5, 1097:20, 1098:17, 1099:16, 1100:18, 1100:21, 1100:23, 1101:5, 1101:14, 1104:5, 1107:23, 1108:6, 1108:7, 1109:22, 1110:1, 1117:11, 1118:13, 1120:18, 1121:2, 1122:1, 1130:16, 1130:18, 1132:16, 1132:22, 1144:12, 1146:7, 1146:12, 1146:14, 1146:22, 1147:9, 1153:10, 1154:17, 1154:24, 1155:7, 1166:13, 1166:14, 1166:15, 1166:18, 1166:20, 1166:21, 1167:2, 1172:3, 1172:22, 1174:18, 1174:24, 1175:12, 1175:14,

1181:16

intersections [8] -

1001:6, 1059:21,

intervals [1] - 1022:1 introduce [3] -997:21, 1091:16, 1153:19 introducing [3] -1091:16, 1143:23, 1157:5 invest [1] - 1045:19 investigate [1] -1095:23 investigating [1] -1109:21 involved [1] -1091:23 involvement [1] -1080:24 involves [1] -1174:17 issuance [1] -1133:19 issue [5] - 1004:15, 1025:22, 1054:14, 1133:8, 1155:23 issued [4] - 1109:16, 1133:15, 1150:21, 1176:5 issues [5] - 1151:13, 1155:19, 1158:21, 1167:13, 1167:14 ITE [2] - 1014:8, 1015:8 item [4] - 1102:16, 1103:6, 1108:11, 1175:23 items [12] - 1035:13, 1036:8, 1036:14, 1036:16, 1036:17, 1036:18, 1036:23, 1055:9, 1104:8, 1151:6, 1151:7, 1181:24 iteration [1] -1104:10 iterations [1] -1136:7 itself [5] - 1005:15,

1087:11, 1094:3,

1095:9, 1107:22,

1130:20, 1166:7

J

1064:2, 1066:13,

1074:4, 1121:22

Jacqueline [2] -1011:12, 1158:19 Jaeger [1] - 1122:11 January [6] - 1003:3, 1012:4, 1095:18, 1134:5, 1134:6,

1171:18 Jeffrey [1] - 1122:15 Jennifer [1] -1122:15 Jim [1] - 1122:22 John [1] - 999:5 join [1] - 1076:1 joint [1] - 1167:8 Jones [1] - 1117:18 **JONES** [1] - 1117:19 July [4] - 996:11, 1047:3, 1123:11, 1187:12 jump [1] - 1152:10 June [2] - 998:11, 998:18 jurisdiction [6] -1035:14, 1035:15, 1110:16, 1110:18, 1167:8 jurisdictional [2] -1169:1, 1169:2

K KATHRYN [1] -997:7 keep [3] - 1078:20, 1107:3. 1117:12 keeps [1] - 1068:13 Kimley [9] - 1070:15, 1096:12, 1096:16, 1126:2, 1126:3, 1126:4, 1133:8, 1133:14, 1149:19 kind [6] - 1004:10, 1033:20, 1100:3, 1106:20, 1116:20, 1179:18 Kirk [1] - 1118:8 Kline [23] - 998:16, 998:17, 998:21, 999:15, 999:18, 999:24, 1011:24, 1012:23, 1047:1, 1047:2, 1064:4, 1066:23, 1068:24, 1079:15, 1081:8, 1086:10, 1090:19, 1112:10, 1112:20, 1123:10, 1131:3, 1162:14, 1185:19 **KLINE** [1] - 999:12 Kline's [7] - 1131:5, 1131:7, 1141:22, 1144:13, 1157:15, 1160:16, 1164:11 knowing [1] -1114:10 knowledge [5] -

1023:21, 1031:15, 1071:9, 1138:12, 1162:10 known [1] - 1158:19 knows [2] - 1050:21, 1064:4 Kramer [1] - 1122:15 KRAMER [1] -1122:16

L

L.P [1] - 996:8 labrum [2] - 1086:5, 1090:11 Labrum [1] - 1185:23 **LABRUM** [5] - 997:7, 1086:7, 1086:9, 1090:9, 1090:12 lack [1] - 1077:17 ladies [1] - 998:8 Lake [4] - 1119:9, 1119:12, 1119:23, 1120:2 land [10] - 1006:5, 1006:15, 1013:23, 1016:14, 1038:17, 1038:22, 1183:8, 1183:14, 1184:5, 1184:6 Land [2] - 1177:2, 1183:5 landscaping [1] -1036:5 lane [14] - 1002:15, 1002:17, 1129:9, 1132:12, 1132:13, 1145:3, 1172:18, 1172:19, 1172:20, 1173:1, 1173:11, 1173:19, 1174:21 lanes [16] - 1002:16, 1141:12, 1144:5, 1144:8, 1144:9, 1144:14, 1144:23, 1145:8, 1145:9, 1157:12, 1157:14, 1157:18, 1157:20, 1168:22, 1169:3, 1172:16 language [1] -1034:15 large [2] - 1042:22, 1098:9 larger [2] - 1018:6, 1176:23 last [12] - 998:11, 1004:24, 1022:6, 1037:18, 1055:8,

1108:17, 1121:4

1095:7, 1101:15,

1103:8, 1109:15, 1124:3, 1125:16, 1183:18 lead [1] - 1137:9 least [5] - 1107:2, 1119:20, 1121:24, 1151:22, 1164:12 leave [1] - 1184:15 led [1] - 1133:18 left [13] - 998:2, 1000:14, 1001:7, 1067:3, 1067:13, 1089:5, 1102:15, 1119:10, 1119:22, 1120:13, 1122:14, 1153:19, 1153:20 left-hand [3] -1119:10, 1119:22, 1120:13 leg [2] - 1095:24, 1109:22 legal [3] - 1169:14, 1170:10, 1183:11 length [7] - 1012:14, 1099:18, 1099:23, 1100:7, 1145:2, 1157:19, 1157:20 Leraris [1] - 1117:23 LERARIS [1] -1117:24 less [4] - 1068:11, 1085:20, 1116:24, 1179:11 lessen [1] - 1159:4 lessening [1] -1085:13 letter [26] - 1018:15, 1026:14, 1026:23, 1028:2, 1028:14, 1048:17, 1063:24, 1070:15, 1095:18, 1108:10, 1108:12, 1108:15, 1125:5, 1135:13, 1135:16, 1135:20, 1148:15, 1150:5, 1160:24, 1163:17, 1175:10, 1175:17, 1176:2, 1176:4, 1182:23, 1186:14 letters [10] - 1053:17, 1133:8, 1133:13, 1133:19, 1150:14, 1150:16, 1150:20, 1151:2, 1175:22, 1176:4 level [13] - 1101:10, 1117:12, 1146:15, 1146:17, 1146:21, 1147:2, 1147:3,

1160:8, 1175:5, 1175:7, 1175:10, 1175:11, 1175:18 levels [2] - 1174:23, 1175:1 licensed [1] - 1110:6 light [8] - 1002:20, 1027:7, 1046:12, 1118:12, 1118:19, 1119:7, 1119:16, 1119:18 lights [2] - 1120:11, 1122:3 likely [3] - 1088:20, 1172:1, 1172:12 limited [2] - 1106:22, 1107:9 Linda [1] - 1123:2 line [6] - 1000:20, 1036:9, 1051:16, 1081:14, 1098:17 lines [1] - 1004:11 links [1] - 1179:10 list [2] - 1051:9, 1111:20 listed [5] - 1058:19, 1058:20, 1058:23, 1102:6, 1135:8 listen [1] - 1000:6 LISTSERV [1] -1185:7 literal [1] - 1169:18 live [3] - 1011:4, 1011:11, 1072:21 lives [3] - 1000:19, 1078:23, 1081:15 LLC [1] - 997:9 loads [1] - 1020:20 local [24] - 1026:8, 1027:8, 1027:10, 1031:4, 1031:11, 1050:7, 1050:8, 1050:10, 1050:13, 1069:9, 1070:20, 1084:10, 1084:16, 1084:18, 1087:8, 1116:12, 1117:5, 1129:7, 1129:10, 1143:6, 1143:8, 1158:17, 1178:7, 1178:8 locate [1] - 1098:2 located [20] -1004:17, 1018:21, 1018:24, 1019:4, 1026:23, 1060:13, 1077:20, 1089:15, 1089:22, 1090:7,

1092:1, 1097:6,

1119:4, 1119:7,

1130:17, 1130:19, 1137:21, 1144:9, 1160:8 locating [1] -1098:21 location [16] -1028:12, 1034:18, 1094:15, 1097:14, 1097:21, 1098:22, 1143:24, 1144:10, 1153:6, 1154:1, 1171:4, 1171:5, 1171:14, 1172:8, 1174:5, 1174:6 locations [9] -1077:24, 1097:10, 1109:10, 1109:14, 1141:15, 1144:3, 1144:4, 1144:24, 1168:23 lodge [1] - 1107:1 logical [1] - 1087:19 long-term [1] -1021:8 look [27] - 1008:12, 1008:23, 1009:10, 1009:15, 1010:12, 1014:14, 1014:20, 1014:22, 1020:1, 1031:10, 1039:8, 1043:4, 1045:8, 1053:7, 1077:2, 1078:17, 1091:19, 1120:18, 1121:1, 1127:4, 1139:1, 1139:11, 1146:24, 1148:12, 1158:2, 1182:4, 1182:8 looked [8] - 1011:15, 1045:14, 1085:17, 1086:21, 1088:1, 1088:15, 1133:20, 1134:8 looking [10] -1008:6, 1020:19, 1021:8, 1022:3, 1061:23, 1062:1, 1065:10, 1073:7, 1122:1, 1130:14 lost [1] - 1005:4 lower [2] - 1068:14, 1117:4 Ls [1] - 1069:5 Lutz [1] - 1057:18

# M

ma'am [2] - 1118:1, 1122:7 maintained [1] -

1167:10 maintenance [1] -1046:19 majority [2] - 1138:9, 1171:22 make-up [1] - 1015:2 Makemie [1] - 1061:2 Mammucari [1] -1117:16 managed [1] -1145:11 Management [14] -1026:15, 1065:4, 1066:7, 1070:21, 1070:23, 1071:20, 1071:22, 1142:9, 1142:11, 1169:7, 1169:13, 1169:17, 1169:23, 1181:4 Manager [4] -996:18, 998:3, 1102:11, 1160:1 manager [2] -1126:7, 1133:2 maneuver[1] -1067:8 manner [1] - 1084:13 map [1] - 1003:23 March [2] - 1125:6, 1134:10 MARK [1] - 997:8 marked [16] -1062:17, 1072:8, 1083:21, 1085:1, 1124:15, 1124:22, 1127:4, 1128:9, 1133:10, 1134:7, 1134:23, 1135:5, 1135:10, 1136:11, 1139:2, 1150:18 Martin [1] - 1111:22 master [2] - 1043:6, 1102:20 match [1] - 1015:16 matches [1] -1115:19 material [1] -1164:14 materials [7] -1129:17, 1133:18, 1135:24, 1136:4, 1137:22, 1140:12, 1171:7 math [1] - 1012:7 Matt [1] - 1123:2 matter [7] - 1002:1, 1133:15, 1135:22, 1138:16, 1147:23,

1163:21, 1187:12

mature [1] - 1048:1

maximum [2] -1003:14, 1012:6 McDermott [1] -1122:22 McFadden [1] -1122:23 McFalls [1] - 1112:6 MCFALLS [1] -1112:7 McKenna [5] - 998:4, 998:6, 1106:19, 1123:17, 1124:13 MCKENNA [102] -997:2, 998:7, 999:6, 999:9, 999:15, 1046:23, 1047:10, 1047:18, 1048:4, 1048:10, 1048:14, 1048:21, 1049:15, 1050:2, 1050:13, 1050:20, 1050:24, 1051:4, 1051:12, 1052:3, 1052:9, 1052:18, 1053:13, 1053:18, 1053:20, 1054:3, 1054:17, 1054:22, 1055:6, 1055:12, 1055:20, 1056:1, 1056:8, 1056:14, 1057:8, 1057:10, 1057:15, 1058:10, 1061:19, 1061:22, 1062:1, 1063:8, 1063:14, 1063:20, 1064:3, 1064:8, 1065:15, 1065:19, 1065:23, 1066:14, 1066:19, 1066:23, 1067:14, 1068:16, 1084:2, 1086:3, 1090:10, 1090:13, 1092:4, 1092:7, 1092:11, 1106:10, 1106:16, 1107:5, 1111:11, 1111:15, 1111:18, 1112:8, 1112:12, 1112:18, 1114:23, 1117:15, 1117:20, 1118:1, 1118:4, 1118:7, 1121:19, 1121:21, 1122:8, 1122:11, 1122:17, 1122:21, 1123:2, 1123:9, 1123:13, 1123:21, 1124:10, 1124:18, 1126:14, 1164:20, 1165:14, 1165:17, 1170:14, 1173:2, 1180:1,

1180:8, 1180:13, 1183:16, 1184:2, 1184:14, 1184:18, 1185:4 McMahon [3] -1133:22, 1134:4, 1134:10 mean [12] - 1002:22, 1034:9, 1034:12, 1035:7, 1036:2, 1036:9, 1038:8, 1049:9. 1095:22. 1099:11, 1154:7, 1157:24 meaning [4] -1002:8, 1018:2, 1049:16, 1097:15 means [5] - 1009:1, 1141:24, 1143:5, 1157:9, 1178:6 meant[1] - 1033:23 measure [1] -1020:21 measurements [1] -1095:16 measures [3] -1030:18, 1101:19, 1159:6 mechanisms [1] -1007:21 median [8] -1009:12, 1009:14, 1020:10, 1020:13, 1020:17, 1020:22, 1021:2, 1022:1 meet [1] - 1038:21 meeting [30] -1047:8, 1048:12, 1049:17, 1049:22, 1050:16, 1052:7, 1053:4, 1053:10, 1057:2, 1059:8, 1059:9, 1059:10, 1059:16, 1085:15, 1097:1, 1101:16, 1102:4, 1102:7, 1102:12, 1102:15, 1102:16, 1106:1, 1125:4, 1134:22, 1136:24, 1137:8, 1138:20, 1138:22, 1139:10 meetings [7] -1055:17, 1055:21, 1134:15, 1134:19, 1135:2, 1135:20, 1136:3 Megan [1] - 1122:17 member [1] - 1000:4

1082:19, 1124:13 memo [3] - 1048:23, 1052:13, 1055:9 memoranda [1] -1133:14 mentioned [12] -1026:1, 1044:2, 1044:16, 1098:15, 1103:9, 1116:19, 1141:17, 1143:17, 1145:17, 1145:22, 1151:8, 1154:19 Merit[1] - 1187:8 merit[1] - 1078:12 met [2] - 1043:2, 1155:1 methodology [1] -1012:11 Michael [1] - 1054:9 WICHAEL [2] -996:14, 997:5 microphone [3] -999:17, 1112:13, 1173:4 midblock [1] -1171:22 middle [1] - 1020:13 might[4] - 1074:20, 1084:7, 1152:7, 1169:24 mike [2] - 1092:10, 1165:15 Wike [9] - 998:1, 1052:12, 1052:13, 1052:17, 1052:18, 1054:8, 1058:18, 1058:24 mile [2] - 1011:11, 1119:5 mind [5] - 999:3, 1013:2, 1051:7, 1141:21, 1184:14 minimal [1] -1073:22 minimum [3] -1069:17, 1078:7, 1164:3 minor[1] - 1143:6 minute [5] - 1030:16, 1111:12, 1124:19, 1180:2, 1183:19 minutes [20] -1011:10, 1047:7, 1052:4, 1052:7, 1085:15, 1101:7, 1102:4, 1102:7, 1102:17, 1104:1, 1106:12, 1109:20,

1125:2, 1134:22,

1135:5, 1135:19,

1139:9, 1139:12, 1180:7, 1186:13 miscommunication [1] - 1182:12 missed [4] -1155.23 1181:22 1182:2, 1182:17 mitigate [4] -1042:24, 1172:21, 1173:19, 1174:14 mitigation [5] -1025:2, 1146:8, 1146:12, 1146:13, 1174:20 mix [1] - 1016:9 mobility [1] -1156:23 modal [2] - 1006:23, 1007:3 modifications [2] -1010:13, 1032:3 modified [3] -1085:17, 1145:14, 1162:13 moment [15] -1027:22, 1127:6, 1131:24, 1133:5, 1138:13, 1142:4, 1145:21, 1146:24, 1151:13, 1151:19, 1154:19, 1156:6, 1162:1, 1162:16, 1171:16 money [1] - 1181:20 monitoring [3] -1007:22, 1154:24, 1155:10 month [1] - 1103:8 morning [7] -1014:14, 1099:18, 1099:24, 1100:13, 1100:14, 1119:11, 1119:20 Moscharis [1] -1117:20 most [5] - 1000:23, 1000:24, 1088:8, 1132:24, 1166:6 motorists [1] -1064:12 move [2] - 1037:5, 1107:23 moved [5] - 1039:3, 1039:15, 1039:21, 1108:4, 1108:8 movement [8] -1000:10, 1001:15, 1002:13, 1030:4, 1065:2, 1066:5,

movements [6] -1088:1, 1088:14, 1088:16, 1099:15, 1101:14, 1104:4 moving [6] -1022:23, 1024:6, 1037:20, 1060:7, 1153:9, 1156:8 MR [317] - 998:7, 999:5, 999:6, 999:8, 999:9, 999:11, 999:15, 1003:5, 1003:6, 1003:7, 1010:4, 1012:23, 1013:5, 1014:13, 1014:20, 1015:4, 1015:15, 1016:23, 1017:13, 1018:10, 1018:16, 1018:18, 1019:11, 1020:8, 1020:16, 1021:19, 1022:23, 1023:16, 1024:6, 1024:10, 1024:12, 1024:17, 1025:9, 1026:13, 1027:18, 1027:22, 1028:4, 1028:18, 1028:20, 1029:6, 1029:15, 1030:12, 1031:1, 1031:9, 1031:18, 1032:6, 1032:13, 1032:21, 1033:2, 1033:7, 1034:9, 1035:6, 1035:24, 1036:11, 1037:6, 1038:4, 1038:13, 1038:24, 1039:11, 1039:23, 1040:6, 1040:12, 1044:6, 1046:3, 1046:22, 1046:23, 1047:10, 1047:18, 1048:4, 1048:10, 1048:14, 1048:21, 1049:15, 1050:2, 1050:13, 1050:18, 1050:20, 1050:24, 1051:4, 1051:12, 1052:3, 1052:9, 1052:18, 1053:13, 1053:18, 1053:20, 1054:3, 1054:17, 1054:22, 1055:6, 1055:12, 1055:20, 1056:1, 1056:8, 1056:14, 1057:8, 1057:10, 1057:15, 1058:10, 1058:12, 1058:15, 1059:2, 1059:5, 1059:17, 1059:24, 1060:7,

1060:21, 1060:24, 1061:12, 1061:17, 1061:19, 1061:21, 1061:22, 1061:24, 1062:1, 1062:4, 1062:6, 1063:6, 1063:8, 1063:13, 1063:14, 1063:17, 1063:20, 1064:1, 1064:3, 1064:6, 1064:8, 1065:11, 1065:15, 1065:17, 1065:19, 1065:21, 1065:23, 1066:10, 1066:14, 1066:17, 1066:19, 1066:23, 1067:14, 1067:18, 1068:2, 1068:15, 1068:16, 1068:20, 1068:23, 1083:24, 1084:2, 1084:6, 1086:1, 1086:3, 1090:10, 1090:13, 1090:18, 1092:3, 1092:4, 1092:6, 1092:7, 1092:9, 1092:11, 1092:14, 1092:21, 1093:3, 1093:6, 1093:10, 1093:12, 1093:15, 1093:22, 1094:2, 1094:6, 1094:11, 1094:14, 1095:1, 1095:17, 1096:10, 1096:14, 1096:19, 1096:23, 1097:3, 1097:11, 1097:18, 1098:3, 1098:8, 1098:14, 1099:2, 1099:10, 1099:14, 1099:19, 1099:22, 1100:3, 1100:8, 1100:13, 1100:16, 1100:24, 1101:6, 1101:15, 1102:1, 1102:8, 1102:13, 1102:23, 1103:7, 1103:17, 1103:24, 1104:19, 1104:23, 1105:4, 1105:12, 1105:16, 1105:21, 1105:23, 1106:9. 1106:10, 1106:14, 1106:16, 1106:18, 1107:5, 1107:17, 1108:3, 1108:9, 1109:6, 1109:15, 1110:20, 1111:2, 1111:9, 1111:11, 1111:15, 1111:17, 1111:18, 1112:7,

members [2] -

1088:4, 1089:6

1112:8, 1112:10, 1112:12, 1112:16, 1112:18, 1112:20, 1113:8, 1113:12, 1113:20, 1113:23, 1114:2, 1114:9, 1114:21, 1114:23, 1117:15, 1117:19, 1117:20, 1118:1. 1118:4, 1118:7, 1118:11, 1119:4, 1120:20, 1121:3, 1121:16, 1121:19, 1121:20, 1121:21, 1122:6, 1122:8, 1122:10, 1122:11, 1122:17, 1122:19, 1122:21, 1123:2, 1123:8, 1123:9, 1123:13, 1123:15, 1123:17, 1123:21, 1123:23, 1124:2, 1124:5, 1124:10, 1124:13, 1124:18, 1124:21, 1125:14, 1126:8, 1126:11, 1126:12, 1126:14, 1126:19, 1126:20, 1164:18, 1164:20, 1164:23, 1165:14, 1165:17, 1165:23, 1170:9, 1170:11, 1170:14, 1170:17, 1173:2, 1173:7, 1173:12, 1173:16, 1180:1, 1180:6, 1180:8, 1180:11, 1180:13, 1180:14, 1183:10, 1183:12, 1183:16, 1183:20, 1183:24, 1184:2. 1184:3, 1184:13, 1184:14, 1184:16, 1184:18, 1185:4, 1185:21 MS [73] - 1000:8, 1000:19, 1001:3, 1001:8, 1001:13, 1001:21, 1002:4, 1002:10, 1002:18, 1002:24, 1003:12, 1003:16, 1004:1,

1010:21, 1011:3, 1011:10, 1011:22, 1020:15, 1040:14, 1040:23, 1041:8, 1041:19, 1041:23, 1042:7, 1042:18, 1043:10, 1043:22, 1044:1, 1044:7, 1044:15, 1044:23, 1045:4, 1045:14, 1046:1, 1063:10, 1063:21, 1064:23, 1066:21, 1067:15, 1086:7, 1086:9, 1090:9, 1090:12, 1115:4, 1115:24, 1116:11, 1116:18, 1117:4, 1117:14, 1117:24, 1118:3, 1118:6, 1122:2, 1122:16, 1123:1 multi [2] - 1006:23, 1007:3 multi-modal [2] -1006:23, 1007:3 multiple [4] - 1069:9, 1101:4, 1101:9, 1174:17 multitude [1] -1017:22 municipal [1] -1114:19 municipality [3] -1167:10, 1182:5, 1182:7 Wurnane [1] - 1118:7 Museum [1] -1047:21 must [7] - 1001:17, 1006:1, 1006:6, 1018:21, 1026:5, 1026:23, 1095:23

# N

name [5] - 999:4, 1001:8, 1125:16, 1126:1 named [1] - 1052:12 National [1] - 1114:1 nature [4] - 1067:24, 1077:21, 1127:17, 1132:8 near [2] - 1121:10, 1174:17 nearby [1] - 1077:13 nearest [1] - 1095:9 nearly [1] - 1110:5 necessarily [4] -1020:21, 1035:22,

1130:6, 1148:3 need [18] - 1023:4, 1023:18, 1032:7, 1037:15, 1037:19, 1037:20, 1045:19, 1058:6, 1076:5, 1076:18, 1077:2, 1078:12, 1079:22, 1127:6, 1154:23, 1163:12, 1168:22, 1181:20 needed [11] - 1023:7, 1035:21, 1036:8, 1037:4, 1039:14, 1045:4, 1045:9, 1067:4, 1068:9, 1077:11, 1082:2 needs [4] - 1009:21, 1039:3, 1076:6, 1081:11 negative [1] - 1159:2 negligible [2] -1032:19, 1072:15 neighbor[1] -1005:4 neighborhood [14] -1011:13, 1027:15, 1027:16, 1028:23, 1042:21, 1043:7, 1102:19, 1110:11, 1110:12, 1116:22, 1179:2, 1179:3, 1179:5, 1180:21 neighborhoods [5] -1143:7, 1178:9, 1178:24, 1179:1, 1181:12 neighboring [1] -1044:14 Neighbors [2] -997:9, 1090:15 neighbors [1] -1043:5 network [10] -1074:14, 1074:16, 1108:16, 1128:21, 1129:1, 1129:14, 1132:1, 1145:12, 1145:14, 1179:4 never [3] - 1061:12, 1071:17, 1094:19 nevertheless [3] -1069:21, 1138:12, 1164:11 New [48] - 1000:20, 1002:5, 1002:8,

1038:21, 1160:20

necessary [4] -

1067:7, 1081:10,

1002:19, 1003:10, 1003:17, 1004:13, 1004:17, 1004:20, 1004:24, 1005:18, 1006:10, 1006:19, 1007:16, 1011:4, 1012:8, 1024:22, 1030:8, 1042:16, 1044:18, 1045:16, 1047:12, 1047:20, 1047:24, 1048:7, 1056:19, 1073:13, 1076:23, 1088:11, 1088:12, 1090:21, 1091:12, 1095:11, 1112:23, 1113:1, 1113:6, 1118:13, 1118:19, 1119:3, 1119:5, 1119:8, 1119:17, 1129:5, 1144:12, 1166:19, 1178:19 new [16] - 1009:20, 1014:5, 1014:6, 1015:19, 1038:14, 1038:22, 1042:10, 1043:12, 1046:8, 1088:18, 1088:22, 1091:16, 1091:17, 1127:21, 1130:18, 1153:17 next [6] - 1038:5, 1057:15, 1081:14, 1124:9, 1151:15, 1180:5 Nicole [6] - 998:16, 1058:13, 1060:9, 1062:7, 1092:14, 1185:19 NICOLE [1] - 999:12 night[1] - 998:17 non [2] - 1026:8, 1173:17 non-local [1] -1026:8 non-peak [1] -1173:17 nonability [1] -1168:20 none [1] - 1006:16 normal [1] - 1164:1 north [12] - 1000:20, 1001:7, 1011:11, 1044:5, 1078:21, 1084:21, 1089:2, 1089:5, 1130:17, 1137:19, 1178:12, 1178:19

northbound [12] -

1000:10, 1000:15,

1000:21, 1001:15, 1001:17, 1042:11, 1042:14, 1042:17, 1065:2, 1066:5, 1067:3, 1067:13 northern [1] - 1160:4 Notary [1] - 1187:8 note [1] - 1095:7 noted [6] - 1055:10, 1058:17, 1059:10, 1086:11, 1107:11, 1157:10 notes [1] - 1187:11 nothing [5] -1055:23, 1063:7, 1123:8, 1136:1, 1185:11 notice [1] - 1180:3 notwithstanding [3] - 1051:20, 1080:4, 1175:9 November [1] -1061:9 nowhere [3] -1076:10, 1077:6, 1079:13 number [21] -1001:6, 1012:14, 1013:17, 1013:24, 1014:9, 1014:16, 1016:5, 1017:15, 1055:9, 1061:1, 1072:5, 1086:16, 1087:20, 1091:14, 1091:19, 1105:13, 1107:22, 1115:5, 1129:23, 1179:10 numbers [24] -1003:2, 1006:21, 1007:19, 1007:23, 1008:7, 1008:16, 1013:13, 1013:15, 1014:7, 1014:11, 1015:16, 1016:17, 1016:18, 1017:6, 1017:17, 1020:13, 1020:14, 1021:16, 1022:4, 1025:16, 1042:22, 1087:2 numerous [1] -1005:5

#### 0

o'clock [3] - 996:11, 1184:19, 1184:22 oath [2] - 999:17, 1125:11 object [5] - 1063:13, 1064:1, 1065:11,

1004:3, 1004:10,

1004:22, 1005:4,

1005:11, 1005:23,

1006:8, 1006:12,

1006:18, 1007:11,

1007:17, 1008:6,

1008:16, 1009:2,

1009:6, 1009:19,

1010:2, 1010:5,

1002:10, 1002:15,

1065:13, 1066:10 objecting [2] -1065:16, 1066:17 objection [9] -1050:18, 1063:15, 1066:16, 1107:2, 1107:10, 1126:14, 1170:9, 1183:10, 1184:1 observed [2] -1128:14, 1128:16 obstacles [1] -1097:12 obtaining [1] -1163:11 obvious [1] - 1088:8 occasionally [3] -1155:2, 1155:19, 1155:22 occupancy [1] -1073:23 occur [4] - 1045:13, 1054:19, 1056:13, 1172:22 occurred [6] -1004:23, 1039:22, 1119:14, 1135:3, 1171:24, 1174:5 occurring [1] -1055:21 October [3] -1092:18, 1095:6, 1133:22 OF [5] - 996:1, 996:2, 1186:17, 1187:5 offer [2] - 1126:9, 1168:16 offered [1] - 999:20 offhand [1] - 1177:7 office [2] - 1083:10, 1105:9 offset [2] - 1089:18, 1153:1 offsetting [1] -1153:18 once [3] - 1020:15, 1026:13, 1040:3 one [48] - 1001:8, 1008:20, 1018:2, 1018:4, 1028:20, 1030:7, 1030:12, 1031:13, 1034:14, 1034:15, 1037:6, 1039:24, 1046:3, 1056:15, 1058:19, 1064:6, 1067:19, 1078:2, 1082:19, 1083:21, 1086:7, 1089:22, 1096:19, 1100:18, 1107:21,

1107:23, 1111:23, 1112:12, 1118:18, 1131:16, 1134:19, 1135:2, 1135:3, 1136:11, 1136:15, 1140:10, 1144:10, 1150:2, 1155:18, 1156:6, 1158:5, 1162:16, 1168:4, 1170:22, 1171:16, 1176:3, 1181:23, 1183:17 ones (8) - 1034:10, 1035:9, 1035:10, 1035:24, 1134:23, 1150:16, 1151:8, 1174:14 ongoing [4] -1036:17, 1036:24, 1102:21, 1110:9 open [5] - 1034:11, 1034:13, 1035:7, 1035:11, 1037:1 opening [1] -1172:22 operations [1] -1164:5 opined [1] - 1176:12 opinion [32] -1027:19, 1027:21, 1027:23, 1033:6, 1050:9, 1055:2, 1073:4, 1074:6, 1074:11, 1110:15, 1116:19, 1138:1, 1141:18, 1143:10, 1143:19, 1144:21, 1145:24, 1146:4, 1147:15, 1147:22, 1149:7, 1153:3, 1153:15, 1154:19, 1155:14, 1156:11, 1156:17, 1158:7, 1159:5, 1159:21, 1168:18, 1171:21 opinions [1] - 1037:3 opportunity [5] -999:20, 1139:5, 1162:12, 1162:24, 1184:8 oppose [2] -1075:16, 1076:4 opposed [1] -1068:12 opposite [22] -1018:22, 1019:1, 1019:4, 1019:8, 1026:6, 1026:24,

1028:13, 1035:2,

1045:13, 1051:16,

1060:11, 1060:13, 1088:24, 1089:15, 1089:22, 1096:1, 1097:6, 1098:2, 1136:17, 1180:17 option [9] - 1001:18, 1001:20, 1002:1, 1002:2, 1042:15, 1065:1, 1066:4, 1089:3 options [1] - 1030:11 order [12] - 998:19, 1023:7, 1067:2, 1067:7, 1080:9, 1081:7, 1081:22, 1082:12, 1148:3, 1160:7, 1163:20, 1174:13 Ordinance [11] -1140:2, 1140:6, 1140:9, 1140:17, 1142:15, 1143:3, 1149:3, 1168:3, 1168:13, 1177:2, 1183:6 ordinance [11] -1023:8, 1040:22, 1069:20, 1141:1, 1148:4, 1148:5, 1151:9, 1151:10, 1151:12, 1169:20, 1170:3 ordinances [3] -1026:18, 1041:3, 1041:6 ordinarily [1] -1184:5 Orth [2] - 1095:5, 1098:15 Orth-Rodgers [2] -1095:5, 1098:15 Orvis [2] - 1034:21, 1034:24 otherwise [1] -1115:14 ou [1] - 1076:8 outcome [1] -1102:14 outside [4] -1041:10, 1085:8, 1087:17, 1110:18 outstanding [3] -1124:3, 1151:5, 1151:7 overall [2] - 1175:14, 1182:15 overcome [1] -1098:1 overlap [2] -

1051:18, 1052:1,

1151:11, 1163:8 overrule [3] -1107:10, 1170:15, 1183:17 overruled [2] -1066:20, 1184:1 own [9] - 1019:8, 1031:14, 1035:3, 1055:2, 1076:11, 1142:20, 1160:19, 1167:16, 1167:18 owned [2] - 1167:9. 1182:4 ownership [1] -1005:16 owns [1] - 1167:15

# P

p.m [3] - 996:12, 1016:18, 1185:14 PÅ[7] - 996:8, 1018:20, 1129:4, 1130:18, 1130:19, 1132:11, 1132:23 page [16] - 1013:2, 1047:13, 1048:15, 1051:8, 1054:8, 1055:8, 1055:10, 1056:16, 1060:8, 1095:7, 1098:16, 1115:7, 1115:24, 1139:12, 1140:9, 1171:18 PAGE [1] - 1186:17 pages [1] - 1187:9 painful [1] - 1081:13 paragraph [7] -1048:15, 1051:5, 1052:11, 1052:20, 1054:4, 1056:17, 1057:16 parailel [1] - 1095:22 parcel [1] - 1108:18 pardon [1] - 1004:2 part [46] - 1005:22, 1006:21, 1010:16, 1010:24, 1011:16, 1011:20, 1015:10, 1026:1, 1029:8, 1031:4, 1031:7, 1032:10, 1039:7, 1039:9, 1039:18, 1041:17, 1042:5, 1043:20, 1057:24, 1058:2, 1058:4, 1065:5, 1065:12, 1066:8, 1075:12, 1075:23, 1080:21, 1080:23, 1080:24,

1086:19, 1087:3, 1087:10, 1089:9, 1089:24, 1105:20, 1108:13, 1108:19, 1109:4, 1120:18, 1121:2, 1133:6, 1146:2, 1152:14, 1164:15, 1181:3 participated [1] -1134:15 particular [11] -1002:17, 1005:7, 1007:12, 1008:19. 1040:18, 1041:12, 1063:23, 1065:9, 1088:16, 1090:19, 1131:14 particularly [3] -1082:4, 1137:20, 1157:4 particulars [1] -1132:2 parties [4] - 999:20, 1010:14, 1111:20, 1126:15 partner [1] - 1150:6 parts [2] - 1060:16, 1131:5 party [1] - 1121:4 pass [1] - 1124:14 passenger [1] -1012:13 past [4] - 997:21, 1008:1, 1008:13, 1137:20 Pat [2] - 1062:4, 1184:13 Patricia [1] - 1122:23 PATRICK [1] - 997:2 Patrick [1] - 998:4 patterns [2] -1025:13, 1087:14 Paul [2] - 1057:17, 1057:18 paved [1] - 1179:24 Pavelchek [1] -1122:9 PAVELCHEK [1] -1122:10 paving [1] - 1183:4 pay [1] - 1155:11 payments [1] -1046:11 PC [4] - 1052:4, 1052:7, 1058:16, 1140:18 PC-10 [3] - 1124:16, 1124:22, 1186:11 PC-11 [4] - 1124:24,

1127:5, 1128:10,

1186:12 PC-12 [5] - 1125:2, 1139:2, 1140:9, 1148:23, 1186:13 PC-13[7] - 1124:16, 1125:5, 1135:10, 1160:24, 1163:1, 1163:5, 1186:14 **PC-3** [2] - 1135:6, peak [11] - 1014:14, 1017:20, 1099:24, 1100:5, 1138:1, 1141:18, 1164:6, 1168:21, 1172:23, 1173:9, 1173:17 peaks [1] - 1020:20 pedestrian [30] -1006:20, 1007:8, 1043:11, 1043:15, 1044:8, 1044:12, 1073:12, 1073:15, 1074:7, 1074:13, 1074:18, 1075:3, 1075:8, 1075:18, 1076:2, 1076:6, 1076:22, 1077:9, 1077:17, 1077:22, 1079:22, 1080:5, 1080:6, 1081:11, 1081:18, 1081:23, 1082:6, 1132:15 pedestrians [3] -1007:4, 1077:7, 1077:19 pending [2] -1023:14, 1103:2 PennDOT [117] -1018:20, 1021:14, 1026:5, 1026:12, 1026:22, 1027:23, 1028:1, 1028:6, 1028:10, 1028:11, 1031:8, 1035:14, 1035:15, 1035:17, 1035:23, 1036:19, 1037:9, 1038:2, 1038:24, 1040:9, 1048:19, 1048:24, 1049:8, 1051:11, 1051:21, 1053:4, 1053:11, 1056:17, 1056:23, 1057:3, 1057:18, 1058:5, 1074:16, 1074:22, 1075:2, 1075:8, 1075:13, 1075:20, 1075:24, 1082:3, 1082:10, 1083:5, 1085:16, 1095:18,

1096:12, 1097:7, 1102:5, 1105:17, 1107:19, 1108:2, 1108:7, 1108:10, 1109:16, 1110:7, 1110:13, 1110:16, 1120:10, 1120:17, 1121:14, 1122:4, 1132:3, 1134:17, 1135:17, 1135:20, 1135:22, 1136:20, 1136:22, 1145:22, 1146:3. 1146:9. 1146:10, 1147:7, 1147:12, 1147:19, 1148:1, 1153:4, 1153:5, 1154:20. 1154:22, 1155:20, 1155:23, 1160:24, 1161:3, 1161:4, 1161:9, 1161:12, 1161:19, 1161:23, 1162:11, 1163:4, 1163:12, 1163:16, 1163:18, 1165:6, 1165:8, 1165:21, 1166:6, 1166:11, 1166:13, 1166:15, 1166:20, 1167:2, 1167:3, 1167:7, 1167:11, 1167:1**3**, 1167:14, 1169:5, 1172:11, 1172:15, 1174:16, 1182:3, 1162:9, 1186:14 PennDOT's [8] -1026:14, 1036:1, 1037:23, 1056:18, 1110:22, 1111:1, 1125:5, 1133:1 PennDOTcontrolled [1] -1166:13 Pennoni [1] -1051:10 PENNSYLVANIA [1] - 996:3 Pennsylvania [3] -996:11, 1047:21, 1187:1 people [8] - 1011:16, 1018:6, 1042:10, 1072:14, 1072:21, 1077:24, 1087:21, 1107:3 per [9] - 1012:12, 1012:15, 1013:24,

1017:10, 1017:12,

1020:18, 1089:17,

1099:12

percent [3] -1040:10, 1098:5, 1098:10 percentage [1] -1088:17 perfectly [1] -1160:10 perhaps [2] -1001:23, 1074:5 period [3] - 998:15, 1016:19, 1180:4 periods [6] - 1138:2, 1141:18, 1164:6, 1168:21, 1172:23, 1173:10 permit [3] - 1035:18, 1167:13, 1167:14 permits [1] - 1147:21 permitted [2] -1172:11, 1172:14 permitting [2] -1167:12, 1182:9 perpetuating [1] -1144:6 person [1] - 1063:12 personal [2] -1129:15, 1142:20 personally [1] -1128:12 perspective [2] -1156:23, 1164:13 pharmacy [1] -1081:16 phase [7] - 1039:1, 1046:15, 1100:1, 1100:7, 1100:15, 1101:12, 1133:3 phasing [1] -1132:13 Phillip [2] - 1117:18, 1122:11 philosophy [1] -1084:9 **PHMC** [3] - 1047:20, 1048:5, 1113:24 PHMC's [1] -1041:11 phone [1] - 1185:3 physically [1] -1035:4 pieces [1] - 1041:2 piggyback [1] -1012:2 **PINGAR** [12] -996:17, 1058:12, 1058:15, 1059:2, 1059:5, 1059:17, 1059:24, 1060:7,

Pingar [1] - 998:3 pinpoint[1] -1101:10 place [1] - 997:19 placed [2] - 1063:23, 1181:21 placement [1] -1155:11 Pian [22] - 1026:15, 1026:16, 1065:3, 1065:4, 1066:6, 1066:7, 1066:11, 1066:12, 1070:22, 1070:23, 1071:20, 1071:22, 1141:3, 1142:8, 1142:9, 1142:11, 1169:7, 1169:13, 1169:17, 1169:23, 1181:4 plan [91] - 1004:6, 1006:5, 1006:12, 1006:22, 1010:7, 1010:10, 1010:13, 1010:21, 1010:24, 1013:9, 1025:16, 1026:2, 1026:11, 1029:2, 1029:19, 1036:5, 1041:9, 1042:10, 1043:6, 1044:9, 1051:21, 1052:1, 1052:22, 1052:24, 1053:3, 1053:21, 1054:2, 1054:6, 1054:10, 1054:13, 1054:15, 1055:5, 1057:12, 1059:7, 1059:12, 1059:14, 1060:18, 1061:1, 1061:7, 1061:13, 1065:10, 1067:20, 1069:22, 1072:6, 1072:8, 1083:19, 1083:22, 1085:1, 1085:21, 1089:18, 1090:8, 1090:23, 1092:23, 1093:9, 1093:16, 1093:22, 1093:24, 1102:20, 1103:16, 1103:22, 1104:12, 1104:20, 1105:8, 1106:6, 1108:24, 1109:3, 1109:5, 1115:18, 1115:19, 1130:16, 1133:24, 1134:13, 1136:7, 1136:11, 1143:18, 1154:11, 1161:13, 1161:14, 1161:19, 1161:20, 1162:21,

1164:8, 1164:9, 1168:2, 1168:5, 1168:7, 1168:11, 1170:8, 1170:13, 1170:20 planning [4] -1005:24, 1010:17, 1114:13, 1126:9 Planning [36] -997:6, 1010:15, 1024:19, 1033:10, 1068:19, 1092:19, 1092:24, 1101:17, 1103:1, 1118:14, 1118:24, 1123:18, 1124:7, 1125:3, 1125:4, 1138:23, 1139:9, 1139:13, 1139:22, 1148:19, 1148:23, 1149:12, 1149:22, 1150:4, 1150:8, 1150:12, 1154:13, 1155:9, 1156:15, 1163:6, 1163:14, 1175:19, 1176:7, 1182:23, 1185:8, 1186:13 PLANNING [1] -1186:9 plans [12] - 1007:12, 1080:21, 1086:22, 1095:2, 1098:15, 1103:13, 1103:18, 1104:9, 1105:7, 1105:10, 1105:16, 1131:15 play [1] - 1149:20 Pleasant [60] -1010:19, 1019:1, 1019:4, 1025:13, 1027:2, 1028:15, 1029:17, 1029:24, 1030:2, 1030:8, 1030:14, 1030:16, 1030:20, 1040:15, 1042:16, 1044:3, 1060:12, 1061:5, 1061:15, 1062:23, 1067:5, 1067:10, 1068:4, 1068:5, 1070:18, 1071:2, 1071:23, 1073:13, 1073:17, 1076:23, 1078:6, 1078:8, 1079:3, 1079:10, 1084:12, 1085:3, 1088:11, 1089:8, 1108:21, 1115:12, 1115:17, 1115:22, 1116:21, 1129:6,

1060:21, 1060:24,

1061:12, 1061:17

1130:21, 1136:15, 1141:5, 1142:1, 1143:14, 1144:11, 1156:11, 1156:21, 1157:3, 1159:15, 1166:10, 1174:2, 1178:12, 1179:6, 1179:22, 1183:1 Pledge [2] - 997:17, 997:18 point [24] - 999:21, 1000:3, 1020:14, 1021:12, 1021:20, 1046:18, 1049:23, 1071:1, 1072:4, 1077:6, 1079:12, 1082:19, 1082:21, 1085:23, 1100:5, 1111:13, 1114:17, 1119:7, 1123:16, 1138:1, 1141:24, 1144:21, 1154:4 points [7] - 1009:11, 1071:1, 1103:12, 1104:13, 1130:15, 1157:6 police [4] - 997:24, 1062:18, 1062:21, 1063:11 Pond [1] - 1129:11 portion [3] -1065:16, 1101:17, 1124:3 portions [1] - 1166:9 position [3] -1063:21, 1126:6, 1144:17 possibility [1] -1120:21 possible [5] -1006:1, 1023:5, 1103:71, 1160:9, 1160:15 possibly [2] -1044:17, 1047:22 post[4] - 1079:5, 1147:4, 1175:1, 1175:6 post-construction [1] - 1079:5 post-development [3] - 1147:4, 1175:1, 1175:6 potential [16] -1010:13, 1025:1, 1026:2, 1032:17, 1037:11, 1043:6, 1053:8, 1086:24, 1091:17, 1093:19, 1101:22, 1102:19,

1157:7, 1158:16, 1159:4, 1170:24 potentially [11] -1004:20, 1035:18, 1037:20, 1078:2, 1078:3, 1085:17, 1143:22, 1144:7, 1169:1, 1182:11, 1182:13 practice [1] -1062:13 pre [4] - 1124:15, 1124:22, 1127:4, 1150:18 pre-marked [4] -1124:15, 1124:22, 1127:4, 1150:18 preclude [1] -1460:20 predicated (1) -1139:24 prefer[1] - 1028:7 preference [2] -1048:6, 1142:20 preliminarily (1) -1025:24 preliminary [11] -1010:12, 1045:8, 1053:7, 1057:3, 1059:13, 1080:21, 1093:18, 1108:10, 1109:17, 1132:23, 1184:17 preparation [1] -1024:13 propare (4) -1103:13, 1103:16, 1103:21, 1103:22 prepared [16] -1047:8, 1083:18, 1092:18, 1092:23, 1093:3, 1093:6, 1093:9, 1093:23, 1095:4, 1098:24, 1104:18, 1124:7, 1133:22, 1133:24, 1134:4, 1134:10 Presbyterian [6] -1019:2, 1034:20, 1042:8, 1042:9, 1079:1, 1112:5 presance [1] -1097:19 present (11) -1049:18, 1112:4, 1130:22, 1131:4, 1138:20, 1138:21, 1153;2, 1153;12,

1154:11, 1164:1,

1185:8

PRESENT [1] -996:17 presentation [1] -1118:23 presentations [1] -998:20 presented [8] -998:15, 1000:1, 1000:3, 1053:4, 1059:8, 1080:20, 1146:4, 1163:16 presently [1] -1126:21 presents [1] -1145:18 pressured [1] -1183:21 presume [1] -1151:18 presumes [1] -1142:11 **pretty** [1] - 1079:14 prevent [3] - 1081:5, 1143:18, 1172:21 previous [2] -1129:18, 1159:24 previously [5] -999:13, 1098:15, 1141:16, 1150:17, 1160:13 primarily [3] -1053:19, 1077:21, 1129:9 primary [6] - 1002:2, 1042:15, 1088:4, 1108:6, 1130:15, 1132:9 prime [1] - 1119:11 privy [3] - 1021:15, 1031:15 problem [4] -1064:14, 1066:21, 1110:14, 1120:5 problems [3] -1110:10, 1153:2, 1153:13 proceed [5] -1123:19, 1124:7, 1133:4, 1146:1, 1147:14 Proceedings [1] -1185:13 proceedings [2] -998:5, 999:1 process [11] - 998:6, 1009:8, 1058:5, 1075:13, 1075:24, 1091:24, 1106:5, 1106:7, 1106:8,

professional [1] -1033:6 progressing [2] -1132:19, 1132:20 project [32] - 1007:5, 1010:1, 1037:23, 1040:9, 1081:1, 1082:5, 1082:11, 1103:22, 1120:19, 1121:6, 1121:11, 1126:7, 1131:14, 1132:21, 1132:22, 1133:1, 1136:8, 1145:22, 1145:23, 1146:3, 1146:6, 1147:7, 1148:21, 1149:1, 1155:15, 1163:12, 1165:21, 1166:3, 1169:11, 1170:1, 1174:16, 1182:16 projected [1] -1165:11 projects [2] -1039:22, 1073:9 promote [1] -1178:23 propensity [1] -1174:6 proper [1] - 1110:6 properly [1] - 1111:7 properties [10] -1004:8, 1005:13, 1005:21, 1006:3, 1006:9, 1006:14, 1006:17, 1041:21, 1061:8, 1178:4 property [63] -1003:20, 1005:14, 1005:15, 1005:17, 1006:4, 1015:2, 1015:24, 1019:2, 1019:8, 1019:10, 1023:2, 1023:19, 1035:2, 1041:12, 1041:14, 1042:4, 1044:19, 1045:2, 1045:11, 1061:10, 1071:23, 1073:21, 1074:3, 1074:4, 1074:19, 1074:23, 1076:11, 1076:12, 1076:16, 1077:3, 1077:14, 1078:11, 1078:15, 1078:22, 1085:5, 1091:10, 1091:13, 1097:23, 1111:6, 1113:5, 1113:7, 1113:14, 1113:17, 1113:18,

1114:14, 1114:20, 1127:22, 1128:7, 1128:13, 1128:14, 1128:22, 1129:2, 1132:5, 1142:15, 1152:8, 1160:6, 1160:12, 1160:19, 1161:13, 1166:16, 1169:8, 1178:3, 1178:15 proposal [3] -1007:9, 1150:12, 1162:6 propose [1] - 1071:7 proposed [71] -1004:18, 1007:6, 1007:15, 1009:24, 1018:24, 1019:9, 1025:6, 1025:7, 1026:4, 1026:11, 1030:1, 1032:3, 1032:11, 1034:21, 1035:1, 1043:14, 1046:8, 1051:15, 1058:8, 1061:10, 1070:16, 1079:2, 1084:24, 1095:22, 1097:20, 1103:14, 1104:4, 1105:24, 1111:7, 1130:2, 1130:8, 1130:10, 1130:16, 1131:10, 1133:7, 1137:21, 1141:11, 1143:12, 1145:24, 1149:17, 1150:12, 1153:17, 1157:24, 1158:1, 1158:3, 1159:7, 1159:8, 1159:11, 1160:20, 1163:6, 1166:23, 1168:2, 1168:11, 1169:11, 1169:22, 1170:23, 1171:5, 1171:10, 1171:14, 1172:4, 1172:10, 1176:12, 1176:18, 1177:11, 1177:18, 1179:2, 1179:4, 1179:7, 1179:13, 1179:16, 1179:18 proposing [4] -1057:23, 1071:10, 1152:20, 1181:8 protection [1] -1040:18 protracted [1] -1155:2 provide [44] -1010:18, 1013:22,

1120:16, 1183:15

1035:4, 1047:19, 1055:13, 1064:11, 1067:2, 1067:11, 1069:24, 1070:2, 1070:17, 1071:6, 1074:17, 1076:6, 1076:9, 1079:8, 1079:22, 1079:23, 1084:16, 1085:18, 1091:12, 1108:20, 1109:13, 1109:23, 1115:9, 1115:16, 1115:21, 1116:2, 1116:5, 1117:1, 1117:10, 1132:11, 1132:12, 1141:17, 1142:5, 1143:1, 1143:13, 1145:8, 1156:5, 1156:24, 1160:7, 1178:2, 1178:4, 1179:7 provided [22] -1013:20, 1016:2, 1031:24, 1032:2, 1032:21, 1049:2, 1053:2, 1060:10, 1060:21, 1061:8, 1062:24, 1072:18, 1086: 12, 1090:24, 1091:1, 1091:10, 1105:7, 1138:14, 1142:17, 1149:1, 1149:21, 1171:7 provides [5] -1047:14, 1116:6, 1141:23, 1143:5, 1160:14 providing [6] -1057:1, 1064:19, 1069:15, 1077:5, 1078:11, 1078:14 provision [4] -1046:16, 1047:14, 1054:5, 1108:17 proximity [4] -1043:18, 1084:20, 1121:5, 1158:18 Pryze [1] - 1122:13 public [18] - 1009:20, 1009:24, 1031:11, 1031:12, 1031:19, 1031:22, 1032:1, 1032:7, 1032:12, 1032:18, 1073:8, 1115:10, 1116:3, 1116:6, 1116:12, 1128:17, 1128:20, 1129:2 Public [1] - 1187:8 pull [3] - 1003:1,

1003:22, 1018:14 purchase [2] -1005:17, 1073:1 purpose [5] -1110:12, 1177:24, 1178:16, 1178:18, 1178:23 purposes [3] -1007:3, 1057:24, 1058:8 pursuant[1] -1127:19 purview [2] - 1036:1, 1037:23 put [8] - 1007:18, 1030:17, 1050:7, 1067:20, 1090:22, 1107:2, 1111:2, 1173:15

# Q

qualifications [1] -1126:13 quantified [3] -1024:5, 1158:21, 1180:23 Quarry [5] - 1005:16, 1044:23, 1112:8, 1112:22, 1113:13 quarry [3] - 1003:19, 1113:8, 1114:10 questioning [1] -1081:14 questions (39] -999:23, 1000:4, 1012:24, 1018:11, 1019:14, 1024:20, 1031:2, 1033:8, 1040:15, 1046:23, 1047:5, 1055:4, 1058:11, 1058:16, 1061:18, 1062:7, 1062:8, 1067:16, 1072:12, 1084:1, 1084:7, 1090:11, 1090:16, 1092:8, 1094:15, 1106:12, 1106:21, 1107:4, 1107:7, 1107:9, 1107:15, 1117:19, 1122:10, 1122:16, 1122:19, 1123:1, 1160:1, 1163:2, 1174:23 queue [8] - 1003:14, 1004:7, 1012:6, 1012:21, 1099:5, 1099:11, 1100:4,

1100:17

queued [2] - 1090:6, 1172:24 queues [8] - 1002:8, 1002:22, 1002:23, 1137:19, 1137:24, 1154:3, 1154:7, 1154:9 queuing [1] -1153:24 quick [2] - 999:18, 1012:7 quite [1] - 1107:14

R 1117:12 Radley [2] - 1111:21, 1108:2 1111:23 raised [3] - 1150:14, 1151:1, 1151:13 1108:6 range [3] - 1009:17, 1096:9, 1176:22 rate [9] - 1014:23, 1015:4, 1015:14, 1016:19, 1017:1, 1017:9, 1017:11, 1106:8 1017:21, 1018:2 rates [9] - 1013:22, 1132:24 1014:8, 1014:11, recently [2] -1016:2, 1016:7, 1016:16, 1016:21, 1017:22, 1018:9 1184:20 rather [7] - 1000:6, 1009:12, 1022:13, 1065:8, 1073:22, 1084:16, 1085:7 1139:3 raw [11] - 1009:5, 1009:15, 1009:17, 1071:3 1015:8, 1019:15, 1020:1, 1020:4, 1021:11, 1021:13, 1021:17, 1022:14 RE [2] - 996:7, 1062:5 re [2] - 1051:15, 1094:15 re-aligning [1] -1051:15 **RE-EXAMINATION** [1] - 1062:5 reached [2] -1109:11, 1151:19 read [5] - 1048:2, 1065:22, 1066:1, 1108:13, 1109:20 ready [4] - 999:16, 1111:16, 1147:14, 1156:6 realign [1] - 1051:22

realize [1] - 1051:13 really [7] - 1011:13, 1032:23, 1037:22, 1038:1, 1038:7, 1038:11, 1087:5 rear [2] - 1171:23, 1171:24 rear-end [2] -1171:23, 1171:24 reason [3] - 1015:16, 1090:20, 1109:23 reasonable [3] -1095:15, 1096:6, reasoning [1] reasons [4] - 1008:5, 1107:21, 1108:4, recap [1] - 999:18 received [7] -1010:14, 1044:10, 1053:9, 1071:16, 1072:2, 1096:15, recent [2] - 1005:16, 1132:17, 1165:20 recess [2] - 1111:13, Recess [1] - 1111:14 recite [1] - 1181:22 recognize [1] recollection [1] recommend [10] -1048:24, 1049:1, 1077:1, 1078:10, 1081:22, 1082:13, 1110:21, 1110:24, 1119:2, 1154:14 recommendation [18] - 1062:22, 1063:1, 1064:9, 1074:12, 1079:7, 1101:18, 1103:1, 1112:24, 1114:10, 1114:13, 1119:16, 1120:10, 1139:13, 1139:18, 1139:23, 1140:3, 1140:18, 1155:10 recommendations [4] - 1029:13, 1118:18, 1148:20, 1157:19 recommended [3] -1148:24, 1159:7, 1163:6 recommends [2] -

1063:3, 1149:12 reconcile [1] -1169:10 record [15] - 1003:4, 1007:18, 1015:10, 1033:15, 1065:22, 1066:1, 1087:4, 1107:2, 1107:12, 1111:19, 1124:19, 1124:20, 1125:17, 1129:22, 1187:9 recording [1] - 999:1 RECROSS [5] -1068:22, 1084:5, 1086:8, 1090:17, 1185:18 recross [8] - 1000:2, 1068:18, 1084:1, 1084:4, 1086:6, 1106:20, 1106:22, 1107:8 **RECROSS-EXAMINATION** [4] -1068:22, 1084:5, 1086:8, 1090:17 red [2] - 1119:19, 1120:12 redid [1] - 1104:3 REDIRECT [1] -1185:18 redirect [5] - 1000:1, 1061:20, 1062:2, 1106:22, 1106:23 redistributed [1] -1088:22 reduce [3] - 1064:11, 1107:22, 1175:13 refer [8] - 1003:2, 1035:13, 1036:17, 1047:15, 1069:14, 1072:3, 1085:15, 1095:17 reference [16] -1018:14, 1033:14, 1034:5, 1057:17, 1059:7, 1079:16, 1112:21, 1131:9, 1136:6, 1140:13, 1148:6, 1148:22, 1149:4, 1150:17, 1157:14, 1171:18 referenced [7] -1102:3, 1102:16, 1104:5, 1140:17, 1141:1, 1157:13, 1159:24 references [4] -1141:9, 1142:16, 1143:21, 1176:8

referencing [1] -

realigned [2] -

1136:15, 1136:16

1036:13 referred [4] -1008:17, 1013:1, 1069:3, 1086:20 referring [12] -1003:8, 1022:15, 1022:19, 1036:15, 1036:24, 1053:15, 1056:22, 1070:5, 1113:4, 1113:9, 1120:24, 1181:10 refers [5] - 1048:17, 1052:12, 1056:17, 1071:22, 1183:2 reflected [1] -1149:11 regard [16] - 1069:1, 1070:14, 1074:12, 1081:19, 1104:18, 1118:12, 1129:21, 1133:15, 1134:16, 1135:22, 1139:14, 1151:9, 1151:16, 1152:11, 1155:10, 1156:9 regarding [7] -1024:20, 1037:7, 1040:17, 1055:13, 1127:2, 1165:6, 1174:23 regardless [2] -1143:12, 1148:1 regards [4] -1033:17, 1043:16, 1046:4, 1166:6 region [4] - 1008:4, 1032:2, 1072:18, regional [3] - 1026:8, 1084:17, 1108:16 register [3] -1113:19, 1113:20, 1113:23 Registered [1] -1187:7 registry [1] - 1045:3 Registry [1] - 1114:1 Regulations [1] -1161:6 regulations [1] -1040:17 Reichert [1] - 1123:3 relate [1] - 1041:3 related [12] -1033:13, 1047:12, 1109:18, 1130:8, 1133:6, 1134:16, 1149:16, 1153:12, 1157:16, 1159:8, 1163:13, 1163:22

relates [3] - 1041:6, 1082:4, 1163:17 relation [2] -1094:17, 1157:15 relative [1] - 1166:9 relatively [1] -1081:3 released [1] -1037:24 relief [1] - 1109:24 relieving [1] -1110:13 relocated [1] -1159:23 relocating [4] -1095:23, 1097:5, 1109:7, 1109:21 relocation [1] -1109:23 remain [1] - 1147:9 remaining [2] -1107:15, 1124:3 remember [4] -1005:7, 1010:5, 1037:14, 1082:21 removal [2] -1093:19, 1103:11 remove [2] -1030:13, 1137:6 removed [15] -1029:21, 1030:5, 1052:24, 1059:11, 1059:16, 1059:18, 1060:2, 1093:16, 1104:17, 1132:14, 1169:22, 1169:11, 1170:7, 1170:12, 1170:19 removing [2] -1029:4, 1029:6 repeat [2] - 1173:8, 1177:13 report [7] - 1002:22, 1013:6, 1020:23, 1024:13, 1032:24, 1082:18, 1083:13 reported [1] -1021:13 Reporter [1] - 1187:8 reporter [1] -1106:11 REPORTER [3] -996:23, 1186:17, 1187:5 reporters [1] -1092:12 reports [1] - 1032:22 represent [1] -1028:19

representative (1) -

1059:9 represented [1] request [9] - 1058:5, 1070:3, 1076:1, 1076:3, 1107:21, 1110:22, 1111:1, 1121:22, 1184:8 requested [6] -1009:16, 1071:17, 1071:19, 1076:17, 1077:10, 1109:1 require [15] -1026:20, 1038:1, 1070:24, 1074:22, 1075:3, 1075:8, 1075:14, 1075:24, 1080:9, 1080:12, 1081:7, 1081:21, 1146:7, 1147:20, 1172:15 required [21] -1000:17, 1005:22, 1030:17, 1031:8, 1039:15, 1039:20, 1071:19, 1082:3, 1082:12, 1082:17, 1107:19, 1114:18, 1121:24, 1143:11, 1143:16, 1145:3, 1169:12, 1174:20, 1176:14, 1176:21, 1179:11 requirement [16] -1023:22, 1031:10, 1031:16, 1039:19, 1065:5, 1066:8, 1069:20, 1075:19, 1075:21, 1097:7, 1098:7, 1146:11, 1148:4, 1152:1, 1165:5, 1184:9 requirements [12] -1005:20, 1023:9, 1026:5, 1026:11, 1038:17, 1074:17, 1098:4, 1114:19, 1121:13, 1148:5, 1163:4, 1168:3 requires [1] -1168:13 requiring [2] -1076:22, 1169:10 rerouted [1] -1042:23 reside [2] - 1000:9, 1083:10 resident [1] -1001:14

1001:11, 1014:1, 1016:3, 1016:4, 1016:10, 1016:11, 1016:15, 1026:3, 1026:7, 1027:15, 1027:16, 1049:6, 1064:14, 1064:21, 1070:19, 1071:14, 1073:23, 1074:8, 1077:21, 1110:4, 1111:3, 1116:22, 1117:3, 1117:9, 1117:13, 1155:4, 1159:2 residents [12] -1000:8, 1009:21, 1064:16, 1064:24, 1066:3, 1072:19, 1074:10, 1077:15, 1080:1, 1084:19, 1110:9, 1178:5 residing [2] -1011:16, 1072:14 resoive [1] - 1182:16 resource [3] -1114:3, 1114:7, 1114:11 resources [1] -1042:4 respect [16] - 1006:1, 1011:12, 1041:8, 1042:7, 1058:16, 1062:22, 1103:19, 1169:6, 1170:6, 1171:5, 1171:14, 1174:10, 1176:11, 1181:9, 1181:14, 1182:22 respectful [1] -1106:7 responded [1] -1096:16 responding [1] -1072:12 response [8] -1020:9, 1025:22, 1027:5, 1049:2, 1070:14, 1070:15, 1101:20, 1110:19 responses [2] -1094:15, 1096:20 responsibilities [1] -1110:13 responsibility [2] -1046:7, 1144:18 responsible [1] -1182:9 rest[1] - 1033:16 rested [1] - 1124:6

resting [1] - 1123:24

resubmission [3] -1055:5, 1134:3, 1134:9 result [6] - 1042:23, 1082:22, 1141:9, 1146:14, 1168:14, 1179:14 resulted [1] -1040:10 results [4] - 1029:11, 1029:13, 1030:24, 1082:23 retained [1] -1126:21 retime [1] - 1119:2 retiming [1] - 1058:7 retirement [1] -1109:18 review [44] -1023:24, 1024:12, 1024:14, 1028:14, 1041:17, 1042:5, 1053:17, 1057:7, 1060:5, 1070:15, 1083:4, 1096:14, 1108:10, 1108:12, 1109:17, 1127:1, 1129:17, 1131:17, 1131:18, 1133:6, 1133:13, 1133:19, 1133:20, 1134:2, 1134:7, 1134:12, 1135:17, 1135:23, 1139:5, 1140:12, 1150:14, 1150:16, 1150:20, 1151:1, 1161:24, 1162:12, 1162:24, 1163:16, 1163:22, 1167:11, 1171:4, 1172:9, 1175:22, 1176:4 reviewed [13] -1024:15, 1042:3, 1092:18, 1095:2, 1096:15, 1099:1, 1105:17, 1130:2, 1133:18, 1134:3, 1136:5, 1136:11, 1161:4 reviewer [1] -1051:10 reviewing [7] -1094:14, 1131:23, 1161:3, 1161:9, 1161:12, 1161:23, 1171:7 reviews [2] -1096:16, 1135:21 revised [17] -

residential [27] -

1051:21, 1052:16,

1053:3, 1060:1, 1060:4, 1083:12, 1095:7, 1096:20, 1115:6, 1124:16, 1134:1, 1134:6, 1136:14, 1154:11, 1164:3, 1164:7, 1164:9 revisit [1] - 1084:8 Ridge [1] - 1061:2 right-of-way [4] -1045:12, 1163:19, 1176:19, 1176:21 right-of-ways [3] -1023:18, 1023:23, 1024:2 rights [1] - 1128:17 rights-of-way [1] -1128:17 rise [1] - 997:17 RMR [1] - 996:23 road [136] - 1004:9, 1010:7, 1010:16, 1010:22, 1011:2, 1025:11, 1025:12, 1025:15, 1025:20, 1026:3, 1026:17, 1027:7, 1028:7, 1028:11, 1030:17, 1030:18, 1034:18, 1034:19, 1037:11, 1038:6, 1040:18, 1040:23, 1041:2, 1041:9, 1041:10, 1041:13, 1041:22, 1042:1, 1045:5, 1048:17, 1048:22, 1049:1, 1049:3, 1049:10, 1050:4, 1050:8, 1050:9, 1050:11, 1050:12, 1050:14, 1054:6, 1060:10, 1060:15, 1060:18, 1061:4, 1061:6, 1061:10, 1062:23, 1063:4, 1064:19, 1067:19, 1067:21, 1067:24, 1068:10, 1069:2, 1069:4, 1069:6, 1069:10, 1069:13, 1069:18, 1069:24, 1070:3, 1070:4, 1070:5, 1070:9, 1070:10, 1070:24, 1071:6, 1071:8, 1071:10, 1071:12, 1071:13, 1071:16, 1072:3, 1074:14, 1074:15, 1078:6,

1086:18, 1086:23, 1087:1, 1087:13, 1087:22, 1089:7, 1094:7, 1095:22, 1095:24, 1097:21, 1098:21, 1108:18, 1108:20, 1109:1, 1109:8, 1109:22, 1110:8, 1111:3, 1115:10, 1115:13, 1116:3, 1116:6, 1116:16, 1116:21, 1129:14, 1132:1, 1141:4, 1141:6, 1142:5, 1142:8, 1142:16, 1142:18, 1143:1, 1143:5, 1145:11, 1145:14, 1151:16, 1152:7, 1153:17, 1157:6, 1168:6, 1169:22, 1170:5, 1170:19, 1176:15, 1176:18, 1176:20, 1177:10, 1177:16, 1177:21, 1177:24, 1178:1, 1178:15, 1179:7, 1180:15, 1181:9, 1181:17 Road [55] - 996:11, 1010:19, 1019:1, 1019:4, 1025:14, 1027:3, 1028:15, 1029:24, 1030:2, 1030:8, 1030:20, 1044:4, 1060:13, 1061:5, 1067:5, 1067:10, 1068:5, 1070:18, 1071:23, 1073:13, 1073:18, 1076:24, 1078:6, 1078:9, 1079:4, 1079:10, 1084:12, 1085:3, 1088:11, 1095:3, 1098:16, 1108:21, 1115:17, 1115:22, 1119:6, 1119:8, 1119:19, 1120:6, 1129:6, 1129:11, 1129:12, 1130:21, 1136:15, 1141:5, 1142:2, 1144:11, 1156:11, 1156:21, 1157:3, 1159:16, 1166:10, 1179:22, 1183:2 roads [13] - 1040:19, 1044:17, 1061:14,

1094:3, 1094:12,

1129:10, 1129:15,

1129:16, 1142:13,

1158:17, 1166:11, 1166:16, 1166:22 roads' [1] - 1041:3 Roadway [2] -1095:2, 1098:16 roadway [40] -1007:2, 1007:7, 1007:10, 1010:18, 1020:5, 1023:1, 1023:7, 1023:13, 1024:22, 1040:21, 1041:20, 1043:5, 1049:5, 1069:7, 1069:15. 1071:11. 1085:17, 1108:16, 1115:16, 1115:21, 1117:5, 1117:10, 1128:21, 1129:1, 1129:4, 1129:5, 1129:6, 1129:7, 1130:7, 1132:4, 1160:3, 1166:14, 1167:4, 1177:4, 1179:4, 1179:10, 1179:13, 1179:14, 1179:17, 1179:18 roadways [21] -1008:4, 1035:16, 1038:10, 1041:7, 1063:5, 1069:9, 1069:16, 1070:17, 1074:3, 1074:16, 1074:18, 1075:20, 1076:14, 1091:5, 1110:17, 1110:19, 1129:3, 1129:4, 1129:9, 1166:7 **rob** [1] - 998:3 ROBERT [1] - 996:17 Robert [1] - 1118:10 Robinson [2] -1003:19, 1005:14 Robinsons [1] -1006:10 Rodgers [2] -1095:5, 1098:15 role [3] - 1103:22, 1149:19, 1152:3 roughly [1] - 1101:1 roundabout [3] -1056:20, 1057:1, 1057:6 Route [22] - 1000:9, 1001:17, 1007:20, 1059:11, 1067:3, 1090:4, 1094:7, 1094:9, 1095:10,

1152:21, 1169:6, 1170:6, 1170:12, 1171:10, 1174:10, 1177:22 route [8] - 1000:22, 1064:12, 1068:13, 1086:12, 1088:21, 1095:19, 1116:8 routes [1] - 1138:11 run [6] - 1081:2, 1081:19, 1081:23, 1082:13, 1138:4, 1149:24 Run [2] - 1111:21, 1111:23 rush [2] - 1119:11, 1119:21 Rustin [2] - 996:10, 1184:23

# S

safe [7] - 1038:5, 1038:12, 1080:6, 1080:10, 1081:5, 1141:18 safely [2] - 1077:19, 1145:10 safer [1] - 1157:8 safety [2] - 1042:20, 1077:9 sake [1] - 998:20 satisfactorily [2] -1150:13, 1150:24 satisfy [4] - 1023:8, 1146:11, 1148:4, 1176:13 scale [2] - 1110:5, 1111:3 Scanlon [1] - 1112:3 scenario [2] -1089:17, 1104:20 scenic [2] - 1040:16, 1041:2 schedule [1] -1057:13 scheduled [1] -1055:24 School [2] - 996:10, 1112:2 school [13] - 1009:8, 1019:20, 1031:3, 1031:13, 1031:19, 1031:20, 1043:13, 1043:16, 1043:20, 1178:10, 1178:13, 1178:21 schools [2] - 1044:4, 1044:14 Schwandt [2] -

1187:7, 1187:20 SCHWANDT [1] -996:23 scope [8] - 1005:20, 1005:22, 1011:20, 1031:7, 1031:16, 1127:18, 1133:17, 1141:11 scoping [4] - 1047:8, 1052:7, 1120:16, 1135:24 Scott [1] - 1122:8 seal [1] - 1187:15 seasonal [2] -1022:12, 1022:21 second [9] - 1013:3, 1056:15, 1056:16, 1059:6, 1065:1, 1066:4, 1107:23, 1112:12, 1134:2 seconds [4] -1099:18, 1099:19, 1100:15, 1120:4 section [4] - 1160:3, 1160:4, 1170:3, 1171:12 Section [1] - 1183:3 sections [5] -1140:8, 1140:16, 1169:20, 1183:2, 1183:5 security [1] -1182:15 see [25] - 999:24, 1003:23, 1004:14, 1008:7, 1008:8, 1009:15, 1009:17, 1015:11, 1016:17, 1020:2, 1024:1, 1036:19, 1038:9, 1047:13, 1052:13, 1055:10, 1124:12, 1130:5, 1135:8, 1152:12, 1159:12, 1161:20, 1175:22, 1176:18 seek [2] - 1110:7, 1138:11 seeking [3] - 1072:7, 1127:19, 1162:7 seeks [3] - 1069:23, 1083:20, 1110:4 seem [4] - 1013:16, 1026:9, 1064:21, 1121:6 segment [1] - 1061:3 segments [1] -1060:16 Semon [8] - 1047:16,

1049:2, 1049:18,

1096:2, 1099:5,

1109:24, 1137:14,

1141:17, 1152:12,

1050:16, 1050:19, 1051:1, 1058:23, 1061:19 send [1] - 1185:6 sense [4] - 1027:8, 1027:11, 1036:15, 1079:21 separate [5] -1023:17, 1104:8, 1130:12, 1179:10, 1182:20 September [1] -1120:7 series [2] - 1118:17, 1143:8 Serpentine [1] -1044:24 serve [7] - 1025:6, 1091:2, 1091:5, 1116:9, 1143:15, 1178:16, 1179:12 served [1] - 1129:21 service [14] -1032:19, 1143:11, 1146:15, 1146:17, 1146:21, 1147:2, 1147:3, 1174:24, 1175:1, 1175:5, 1175:7, 1175:10, 1175:12, 1175:18 session [1] -1019:20 sessions [2] -1130:24, 1136:5 set[11] - 1020:14, 1020:19, 1021:5, 1022:4, 1022:14, 1022:16, 1036:16, 1095:2, 1140:2, 1155:18, 1187:15 setbacks [1] -1038:18 **settings** [1] - 1074:8 several [4] - 1008:1, 1103:10, 1120:4, 1144:2 share [1] - 1102:21 sheds [1] - 1047:24 Shiloh [1] - 996:10 shopping [1] -1057:19 shot[1] - 1068:4 **show** [11] - 1008:13, 1008:15, 1010:22, 1020:17, 1052:1, 1061:11, 1073:10, 1085:2, 1094:7, 1094:11, 1138:15 showed [2] -1021:14, 1021:15

showing [6] -1061:3, 1090:20, 1154:11, 1162:21, 1164:4 shown [17] - 1011:9, 1029:2, 1071:11, 1080:15, 1085:1, 1085:21, 1109:10, 1131:16, 1151:23, 1152:6, 1152:19, 1153:11, 1153:18, 1154:2, 1159:18, 1169:7, 1169:23 shows [10] - 1011:1, 1029:20, 1054:6, 1061:9, 1061:14, 1093:12, 1098:17, 1104:20, 1109:1, 1136:20 side [12] - 1000:14, 1001:14, 1044:19, 1045:6, 1045:13, 1065:1, 1066:4, 1077:20, 1078:21, 1084:20, 1113:2, 1178:5 sidewalk [11] -1073:17, 1077:6, 1078:8, 1079:9, 1079:11, 1079:13, 1080:10, 1080:13, 1081:2, 1081:23, 1082:13 sidewalks [5] -1074:2, 1074:22, 1076:9, 1078:11, 1078:14 sight [2] - 1004:11, 1157:9 signal [34] - 1046:9, 1046:13, 1057:16, 1057:19, 1057:21, 1057:23, 1057:24, 1058:7, 1058:8, 1067.6, 1067.12, 1089:4, 1119:2, 1132:14, 1132:18, 1153:6, 1153:7, 1154:20, 1154:24, 1155:1, 1155:6, 1155:12, 1155:18, 1156:5, 1165:6, 1165:8, 1165:11, 1165:21, 1167:5, 1167:15, 1167:17, 1167:19, 1182:4, 1182:8 signalized [3] -1000:15, 1051:15, 1172:2

signals [2] -1155:21, 1167:9 significance [2] -1041:4, 1047:23 significant [10] -1008:7, 1008:10, 1008:24, 1009:1, 1011:9, 1011:14, 1012:20, 1089:20, 1168:15 similar [5] - 1025:20, 1027:5, 1064:18, 1073:9, 1108:15 similarly [1] - 1182:7 simple [2] - 1021:9, 1021:10 **simply** [2] - 1021:5, 1070:24 single [9] - 1002:15, 1014:3, 1014:5, 1015:5, 1015:19, 1015:21, 1017:1, 1017:16, 1068:6 single-family [7] -1014:3, 1015:5, 1015:19, 1015:21, 1017:1, 1017:16, 1068:6 single-lane [1] -1002:15 Sirianni [1] - 1051:9 sit [1] - 1000:6 site [59] - 1010:20, 1018:20, 1018:24, 1019:3, 1025:6, 1026:16, 1030:2, 1030:6, 1042:2, 1044:21, 1046:6, 1048:23, 1051:15, 1052:22, 1052:23, 1059:11, 1059:19, 1059:21, 1061:6, 1067:22, 1073:16, 1077:20, 1078:5, 1079:5, 1079:17, 1079:18, 1081:20, 1085:4, 1085:18, 1086:13, 1087:12, 1092:23, 1093:8, 1094:7, 1094:12, 1094:16, 1098:13, 1103:10, 1103:18, 1109:17, 1128:15, 1134:13, 1138:10, 1144:4, 1153:21, 1153:22, 1154:1, 1158:18, 1160:4, 1161:14, 1161:18, 1161:19, 1164:8,

1173:24 situation [3] -1120:22, 1144:6, 1169:18 size [6] - 1013:11, 1013:17, 1014:21, 1018:5, 1026:19, 1031:10 sketches [1] -1103:14 Skiles [3] - 1067:5, 1067:11, 1089:8 **Skros** [1] - 1122:18 SKROS [1] - 1122:19 Skupp [1] - 1117:22 slight[1] - 1008:14 slope [2] - 1098:9, 1098:12 slopes [3] - 1097:19, 1097:23, 1098:5 slows [1] - 1068:13 small [1] - 1045:15 smaller [1] - 1176:23 so-called [1] -1146:2 Sobers [1] - 1122:8 solicitor [1] - 998:3 someone [2] -1000:19, 1085:8 sometimes [3] -1099:6, 1155:24, 1181:21 somewhere [1] -1176:22 soon [2] - 1091:15, 1106:11 sorry [22] - 1006:13, 1039:23, 1042:9, 1046:3, 1065:15, 1067:18, 1082:20, 1087:5, 1090:12, 1103:8, 1106:18, 1118:4, 1130:7, 1136:8, 1152:15, 1154:17, 1157:23, 1159:12, 1162:13, 1169:12, 1177:13, 1183.22 sort [3] - 1031:2, 1053:3, 1158:20 sound [1] - 1092:11 sounds [4] -1092:13, 1095:14, 1096:8 South [22] - 1000:20, 1002:5, 1002:19, 1004:13, 1004:23, 1005:18, 1006:10, 1006:19, 1011:4,

1012:8, 1024:22,

1044:18, 1045:16, 1090:21, 1091:12, 1118:13, 1118:19, 1119:8, 1119:17, 1119:18, 1166:19, 1178:19 south [15] - 1001:10, 1001:12, 1001:22, 1027:17, 1029:22, 1030:6, 1042:21, 1088:6, 1088:10, 1137:18, 1138:4, 1138:10, 1138:11, 1172:4, 1178:19 southbound [9] -1002:12, 1003:10, 1132:11, 1143:22, 1144:10, 1171:24, 1173:23, 1174:2, 1174:21 space [1] - 1127:7 spacing [1] -1012:13 Spackman [2] -1056:4, 1115:2 speaking [1] -1128:24 speaks [5] - 1034:17, 1036:4, 1036:7, 1064:2, 1066:13 special [2] - 1043:3, 1102:18 **specific** [9] - 1009:3, 1033:15, 1069:19, 1079:14, 1103:6, 1171:13, 1172:7, 1172:9, 1176:21 specifically [12] -1009:11, 1024:20, 1080:11, 1087:10, 1141:12, 1146:23, 1165:24, 1166:12, 1176:24, 1177:10, 1177:17, 1177:21 Specifically [1] -1167:20 specificity [1] -1101:10 specifics [3] -1114:6, 1166:3, 1169:15 specified [2] -1169:4, 1174:15 specifies [1] -1141:4 specify [2] - 1034:6, 1172:6 speed [2] - 1027:13, 1117:5 speeds [4] - 1117:2,

1164:9, 1173:23,

1117:12, 1157:3, 1179:14 spell [1] - 1125:16 split[1] - 1132:13 split-phasing [1] -1132:13 stacking [7] -1002:5, 1002:7, 1002:11, 1002:19, 1002:21, 1003:10, 1004:14 staff [1] - 1060:22 staggered [1] -1167:1 stand [2] - 1184:20, 1185:11 standard [7] -1013:20, 1017:15, 1038:8, 1038:11, 1038:22, 1062:12, 1099:12 standards [6] -1040:21, 1040:23, 1140:2, 1149:3, 1177:4, 1179:21 standpoint [1] -1114:14 started [2] - 998:18, 1156:4 starting [4] -1106:23, 1106:24, 1107:3, 1150:11 starts [2] - 1051:6, 1060.9 State [4] - 1094:7, 1096:2, 1099:5, 1109:24 state [15] - 1027:1, 1028:1, 1035:16, 1038:6, 1074:16, 1074:18, 1074:22, 1075:6, 1075:20, 1110:17, 1110:19, 1114:18, 1125:15, 1129:3, 1166:21 statement [18] -1022:6, 1028:6, 1048:11, 1049:17, 1049:21, 1065:12, 1065:17, 1066:18, 1073:19, 1075:17, 1076:2, 1080:4, 1084:14, 1084:15, 1085:23, 1101:23, 1109:19, 1144:17 statements [2] -1137:7, 1165:3 states [4] - 1018:19, 1026:22, 1056:20, 1095:8

stating [1] - 1170:22 statistical [2] -1021:1, 1022:2 statistically [2] -1015:17, 1020:12 statistics [1] -1021:6 status [7] - 1041:11, 1045:2, 1050:6, 1054:5, 1132:21, 1132:22, 1145:23 staying [2] - 1144:8, 1145:21 steep [1] - 1097:19 stenographic [1] -1187:11 step [1] - 1153:9 still [12] - 999:17, 1053:1, 1085:20, 1088:19, 1088:20, 1133:2, 1151:5, 1153:16, 1159:18, 1175:7, 1175:17, 1175:18 stipulate [4] -1033:11, 1063:15, 1063:17, 1126:12 **stop** [1] - 1031:2 stopped [2] - 1138:4, 1138:7 stops [2] - 1032:8, 1068:11 storage [1] - 1002:17 stormwater [1] -1080:21 straight [3] -1085:19, 1179:14, 1179:17 Street [52] - 1000:20, 1002:5, 1002:9, 1002:10, 1002:15, 1002:19, 1003:10, 1003:18, 1004:13, 1004:17, 1004:20, 1004:24, 1005:18, 1006:10, 1006:19, 1007:16, 1011:4, 1012:9, 1024:23, 1030:8, 1042:16, 1044:18, 1045:16, 1047:12, 1047:20, 1047:24, 1048:7, 1056:20, 1073:13, 1076:23, 1084:12, 1088:11, 1088:12, 1090:21, 1091:12, 1095:3, 1095:11, 1098:16, 1108:21, 1112:23, 1113:1,

1113:6, 1118:13,

1118:19, 1119:3, 1119:5, 1119:8, 1119:17, 1129:5, 1144:12, 1166:19, 1178:20 street [1] - 1023:8 streets [4] - 1025:2, 1129:10, 1143:6, 1143:8 stretch [1] - 1004:9 stretching [1] -1185:3 strike [1] - 1169:1 strongly [5] -1048:24, 1049:1, 1051:18, 1063:3, 1108:22 structural [1] -1045:17 structure [8] -1037:7, 1037:21, 1038:19, 1039:3, 1039:7, 1039:21, 1041:12, 1045:23 structures [2] -1038:15, 1039:15 studies [8] - 1006:7, 1016:5, 1042:19, 1072:24, 1073:10, 1109:11, 1115:13, 1174:16 **Study** [6] - 1092:17, 1133:21, 1134:6, 1138:15, 1158:22, 1171:19 study [61] - 1000:13, 1000:17, 1003:3, 1003:23, 1005:21, 1007:8, 1010:9, 1011:8, 1011:9, 1011:20, 1012:4, 1015:11, 1017:18, 1024:13, 1025:17, 1029:8, 1029:11, 1030:21, 1030:24, 1031:5, 1031:7, 1031:17, 1032:2, 1032:5, 1039:14, 1040:1, 1043:21, 1056:18, 1060:1, 1060:4, 1082:23, 1082:24, 1083:3, 1086:19, 1087:3, 1087:11, 1089:14, 1090:1, 1096:21, 1096:24, 1098:24, 1102:19, 1103:23, 1104:11, 1104:17, 1115:6, 1115:18,

1135:18, 1136:14, 1137:23, 1138:2, 1143:21, 1146:5, 1161:10, 1161:17, 1162:3, 1162:16, 1162:18, 1171:8 Subdivision [3] -1143:2, 1177:2, 1183:5 subdivision [2] -1133:23, 1183:14 subject [15] -1053:10, 1054:16, 1059:15, 1083:16, 1087:3, 1104:12, 1108:18, 1110:9, 1127:14, 1127:23, 1128:8, 1128:22, 1132:5, 1139:20, 1149:1 submission [4] -1060:5, 1083:18, 1095:21, 1161:15 submissions [3] -1120:16, 1136:19, 1136:22 submit [1] - 1057:6 submitted [31] -1008:12, 1015:10, 1058:4, 1059:14, 1059:15, 1083:1 1083:4, 1083:5, 1083:7, 1083:14, 1083:23, 1086:19, 1092:15, 1093:17, 1094:1, 1096:11, 1096:24, 1104:18, 1108:24, 1109:5, 1115:19, 1129:17, 1131:16, 1131:18, 1135:18, 1137:22, 1141:5, 1141:8, 1161:10, 1161:19, 1164:17 submitting [1] -1164:14 substance [1] -1163:13 substantially [2] -1141:10, 1168:14 suffice [1] - 1081:9 sufficient [1] -1091:8 suggest [4] -1052:21, 1070:24, 1078:7, 1138:8 suggested [5] -1075:13, 1080:10,

1095:19, 1156:14,

1163:14

suggesting [1] -1179:20 suggestion [1] -1001:21 summary [3] -1031:24, 1115:7, 1116:1 summer [1] -1019:21 Supervisor [2] -1062:8, 1065:13 Supervisors [6] -997:2, 997:22, 1092:16, 1139:14, 1156:12, 1158:8 SUPERVISORS [1] -996:1 support [6] -1028:10, 1028:14, 1075:15, 1122:4, 1137:14, 1171:20 supportive [1] -1027:1 supports [1] -1028:1 suppose [1] - 1124:8 surprise [1] - 1074:1 surrounding [7] -1027:10, 1073:16, 1087:12, 1091:5, 1111:8, 1128:21, 1181:11 Survey [1] - 1044:21 survey [1] - 1044:21 swim [1] - 1113:2 Swim [1] - 1005:16 Swimming [3] -1112:8, 1112:22, 1113:13 swimming [1] -1114:11 sworn [3] - 999:13, 1125:8, 1125:11 system [4] - 1009:22, 1041:13, 1042:1, 1065:9 systems [2] -1041:10, 1041:20

# Т

table [1] - 1013:6

Table [5] - 1008:17,
1013:2, 1021:14

tables [2] - 1019:12,
1021:13

talks [2] - 1025:10,
1048:18

tasked [1] - 1147:16

technical [1] -

1119:1, 1131:19,

1173:13 ten [3] - 1008:13, 1111:12, 1171:23 ten-minute [1] -1111:12 tenths [1] - 1119:5 term [3] - 1021:2. 1021:8, 1069:11 terminology [1] -1039:2 terms [24] - 1004:8, 1005:19, 1012:11, 1018:5, 1020:24, 1021:3, 1021:6, 1022:2, 1027:8, 1034:7, 1038:11, 1040:8, 1046:15, 1049:14, 1069:13, 1070:10, 1072:17, 1073:16, 1073:22, 1074:17, 1075:3, 1101:13, 1114:19, 1121:14 testified [40] -999:14, 1008:10, 1008:11, 1010:11, 1028:10, 1028:16, 1028:21, 1034:16, 1034:23, 1037:8, 1046:6, 1053:6, 1062:19, 1064:18, 1072:13, 1096:15, 1097:4, 1099:3, 1099:4, 1104:1, 1104:7, 1104:9, 1104:14, 1106:3, 1111:4, 1115:11, 1115:15, 1115:20, 1118:16, 1125:12, 1138:13, 1142:4, 1149:6, 1162:15, 1165:8, 1169:24, 1170:11, 1175:21, 1181:14 testify [1] - 1051:1 testifying [3] -1010:6, 1033:2, 1033:5 testimony [53] -998:14, 998:16, 999:19, 1012:24, 1022:24, 1023:17, 1033:9, 1034:1, 1034:2, 1044:16, 1055:4, 1066:22, 1069:1, 1069:3, 1069:12, 1069:14, 1069:21, 1070:1, 1070:7, 1070:13, 1071:5, 1072:16,

1080:23, 1086:11, 1092:23, 1103:8, 1112:21, 1113:6, 1116:23, 1127:9, 1128:4, 1131:2, 1131:5, 1131:7, 1135:14, 1139:6, 1141:22, 1144:13, 1148:16, 1151:18, 1157:15, 1160:16, 1164:12, 1165:3, 1165:4, 1166:6, 1168:1, 1168:10, 1170:6, 1174:8, 1174:11, 1175:4, 1185:5 THE [233] - 996:1, 996:2, 997:13, 997:20, 1000:5, 1000:12, 1000:24, 1001:5, 1001:9, 1001:19, 1001:24, 1002:7, 1002:14, 1002:21, 1003:1, 1003:8, 1003:13, 1003:22, 1004:2, 1004:5, 1004:16, 1005:2, 1005:9, 1005:19, 1006:4, 1006:11, 1006:13, 1007:1, 1007:14, 1007:24, 1008:9, 1008:21, 1009:4, 1009:13, 1009:23, 1010:9, 1010:23, 1011:7, 1011:19, 1011:24, 1012:10, 1012:16, 1012:20, 1012:22, 1013:4, 1013:19, 1014:18, 1015:3, 1015:7, 1016:1, 1017:3, 1017:19, 1018:13, 1018:17, 1019:7, 1019:17, 1020:24, 1022:8, 1023:11, 1024:3, 1024:8, 1024:11, 1024:15, 1025:4, 1025:18, 1026:22, 1027:20, 1027:24, 1028:9, 1028:19, 1029:1, 1029:10, 1029:18, 1030:22, 1031:6, 1031:12, 1031:24, 1032:10, 1032:15, 1032:23, 1033:5, 1033:24, 1034:14, 1035:12, 1036:3,

1036:14, 1037:22,

1038:7, 1038:16,

1039:6, 1039:18, 1040:5, 1040:8, 1040:13, 1040:20, 1041:5, 1041:15, 1041:22, 1042:1, 1042:12, 1043:2, 1043:14, 1043:24, 1044:11, 1044:22, 1045:1, 1045:7, 1045:21, 1046:14, 1047:9, 1047:17, 1048:3, 1048:8, 1048:13, 1048:20, 1049:12, 1049:20, 1050:10, 1050:22, 1051:2, 1051:8, 1051:24, 1052:6. 1052:15, 1053:5, 1053:16, 1053:19, 1053:24, 1054:15, 1054:21, 1055:1, 1055:11, 1055:19, 1055:23, 1056:6, 1056:11, 1056:23, 1057:9, 1057:12, 1058:2, 1058:14, 1058:22, 1059:4, 1059:13, 1059:22, 1060:3, 1060:20, 1060:23, 1061:7, 1061:16, 1064:9, 1067:1, 1067:23, 1068:8, 1092:20, 1093:1, 1093:5, 1093:8, 1093:11, 1093:14, 1093:18, 1093:24, 1094:5, 1094:10, 1094:13, 1094:23, 1095:14, 1096:7, 1096:13, 1096:18, 1096:22, 1097:2, 1097:9, 1097:16. 1097:22. 1098:6, 1098:11, 1098:23, 1099:9, 1099:13, 1099:17, 1099:20, 1100:1, 1100:6, 1100:11, 1100:14, 1100:19, 1101:3, 1101:8, 1101:24, 1102:3, 1102:10, 1102:15, 1103:2, 1103:15, 1103:21, 1104:7, 1104:22, 1105:2, 1105:6, 1105:14, 1105:19, 1105:22, 1106:2, 1108:1, 1108:5, 1109:3, 1109:9, 1110:15,

1113:4, 1113:10, 1113:15, 1113:21, 1113:24, 1114:5, 1114:16, 1115:15, 1116:4, 1116:14, 1116:23, 1117:8, 1118:22, 1120:15, 1120:23, 1121:12, 1165:16, 1165:19, 1173:9, 1173:14, 1183:22, 1185:2 theirs [1] - 1031:21 themselves [2] -1036:7, 1078:24 thereby [1] - 1145:4 therefore [4] -1019:3, 1079:13, 1144:18, 1163:10 third [2] - 1054:3, 1134:7 Thomas [1] - 997:23 THOMAS [1] -996:15 Thompson [3] -1090:16, 1092:5, 1185:24 THOMPSON [4] -997:8, 1090:18, 1092:3, 1092:6 Thornbury [24] -997:7, 1001:11, 1001:22, 1010:16, 1027:17, 1043:3, 1043:9, 1053:11, 1055:12, 1055:17, 1056:2, 1085:16, 1086:5, 1089:12, 1092:8, 1095:4, 1101:21, 1102:5, 1102:11, 1102:17, 1103:3, 1103:5, 1115:1, 1167:21 thousand [1] -1120:8 thousand-fold [1] -1120:8 three [7] - 1004:24, 1086:21, 1096:16, 1130:12, 1133:14, 1176:4, 1176:8 throughout [5] -1019:18, 1036:22, 1043:16, 1130:22, 1136:3 throughways [1] -1025:3 timing [10] -

1046:12, 1057:16,

1057:21, 1057:24,

1058:7, 1118:19,

1119:16, 1119:17, 1120:11, 1122:2 TIP [2] - 1037:9, 1038:24 **TIS** [1] - 1138:14 title [2] - 1019:23, 1022:3 today [11] - 1003:15, 1007:10, 1012:21, 1022:14, 1040:3, 1042:13, 1042:14, 1073:16, 1088:6, 1088:21, 1153:5 together [1] - 1143:8 Toll [21] - 997:16, 998:10, 1010:12, 1022:24, 1023:3, 1025:24, 1047:20, 1049:9, 1052:17, 1053:7, 1055:13, 1056:18, 1071:7, 1102:2, 1102:6, 1102:21, 1105:23, 1110:3, 1121:5, 1121:11, 1156:2 **TOLL** [1] - 996:8 tonight [3] - 1033:3, 1111:5, 1115:10 took [2] - 1015:17, 1063:22 top [2] - 1041:23, 1048:15 topography [4] -1079:4, 1079:17, 1081:20, 1082:10 total [1] - 1105:12 toward [3] - 1100:10, 1108:23, 1145:8 townhomes [1] -1078:23 townhouses [3] -1078:21, 1079:9, 1081:5 TOWNSHIP [1] -996:2 township [51] -1011:17, 1023:8, 1027:6, 1029:5, 1030:17, 1031:8, 1036:5, 1037:4, 1040:21, 1050:3, 1053:16, 1059:10, 1060:22, 1061:13, 1075:12, 1075:23, 1076:18, 1076:20, 1078:6, 1078:7,

1110:23, 1111:4,

1083:8, 1098:4,

1105:18, 1114:4,

1120:17, 1121:13,

1121:18, 1122:3,

1126:22, 1129:3, 1129:20, 1129:22, 1131:22, 1136:20, 1136:23, 1147:24, 1152:3, 1152:5, 1156:4, 1157:2, 1160:12, 1161:24, 1162:11, 1167:15, 1178:6, 1181:1, 1181:8, 1183:6, 1184:10, 1185:6 Township [26] -996:18, 997:5, 997:7, 997:10, 998:2, 1000:9, 1000:21, 1053:1, 1053:11, 1053:14, 1064:16, 1069:5, 1069:18, 1072:22, 1084:3, 1092:19, 1095:4, 1102:10, 1103:3, 1103:5, 1108:23, 1114:12, 1125:4, 1138:22, 1142:9, 1160:1 Township's [3] -1143:2, 1177:1, 1181:4 township's [7] -1025:21, 1118:24, 1131:13, 1138:16, 1140:6, 1147:22, 1163:20 townships [1] -1155:22 tracking [1] -1007:22 tract [5] - 997:15, 998:11, 1034:22, 1034:24, 1060:19 traditionally [1] -1064:15 Traffic [2] - 1138:15, 1171:19 traffic [210] -1004:19, 1004:21, 1005:20, 1006:7, 1007:13, 1007:19, 1008:3, 1010:9, 1011:14, 1018:4, 1019:15, 1019:19, 1019:20, 1019:22, 1020:4, 1020:7, 1020:18, 1021:4, 1021:21, 1022:9, 1022:11, 1022:18, 1024:13, 1025:2, 1025:13, 1025:16, 1025:21, 1026:8, 1027:6, 1027:9,

1027:10, 1027:14, 1029:8, 1029:11, 1029:16, 1029:19, 1029:21, 1030:3, 1030:5, 1030:14, 1030:18, 1030:20, 1030:21, 1030:23, 1030:24, 1031:5, 1031:7, 1031:16, 1032:5, 1039:13, 1040:1, 1042:20, 1043:3, 1043:6, 1043:21, 1045:20, 1046:8, 1046:11, 1053:17, 1055:14, 1055:18, 1056:18, 1057:19, 1057:23, 1059:19, 1060:1, 1060:4, 1062:9, 1062:12, 1063:11, 1064:11, 1064:13, 1064:15, 1064:20, 1065:2, 1065:9, 1066:5, 1067:2, 1067:6, 1067:12, 1068:13, 1068:14, 1069:8, 1070:20, 1074:7, 1075:15, 1082:23, 1082:24, 1084:10, 1084:13, 1086:13, 1086:18, 1086:23, 1086:24, 1087:8, 1087:14, 1087:15, 1087:17, 1088:6, 1088:8, 1088:9, 1088:17, 1088:20, 1088:22, 1088:24, 1089:4, 1090:1, 1096:20, 1096:23, 1099:23, 1100:2, 1101:19, 1101:22, 1102:18, 1102:20, 1103:23, 1104:3, 1104:4, 1104:10, 1104:15, 1110:1, 1110:6, 1110:10, 1114:13, 1116:17, 1117:6, 1118:12, 1118:16, 1118:20, 1119:1, 1119:7, 1120:3, 1120:5, 1120:7, 1126:10, 1126:17, 1129:22, 1130:8, 1131:3, 1131:14, 1131:19, 1133:6, 1133:21, 1134:16, 1135:17, 1136:14, 1137:18, 1137:23,

1138:5, 1138:7,

1138:16, 1140:10,

1141:10, 1141:13, 1142:22, 1143:17, 1143:18, 1143:21, 1144:3, 1145:3, 1145:9, 1146:5, 1147:23, 1149:16, 1152:3, 1153:2, 1153:6, 1153:7, 1153:12, 1153:16, 1155:3, 1155:12, 1155:15, 1156:5, 1156:20, 1157:7, 1158:15, 1158:17, 1158:23, 1159:1, 1159:6, 1161:9, 1162:13, 1163:13, 1163:21, 1163:22, 1164:5, 1164:12, 1167:5, 1167:9, 1168:10, 1168:11, 1168:15, 1168:16, 1170:23, 1171:8, 1172:23, 1174:15, 1177:11, 1177:18, 1177:22, 1180:19, 1180:20, 1182:4, 1182:8 traffic-related [6] -1130:8, 1133:6, 1134:16, 1153:12, 1163:13, 1163:22 trail [1] - 1056:4 transcript [1] -1187:11 transit [8] - 1032:18, 1072:12, 1072:14, 1072:18, 1072:20, 1072:22, 1073:2, 1073:8 transportation [15] -1005:12, 1007:22, 1009:20, 1009:22, 1009:24, 1031:4, 1031:11, 1031:13, 1031:14, 1031:20, 1031:23, 1032:1, 1032:8, 1032:12, 1115:6 Transportation [5] -1013:21, 1092:17, 1133:21, 1134:5, 1158:22 travel [14] - 1000:13, 1000:14, 1000:23, 1001:2, 1001:7, 1030:6, 1042:13,

1100:11, 1137:18, 1138:4, 1138:9, 1178:19 traverse [1] -1084:11 trees [1] - 1048:1 trend [2] - 1008:1, 1072:23 trends [1] - 1021:9 trip [7] - 1013:6, 1013:20, 1013:22, 1014:8, 1015:21, 1016:2, 1017:8 trips [10] - 1013:16, 1013:23, 1014:9, 1014:22, 1017:10, 1017:12, 1043:19, 1043:20, 1178:7, 1178:8 true [5] - 1010:8, 1169:22, 1177:9, 1177:15, 1187:10 trust [1] - 1184:18 Trust [1] - 1115:1 try [1] - 1106:17 trying [2] - 1035:7, 1036:12 Tuesday [2] -996:11, 1184:21 turn [35] - 998:4, 1000:14, 1029:23, 1030:1, 1030:10, 1045:16, 1047:4, 1048:14, 1052:3, 1067:3, 1089:5, 1119:10, 1119:23, 1119:24, 1120:14, 1128:3, 1132:12, 1135:9, 1141:12, 1144:4, 1144:8, 1144:9, 1144:14, 1144:23, 1145:2, 1145:8, 1145:9, 1150:1, 1157:12, 1157:13, 1157:18, 1157:20, 1168:22, 1169:3, 1174:21 turning [8] -1002:16, 1002:17, 1055:8, 1088:7, 1088:10, 1104:4, 1160:23, 1175:19 turns [7] - 1058:18, 1068:10, 1153:19, 1153:20, 1172:13,

1172:14, 1179:11

two [34] - 1004:24,

traveling [9] -

1029:22, 1088:6,

1088:9, 1089:1,

1014:3, 1014:5, 1014:11, 1015:18, 1016:9, 1017:17, 1029:24, 1040:7, 1044:4, 1061:14, 1063:5, 1069:5, 1069:16, 1071:1, 1096:4, 1104:8, 1106:21, 1107:9, 1107:21, 1117:5, 1120:11, 1129:3, 1129:9, 1130:20, 1135:19, 1142:13, 1157:5, 1163:9, 1166:21, 1175:22, 1176:8, 1183:2 two-lane [1] - 1129:9 type [6] - 1026:7, 1026:20, 1027:12, 1045:20, 1049:24, 1181:13 types [5] - 1016:9, 1022:18, 1041:6, 1046:17, 1073:2 typical [1] - 1158:22 typically [7] -1012:10, 1018:3, 1020:4, 1038:4, 1039:17, 1073:1, 1076:8 tvpo [1] - 1058:17

#### U

umbrella [1] -1016:15 unable [1] - 1161:22 unbuilt [1] - 1072:20 uncommon [1] -1038:20 under [15] - 999:17, 1015:18, 1018:12, 1018:19, 1035:13, 1035:15, 1036:1, 1071:19, 1089:17, 1115:20, 1123:18, 1144:14, 1145:1, 1154:21, 1159:7 underlying [3] -1087:6, 1110:14, 1142:15 understandable [1] -1099:3 understood [10] -1049:22, 1063:20, 1064:3, 1066:19, 1107:5, 1122:6, 1160:10, 1174:9, 1175:19, 1183:16 undesirable [5] -

1042:15, 1067:3,

1088:7, 1089:1,

1100:23, 1143:6,

1180:21

1049:4, 1049:23, 1117:6, 1144:6, 1153:14 unit [5] - 1017:10, 1017:12, 1018:3, 1018:4, 1018:5 units [29] - 1013:10, 1013:11, 1013:24, 1014:3, 1014:6, 1014:12, 1014:22, 1015:2, 1015:19, 1016:3, 1016:4, 1016:10, 1016:11, 1016:12, 1016:13, 1017:7, 1017:9, 1017:11, 1018:1, 1078:22, 1104:21, 1104:24, 1105:3, 1105:5, 1105:7, 1105:11, 1105:15 unknown [1] -1082:7 unnecessary [2] -1153:19, 1153:20 unpack [1] - 1141:21 unplugs [1] -1112:17 unsafe [3] - 1080:11, 1144:7, 1145:18 up [29] - 1003:1, 1003:22, 1012:2, 1015:2, 1015:16, 1018:14, 1028:5, 1039:10, 1039:24, 1044:4, 1047:11, 1051:16, 1078:21, 1090:6, 1107:3, 1110:5, 1111:3, 1114:7, 1123:5, 1124:11, 1124:14, 1124:21, 1128:1, 1146:24, 1148:11, 1165:18, 1178:9, 1180:2, 1180:9 up-scale [2] -1110:5, 1111:3 update [1] - 1138:14 updated [2] - 1083:2, 1104:15 upgrade [1] - 1032:7 upgraded [1] -1145:15 upgrades [1] -1046:11 ups [1] - 1064:13 **US** [9] - 1094:8, 1094:17, 1094:21, 1129:4, 1130:16, 1132:10, 1132:12, 1137:19, 1171:24

USE [1] - 996:7 user [1] - 1007:12 users [2] - 1006:23, 1006:24 usership [1] -1032:16 uses [5] - 1013:23, 1016:14, 1016:20, 1026:10, 1027:7 utilize [5] - 1014:8, 1017:15, 1026:9, 1027:10, 1088:17

# V vaque [1] - 1033:20

valleys [1] - 1020:20

value [6] - 1015:21,

1074:7, 1075:17,

1076:2, 1080:5, 1080:6 varies [1] - 1019:19 variety [4] - 1008:4. 1013:23, 1016:14, 1016:21 various [3] -1010:14, 1019:18, 1053:9 vary [3] - 1100:2, 1100:22, 1101:12 vehicle [5] - 1012:12, 1012:13, 1012:15, 1091:17 vehicles [19] -1007:4, 1012:15, 1012:17, 1012:19, 1018:7, 1022:20, 1086:14, 1087:7, 1100:20, 1100:22, 1101:11, 1138:3, 1138:4, 1138:5, 1138:9, 1153:24, 1164:5, 1173:22, 1179:15 vehicular [3] -1002:22, 1013:6, 1143:15 verify [1] - 1037:16 versus [12] - 1015:5, 1015:22, 1016:3; 1016:12, 1016:13, 1017:1, 1017:16, 1019:21, 1116:12. 1116:15, 1157:16 vertical [2] -1080:17, 1081:19 vested [1] - 1006:5 via [1] - 1138:6 vice [1] - 997:23 vicinity [2] - 1128:22,

1132:4 video [1] - 999:6 view [2] - 1047:24, 1120:3 viewsheds [2] -1040:19, 1041:4 violation [1] -1064:16 visit [2] - 1081:16, 1129:15 visited [1] - 1128:12 **VOICE** [1] - 1165:12 **VOLUME** [1] - 996:5 volume [16] -1019:22, 1020:6, 1021:4, 1022:18, 1042:22, 1049:5, 1049:24, 1050:4, 1050:7, 1050:8, 1050:11, 1050:15, 1068:14, 1086:13, 1088:2, 1120:4 volumes [6] -1008:3, 1019:16, 1020:18, 1087:15, 1117:2, 1117:12 vulnerable [1] -1042:21

# W

waiting [1] - 1002:19 waiver [2] - 1184:8, 1184:11 walk [4] - 1043:12, 1077:15, 1077:16, 1078:1 walking [5] -1043:16, 1043:20, 1074:9, 1080:2, 1081:5 wants [2] - 1037:4, 1081:15 warrant[1] - 1154:20 warranted [9] -1144:5, 1144:14, 1144:24, 1153:8, 1155:7, 1157:21, 1167:17, 1170:1, 1181:16 warrants [1] - 1155:1 ways [4] - 1023:18, 1023:23, 1024:2, 1069:3 weekday [2] -1016:18 weekly [1] - 1014:14 weigh [1] - 1038:2 welcome [1] - 997:14 Weller [1] - 1122:24

1005:17, 1011:15, 1034:19, 1044:19, 1065:1, 1066:4, 1077:20, 1084:20, 1088:7, 1088:13, 1094:8, 1096:2, 1119:5, 1120:2 West [60] - 996:11, 1010:19, 1019:1, 1019:3, 1025:13, 1027:2, 1028:15, 1029:23, 1030:2, 1030:7, 1030:14, 1030:16, 1030:20, 1040:15, 1042:16, 1044:3, 1060:12, 1061:4, 1061:15, 1062:23, 1067:4, 1067:10, 1068:4, 1070:18, 1071:1, 1071:23, 1073:17, 1076:23, 1078:6, 1078:8, 1079:3, 1079:10, 1084:12, 1085:3, 1088:10, 1089:7, 1095:10. 1108:21, 1112:1, 1112:2, 1115:12, 1115:17, 1115:21, 1116:21, 1129:6, 1130:21, 1136:15, 1141:4, 1142:1, 1144:11, 1156:10, 1156:20, 1157:3, 1159:15, 1166:10, 1174:2, 1178:12, 1179:6, 1179:22, 1183:1 western [2] -1011:16, 1178:5 westernmost [1] -1078:22 Westminster [5] -1019:2, 1019:10, 1034:20, 1042:8, 1112:5 Westtown [17] -997:5, 997:22, 1000:9, 1000:21, 1001:13, 1001:14, 1053:1, 1053:11, 1053:14, 1064:16, 1069:5, 1069:17, 1072:21, 1085:16, 1114:12, 1126:22, 1167:21 WESTTOWN[1] -

WELLER [1] - 1123:1

west [17] - 1000:9,

1000:13, 1001:14,

whereas [1] - 1014:4 whereby [1] -1091:24 WHEREOF [1] -1187:14 wide [1] - 1027:12 widen [1] - 1045:5 widening [6] -1037:11, 1044:17, 1045:9, 1045:12, 1112:22, 1112:24 widenings [1] -1023:7 width [6] - 1023:8, 1069:17, 1143:1, 1156:21, 1156:24, 1183:4 wife [1] - 1112:16 William [1] - 1111:24 willing [9] - 1028:22, 1039:5, 1049:10, 1049:13, 1085:12, 1137:5, 1137:12, 1152:4 willingness [2] -1137:1, 1151:21 winter [1] - 1019:21 wishes [1] - 1106:4 wishing [2] - 1030:5, 1089:1 witness [4] - 998:16, 1124:4, 1124:9, 1125:10 Witness [1] -1123:12 WITNESS [228] -1000:12, 1000:24, 1001:5, 1001:9, 1001:19, 1001:24, 1002:7, 1002:14, 1002:21, 1003:1. 1003:8, 1003:13, 1003:22, 1004:2, 1004:5, 1004:16, 1005:2, 1005:9, 1005:19, 1006:4, 1006:11, 1006:13, 1007:1, 1007:14, 1007:24, 1008:9, 1008:21, 1009:4, 1009:13, 1009:23, 1010:9, 1010:23, 1011:7, 1011:19, 1012:10, 1012:20, 1013:4, 1013:19, 1014:18, 1015:3, 1015:7, 1016:1, 1017:3, 1017:19, 1018:13, 1018:17,

76 of 76 sheets

1019:7, 1019:17, 1020:24, 1022:8, 1023:11, 1024:3, 1024:8, 1024:11, 1024:15, 1025:4, 1025:18, 1026:22, 1027:20, 1027:24, 1028:9, 1028:19, 1029:1, 1029:10, 1029:18, 1030:22, 1031:6, 1031:12, 1031:24, 1032:10, 1032:15, 1032:23, 1033:5, 1033:24, 1034:14, 1035:12, 1036:3, 1036:14, 1037:22, 1038:7, 1038:16, 1039:6, 1039:18, 1040:5, 1040:8, 1040:13, 1040:20, 1041:5, 1041:15, 1041:22, 1042:1, 1042:12, 1043:2, 1043:14, 1043:24, 1044:11, 1044:22, 1045:1, 1045:7, 1045:21, 1046:14, 1047:9, 1047:17, 1048:3, 1048:8, 1048:13, 1048:20, 1049:12, 1049:20, 1050:10, 1050:22, 1051:2, 1051:8, 1051:24, 1052:6, 1052:15, 1053:5, 1053:16, 1053:19, 1053:24, 1054:15, 1054:21, 1055:1, 1055:11, 1055:19, 1055:23, 1056:6, 1056:11, 1056:23, 1057:9, 1057:12, 1058:2, 1058:14, 1058:22, 1059:4, 1059:13, 1059:22, 1060:3, 1060:20, 1060:23, 1061:7, 1061:16. 1064:9, 1067:1, 1067:23, 1068:8, 1092:20, 1093:1, 1093:5, 1093:8, 1093:11, 1093:14, 1093:18, 1093:24, 1094:5, 1094:10, 1094:13, 1094:23, 1095:14, 1096:7, 1096:13, 1096:18, 1096:22, 1097:2, 1097:9, 1097:16, 1097:22, 1098:6,

1098:11, 1098:23, 1099:9, 1099:13, 1099:17, 1099:20, 1100:1, 1100:6, 1100:11, 1100:14, 1100:19, 1101:3, 1101:8, 1101:24, 1102:3, 1102:10, 1102:15, 1103:2, 1103:15, 1103:21, 1104:7, 1104:22, 1105:2, 1105:6, 1105:14, 1105:19, 1105:22, 1106:2, 1108:1, 1108:5, 1109:3, 1109:9, 1110:15, 1110:23, 1111:4, 1113:4, 1113:10, 1113:15, 1113:21, 1113:24, 1114:5, 1114:16, 1115:15, 1116:4, 1116:14, 1116:23, 1117:8, 1118:22, 1120:15, 1120:23, 1121:12, 1165:16, 1165:19, 1173:9, 1173:14, 1183:22, 1185:2, 1185:18, 1186:1, 1187:14 witnesses [2] -1051:3, 1185:7 Wolter [1] - 1118:8 wondered [1] -1005:6 wonderful [1] -1040:16 wondering [4] -1024:24, 1033:21, 1037:17, 1115:14 works [2] - 1051:10, 1125:21 worse [1] - 1091:20 wrapping [1] -1022:6 writing [2] - 1048:6, 1070:4 written [3] - 1026:14, 1071:16, 1072:2 wrote [1] - 1108:15

X

XVIII [1] - 996:8

year [3] - 1009:7, 1019:18, 1019:24 years [5] - 1005:1,

1008:2, 1008:13, 1061:1, 1129:23

Z

zones [1] - 1038:9 Zoning [8] - 1140:2, 1140:6, 1140:8, 1140:17, 1142:14, 1149:3, 1168:3, 1168:13 zoning [1] - 1026:18