	1362		1364
		18:06:49 1	would like to introduce Mrs. Carol DeWolf, to
17:52:28		18:06:52	my right, vice chair; Mr. Tom Haws, police
	OF THE TOWNSHIP OF WESTTOWN CHESTER COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA	18:06:55	commissioner; I'm Mike DiDomenico, Chair.
	4	18:06:58	To my far left is Mr. Pingar,
	5 VOLUME 8	18:07:00 5	Township Manager. And to my left is Mr.
	6	18:07:03 6	Patrick McKenna, our township solicitor. At
	7 IN RE: CONDITIONAL USE APPLICATION	18:07:07 7	this time I'll turn it over to Mr. McKenna.
	8 TOLL PA XVIII, L.P.	18:07:09	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.
	10 Hearing was held at the Bayard	18:07:11 9	Chairman. Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
	Rustin High School, Auditorium, 1100 Shiloh 11 Road, West Chester, Pennsylvania, on Tuesday September 19, 2017, beginning at 6:05	18:07:13 10	We are here on the continued hearing of the
	12 o'clock, p.m.	18:07:15 11	Toll Brothers Crebilly application. We were
	13	18:07:17 12	last here on August 29th.
	BEFORE: MICHAEL T. DIDOMENICO, Chairman CAROL R. DEWOLF	18:07:19 13	As we have with every other
	THOMAS HAWS	18:07:21 14	evening, my first question is: Is there anyone
	17 ALSO PRESENT: ROBERT R. PINGAR,	18:07:23 15	who is recording either the audio or visually?
	18 Township Manager	18:07:25 16	MR. BRAXTON: Yes.
	20	18:07:26 17	MR. MCKENNA: Yes, sir, one more
	21	18:07:27 18	time for the record, your name, please.
	22	18:07:28 19	MR. BRAXTON: John Braxton.
18:02:08	23 ELEANOR J. SCHWANDT, RMR COURT REPORTER	18:07:31 20	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir.
18:04:36	∠4	18:07:33 21	This evening we are going to pick
		18:07:34 22	up where we left off. I believe the Planning
		18:07:37 23	Commission has one more witness, Mr. John
1		18:07:40 24	Snook, who is here and ready to testify. At
1	1363 APPEARANCES:		1365
•		18:07:42 1	that time we are going to move on to the other
2	PATRICK M. MCKENNA, Esquire on behalf of the Board of Supervisors	18:07:44 2	parties. Birmingham Township has already
3		18:07:46 3	advised they will not have any witnesses to
4	GREGG I. ADELMAN, Esquire on behalf of the Applicant	18:07:48 4	present. I'm fairly certain Thornbury Township
		18:07:51 5	has one witness at least to present.
5	KRISTIN CAMP, Esquire on behalf of Westtown Township	18:07:53	I know Neighbors for Crebilly
6	Planning Commission	16:07:55 7	does as well, but, unfortunately, the witness
7	KATHRYN L. LABRUM, Esquire	18:07:57	could not be here this evening. We are already
•	on behalf of Thornbury Township	18:07:59	scheduled for October 24th, so, and we still
8	MARK THOMPSON, Esquire	18:08:03 10	have to hear public comment, at a minimum we
9	on behalf of Neighbors for Crebilly, LLC	18:08:05 11	are going to be coming back then. We
10	FRONEFIELD CRAW FORD, Esquire	18:08:07 12	anticipate hearing that witness at that time.
10	on behalf of Birmingham Township	18:08:09 13	But if we get through those parties, ladies and
11	JOHN DENDEMONTI Facuiro	18:08:11 14	gentlemen, we will be coming to all the other
12	JOHN RENDEMONTI, Esquire on behalf of Vasilios Moscharis	18:08:13 15	parties for your presentations. Now would be
40		18:08:17 16	the time to be sworn in, provide any testimony
13 18:05:49 14	******	18:08:19 17	or evidence or present any witnesses that you
18:06:13 15	THE CHAIRMAN: Okay. Good	18:08:22 18	may have.
18:06:14 16	evening, everyone. Welcome to the eighth conditional use hearing for the Crebilly tract	18:08:22 19	So we will go through our list.
∫ ₈ 18	and Toll Brothers developers. Please rise for	18:08:24 20	The crowd is a bit thin tonight. So if you are
18:06:21 19 18:06:37 20	our Pledge of Allegiance. (Pledge of Allegiance takes	18:08:28 21	not here, we will deal with it potentially one
18:06:38 21	place.)	18:08:32 22	last time in October since we have to be here.
18:06:38 22 18:06:42 23	THE CHAIRMAN: Thank you. I'll do this for the eighth time. For those who may	18:08:35 23	For those of you that are here this evening,
18:06:46 24	not know the Westtown Board of Supervisors, I	18:08:37 24	please reiterate to any other party that you

	4200			4200
18:08:40	1366 may know that they attend in October.	18:10:20	1	1368 pre-marked as Exhibit Planning Commission 19.
18:08:43 2	Typically you only get one	18:10:23	2	I'm handing Mr. Adelman a copy.
18:08:44 3	opportunity, so the fact you are likely to get	18:10:25	3	I have previously provided copies to the Board
16 4	two is unusual, to say the least, but we want	18:10:27	4	and to the other represented parties.
T -	to give everyone the chance to be heard. We	1	5	Can you identify that document,
	realize it is important. So please spread the	18:10:30	6	please?
18:08:51 b	word.	18:10:32	7	A. This is my CV or resume.
	MS. DEWOLF: Pat, do we have	18:10:32	8	Q. And can you briefly describe your
	their e-mails?	18:10:42	9	education and professional background as you
40	MR. MCKENNA: No.	18:10:44		
44		18:10:46	10	have summarized on your CV?
18:08:59 11	MS. DEWOLF: I think the township	1		A. Yes. I have a bachelor's degree in
18:09:01 12	might, it might be nice if we could get an	18:10:51		architecture from the University of California,
18:09:03 13	e-mail out to them notifying them of that for	18:10:54		Berkeley, and a master's of architecture in
18:09:05 14	the ones that we do have.	18:10:57		urban design, which is sort of the marriage of
18:09:07 15	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Well, let's	18:11:00		planning and architecture, from Virginia Tech.
18:09:09 16	talk about that off the record if that's all	18:11:05		I also have worked as a planner
18:09:11 17	right, Carol. We will try to facilitate. I	18:11:07		for over 40 years. I have worked in over 100
18:09:13 18	know it went out on LISTSERV for this evening.	18:11:12		municipalities in Pennsylvania, I have worked
18:09:16 19	We specifically tried to emphasize that as	18:11:14		in several other states, notably on behalf of
18:09:18 20	well.	18:11:17		other land trusts. And I think, frankly, that
18:09:18 21	Mr. Adelman, anything else before	18:11:23		it speaks for itself.
18:09:21 22	we continue?	18:11:25		MR. ADELMAN: Kristin, if I may,
18:09:21 23	MR. ADELMAN: Nothing from me.	18:11:27		what is your intention in terms of his offer
23 24	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Ms. Camp, go	18:11:30	24	for qualifications an expert?
1	1367			1369
18:09:24	ahead with your witness, please.	18:11:31	1	MS. CAMP: I would like to offer
18:09:25	MS. CAMP: Thank you. I'd like	18:11:32	2	Mr. Snook as an expert in land planning.
18:09:26	to call John D. Snook. John, you have to be	18:11:34	3	MR. ADELMAN: You are not going
18:09:47	sworn.	18:11:35	4	to offer him as an expert in traffic
5	JOHN D. SNOOK,	18:11:37	5	engineering or history?
6	the witness herein, having first been	18:11:38	6	MS. CAMP: I am not.
7	duly sworn on oath, was examined and	18:11:39	7	MR. ADELMAN: I don't have any
18:09:54	testified as follows:	18:11:40	8	objection.
18:09:54	DIRECT EXAMINATION	18:11:41	9	MR. MCKENNA: All right. Mr.
10	BY MS. CAMP:	18:11:43		Snook will be admitted as an expert land
18:09:57 11	Q. Please state your name.	18:11:45		planner.
18:09:58 12	A. John D. Snook.	18:11:46		BY MS. CAMP:
18:10:00 13	Q. And your business	18:11:46		Q. Mr. Snook, does the Brandywine
18:10:01 14	A. Is that adequate in the mike?		14	Conservancy, your employer, serve as the land
18:10:04 15	Okay. Good.	18:11:51		planner for Westtown Township?
18:10:05 16	Q. Good. And your business address,	18:11:53		A. Yes, although not exclusively.
18:10:07 17	please?	18:11:55		Westtown has their own planner on staff, and
18:10:07 18	A. Pardon me?	18:11:59		also hires other consultants from time to time,
18110:08 19	Q. Business address?	18:12:03		notably Tom Comitta and his staff, as well as
20	A. Is 1 Hoffman's Mill Road, Chadds Ford,	18:12:06		the fact that URDC in Bethelem prepared the
18:10:13 21	Pennsylvania.	18:12:12		2001 Growth Management Plan and Natural Lands
18:10:13 22	Q. With whom are you employed?	18:12:13		prepared the 2014 Open Space Plan.
	A. The Brandywine Conservancy.	18:12:17	.3	I have worked with all of those
18:10:15 23 18:10:16 24	Q. I'm going to hand you a document I have	18:12:18	A	consultants, frequently, and I am very familiar

	1370	Π		1372
18:12:22 1	with their work.	18:13:53	1	under.
18:12:23 2	Q. Does Westtown Township ask you to	18:13:54	2	Q. And are you familiar with the Crebilly
18:12:24 3	review land development plans from a planning	18:13:56	3	property that is the subject of the conditional
27 4	perspective?	18:13:58	4	use application before the Board this evening?
18:12:28 5	A. Yes.	18:14:01	5	A. Yes.
18:12:29 6	Q. Do you also serve as a member of the	18:14:01	6	Q. And explain to the Board how you have
18:12:33 7	Board of Supervisors in East Bradford Township?	16:14:04	7	become familiar with the Crebilly property.
18:12:35	A. I do, for ten years.	18:14:05	8	A. Through many years of observation,
18:12:36 9	Q. And as a member of the East Bradford	18:14:10	9	through several plan reviews for prior plans,
18:12:39 10	Board are you involved in a land use appeal	16:14:13	10	and one detailed tour of the property in the
18:12:41 11	with Toll Brothers concerning the development	18:14:18	11	context of the Presby Homes CCRC development
18:12:44 12	of the Tigue tract?	18:14:21	12	proposal.
18:12:45 13	A. We are at the moment, although my role	18:14:22	13	Q. Did you perform planning reviews of
18:12:48 14	as a supervisor in East Bradford is entirely	18:14:24	14	other land development applications that have
18:12:51 15	unrelated to my professional role as a land	18:14:26	15	been submitted over the past years for the
18:12:54 16	planning consultant to Westtown.	18:14:28	16	Crebilly tract?
18:12:55 17	Q. Did you provide your objective	18:14:29	17	A. Yes. As I just noted, the Presby Homes
18:12:57 18	professional planning opinion to the Westtown	18:14:34	18	continuing care retirement community plan, as
18:13:00 19	Planning Commission in your review of the	18:14:36	19	well as the Bozzuto apartment plan.
18:13:02 20	applicant's plans and application?	18:14:39	20	Q. Did you prepare a memorandum to the
18:13:03 21	A. Yes, I did.	18:14:41	21	Planning Commission dated December 15th, 2016,
18:13:04 22	Q. Do you have any personal or pecuniary	18:14:45	22	actually addressed to the Planning Commission
18:13:07 23	interest in the outcome of this hearing?	18:14:47	23	as well as the Township Manager and the former
08 24	A. No.	18:14:49	24	township planner, Chris Patriarca, which was
, ,	1371			1373
18:13:08 1	Q. Do any members of your family have any	18:14:52	1	marked Exhibit B-16?
18:13:11 2	personal or pecuniary interest in the outcome	18:14:54	2	A. Yes.
18:13:13 3	of this hearing?	18:14:54	3	Q. And what materials did you review prior
18:13:14 4	A. No.	18:14:56	4	to preparing that memorandum?
18:13:14 5	Q. Does the Brandywine Conservancy or any	16:14:58	5	A. I reviewed all plans and documents that
18:13:17 6	business in which you are affiliated have any	18:15:02	6	had been submitted by the applicant as of that
18:13:19 7	pecuniary interest in the outcome of this	18:15:06	7	date, although the ones that pertained to other
18:13:21 8	hearing?	18:15:10	8	consultants, such as traffic, soils, geology, I
18:13:22 9	A. No.	18:15:15	9	simply read through briefly and focused on the
18:13:22 10	Q. Does any business that your family	18:15:20	10	documents and notably the plan sheets pertinent
18:13:24 11	members may be involved with or own have any	18:15:24	11	to land planning.
18:13:28 12	pecuniary interest in the outcome of this	18:15:25	12	Q. In addition to reviewing what you just
18:13:30 13	hearing?	18:15:27	13	mentioned, there was a plan, Plan A Alternate
18:13:30 14	A. No.	18:15:32	14	is how the applicant has referred to it, and I
18:13:30 15	Q. Are you familiar with the Westtown	18:15:34	15	think it has been marked as Exhibit A-7. Did
18:13:33 16	Township 2001 Comprehensive Plan, otherwise	18:15:36		you review that plan?
18:13:36 17	known as the Growth Management Plan?	18:15:37	17	A. Yes, I did.
18:13:38 18	A. Yes.	18:15:38		Q. And that plan indicates a reduction in
18/13:39 19	Q. Are you familiar with the Westtown	18:15:42		building separation distances from 60 feet to
。20	Township Zoning Ordinances and Subdivision and	18:15:44		30 feet. Do you support that plan?
18:13:42 21	Land Development Ordinances?	18:15:46		A. Yes, I do, very much.
18:13:44 22	A. Yes. And in fact, I was one of the	18:15:47		Q. And why?
18:13:46 23	authors of the terms of the Flexible Design	18:15:48		A. Because the 60-foot separation, which
18:13:51 24 3 of 62 shee	procedure which this application is submitted ets Page 1370 to	18:15:52		may be normal say for apartment buildings, is 09/30/2017 08:58:07 Al

1378	1	1380
	18:23:27	Q. Explain the circumstances, and then I
scenic. Again, the disturbance of 50 percent	18:23:30 2	would like you to identify what I have marked
is permitted.	18:23:31 3	as Exhibit PC-20.
In terms of external views, the	18:23:33 4	A. I attended the battle re-enactment at
entire perimeter of the tract is scenic at	18:23:39 5	Sandy Hollow on last Saturday, in Birmingham
•	18:23:44 6	Township, and it was the first time I really
	18:23:48 7	walked out into the middle of the Sandy Hollow
•	18:23:51	tract, and I was amazed at what a clear view
	18:23:57	there is to Crebilly Farm, despite lots of tree
So the scenic views from the	18:24:01 10	growth in between over the years.
exterior are variable. But, in evaluating the	18:24:04 11	And it was amazing to me that
	18:24:09 12	from one important interpretive site another
	18:24:13 13	can actually be scene.
	l	Q. Did you take a photograph that we have
	18:24:17 15	marked as PC-20 on Saturday, September 16th I
Crebilly is an incredibly intact landscape,	18:24:21 16	guess it was?
,	18:24:21 17	A. Yes, I did.
there in September 1777.	18:24:22 18	Q. And does that photograph accurately
The main thing that's changed,	18:24:25 19	depict what you observed when you were taking
	18:24:28 20	the photograph?
	18:24:29 21	A. Yes. And I apologize for the audience
This tract is even visible today	18:24:35 22	not being able to see, because I don't have a
from an external view standpoint from other	18:24:37 23	projection means for it, but I do have extra
important tracts in the Battle of Brandywine	18:24:43 24	copies which can be spread around if someone
1379		1381
where Continental troops may, in fact, have	18:24:46	would like to do that.
first seen approaching British and Hessian	18:24:55 2	Q. Again, Mr
forces.	18:24:56 3	A. I also apologize, the photo is rather
Q. And, Mr. Snook, were you in attendance	18:24:58 4	fuzzy because it was taken from my ancient
at the prior conditional use hearings where the	18:25:03 5	cellphone.
Planning Commission presented the expert	18:25:03	Q. And again, what do you believe to be
testimony of Mr. Harris and also the testimony	18:25:06 7	the importance with respect to this photograph
of Sean Moir?	18:25:08	in terms of what it depicts with respect to
A. I was not. I had to leave the last	18:25:11 9	then what the ordinance would require for
hearing right as they were coming on, although	18:25:13 10	Flexible Design development?
I heard Mr. Moir's testimony before the	18:25:14 11	A. Okay. The photograph, you see parts of
well, it wasn't formal testimony at that point,	18:25:18 12	the re-enactment encampment in the foreground
presentation before the Planning Commission	18:25:22 13	right there on the Sandy Hollow ground. I was
before this went before the Board.	18:25:24 14	surprised, standing there, at the sense of
And I am familiar with what they	18:25:27 15	elevation at Sandy Hollow above Crebilly which
testified about. I would like, however, to see	18:25:31 16	was clearly visible in the distance.
, , ,		
the transcript at some point.	18:25:34 17	The barn complex, the main barn
	18:25:34 17 18:25:36 18	The barn complex, the main barn complex, the one with the driveway off the
the transcript at some point.		• •
the transcript at some point. Q. In talking about what you view to be	18:25:36 18	complex, the one with the driveway off the
the transcript at some point. Q. In talking about what you view to be relatively, I guess, you didn't say this, but	18:25:36 18 18:25:39 19	complex, the one with the driveway off the Street Road, with the sign Crebilly Farm, is
the transcript at some point. Q. In talking about what you view to be relatively, I guess, you didn't say this, but one of the more scenic views that you would	18:25:36	complex, the one with the driveway off the Street Road, with the sign Crebilly Farm, is clearly poking above the trees that are in
the transcript at some point. Q. In talking about what you view to be relatively, I guess, you didn't say this, but one of the more scenic views that you would find worthy of protection, did you have an	18:25:36	complex, the one with the driveway off the Street Road, with the sign Crebilly Farm, is clearly poking above the trees that are in Thornbury Township, in between. And behind the
_	In terms of external views, the entire perimeter of the tract is scenic at varying depths, due to either topography or tree masses that exist, or historical buildings such as the Westtown Inn at Darlington Corners, which block the view further into the tract. So the scenic views from the exterior are variable. But, in evaluating the relative importance of the scenic views, in my view, the most important issue is the relevance of the scenic views to the interpretation of the Battle of Brandywine, as this landscape at Crebilly is an incredibly intact landscape, very similar in appearance to what was likely there in September 1777. The main thing that's changed, obviously, one, new buildings. The other is more trees, but not that many more. This tract is even visible today from an external view standpoint from other important tracts in the Battle of Brandywine 1379 where Continental troops may, in fact, have first seen approaching British and Hessian forces. Q. And, Mr. Snook, were you in attendance at the prior conditional use hearings where the Planning Commission presented the expert testimony of Mr. Harris and also the testimony of Sean Moir? A. I was not. I had to leave the last hearing right as they were coming on, although I heard Mr. Moir's testimony before the —well, it wasn't formal testimony at that point, presentation before the Planning Commission before this went before the Board. And I am familiar with what they	would be by most people considered to be scenic. Again, the disturbance of 50 percent is permitted. In terms of external views, the entire perimeter of the tract is scenic at varying depths, due to either topography or tree masses that exist, or historical buildings such as the Westtown Inn at Darlington Corners, which block the view further into the tract. So the scenic views from the exterior are variable. But, in evaluating the relative importance of the scenic views, in my view, the most important issue is the relevance of the scenic views to the interpretation of the Battle of Brandywine, as this landscape, very similar in appearance to what was likely there in September 1777. The main thing that's changed, obviously, one, new buildings. The other is more trees, but not that many more. This tract is even visible today from an external view standpoint from other important tracts in the Battle of Brandywine 182425 22 from an external view standpoint from other important tracts in the Battle of Brandywine 182426 3 Q. And, Mr. Snook, were you in attendance at the prior conditional use hearings where the Planning Commission presented the expert testimony of Mr. Harris and also the testimony of Sean Moir? A. I was not. I had to leave the last hearing right as they were coming on, although I heard Mr. Moir's testimony before the well, it wasn't formal testimony at that point, presentation before the Planning Commission before this went before the Board. And I am familiar with what they 182227 15

1382 1384 1 red oval, it is elongated because at this 1 although the applicant didn't offer or submit 18:26:02 18:28:33 distance, obviously, east-west dimension is 2 any mitigation of scenic view demise since they 2 18:26:05 accurate, north-south is not. 3 didn't map them. 3 18:26:10 So, but that portion that I have Q. Mr. Snook, you indicated in your .2 18:28:43 encircled is the portion that is largely within 18:26:16 5 18:28:45 5 testimony that the ordinance allows 50 percent 6 what the County Planning Commission identified of the areas that have been mapped as secondary 18:26:20 18:28:48 as the battlefield swath. The rest of Crebilly conservation areas to be disturbed. Is there a 7 18:26:24 18:28:51 8 Farm goes actually clear beyond the other side 8 way, in your professional opinion, that the 18:28:53 18:26:28 of the photograph, behind the trees. And those 9 Crebilly tract can be developed like the 9 18:28:55 18:26:31 18:26:35 10 trees are in Thornbury Township. 10 applicant is proposing in terms of 18:28:59 single-family dwellings, multiple-family 11 While I was standing there I 18:29:01 11 18:26:39 12 could see, but it didn't make it into my 18:29:03 12 dwellings, and yet preserve the scenic views 18:26:40 18:26:43 13 photograph, I could see the Westminster Church 18:29:05 13 from the three points you mentioned, Sandy 14 and I could see the houses on Hidden, I believe 18:29:09 14 Hollow, New Street and Route 926? 18:26:45 it is Hidden Pond Way, for example. That water 18:29:12 15 A. Yes. Not entirely, because any 15 18:26:49 tower that you can see in the distance is in 18:29:15 16 development will be visible. The key is the 16 18:26:53 17 West Chester. 18:29:17 17 depth of view. 18:26:56 18:26:57 18 Q. John, in your opinion, does the plan 18:29:19 18 The applicant has, in fact, 18:29:21 19 provided some depth of view in their current 19 that the applicant has presented for 18:26:59 conditional use approval adequately protect the plans, but they are prominently in the path of 20 18:29:24 20 18:27:01 scenic view from Sandy Hollow? the battle movements and prominently visible, 21 18:29:29 21 18:27:03 as I showed with my photograph, from Sandy 22 A. No, it does not. In fact, you will 18:29:33 22 18:27:08 18:29:37 23 18:27:11 23 recall at the Planning Commission meetings I Hollow. 18:29:38 24 have prepared a model, a video model of the 24 The way they could, however, do 1385 1383 it is by moving the development out of the development plan showing how it would be seen 18:27:18 1 18:29:40 from outside the tract. so-called battlefield swath and clustering it 2 18:29:43 18:27:22 And on this photograph, the hill 3 more tightly, perhaps a different mix, perhaps 18:27:24 3 that you see directly behind the yellow oval, more carriage homes, perhaps move septic 4 4 18:29:50 18:27:26 which is the barn complex, will, in fact, if disturbance areas so that they are in the swath 5 18:29:54 18:27:29 6 development goes as proposed be filled with new 6 rather than up where development might occur, 18:27:32 7 out of the swath. And I think they could go a 7 houses. 18:27:38 18:29:59 8 long way toward achieving conservation of 8 Q. In your opinion, does the plan 18:30:02 18:27:38 9 significant interpretive landscape. 9 presented by the applicant adequately protect 18:30:06 18:27:40 18:30:09 10 Q. In your opinion, has the applicant's 10 scenic views from New Street or Route 926? 18:27:42 plan been designed with minimal intrusion into 11 A. No. And I would note, I agree with the 18:30:11 11 18:27:45 secondary conservation areas as is required by 12 inference of your question in ascertaining 18:30:14 12 18:27:50 18:30:18 13 Section 1617.C.2 of the Zoning Ordinance? 13 greater importance to New Street and Street 14 Road, 926, because those are the roads clearly A. No. The plan submitted does not 18:30:22 14 18:27:57 within the, what the County Planning Commission demonstrate any minimization of disturbance or 18:30:25 15 18:28:00 intrusion. It simply is a plan, since, again, called the battlefield swath. 18:30:29 16 16 18:30:33 17 Route 202 obviously has lots of since critical secondary resources, namely 18:28:07 17 18:30:37 18 other things along it and things distracting scenic views, were not included, there was also 18 18:28:09 18128:12 19 18:30:42 19 no analysis of them or their impact to them, from the view. 18:30:47 20 4 20 Pleasant Grove Road has a large nor mitigation of impact. 18:30:49 21 18:28:16 21 Q. And in your opinion, has the applicant tree mass along the eastern leg, which is not 18:30:53 22 designed the plan to protect the most critical 18:28:19 22 in the battlefield swath, and the westerly leg, the topography is such that it would be more 18:30:55 23 features of the site that are worthy of 18:28:23 23 18:30:57 24 easy to provide landscaping to mitigate, conservation, in your opinion?

1386 1388 1 A. The applicant has shown proposed 18:31:00 18:33:26 1 percent of the net tract area is 27 acres, development areas largely avoiding the primary 18:31:02 2 18:33:29 2 which is quite, is considerable. That should conservation areas, which are resources such as 18:31:07 3 3 be after recreational ground and facilities. 4 wetlands and steep slopes. There has been no 4 This has not been demonstrated, to my 18:33:38 effort, however, to protect, minimize or 5 knowledae. 18:31:16 18:33:41 mitigate the impacts to important scenic views, 6 18:31:20 6 18:33:42 In addition, the Comprehensive and notably those associated with the Battle of 7 Plan specifically suggests a perimeter trail be 18:31:23 7 18:33:46 8 Brandywine. required around the entire Crebilly Farm tract 18:31:27 18:33:49 Q. Do you have any other planning 9 9 in the context of future development. The 18:31:27 18:33:52 18:33:55 10 former Bozzuto development plan, for example, 10 recommendations for how the applicant's plan 18:31:28 11 could be revised to meet ordinance requirements 18:33:58 11 in the actual approval, required such a trail, 18:31:31 12 to minimize intrusion into secondary 18:34:03 12 as well as a fourth leg, if you will, of 18:31:33 13 conservation areas? 18:34:08 13 parkway, it was termed, alongside the required 18:31:35 14 A. Yes. I would suggest that the 18:34:11 14 connector road, of varying width, with an 18:31:37 15 applicant work with the township to identify 18:34:16 15 off-road pedestrian and bicycle trail and areas 18:31:41 16 scenic views and their relative importance from for interpretation of the historical landscape 18:34:19 16 17 place to place on the tract; to seek protection 18:34:22 17 and view, which that plan intended to preserve. 18:31:49 18 and mitigation of the impacts through design, 18:34:27 18 Additionally, perimeter trails 18:31:52 19 as required by the ordinance, frankly, noting 18:34:30 19 which could be natural surface trails should be 18:31:56 18:32:00 20 in particular the importance or the perspective 18:34:33 20 required along West Pleasant Grove Road, South 18:34:37 21 21 of interpretation of the Battle of Brandywine New Street and Street Road, Route 926, 18:32:05 22 within scenic views; and then propose connecting with what may go along the connector 18:34:40 22 18:32:12 23 mitigation to disturbance where those secondary road, which I call the parkway. 18:34:44 23 18:34:46 24 24 resources are to be disturbed. Q. Why do you believe that a trail network 14 1387 1389 1 Q. In your opinion, do you believe that along the perimeter of the Crebilly tract is an 18:32:18 2 2 the applicant's plan is generally consistent important planning tool? 18:34:51 18:32:20 A. One, it is a requirement of the comp 3 with the Township's Comprehensive Plan? 3 18:34:53 18:32:23 4 A. No. 4 plan. 18:34:55 18:32:25 5 Q. And why not? 5 Two, it is a very important means 18:32:25 18:34:56 6 to help provide for the interpretation of this A. The submitted plan does not adequately 18:34:59 18:32:27 provide for a connector road as testified 7 7 historical landscape. Too, it's, as also 18:32:32 8 required in the ordinance, on the perimeter in 8 previously. It does not provide adequately for 18:32:36 18:35:08 9 protection of historic resources, nor scenic particular it would be easy to provide for 18:35:13 18:32:40 18:35:15 10 18:32:43 10 views, as testified. connection into nearby trails, notably in 11 It does not provide adequately 18:35:18 11 Thornbury and Birmingham Townships where much 18:32:45 18:35:22 12 of the Battle of Brandywine took place. 12 for recreational open space or perimeter trails 18:32:46 18:35:24 13 Q. And do you believe, in your opinion, 18:32:51 13 and trail connections. 14 18:35:26 14 18:32:55 Q. What would you suggest as far as does the applicant's plan provide sufficient pedestrian facilities internal to the site? 15 revisions to the plan for location of trails 18:35:29 15 18:32:56 A. The plan provides for internal trails 16 and recreational land? 18:35:31 16 18:32:58 17 A. The Comprehensive Plan or Growth 18:35:35 17 linking the internal road system, which in that 18:33:02 18:35:39 18

18:35:44 19

18:35:46 20

18:35:49 21

18:35:51 22

18:35:52 23

18:35:57 24

described.

I have nothing further.

18:33:05 18

19/33:07 19 20

0

18:33:14 21

18:33:16 22

18:33:20 23 18:33:24 24

Management Plan requires dedication of

recreational lands. The Zoning Ordinance in

percent of the net tract area, not 10 percent

of the open space, be available, suitable and

In the case of Crebilly, 10

developed for active recreation.

the Flexible Design option requires that 10

context I believe is generally adequate. But I

do believe it should be extended to connect to

MS. CAMP. Thank you, Mr. Snook.

MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Adelman, cross.

an external trail system as I have just

-			1000
1	1390		1392
18:35:59	MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.	18:38:08 1	called it in some cases a visually significant
18:35:59	CROSS-EXAMINATION	18:38:11 2	landscape, whereas, and not to be elitist, a
18:36:00	BY MR. ADELMAN:	18:38:15	mobile home park was not.
12 4	Q. Mr. Snook, most of your testimony I	18:38:18 4	Q. Let me ask the question again because I
18:36:04 5	think centered on the scenic view requirement	18:38:20 5	don't think you answered it.
18:36:07 6	of the ordinance; is that correct?	18;38:21 6	A. All right.
18:36:09	A. Yes.	18:38:21 7	Q. I'll state it another way. Can you
18:36:10	Q. Now, is it true that the Zoning	18;38:22	direct me to the section of the Zoning
18:36:14 9	Ordinance doesn't define what is a,	18:38:24 9 18:38:27 10	Ordinance that provides the objective criteria?
18:36:19 10	quote-unquote, scenic view? A. The Zoning Ordinance does not define	18:38:27 10	A. The Zoning Ordinance does not provide, it simply lists scenic landscapes and it lists
18:36:19 11	scenic view, that is correct.	18:38:29 11	also them in terms of views, what should be
18:36:22 12 18:36:23 13	Q. You also just used the term depth of	18:38:36 13	considered and mapped.
	view, correct?	18:38:36 13	Now, a view
18:36:26 14	A. Yes.	18:38:40 15	Q. Well, there is nothing in the
	Q. And isn't that also the same, the	18:38:40 13	ordinance, then, for the applicant to
18:36:29 17	ordinance doesn't define what depth of view is?	18:38:41 17	specifically follow with respect to objective
18:36:29 17	A. The ordinance doesn't define that.	18:38:43	criteria; is that correct?
18:36:31 10	That was my way of suggesting a means to	18:38:46 19	A. Well, the word "view" is somewhat
18:36:38 20	differentiate between views that might be	18:38:49 20	objective, because if you drive along the
18:36:38 20	disturbed and views that you wouldn't disturb,	18:38:52 21	outside of the tract, you can draw a line as to
18:36:42 22	because I was describing the relative depth as	18:36:55 22	where the end of your view is, so that's not
18:36:42 22	a means to evaluate, but there was no	18:39:01 23	entirely unobjective. And that's the term the
18.38,46 24	evaluation.	18:39:04 24	ordinances use. It uses the term scenic views.
	1391		1393
18:36:50	1391 Q. So isn't it true that there is no	18:39:08	1393 Q. But there is no criteria in the
18:36:50 1		18:39:08 1 18:39:09 2	
	Q. So isn't it true that there is no		Q. But there is no criteria in the
18:36:52 2	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance	18:39:09 2	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there?
18:36:52 2 18:36:54 3	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there?A. There are no specific criteria.
18:36:52 2 18:36:54 3 18:36:57 4	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is?	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4	 Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from
18:36:52 2 18:36:54 3 18:36:57 4 18:36:59 5	 Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term 	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5	 Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202,
18:36:52 2 18:36:54 3 18:36:57 4 18:36:59 5 18:37:04 6	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6	 Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe
18:36:52 2 18:36:54 3 18:36:57 4 18:36:59 5 18:37:04 6 18:37:06 7	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view.	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7	 Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8	 Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property?
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:28 9	 Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:28 9 18:39:30 10	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:28 9 18:39:32 10	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm.
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation. But I also have been involved in,	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:28 9 18:39:28 10 18:39:30 10 18:39:30 11 18:39:30 12 18:39:30 13 18:39:30 13	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation.	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:26 8 18:39:26 8 18:39:26 10 18:39:30 10 18:39:32 11 18:39:32 11 18:39:34 14 18:39:40 14	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those surrounding roadways looking inward, I would
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation. But I also have been involved in, over these last 40 years, in a number, in scenic analyses, one in the State of Kentucky,	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 19:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:28 9 18:39:28 10 18:39:30 10 18:39:30 11 18:39:30 12 18:39:30 13 19:39:40 14 18:39:42 15 18:39:45 16	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those surrounding roadways looking inward, I would see a farm field, some agricultural structures,
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation. But I also have been involved in, over these last 40 years, in a number, in scenic analyses, one in the State of Kentucky, one in Delaware, several here in Chester	18:39:09	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those surrounding roadways looking inward, I would see a farm field, some agricultural structures, a barn, a couple houses, whatever is on the
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation. But I also have been involved in, over these last 40 years, in a number, in scenic analyses, one in the State of Kentucky, one in Delaware, several here in Chester County, where we map scenic landscapes, and the	18:39:09	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those surrounding roadways looking inward, I would see a farm field, some agricultural structures, a barn, a couple houses, whatever is on the property today; isn't that correct?
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation. But I also have been involved in, over these last 40 years, in a number, in scenic analyses, one in the State of Kentucky, one in Delaware, several here in Chester County, where we map scenic landscapes, and the criteria was basically that the landscape that	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:28 9 18:39:30 10 18:39:32 11 18:39:36 12 18:39:39 13 18:39:40 14 18:39:42 15 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 17 18:39:45 18 18:39:53 18	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those surrounding roadways looking inward, I would see a farm field, some agricultural structures, a barn, a couple houses, whatever is on the property today; isn't that correct? A. That is correct.
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation. But I also have been involved in, over these last 40 years, in a number, in scenic analyses, one in the State of Kentucky, one in Delaware, several here in Chester County, where we map scenic landscapes, and the criteria was basically that the landscape that represented the characteristic landscape of the	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:26 9 18:39:30 10 18:39:32 11 18:39:32 12 18:39:35 12 18:39:40 14 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 17 18:39:55 18 18:39:55 20	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those surrounding roadways looking inward, I would see a farm field, some agricultural structures, a barn, a couple houses, whatever is on the property today; isn't that correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do the flexible development regulations
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation. But I also have been involved in, over these last 40 years, in a number, in scenic analyses, one in the State of Kentucky, one in Delaware, several here in Chester County, where we map scenic landscapes, and the criteria was basically that the landscape that represented the characteristic landscape of the area, in other words, it was a product of the	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:28 9 18:39:30 10 18:39:32 11 18:39:32 11 18:39:34 14 18:39:42 15 18:39:45 16 18:39:49 17 18:39:53 18 18:39:54 19 18:39:55 20 18:39:59 21	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those surrounding roadways looking inward, I would see a farm field, some agricultural structures, a barn, a couple houses, whatever is on the property today; isn't that correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do the flexible development regulations require screening of the proposed development?
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation. But I also have been involved in, over these last 40 years, in a number, in scenic analyses, one in the State of Kentucky, one in Delaware, several here in Chester County, where we map scenic landscapes, and the criteria was basically that the landscape that represented the characteristic landscape of the area, in other words, it was a product of the working landscape of the last say 300 years,	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:28 9 18:39:30 10 18:39:32 11 18:39:32 11 18:39:32 15 18:39:40 14 18:39:41 15 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 16 18:39:45 20 18:39:55 20 18:39:55 20 18:39:55 21	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those surrounding roadways looking inward, I would see a farm field, some agricultural structures, a barn, a couple houses, whatever is on the property today; isn't that correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do the flexible development regulations require screening of the proposed development? A. It requires a landscape plan.
18:36:52	Q. So isn't it true that there is no objective criteria under the Zoning Ordinance with respect to what is scenic view is or what depth of view is? A. I would argue that, one, the term "scenic view" is understood in the English language as scenic view. Yes, you might think something is more or less scenic than I think, which is why my view of the relative evaluation of the scenic view should be linked to factors that enhance the scenic value, such as the historical interpretation. But I also have been involved in, over these last 40 years, in a number, in scenic analyses, one in the State of Kentucky, one in Delaware, several here in Chester County, where we map scenic landscapes, and the criteria was basically that the landscape that represented the characteristic landscape of the area, in other words, it was a product of the	18:39:09 2 18:39:11 3 18:39:13 4 18:39:15 5 18:39:21 6 18:39:24 7 18:39:26 8 18:39:28 9 18:39:30 10 18:39:32 11 18:39:32 11 18:39:34 14 18:39:42 15 18:39:45 16 18:39:49 17 18:39:53 18 18:39:54 19 18:39:55 20 18:39:59 21	Q. But there is no criteria in the ordinance, is there? A. There are no specific criteria. Q. Thank you. Currently, if I looked from inside the site out, wouldn't I see Routes 202, 926, New Street, West Pleasant Grove, and maybe the church and some other structures that are surrounding the property? A. Yes. Obviously, it would depend on where you were. And in fact, as my photograph would indicate, if you can see Crebilly Farm from Sandy Hollow, you can see Sandy Hollow from Crebilly Farm. Q. Right. And if I was to sit on those surrounding roadways looking inward, I would see a farm field, some agricultural structures, a barn, a couple houses, whatever is on the property today; isn't that correct? A. That is correct. Q. Do the flexible development regulations require screening of the proposed development?

	_	1204			1396
	4	1394		1	new or expanded nonresidential principal use
18:40:14	1	permitted.	18:43:12	2	that abuts an existing residential use.
18:40:15	2	Q. I would like to show you a copy of	18:43:16	_	Specific buffer requirements, as contained in
18:40:20	3	Section 170-905.G.	18:43:20	3	
14	4	A. I actually have that.	18:43:22	4	the use districts, shall be considered to have
18:40:25	5	Q. Excellent. If you could turn to that,	18:43:24	5	fulfilled the obligations herein."
18:40:28	6	170-905.G of the flexible development	18:43:31	6	Q. Mr. Snook, I've handed out to you what
18:40:32	7	regulations. Does that state that screening is	18:44:06	7	I have marked as Exhibit A-39. It is an
18:40:38	8	required?	18:44:09	8	excerpt from Exhibit A-3, currently already
18:40:40	9	A. One second. I'm not there yet.	18:44:14	9	admitted.
18:40:41	10	Q. Sure.	18:44:15		A. Mm-hmm.
18:40:44	11	A. 905.G, did you say?	18:44:15		Q. Consisting of sheets 44 A, B, C, D and
18:40:46	12	Q. Yes.	16:44:23	12	E, prepared by ESE Engineering entitled
18:40:55	13	A. G, screening as required, and it	18:44:29	13	"Landscape Plan." Have you reviewed the
18:40:57	14	references to the landscape requirement.	18:44:32	14	landscape plan for the proposed project?
18:40:58	15	Q. Section 170-1508, is that correct?	18:44:34	15	A. I had reviewed this sheet back when it
18:41:01	16	A. Yes, which I do not have.	18:44:37	16	was submitted, and considered it to be a
18:41:02	17	Q. And I do. One moment.	18:44:42	17	generalized portrayal
18:41:35	18	Mr. Snook, I've handed out to you	18:44:45	18	Q. Sure.
18:41:43	19	what I have marked as Exhibit A-38. Is this a	18:44:46	19	A at that time.
18:41:47	20	copy of Section 170-1508 of the Zoning	18:44:46	20	Q. Well, that's good. Let's go through
18:41:51	21	Ordinance?	18:44:47	21	it. If we start on sheets 44 A and B of
18:41:51	22	A. Yes.	18:44:52	22	Exhibit A-39, aren't there screen plantings and
18:41:52	23	Q. And this governs screening regulations;	18:44:57	23	a landscape berm and buffer proposed along West
840	24	isn't that correct?	18:45:01	24	Pleasant Grove Road?
1		1395			1397
18:41:54	1	A. Yes.	18:45:01	1	A. Yes.
18:41:56	2	Q. Now, under the flexible development	18:45:02	2	Q. And isn't there also existing
18:42:00	3	regulations isn't it true that the townhomes	18:45:04	3	vegetation to remain along West Pleasant Grove?
18:42:05	4	proposed by Toll are considered multi-family	18:45:07	4	A. Yes, there is.
18:42:07	5	dwellings?	18:45:08	5	Q. Okay. And if I look at sheet 44 B, the
16:42:07	6	A. Yes, they would be.	18:45:18	6	lower right-hand side where I have handwritten
18:42:09	7	Q. And if you would be so kind, if you	18:45:23	7	in Route 202?
18:42:14	8	could read Section 170-1508.A into the record,	18:45:25	8	A. Yes.
18:42:19	9	please.	18:45:25	9	Q. And then sheet 44 D of Exhibit A-39,
18:42:19	10	A. "A completely planted visual barrier or	18:45:32	10	again, aren't there proposed landscape screen
18:42:24	11	landscape screen, of sufficient density not to	18:45:35	11	plantings along those roadways?
18:42:28	12	be seen through and of sufficient height to	18:45:37	12	A. Yes, where adjacent to proposed
18:42:31	13	constitute an effective screen and give maximum	18:45:40	13	multi-family dwellings.
18:42:34	14	protection and immediate visual screening,	18:45:42	14	Q. Correct. Now, moving on to along Route
18:42:37	15	shall be provided and continually maintained	18:45:48	15	926, the viewshed along that road, sheets 44 C
18:42:40	16	between any industrial, office, or C-1	18:45:52	16	and 44 D of Exhibit A-39, there is some natural
18:42:44	17	Commercial District," which of course does not	18:45:58	17	landscaping that's maintained; is that correct?
18:42:47		apply here," and any contiguous	18:46:01	18	A. Yes. Notably along Radley Run.
19 42:50		residentially-zoned district; any multifamily	18:46:04	19	Q. Correct. And there is also, if you
6		residential use and any contiguous	18:46:07	20	notice, some additional landscape screen
18:42:59		single-family detached or two-family	18:46:11	21	plantings closer to the rear of the homes along
18:43:01		residential use;" which would be the case here,	18:46:13		that corridor; is that correct?
18:43:07		"any use by special exception permitted in the	18:46:15	23	A. Yes.
18:43:09		Commercial District," not applicable, "and any	18:46:16		Q. And then lastly, if you look at sheets
					11 00/20/2017 09:59:07 A

Page 1394 to 1397 of 1511

09/30/2017 08:58:07 AM

9 of 62 sheets

	1398		1400
18:46:21 1	44 A and 44 C of Exhibit A-39, along New	18:48:18 1	respect to the property's alleged involvement
18:46:28 2	Street.	18:48:19 2	in the Battle of Brandywine?
18:46:28 3	A. Oh, okay.	18:48:20 3	A. That and all my own reading, and the
19 4	Q. Starting I guess on the southwest	18:48:23 4	testimony that rather, the presentations
18:46:31 5	corner, on 44 C of Exhibit A-39. Is there	18:48:27 5	that were made before the Planning Commission.
18:46:36	existing vegetation there proposed to be	18:48:29 6	Q. But you are not an expert in history;
18:46:39	maintained?	18:48:32 7	is that correct?
	A. There is existing vegetation in the	18:48:32	A. No. Although I have written probably
•	southern leg of New Street.		more historic preservation ordinances than
40	Q. Mm-hmm.	18:48:37 10	•
4.4		18:48:42 11	anyone else in Pennsylvania. But my degree is not in historic preservation.
	A. But up to the point where Radley Run crosses under New Street.	18:48:42	-
18:46:52 12			Q. There is no historic preservation
18:46:53 13	Q. Correct. And then at that point, if	18:48:45 13	ordinance with respect to this type of viewshed
18:46:54 14	you look closer to the rear of the homes,	18:48:48 14	in this township; isn't that correct?
18:46:56 15	again, isn't there proposed landscape screen	18:48:49 15	A. Not in Westtown.
18:46:59 16	plantings behind those homes?	18:48:52 16	Q. And with respect to your testimony on
18:47:00 17	A. There is. Although those are	18:48:57 17	the connector road, did you base your opinion
18:47:02 18	single-family dwellings, so technically it	18:49:00 18	that a connector road is required upon the
18:47:04 19	wouldn't be required.	18:49:02 19	statements from the Township's Growth
18:47:05 20	Q. Okay. But it runs all the way up, if	18:49:06 20	Management Plan?
18:47:08 21	you look at 44 A on Exhibit A-39?	18:49:06 21	A. Yes, as well as my prior involvement
18:47:12 22	A. Yes.	18:49:09 22	with the other two large projects proposed for
18:47:12 23	Q. It runs up behind all those homes,	18:49:12 23	this tract.
4 24	correct?	18:49:12 24	Q. And when you made those statements in
	1399	١.,	1401
18:47:14 T	A. Yes, essentially.	18:49:16	the other projects, that, again, was based upon
18:47:19	Q. Turning to your Exhibit P-20, the	18:49:18 2	the Growth Management Plan's statements?
18:47:22 3	photograph from Sandy Hollow, approximately how	18:49:20 3	A. Yes, as well as my, frankly, my own
18:47:25	far away is Sandy Hollow from the Crebilly	18:49:22 4	opinion for many years.
18:47:28		=	O But you are not a traffic ansinger?
•	property?	18:49:23 5	Q. But you are not a traffic engineer?
18:47:29 6	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't	18:49:25	A. No. But planners do deal with the
18:47:33 7	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile.	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that
18:47:33 7 18:47:35 8	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay.	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with.
18:47:33 7 18:47:35 8 18:47:36 9	 A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. 	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis
18:47:33 7 18:47:35 8 18:47:36 9 18:47:38 10	 A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is 	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for
18:47:33 7 18:47:35 8 18:47:36 9 18:47:38 10 18:47:41 11	 A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a 	16:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10 18:49:35 11	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property?
18:47:33	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct?	16:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No.
18:47:33	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street.	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning
18:47:33	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not	16:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:40 14	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road;
18:47:33	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not there is a perimeter trail on Sandy Hollow,	16:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:40 14 18:49:44 15	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road; isn't that correct?
18:47:33	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not there is a perimeter trail on Sandy Hollow, and there have been proposals to link it to	16:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:44 15 18:49:44 16	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road; isn't that correct? A. Not in the Zoning Ordinance, other than
18:47:33	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not there is a perimeter trail on Sandy Hollow, and there have been proposals to link it to other trails in Thornbury Township and	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:40 14 18:49:44 15 18:49:44 16 18:49:46 17	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road; isn't that correct? A. Not in the Zoning Ordinance, other than the express reference to the comp plan,
18:47:33	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not there is a perimeter trail on Sandy Hollow, and there have been proposals to link it to other trails in Thornbury Township and Birmingham Township.	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:40 14 18:49:44 15 18:49:46 17 18:49:50 18	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road; isn't that correct? A. Not in the Zoning Ordinance, other than the express reference to the comp plan, consistency with the comp plan.
18:47:33	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not there is a perimeter trail on Sandy Hollow, and there have been proposals to link it to other trails in Thornbury Township and Birmingham Township. Q. With respect to your conclusions in	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:40 14 18:49:44 15 18:49:44 16 18:49:46 17 18:49:50 18 18:49:50 18	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road; isn't that correct? A. Not in the Zoning Ordinance, other than the express reference to the comp plan, consistency with the comp plan. Q. With respect to the open space on the
18:47:33 7 18:47:35 8 18:47:36 9 18:47:38 10 18:47:41 11 18:47:47 13 18:47:47 13 18:47:49 14 18:47:55 15 18:47:50 16 18:48:00 17 18:48:00 17 18:48:04 18 	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not there is a perimeter trail on Sandy Hollow, and there have been proposals to link it to other trails in Thornbury Township and Birmingham Township. Q. With respect to your conclusions in your letter, the, was it December 15th	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:32 10 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:40 14 18:49:44 15 18:49:46 17 18:49:46 17 18:49:50 18 18:49:52 19 18:49:55 20	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road; isn't that correct? A. Not in the Zoning Ordinance, other than the express reference to the comp plan, consistency with the comp plan. Q. With respect to the open space on the property, did you review sheet 4 D of
18:47:33 7 18:47:35 8 18:47:36 9 18:47:41 11 18:47:41 12 18:47:47 13 18:47:45 15 18:47:56 16 18:48:00 17 18:48:04 18 19:46 20 18:48:11 21	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not there is a perimeter trail on Sandy Hollow, and there have been proposals to link it to other trails in Thornbury Township and Birmingham Township. Q. With respect to your conclusions in your letter, the, was it December 15th letter	16:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:40 14 18:49:44 15 18:49:46 17 18:49:46 17 18:49:50 18 18:49:52 19 18:49:55 20 18:50:03 21	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road; isn't that correct? A. Not in the Zoning Ordinance, other than the express reference to the comp plan, consistency with the comp plan. Q. With respect to the open space on the property, did you review sheet 4 D of Exhibit A-3?
18:47:33 7 18:47:35 8 18:47:36 9 18:47:38 10 18:47:41 11 18:47:47 13 18:47:47 13 18:47:55 15 18:47:58 16 18:48:00 17 18:48:01 18 18:48:01 19 18:48:11 21 18:48:11 22	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not there is a perimeter trail on Sandy Hollow, and there have been proposals to link it to other trails in Thornbury Township and Birmingham Township. Q. With respect to your conclusions in your letter, the, was it December 15th letter A. Yes.	18:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:40 14 18:49:41 15 18:49:40 17 18:49:40 17 18:49:50 18 18:49:52 19 18:49:55 20 18:50:03 21 18:50:05 22	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road; isn't that correct? A. Not in the Zoning Ordinance, other than the express reference to the comp plan, consistency with the comp plan. Q. With respect to the open space on the property, did you review sheet 4 D of Exhibit A-3? A. Was that the initial submission or then
18:47:33 7 18:47:35 8 18:47:36 9 18:47:41 11 18:47:41 12 18:47:47 13 18:47:45 15 18:47:56 16 18:48:00 17 18:48:04 18 19:46 20 18:48:11 21	A. Going on I didn't measure, haven't measured it. But going on a mile. Q. Okay. A. It is probably three-fourths of a mile. Q. And that photo, isn't it correct, it is not taken from an adjacent existing street or a nearby trail; isn't that correct? A. No. It is right off of New Street. But it is, as it continues south, but it is not there is a perimeter trail on Sandy Hollow, and there have been proposals to link it to other trails in Thornbury Township and Birmingham Township. Q. With respect to your conclusions in your letter, the, was it December 15th letter	16:49:25 6 18:49:27 7 18:49:29 8 18:49:29 9 18:49:35 11 18:49:36 12 18:49:36 13 18:49:40 14 18:49:44 15 18:49:46 17 18:49:46 17 18:49:50 18 18:49:52 19 18:49:55 20 18:50:03 21	A. No. But planners do deal with the roads because it is part of the landscape that we deal with. Q. Did you do any independent analysis with respect to traffic coming off of 202 for this property? A. No. Q. And there is no provision in the Zoning Ordinance expressly requiring a connector road; isn't that correct? A. Not in the Zoning Ordinance, other than the express reference to the comp plan, consistency with the comp plan. Q. With respect to the open space on the property, did you review sheet 4 D of Exhibit A-3?

	1402		1404
18:50:12	There is an Exhibit A	18:52:12	Q. You had made a statement early in your
18:50:14 2	A. I did. I do not have it with me. I	18:52:16 2	testimony regarding the failure of Toll to
18:50:16 3	have the supplementary.	18:52:20 3	comply with the iterative process of the
6 4	Forgive me. I have the	18:52:23 4	conservation design requirements; isn't that
18:50:19 5	supplementary sheets.	18:52:25 5	correct?
18:50:21 6	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Snook, do me a	18:52:25 6	A. Yes.
18:50:22 7	favor. As Mr. Adelman is questioning you, let	18:52:26 7	Q. Isn't it true that Section 170-1617
18:50:24	him get the question all the way out, even	18:52:31	does not expressly require an iterative process
8:50:26	though you are anticipating the answer, so that	18:52:34	with the Planning Commission in that the
8:50:28 10	the court reporter doesn't have to take you	18:52:36 10	applicant doesn't have to submit a plan to the
8:50:29 11	both down at the same time.	18:52:38 11	Planning Commission to determine what the
6:50:30 12	THE WITNESS: Okay. Sorry.	18:52:40 12	secondary conservation areas are and then have
8:50:31 13	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.	18:52:42 13	the ability to file?
8:50:32 14	BY MR. ADELMAN:	18:52:44 14	A. No, not really, because it does say in
8:50:33 15	Q. I'm going to show you sheet 4 D of	18:52:49 15	a couple points and I'll hunt them down for
8:50:36 16	Exhibit A-3.	18:52:52 16	you, but I need to find my original copies
8:50:37 17	A. Okay. Thank you.	18:53:02 17	here.
8:50:43 18	Q. Just ask you: Have you had an	18:53:04 18	Well, I have that wait, is
8:50:44 19	opportunity to review that sheet?	18:53:06 19	that oh, conservation. Oh, yeah, thank you.
8:50:46 20	A. I have.	18:53:11 20	That's good.
8:50:48 21	Q. And doesn't that sheet provide an	18:53:12 21	As I said actually before the
8:50:50 22	active open space area of I believe it is 29.9	18:53:18 22	Planning Commission back in December, there is
8:50:54 23	acres?	18:53:24 23	basically a chicken and egg factor here where
56 24	A. I know that it shows some active	18:53:27 24	the applicant has actually submitted the plan,
	1403		1405
8:51:00	recreation facilities, but I was not aware of	18:53:30 1	but then the applicant in completing the
8:51:03	the acreage of them.	18:53:34 2	process has asked to work with, and this is not
8:51:06 3	Q. If I can have that back. Isn't it true	1 2	
8:51:14 4		18:53:38 3	the ordinance terms, but to work with the
	in your December 15 letter you stated that the	18:53:38 3 18:53:40 4	the ordinance terms, but to work with the Planning Commission, and
8:51:18 5	in your December 15 letter you stated that the proposed plan actually supplies the required		
•		18:53:40 4	Planning Commission, and
8:51:22 6	proposed plan actually supplies the required	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space?	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6 18:53:46 7	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did.	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6 18:53:46 7 18:53:48 8	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process?
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails,	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6 18:53:46 7 18:53:48 8 18:53:50 9	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:36 11	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road,	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6 18:53:46 7 18:53:48 8 18:53:50 9 18:53:59 10	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:36 11 8:51:39 12	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6 18:53:46 7 18:53:48 8 18:53:50 9 18:53:59 10 18:54:03 11	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:36 11 8:51:39 12 8:51:31 13	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6 18:53:46 7 18:53:48 8 18:53:50 9 18:53:59 10 18:54:03 11 18:54:06 12	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commission
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:36 11 8:51:39 12 8:51:41 13 8:51:44 14 8:51:44 15	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property because of statements in the Comprehensive	18:53:40	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commissio may require the identification of scenic views beyond those identified by the applicant." And they can't do that if they
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:36 11 8:51:39 12 8:51:41 13 8:51:44 14 8:51:44 15	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property because of statements in the Comprehensive Plan?	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6 18:53:46 7 18:53:48 8 18:53:50 9 18:53:59 10 18:54:03 11 18:54:06 12 18:54:08 13 18:54:11 14	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commission may require the identification of scenic views beyond those identified by the applicant." And they can't do that if they aren't in some means having a discussion with
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:39 12 8:51:41 13 8:51:41 14 8:51:44 15 8:51:44 16	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property because of statements in the Comprehensive Plan? A. Yes.	18:53:40	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commissio may require the identification of scenic views beyond those identified by the applicant." And they can't do that if they
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:36 11 8:51:36 12 8:51:41 13 8:51:41 14 8:51:44 15 8:51:44 16 8:51:44 16	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property because of statements in the Comprehensive Plan? A. Yes. Q. And again, there is no Zoning Ordinance	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6 18:53:46 7 18:53:48 8 18:53:50 9 18:53:50 10 18:54:03 11 18:54:06 12 18:54:08 13 18:54:14 15 18:54:16 16	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commission may require the identification of scenic views beyond those identified by the applicant." And they can't do that if they aren't in some means having a discussion with
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:39 12 8:51:34 13 8:51:44 14 8:51:44 15 8:51:44 16 8:51:47 17 8:51:50 18	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property because of statements in the Comprehensive Plan? A. Yes. Q. And again, there is no Zoning Ordinance provision expressly requiring trails around the	18:53:40	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commissio may require the identification of scenic views beyond those identified by the applicant." And they can't do that if they aren't in some means having a discussion with the applicant.
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:36 11 8:51:36 12 8:51:44 14 8:51:44 15 8:51:44 16 8:51:47 17 8:51:50 18	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property because of statements in the Comprehensive Plan? A. Yes. Q. And again, there is no Zoning Ordinance provision expressly requiring trails around the perimeter of the property; isn't that correct?	18:53:40 4 18:53:42 5 18:53:44 6 18:53:46 7 18:53:48 8 18:53:50 9 18:53:59 10 18:54:03 11 18:54:06 12 18:54:08 13 18:54:14 15 18:54:16 16 18:54:19 17 18:54:21 18	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commission may require the identification of scenic views beyond those identified by the applicant." And they can't do that if they aren't in some means having a discussion with the applicant. Q. Isn't it true that this plan went
8:51:22 6 8:51:24 7 8:51:28 8 8:51:28 9 8:51:34 10 8:51:36 11 8:51:36 12 8:51:44 14 8:51:44 15 8:51:44 16 8:51:47 17 8:51:50 18 8:51:50 18 8:51:50 18	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property because of statements in the Comprehensive Plan? A. Yes. Q. And again, there is no Zoning Ordinance provision expressly requiring trails around the perimeter of the property; isn't that correct? A. No. In part because the property,	18:53:40	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commissio may require the identification of scenic views beyond those identified by the applicant." And they can't do that if they aren't in some means having a discussion with the applicant. Q. Isn't it true that this plan went through Planning Commission review?
18:51:22 6 18:51:24 7 18:51:28 9 18:51:28 10 18:51:34 10 18:51:39 12 18:51:41 13 18:51:44 14 18:51:44 15 18:51:44 16 18:51:44 17 18:51:47 17 18:51:50 18	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property because of statements in the Comprehensive Plan? A. Yes. Q. And again, there is no Zoning Ordinance provision expressly requiring trails around the perimeter of the property; isn't that correct? A. No. In part because the property, until recently, was not following one zoning	18:53:40	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commissio may require the identification of scenic views beyond those identified by the applicant." And they can't do that if they aren't in some means having a discussion with the applicant. Q. Isn't it true that this plan went through Planning Commission review? A. Yes. But
18:51:22 6 18:51:24 7 18:51:28 9 18:51:34 10 18:51:39 12 18:51:34 14 18:51:44 15 18:51:44 15 18:51:44 16 18:51:47 17 18:51:50 18 18:51:50 18 18:51:50 18 18:51:50 20 18:51:50 20 18:51:50 21	proposed plan actually supplies the required acreage of open space? A. Of gross, of open space overall, yes, I did. Q. With respect to the proposed trails, did you, again, similar to the connector road, base your statements that trails are required around the perimeter of the Crebilly property because of statements in the Comprehensive Plan? A. Yes. Q. And again, there is no Zoning Ordinance provision expressly requiring trails around the perimeter of the property; isn't that correct? A. No. In part because the property, until recently, was not following one zoning district. I mean it was partly in an overlay	18:53:40	Planning Commission, and Q. Can you point that specific section where it says the applicant must work with the Planning Commission with respect to the conservation design process? A. Okay. Well, the first one is in the discussion in subsection C(1)(c), the subsection dealing with secondary conservation areas, where it says: "The Planning Commissio may require the identification of scenic views beyond those identified by the applicant." And they can't do that if they aren't in some means having a discussion with the applicant. Q. Isn't it true that this plan went through Planning Commission review? A. Yes. But Q. Isn't your objection the applicant

1408 1406 bad faith on the part of the applicant, either. streets and trails. These resources are known 18:54:35 The applicant agreed to several meetings in 2 as 'secondary conservation areas.' The 2 18:54:38 18:57:25 front of the Planning Commission. But those Planning Commission may require the 3 3 18:54:42 18:57:28 meetings did not take advantage of any identification of scenic views beyond those 15 18:57:30 opportunity to iteratively discuss the relative 5 identified by the applicant." 5 18:54:47 18:57:33 value of the secondary conservation areas and 6 Then it goes on to list other 18:54:54 18:57:36 thereby impact the plan to mitigate the impacts things that should be added which are not 18:57:38 18:54:58 8 to those areas. That simply did not occur. 8 specifically described as secondary 18:57:41 And I'm not saving that the onus of that was 9 conservation areas. 9 18:55:07 18:57:43 10 all on the applicant. 18:57:45 10 Q. I would like to show you a copy of 18:55:10 Q. I understand. But is that your opinion sheet 3 E of Exhibit A-3. 18:57:52 11 18:55:12 11 18:55:15 12 of what the ordinance requires as opposed --18:57:58 12 A. Oh, ves. 18:58:04 13 A. It is mv --Q. And also sheet 3 B of Exhibit A-3. 18:55:17 Isn't it true that those sheets consider Q. Excuse me. -- as opposed to what is 14 18:58:23 14 secondary conservation areas? 15 expressly written in the ordinance? 18:58:25 15 18:55:20 18:58:27 16 A. Yes, because you will notice, and I was A. Yes. But the areas labeled "secondary 16 18:55:21 18:58:31 17 conservation areas," which are the partly involved in writing this section, it 17 18:55:26 describes in subsection C, it describes a cross-hatched on this sheet 3 B, are areas of 18:58:33 18 18 18:55:33 18:58:38 19 19 process, and the intention of that process was existing vegetation. 18:55:37 to create this iterative process, although I 18:58:41 20 The other thing that was added to 20 18:55:43 18:55:47 21 will grant you the word "iterative" is never 18:58:43 21 this supplementary sheet, which is in a further used in the ordinance. list as to be added but are not defined as 22 18:58:45 22 18:55:49 18:58:49 23 Q. Well, is there a provision in the secondary conservation areas, are high 18:55:50 23 18:58:52 24 groundwater table soils. 24 ordinance that says they must go back and forth 1407 1409 The other thing shown on the map with the Planning Commission on the 1 18:55:55 18:58:53 2 in the darker gray tone are primary 2 conservation design? 18:58:55 18:55:56 conservation areas. There are, in addition, A. It doesn't say back and forth. But it 3 3 18:58:59 individual trees added. says they have to analyze the resources, they 4 18:56:01 18:59:06 have to suggest mitigation of impacts, and 5 Q. May I ask, what does sheet 3 E list as 18:59:08 18:56:05 that, frankly, takes such a process to 6 the total acreage of the secondary conservation 6 18:56:10 18:59:38 areas on the site? 7 adequately do. 18:56:13 18:59:42 8 A. It shows a mapping of potential 8 Q. That's your opinion? 18:59:43 18:56:15 a A. That's, okay, that's my opinion. 9 development areas and shows, identifies where 18:59:47 10 Q. Isn't it true the applicant in 18:59:52 10 primary conservation areas are disturbed and 18:56:18 where secondary conservation areas are Exhibit A-3 did map out primary and secondary 18:59:56 11 18:56:21 19:00:00 12 conservation areas? disturbed. 12 18:56:24 19:00:00 13 Q. On the right-hand side of sheet 3 E A. Yes. But the only thing mapped in the 13 18:56:26 does the plan purport to have a total acreage secondary conservation areas was woodlands. 19:00:04 14 18:56:29 Q. What are the other secondary of secondary conservation areas listed? 19:00:06 15 15 18:56:32 conservation resources? 19:00:12 16 A. It is small, so I'm looking for it. 16 18:56:46 18:56:49 17 A. Okav. Other important existing 19:00:16 17 Q. May I indicate it to you? 19:00:18 18 A. Yes, you may. resources, I am reading, pardon me, 170-1617, 18 It indicates a total of 27 acres. 18:57:00 19 subsection C(1)(c), "Other important existing 19:00:29 19 6 20 Again, however, the scenic views, ridgelines resources on the site shall be added to the 19:00:35 20 and scenic views from existing streets and 19:00:41 21 21 map, including woodlands, tree lines, large 18:57:08 19:00:43 22 trails, the map notes as not quantifiable. 18:57:12 22 specimen trees over 18 inches in trunk 19:00:48 23 Q. Understood. 18:57:15 23 diameter, scenic views from inside the site, ridgelines, and scenic views from existing 19:00:49 24 A. I would argue with at least they are 18:57:19 24

	1410		1412
19:00:51	1 mapable.	19:02:52	Q. Now, does the historic significance of
	Q. Understood. Isn't it true that the	19:02:58 2	
19:01:13	plans you just looked at are an example of a	19:03:01 3	
31	graphic analysis of the primary and secondary	19:03:07 4	
19:01:20	5 conservation areas?	19:03:11 5	I did not expect was how obvious the view
19:01:21	A. Yes, they are, although they are	19:03:15 6	toward Crebilly Farm was from Sandy Hollow,
19:01:23	7 incomplete, in my view.	19:03:18 7	both important places in movements of the
19:01:26	Q. Aren't they also what could be	19:03:23	
19:01:28	considered an overlay on the property? An	19:03:25	Obviously, along with what
19:01:32	overlay mapping of the secondary and primary	19:03:27 10	intervenes, the two ends of the picture, all
19:01:35	conservation areas of the property?	19:03:30 11	that woodland or what appears to be all
19:01:36 1	A. Yes. Again, without the scenic view	19:03:33 12	woodland but, of course, isn't all woodland,
19:01:39 1	aspect, I consider it to be incomplete.	19:03:35 13	but the trees hide everything which is
19:01:59 1	MR. ADELMAN: Understood. I have	19:03:37 14	Thornbury Farm, where we know lots of action
19:02:00 1	5 nothing further.	19:03:41 15	occurred. And, obviously, other properties to
19:02:01 1	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.	19:03:45 16	the west of this and northwest are very
19:02:04 1	7 Adelman.	19:03:49 17	important, and a lot of them are, in fact,
19:02:04	MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.	19:03:52 18	preserved. But here is an example of looking
19:02:04	MR. MCKENNA: Does Birmingham	19:03:56 19	from one preserved battlefield remnant to
19:02:07 2	Township have any questions for Mr. Snook?	19:04:00 20	another that is not.
19:02:09 2	MR. CRAWFORD: No questions.	19:04:03 21	Q. So does the view that's in PC-20 have
19:02:10 2	2 Thank you.	19:04:08 22	at least as much significance as other views
19:02:11 2	MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, for	19:04:10 23	that are already preserved?
13 2	Thornbury Township?	19:04:14 24	A. I would say that there are better views
1	1411		1413
19:02:14	MS. LABRUM: No questions of Mr.	19:04:20 1	of Crebilly Farm, because this is from
19:02:16	2 Snook.	19:04:23 2	
19:02:16	•	19:04:26 3	
19:02:17		19:04:30 4	say, would say the view on Sandy Hollow itself
19:02:18	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	19:04:34 5	or notably the view at the bend in Birmingham
19:02:20		19:04:38 6	Road just past Wylie Road, the view over what
19:02:21		19:04:41 7	, ,
19:02:21		19:04:45	extremely significant views, as would be the
19:02:21	_	19:04:48	view of the Sullivan tract from Osborne Hill.
19:02:22	_	19:04:56 10	, ,
19:02:22 1	,	19:04:58 11 19:04:59 12	
19:02:27 1		19:04:59 12	
19:02:28 14	_	19:05:01 13	
19:02:28		19:05:03	us for this witness.
19:02:31		19:05:08 16	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Bertinatti or
19:02:34	•	19:05:10 17	Mr. Martin for Radley Run III HOA?
19:02:37	•	19:05:15 18	-
19:02:41	·	19:05:23 19	
14 20		19:05:27 20	Glen HOA or the School District?
19:02:46 2	<u>-</u>	19:05:29 21	Mr. McFalls for Westminster
19:02:47 22	_	19:05:38 22	Presbyterian Church?
19:02:49 2	·	19:05:38 23	Mr. Feryo for Quarry Swimming
19:02:51 24		19:05:45 24	Association?
	hoots Page 1410 to		11 00/30/2017 09:59:07 AN

Page 1410 to 1413 of 1511

09/30/2017 08:58:07 AM

13 of 62 sheets

1	1414		1416
19:05:46			
	MR. FERYO: Yes. Mr. Snook, are you familiar with the property adjacent to	19:07:56 1	THE WITNESS: Yes, that is true. MR. FERYO: Thank you.
	Crebilly Farm, Quarry Swimming Association,	_	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.
30%	directly to the west?		
(0)	THE WITNESS: I am familiar with	19:08:05 4	Feryo.
	where it is and just looking sort of askance at		Mr. Spackman for Thornbury Farm Trust?
19:06:15	it from New Street, but I have never been in,	_	MR. SPACKMAN: Yes. Thank you.
19:06:20 /	on the property.		How are you doing this evening?
	MR. FERYO: The upper parking		THE WITNESS: Hi. Fine, thank
19:06:23 9	area of the picnic area and the serpentine	19:08:13 9	you.
19:06:24	barrens that overlook the quarry have a direct	19:08:14 11	MR. SPACKMAN: One big question
19:06:27	view of Crebilly Farm. Do you believe that	19:08:14	is, I believe, and I'm kind of running it all,
19:06:29 12	that view should be taken into consideration as	19:08:16 12	is, from the Planning Commission made a
19:06:32	part of this development?	19:08:20 13	recommendation, and you would have to give me
19:06:36 15	THE WITNESS: That would be an	19:08:22 14	your thoughts on preserving the view, which we
19:06:36	example of what the ordinance calls an external	19:08:24 15	talked about, but my question is, with the
19:06:40 17	view or a view from outside the tract in, and,	19:08:28 10	structures, with the barn, with the scale house
19:06:40	especially from neighboring properties, I think	19:08:30 17	and those items we see along the 926 corridor,
19:06:44 10	should absolutely be evaluated.	19:08:33 10	or the recreation barn, I am glad Toll is going
19:06:46	MR. FERYO: So you would consider	19:08:36 13	to be trying to save some of those structures.
19:06:49 20	the Quarry Swimming Association an external	19:08:40 20	My question is: Have you worked with facade
19:06:50 21	view?	19:08:44 22	easements or things like that to protect them
19:06:53 22	THE WITNESS: Yes.	19:08:44 22	from future changes or protection?
19:06:53 23	MR. FERYO: And does this plan	19:08:49 24	I believe and you may already
35 24	1415	15.05,45	1417
			1417
10:06:56 1		10·08·52 1	
19:06:56 1	take that view into consideration?	19:08:52 1	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My
19:06:59 2	take that view into consideration? THE WITNESS: It might be argued	19:08:54 2	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3	take that view into consideration? THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if	19:08:54 2 19:08:55 3	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:03 4	take that view into consideration? THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that	19:08:54 2	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation?
19:07:00 3 19:07:03 4 19:07:07 5	take that view into consideration? THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as	19:08:54 2 19:08:55 3 19:08:57 4 19:08:58 5	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:03 4 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6	take that view into consideration? THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January,	19:08:54 2 19:08:55 3 19:08:57 4 19:08:58 5	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:03 4 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of	19:08:54 2 19:08:55 3 19:08:57 4 19:08:58 5 19:09:00 6	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club.	19:08:54 2 19:08:55 3 19:08:57 4 19:08:58 5 19:09:00 6 19:09:04 7	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:03 4 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine	19:08:54 2 19:08:55 3 19:08:57 4 19:08:58 5 19:09:00 6 19:09:04 7 19:09:08 8	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club.	19:08:54 2 19:08:55 3 19:08:57 4 19:08:58 5 19:09:00 6 19:09:04 7 19:09:08 8 19:09:10 9	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202.	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right.	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance.
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11 19:07:27 12	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:01 4 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:24 10 19:07:24 11 19:07:27 12 19:07:28 13	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And so would screening in any way mitigate that	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a positive thing to protect the viewshed that
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:07 5 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11 19:07:27 12 19:07:28 13 19:07:31 14	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And so would screening in any way mitigate that obstruction of view? I guess my question is:	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a positive thing to protect the viewshed that Toll could do to protect the buildings and for
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:01 4 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11 19:07:27 12 19:07:28 13 19:07:31 14 19:07:34 15	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And so would screening in any way mitigate that obstruction of view? I guess my question is: Is screening the same as preserving a view or	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a positive thing to protect the viewshed that Toll could do to protect the buildings and for the next generation, keep them in their
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11 19:07:27 12 19:07:28 13 19:07:31 14 19:07:34 15 19:07:36 16	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And so would screening in any way mitigate that obstruction of view? I guess my question is: Is screening the same as preserving a view or is screening blocking a view?	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a positive thing to protect the viewshed that Toll could do to protect the buildings and for the next generation, keep them in their entirety?
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:00 4 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11 19:07:27 12 19:07:28 13 19:07:31 14 19:07:34 15 19:07:38 16 19:07:38 17	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And so would screening in any way mitigate that obstruction of view? I guess my question is: Is screening the same as preserving a view or is screening blocking a view? THE WITNESS: That's a very good	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a positive thing to protect the viewshed that Toll could do to protect the buildings and for the next generation, keep them in their entirety? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11 19:07:27 12 19:07:28 13 19:07:31 14 19:07:31 14 19:07:36 16 19:07:36 16 19:07:36 17 19:07:40 18	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And so would screening in any way mitigate that obstruction of view? I guess my question is: Is screening the same as preserving a view or is screening blocking a view? THE WITNESS: That's a very good statement. Screening is not protecting the	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a positive thing to protect the viewshed that Toll could do to protect the buildings and for the next generation, keep them in their entirety? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I believe, as you inferred, that was, in fact, in
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:00 4 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11 19:07:27 12 19:07:28 13 19:07:31 14 19:07:31 15 19:07:36 16 19:07:38 17 19:07:40 18 19:07:43 19	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And so would screening in any way mitigate that obstruction of view? I guess my question is: Is screening the same as preserving a view or is screening blocking a view? THE WITNESS: That's a very good statement. Screening is not protecting the view. It is blocking the view.	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a positive thing to protect the viewshed that Toll could do to protect the buildings and for the next generation, keep them in their entirety? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I believe, as you inferred, that was, in fact, in the specific list of recommendations of the
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:01 4 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11 19:07:27 12 19:07:28 13 19:07:31 14 19:07:34 15 19:07:38 17 19:07:38 17 19:07:38 17 19:07:40 18 19:07:41 19	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And so would screening in any way mitigate that obstruction of view? I guess my question is: Is screening the same as preserving a view or is screening blocking a view? THE WITNESS: That's a very good statement. Screening is not protecting the view. It is blocking the view. MR. FERYO: So the screening	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a positive thing to protect the viewshed that Toll could do to protect the buildings and for the next generation, keep them in their entirety? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I believe, as you inferred, that was, in fact, in the specific list of recommendations of the Planning Commission.
19:06:59 2 19:07:00 3 19:07:00 3 19:07:07 5 19:07:11 6 19:07:16 7 19:07:20 8 19:07:22 9 19:07:24 10 19:07:26 11 19:07:27 12 19:07:28 13 19:07:31 14 19:07:36 16 19:07:36 16 19:07:36 17 19:07:40 18 19:07:40 18 19:07:40 21	THE WITNESS: It might be argued that because there is some depth of view, if you will, or setback on New Street that that takes it into account. But the development, as my model showed back in December or January, the development will still be fully in view of the Quarry Swim Club. MR. FERYO: From the serpentine barrens you can see Route 202. THE WITNESS: Right. MR. FERYO: So it would not. And so would screening in any way mitigate that obstruction of view? I guess my question is: Is screening the same as preserving a view or is screening blocking a view? THE WITNESS: That's a very good statement. Screening is not protecting the view. It is blocking the view. MR. FERYO: So the screening that's allowed from the landscape plan actually	19:08:54	be trying to do this. That I don't know. My question is: Would a facade easement on some of the structures be a possibility or recommendation? THE WITNESS: It could be. I have worked with them myself and at the conservancy. We frankly avoid administration of facade easements because they can be a pain in the neck. But they are potentially an important tool for preserving structures in their critical historical appearance. MR. SPACKMAN: So that would be a positive thing to protect the viewshed that Toll could do to protect the buildings and for the next generation, keep them in their entirety? THE WITNESS: Yes. And I believe, as you inferred, that was, in fact, in the specific list of recommendations of the Planning Commission. MR. SPACKMAN: Okay. Thank you

	4440		4 400
	1418		1420
19:09:44 1	MR. SPACKMAN: Thank you.	19:11:45	MS. WELLER: No questions.
19:09:44 2	MR. MCKENNA: Bradley or Amy	19:11:46 2	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am.
19:09:46 3	Harkins?	19:11:48 3	Linda or Matt Reichert?
17 4	MS. HARKINS: No questions.	19:11:52 4	All right. Does the Board have
19:09:49 5	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Mammucari?	19:11:54 5	any questions?
19:09:50 6	MR. MAMMUCARI: No questions.	19:11:55 6	MS. DEWOLF: I do. John, have
19:09:51 7	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Gadaleto?	19:12:03 7	you protected any portions of the Brandywine
19:09:57	Phillip Jones?	19:12:08	Battlefield in your work?
19:09:59	Mr. Moscharis, who I do know is	19:12:09	THE WITNESS: I have worked with
19:10:05 10	now represented by John Rendemonti in this	19:12:11 10	efforts to, yes.
19:10:07 11	matter. Mr. Rendemonti is here. Do you have	19:12:13 11	MS. DEWOLF: And where are they
19:10:09 12	any questions?	19:12:14 12	located?
19:10:10 13	MR. RENDEMONTI: None at this	19:12:15 13	THE WITNESS: Most notably, the
19:10:11 14	time. Thank you.	19:12:18 14	Birmingham Hill property and also the Brigham
19:10:13 15	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. Allison	19:12:22 15	and Worth properties along Meetinghouse Road.
16	Corcoran?	19:12:25 16	MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar
19:10:18 17	Mr. Skupp, any questions?	19:12:26 17	with the Dilworthtown, the Dilworth Farm that
19:10:22 18	Diana Leraris, any questions?	19:12:29 18	was just protected which is part of the Battle
19:10:27 19	Mr. Boyer, do you have any	19:12:32 19	of Brandywine?
19:10:28 20	questions for the witness?	19:12:32 20	THE WITNESS: Yes, in general.
19:10:32 21	Amy Murnane, any questions?	19:12:34 21	MS. DEWOLF: And are you familiar
19:10:37 22	Kirk Wolter, any questions?	19:12:36 22	with another property that is on the other side
19:10:42 23	Mr. Corgnale, any questions?	19:12:39 23	of Crebilly Farm that is being protected, part
18 24	Robert Daull, any questions for	19:12:45 24	of the Battle of Brandywine? Osborne Hill?
, -			
1	1419		1421
19:10:50	the witness?	19:12:51	1421 THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar
19:10:50 1 19:10:50 2	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions.	19:12:51 1 19:12:52 2	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property.
19:10:50 1 19:10:50 2 19:10:51 3	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir.	19:12:51 1 19:12:52 2 19:12:53 3	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in
19:10:50 1 19:10:50 2 19:10:51 3 19:10:52 4	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions?	19:12:51 1 19:12:52 2 19:12:53 3 19:12:54 4	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions?	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine?
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes.
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness?	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness?	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions?	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield?
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer?	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions.	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question.
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am.	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Megan Bruns?	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question. MS. DEWOLF: Is this Crebilly Farm in between both of the interests that are
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Megan Bruns? Ed Skros?	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question. MS. DEWOLF: Is this Crebilly
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Megan Bruns?	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question. MS. DEWOLF: Is this Crebilly Farm in between both of the interests that are being protected right now, called the Battle of
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Megan Bruns? Ed Skros? MR. SKROS: No questions.	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question. MS. DEWOLF: Is this Crebilly Farm in between both of the interests that are being protected right now, called the Battle of Brandywine, between Osborne Hill and Dilworth
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Megan Bruns? Ed Skros? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir.	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question. MS. DEWOLF: Is this Crebilly Farm in between both of the interests that are being protected right now, called the Battle of Brandywine, between Osborne Hill and Dilworth Farm?
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Megan Bruns? Ed Skros? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey?	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question. MS. DEWOLF: Is this Crebilly Farm in between both of the interests that are being protected right now, called the Battle of Brandywine, between Osborne Hill and Dilworth Farm? THE WITNESS: Yes.
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Megan Bruns? Ed Skros? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey? MS. CAREY: No questions.	19:12:51 1 19:12:52 2 19:12:53 3 19:12:54 4 19:12:56 5 19:13:06 6 19:13:06 7 19:13:06 9 19:13:10 10 19:13:15 11 19:13:16 12 19:13:17 13 19:13:21 14 19:13:25 15 19:13:28 16 19:13:33 17 19:13:37 18 19:13:38 19 19:13:40 20	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question. MS. DEWOLF: Is this Crebilly Farm in between both of the interests that are being protected right now, called the Battle of Brandywine, between Osborne Hill and Dilworth Farm? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: Thank you. Is this
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Megan Bruns? Ed Skros? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey? MS. CAREY: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am.	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question. MS. DEWOLF: Is this Crebilly Farm in between both of the interests that are being protected right now, called the Battle of Brandywine, between Osborne Hill and Dilworth Farm? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: Thank you. Is this the location for the history of our nation and,
19:10:50	the witness? MR. DAULL: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Scott Sobers, any questions? Mr. Pavelchek, do you have any questions? Phillip Jaeger, do you have any questions for the witness? Mr. Cahill, do you have any questions for the witness? David Pryze, any questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? MS. KRAMER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Megan Bruns? Ed Skros? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey? MS. CAREY: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Jim McKENNA: Thank you, ma'am.	19:12:51	THE WITNESS: Yes, I'm familiar with that property. MS. DEWOLF: Is Crebilly in between these two highly significant properties that the federal government is interested in for the Battle of Brandywine? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: And so is this property a key between them in terms of a contiguous continuity of preservation of the Brandywine Battlefield? MR. ADELMAN: Objection. I don't think he is qualified to answer that question. MS. DEWOLF: Is this Crebilly Farm in between both of the interests that are being protected right now, called the Battle of Brandywine, between Osborne Hill and Dilworth Farm? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: Thank you. Is this the location for the history of our nation and, in fact, our heritage?

1422 1424 1 length. and secondary resources, conservation resources 1 19:14:01 19:16:35 2 MS. DEWOLF: I'm going to switch 2 so critical in our landscape planning today? 19:14:02 19:16:39 to the primary, secondary conservation 3 3 THE WITNESS: They are critical 19:14:03 19:16:47 resources. That is a concept that has been to our understanding of the landscape, and, 16 19:16:47 standardized and utilized more than just most notably here, understanding the sense of 19:14:14 5 19:16:50 Westtown Township, correct? where we came from and how our history has 19:14:16 THE WITNESS: Yes. Many 7 occurred and evolved, and that doesn't mean you 19-14-18 19:16:58 townships in Chester County under the County can't put development into it, but it means 8 19:14:21 19:17:01 Open Space Program have completed scenic 9 9 putting it in in the right manner. 19:14:25 19:17:04 analyses of their entire municipality. MS. DEWOLF: In terms of the 10 19:17:28 10 19:14:31 19:14:34 11 And my own East Bradford, for general layout of the plan, what is your 19:17:29 11 19:14:38 12 example, even has a scenic overlay zoning 19:17:35 12 opinion of the road layout and the fronts and district. That is somewhat unusual, but it is backyards, and, in general, the general layout 19:14:41 13 19:17:39 13 certainly not out of the lexicon of planning to of this plan as a planner? 19:17:45 14 19:14:45 use the term scenic views and to even regulate THE WITNESS: I am having an 15 19:17:47 15 19:14:54 16 19:17:51 16 oblique view of it here on the screen. Maybe I 19:14:56 17 MS. DEWOLF: And so the word can move where I can see better. But I am 19:17:55 17 "primary" and what "primary conservation familiar with it. Oh, and I see -- thank you 18 19:17:57 18 19:14:57 resources" mean, and the word "secondary" and very much. Yes, much easier. 19:18:00 19 19:14:59 19 what "secondary conservation resources" mean, Okay. Well, the overall, the 19:15:03 20 19:18:04 20 the definition of those beyond our ordinance is plan offers a very circuitous, yet 19:15:07 21 19:18:15 21 sort of a standard across-the-board; am I 19:15:11 22 interconnected roadway system, which I would 19:18:22 22 19:15:15 23 correct? 19:18:26 23 have done somewhat differently. But from my perspective in terms 16 24 THE WITNESS: Yes. Typically, 19:18:28 24 1423 1425 though, use of the term "primary" and of the resources I have been talking about, the 19:15:17 1 19:18:32 "secondary" doesn't mean that some are more western part of the plan, which is on, exactly 19:18:36 19-15-19 important than others, but it means the primary on the hill in the picture I presented, is 19:15:24 3 19:18:41 3 really debilitating to the preservation of the are the most susceptible to degradation if 19:18:48 19:15:27 disturbed, wetlands, steep slopes in scenic landscape and the historical 5 19:18:53 19:15:32 6 particular. 6 significance. 19:15:35 19:18:55 7 The secondary resources are The good aspect of the plan is 19:15:36 19:18:56 resources which are important but where that the internal roads are interconnected with 8 19:19:01 19:15:39 disturbance might be placed based on an trails, for example. I mean, I don't think the 9 9 19:19:04 19:15:43 evaluation of the relative value, because layout, for what it is, if you were to plop it 19:19:06 10 19:15:47 10 woodlands or scenic landscapes don't preclude on another property somewhere else, that it is 11 19:19:11 11 19:15:50 development on their own. They are not not unreasonable, other than the fact that if 12 19:19:16 12 19:15:55 you live in a lot at the end of the southerly 19:19:20 13 13 dangerous to build in, like a wetland would be, 19:15:57 loop and you want to get to your neighbors at 19:16:02 14 but they are not unimportant. 19:19:24 14 MS. DEWOLF: And were they the end of the more northerly loop, you have to 15 19:19:30 15 19:16:06 16 initiated by Conservation By Design originally? 19:19:32 16 drive about two miles to get to what you could 19:16:07 Was this sort of a concept of conservation walk in a hundred yards, if you could walk 17 19:19:35 17 19:16:10 through the bottom land there, which you 19:16:12 18 landscapes? 19:19:37 18 10:16:14 19 THE WITNESS: That was certainly 19:19:42 19 probably can in the dry period. 6 20 a very important iteration of it. The concept 19:19:45 20 Also, the westerly part of the was really with us way back when Ian McCarg tract is a very long distance from access to 21 19:19:49 21 19:16:20 202, even if the intermediate connection were 19:16:25 22 authored a book Design With Nature, long before 19:19:56 22 Randall Arrendt came upon the scene. But, yes. 19:20:01 23 there, which has been recommended to be 19:16:28 23 MS. DEWOLF: And why are primary 19:20:04 24 excluded. 19:16:33 24

	1426			1428
19:20:08	Those are all, those are	19:22:33	1	further.
19:20:09 2		19:22:34	2	MR. MCKENNA: Anything from
19:20:13 3	planning perspective. I don't criticize the	19:22:35	3	anyone else?
16 4		19:22:36	4	Thank you, Mr. Snook.
19:20:19 5	suggest a fine-tuning of that to help permit a	19:22:38	5	MR. ADELMAN: Thank you, John.
19:20:22 6	greater degree of open space from the	19:22:39	6	THE WITNESS: You are welcome.
19:20:26 7	standpoint of preservation of scenic views.	19:22:40	7	(Witness excused.)
19:20:30	MS. DEWOLF: Thank you. That's	19:22:40	8	MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Camp, anything
19:20:31 9	all I have.	19:22:41	9	further from the Planning Commission this
19:20:34 10	MR. MCKENNA: Any other member of	19:22:42	10	evening?
19:20:35 11	the Board have questions?	19:22:42	11	MS. CAMP: Nothing further. And
19:20:39 12	MR. HAWS: Hey, John. Just a	19:22:45	12	I move for the admission of my exhibits, PC-1
19:20:40 13	couple.	19:22:49	13	through PC-20. I don't think that's been done
19:20:41 14	THE WITNESS: Hi.	19:22:51	14	yet.
19:20:41 15	MR. HAWS: Just a couple quick	19:22:52	15	MR. ADELMAN: I thought we were
19:20:43 16	questions. So in regards to your opinion based	19:22:53	16	going to do that at the end.
19:20:48 17	on the secondary requirements looking at scenic	19:22:54	17	MS. CAMP: That's fine.
19:20:56 18	views, how would that calculation of the plan	19:22:55	18	MR. MCKENNA: I was going to hold
19:20:59 19	submitted before us today have changed based on	19:22:56	19	off until the end, if that's okay.
19:21:02 20	where you think it should be versus what it is?	19:22:58	20	MS. CAMP: That's fine.
19:21:06 21	THE WITNESS: Well, Mr. Adelman	19:23:00	21	MR. MCKENNA: All right. I'll go
19:21:10 22	asked me the question of the ordinance doesn't	19:23:01	22	down our list here moving forward. Mr.
19:21:14 23	prescribe a means to map them.	19:23:06	23	Crawford, are you going to confirm that there
19 24	What I have done in numerous	19:23:08	24	is nothing for Birmingham Township this
)	1427			1429
19:21:21 1	cases is literally map the view based on the	19:23:09	1	evening?
19:21:25 2		19:23:10	2	MR. CRAWFORD: That is correct,
19:21:27 3	, , ,	19:23:11	3	sir.
19:21:30 4	view, marked what landscape, and then evaluated	19:23:11	4	MR. MCKENNA: Moving forward we
19:21:35 5	that landscape in view, in terms of relative	19:23:12	5	are not going to hear from Birmingham Township?
19:21:40 6	importance, then decided where to put the	19:23:14	6	In other words, waiving your right to provide
19:21:44 7	permitted 50 percent disturbance.	19:23:17	7	anything?
19:21:46	In my view, frankly, what the	19:23:17	8	MR. CRAWFORD: I'm not
19:21:47	County Planning Commission suggested in mapping	19:23:16	9	anticipating, but I would like to reserve the
19:21:51 10	a relatively wide battlefield swath to cluster	19:23:21		right to change institutional mind, if needed.
19:21:57 11	the development more tightly to the east is a	19:23:25		MR. MCKENNA: Understood. Ms.
19:22:03 12	way to preserve a lot of the most critical	19:23:26		Labrum, anything from Thornbury Township?
19:22:09 13	scenic landscape and to preserve its	19:23:29		MS. LABRUM: Mr. McKenna, we have
19:22:11 14		19:23:30		one witness, and I would ask if the Board would
19:22:13 15		19:23:32 19:23:36		permit the witness to testify from the table as he doesn't believe there is sufficient room on
19:22:15 16	might not be the same market product.			
19:22:23 17 19:22:24 18	MR. HAWS: That's all the	19:23:40 19:23:42		the dais for his documents. MR. MCKENNA: I don't disagree
19:22:24 18	questions. Thank you.	19:23:42		with that. My only problem is we can't see
1	THE CHAIRMAN: Ms. Camp, any further redirect?	19:23:43		him. Mr. Adelman has a hard time and the
19:22:29 21	MS. CAMP: No.	19:23:45		audience can't see him.
19:22:29 21	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Adelman, any	19:23:48		MR. ADELMAN: I don't have any
19:22:30 22	rinx ricklings in Adellian, any	10.20.49	_	This ribetti mit. I don't have dry
II 19:22:31 ∠ -≸	recross based on what you heard?	19:23:49	23	objection. As long as it is not because of me

	1430			1432
19:23:54	MR. MCKENNA: All right. You are	19:25:25	1	Q. As a result of your attendance at the
19:23:57 2	okay with it, Mr. Adelman. Is everybody else	19:25:28	2	hearings in this matter and your review of the
19:23:59 3	all right with it?	19:25:30	3	materials submitted, have you made any findings
o 4	All right. Now, I just ask, Mr.	19:25:32	4	or reached any conclusions?
19:24:01 5	Tavani, to keep your voice up so that the	19:25:33	5	A. Yes, I have five such findings or
19:24:03 6	audience can hear you since many of them may	19:25:36	6	conclusions.
19:24:06 7	not be able to see you. Thank you.	19:25:38	7	Q. And what is the first of those
8	FRANK TAVANI,	19:25:39	8	conclusions?
9	the witness herein, having first been	19:25:40	9	A. Well, the first concern is the proposed
10	duly sworn on oath, was examined and	19:25:43	10	right in/right out access on Route 202.
19:24:18 11	testified as follows:	19:25:47	11	By way of reminder, Mr. Federico,
19:24:18 12	DIRECT EXAMINATION	19:25:49	12	for example, testified about the location of
19:24:20 13	BY MS. LABRUM:	19:25:51	13	this proposed driveway back in July. I
19:24:20 14	Q. Can you state your name and business	19:25:56	14	confirmed by looking at the notes of testimony,
19:24:24 15	address for the record, please?	19:25:59	15	it is on page 1130, line 17. The proposed
19:24:26 16	A. Certainly. My name is Frank Tavani,	19:26:03	16	right in/right out is located approximately
19:24:29 17	T-A-V-A-N-I, 105 Kenilworth Street,	19:26:05	17	2,000 feet north of the intersection of Route
19:24:35 18	Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, 19147.	19:26:08	18	202 and 926. And that access, if constructed,
19:24:38 19	Q. Who is your current employer, Mr.	19:26:14	19	would likely require a right turn decel lane.
19:24:41 20	Tavani?	19:26:18	20	I think it would meet the qualifications under
19:24:41 21	A. F. Tavani & Associates, Incorporated.	19:26:20	21	PennDOT guidelines for a decel lane probably
19:24:44 22	Q. Could you provide the Board with a	19:26:23	22	200 feet or longer.
19:24:46 23	brief summary of your educational and	19:26:25	23	So depending on what traffic you
48 24	professional background?	19:26:26	24	are talking about, the distance from which you
1	1431			1433
19:24:50 1	A. Certainly. I hold a Bachelor of	19:26:29	1	could measure could be 2,000 feet or it could
19:24:52 2	Science in civil	19:26:31	2	be 2200 feet or greater, and that plays into
19:24:53 3	MR. ADELMAN: I'm sorry, Kathy,	19:26:35	3	something which I'm going to touch on
19:24:54	if I may interject. You handed out Exhibit 1.	19:26:37	4	momentarily.
19:24:57 - 5	MS. LABRUM: I did.	19:26:38	5	But first, and, I apologize, I
19:24:58 6	MR. ADELMAN: I will stipulate to	19:26:40	6	can't recall the exhibit number for the
19:24:59 7	his qualifications as a traffic engineer.	19:26:41	7	applicant's traffic study. Does anyone happen
19:25:02	MR. MCKENNA: Any party have any	19:26:44	8	to know that?
19:25:03	objection to that?	19:26:45	9	MR. ADELMAN: Which traffic
19:25:04 10	MS. CAMP: No objection.	19:26:46	10	study?
19:25:04 11	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Tavani will be	19:26:47	11	THE WITNESS: The update, the
19:25:05 12	admitted as an expert in traffic engineering.	19:26:49	12	study which was updated January 20th, 2017.
19:25:07 13	MS. LABRUM: Thank you.	19:26:55	13	MS. CAMP: A-33. A-33.
19:25:08 14	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	19:26:58	14	THE WITNESS: So I'll make
19:25:09 15	BY MS. LABRUM:	19:26:59	15	reference to
19:25:09 16	Q. Mr. Tavani, have you been present for	19:27:00	16	MR. ADELMAN: A-33.
19:25:11 17	all of the testimony that's been presented by	19:27:02	17	THE WITNESS: Thank you. I'll
19:25:15 18	Ms. Kline and Mr. Federico during these	19:27:02	18	make reference a few times to A-33. And if it
19 25:17 19	hearings?	19:27:05	19	pleases the Board, if anyone has a copy, if you
l7 20	A. Yes.	19:27:07	20	turn to page 54 of A-33 you will see in the
19:25:17 21	Q. Have you had the opportunity to review	19:27:10	21	upper right corner of this page, which is a
19:25:19 22	all of the exhibits presented during this	19:27:13	22	trip distribution figure, that 40 percent of
19:25:21 23	conditional use hearing to date?	19:27:16	23	the site traffic is estimated to either
1				originate from or be destined to the north on

	4404		4400
19:27:22 1	1434 Route 202.	19:29:22	1436 MS. DEWOLF: Can you do me a
19:27:22 1	So, for example, traffic that's	19:29:22 1 19:29:23 2	favor and speak into your microphone and go a
19:27:25 3	entering the site coming from the north, its	19:29:23 2	little slower. I'm having trouble hearing.
19.27.25 3	most direct path would be the proposed right	19:29:30 4	THE WITNESS: Certainly.
19:27:31 5	in/right out driveway if it were provided.	19:29:30 5	Certainly.
19:27:33 6	Likewise, any traffic that is	19:29:33 6	Page 37 of A-33 is a queue
19:27:36 7	leaving the community that's heading south, for	19:29:36 7	summary table that indicates the length of the
19:27:40	example, which is the next highest destination,	19:29:36	queue under existing conditions and also
19:27:40	30 percent of site traffic is to or from the	19:29:42	projected conditions at full build and at
19:27:46 10	south, traffic heading in that direction would	19:29:42 3	design year, which is the year 2028. It
19:27:48 11	use the right out component of the proposed	19:29:49 11	includes a substantial amount of background
19:27:51 12	driveway.	19:29:49 11	growth traffic.
19:27:51 12	And the access of that driveway,	19:29:51 12	One of the components of most
19:27:55 14	for example, that right out movement would have	19:29:55 14	traffic studies is a per diem type of surcharge
19:27:57 15	to take the 926 access, make a left turn, and	19:29:59 15	for just regional growth and traffic. It is a rate that is gathered from PennDOT and it is
19:28:01 16 19:28:03 17	then go to the eastbound approach of 926 and	19:30:02 17	typically updated every summer.
19:28:03	202, which, upon looking at this figure once again, you could see already hosts a lot of	19:30:05 17	At the time A-33 was prepared,
		l	• • • •
19:28:10 19	site traffic. 40 percent turning left, 5 going	19:30:09 19	the annualized grade for Chester County was
19:28:13 20	through, 10 turning right. That's a simple	19:30:13 20	1.71 percent, which is a substantial grade, and
19:28:15 21 19:28:17 22	majority of 55 percent.	19:30:17 21	we grow that out to the year 2028, you get a
	If the right in/right out is not		substantial amount of additional through
19:28:19 23	provided, another 20 percent would be surcharged on that. So that becomes a pretty	19:30:23 23 19:30:24 24	traffic surcharged on the network. Of course, sometimes that growth
21 🚄	suicharged on that. So that becomes a pretty	19:30:24	Or Course, Sometimes that drowin
-	1425		
1	1435	10,20,27	1437
19:28:23 1	busy approach.	19:30:27 1	doesn't really even materialize. And the most
19:28:24 2	busy approach. So what I'm building up to is	19:30:30 2	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate
19:28:24 2 19:28:26 3	busy approach. So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going
19:28:24 2 19:28:26 3 19:28:28 4	busy approach. So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7
19:28:24 2 19:28:26 3 19:28:28 4 19:28:30 5	busy approach. So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4 19:30:41 5	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it
19:28:24 2 19:28:26 3 19:28:28 4 19:28:30 5 19:28:33 6	busy approach. So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4 19:30:41 5 19:30:44 6	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be.
19:28:24	busy approach. So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan.	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4 19:30:41 5 19:30:44 6 19:30:45 7	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe
19:28:24	busy approach. So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4 19:30:41 5 19:30:44 6 19:30:45 7 19:30:46 8	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions
19:28:24	busy approach. So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4 19:30:41 5 19:30:44 6 19:30:45 7 19:30:46 8 19:30:48 9	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are
19:28:24	busy approach. So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4 19:30:41 5 19:30:44 6 19:30:45 7 19:30:46 8 19:30:48 9 19:30:52 10	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated.
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4 19:30:41 5 19:30:44 6 19:30:45 7 19:30:46 8 19:30:48 9 19:30:52 10 19:30:54 11	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway.	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4 19:30:41 5 19:30:45 7 19:30:46 8 19:30:48 9 19:30:52 10 19:30:54 11 19:30:55 12	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did	19:30:30 2 19:30:33 3 19:30:36 4 19:30:41 5 19:30:45 7 19:30:46 8 19:30:48 9 19:30:52 10 19:30:55 12 19:30:59 13	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard the testimony from Mr. Federico that one of the	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the southbound queue at maximum is 1850 feet, which
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard the testimony from Mr. Federico that one of the concerns is there is a substantial amount of	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the southbound queue at maximum is 1850 feet, which is well shy of the proposed location of the
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard the testimony from Mr. Federico that one of the concerns is there is a substantial amount of traffic southbound on Route 202. Sometimes the	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the southbound queue at maximum is 1850 feet, which is well shy of the proposed location of the right in/right out access. During the p.m.
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard the testimony from Mr. Federico that one of the concerns is there is a substantial amount of traffic southbound on Route 202. Sometimes the queue does extend to or even beyond that	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the southbound queue at maximum is 1850 feet, which is well shy of the proposed location of the right in/right out access. During the p.m. peak hour it is 2800 feet.
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard the testimony from Mr. Federico that one of the concerns is there is a substantial amount of traffic southbound on Route 202. Sometimes the queue does extend to or even beyond that proposed access. And that could be playing the	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the southbound queue at maximum is 1850 feet, which is well shy of the proposed location of the right in/right out access. During the p.m. peak hour it is 2800 feet. If you turn to the next page,
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard the testimony from Mr. Federico that one of the concerns is there is a substantial amount of traffic southbound on Route 202. Sometimes the queue does extend to or even beyond that proposed access. And that could be playing the role in some of the accident history which is	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the southbound queue at maximum is 1850 feet, which is well shy of the proposed location of the right in/right out access. During the p.m. peak hour it is 2800 feet. If you turn to the next page, depending on what assortment of PennDOT
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard the testimony from Mr. Federico that one of the concerns is there is a substantial amount of traffic southbound on Route 202. Sometimes the queue does extend to or even beyond that proposed access. And that could be playing the role in some of the accident history which is mentioned in A-33.	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the southbound queue at maximum is 1850 feet, which is well shy of the proposed location of the right in/right out access. During the p.m. peak hour it is 2800 feet. If you turn to the next page, depending on what assortment of PennDOT improvements at 202 and 926 are constructed,
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard the testimony from Mr. Federico that one of the concerns is there is a substantial amount of traffic southbound on Route 202. Sometimes the queue does extend to or even beyond that proposed access. And that could be playing the role in some of the accident history which is mentioned in A-33. Now, I will again reference A-33,	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the southbound queue at maximum is 1850 feet, which is well shy of the proposed location of the right in/right out access. During the p.m. peak hour it is 2800 feet. If you turn to the next page, depending on what assortment of PennDOT improvements at 202 and 926 are constructed, that queue could be as long as approximately
19:28:24	So what I'm building up to is there is a benefit to this right in/right out access. And it is not surprising to me as a traffic engineer that the applicant originally proposed this and included this access on their plan. In addition to the benefits I just mentioned, there is also the concern of life safety, of fire trucks and ambulances which would undoubtedly take access to that road, to that driveway. So the question becomes, Why did it go away? at least in my mind. And we heard the testimony from Mr. Federico that one of the concerns is there is a substantial amount of traffic southbound on Route 202. Sometimes the queue does extend to or even beyond that proposed access. And that could be playing the role in some of the accident history which is mentioned in A-33.	19:30:30	doesn't really even materialize. And the most recent data from PennDOT suggests that the rate used last year is too high. Now the rate going forward is actually .65 percent. It is not 1.7 plus. It is .65, nearly one-third of what it used to be. So there is a potential, believe it or not, that some of the traffic conditions in A-33 and the queuing related to that are slightly overstated. So keeping that in mind, and looking, for example, at page 37, lower left corner of this table, you will see that under existing a.m. peak hour conditions the southbound queue at maximum is 1850 feet, which is well shy of the proposed location of the right in/right out access. During the p.m. peak hour it is 2800 feet. If you turn to the next page, depending on what assortment of PennDOT improvements at 202 and 926 are constructed,

	1438	1	1440
19:31:35	This, again, is one of the	19:33:42	1440 The reason why that intersection
19:31:35	reasons Mr. Federico suggested maybe this	19:33:42	is unsignalized presently may have to do with
19:31:36 2	access should not be provided. Maybe the	19:33:44 2	the signal spacing or it may have to do with
3	queues are such that people can't even get to		other issues. But it occurred to me as I was
71	the access and maybe won't use it, and instead	_	reviewing A-33, and just presenting discussion
	will go to West Pleasant Grove Road.		of the right in/right out access, that most of
_	I would submit that during the	_	the site traffic is destined to or from the
	a.m. peak hour it is possible the queue could		north on 202.
	extend to that driveway. But based on what I	19:34:02 8	It would be better for everyone,
19:31:53 9		19:34:05	including the traffic that is ostensibly the
19:31:56	just presented, I think it more likely it is	19:34:07 10	concern of Westtown and PennDOT at 202 and 926,
19:31:59 11	not going to impede someone's desire to enter		
19:32:02 12	that driveway, especially if you consider a decel lane or even exit that driveway.	19:34:15 12	if there were a more direct path motorists
	•	19:34:17 13	could take to leave the Crebilly site and go
19:32:07 14	As long as you would have	19:34:20 14	north.
19:32:09 15	afforded clear lines of sight, I really see no	19:34:21 15	So I found it curious that during
19:32:12 16	reason that a right out movement should be	19:34:24 16	the length of the hearing there have been no
19:32:15 17	eliminated from the plan just based on	19:34:26 17	discussions about why signalizing that
19:32:17 18	projected queuing conditions.	19:34:29 18	intersection and providing additional
19:32:20 19	If during the a.m. peak hour the	19:34:31 19	functionality improvement wasn't considered.
19:32:22 20	queue does extend beyond this right-of-way,	19:34:34 20	So I started looking at the obvious things like
19:32:25 21	keep in mind that is one hour out of 24, and	19:34:37 21	signal spacing.
19:32:28 22	the hour preceding and the hour following the	19:34:38 22	The intersection of West Pleasant
19:32:31 23	a.m. peak, and the hour preceding that,	19:34:41 23	Grove, it is approximately 3,100 feet north of
14 24	preceding hour, etcetera, are typically lower	19:34:44 24	926, it is approximately 1200 feet south of
		1	
Ĭ	1439		1441
19:32:37 1	and have shorter queues.	19:34:49 1	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on
19:32:37 1 19:32:38 2	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually	19:34:51 2	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side.
	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the		Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation
19:32:38 2	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably	19:34:51 2	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have
19:32:38 2 19:32:40 3	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few	19:34:51 2 19:34:53 3	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet
19:32:38 2 19:32:40 3 19:32:43 4	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon.	19:34:51 2 19:34:53 3 19:34:55 4	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in
19:32:38 2 19:32:40 3 19:32:43 4 19:32:46 5	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that	19:34:51 2 19:34:53 3 19:34:55 4 19:34:59 5	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation
19:32:38 2 19:32:40 3 19:32:43 4 19:32:46 5 19:32:49 6	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route	19:34:51 2 19:34:53 3 19:34:55 4 19:34:59 5 19:35:04 6	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site	19:34:51 2 19:34:53 3 19:34:55 4 19:34:59 5 19:35:04 6 19:35:07 7	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial.
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access	19:34:51 2 19:34:53 3 19:34:55 4 19:34:59 5 19:35:04 6 19:35:07 7 19:35:10 8	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for	19:34:51 2 19:34:53 3 19:34:55 4 19:34:59 5 19:35:04 6 19:35:07 7 19:35:10 8 19:35:12 9	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access	19:34:51 2 19:34:53 3 19:34:55 4 19:34:59 5 19:35:04 6 19:35:07 7 19:35:10 8 19:35:12 9 19:35:13 10	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the Board should reconsider adding or leaving that	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the Board should reconsider adding or leaving that access as originally proposed by the applicant.	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322 and 1, and the presence of the State Farm complex in the northeast quadrant of that intersection. There is State Farm Drive, which
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the Board should reconsider adding or leaving that access as originally proposed by the applicant. So that's the first issue. I can	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322 and 1, and the presence of the State Farm complex in the northeast quadrant of that
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the Board should reconsider adding or leaving that access as originally proposed by the applicant. So that's the first issue. I can continue unless	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322 and 1, and the presence of the State Farm complex in the northeast quadrant of that intersection. There is State Farm Drive, which
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the Board should reconsider adding or leaving that access as originally proposed by the applicant. So that's the first issue. I can continue unless Okay. So the second issue	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322 and 1, and the presence of the State Farm complex in the northeast quadrant of that intersection. There is State Farm Drive, which is effectively a real connector road, in my
19:32:38	and have shorter queues. So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the Board should reconsider adding or leaving that access as originally proposed by the applicant. So that's the first issue. I can continue unless Okay. So the second issue regards the next intersection to the north,	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322 and 1, and the presence of the State Farm complex in the northeast quadrant of that intersection. There is State Farm Drive, which is effectively a real connector road, in my opinion, in that quadrant.
19:32:38	So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the Board should reconsider adding or leaving that access as originally proposed by the applicant. So that's the first issue. I can continue unless Okay. So the second issue regards the next intersection to the north, which is West Pleasant Grove. As I'm sure the	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322 and 1, and the presence of the State Farm complex in the northeast quadrant of that intersection. There is State Farm Drive, which is effectively a real connector road, in my opinion, in that quadrant. The intersection of State Farm
19:32:38	So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the Board should reconsider adding or leaving that access as originally proposed by the applicant. So that's the first issue. I can continue unless Okay. So the second issue regards the next intersection to the north, which is West Pleasant Grove. As I'm sure the Board is aware, that is an unsignalized	19:34:51 2 19:34:53 3 19:34:55 4 19:34:59 5 19:35:04 6 19:35:07 7 19:35:10 8 19:35:12 9 19:35:13 10 19:35:17 11 19:35:19 12 19:35:22 13 19:35:27 14 19:35:31 15 19:35:33 16 19:35:36 17 19:35:38 18 19:35:41 19 19:35:42 20	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322 and 1, and the presence of the State Farm complex in the northeast quadrant of that intersection. There is State Farm Drive, which is effectively a real connector road, in my opinion, in that quadrant. The intersection of State Farm Drive and Route 202, which is signalized, and
19:32:38	So I think that access actually affords functionality, certainly during the off-peak hours for site residents, and probably for the a.m. peak, and maybe even for a few hours in the afternoon. So considering that removing that access impacts the eastbound approach of Route 926, which already hosts the majority of site traffic, and would host even more if the access were removed, as well as consideration for things such as life safety, I think that the Board should reconsider adding or leaving that access as originally proposed by the applicant. So that's the first issue. I can continue unless Okay. So the second issue regards the next intersection to the north, which is West Pleasant Grove. As I'm sure the Board is aware, that is an unsignalized intersection. The side streets are limited to	19:34:51	Skiles Boulevard, so it is certainly closer on that side. According to Smart Transportation Guidelines, a regional arterial should have intersection spacing typically between 660 feet and 1320 feet. So at 1200 you are actually in the range, according to Smart Transportation Guidelines, that's accepted for a regional arterial. I next looked to 202 itself to see if there were any other instances of similar intersection spacing. The Board may be familiar with the intersection of 202 and 322 and 1, and the presence of the State Farm complex in the northeast quadrant of that intersection. There is State Farm Drive, which is effectively a real connector road, in my opinion, in that quadrant. The intersection of State Farm Drive and Route 202, which is signalized, and its offset to the next intersection south,

		1442		1444
19:35:59	1	feet from State Farm. And all three are	19:38:16 1	and from other points of attraction outside the
19:36:01	2	signalized.	19:38:19 2	community.
19:36:02	3	So considering that having added	19:38:20	As the Board knows, there is a
)6	4	turning movement functionality at that location	19:38:21 4	shopping center in the northeast quadrant of
19:36:09	5	would benefit Route 202 and 926, which is a	19:38:24 5	the intersection, 202 and 926. There are two
19:36:13	6	concern, would provide a more direct path to	19:38:29 6	marked pedestrian crossings at that
19:36:16	7	the residents, I was surprised that there was	19:38:30 7	intersection. There is also a CVS in the
19:36:18	8	no discussion about investigating that a little	19:38:33	southwest quadrant, and sidewalks along the
19:36:21	9	bit further.	19:38:37	frontage of the CVS and at the shopping center.
19:36:23		I should also mention, this is	19:38:42 10	To the northeast of the site
19:36:25		more I guess altruism than anything else, there	19:38:44 11	itself there is a church, and slightly further
19:36:29		are hundreds of existing homes on the east side	19:38:47 12	to the north directly is a school.
19:36:32		of 202 that could also potentially benefit from	19:38:51 13	I would submit, again, reflecting
19:36:35		this signalization. If they want to go to or	19:38:53 14	the known concerns of congestion at 202 and
19:36:39		from the south, they have no choice but to	19:38:56 15	926, that some additional efforts to embrace
19:36:41		filter southward toward 926, head west and turn	19:39:01 16	multi-modalism is probably appropriate for this
19:36:44 19:36:47		left. So this would be an option to benefit	19:39:05 17	site, and providing sidewalks to connect all of
19:36:47		them as well. So that was the second thing.	19:39:07 18	those potential destinations I just mentioned is something I would very strongly suggest the
19:36:48		The third point shifts gears a	19:39:10 15	applicant consider. So this would include
19:36:52		little and it looks at the other side of the	19:39:11 20	sidewalks both along 926, as well as West
19:36:54		site, and mainly the intersection of New Street	19:39:14 21	Pleasant Grove Road.
19:36:56		and 926, which is a signalized intersection,	19:39:19 22	And then the fifth and final
19:36:59		and, according to A-33, has some failing levels	19:39:19 23	point has to do with the access proposed on
. 2		1443	10.35,23	1445
19:37:08	1	of service today.	19:39:27	Route 926. As shown on the plan in A-33, and
19:37:09	2	This intersection was very close	19:39:32 2	elsewhere in the proceedings, originally that
19:37:11	3	to Thornbury Farm Trust, the Spackman property.	19:39:35 3	access was proposed to be closer to Route 202,
19:37:15	4	We heard from Mr. Spackman earlier.	19:39:39 4	and some concerns were voiced by PennDOT and I
19:37:17	5	The intersection is fairly unique	19:39:41 5	believe Mr. Federico that the queue on that
19:37:19	6	in that in addition to hosting vehicular	19:39:44 6	approach will extend beyond that driveway. It
19:37:22	7	travel, automobile variety, there is also horse	19:39:48 7	will be difficult to meet signal warrants
19:37:28	8	crossings and farm equipment crossings.	19:39:50	potentially for that driveway by itself. And
19:37:29	9	Now, I heard some discussion	19:39:52	for these reasons, perhaps it makes more sense
19:37:31	10	about the possibility of a roundabout being	19:39:55 10	to shift the driveway to the west.
19:37:34	11	considered for that location. And the purpose	19:39:57 11	I would turn again to A-33, page
19:37:36	12	of a roundabout is to keep traffic moving,	19:40:01 12	38. If you look in the upper left corner under
19:37:39	13	although at lower speeds, but not have it stop	19:40:07 13	these different potential build-out
19:37:41	14	as it does ostensibly at a traffic signal.	19:40:09 14	alternatives, A through C, and depending on
19:37:45	15	I would submit that the applicant	19:40:11 15	what level of PennDOT improvements are
1	13			what level of rehilbor improvements are
19:37:46		and the Board should consider strongly not	19:40:15 16	provided, the eastbound queue could be as long
19:37:46 19:37:49	16	•	1	·
1	16 17	and the Board should consider strongly not doing a roundabout option because, knowing that there is crossings of both animals and farm	19:40:15 16 19:40:18 17 19:40:24 18	provided, the eastbound queue could be as long as 2,185 feet or it could be as short as 1,000 feet.
19:37:49	16 17 18	and the Board should consider strongly not doing a roundabout option because, knowing that there is crossings of both animals and farm equipment, that might not be in keeping with	19:40:15 16 19:40:18 17	provided, the eastbound queue could be as long as 2,185 feet or it could be as short as 1,000 feet. So if those improvements are
19:37:49 19:37:52 10:37:55	16 17 18 19 20	and the Board should consider strongly not doing a roundabout option because, knowing that there is crossings of both animals and farm equipment, that might not be in keeping with the best intentions for all intersection users.	19:40:15	provided, the eastbound queue could be as long as 2,185 feet or it could be as short as 1,000 feet. So if those improvements are provided, and I believe Mr. Federico testified
19:37:49 19:37:52	16 17 18 19 20	and the Board should consider strongly not doing a roundabout option because, knowing that there is crossings of both animals and farm equipment, that might not be in keeping with the best intentions for all intersection users. Fourth, in regards sidewalks,	19:40:15 16 19:40:16 17 19:40:24 18 19:40:24 19 19:40:27 20 19:40:32 21	provided, the eastbound queue could be as long as 2,185 feet or it could be as short as 1,000 feet. So if those improvements are provided, and I believe Mr. Federico testified at least in his opinion either PennDOT or the
19:37:49 19:37:52 19:37:55 17 19:38:01 19:38:06	16 17 18 19 20 21	and the Board should consider strongly not doing a roundabout option because, knowing that there is crossings of both animals and farm equipment, that might not be in keeping with the best intentions for all intersection users. Fourth, in regards sidewalks, there was some, I think, discussion and some	19:40:15 16 19:40:16 17 19:40:24 18 19:40:24 19 19:40:27 20 19:40:32 21 19:40:36 22	provided, the eastbound queue could be as long as 2,185 feet or it could be as short as 1,000 feet. So if those improvements are provided, and I believe Mr. Federico testified at least in his opinion either PennDOT or the applicant is going to provide those
19:37:49 19:37:52 19:37:55 7 19:38:01	16 17 18 19 20 21	and the Board should consider strongly not doing a roundabout option because, knowing that there is crossings of both animals and farm equipment, that might not be in keeping with the best intentions for all intersection users. Fourth, in regards sidewalks,	19:40:15 16 19:40:16 17 19:40:24 18 19:40:24 19 19:40:27 20 19:40:32 21	provided, the eastbound queue could be as long as 2,185 feet or it could be as short as 1,000 feet. So if those improvements are provided, and I believe Mr. Federico testified at least in his opinion either PennDOT or the

	1446		1448
19:40:43 1	1446 1146, beginning on line 9, if those	19:42:50	agreement by Westtown Township and the
19:40:48 2	improvements are built, then firstly it seems	19:42:51 2	applicant that the applicant meets its burden
19:40:49 3	like this offset concern is to some extent	19:42:55 3	by providing the improvements, or PennDOT.
53 4	minimized.	19:42:57	So with that conclusion in mind,
19:40:54	Nevertheless, if it is	19:43:00 5	I think the Board should be not surprised at
19:40:57	unavoidable to shift this access opposite	19:43:03 6	all if the residents of Bridlewood at
19:41:01 7	Bridlewood, there is a few things to keep in	19:43:07 7	Thornbury, Thornbury Township, or anyone else,
19:41:04 8	mind.	19:43:10 8	for that matter, believes that if the access is
19:41:06 9	As I just mentioned, under Mr.	19:43:12	constructed opposite Bridlewood at Thornbury,
19:41:10 10	Federico's direct, perhaps his cross, he	19:43:15 10	whether it is signalized or not, it is entirely
19:41:12 11	clearly stated that the impact of this	19:43:18 11	possible that there will be a request to design
19:41:14 12	development at the intersection of 202 and 926	19:43:21 12	that intersection so that no through movements
19:41:19 13	is mitigated by these PennDOT improvements.	19:43:24 13	can occur to or from either community. And
19:41:22 14	For purposes of the record I'll clarify, it is	19:43:28 14	this would likely be achieved through
19:41:25 15	a new southbound right turn lane and an	19:43:31 15	channelization islands.
19:41:27 16	additional eastbound lane. And if those	19:43:33 16	I have not provided any sketch at
19:41:29 17	improvements are provided, it was his opinion,	19:43:35 17	this point. But, clearly, that could be
19:41:32 18	and mine, frankly, that the impact of this	19:43:37 18	designed to allow rights in, rights out, lefts
19:41:34 19	development at that intersection is offset, it	19:43:40 19	in, lefts out, and discourage through physical
19:41:39 20	is mitigated.	19:43:45 20	means any through traffic going back and forth
19:41:40 21	That is based on the findings of	19:43:47 21	to either community.
19:41:42 22	A-33. I believe that's what Mr. Federico based	19:43:48 22	And that would not be
19:41:44 23	his conclusion on. PennDOT doesn't seem to	19:43:50 23	problematic, according to the applicant and
46 24	have a concern with that conclusion. It seems	19:43:52 24	according to the review by Mr. Federico, based
1	1447		1449
19:41:48 1	to agree to this point. Obviously, the	19:43:55	on the study as offered in A-33.
19:41:50 2	applicant agrees, and we are all going on our	19:44:00 2	Those are my comments.
19:41:53	merry way.	19:44:03	BY MS. LABRUM:
19:41:54 4	If you turn back to page 54 of	19:44:03 4	Q. Have you had an opportunity to look at
19:41:57 5	A-33, you look at the trip distribution once	19:44:05 5	the April 17th, 2017 scoping meeting notes of
19:42:01 6	again, you have to ask yourself: How much	19:44:11 6	PennDOT?
19:42:04 7	traffic was considered to potentially cut	19:44:12 7	A. Yes, as prepared by McMahon. PC-3 is
19:42:08	through the Bridlewood at Thornbury community	19:44:16	They reference in bullet point No. 2 a
19:42:11 9	in arriving at the conclusions offered in A-33,	19:44:17 9	Q. They reference in bullet point No. 2 a current site plan. Have you reviewed that
19:42:15 10 19:42:18 11	the conclusions that were embraced and upheld by Westtown's consultant and by the applicant	19:44:22 10	current site plan?
19:42:18 11	themselves.	19:44:25 12	A. No.
19:42:21 12	And if you look at the	19:44:25 13	Q. Are you aware of the contents of PC-3?
19:42:24 14	intersection of Bridlewood Boulevard and 926	19:44:34 14	A. Yes.
19:42:24 14	you will see a lot of zeros. And if you look	19:44:34 15	Q. Those notes. And what do those notes
19:42:28 16	at the intersection of the proposed site access	19:44:38 16	suggest that the current plan you have not seen
19:42:30 17	and 926, you will see a lot of zeros.	19:44:41 17	looks like?
19:42:33 18	So what that means is that this	19:44:42 18	A. So it is probably easiest just to read
19 42:35 19	case, this study was based on an assumption	19:44:44 19	the first two sentences from the second bullet
a 20	that no traffic would cut through the	19:44:46 20	point of PC-3. "Nicole highlighted the
19:42:41 21	community, and, in doing so, surcharged the	19:44:49 21	proposed access configuration based on the
19:42:43 22	most amount of traffic on the intersection of	19:44:52 22	current site plan, which will continue to
19:42:46 23	202 and 926.	19:44:54 23	evolve. The site access to US Route 202 has
19:42:48 24	And invariably, there was	19:44:58 24	been removed from the plan"
00 (00 (004	7.00.E0.07 AM Page 1446 to	1440 -645	11 22 of 62 sheet

			_	
	1450			1452
19:45:00 1	So I have not seen that plan.	20:03:49	1	MS. CAMP: I have a few.
19:45:02 2	The plan contained in A-33 includes that access	20:03:50	2	CROSS-EXAMINATION
19:45:06 3	to Route 202. And, as I mentioned at the	20:03:51	3	BY MS. CAMP:
)9 4	beginning of my direct, if that access is	20:03:52	4	Q. Mr. Tavani, are you familiar with the
19:45:11 5	removed, it will add additional traffic to	20:03:54	5	Westtown Township Zoning Ordinance?
19:45:15 6	other roads, including 926.	20:03:57	6	A. Very little.
19:45:18 7	Q. If the applicant determines to place a	20:03:57	7	Q. So you have not reviewed Section
19:45:24	regional connector road from West Pleasant	20:04:00	8	170-1512 of the Zoning Ordinance which
19:45:26	Grove to 926, what measures would you suggest		9	addresses access to Route 202?
19:45:29 10	that Thornbury Township implement?	20:04:05 1		A. No.
19:45:31 11	A. I'm sorry, can you repeat that	20:04:05	_	Q. So you are not familiar with Section
19:45:33 12	question?	20:04:08 1		1512.B, which specifically encourages
19:45:33 13	Q. If the applicant determines to put in a	20:04:12 1		applicants not to have access onto Route 202 as
19:45:35 14	regional connector road from West Pleasant	20:04:17 1		a zoning requirement?
19:45:37 15	Grove to 926, what measures would you suggest	20:04:18 1		A. I am not familiar with that portion of
19:45:40 16	that Thornbury Township implement?	20:04:19 1		the code.
19:45:44 17	A. Well, firstly, I would certainly hope	20:04:20 1		Q. Have you reviewed the Westtown Township
19:45:47 18	the applicant does not construct a regional	20:04:22		Subdivision and Land Development Ordinance?
19:45:50 19	connector. Ms. Kline's direct testimony on	20:04:24 1		A. I have not.
19:45:51 20	multiple occasions offered that she thought	20:04:24		Q. So you are not familiar with Section
19:45:54 21	that at most a local connection, a connection	20:04:26		149-300.E that suggests that proposed
19:45:56 22	for local traffic, not regional traffic, may be	20:04:30 2		developments shall be coordinated with existing
19:45:58 23	provided.	20:04:33		nearby neighborhoods with respect to street layout, future extensions of utilities and
00 24	In any event, to answer your 1451	20:04:36		1453
19:46:02	question, which is if a regional connector were		1	street rights-of-way, so communities can
	provided, that would only serve to reinforce	20:04:38	2	develop harmoniously?
19:46:04 2 19:46:07 3	point 5 as I offered during direct, which is		3	A. As stated, I am not familiar with that
19:46:07 4	that there should be some means of	20:04:48	4	ordinance.
19:46:13 5	channelization to eliminate the possibility of	20:04:53	5	MS. CAMP: I have nothing
19:46:15	through traffic between communities.	20:04:54	6	further.
19:46:20 7	MS. LABRUM: I have no further	20:04:55	7	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms.
19:46:22 8	questions.	20:04:56	8	Camp.
19:46:24	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Adelman, do you		9	Mr. Crawford, any questions for
19:46:26 10	want to start questions now or do you want to	20:04:58	10	Birmingham Township?
19:46:28 11	take a break? I don't know how long your	20:04:59		MR. CRAWFORD: No questions.
19:46:29 12	questions are going to be.	20:05:00 1		Thank you.
19:46:30 13	MR. ADELMAN: I don't have any	20:05:01	13	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, any
19:46:31 14	questions.	20:05:04	14	questions for Mr. Tavani from Neighbors of
19:46:31 15	MR. MCKENNA: That makes it very	20:05:06	15	Crebilly?
19:46:32 16	easy. Thank you.	20:05:07	16	MR. THOMPSON: No questions.
19:46:39 17	With that in mind, let's take a	20:05:08 1	17	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. DuFault, any
19:46:40 18	ten-minute recess and we will come back in a	20:05:10 1	18	questions for Mr. Tavani?
19:46:44 19	couple minutes before 8:00 o'clock. Thank you.	20:05:11 1	19	MR. DUFAULT: Since I have
)9 20	(Recess taken.)	20:05:20 2	20	trouble with the mic from past experience.
20:03:42 21	MR. MCKENNA: All right. The	20:05:26	21	Yes. All this is new, kind of new to me, so
20:03:43 22	applicant had no questions for Mr. Tavani.	20:05:31	22	I'm stumbling along here.
20:03:46 23	Does the Planning Commission have any questions	20:05:34	23	You stated, Mr. Tavani, that the
20:03:48 24	for Mr. Tavani?	20:05:37	24	applicant had mitigated the traffic impacts by

	1454			1456
20:05:43	doing the improvements at 202 and 926?	20:07:58	1	p.m. peak.
20:05:48 2	THE WITNESS: Essentially, yes.	20:07:59	2	Brandywine Boulevard is 2300 feet
20:05:50 3	I did say that.	20:08:05	3	west of 202. So it would seem that using that
53 4	MR. DUFAULT: Is it true that	20:08:11	4	metric you should be able to locate the
20:05:54 5	before, at the present time that intersection	20:08:14	5	driveway closer to 202 rather than directly
20:05:55 6	is working at a level of service of F?	20:08:18	6	opposite Bridlewood, although I would offer
20:05:59 7	THE WITNESS: Yes.	20:08:21	7	that one of the other benefits that PennDOT
20:06:00 8	MR. DUFAULT: And that the	20:08:25	8	mentions, and possibly the applicant, is if and
20:06:01 9	proposed improvements are not going to change	20:08:28	9	when a signal is warranted that if the
20:06:04 10	that designation?	20:08:31	0	driveways are lined up opposite one another
20:06:07 11	THE WITNESS: The letter	20:08:33 1	1	that the signal would then benefit both
20:06:08 12	designation will not change, although the	20:08:36 1		communities instead of whoever got there.
20:06:10 13	estimated delay either stays the same or is	20:08:43		MR. DUFAULT: Isn't it true that
20:06:14 14	reduced in the post-development condition.	20:08:44 1		putting a signal there would also allow cross
20:06:17 15	MR. DUFAULT: And that qualifies	20:08:47		traffic to enter? Right now let me rephrase
20:06:18 16	as a mitigation?	20:08:53		that.
20:06:19 17	THE WITNESS: Yes.	20:08:54 1		Right now, as I recall the
20:06:19 18	MR. DUFAULT: F is still an F.	20:08:57		turning movements, based on their traffic
20:06:23 19	THE WITNESS: I believe Mr.	20:09:00 1		study, movements eastbound, from eastbound
20:06:25 20	Federico during his cross was asked similar	20:09:04 2		traffic turning into Bridlewood is zero. Is
20:06:27 21	questions, and, although your statement is	20:09:07 2		that correct?
20:06:30 22	true, it is also true that the burden as	20:09:07 2		THE WITNESS: Could you please
20:06:34 23	imposed by the state or the Commonwealth,	20:09:09 2		restate?
36 24	rather, is to leave an intersection no worse	20:09:15 2	24	MR. MCKENNA: Can you repeat your
		i –		
1	1455			1457
20:06:40	1455 than it found it. If you make it better,			question, Mr. DuFault?
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the	20:09:16	2	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would	20:09:16	2	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24	2 3 4	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood.
20:06:40	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29	2 3 4 5	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking
20:06:40	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met.	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31	2 3 4 5 6	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:54 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:35	2 3 4 5 6 7	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33.
20:06:40	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr.	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:35 20:09:37	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:54 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion.	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:35 20:09:37	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:54 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:35 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:43	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements.
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:56 5 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:06 11	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:45 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:54 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:05 11 20:07:09 12	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:43 11 20:09:45 11 20:09:47	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about.
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:56 5 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:06 11 20:07:09 12 20:07:14 13	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard?	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:43 11 20:09:45 12 20:09:47 11 20:09:50 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:54 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:05 11 20:07:09 12 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:37 20:09:45 1 20:09:47 1 20:09:50 1 20:09:55	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:06 11 20:07:08 11 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14 20:07:23 15	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that depends on who you are asking. I think the	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:45 1: 20:09:47 1: 20:09:55 1: 20:09:58	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any peak hour, whether you are heading east and
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:54 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:05 11 20:07:09 12 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14 20:07:23 15 20:07:26 16	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that depends on who you are asking. I think the answer is yes. And, again, I'm looking at	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:37 20:09:45 1 20:09:47 1 20:09:50 1 20:09:58 1 20:09:58	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any peak hour, whether you are heading east and turning right or heading west and turning left.
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:06 11 20:07:08 12 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14 20:07:23 15 20:07:26 16 20:07:30 17	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that depends on who you are asking. I think the answer is yes. And, again, I'm looking at A-33, page 38, which is a queue summary table.	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:45 1: 20:09:47 1: 20:09:55 1: 20:09:58	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any peak hour, whether you are heading east and turning right or heading west and turning left. There are existing volumes that
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:56 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:06 11 20:07:09 12 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14 20:07:29 15 20:07:26 16 20:07:36 18	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that depends on who you are asking. I think the answer is yes. And, again, I'm looking at A-33, page 38, which is a queue summary table. And it appears that no matter which alternative	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:45 1 20:09:50 1: 20:09:58 1: 20:10:00 1 20:10:04 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any peak hour, whether you are heading east and turning right or heading west and turning left. There are existing volumes that make those turns today, but site traffic is
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:54 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:05 11 20:07:09 12 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14 20:07:28 16 20:07:26 16 20:07:30 17 20:07:36 18	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that depends on who you are asking. I think the answer is yes. And, again, I'm looking at A-33, page 38, which is a queue summary table. And it appears that no matter which alternative for build-out is selected, with the PennDOT	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:43 11 20:09:45 12 20:09:55 14 20:09:58 12 20:09:58 12 20:10:00 11 20:10:04 11 20:10:04 11 20:10:06 11	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any peak hour, whether you are heading east and turning right or heading west and turning left. There are existing volumes that make those turns today, but site traffic is shown to be zero.
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:06 11 20:07:08 12 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14 20:07:23 15 20:07:26 16 20:07:30 17 20:07:30 17 20:07:36 18 20:07:36 18	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that depends on who you are asking. I think the answer is yes. And, again, I'm looking at A-33, page 38, which is a queue summary table. And it appears that no matter which alternative for build-out is selected, with the PennDOT improvements in place, even at full build-out	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:45 1 20:09:50 1: 20:09:58 1: 20:10:00 1 20:10:04 1	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any peak hour, whether you are heading east and turning right or heading west and turning left. There are existing volumes that make those turns today, but site traffic is
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:54 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:05 11 20:07:09 12 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14 20:07:28 16 20:07:26 16 20:07:30 17 20:07:36 18	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that depends on who you are asking. I think the answer is yes. And, again, I'm looking at A-33, page 38, which is a queue summary table. And it appears that no matter which alternative for build-out is selected, with the PennDOT improvements in place, even at full build-out and even with substantial background growth	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:45 1 20:09:50 1: 20:09:58 1: 20:10:00 1: 20:10:04 1 20:10:05 1 20:10:10 1 20:10:11 20:10:11	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 20 21	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any peak hour, whether you are heading east and turning right or heading west and turning left. There are existing volumes that make those turns today, but site traffic is shown to be zero. MR. DUFAULT: So no traffic study
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:54 5 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:05 11 20:07:09 12 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14 20:07:26 16 20:07:26 16 20:07:26 16 20:07:36 18 20:07:36 18 20:07:38 19 42 20 20:07:45 21	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that depends on who you are asking. I think the answer is yes. And, again, I'm looking at A-33, page 38, which is a queue summary table. And it appears that no matter which alternative for build-out is selected, with the PennDOT improvements in place, even at full build-out	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:43 11 20:09:45 12 20:09:55 12 20:09:55 12 20:10:00 11 20:10:04 11 20:10:01 11 20:10:11 20:10:11 20:10:15 2	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	question, Mr. DuFault? MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any peak hour, whether you are heading east and turning right or heading west and turning left. There are existing volumes that make those turns today, but site traffic is shown to be zero. MR. DUFAULT: So no traffic study was done at Bridlewood and 926 indicating the
20:06:40 1 20:06:43 2 20:06:46 3 20:06:50 4 20:06:56 6 20:06:56 7 20:06:58 8 20:07:01 9 20:07:05 10 20:07:06 11 20:07:08 12 20:07:14 13 20:07:18 14 20:07:23 15 20:07:26 16 20:07:30 17 20:07:36 18 20:07:36 18 20:07:38 19 42 20 20:07:48 22	than it found it. If you make it better, that's great. But you cannot degrade the condition worse than the future condition would be if the site weren't developed. And I believe A-33 demonstrates that burden has been met. More importantly, what I really offered during my direct was that it was Mr. Federico who agreed with that conclusion. MR. DUFAULT: All right. Let me move on to another question. Can the access road to 926 be moved less distance and not connect directly to Bridlewood Boulevard? THE WITNESS: Well, I guess that depends on who you are asking. I think the answer is yes. And, again, I'm looking at A-33, page 38, which is a queue summary table. And it appears that no matter which alternative for build-out is selected, with the PennDOT improvements in place, even at full build-out and even with substantial background growth added, it appears that eastbound queue is going	20:09:16 20:09:19 20:09:24 20:09:29 20:09:31 20:09:37 20:09:39 20:09:45 1: 20:09:47 1: 20:09:50 1: 20:10:00 1: 20:10:01 1: 20:10:10 1: 20:10:11 20:10:12 20:10:20 2:	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. DUFAULT: Yes. The chart shows zero movements on, eastbound movement on 926 into Bridlewood. THE WITNESS: If you are talking about Crebilly traffic, the answer is yes. And it is shown on page 54 of A-33. MR. DUFAULT: No. Doesn't that arrow, it shows, the arrow shows turning movements. THE WITNESS: Perhaps I'm failing to grasp which traffic you are talking about. The site traffic for Crebilly shows no assignment to Bridlewood Boulevard during any peak hour, whether you are heading east and turning right or heading west and turning left. There are existing volumes that make those turns today, but site traffic is shown to be zero. MR. DUFAULT: So no traffic study was done at Bridlewood and 926 indicating the amount of traffic coming, cut-through traffic?

	1458		1460
20:10:31 1	any records that indicate what that cut-through	20:12:51 1	concern me.
20:10:33 2	traffic might be?	20:12:53	
20:10:34 3	THE WITNESS: No.	20:12:56 3	
35 4	MR. DUFAULT: Is it possible to	20:12:57 4	
20:10:56 5	put the well, you said that it is possible	20:12:58 5	Mr. or Mrs. Harkins, any
20:10:58 6	to put the connector road at a different	20:13:00 6	
20:11:01 7	location on 926?	20:13:00 7	MS. HARKINS: No questions.
20:11:04 8	THE WITNESS: I said it depends	20:13:02	MR. MCKENNA: I'm sorry?
20:11:06 9	who you are asking, and I believe that there is	20:13:03	MS. HARKINS: No questions.
20:11:09 10	a possibility to locate it closer to Route 202	20:13:04 10	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.
20:11:14 11	rather than directly opposite Bridlewood.	20:13:05 11	Mr. Mammucari, any questions?
20:11:17 12	MR. DUFAULT: I have no further	20:13:08 12	Mr. Mammucari? I don't know if
20:11:18 13	questions.	20:13:11 13	he is still here or not. It appears he is no
20:11:20 14	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.	20:13:13 14	longer here.
20:11:22 15	DuFault.	20:13:14 15	Mr. Rendemonti, any questions?
20:11:23 16	So for the other parties that are	20:13:24 16	MR. RENDEMONTI: Yes, counsel.
20:11:25 17	here this evening, Mr. Feryo from the Quarry	20:13:26 17	Thank you.
20:11:31 18	Swimming Association, do you have any questions	20:13:27 18	CROSS-EXAMINATION
20:11:32 19	for Mr. Tavani?	20:13:28 19	BY MR. RENDEMONTI:
20:11:33 20	MR. FERYO: No questions.	20:13:28 20	Q. Mr. Tavani, if I ask you to look at the
20:11:34 21	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Spackman, from	20:13:30 21	map up on the board there, you can see that if
20:11:38 22	Thornbury Farm Trust, do you have any questions	20:13:33 22	you travel about 1,000 feet north from the
20:11:40 23	for Mr. Tavani?	20:13:36 23	intersection of 926 on 202 there is a large
11 24	MR. SPACKMAN: Yes, I do. Thank	20:13:39 24	section of real estate that's cut out and it is
ĺ	1459		1461
20:11:43 1	you. I guess one of my questions is and	20:13:41 1	•
20:11:48 2	thank you is with the potential options for	20:13:43 2	
20:11:52 3	South New Street and 926, have there been	20:13:45	
20:11:55 4	recommendations considered for our mounted	20:13:46 4	
20:12:01 5	horse traffic and carriages and also for the	20:13:49 5	left in or the right in and right out only
20:12:02 6	walking trails that proceed from Thornbury Farm	20:13:53 6	design that they have for the traffic to come
20:12:07 7	north that show in the county plans?	20:13:55 7	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
20:12:10	Because crossing 926 now is	20:13:57	that piece of property that is there depicted
20:12:12	already horrible. We are worried about	20:14:00 9	on the map for access, for people to gain
20:12:15 10	increased traffic, with horses and things like	20:14:05 10	
20:12:17 11	that, and, of course, our agricultural	20:14:07 11	In other words, would the right out lane hinder people from getting into that
20:12:20 12	equipment which is varied lengths and widths.	20:14:09 12	
20:12:23 13	THE WITNESS: So your question was, has there been any	20:14:12 13	
20:12:24 14	MR. SPACKMAN: Consideration.	20:14:15 14	
20:12:26 15	THE WITNESS: I believe the	20:14:19 13	you are reviewing. Mr. Adelman, real quick
20:12:27 10	answer is no. But that might be a better	20:14:20 17	question, what is the exhibit we are looking at
20:12:28 17	question for the applicant.	20:14:22 17	that's being referenced?
	question for the application	20.14.23	and boning referenced.
224224 10	MR. SPACKMAN: Would a roundahout	20:14:24 10	MR. ADFI MAN: A-6
1 m + 2:34 19	MR. SPACKMAN: Would a roundabout or other things create more concern in that	20:14:24 19	MR. ADELMAN: A-6. MR. RENDEMONTI: Thank you.
j ₈ 20	or other things create more concern in that	20:14:26 20	MR. RENDEMONTI: Thank you.
20:12:42 21	or other things create more concern in that intersection for these different		MR. RENDEMONTI: Thank you. THE WITNESS: So I'm looking at
j ₈ 20	or other things create more concern in that	20:14:26 20 20:14:28 21	MR. RENDEMONTI: Thank you. THE WITNESS: So I'm looking at figure 6 C strike that. I'll look at figure

	4.400	T	1404
	1462		1464
20:14:42 1	But according to this figure, in	20:17:03	is you start with the existing signal phasing
20:14:44 2	the southbound direction, for example, during	20:17:07 2	and cycle lengths. But when dealing with the
20:14:48 3	the p.m. peak there is just over 2,000 vehicles	20:17:10 3	projected future condition, whether it is a
52 4	heading south, total, past the proposed site	20:17:13 4	base condition, which is just background growth
20:14:59 5	access and essentially past the property you	20:17:16 5	and no site traffic, or it is the build
20:15:02 6	just described.	20:17:20 6	condition, which is the former plus site
20:15:02 7	If the right in/right out is	20:17:22 7	traffic, both of those conditions are to be
20:15:04	provided, 19 additional vehicles would be added	20:17:25	modeled with optimized signal timings in place.
20:15:07	to that 2,000. I don't know if that is what	20:17:29	And that's a somewhat newish
20:15:11 10	you were angling for. But there would be a	20:17:32 10	requirement of PennDOT. It was intended to
20:15:15 11	small increase in traffic past the property,	20:17:34 11	eliminate I guess low-hanging fruit or from the
20:15:18 12	and I say small relative to the total traffic	20:17:38 12	developer taking that benefit.
20:15:22 13	on Route 202.	20:17:40 13	But essentially, to answer your
20:15:24 14	MR. RENDEMONTI: Mr. Tavani,	20:17:41 14	question, A-33, as far as I can recall, does
20:15:25 15	thank you very much.	20:17:46 15	reflect optimized signal timings in the future
20:15:26 16	THE WITNESS: You are welcome.	20:17:50 16	condition.
20:15:33 17	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Mr.	20:17:51 17	MS. CAREY: Does it also take
18	Rendemonti.	20:17:53 18	into effect trying to get out of things like
20:15:36 19	Robert Daull, do you have any	20:17:55 19	CVS, trying to get out of 926 at Dalmally,
20:15:37 20	questions?	20:18:00 20	where the Amish Market is, things like that?
20:15:38 21	MR. DAULL: No questions.	20:18:02 21	Because I cannot get out of my development
20:15:39 22	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir.	20:18:06 22	because of the timing of the lights and the
20:15:42 23	Mr. or Mrs. Kramer, any	20:18:09 23	amount of traffic right now. So do you, does
# 24	questions? Jennifer or Jeffrey Kramer? Do not	20:18:13 24	it take into account people coming out of the
_			
1	1463		1465
20:15:51 1		20:18:15 1	1465 current businesses that are there?
20:15:51 1 20:15:54 2	1463	20:18:15 1 20:18:17 2	
	appear to be here any longer.		current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that.
20:15:54 2	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any	20:18:17 2	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you.
20:15:54 2 20:15:56 3	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions?	20:18:17 2 20:18:19 3	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am.
20:15:54 2 20:15:56 3 20:15:67 4	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions.	20:18:17 2 20:18:19 3 20:18:20 4	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions?
20:15:54 2 20:15:56 3 20:15:57 4 20:15:67 5	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir.	20:18:17 2 20:18:19 3 20:18:20 4 20:18:22 5	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions.
20:15:54 2 20:15:56 3 20:15:57 4 20:15:57 5 20:15:59 6	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions?	20:18:17 2 20:18:19 3 20:18:20 4 20:18:22 5 20:18:28 6	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions?
20:15:54 2 20:15:56 3 20:15:57 4 20:15:57 5 20:15:59 6 20:16:02 7	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am.
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions?
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize.
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of the lights, I was just wondering if that's ever	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize.
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of the lights, I was just wondering if that's ever taken into consideration.	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize. MR. HAWS: Sure. I just had a couple quick questions. As I understand, you outlined your five findings, and I was
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of the lights, I was just wondering if that's ever taken into consideration. Because right now, with the	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize. MR. HAWS: Sure. I just had a couple quick questions. As I understand, you outlined your five findings, and I was following right along, and then I completely
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of the lights, I was just wondering if that's ever taken into consideration. Because right now, with the amount of traffic that we have, it doesn't	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize. MR. HAWS: Sure. I just had a couple quick questions. As I understand, you outlined your five findings, and I was following right along, and then I completely lost you on finding number 3. So could you
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of the lights, I was just wondering if that's ever taken into consideration. Because right now, with the amount of traffic that we have, it doesn't matter if you have 17 more cars or things like that. If the lights are not timed correctly, you will sit there, and you will have people	20:18:17	current businesses that are there? THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize. MR. HAWS: Sure. I just had a couple quick questions. As I understand, you outlined your five findings, and I was following right along, and then I completely lost you on finding number 3. So could you just resummarize what your third finding was?
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of the lights, I was just wondering if that's ever taken into consideration. Because right now, with the amount of traffic that we have, it doesn't matter if you have 17 more cars or things like that. If the lights are not timed correctly,	20:18:17	THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize. MR. HAWS: Sure. I just had a couple quick questions. As I understand, you outlined your five findings, and I was following right along, and then I completely lost you on finding number 3. So could you just resummarize what your third finding was? THE WITNESS: Number 3 regarded
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of the lights, I was just wondering if that's ever taken into consideration. Because right now, with the amount of traffic that we have, it doesn't matter if you have 17 more cars or things like that. If the lights are not timed correctly, you will sit there, and you will have people	20:18:17	THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize. MR. HAWS: Sure. I just had a couple quick questions. As I understand, you outlined your five findings, and I was following right along, and then I completely lost you on finding number 3. So could you just resummarize what your third finding was? THE WITNESS: Number 3 regarded the intersection of New Street and 926. That
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of the lights, I was just wondering if that's ever taken into consideration. Because right now, with the amount of traffic that we have, it doesn't matter if you have 17 more cars or things like that. If the lights are not timed correctly, you will sit there, and you will have people who will completely block intersections.	20:18:17	THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize. MR. HAWS: Sure. I just had a couple quick questions. As I understand, you outlined your five findings, and I was following right along, and then I completely lost you on finding number 3. So could you just resummarize what your third finding was? THE WITNESS: Number 3 regarded the intersection is constrained today. It does
20:15:54	appear to be here any longer. Mr. Skros, do you have any questions? MR. SKROS: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, sir. Eileen Carey, any questions? MS. CAREY: I have a question. I have a question on, I understand the footage, and the different street lengths and things that go in, or stop lights, and the increasing cars, and it will only increase by a certain percentage, etcetera. But with the timing of the lights, I was just wondering if that's ever taken into consideration. Because right now, with the amount of traffic that we have, it doesn't matter if you have 17 more cars or things like that. If the lights are not timed correctly, you will sit there, and you will have people who will completely block intersections. So how does that work with the	20:18:17	THE WITNESS: Yes, A-33 accounts for that. MS. CAREY: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Carol Weller, any questions? MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, ma'am. Does the Planning Commission have any further questions? MS. CAMP: Additional questions? MR. MCKENNA: Excuse me. I'm sorry. The Board of Supervisors, I apologize. MR. HAWS: Sure. I just had a couple quick questions. As I understand, you outlined your five findings, and I was following right along, and then I completely lost you on finding number 3. So could you just resummarize what your third finding was? THE WITNESS: Number 3 regarded the intersection of New Street and 926. That

		r	
	1466		1468
20:19:08 1	unique in that the Thornbury Farm Trust has	20:21:15	THE WITNESS: Well, there is two
20:19:12 2	trails or pathways which cross I believe two	20:21:17 2	crossings currently. I am not aware exactly of
20:19:16 3	legs of that intersection in proximity to the	20:21:21 3	what the pedestrian capabilities of that signal
)9 4	intersection, not immediately at the	20:21:24 4	are, nor am I aware of what they are based on,
20:19:20 5	intersection, at least one of them is,	20:21:28 5	for example, with respect to pedestrians'
20:19:23 6	actually, but in proximity to the intersection,	20:21:30 6	speed.
20:19:25 7	and these crossings aren't for cars, they are	20:21:31 7	There have been some changes over
20:19:28	for animals and for farm equipment.	20:21:32	the years regarding how much time we should
20:19:30	And one of the potential	20:21:35	give a pedestrian to cross a street. But these
20:19:31 10	improvements which had been discussed at that	20:21:37 10	are relatively minor tweaks.
20:19:34 11	intersection was a roundabout. And a	20:21:40 11	And the thing that's a little
20:19:36 12	roundabout, the hallmark of a roundabout is	20:21:41 12	different about pedestrians is that
20:19:40 13	traffic is always moving, it doesn't have to	20:21:44 13	automobiles, automobiles form a line, they form
20:19:42 14	stop as it does for a signalized intersection	20:21:46 14	a queue, and when a light turn greens they all
20:19:45 15	or even a stop-controlled intersection.	20:21:49 15	start going one after the other. Pedestrians
20:19:47 16	Under normal circumstances that	20:21:52 16	will congregate on a corner of an intersection,
20:19:49 17	would be viewed as a benefit. But if you have	20:21:54 17	and you can have one or you can have five
20:19:52 18	crossings of animals and farm equipment,	20:21:56 18	people all standing side by side, and when you
20:19:55 19	perhaps it is better to have vehicles stopped	20:21:58 19	have a walk indication, providing you can fit
20:19:57 20	on occasion. So point 3 essentially stated	20:22:01 20	in the crosswalk, you can move in a platoon
20:20:02 21	that perhaps that's something to consider with	20:22:05 21	simultaneously.
20:20:04 22	whatever improvements are ultimately offered by	20:22:06 22	So if there is going to be three
20:20:07 23	the applicant at that location.	20:22:07 23	crossings today and there is going to be
15 24	MR. HAWS: I'm sorry. For point	20:22:08 24	double, triple, quadruple that in the future
1 .	1467		1469
20:20:18	4 you were mentioning sidewalks.	20:22:11 1	due to a development, it doesn't necessarily
20:20:19 2	THE WITNESS: Yes.	20:22:13 2	mean that you need more pedestrian time,
20:20:20 3	MR. HAWS: I guess your take-home message was that they were okay?	20:22:15	because they tend to move in groups anyway. MR. HAWS: So I guess to follow
20:20:21 4	THE WITNESS: Yes. Again, we	20:22:18 4	up on that question, do you know what the
	have heard many times from different people	20:22:20 5	pedestrian crossings are across 202 and 926
1 -	that there is congestion on 202, and you can	20:22:23 7	today, and based off of the proposed
	attempt to build your way out of congestion,	20:22:30 8	development what they would be in the future?
20:20:31 8	with the PennDOT improvements, or you can	20:22:32	THE WITNESS: Are you talking
20:20:34 9	attempt to change your way of travel to be less	20:22:32 10	about a count?
20:20:39 11	car dependent, and one way of doing that is by	20:22:33 11	MR. HAWS: Yes.
20:20:42 12	providing non-car, non-car-based improvements	20:22:34 12	THE WITNESS: I do not. I'm
20:20:47 13	such as sidewalks, encourage people who want to	20:22:35 13	sorry.
20:20:50 14	go food shopping or go to CVS to not get in	20:22:36 14	MR. HAWS: Well, I know you were
20:20:54 15	their car and do that and drive through the	20:22:37 15	giving an example like there may be two
20:20:55 16	intersections to the supermarket or to the	20:22:40 16	crossings today and in the future there could
20:20:57 17	shopping center across the street. To walk	20:22:41 17	be five. I don't know if you have any sort of
20:20:59 18	there. But they have to have sidewalks. They	20:22:43 18	simulations on that.
20:21:01 19	have to have the facility to actually provide	20:22:45 19	THE WITNESS: I do not. A-33,
j ₄ 20	that ability.	20:22:47 20	despite being about 22 pages of text, is
20:21:05 21	MR. HAWS: Would they need to do	20:22:49 21	hundreds of pages of appendix material. I did
20:21:07 22	upgrades to the crossings at 926 to get over to	20:22:52 22	not bring all of that with me tonight. I
20:21:10 23	CVS or across 202 to get over to where the	20:22:55 23	believe the applicant may have counted
20:21:14 24	Amish Market is?	20:22:57 24	pedestrian crossings and it may be provided in

1470 1472 turning movements. You need to consider what 1 an appendix. I don't have it with me this 1 20:23:00 20:25:15 2 the impact on the opportunity would be within 2 evenina. 20:23:02 the community itself, noise and things of that 3 MR. HAWS: Okay. One final 3 20:23:02 20:25:20 question around pedestrian traffic. I forget sort. 13 20:25:23 what meeting it was. It was one of the 5 I think if there were sidewalk 20:23:09 5 20:25:23 meetings when either the applicant's traffic connections to places like the existing 6 6 20:23:10 20:25:26 consultant, I think it was the applicant's shopping center, which isn't too far away, that 7 7 20:23:13 20:25:28 traffic consultant was going over the A-33, and perhaps that would be a more appropriate 8 8 20:25:31 20:23:14 there was some mention of pedestrian movement, location to try and concentrate mass transit 9 9 20:25:33 20:23:18 10 and the Board here had asked a question about opportunities rather than within the community 20:25:36 10 20:23:22 do they need to have a bus stop somewhere along 11 20:25:38 11 itself. 20:23:25 20:25:39 12 12 202 for this new development, and their MS. DEWOLF: I'm not talking 20:23:30 response I believe was no. about mass transit. I'm talking about the 20:23:36 13 20:25:40 13 20:23:39 14 people that live here, and encouraging them to But based on the testimony that 14 20:25:42 you are providing here tonight, you are saying use multi-modal opportunities, which you have 20:25:43 15 15 suggested a sidewalk and other methods. But 20:23:45 16 that to change the pattern of traffic flow, 20:25:47 16 vet I don't hear you saying how to integrate 20:23:49 17 whether it be from cars or pedestrians, do you 20:25:52 17 those into the site. I wonder, do you know -have an opinion, one way or the other, whether 20:25:56 18 20:23:53 18 or not a bus stop should be part of this 20:26:01 19 THE WITNESS: Well, if you are 20:23:55 19 20:26:02 20 20:23:57 20 development? talking how to incentivize potential future 20:23:58 21 THE WITNESS: Well, firstly, I do residents to use something other than their 20:26:05 21 not recall that testimony or that conversation, 20:24:00 **22** 20:26:08 22 cars, what I tried to illustrate was making the 20:26:10 23 20:24:04 23 unfortunately. connection of a sidewalk from the site to other 20:26:13 24 24 If there was discussion about the existing sidewalks and points of attraction 105 1471 1473 potential for a school bus stop on Route 202 -should help incentivize residents to use that 1 1 20:26:16 20:24:06 2 alternative to drive through. MR. HAWS: No, I meant public 20:26:20 20:24:09 3 I'm not sure how else you would transportation, not school bus. Public 3 20:26:24 20:24:11 transportation, SEPTA. do it. Having sidewalks within the community 4 4 20:26:26 20:24:13 THE WITNESS: I see. My initial 5 is probably not the worst idea either. 5 20:26:29 20:24:17 MS. DEWOLF: You mentioned for 6 6 reaction is having SEPTA go through the site is 20:26:32 20:24:19 probably not the best idea. But to augment the right in/right out on 202 the additional 20:24:23 7 20:26:33 traffic numbers, if that were implemented, was existing transit opportunities along 202 or 8 8 20:26:40 20:24:25 elsewhere could only benefit this community, 9 19 cars adding to the stacking. Can you 9 20:24:28 explain how that number of residences and that and other communities like it, frankly. 20:26:48 10 20:24:32 10 MR. HAWS: Okav. Thank you. 20:26:55 11 possibility here would yield 19 plus cars? 11 20:24:35 THE WITNESS: I can, yes. So the MS. DEWOLF: I'll follow up on 20:27:02 12 12 20:24:38 20:27:05 13 number that -that one. I didn't understand that. So you 13 20:27:06 14 think that increasing different multi-modal MS. DEWOLF: Vehicles. 20:24:44 14 THE WITNESS: The number that I opportunities in the area is good. You think 20:27:07 15 15 20:24:49 that a station or a location for residents to quoted, which you also correctly quoted back, 20:27:07 16 16 20:24:51 20:27:10 17 was during the p.m. peak hour for the outbound 20:24:58 17 actually get on the bus then is not appropriate right turn movement. And I just chose that for this site, or is? 20:27:13 18 18 20:25:01 20:25:02 19 THE WITNESS: It depends where 20:27:15 19 randomly to answer a prior question. 20:27:19 20 20 you are talking about. If you mean within the MS. DEWOLF: So people leaving at)4 site itself, I think that that would need to be 20:27:21 21 the peak hour. 21 20:25:06 considered a little bit more than I can offer 20:27:22 22 THE WITNESS: During the peak, 20:25:11 22 off the cuff toniaht. 20:27:23 23 which is the minimal movement, during the p.m. 20:25:12 23 20:27:25 24 for residential community. We need to look at things like 20:25:14 24

7	1474	ļ	1476
20:27:27 1	MS. DEWOLF: Okay.	20:29:24 1	Plan.
20:27:27 2	THE WITNESS: It is the inbound	20:29:24 2	THE WITNESS: But the road has
20:27:28 3	flow which is greater. I just chose that	20:29:27 3	MS. DEWOLF: That has been on
30 4	number because it was convenient relative to	20:29:28 4	every plan, and John Snook has stated just
20:27:33 5	the quartile that was in question.	20:29:31 5	previous, prior.
20:27:34 6	Conversely, the right turn in	20:29:32 6	THE WITNESS: It is my
20:27:36 7	movement during the p.m. peak at that location	20:29:32 7	understanding
20:27:40 8	is higher. It is projected to be 147 trips.	20:29:33	MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar
20:27:44 9	So, and that's only at that location. There is	20:29:33	with that? Have you looked at our Growth
20:27:47 10	other driveways.	20:29:35 10	Management Plan?
20:27:49 11	MS. DEWOLF: And morning?	20:29:35 11	MR. MCKENNA: Let him finish the
20:27:50 12	THE WITNESS: In the morning for	20:29:38 12	answer.
20:27:51 13	which movement?	20:29:38 13	THE WITNESS: I have looked at
20:27:52 14	MS. DEWOLF: Right in/right out.	20:29:40 14	the plan. I don't have every element of the
20:27:54 15	THE WITNESS: In the morning the	20:29:41 15	plan committed to memory. I have heard the
20:27:55 16	right turn in is 126, if I'm reading this	20:29:44 16	discussion about the potential connector road
20:27:59 17	correctly, and the right turn out is 35.	20:29:45 17	from Skiles to West Pleasant Grove Road, both
20:28:04 18	MS. DEWOLF: Thank you.	20:29:48 18	in the context of previously considered as well
20:28:04 19	THE WITNESS: You are welcome.	20:29:50 19	as where it stands today. And it was my
20:28:06 20	MS. DEWOLF: Are you aware that	20:29:52 20	understanding that that road is not moving
20:28:07 21	we have a Comprehensive Plan that suggests a	20:29:54 21	forward currently.
20:28:13 22	frontage road?	20:29:56 22	MS. DEWOLF: Well, you are
20:28:16 23	THE WITNESS: I am aware of	20:29:57 23	incorrect. And if that road was built, then
17 24	elements of the Comprehensive Plan but not that	20:30:02 24	would you change your suggestion of the
-	4.75		4 477
	1475	4	1477
20:28:19	particular element.	20:30:05 1	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and
20:28:21 2	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our	20:30:08 2	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202?
20:28:21 2 20:28:24 3	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It	20:30:08 2 20:30:08 3	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend
20:28:21 2 20:28:24 3 20:28:28 4	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes	20:30:08 2 20:30:08 3 20:30:10 4	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector
20:28:21 2 20:28:24 3 20:28:28 4 20:28:30 5	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through	20:30:08 2 20:30:08 3 20:30:10 4 20:30:12 5	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be.
20:28:24	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar
20:28:24	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into	20:30:08 2 20:30:08 3 20:30:10 4 20:30:12 5	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it
20:28:21	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that?	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the
20:28:24	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am.	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it
20:28:24	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that?	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you
20:28:24	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by
20:28:21	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it.	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled?
20:28:24	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No.
20:28:21	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just wondered if you had seen that, because you are	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No. MS. DEWOLF: And are you aware of
20:28:24	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just wondered if you had seen that, because you are talking about the signalization of West	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No. MS. DEWOLF: And are you aware of the distance that Skiles Boulevard is to West
20:28:21	particular element. MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just wondered if you had seen that, because you are talking about the signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202, and it almost	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No. MS. DEWOLF: And are you aware of the distance that Skiles Boulevard is to West Pleasant Grove Road and 202?
20:28:24	MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just wondered if you had seen that, because you are talking about the signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202, and it almost sounded as if you weren't aware of that	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No. MS. DEWOLF: And are you aware of the distance that Skiles Boulevard is to West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: What is that? THE WITNESS: This was offered
20:28:21	MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just wondered if you had seen that, because you are talking about the signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202, and it almost sounded as if you weren't aware of that priority of that road structure as an alternate	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No. MS. DEWOLF: And are you aware of the distance that Skiles Boulevard is to West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: What is that? THE WITNESS: This was offered during my direct. The distance between Skiles
20:28:21 2 20:28:24 3 20:28:28 4 20:28:30 5 20:28:34 6 20:28:38 7 20:28:42 8 20:28:45 9 20:28:47 10 20:28:49 11 20:28:50 12 20:28:51 13 20:28:52 14 20:28:56 15 20:28:59 16 20:29:02 17 20:29:07 18 20:29:12 19	MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just wondered if you had seen that, because you are talking about the signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202, and it almost sounded as if you weren't aware of that priority of that road structure as an alternate road, as well as getting people up northbound that live on the west side. THE WITNESS: So you are asking	20:30:08	signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No. MS. DEWOLF: And are you aware of the distance that Skiles Boulevard is to West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: What is that? THE WITNESS: This was offered during my direct. The distance between Skiles and West Pleasant Grove is approximately 1200
20:28:21 2 20:28:24 3 20:28:28 4 20:28:30 5 20:28:34 6 20:28:38 7 20:28:42 8 20:28:45 9 20:28:47 10 20:28:50 12 20:28:50 12 20:28:51 13 20:28:52 14 20:28:56 15 20:28:59 16 20:29:02 17 20:29:07 18 20:29:12 19 13 20 20:29:14 21	MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just wondered if you had seen that, because you are talking about the signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202, and it almost sounded as if you weren't aware of that priority of that road structure as an alternate road, as well as getting people up northbound that live on the west side. THE WITNESS: So you are asking me if I am aware of the contemplated connector	20:30:08	Signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No. MS. DEWOLF: And are you aware of the distance that Skiles Boulevard is to West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: What is that? THE WITNESS: This was offered during my direct. The distance between Skiles and West Pleasant Grove is approximately 1200 feet.
20:28:21 2 20:28:24 3 20:28:28 4 20:28:30 5 20:28:34 6 20:28:34 6 20:28:42 8 20:28:45 9 20:28:47 10 20:28:49 11 20:28:50 12 20:28:51 13 20:28:52 14 20:28:52 14 20:28:59 16 20:29:02 17 20:29:07 18 20:29:07 18 20:29:17 22	MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just wondered if you had seen that, because you are talking about the signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202, and it almost sounded as if you weren't aware of that priority of that road structure as an alternate road, as well as getting people up northbound that live on the west side. THE WITNESS: So you are asking me if I am aware of the contemplated connector road from Skiles to West Pleasant?	20:30:08	Signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No. MS. DEWOLF: And are you aware of the distance that Skiles Boulevard is to West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: What is that? THE WITNESS: This was offered during my direct. The distance between Skiles and West Pleasant Grove is approximately 1200 feet. MS. DEWOLF: Mm-hmm. And as I
20:28:21 2 20:28:24 3 20:28:28 4 20:28:30 5 20:28:34 6 20:28:38 7 20:28:42 8 20:28:45 9 20:28:47 10 20:28:50 12 20:28:50 12 20:28:51 13 20:28:52 14 20:28:56 15 20:28:59 16 20:29:02 17 20:29:07 18 20:29:12 19 13 20 20:29:14 21	MS. DEWOLF: It has been on our Growth Management Plan from the beginning. It is the second one that's been on. And it goes from Skiles Boulevard all the way down through what was called the Orvis tract, which is now going down all the way past the church and into this site. Are you familiar with that? THE WITNESS: I believe I am. Perhaps if you ask the question I can attempt to answer it. MS. DEWOLF: Okay. I just wondered if you had seen that, because you are talking about the signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202, and it almost sounded as if you weren't aware of that priority of that road structure as an alternate road, as well as getting people up northbound that live on the west side. THE WITNESS: So you are asking me if I am aware of the contemplated connector	20:30:08	Signalization of West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: It would depend exactly where the intercept of the connector road on West Pleasant Grove Road would be. MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar that, you might not know that the reason it isn't signaled is, are you aware of the stack-up if you signaled that road? Are you aware of the back-up that was projected by PennDOT if that was signaled? THE WITNESS: No. MS. DEWOLF: And are you aware of the distance that Skiles Boulevard is to West Pleasant Grove Road and 202? THE WITNESS: Yes. MS. DEWOLF: What is that? THE WITNESS: This was offered during my direct. The distance between Skiles and West Pleasant Grove is approximately 1200 feet.

	1478		1480
20:31:03	signalized at that location?	20:32:57 1	farm property that the roundabout would?
20:31:04 2	THE WITNESS: It would depend on	20:33:00 2	THE WITNESS: It would not be the
20:31:05 3	the timing and phasing of the intersection. If	20:33:01 3	same. But it could be different.
)8 4	there is multiple phases which are afforded and	20:33:05 4	MR. MCKENNA: Can you elaborate
20:31:10 5	long cycle lengths, you tend to have longer	20:33:06 5	at all what you mean by that?
20:31:13 6	queues. So I couldn't tell you precisely how	20:33:07 6	THE WITNESS: Yes. Well, as I
20:31:15 7	long it would be. I would think it would be	20:33:08 7	mentioned, a roundabout will encourage and
20:31:17 8	shorter than the queues southbound at the	20:33:13	under most circumstances provide for free-flow
20:31:20 9	intersection of 202 and 926.	20:33:15	traffic on all approaches.
20:31:23 10	MS. DEWOLF: Are you familiar	20:33:18 10	What this specific document
20:31:23 11	with what the back-up now is from 202 to	20:33:20 11	suggests is adding left turn lanes on all four
20:31:28 12	practically around Skiles?	20:33:23 12	approaches, that makes the road wider and
20:31:32 13	THE WITNESS: I am. That was	20:33:25 13	increases the crossing distance for people,
20:31:33 14	also covered during my direct.	20:33:29 14	farm animals and farm equipment and the like.
20:31:42 15	MS. DEWOLF: I don't think I have	20:33:32 15	So there would be an impact, but it would be a
20:31:43 16	any other questions.	20:33:35 16	different impact than what I was articulating
20:31:44 17	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Tavani, a	20:33:37 17	with the roundabout.
20:31:45 18	couple questions for you. You mentioned	20:33:39 18	MR. MCKENNA: So the impact, not
20:31:47 19	several times about the roundabout. And I have	20:33:40 19	necessarily positive or negative, but just an
20:31:51 20	PC-13 in front of me. I don't know if you have	20:33:42 20	impact would necessarily develop?
20:31:53 21	reviewed that or not, or if you have that in	20:33:44 21	THE WITNESS: This impact is more
20:31:55 22	front of you. I just wanted to find out if	20:33:47 22	manageable than the roundabout option.
20:31:57 23	that's the reference, where you were getting	20:33:50 23	MR. MCKENNA: Fair enough. And
10 24	the reference from. This was a March 3rd, 2017	20:33:51 24	then as it relates to the intersection of 926
	1479		1481
20:32:03	letter from PennDOT to the applicant regarding	20:33:54 1	and New Street, the access point that's going
20:32:07 2	the highway occupancy permit application, and	20:33:56	to come out onto 926 or 926 and 202, whatever
20:32:11 3	on page 3 it talked about the impact assessment	20:34:01 3	improvements are installed ultimately is
20:32:14	and the impact study, and there is a numbered	20:34:05 4	PennDOT's determination to make, am I correct
20:32:17 5	paragraph for Street Road and New Street, and	20:34:07 5	on that, since they are all PennDOT roads?
20:32:19 6	it says "provide a roundabout analysis for the	20:34:10 6	THE WITNESS: PennDOT has to
20:32:22 7	department's review."	20:34:13 7	issue highway occupancy permits any time a
20:32:24	Do you think that's where this	20:34:17	shovel goes into a state roadway and that
20:32:26	discussion was coming from? Or you recall	20:34:19 9	includes 926. MR. MCKENNA: My point being, if
20:32:29 10	having it come from?	20:34:21	the Board were inclined to condition approval
20:32:30 11	THE WITNESS: This and possibly other sources which I cannot articulate at the	20:34:22 11	on installing a roundabout, isn't that really
20:32:31 12 20:32:34 13	present.	20:34:24 12	up to PennDOT on whether or not that's ever
20:32:34 13	MR. MCKENNA: All right. And so	20:34:31 14	going to get installed on that road?
20:32:35 15	we heard your discussion about the roundabout	20:34:32 15	THE WITNESS: PennDOT is the
20:32:36 16	and the impact it may have on neighboring	20:34:33 16	reviewing and approving agency. Of course, I
20:32:39 17	properties and specifically Mr. Spackman's.	20:34:36 17	would hope PennDOT would take other advisement,
20:32:42 18	Further down in that paragraph they talk about	20:34:39 18	whatever rulings or suggestions come from the
20.02.44 19	minimum following improvements which PennDOT	20:34:42 19	Board.
la 20	lays out, left turn lanes on all four	20:34:42 20	MR. MCKENNA: Sure. In fact,
20:32:50 21	approaches at that intersection.	20;34:44 21	PC-13 makes reference to confirming the
20:32:51 22	Do you have any opinion on	20:34:46 22	township's desires as it relates to certain
20:32:52 23	whether or not those turn lanes would have	20:34:49 23	issues, I agree with you on that. I just
20:32:54 24	those same negative impacts to the Spackman	20:34:51 24	wasn't clear on who would make the final call

	1482	1	1484
20:34:56	along that section.	20:37:05	could turn left and head toward Route 202. In
20:34:56 1	THE WITNESS: I believe it is	20:37:05 1	doing so that would impact the queue
20:34:57			projections which are currently shown in A-33
39 4	MR. MCKENNA: Okay.		in the queue tables.
20:35:02 5	MS. DEWOLF: I have another	20:37:15 4	So my suggestion was based on
20:35:03 6	question.	20:37:19 6	A-33, which includes the right in/right out,
20:35:03 7	MR. MCKENNA: Sure. Go ahead.		and does not necessarily include regional
20:35:04	MS. DEWOLF: I haven't been aware		connectivity through the site, the queue was I
20:35:07	of any roundabout discussions on that location	20:37:26 8	believe on the order of 1,000 feet. That queue
20:35:11 10	at 926. Where are you sensing that those are,	20:37:32 10	would get longer if there was more traffic
20:35:17 11	were they mentioned or referred to?	20:37:34 11	added to the eastbound approach, which could
20:35:20 12	MR. MCKENNA: Carol, I did refer	20:37:37 12	include this regional traffic.
20:35:22 13			I don't know if it would double
20:35:24 14			in size because Bridlewood is offset 2300 feet
20:35:27 15	references, so I don't know if it is elsewhere.	20:37:44 15	from Route 202. But it would get longer. And
20:35:29 16	But I will tell you, it was referenced in	20:37:48 16	to avoid having an access into the tail end of
20:35:31 17	Exhibit PC-13, at a minimum. Not about	20:37:51 17	the queue, it might be something greater than
20:35:35 18	installation, but PennDOT was asking the	20:37:53 18	1,000 feet away, but potentially still less
20:35:37 19	applicant to at least provide an analysis of a	20:37:57 19	than 2300 feet away, not square feet.
20:35:41 20	roundabout at that intersection.		MR. HAWS: Sure. I guess, and
20:35:43 21	MS. DEWOLF: At 926 and South	20:38:01 21	I'm not a traffic engineer or a street
20:35:44 22	New?	20:38:04 22	designer, but if you are suggesting that the
20:35:45 23	MR. MCKENNA: Correct.		entrance could be at a thousand feet,
16 24	MS. DEWOLF: Okay. Because we		Bridlewood is at 2300, and what I heard you say
	1483		1485
20:35:47 1	did discuss it on West Pleasant Grove. But I	20:38:14 1	here, and correct me if I'm wrong, is that if
20:35:50 2	the same of the contract of the state of the same of t		
	wasn't familiar with that one. Thank you.	20:38:15 2	we had a collector road in there that it would
20:35:56 3	MR. HAWS: Just one additional	20:38:15 2 20:38:18 3	increase the traffic, which would increase the
	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5,		increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be
20:35:56 3	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on	20:38:18 3	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So
20:35:56 3	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on	20:38:18 3	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that
20:35:56 3 20:35:57 4 20:36:01 5 20:36:04 6 20:36:09 7	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection	20:38:18	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the	20:38:18	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that	20:36:18 3 20:36:21 4 20:36:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:33 8 20:38:36 9	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:33 8 20:38:36 9 20:38:39 10	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible?
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct?	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:38 9 20:38:39 10 20:38:44 11	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:33 8 20:38:36 9 20:38:39 10 20:38:44 11 20:38:45 12	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question.
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement.	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:33 8 20:38:36 9 20:38:39 10 20:38:44 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded.
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:38 9 20:38:38 10 20:38:44 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:48 14	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking,
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off of this design, A-6 that's up on the board	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:33 8 20:38:36 9 20:38:34 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:48 14 20:38:50 15	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, if you can align roadways and driveways
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off of this design, A-6 that's up on the board here. If there was a plan that required this	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:36 9 20:38:36 10 20:38:44 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:48 14 20:38:50 15 20:38:53 16	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, if you can align roadways and driveways opposite each other, that is a preferred
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off of this design, A-6 that's up on the board here. If there was a plan that required this collector road, that would be a frontage kind	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:33 8 20:38:36 9 20:38:34 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:48 14 20:38:50 15 20:38:53 16 20:38:56 17	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, if you can align roadways and driveways opposite each other, that is a preferred situation.
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off of this design, A-6 that's up on the board here. If there was a plan that required this collector road, that would be a frontage kind of running parallel to 202, in your opinion,	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:38 9 20:38:38 10 20:38:44 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:48 14 20:38:50 15 20:38:51 16 20:38:56 17 20:38:58 18	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, if you can align roadways and driveways opposite each other, that is a preferred situation. And again, Mr. Federico covered
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off of this design, A-6 that's up on the board here. If there was a plan that required this collector road, that would be a frontage kind of running parallel to 202, in your opinion, does that change your assessment on the	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:33 8 20:38:36 9 20:38:34 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:48 14 20:38:50 15 20:38:53 16 20:38:56 17	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, if you can align roadways and driveways opposite each other, that is a preferred situation. And again, Mr. Federico covered this in his direct. He actually said that one
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off of this design, A-6 that's up on the board here. If there was a plan that required this collector road, that would be a frontage kind of running parallel to 202, in your opinion, does that change your assessment on the alignment of the road?	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:33 8 20:38:36 9 20:38:36 10 20:38:44 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:48 14 20:38:50 15 20:38:51 16 20:38:58 18 20:39:00 19	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, if you can align roadways and driveways opposite each other, that is a preferred situation. And again, Mr. Federico covered this in his direct. He actually said that one of his concerns with what is shown on A-6 is
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off of this design, A-6 that's up on the board here. If there was a plan that required this collector road, that would be a frontage kind of running parallel to 202, in your opinion, does that change your assessment on the	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:33 8 20:38:36 9 20:38:34 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:48 14 20:38:50 15 20:38:50 17 20:38:56 17 20:38:58 18 20:39:00 19 20:39:04 20	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, if you can align roadways and driveways opposite each other, that is a preferred situation. And again, Mr. Federico covered this in his direct. He actually said that one
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off of this design, A-6 that's up on the board here. If there was a plan that required this collector road, that would be a frontage kind of running parallel to 202, in your opinion, does that change your assessment on the alignment of the road? THE WITNESS: If there were, if	20:38:18 3 20:38:21 4 20:38:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:36 9 20:38:36 10 20:38:44 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:46 13 20:38:50 15 20:38:50 15 20:38:50 17 20:38:56 17 20:38:56 18 20:39:00 19 20:39:04 20 20:39:08 21	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, if you can align roadways and driveways opposite each other, that is a preferred situation. And again, Mr. Federico covered this in his direct. He actually said that one of his concerns with what is shown on A-6 is the possibility of northbound traffic on
20:35:56	MR. HAWS: Just one additional question. So I know for your point No. 5, talking about access from the development on 926 and how you were saying that based on potential upgrades to the 202/926 intersection the stacking lengths may be shorter, and the access point could be potentially moved so that it is not directly across from Bridlewood; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That's a fair statement. MR. HAWS: So that is based off of this design, A-6 that's up on the board here. If there was a plan that required this collector road, that would be a frontage kind of running parallel to 202, in your opinion, does that change your assessment on the alignment of the road? THE WITNESS: If there were, if there were a connector road through the	20:36:18 3 20:36:21 4 20:36:23 5 20:38:27 6 20:38:30 7 20:38:38 9 20:38:36 9 20:38:36 10 20:38:44 11 20:38:45 12 20:38:46 13 20:38:50 15 20:38:53 16 20:38:58 18 20:39:00 19 20:39:04 20 20:39:08 21 20:39:10 22	increase the traffic, which would increase the stacking lane, so that it would have to be something greater than a thousand feet. So from planning purposes, on a state highway that is congested, does it make sense to have multiple entry points on a congested road like that? Or does it make more sense to line roads up when possible? THE WITNESS: That was a long question. MR. HAWS: I'm long winded. THE WITNESS: Generally speaking, if you can align roadways and driveways opposite each other, that is a preferred situation. And again, Mr. Federico covered this in his direct. He actually said that one of his concerns with what is shown on A-6 is the possibility of northbound traffic on Bridlewood turning right, and then turning left

2021 1 the opposite alignment you eliminate those ways 2 possible dogleg left turns, and that should 2022 2 possible dogleg left turns, and that should 2022 2 So all things considered, if you 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with things to 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite each 2022 3 So all things considered with the alignment is made opposite and the alignment is				
2 possible dogleg lieft turns, and that should 2 reduce the likelihood or potential of 3 reduce the likelihood or possible to 3 reduce the likelihood or possible to 3 reduce the likelihood or possible to 3 reduce the likelihood or purposes of consolidating 3 reduce the likelihood of the reduc		1486		1488
sequence of the collisions with through vehicles. 3 reduce the likelihood or potential of So all things considered, if you shall the things considered, if you would like to offer this evening. 3 reduct 12 you would salo to consider. 3 reduct 14 you mind, Mr. DuFault, to shall the t				
4 collisions with through vehicles. 5 So all things considered, if you 5 So all things considered, if you 5 and align driveways opposite one another, you 5 And if the alignment is made opposite each 5 will be seen the right to speak at the next meeting, 5 will be seen the right to spea	_			•
So all things considered, if you can be a marker, you can be a pain, but it is difficult to hear you otherwise. Would you will all so be on where those roads connect to. would also be on where the those roads connect to. would also be on where the postible to would also be on where so would also be on where the post to would also be on where the thing the post did not all the post of the while and the post did not all the post of the while and the post did not all the post of the while and the post did not all the post of the while and the post did not all the post of the while and the post did not all the post of the while and the post did not all the post of the while and the post did not all the post of the while and the post did not all the post of the while and the post did not all the post of the while and		·		_
### 6 can align driveways opposite one another, you was 7 of setensibly eliminate that possibility. ### 7 ostensibly eliminate that possibility. ### 8 However, you have to consider what that impact was 1 owned 10 And if the alignment is made opposite each was 12 signalization, as well as eliminating the left to their for purposes of consolidating with the for purposes of consolidating with the signal to their for purposes of consolidating with the signal to their for purposes of consolidating with the signalization, as well as eliminating the left to design the intersection to physically prohibit with the design the intersection to physically prohibit with the signal to the for purposes of consolidating with the signal to their for purposes of consolidating with the signal to their for purposes of consolidating with the signal to their for purposes of consolidating with the signal to their for purposes of consolidating with the signal to the for purposes of consolidating with the signal the signal to the for purposes of consolidating with the signal t	0			
### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 3 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have to conside what the mext meeting, ### 4 However, you have to consider what the mext meeting, ### 4 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have to consider what that impact ### 4 However, you have the mext meeting, ### 4 However, you have the next meeting, ### 4 However, you have anything #	_	, ,		
## 8 However, you have to consider what that impact ## would also be on where those roads connect to. ## 19 would also be on where those roads connect to. ## 19 would also be on where those roads connect to. ## 19 would also be on where those roads connect to. ## 19 would also be on where those roads connect to. ## 19 would also be on where those roads connect to. ## 11 signalization, as well as eliminating the left ## 12 signalization, as well as eliminating the left ## 12 signalization, as well as eliminating the left ## 11 statement. ## 12 mm, M.K. MCKENNA: But you don't ## 12 through movements from one community to the ## 14 through movements from one community to the ## 18 through movements from o	_	-		•
aws 9 would also be on where those roads connect to, 200 And if the alignment is made opposite each 10 and if the alignment is made opposite each 11 are for purposes of consolidating 12 signalization, as well as eliminating the left 12 signalization, as well as eliminating the left 13 turns, I think it may also be possible to 14 to 15 through movements from one community to the 15 through movements from one community to the 16 through movements from one community to the 17 metric 18 metric 19 metric 1				
was 10 And if the alignment is made opposite each was 11 other for purposes of consolidating was 12 signalization, as well as eliminating the left was 12 signalization, as well as eliminating the left was 13 turns, I think it may also be possible to was 14 design the intersection to physically prohibit was 15 to mouth movements from one community to the next. was 16 next. was 17 MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Any other questions was 18 there? MR. MCKENNA: Based on that, max 19 then, Mr. Adelman, any objection? MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Adelman, any objection? MR. ADELMAN: No. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further was 22 MS. LABRUM: No. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further was 24 cross by anyone else? MR. ADELMAN: No. MR. ADELMAN: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank was 14 to offer on behalf of the Quarry Swimming MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, was 15 to offer on behalf of the Quarry Swimming max 16 this defendant, any objection? was 24 mr. Feryo, do you have anything 1489 MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, was 25 to offer on behalf of the Quarry Swimming max 26 to offer on behalf of the Quarry Swimming max 27 mything else? MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, was 16 think there will be any objection, but we will was 17 mk. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't was 18 there? MR. MCKENNA: Dath you have mything else? MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, was 16 think there will be any objection, but we will was 11 think there will be any objection, but we will was 12 hold off on admission of any of the exhibits max 12 mr. McKENNA: Thank you. I don't max 14 mr. McKENNA: Thank you. MR. MCKENNA:			20:41:14 8	
11 other for purposes of consolidating 2 signalization, as well as eliminating the left 2 signalization to physically prohibit 2 signalization and witnesses or exhibits 2 signal 1 statement. 2 signal 1 staticipate providing any witnesses or exhibits 2 signal 1 staticipate providing any witnesses or exhibits 3 signal 1 staticipate providing any witnesses or exhibits 3 signalization. 3 signalization and signalization. 3 s				-
### 12 signalization, as well as eliminating the left torush it may also be possible to the particular torush. It think it may also be possible to the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the content of the picture of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it then, through any witnesses or exhibits of the mask of the particular torush it then, through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it then, through one that, the particular torush it then, through movements from one community to the mask of the particular torush it then, through one that the particular torush it then, through substituting the particular torush it then, through substituting the particular torush it then, through substituting torush it then, through substi				
2021 13 turns, I think it may also be possible to design the intersection to physically prohibit 2021 15 through movements from one community to the 2021 15 through movements from one community to the 2021 17 mext. 2021 17 mext. 2021 18 mext. 2021 18 mext. 2021 19 mext. 2021 21 mext. 2021 22 mex				
xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx				-
2016 15 through movements from one community to the 2016 next. 2017 MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you. 2018 MR. MCKENNA: Any other questions 2018 MR. MCKENNA: Any other questions 2019 from the Board? 2018 MS. Labrum, any further 2018 MS. MS.	20:39:51 13			anticipate providing any witnesses or exhibits
16			1	
2006 17 MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: Any other questions MR. MCKENNA: Any other questions MR. ADELMAN: Not as long as it MR. ADELMAN: Not as long as it is limited to public comment. MR. MCKENNA: All right. I will general 20 MR. DLFAULT: Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: All right. I will mR. MCKENNA: Diapun, mR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank mR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank mR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank mR. MCKENNA: MR. Labrum, mR. MCKENNA: MR. Labrum, mR. MCKENNA: MR. Labrum, mR. MCKENNA: MR. MCKENNA: MR. Labrum, mR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't think there will be any objection, but we will may all think there will be any objection, but we will may all bold off on admission of any of the exhibits may believe you only have one witness, but they may believe you only have one witness, but they may believe you only have one witness, but they may believe you only have one witness, but they may believe you only have one witness, but they may believe you only have one witness, but they may believe you only have one witness, but they may believe you only have one witness, but they may be may		through movements from one community to the	20:41:27 15	MR. DUFAULT: No, no.
200 18 MR. MCKENNA: Any other questions make in the Board? 20 Ms. Labrum, any further make in the Board? 21 MR. MCKENNA: Mr. McKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 22 MS. LABRUM: No. make in the Board? 23 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 24 Cross by anyone else? 25 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 26 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 27 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 28 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 29 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 20 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 21 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 22 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 23 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further make in the Board? 24 MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Feryo, do you have anything in the Great in the Board? 25 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank in the Board? 26 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank in the Mr. Feryo, do you have anything in the Board? 26 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank in the Mr. Feryo, do you have anything in the Great in the Great in the Mr. Feryo, do you have anything in the Mr. Feryo, do you have anything in the Great in the Great in the Mr. Feryo, do you have anything in the Great in the Great in the Mr. Feryo, do you have anything in the Great i		next.	20:41:27 16	MR. MCKENNA: Based on that,
23-25 19 from the Board? 24 Ms. Labrum, any further 25-26 21 questions? 25 Ms. LaBrum: No. 25-26 22 Ms. LaBrum: No. 25-26 23 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 25-26 25 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 25-26 26 27 cross by anyone else? 26-27 Cross by anyone else? 27 Ms. ADELMAN: No. 25-26 28 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 25-26 29 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 25-26 29 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 25-26 29 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 25-26 20 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 26-26 20 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 27 Ms. ADELMan: No. 25-26 20 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 28-26 20 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 29 Ms. ADELMan: No. 25-26 20 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 29 Ms. Ms. ADELMan: Okay. Any further 29 Ms. Ms. ADELMan: No. 25-26 20 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 29 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 29 Ms. ADELMan: Okay. Any further 29 Ms. Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 29 Ms. McKenna: Okay. Any further 29 Ms. Ms. McKenna: Okay. Okay. Any further 29 Ms. Ms. McKenna: Okay. Ok		MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you.	20:41:28 17	then, Mr. Adelman, any objection?
20 MS. Labrum, any further 21 questions? 22 MS. LaBRUM: No. 23 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further 24 cross by anyone else? 25 MR. ADELMAN: No. 26 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further 26 Labrum, any further 27 Labrum 1 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further 28 Labrum, any further 29 Labrum 2 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further 29 Labrum 2 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 20 Labrum, any further 29 Labrum 2 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 20 Labrum, any further 20 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 20 Labrum, any further 21 Labrum, any further 22 Labrum 2 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 20 Labrum, any further 24 Labrum, any further 25 Labrum, any further 26 Labrum, any further 27 Labrum, any further 28 Labrum, any further 28 Labrum, any further 29 Labrum, any further 29 Labrum, any further 29 Labrum, any further 20 Labrum, any further 21 Labrum, any further 21 Labrum, any further 22 Labrum, any further 24 Labrum, any further 25 Labrum, any further 26 Labrum, any further 26 Labrum, any further 26 Labrum, any further 27 Labrum, any further 28 Labrum, any fur	20:40:07 18	MR. MCKENNA: Any other questions	20:41:30 18	MR. ADELMAN: Not as long as it
224 1 questions? MS. LABRUM: No. 224 1 cross by anyone else? 1487 24 1	20:40:08 19	from the Board?	20:41:31 19	is limited to public comment.
22 MS. LABRUM: No. 24 Cross by anyone else? 25 MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further 26 Cross by anyone else? 26 MR. ADELMAN: No. 27 MR. ADELMAN: No. 28 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 28 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 29 MR. MCKENNA: MS. Labrum, 29 MR. MCKENNA: MS. Labrum, 29 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 29 Witness. 29 MS. LABRUM: Thank you. I don't 29 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I	20:40:11 20	Ms. Labrum, any further	20:41:33 20	MR. DUFAULT: Thank you.
MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further 244 cross by anyone else? 1487 1489 MR. ADELMAN: No. MR. ADELMAN: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank MR. ADELMAN: All right. Thank MR. MCKENNA: Did you hear that, MR. Spackman, do you have MR. Spackman, do you have MR. Spackman, No you have MR. Spackman, Wo you have MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. MR. RENDEMONTI: Counsel, we have MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. MR. MCKENNA: I figured you MR. MCKENNA: I figured you MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. MR. ADELMAN: I tis from an MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an MR. Sevage component and the drain field that	20:40:13 21	questions?	20:41:42 21	MR. MCKENNA: All right. I will
1489 1489 1489 1489 1489 1489 1489 1489 1489 1489 15 MR. ADELMAN: No. 16 MR. ACKENNA: All right. Thank 204151 2040152 21 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 204151	20:40:14 22	MS. LABRUM: No.	20:41:43 22	proceed to the parties who are here this
1487 204019 1 MR. ADELMAN: No. 204197 2 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 204019 2 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 204019 3 You, Mr. Tavani. 204020 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 204020 5 (Witness excused.) 204020 6 MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, 204020 7 Mr. Spackman, do you have 204020 8 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 204020 8 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 204020 9 Witness. 204020 10 MR. SPACKMAN: Nothing additional 204020 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204020 12 hold off on admission of any of the exhibits 204020 13 until the end of the case. 204020 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 204020 15 Believe you only have one witness, but they 204020 16 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204020 17 MR. RENDEMONTI: Counsel, we have 204020 18 MR. ACKENNA: Thank you. So we 204020 19 Will move along then. 204020 19 Will move along then. 204020 20 Would Like to offer this evening for 204020 21 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 204020 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 204020 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 204020 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:15 23	MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Any further	20:41:45 23	evening.
204018 1 MR. ADELMAN: No. 204018 2 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 20402 3 You, Mr. Tavani. 20402 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 20402 5 (Witness excused.) 20402 6 MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, 20402 7 anything else? 20402 7 anything else? 20402 8 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 20402 9 witness. 20402 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't 20402 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 20402 12 hold off on admission of any of the exhibits 20402 13 until the end of the case. 20402 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 20402 15 believe you only have one witness, but they 20402 16 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 20402 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 20402 18 MR. MCKENNA: I hank you. So we 20402 19 will move along then. 20402 20 Mr. DuFault, do you have anything 20402 21 Sandywine at Thornbury HOA? 20402 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an anything will be testifying as to the sewage component and the drain field that	16 24	cross by anyone else?	20:41:45 24	Mr. Feryo, do you have anything
2 MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank 204020 3 you, Mr. Tavani. 204021 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 204020 5 (Witness excused.) 204020 6 MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, 204020 7 anything else? 204020 8 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 204020 9 witness. 204020 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't 204020 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204020 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204020 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204020 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204020 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204020 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204020 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204020 12 hold off on admission of any of the exhibits 204020 13 until the end of the case. 204021 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 204021 15 believe you only have one witness, but they 204021 16 intend to go at the October hearing? 204021 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204020 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 204020 19 will move along then. 204020 19 vou would like to offer this evening for 204020 20 Mr. DuFault, do you have anything 204020 21 you would like to offer this evening for 204020 22 MR. DuFault; do you have anything 204020 22 MR. DuFault, do you have anything 204020 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 204020 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204020 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204020 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204020 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204020 25 the sewage component and the drain field that		1487		1489
204020 3 you, Mr. Tavani. 204021 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 204022 5 (Witness excused.) 204023 6 MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, 204024 7 anything else? 204025 8 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 204026 9 witness. 204027 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't 204028 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204029 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204029 12 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. 204029 13 until the end of the case. 204021 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 204021 15 believe you only have one witness, but they 204021 16 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204021 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204022 19 will move along then. 204022 19 you would like to offer this evening for 204022 20 MR. DuFault, do you have anything 204022 21 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 204023 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 204023 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204023 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204023 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204025 24 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is find an engineering firm, who will be testifying as to 204026 27 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is find an 204027 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204028 26 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is find an 204029 27 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 204029 28 mR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 204029 29 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 204029 20 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 204029 21 sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:18 1	MR. ADELMAN: No.	20:41:47 1	to offer on behalf of the Quarry Swimming
204021 4 THE WITNESS: Thank you. 204022 5 (Witness excused.) 204023 6 MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, 204024 7 anything else? 204025 8 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 204026 9 witness. 204027 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't 204028 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204029 12 hold off on admission of any of the exhibits 204021 13 until the end of the case. 204021 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 204021 15 believe you only have one witness, but they 204021 16 intend to go at the October hearing? 204021 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204021 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we will so me witness I would like to reserve it is 204021 19 will move along then. 204022 20 Mr. DuFault, do you have anything 204022 21 you would like to offer this evening for 204022 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 204022 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 204024 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204025 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204026 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204026 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204027 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204028 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204028 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204028 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204028 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204028 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting	20:40:19 2	MR. MCKENNA: All right. Thank	20:41:51 2	Association?
204022 5 (Witness excused.) 204024 7 anything else? 204025 8 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 204026 9 witness. 204027 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't think there will be any objection, but we will anything the difference of the case. 204027 11 think there do f the case. 204028 12 All right. Mr. Thompson, I anything to present this evening on behalf of the difference of the case. 204029 15 believe you only have one witness, but they lebileve you only have one witness, but they will move along then. 204022 19 Will move along then. 204022 19 Will move along then. 204022 20 Would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who leb letsifying as to reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 240223 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:20 3	you, Mr. Tavani.	20:41:51 3	MR. FERYO: I do not.
menunce of the case. may be divided to go at the October hearing? may the first off the case of the divided to go at the October hearing? may the first off the case of the maximum of the maximum off the	20:40:21 4	THE WITNESS: Thank you.	20:41:52 4	MR. MCKENNA: Did you hear that,
204024 7 anything else? 204025 8 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 204026 9 witness. 204027 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't 204028 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204029 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204029 12 hold off on admission of any of the exhibits 204029 13 until the end of the case. 204021 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 204021 15 believe you only have one witness, but they 204021 16 intend to go at the October hearing? 204021 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204022 18 MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. 204028 19 MR. ADELMAN: I figured you 204029 19 MR. ADELMAN: I figured you 204029 10 MR. MCKENNA: Think you. 204029 11 this evening. 204029 12 MR. RENDEMONTI: Counsel, we have 204029 13 MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. 204029 19 MR. ADELMAN: I figured you 204029 19 MR. DuFault, do you have anything 204029 20 MR. DuFault, do you have anything 204029 21 is the witness? 204029 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 204029 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 204029 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:22 5	(Witness excused.)	20:41:54 5	Eleanor? Just to reiterate, Mr. Feryo has
204028 8 MS. LABRUM: That was our only 204028 9 witness. 204027 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't 204028 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204028 12 hold off on admission of any of the exhibits 204028 13 until the end of the case. 204021 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 204028 15 believe you only have one witness, but they 204028 16 intend to go at the October hearing? 204028 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204028 18 anything to present this evening on behalf of 204029 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204020 12 MR. SPACKMAN: Nothing additional 204020 12 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. 204020 12 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. 204020 13 Until the end of the case. 204021 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 204021 15 believe you only have one witness, but they 204021 16 intend to go at the October hearing? 204021 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204021 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 204021 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 204021 19 MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. 204021 19 Will move along then. 204022 19 MR. MCKENNA: I figured you 204021 20 Mr. DuFault, do you have anything 204022 21 you would like to offer this evening for 204021 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 204022 23 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an engineering firm, who will be testifying as to 204021 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204021 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting	20:40:23 6	MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum,	20:41:57 6	nothing to present.
204028 9 witness. 204027 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't 204028 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204028 12 hold off on admission of any of the exhibits 204028 13 until the end of the case. 204028 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 204028 15 believe you only have one witness, but they 204048 16 intend to go at the October hearing? 204048 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204028 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 204028 19 will move along then. 204028 19 Thornbury Farm Trust? 204029 10 MR. SPACKMAN: Nothing additional 204029 11 this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. 204029 12 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. 204021 13 Mr. Rendemonti, do you have 204021 14 anything to offer this evening? 204021 15 MR. RENDEMONTI: Counsel, we have 204024 16 one witness I would like to reserve it is 204024 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204022 17 going to take awhile for the object meeting. MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who 204028 20 would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who 204028 21 be mandywine at Thornbury HOA? 204028 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 204028 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 204028 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204028 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting	20:40:24 7	anything else?	20:42:01 7	Mr. Spackman, do you have
204027 10 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't 204028 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204028 11 think there will be any objection, but we will 204028 12 hold off on admission of any of the exhibits 204028 13 until the end of the case. 204028 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 204028 15 believe you only have one witness, but they 204048 16 intend to go at the October hearing? 204048 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 204048 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 204048 19 will move along then. 204048 19 will move along then. 204059 21 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 204059 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 204048 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204049 14 this evening. 204050 12 MR. MCKENNA: Nothing additional 204026 10 MR. SPACKMAN: Nothing additional 204026 11 this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. 204027 12 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. 204027 14 anything to offer this evening? 204028 15 MR. RENDEMONTI: Counsel, we have 204028 16 one witness I would like to reserve it is 204028 17 MR. ADELMAN: I object meeting. 204029 18 MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. 204029 19 MR. MCKENNA: I figured you 204029 20 Would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who 204029 21 is the witness? 204029 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 204029 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 204029 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 204029 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting	20:40:25	MS. LABRUM: That was our only	20:42:02	anything to present this evening on behalf of
think there will be any objection, but we will bold off on admission of any of the exhibits bold of any of the exhibits bold off on admission of any of the exhibits bold off on admission of any of the exhibits bold off on admission of any of the exhibits bold offer this evening. MR. Rendemonti, do you have anything to offer this evening? MR. RENDEMONTI: Counsel, we have anything to one witness I would like to reserve it is going to take awhile for the object meeting. MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who would be to bold offer this evening for bold offer this evening for bold offer this evening for bold offer this evening. MR. DUFAULT: I would like to bold offer this evening for bold offer this evening. MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an engage of the exhibits anything to offer this evening. MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an engage of the exhibits anything to offer this evening. MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. MR. AD	20:40:26	witness.	20:42:04 9	Thornbury Farm Trust?
hold off on admission of any of the exhibits until the end of the case. 2042:07 12 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. Mr. Rendemonti, do you have 2040:05 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 2040:42 15 believe you only have one witness, but they intend to go at the October hearing? 2040:46 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 2040:47 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 2040:48 19 will move along then. MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 2040:51 21 you would like to offer this evening for 2040:52 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 2042:33 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:27 10	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. I don't	20:42:06 10	MR. SPACKMAN: Nothing additional
2040:32 13 until the end of the case. 2040:35 14 All right. Mr. Thompson, I 2040:42 15 believe you only have one witness, but they intend to go at the October hearing? 2040:44 16 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 2040:47 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 2040:48 19 will move along then. 2040:49 20 Mr. DuFault, do you have anything 2040:51 21 you would like to offer this evening for 2040:52 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 2040:52 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 2040:33 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:29 11	think there will be any objection, but we will	20:42:07 11	this evening.
All right. Mr. Thompson, I 20:40:42 15 believe you only have one witness, but they intend to go at the October hearing? 20:40:44 16 intend to go at the October hearing? 20:40:45 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 20:40:47 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 20:40:48 19 will move along then. 20:40:48 19 Will move along then. 20:40:49 20 Mr. DuFault, do you have anything 20:40:45 21 you would like to offer this evening for 20:40:45 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 20:40:56 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 20:40:40 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20:40:40 24 in anything to offer this evening? MR. RENDEMONTI: Counsel, we have one witness I would like to reserve it is 20:40:22 17 going to take awhile for the object meeting. MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. 20:40:22 19 MR. MCKENNA: I figured you 20:40:22 20 would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who 20:40:22 21 is the witness? 20:40:23 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 20:40:35 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 20:42:31 23 engineering firm, who will be testifying as to 20:42:33 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:30 12	hold off on admission of any of the exhibits	20:42:07 12	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.
believe you only have one witness, but they intend to go at the October hearing? 20:40:44 16 intend to go at the October hearing? 20:40:46 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 20:40:46 17 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we will move along then. 20:40:46 19 Mr. DuFault, do you have anything you would like to offer this evening for Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 20:40:52 22 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to speak at the next meeting 20:40:42 15 MR. RENDEMONTI: Counsel, we have one witness I would like to reserve it is going to take awhile for the object meeting. 20:42:22 17 going to take awhile for the object meeting. MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. MR. MCKENNA: I figured you would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who is the witness? 20:42:28 21 is the witness? MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an engineering firm, who will be testifying as to the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:32 13	until the end of the case.	20:42:14 13	Mr. Rendemonti, do you have
intend to go at the October hearing? 20:40:44 17	20:40:35 14	All right. Mr. Thompson, I	20:42:17 14	anything to offer this evening?
20:40:46 17 MR. THOMPSON: That is correct. 20:40:47 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 20:40:48 19 will move along then. 20:40:48 19 Will move along then. 20:40:48 20 Mr. DuFault, do you have anything 20:40:51 21 you would like to offer this evening for 20:40:52 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 20:40:58 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 20:40:50 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20:40:40:51 27 going to take awhile for the object meeting. MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. 20:40:22 19 MR. MCKENNA: I figured you 20:40:22 20 would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who 20:40:52 21 is the witness? 20:40:28 21 is the witness? 20:40:29 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 20:40:50 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20:42:23 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:42 15	believe you only have one witness, but they	20:42:18 15	MR. RENDEMONTI: Counsel, we have
20:40:47 18 MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we 20:40:48 19 will move along then. 20:40:52 19 MR. MCKENNA: I figured you 20:40:52 21 you would like to offer this evening for 20:40:52 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 20:40:52 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 20:40:52 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20:40:40 8 MR. ADELMAN: I object to that. 20:40:22 19 MR. MCKENNA: I figured you 20:40:22 20 would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who 20:40:28 21 is the witness? 20:40:28 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 20:40:58 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 20:41:00 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20:42:31 23 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:44 16	intend to go at the October hearing?	20:42:20 16	one witness I would like to reserve it is
will move along then. 20:40:48 19 will move along then. 20:40:40 19 will move along then. 20:40:40 20 Mr. DuFault, do you have anything 20:40:51 21 you would like to offer this evening for 20:40:52 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 20:40:58 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 20:40:50 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20:42:25 19 MR. MCKENNA: I figured you 20:42:26 20 would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who 20:42:28 21 is the witness? 20:42:28 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 20:40:58 23 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:46 17	MR. THOMPSON: That is correct.	20:42:22 17	going to take awhile for the object meeting.
Mr. DuFault, do you have anything you would like to offer this evening for Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? MR. DUFAULT: I would like to mR. DUFAULT: I would like to mr. DuFault, do you have anything you would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who mould like to speak at the next meeting would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who mould like witness? MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an engineering firm, who will be testifying as to mould. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who mould like to speak at the witness? 20:42:28 21 is the witness? 20:42:28 22 mg. RENDEMONTI: It is from an engineering firm, who will be testifying as to mould. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who mould like to offer this evening is the witness? 20:42:28 22 the witness? 20:42:28 22 the witness? 20:42:28 22 the witness?	20:40:47 18	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you. So we	20:42:24 18	MR. ADELMAN: I object to that.
you would like to offer this evening for 20:40:51 21 you would like to offer this evening for 20:40:52 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 20:40:58 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 20:41:00 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20:42:28 21 is the witness? 20:42:29 22 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 20:42:31 23 engineering firm, who will be testifying as to 20:42:33 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:48 19	will move along then.	20:42:25 19	MR. MCKENNA: I figured you
20:40:52 22 Brandywine at Thornbury HOA? 20:40:52 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 20:41:00 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20:42:31 24 MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an 20:42:31 23 engineering firm, who will be testifying as to 20:42:31 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	le 20	Mr. DuFault, do you have anything	20:42:26 20	would. Let's go in order. Mr. Rendemonti, who
20.40.58 23 MR. DUFAULT: I would like to 20.41.00 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20.42.31 23 engineering firm, who will be testifying as to 20.42.33 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:51 21	you would like to offer this evening for	20:42:28 21	is the witness?
20.41:00 24 reserve the right to speak at the next meeting 20.42:33 24 the sewage component and the drain field that	20:40:52 22	Brandywine at Thornbury HOA?	20:42:29 22	MR. RENDEMONTI: It is from an
	20:40:58 23	MR. DUFAULT: I would like to	20:42:31 23	engineering firm, who will be testifying as to
09/30/2017 08:58:07 AM Page 1486 to 1489 of 1511 32 of 62 sheet	20:41:00 24	reserve the right to speak at the next meeting	20:42:33 24	the sewage component and the drain field that
	9/30/2017	08:58:07 AM Page 1486 to	1489 of 15	11 32 of 62 sheet

7			
	1490		1492
20:42:36	is immediately to the south of my client's	20:47:32	on that representation then the Board will
20:42:39 2	property, that they have designated some 15 or	20:47:34 2	allow it for next month.
20:42:41 3	so acres for drip irrigation plan, and my	20:47:36	MR. ADELMAN: Let the record note
15 4	client, being next door, has his water service	20:47:37 4	I object, and I would request that the Board
20:42:50 5	from the ground.		set a time limit on the testimony.
20:42:51 6	MR. MCKENNA: Is there a reason		MR. MCKENNA: We will take your
20:42:51 7	why the witness is not available to proceed		requests under advisement for next month, Mr.
20:42:53	this evening?		Adelman. We note your objection, for the
20:42:54	MR. RENDEMONTI: We didn't think	20:47:48 9	record.
20:42:58 10	this meeting would go too much longer, so he		MR. RENDEMONTI: Thank you for
20:43:01 11			your consideration.
20:43:03 12			MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Daull, do you
20:43:04 13	·		have anything you would like to put on this
20:43:04 14	MR. ADELMAN: My position is they	20:48:01 14	evening?
20:43:06 15	should be prepared to proceed at this time.	20:48:01 15	MR. DAULL: No.
20:43:07 16	This has been going on, we are on hearing	20:48:02 16	MR. MCKENNA: I'm sorry?
20:43:09 17	number I lost count.	20:48:03 17	MR. DAULL: No.
20:43:10 18	MR. MCKENNA: 8.	20:48:04 18	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you.
20:43:12 19	MR. ADELMAN: 8. I mean, the	20:48:11 19	Mr. Skros, do you have any case
20:43:13 20	process was announced at the last hearing. We	20:48:12 20	you would like to put on tonight?
20:43:16 21	were moving forward with the other parties'	20:48:17 21	MR. SKROS: No.
20:43:18 22	cases and they were supposed to be ready to		MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do
20:43:20 23	proceed.	20:48:22 23	you have any case you would like to put on?
2.4	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Rendemonti, how		MS. CAREY: No.
23 24		20:48:23 24	
23 24	1491	20,40.23	1493
23 24	1491 long do you anticipate that witness is going to	20:48:24 1	1493 MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller?
	1491 long do you anticipate that witness is going to take?		1493 MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No.
20:43:25	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes.	20:48:24 1	1493 MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have
20:43:25 1 20:43:26 2	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present
20:43:25	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have
20:43:25 1 20:43:26 2 20:43:27 3 20:43:29 4	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take?	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:34 4	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight?
20:43:25	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes.	20:48:24	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would
20:43:25	In 1491 Iong do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will	20:48:24	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a
20:43:25	In 1491 Iong do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute.	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:34 4 20:48:36 5 20:48:37 6 20:48:39 7 20:48:40 8 20:48:42 9	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I
20:43:25	In long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.)	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:34 4 20:48:36 5 20:48:37 6 20:48:39 7 20:48:40 8 20:48:42 9 20:48:45 10	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief
20:43:25	Iong do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:34 4 20:48:36 5 20:48:37 6 20:48:39 7 20:48:40 8 20:48:42 9 20:48:45 10 20:48:48 11	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you
20:43:25	Iong do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record.	20:48:24	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be
20:43:25	Iong do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again,	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:34 4 20:48:36 5 20:48:37 6 20:48:39 7 20:48:40 8 20:48:42 9 20:48:45 10 20:48:48 11 20:48:50 12 20:48:53 13	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board
20:43:25	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify?	20:48:24	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this
20:43:25	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify? MR. RENDEMONTI: Sewage waste	20:48:24	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this evening.
20:43:25	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify? MR. RENDEMONTI: Sewage waste disposal engineer for on-site systems will be	20:48:24	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Any objection from
20:43:25	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify? MR. RENDEMONTI: Sewage waste disposal engineer for on-site systems will be testifying as to the incompatibility of that	20:48:24	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Any objection from the parties or counsel?
20:43:25	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify? MR. RENDEMONTI: Sewage waste disposal engineer for on-site systems will be testifying as to the incompatibility of that corner property there being used as the drip	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:34 4 20:48:36 5 20:48:37 6 20:48:39 7 20:48:40 8 20:48:45 10 20:48:45 11 20:48:50 12 20:48:53 13 20:48:55 14 20:48:58 15 20:48:59 16 20:49:01 17 20:49:02 18	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Any objection from the parties or counsel? All right. Hearing none, we will
20:43:25	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify? MR. RENDEMONTI: Sewage waste disposal engineer for on-site systems will be testifying as to the incompatibility of that corner property there being used as the drip irrigation field.	20:48:24	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Any objection from the parties or counsel? All right. Hearing none, we will go ahead and hear Ms. Kline out of order for
20:43:25 1 20:43:26 2 20:43:27 3 20:43:29 4 20:43:30 5 20:43:31 6 20:43:31 7 20:43:36 9 20:43:38 10 20:47:07 11 20:47:08 12 20:47:09 13 20:47:11 14 20:47:13 15 20:47:14 16 20:47:18 17 20:47:20 18 20:47:21 19	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify? MR. RENDEMONTI: Sewage waste disposal engineer for on-site systems will be testifying as to the incompatibility of that corner property there being used as the drip irrigation field. MR. MCKENNA: And that's the only	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:34 4 20:48:36 5 20:48:37 6 20:48:39 7 20:48:40 8 20:48:45 10 20:48:45 11 20:48:50 12 20:48:51 13 20:48:51 14 20:48:58 15 20:48:59 16 20:49:01 17 20:49:02 18 20:49:04 19 20:49:06 20	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Any objection from the parties or counsel? All right. Hearing none, we will go ahead and hear Ms. Kline out of order for rebuttal.
20:43:25 1 20:43:26 2 20:43:27 3 20:43:29 4 20:43:30 5 20:43:31 6 20:43:31 7 20:43:35 8 20:43:36 9 20:43:36 10 20:47:08 12 20:47:08 12 20:47:09 13 20:47:11 14 20:47:13 15 20:47:14 16 20:47:14 17 20:47:20 18 20:47:20 18 20:47:23 19 35 20 20:47:26 21	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify? MR. RENDEMONTI: Sewage waste disposal engineer for on-site systems will be testifying as to the incompatibility of that corner property there being used as the drip irrigation field. MR. MCKENNA: And that's the only witness you are going to offer for this	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:36 5 20:48:37 6 20:48:39 7 20:48:40 8 20:48:42 9 20:48:45 10 20:48:50 12 20:48:53 13 20:48:55 14 20:48:59 16 20:49:01 17 20:49:01 17 20:49:02 18 20:49:04 19 20:49:04 20 20:49:07 21	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Any objection from the parties or counsel? All right. Hearing none, we will go ahead and hear Ms. Kline out of order for rebuttal. MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.
20:43:25 1 20:43:26 2 20:43:27 3 20:43:29 4 20:43:30 5 20:43:31 6 20:43:31 7 20:43:36 9 20:43:38 10 20:47:07 11 20:47:08 12 20:47:09 13 20:47:11 14 20:47:13 15 20:47:14 16 20:47:18 17 20:47:20 18 20:47:20 18 20:47:26 21 20:47:27 22	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify? MR. RENDEMONTI: Sewage waste disposal engineer for on-site systems will be testifying as to the incompatibility of that corner property there being used as the drip irrigation field. MR. MCKENNA: And that's the only witness you are going to offer for this proceeding?	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:34 4 20:48:36 5 20:48:37 6 20:48:39 7 20:48:40 8 20:48:45 10 20:48:45 11 20:48:50 12 20:48:51 13 20:48:55 14 20:48:58 15 20:48:59 16 20:49:01 17 20:49:02 18 20:49:04 19 20:49:04 19 20:49:06 20 20:49:07 21 20:49:08 22	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Any objection from the parties or counsel? All right. Hearing none, we will go ahead and hear Ms. Kline out of order for rebuttal. MR. ADELMAN: Thank you. Appreciate it.
20:43:25 1 20:43:26 2 20:43:27 3 20:43:29 4 20:43:30 5 20:43:31 6 20:43:31 7 20:43:35 8 20:43:36 9 20:43:36 10 20:47:08 12 20:47:08 12 20:47:09 13 20:47:11 14 20:47:13 15 20:47:14 16 20:47:14 17 20:47:20 18 20:47:20 18 20:47:23 19 35 20 20:47:26 21	long do you anticipate that witness is going to take? MR. RENDEMONTI: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, how long do you anticipate your witness is going to take? MR. THOMPSON: 30 minutes. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We will go off the record for a minute. (Discussion off the record.) MR. MCKENNA: We will go back on the record. Mr. Rendemonti, tell me again, you are going to have an engineer testify? MR. RENDEMONTI: Sewage waste disposal engineer for on-site systems will be testifying as to the incompatibility of that corner property there being used as the drip irrigation field. MR. MCKENNA: And that's the only witness you are going to offer for this	20:48:24 1 20:48:29 2 20:48:30 3 20:48:36 5 20:48:37 6 20:48:39 7 20:48:40 8 20:48:42 9 20:48:45 10 20:48:50 12 20:48:53 13 20:48:55 14 20:48:59 16 20:49:01 17 20:49:01 17 20:49:02 18 20:49:04 19 20:49:04 20 20:49:07 21	MR. MCKENNA: Carol Weller? MS. WELLER: No. MR. MCKENNA: All right. We have been through all the parties who are present here this evening. Mr. Adelman, do you have anything else you want to offer tonight? MR. ADELMAN: Yes. I would actually request the Board consider taking a rebuttal witness out of order at this time. I have Ms. Kline here to testify on some brief rebuttal testimony. Given the fact that you just added a witness on what was supposed to be the last day, I would request the Board consider taking her given there is time this evening. MR. MCKENNA: Any objection from the parties or counsel? All right. Hearing none, we will go ahead and hear Ms. Kline out of order for rebuttal. MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.

	1494	T	1496
20:49:16	be under oath.	20:51:25	mitigation for overall intersection delay, a
2	(Nicole R. Kline, having been	20:51:29 2	separate southbound 202 right turn lane would
3	previously duly sworn, was examined and	20:51:33	be required.
20 4			If PennDOT requires mitigation
20:49:20 5	REDIRECT EXAMINATION	20:51:34 4	for both overall and movement delay at the
20:49:20 6			intersection, a second westbound 926 left turn
20:49:47 7			lane and signal modifications to eliminate the
20:49:50 8	a. Mosto, in your an ooc costimony from		split phasing of the signal along 926 would be
	Brothers was willing to remove the Route 202	20:51:48 8	required.
40	access in order to satisfy the township traffic	20:51:52 9	Q. Are both of those improvements
44	engineer's comments; is that correct?	20:51:53 10	·
40	A. Yes.		required? A. No. It is one or the other.
		20:51:56 12	_
20:50:01 13	Q. Did you perform any additional analysis	20:51:57 13	Q. And were you present during Mr.
20:50:04 14	with respect to what happens if the Route 202	20:52:00 14	Federico's testimony on this topic?
20:50:06 15	access is removed?	20:52:01 15	A. Yes, I was.
20:50:07 16	A. Yes, I did.	20:52:02 16	Q. And did he correctly state what
20:50:09 17	Q. I would like to show you what I have	20:52:04 17	mitigation was required at the 202/926
20:50:10 18	marked as Exhibit A-40. Could you identify	20:52:07 18	intersection?
20:50:13 19	this document for the record, please?	20:52:08 19	A. No. He indicated that both
20:50:15 20	A. Yes. This is a letter prepared, that I	20:52:10 20	improvements were required.
20:50:19 21	prepared, that illustrates the traffic analysis	20:52:11 21	Q. I believe you just heard Mr. Tavani
20:50:23 22	should the Route 202 access be removed from the	20:52:13 22	testify to the same conclusion; is that
20:50:25 23	plan.	20:52:14 23	correct?
26 24	Q. And what is the date of the letter?	20:52:14 24	A. That is correct.
	1495		1497
20:50:27	A. The date of that letter is August 29th,	20:52:15	Q. And is his testimony also incorrect?
20:50:30 2	2017.	20:52:17 2	A. It is incorrect as well.
20:50:30	Q. And what is attached to the letter?	20:52:20 3	MR. ADELMAN: Nothing further.
20:50:32	A. Attached to the letter are revised	20:52:28 4	MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Camp, do you
20:50:35 5	figures and revised traffic analyses supporting	20:52:30 5	have any questions?
20:50:39 6	the removal, the results of the removal of the	20:52:32	MS. CAMP: Just real quick.
20:50:43 7	202 access.	7	RECROSS-EXAMINATION
20:50:44	Q. What happens if the Route 202 access is	20:52;34	BY MS. CAMP:
20:50:46	removed?	20:52:34	Q. Ms. Kline, PennDOT ultimately will
20:50:46 10	A. If that access were to be removed more	20:52:36 10	determine what improvements are necessary at
20:50:50 11	site traffic would utilize the other accesses	20:52:37 11	that intersection, correct?
20:50:52 12	along West Pleasant Grove Road and 202. And	20:52:38 12	A. Yes, they will.
20:50:56 13	ultimately, the southbound right turn lane that	20:52:39 13	Q. So it doesn't matter what Mr. Federico
20:50:59 14	is warranted at 202 and West Pleasant Grove	20:52:41 14	says or Mr. Tavani says; it matters what
20:51:02 15	Road, based on PennDOT criteria, would increase	20:52:43 15	PennDOT says?
20;51:04 16	by 50 feet.	20:52:44 16	A. Ultimately it is PennDOT's decision,
20:51:06 17	Q. Does it have any adverse impacts that	20:52:45 17	yes.
20:51:09 18	can't be mitigated, as per your prior	20:52:46 18	Q. And the applicant will have no choice
20:51:12 19	testimony?	20:52:47 19	but to do what PennDOT requires?
12 20	A. No, it does not.	20:52:49 20	A. They will have to fulfill the
	a		
20:51:13 21	Q. And again, what mitigation must Toll	20:52:51 21	requirements of PennDOT.
20:51:15 22	Brothers do at the Route 202/926 intersection?	20:52:51 22	MS. CAMP: Thank you.
			•

		1498		1500
20:52:57 1		MR. CRAWFORD: No questions.	20:54:14	time it has been introduced. I have extra
20:52:59	Thanks.		20:54:17 2	copies if Mr. Federico needs it as well.
20 52:59 3		MR. MCKENNA: Ms. Labrum, do you	20:54:19 3	MR. MCKENNA: That brings up one
o 4	have any ques	stions?	20:54:20 4	question then. Mr. Adelman, since we are
20:53:01 5		MS. LABRUM: No questions.	20:54:22 5	taking Ms. Kline out of order, if any of the
20:53:03 6		MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Thompson, any	20:54:25	parties would like her to come back, based upon
20:53:04 7	questions?		20:54:29 7	the review, do you have any objection to that?
20:53:05 8		MR. THOMPSON: No questions.	20:54:30	MR. ADELMAN: Well, for a
20:53:06 9	Thank you.		20:54:32	cross-examination I would object. I don't have
20:53:06 10		MR. MCKENNA: Mr. DuFault, do you	20:54:35 10	any objection if the Planning Commission needs
20:53:08 11	have any ques	stions?	20:54:37 11	to call Mr. Federico to respond. But the
20:53:09 12		MR. DUFAULT: No questions.	20:54:40 12	witness is here and present this evening and is
20:53:10 13		MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Feryo, do you	20:54:42 13	available for cross-examination.
20:53:13 14	have any ques	itions?	20:54:44 14	MR. MCKENNA: I meant as to
20:53:14 15		MR. FERYO: No questions.	20:54:45 15	rebuttal. I apologize.
20:53:15 16		MR. MCKENNA: Mr. or Mrs.	20:54:47 16	MR. ADELMAN: So I don't believe
20:53:18 17	Harkins, any q	juestions?	20:54:48 17	she should have to come back.
20:53:19 18		MS. HARKINS: No questions.	20:54:50 18	MS. CAMP: I'm okay with that. I
20:53:20 19	!	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Rendemonti, any	20:54:53 19	have a question. It is dated August 29th and
20:53:24 20	questions?		20:54:54 20	was addressed to Mr. Pingar. So did Mr. Pingar
20:53:24 21		MR. RENDEMONTI: No, none. Thank	20:54:57 21	receive this correspondence?
20:53:27 22	you.		20:54:59 22	MR. PINGAR: No.
20:53:27 23		MR. MCKENNA: Robert Daull, any	20:54:59 23	MR. ADELMAN: No. It has not
₩ 24	questions?		20:55:01 24	been submitted. This is the first time. It
1		1499		1501
20:53:29		MR. DAULL: No questions.	20:55:04 1	was prepared last month.
20:53:31 2		MR. MCKENNA: Ed Skros, any	20:55:05 2	MS. CAMP: Okay. But it was
20:53:33	questions?		20:55:06	d-td A
20:53:34 4		MR. SKROS: No questions.	1	dated August 29th?
	·	The Grand of the queen of the	20:55:07 4	14B 4BEI14441 TI II
20:53:35 5		MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do	20:55:07 4	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct,
20:53:35 5 20:53:37 6	1			MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted.
	you have any	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do	20:55:07	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would
20:53:37 6	you have any any questions?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have	20:55:07 5	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7	you have any any questions?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left.	20:55:07 5 20:55:10 6 20:55:10 7	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico.
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8	you have any questions?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left.	20:55:10 5 20:55:10 6 20:55:10 7 20:55:12 8	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9	you have any questions?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any	20:55:07 5 20:55:10 6 20:55:10 7 20:55:12 8 20:55:13 9	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that.
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10	you have any questions?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions.	20:55:07	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay.
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:53 11	you have any questions? questions? Adelman?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions.	20:55:07	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:53 11 20:53:55 12	you have any questions? questions? Adelman?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr.	20:55:07	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:53 11 20:53:55 12 20:53:56 13	you have any questions? questions? Adelman?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr. MR. ADELMAN: Nothing.	20:55:07	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan this while you were talking at the same time.
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:53 11 20:53:55 12 20:53:56 13 20:53:57 14	you have any questions? questions? Adelman?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr. MR. ADELMAN: Nothing.	20:55:10 6 20:55:10 7 20:55:12 8 20:55:13 9 20:55:14 10 20:55:15 11 20:55:17 12 20:55:19 13	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan this while you were talking at the same time. So I just want to make sure I understand
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:55 12 20:53:56 13 20:53:57 14 20:53:59 15	you have any questions? questions? Adelman? Ms. Kline.	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr. MR. ADELMAN: Nothing. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you,	20:55:07	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan this while you were talking at the same time. So I just want to make sure I understand everything. On page 4, I guess page 3 and 4 of
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:55 12 20:53:55 12 20:53:57 14 20:53:59 15 20:54:00 16	you have any questions? questions? Adelman? Ms. Kline.	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr. MR. ADELMAN: Nothing. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you, Excuse me. I'm sorry. Does the	20:55:07	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan this while you were talking at the same time. So I just want to make sure I understand everything. On page 4, I guess page 3 and 4 of your document, where you are talking about
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:55 12 20:53:55 13 20:53:57 14 20:53:59 15 20:54:00 16 20:54:01 17	you have any questions? questions? Adelman? Ms. Kline.	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr. MR. ADELMAN: Nothing. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you, Excuse me. I'm sorry. Does the by questions? I apologize.	20:55:07	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan this while you were talking at the same time. So I just want to make sure I understand everything. On page 4, I guess page 3 and 4 of your document, where you are talking about tables 2 A and 2 B, so what you are saying is
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:55 12 20:53:55 12 20:53:56 13 20:53:57 14 20:53:59 15 20:54:00 16 20:54:01 17 20:54:03 18	you have any questions? questions? Adelman? Ms. Kline. Board have an couple of questions	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr. MR. ADELMAN: Nothing. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you, Excuse me. I'm sorry. Does the by questions? I apologize. MR. HAWS: Yeah. I just have a	20:55:07 5 20:55:10 6 20:55:10 7 20:55:12 8 20:55:13 9 20:55:14 10 20:55:15 11 20:55:17 12 20:55:19 13 20:55:20 14 20:55:23 15 20:55:24 16 20:55:31 17 20:55:34 18	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan this while you were talking at the same time. So I just want to make sure I understand everything. On page 4, I guess page 3 and 4 of your document, where you are talking about tables 2 A and 2 B, so what you are saying is that based, if the 202 right in/right out
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:55 12 20:53:55 12 20:53:57 14 20:53:59 15 20:54:00 16 20:54:01 17 20:54:03 18	you have any questions? questions? Adelman? Ms. Kline. Board have an couple of questions	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr. MR. ADELMAN: Nothing. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you, Excuse me. I'm sorry. Does the y questions? I apologize. MR. HAWS: Yeah. I just have a stions. Has our traffic engineer by of this letter or is this just	20:55:07	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan this while you were talking at the same time. So I just want to make sure I understand everything. On page 4, I guess page 3 and 4 of your document, where you are talking about tables 2 A and 2 B, so what you are saying is that based, if the 202 right in/right out intersection was eliminated that the 202 and
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:53 11 20:53:55 12 20:53:56 13 20:53:57 14 20:53:59 15 20:54:00 16 20:54:01 17 20:54:03 18 20:53:57 19 20:54:03 18	you have any questions? questions? Adelman? Ms. Kline. Board have an couple of questions questions?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr. MR. ADELMAN: Nothing. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you, Excuse me. I'm sorry. Does the y questions? I apologize. MR. HAWS: Yeah. I just have a stions. Has our traffic engineer by of this letter or is this just	20:55:07 5 20:55:10 6 20:55:10 7 20:55:12 8 20:55:13 9 20:55:14 10 20:55:15 11 20:55:17 12 20:55:19 13 20:55:20 14 20:55:23 15 20:55:24 16 20:55:34 18 20:55:34 18 20:55:39 19	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan this while you were talking at the same time. So I just want to make sure I understand everything. On page 4, I guess page 3 and 4 of your document, where you are talking about tables 2 A and 2 B, so what you are saying is that based, if the 202 right in/right out intersection was eliminated that the 202 and Street Road intersection would have an increase
20:53:37 6 20:53:40 7 20:53:45 8 20:53:50 9 20:53:51 10 20:53:55 12 20:53:55 12 20:53:57 14 20:53:59 15 20:54:00 16 20:54:01 17 20:54:03 18 20:53:50 19 20:54:01 20	you have any questions? questions? Adelman? Ms. Kline. Board have an couple of questions questions?	MR. MCKENNA: Eileen Carey, do questions? Ms. Carey, do you have? Ms. Carey has now left. Carol Weller, do you have any MS. WELLER: No questions. MR. MCKENNA: Any redirect, Mr. MR. ADELMAN: Nothing. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. Thank you, Excuse me. I'm sorry. Does the you questions? I apologize. MR. HAWS: Yeah. I just have a stions. Has our traffic engineer by of this letter or is this just	20:55:07 5 20:55:10 6 20:55:10 7 20:55:12 8 20:55:13 9 20:55:14 10 20:55:15 11 20:55:17 12 20:55:20 14 20:55:23 15 20:55:24 16 20:55:31 17 20:55:34 18 20:55:39 19 20:55:43 20 20:55:48 21	MR. ADELMAN: That's correct, dated last month. Just hasn't been submitted. MS. CAMP: With that I would reserve the right, if the Planning Commission felt necessary, to call Mr. Federico. MR. ADELMAN: Yeah, I have no objection to that. MR. MCKENNA: Okay. MR. HAWS: Just a couple other quick questions, because I'm trying to scan this while you were talking at the same time. So I just want to make sure I understand everything. On page 4, I guess page 3 and 4 of your document, where you are talking about tables 2 A and 2 B, so what you are saying is that based, if the 202 right in/right out intersection was eliminated that the 202 and Street Road intersection would have an increase of 13 seconds, and Street Road and Bridlewood

	1502		1504
20:56:04 1	intersection was taken off?	20:58:08 1	comments. And they seem in their comments and
20:56:06 2	THE WITNESS: That is correct.	20:58:11 2	in our meetings with them, which have been
20:56:07 3	h		entered into the record, they seem to be in
0 4	4 morning.		agreement at this time with the recommended
20:56:11 5	MR. HAWS: Yes.		mitigation. However, if the plan changes then
20:56:11 6	THE WITNESS: And 2 B illustrates		PennDOT needs to re-review it. So they have
20:56:13 7	the same, the results of the p.m. analysis. 20.58:26 7		not done a full review in this scenario where
20:56:17	MR. HAWS: So the p.m. analysis	20:58:28	the 202 access has been removed.
20:56:18	would be 202 and Street Road would increase by	20:58:31 9	MR. HAWS: Okay. And, again, I
20:56:20 10	12.4 seconds, and New Street and West Pleasant	20:58:34 10	don't know the rules here, so I could be wrong,
20:56:24 11	Grove would increase by 6.6. And as I was	20:58:35 11	but, I know this is rebuttal, so are we allowed
20:56:29 12	scanning this, anything that's greater than a	20:58:38 12	to ask questions that are outside of the scope
20:56:31 13	ten-second delay is considered a mitigation is	n-second delay is considered a mitigation is	
20:56:34 14	required?	20:58:42 14	MR. MCKENNA: Just on that.
20:56:34 15	THE WITNESS: That is the PennDOT	20:58:43 15	MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you.
20:56:35 16	criteria, yes.	20:58:49 16	MR. MCKENNA: Okay.
20:56:37 17	MR. HAWS: So what mitigation	20:58:51 17	MR. HAWS: I'm sorry. I thought
20:56:38 18	would be required for the 202 and Street Road,	20:58:53 18	of a way to phrase it. So if the 202, and I
20:56:46 19	both morning and p.m.?	20:58:59 19	could be wrong, but if the 202 right in/right
20:56:50 20	THE WITNESS: What I just	20:59:02 20	out is eliminated, and there were to be a
20:56:50 21	testified to, again, which is if PennDOT looks	20:59:06 21	collector road put in here, does that change
20:56:54 22	at overall intersection delay that the		the report that's before us?
20:56:58 23	southbound separate 202 right turn lane would	20:59:12 23	THE WITNESS: The nature of the
a 24	be required to mitigate the impact. And if	20:59:13 24	connector road would have to be completely
Ĩ	1503		1505
20:57:04	PennDOT looks at overall and movement delay at	20:59:15	vetted and defined before we could evaluate the
20:57:08 2	the intersection, then the improvement that	20:59:20 2	traffic changes resulting. If it is a local
20:57:10 3	would be required for mitigation would be a	20:59:23 3	connection, if it is a regional connection, if
20:57:13 4	second 926 eastbound left turn lane and the	20:59:25 4	the through movements are allowed through
20:57:17 5	signal modifications necessary to eliminate the	20:59:27 5	Bridlewood or not allowed. There are a host of
20:57:20 6	split phasing along 926.	20:59:30 6	design elements that would need to be defined
20:57:22 7	So it depends on how PennDOT	20:59:33 7	with that connector to be able to analyze what
20:57:24	looks at it. They reserve the right to look at	20:59:35	the traffic impacts may be.
20:57:27 9	it either way.	20:59:38	MR. HAWS: Okay. Thank you.
20:57:31 10	MR. HAWS: So when will we know	20:59:39 10	THE WITNESS: Thank you.
20:57:33 11	how PennDOT is going to evaluate this? Because	20:59:48 11	MR. MCKENNA: Any other questions
20:57:37 12	to me it seems like this I know you are	20:59:49 12	on the Board? Carol, do you have any
20:57:39 13	probably going to tell me it is PennDOT's, but,	20:59:57 13	questions?
20:57:41 14	I mean, how will you know what the objective	20:59:57 14	MS. DEWOLF: No.
20:57:44 15	criteria that PennDOT is setting so that you	20:59:58 15	MR. MCKENNA: Mr. Adeiman,
20:57:47 16	can assess this development?	20:59:59 16	anything further based on that?
20:57:49 17	Because, obviously, as the	21:00:00 17	MR. ADELMAN: No, I do not have
20:57:51 18	applicant and if you are putting in an	21:00:01 18	anything further.
20157:52 19	application, they should tell you how they are	21:00:02 19	MR. MCKENNA: Thank you, Ms.
6 20	assessing that.	21:00:03 20	Kline.
20:57:58 21	THE WITNESS: PennDOT reserves	21:00:03 21	(Witness excused.)
20:58:00 22	the right to make their decision when they make	21:00:05 22	MR. MCKENNA: All right. Unless
20:58:02 23	their decision. We did submit the study to	21:00:06 23	someone corrects me if I'm wrong, I think all
20:58:05 24	PennDOT and they have given us preliminary	21:00:08 24	of the parties that are present here this

	1506		1508		
21:00:09	evening have completed all of their cases.	21:01:36 1	time all of the parties will have concluded		
21:00:13	MR. ADELMAN: I will reserve the	21:01:38 2	their cases. If that is the case, depending		
21:00:14 3	right to call additional rebuttal witness after	21:01:43 3	upon what the hour is that evening, we will		
17 4	reviewing Mr. Snook's testimony. I may or may	21:01:45 4	begin to take public comment for anyone who has		
21:00:19 5	not do that. I don't know at this time.	21:01:47 5	not yet been heard. So please be prepared to		
21:00:21 6	MR. MCKENNA: Understood. I	21:01:52 6	do so.		
21:00:21 7	think it is fair, given everything that we have	21:01:53 7	If there is any way that we can		
21:00:23 8	just talked about this evening relative to Mr.	21:01:54 8	finish, I'm sure the parties are all going to		
21:00:26 9	Federico.	21:01:56 9	try to finish next month. I can't tell you if		
21:00:27 10	Mr. Adelman, based on that,	21:01:59 10	that will happen or not. We do not have any		
21:00:29 11	anything further from you this evening?	21:02:01 11	further dates other than the ones I have		
21:00:30 12	MR. ADELMAN: Nothing further	21:02:02 12	already told you. We haven't even discussed it		
21:00:30 13	from me this evening.	21:02:04 13	internally, and I haven't done anything with		
21:00:32 14	MR. MCKENNA: Anything further	21:02:06 14	the parties, and I don't know what rooms are		
21:00:32 15	from any of the other parties here this	21:02:08 15	available. So that's everything that I'm aware		
21:00:34 16	evening?	21:02:11 16	of for next month.		
21:00:34 17	All right. Here is what is going	21:02:12 17	I would ask everyone to please be		
21:00:36 18	to happen: We are going to stand in	21:02:14 18	prepared, and we will see you at Stetson on the		
21:00:37 19	continuance until October 24th. I am going to	21:02:17 19	24th of October at 6:00 p.m., unless there is		
21:00:40 20	point out that we do not have this room	21:02:20 20	anything further.		
21:00:41 21	available for October 24th, I regret to inform	21:02:25 21	MR. HAWS: Can we go off the		
21:00:43 22	you all. So we will be back at Stetson on the	21:02:26 22	record for a second.		
21:00:48 23	24th.	21:02:27 23	MR. MCKENNA: Off the record.		
48 24	As I noted earlier, those parties	21:02:29 24	(Discussion off the record.)		
	1507		1509		
21:00:50	that are not here this evening, we are going to	21:05:03 1	MR. MCKENNA: Ladies and		
21:00:51 2	give them one additional opportunity if they	21:05:04 2	gentlemen, we are going to conclude the		
21:00:53	want to put on their case, because we are	21:05:06 3	hearing. We will stand in continuance. Thank		
21:00:56 4	coming back in October as it is. So if you	21:05:08 4	you.		
21:00:59 5	know those people, I would ask you please reach	21:05:08 5	(Proceedings conclude at 9:05,		
21:01:01 6	out to them. We will talk internally about	6	p.m.)		
21:01:03 7	additional notice. I'm sure it will go out on	7	INDEV		
21:01:06	LISTSERV.	8	INDEX		
21:01:06 9	At that time Neighbors for	9 10	WITNESS DIRECT CROSS REDIRECT RECROSS John D. Snook 1367		
21:01:09 10	Crebilly is going to put on their witness. Mr. Rendemonti is going to put on his witness. I	11	By Mr. Adelman 1390		
21:01:12 11	don't know how long that will take.	12	By Mr. Thompson 1411		
21:01:15 12	Mr. Adelman may put on a rebuttal	13	5, 111 Hompson 1711		
21:01:20 14	witness. If he does, I don't know how long	14	Frank Tavani 1430		
21:01:21 15	that will take.	15	By Ms. Camp 1452		
21:01:22 16	MR. ADELMAN: Mr. McKenna, I may	16	By Mr. Rendemonti 1460		
21:01:24 17	also have a rebuttal witness based upon Ms.	17			
21:01:27 18	Adams' testimony. I don't know yet. But I'll	18	REBUTTAL		
21/01:29 19	be prepared to go at the hearing.	19	Nicole R. Kline 1494		
。20	MR. MCKENNA: That's fine. Thank	20	By Ms. Camp 1497		
21:01:31 21	you.	21			
21:01:31 22	MR. ADELMAN: Thank you.	22			
21:01:32 23	MR. MCKENNA: The long and short	23			
21:01:33 24	of it being, there is a chance that at that	24			

	170-1512 [1] - 1452:8	1473:7, 1475:15,	3rd [1] - 1478:24	1440:24, 1442:5,
	170-1617 [2] -	1477:2, 1477:15,		1442:16, 1442:23,
'secondary [1] -	1404:7, 1407:18	1478:9, 1478:11,	4	1444:5, 1444:15,
1408:2	170-1617.C.1.c [1] -	1481:2, 1483:18,		1444:21, 1445:1,
	1376:24	1484:1, 1484:15,	4 [5] - 1401:20,	1446:12, 1447:14,
1	170-1617.C.3.b [1] -	1494:9, 1494:14,	1402:15, 1467:1,	1447:17, 1447:23,
4 4007.00	1375:12	1494:22, 1495:7,	1501:16	1450:6, 1450:9,
1 [4] - 1367:20,	170-905.G [2] -	1495:8, 1495:12,	40 [4] - 1368:17,	1450:15, 1454:1,
1431:4, 1441:14,	1394:3, 1394:6	1495:14, 1496:2,	1391:15, 1433:22,	1455:12, 1457:4,
1441:22	1777 [1] - 1378:18	1501:19, 1501:20, 1501:24, 1502:9,	1434:19 44 [10] - 1396:11,	1457:21, 1458:7, 1459:3, 1459:8,
1,000 [4] - 1445:17, 1460:22, 1484:9,	17th [1] - 1449:5	1501:24, 1502:9,	1396:21, 1397:5,	1459:3, 1459:8,
1484:18	18[1] - 1407:22	1504:8, 1504:18,	1397:9, 1397:15,	1464:19, 1465:21,
1.7 [1] - 1437:4	1850 [1] - 1437:15	1504:19	1397:16, 1398:1,	1467:22, 1469:6,
1.71 [1] - 1436:20	19 [6] - 1362:11,	202/926 [3] - 1483:7,	1398:5, 1398:21	1478:9, 1480:24,
10 [4] - 1387:20,	1368:1, 1462:8,	1495:22, 1496:17	45 [1] - 1376:5	1481:2, 1481:9,
1387:21, 1387:24,	1473:9, 1473:11, 1511:12	2028 [2] - 1436:10,	10[1] 107010	1482:10, 1482:21,
1434:20	19147 [1] - 1430:18	1436:21	5	1483:6, 1483:24,
100 [1] - 1368:17	19147 [1] - 1430.10	20th [1] - 1433:12		1496:6, 1496:8,
105 [1] - 1430:17	2	22 [1] - 1469:20	5 [3] - 1434:19,	1503:4, 1503:6
1100 [2] - 1362:10,		2200 [1] - 1433:2	1451:3, 1483:4	9:05 [1] - 1509:5
1441:24	2 [5] - 1449:9,	2300 [5] - 1437:23,	50 [6] - 1377:12,	
1130 [1] - 1432:15	1501:18, 1502:3,	1456:2, 1484:14,	1377:16, 1378:2,	Α
1146 [1] - 1446:1	1502:6	1484:19, 1484:24	1384:5, 1427:7,	
12.4 [1] - 1502:10	2,000 [4] - 1432:17,	23rd [1] - 1494:8	1495:16	A-3 [7] - 1376:3,
1200 [3] - 1440:24,	1433:1, 1462:3,	24 [1] - 1438:21	54 [3] - 1433:20,	1396:8, 1401:21,
1441:6, 1477:20	1462:9	24th [5] - 1365:9,	1447:4, 1457:7	1402:16, 1407:11,
126 [1] - 1474:16	2,185 [1] - 1445:17	1506:19, 1506:21,	55 [1] - 1434:21	1408:11, 1408:13
13 [1] - 1501:22	20 [1] - 1434:23	1506:23, 1508:19		A-33 [29] - 1433:13, 1433:16, 1433:18,
1320 [1] - 1441:6	200 [1] - 1432:22	27 [2] - 1388:1,	6	1433:10, 1435:10,
1362 [1] - 1511:9	2001 [2] - 1369:21,	1409:19	6 [2] - 1461:22,	1435:22, 1436:6,
1367 [1] - 1509:10	1371:16	2800 [1] - 1437:18	1461:23	1436:18, 1437:9,
1390 [1] - 1509:11	2014 [1] - 1369:22	29.9 [1] - 1402:22	6.6 [1] - 1502:11	1440:5, 1442:24,
1400 [1] - 1441:22	2016 [1] - 1372:21	29th [4] - 1364:12,	60 [1] - 1373:19	1445:1, 1445:11,
1411 [1] - 1509:12	2017 [8] - 1362:11,	1495:1, 1500:19, 1501:3	60-foot [1] - 1373:23	1446:22, 1447:5,
1430 [1] - 1509:14	1433:12, 1449:5,	1501.5	65 [2] - 1437:4,	1447:9, 1449:1,
1452 [1] - 1509:15	1478:24, 1494:8, 1495:2, 1511:12,	3	1437:5	1450:2, 1455:5,
1460 [1] - 1509:16	1511:16		660 [1] - 1441:5	1455:17, 1457:7,
147 [1] - 1474:8	202 [68] - 1383:17,	3 [13] - 1376:4,	6:00 [1] - 1508:19	1461:23, 1464:14,
149-300.E [1] - 1452:21	1393:5, 1397:7,	1376:16, 1408:11,	6:05 [1] - 1362:11	1465:2, 1469:19,
1494 [1] - 1509:19	1401:10, 1415:10,	1408:13, 1408:18,		1470:8, 1484:3,
1497 [1] - 1509:19	1425:22, 1432:10,	1409:5, 1409:13,	8	1484:6
15 [2] - 1403:4,	1432:18, 1434:1,	1465:18, 1465:20,		A-38 [2] - 1394:19,
1490:2	1434:17, 1435:17,	1466:20, 1479:3,	8 [3] - 1362:5,	1510:11
1511 [2] - 1510:15,	1437:21, 1440:8,	1501:16, 1510:12	1490:18, 1490:19	A-39 [8] - 1396:7,
1511:10	1440:11, 1441:10,	3,000 [1] - 1437:23	8/29/17 [1] - 1510:13	1396:22, 1397:9, 1397:16, 1398:1,
1512.B [1] - 1452:12	1441:13, 1441:20,	3,100 [1] - 1440:23	8:00 [1] - 1451:19	1398:5, 1398:21,
15th [2] - 1372:21,	1441:22, 1442:5,	30 [4] - 1373:20,		1510:12
1399:20	1442:13, 1444:5,	1434:9, 1491:3,	9	A-40 [2] - 1494:18,
1617.C.2 [1] -	1444:14, 1445:3,	1491:7	9[1] - 1446:1	1510:13
1385:13	1446:12, 1447:23,	300 [1] - 1391:22	905.G [1] - 1394:11	A-6 [3] - 1461:19,
16th [1] - 1380:15	1449:23, 1450:3,	30th [1] - 1511:15	926 [54] - 1383:10,	1483:15, 1485:20
17 [2] - 1432:15,	1452:9, 1452:13,	322 [2] - 1441:13, 1441:22	1383:14, 1384:14,	A-7 [1] - 1373:15
1463:17	1454:1, 1456:3, 1456:5, 1458:10,	35 _[1] - 1474:17	1388:21, 1393:6,	a.m [6] - 1437:14,
170-1508 [3] -	1450:5, 1458:10,	35 [1] - 1474.17 37 [3] - 1435:24,	1397:15, 1416:18,	1438:8, 1438:19,
1394:15, 1394:20,	1460:23, 1462:13,	1436:6, 1437:12	1432:18, 1434:15,	1438:23, 1439:5,
1510:11	1469:6, 1470:12,	38 [2] - 1445:12,	1434:16, 1437:21,	1455:24
170-1508.A [1] -	1471:1, 1471:8,	1455:17	1439:9, 1440:11,	ability [2] - 1404:13,
1395:8	1			
	N .			

1467:20 able [5] - 1380:22, 1430:7, 1456:4, 1459:22, 1505:7 above-captioned [1] - 1511:12 absolutely [1] -1414:19 abuts [1] - 1396:2 accepted [1] -1441:8 access [43] -1425:21, 1432:10, 1432:18, 1434:13, 1434:15, 1435:4, 1435:6, 1435:11, 1435:19, 1437:17, 1438:3, 1438:5, 1439:2, 1439:8, 1439:10, 1439:14, 1440:6, 1444:24, 1445:3, 1446:6. 1447:16, 1448:8, 1449:21, 1449:23, 1450:2, 1450:4, 1452:9, 1452:13, 1455:11, 1461:9, 1461:10, 1462:5, 1481:1, 1483:5, 1483:9, 1484:16, 1494:10, 1494:15, 1494:22, 1495:7. 1495:8, 1495:10, 1504:8 accesses [1] -1495:11 accident[1] -1435:20 accompli[1]-1375:24 according [7] -1376:5, 1441:3, 1441:7, 1442:24, 1448:23, 1448:24, 1462:1 account [2] - 1415:5, 1464:24 accounts [1] -1465:2 accurate [2] -1382:3, 1511:10 accurately [2] -1377:5, 1380:18 achieved [1] -1448:14 achieving [1] -1385:8 acreage [4] - 1403:2, 1403:6, 1409:6, 1409:14

acres [4] - 1388:1, 1402:23, 1409:19, 1490:3 across-the-board [1] - 1422:22 action [1] - 1412:14 active [3] - 1387:23, 1402:22, 1402:24 actual [1] - 1388:11 Adams' [1] - 1507:18 add [1] - 1450:5 added [11] - 1376:17, 1407:20, 1408:7, 1408:20, 1408:22, 1409:4, 1442:3, 1455:22, 1462:8, 1484:11, 1493:12 adding [3] - 1439:13, 1473:9, 1480:11 addition [6] -1373:12, 1376:19, 1388:6, 1409:3, 1435:8, 1443:6 additional [16] -1375:3, 1397:20, 1436:22, 1440:18, 1444:15, 1446:16, 1450:5, 1462:8, 1465:11, 1473:7, 1483:3, 1489:10, 1494:13, 1506:3, 1507:2, 1507:7 additionally [1] -1388:18 address [3] -1367:16, 1367:19, 1430:15 addressed [2] -1372:22, 1500:20 addresses [1] -1452.9 ADELMAN [43] -1363:3, 1366:23, 1368:22, 1369:3, 1369:7, 1390:1, 1390:3, 1402:14, 1410:14, 1410:18, 1421:12, 1427:24, 1428:5, 1428:15, 1429:22, 1431:3, 1431:6, 1433:9, 1433:16, 1451:13, 1461:19, 1487:1, 1488:18, 1489:18, 1490:14, 1490:19, 1492:3, 1493:7,

1493:21, 1494:6,

1497:3, 1499:13,

1499:24, 1500:8,

1500:16, 1500:23,

1501:4, 1501:9, 1505:17, 1506:2, 1506:12, 1507:16, 1507:22 Adelman [21] -1366:21, 1368:2, 1389:24, 1402:7, 1410:17, 1426:21, 1427:22, 1429:20, 1430:2, 1451:9, 1461:16, 1488:17, 1490:12, 1492:8, 1493:5, 1499:12, 1500:4, 1505:15, 1506:10, 1507:13, 1509:11 adequate [3] -1367:14, 1375:7, 1389:18 adequately [7] -1376:10, 1382:20, 1383:9, 1387:6, 1387:8, 1387:11, 1407:7 adhere [1] - 1374:7 adjacent [3] -1397:12, 1399:11, 1414:2 administration [1] -1417:7 admission [2] -1428:12, 1487:12 admitted [3] -1369:10, 1396:9, 1431:12 advantage [1] -1406:4 adverse [1] -1495:17 advised [1] - 1365:3 advisement [2] -1481:17, 1492:7 affect [1] - 1461:7 affiliated [1] - 1371:6 afforded [2] -1438:15, 1478:4 affords [1] - 1439:3 afternoon [2] -1437:24, 1439:6 agency [1] - 1481:16 agree [3] - 1383:11, 1447:1, 1481:23 agreed [2] - 1406:2, 1455:9 agreement [2] -1448:1, 1504:4 agrees [1] - 1447:2 agricultural [2] -1393:16, 1459:11 ahead [3] - 1367:1,

1482:7, 1493:19 align [2] - 1485:15, 1486:6 alignment [3] -1483:20, 1486:1, 1486:10 alleged [1] - 1400:1 Allegiance [2] -1363:19, 1363:20 Allison [1] - 1418:15 allow[3] - 1448:18, 1456:14, 1492:2 allowed [4] -1415:21, 1504:11, 1505:4, 1505:5 allows [1] - 1384:5 almost [1] - 1475:15 alongside [1] -1388:13 ALSO [1] - 1362:17 Alternate [1] -1373:13 alternate [1] -1475:17 alternative [2] -1455:18, 1473:2 alternatives [1] -1445:14 altruism [1] -1442:11 amazed [1] - 1380:8 amazing [1] -1380:11 ambulances [1] -1435:10 Amish [2] - 1464:20, 1467:24 amount [7] -1435:16, 1436:11, 1436:22, 1447:22, 1457:22, 1463:16, 1464:23 Amy [2] - 1418:2, 1418:21 analyses [3] -1391:16, 1422:10, 1495:5 analysis [10] -1375:8, 1385:19, 1401:9, 1410:4, 1479:6, 1482:19, 1494:13, 1494:21, 1502:7, 1502:8 analyze [2] - 1407:4, 1505:7 ancient[1] - 1381:4 angling [1] - 1462:10 animals [4] -1443:18, 1466:8,

1466:18, 1480:14

announced [1] -1490:20 annualized [1] -1436:19 answer [10] - 1402:9, 1421:13, 1450:24, 1455:16, 1457:6, 1459:17, 1464:13, 1473:19, 1475:11, 1476:12 answered [1] -1392:5 anticipate [4] -1365:12, 1488:13, 1491:1, 1491:5 anticipating [2] -1402:9, 1429:9 anyway [1] - 1469:3 apartment [2] -1372:19, 1373:24 apologize [6] -1380:21, 1381:3, 1433:5, 1465:13, 1499:17, 1500:15 appeal [1] - 1370:10 appear [2] - 1374:22, 1463:1 appearance [2] -1378:17, 1417:11 APPEARANCES [1] -1363:1 appendix [2] -1469:21, 1470:1 applicable [1] -1395:24 Applicant [1] -1363:4 applicant [51] -1373:6, 1373:14, 1374:2, 1374:7, 1375:13, 1377:3, 1382:19, 1383:9, 1384:1, 1384:10, 1384:18, 1385:21, 1386:1, 1386:15, 1392:16, 1404:10, 1404:24, 1405:1, 1405:6, 1405:14, 1405:17, 1405:21, 1406:1, 1406:2, 1406:10, 1407:10, 1408:5, 1411:15, 1435:5, 1439:14, 1443:15, 1444:20, 1445:22, 1447:2, 1447:11, 1448:2, 1448:23, 1450:7, 1450:13, 1450:18, 1451:22, 1453:24, 1456:8, 1459:18,

1466:23, 1469:23, 1479:1, 1482:19, 1497:18, 1503:18 APPLICANT'S [1] -1510:9 applicant's [9] -1370:20, 1376:6, 1385:10, 1386:10, 1387:2, 1389:14, 1433:7, 1470:6, 1470:7 applicants [1] -1452:13 application [8] -1364:11, 1370:20, 1371:24, 1372:4, 1374:15, 1376:2, 1479:2, 1503:19 APPLICATION [1] -1362:7 applications [1] -1372:14 apply [1] - 1395:18 appreciate [1] -1493:22 approach [5] -1434:16, 1435:1, 1439:8, 1445:6, 1484:11 approaches [3] -1479:21, 1480:9, 1480:12 approaching [1] -1379:2 appropriate [3] -1444:16, 1471:17, 1472:8 approval [3] -1382:20, 1388:11, 1481:11 approving [1] -1481:16 **April** [1] - 1449:5 Arborview [1] -1413:18 architecture [3] -1368:12, 1368:13, 1368:15 area [8] - 1387:21, 1388:1, 1391:21, 1402:22, 1411:19, 1414:10, 1471:15 areas [42] - 1375:15, 1376:7, 1376:11, 1376:13, 1376:15, 1376:17, 1376:18, 1376:21, 1377:6, 1377:7, 1377:13, 1377:17, 1377:20,

1404:12, 1405:12, 1406:6, 1406:8, 1407:12, 1407:14, 1408:2, 1408:9, 1408:15, 1408:16, 1408:17, 1408:18, 1408:23, 1409:3, 1409:7, 1409:9, 1409:10, 1409:11, 1409:15, 1410:5, 1410:11 argue [2] - 1391:5, 1409:24 argued [1] - 1415:2 Arrendt [1] - 1423:23 arriving [1] - 1447:9 arrow [2] - 1457:9 arterial [2] - 1441:4, **144**1:9 articulate [1] -1479:12 articulating [1] -1480:16 ascertaining [1] -1383:12 askance [1] - 1414:6 aspect [2] - 1410:13, 1425:7 assess [1] - 1503:16 assessing [1] -1503:20 assessment [2] -1479:3, 1483:19 assignment[1] -1457:14 associated [1] -1386:7 Associates [1] -1430:21 Association [5] -1413:24, 1414:3, 1414:21, 1458:18, 1489:2 assortment [1] -1437:20 assumption [1] -1447:19 attached [2] -1495:3, 1495:4 attempt [3] - 1467:8, 1467:10, 1475:10 attend [1] - 1366:1 attendance [2] -1379:4, 1432:1 attended [1] - 1380:4 attraction [2] -

1444:1, 1472:24

1385:5, 1385:12,

1386:2, 1386:3,

1386:13, 1388:15,

audience [3] -1380:21, 1429:21, 1430:6 audio [1] - 1364:15 Auditorium [1] -1362:10 augment[1] - 1471:7 August [5] -1364:12, 1495:1, 1500:19, 1501:3, 1511:12 authored [1] -1423:22 authors [1] - 1371:23 automobile [1] -1443:7 automobiles [2] -1468:13 available [5] -1387:22, 1490:7, 1500:13, 1506:21, 1508:15 avoid [2] - 1417:7, 1484:16 avoiding [1] - 1386:2 aware [16] - 1403:1, 1411:18, 1411:22, 1439:20, 1449:13, 1468:2, 1468:4, 1474:20, 1474:23, 1475:16, 1475:21, 1477:8, 1477:10, 1477:13, 1482:8, 1508:15 awhile [1] - 1489:17

В

B-16[1] - 1373:1 BEFORE (2) -1362:1, 1362:14 Bachelor [1] -1431:1 beginning [4] bachelor's [1] -1368:11 1362:11, 1446:1, back-up [3] -1450:4, 1475:3 1477:10, 1477:23, 1363:4, 1363:5, 1478:11 1363:7, 1363:9, background [5] -1368:9, 1430:24, 1436:11, 1455:21, 1368:19, 1489:1, 1489:8 1464:4 backyards [1] -1424:13 1382:9, 1383:4, bad [1] - 1406:1 1398:16, 1398:23 barn [7] - 1381:17, 1381:22, 1383:5, 1393:17, 1416:17, 1416:19 1442:5, 1442:13, 1442:17, 1456:11, barrens [2] -1414:11, 1415:10 1464:12, 1466:17, 1471:9 barrier [1] - 1395:10

base [4] - 1400:17, benefits [2] - 1435:8, 1403:11, 1403:22, 1456:7 1464:4 Berkeley [1] based [29] - 1401:1, 1368:13 1423:9, 1426:16, berm [1] - 1396:23 1426:19, 1427:1, Bertinatti [1] -1427:23, 1438:9, 1413:16 1438:17, 1446:21, best [2] - 1443:20, 1446:22, 1447:19, 1471:7 1448:24, 1449:21, Bethelem [1] -1456:18, 1467:12, 1369:20 1468:4, 1469:7, better [6] - 1412:24, 1470:14, 1483:6, 1424:17, 1440:9, 1483:14, 1484:5, 1455:1, 1459:17, 1488:16, 1491:24, 1466:19 1495:15, 1500:6, between [11] -1501:19, 1505:16, 1380:10, 1381:21, 1506:10, 1507:17 1390:20, 1395:16, battle [2] - 1380:4, 1421:4, 1421:9, 1384:21 1421:15, 1421:17, Battle [11] - 1378:15, 1441:5, 1451:6, 1378:24, 1386:7, 1477:19 1386:21, 1389:12, Bevilacqua [1] -1400:2, 1412:8, 1413:19 1420:18, 1420:24, beyond [8] - 1377:2, 1421:6, 1421:16 1382:8, 1405:14, battlefield [6] -1408:4, 1422:21, 1382:7, 1383:16, 1435:18, 1438:20, 1383:22, 1385:2, 1445:6 1412:19, 1427:10 bicycle [1] - 1388:15 Battlefield [3] big [1] - 1416:11 1411:20, 1420:8, Birmingham [12] -1421:11 1363:10, 1365:2, Bayard [1] - 1362:10 1380:5, 1389:11, bear[1] - 1461:14 1399:18, 1410:19, become [1] - 1372:7 1413:5, 1413:7, becomes [2] -1420:14, 1428:24, 1429:5, 1453:10 1434:24, 1435:13 bit [4] - 1365:20, 1374:11, 1442:9, begin [1] - 1508:4 1471:22 block [2] - 1378:9, 1463:20 blocking [2] behalf [10] - 1363:2, 1415:16, 1415:19 Board [31] - 1363:2, 1363:24, 1368:3, 1363:10, 1363:12, 1370:7, 1370:10. 1372:4, 1372:6, 1379:14, 1420:4, behind [5] - 1381:21, 1426:11, 1429:14, 1430:22, 1433:19, 1435:23, 1439:13, believes [1] - 1448:8 1439:20, 1441:12, bend [1] - 1413:5 1443:16, 1444:3, benefit [8] - 1435:3, 1448:5, 1465:13, 1470:10, 1481:11, 1481:19, 1486:19, 1492:1, 1492:4, 1493:8, 1493:13,

1384:6, 1384:7,

1499:17, 1505:12 board [3] - 1422:22, 1460:21, 1483:15 **BOARD** [1] - 1362:1 book [1] - 1423:22 bottom [1] - 1425:18 Boulevard [7] -1441:1, 1447:14, 1455:13, 1456:2, 1457:14, 1475:5, 1477:14 Boyer [1] - 1418:19 Bozzuto [2] -1372:19, 1388:10 Bradford [4] -1370:7, 1370:9, 1370:14, 1422:11 **Bradley** [1] - 1418:2 Brandywine [20] -1367:23, 1369:13, 1371:5, 1378:15, 1378:24, 1386:8, 1386:21, 1389:12, 1400:2, 1411:20, 1412:8, 1413:13, 1420:7, 1420:19, 1420:24, 1421:6, 1421:11, 1421:17, 1456:2, 1487:22 BRAXTON [2] -1364:16, 1364:19 Braxton [1] -1364:19 break [1] - 1451:11 Bridlewood [18] -1446:7, 1447:8, 1447:14, 1448:6, 1448:9, 1455:13, 1456:6, 1456:20, 1457:4, 1457:14, 1457:21, 1458:11, 1483:10, 1484:14, 1484:24, 1485:22, 1501:22, 1505:5 brief [2] - 1430:23, 1493:10 briefly [2] - 1368:8, 1373:9 Brigham [1] -1420:14 bring [1] - 1469:22 brings [1] - 1500:3 British [1] - 1379:2

build [7] - 1423:13, 1436:9, 1445:13, 1455:19, 1455:20, 1464:5, 1467:8 build-out [3] -1445:13, 1455:19, 1455:20 building [2] -1373:19, 1435:2 buildings [5] -1373:24, 1374:4, 1378:7, 1378:20, 1417:14 built [2] - 1446:2, 1476:23 bullet [2] - 1449:9, 1449 19 burden [3] - 1448:2, 1454:22, 1455:5 bus [5] - 1470:11, 1470:19, 1471:1, 1471:3, 1471:17 business [6] -1367:13, 1367:16, 1367:19, 1371:6, 1371:10, 1430:14 businesses [1] -1465:1 busy [1] - 1435:1 BY [12] - 1367:10, 1369:12, 1390:3, 1402:14, 1411:8, 1430:13, 1431:15, 1449:3, 1452:3, 1460:19, 1494:6, 1497:8

C

C(1)(c [2] - 1405:10, 1407:19 C-1 [1] - 1395:16 Cahill [1] - 1419:9 calculation [1] -1426:18 California [1] -1368:12 **CAMP** [23] - 1363:5, 1367:2, 1367:10, 1369:1, 1369:6, 1369:12, 1389:22, 1427:21, 1428:11, 1428:17, 1428:20, 1431:10, 1433:13, 1452:1. 1452:3. 1453:5, 1465:11, 1497:6, 1497:8, 1497:22, 1500:18, 1501:2, 1501:6 camp [5] - 1366:24,

1453:8, 1497:4 Camp [2] - 1509:15, 1509:20 cannot [4] - 1439:22, 1455:2, 1464:21, 1479:12 capabilities [1] -1468:3 captioned [1] -1511:12 car[4] - 1467:11, 1467:12, 1467:15 care [1] - 1372:18 Carey [6] - 1419:19, 1463:6, 1492:22, 1499:5, 1499:6, 1499:7 **CAREY** [5] -1419:20, 1463:7, 1464:17, 1465:4, 1492:24 **CAROL** [1] - 1362:15 Carol [8] - 1364:1, 1366:17, 1419:24, 1465:6, 1482:12, 1493:1, 1499:8, 1505:12 carriage [2] - 1374:1, 1385:4 carriages [1] -1459:5 cars [7] - 1463:11, 1463:17, 1466:7, 1470:17, 1472:22, 1473:9, 1473:11 case [8] - 1387:24, 1395:22, 1447:19, 1487:13, 1492:19, 1492:23, 1507:3, 1508:2 cases [5] - 1392:1, 1427:1, 1490:22, 1506:1, 1508:2 CCRC [1] - 1372:11 cellphone [1] -1381:5 center [4] - 1444:4, 1444:9, 1467:17, 1472:7 centered [1] - 1390:5 certain [3] - 1365:4, 1463:11, 1481:22 certainly [11] -1393:23, 1393:24,

1427:19, 1428:8,

CERTIFICATE [2] -1510:15, 1511:5 certify [1] - 1511:9 Chadds [1] - 1367:20 chair [1] - 1364:2 Chair [1] - 1364:3 Chairman [2] -1362:14, 1364:9 CHAIRMAN [3] -1363:15, 1363:22, 1427:19 chance [2] - 1366:5, 1507:24 change [8] -1429:10, 1454:9, 1454:12, 1467:10, 1470:16, 1476:24, 1483:19, 1504:21 changed [2] -1378:19, 1426:19 changes [4] -1416:23, 1468:7, 1504:5, 1505:2 channelization [2] -1448:15, 1451:5 characteristic [1] -1391:20 chart [1] - 1457:2 CHESTER [1] -1362:3 Chester [7] -1362:11, 1382:17, 1391:17, 1399:23, 1422:8, 1436:19, 1511:2 chicken [1] -1404:23 choice [2] - 1442:15, 1497:18 chose [2] - 1473:18, 1474:3 Chris [1] - 1372:24 Church [2] -1382:13, 1413:22 **church** [3] - 1393:7, 1444:11, 1475:7 circuitous [1] -1424:21 circumstances [3] -1380:1, 1466:16, 1480:8 civil [1] - 1431:2 clarify [1] - 1446:14 classified [2] -1376:14, 1376:20 clear [4] - 1380:8, 1382:8, 1438:15, 1481:24 clearly [6] - 1381:16, 1381:20, 1383:14,

1413:3, 1446:11, 1448:17 client [1] - 1490:4 client's [1] - 1490:1 close [1] - 1443:2 closer [6] - 1397:21, 1398:14, 1441:1, 1445:3, 1456:5, 1458:10 closing [1] - 1488:10 Club [1] - 1415:8 cluster [1] - 1427:10 clustering [1] -1385:2 code [1] - 1452:16 Code [1] - 1510:11 collector [3] -1483:17, 1485:2, 1504:21 collisions [1] -1486:4 coming [10] -1365:11, 1365:14, 1379:10, 1401:10, 1434:3, 1457:22, 1464:24, 1479:9, 1488:4, 1507:4 Comitta [1] -1369:19 comment [3] -1365:10, 1488:19, 1508:4 comments [4] -1449:2, 1494:11, 1504:1 Commercial [2] -1395:17, 1395:24 COMMISSION [1] -1510:4 Commission [36] -1363:6, 1364:23, 1368:1, 1370:19, 1372:21, 1372:22, 1375:14, 1375:22, 1375:23, 1376:22, 1377:1, 1379:6, 1379:13, 1382:6, 1382:23, 1383:15, 1400:5, 1404:9, 1404:11, 1404:22, 1405:4, 1405:7, 1405:12, 1405:19, 1406:3, 1407:1. 1408:3, 1416:13, 1417:20, 1427:9, 1428:9, 1451:23, 1465:9, 1482:13, 1500:10, 1501:7 Commission's [1] -1399:24

Brothers [5] -

1363:18, 1364:11,

Bruns [1] - 1419:15

buffer [2] - 1396:3,

1370:11, 1494:9,

1495:22

1396:23

1422:14, 1423:19,

1430:16, 1431:1,

1436:4, 1436:5,

1439:3, 1441:1,

commissioner [1] -1364:3 committed [1] -1476:15 Commonwealth [2] -1454:23, 1511:1 communities [4] -1451:6, 1453:1, 1456:12, 1471:10 community [14] -1372:18, 1434:7, 1443:24, 1444:2, 1447:8, 1447:21, 1448:13, 1448:21, 1471:9, 1472:3, 1472:10, 1473:4, 1473:24, 1486:15 comp [4] - 1389:3, 1401:17, 1401:18, 1403:23 completed [2] -1422:9, 1506:1 completely [4] -1395:10, 1463:20, 1465:17, 1504:24 completing [1] -1405:1 complex [4] -1381:17, 1381:18, 1383:5, 1441:15 compliance [1] -1375:4 comply [1] - 1404:3 component [2] -1434:11, 1489:24 components [1] -1436:13 Comprehensive [7] -1371:16, 1387:3, 1387:17, 1388:6, 1403:13, 1474:21, 1474:24 concentrate [1] -1472:9 concept [3] - 1422:4, 1423:17, 1423:20 concern [9] - 1432:9, 1435:9, 1440:11, 1442:6, 1446:3, 1446:24, 1459:20, 1460:1, 1485:24 concerning [1] -1370:11 concerns [4] -1435:16, 1444:14, 1445:4, 1485:20 conclude [2] -1509:2, 1509:5 concluded [1] -1508:1

conclusion [5] -1446:23, 1446:24, 1448:4, 1455:9, 1496:22 conclusions [7] -1399:19, 1399:24, 1432:4, 1432:6, 1432:8, 1447:9, 1447:10 condition [8] -1454:14, 1455:3, 1464:3, 1464:4, 1464:6, 1464:16, 1481:11 conditional [7] -1363:17, 1372:3, 1374:15, 1376:4, 1379:5, 1382:20, 1431:23 CONDITIONAL [1] -1362:7 conditions [6] -1436:8, 1436:9, 1437:8, 1437:14, 1438:18, 1464:7 configuration [1] -1449:21 confirm [1] - 1428:23 confirmed [1] -1432:14 confirming [1] -1481:21 congested [2] -1485:7, 1485:8 congestion [3] -1444:14, 1467:7, 1467:8 congregate [1] -1468:16 connect [4] -1389:19, 1444:17, 1455:13, 1486:9 connecting [1] -1388:22 connection [7] -1389:10, 1425:22, 1450:21, 1472:23, 1505:3 connections [2] -1387:13, 1472:6 connectivity [1] -1484:8 connector [19] -1387:7, 1388:14, 1388:22, 1400:17, 1400:18, 1401:14, 1403:10, 1441:17, 1450:8, 1450:14, 1450:19, 1451:1,

1458:6, 1475:21,

1476:16, 1477:4, 1483:22, 1504:24, 1505:7 conservancy [1] -1417:7 Conservancy [3] -1367:23, 1369:14, 1371:5 Conservation [1] -1423:16 conservation [47] -1374:7, 1374:16, 1374:24, 1375:4, 1375:15, 1375:21, 1376:7, 1376:11, 1376:15, 1376:18, 1376:21, 1377:7, 1377:13, 1377:20, 1384:7, 1385:8, 1385:12, 1385:24, 1386:3, 1386:13, 1404:4, 1404:12, 1404:19, 1405:8, 1405:11, 1406:6, 1407:2, 1407:12, 1407:14, 1407:16, 1408:2, 1408:9, 1408:15, 1408:17, 1408:23, 1409:3, 1409:6, 1409:10, 1409:11, 1409:15, 1410:5, 1410:11, 1422:3, 1422:18, 1422:20, 1423:17, 1424:1 consider [13] -1377:18, 1408:14, 1410:13, 1411:16, 1414:20, 1438:12, 1443:16, 1444:20, 1466:21, 1472:1, 1486:8, 1493:8, 1493:14 considerable [1] -1388:2 consideration [6] -1414:13, 1415:1, 1439:11, 1459:15, 1463:14, 1492:11 considered [14] -1378:1, 1392:13, 1395:4, 1396:4, 1396:16, 1410:9, 1440:19, 1443:11, 1447:7, 1459:4, 1471:22, 1476:18, 1486:5, 1502:13 considering [2] -1439:7, 1442:3 consistency [2] -

1401:18, 1403:23 consistent [2] -1374:21, 1387:2 consisting [1] -1396:11 consolidating [1] -1486:11 constitute [1] -1395:13 constrained [1] -1465:22 construct [1] -1450:18 constructed [3] -1432:18, 1437:21, 1448:9 consultant [4] -1370:16, 1447:11, 1470:7, 1470:8 consultants [3] -1369:18, 1369:24, 1373:8 consulted [1] -1376:22 contained [3] -1396:3, 1450:2, 1495:24 contemplated [2] -1475:21, 1475:23 contents [1] -1449:13 context [4] -1372:11, 1388:9, 1389:18, 1476:18 contiguous [3] -1395:18, 1395:20, 1421:10 Continental [1] -1379:1 continually [1] -1395:15 continuance [2] -1506:19, 1509:3 continue [4] -1366:22, 1439:16, 1449:22, 1493:24 continued [1] -1364:10 continues [1] -1399:14 continuing [1] -1372:18 continuity [1] -1421:10 controlled [1] -1466:15 convenient [1] -1474:4 conversation [1] -

conversely [1] -1474:6 coordinated [2] -1375:10, 1452:22 copies [4] - 1368:3, 1380:24, 1404:16, 1500:2 copy [6] - 1368:2, 1394:2, 1394:20, 1408:10, 1433:19, 1499:20 Corcoran [1] -1418:16 Corgnale [1] -1418:23 corner [6] - 1398:5, 1433:21, 1437:13, 1445:12, 1468:16, 1491:18 Corners [1] - 1378:8 correct [37] - 1390:6, 1390:12, 1390:14, 1392:18, 1393:18, 1393:19, 1394:15, 1394:24, 1397:14, 1397:17, 1397:19, 1397:22, 1398:13, 1398:24, 1399:10, 1399:12, 1400:7, 1400:14, 1401:15, 1403:18, 1404:5, 1422:6, 1422:23, 1429:2, 1456:21, 1457:23, 1481:4, 1482:23, 1483:11, 1485:1, 1487:17, 1494:11, 1496:23, 1496:24, 1497:11, 1501:4, 1502:2 correctly [4] -1463:18, 1473:16, 1474:17, 1496:16 corrects [1] -1505:23 correspondence [1] - 1500:21 corridor [2] -1397:22, 1416:18 counsel [3] -1460:16, 1489:15, 1493:17 count [2] - 1469:10, 1490:17 counted [1] -1469:23 County [9] - 1382:6, 1383:15, 1391:18, 1399:24, 1422:8, 1427:9, 1436:19, 1511:2

COUNTY [1] - 1362:3 county [1] - 1459:7 couple [9] - 1393:17, 1404:15, 1426:13, 1426:15, 1451:19, 1465:15, 1478:18, 1499:19, 1501:12 course [5] - 1395:17, 1412:12, 1436:24, 1459:11, 1481:16 court [1] - 1402:10 COURT [1] - 1362:23 covered [2] -1478:14, 1485:18 CRAWFORD [6] -1363:10, 1410:21, 1429:2, 1429:8, 1453:11, 1498:1 Crawford [3] -1428:23, 1453:9, 1497:23 create [2] - 1406:20, 1459:20 creating [1] -1485:24 Crebilly [36] -1363:9, 1363:17, 1364:11, 1365:6, 1372:2, 1372:7, 1372:16, 1377:18, 1378:16, 1380:9, 1381:15, 1381:19, 1382:7, 1384:9, 1387:24, 1388:8, 1389:1, 1393:11, 1393:13, 1399:4, 1403:12, 1411:4, 1412:6, 1413:1, 1414:3, 1414:12, 1420:23, 1421:3, 1421:14, 1440:13, 1453:15, 1457:6, 1457:13, 1483:23, 1485:23, 1507:10 criteria [9] - 1391:2, 1391:19, 1392:9, 1392:18, 1393:1, 1393:3, 1495:15, 1502:16, 1503:15 critical [6] - 1385:17, 1385:22, 1417:11, 1424:2, 1424:3, 1427:12 criticisms [1] -1426:2 criticize [1] - 1426:3 cross [11] - 1389:24. 1408:18, 1446:10, 1454:20, 1456:14, 1459:22, 1466:2,

1468:9, 1486:24, 1500:9, 1500:13 CROSS [5] - 1390:2, 1411:7, 1452:2, 1460:18, 1509:9 cross-examination [2] - 1500:9, 1500:13 CROSS-**EXAMINATION** [4] -1390:2, 1411:7, 1452:2, 1460:18 cross-hatched [1] -1408:18 crosses [1] -1398:12 crossing [2] -1459:8, 1480:13 crossings [12] -1443:8, 1443:18, 1444:6, 1466:7, 1466:18, 1467:22, 1468:2, 1468:23, 1469:6, 1469:16, 1469:24 crosswalk [1] -1468:20 crowd [1] - 1365:20 cuff [1] - 1471:23 curious [1] - 1440:15 current (8) -1384:19, 1415:22, 1430:19, 1449:10, 1449:11, 1449:16, 1449:22, 1465:1 cut [6] - 1447:7, 1447:20, 1457:22, 1458:1, 1460:24, 1485:23 cut-through [2] -1457:22, 1458:1 CV [3] - 1368:7, 1368:10, 1510:6 CVS [5] - 1444:7, 1444:9, 1464:19, 1467:14, 1467:23 cycle [2] - 1464:2, 1478:5

D

dais [1] - 1429:17 Dalmally [1] -1464:19 dangerous [1] -1423:13 darker [1] - 1409:2 Darlington [1] -1378:8 data [1] - 1437:2 date [4] - 1373:7

1431:23, 1494:24, 1495.1 dated [4] - 1372:21, 1500:19, 1501:3, 1501:5 dates [1] - 1508:11 Daull [4] - 1418:24, 1462:19, 1492:12, 1498:23 DAULL [5] - 1419:2, 1462:21, 1492:15, 1492:17, 1499:1 David [1] - 1419:11 deal [3] - 1365:21, 1401:6, 1401:8 dealing [2] -1405:11, 1464:2 debilitating [1] -1425:4 decel [3] - 1432:19, 1432:21, 1438:13 December [5] -1372:21, 1399:20, 1403:4, 1404:22, 1415:6 decided [1] - 1427:6 decision [3] -1497:16, 1503:22, 1503:23 dedication [1] -1387:18 define [4] - 1390:9, 1390:11, 1390:17, 1390:18 defined [5] -1376:18, 1377:19, 1408:22, 1505:1, 1505:6 defines [1] - 1377:6 definition [1] -1422:21 degradation [1] -1423:4 degrade [1] - 1455:2 degree [3] - 1368:11, 1400:10, 1426:6 Delaware [1] -1391:17 delay [7] - 1454:13, 1496:1, 1496:5, 1501:23, 1502:13, 1502:22, 1503:1 demise [1] - 1384:2 demonstrate [2] -1374:16, 1385:15 demonstrated [1] -1388:4 demonstrates [1] -

density [1] - 1395:11 department's [1] -1479:7 dependent[1] -1467:11 depict [1] - 1380:19 depicted [1] - 1461:8 depicts [1] - 1381:8 depth [7] - 1384:17, 1384:19, 1390:13, 1390:17, 1390:22, 1391:4, 1415:3 depths [1] - 1378:6 describe [1] - 1368:8 described [3] -1389:21, 1408:8, 1462:6 describes [2] -1406:18 describing [1] -1390:22 design [16] -1368:14, 1374:7, 1374:16, 1374:24, 1375:4, 1375:21, 1386:18, 1404:4, 1405:8, 1407:2, 1436:10, 1448:11, 1461:6, 1483:15, 1486:14, 1505:6 Design [6] - 1371:23, 1374:9, 1381:10, 1387:20, 1423:16, 1423:22 designated [1] -1490:2 designation [2] -1454:10, 1454:12 designed [3] -1385:11, 1385:22, 1448:18 designer[1] -1484:22 desire [1] - 1438:11 desires [1] - 1481:22 despite [2] - 1380:9, 1469:20 destination [1] -1434:8 destinations [1] -1444:18 destined [2] -1433:24, 1440:7 detached [1] -1395:21 detailed [1] -1372:10 determination [2] -1375:16, 1481:4

determine [2] -

1404:11, 1497:10 determines [2] -1450:7, 1450:13 develop [2] - 1453:2, 1480:20 developed [3] -1384:9, 1387:23, 1455:4 developer [2] -1461:2, 1464:12 developers [1] -1363:18 development [39] -1370:3, 1370:11, 1372:11, 1372:14, 1374:9, 1375:8, 1375:17, 1381:10, 1383:1, 1383:6, 1384:16, 1385:1, 1385:6, 1386:2, 1388:9, 1388:10, 1393:20, 1393:21, 1394:6, 1395:2, 1409:9, 1414:14, 1415:5, 1415:7, 1423:12, 1424:8, 1427:11, 1446:12, 1446:19, 1454:14, 1461:7, 1464:21, 1469.1, 1469:8, 1470:12, 1470:20, 1483:5, 1501:24, 1503:16 Development [2] -1371:21, 1452:18 developments [1] -1452:22 **DeWolf** [1] - 1364:1 **DEWOLF** [45] -1362:15, 1366:8, 1366:11, 1420:6, 1420:11, 1420:16, 1420:21, 1421:3, 1421:8, 1421:14, 1421:20, 1422:2, 1422:17, 1423:15, 1423:24, 1424:10, 1426:8, 1436:1, 1471:12, 1472:12, 1473:6, 1473:14, 1473:20, 1474:1, 1474:11, 1474:14, 1474:18, 1474:20, 1475:2, 1475:12, 1475:23, 1476:3, 1476:8, 1476:22, 1477:6, 1477:13, 1477:17, 1477:22, 1478:10, 1478:15,

1482:5, 1482:8,

Dennis [1] - 1419:23

1482:21, 1482:24, 1505:14 diameter [1] -1407:23 Diana [1] - 1418:18 DiDomenico [1] -1364:3 DIDOMENICO [1] -1362:14 diem [1] - 1436:14 different [10] -1385:3, 1445:13, 1458:6, 1459:21, 1463:9, 1467:6, 1468:12, 1471:14, 1480:3, 1480:16 differentiate [1] -1390:20 differently [1] -1424:23 difficult [3] -1377:10, 1445:7, 1488:6 Dilworth [2] -1420:17, 1421:17 Dilworthtown [1] -1420:17 dimension [1] -1382:2 direct [14] - 1392:8, 1414:11, 1434:4, 1440:12, 1442:6, 1446:10, 1450:4, 1450:19, 1451:3, 1455:8, 1477:19, 1478:14, 1485:19, 1494:7 DIRECT [3] - 1367:9, 1430:12, 1509:9 direction [2] -1434:10, 1462:2 directly [7] - 1383:4, 1414:4, 1444:12, 1455:13, 1456:5, 1458:11, 1483:10 disagree [1] -1429:18 discourage [1] -1448:19 discuss [2] - 1406:5, 1483:1 discussed [2] -1466:10, 1508:12 Discussion [2] -1491:10, 1508:24 discussion [10] -1405:10, 1405:16, 1440:5, 1442:8, 1443:9, 1443:22, 1470:24, 1476:16,

1479:9, 1479:15 discussions [2] -1440:17, 1482:9 disposal [1] -1491:16 distance [9] -1381:16, 1382:2, 1382:16, 1425:21, 1432:24, 1455:12, 1477:14, 1477:19, 1480:13 distances [1] -1373:19 distracting [1] -1383:18 distribution [2] -1433:22, 1447:5 District [3] -1395:17, 1395:24, 1413:20 district [3] - 1395:19, 1403:21, 1422:13 districts [1] - 1396:4 disturb [2] - 1377:16, 1390:21 disturbance [8] -1375:19, 1377:12, 1378:2, 1385:5, 1385:15, 1386:23, 1423:9, 1427:7 disturbed [6] -1384:7, 1386:24, 1390:21, 1409:10, 1409:12, 1423:5 document [5] -1367:24, 1368:5, 1480:10, 1494:19, 1501:17 documents [3] -1373:5, 1373:10, 1429:17 dogleg [1] - 1486:2 done [7] - 1377:4, 1424:23, 1426:24, 1428:13, 1457:21, 1504:7, 1508:13 door[1] - 1490:4 double [2] - 1468:24, 1484:13 down [6] - 1402:11, 1404:15, 1428:22, 1475:5, 1475:7, 1479:18 drain [1] - 1489:24 draw [1] - 1392:21 drip [2] - 1490:3, 1491:18

drive [4] - 1392:20,

1425:16, 1467:15,

1473:2

Drive [2] - 1441:16, 1441:20 driveway [13] -1381:18, 1432:13, 1434:5, 1434:12, 1434:13, 1435:12, 1438:9, 1438:12, 1438:13, 1445:6, 1445:8, 1445:10, 1456:5 driveways [4] -1456:10, 1474:10, 1485:15, 1486:6 dry [1] - 1425:19 due [2] - 1378:6, 1469:1 DuFault [7] -1413:12, 1453:17, 1457:1, 1458:15, 1487:20, 1488:4, 1498:10 DUFAULT [19] -1413:14, 1453:19, 1454:4, 1454:8, 1454:15, 1454:18, 1455:10, 1456:13, 1457:2, 1457:8, 1457:20, 1457:24, 1458:4, 1458:12, 1487:23, 1488:8, 1488:15, 1488:20, 1498:12 duly [3] - 1367:7, 1430:10, 1494:3 during [21] -1431:18, 1431:22, 1437:17, 1438:7, 1438:19, 1439:3, 1440:15, 1451:3, 1454:20, 1455:8, 1455:23, 1455:24, 1457:14, 1462:2, 1473:17, 1473:22, 1473:23, 1474:7, 1477:19, 1478:14, 1496:13 dwellings [5] -1384:11, 1384:12, 1395:5, 1397:13,

Ε

1398:18

e-mail [1] - 1366:13 e-mails [1] - 1366:9 early [1] - 1404:1 easement [1] -1417:2 easements [2] -1416:22, 1417:8

easier[1] - 1424:19 easiest[1] - 1449:18 east[4] - 1382:2, 1427:11, 1442:12, 1457:15 East [4] - 1370:7, 1370:9, 1370:14, 1422:11 east-west [1] -1382:2 eastbound (11) -1434:16, 1439:8, 1439:23, 1445:16, 1446:16, 1455:22, 1456:19, 1457:3, 1484:11, 1503:4 eastern [1] - 1383:21 easy [3] - 1383:24, 1389:9, 1451:16 Ed [2] - 1419:16, 1499:2 education [1] -1368:9 educational [1] -1430:23 effect [1] - 1464:18 effective [1] -1395:13 effectively [1] -1441:17 effort [1] - 1386:5 efforts [2] - 1420:10, 1444:15 egg [1] - 1404:23 eighth [2] - 1363:16, 1363:23 Eileen [4] - 1419:19, 1463:6, 1492:22, 1499:5 either [12] - 1364:15, 1378:6, 1406:1, 1413:19, 1433:23, 1445:21, 1448:13, 1448:21, 1454:13, 1470:6, 1473:5, 1503:9 elaborate [1] -1480.4 Eleanor [3] - 1489:5, 1511:7, 1511:20 ELEANOR [1] -1362:23 element [2] - 1475:1, 1476:14 elements [2] -1474:24, 1505:6 elevation [1] -1381:15

eliminate [6] -

1451:5, 1464:11,

1486:1, 1486:7, 1496:7, 1503:5 eliminated [3] -1438:17, 1501:20, 1504:20 eliminating [1] -1486:12 elitist [1] - 1392:2 elongated [1] -1382:1 elsewhere [3] -1445:2, 1471:9, 1482:15 embrace [1] -1444:15 embraced [1] -1447:10 emphasize [1] -1366:19 employed [1] -1367:22 employer [2] -1369:14, 1430:19 enactment [2] -1380:4, 1381:12 encampment[1] -1381:12 encircled [1] -1382:5 encourage [2] -1467:13, 1480:7 encourages [1] -1452:12 encouraging [1] -1472:14 end [7] - 1392:22, 1425:13, 1425:15, 1428:16, 1428:19, 1484:16, 1487:13 ends [1] - 1412:10 engage [1] - 1405:23 engaged [1] -1375:14 engineer [7] -1401:5, 1431:7, 1435:5, 1484:21, 1491:14, 1491:16, 1499:19 engineer's [1] -1494:11 engineering [3] -1369:5, 1431:12, 1489:23 Engineering [1] -1396:12 English [1] - 1391:6 enhance [2] -1391:12, 1412:2 enter [2] - 1438:11, 1456:15

entered [2] -1499:21, 1504:3 entering [1] - 1434:3 entire [3] - 1378:5, 1388:8, 1422:10 entirely [5] -1370:14, 1374:10, 1384:15, 1392:23, 1448:10 entirety [1] - 1417:16 entitled [1] - 1396:12 entrance [1] -1484:23 entry [1] - 1485:8 equipment [6] -1443:8, 1443:19, 1459:12, 1466:8, 1466:18, 1480:14 **ESE** [1] - 1396:12 especially [2] -1414:18, 1438:12 **Esquire** [7] - 1363:2, 1363:3, 1363:5, 1363:7, 1363:8, 1363:10, 1363:11 essentially [6] -1375:24, 1399:1, 1454:2, 1462:5, 1464:13, 1466:20 estate [1] - 1460:24 estimated [2] -1433:23, 1454:13 etcetera [2] -1438:24, 1463:12 evaluate [5] -1377:15, 1390:23, 1488:1, 1503:11, 1505:1 evaluated [2] -1414:19, 1427:4 evaluating [1] -1378:11 evaluation [4] -1375:14, 1390:24, 1391:10, 1423:10 evening [30] -1363:16, 1364:9, 1364:14, 1364:21, 1365:8, 1365:23, 1366:18, 1372:4, 1416:8, 1428:10, 1429:1, 1458:17, 1470:2, 1487:21, 1488:23, 1489:8, 1489:11, 1489:14, 1490:8, 1492:14, 1493:5, 1493:15, 1500:12, 1506:1, 1506:8, 1506:11, 1506:13, 1506:16,

1507:1, 1508:3 event[1] - 1450:24 evidence [1] -1365:17 evolve [1] - 1449:23 evolved [1] - 1424:7 exactly [3] - 1425:2. 1468:2, 1477:4 **EXAMINATION** [8] -1367:9, 1390:2, 1411:7, 1430:12. 1452:2, 1460:18, 1494:5, 1497:7 examination [2] -1500:9, 1500:13 examined [3] -1367:7, 1430:10, 1494:3 example [16] -1382:15, 1388:10, 1410:3, 1412:18, 1414:16, 1422:12, 1425:9, 1432:12, 1434:2, 1434:8, 1434:14, 1437:12, 1439:23, 1462:2, 1468:5, 1469:15 excellent [1] -1394:5 exception [1] -1395:23 Excerpt [2] -1510:11, 1510:12 excerpt [1] - 1396:8 excluded [2] -1375:6, 1425:24 exclusively [1] -1369:16 excuse [3] - 1406:14, 1465:12, 1499:16 excused [3] -1428:7, 1487:5, 1505:21 Exhibit [26] - 1368:1, 1373:1, 1373:15, 1376:3, 1376:16, 1380:3, 1394:19, 1396:7, 1396:8, 1396:22, 1397:9, 1397:16, 1398:1, 1398:5, 1398:21, 1399:2, 1401:21, 1402:1, 1402:16, 1407:11, 1408:11, 1408:13, 1431:4, 1482:17, 1494:18, 1510:12 exhibit [3] - 1433:6,

1449:8, 1461:17

EXHIBITS [2] -

1510:4, 1510:9 exhibits [6] -1428:12, 1431:22, 1482:13, 1487:12, 1488:13, 1495:24 exist[1] - 1378:7 existing [19] -1396:2, 1397:2, 1398:6, 1398:8, 1399:11, 1407:17, 1407:19, 1407:24, 1408:19, 1409:21, 1436:8, 1437:14, 1442:12, 1452:22, 1457:17, 1464:1, 1471:8, 1472:6, 1472:24 exit[1] - 1438:13 expanded [1] -1396:1 expect [1] - 1412:5 experience [1] -1453:20 expert [7] - 1368:24, 1369:2, 1369:4, 1369:10, 1379:6, 1400:6, 1431:12 explain [5] - 1372:6, 1374:11, 1376:13, 1380:1, 1473:10 express [1] -1401:17 expressly [4] -1401:14, 1403:17, 1404:8, 1406:15 extend [4] - 1435:18, 1438:9, 1438:20, 1445:6 extended [1] -1389:19 extensions [1] -1452:24 extent [1] - 1446:3 exterior [1] - 1378:11 external [7] -1377:23, 1378:4, 1378:23, 1389:20, 1411:14, 1414:16, 1414:21 extra [2] - 1380:23, 1500:1 extremely [1] -1413:8

F

eye [1] - 1374:20

facade [3] - 1416:21, 1417:2, 1417:8 facilitate [1] -

1366:17 facilities [3] -1388:3, 1389:15, 1403:1 facility [1] - 1467:19 fact [16] - 1366:3, 1369:20, 1371:22, 1374:21, 1379:1, 1382:22, 1383:5, 1384:18, 1393:10, 1412:4, 1412:17, 1417:18, 1421:22, 1425:12, 1481:20, 1493:11 factor [1] - 1404:23 factors [1] - 1391:11 failing [3] - 1442:24, 1457:11, 1465:23 failure [1] - 1404:2 fair [3] - 1480:23, 1483:12, 1506:7 fairly [3] - 1365:4, 1443:5, 1465:24 fait [1] - 1375:24 faith [1] - 1406:1 familiar [23] -1369:24, 1371:15, 1371:19, 1372:2, 1372:7. 1379:15. 1414:2, 1414:5, 1420:16, 1420:21, 1421:1, 1424:18, 1441:13, 1452:4, 1452:11, 1452:15, 1452:20, 1453:3, 1475:8, 1476:8, 1477:6, 1478:10, 1483:2 family [9] - 1371:1, 1371:10, 1384:11, 1395:4, 1395:21, 1397:13, 1398:18 far [5] - 1364:4, 1387:14, 1399:4, 1464:14, 1472:7 farm [9] - 1381:23, 1393:16, 1443:8, 1443:18, 1466:8, 1466:18, 1480:1, 1480:14 Farm [25] - 1380:9, 1381:19, 1382:8, 1388:8, 1393:11, 1393:13, 1412:6, 1412:14, 1413:1, 1414:3, 1414:12, 1416:5, 1420:17, 1420:23, 1421:15, 1421:18, 1441:14,

1441:16, 1441:19,

1442:1, 1443:3, 1458:22, 1459:6, 1466:1, 1489:9 farm/agricultural [1] - 1459:22 favor [2] - 1402:7, 1436:2 features [1] -1385:23 federal [1] - 1421:5 Federico [16] -1431:18, 1432:11, 1435:15, 1438:2, 1445:5, 1445:20, 1446:22, 1448:24, 1454:20, 1455:9, 1485:18, 1497:13, 1500:2, 1500:11, 1501:8, 1506:9 Federico's [2] -1446:10, 1496:14 feet [30] - 1373:19, 1373:20, 1432:17, 1432:22, 1433:1, 1433:2, 1437:15, 1437:18, 1437:23, 1440:23, 1440:24, 1441:5, 1441:6, 1441:22, 1442:1, 1445:17, 1445:18, 1455:23, 1456:2, 1460:22, 1477:21, 1484:9, 1484:14, 1484:18, 1484:19, 1484:23, 1485:5, 1495:16 felt[1] - 1501:8 Feryo [6] - 1413:23, 1416:4, 1458:17, 1488:24, 1489:5, 1498:13 FERYO [11] - 1414:1, 1414:9, 1414:20, 1414:24, 1415:9, 1415:12, 1415:20, 1416:2, 1458:20, 1489:3, 1498:15 few [5] - 1411:5, 1433:18, 1439:5, 1446:7, 1452:1 field [3] - 1393:16, 1489:24, 1491:19 fifth [2] - 1375:13, 1444:23 figure [5] - 1433:22, 1434:17, 1461:22, 1462:1 figured [1] - 1489:19 figures [1] - 1495:5 file [1] - 1404:13

1501:12, 1502:5,

filled [1] - 1383:6 filter[1] - 1442:16 fina! [3] - 1444:23, 1470:3, 1481:24 findings [4] - 1432:3, 1432:5, 1446:21, 1465:16 fine [6] - 1416:9, 1426:5, 1428:17, 1428:20, 1429:24, 1507:20 fine-tuning [1] -1426:5 finish [3] - 1476:11, 1508:8, 1508:9 fire [1] - 1435:10 firm [1] - 1489:23 first [15] - 1364:14, 1367:6, 1374:14, 1379:2, 1380:6, 1405:9, 1430:9, 1432:7, 1432:9, 1433:5, 1439:15, 1449:19, 1499:23, 1499:24, 1500:24 firstly [3] - 1446:2, 1450:17, 1470:21 fit [1] - 1468:19 five [4] - 1432:5, 1465:16, 1468:17, 1469:17 Flexible [4] -1371:23, 1374:9, 1381:10, 1387:20 flexible [3] -1393:20, 1394:6, 1395:2 flow [3] - 1470:16, 1474:3, 1480:8 focused [1] - 1373:9 follow [3] - 1392:17, 1469:4, 1471:12 following [4] -1403:20, 1438:22, 1465:17, 1479:19 follows [3] - 1367:8, 1430:11, 1494:4 food [1] - 1467:14 footage [1] - 1463:8 forces [2] - 1374:4, 1379:3 Ford [1] - 1367:20 foregoing [1] -1511:9 foreground [1] -1381:12 forget [1] - 1470:4

forgive [1] - 1402:4

form [4] - 1393:23,

1413:14, 1468:13

formal [1] - 1379:12 former [3] - 1372:23, 1388:10, 1464:6 forth [3] - 1406:24, 1407:3, 1448:20 forward [5] -1428:22, 1429:4, 1437:4, 1476:21, 1490:21 four [2] - 1479:20, 1480:11 fourth [3] - 1375:6, 1388:12, 1443:21 fourths [2] - 1399:9, 1413:2 FRANK [1] - 1430:8 Frank [2] - 1430:16, 1509:14 frankly [9] - 1368:20, 1386:19, 1401:3, 1407:6, 1412:4, 1417:7, 1427:8, 1446:18, 1471:10 free [1] - 1480:8 free-flow [1] - 1480:8 frequently [1] -1369:24 FRONEFIELD [1] -1363:10 front [3] - 1406:3, 1478:20, 1478:22 frontage [3] -1444:9, 1474:22, 1483:17 fronts [1] - 1424:12 fruit [1] - 1464:11 fulfili [1] - 1497:20 fulfilled [1] - 1396:5 full [3] - 1436:9, 1455:20, 1504:7 fully [2] - 1374:15, 1415:7 functionality [3] -1439:3, 1440:19, 1442:4 future [10] - 1388:9, 1416:23, 1452:24, 1455:3, 1464:3, 1464:15, 1468:24, 1469:8, 1469:16, 1472:20 fuzzy [1] - 1381:4

G

Gadaleto [1] -1418:7 gain [1] - 1461:9 gathered [1] -1436:16

generalized [1] -1396:17 generally [3] -1387:2, 1389:18, 1485:14 generation [1] -1417:15 gentlemen [3] -1364:9, 1365:14, 1509:2 geology [1] - 1373:8 given [4] - 1493:11, 1493:14, 1503:24, 1506:7 glad [1] - 1416:19 Glen [1] - 1413:20 government [1] -1421:5 governs [1] -1394:23 grade [2] - 1436:19, 1436:20 grant [2] - 1406:21, 1427:15 granted [1] - 1427:15 graphic [2] - 1375:7, 1410:4 grasp [1] - 1457:12 gray [1] - 1409:2 great [1] - 1455:2 greater [8] - 1374:3, 1383:13, 1426:6, 1433:2, 1474:3, 1484:17, 1485:5, 1502:12 greens [1] - 1468:14 **GREGG** [1] - 1363:3 gross [1] - 1403:7 ground [3] -1381:13, 1388:3, 1490:5 groundwater [1] -1408:24 groups [1] - 1469:3 Grove [22] - 1383:20, 1388:20, 1393:6, 1396:24, 1397:3, 1438:6, 1439:19, 1439:24, 1440:23, 1444:22, 1450:9, 1450:15, 1475:15, 1476:17, 1477:1, 1477:5, 1477:15, 1477:20, 1483:1, 1495:12, 1495:14, 1502:11

gears [1] - 1442:20

general [5] -

1420:20, 1424:11,

1424:13, 1426:2

grow [1] - 1436:21 Growth [8] -1369:21, 1371:17, 1387:17, 1400:19, 1401:2, 1475:3, 1475:24, 1476:9 growth [6] - 1380:10, 1436:12, 1436:15, 1436:24, 1455:21, 1464:4 guess [12] - 1379:19, 1380:16, 1398:4, 1415:14, 1442:11, 1455:14, 1459:1, 1464:11, 1467:3, 1469:4, 1484:20, 1501:16 Guidelines [2] -1441:4, 1441:8 guidelines [1] -1432:21

Н hallmark [1] -1466:12 hand [4] - 1367:24, 1397:6, 1409:13, 1511:15 handed [3] -1394:18, 1396:6, 1431:4 handing [1] - 1368:2 handwritten [1] -1397:6 hanging [1] -1464:11 hard [1] - 1429:20 Harkins (3) - 1418:3. 1460:5, 1498:17 HARKINS [4] -1418:4, 1460:7, 1460:9, 1498:18 harmoniously [1] -1453:2 Harris [1] - 1379:7 hatched [1] -1408:18 Haws [1] - 1364:2 HAWS [30] -1362:15, 1426:12, 1426:15, 1427:17, 1465:14, 1466:24, 1467:3, 1467:21, 1469:4, 1469:11, 1469:14, 1470:3, 1471:2, 1471:11, 1483:3, 1483:14, 1484:20, 1485:13, 1486:17, 1499:18,

1502:8, 1502:17, 1503:10, 1504:9, 1504:15, 1504:17, 1505:9, 1508:21 head [2] - 1442:16, 1484:1 heading [5] - 1434:7, 1434:10, 1457:15, 1457:16, 1462:4 hear [7] - 1365:10, 1429:5, 1430:6, 1472:17, 1488:6, 1489:4, 1493:19 heard [12] - 1366:5, 1379:11, 1427:23, 1435:14, 1443:4, 1443:9, 1467:6, 1476:15, 1479:15, 1484:24, 1496:21, 1508:5 hearing [17] -1363:17, 1364:10, 1365:12, 1370:23, 1371:3, 1371:8, 1371:13, 1379:10, 1431:23, 1436:3, 1440:16, 1487:16, 1490:16, 1490:20, 1493:18, 1507:19, 1509:3 Hearing [1] -1362:10 hearings [3] -1379:5, 1431:19, 1432:2 height [1] - 1395:12 held [1] - 1362:10 help [3] - 1389:6, 1426:5, 1473:1 hereby [1] - 1511:8 herein [3] - 1367:6, 1396:5, 1430:9 hereunto [1] -1511:14 heritage [1] -1421:22 Hessian [1] - 1379:2 hi [2] - 1416:9, 1426:14 Hidden [2] - 1382:14, 1382:15 hide [1] - 1412:13 High [1] - 1362:10 high [2] - 1408:23, 1437:3 higher [1] - 1474:8 highest [1] - 1434:8 highlighted [1] -

highly [1] - 1421:4 highway [3] -1479:2, 1481:7, 1485:6 hill [4] - 1381:22, 1383:3, 1413:7, 1425:3 Hill [4] - 1413:9, 1420:14, 1420:24, 1421:17 hinder [1] - 1461:12 hires [1] - 1369:18 historic [6] - 1387:9, 1400:9, 1400:11. 1400:12, 1411:18, 1412:1 historical [6] -1378:7, 1388:16, 1389:7, 1391:13, 1417:11, 1425:5 history [5] - 1369:5, 1400:6, 1421:21, 1424:6, 1435:20 hmm [3] - 1396:10, 1398:10, 1477:22 HOA [5] - 1413:13, 1413:17, 1413:18, 1413:20, 1487:22 Hoffman [1] -1413:18 Hoffman's [1] -1367:20 hold [3] - 1428:18, 1431:1, 1487:12 Hollow [14] - 1380:5, 1380:7, 1381:13, 1381:15, 1382:21, 1384:14, 1384:23, 1393:12, 1399:3, 1399:4, 1399:15, 1412:6, 1413:4 home [2] - 1392:3, 1467:3 Homes [2] - 1372:11, 1372:17 homes [6] - 1385:4, 1397:21, 1398:14, 1398:16, 1398:23, 1442:12 hope [2] - 1450:17, 1481:17 horrible [1] - 1459:9 horse [2] - 1443:7, 1459:5 horses [1] - 1459:10 host [2] - 1439:10, 1505:5 hosting [1] - 1443:6 hosts [2] - 1434:18,

hour [13] - 1437:14, 1437:18, 1438:8, 1438:19, 1438:21, 1438:22, 1438:23, 1438:24, 1457:15, 1473:17, 1473:21, 1508:3 hours [2] - 1439:4, 1439:6 house [1] - 1416:17 houses [4] - 1374:2, 1382:14, 1383:7, 1393:17 hundred [1] -1425:17 hundreds [2] -1442:12, 1469:21 hunt[1] - 1404:15

lan [1] - 1423:21 idea [2] - 1471:7, 1473:5 identification [3] -1377:2, 1405:13, 1408:4 identified [4] -1377:3, 1382:6, 1405:14, 1408:5 identifies [2] -1376:5, 1409:9 identify [4] - 1368:5, 1380:2, 1386:15, 1494:18 III [1] - 1413:17 iliustrate [1] -1472:22 illustrates [2] -1494:21, 1502:6 immediate [1] -1395:14 immediately [2] -1466:4, 1490:1 impact [18] -1385:19, 1385:20, 1406:7, 1445:24, 1446:11, 1446:18, 1472:2, 1479:3, 1479:4, 1479:16, 1480:15, 1480:16, 1480:18, 1480:20, 1480:21, 1484:2, 1486:8, 1502:24 impacts [9] - 1386:6, 1386:18, 1406:7, 1407:5, 1439:8, 1453:24, 1479:24, 1495:17, 1505:8

impede [1] - 1438:11

implemented [1] -1473:8 importance [6] -1378:12, 1381:7, 1383:13, 1386:16, 1386:20, 1427:6 important [18] -1366:6, 1375:9, 1377:5, 1377:8, 1378:13, 1378:24, 1380:12, 1386:6, 1389:2, 1389:5, 1407:17, 1407:19, 1412:7, 1412:17, 1417:10, 1423:3, 1423:8, 1423:20 importantly [1] -1455:7 imposed [1] -1454:23 improvement [2] -1440:19, 1503:2 improvements [20] -1437:21, 1445:15, 1445:19, 1445:23, 1446:2, 1446:13, 1446:17, 1448:3, 1454:1, 1454:9, 1455:20, 1466:10, 1466:22, 1467:9, 1467:12, 1479:19, 1481:3, 1496:10, 1496:20, 1497:10 IN [2] - 1362:7, 1511:14 in/out[1] - 1461:4 in/right [13] -1432:10, 1432:16, 1434:5, 1434:22, 1435:3, 1437:17, 1440:6, 1462:7, 1473:7, 1474:14, 1484:6, 1501:19, 1504:19 inbound [1] - 1474:2 incentivize [2] -1472:20, 1473:1 inches [1] - 1407:22 inclined [1] -1481:11 include [3] -1444:20, 1484:7, 1484:12 included [2] -1385:18, 1435:6

impedes [1] -

implement [2] -

1450:10, 1450:16

1415:22

1436:11, 1450:2, 1481:9, 1484:6 including [4] -1377:9, 1407:21, 1440:10, 1450:6 inclusive [1] -1511:10 incompatibility [1] -1491:17 incomplete [3] -1375:5, 1410:7, 1410:13 incorporate [1] -1375:9 Incorporated [1] -1430:21 incorrect [3] -1476:23, 1497:1, 1497:2 increase [9] -1462:11, 1463:11, 1485:3, 1495:15, 1501:21, 1501:23, 1502:9, 1502:11 increased [1] -1459:10 increases [1] -1480:13 increasing [2] -1463:10, 1471:14 incredibly [1] -1378:16 independent [1] -1401:9 indicate [3] -1393:11, 1409:17, 1458:1 indicated [2] -1384:4, 1496:19 indicates [3] -1373:18, 1409:19, 1436:7 indicating [1] -1457:21 indication [1] -1468:19 individual [1] -1409:4 industrial [1] -1395:16 inference [1] -1383:12 inferred [1] -1417:18 inform [2] - 1374:23, 1506:21 information [3] -1374:19, 1375:3, 1375:5 initial [2] - 1401:22,

1471:5 initiated [1] -1423:16 inn [1] - 1378:8 inside [2] - 1393:5, 1407:23 installation [1] -1482:18 installed [2] -1481:3, 1481:14 installing [1] -1481:12 instances [1] -1441:11 instead [3] -1375:23, 1438:5, 1456:12 institutional [1] -1429:10 intact [1] - 1378:16 integrate [1] -1472:17 intend [1] - 1487:16 intended [3] -1375:20, 1388:17, 1464:10 intention [2] -1368:23, 1406:19 intentions [1] -1443:20 intercept [1] - 1477:4 interconnected [2] -1424:22, 1425:8 interest [4] -1370:23, 1371:2, 1371:7, 1371:12 interested [2] -1421:5, 1435:23 interests [1] -1421:15 interject [1] - 1431:4 intermediate [1] -1425:22 internal [5] -1377:21, 1389:15, 1389:16, 1389:17, 1425:8 internally [2] -1507:6, 1508:13 interpretation [5] -1378:14, 1386:21, 1388:16, 1389:6, 1391:13 interpretive [3] -1380:12, 1385:9, 1427:14 intersection [60] -1432:17, 1439:18, 1439:21, 1440:1, 1440:18, 1440:22,

1439:9

includes [4] -

1441:5, 1441:12, 1441:13, 1441:16, 1441:19, 1441:21, 1441:24, 1442:22, 1442:23, 1443:2, 1443:5, 1443:20, 1444:5, 1444:7, 1446:12, 1446:19, 1447:14, 1447:16, 1447:22, 1448:12, 1454:5, 1454:24, 1459:21, 1460:23, 1461:4, 1465:21, 1465:22, 1465:24, 1466:3, 1466:4, 1466:5, 1466:6, 1466:11, 1466:14, 1466:15, 1468:16, 1477:24, 1478:3, 1478:9, 1479:21, 1480:24, 1482:20, 1483:7, 1486:14, 1495:22, 1496:1, 1496:6, 1496:18, 1497:11, 1501:20, 1501:21, 1502:1, 1502:22, 1503:2 intersections [2] -1463:20, 1467:16 intervenes [1] -1412:10 introduce [1] -1364:1 introduced [1] -1500:1 intrusion [3] -1385:11, 1385:16, 1386:12 invariably [1] -1447:24 investigating [1] -1442:8 involved [4] -1370:10, 1371:11, 1391:14, 1406:17 involvement [2] -1400:1, 1400:21 inward [1] - 1393:15 irrigation [2] -1490:3, 1491:19 islands [1] - 1448:15 issue [4] - 1378:13, 1439:15, 1439:17, 1481:7 issues [2] - 1440:4, 1481:23 items [1] - 1416:18 iteration [1] -1423:20 iterative [5] -

1375:21, 1404:3, 1404:8, 1406:20, 1406:21 iteratively [1] -1406:5 itself [8] - 1368:21, 1413:4, 1441:10, 1444:11, 1445:8, 1471:21, 1472:3, 1472:11

J

Jaeger [1] - 1419:7 January [2] - 1415:6, 1433:12 Jeffrey [2] - 1419:12, 1462:24 Jennifer [2] -1419:12, 1462:24 Jim [1] - 1419:22 JOHN [2] - 1363:11, 1367:5 John [12] - 1364:19, 1364:23, 1367:3, 1367:12, 1382:18, 1418:10, 1420:6, 1426:12, 1428:5, 1476:4, 1509:10 Jones [1] - 1418:8 July [1] - 1432:13

K

KATHRYN [1] -1363:7 Kathy [1] - 1431:3 keep [5] - 1417:15, 1430:5, 1438:21, 1443:12, 1446:7 keeping [2] -1437:11, 1443:19 Kenilworth [1] -1430:17 Kentucky [1] -1391:16 key [2] - 1384:16, 1421:9 kind [4] - 1395:7, 1416:12, 1453:21, 1483:17 Kirk [1] - 1418:22 Kline [11] - 1431:18, 1493:10, 1493:19, 1493:23, 1494:2, 1497:9, 1499:15, 1500:5, 1505:20, 1509:19, 1510:13

Kiine's [1] - 1450:19

knowing [1] -

1443:17
knowledge [2] 1388:5, 1499:22
known [3] - 1371:17,
1408:1, 1444:14
knows [1] - 1444:3
Kramer [3] 1419:12, 1462:23,
1462:24
KRAMER [1] 1419:13
Kristin [1] - 1368:22
KRISTIN [1] - 1363:5

L

labeled [1] - 1408:16

L.P [1] - 1362:8

LABRUM [12] -

1429:13, 1430:13,

1363:7, 1411:1,

1431:5, 1431:13, 1431:15, 1449:3, 1451:7, 1486:22, 1487:8, 1498:5 labrum [5] - 1410:23, 1429:12, 1486:20, 1487:6, 1498:3 ladies [3] - 1364:9, 1365:13, 1509:1 Land [2] - 1371:21, 1452:18 land [12] - 1368:20, 1369:2, 1369:10, 1369:14, 1370:3, 1370:10, 1370:15, 1372:14, 1373:11, 1374:5, 1387:16, 1425:18 lands [1] - 1387:19 Lands [1] - 1369:21 landscape [26] -1378:15, 1378:16, 1385:9, 1388:16, 1389:7, 1391:19, 1391:20, 1391:22, 1391:24, 1392:2, 1393:22, 1394:14, 1395:11, 1396:14, 1396:23, 1397:10, 1397:20, 1398:15, 1401:7, 1415:21, 1424:2, 1424:4, 1425:5, 1427:4, 1427:5, 1427:13 Landscape [1] -1396:13 landscapes [4] -1391:18, 1392:11, 1423:11, 1423:18

landscaping [2] -1383:24, 1397:17 lane [12] - 1432:19, 1432:21, 1438:13, 1446:15, 1446:16, 1461:12, 1485:4, 1495:13, 1496:2, 1496:7, 1502:23, 1503:4 lanes [3] - 1479:20, 1479:23, 1480:11 language [1] -1391:7 large [4] - 1383:20, 1400:22, 1407:21, 1460:23 largely [2] - 1382:5, 1386:2 last[11] - 1364:12, 1365:22, 1379:9, 1380:5, 1391:15, 1391:22, 1437:3, 1490:20, 1493:13, 1501:1, 1501:5 lastly [1] - 1397:24 layout [5] - 1424:11, 1424:12, 14**24:13**, 1425:10, 14**52:24** lavs [1] - 1479:20 leading [1] - 1443:24 least [8] - 1365:5, 1366:4, 1409:24, 1412:22, 1435:14, 1445:21, 1466:5, 1482:19 leave [3] - 1379:9, 1440:13, 1454:24 leaving [3] - 1434:7, 1439:13, 1473:20 left [20] - 1364:4, 1364:5, 1364:22, 1434:15, 1434:19, 1437:12, 1439:22, 1442:17, 1445:12, 1457:16, 1461:5, 1479:20, 1480:11, 1484:1, 1485:22, 1486:2, 1486:12, 1496:6, 1499:7, 1503:4 lefts [2] - 1448:18, 1448:19 leg [4] - 1383:21, 1383:22, 1388:12, 1398:9 legs [1] - 1466:3 length [3] - 1422:1, 1436:7, 1440:16 lengths [5] -1459:12, 1463:9,

1464:2, 1478:5, 1483:8 Leraris [1] - 1418:18 less [7] - 1374:5, 1391:9, 1415:23, 1455:12, 1455:24, 1467:10, 1484:18 letter [12] - 1399:20, 1399:21, 1403:4, 1454:11, 1479:1, 1494:20, 1494:24, 1495:1, 1495:3, 1495:4, 1499:20, 1510:13 level [2] - 1445:15, 1454.6 levels [2] - 1442:24, 1465:23 lexicon [1] - 1422:14 life [2] - 1435:10, 1439:12 light [1] - 1468:14 lights [5] - 1463:10, 1463:13, 1463:18, 1463:22, 1464:22 likelihood [1] -1486:3 likely [6] - 1366:3, 1378:17, 1401:24, 1432:19, 1438:10, 1448:14 likewise [1] - 1434:6 limit [1] - 1492:5 limited [2] - 1439:21, 1488:19 Linda [1] - 1420:3 line [5] - 1392:21, 1432:15, 1446:1, 1468:13, 1485:9 lined [1] - 1456:10 lines [2] - 1407:21, 1438:15 link [1] - 1399:16 linked [1] - 1391:11 linking [1] - 1389:17 list [6] - 1365:19, 1408:6, 1408:22, 1409:5, 1417:19, 1428:22 listed [1] - 1409:15 lists [2] - 1392:11 LISTSERV [2] -1366:18, 1507:8 literally [1] - 1427:1 live [3] - 1425:13, 1472:14, 1475:19 LLC [1] - 1363:9 local [3] - 1450:21, 1450:22, 1505:2

locate [2] - 1456:4,

1458:10 located [2] -1420:12, 1432:16 location [14] -1387:15, 1421:21, 1432:12, 1437:16, 1442:4. 1443:11. 1458:7, 1466:23, 1471:16, 1472:9, 1474:7, 1474:9, 1478:1, 1482:9 look [13] - 1397:5, 1397:24, 1398:14, 1398:21, 1445:12, 1447:5, 1447:13, 1447:15, 1449:4, 1460:20, 1461:22, 1471:24, 1503:8 looked [6] - 1393:4, 1410:3, 1441:10, 1457:24, 1476:9, 1476:13 looking [13] -1393:15, 1409:16, 1411:11, 1412:18, 1414:6, 1426:17, 1432:14, 1434:17, 1437:12, 1440:20, 1455:16, 1461:17, 1461:21 looks [5] - 1442:21, 1449:17, 1502:21, 1503:1, 1503:8 loop [2] - 1425:14, 1425:15 lost [2] - 1465:18, 1490:17 love [1] - 1377:24 low [1] - 1464:11 low-hanging [1] -1464:11 lower [4] - 1397:6, 1437:12, 1438:24, 1443:13

M

ma'am [5] - 1419:14, 1419:21, 1420:2, 1465:5, 1465:8 mail [1] - 1366:13 mails [1] - 1366:9 main [2] - 1378:19, 1381:17 maintained [3] -1395:15, 1397:17, 1398:7 majority [2] -1434:21, 1439:9 Mammucari [3] -

1377:8, 1377:11, 1377:14, 1384:3, 1391:18, 1407:11, 1407:21, 1409:1, 1409:22, 1426:23, 1427:1, 1460:21, 1461:9 mapable [1] - 1410:1 mapped [4] -1376:21, 1384:6, 1392:13, 1407:13 mapping [3] -1409:8, 1410:10, 1427:9 maps [1] - 1376:10 March [1] - 1478:24 MARK [1] - 1363:8 marked [11] - 1368:1, 1373:1, 1373:15, 1376:2, 1380:2, 1380:15, 1394:19, 1396:7, 1427:4, 1444:6, 1494:18 Market [2] - 1464:20, 1467:24 market [1] - 1427:16 marriage [1] -1368:14 Wartin [1] - 1413:17 mass [3] - 1383:21, 1472:9, 1472:13 masses [1] - 1378:7 master's [1] -1368:13 material [1] -1469:21 materialize [1] -1437:1 materials (3) -1373:3, 1376:1, 1432:3 Matt [1] - 1420:3 matter [7] - 1418:11,

1418:5, 1460:11,

MAMMUCARI [1] -

manageable [1] -

Management [8] -

1369:21, 1371:17,

1387:18, 1400:20,

1401:2, 1475:3,

Manager [3] -

1362:18, 1364:5,

manner [2] - 1424:9,

map [14] - 1377:5,

1475:24, 1476:10

1460:12

1418:6

1480:22

1372:23

1459:23

1432:2, 1448:8, 1455:18, 1463:17, 1497:13, 1511:12 matters [1] - 1497:14 maximum [2] -1395:13, 1437:15 McCarg [1] - 1423:21 McDermott [1] -1419:22 McFadden [1] -1419:23 McFalls [1] - 1413:21 McKenna [5] -1364:6, 1364:7, 1411:6, 1429:13, 1507:16 MCKENNA [131] -1363:2, 1364:8, 1364:17, 1364:20, 1366:10, 1366:15, 1366:24, 1369:9, 1389:24, 1402:6, 1402:13, 1410:16, 1410:19, 1410:23, 1411:3, 1413:12, 1413:16, 1416:3, 1417:23, 1418:2, 1418:5, 1418:7, 1418:15, 1419:3, 1419:14, 1419:18, 1419:21, 1420:2, 1426:10, 1427:22, 1428:2, 1428:8, 1428:18, 1428:21, 1429:4, 1429:11, 1429:18, 1430:1, 1431:8, 1431:11, 1451:9, 1451:15, 1451:21, 1453:7, 1453:13, 1453:17, 1456:24, 1458:14, 1458:21, 1460:3, 1460:8, 1460:10, 1461:15, 1462:17, 1462:22, 1463:5, 1465:5, 1465:8, 1465:12, 1476:11, 1478:17, 1479:14, 1480:4, 1480:18, 1480:23, 1481:10, 1481:20, 1482:4, 1482:7, 1482:12, 1482:23, 1486:18, 1486:23, 1487:2, 1487:6, 1487:10, 1487:18, 1488:3, 1488:12, 1488:16, 1488:21, 1489:4, 1489:12, 1489:19,

1490:18, 1490:24, 1491:4, 1491:8, 1491:11, 1491:20, 1491:24, 1492:6, 1492:12, 1492:16, 1492:18, 1492:22, 1493:1, 1493:3, 1493:16, 1493:23, 1497:4, 1497:23, 1498:3, 1498:6, 1498:10, 1498:13, 1498:16, 1498:19, 1498:23, 1499:2, 1499:5, 1499:11, 1499:14, 1499:22, 1500:3, 1500:14, 1501:11, 1504:14, 1504:16, 1505:11, 1505:15, 1505:19, 1505:22, 1506:6, 1506:14, 1507:20, 1507:23, 1508:23, 1509:1 McMahon [1] -1449:7 mean [12] - 1403:21, 1422:19, 1422:20, 1423:2, 1424:7, 1425:9, 1469:2, 1471:20, 1480:5, 1488:5, 1490:19, 1503:14 means (11) -1380:23, 1389:5, 1390:19, 1390:23, 1405:16, 1423:3, 1424:8, 1426:23, 1447:18, 1448:20, 1451:4 meant [2] - 1471:2, 1500:14 measure [2] -1399:6, 1433:1 measured [1] -1399:7 measures [2] -1450:9, 1450:15 meet [3] - 1386:11, 1432:20, 1445:7 meeting [6] - 1449:5, 1470:5, 1487:24, 1488:9, 1489:17, 1490:10 Meetinghouse [1] -1420:15 meetings [5] -1382:23, 1406:2, 1406:4, 1470:6, 1504:2

meets [1] - 1448:2

Megan [1] - 1419:15 member [3] - 1370:6, 1370:9, 1426:10 members [2] -1371:1, 1371:11 memorandum [2] -1372:20, 1373:4 memory [1] -1476:15 mention [2] -1442:10, 1470:9 mentioned [11] -1373:13, 1384:13, 1435:9, 1435:21, 1444:18, 1446:9, 1450:3, 1473:6, 1478:18, 1480:7, 1482:11 mentioning [1] -1467:1 mentions [1] -1456:8 Merit [1] - 1511:8 merry [1] - 1447:3 message [1] -1467:4 met [1] - 1455:6 methods [1] -1472:16 metric [1] - 1456:4 mic [1] - 1453:20 MICHAEL [1] -1362:14 microphone [2] -1436:2, 1488:5 middle [1] - 1380:7 might [14] - 1366:12, 1375:18, 1385:6, 1390:20, 1391:8, 1415:2, 1423:9, 1427:16, 1443:19, 1458:2. 1459:17. 1477:7, 1484:17 Mike [1] - 1364:3 mike [1] - 1367:14 mile [3] - 1399:7, 1399:9, 1413:2 miles [1] - 1425:16 Mill [1] - 1367:20 mind [9] - 1429:10, 1435:14, 1437:11, 1438:21, 1446:8, 1448:4, 1451:17, 1488:4, 1488:7 mine [1] - 1446:18 minimal [2] -1385:11, 1473:23 minimization [1] -1385:15 minimize [2] -

1490:6, 1490:12,

1386:5, 1386:12 minimized [1] -1446:4 minimum [3] -1365:10, 1479:19, 1482:17 minor[1] - 1468:10 minute [2] - 1451:18, 1491:9 minutes (3) -1451:19, 1491:3, 1491:7 mitigate [5] -1383:24, 1386:6, 1406:7, 1415:13, 1502:24 mitigated [4] -1446:13, 1446:20, 1453:24, 1495:18 mitigation [16] -1375:18, 1384:2, 1385:20, 1386:18, 1386:23, 1393:24, 1407:5, 1454:16, 1495:21, 1496:1, 1496:4, 1496:17, 1502:13, 1502:17, 1503:3, 1504:5 mix [2] - 1385:3, 1426:4 mobile [1] - 1392:3 modal [2] - 1471:14, 1472:15 modalism [1] -1444:16 model [3] - 1382:24, 1415:6 modeled [1] - 1464:8 modifications [2] -1496:7, 1503:5 Moir [1] - 1379:8 Moir's [1] - 1379:11 moment [2] -1370:13, 1394:17 momentarily [1] -1433:4 month [6] - 1492:2, 1492:7, 1501:1, 1501:5, 1508:9, 1508:16 morning [6] -1437:23, 1474:11, 1474:12, 1474:15, 1502:4, 1502:19 Moscharis [2] -1363:12, 1418:9 most [17] - 1376:18, 1378:1, 1378:13, 1385:22, 1390:4, 1401:24, 1420:13,

1423:4, 1424:5, 1427:12, 1434:4, 1436:13, 1437:1, 1440:6, 1447:22, 1450:21, 1480:8 motorists [1] -1440:12 mounted [1] - 1459:4 move [8] - 1365:1, 1385:4, 1424:17, 1428: 12, 1455:11, 1468:20, 1469:3, 1487:19 moved [2] - 1455:12, 1483:9 movement [11] -1434:14, 1438:16, 1442:4, 1457:3, 1470:9, 1473:18, 1473:23, 1474:7, 1474:13, 1496:5, 1503:1 movements [10] -1384:21, 141**2**:7, 1448:12, 1456:18, 1456:19, 1457:3, 1457:10, 1472:1, 1486:15, 1505:4 moving [8] - 1385:1, 1397:14, 1428:22, 1429:4, 1443:12, 1466:13, 1476:20, 1490:21 MR [279] - 1364:8, 1364:16, 1364:17, 1364:19, 1364:20, 1366:10, 1366:15, 1366:23, 1366:24, 1368:22, 1369:3, 1369:7, 1369:9, 1389:24, 1390:1, 1390:3, 1402:6, 1402:13, 1402:14, 1410:14, 1410:16, 1410:18, 1410:19, 1410:21, 1410:23, 1411:3, 1411:5, 1411:8, 1413:10, 1413:12, 1413:14, 1413:16, 1414:1, 1414:9, 1414:20, 1414:24, 1415:9, 1415:12, 1415:20, 1416:2, 1416:3, 1416:7, 1416:11, 1417:12, 1417:21, 1417:23, 1418:1, 1418:2, 1418:5,

1418:6, 1418:7,

1418:13, 1418:15,

1419:2, 1419:3, 1419:14, 1419:17, 1419:18, 1419:21, 1420:2, 1421:12, 1426:10, 1426:12, 1426:15, 1427:17, 1427:22, 1427:24, 1428:2, 1428:5, 1428:8, 1428:15, 1428:18, 1428:21, 1429:2, 1429:4, 1429:8, 1429:11, 1429:18, 1429:22, 1430:1, 1431:3, 1431:6, 1431:8, 1431:11, 1433:9, 1433:16, 1451:9, 1451:13, 1451:15, 1451:21, 1453:7, 1453:11, 1453:13, 1453:16, 1453:17, 1453:19, 1454:4, 1454:8, **14**54:15, 1454:18, 1455:10, 1456:13, 1456:24, 1457:2, 1457:8, 1457:20, 1457:24, 1458:4, 1458:12, 1458:14, 1458:20, 1458:21, 1458:24, 1459:15, 1459:19, 1460:2, 1460:3, 1460:8, 1460:10, 1460:16, 1460:19, 1461:15, 1461:19, 1461:20, 1462:14, 1462:17, 1462:21, 1462:22, 1463:4, 1463:5, 1465:5, 1465:8, 1465:12, 1465:14, 1466:24, 1467:3, 1467:21, 1469:4, 1469:11, 1469:14, 1470:3, 1471:2, 1471:11, 1476:11, 1478:17, 1479:14, 1480:4, 1480:18, 1480:23, 1481:10, 1481:20, 1482:4, 1482:7, 1482:12, 1482:23, 1483:3, 1483:14, 1484:20, 1485:13, 1486:17, 1486:18, 1486:23, 1487:1, 1487:2, 1487:6, 1487:10, 1487:17, 1487:18, 1487:23, 1488:3, 1488:8, 1488:12, 1488:15,

1488:20, 1488:21, 1489:3, 1489:4, 1489:10, 1489:12, 1489:15, 1489:18, 1489:19, 1489:22, 1490:6, 1490:9, 1490:12, 1490:14, 1490:18, 1490:19, 1490:24, 1491:3, 1491:4, 1491:7, 1491:8, 1491:11, 1491:15, 1491:20, 1491:23, 1491:24, 1492:3, 1492:6, 1492:10, 1492:12, 1492:15, 1492:16, 1492:17, 1492:18, 1492:21, 1492:22, 1493:1, 1493:3, 1493:7, 1493:16, 1493:21, 1493:23, 1494:6, 1497:3, 1497:4, 1497:23, 1498:1, 1498:3, 1498:6, 1498:8, 1498:10, 1498:12, 1498:13, 1498:15, 1498:16, 1498:19, 1498:21, 1498:23, 1499:1, 1499:2, 1499:4, 1499:5, 1499:11, 1**499**:13, 1499:14, 1499:18, 1499:22, 1499:24, 1500:3, 1500:8, 1500:14, 1500:16, 1500:22, 1500:23, 1501:4, 1501:9, 1501:11, 1501:12, 1502:5, 1502:8, 1502:17, 1503:10, 1504:9, 1504:14, 1504:15, 1504:16, 1504:17, 1505:9, 1505:11, 1505:15, 1505:17, 1505:19, 1505:22, 1506:2, 1506:6, **1506:12**, 1506:14, 1507:16, 1507:20, 1507:22, 1507:23, 1508:21, 1508:23, 1509:1 MS [91] - 1366:8, 1366:11, 1367:2, 1367:10, 1369:1, 1369:6, 1369:12, 1389:22, 1411:1, 1418:4, **1419:13**, 1419:20, 1420:1, 1420:6, 1420:11, 1420:16, 1420:21,

1421:3, 1421:8, 1421:14, 1421:20, 1422:2, 1422:17, 1423:15, 1423:24, 1424:10, 1426:8, 1427:21, 1428:11, 1428:17, 1428:20, 1429:13, 1430:13, 1431:5, 1431:10, 1431:13, 1431:15, 1433:13, 1436:1, 1449:3, 1451:7, 1452:1. 1452:3. 1453:5, 1460:7, 1460:9, 1463:7, 1464:17, 1465:4, 1465:7, 1465:11, 1471:12, 1472:12, 1473:6, 1473:14, 1473:20, 1474:1, 1474:11, 1474:14, 1474:18, 1474:20, 1475:2, 1475:12, 1475:23, 1476:3, 1476:8, 1476:22, 1477:6, 1477:13, 1477:17, 1477:22, 1478:10, 1478:15, 1482:5, 1482:8, 1482:21, 1482:24, 1486:22, 1487:8, 1492:24, 1493:2, 1497:6, 1497:8, 1497:22, 1498:5, 1498:18, 1499:10, 1500:18, 1501:2, 1501:6, 1505:14 multi [5] - 1395:4, 1397:13, 1444:16, 1471:14, 1472:15 multi-family [2] -1395:4, 1397:13 multi-modal [2] -1471:14, 1472:15 multi-modalism [1] -1444:16 multifamily [1] -1395:19 multiple [4] -1384:11, 1450:20, 1478:4, 1485:8 multiple-family [1] -1384:11 municipalities [1] -1368:18 municipality [1] -1422:10 Murnane [1] -1418:21 must [3] - 1405:6,

1488:16, 1488:18,

1406:24, 1495:21

N name [4] - 1364:18, 1367:11, 1430:14, 1430:16 namely [1] - 1385:17 nation [1] - 1421:21 natural [2] - 1388:19, 1397:16 Natural [1] - 1369:21 Nature [1] - 1423:22 nature [1] - 1504:23 nearby [3] - 1389:10, 1399:12, 1452:23 nearly [1] - 1437:5 necessarily [4] -1469:1, 1480:19, 1480:20, 1484:7 necessary [5] -1375:18, 1445:23, 1497:10, 1501:8, 1503:5 neck [1] - 1417:9 need [8] - 1404:16, 1467:21, 1469:2, 1470:11, 1471:21, 1471:24, 1472:1, 1505:6 needed [1] - 1429:10 neeas [3] - 1500:2, 1500:10, 1504:6 negative [2] -1479:24, 1480:19 neighborhoods [1] -1452:23 neighboring [2] -1414:18, 1479:16 Neighbors [5] -1363:9, 1365:6, 1411:4, 1453:14, 1507:9 neighbors [1] -1425·14 net [2] - 1387:21, 1388:1 network [2] -1388:24, 1436:23 never [3] - 1375:13, 1406:21, 1414:7 nevertheless [1] -1446:5 New [18] - 1383:10, 1383:13, 1384:14, 1388:21, 1393:6, 1398:1, 1398:9, 1398:12, 1399:13, 1414:7, 1415:4,

1465:21, 1479:5, 1481:1, 1482:22, 1502:10 new [8] - 1378:20, 1383:6, 1396:1, 1446:15, 1453:21, 1461:7. 1470:12 newish [1] - 1464:9 next [16] - 1417:15, 1429:24, 1434:8, 1437:19, 1439:18, 1441:10, 1441:21, 1441:23, 1486:16, 1487:24, 1488:9, 1490:4, 1492:2, 1492:7, 1508:9, 1508:16 nice [1] - 1366:12 Nicole [4] - 1449:20, 1494:2, 1494:7, 1509:19 nine [1] - 1501:23 noise [1] - 1472:3 non [2] - 1467:12 non-car[1] - 1467:12 non-car-based [1] -1467:12 none [3] - 1418:13, 1493:18, 1498:21 nonresidential [1] -1396:1 normal [2] - 1373:24, 1466:16 north [12] - 1382:3, 1432:17, 1433:24, 1434:3, 1439:18, 1440:8, 1440:14, 1440:23, 1441:23, 1444:12, 1459:7, 1460:22 north-south [1] -1382:3 northbound [2] -1475:18, 1485:21 northeast 3 -1441:15, 1444:4, 1444:10 northerly [1] -1425:15 northwest [1] -1412:16 notably [11] -1368:19, 1369:19, 1373:10, 1375:6, 1376:19, 1386:7, 1389:10, 1397:18, 1413:5, 1420:13,

1424:5

Notary [1] - 1511:8

mote [3] - 1383:11,

1492:3, 1492:8 noted [2] - 1372:17, 1506:24 notes [6] - 1409:22, 1432:14, 1449:5, 1449:15, 1511:11 nothing [13] -1366:23, 1389:23, 1392:15, 1410:15, 1427:24, 1428:11, 1428:24, 1453:5, 1489:6, 1489:10, 1497:3, 1499:13, 1506:12 notice [3] - 1397:20, 1406:16, 1507:7 notifying [1] -1366:13 noting [1] - 1386:19 Number [1] -1465:20 number [9] -1391:15, 1433:6, 1461:23, 1465:18, 1473:10, 1473:13, 1473:15, 1474:4, 1490:17 numbered [1] -1479:4 numbers [2] -1473:8, 1502:3 numerous [1] -1426:24

0

o'clock [2] - 1362:12, 1451:19 1511:5 Oakland [1] -1441:24 oath [3] - 1367:7, 1388:15 1430:10, 1494:1 object [4] - 1489:17, 1489:18, 1492:4, 1500:9 objection [13] -1369:8, 1405:21, 1421:12, 1429:23, 1431:9, 1431:10, 1487:11, 1488:17, 1492:8, 1493:16, 1500:7, 1500:10, 1501:10 objective [6] -1370:17, 1391:2, 1392:9, 1392:17, 1392:20, 1503:14 obligations [1] -1396:5 1447:5 oblique [1] - 1424:16

1461:24 observation [1] -1372:8 observed [1] -1380:19 obstruction [1] -1415:14 obvious [2] - 1412:5, 1440:20 obviously [11] -1374:20, 1377:10, 1377:23, 1378:20, 1382:2, 1383:17, 1393:9, 1412:9, 1412:15, 1447:1, 1503:17 occasion [2] -1379:22, 1466:20 occasions [1] -1450:20 occupancy [2] -1479:2, 1481:7 occupy [1] - 1374:4 occur[4] - 1375:17, 1385:6, **1406:8**, 1448:13 occurred [3] -1412:15, 1424:7, 1440:4 October [8] - 1365:9, 1365:22, 1366:1, 1487:16, 1506:19, 1506:21, 1507:4, 1508:19 OF [5] - 1362:1, 1362:2, 1510:15, off-peak [1] - 1439:4 off-road [1] offer [11] - 1368:23, 1369:1, 1369:4. 1384:1, 1456:6, 1471:22, 1487:21, 1489:1, 1489:14, 1491:21, 1493:6 oñered [7] - 1447:9, 1449:1, 1450:20, 1451:3, 1455:8, 1466:22, 1477:18 offers [1] - 1424:21 office [1] - 1395:16 offset [5] - 1441:21, 1445:24, 1446:3, 1446:19, 14**84:14** on-site [1] - 1491:16 once [2] - 1434:17, one [54] - 1364:17,

obscured [1] -

1364:23, 1365:5, 1365:21, 1366:2, 1371:22, 1372:10, 1376:1, 1378:20, 1379:20, 1380:12, 1381:18, 1389:3, 1391:5, 1391:16, 1391:17, 1394:9, 1394:17, 1403:20, 1405:9, 1412:19, 1416:11, 1429:14, 1435:15, 1436:13, 1437:5, 1438:1, 1438:21, 1456:7, 1456:10, 1459:1, 1463:23, 1466:5, 1466:9, 1467:11, 1468:15, 1468:17, 1470:3, 1470:5, 1470:18, 1471:13, 1475:4, 1475:24, 1482:13, 1483:2, 1483:3, 1485:19, 1486:6, 1486:15, 1487:15, 1489:16, 1496:12, 1500:3, 1507:2 one-third [1] -1437:5 ones [3] - 1366:14, 1373:7, 1508:11 onus [1] - 1406:9 open [9] - 1374:5, 1381:22, 1387:12, 1387:22, 1401:19, 1402:22, 1403:6, 1403:7, 1426:6 Open [2] - 1369:22, 1422:9 opinion [28] -1370:18, 1374:6, 1376:9, 1377:17, 1382:18, 1383:8, 1384:8, 1385:10, 1385:21, 1385:24, 1387:1, 1389:13, 1400:17, 1401:4, 1406:11, 1407:8, 1407:9, 1411:12, 1412:3, 1421:23, 1424:12, 1426:16, 1441:18, 1445:21, 1446:17, 1470:18, 1479:22, 1483:18 opportunities [4] -1471:8, 1471:15, 1472:10, 1472:15 opportunity [7] -1366:3, 1402:19, 1406:5, 1431:21,

1442:22, 1459:3,

1449:4, 1472:2, 1507:2 opposed [2] -1406:12, 1406:14 opposite [9] -1446:6, 1448:9, 1456:6, 1456:10, 1458:11, 1485:16, 1486:1, 1486:6, 1486:10 optimized [2] -1464:8, 1464:15 option [4] - 1387:20, 1442:17, 1443:17, 1480:22 options [1] - 1459:2 order [7] - 1455:23, 1484:9, 1489:20, 1493:9, 1493:19, 1494:10, 1500:5 ordinance [23] -1375:20, 1377:11, 1381:9, 1384:5, 1386:11, 1386:19, 1389:8, 1390:6, 1390:17, 1390:18, 1392:16, 1393:2, 1400:13, 1405:3, 1406:12, 1406:15, 1406:22, 1406:24, 1411:15, 1414:16, 1422:21, 1426:22, 1453:4 Ordinance [17] -1374:9, 1377:6, 1385:13, 1387:19, 1390:9, 1390:11, 1391:2, 1392:9, 1392:10, 1394:21, 1401:14, 1401:16, 1403:16, 1403:23, 1452:5, 1452:8, 1452:18 ordinances [2] -1392:24, 1400:9 Ordinances [2] -1371:20, 1371:21 original [1] - 1404:16 originally [4] -1423:16, 1435:5, 1439:14, 1445:2 originate (1) -1433:24 Orvis [1] - 1475:6 Osborne [3] -1413:9, 1420:24, 1421:17 ostensibly [3] -1440:10, 1443:14,

1486.7

53 of 62 sheets

otherwise [2] -1371:16, 1488:6 outbound [1] -1473:17 outcome [4] -1370:23, 1371:2, 1371:7, 1371:12 outlined [1] -1465:16 outside [5] - 1383:2, 1392:21, 1414:17, 1444:1, 1504:12 oval [2] - 1382:1, 1383:4 overail [6] - 1403:7, 1424:20, 1496:1, 1496:5, 1502:22, 1503:1 overlay [4] -1403:21, 1410:9, 1410:10, 1422:12 overlook [1] -1414:11 overstated [1] -1437:10 own [6] - 1369:17, 1371:11, 1400:3, 1401:3, 1422:11, 1423:12 owned [1] - 1461:1

P

P-20 [1] - 1399:2 p.m [12] - 1362:12, 1437:17, 1456:1, 1462:3, 1473:17, 1473:23, 1474:7, 1502:7, 1502:8, 1502:19, 1508:19, 1509:6 PA[1] - 1362:8 page [16] - 1432:15, 1433:20, 1433:21, 1435:24, 1436:6, 1437:12, 1437:19, 1445:11, 1445:24, 1447:4, 1455:17, 1457:7, 1461:23, 1479:3, 1501:16 PAGE [1] - 1510:15 pages [3] - 1469:20, 1469:21, 1511:9 pain [2] - 1417:8, 1488:5 paragraph [2] -1479:5, 1479:18 parailel [1] - 1483:18 pardon [3] - 1367:18, 1374:12, 1407:18

1420:18, 1420:23, 1425:2, 1425:20, 1470:19 particular [5] -1386:20, 1389:9, 1423:6, 1461:13, 1475:1 parties [15] - 1365:2, 1365:13, 1365:15, 1368:4, 1458:16, 1488:22, 1493:4, 1493:17, 1500:6, 1505:24, 1506:15, 1506:24, 1508:1, 1508:8, 1508:14 parties' [1] - 1490:21 partly [2] - 1403:21, 1406:17 parts [1] - 1381:11 party [2] - 1365:24, 1431.8 past [8] - 1372:15, 1379:22, 1413:6, 1453:20, 1462:4, 1462:5, 1462:11, 1475:7 pat[1] - 1366:8 path [4] - 1384:20, 1434:4, 1440:12, 1442:6 pathways [1] -1466:2 Patriarca [1] -1372:24 Patricia [1] - 1419:23 PATRICK [1] -1363:2 Patrick [1] - 1364:6 pattern [1] - 1470:16 Pavelchek [1] -1419:5 PC-1 [1] - 1428:12 PC-13 [3] - 1478:20, 1481:21, 1482:17 PC-19[1] - 1510:6 PC-20 [7] - 1380:3, 1380:15, 1411:11, 1412:2, 1412:21, 1428:13, 1510:7 PC-3 [3] - 1449:7, 1449:13, 1449:20 peak [15] - 1437:14,

park [1] - 1392:3

parkway [2] -

1388:13, 1388:23

1381:22, 1401:7,

1403:19, 1405:24,

1406:1, 1414:14,

part [12] - 1376:3,

parking [1] - 1414:9

1437:18, 1438:8, 1438:19, 1438:23, 1439:4, 1439:5, 1455:24, 1456:1, 1457:15, 1462:3, 1473:17, 1473:21, 1473:22, 1474:7 pecuniary [4] -1370:22, 1371:2, 1371:7, **1371:12** pedestrian [10] -1388:15, 1389:15, 1444:6, 1468:3, 1468:9, 1469:2, 1469:6, 1469:24, 1470:4, 1470:9 pedestrians [3] -1468:12, 1468:15, 1470:17 pedestrians' [1] -1468:5 PennDOT [43] -1432:21, 1436:16, 1437:2, **1437:20**, 1440:11, 1445:4, 1445:15, 1445:21, 1446:13, 1446:23, 1448:3, 1449:6, 1455:19, 14**56**:7, 1463:24, 1464:10, 1467:9, 1477:11, 1479:1, 1479:19, 1481:5, 1481:6, 1481:13, 1481:15, **1**481:17, **1482**:**3**, 1482:18, 1495:15, 1495:24, **1496**:4, 1497:9, **1497**:15, 1497:19, 1497:21, 1502:15, 1502:21, 1503:1, 1503:7, 1503:11, 1503:15, 1503:21, 1503:24, 1504:6 PennDOT's [3] -1481:4, 1497:16, 1503:13 PENNSYLVANIA [1] 1362:3 Pennsylvania [6] -1362:11, 1367:21, 1368:18, 1400:10, 1430:18, 1511:1 people [14] - 1378:1, 1438:4, 1461:9, 1461:12, 1463:19, 1464:24, 1467:6, 1467:13, **1468:18**, 1472:14, 1473:20, 1475:18, 1480:13,

1507:5 per [2] - 1436:14, 1495:18 percent [15] -1377:12, 1377:16, 1378:2, 1384:5, 1387:21, 1388:1, 1427:7, 1433:22, 1434:9, 1434:19, 1434:21, 1434:23, 1436:20, 1437:4 percentage [1] -1463:12 perform [2] -1372:13, 1494:13 perhaps [10] -1385:3, 1385:4, 1445:9, 1446:10, 1457:11, 1466:19, 1466:21, 1472:8, 1475:10 perimeter [9] -1378:5, 1387:12, 1388:7, 1388:18, 1389:1, 1389:8, 1399:15, 1403:12, 1403:18 period [1] - 1425:19 permit [3] - 1426:5, 1429:15, 1479:2 permits [2] -1377:11, 1481:7 permitted [4] -1378:3, 1394:1, 1395:23, 1427:7 personal [2] -1370:22, 1371:2 perspective [4] -1370:4, 1386:20, 1424:24, 1426:3 pertained [1] -1373:7 pertinent [1] -1373:10 phases [1] - 1478:4 phasing [4] - 1464:1, 1478:3, 1496:8, 1503:6 Philadelphia [1] -1430:18 Phillip [2] - 1418:8, 1419:7 photo [2] - 1381:3, 1399:10 photograph [14] -1379:23, 1380:14, 1380:18, 1380:20, 1381:7, 1381:11, 1381:24, 1382:9, 1382:13, 1383:3,

1384:22, 1393:10, 1399:3, 1510:7 phrase [1] - 1504:18 physical [1] -1448:19 physically [1] -1486:14 pick [1] - 1364:21 picnic [1] - 1414:10 picture [2] - 1412:10, 1425:3 piece [2] - 1461:8, 1461:13 PINGAR [2] -1362:17, 1500:22 Pingar [3] - 1364:4, 1500:20 piace [7] - 1363:21, 1386:17, 1389:12, 1450:7, 1455:20, 1464:8 placed [1] - 1423:9 places [2] - 1412:7, 1472:6 Plan [17] - 1369:21, 1369:22, 1371:16, 1371:17, 1373:13, 1387:3, 1387:17, 1387:18, 1388:7, 1396:13, 1400:20, 1403:14, 1474:21, 1474:24, 1475:3, 1476:1, 1476:10 plan [63] - 1372:9, 1372:18, 1372:19, 1373:10, 1373:13, 1375:16, 1373:18, 1373:20, 1374:20, 1374:21, 1376:4, 1376:7, 1382:18, 1383:1, 1383:8, 1385:11, 1385:14, 1385:16, 1385:22, 1386:10, 1387:2, 1387:6, 1387:15, 1388:10, 1388:17, 1389:4, 1389:14 1389:16, 1393:22, 1396:14, 1401:17, 1401:18, 1403:5, 1403:24, 1404:10, 1404:24, 1405:18, 1406:7, 1409:14, 1414:24, 1415:21, 1424:11, 1424:14, 1424:21, 1425:2, 1425:7, 1426:18, 1435:7, 1438:17, 1445:1, 1449:10, 1449:11, 1449:16,

1449:22, 1450:1, 1450:2, 1476:4, 1476:14, 1476:15, 1483:16, 1490:3, 1494:23, 1504:5 Plan's [1] - 1401:2 pian.. [1] - 1449:24 planner [6] -1368:16, 1369:11, 1369:15, 1369:17, 1372:24, 1424:14 planner's [1] -1376:6 planners [1] - 1401:6 Planning [37] -1363:6, 1364:22, 1368:1, 1370:19, 1372:21, 1372:22, 1375:14, 1375:22, 1375:23, 1376:**22**, 1377:1, 1379:6, 1379:13, 1382:6, 1382:23, 1383:15, 1399:24, 1400:5, 1404:9, 1404:11, 1404:22, 1405:4, 1405:7, 1405:12, 1405:19, 1406:3, 1407:1, 1408:3, 1416:13, 1417:20, 1427:9. 1428:9. 1451:23, 1465:9. 1482:13, 1500:10, 1501:7 planning [14] -1368:15, 1369:2, 1370:3, 1370:16, 1370:18, 1372:13, 1373:11, 1374:23, 1386:9, 1389:2, 1422:14, 1424:2, 1426:3, 1485:6 PLANNING [1] -1510:4 plans [7] - 1370:3, 1370:20, 1372:9, 1373:5, 1384:20, 1410:3, 1459:7 planted [1] - 1395:10 plantings [4] -1396:22, 1397:11, 1397:21, 1398:1**6** platoon [1] - 1468:20 playing [1] - 1435:19 plays [1] - 1433:2 Pleasant [23] -1383:20, 1388:20, 1393:6, 1396:24,

1397:3, 1438:6,

1439:19, 1439:23,

1440:22, 1444:22, 1450:8, 1450:14, 1475:15, 1475:22, 1476:17, 1477:1, 1477:5, 1477:15, 1477:20, 1483:1, 1495:12, 1495:14, 1502:10 pleases [1] - 1433:19 Pledge [2] - 1363:19, 1363:20 **plop** [1] - 1425:10 plus [3] - 1437:5, 1464:6, 1473:11 point [21] - 1379:12, 1379:17, 1398:11, 1398:13, 1405:5, 1427:2, 1427:3, 1442:20, 1444:24, 1447:1, 1448:17, 1449:9, 1449:20, 1451:3, 1466:20, 1466:24, 1481:1, 1481:10, 1483:4, 1483:9, 1506:20 points [5] - 1384:13, 1404:15, 1444:1, 1472:24, 1485:8 poking [1] - 1381:20 police [1] - 1364:2 Pond [1] - 1382:15 portion [3] - 1382:4, 1382:5, 1452:15 portions [1] - 1420:7 portrayal [1] -1396:17 position [2] -1490:13, 1490:14 positive [2] -1417:13, 1480:19 possibility [7] -1417:3, 1443:10, 1451:5, 1458:10, 1473:11, 1485:21, 1486:7 possible [7] -1438:8, 1448:11, 1458:4. 1458:5. 1485:10, 1486:2, 1486:13 possibly [2] -1456:8, 1479:11 post[1] - 1454:14 post-development [1] - 1454:14 postdated [1] -1374:19 potential [12] -1393:23, 1409:8,

1445:13, 1459:2, 1466:9, 1471:1, 1472:20, 1476:16, 1483:7, 1486:3 potentially [7] -1365:21, 1417:9, 1442:13, 1445:8, 1447:7, 1483:9, 1484:18 practically [1] -1478:12 pre [1] - 1368:1 pre-marked [1] -1368:1 preceding [3] -1438:22, 1438:23, 1438:24 precisely [1] -1478:6 preclude [1] -1423:11 preferred [1] -1485:16 preliminary [1] -1503:24 prepare [1] - 1372:20 prepared [13] -1369:20, 1369:22, 1382:24, 1396:12, 1436:18, 1449:7, 1490:15, 1494:20, 1494:21, 1501:1, 1507:19, 1508:5, 1508:18 preparing [1] -1373:4 Presby [2] - 1372:11, 1372:17 Presbyterian [1] -1413:22 prescribe [1] -1426:23 presence [1] -1441:14 PRESENT[1] -1362:17 present [12] -1365:4, 1365:5, 1365:17, 1431:16, 1454:5, 1479:13, 1489:6, 1**489:8**, 1493:4. 1496:13. 1500:12, 1505:24 presentation [1] -1379:13 presentations [2] -1365:15, 1400:4 presented [8] -1375:24, 1379:6,

1382:19, 1383:9,

1425:3, 1431:17, 1431:22, 1438:10 presenting [1] -1440:5 presently [1] -1440:2 preservation [6] -1400:9, 1400:11, 1400:12, 1421:10, 1425:4, 1426:7 preserve [5] -1384:12, 1388:17, 1411:16, 1427:12, 1427:13 preserved [4] -1411:23, 1412:18, 1412:19, 1412:23 preserving [3] -1415:15, 1416:15, 1417:10 pretty [1] - 1434:24 previous [1] - 1476:5 previously [5] -1368:3, 1387:8, 1476:18, 1494:3, 1495:23 primary [13] -1375:15, 1386:2, 1407:11, 1409:2, 1409:10. 1410:4. 1410:10, 1422:3, 1422:18, 1423:1, 1423:3, 1423:24 principal [1] - 1396:1 priority [1] - 1475:17 problem [1] -1429:19 problematic [1] -1448:23 procedure [1] -1371:24 proceed [5] - 1459:6, 1488:22, 1490:7, 1490:15, 1490:23 proceeding [1] -1491:22 Proceedings [1] -1509:5 proceedings [1] -1445:2 process [17] -1374:8, 1374:17, 1374:23, 1375:1, 1375:5, 1375:21, 1375:22, 1404:3, 1404:8, 1405:2, 1405:8, 1405:23, 1406:19, 1406:20, 1407:6, 1490:20

product [2] -

1437:7, 1444:18,

1391:21, 1427:16 professional [5] -1368:9. 1370:15. 1370:18, 1384:8, 1430:24 Program [1] - 1422:9 prohibit [1] -1486:14 project [1] - 1396:14 projected [6] -1436:9, 1438:18, 1464:3, 1474:8, 1477:10 projection [1] -1380:23 projections [1] -1484:3 projects [2] -1400:22, 1401:1 prominently [2] -1384:20, 1384:21 properties [8] -1375:11, 1411:19, 1411:23, 1412:15, 1414:18, 1420:15, 1421:4, 1479:17 property [28] -1372:3, 1372:7, 1372:10, 1393:8, 1393:18, 1399:5, 1401:11, 1401:20, 1403:12, 1403:18, 1403:19, 1410:9, 1410:11, 1414:2, 1414:8, 1420:14, 1420:22, 1421:2, 1421:9, 1425:11, 1443:3, 1461:8, 1461:13, 1462:5, 1462:11, 1480:1, 1490:2, 1491:18 property's [1] -1400:1 proposal [1] -1372:12 proposals [1] -1399:16 propose [1] -1386:22 proposed [33] -1374:2, 1375:8, 1375:18, 1383:6, 1386:1, 1393:21, 1395:4, 1396:14, 1396:23, 1397:10, 1397:12, 1398:6, 1398:15, 1400:22, 1403:5, 1403:9, 1432:9, 1432:13, 1432:15, 1434:4,

1434:11, 1435:6, 1435:19, 1437:16, 1439:14, 1444:24, 1445:3, 1447:16, 1449:21, 1452:21, 1454:9, 1462:4, 1469:7 proposing [1] -1384:10 protect [8] - 1377:16, 1382:20, 1383:9, 1385:22, 1386:5, 1416:22, 1417:13, 1417:14 protected [5] -1375:17, 1420:7, 1420:18, 1420:23, 1421:16 protecting [1] -1415:18 protection [5] -1379:21, 1386:17, 1387:9, 1395:14, 1416:23 provide [20] -1365:16, 1370:17, 1383:24, 1387:7, 1387:8, 1387:11, 1389:6, 1389:9, 1389:14, 1392:10, 1402:21, 1405:22, 1429:6, 1430:22, 1442:6, 1445:22, 1467:19, 1479:6. 1480:8, 1482:19 provided [15] -1368:3, 1384:19, 1395:15, 1434:5, 1434:23, 1438:3, 1443:24, 1445:16, 1445:20, 1446:17, 1448:16, 1450:23, 1451:2, 1462:8, 1469:24 provides [2] -1389:16, 1392:9 providing [7] -1440:18, 1444:17, 1448:3, 1467:12, 1468:19, 1470:15, 1488:13 provision [3] -1401:13, 1403:17, 1406:23 proximity [2] -1466:3, 1466:6 Pryze [1] - 1419:11 public [6] - 1365:10, 1427:3, 1471:2,

1471:3, 1488:19,

1508:4 Public [1] - 1511:8 purport [1] - 1409:14 purportedly [1] -1375:3 purpose [2] -1374:24, 1443:11 purposes [3] -1446:14, 1485:6, 1486:11 put [15] - 1381:24, 1424:8, 1427:6, 1450:13, 1458:5, 1458:6, 1477:24, 1492:13, 1492:20, 1492:23, 1504:21, 1507:3, 1507:10, 1507:11, 1507:13 putting [3] - 1424:9, 1456:14, 1503:18

Q

quadrant [4] -1441:15, 1441:18, 1444:4, 1444:8 quadruple [1] -1468:24 qualifications [3] -1368:24, 1431:7, 1432:20 qualified [1] -1421:13 qualifies [1] -1454:15 quantifiable [1] -1409:22 Quarry [6] - 1413:23, 1414:3, 1414:21, 1415:8, 1458:17, 1489:1 quarry [1] - 1414:11 quartile [1] - 1474:5 questioning [1] -1402:7 questions [94] -1410:20, 1410:21, 1411:1, 1413:13, 1413:14, 1418:4, 1418:6, 1418:12, 1418:17, 1418:18, 1418:20, 1418:21, 1418:22, 1418:23, 1418:24, 1419:2, 1419:4, 1419:6, 1419:8, 1419:10, 1419:11, 1419:13, 1419:17, 1419:20, 1420:1, 1420:5,

1451:14, 1451:22, 1451:23, 1453:9, 1453:11, 1453:14, 1453:16, 1453:18, 1454:21, 1458:13, 1458:18, 1458:20, 1458:22, 1459:1, 1460:6, 1460:7, 1460:9, 1460:11, 1460:15, 1462:20, 1462:21, 1462:24, 1463:3, 1463:4, 1463:6, 1465:6, 1465:7, 1465:10, 1465:11, 1465:15, 1478:16, 1478:18, 1486:18, 1486:21, 1497:5, 1497:24, 1498:1, 1498:4, 1498:5, **1498**:7, 1498:8, 1498:11, 1498:12, 1498:14, 1498:15, 1498:17, 1498:18, 1498:20, 1498:24, 1499:1, 1499:3, 1499:4, 1499:6, 1499:7, 1499:9, 1499:10, 1499:17, 1499:19, 1501:13, 1504:12, 1505:11, 1505:13 queue [17] - 1435:18, 1436:6, 1436:8, 1437:15, 1437:22, 1438:8. 1438:20. 1445:5, 1445:16, 1455:17, 1455:22, 1468:14, 1484:2, 1484:4, 1484:8, 1484:9, 1484:17 queues [4] - 1438:4, 1439:1, 1478:6, 1478:8 queuing [2] - 1437:9, 1438:18 quick [5] - 1426:15, 1461:16, 1465:15, 1497:6, **1501:13** quite [1] - 1388:2 quote [1] - 1390:10 quote-unquote [1] -1390:10 quoted [2] - 1473:16

1427:18, 1451:8,

1451:10, 1451:12,

R

Radley [3] - 1397:18, 1398:11, 141**3**:17

Randall [1] - 1423:23 randomly [1] -1473:19 range [1] - 1441:7 rate [3] - 1436:16, 1437:2, 1437:3 rather [9] - 1374:1, 1377:22, 1381:3, 1385:6, 1400:4, 1454:24, 1456:5, 1458:11, 1472:10 **RE**[1] - 1362:7 re [3] - 1380:4, 1381:12, 1504:6 re-enactment [2] -1380:4, 1381:12 re-review [1] -1504:6 reach [1] - 1507:5 reached [1] - 1432:4 reaction [1] - 1471:6 read [3] - 1373:9. 1395:8, 1449:18 reading [3] - 1400:3, 1407:18, 1474:16 ready [2] - 1364:24, 1490:22 real [4] - 1441:17, 1460:24, 1461:16, 1497:6 realize [1] - 1366:6 really [8] - 1380:6, 1404:14, 1423:21, 1425:4, 1437:1, 1438:15, 1455:7, 1481:12 rear [2] - 1397:21, 1398:14 reason [4] - 1438:16, 1440:1, 1477:7, 1490.6 reasons [2] - 1438:2, 1445:9 rebuttal [8] - 1493:9, 1493:11, 1493:20, 1500:15, 1504:11, 1506:3, 1507:13, 1507:17 REBUTTAL [1] -1509:18 receive [1] - 1500:21 received [1] -1499:20 recent [1] - 1437:2 recently [1] -1403:20 recess [1] - 1451:18

1426:11, 1426:16,

Recess [1] - 1451:20

recommendation [2]

- 1416:14, 1417:4

recommendations [3] - 1386:10, 1417:19, recommended [2] -1425:23, 1504:4 reconsider [1] -1439:13 record [16] -1364:18, 1366:16, 1395:8, 1430:15, 1446:14, 1491:9, 1491:10, 1491:12, 1492:3, 1492:9, 1494:19, 1504:3, 1508:22, 1508:23, 1508:24, 1511:9 recording [1] -1364:15 records [1] - 1458:1 recreation [3] -1387:23, 1403:1, 1416:19 recreational [4] -1387:12, 1387:16, 1387:19, 1388:3 RECROSS [2] -1497:7, 1509:9 recross [1] - 1427:23 RECROSS-**EXAMINATION** [1] -1497:7 red [1] - 1382:1 redirect [2] -1427:20, 1499:11 REDIRECT [2] -1494:5, 1509:9 reduce [1] - 1486:3 reduced [1] -1454:14 reduction [1] -1373:18 refer [1] - 1482:12 reference [8] -1401:17, 1433:15, 1433:18, 1435:22, 1449:9, 1478:23, 1478:24, 1481:21 referenced [2] -1461:18, 1482:16 references [3] -1394:14, 1403:23, 1482:15 referred [2] -1373:14, 1482:11 reflect [1] - 1464:15 reflecting [1] -1444:13 reformulate [1] -

regarded [1] -1465:20 regarding [4] -1404:2, 1443:23, 1468:8, 1479:1 regards [3] -1426:16, 1439:18, 1443:21 regional [11] -1435:15, 1441:4, 1441:8, 1450:8, 1450:14, 1450:18, 1450:22, 1451:1, 1484:7, 1484:12, 1505:3 Registered [1] -1511:7 regret[1] - 1506:21 regulate [1] -1422:15 regulations [4] -1393:20, 1394:7, 1394:23, 1395:3 Reichert [1] - 1420:3 reinforce [1] -1451:2 reiterate (2) -1365:24, 1489:5 related [2] - 1431:24, 1437.9 relates [2] - 1480:24, 1481:22 relative [10] -1378:12, 1386:16, 1390:22, 1391:10, 1406:5, 1423:10, 1427:5, 1462:12, 1474:4, 1506:8 relatively [3] -1379:19, 1427:10, 1463:10 relevance [1] -1378:13 relying [1] - 1399:23 remain [1] - 1397:3 remember [1] -1374:13 remind [1] - 1493:23 reminder [1] -1432:11 remnant [1] -1412:19 removal [2] - 1495:6 remove [1] - 1494:9 removed [8] -1439:11, 1449:24, 1450:5, 1494:15, 1494:22, 1495:9,

1495:10, 1504:8

removing [1] -

1439:7 Rendemonti [11] -1418:10, 1418:11, 1460:15, 1462:18, 1489:13, 1489:20, 1490:24, 1491:13, 1498:19, 1507:11, 1509:16 **RENDEMONTI** [14] -1363:11, 1418:13, 1460:16, 1460:19, 1461:20, 1462:14, 1489:15, 1489:22, 1490:9, 1491:3, 1491:15, 1491:23, 1492:10, 1498:21 repeat [2] - 1450:11, 1456:24 repeating [1] -1488:7 rephrase [1] -1456:15 report [1] - 1504:22 Reporter [1] - 1511:8 reporter [1] -1402:10 REPORTER [3] -1362:23, 1510:15, 1511:5 representation [1] -1492:1 represented [3] -1368:4, 1391:20, 1418:10 request [4] -1448:11, 1492:4, 1493:8, 1493:13 requests [1] - 1492:7 require [7] - 1377:1, 1381:9, 1393:21, 1404:8, 1405:13, 1408:3, 1432:19 required [26] -1374:8, 1374:17, 1375:11, 1385:12, 1386:19, 1388:8, 1388:11, 1388:13, 1388:20, 1389:8. 1394:8, 1394:13, 1398:19, 1400:18, 1403:5, 1403:11, 1483:16, 1496:3, 1496:9, 1496:11, 1496:17, 1496:20, 1502:14, 1502:18, 1502:24, 1503:3 requirement [5] -1389:3, 1390:5, 1394:14, 1452:14,

requirements [6] -1386:11, 1396:3, 1404:4, 1426:17, 1463:24, 1497:21 requires [8] -1387:18, 1387:20, 1393:22, 1406:12, 1411:15, 1495:24, 1496:4, 1497:19 requiring [2] -1401:14, 1403:17 reserve [7] - 1429:9, 1487:24, 1488:9, 1489:16, 1501:7, 1503:8, 1506:2 reserves [1] -1503:21 residences [1] -1473:10 residential [4] -1395:20, 1395:22, 1396:2, 1473:24 residentially [1] -1395:19 residentially-zoned [1] - 1395:19 residents [6] -1439:4, 1442:7, 1448:6, 1471:16, 1472:21, 1473:1 resources [20] -1375:9, 1375:10, 1377:9, 1385:17, 1386:3, 1386:24, 1387:9, 1407:4, 1407:16, 1407:18, 1407:20, 1408:1, 1422:4, 1422:19, 1422:20, 1423:7, 1423:8, 1424:1, 1425:1 respect [16] - 1375:9, 1381:7, 1381:8, 1391:3, 1392:17, 1399:19, 1400:1, 1400:13, 1400:16, 1401:10, 1401:19, 1403:9, 1405:7, 1452:23, 1468:5, 1494:14 respond [1] -1500:11 response [1] -1470:13 rest[1] - 1382:7 restate [1] - 1456:23 result [1] - 1432:1 resulting [1] - 1505:2 results [2] - 1495:6,

resume [1] - 1368:7 resummarize [1] -1465:19 retirement[1] -1372:18 review [15] - 1370:3, 1370:19. 1373:3. 1373:16, 1376:7, 1401:20, 1402:19, 1405:19, 1431:21, 1432:2, 1448:24, 1479:7, 1500:7, 1504:6, 1504:7 reviewed [7] -1373:5, 1396:13, 1396:15, 1449:10, 1452:7, 1452:17, 1478:21 reviewing [5] -1373:12, 1440:5, 1461:16, 1481:16, 1506:4 reviews [2] - 1372:9, 1372:13 revised [4] - 1376:3, 1386:11, 1495:4, 1495:5 revisions [1] -1387:15 ridgelines [2] -1407:24, 1409:20 right-hand [2] -1397:6, 1409:13 right-of-way [1] -1438:20 rights [3] - 1448:18, 1453:1 rights-of-way [1] -1453:1 rise [1] - 1363:18 RMR [1] - 1362:23 road [37] - 1387:7, 1388:14, 1388:15, 1388:23, 1389:17, 1397:15, 1400:17, 1400:18, 1401:14, 1403:10, 1424:12, 1435:12, 1441:17, 1450:8, 1450:14, 1455:12, 14**58**:6, 1474:22, 1475:17, 1475:18, 1475:22, 1475:24, 1476:2, 1476:16, 1476:20, 1476:23, 1477:5, 1477:9, 1480:12, 1481:14, 1483:17, 1483:20, 1483:22, 1485:2, 1485:8, 1504:21, 1504:24

regard [1] - 1376:23

1502:7

Road [25] - 1362:11, 1367:20, 1381:19, 1383:14, 1383:20, 1388:20, 1388:21, 1396:24, 1413:6, 1420:15, 1438:6, 1444:22, 1475:15, 1476:17, 1477:1, 1477:5, 1477:15, 1479:5, 1495:12. 1495:15, 1501:21, 1501:22, 1502:9, 1502:18 roads [7] - 1383:14, 1401:7, 1425:8, 1450:6, 1481:5, 1485:9, 1486:9 roadway [2] -1424:22, 1481:8 roadways [3] -1393:15, 1397:11, 1485:15 Robert [3] - 1418:24, 1462:19, 1498:23 ROBERT [1] -1362:17 role [3] - 1370:13, 1370:15, 1435:20 room [2] - 1429:16, 1506:20 rooms [1] - 1508:14 roundabout [17] -1443:10, 1443:12, 1443:17, 1459:19, 1466:11, 1466:12, 1478:19, 1479:6, 1479:15, 1480:1, 1480:7, 1480:17, 1480:22, 1481:12, 1482:9, 1482:20 Route [31] - 1383:10, 1383:17, 1384:14, 1386:21, 1397:7, 1397:14, 1415:10, 1432:10, 1432:17, 1434:1, 1435:17, 1439:8, 1441:20, 1441:22, 1442:5, 1445:1, 1445:3, 1449:23, 1450:3, 1452:9, 1452:13, 1458:10, 1462:13, 1471:1, 1484:1, 1484:15, 1494:9, 1494:14, 1494:22, 1495:8, 1495:22 Routes [1] - 1393:5 rules [1] - 1504:10 rulings [1] - 1481:18 Run [3] - 1397:18,

1398:11, 1413:17
running [2] 1416:12, 1483:18
runs [2] - 1398:20,
1398:23
Rustin [1] - 1362:10

6

safe [1] - 1459:23 safety [2] - 1435:10, 1439:12 Sandy [14] - 1380:5, 1380:7, 1381:13, 1381:15, 1382:21, 1384:13, 1384:22, 1393:12, 1399:3, 1399:4, 1399:15, 1412:6, 1413:4 satisfy [1] - 1494:10 Saturday [2] -1380:5, 1380:15 save [1] - 1416:20 scale [1] - 1416:17 scan [1] - 1501:13 scanning [1] -1502:12 scenario [1] - 1504:7 scene [2] - 1380:13, 1423:23 scenic [54] -1376:20, 1377:2, 1377:10, 1377:19, 1377:24, 1378:2, 1378:5, 1378:10, 1378:12, 1378:14, 1379:20, 1382:21, 1383:10, 1384:2, 1384:12, 1385:18, 1386:6, 1386:16, 1386:22, 1387:9. 1390:5, 1390:1**0**, 1390:12, 1391:3, 1391:6, 1391:7, 1391:9, 1391:11, 1391:12, 1391:16, 1391:18, 1391:24, 1392:11, 1392:24, 1405:13, 1405:22, 1407:23, 1407:24, 1408:4, 1409:20, 1409:21, 1410:12, 1411:11, 1411:14, 1412:3, 1422:9, 1422:12, 1422:15, 1423:11, 1425:5, 1426:7, 1426:17, 1427:13

scheduled [1] -

1365:9

1471:1, 1471:3 School [2] - 1362:10, 1413:20 Schwandt [2] -1511:7, 1511:20 SCHWANDT [1] -1362:23 Science [1] - 1431:2 **scope** [1] - 1504:12 scoping [1] - 1449:5 Scott [1] - 1419:4 screen [7] - 1395:11, 1395:13, 1396:22, 1397:10, 1397:20, 1398:15, 1424:16 screening [11] -1393:21, 1393:23, 1394:7, 1394:13, 1394:23, 1395:14, 1415:13, 1415:15, 1415:16, 1415:18, 1415:20 seal [1] - 1511:15 Sean [1] - 1379:8 second [10] -1374:18, 1394:9, 1439:17, 1442:19, 1449:19, 1475:4, 1496:6, 1502:13, 1503:4, 1508:22 secondary [37] -1375:15, 1376:6, 1376:10, 1376:14, 1376:18, 1376:20, 1377:7, 1377:9, 1377:12, 1377:20, 1384:6, 1385:12, 1385:17, 1386:12, 1386:23, 1404:12, 1405:11, 1406:6, 1407:11, 1407:14, 1407:15, 1408:8, 1408:15, 1408:16, 1408:23, 1409:6, 1409:11, 1409:15, 1410:4, 1410:10, 1422:3, 1422:19, 1422:20, 1423:2, 1423:7, 1424:1, 1426:17 seconds [3] -1501:22, 1501:23, 1502:10 Section [10] -1376:24, 1385:13, 1394:3, 1394:20, 1395:8, 1404:7, 1452:7, 1452:11, 1452:20, 1510:11

school [3] - 1444:12,

section [7] -1375:12, 1392:8, 1394:15, 1405:5, 1406:17, 1460:24, 1482:1 see [34] - 1379:16, 1380:22, 1381:11, 1381:22, 1382:12, 1382:13, 1382:14, 1382:16, 1383:4, 1393:5, 1393:11, 1393:12, 1393:16, 1413:3, 1415:10, 1415:23, 1416:18, 1424:17, 1424:18, 1429:19, 1429:21, 1430:7, 1433:20, 1434:18, 1437:13, 1438:15, 1441:11, 1447:15, 14**47:17**, 1460:21, 1461:2, 1461:3, 1471:5, 1508:18 seek [1] - 1386:17 seem [4] - 1446:23, 1456:3, 1504:1, 1504:3 selected [1] -1455:19 sense [5] - 1381:14. 1424:5, 1445:9, 1485:7, 1485:9 sensing [1] -1482:10 sentences [1] -1449:19 separate [2] -1496:2, 1502:23 separation [3] -1373:19, 1373:23, 1374:3 SEPTA [2] - 1471:4, 1471:6 September [4] -1362:11, 1378:18, 1380:15, 1511:16 septic [1] - 1385:4 serpentine [2] -1414:10, 1415:9 serve [3] - 1369:14, 1370:6, 1451:2 service [4] - 1443:1, 1454:6, 1465:23, 1490:4 set [2] - 1492:5, 1511:15 setback [1] - 1415:4 setting [1] - 1503:15 several [5] - 1368:19,

1372:9, 1391:17,

1406:2, 1478:19 sewage [2] -1489:24, 1491:15 shall [4] - 1395:15, 1396:4, 1407:20, 1452:22 sheet [14] - 1376:4, 1396:15, 1397:5, 1397:9, 1401:20, 1402:15, 1402:19, 1402:21, 1408:11, 1408:13, 1408:18, 1408:21, 1409:5, 1409:13 sheets [7] - 1373:10, 1396:11, 1396:21, 1397:15, 1397:24, 1402:5, 1408:14 **shift** [2] - 1445:10, 1446:6 shifts [1] - 1442:20 Shiloh [1] - 1362:10 shopping [5] -1444:4, 1444:9, 1467:14, 1467:17, 1472:7 short [2] - 1445:17, 1507:23 shorter [3] - 1439:1, 1478:8, 1483:8 shovel [1] - 1481:8 show [5] - 1394:2, 1402:15, 1408:10, 1459:7, 1494:17 showed [2] -1384:22, 1415:6 showing [1] - 1383:1 shown [8] - 1386:1, 1409:1, 1412:2, 1445:1, 1457:7, 1457:19, 1484:3, 1485:20 shows [7] - 1402:24, 1409:8, 1409:9, 1457:3, 1457:9, 1457:13 shy [1] - 1437:16 side [11] - 1382:8, 1397:6, 1409:13, 1420:22, 1439:21, 1441:2, 1442:12, 1442:21, 1468:18, 1475:19 sidewalk [3] -1472:5, 1472:16, 1472:23 sidewalks [10] -1443:21, 1443:23, 1444:8, 1444:17, 1444:21, 1467:1,

1467:13, 1467:18, 1472:24, 1473:4 sight[1] - 1438:15 sign [1] - 1381:19 signal [14] - 1440:3, 1440:21, 1443:14, 1445:7, 1456:9, 1456:11, 1456:14, 1464:1, 1464:8, 1464:15, 1468:3, 1496:7, 1496:8, 1503:5 signaled [3] -1477:8, 1477:9, 1477:11 signalized [6] -1441:20, 1442:2, 1442:23, 1448:10, 1466:14, 1478:1 signalizing [1] -1440:17 significance [4] -1411:19, 1412:1, 1412:22, 1425:6 significant [4] -1385:9, 1392:1, 1413:8, 1421:4 similar [4] - 1378:17, 1403:10, 1441:12, 1454:20 simple [1] - 1434:20 simply [6] - 1373:9, 1374:3, 1374:4, 1385:16, 1392:11, 1406:8 simulations [1] -1469:18 simultaneously [1] -1468:21 single [3] - 1384:11, 1395:21, 1398:18 single-family [3] -1384:11, 1395:21, 1398:18 sit[2] - 1393:14, 1463:19 site [41] - 1375:10, 1380:12, 1385:23, 1389:15, 1393:5, 1407:20, 1407:23, 1409:7, 1433:23, 1434:3, 1434:9, 1434:19, 1439:4. 1439:9, 1440:7, 1440:13, 1442:22, 1444:10, 1444:17. 1445:24, 1447:16, 1449:10, 1449:11, 1449:22, 1449:23, 1455:4, 1457:13,

1457:18, 1462:4, 1464:5, 1464:6, 1471:6, 1471:18, 1471:21, 1472:18, 1472:23, 1475:8, 1483:23, 1484:8, 1491:16, 1495:**11** strting [1] - 1429:24 situation [1] -1485:17 size [1] - 1484:14 sketch [1] - 1448:16 Skiles [7] - 1441:1, 1475:5, 1475:22, 1476:17, 1477:14, 1477:19, 1478:12 SKROS [4] -1419:17, 1463:4, 1492:27, 1499:4 Skros [4] - 1419:16, 1463:2, 1492:19, 1499:2 Skupp [1] - 1418:17 slightly [2] -1437:10, 1444:11 slopes [2] - 1386:4, 1423:5 slower[1] - 1436:3 small |31 - 1409:16. 1462:11, 1462:12 Smart [2] - 1441:3, 1641.7 Snook [23] -1364:24, 1367:3, 1367:12, 1369:2, 1369:10, 1369:13, 1379:4, 1384:4, 1389:22, 1390:4, 1394:18, 1396:6, 1402:6, 1410:20, 1411:2, 1411:9, 1413:11, 1414:1, 1428:4, 1476:4, 1509:10, 1510:6, 1510:7 SNOOK [1] - 1367:5 Shook's m - 1506:4 so-called m -1385:2 Sobers [1] - 1419:4 soils [2] - 1373:8, 1408:24 solicitor [1] - 1364:6 someone [2] -1380:24, 1505:23 sometimes [2] -1435:17, 1436:24 somewhat [4] -

1392:19, 1422:13,

1424:23, 1464:9

somewhere [2] -1425:11, 1470:11 sorry [11] - 1402:12, 1431:3, 1450:11, 1460:8, 1461:23, 1465:13, 1466:24, 1469:13, 1492:16, 1499:16, 1504:17 sort [6] - 1368:14, 1414:6, 1422:22, 1423:17, 1469:17, 1472:4 sounded [1] -1475:16 sources [1] -1479:12 south [9] - 1382:3, 1399:14, 1434:7, 1434:10, 1440:24, 1441:21, 1442:15, 1462:4, 1490:1 South [3] - 1388:20, 1459:3, 1482:21 southbound [8] -1435:17, 1437:15, 1446:15, 1462:2, 1478:8, 1495:13, 1496:2, 1502:23 southerly [1] -1425:13 southern [1] -1398:9 southward [1] -1442:16 southwest [2] -1398:4, 1444:8 space [8] - 1374:5, 1387:12, 1387:22, 1401:19, 1402:22, 1403:6, 1403:7, 1426:6 Space [2] - 1369:22, 1422:9 spacing [4] - 1440:3, 1440:21, 1441:5, 1441:12 Spackman [8] -1416:5, 1417:24, 1443:3, 1443:4, 1458:21, 1460:4, 1479:24, 1489:7 SPACKMAN [10] -1416:7, 1416:11, 1417:12, 1417:21, 1418:1, 1458:24, 1459:15, 1459:19, 1460:2, 1489:10 Spackman's [1] -1479:17

1485:14 speaks [1] - 1368:21 special [1] - 1395:23 specific [5] - 1393:3, 1396:3, 1405:5, 1417:19, 1480:10 specifically [8] -1366:19, 1376:4, 1376:17, 1388:7, 1392:17, 1408:8, 1452:12, 1479:17 specimen [1] -1407:22 speed [1] - 1468:6 speeds [1] - 1443:13 split [2] - 1496:8, 1503:6 spread [2] - 1366:6, 1380:24 square [1] - 1484:19 stack [1] - 1477:9 stack-up [1] - 1477:9 stacking [3] -1473:9, 1483:8, 1485:4 staff [2] - 1369:17, 1369:19 stand [2] - 1506:18, 1509:3 standard [1] -1422:22 standardized [1] -1422:5 standing [3] -1381:14, 1382:11, 1468:18 standpoint [2] -1378:23, 1426:7 stands [1] - 1476:19 start [4] - 1396:21, 1451:10, 1464:1. 1468:15 started [1] - 1440:20 starting [1] - 1398:4 state [8] - 1367:11, 1392:7, 1394:7, 1430:14, 1454:23, 1481:8, 1485:6, 1496:16 State [5] - 1391:16, 1441:14, 1441:16, 1441:19, 1442:1 statement [5] -1404:1, 1415:18, 1454:21, 1483:13, 1488:11 statements [5] -1400:19, 1400:24, 1401:2, 1403:11,

states [2] - 1368:19, 1376:24 station [1] - 1471:16 stays [1] - 1454:13 steep [2] - 1386:4, 1423:5 stenographic [1] -1511:11 Stetson [2] -1506:22, 1508:18 still [6] - 1365:9, 1375:5, 1415:7, 1454:18, 1460:13, 1484:18 stipulate [1] - 1431:6 stop [7] - 1443:13, 1463:10, 1466:14, 1466:15, 1470:11, 1470:19, 1471:1 stop-controlled [1] -1466:15 stopped [1] -1466:19 street [7] - 1399:11, 1452:23, 1453:1, 1463:9, 1467:17, 1468:9, 1484:21 Street [26] - 1381:19, 1383:10, 1383:13, 1384:14, 1388:21, 1393:6, 1398:2, 1398:9, 1398:12, 1399:13, 1414:7, 1415:4, 1430:17, 1442:22, 1459:3, 1465:21, 1479:5, 1481:1, 1501:21, 1501:22, 1502:9, 1502:10, 1502:18 streets [3] - 1408:1, 1409:21, 1439:21 strike [1] - 1461:22 strongly [2] -1443:16, 1444:19 struck [2] - 1412:4, 1413:2 structure [1] -1475:17 structures [6] -1393:7, 1393:16, 1416:17, 1416:20, 1417:3, 1417:10 studies [1] - 1436:14 study [10] - 1433:7, 1433:10, 1433:12, 1447:19, 1449:1, 1456:19, 1457:20, 1463:24, 1479:4, 1503:23 stumbling [1] -

1403:13

speaking [1] -

1453:22 Subdivision [2] -1371:20, 1452:18 subject [1] - 1372:3 submission [7] -1374:14, 1374:18, 1374:20, 1375:2, 1375:7, 1401:22, 1401:23 supmit [6] - 1384:1, 1404:10, 1438:7, 1443:15, 1444:13, 1503:23 submitted [12] -1371:24, 1372:15, 1373:6. 1376:1. 1385:14, 1387:6, 1396:16, 1404:24, 1426:19, 1432:3, 1500:24, 1501:5 subsection [4] -1405:10, 1405:11, 1406:18, 1407:19 substantial [5] -1435:16, 1436:11, 1436:20, 1436:22, 1455:21 sufficient [4] -1389:14, 1395:11, 1395: 72, 1429:16 suggest [9] -1386:14, 1387:14, 1407:5, 1426:5, 1435:23, 1444:19, 1449:16, 1450:9. 1450:15 suggested [3] -1427:9, 1438:2, 1472:16 suggesting [2] -1390:19, 1484:22 suggestion [2] -1476:24, 1484:5 suggestions [1] -1481:18 **Suggests** [5] -1388:7, 1437:2, 1452:21, 1474:21, 1480:11 suitable [1] -1387:22 Su:/livan [1] - 1413:9 sammarized [1] -1368:10 summary [3] -1430:23, 1436:7, 1455:17 summer [1] -1436:17 supermarket[1] -

1467:16 supervisor [1] -1370:14 Supervisors [4] -1363:2, 1363:24. 1370:7, 1465:13 SUPERVISORS [1] supplementary [6] -1374:19, 1401:23, 1401:24, 1402:3, 1402:5, 1408:21 supplies [1] - 1403:5 support [1] -1373:20 supporting [1] -1495:5 supposed [2] -1490:22, 1493:12 surcharge [1] -1436.14 surcharged (3) ~ 1434:24; 1436:23, 1447:21 surface [1] - 1388:19 surprised [3] -1381:14, 1442:7, 1448:5 surprising [1] -1435:4 surrounding [4] -1375:17, 1393:8, 1393:15, 1411:20 susceptible [1] -1423:4 swath [7] - 1382:7, 1383:16, 1383:22, 1385:2, 1385:5, 1385:7, 1427:10 Swim [1] - 1415:8 Swimming [5] -1413:23, 1414:3, 1414:21, 1458:18, 1489:1 switch [1] - 1422:2 sworn [6] - 1365:16, 1367:4, 1367:7, 1430:10, 1493:24, 1494:3 system (3) - 1389:17, 1389:20, 1424:22 systems [1] -1491:16 T

table [8] - 1408:24,

1429:15, 1436:7,

1437:13, 1455:17,

1502:3

1467:3 Tavani [23] - 1430:5, 1430:16, 1430:20, 1430:21, 1431:11, 1431:16, 1451:22, 1451:24, 1452:4, 1453:14, 1453:18, 1453:23, 1458:19, 1458:23, 1460:20, 1461:15, 1462:14, 1478:17, 1482:14, 1487:3, 1496:21, 1497:14, 1509:14 **TAVANI** [2] - 1430:8, 1430:17 Tavani's [1] - 1488:1 Tech [1] - 1368:15 technically [1] -1398:18 ten [3] - 1370:8, 1451:18, 1502:13 ten-minute [1] -1451:18 ten-second [1] -1502:13 tend [2] - 1469:3, 1478:5 term [6] - 1390:13, 1391:5, 1392:23, 1392:24, 1422:15, 1423:1 termed [1] - 1388:13 terminus [1] - 1427:2 terms [12] - 1368:23, 1371:23, 1377:21, 1378:4, 1381:8, 1384:10, 1392:12, 1405:3, 1421:9, 1424:10, 1424:24, 1427:5 testified [11] -1367:8, 1379:16, 1387:7, 1387:10, 1421:24, 1430:11, 1432:12, 1445:**20**, 1494:4, 1495:23, 1502:21 testify [5] - 1364:24, 1429:15, 1491:14, 1493:10, 1496:22 testifying [2] -1489:23, 1491:17 testimony [27] -1365:16, 1376:6, 1379:7, 1379:11, 1379:12, 1384:5,

tables [2] - 1484:4,

tail [1] - 1484:16

take-home [1] -

1501:18

1390:4, 1400:4, 1400:16, 1404:2, 1431:17, 1432:14, 1435:15, 1443:23, 1450:19, 1470:14, 1470:22, 1488:2, 1492:5, 1493:11, 1494:7, 1495:19, 1496:14, 1497:1, 1506:4, 1507:18 text [1] - 1469:20 THE [104] - 1362:1, 1362:2, 1363:15, 1363:22, 1402:12, 1414:5, 1414:15, 1414:23, 1415:2, 1415:11, 1415:17, 1416:1, 1416:9, 1417:5, 1417:17, 1420:9, 1420:13, 1420:20, 1421:1, 1421:7, 1421:19, 1421:23, 1422:7, 1422:24, 1423:19, 1424:3, 1424:15, 1426:14, 1426:21, 1427:19, 1428:6, 1431:14, 1433:11, 1433:14, 1433:17, 1436:4, 1454:2, 1454:7, 1454:11, 1454:17, 1454:19, 1455:14, 1456:22, 1457:5, 1457:11, 1457:23, 1458:3, 1458:8, 1459:13, 1459:16, 1459:24, 1461:21, 1462:16, 1463:23, 1465:2, 1465:20, 1467:2, 1467:5, 1468:1, 1469:9. 1469:12. 1469:19, 1470:21, 1471:5, **1471:19**, 1472:19, 1473:12, 1473:15, 1473:22, 1474:2, 1474:12, 1474:15, 1474:19, 1474:23, 1475:9, 1475:20, 1476:2, 1476:6, 1476:13, 1477:3, 1477:12, 1477:16, 1477:18, 1478:2, 1478:13, 1479:11, 1480:2, 1480:6, 1480:21, 1481:6, 1481:15, 1482:2, 1483:12, 1483:21, 1485:11, 1485:14, 1487:4, 1502:2, 1502:6,

1502:15, 1502:20, 1503:21, 1504:23, 1505:10 themselves [1] -1447:12 thereby [1] - 1406:7 therefore [1] -1374:5 thin [1] - 1365:20 third [4] - 1375:2, 1437:5, 1442:20, 1465:19 THOMAS [1] -1362:15 Thompson [6] -1411:3, 1453:13, 1487:14, 1491:4, 1498:6, 1509:12 THOMPSON [8] -1363:8, 1411:5, 1411:8, 1413:10, 1453:16, 1487:17, 1491:7, 1498:8 Thornbury [23] -1363:7, 1365:4, 1381:21, 1382:10, 1389:11, 1399:17, 1410:24, 1412:14, 1413:13, 1416:5. 1429:12, 1443:3, 1447:8, 1448:7, 1448:9, 1450:10, 1450:16, 1458:22, 1459:6, 1466:1, 1487:22, 1489:9 thoughts [1] -1416:15 thousand [3] -1455:23, 1484:23, 1485:5 three [5] - 1384:13, 1399:9, 1413:2, 1442:1, 1468:22 three-fourths [2] -1399:9, 1413:2 tightly [2] - 1385:3, 1427:11 Tigue [1] - 1370:12 timed [1] - 1463:18 timing [4] - 1463:12, 1463:22, 1464:22, 1478:3 timings [2] - 1464:8, 1464:15 today [11] - 1378:22, 1393:18, 1424:2, 1426:19, 1443:1, 1457:18, 1465:22, 1468:23, 1469:7, 1469:16, 1476:19

TOLL [1] - 1362:8 Toll [9] - 1363:18, 1364:11, 1370:11, 1395:4, 1404:2, 1416:19, 1417:14, 1494:8, 1495:21 Tom [2] - 1364:2, 1369:19 tone [1] - 1409:2 tonight [6] - 1365:20, 1469:22, 1470:15, 1471:23, 1492:20, 1493:6 took [1] - 1389:12 tool [2] - 1389:2, 1417:10 topic [1] - 1496:14 topography [2] -1378:6, 1383:23 total [5] - 1409:6, 1409:14, 1409:19, 1462:4, 1462:12 touch [1] - 1433:3 tour[1] - 1372:10 toward [4] - 1385:8. 1412:6, 1442:16, 1484:1 tower[1] - 1382:16 townhomes [1] -1395:3 townhouses [1] -1374:1 township [6] -1364:6, 1366:11, 1372:24, 1386:15, 1400:14, 1494:10 TOWNSHIP [1] -1362:2 Township [31] -1362:18, 1363:5, 1363:7, 1363:10, 1364:5, 1365:2, 1365:4, 1369:15, 1370:2, 1370:7, 1371:16, 1371:20, 1372:23, 1380:6, 1381:21, 1382:10, 1399:17, 1399:18, 1410:20, 1410:24, 1422:6, 1428:24, 1429:5, 1429:12, 1448:1, 1448:7, 1450:10, 1450:16, 1452:5, 1452:17, 1453:10 rownship's [1] -1481:22 Township's [2] -1387:3, 1400:19 Town**shi**ps [1] -

1389:11 townships [1] -1422.8 tract [25] - 1363:17, 1370:12, 1372:16, 1377:18, 1377:22, 1377:23, 1377:24, 1378:5, 1378:9, 1378:22, 1380:8, 1383:2, 1384:9, 1386:17, 1387:21, 1388:1, 1388:8, 1389:1, 1392:21, 1400:23, 1413:9, 1414:17, 1425:21, 1427:3, 1475:6 tracts [1] - 1378:24 traffic [79] - 1369:4, 13/3:8, 1401:5, 1401:10, 1431:7, 1431:12, 1431:24, 1432:23, 1433:7, 1433:9, 1433:23, 1434:2, 1434:6, 1434:9, 1434:10, 1434:19, 1435:5, 1435:17, 1436:12, 1436:14, 1436:15, 1436:23, 1437:8, 1439:10, 1440:7, 1440:10, 1443:12, 1443:14, 1447:7, 1447:20, 1447:22, 1448:20, 1450:5, 1450:22, 1451:6, 1453:24, 1456:15, 1456:18, 1456:20, 1457:6, 1457:12, 1457:13, 1457:18, 1457:20, 1457:22, 1453:2, 1459:5, 1459:10, 1461:6, 1462:11, 1462:12, 1463:16, 1463:24, 1464:5, 1464:7, 1464:23, 1466:13, 1470:4, 1470:6, 1470:8, 1470:16, 1473:8, 1480:9, 1483:23, 1483:24, 1484:10, 1484:12, 1484:21, 1485:3, 1485:21, 1494:10, 1494:21, 1495:5, 1495:11, 1499:19, 1505:2, 1505:8 trall [8] - 1387:13, 1368:7, 1388:11,

1388:15, 1388:24,

1389:20, 1399:12,

1387:15, 1388:18, 1388:19, 1389:10, 1389:16, 1399:17, 1403:9, 1403:11, 1403:17, 1408:1, 1409:22, 1425:9, 1459:6, 1466:2 transcript [2] -1379:17, 1511:11 transit [3] - 1471:8, 1472:9, 1472:13 Transportation [2] -1441:3, 1441:7 transportation [2] -1471:3, 1471:4 travel [3] - 1443:7, 1460:22, 1467:10 tree [4] - 1378:7, 1380:9, 1383:21, 1407:21 trees [8] - 1376:19, 1378:21, 1381:20, 1382:9, 1382:10, 1407:22, 1409:4, 1412:13 tried [2] - 1366:19, 1472:22 trip [2] - 1433:22, 1447:5 triple [1] - 1468:24 trips [1] - 1474:8 troops [1] - 1379:1 trouble [2] - 1436:3, 1453:20 trucks [1] - 1435:10 true [15] - 1390:8, 1391:1, 1395:3, 1403:3, 1404:7, 1405:18, 1407:10, 1408:14, 1410:2, **1**416:1, **14**54:4, 1454:22, 1456:13, 1511:10 trunk [1] - 1407:22 Trust [5] - 1416:6, 1443:3, 1458:22, 1466:1, 1489:9 trusts [1] - 1368:20 try [3] - 1366:17, 1472:9, 1508:9 trying [5] - 1416:20, 1417:1, 1464:18, 1464:19, 1501:13 Tuesday [1] -1362:11 tuning [1] - 1426:5 turn [25] - 1364:7,

1399:15

trails [15] - 1387:12,

1433:20, 1434:15, 1437:19, 1439:22, 1442:16, 1445:11, 1446:15, 1447:4, 1468:14, 1473:18, 1474:6, 1474:16, 1474:17, 1479:20, 1479:23, 1480:11, 1484:1, 1495:13, 1496:2, 1496:6, 1502:23, 1503:4 turning [13] - 1399:2, 1434:19, 1434:20, 1435:24, 1442:4, 1456:18, 1456:20, 1457:9, 1457:16, 1472:1, 1485:22 turns (4) - 1439:22. 1457:18, 1486:2, 1486:13 tweaks [1] - 1468:10 two [12] - 1366:4, 1389:5, 1395:21, 1400:22, 1412:10, 1421:4, 1425:16, 1444:5, 1449:19, 1466:2, 1468:1, 1469:15 two-family [1] -1395:21 type [4] - 1400:13, 1411:14, 1426:4, 1436:14 typically [5] - 1366:2, 1422:24, 1436:17, 1438:24, 1441:5

ultimately [6] -1466:22, 1481:3, 1483:23, 1495:13, 1497:9, 1497:16 unavoidable [1] -1446:6 under [14] - 1372:1, 1391:2, 1395:2, 1398:12, 1422:8, 1432:20, 1436:8, 1437:13, 1445:12, 1446:9, 1466:16, 1480:8, 1492:7, 1494:1 understood [6] -1391:6, 1409:23, 1410:2, 1410:14, 1429:11, 1506:6 undoubtedly [1] -1435:11 unfortunately [2] -

unimportant [1] -1423:14 unique [2] - 1443:5, 1466:1 unit [1] - 1426:4 units [1] - 1426:4 University [1] -1368:12 unless [2] - 1505:22, 1508:19 unless.. [1] -1439:16 unobjective [1] -1392:23 unquote [1] -1390:10 unreasonable [1] -1425:12 unrelated [1] -1370:15 unsignalized [2] -1439:20, 1440:2 unusual [3] - 1366:4, 1374:1, 1422:13 up [21] - 1364:22, 1385:6, 1398:11, 1398:20, 1398:23, 1430:5, 1435:2, 1456:10, 1460:21, 1469:5, 1471:12, 1475:18, 1477:9, 1477:10, 1477:23, 1478:11, 1481:13, 1483:15, 1485:10, 1488:4, 1500:3 update [1] - 1433:11 updated [2] -1433:12, 1436:17 upgrades [2] -1467:22, 1483:7 upheld [1] - 1447:10 upper [3] - 1414:9, 1433:21, 1445:12 urban [1] - 1368:14 URDC [1] - 1369:20 **US** [1] - 1449:23 USE [1] - 1362:7 users [1] - 1443:20 uses [2] - 1392:24, 1459:22 utilities [1] - 1452:24 utilize [1] - 1495:11 utilized [1] - 1422:5

1365:7, 1470:23

V

value [4] - 1391:12, 1406:6, 1423:10, 1427:14

1394:5, 1432:19,

variable [1] -1378:11 varied [1] - 1459:12 variety [1] - 1443:7 varying [2] - 1378:6, 1388:14 Vasilios [1] -1363:12 vegetation [4] -1397:3, 1398:6, 1398:8, 1408:19 vehicles [5] - 1462:3, 1462:8, 1466:19, 1473:14, 1486:4 vehicular [1] -1443:6 versa [1] - 1485:23 versus [2] - 1377:16, 1426:20 verted [1] - 1505:1 vice [2] - 1364:2, 1485:23 video [1] - 1382:24 view [61] - 1374:22, 1378:9, 1378:13, 1378:23, 1379:18, 1380:8, 1382:21, 1383:19, 1384:2, 1384:17, 1384:19, 1388:17, 1390:5, 1390:10, 1390:12, 1390:14, 1390:17, 1391:3, 1391:4, 1391:6, 1391:7, 1391:10, 1391:11, 1392:14, 1392:19, 1392:22, 1410:7, 1410:12, 1411:12, 1411:15, 1412:2, 1412:3, 1412:5, 1412:21, 1413:4, 1413:5, 1413:6, 1413:9, 1414:12, 1414:13, 1414:17, 1414:22, 1415:1, 1415:3, 1415:7, 1415:14, 1415:15, 1415:16, 1415:19, 1415:22, 1415:23, 1416:15, 1424:16, 1427:1, 1427:2,

1379:20, 1383:10, 1384:12, 1385:18, 1386:6, 1386:16, 1386:22, 1387:10, 1390:20, 1390:21, 1392:12, 1392:24, 1405:13, 1405:22, 1407:23, 1407:24, 1408:4, 1409:20, 1409:21, 1412:22, 1412:24, 1413:8, 1422:15, 1426:7, 1426:18 Viewshed [3] -1397:15, 1400:13, 1417:13 Virginia [1] - 1368:15 visible [4] - 1378:22, 1381:16, 1384:16, 1384:21 vieual [2] - 1395:10, 1395:14 Vโซนสม**ีy** [2] -1364:15, 1392:1 voice [1] - 1430:5 voiced [1] - 1445:4 VULUME [1] -1362:5 volumes [1] -1457:17

8414

wait [1] - 1404:18 waiving [1] - 1429:6 walk [4] - 1425:17, 1467:17, 1468:19 walked [1] - 1380:7 walking [1] - 1459:6 warranted [2] -1456:9, 1495:14 warrants [1] - 1445:7 waste [1] - 1491:15 water [2] - 1382:15, 1490:4 weske**nd** [1] -1379:22 welcome [4] -1363:16, 1428:6, 1462:16, 1474:19 Waller [4] - 1419:24, 1465:6, 1493:1, 1499.8 WELLER [4] -1420:1, 1465:7, 1493:2, 1499:10 west [8] - 1382:2, 14.12:16, 1414:4, 1442:16, 1445:10,

1456:3, 1457:16,

1475:19 West [25] - 1362:11, 1382:17, 1388:20, 1393:6, 1396:23, 1397:3, 1413:19, 1438:6, 1439:19, 1439:23, 1440:22, 1444:21, 1450:8, 1450:14, 1475:14, 1475:22, 1476:17, 1477:1, 1477:5, 1477:14, 1477:20, 1483:1, 1495:12, 1495:14, 1502:10 westbound [1] -1496:6 westerly [2] -1383:22, 1425:20 western [1] - 1425:2 Westminster [2] -1382:13, 1413:21 Westtown [16] -1363:5, 1363:24, 1369:15, 1369:17, 1370:2, 1370:16, 1370:18, 1371:15, 1371:19, 1378:8, 1400:15, 1422:6, 1440:11, 1448:1, 1452:5, 1452:17 WESTTOWN [1] -1362:2 Westtown's [1] -1447:11 wetland [1] -1423:13 wetlands [2] -1386:4, 1423:5

whereas [1] - 1392:2

WHEREOF [1] -

white [1] - 1461:1

wide [1] - 1427:10

wider[1] - 1480:12

width [1] - 1388:14

widths [1] - 1459:12

winded [1] - 1485:13

willing [1] - 1494:9

WITNESS [101] -

1402:12, 1414:5,

1415:2, 1415:11,

1415:17, 1416:1,

1416:9, 1417:5,

1417:17, 1420:9,

1421:1, 1421:7,

1420:13, 1420:20,

1421:19, 1421:23,

1422:7, 1422:24,

1423:19, 1424:3,

1414:15, 1414:23,

1511:14

1424:15, 1426:14, 1426:21, 1428:6, 1431:14, 1433:11, 1433:14, 1433:17, 1436:4, 1454:2, 1454:7, 1454:11, 1454:17, 1454:19, 1455:14, 1456:22, 1457:5, 1457:11, 1457:23, 1458:3, 1458:8, 1459:13, 1459:16, 1459:24, 1461:21, 1462:16, 1463:23, 1465:2, 1465:20, 1467:2, 1467:5, 1468:1, 1469:9, 1469:12, 1469:19, 1470:21, 1471:5, 1471:19, 1472:19, 1473:12, 1473:15, 1473:22, 1474:2, 1474:12, 1474:15, 1474:19, 1474:23, 1475:9, 1475:20, 1476:2, 1476:6, 1476:13, 1477:3, 1477:12, 1477:16, 1477:18, 1478:2, 1478:13, 1479:11, 1480:2, 1480:6, 1480:21, 1481:6, 1481:15, 1482:2, 1483:12, 1483:21, 1485:11, 1485:14, 1487:4, 1502:2, 1502:6, 1502:15, 1502:20, 1503:21, 1504:23, 1505:10, 1509:9, 1511:14 Witness [3] - 1428:7, 1487:5, 1505:21 witness [30] -1364:23, 1365:5, 1365:7, **1365:12**, 1367:1, 1367:6, 1413:15, 1418:20, 1419:1, 1419:8, 1419:10, 1429:14, 1429:15, 1430:9, 1487:9, 1487:15, 1489:16, 1489:21, 1490:7, 1491:1, 1491:5, 1491:21, 1493:9, 1493:12, 1500:12, 1506:3, 1507:10, 1507:11, 1507:14, 1507:17

witnesses [3] -

1365:3, 1365:17,

1488:13

Wolter [1] - 1418:22 wonder[1] - 1472:18 wondered [1] -1475:13 wondering [1] -1463:13 woodland [4] -1376:17, 1412:11, 1412:12 woodlands [4] -1376:19, 1407:14, 1407:21, 1423:11 woods [1] - 1391:23 word [5] - 1366:7, 1392:19, 1406:21, 1422:17, 1422:19 words [4] - 1391:21, 1429:6, 1461:1, 1461:11 worried [1] - 1459:9 worse [2] - 1454:24, 1455:3 worst [1] - 1473:5 Worth [1] - 1420:15 worthy [2] - 1379:21, 1385:23 writing [1] - 1406:17 written [3] - 1375:7, 1400:8, 1406:15 Wylie [1] - 1413:6

X

XVIII [1] - 1362:8

Y

yards [1] - 1425:17 year [4] - 1436:10, 1436:21, 1437:3 years [9] - 1368:17, 1370:8, 1372:8, 1372:15, 1380:10, 1391:15, 1391:22, 1401:4, 1468:8 yellow [1] - 1383:4 yield [1] - 1473:11 yourself [1] - 1447:6

Z

zero [3] - 1456:20, 1457:3, 1457:19 zeros [2] - 1447:15, 1447:17 zoned [1] - 1395:19 Zoning [17] -1371:20, 1374:8, 1377:6, 1385:13, 1387:19, 1390:8,

1427:4, 1427:5,

1377:2, 1377:10,

1377:19, 1377:21,

1377:22, 1377:23,

1378:4, 1378:10,

1378:12, 1378:14,

viewed [1] - 1466:17

views [37] - 1376:20,

1390:11, 1391:2, 1392:8, 1392:10, 1394:20, 1401:13, 1401:16, 1403:16, 1403:22, 1452:5, 1452:8 zoning [3] - 1403:20, 1422:12, 1452:14