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CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Good evening. Thank for attending tonight's Planning Board meeting for the Town of Ossining, April 29, 2015. Let us start with the pledge of allegiance.
(Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) (The pledge of allegiance is recited.)

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you. Tonight we have one item on our agenda, the High View Farm scoping document. We will first begin with a brief summary from Mr. Stolman, on the scoping document and the addition. Then we will move to our attorney and our engineer. After that we will move to our Board members and any comments they may have, and then after that we will speak to the applicant and open it up to the members of the audience.

All of our comments we ask should be based upon the scoping document, so that we can move through the document and start to finalize it, so we can move to the next step. Okay. Mr. Stolman?

MR. STOLMAN: Do we have a microphone
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that I can use here.
THE CLERK: We do not, I'm sorry.
MR. STOLMAN: Okay. I'll try and speak up. There are seats in the front if people can't hear me. We took the applicant's scoping document and we've double underlined it and strike out, have shown additions and deletions and other things.

I had the benefit of comments from the Planning Board and there were some other correspondence as well, and what we have here is a fairly lengthy document at this point, it is currently sixteen pages, single space, and just to sort of walk through the general headings of the document anyway, it is really kind of lengthy to go through it word-by-word.

We have some general guidelines and then we have a description of the proposed action and the approvals that are required for the proposed action, and then we get into the scope of the document itself, and by law you have to have a cover sheet on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement.
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So, we have provided information as per part 617 of the DEC's guidelines, relative to putting together Enviromental Impact Statement, which explains what has to be included in the coversheet, there has to be a table of contents and the first official chapter is actually an executive summary of the document of the DEIS, which will talk about the proposal, the alternatives, the potential adverse enviromental impacts, mitigation measures. And the executive summary also includes a list of approvals and permits required for the project.

Then, the second chapter is a description of the project, and the project is described in great detail as per the scoping outline, and then chapter three is pretty much the meat of the matter. There are a variety of -- what we call a variety impact issues, and I'll run through the impact issues.

And in each case the DEIS has to describe the exiting conditions, the potential environmental impacts and the
mitigation measures for the environmental impacts.

So, the first issue area is wetlands, and we have several paragraphs which describe how about to -- how to go about describing and evaluating the exiting conditions, potential impacts and the mitigating measures.

The second issue area is topography and steep slopes. The third is stormwater managements and subsurface water. The fourth is vegetation and wild life. Then come historical and archeological resources, and once again, the scoping outline describes how to discrep -- outlines how to describe and evaluate the exiting conditions, the potential environmental impacts and the mitigation measures.

After historical and archeological resources, we have infrastructure and utilities, land use, zoning and community character, which deals with visual impacts as well, then traffic and transportation and then the next area is community facilities, then fiscal impacts of the project, cost
benefit analysis and that kind of thing, and then construction impacts, and all of those have to be evaluated in terms of existing conditions, potential impacts and mitigation measures. There is a substantial amount of detail as to how to go about doing that kind of work.

And then chapter four is required by SEQRA, it is a chapter about adverse environmental impacts that cannot be avoided if the project is implemented. And then chapter five is possible alternatives and we have alternatives regarding -- the first one is a conventional layout meeting all of the requirements that there are for a zoning district, the balance of the zoning law and the various other chapters of the Town code.

And then section $B$ would be a conventional layouts with lower lot counts and then section $C$ is a variety of different cluster alternatives. And alternative D includes an open space corridor, linking the Peekskill Briarcliff trail way.

Section E has to do with alternative project access if required by SEQRA, the new
optional alternative, which is a discussion of what would happen, what the situation would be if the project is not implemented. Chapter six is irreversible and irretrievable commitment of resources. Chapter seven is on road condition impacts during the project. Chapter eight is on the effects and use of energy resources and solid waste management, and then we have technical appendices regarding such things as the natural resource studies. Stormwater pollution prevention plan; the water and sewer system reports, the traffic study.

Phase one, and if needed phase two, cultural resources reports, and then all of the various SEQRA documentation, it needs to be included in the appendix as well, and then lastly all official correspondence related to the issues discussed in the DEIS. So, that's just a synopsis and I am hoping that most of you have copies of the draft scoping outline, the first draft of the Planning Board scoping outlines and if you don't have one yourself perhaps you can look with someone else.
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CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you. Wayne, do you have any comments for us on the scoping document tonight.

MR. SPECTOR: No, nothing other than to say that Davis's firm in preparing this document I believe followed the law, the body of the law as far as what needs to be included in this document, and it seems to be a very complete document from the stand point of what is legally required.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you, Wayne. Dan, do you have any comments.

MR. CIARCIA: No, as far as the utilities and stuff it has already been covered. The Croton aqueduct, the stormwater, and in looking at the adequacy of the existing water, sewers, that is really my focus and we will evaluate that when the report is prepared.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you. So now we are going to have the Board members introduced themselves and if they have any comments they would like to provide on the document, we ask that you do that tonight. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can hear you
but not everyone can. Can everyone maybe speak a little --

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay. Okay. Would you like to start?

MR. HOUGHAM: Sure. My name is Gareth Hougham, and I sent a couple of preliminary comments regarding the draft scoping document that David sent around and I'll summarize those now or some of them anyway.

So, under chapter three section A, wetlands. It was stated that it should follow, if necessary, the US Army Corps of engineers processes and I wonder whether or not the New York State DEC regulations could be more appropriate.

There has been a lot of discussion among the Environmental Advisory Counsel over the course of the last year about these two different sets of standards, and there are some significant differences.

And it might be worth speaking with the EAC and -- to get their recommendation for this particular project, what would be most appropriate. That's something I would
like to have consider.
MR. STOLMAN: Do you want a response at this point?

MR. HOUGHAM: Sure, if you think a response now would be --

MR. STOLMAN: They definitely have to use the Town of Ossining wetlands law regulations to delineate town wetland.

MR. HOUGHAM: Right.
MR. STOLMAN: There may be a report of wetlands on the property as well, in which they would use the Army Corp criteria and perhaps come up with a different boundary. If there are DEC wetlands, which there are not, then they would use the DEC criteria and maybe have a third boundary.

So, the criteria are different and if there is an Army Corp wetland on there, then they have to use the Army Corp regulations, and we know it is the Town of Ossining wetlands so they have to use the Town of Ossining wetlands delineation criteria.

MR. HOUGHAM: Okay, okay.
MR. STOLMAN: So, depending upon who has the jurisdiction, those would be the
criteria that would be used.
MR. HOUGHAM: Okay. If there is no New York State jurisdiction in this case then the Army Corp sounds right -MR. STOLMAN: And the Town of Ossining.

MR. HOUGHAM: And the Town of Ossining.

MR. STOLMAN: So, there may be two different boundaries.

MR. HOUGHAM: There had been a discussion about trying to modify the Town of Ossining regulations, to adopt one or the other as our standard approach, but that has not yet been done, we have to go with what's currently --

MR. STOLMAN: But that could --
MR. HOUGHAM: Okay.
MR. STOLMAN: -- but that could occur during the, you know -- what you are talking about now could occur during the process of the applicant preparing the DEIS, and if that happens, the applicant will be bound by the new regulations, the new local regulations.

MR. HOUGHAM: True again. Under page six, chapter three, section C. Stormwater Management. I believe that there should be an addition with the headline Historical Flood Occurrence, and I'd like -- I would recommend that the detail history of flooding along the North State Road corridor be prepared.

There has been significant flooding there in several of the major storms in the last couple of years, and I would recommend that a study show by description and map delineation the flooding from storms Floyd, Irene and Sandy, at the least, and that they should make reference to newspaper accounts as well as any technical reports that have been prepared by the town, county, state or federal agencies involved. I know that FEMA was involved in some of those cases.

MR. STOLMAN: Why don't I confer with Dan about that.

MR. HOUGHAM: Okay.
MR. STOLMAN: You don't have to do it right now.

MR. HOUGHAM: Okay, I know.


North State Road that were completely clogged up and not functioning, so a lot of the problems that occurred down at that area were the result of those culverts that have since been replaced. That should remedy a lot of that. And the problem is that some of these things, what you really need to do is, you've got to ana -- essentially, where do you stop, you know.

You keep analyzing down the system, but certainly if there are deficiencies in the system itself, which have been identified and corrected, I think it goes beyond what this applicant can do. But the town has looked into those problems on North State Road, and address them.

MR. HOUGHAM: Okay.
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: May I just ask, when there is a development $I$ would think that the developer has to do as much as they can to ensure that there is a limited or no runoff that is coming through the property due to the development. Could you go into that you know thought.

MR. CIARCIA: I mean, you know,
it's -- the storm water -- that the New York State guidelines for doing stormwater doesn't have -- they've kept ramping it up. So, it used to be that you just had to look at a variety of storms and seek to it that you didn't increase the flow.

As the regulations evolved then they brought in criteria in terms of how these practices are constructed to deal with water quality, and then how to treat the water. And then it kept going, and then what you have to do is you have to employ practices that actually reduce runoff altogether. So, in other words, it is not good enough just to hold the line on predevelopment flow rate, you actually have to reduce the runoff.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Make it even better that what it was before.

MR. CIARCIA: Yes, yes. So --
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: That's interesting.

MR. CIARCIA: Because over the past decade since they adopted these general permits for stormwater, every integration of
it has become more and more you know, rigorous and the standards keep going up. So -- but that is not to say that if there are you know, in the proximity of the project there is something obvious, that's not to say that during this analysis if we found out you know, that there is a pipe in Ryder Park for some -- some improvement that could go a long way.

I mean, you can take this to the next step and you can look at it and say you know what, there is -- for example, one of the issues we end up with, is the Town and the applicant, you've got to address this on your property only.

Through SEQRA you can look at other things, like for example you could go into Ryder Park, say if there was -- and not to hold his line, but in other words, if you were able to take the money or the infrastructure that he was going to do to solve the problem on his site, and you could take that same money and apply it say at a town on a piece of land, and go above and beyond what could be achieved, you could
actually fix stuff, you know. That's the kind of thing where -- but you know, that gets sometimes difficult to work out.

But you know, we are going down stream, those are the kind of things that you can look at to sort of reaching a solution. But, to some extent you know, then you do that then you really need to begin to do a more holistic view of your infrastructure and where your bottlenecks are and where you can do things to correct the exiting problem.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay. Thank you.

MR. STOLMAN: We make sure that on page six, we say that all of stormwater manage practices have to comply with the DEC regulations.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: That's right.
MR. STOLMAN: Pursuant to quantity and quality and the DEC regulations are more stringiest than the Town of Ossining regulations.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: And that's why I wanted him to flush that out to know
that -- so then everyone understands that it can actually be better through this development. These issues can actually be improved through this development.

MR. CIARCIA: You know, there is definitely drainage issues up in that neighborhood, and to the extent that we are aware of them and to the Extent that we can design a drainage system to make sure those things are addressed that you know, there is the sort of the holistic view of the North State Road and all of that, but there is more of a local issue where there are some issues. So, to that end there are certain things that can be done to correct those exiting problems.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay, thank you.

MR. HOUGHAM: Number four, on page six, under chapter three, section $D$, vegetation and wildlife, by the way, I apologize for a misspelling there. UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What page is that?

MR. HOUGHAM: Excuse me, page six,
chapter three, D, vegetation and wildlife. In addition to the rare, threatened or endangered species as mentioned, the species listed by the New York State DEC as of special concern, $I$ think should also be included.

And as there are many examples of endangered threatened certain species that are of a wide variety of types that are rarely considered, such as aquatic micro invertebrates that are little bugs that you find in the water and as such, I would recommend that we explicitly state that the animals that should be considered must include mammals, fish, insects, reptiles amphibians, birds and plants.

To explicitly state the list so that some of the you know, lesser members of God's creation are not forgotten, such as the bugs. So, that's just a matter of explicitly stating something that is probably covered by the word "all". I would rather not assume that things would be forgotten.

Under page seven, chapter three,
section E, historical and archeological. I believe there should state that the project site will be analyzed via phase one assessment as you said, but to include a ground base observation by a certified archeologist.

And it is my understanding that phase one assessment is sort of a preliminary assessment to see whether there -- whether it warrants some much in depth study, and I would think that a walk through the property by an archeologist would suffice for that, but not doing a ground base walk through that would be insufficient, that would be my thought on that matter.

On page fourteen, under chapter five, possible alternatives. I think that there should be a new letter, $E$, suggesting a raised platform walkway through the wetlands with educational signage that form a pedestrian thru path from Ryder Park to Peekskill trail way protected under a conservation easement.

Some of those are mentioned in some of the other alternatives, but this sort of
brings them together in one alternative or a piece of an alternative that $I$ think it would be very desirable.

Page fifteen, under technical appendices, within the existent parenthesis should state, including wetlands, soils, vegetation, all animals including fish, terrestrial and aquatic micro invertebrates, birds, amphibians and reptiles. Again, the same issue there, just to explicitly estate there the variety of animals that need to be included.

To this memo that I sent out earlier I would like to add two things. One is that to explicitly state that in the water quality analysis that a phosphorous nitrate, nitrite and ammonia analysis should be done, and that may already be stated in the New York State DEC water quality regulations, I don't know, I didn't look. If there is not, then I'd like these very minimal water quality measurements to be made to give us a baseline to compare future analysis too.

So, post construction this could be done and it would be useful to see whether
nitrogen and phosphorous fertilizers for instance are coming off of the developed property. Without this baseline there would be no way to tell, if there was a problem with runoff.

Lastly, I want to backtrack a little bit on something that $I$ said at the last meeting, where $I$ was wanting a requirement for a full year of hydrological study. Since that time, myself and members of the EAC have talked to quiet a few professionals in the field, arraigning from biologists and many engineering professionals.

And while the biologists tend to remain firm that a full annual cycle study should be done almost to the person, the professionals in the field think that if it is adequate to do the analysis -- without -to do meaningful analysis without a full year cycle, but that they must be done within appropriate times of the year, for again the animal, plants and water studies.

So, given that as long as they are timed properly, I don't think that the annual studies are needed. So, I wanted to
state that. So, one last comment I would like to make is in response to the letter that Mr. Wekstein sent today, in response to the scoping and if I may, I'd like to just read this.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Could we do that once the applicant has made their comments and then you can respond to those comments?

MR. HOUGHAM: Perfect.
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: So that everyone understands what you are responding to.

MR. HOUGHAM: I think that makes sense.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you very much. Thank you for all the comments.

MR. HOUGHAM: Thank you very much.
MR. STOLMAN: I am sorry, I thought you were going to go into Greg.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Yes, I was going to --

MR. STOLMAN: I just wanted to say something first.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Please do.

MR. STOLMAN: If I could. I think

it's potential for common passive use, and specifics about maintenance of said open space, roadways, common site improvements. It's been implied that there is open space where the clusters came, but as to how that is used or not used, what specifics, how it is maintained and everything else including the roadway, that should be essential included in the executive statement. There should be some verbiage on that.

The other thing is chapter five, under possible alternatives. Proposed cluster development alternatives should be presented that include possible variations in lot size, in addition to lot count. Varying lot sizes will provide for various utilization of the existing site in terms of decreasing density in critical steep slope areas and possibly add visual interest in the individuality for proposed residences. Developing a property as per standardized minimum R5 lot size, per specific bulk regulations, might result in a cookie cutter lot building layout that is composed uniformly over varying different
site conditions.
So, those points and add some verbiage in here that -- it is really something that $I$ am sure the applicant is going to pursue, but it would really be worth while particularly from the end of Morningside Court, to have renderings of what these building are going to look like right above there.

In that particular layout area is probably where $I$ was getting at in terms of decreasing the density up there, it's a sensitive area, and having more dense areas around the site, but that's one area that $I$ think should be relatively minimally develop.

So, that in addition to all the other comments that this Board members have made, that those are basically the things that are different for me.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay. Dennis.
MR. KIRBY: My name is Dennis Kirby, good evening everyone. All of my comments that I submitted have been included in this document, so I am not going to going through
them. I would like to ask a couple of questions and possibly a comment.

And that first question has to do with proposed action. Starts on the bottom of page two, but then it goes to page three. And I am wondering if the New York City Water Department for the New York City Department of Environmental Protection should be included on that list, because the aqueduct runs under the property.

MR. STOLMAN: Let me explore that.
MR. KIRBY: So, that is question one. Then, on top of page five, under existing conditions, the third paragraph, that the soil analysis should be performed by the wetland scientists. Is there any certification required for the wetland scientist.

MR. STOLMAN: I believes so. I don't know what the exact certification is, but $I$ believe so.

MR. KIRBY: So they -- should that be a certified professional wetlands scientist and is there any involvement by the Planning Board on who that wetland scientist would be
or what company that would be. So, that was my second question.

Under page six, stormwater management and subsurface water, potential impact. I am interested to know if there would be a study of potential impact of stormwater management during construction. And I believe -- let me go through it very quickly, that's it. Thank you.

MR. STOLMAN: Just one comment. I will check out the New York City DEP and the -- and SHPO, there are mentioned in here later on when it comes to the aqueduct, but I will find out what permits to grant.

MR. KIRBY: Thank you.
MR. STOLMAN: DEP wrote a letter, we have a letter from DEP, but as to whether they have an official permit to grant, I'll look into that.

MR. KIRBY: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Mr. Bosinnas.
MR. BOSINNAS: Good evening, my name is Jim Bosinnas, my comments are going out to other Board members, I will keep it brief. They are based on exploring the
options on the site plan. I am looking for other options that are zoning district complaint as opposed to the cluster development that is being proposed, so we can see what those options are when they come in.

There is already been a set of plans submitted for the benefit of establishing a lot count, but $I$ don't want to assume that, that is the land that they are going to pursue. So, we will wait and see what other options come in.

The other issues specifically looking for a discussion on the runoff concerns from the adjacent properties, and so a couple of months ago we received a letter from the Highway Department regarding the Town Board approval for some of the work that's going to take place in at Ryder Park. So, what we would do to address that as well.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you
member Bosinnas. I too have submitted my thoughts and my comments with regard to the scoping document, and as the Board members know most of them went over the alternatives
that we would like to see analyzed through this process. Obviously the conventional subdivision and the clusters, looking at a number of different lots, 10 I think, 15, etc, so that we have a good idea what all different types of alternatives would look like for the Board.

Also, there is a fair amount of steep slopes on the property and I know -- I think I have seen the steep slopes map that demonstrates all the steep slopes. The percentages of the steep slopes weren't indicated or I didn't see them indicated, you know, if it's a 30 percent slope, etc, etc.

That amount of what's current -- of the slopes and what is currently out there, we should be able to obtain a copy of that for our review, and eventually we should have the property staked for obviously building lot line, building envelopes, the lot lines, etc, so that we know exactly where everything is proposed to be place so can see it and view, and the Planning Board of course can go to the site and look at it.

At this point, we will have the applicant come and address the Board if the applicant has any comments.

MR. WEKSTEIN: Thank you. Thank you madam Chairperson, members of the Board. I'm Adam Wekstein partner at the law firm of Hocheman Tortorella \& Wekstein, I am here on behalf of the applicant.

My comments are actually restricted primarily to alternatives not surprisingly. We feel number one, that there are too many alternatives, and number two, that some of the alternatives are unreasonable in light of what is being proposed, in light of the site. By my count there are at least ten alternatives that have already been asked for.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I can't hear you. Sorry.

MR. WEKSTEIN: My comments were made primarily to the alternatives. We believe there are too many and we believe some of them are inappropriate. In this case there are at least ten alternatives that are required by the scope, five different
cluster alternatives, multiple and unspecified number of reduced density unconventional alternatives.

Obviously the proposed action, a zoning compliant conventional alternative, four different access alternatives to the site, and now we are hearing a pathway plus the -- previously in the scope there was the Briarcliff/Peekskill pathway link.

For a project of this magnitude, and frankly for a project of any magnitude that's an incredible amount of alternative analysis. I mean the process again in looking at alternative is supposed to require the applicants project sponsor to do a reasonable range of alternatives considering the objectives and capability of the project sponsor.

It's supposed to give you and the public a basis to make an intelligent decision, but not to go into every conceivable permutation and combination that can relate to this property. So, number one we think there are too many and we think you can achieve the same thing by having a
lesser number than what is there right now. It is as burden on the applicant and frankly I don't think it helps on your fact finding or the public's ability to make an intelligent review of what is being proposed.

We think number two, that several of the alternatives are at a density that is inconsistent with the applicant's capabilities, objectives and what is reasonable. What we have here as you know, and not to belabor it, it's a 31 and a half acre site. You have a determination by your Board already that there is a maximum lot count of 24 , which is a maximum, you are not bound by that. We understand that.

You have a site with public sewer, public water. Minimum lot size of forty thousand square feet. Frankly we don't think there is any place in this scope for the 10,12 or 15 model alternatives.

My other comments are really more limited. One is that the tree surveyor you are asking for, we understand one will be needed and required to evaluate it, but we do not believe, and it has not been our experience in other municipalities that, that should be of the entire site.

Your tree ordinance requires -- what defines a tree is anything with a six inch diameter abreast of DBH. In some instances, trees as small as three inch DBH can also be trees as defined in the ordinance.

What we are requesting is something that the scope just be modified to say that we will do the surveying, identification and classification of the trees that are within the disturbed areas or the areas proposed to be disturbed by the action in the alternatives that are included in the EIS.

On traffic study, again in speaking to our traffic consultant and seeing what has been done, when we have done studies in the past, for residential development traffic generally is not looked at on weekends, that's for commercial that our institution uses. It is not normal practice, but that's obviously your Board's decision whether you want to see that, but we don't think that's appropriate in this
case.
The final mention, and I skipped this one when $I$ was looking for the alternatives, and probably from our perspective it's one of the most important ones, is the alternative that is requested for access through New Castle, and we will object to that because number one, the New Castle piece is not part of the subdivision, it has never been, it doesn't have connected utilities, it isn't functionally integrated to it.

Number two, with the exception of a small piece, it is not owned by the same entity, it is owned by a different entity. So, we don't think it is appropriate, we think that the alternatives that we have been asked to show for access which would be Morningside with emergency -- well, what we are proposing, which is Tavano and emergency over Morningside. Morningside with emergency over Tavano and a tru road are the appropriate three alternatives for access. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you. Are
there any department heads, chairs of boards who would like to come to the front and address the Board at this time.

MS. ELKES: Thank you, I'm Mitzi Elkes, Chairperson of the Environmental Advisory Committee, and I have copies of comments that I also mailed.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Do you have her comments?

THE CLERK: I do, these were the same that were e-mailed.

MS. ELKES: No.
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: This is new.
THE CLERK: Oh, okay.
MS. ELKES: These are the same ones. But what I am going -- what I would like to start with is really just to state for the record, that there are ordinance in this town, there are state, federal whatnot regulations, laws, that aim to protect the environment and the residents of communities, regarding runoff, regarding biodiversity, $I$ am not going to go on.

But, these regulations apply to a gamut of various different sites and
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locations. And for the record, this site from the get go, it has always been very high elevation, surrounded by highly developed communities with respectable homes, very respectable home owners and respectable businesses along North State Road.

And we're even going to travel down Route 100, down to Briacliff, down through the thru streets, down to Sleepy Hollow, all of these areas are affected by this very sensitive unique piece of property. And that is really to be very much emphasized in the review, in the approach, and I speak as an environmental protection person for the community, that is an issue that really should stand out and stand out as a priority when approaching this development.

And it really needs to be stated and emphasized because I think it is lost in translation. It is not just wetlands, it is not just steep slopes, it is towering over the entire Pocantico watershed and it also happens to have an aqueduct so many feet below.

But there are many communities and population impacted by what will transpire on this site and it needs to be taken seriously, and $I$ think it should in the description more profoundly than this -CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Can we go through the -- I want to make sure that the -MS. ELKES: Well, that's not my job. CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: No, no, no. I want to make sure for the record what is it that --

MS. ELKES: What is in this report.
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: So we can just quickly.

MS. ELKES: Okay, I can --
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: -- or I can just go through it.

MS. ELKES: Donna is gonna go through
it. I was gonna --
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay, you're gonna go through it.

MS. ELKES: I am just saying it for the record.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.

MS. ELKES: That this property should


UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you, speak louder.

MS. SHARRATT: So, pages three and four of the Planning Board's first draft with mitigation of project description. We would like to see plans and a timeline for any ongoing maintenance of the proposed mitigation.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MS. SHARRATT: We would like that included and particularly a timeline, so that when it is mitigated wetlands often fail and they need three years or so to maintain.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MS. SHARRATT: That's what we would
like. Page five, wetlands. Chapter three, the existing conditions. All existing wetlands, water courses, vernal pools and assembled streams, including those within two hundred feet of the site and regardless of size should be delineated and inscribed in the wetland study.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MS. SHARRATT: The wetland
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| 1 | delineation should be determined by both, |
| 2 | hydrophytic vegetation and hydric soils. |
| 3 | CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay. |
| 4 | MS. SHARRATT: And list the soils. |
| 5 | And I think that, that -- |
| 6 | CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: So you want to |
| 7 | add. |
| 8 | MS. SHARRATT: Hydrophytic |
| 9 | vegetation, also. Then this would speak |
| 10 | to -- Gareth mentioned the vernal pools and |
| 11 | ephemeral streams are only going to be able |
| 12 | to be identified during the Spring season, |
| 13 | so -- |
| 14 | CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: He has |
| 15 | communicated that. |
| 16 | MS. SHARRATT: Well, this is one of |
| 17 | those cases where there is a specific time. |
| 18 | CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Right. |
| 19 | MS. SHARRATT: So, rather than saying |
| 20 | we need a long year study -- |
| 21 | CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Just say Spring |
| 22 | season; emphasized that. |
| 23 | MS. SHARRATT: Right, for ephemeral |
| 24 | streams and vernal pools. Now, bringing |
| 25 | into the idea of the DEC determining what |

the wetland is, the jurisdiction of the wetlands I -- we feel should not be determined until all the wetlands have been delineated and any possible wetland and water course connectivity has been established.

Connectivity of wetlands and watercourses may establish a combined size of wetland that would warrant additional governing jurisdictions, including the New York State DEC.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MS. SHARRATT: Then, I am speaking to Rob Doscher, he is the District Manager of the Office of Water and Soil Conservation of Westchester County Department of Planning. He suggested that the wetlands hydrology or the wetlands budget -- water budget would be determined. To determined if it's -- the wetlands that are there are created by impervious soils, ground water or stormwater runoff.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MS. SHARRATT: And I think this is
important, because when you are taking all
those impervious surfaces, the groves on the roads, and you are channeling water to other places, where this is a property that used to have uniformed waters are coming down, that might change for any of the wetlands that aren't going to be.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: This needs to be analyzed.

MS. SHARRATT: Yes, right. CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: The creation and the --

MS. SHARRATT: Yes, how that is going to change that. Mr. Doscher also stated that wetland identification should be performed during the growing season with soils free of snow and not frozen. And I would really prefer that to be in there because this is -- traditionally a lot of the developers try to come in January, under snow. I don't know how you do soil testing at that time.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay. So, that comment you want.

MS. SHARRATT: Yes, and that's also existing conditions of wetland, on page
five. He suggested that each point should be flagged and have a GPS identification, that a full report and data sheet should be provided and that an independent consultant should verify the boundaries and results. Now on wetlands, number two, of potential impact. Any disturbance to or crossing of wetlands, wetland buffers and watercourses and -- or watercourse buffers should be clearly identified, described and mapped. He also stated that you should note that any wetlands that comes hydrologically isolated due to construction could be considered a disturbed wetland and therefore included in mitigation plans.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MS. SHARRATT: So, if the -- it
shouldn't be just where the road is going through the wetland. If they're cutting off part of the wetland then it becomes isolated, then where the road goes through and that part becomes isolated --

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Through construction should be considered.

MS. SHARRATT: To be considered in
the mitigation process.
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MS. SHARRATT: All vegetative covert that is anticipated to be lost due to construction should be listed and described. All replacement plant materials for any proposed mitigation should be listed with both their common and scientific names. Comments, I know that David included that in another area, $I$ just want to make sure that, that was in there too. For all of the other you have cover that all.

MR. STOLMAN: I will make sure this is.

MS. SHARRATT: I know it is being redundant.

MR. STOLMAN: I'll make sure it does.
MS. SHARRATT: Thank you. Native plant materials should be used, particularly with any mitigation process of projects. Under no circumstances should plant materials which are listed on the New York State DEC prohibited and regulated invasive plant law, which is just been recently passed. None of that should be permitted.

wildife, existing conditions for the stormwater. Stormwater analysis should be done during the wet season when soils are free of snow and not frozen. We request a couple of studies, one of which I just mentioned, which is the runoff into the North State Road area --

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: And we discussed runoff and how it is --

MS. SHARRATT: Right --
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: -- supposed to work with the development.

MS. SHARRATT: -- and this is that, so I don't need to go into that any more, and then the Pocantico watershed history study is requested to clear all these things that Mitzi spoke about.

Water quality study which Gareth has spoken about, so I don't need to go into that at all, but those things, the phosphorous, the slope studies and all of that is something that would be very important, I think.

So, under potential impact, which is number two. The Pocantico tributary should
be included in the watershed maps and to include those which flow through the Town of New Castle. So, just north of the Morningside Court area, when you're driving on Morningside Drive you can see a big water fall coming down, I am guessing that starts at High view Farms because where else would it come from. And that comes through the Town of New Castle, and then it flows way down to North State.

So, that is not on the watershed maps that I have seen, so it seems like there are additional tributaries, one of them come through my backyard, so they are not shown in the map so I think all of them need to be included.

Now, going on to vegetation and wildlife, existing conditions. All natural habitats and community types on this site should be identified. All species on the US Fish and Wildlife and the New York State DEC, threatened, endangered species. Gareth went into that, so I don't need to go into that too much. But mainly we'd like the habitats considered.

Because for instance I spoke to the Sandy Doran, who is a biologist for the Department of US Fish and Wildlife and I spoke to someone at Cornell Department of Ornithology, so in those situations it is going to be really hard for the applicant to get somebody there to identify some of these things, but you can identify habitats, and that's something that $I$ think is important.

For instance, when they were doing the Tappan Z Bridge, they determined that bass would possibly go under the trees that were being cut down, so, trees were not allowed to be cut down except from October 31 to March 31, so that there would be no impact to possibility of migrating mammals.

Plant identification should include both, early season spring and ephemerals and later season plants for the most accurate assessment that again, speaks to the same issue. Tim Post of the Freshwater Wetlands Program Manager with the New York State DEC, stated that online vegetation and wildlife mapping resources are not intended for
definitive analysis and should not be used during any part of the review of this proposed action.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MS. SHARRATT: Almost everything that we've seen that comes forth in front of us, they use something called the resource mapper and this -- the head of the wetlands program manager says that is not accurate.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay, we can add that.

MR. STOLMAN: The resource mapper is very general.

MS. SHARRATT: Right.
MR. STOLMAN: Very general. So, that's sort of our first cut, but you are talking about actually studies being done.

MS. SHARRATT: Right.
MR. STOLMAN: Actual studies being done.

MS. SHARRATT: Right, right, because that's usually on their application. Basically he's saying if someone it's been on the property then they notice something and that goes on the map, but if none it's
been on the property it would not be noticed on the map.

So, David Kvinge, Director of
Environmental Planning of Westchester County Department of Planning stated that landscaping changes should include the amount of tree canopies proposed to be lost and any disruption to wildlife corridors which would result from the proposed action should be considered. And this -- I am just learning about the tree request.

I think that it would be important to know all the trees, a complete tree survey, because not just where they are being proposed, because if there is trees just beyond the range of where the disturbance is, the roots could be disturbed and it also would change what the water life corridors are.

So, the next chapter three, vegetation and wildlife habitat should be considered. Plans and methods that would be employed to protect plant materials not permitted for removable, to include but not limited to their complete root system should
be described.
Proposed plans and methods that will be employed to revert soil comparison due to construction activity within permeable areas should be described, because that would definitely impact how the roots uptake, particularly in old trees.

Mr. Kardel stated the introduction of light into the nighttime environment is known to affect the normal distribution of night flying food resources for nocturnal species. Determination of the amount of nighttime lighting should be made and the potential impacts of this lighting to wildlife species.

To address potential impacts on bird -- existing bird migration patterns specifications for all proposed outdoor lighting should be provided, and particularly it will be requested to be use warm LED lights, so that LED lights be used, so not to impact wildlife. So, we would like specifications on that.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MS. SHARRATT: We also -- he also suggested that in any kind of mapping of the plans that the potential light trespass on adjacent properties be illustrated. So, if it is going to impact one of the neighbor's houses from street lights or housing lights, that should be known. Needless to say I'd also like to know if any of that is going to disturb some of those habitats that are possibly outside of the developed area. And then I talked about the tree removal. And finishing up here, mitigation of destroyed or impact -- impacted habitat should be proposed. On the traffic and transportation. I live on Morningside Drive, so I would suggest that the weekday morning would be 6:00 a.m. to 9:30 a.m., there is a lot -- people travel to New York, to take the train for New York, so 6:00 a.m. is more appropriate, and the weekday afternoon we have buses starting to come through, so $I$ would say $2: 30$ start that. CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay. MS. SHARRATT: On page thirteen, construction impacts, the impacts on wildife and vegetation should be included.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you. Do we have any other members, department heads or chairs of our committees who would like to speak? Okay. Now we are going to open it up to the public, and I ask that the comments relate directly to the scoping document so we can complete the document because as you know we are under a timeline. So, and with -- when you come to the front I will like to ask you to clearly state your name, the street that you live on and make your comment. Yes, sir.

MR. HOEFLICH: Thank you, I am Mark Hoeflich, of Morningside Drive. I am just going to be very brief. As an architect when you are dealing with a very difficult type of project, it is sometimes nice to have a topographical actual model of this entire spaces built, small scale, with all the different things showing the clusters, the conventional, and even something where you could even have this element -- this model show water running off it.

I know that as an architect, when I've had to design very difficult projects
in the past, we had to build a model to present to a building department for review, whether it's in New York City or in Oshkosh Bigosh, anywhere.

Something like this, where you have thirty acres of which approximately ten are wetlands, I personally think that the Planning Board and the Zoning Board in the town should request something like this, so that we, the citizens who live on Morningside Drive actually see. I am just keeping it very brief, I think that's something that should be really added into this document. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you.
MS. MASSERMAN: My name is Wendy Masserman, I live at 10 Morningside Court in the Town of Ossining. I am a member of the Concerned Citizens of Ossining, I've been asked to present some items that we feel should be included in the DEIS, much of it I took out of EAC, so I'm gonna kind of cut through it here and there.

I have reviewed both, the scoping document and the EAC report, and I guess
this was supposed to be included, but there were many things that were not included from the EAC report. I want to say about the existing conditions on the wetlands, I believe it's page five in your scoping document.

Where page three of the EAC report recommends that a wetland study include all existing wetlands, not just existing wetlands, but all, and water bodies, including watercourses, vernal pools ephemeral springs within two hundred feet of the site, regardless of size and in the draft scope it only mentions wetlands, and water bodies, and I think they all should be studied as the EAC does.

I would -- the comment by Rob Doscher about the mitigation of wetlands is not a good draft, it does not usually work. Extensive analysis study are necessary to complete this, and more often than not the new wetlands do not function as intended.

We would like to request that an alternative be put in, that placing a bridge over the wetlands, that is proposed on

Tavano which would -- if the bridge -- if the road goes thru it could cause a hydrological isolation and could affect everybody. So I would like that alternative; we would like to request that. CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Under wetlands. MS. MASSERMAN: On the stormwater management subsurface water I would like to speak as a -- an owner of a business on North State Road. And all the water problems are not fixed, and some of them are not even in Ossining. As we talked about before the water fall, that comes down through the High View Farm property down through the Carrie Chapman House, down and if you look at North State Road after any big rain, it is flooded.

Now, we are lucky our area is not, we did a lot of work to -- when we built our building, so -- because we knew of the water problem. So, we are very lucky there, but if you go up a little ways and it is very, very, affected and $I$ think that really has to be looked into.

We would like to identify -- have the applicant identify and described existing drainage patterns on the site and within surrounding offsite areas located within the same drainage basins, include evaluation of the drainage problems in neighboring properties adjoining the proposed development. Include perc testing on all the adjoining properties since the perc performance could be effected by the new drainage patterns.

We'd like to have an evaluation of the existent farmers drains running through the proposed development and how water flow will affect neighboring property. There are farmers drains that run all the way down to Ryder Park. We -- the gentleman who paved -- who did the road for Morningside Court told me that when he put through -every ten feet there were the drains running, and we have been told by

Mr. Ciarcia that Morningside Court should never been built. So, I am wondering what we are thinking with this 31 acres that are now being considered.

We would like to have you document
how stormwater from impervious surfaces, including exposed rock would be directed and controlled during the construction phase and after the construction is complete. In addition, document how post development pollutant loading would be addressed. Post development area should include a best estimate of impervious surfaces from buildings, rooftops, roadways, parking lots, driveways and sidewalks.

In addition, we would request that all of the items in the EAC about stormwater be included in this document, they were not included in there as of yet.

I'd like to address the historical archeological resources. The houses on Tavano Road are included on the historic homes tour given by the Ossining Historical Society. Known as Robinwood it was a 21 -it was a development of 21 homes designed by a single architect. I would like to request that the following be included in the scope, and this a request that $I$ spoke to someone from the Historical Society.

Study and submit for evaluation the

Tavano Road houses as a potential historical district. With the proposed extension of the cul-de-sac, it should be considered as part of the project. The environmental impact to these properties needs to be considered.

Interestingly a long time resident of Tavano Road recalled the discovery of a human bone on the property approximately, thirty years ago. Historical records should be reviewed to determine if there were Indian burial grounds in the area at that time.

The proposed cluster plans show that these would be two-bedroom homes, which are totally out of character with the neighborhood, where all the homes are three four, and possibly five-bedroom homes.

Under the section land, use, zoning and community character, I would like to request the following be included. Show on the proposed development plan how the character of the neighborhoods will be preserved such as the replacement of trees that are consistent with the existing forest
on the site and on neighboring properties. Describe size of replacement trees comparing them to sizes of removed trees.

Cluster sketches show roads at the end of Morningside Court, leaving a circle in place. These streets have -- this street has a cul-de-sac at the end of it. Document what changes will need to be made to the existing driveways on the cul-de-sac and at whose expense.

In addition, provide documentation that shows plans for pedestrian safety, safe traffic patterns and aesthetic appearance. The snow is piled up typically piled up at the perimeter of circle. With a circle as such removed, have the highway superintendent describe where the snow will be placed or be moved to. Leaving the circle in place with a road running through the middle leaves an unfinished appearance of the most bizarre unkempt and unfinished sort.

Demonstrate why this will not be negatively -- why this will not negatively affect the neighboring appearance and the
market for adjacent houses.
Descriptions and analysis of the visual character of the existing neighborhood. The sketch -- again, the sketch shows that these will be two-bedroom houses. And I noticed in a lot of places the term feasible, if feasible. Who determines what is feasible? Thank you. CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you. MR. JAENIKE: Bill Jaenike, 12 Morningside Court, the town outside. I'm gonna have to do some fancy footwork, to inter lead what I have to say about wetlands. I am also from the Concerned Citizens of Ossining. For me the cluster plan is a big step backward from the conventional plan. It exacerbates impacts on the environment and homeowners like me, especially like me, since I'm in the epicenter of the steep slope coming down from the top of the hill. I'll justify those assertions with some facts.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: With the cluster alternatives, we looked at different lot counts.

MR. JAENIKE: Yes.
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: So, I just want you to be aware of that, under cluster we are looking at lower lot counts. MR. JAENIKE: Right, understood. CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay. MR. JAENIKE: I was interested especially in Mr. McWilliams's comments about the top of Morningside Court, and there should be clear understanding of the implications of the cluster plan and the conventional plan, what happens to the top of the court.

I'd like to start with the general guidelines, on page one. The last bullet, it talks about all analysis in the DEIS shall be performed by professionals in their respective fields. We talked about certification from those professionals, but a question $I$ have multiplied question is, how will the annalists be chosen? Who will choose them?

How will they be encouraged or required to maintain their neutrality? Encouraged I'd say. Should the Town pay
their fees, and then, have the applicant reimburse the Town to try to remove the direct connection between the applicant and the annalists?

Objectivity is obviously vital. When you go to trial, a trial is often decided by a choosing of a jury. And this is what we are talking about here. The jury are the annalists -- is the annalist. We need a more reasonable outcome.

On chapter two, I'd like to talk about the steep slopes and elevations. Description of the site, $C$, it is on page four. In past iterations there have been discussions about blasting. There is no blasting mentioned in this one.

However, I'd like to make it absolutely clear that we are totally opposed to any blasting in the area, so that if we didn't take this position now $I$ would be concerned that later on we would be barred from addressing it and it should be introduced.

Pneumatic jack hammers and large pieces of equipment can produce a loud
vibration, affecting the homes in the area. The homes are built in concrete slabs, some of them already have cracks in those slabs. Heavy jack hammer work can make that worse, especially since the vibrations would be transmitted through the rock, underpinning the soil that goes up the hill.

Road options. There should be a consideration for shoulders on the road, especially this road that is going to go up from Morningside Court up it to Tavano Road. Is there gonna be -- shouldn't there be a sidewalk and if not a sidewalk at least a broad shoulder that people in bicycles can use.

With the traffic coming down that hill or up the hill with limited sight distance, it is going to be very risky for pedestrians to walk on that road without proper protections. Will there be emergency passing for two cars or two vehicles. That needs to be addressed. Should there be turnoffs if there is a breakdown of some vehicle coming up or down and get that vehicle out of the way.

The question of the foundation underneath that road is very important. The soil there may be not able to support a road that would carry potentially heavy equipment, like fire trucks. I have been told that there should be fifty foot borings, every fifty feet on that road going up to Tavano Road from Morningside Court, they should be drilling to establish the strength of the foundation.

The question is, who is liable if there is a washout of that road, and who pays the freight for its repair. Wendy touched on the bizarre shape of Morningside Court. What that's gonna look like if the plan shown on the -- the conventional plan and the cluster plan diagram is followed. The road -- Morningside Court will continue going on up, pass what is now the end of Morningside Court circle and then there'd be a right turn going up to Tavano Road and if the plan is what we are going wind up with, we are going to have these two bulgers out the side of Morningside Court extension. It is going to be really bizarre looking and people wonder about us.

The accesses road, I talked about the thing now. The soil, underlying rock, potential for mudslides in that area without the proper soil testing and drilling down into the underlying rock.

Chapter three, under B, topography, steep slopes. B-2, grading would be carried out to minimize runoff, potentially the word is used, using swells in the land to redirect water runoff and minimize any impacts caused by construction where it is reasonable and possible.

Who makes the determination as to what is reasonable and what is possible? How can we get some competent, objective, neutral party to make those judgments? I have some photographs which in the interest of time $I$ am not going to distribute them, but I'm going to enter them into the record through Sandy.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you.
MR. JAENIKE: Finally, a traffic -turning -- it says page eleven, G, traffic cutting through the road from Tavano to

Morningside Court shall be discussed. What does that mean? Shall be discussed? We have been talking about this for two years almost. Are we going to continue the discussion, what are we gonna learn that we didn't learn before?

In J, page twelve, fiscal impacts. I hear that the reduction in value of nearby properties could be included and should be include. The last thing I want to say is that throughout the entire paper there are terms that are very troublesome.

For example, I just mentioned, an issue should be discussed. Shall be discussed, should be discussed, that's mentioned ten times in the paper. As necessary or feasible, seven times. Describe and evaluate it, three times. No next step specify once, for a total of 21 different references to uncertainty.

And I think that is an awful lot of uncertainty to be left in this paper at this point. And I understand that much of this will be cleaned up later on, at the same time going into that file of the DEIS paper.


However, as we learned at an informational meeting that was conducted last year, property owners cannot legally be denied their right to cluster development of their property. Notwithstanding the existence of that law being what it is, the significant detriment to surrounding property owners is an additional consideration that must be taken into account.

Clustering is not a concept that simply solves the dilemma for builders to squeeze maximum units onto otherwise unbuildable land. In this case, the central location of unbuildable wetlands has forced the units proposed within High View Farms to be clustered at the perimeter of this property, and will result in significantly negative impacts to the surrounding neighbors.

Open space that remains will be enjoyed only by the residents of the new properties, whereas property values of the surrounding neighbors will decline significantly due to the inconsistent scale,
close proximity and limited scope of the new housing units.

Aside from the lot sizes, the units currently have been limited to just two bedrooms. What then will the square footage for the living space be for each unit? Isn't this proposal significantly out of character relative to the surrounding properties?

Also, will a homeowner association with fees be established to ensure proper maintenance of common areas, such that changes to the topography won't impact neighbors down the road, and any remediation, if and when flooding occurs?

If not, who will fund those costs, the builder or the town? Also of concern is that one of the proposed cul-de-sac roads runs adjacent to the backyard property lines of homes located on Tavano road, which creates new frontage on their backyards.

I request the Town of Ossining's Planning Department to investigate and advise the public regarding the legality of such an arrangement, and whether the
developer in this case should be liable for the decreased fair market value of their residences due to having become surrounded with traffic and a resulting loss of privacy.

Furthermore, accordingly to the Ossining Town Code regarding street layouts Chapter-Section 176-14, item C. Minor streets shall be laid out that their use by through traffic will be discouraged.

Currently the options proposed for High View Farm varying with each other, regarding the access to Morningside Court such that a crash gate in one option, or may not be installed in the others.

The intent for this gate needs to be clarified regarding whether thru traffic would be allowed. The building of new roads to intersect with an existing cul-de-sac should also be designed and implemented at the builders expense to ensure public safety and aesthetic integration of homeowner frontage with the new intersections.

Aside from the long term detriments to neighbors the following impacts through
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and during the development also need to be considered. Slope exposure from excavation and soil stock pilling should be immediately protected by silk fencing and hay bales. The slope stabilization, via grass and/or other plantings should occur during the current growing seasons and not a subsequent winter season. Rock excavation and blasting concerns. I am sorry I am telling you, this is repetitive, but I want to make sure it gets into the record.

Deep testing of every fifty feet on the center of roads should occur to verify the quantity of rock to be excavated. Develop a study to determine and document the weights of loads from these roads from vehicular traffic in them and show how the subsurface foundation would be able to bear them. Demonstrate how the subsurface will not be washed out overtime causing the road and especially its edges to collapse.

Provide guarantees to the Town for road damage repair using bonds or other third party guarantee, provide a study of the impact of jack hammers on neighboring
foundations, and we are not talking about the little manual ones, we are talking about the huge tractor types. Guarantee against homeowners damages for a bond or a third party guarantee.

Provide documentation assessing the impacts and risks of blasting on the Croton aqueduct, neighboring foundations and children playing in Ryder Park. Finally on balancing, and $I$ know this is subjective and an opinion, but it seems to me obvious that the cost and impacts to neighbors and the environment, outrageously outweighs the benefits to be derived by allowing R-5 zoning.

This would not be an equitable development with respect to the surrounding neighbors enjoinment of their properties. Adhering to R-40 zoning originally designated by the Town or something less dense, seems more appropriate. Thanks for your consideration of these comments.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Is there any other member of the audience that would like to speak?

MS. VAN STEEN: Madam Chair, I am Deborah Van Steen, I live in the Village of Ossining, I am an architectural historian, I am on the Board of the Conservation Historical Commission, I am also on the Village Historical Preservation Committee. Just a couple of comments in the review of the scoping document. Page seven, under E, historical and cultural resources. This section needs to be supported by a report and not just limited to architectural -- archeological phase one, and that report needs to be added to your list of appendices. That report also should be not only completed by a qualified archeologist who meets the standards, but also an architectural historian.

I also made note of the words help in there, that is not -- how should I say it, not an appropriate or a professional term. The report should make recommendations which would then be submitted to SHPO for comment and concurrence in terms of their findings, and then SHPO would direct additional work should it need to be done in terms of archeology and historic architecture.

I have for submission to the record a brief note I made up drafted on the architectural importance of the Tavano Road passage. I just want to point out that generally in terms of historic architecture, that a 50 year timeline is usually left out in terms of what is evaluated.

Since the houses on Tavano Road were part of the subdivision laid out in 1964, that the houses themselves were built in 1966 throughout 1968, they will be coming into that 50 year range, and so they certainly will be 50 years by the time this project will be executed. So, therefore they should be considered as a historic property and -- in terms of the report.

Just to make your lives a little bit better and not belabor it, I will just submit this for you to read when you have time.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you.
MS. VAN STEEN: Thank you.
CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you. Do we have any other members of the audience
who would like to speak.
MS. SHARRATT: I have a couple of questions that $I$ didn't put in my letter. It is just clarification that maybe I will be able to read. I noticed that in all the different documents that have submitted, there is several different names for the applicant. Is there in all the -- there is a car wash, there is Zappico.com. Is there -- do we have to use one uniformed or do we have to include --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

MS. SHARRATT: The fact that in every document that has been submitted, Zappico -it's either Zappico car wash, Zappico Development, Zappico.com, Zappico. So, I wanted to know that in the report there has to be a consistent name.

MR. SPECTOR: Maybe the applicant's attorney should address it.

MR. WEKSTEIN: Actually the scoping document correctly has it. There are two applicants. One is Zappico Construction, Co. LLC, and one is Zappico Car Wash LLC.

There is approximately a two-acre piece that is owned by Zappico Car Wash. The remainder is owned by Zappico Construction, in Ossining.

MS. SHARRATT: So, then this would be addressed.

MR. WEKSTEIN: Both are the applicant.

MS. SHARRATT: Okay. So, when there is in just one page here, is just says Zappico, is that just to shorthanded like that.

MR. STOLMAN: I think we are --
MS. SHARRATT: I don't know, it just
it seems like -- I don't want to --
MR. STOLMAN: I think my attorney will --

MR. SPECTOR: We can clean it up so the references are uniformed.

MS. SHARRATT: Okay. So my other question and this is also for clarification, I didn't really understand what this meant. On page seven, it says a tree survey would also be performed listing all Town and regulated existing trees. What does that
mean, the Town regulated existing trees.
MR. STOLMAN: Trees that are
regulated by the tree ordinance.
MS. SHARRATT: Is that just by diameter or --

MR. STOLMAN: Well, I don't have -MS. SHARRATT: -- by species?

Because I looked through the tree law, they actually have the wrong one on the website, I had it printed out and I made copies if you want.

MR. STOLMAN: They are defined within the chapter.

MS. SHARRATT: Is it by species or is it by size?

MR. STOLMAN: Size, I believe.
MS. SHARRATT: Size, okay. I think
it said six inches of diameter.
MR. STOLMAN: I think you are right.
MS. SHARRATT: Great. I just wanted you to clarify that because I wasn't sure. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Is there any
other member of the audience who would like to speak on the scoping document tonight?

Thank you.
MR. WEKSTEIN: May I be heard briefly?

MS. MASSERMAN: When will we be able to see -- I know it is due on the 15th.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Can you come forward again?

MS. MASSERMAN: Oh, I am sorry. I noticed that this test has to be completed by the 15th, when will we see a second draft? Will we be able to see that ours thoughts were included or the EAC or whatever?

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: David, can you answer that question for us?

MR. STOLMAN: I am going to try to incorporate everything that has been offered as soon as possible. I'm not sure when it is going to be done exactly, it is going to be done before the 6th, which is our next meeting.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: We are having a meeting on May 6th to discuss this --

MS. MASSERMAN: That's next
Wednesday.

MR. STOLMAN: I think the intention is to adopt the final scope on the 6th. CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Yes. MR. STOLMAN: That's our last meeting --

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: So the public will have an opportunity to see it prior to our adoptions.

MS. MASSERMAN: So like for instance, I mean, I don't want to complain, although we got this document yesterday, and then it's probably ten hours of my time in reviewing it to get here tonight, where as if it came a few days earlier, and $I$ know that the EAC report was issued on the 15 th of April, and $I$ was very surprised to see that more of their information was not adopted into this document.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay.
MR. HOEFLICH: Is there a legal time limit you you should send it so that we can review it, so everyone in the town can review it or not?

MR. SPECTOR: We have a time limit.

MR. STOLMAN: So, I am going to get this done as soon as $I$ possibly can and give it to you as much in advance of the 6th as 1 can, but $I$ am not sure when it is actually going to be done.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Is there another member of the public who would like to speak specifically on the scoping document tonight? Is there a Board member who would like to make a comment at this point?

MR. HOUGHAM: I would like to make a quick comment.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Okay, please do.

MR. HOUGHAM: I'd like to respond briefly to Mr. Wekstein's comment about the tree survey. I wrote a memo about this earlier today, but I'll summarize it here. Mr. Wekstein claims that there is little to be gained by surveying trees outside of the area to be disturbed, and I reject that argument because without a thorough full property tree survey there would be no way to document tree removal beyond the limited
there is that he has defined. And illegal and unauthorized tree removal is not uncommon in a development and I think that is something that needs to be guarded against.

In addition, $I$ don't believe that the large tract of land and large number of trees that it refers to, is a -- an especially large burden because it's exactly proportional to the size of the property.

So, it is the same burden that any property owner of any lot size proportionally would have to do. So, I strongly recommend that a full property tree survey is retained as a scoping requirement.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you.
MR. STOLMAN: Just to sort of rebut what you are saying Gareth. Because the alternatives are varied and we don't know which alternative may be chosen ultimately by the Planning Board, either the proposed project of one of the alternatives, unless you do a tree survey for the whole property, you are not going to know which trees are affected by the various alternatives. So, I
would agree with Gareth and just -- I just wanted to mention one other thing.

In the section on alternatives we do say, all cluster layouts shall be substantial wooded common space buffer between the proposed lots and the outer property lines of the subject property. So, we are not talking about any clusters that have any lots up against any perimetered lot lines.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you for clarifying that.

MR. WEKSTEIN: May I be heard briefly?

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Yes, please.
MR. WEKSTEIN: I don't mean to make this too much longer. Number one, because it has now been mentioned a few times. The use of New York State Department of Environmental Conservation standards for wetlands on this site would be totality inappropriate. And I would say contrary to SEQRA which has -- SEQRA is one of the fundamental principals is that SEQRA doesn't change jurisdiction between and among
agencies. You have your own wetlands ordinances, we have the federal wetlands ordinance, federal wetlands law, Army Corp of Engineers criteria and that should be what's in the scope, nothing more, nothing less.

There has been requests that we do studies of wetlands offsite, we do perc tests offsite. We only own our property. To the extent that these futures such as wetlands can be determined from public sources from aerial photos, we can do that. But we can't be required by the scope to go take perc tests and go do testing. Have a wetlands consultant go within two hundred feet of the site and do that.

Aside from the burden that would be involved, we don't have -- again, we don't have the capacity to do that. There are a lot of things I would like to speak to, but I won't, because I am not an expert consultant.

I will say on the tree issue again, on the survey, even if the Board thinks that should be on the area of disturbance, I will
ask that you don't require us to do it in any of the areas of wetlands that are not being disturbed, because no one would suggest that we should be exploring alternatives in terms of going into wetlands. And if that happens, we would be violating the law like anybody else in the community.

And I would say, anybody else in the community who would be working on a property, does not have to get a tree permit, does not have to survey their entire site. As a development I understand there is a distinction. And finally I would ask that you not -- you've heard a lot of people speaking here as to what people would like to see.

I mean the way -- I believe the way SEQRA work is, our professionals look at it. They are the experts, they determine what's appropriate in the study within reason. You give them guidance, it has been asked. You are the juror, but it goes beyond that.

Our consultants will do the studies as you know, you will retain consultants to
do -- to review those. Ultimately we will have to reimburse you for that. So, this isn't just us telling you things. But what we are hearing tonight from the public, and I don't mean to diminish their concerns, and I think all of the issues have to be addressed.

But I will ask you not to micromanage what the studies will look like based on what some of the people have spoken tonight saying someone else told them should be study and/or study. If I ask somebody who is a third party a question and add a context, $I$ can get whatever answer I want. Maybe that's because I do bad things because I am a lawyer, but the fact is that at the end of the day, at the end of the day, it really should be the experts and what is traditional on the field and not what people are telling you they've heard from third parties. And I thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you.
MS. SHARRATT: In the Town of
Ossining, Wetlands -- Chapter 105 wetlands, fresh wetlands, water pools, water bodies,

Section 1057A2A1, additional information may be requested by the Planning Board, including any of the following: "The location of all wetlands, watercourses and water bodies on the site under review and within two hundred feet of the site no earlier than twelve months prior to the date of filing the application. Thank you.

CHAIRWOMAN RICHARDS: Thank you. Thank you all for all your comments. At this point David and Wayne, we have a number of comments and we will go over that. We would like to include as many as possible in the document to insure that we are taking a very strong look at our wetlands or steep slopes and all of the environment impacts, that could potentially happen at this development, and we want to make sure that there is a very thorough study through obviously this DEIS. So, we look forward to receiving an updated document, and if you have any comments you would like to share before we close the meeting please do.

MR. STOLMAN: I have no additional comment to make tonight.



|  | ings |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ago [2] 30/16 61/10 agree [1] 85/1 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | AICP [1] 2/19 |
| 1/2 1/8 | above [2] ${ }^{\text {abreast [1] }}$ | aim [1] 37/20 |
| 0 |  | all [52] |
| 0201 [1] 1/25 | $\begin{array}{llllll} \text { ccess } & {[6]} & 7 / 25 & 33 / 6 & 36 / 6 \\ 36 / 18 & 36 / 23 & 73 / 13 & \end{array}$ | allegiance [2] $3 / 5$ 3/7 |
| 1 |  | allowing [2] 70/16 |
| 10 [3] 31/4 34/21 56/17 | accesses [1] 68/2 almost [3] 23/16 51/5 69/4 |  |
| 100 [1] 38/9 | accordingly [1] $73 / 6$ along [3] $13 / 7$ $14 / 25$ $38 / 6$ <br> account [1] $71 / 10$   <br> accounts [1] $13 / 15$   already [7] $9 / 14$ $22 / 18$ $25 / 5$ <br> $30 / 7$ $32 / 16$ $34 / 14$ $66 / 3$  |  |
| 105 [1] 88/24 |  |  |  |
| 10530 [1] 1/24 | accurate [3] $50 / 20$ $51 / 9$ $91 / 9$ also $[27]$ $2 / 17$ $5 / 12$ $20 / 5$ $31 / 8$ <br> achieve [1] $33 / 25$   $35 / 7$ $37 / 7$ $38 / 23$ $40 / 2$ $42 / 9$  |  |
| 10562 [1] 1/9 |  |  |  |
| 1057A2A1 [1] 89/ | achieved [1] $17 / 25$ $44 / 13$ $44 / 24$ $45 / 11$ $52 / 17$ $53 / 25$ |  |
| 10601-2319 [1] 2/14 | acre [2] $34 / 13$ $79 / 1$ $53 / 25$ $54 / 7$ $63 / 14$ $72 / 10$ $72 / 17$ <br> acres [2] $56 / 6$ $59 / 23$ $73 / 20$ $74 / 1$ $76 / 5$ $76 / 14$ $76 / 17$ |  |
| 111 [1] 1/24 |  |  |  |
| 12 [2] $34 / 21 \quad 63 / 10$ | across $[1]$ $40 / 4$    <br> action $[7]$ $4 / 21$ $4 / 22$ $28 / 4$ $33 / 4$ <br> $35 / 14$ $51 / 3$ $52 / 9$    | $76 / 18 \quad 79 / 21 \quad 79 / 24$ |
| 123 [1] 1/5 |  | alternative [12] 7/21 7/24 8/1 |
| 14 [1] 73/8 |  | 22/1 $22 / 2$ 33/5 33/12 $33 / 14$ |
| 15 [2] 31/4 34/21 | activity [1] $53 / 4$ $5 / 4$   <br> actual [2] $51 / 19$ $55 / 18$   <br> actually [13] $5 / 7$ $14 / 5$ $16 / 13$$\|$$36 / 6$ $57 / 24$ $58 / 5$ $84 / 20$  <br> alternatives [32] $5 / 10$ $7 / 12$  <br> $7 / 13$ $7 / 21$ $21 / 17$ $21 / 25$ $26 / 12$ |  |
| 15th [3] 81/5 81/10 |  |  |  |
| 176-14 [1] 73/8 |  |  |  |
| 1964 [1] 77/10 | $16 / 16$ $18 / 1$ $19 / 2$ $19 / 3$ $32 / 9$ $26 / 13$ $30 / 25$ $31 / 6$ $32 / 10$ $32 / 12$ <br> $51 / 17$ $56 / 11$ $78 / 22$ $80 / 9$ $83 / 4$ $32 / 13$ $32 / 16$ $32 / 21$ $32 / 24$ $33 / 1$ |  |
| 1966 [1] 77/12 |  |  |  |
| 1968 [1] 77/12 | ADAM [2] $2 / 15$ 32/6 <br> add [6] 22/14 26/19 27/2 $42 / 7$ | 33/3 33/6 33/16 34/8 34/21 |
| 2 |  | 35/15 $36 / 3 \quad 36 / 17$ 36/23 63/24 |
| 2015 [2] 1/10 3/4 | 51/11 88/13 <br> added [2] 56/13 76/13 | 84/19 84/22 84/25 85/3 87/5 <br> although <br> [1] $82 / 11$ |
| 21 [3] 60/19 60/20 69/19 | addition [9] 3/14 $13 / 4$ 20/2 <br> 26/15 27/17 60/5 60/11 62/11 <br> $84 / 6$ | altogether [1] 16/13 <br> always [1] 38/2 |
| 2319 [1] 2/14 |  |  |
| 24 [1] 34/15 |  | am [35] 1/10 8/20 24/19 27/4 |
| 29 [2] 1/10 3/3 | additional [7] 25/14 43/9 49/13 71/8 76/24 89/1 89/24 | 27/25 28/6 29/5 30/1 32/7 |
| 2:30 [1] 54/21 |  | $37 / 16$ 37/23 39/23 40/14 43/13 49/6 52/10 55/13 55/14 56/11 |
| 3 | 49/13 71/8 76/24 89/1 89/24 <br> additions [1] 4/8 |  |
| 30 [1] 31/14 | $\begin{array}{ccccccl}\text { address [9] } & 15 / 16 & 17 / 14 & 30 / 20 \\ 32 / 2 & 37 / 3 & 47 / 7 & 53 / 16 & 60 / 15\end{array}$ | 56/18 59/22 63/14 68/19 74/9 |
| 31 [3] $34 / 12$ 50/15 50/15 | 32/2 37/3 47/7 53/16 60/15 $78 / 21$ | $74 / 9$ 76/1 76/3 76/4 76/5 81/8 81/16 83/1 83/4 86/21 88/16 |
| 31 acres [1] 59/23 | addressed [5] 19/10 60/6 66/22 | am-pm [1] 1/10 |
| 4 |  | ammonia [1] 22/17 <br> among [2] 10/18 85/25 |
| 40 [3] 70/22 70/23 | addressing [2] 65/22 70/2 <br> adequacy [1] 9/16 | among [2] 10/18 85/25 <br> amount [6] 7/5 31/8 31/16 |
| 5 | adequacy [1] $9 / 16$ amount $[6]$ $7 / 5$ $31 / 8$ <br> adequate [1] $23 / 18$ $31 / 16$    <br> $33 / 12$ $52 / 7$ $53 / 12$    |  |
| 50 [3] 77/7 77/13 77/14 | Adhering [1] $75 / 19$   <br> adjacent [4] $30 / 15$ $54 / 3$ $63 / 1$ | amphibians [2] 20/16 22/9 |
| 6 | $72 / 19$$\left\|\begin{array}{lllll}\text { adjoining [2] } & 59 / 6 & 59 / 8\end{array}\right\|$analysis $[15]$ $7 / 1$ $14 / 7$ $17 / 6$ <br> $22 / 16$ $22 / 17$ $22 / 23$ $23 / 18$ $23 / 19$ |  |
| 617 [1] 5/2 |  |  |  |
| 684-0201 [1] 1/25 | adopt [2] 12/13 82/3 <br> adopted [3] 16/24 47/3 82/19 | $28 / 15 \text { 33/13 } 48 / 2 \text { 51/1 } 57 / 20$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 6:00 a.m [2] } \quad 54 / 16 \quad 54 / 18 \\ & \text { 6th [4] } \\ & \hline 1 / 20 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | adopted [3] 16/24 47/3 82/19 adoptions [1] 82/9 | $\begin{array}{\|lrll} \text { analyze [1] } & 14 / 17 & & \\ \text { analyzed [3] } & 21 / 3 & 31 / 1 & 44 / 8 \end{array}$ |
| 7 | advance [1] $83 / 3$   <br> adverse [3] $5 / 10$ $7 / 9$ $47 / 8$ <br> advise [1] $72 / 24$   |  |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { analyzing [1] } & 15 / 10 \\ \text { and/or [2] } & 74 / 6 & 88 / 12\end{array}$ |
| 7:30 [1] 1 | advise Advisory [1] | Anelli [1] $2 / 22$ <br> animal [1] 23/22 |
| 9 | ```aesthetic [2] 62/13 73/22 affect [4] 53/10 58/3 59/14 62/25``` |  |
| 914 [1] 1/2 |  | $\begin{array}{\|llll} \text { animals [3] } & 20 / 14 & 22 / 7 & 22 / 11 \\ \text { annalist [1] } & 65 / 9 & & \end{array}$ |
| 95 [1] 1/9 | affected [3] 38/11 58/23 84/25 affecting [1] 66/1 <br> aforesaid [1] 91/10 | annalists [3] $64 / 21$ $65 / 4$ $65 / 9$ <br> annual [2] $23 / 15$ $23 / 25$  <br> another [3] $46 / 10$ $47 / 13$ $83 / 7$ <br> answer [2] $81 / 15$ $88 / 14$  |
| $\begin{array}{ll} \text { 9:14 p.m [1] } & 90 / 9 \\ 9: 30 \text { a.m [1] } & 54 / 1 \end{array}$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| A | $\left.\begin{array}{llllll}\text { after [5] } & 3 / 15 & 3 / 17 & 6 / 19 & 58 / 16 \\ 60 / 4 \\ \text { afternoon } & & & & & \end{array}\right]$ | anticipate [1] 70/24 <br> anticipated [1] 46/4 <br> any [42] 3/16 9/2 9/12 9/22 |
| a.m [3] 54/16 54/16 5 |  |  |
| ability [1] 34/4 | ```afternoon [1] 54/20 again [14] 6/14 13/1 14/19 22/9 23/22 25/17 33/13 35/16 47/12 50/21 63/4 81/7 86/18 86/23 against [3] 75/3 84/5 85/9 agencies [2] 13/18 86/1 agenda [1] 3/10``` | any [42] 3/16 9/2 9/12 9/22 <br> 13/16 25/13 28/16 28/24 32/3 |
| $\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { able [8] } & 17 / 20 & 31 / 18 & 42 / 11 \\ 67 / 3 & 74 / 18 & 78 / 5 & 81 / 4 & 81 / 11\end{array}$ |  |  |
| about [34] $5 / 9$ 6/5 $6 / 5$ 7/6 $7 / 9$ |  | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 4 / 5 & 45 / 7 & 45 / 12 & 46 / 6 & 46 / 20\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 19 & 12 / 12 & 12 / 21 & 13 / 21 & 26 / 2\end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{lllll} 47 / 7 & 48 / 14 & 51 / 2 & 52 / 8 & 54 / 1 \\ 54 / 7 & 55 / 2 & 58 / 16 & 65 / 19 & 68 / 11 \end{array}$ |
| $48 / 17$ 48/19 51/17 $52 / 11$ 54/10 $57 / 3 \quad 57 / 18$ $58 / 12$ $60 / 12$ $63 / 13$ |  | $\begin{array}{lllll} 54 / 7 & 55 / 2 & 58 / 16 & 65 / 19 & 68 / 11 \\ 70 / 4 & 72 / 14 & 75 / 23 & 77 / 25 & 80 / 23 \end{array}$ |
|  |  | 84/11 84/12 85/8 85/9 85/9 |


|  | Proceedings |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A | assessing [1] 75/6 | benefits [1] 75/14 |
| any... [3] 87/2 89/3 89/22 | 50/21 | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { better [4] 16/19 19/2 } & 70 / 1\end{array}$ |
| anybody [2] 87/7 87/9 | Associates [1] 2/20 | 77/19 |
| anything [1] 35/5 | association [1] 72/10 | between [3] 65/3 85/6 85/25 |
| anyway [2] 4/16 10/10 | assume [2] 20/23 30/9 | beyond [7] 14/15 $14 / 16$ 15/14 |
| anywhere [1] 56/4 | attending [2] 3/2 90/2 | 17/25 52/16 83/25 87/23 |
| apologize [1] 19/22 | attorney [4] $2 / 18$ 3/14 $78 / 21$ | bicycles [1] 66/14 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { appearance [3] } \\ 62 / 25 & 62 / 13 & 62 / 20\end{array}$ | 79/16 | big [3] 49/5 58/17 63/16 Bigosh [1] 56/4 |
| appendices [3] 8/10 $22 / 5$ 76/14 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { audience [5] } & 3 / 19 & 70 / 5 & 75 / 24\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Bill [1] } & 63 / 10\end{array}$ |
| appendix [1] 8/17 | 77/25 80/24 | biodiversity [1] 37/23 |
| applicant [18] 2/12 3/18 12/22 | Avenue [1] 1/24 | biologist [1] 50/2 |
| 12/23 15/14 17/14 24/7 27/4 | avoided [1] 7/10 | biologists [2] 23/12 23/14 |
| 32/2 32/3 32/8 34/2 50/6 59/1 | aware [3] 19/8 25/3 64/3 | bird [2] 53/16 53/17 |
| 65/1 $65 / 3$ 78/8 $79 / 8$ | awful [1] 69/21 | birds [2] 20/16 22/9 |
| applicant's [4] 4/6 25/4 34/9 | B | bit [2] 23/7 77/18 |
| 78/20 |  | bizarre [3] 62/21 67/14 67/25 |
| applicants [2] 33/15 78/24 | B-2 [1] 68/8 | blasting [5] 65/15 65/16 65/19 |
| application [2] 51/22 89/8 | backtrack [1] 23/6 | 74/9 75/7 |
| apply [2] 17/23 37/24 | backward [1] 63/16 | BOARD [27] $1 / 3$ 3/2 $3 / 16$ 4/11 |
| approach [2] 12/14 38/14 | backyard [2] 49/14 72/19 | 8/23 9/21 25/4 27/18 28/25 |
| approaching [1] 38/18 | backyards [1] 72/21 | 29/24 30/17 30/24 31/7 31/24 |
| appropriate [10] 10/16 10/25 | bad [1] 88/15 | $32 / 2$ 32/5 $34 / 14$ 37/3 40/25 |
| 23/21 35/25 36/16 36/23 54/19 | balance [1] 7/16 | 56/8 56/8 70/16 76/4 83/9 |
| 75/21 76/20 87/21 | balancing [1] 75/10 | 84/21 86/24 89/2 |
| approval [1] 30/18 | bales [1] 74/4 | Board's [2] 35/23 41/4 |
| approvals [2] 4/21 5/13 | BARNES [1] | boards [1] 37/1 |
| approximately [3] 56/6 61/9 | barred [1] 65/21 | bodies [4] 57/10 57/15 88/25 |
| 79/1 | base [2] 21/5 21/13 | 89/5 |
| April [3] 1/10 3/3 82/17 | based [5] 3/21 29/25 40/24 | body [1] 9/7 |
| April 29 [1] 3/3 | 40/24 88/9 | bond [1] 75/4 |
| aquatic [2] 20/10 22/8 | baseline [2] 22/23 23/3 | bonds [1] 74/23 |
| aqueduct [5] 9/15 28/10 $29 / 13$ | basically [2] 27/19 51/23 | bone [1] 61/9 |
| 38/24 75/8 | basins [1] 59/4 | borings [1] 67/7 |
| archeological [5] 6/13 6/19 | basis [1] 33/20 | Bosinnas [3] 29/21 29/23 30/22 |
| 21/1 60/16 76/12 | bass [1] 50/12 | BOSSINAS [1] 2/8 |
| archeologist [3] 21/6 21/12 | be [240] | both [5] 42/1 46/8 50/19 56/24 |
| 76/16 | bear [1] 74/18 | 79/7 |
| archeology [1] 77/1 | because [24] 16/23 28/9 36/8 | bottlenecks [1] 18/10 |
| architect [3] 55/15 55/24 | 38/20 $43 / 2544 / 18$ 49/7 $50 / 1$ | bottom [1] 28/4 |
| 60/21 | 51/21 52/14 52/15 53/5 55/8 | bound [2] 12/23 34/16 |
| architectural [4] 76/3 76/12 | 58/20 80/8 80/21 83/23 84/9 | boundaries [2] 12/10 45/5 |
| 76/17 77/4 | 84/18 85/17 86/21 87/3 88/15 | boundary [2] 11/14 11/16 |
| architecture [2] 77/1 77/6 | 88/15 | breakdown [1] 66/23 |
| are [132] | become [2] 17/1 73/3 | Briacliff [1] 38/9 |
| area [20] 6/3 6/9 6/24 14/21 | becomes [2] 45/20 45/22 | Briarcliff [2] 7/23 33/9 |
| 15/3 27/10 27/13 27/14 46/10 | bedroom [3] 61/15 61/18 63/5 | Briarcliff/Peekskill [1] 33/9 |
| 48/7 49/4 54/9 58/18 60/7 | bedrooms [1] 72/5 | bridge [3] 50/11 57/24 58/1 |
| 61/12 65/19 66/1 68/4 83/22 | been [36] 9/14 10/17 12/11 | brief [6] $3 / 6$ 3/12 $29 / 25$ 55/15 |
| 86/25 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 15 & 13 / 9 & 13 / 17 & 14 / 5 & 15 / 5\end{array}$ | 56/12 77/3 |
| areas [10] 26/19 27/13 35/13 | 15/12 25/6 26/4 27/24 30/7 | briefly [3] 81/3 83/17 85/14 |
| 35/13 38/11 47/22 53/4 59/3 | $32 / 16$ 35/1 35/18 36/10 36/18 | bringing [1] 42/24 |
| 72/12 87/2 | 38/2 43/3 43/5 46/24 51/23 | brings [1] 22/1 |
| aren't [1] 44/6 | 52/1 56/19 59/20 59/22 65/14 | broad [1] 66/14 |
| argument [1] 83/23 | 67/5 69/3 72/4 78/15 81/17 | Broadway [2] 1/9 2/13 |
| Army [6] 10/13 11/12 11/18 | 85/18 86/7 87/22 | brought [1] 16/8 |
| 11/19 12/4 86/3 | before [5] 16/19 58/13 69/6 | budget [2] 43/18 43/18 |
| around [2] 10/8 27 | 81/20 89/23 | buffer [3] 47/5 47/6 85/5 |
| arraigning [1] 23/12 | begin [2] 3/12 18/9 | buffers [2] 45/8 45/9 |
| arrangement [1] 72/25 | behalf [1] 32/8 <br> being [11] 30/4 $32 / 14 \quad 34 / 5$ | bugs [2] 20/11 20/20 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Aside [3] } & 72 / 3 & 73 / 24 & 86 / 17\end{array}$ | 46/15 50/13 51/17 51/19 52/14 | builder <br> [1] $72 / 17$ |
| ask [10] 3/20 9/24 15/18 28/1 | 59/24 71/6 87/3 | builders [2] 71/12 73/21 |
| 55/5 55/10 87/1 87/14 88/8 | belabor [2] 34/12 77/19 | building [7] 26/24 27/8 31/21 |
| 88/12 | believe [13] 9/6 13/3 21/2 | 31/21 56/2 58/20 73/18 |
| asked [4] 32/16 $36 / 18$ 56/20 | 28/21 29/8 32/21 32/22 35/1 | buildings [1] 60/9 |
| 87/22 | 57/5 80/16 84/6 87/18 90/4 | built [5] 55/19 58/19 59/22 |
| asking [1] 34/24 | believes [1] 28/19 | 66/2 77/11 |
| assembled [1] 41/20 | below [1] 38/25 | bulgers [1] 67/23 |
| assertions [1] 63/22 | benefit [3] 4/10 7/1 30/8 | bulk [1] 26/23 |


|  | Proceedi |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| B | 62/19 67/20 | 55/7 57/21 60/4 |
| bullet [1] 64/15 | cite [1] 47/23 | y [1] |
| burden [4] 34/2 84/9 84/11 | Citizens [3] 56/10 56/19 63/15 | compliant [1] 33/5 |
| 86/17 | City [4] 28/6 28/7 29/11 56/3 | comply [1] 18/17 |
| burial [1] 61/12 | claims [1] 83/20 | composed [1] 26/25 |
| buses [1] 54/20 | clarification [2] 78/4 79/21 | conceivable [1] 33/22 |
| business [1] 58/9 | clarified [1] 73/17 | concept [1] 71/11 |
| businesses [1] 38/6 | clarify [1] 80/21 | conceptual [1] 25/1 |
| C | clarifying [1] 85/12 | concern [2] 20/5 72/1 |
| call [2] 5/20 | classification [1] 35/12 | $65 / 21$ |
| called [1] 51/ | clean [1] 79/18 | concerns [4] 30/14 $70 / 12 \quad 74 / 9$ |
| came [2] 26/5 82/15 | cleaned [1] 69/24 | 88/5 |
| can [51] | clear [3] 48/16 64/10 65/18 | concrete [1] 66/2 |
| can't [5] 4/5 32/18 41/1 78/12 | clearly [2] 45/10 55/10 | concurrence [1] 76/23 |
| 86/13 | clogged [1] 15/2 | condition [1] 8/6 |
| cannot [2] 7/10 71 | close [2] 72/1 89/23 | conditions [11] 5/24 6/7 6/1 |
| canopies [1] 52/7 | cluster [14] 7/21 26/13 30/3 | 7/4 27/1 28/14 41/18 44/25 |
| capabilities [1] 34/10 | 33/1 61/14 62/4 63/15 63/24 | 48/1 49/18 57/4 |
| capability [1] 33/17 | 64/3 64/11 67/17 70/13 71/4 | conducted [1] 71/2 |
| capacity [1] 86/19 | 85/4 | confer [1] 13/20 |
| Caputo [1] 1/8 | clustered [1] 71/17 | connected [1] 36/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}\text { car [4] } & 78 / 9 & 78 / 16 & 78 / 25 & 79 / 2\end{array}$ | clustering [3] 70/18 70/21 | connection [1] 65/3 |
| Carrie [1] 58/15 | 71/11 | connectivity [2] 43/5 43/7 |
| carried [1] 68/8 | clusters [4] 26/5 31/3 55/20 | conservation [4] 21/23 43/15 |
| carry [1] 67/4 | 85/8 | 76/4 85/20 |
| cars [1] 66/21 | Co [1] | consider [1] 11/1 |
| case [6] 5/23 12/3 32/23 36/1 | code [2] 7/17 73/7 | consideration [3] 66/9 71/9 |
| 71/14 73/1 | collapse [1] | 75/22 |
| cases [2] 13/19 42/17 | combination [1] 33/22 | considered [14] 20/10 20/14 |
| Castle [5] 36/7 36/8 49/3 49/9 | combined [1] 43/8 | 40/21 45/14 $45 / 24$ 45/25 49/25 |
| 70/9 | come [12] 6/13 11/13 30/6 | 52/10 52/22 59/24 61/3 61/6 |
| cause [1] 5 | 30/12 $32 / 2 \quad 37 / 2$ 44/19 49/8 | 74/2 77/16 |
| caused [1] 68/12 | 49/13 54/20 55/9 81/6 | considering [2] 14/19 33/17 |
| causing [1] 74/20 | comes [5] 29/13 45/12 $49 / 8$ | consistent [2] 61/25 78/19 |
| center [2] 1/8 74/ | 51/6 58/13 | constructed [1] 16/9 |
| central [2] 1/24 71/14 | coming [8] 15/22 $23 / 2$ 44/4 | construction [13] 7/2 22/24 |
| certain [3] 14/3 19/14 20/8 | 49/6 63/20 66/16 66/24 77/12 | 29/7 $45 / 13$ 45/24 $46 / 5$ 53/4 |
| certainly [3] 14/15 15/11 | comment [12] 24/1 28/2 29/10 | 54/24 60/3 60/4 68/12 78/24 |
| 77/14 | 40/11 44/23 55/12 57/17 76/22 | 79/3 |
| certification [3] 28/17 28/20 | 83/10 83/13 83/17 89/25 | consultant [4] 35/17 45/4 |
| 64/19 | commented [2] 25/4 25/11 | 86/15 86/22 |
| certified [3] 21/5 28/23 91/9 | comments [34] 3/16 3/20 4/10 | consultants [2] 87/24 87/25 |
| CHAIR [3] 2/5 40/18 76/1 | 9/2 9/12 9/23 10/7 24/8 24/9 | Consulting [1] 2/21 |
| Chairperson [2] $32 / 5$ 37/5 | 24/17 $25 / 6$ 25/14 25/16 $25 / 18$ | contents [1] 5/6 |
| chairs [2] 37/1 55/3 | 27/18 27/23 29/23 30/23 32/3 | context [1] 88/14 |
| CHAIRWOMAN [1] 2/4 | 32/9 32/20 34/22 37/7 37/9 | continue [2] 67/18 69/4 |
| change [4] 44/5 44/13 52/18 | 40/20 46/9 55/6 64/8 70/17 | contrary [1] 85/22 |
| 85/25 | 75/22 76/7 89/10 89/12 89/22 | controlled [1] 60/3 |
| changes [3] 52/6 62/8 72/13 | commercial [1] 35/21 | conventional [8] 7/14 7/19 |
| channeling [1] 44/2 | Commission [1] 76/5 | 31/2 33/5 55/21 63/17 64/12 |
| Chapman [1] 58/15 | commitment [1] 8/5 | 67/16 |
| chapter [26] 5/7 5/15 5/18 7/8 | Committee [3] $37 / 6$ 40/15 $76 / 6$ | cookie [1] 26/24 |
| 7/9 7/12 8/4 8/6 8/7 10/11 | committees [1] 55/3 | copies [3] 8/21 37/6 80/10 |
| 13/2 19/20 20/1 20/25 21/16 | common [6] $25 / 25$ 26/1 $26 / 3$ | copy [1] 31/18 |
| 25/23 26/11 41/17 47/1 47/1 | 46/8 72/12 85/5 | Cornell [1] 50/4 |
| 52/20 65/11 68/7 73/8 80/13 | communicate [1] 40/ | Corp [5] 11/12 11/18 11/19 |
| 88/24 | communicated [1] 42/15 | $12 / 486 / 3$ |
| Chapter-Section [1] 73/8 | communities [3] 37/22 38/4 | Corps [1] 10/13 |
| chapters [2] 7/17 47/24 | 39/1 | correct [2] 18/11 19/15 |
| character [6] 6/22 61/16 61/20 | community [8] $1 / 8$ 6/21 6/24 | corrected [1] 15/13 |
| 61/23 63/3 72/8 | 38/16 49/19 61/20 87/8 87/10 | correctly [1] 78/23 |
| check [1] 29/11 | company [1] 29/1 | correspondence [2] 4/12 8/18 |
| chemical [1] 47/21 | compare [1] 22/23 | corridor [2] 7/22 13/7 |
| children [1] 75/9 | comparing [1] 62/2 | corridors [2] 52/8 52/18 |
| choose [1] 64/22 | comparison [1] 53/3 | cost [2] 6/25 75/12 |
| choosing [1] 65/7 | competent [1] 68/16 | costs [1] 72/16 |
| chosen [2] 64/21 84/20 | complain [1] 82/11 | could [22] $10 / 15$ 12/17 $12 / 19$ |
| Ciarcia [2] 2/21 59/21 | complaint [1] 30/3 | 12/21 15/23 17/9 17/17 17/22 |
| circle [5] 62/5 62/15 62/15 | complete [6] 9/9 52/13 52/25 | 17/25 17/25 22/24 $24 / 6$ 25/1 |



|  | Proceedings | 96 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D | ```entire [5] 35/3 38/23 55/19``` | experience [1] 35/2 expert [1] 86/21 |
| down [21] 15/3 15/10 18/4 $38 / 8$ | entity [2] 36/15 36/15 | experts [2] 87/20 88/18 |
| 38/9 38/9 38/10 44/4 49/6 | envelopes [1] 31/21 | explains [1] 5/4 |
| 49/10 50/13 50/14 58/13 58/14 | enviromental [2] 5/3 5/11 | explicitly [5] 20/13 20/17 |
| 58/15 59/15 63/20 66/16 66/24 | environment [5] 37/21 53/9 | 20/21 22/10 22/15 |
| 68/5 72/14 | 63/18 75/13 89/16 | explore [1] 28/11 |
| draft [11] 1/6 4/25 8/22 8/22 | environmental [15] 1/6 4/25 | exploring [2] 29/25 87/4 |
| 10/7 25/5 25/7 41/4 57/14 | 5/25 6/1 6/17 7/10 10/18 28/8 | exposed [1] 60/2 |
| 57/19 81/11 | 37/5 38/15 $40 / 15$ 40/18 52/4 | exposure [1] 74/2 |
| drafted [1] 77/3 | 61/4 85/20 | extension [2] 61/2 67/24 |
| drainage [6] 19/6 19/9 59/2 | ephemeral [3] 42/11 42/23 | Extensive [1] 57/20 |
| 59/4 59/5 59/10 | 57/12 | extent [5] 14/22 18/7 19/7 |
| drains [4] 14/20 59/12 $59 / 15$ | ephemerals [1] 50/19 | 19/8 86/10 |
| 59/19 | epicenter [1] $63 / 20$ | F |
| drilling [2] | equipment [2] 65/25 67/5 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { DRIVE [5] } \\ \text { 56/11 } & 1 / 5 & 49 / 5 & 54 / 15 & 55 / 14\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} \hline \text { equitable [1] } & 75 / 16 \\ \text { especially [6] } & 63 / 19 & 64 / 8 & 66 / 5 \end{array}$ | ```facilities [1] 6/24 fact [3] 34/3 78/14 88/16``` |
| driveways [2] 60/10 62/9 | 66/10 74/21 84/9 | facts [1] 63/22 |
| driving [1] 49/4 | ESQ [2] 2/15 2/18 | fail [1] 41/13 |
| due [8] 15/23 45/13 $46 / 4$ 53/3 | essential [1] 26/8 | fair [2] 31/8 73/2 |
| 70/19 71/25 73/3 81/5 | essentially [1] 15/ | fairly [1] 4/13 |
| during [12] 8/7 12/20 12/21 | establish [2] 43/8 67/9 | fall [2] 49/6 58/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 6 & 29 / 7 & 42 / 12 & 44 / 15 & 48 / 3\end{array}$ | established [2] 43/6 72/11 | falls [1] 14/16 |
| 51/2 60/3 $74 / 1 \quad 74 / 6$ | establishing [1] 30/8 | fancy [1] 63/12 |
| E | estate [1] 22/10 | far [2] 9/7 9/13 <br> FARM [5] 1/5 3/11 |
| e-mailed [1] | etc [4] 31/5 31/14 31/15 | 73/12 |
| EAC [10] 10/23 23/11 56/22 | Eunice [2] 1/23 91/14 | farmers [2] 59/12 59/15 |
| 56/25 57/3 57/7 57/16 60/12 | evaluate [4] 6/16 9/18 $34 / 25$ | Farms [2] 49/7 71/16 |
| 81/12 82/16 | 69/18 | feasible [5] 47/7 63/7 63/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { each [4] 5/23 } & 45 / 1 & 72 / 6 & 73 / 12\end{array}$ | evaluated [2] 7/3 77/8 | 63/8 69/17 |
| earlier [4] 22/13 82/15 83/19 | evaluating [1] 6/6 | federal [4] 13/18 37/19 86/2 |
| 89/7 | evaluation [3] 59/4 59/11 | 86/3 |
| early [1] | 60/25 | feel [3] 32/11 43/2 56/20 |
| easement [1] 21/23 | even [6] 16/18 $38 / 8$ 55/21 | fees [2] 65/1 72/11 |
| edges [1] 74/21 | 55/22 58/12 86/24 | feet [9] 34/19 38/24 41/21 |
| Edgewood [1] 70/ | evening [3] 3/1 27/23 29/22 | 57/12 59/19 67/7 74/12 86/16 |
| educational [1] 21/20 | eventually [1] 31/19 | 89/6 |
| effected [1] 59/9 | every [7] 16/25 25/3 33/21 | FEMA [1] 13/18 |
| effects [1] 8/8 | 59/19 67/7 74/12 78/14 | fencing [1] 74/4 |
| eight [1] 8/7 | everybody [1] 58/4 | fertilizers [1] 23/1 |
| EIS [1] 35/15 | everyone [6] 10/1 10/1 19/1 | few [3] 23/11 82/15 85/18 |
| either [2] 78/16 84/21 | 24/12 27/23 82/23 | field [3] 23/12 23/17 88/19 |
| element [1] 55/22 | everything [4] 26/7 31/23 51/5 | fields [1] 64/18 |
| elevation [2] 38/3 40/ | 81/17 | fifteen [1] 22/4 |
| elevations [1] 65/12 | evolved [1] 16/7 | fifty [3] 67/6 67/7 74/12 |
| eleven [1] 68/24 | exacerbates [1] 63/17 | file [1] 69/25 |
| Elkes [2] 37/5 40/17 | exact [1] 28/20 | filing [1] 89/8 |
| else [6] 8/25 26/7 49/7 87/7 | exactly [3] 31/22 81/19 84/9 | final [2] 36/2 82/ |
| 87/9 88/11 | example [3] 17/12 $17 / 17$ 69/13 | finalize [1] 3/23 |
| emergency [4] 36/19 36/20 | examples [1] 20/7 | finally [3] 68/23 75/9 87/14 |
| 36/22 66/20 | excavated [1] 74/14 | find [2] 20/12 29/14 |
| emphasized [3] 38/13 38/20 42/22 | $\begin{array}{lccc} \text { excavation }[2] & 74 / 2 & 74 / 8 \\ \text { except [1] } 50 / 14 & \end{array}$ | finding [1] 34/3 <br> findings [1] 76/23 |
| employ [1] 16/12 | exception [1] 36/13 | finishing <br> [1] <br> $54 / 11$ |
| employed [3] 47/20 52/23 53/3 | excerpts [1] 25/22 | fire [1] 67/5 |
| encouraged [2] 64/23 64/25 | Excuse [1] 19/25 | firm [3] $9 / 5$ 23/15 $32 / 6$ |
| end [9] $14 / 12$ 17/13 19/14 $27 / 6$ | executed [1] 77/15 | first [9] $3 / 12$ 5/6 6/3 7/13 |
| 62/5 62/7 67/19 88/17 88/17 | executive [5] 5/7 5/12 25/23 | 8/22 24/24 28/3 41/4 51/16 |
| endangered [3] 20/3 20/8 49/22 | 25/24 26/9 | fiscal [2] 6/25 69/7 |
| energy [1] 8/8 | existence [1] 71/6 | fish [4] 20/15 22/7 49/21 50/3 |
| engineer [2] 2/21 3/15 | existent [2] 22/5 59/12 | five [9] 7/12 21/16 26/11 |
| engineering [1] 23/13 | existing [20] 7/3 9/17 26/17 | 28/13 32/25 41/17 45/1 57/5 |
| engineers [2] 10/14 86/4 | 28/13 41/18 41/18 44/25 48/1 | 61/18 |
| enjoinment [1] 75/18 | 49/18 53/17 57/4 57/9 57/9 | five-bedroom [1] 61/18 |
| enjoyed [1] 71/22 | 59/1 61/25 62/9 63/3 73/19 | fix [1] 18/1 |
| enough [1] 16/14 | 79/25 80/1 | fixed [1] 58/11 |
| ensure [4] 15/21 47/20 72/11 | exiting [5] 5/24 6/6 6/16 | flagged [1] 45/2 |
| 73/21 | 18/12 19/16 | Flood [1] 13/5 |
| enter [1] 68/20 | expense [2] 62/10 73/21 | flooded [1] 58/17 |


|  | Proceedings | 97 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| F | given [2] 23/23 60/18 | heads [2] 37/1 55/2 |
| flooding [4] $13 / 7$ 13/9 $13 / 13$ | 15/23 17/9 17/17 17/24 24/20 | /8 78/12 |
| 72/15 | 25/9 25/16 29/8 31/25 33/21 | heard [4] 81/2 85/13 87/15 |
| flow [4] 16/6 16/15 49/2 59/13 | 37/23 38/2 39/6 39/18 39/19 | 88/20 |
| flows [1] 49/9 | 39/22 40/24 48/14 48/19 49/23 | hearing [2] 33/7 88/4 |
| Floyd [1] 13/13 | 50/12 58/22 65/6 66/10 86/13 | heavy [2] 66/4 67/4 |
| flush [1] 18/25 | 86/14 86/15 89/12 | help [1] 76/18 |
| flying [1] 53/11 | God's [1] 20/19 | helps [1] 34/3 |
| focus [1] 9/18 | goes [8] 15/13 28/5 45/21 | her [1] 37/8 |
| follow [2] 10/13 14/8 | 51/25 58/2 66/7 70/24 87/23 | here [16] $4 / 1$ |
| followed [2] 9/6 67/17 | going [51] | 29/12 $32 / 7$ 34/11 $47 / 14$ 47/23 |
| following [4] 60/22 61/21 | gonna [8] 39/19 39/20 39/22 | 54/11 56/23 65/8 79/10 82/14 |
| 73/25 89/3 | 56/22 63/12 66/12 67/15 69/5 | 83/19 87/16 |
| food [1] 53/11 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { good [7] } & 3 / 1 & 16 / 14 & 27 / 23 & 29 / 22\end{array}$ | high [9] $1 / 5$ 3/11 $38 / 3$ 40/3 |
| foot [1] 67/6 | 31/5 57/19 90/7 | 49/7 58/14 70/13 71/16 73/12 |
| footage [1] 72/5 | got [4] 15/8 17/14 40/4 82/12 | highly [1] 38/3 |
| footwork [1] 63/12 | governing [1] 43/10 | highway [2] 30/17 62/16 |
| forced [1] 71/15 | GPS [1] 45/2 | hill [4] 63/21 66/7 66/17 |
| forest [1] 61/25 | grading [1] 68/8 | 66/17 |
| forgotten [2] 20/19 20/24 | grant [2] 29/14 29/18 | him [2] 14/13 18/25 |
| form [1] 21/20 | grass [1] 74/5 | his [4] 14/8 14/10 17/19 17/22 |
| forth [1] 51/6 | great [2] 5/17 80/20 | historian [2] 76/3 76/17 |
| forty [1] 34/18 | GREG [3] 2/5 24/20 25/17 | historic [5] 14/2 60/17 77/1 |
| forward [2] 81/7 89/20 | ground [3] 21/5 21/13 43/21 | 77/6 77/16 |
| found [1] 17/7 | grounds [1] 61/12 | historical [13] 6/13 6/19 13/4 |
| foundation [3] 67/1 67/10 | groves [1] 44/1 | 14/22 21/1 60/15 60/18 60/24 |
| 74/18 | growing [2] 44/15 74/7 | 61/1 61/10 76/5 76/6 76/9 |
| foundations [2] 75/1 75/8 | guarantee [3] 74/24 75/3 75/5 | history [2] 13/6 48/15 |
| four [7] 7/8 19/19 33/6 40/24 | guarantees [1] 74/22 | HOCHEMAN [2] 2/11 32/7 |
| 41/4 61/18 65/14 | guarded [1] 84/4 | Hoeflich [1] 55/14 |
| fourteen [1] 21/16 | guess [2] 56/25 70/10 | hold [3] 14/13 16/15 17/19 |
| fourth [1] 6/12 | guessing [1] 49/6 | holistic [2] 18/9 19/11 |
| frankly [3] 33/11 34/2 34/19 | guidance [1] 87/22 | Hollow [1] 38/10 |
| Frederick [1] 2/19 | guidelines [4] 4/19 5/2 $16 / 2$ | home [1] 38/5 |
| free [2] 44/16 48/ | 64/15 | homeowner [2] 72/10 73/22 |
| freight [1] 67/13 | H | homeowners [2] 63/18 75/4 |
| fresh [1] 88/25 | H | homes [9] 38/5 60/18 60/20 |
| Freshwater [1] 50/22 | habitat [4] 47/8 47/11 52/21 | 61/15 61/17 61/18 66/1 66/2 |
| front [4] 4/4 37/2 51/6 55/9 | 54/12 | 72/20 |
| frontage [2] 72/21 73/23 | habitats [5] 47/22 49/19 49/25 | hope [1] 70/1 |
| frozen [2] 44/16 48/4 | 50/8 54/8 | hoping [1] 8/21 |
| full [6] 23/9 23/15 23/19 45/3 | had [8] 4/10 12/11 14/21 16/4 | HOUGHAM [2] 2/7 10/6 |
| 83/23 84/14 | 55/25 56/1 80/10 90/3 | hours [1] 82/13 |
| function [1] 57/22 | half [1] 34/12 | House [1] 58/15 |
| functionally [1] 36/11 | hammer [1] 66/4 | houses [7] 54/5 60/16 61/1 |
| functioning [1] 15/2 | hammers [2] 65/24 74/25 | 63/1 63/6 77/9 77/11 |
| fund [1] 72/16 | happen [2] 8/2 89/17 | housing [2] 54/5 72/2 |
| fundamental [1] 85/24 | happens [4] 12/23 38/24 64/12 | how [24] 6/5 6/5 6/15 6/15 7/6 |
| further [1] 40/20 | 87/6 | 16/8 16/10 26/5 26/6 44/12 |
| Furthermore [1] 73/6 | hard [1] 50/6 | 44/20 47/16 48/9 53/6 59/13 |
| future [1] 22/23 | Hartsdale [1] 1/24 | 60/1 60/5 61/22 64/21 64/23 |
| futures [1] 86/10 | has [38] 5/4 5/5 5/23 7/24 | 68/16 74/17 74/19 76/19 |
| G | 9/14 $10 / 1711 / 25$ 12/14 $13 / 9$ | However [2] 65/17 71/1 |
| gained [1] 83/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 24 / 7 & 25 / 11 & 28 / 3 & 32 / 3 & 35 / 1\end{array}$ | human [1] 61/9 |
| gamut [1] 37/25 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 35 / 18 & 36 / 9 & 38 / 2 & 42 / 14 & 43 / 5\end{array}$ | hundred [4] 41/21 57/12 $86 / 15$ |
| GARETH [7] $2 / 7$ 10/6 42/10 | 48/18 58/23 62/7 71/15 78/15 | 89/6 |
| 48/18 49/22 84/18 85/1 | 78/18 78/23 81/9 81/17 84/1 | hydric [1] 42/2 |
| gate [2] 73/14 73/16 | 85/18 85/23 86/7 87/22 | hydrological [2] 23/9 58/3 |
| general [6] 4/16 4/19 16/24 | have [119] | hydrologically [1] 45/12 |
| 51/13 51/15 64/14 | having [4] $27 / 13$ 33/25 $73 / 3$ | hydrology [1] 43/17 |
| generally [2] 35/20 77/6 | 81/22 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { hydrophytic [2] } & 42 / 2 & 42 / 8\end{array}$ |
| gentleman [1] 59/16 | hay [1] 74/4 | I |
| 50/7 66/24 68/16 82/14 83/1 | $\begin{array}{ccccccl}\text { 43/14 } & 43 / 17 & 45 / 1 & 45 / 11 & 53 / 25\end{array}$ | I'd [10] 13/5 22/21 24/4 54/6 |
| 87/11 88/14 | 59/18 84/1 | 60/15 64/14 64/25 65/11 65/17 |
| gets [2] 18/3 74/11 | he's [1] 51/23 | 83/16 |
| getting [1] 27/11 | head [1] 51/8 | I'll [9] 4/3 5/21 10/9 25/15 |
| give [4] 22/22 33/19 83/2 | headings [1] 4/16 | 25/21 29/18 46/17 63/21 83/19 |
| 87/22 | headline [1] 13/4 | I'm [8] 4/2 32/6 37/4 56/22 |


|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I | ```inscribed [1] 41/22 insects [1] 20/15 installed [1] 73/15 instance [4] 23/2 50/1 50/10``` | ```keep [3] 15/10 17/2 29/24 keeping [1] 56/12``` |
|  |  | kept [2] 16/3 16/1 |
|  |  | key [1] 25 |
| dea [2] 31/5 | $82 / 10$ | 18/5 25/15 25/21 54/1 56/ |
| identification [4] 35/11 44 | $\begin{array}{\|lr} \text { institution [1] } & 35 / 22 \\ \text { insufficient [1] } & 21 / 1 \end{array}$ | KIRBY [2] 2/6 27/2 |
| 45/2 50/18 |  | new [1] |
| dentified | insure [1] 89/14 | 47] |
| 45/10 49/20 | integrated [2] 25/20 36/11 | known [3] 53/10 |
| identify [4] 50/7 50/8 58/2 | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { integration [2] } & 16 / 25 & 73 / 22 \\ \text { intelligent [2] } & 33 / 20 & 34 / 5 \end{array}$ | Kvinge [1] 52/3 |
| /1 |  | L |
| strated | intent <br> [1] $73 / 16$ |  |
| immediately [1] | intention [1] 82/2 | land [8] |
| impact [19] 1/6 4/25 5/4 | interest [2] 26/19 68/18 | 61/19 68/10 70/19 71 |
| 5/22 14/10 29/4 29/6 45/7 |  | landscaping [1] 52/6 |
| 48/24 50/16 53/6 53/22 54/ | interested [2] 29/5 64/7 | large [5] 14/20 65/24 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}54 / 12 & 61 / 5 & 70 / 12 & 72 / 13 & 74 / 25\end{array}$ | interesting [1] 16/22 | 84/7 84/9 |
| impacted [2] 39/2 54/12 | Interestingly [1] 61/7 last [9] 10/19 13/11 23/7 24/1 |  |
| impacts [24] 5/11 5/25 | intersect [1] 73/19 | 25/20 64/15 69/10 71/3 82 |
| 6/18 6/22 6/25 7/2 7/4 7/10 | intersections [1] 73/23 | lastly [2] 8/18 23/6 |
| 8/6 47/8 53/14 53/16 54/24 | introduced [2] 9/22 65/23 | later [4] 29/13 50/20 |
| 54/24 63/17 68/12 69/7 71/19 | introduction [1] 53/8 | 69/24 |
| 73/25 75/7 75/12 89/16 | invasive [1] 46/23 | law [11] 4/24 7/16 |
| impervious [4] 43/21 44/1 60/1 | invertebrates [2] $\quad 20 / 11 \quad 22 / 8$investigate [1] $72 / 23$involved [3] $13 / 18 \quad 13 / 19$ | $11 / 7 \quad 32 / 6 \quad 46 / 24 \quad 71 / 6 \quad 80 / 8$ |
| implemented [3] 7/11 |  | awn [1] |
| implications [1] 64/11 | involvement <br> [1] $28 / 24$ | laws [1] |
| implied [1] 26/4 | Irene [1] 13/14 | lawyer [1] 88/1 |
| importance [1] | irretrievable [1] 8/5 <br> irreversible [1] 8/4 | layout [3] 7/14 26/2 |
| important [8] 25/2 36/5 43/25 |  | layouts [3] 7/19 73/7 |
| 47/12 48/23 50/9 52/12 67/2 | is [254] | lead [1] 63/13 |
| improved [1] 19 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { isn't [3] } 36 / 11 \quad 72 / 7 \quad 88 / 3 \\ & \text { isolated [3] } \end{aligned} 45 / 13 \quad 45 / 21 \quad 45 / 22$ | learn [2] 69/5 69 |
| improvement [1] 1 |  | learned [1] 71/1 |
| improvements [1] 26/3 | isolation [1] 58/3 | learning [1] 52/1 |
| inappropriate [2] 32/23 85/22 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { issue [8] } 6 / 3 \text { 6/9 19/13 } 22 / 10 \\ & 38 / 1650 / 22 \quad 69 / 14 \\ & \hline 66 / 23 \end{aligned}$ | least [4] 13/14 32/15 32/ |
| Inc [1] 2/20 |  |  |
| inch [2] 35/5 | issued [1] $82 / 16$ | leaves [1] 62/20 |
| inches [1] 80 | issues [10] 5/21 5/22 8/19 | leaving [2] 62/5 62 |
| include [15] 20/15 | 14/4 17/13 19/3 19/6 19/14 | LED [2] 53/21 53/21 |
| 47/12 49/2 50/18 52/6 52/2 | 30/13 88/6 | left [2] 69/22 77/ |
| 57/8 59/4 59/7 60/7 69/10 | it [155] <br> it's [16] 16/1 26/1 $26 / 4$ 27/12 | legal [1] 82/21 |
| 78/11 89/13 |  | legality [1] 72/2 |
| included [25] 5/5 8/17 | 31/14 $33 / 19$ 34/12 $36 / 443 / 19$ | legally [2] 9/10 71/3 |
| 20/6 22/12 26/9 27/24 28/9 | 51/23 51/25 56/3 57/5 78/16 | lengthy [2] 4/13 4/1 |
| 35/15 41/11 45/15 $46 / 949$ | $82 / 13 \quad 84 / 9$ | less [2] 75/20 86/6 |
| 49/16 54/25 56/21 57/1 57/2 | item [2] 3/10 73/8 | lesser [2] 20/18 34/ |
| 60/13 60/14 60/17 60/22 61/21 | items [2] $56 / 2060 / 12$ | let [3] 3/4 28/11 29/8 |
| 69/9 81/12 |  | letter [6] 21/18 24/2 29/1 |
| includes [2] 5/12 7/22 | its [3] 67/13 70/20 74/21 | 29/17 30/16 78/3 |
| including [8] $22 / 6 \quad 22 / 7 \quad 26 / 7$ 41/20 43/10 57/11 60/2 89/3 inconsistent [3] 34/9 70/19 | itself [2] $4 / 23$ 15/12 | liable [2] 67/11 73/1 <br> life [3] 6/12 52/18 70/14 |
|  | J |  |
|  |  | $\left.\begin{array}{lllll} \text { light } \\ 54 / 2 \end{array}\right] \quad 32 / 13 \quad 32 / 14 \quad 53 / 9$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { inconsistent [3] } 34 / 9 \quad 70 / 19 \\ & 71 / 25 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |
| incorporate [1] | $\begin{array}{\|lrll} \hline \text { jack [3] } & 65 / 24 & 66 / 4 & 74 / 25 \\ \text { Jaenike [1] } & 63 / 10 & \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{llll} 54 / 2 \\ \text { lighting [3] } & 53 / 13 & 53 / 14 & 53 / 19 \end{array}\right.$ |
| incorporated [1] | January [1] 44/19 | $\underset{\text { lights }}{\substack{\text { li/5 }}} \begin{array}{lllll}  & 53 / 21 & 53 / 21 & 54 / 5 \end{array}$ |
| increase [1] 16/6 | JIM [2] 2/8 29/23 |  |
| incredible [1] 33 | job [2] 39/9 70/1 | like [63] |
| independent [1] 4 | Joseph [1] 1/8judgments [1] 68/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \text { limit [2] } & 82 / 22 & 82 / 25 \\ \text { limited [8] } & 15 / 21 & 34 / 23 & 52 / 25 \\ 66 / 17 & 72 / 1 & 72 / 4 & 76 / 11 & 83 / 25 \end{array}$ |
| Indian [1] 61/12 |  |  |
| indicated [2] 31/13 31/13 | jurisdiction [4]$43 / 1$ 85/25 |  |
| individuality [1] $26 /$ |  | line [3] 16/15 17/19 31/21 |
| influx [1] 47/2 | jurisdictions [1] 43/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lines [4] } \quad 31 / 22 \\ & 85 / 10 \\ & \text { link [1] } 33 / 9 \\ & \text { linking [1] } 7 / 22 \end{aligned}$ |
| information [4]$90 / 5$ | juror [1] 87/23 |  |
|  | just [52] |  |
| informational [1] 71/2 <br> infrastructure [3] 6/20 17/21 $18 / 10$ |  |  |
|  | justify [1] 63/21 | list [5] 5/13 20/17 28/9 42/4 |
|  | K | $76 / 14$ |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|cccc} \text { listed [4] } \\ 46 / 22 \end{array} \quad 20 / 4 \quad 46 / 546 / 7$ |
| inherently [1] 70/18 | Kardel [1] 53/8 |  |


|  | Proceedings |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L | 70/11 89/13 | Mitzi [3] 37/4 40/17 48/17 |
| listing [1] 79/24 | map [5] 13/12 31/10 49/15 | model [4] 34/21 55/18 |
| little [7] 10/2 20/11 23/6 | mapped [1] 45/11 | modified [1] 35/10 |
| 58/22 75/2 77/18 83/20 | mapper [2] 51/8 51/12 | modify [1] 12/12 |
| live [6] 54/14 55/11 56/10 | mapping [2] 50/25 54/1 | money [2] 17/20 17/23 |
| 56/17 70/23 76/2 | maps [2] 49/1 49/11 | monitored [1] 47/17 |
| lives [1] 77/18 | March [1] 50/15 | months [2] 30/16 89/7 |
| living [1] 72/6 | Mark [1] 55/13 | more [17] 10/16 17/1 17/1 18/9 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { LLC [3] } & 1 / 23 & 78 / 25 & 78 / 25\end{array}$ | market [2] 63/1 73/2 | 18/21 19/13 25/18 27/13 34/22 |
| LLP [1] 2/11 | Masserman [1] 56/17 | 39/5 48/14 54/19 57/21 65/10 |
| loading [1] 60/6 | materials [4] 46/6 46/19 46/22 | 75/21 82/18 86/5 |
| loads [1] 74/16 | 52/23 | morning [1] 54/16 |
| local [2] 12/24 19/13 | matter [3] 5/19 20/20 21/15 | MORNINGSIDE [24] 1/5 27/7 |
| located [2] 59/3 72/20 | maximum [3] $34 / 14$ 34/15 $71 / 13$ | 36/19 36/21 $36 / 21$ 49/4 49/5 |
| location [2] 71/15 89/4 | may [14] $3 / 17$ 11/10 $12 / 9$ 15/18 | 54/14 55/14 56/11 56/17 59/17 |
| locations [1] 38/1 | 22/18 24/4 43/8 67/3 73/14 | 59/21 62/5 63/11 64/9 66/11 |
| long [6] 17/9 23/23 42/20 | 81/2 81/23 84/20 85/13 89/1 | 67/8 67/14 67/18 67/20 67/24 |
| 47/16 61/7 73/24 | maybe [5] 10/1 11/16 $78 / 4$ | 69/1 73/13 |
| longer [1] 85/17 | 78/20 88/15 | most [6] 8/21 10/25 30/25 36/5 |
| look [17] 8/25 14/15 16/4 | MCWILLIAMS [3] 2/5 25/10 25/17 | 50/20 62/21 |
| 17/11 17/16 18/6 22/20 $27 / 8$ | McWilliams's [1] 64/8 | move [5] 3/14 3/15 3/22 $3 / 23$ |
| 29/19 31/6 31/25 58/16 67/15 | me [10] 4/5 19/25 27/20 $28 / 11$ | 90/6 |
| 87/19 88/9 89/15 89/20 | 29/8 59/18 63/15 63/18 63/19 | moved [1] 62/18 |
| looked [5] 15/15 35/20 58/24 | 75/11 | Mr [3] 29/21 53/8 83/17 |
| 63/24 80/8 | mean [11] 14/1 15/25 17/10 | Mr. [7] 3/13 3/24 $24 / 3 \quad 44 / 13$ |
| looking [8] 9/16 30/1 30/13 | 33/13 69/2 70/24 80/1 82/11 | 59/21 64/8 83/20 |
| 31/3 33/14 36/3 64/4 67/25 | 85/16 87/18 88/5 | Mr. Ciarcia [1] 59/21 |
| loss [1] 73/4 | meaningful [1] 23/19 | Mr. Doscher [1] 44/13 |
| lost [3] 38/20 46/4 52/7 | meant [1] 79/22 | Mr. McWilliams's [1] 64/8 |
| lot [26] 7/19 10/17 15/2 $15 / 6$ | measurements [1] 22/22 | Mr. Stolman [2] 3/13 3/24 |
| 26/15 26/15 26/16 26/22 26/24 | measures [5] 5/11 6/1 6/8 6/18 | Mr. Wekstein [2] 24/3 83/20 |
| $30 / 9$ 31/21 31/22 34/14 34/18 | 7/5 | Ms [1] 40/5 |
| 44/18 54/17 58/19 63/6 63/25 | meat [1] 5/19 | much [14] 5/19 15/20 21/10 |
| 64/4 69/21 72/3 84/12 85/9 | meeting [11] 1/3 3/3 7/14 $23 / 8$ | 24/17 $24 / 18$ 38/13 $47 / 10$ 49/24 |
| 86/20 87/15 | 71/2 81/21 81/23 82/6 89/23 | 56/21 69/23 70/23 83/3 85/17 |
| lots [4] 31/4 60/9 85/6 85/9 | 90/3 90/3 | 90/8 |
| loud [1] 65/25 | meets [1] 76/16 | mudslides [1] 68/4 |
| louder [1] 41/2 | member [12] $2 / 6$ 2/7 $2 / 8$ 25/3 | multiple [1] 33/1 |
| lower [2] 7/19 64/4 | 25/10 30/22 56/18 $70 / 5 \quad 75 / 24$ | multiplied [1] 64/20 |
| lucky [2] 58/18 58/21 | 80/24 83/7 83/9 | municipalities [1] 35/2 |
| M | members [11] $3 / 16$ 3/19 9/21 | must [3] 20/14 23/20 71/9 |
| madam [2] 32/5 76/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 20 / 18 & 23 / 10 & 27 / 18 & 29 / 24 & 30 / 24 \\ 32 / 5 & 55 / 2 & 77 / 25 & & \end{array}$ | my [28] 9/18 10/5 14/17 21/7 <br> 21/14 25/16 25/17 25/17 27/22 |
| made [9] 22/22 24/7 27/18 | memo [3] 22/13 25/19 83/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}27 / 23 & 29 / 2 & 29 / 22 & 29 / 23 & 30 / 22\end{array}$ |
| 32/20 53/13 62/8 76/18 77/3 | mention [3] 36/2 47/10 85/2 | 30/23 32/9 32/15 32/20 34/22 |
| 80/10 | mentioned [9] 20/3 21/24 29/12 | 39/9 40/4 49/14 56/16 70/7 |
| magnitude [2] 33/10 33/11 | 42/10 48/6 65/16 69/13 69/16 | 78/3 79/16 79/20 82/13 |
| mailed [2] 37/7 37/11 | 85/18 | myself [1] 23/10 |
| mainly [1] 49/24 | mentions [1] 57/14 | N |
| maintain [2] 41/14 64/24 | methods [3] 47/19 52/22 53/2 | $N$ |
| maintained [2] 26/7 47/17 | micro [2] 20/10 22/8 | name [9] 10/5 25/17 27/22 |
| maintenance [3] 26/2 41/7 | micromanage [1] 88/8 | 29/22 40/13 55/11 56/16 70/7 |
| 72/12 | microphone [1] 3/25 | 78/19 |
| major [2] 13/10 14/25 | middle [1] 62/20 | names [2] 46/8 78/7 |
| make [25] 13/15 16/18 18/15 | might [3] 10/22 26/23 44/5 | Native [1] 46/18 |
| 19/9 24/2 33/20 34/4 39/7 | migrating [1] 50/16 | natural [2] 8/11 49/18 |
| 39/11 46/10 46/13 46/17 55/11 | migration [1] 53/17 | nearby [2] 69/8 70/9 |
| 65/17 66/4 68/17 70/16 74/11 | minimal [1] 22/21 | necessary [3] 10/13 57/20 |
| 76/21 77/18 83/10 83/12 85/16 | minimally [1] 27/15 | 69/17 |
| 89/18 89/25 | minimize [2] 68/9 68/11 | need [14] 15/7 18/8 22/11 |
| makes [2] 24/14 68/14 | minimum [2] 26/22 34/18 | 41/13 42/20 48/14 48/19 49/15 |
| mammals [2] 20/15 50/17 | minium [1] 14/9 | 49/23 62/8 65/9 74/1 76/25 |
| manage [1] 18/17 | Minor [1] 73/8 | 90/6 |
| management [6] 8/9 13/3 29/3 | misspelling [1] 19/22 | needed [3] 8/14 23/25 34/25 |
| 29/7 47/25 58/8 | mitigated [2] 14/10 41/12 | Needless [1] 54/6 |
| managements [1] 6/11 | mitigating [1] 6/8 | needs [11] 8/16 9/7 38/19 39/3 |
| manager [3] 43/14 50/23 51/9 | mitigation [16] 5/11 6/1 6/18 | 44/7 61/5 66/22 73/16 76/10 |
| manual [1] 75/2 | 7/4 41/5 41/8 45/15 46/1 $46 / 7$ | 76/13 84/4 |
| many [10] 20/7 23/13 32/11 | 46/20 47/2 47/3 47/6 47/15 | negative [2] 70/12 71/19 |
| 32/22 33/24 38/24 39/1 57/2 | 54/11 57/18 | negatively [2] 62/24 62/24 |


| N | occurred [1] 15/3 | 82/9 86/9 87/19 87/24 89/15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Occurrence [1] 13/5 | ours [1] 81/11 |
| neighbor's [1] 54/4 | occurs [1] 72/15 | out [23] 4/7 17/7 18/3 18/25 |
| neighborhood [3] 19/7 61/17 | October [1] 50/15 | 22/13 $29 / 11$ 29/14 $29 / 23 \quad 31 / 17$ |
| 63/4 | October 31 [1] 50/15 | $38 / 17$ 38/17 56/22 61/16 66/25 |
| neighborhood's [1] 70/14 | Off [3] 23/2 45/19 55/23 | 67/23 68/9 72/7 73/9 74/20 |
| neighborhoods [1] 61/23 | offered [1] 81/17 | 77/5 77/7 77/10 80/10 |
| neighboring [6] 59/5 59/14 | Office [1] 43/15 | Outcome [1] 65/10 |
| 62/1 62/25 74/25 75/8 | Official [3] 5/7 8/18 $29 / 18$ | outdoor [1] 53/18 |
| neighbors [6] 71/20 71/24 | Offsite [3] 59/3 $86 / 8$ 86/9 | outer [1] 85/6 |
| 72/14 73/25 75/12 $75 / 18$ | often [3] 41/12 57/21 65/6 | outline [5] 5/18 6/14 8/22 |
| neutral [1] 68/17 | Oh [2] 37/14 81/8 | 25/5 25/7 |
| neutrality [1] 64/24 | Okay [41] $3 / 24$ 4/3 $10 / 3$ 10/3 | outlines [2] 6/15 8/23 |
| never [2] 36/10 59/22 | 11/23 11/23 12/2 12/18 13/22 | outrageously [1] 75/13 |
| new [36] 1/9 1/24 $2 / 14$ 7/25 | 13/25 15/17 18/13 19/17 $27 / 21$ | Outside [4] 54/9 63/11 70/11 |
| 10/15 12/3 12/24 12/24 16/1 | $37 / 14$ 39/16 $39 / 21 \quad 39 / 25 \quad 40 / 22$ | 83/21 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}20 / 4 & 21 / 18 & 22 / 18 & 28 / 6 & 28 / 7\end{array}$ | 41/9 41/15 41/24 $42 / 3 \quad 43 / 12$ | outweighs [1] 75/13 |
| 29/11 $36 / 7$ 36/8 $37 / 13$ 43/10 | 43/23 $44 / 22$ 45/16 $46 / 2 \quad 47 / 6$ | over [11] 10/19 16/23 25/8 |
| $46 / 22$ 49/3 49/9 49/21 50/23 | $51 / 4 \quad 51 / 10 \quad 53 / 24 \quad 54 / 22 \quad 55 / 4$ | 25/16 26/25 30/25 36/21 36/22 |
| 54/17 54/18 56/3 57/22 59/9 | 64/6 79/9 79/20 80/17 82/20 | 38/22 57/25 89/12 |
| 70/9 71/22 $72 / 1 \quad 72 / 21 \quad 73 / 18$ | 83/14 90/1 | overtime [1] 74/20 |
| 73/23 85/19 | old [1] 53/7 | own [2] 86/1 86/9 |
| newspaper [1] 13/15 | once [3] 6/14 24/7 69/19 | Owned [4] 36/14 $36 / 15$ 79/2 |
| next [9] 3/23 6/24 17/10 40/3 | one [44] 2/13 3/10 $7 / 13$ 8/14 | 79/3 |
| 52/20 69/19 81/20 81/24 90/6 | 8/24 12/13 17/12 $21 / 3 \quad 21 / 8$ | owner [2] 58/9 84/12 |
| nice [1] 55/17 | 22/1 22/14 24/1 25/23 27/14 | Owners [3] $38 / 5$ 71/3 $71 / 8$ |
| night [2] 53/11 90/7 | 28/12 $29 / 10$ 32/11 $33 / 23$ 34/23 | P |
| nighttime [2] 53/9 53/13 | $34 / 24 \quad 36 / 3 \quad 36 / 4 \quad 36 / 8 \quad 42 / 16$ | P |
| nitrate [1] 22/16 | 47/4 $47 / 4$ 48/5 $49 / 13$ 54/4 | p.m [2] 1/10 90/9 |
| nitrite [1] 22/17 | 64/15 65/16 $72 / 18$ 73/14 $76 / 12$ | page [26] 13/1 18/16 19/19 |
| nitrogen [1] 23/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}78 / 10 & 78 / 24 & 78 / 25 & 79 / 10 & 80 / 9\end{array}$ | 19/23 19/25 20/25 21/16 22/4 |
| no [18] 9/4 9/13 12/2 15/21 | 84/22 85/2 85/17 85/23 87/3 | 28/5 28/5 28/13 $29 / 3$ 40/8 |
| 23/4 $25 / 15$ 37/12 $39 / 10 \quad 39 / 10$ | one-on-one [1] 47/4 | $40 / 8 \quad 41 / 17$ 44/25 $54 / 23$ 57/5 |
| $39 / 10$ 46/21 50/16 65/15 69/18 | ones [3] 36/5 37/15 75/2 | 57/7 64/15 65/13 68/24 69/7 |
| 83/24 87/3 89/6 89/24 | ongoing [1] 41/7 | 76/8 79/10 79/23 |
| nocturnal [1] 53/11 | online [1] 50/24 | Page-by-page [1] $40 / 8$ |
| none [2] 46/25 51/25 | only [6] 17/15 42/11 $57 / 14$ | pages [4] 4/14 40/24 41/3 |
| normal [2] 35/22 53/10 | 71/22 76/15 86/9 | 47/24 |
| north [14] 1/24 2/13 13/7 14/5 | open [7] 3/18 7/22 $25 / 25$ 26/2 | paper [4] 69/11 69/16 69/22 |
| 14/14 15/1 15/15 19/11 $38 / 6$ | 26/4 55/4 71/21 | 69/25 |
| 48/7 49/3 49/10 58/10 58/16 | opinion [2] 14/18 75/11 | paragraph [2] 28/14 47/13 |
| not [86] | opportunity [1] 82/8 | paragraphs [1] 6/4 |
| note [3] 45/11 76/18 77/3 | opposed [2] 30/3 65/18 | parenthesis [1] 22/5 |
| noted [1] 90/9 | option [1] 73/14 | park [7] 17/8 17/18 21/21 |
| nothing [3] 9/4 86/5 86/5 | optional [1] 8/1 | 30/19 40/3 59/16 75/9 |
| notice [1] 51/24 | Options [6] 30/1 30/2 $30 / 5$ | parking [1] 60/9 |
| noticed [4] 52/1 63/6 78/5 | 30/12 66/8 73/11 | part [7] 5/2 36/9 45/20 45/22 |
| 81/9 | ordinance [5] 35/4 35/8 37/18 | 51/2 61/4 77/10 |
| Notwithstanding [1] 71/5 | 80/3 86/3 | particular [2] 10/24 27/10 |
| now [17] 9/21 10/9 11/5 12/21 | ordinances [1] 86/2 | particularly [5] 27/6 41/11 |
| 13/24 $33 / 7$ 34/1 $42 / 24 \quad 45 / 6$ | originally [1] 75/19 | 46/19 53/7 53/20 |
| 49/17 $55 / 4 \quad 58 / 18$ 59/24 $65 / 20$ | Ornithology [1] 50/5 | parties [1] 88/21 |
| 67/19 68/3 85/18 | Oshkosh [1] 56/3 | partner [1] 32/6 |
| number [16] 19/19 31/4 32/11 | OSSINING [20] $1 / 1$ 1/9 $3 / 3$ 11/7 | party [5] 2/4 68/17 74/24 $75 / 5$ |
| $32 / 12$ 33/2 $33 / 23$ 34/1 $34 / 7$ | 11/20 11/22 12/6 12/8 12/13 | 88/13 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 8 & 36 / 13 & 45 / 6 & 47 / 2 & 48 / 25\end{array}$ | 18/22 40/16 56/18 56/19 58/12 | pass [1] 67/19 |
| 84/7 85/17 89/11 | 60/18 $63 / 15$ 73/7 $76 / 3 \quad 79 / 4$ | passage [1] 77/5 |
| 0 | 88/24 | passed [1] 46/25 |
| object [1] 36/ | Other [29] 4/8 4/11 $7 / 17$ 9/4 | passive [1] 26/1 |
| objective [1] 68/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 14 & 16 / 14 & 17 / 16 & 17 / 19 & 21 / 25\end{array}$ | past [4] 16/23 35/19 56/1 |
| objectives [2] 33/17 34/10 | 26/11 $27 / 17$ 29/24 $30 / 2 \quad 30 / 11$ | 65/14 |
| Objectivity [1] 65/5 | $30 / 13$ 34/22 35/2 44/2 46/11 | PATCHEN [3] 1/23 1/23 91/14 |
| obligation [1] 14/8 | 55/2 $70 / 5 \quad 73 / 12 \quad 74 / 6 \quad 74 / 23$ | patchensteno.com [1] 1/25 |
| observation [1] 21/5 | 75/24 77/25 79/20 80/24 85/2 | path [1] 21/21 |
| obtain [1] 31/18 | others [1] 73/15 | pathway [2] 33/7 33/9 |
| obvious [2] 17/5 75/11 | otherwise [1] 71/13 | patterns [4] 53/17 59/2 59/10 |
| obviously [6] 31/2 31/20 33/4 | Our [24] 3/10 3/14 3/15 3/16 | 62/13 |
| 35/23 65/5 89/20 | $3 / 20$ 12/14 $31 / 19$ 35/1 $35 / 17$ | paved [1] 59/17 |
| occur [4] 12/19 $12 / 21 \quad 74 / 6$ | $35 / 21 \quad 36 / 4 \quad 51 / 16$ 55/3 $58 / 18$ | pay [1] 64/25 |
| 74/13 | 58/19 70/14 70/17 81/20 82/5 | pays [1] 67/13 |


| P | $40 / 4 \text { 45/1 69/23 77/5 83/11 }$ | $59 / 6 \text { 59/8 61/5 62/1 69/9 }$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| PE [1] 2/21 | points [1] 27/2 | property [36] 11/11 15/22 |
| pedestrian [2] 21/21 62/12 | pollutant [1] 60/6 | 17/15 21/11 23/3 26/21 28/10 |
| pedestrians [1] 66/19 | pollution [1] 8/12 | 31/9 31/20 33/23 38/12 40/1 |
| Peekskill [3] 7/23 21/22 33/9 | pools [5] 41/19 42/10 42/24 | 44/3 51/24 52/1 58/14 59/14 |
| people [8] 4/5 54/17 66/14 | 57/11 88/25 | 61/9 70/15 70/22 71/3 71/5 |
| 68/1 87/15 87/16 88/10 88/19 | population [1] 39/ | 71/8 71/18 71/23 72/19 77/17 |
| per [4] 5/2 5/17 26/21 26/22 | position [1] 65/20 | 83/24 84/10 84/12 84/14 84/23 |
| perc [4] 59/7 59/8 86/8 86/14 | possibility [1] 50/16 | 85/7 85/7 86/9 87/11 |
| percent [1] 31/14 | possible [9] 7/12 21/17 26/12 | proportional [1] 84/10 |
| percentages [1] 31/12 | 26/14 43/4 68/13 68/15 81/18 | proportionally [1] 84/13 |
| Perfect [1] 24/10 | 89/13 | proposal [2] 5/9 72/7 |
| performance [1] 59/9 | possibly [6] 26/19 28/2 50/12 | proposed [34] 4/20 4/22 25/25 |
| performed [4] 28/15 44/15 | 54/9 61/18 83/2 | 26/12 26/20 28/4 30/4 31/23 |
| 64/17 79/24 | post [4] 22/24 50/22 60/5 60/6 | 32/14 $33 / 4$ 34/6 35/13 41/7 |
| perhaps [2] 8/24 11/13 | potential [15] 5/10 5/25 6/7 | 46/7 47/19 51/3 52/7 52/9 |
| perimeter [2] 62/15 71/17 | 6/17 7/4 26/1 $29 / 4$ 29/6 45/7 | 52/15 53/2 53/18 54/13 57/25 |
| perimetered [1] 85/9 | 48/24 53/14 53/16 54/2 61/1 | 59/6 59/13 61/2 61/14 61/22 |
| permeable [1] 53/4 | 68/4 | 70/20 71/16 72/18 73/11 84/21 |
| permit [2] 29/18 87/12 | potentially [3] 67/4 68/ | 85/6 |
| permits [3] 5/13 16/25 29/14 | 89/17 | proposing [1] 36/20 |
| permitted [2] 46/25 52/24 | PP [1] 2/19 | protect [2] 37/20 52/23 |
| permutation [1] 33/22 | practice [1] 35/23 | protected [2] 21/22 74/4 |
| person [2] 23/16 38/15 | practices [3] 16/9 16/12 18/17 | protection [2] 28/8 38/15 |
| personally [1] 56/7 | predevelopment [2] 14/11 16/15 | protections [1] 66/20 |
| perspective [1] 36/4 | prefer [1] 44/17 | provide [8] 9/23 25/24 26/16 |
| phase [6] 8/14 8/14 21/3 21/7 | preliminary [2] 10/7 21/8 | 62/11 74/22 74/24 75/6 90/5 |
| 60/3 76/12 | prepared [3] 9/19 13/8 13/17 | provided [4] 5/1 45/4 47/7 |
| phosphorous [3] 22/16 23/1 | preparing [2] 9/5 12/22 | 53/19 |
| 48/21 | present [3] 2/17 56/2 56/20 | proximity [2] 17/4 72/ |
| photographs [1] 68/18 | presented [1] 26/14 | public [12] 1/3 25/2 33/20 |
| photos [1] 86/12 | Preservation [1] 76/6 | 34/17 34/18 55/5 72/24 73/21 |
| piece [6] 17/24 22/2 36/9 | preserved [1] 61/24 | 82/7 83/7 86/11 88/4 |
| 36/14 38/12 79/1 | pretty [2] 5/19 70/23 | public's [1] 34/4 |
| pieces [1] 65/25 | prevention [1] 8/12 | Pursuant [1] 18/20 |
| piled [2] 62/14 62/14 | previously [1] 33/8 | pursue [2] 27/5 30/11 |
| pilling [1] 74/3 | primarily [2] $32 / 10$ 32/21 | put [3] 57/24 59/18 78/3 |
| pipe [1] 17/7 | principals [1] 85/24 | putting [1] 5/3 |
| place [5] 30/19 31/23 34/20 | printed [1] 80/10 | Q |
| 62/6 62/19 | prior [2] 82/8 89/7 | 2 |
| placed [1] 62/18 | priority [1] 38/17 | qualified [1] 76/15 |
| places [2] 44/3 63/6 | privacy [1] 73/5 | quality [7] 16/10 18/21 22/16 |
| placing [1] 57/24 | probably [4] $20 / 22$ 27/11 $36 / 4$ | 22/19 22/22 48/18 70/14 |
| Plains [1] 2/14 | 82/13 | quantity [2] 18/20 74/14 |
| plan [11] 8/12 30/1 61/22 | problem [5] 15/6 17/22 18/12 | question [10] 28/3 28/12 29/2 |
| 63/16 63/17 64/11 64/12 67/16 | 23/4 58/21 | 64/20 64/20 67/1 67/11 79/21 |
| 67/16 67/17 67/22 | problems [6] 14/22 15/3 15/15 | 81/15 88/13 |
| Planing [1] 70/16 | 19/16 58/11 59/5 | questions [2] 28/2 78/3 |
| PLANNING [15] $1 / 3$ 3/2 $4 / 11$ | procedure [1] 14/8 | quick [1] 83/13 |
| 8/23 25/4 28/24 31/24 41/4 | proceeding [1] 91/10 | quickly [3] 25/21 29/9 39/15 |
| 43/16 52/4 52/5 56/8 72/23 | process [5] 12/21 31/2 33/13 | quiet [1] 23/11 |
| 84/21 89/2 | 46/1 46/20 | R |
| plans [9] 30/7 41/6 45/15 | processes [1] 10/14 | R |
| 47/19 52/22 53/2 54/2 61/14 | produce [1] 65/25 | R-40 [3] 70/22 70/23 75/19 |
| 62/12 | productive [1] 90/3 | R-5 [1] 75/14 |
| plant [6] 46/6 46/19 46/21 | professional [2] 28/23 76/20 | R5 [2] 26/22 70/20 |
| 46/24 50/18 52/23 | professionals [6] 23/11 23/13 | rain [1] 58/17 |
| plantings [1] 74/6 | 23/17 64/17 64/19 87/19 | raised [1] 21/19 |
| plants [3] 20/16 23/22 50/20 | profoundly [1] 39/5 | ramping [1] 16/3 |
| platform [1] 21/19 | program [2] 50/23 51/9 | range [3] 33/16 52/16 77/13 |
| playing [1] 75/9 | prohibited [1] 46/23 | rare [1] 20/2 |
| please [4] $24 / 25$ 83/14 $85 / 15$ | project [21] 5/14 5/16 5/16 | rarely [1] 20/10 |
| 89/23 | 6/25 7/11 7/25 8/3 8/7 10/24 | rate [1] 16/16 |
| pledge [2] 3/4 3/7 | 14/10 17/5 21/2 33/10 33/11 | rather [2] 20/23 42/19 |
| plus [1] 33/7 | 33/15 33/18 41/5 55/17 61/4 | ratio [1] 47/4 |
| pm [1] 1/10 | 77/15 84/22 | reaching [1] 18/6 |
| Pneumatic [1] 65/24 | projects [2] 46/20 55/25 | read [4] $24 / 5$ 25/21 $77 / 20$ 78/5 |
| Pocantico [3] 38/23 48/15 | proper [3] 66/20 68/5 72/11 | really [20] 4/17 9/18 14/3 |
| 48/25 | properly [1] 23/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll}15 / 7 & 18 / 8 & 25 / 18 & 27 / 3 & 27 / 5\end{array}$ |
| point [10] 4/14 9/10 11/3 32/1 | properties [10] 30/15 54/3 | 34/22 37/17 38/13 38/16 38/19 |


| R | $\begin{array}{lllll} 56 / 9 & 57 / 23 & 58 / 5 & 60 / 11 & 60 / 21 \\ 60 / 23 & 61 / 21 & 72 / 22 & & \end{array}$ | rooftops [1] 60/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{array}{\|rrrrrr} \hline \text { really... } & {[7]} & 44 / 17 & 50 / 6 & 56 / 13 \\ 58 / 23 & 67 / 25 & 79 / 22 & 88 / 18 & \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\underset{\substack{\text { requested [4] } \\ \text { 89/2 }}}{ } 36 / 6$ 48/16 $53 / 20$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \text { roots } & {[2]} & 52 / 17 & 53 / 6 \\ \text { Route } & \text { [1] } & 38 / 9 & \end{array}$ |
| reason [1] 87/21 | requesting [1] 35 | run [2] 5/21 59/15 |
| reasonable [5] 33/16 34/11 <br> 65/10 68/13 68/15 | $\text { requests [1] } 86 / 7$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { running [4] } & 55 / 23 & 59 / 12 & 59 / 20\end{array}$ |
| rebut [1] 84/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { required [10] } & 4 / 21 & 5 / 13 & 7 / 8\end{array}$ | runoff [12] $15 / 22 \quad 16 / 13 \quad 16 / 17$ |
| recalled [1] 61/ | 7/25 9/10 28/17 32/25 34/25 | 23/5 30/14 37/22 43/22 47/21 |
| received [1] 30/16 | 64/24 86/13 | 48/6 48/9 68/9 68/11 |
| receiving [1] 89/21 | requirement [2] 23/8 84/15 | runs [2] 28/10 72/19 |
| recently [1] 46 | requirements [1] 7/15 | Ryder [6] 17/8 17/18 21/21 |
| recess [1] 3/6 | requires [1] 35/4 | 30/19 59/16 75/9 |
| recited [1] 3/8 | reside [1] 70/8 | S |
| recommend [4] $84 / 14$ | residences [2] 26/20 73/3 <br> resident <br> [1] 61/7 |  |
| recommendation [1] 10/2 | residential [1] |  |
| recommendations [1] 76/21 | residents [2] 37/21 | safe [1] |
| recommends [1] 57/8 | resolved [1] 14/ | safety [2] 62 |
| record [7] 37/18 38/1 39/11 | resource [4] 8/11 47/23 51/7 | said [4] 21/4 23/7 26/2 80/18 |
| 39/24 68/20 74/11 77/2 | 51/12 | same [11] 17/23 22/10 33/25 |
| records [1] 61/10 | resources [10] 6/13 6/20 8/5 | 36/14 37/10 37/15 47/14 50/21 |
| redirect [1] 68/11 | 8/8 8/15 47/9 50/25 53/11 | 59/4 69/24 84/11 |
| reduce [2] 16/13 16/16 | 60/16 76/9 | Sandy [4] 2/22 13/14 50/2 |
| reduced [1] 33/2 | respect [1] 75/1 | 68/21 |
| reduction [1] 69/ | respectable [3] 38/4 38/5 38/6 | say [23] 9/5 $17 / 3$ 17/6 17/1 |
| redundant [1] 46/16 | respective [1] 64/18 | 17/18 17/23 18/16 24/23 25/10 |
| reference [1] 13/15 | respond [2] 24/8 83/16 | 35/10 42/21 47/1 54/6 54/21 |
| references [2] 69/20 79/19 | responding [1] 24/12 | 57/3 63/13 64/25 69/10 76/1 |
| refers [1] 84/8 | response [4] 11/2 11/5 24/2 | 85/4 85/22 86/23 87/9 |
| regard [1] 30/23 | 24 | saying [5] 39/23 42/19 51/23 |
| regarding [11] 7/13 8/10 | restricted [1] | 84/18 88/11 |
| 30/17 37/22 37/22 70/12 72/24 | result [4] 15/4 26/23 52/9 | says [5] 47/14 51/9 68/24 |
| 73/7 73/13 73/17 | 71/18 | 79/10 79/23 |
| regardless [2] 41/21 57/13 | resulting | scale [2] 55/19 71/25 |
| regulated [4] 46/23 79/25 80/1 | results [1] | scientific [1] $46 / 8$ |
| 80/3 | retain [1] 8 | scientist [3] 28/18 28/23 |
| regulations [14] 10/15 11/8 | retained [1] 84/1 | 28/25 |
| 11/19 $12 / 1312 / 2412 / 2516 / 7$ | revert [1] 53/3 | scientists [1] 28/1 |
| 18/18 18/21 18/23 22/19 26/23 | review [10] $31 / 19$ 34/5 38/14 | scope [12] 4/23 14/16 $32 / 25$ |
| 37/20 37/24 | 51/2 56/2 76/8 82/23 82/24 | 33/8 34/20 35/10 57/14 60/2 |
| reimburse [2] 65/2 | 88/1 89/5 | $72 / 1$ 82/3 86/5 86/13 |
| reject [1] 83/22 | reviewed [2] 56/24 61/1 | scoping [25] 1/7 3/11 3/13 |
| relate [2] 33/23 55/6 | reviewing [1] 82/14 | 3/21 4/6 5/18 6/14 8/22 8/23 |
| related [1] 8/19 | Richard [1] 70/7 | 9/3 10/8 24/4 25/5 25/7 30/24 |
| relative [3] 5/3 70/19 72/8 | RICHARDS [1] 2/4 | 55/6 56/24 57/5 70/6 76/8 |
| relatively [1] 27/15 | right [19] 11/9 1 | 78/22 80/25 83/8 84/15 90/4 |
| remain [1] 23/15 | 18/19 27/9 34/1 40/2 42/18 | season [7] $42 / 12$ 42/22 $44 / 15$ |
| remainder [1] 79/ | 42/23 44/9 48/10 51/14 51/18 | 48/3 50/19 50/20 74/8 |
| remains [1] 71/ | 51/21 51/21 64/5 67/21 71/4 | seasons [1] 74/7 |
| remediation [1] 7 | 80/19 | seats [1] 4/4 |
| remedy [1] 15/5 | rigorous [1] | second [4] 5/15 6/9 29/2 81/10 |
| removable [1] 52/2 | risks [1] 75/7 | Secretary [1] 2/22 |
| removal [3] 54/11 83/25 84/2 | risky [1] 66/18 | section [12] 7/18 $7 / 20$ 7/24 |
| remove [1] 65/2 | road [44] $1 / 6$ 8/6 $13 / 7$ 14/6 | 10/11 13/2 19/20 21/1 61/19 |
| removed [2] 62/3 |  | 73/8 76/10 85/3 89/1 |
| renderings [1] 27/7 | $\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 7 & 45 / 18 & 45 / 21 & 47 / 20 & 48 / 7\end{array}$ | see [17] 21/9 22/25 30/5 30/11 |
| repair [2] 67/13 74/23 | 58/2 58/10 58/16 59/17 60/17 | 31/1 31/13 31/24 35/24 41/6 |
| repetitive [1] 74/10 | 61/1 61/8 62/19 66/8 66/9 | 49/5 56/11 81/5 81/10 81/11 |
| replace [2] 47/5 47/6 | 66/10 66/11 66/19 67/2 67/3 | 82/8 82/17 87/17 |
| replaced [1] 15/5 | 67/7 67/8 67/12 67/18 67/21 | seeing [1] 35/17 |
| replacement [3] 46/6 61/24 | 68/2 68/25 70/9 70/10 72/14 | seek [2] 14/9 16/5 |
| 62/2 | 72/20 74/20 74/23 77/4 77/9 | seem [1] 47/10 |
| report [14] 9/19 11/10 39/13 | roads [6] 44/2 62/4 72/18 | seems [5] 9/8 $49 / 12$ 75/1 |
| 45/3 56/25 57/3 57/7 76/11 | 73/18 74/13 74/16 | 75/21 79/15 |
| 76/13 76/14 76/21 77/17 78/18 | roadway [1] 26/ | seen [3] 31/10 49/12 51/6 |
| 82/16 | roadways [2] 26/3 60/ | send [1] 82/22 |
| reporters [1] 1/ | Rob [2] 43/14 57/17 | sense [1] 24/15 |
| reports [3] 8/13 8/15 13/16 | Robinwood [1] 60/19 | sensitive [2] 27/13 38/12 |
| reptiles [2] 20/15 22/9 | rock [6] 60/2 66/6 68/3 68/6 | sent [4] 10/6 10/8 $22 / 13$ 24/3 |
| request [11] 47/18 48/4 52/11 | 74/8 74/14 | SEQRA [8] 7/9 7/25 8/16 17/16 |


| S | slopes [10] 6/10 31/9 31/10 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { standards [4] } \begin{array}{l} \text { sto/20 } \\ 85 / 20 \end{array} \text { 17/2 } 76 / 16 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SEQRA... [4] 85/23 85/23 85/24 | 68/8 89/16 | start [6] 3/4 3/22 10/4 37/17 |
| 87/19 | small [3] 35/7 36/14 55/19 | 54/21 64/1 |
| seriously [1] 39/4 | snow [5] $44 / 16$ 44/20 48/4 | starting [1] 54/20 |
| SERVICES [1] 1/23 | 62/14 62/17 | starts [2] 28/4 49/6 |
| SESSION [1] 1/7 | so [109] | state [32] 10/15 $12 / 313 / 7$ |
| set [1] 30/7 | Society [2] 60/19 60/24 | 13/17 $14 / 5014 / 1415 / 115 / 16$ |
| sets [1] 10/20 | soil [9] $28 / 15$ 43/15 44/2 | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 2 & 19 / 12 & 20 / 4 & 20 / 13 & 20 / 17\end{array}$ |
| seven [6] 8/6 20/25 47/24 | 53/3 66/7 67/3 68/3 68/5 74/3 | 21/2 22/6 22/15 22/19 24/1 |
| 69/17 76/8 79/23 | soils [6] $22 / 6$ 42/2 $42 / 4$ 43/21 | 37/17 37/19 38/6 40/12 43/11 |
| several [4] 6/4 13/10 $34 / 7$ | 44/16 48/3 | 46/23 48/7 49/10 49/21 50/23 |
| 78/7 | solid [1] 8/9 | 55/10 58/10 58/16 85/19 |
| sewer [2] 8/13 34/17 | solution [1] 18 | stated [8] 10/12 22/18 38/19 |
| sewers [1] 9/17 | solve [1] 17/22 | 44/13 45/11 50/24 52/5 53/8 |
| shall [6] 64/17 69/1 69/2 | solves [1] 71/12 | statement [4] 1/7 4/25 5/4 |
| 69/14 73/9 85/4 | some [34] 4/11 4/19 10/9 10/21 | 26/9 |
| shape [1] 67/14 | 13/19 14/4 14/25 15/6 $17 / 8$ | stating [1] 20/21 |
| share [1] 89/22 | 17/8 18/7 19/13 20/18 21/10 | Steen [1] 76/2 |
| Sharratt [2] 40/6 | 21/24 21/24 26/10 27/2 30/18 | steep [11] 6/10 26/18 31/8 |
| sheet [2] 4/24 45/3 | 32/12 32/22 35/6 40/19 50/7 | 31/10 31/11 31/12 38/22 63/20 |
| shorthanded [1] 79/11 | 54/8 56/20 58/11 63/12 63/22 | 65/12 68/8 89/15 |
| should [95] | 66/2 66/23 68/16 68/18 88/10 | STENO [1] 1/23 |
| shoulder [1] 66/14 | somebody [2] 50/7 88/12 | step [5] 3/24 17/11 63/16 |
| shoulders [1] 66/9 | someone [5] 8/25 50/4 5 | 69/19 90/6 |
| shouldn't [2] 45/18 | 60/23 88/11 | stock [1] $74 /$ |
| show [7] 13/12 36/18 55/23 | something [17] 10/25 17/5 | Stolman [3] 2/19 3/13 3/24 |
| 61/14 61/21 62/4 74/17 | 20/21 23/7 24/24 27/4 35/4 | stop [1] 15/9 |
| showing [1] 55/20 | 48/22 50/9 51/7 51/24 55/21 | storm [1] 16/1 |
| shown [3] 4/8 49/14 67/16 | 56/5 56/9 56/13 75/20 84/4 | storms [4] 13/10 13/13 14/2 |
| shows [2] 62/12 63/5 | sometimes [2] 18/3 55/17 | 16/5 |
| SHPO [3] 29/12 76/22 $76 / 24$ | soon [2] 81/18 83/2 | stormwater [16] 6/10 8/11 9/16 |
| side [1] 67/24 | sorry [5] $4 / 2$ 24/19 $32 / 19$ 74/9 | $\begin{array}{llllll}13 / 2 & 16 / 2 & 16 / 25 & 18 / 16 & 29 / 3\end{array}$ |
| sidewalk [2] 66/13 66/13 | 81/8 | 29/6 43/21 47/25 48/2 $48 / 2$ |
| sidewalks [1] 60/10 | sort [9] 4/15 14/16 18/6 19/11 | 58/7 60/1 60/12 |
| Sieminski [1] 70/8 | 21/8 21/25 51/16 62/22 84/17 | stream [1] 18/5 |
| sight [1] 66/17 | sounds [1] 12/4 | streams [3] 41/20 42/11 42/2 |
| signage [1] 21/2 | sources [1] 86/12 | street [4] 54/5 55/11 62/6 |
| significant [5] 10/21 13/9 | space [8] 4/15 7/22 25/25 26/3 | $73 / 7$ |
| 14/21 47/8 71/7 | 26/4 71/21 72/6 85/5 | streets [3] 38/10 62/6 73/9 |
| significantly [3] 71/18 71/25 | spaces [1] 55/19 | strength [1] 67/10 |
| $72 / 7$ lill | $\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { speak } & {[14]} & 3 / 17 & 4 / 4 & 10 / 2 & 38 / 14\end{array}$ | strike [1] 4/7 |
| silk [1] 74/4 | 41/2 42/9 55/4 58/9 70/6 | stringiest [1] 18/22 |
| simply [1] 71/ | 75/25 78/1 80/25 83/8 86/20 | strong [1] 89/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { since [7] } & 15 / 5 & 16 / 24 & 23 / 10\end{array}$ | speaking [4] 10/22 35/16 $43 / 13$ | strongly [1] 84/14 |
| 59/8 63/19 66/5 77/9 | 87/16 [4] 10/22 $35 / 16$ / ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | studied [1] 57/16 |
| single [3] 4/14 25/3 60/21 | speaks [1] | studies [11] 8/11 23/22 $23 / 25$ |
| sir [1] 55/12 | special [1] 20/5 | 35/18 48/5 48/21 51/17 51/19 |
| site [27] 14/20 17/22 21/3 | species [10] 20/3 20/3 20/8 | 86/8 87/24 88/9 |
| 26/3 26/17 27/1 27/14 30/1 | 47/9 49/20 49/22 53/12 53/15 | study [20] 8/13 $13 / 12 \quad 21 / 10$ |
| 31/25 32/15 33/7 34/13 34/17 | 80/7 80/14 | 23/9 23/15 29/6 35/16 41/23 |
| 35/3 38/1 39/3 41/21 49/19 | specific [2] 26/23 42/17 | 42/20 48/16 48/18 57/8 57/20 |
| 57/13 59/2 62/1 65/13 85/21 | specifically [3] 30/13 70/6 | 60/25 74/15 74/24 87/21 88/12 |
| 86/16 87/13 89/5 89/6 | 83/8 | 88/12 89/19 |
| sites [1] 37/25 | specifications [2] 53/18 53/23 | stuff [2] 9/14 18/1 |
| situation [1] 8/2 | specifics [2] 26/2 26/6 | subdivision [3] 31/3 $36 /$ |
| situations [1] 50/5 | specify [1] 69/19 | 77/10 |
| six [9] 8/4 13/2 $18 / 16$ 19/20 | Spector [1] 2/18 | subject [1] 85/7 |
| 19/25 29/3 35/5 47/24 80/18 | spoke [4] 48/17 50/1 50/ | subjective [1] 75/10 |
| sixteen [1] 4/14 | 60/23 | submission [1] 77/2 |
| size [12] 26/15 26/22 $34 / 18$ | spoken [2] 48/19 88/10 | submit [2] 60/25 77/20 |
| 41/22 43/8 57/13 62/2 80/15 | sponsor [2] 33/15 33/18 | submitted [6] 27/24 30/8 30/22 |
| 80/16 80/17 84/10 84/12 | spring [3] 42/12 42/21 50/19 | 76/22 78/6 78/15 |
| sizes [3] 26/16 62/3 72/3 | springs [1] 57/12 | subsequent [1] 74/8 |
| sketch [2] 63/4 63/5 | square [2] 34/19 72/5 | substantial [2] 7/5 85/5 |
| sketches [1] 62/4 | squeeze [1] 71/13 | subsurface [5] 6/11 29/4 58/8 |
| skipped [1] 36/2 | stabilization [1] 74/5 | 74/18 74/19 |
| slabs [2] 66/2 66/3 | staked [1] 31/20 | such [11] 8/10 20/10 20/12 |
| Sleepy [1] 38/10 | stand [3] 9/9 38/17 38/17 | 20/19 61/24 62/16 70/20 72/12 |
| slope [6] 26/18 31/14 48/21 | standard [2] 12/14 14/12 | 72/25 73/14 86/10 |
| 63/20 74/2 74/5 | standardized [1] 26/22 | suffice [1] 21/12 |


|  | Proceedings |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| S | that [395] | 29/8 31/1 36/7 38/9 39/7 |
| suggest [2] 54/15 87/4 | 17/5 18/1 18/19 18/24 20/20 | 45/23 49/2 49/8 |
| suggested [3] 43/17 45/1 54/1 | 27/14 29/9 $30 / 18$ 33/12 $35 / 21$ | 56/23 58/14 58/15 59/12 59/18 |
| suggesting [1] 21/18 | 35/23 35/25 39/9 41/16 $44 / 24$ | 62/19 66/6 68/21 68/25 70/25 |
| Suite [1] 2/13 | 50/9 51/16 51/22 56/12 67/15 | 73/10 73/25 80/8 89/19 |
| summarize [2] 10/9 83/19 | 69/15 81/24 82/5 88/15 | throughout [2] 69/11 77/12 |
| summary [5] 3/12 5/8 5/12 | their [19] 10/23 24/7 25/5 | thru [4] 21/21 38/10 58/2 |
| 25/23 25/24 | 46/8 51/22 52/25 64/17 64/24 | 73/17 |
| superintendent [1] 62/17 | 65/1 71/4 71/5 72/21 73/2 | Tim [1] 50/22 |
| support [1] 67/3 | 73/9 75/18 76/23 82/18 87/1 | time [15] 23/10 37/3 42/17 |
| supported [1] 76/10 | 88/5 | 44/21 47/15 61/7 61/13 68/19 |
| supposed [4] 33/14 33/19 48/11 | them [21] $10 / 9$ 14/4 $15 / 16$ 19/8 | 69/25 77/14 77/21 82/13 82/21 |
| 57/1 | 22/1 28/1 30/25 31/13 32/23 | 82/25 90/9 |
| sure [15] $10 / 5$ 11/4 $18 / 15$ 19/9 | 49/13 49/15 58/11 62/3 64/22 | timed [1] 23/24 |
| 27/4 39/7 39/11 46/10 46/13 | 66/3 68/19 68/20 74/17 74/19 | timeline [4] 41/6 41/11 55/8 |
| 46/17 74/11 80/21 81/18 83/4 | 87/22 88/11 | 77/7 |
| 89/18 | themselves [2] 9/22 77/11 | times [5] 23/21 69/16 69/17 |
| surfaces [3] 44/1 60/1 60/8 | then [49] | 69/18 85/18 |
| surprised [1] 82/17 | there [127] | today [3] 24/3 25/20 |
| surprisingly [1] 32/ | there'd [1] 67/ | together [2] 5/3 22/1 |
| surrounded [2] 38/3 73/3 | therefore [2] 45/14 77/15 | told [4] 59/18 59/20 67/6 |
| surrounding [7] 59/3 70/21 | these [21] 10/19 15/7 16/8 | 88/11 |
| 71/7 71/19 71/24 72/8 75/17 | 16/24 19/3 22/21 27/8 37/10 | tonight [11] 3/10 9/3 9/24 |
| surroundings [1] 70/20 | 37/15 37/24 38/11 48/16 50/7 | 25/8 70/17 80/25 82/14 83/9 |
| survey [8] 52/13 79/23 83/18 | 61/5 61/15 62/6 63/5 67/23 | 88/4 88/10 89/25 |
| 83/24 84/15 84/23 86/24 87/12 | 74/16 75/22 86/10 | tonight's [2] 3/2 |
| surveying [2] 35/11 83/21 | they [37] 3/16 9/22 9/23 11/6 | too [8] 22/23 30/22 32/11 |
| surveyor [1] 34/23 | 11/12 11/15 11/19 11/21 13/14 | 32/22 33/24 46/11 49/24 85/17 |
| swells [1] 68/10 | 15/20 16/7 16/24 23/20 23/23 | took [2] 4/5 56/2 |
| synopsis [1] 8/20 | 28/22 29/18 29/25 30/5 30/10 | top [4] 28/13 63/21 64/9 64/12 |
| system [5] 8/13 15/10 15/12 | 41/13 $49 / 14$ 50/10 50/11 51/7 | topographical [1] 55/18 |
| 19/9 52/25 | 51/24 52/14 57/15 60/13 64/23 | topography [3] 6/9 68/7 72/13 |
| T | 67/9 77/12 77/13 77/16 80/8 | TORTORELLA [2] 2/11 32/7 |
| table [1] | they're [1] | totality [1] 85/21 |
| take [7] 17/10 17/20 17/23 | they've [2] 16/3 88 | totally [2] 61/16 65/18 |
| 30/19 54/18 65/20 86/14 | thing [8] $7 / 11818 / 2$ 26/11 $33 / 25$ | touched [1] 67/14 |
| taken [3] 3/7 39/3 71/9 | 47/14 68/3 69/10 85/2 | tour [1] 60/18 |
| taking [2] 43/25 89/14 | things [20] 4/9 8/10 15/7 | towering [1] 38/22 |
| talk [2] 5/9 65/11 |  | town [40] $1 / 112 / 18$ 2/21 3/3 |
| talked [5] 23/11 54/10 58/12 | 20/23 22/14 25/19 27/19 48/16 | 7/17 11/7 11/8 11/20 11/21 |
| 64/18 68/2 | 48/20 50/8 55/20 57/2 86/20 | 12/5 12/7 12/12 13/17 14/4 |
| talking [7] 12/20 51/17 65/8 | 88/3 88/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 15 & 17 / 13 & 17 / 24 & 18 / 22 & 30 / 17\end{array}$ |
| 69/3 75/1 75/2 85/8 | think [47] | 37/19 40/16 49/2 49/9 56/9 |
| talks [1] 64/16 | thinking [1] 59/23 | 56/18 63/11 64/25 65/2 70/8 |
| Tappan [1] 50/11 | thinks [1] 86/24 | 70/11 $70 / 11 \quad 72 / 17$ 72/22 $73 / 7$ |
| Tavano [14] 36/20 36/22 58/1 | third [7] 6/10 11/16 28/14 | 74/22 75/20 79/24 80/1 82/23 |
| 60/17 61/1 61/8 66/11 67/8 | 74/24 75/4 88/13 88/20 | 88/23 |
| 67/21 68/25 70/10 72/20 77/ | thirteen [1] 54/23 | tract [1] 84/7 |
| 77/9 | thirty [2] 56/6 61/10 | tractor [1] 75/3 |
| technical [3] 8/10 $13 / 16$ 22/4 | this [104] | traditional [1] 88/1 |
| tell [1] 23/4 | thorough [2] 83/23 89/ | traditionally [1] 44/18 |
| telling [3] 74/10 88/3 88/20 | those [28] 7/2 10/9 11/25 | traffic [14] 6/23 8/13 $35 / 16$ |
| ten [6] 32/15 32/24 56/6 59/19 | 13/19 15/4 $15 / 15$ 18/5 $19 / 9$ | 35/17 35/20 54/13 62/13 66/16 |
| 69/16 82/13 | 19/15 21/24 24/8 27/2 27/19 | 68/23 68/24 73/4 73/10 73/17 |
| ten feet [1] 59 | 30/5 41/20 42/17 44/1 48/20 | 74/17 |
| tend [1] 23/14 | 49/2 50/5 54/8 63/22 64/19 | trail [2] 7/23 21/22 |
| term [3] 63/7 73/24 76/20 | 66/3 68/17 70/2 72/16 88/1 | train [1] 54/18 |
| terms [12] 7/3 14/2 16/8 $26 / 17$ | thought [3] 15/24 21/15 24/19 | transcript [1] 91/10 |
| 27/11 69/12 76/23 76/25 77/6 | thoughts [2] 30/23 81/12 | translation [1] 38/21 |
| 77/8 77/17 87/5 | thousand [1] 34/19 | transmitted [1] 66/6 |
| terrestrial [1] 22/8 | threatened [3] 20/2 20/8 49/22 | transpire [1] 39/2 |
| test [1] 81/9 | three [19] 5/18 10/11 13/2 | transportation [2] 6/23 54/14 |
| testing [5] 44/20 59/7 68/5 | 19/20 20/1 20/25 28/5 35/7 | travel [2] 38/8 54/17 |
| 74/12 86/14 | 36/23 40/24 41/3 41/13 41/17 | treat [1] 16/10 |
| tests [2] 86/9 86/14 | 47/3 52/20 57/7 61/17 68/7 | tree [18] 34/23 $35 / 4 \quad 35 / 5 \quad 52 / 7$ |
| than [7] 9/4 $18 / 22$ 34/1 $39 / 5$ | 69/18 | 52/11 52/13 54/10 79/23 80/3 |
| 42/19 57/21 89/7 | through [42] 3/22 4/15 4/17 | 80/8 83/18 83/24 83/25 84/2 |
| thank [46] | 5/21 14/9 15/22 17/16 19/2 | 84/14 84/23 86/23 87/11 |
| Thanks [1] 75/21 | 19/4 21/11 21/13 21/19 27/25 | trees [17] 35/7 35/8 35/12 |


| T | 67/8 67/19 67/21 67/22 69/24 | 57/3 64/2 69/10 74/10 77/5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| trees... [14] 50/12 50/13 | updated [1] 89/21 | wanted [7] 18/25 23/25 24/23 |
| 52/13 52/15 53/7 61/24 62/2 | upland [1] 47/22 | 47/13 78/18 80/20 85/2 |
| 62/3 79/25 80/1 80/2 83/21 | upon [3] 3/21 11/24 70/14 | wanting [1] 23/8 |
| 84/8 84/24 | uptake [1] 53/6 | warm [1] 53/21 |
| trespass [1] 54/2 | us [13] 3/4 9/2 10/13 22/22 | warrant [1] 43/9 |
| trial [2] 65/6 65/ | 49/20 50/3 51/6 68/1 70/16 | warrants [1] 21/10 |
| tributaries [1] 49/13 | 81/15 87/1 88/3 90/5 | was [24] $3 / 6$ 10/12 $13 / 19$ 16/19 |
| tributary [1] 48/25 | use [17] 4/1 6/21 8/8 $11 / 7$ | 17/18 $17 / 21 \quad 23 / 4 \quad 23 / 8 \quad 24 / 21$ |
| troublesome [1] 69/12 | 11/12 11/15 11/19 11/21 26/1 | 25/10 $27 / 11 \quad 29 / 1 \quad 33 / 8 \quad 36 / 3$ |
| tru [1] 36/22 | 51/7 53/20 61/19 66/15 70/19 | $39 / 20 \quad 46 / 11 \quad 57 / 1 \quad 60 / 1960 / 20$ |
| trucks [1] 67/5 | 73/9 78/10 85/19 | 64/7 71/2 82/16 82/17 82/18 |
| true [2] 13/1 91/9 | used [9] 12/1 16/4 26/6 26/6 | wash [4] 78/9 78/16 $78 / 25$ 79/2 |
| try [4] 4/3 44/19 65/2 81/16 | 44/3 46/19 51/1 53/21 68/10 | washed [1] 74/20 |
| trying [1] 12/12 | useful [1] 22/25 | washout [1] 67/12 |
| turn [1] 67/ | uses [1] 35/22 | wasn't [1] 80/21 |
| turning [1] | using [2] 68/10 74/23 | waste [1] 8/9 |
| turnoffs [1] 66/ | usually [3] 51/22 57/19 77/7 | water [35] 6/11 $8 / 12$ 9/17 $16 / 1$ |
| twelve [2] 69/7 89/7 | utilities [3] 6/21 9/14 36/11 | 16/9 16/10 20/12 22/15 22/19 |
| two [24] 8/14 10/20 12/9 22/14 | utilization [1] 26/17 | 22/21 23/22 $28 / 7$ 29/4 $34 / 18$ |
| 28/5 $32 / 12$ 34/7 $36 / 13$ 41/21 | V | 41/19 $43 / 5$ 43/15 $43 / 18 \quad 43 / 21$ |
| 45/6 48/25 57/12 61/15 63/5 | $V$ | 44/2 $48 / 18$ 49/5 52/18 55/23 |
| 65/11 66/21 66/21 67/23 69/3 | value [2] 69/8 73/2 | $57 / 10 \quad 57 / 15 \quad 58 / 8 \quad 58 / 10 \quad 58 / 13$ |
| 72/4 78/23 $79 / 1$ 86/15 $89 / 6$ | values [3] 70/15 $70 / 22$ 71/23 | 58/20 59/13 68/11 88/25 88/25 |
| two-acre [1] 79/1 | Van [1] 76/2 | 89/5 |
| two-bedroom [2] 61/15 | variations [1] 26/14 | watercourse [1] 45/9 |
| type [3] 14/7 25/19 55/17 | varied [1] 84/19 | watercourses [4] 43/8 45/9 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { types [4] 20/9 } & 31 / 6 & 49 / 19 & 75 / 3\end{array}$ | variety [6] 5/20 5/20 7/20 | 57/11 89/4 |
| typically [1] 62/14 | 16/5 20/9 22/11 | waters [1] 44/4 |
| U | various [5] 7/17 8/16 $26 / 16$ | watershed [4] 38/23 48/15 49/1 |
| ultimately [2] 84/20 8 | varying [3] 26/16 26/25 73/12 | way [11] $7 / 23$ 17/9 $19 / 21$ 21/22 |
| unauthorized [1] 84/2 | vegetation [11] 6/12 19/21 | 23/4 49/9 59/15 66/25 83/24 |
| unbuildable [2] 71/14 71/15 | 20/1 22/7 42/2 42/9 47/25 | 87/18 87/18 |
| uncertainties [1] 70/2 | 49/17 50/24 52/21 54/25 | Wayne [4] 2/18 $9 / 2$ 9/12 $89 / 11$ |
| uncertainty [2] 69/20 69/22 | vegetative [1] 46/3 | ways [1] 58/22 |
| uncommon [1] 84/3 | vehicle [2] 66/24 66/25 | we [165] |
| unconventional [1] 33/3 | vehicles [1] 66/21 | we'd [2] 49/24 59/11 |
| under [24] 10/11 13/1 19/20 | vehicular [1] 74/17 | we're [1] 38/8 |
| 20/25 21/16 $21 / 22$ 22/4 $25 / 23$ | verbiage [2] 26/10 27/3 | we've [2] 4/6 51/6 |
| 26/12 $28 / 10$ 28/13 $29 / 3 \quad 44 / 19$ | verify [2] 45/5 74/13 | website [1] 80/9 |
| 46/21 $47 / 2$ 48/24 $50 / 12 \quad 55 / 8$ | vernal [4] 41/19 $42 / 10$ 42/24 | Wednesday [1] 81/25 |
| 58/6 61/19 64/3 68/7 76/9 | 57/11 | week [1] 25/20 |
| 89/5 | version [1] 25/ | weekday [2] 54/15 54/19 |
| underlined [1] 4/7 | very [30] 9/9 22/3 22/21 24/16 | weekends [1] 35/21 |
| underlying [2] 68/3 68/6 | 24/18 $25 / 21$ 29/8 $38 / 2$ 38/5 | weights [1] 74/16 |
| underneath [1] 67/2 | $38 / 11$ 38/13 $40 / 3 \quad 48 / 22 \quad 51 / 13$ | WEKSTEIN [6] 2/11 $2 / 15$ 24/3 |
| underpinning [1] 66/6 | 51/15 55/15 55/16 55/25 56/12 | 32/6 32/7 83/20 |
| understand [5] 34/16 34/24 | $58 / 2158 / 2258 / 23 \quad 66 / 18 \quad 67 / 2$ | Wekstein's [1] 83/17 |
| 69/23 79/22 87/13 | 69/12 82/17 89/15 89/19 90/3 | well [10] 4/12 6/23 8/17 11/11 |
| understanding [2] 21/7 64/1 | 90/8 | 13/16 $30 / 20 \quad 36 / 19$ 39/9 42/16 |
| understands [2] 19/1 24/12 | via [2] 21/3 74/5 | 80/6 |
| understood [1] 64/5 | vibration [1] 66/1 | Wendy [2] 56/16 67/13 |
| unfinished [2] 62/20 62/21 | vibrations [1] 66/5 | went [2] 30/25 49/23 |
| uniformed [3] 44/4 78/10 $79 / 19$ | VICE [1] $2 / 5$ | were [21] 4/11 14/25 15/1 15/4 |
| uniformly [1] 26/25 | view [10] 1/5 3/11 $18 / 9$ 19/11 | 17/20 $24 / 20 \quad 25 / 16$ 32/20 $37 / 10$ |
| unique [2] 38/12 40/2 | 31/24 49/7 58/14 70/13 71/16 | $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 11 & 50 / 10 & 50 / 13 & 50 / 13 & 57 / 2\end{array}$ |
| unit [1] 72/6 | 73/12 | 57/2 59/19 60/13 61/11 77/9 |
| units [4] $71 / 13$ 71/16 $72 / 2$ | Village [2] 76/2 76/ | $77 / 11$ 81/12 |
| 72/3 | violating [1] 87/7 | weren't [1] 31/12 |
| unkempt [1] 62/21 | visual [3] 6/22 26/19 63/3 | WESTCHESTER [3] 1/1 43/16 52/4 |
| unless [1] $84 /$ | vital [1] 65/5 | wet [1] 48/3 |
| unpopular [1] 70/18 | W | wetland [21] $11 / 8$ 11/18 $28 / 16$ |
| unreasonable [1] 32/13 | W | 28/17 28/25 41/23 41/25 43/1 |
| unspecified [1] 33/2 | wait [1] 30/11 | 43/4 $43 / 9$ 44/14 $44 / 25 \quad 45 / 8$ |
| until [1] 43/3 | walk [4] 4/15 21/11 21/13 | 45/14 $45 / 19 \quad 45 / 20 \quad 47 / 3 \quad 47 / 4$ |
| up [27] 3/18 4/4 11/13 15/2 | 66/19 | 47/5 47/21 57/8 |
| 16/3 17/2 17/13 19/6 $27 / 12$ | walkway [1] 21/19 | wetlands [53] |
| 54/11 55/5 58/22 62/14 62/14 | want [19] 11/2 $23 / 6$ 30/9 35/24 | what [72] |
| 66/7 66/10 66/11 66/17 66/24 | $39 / 7$ 39/11 42/6 44/23 46/10 | what's [5] 12/15 $31 / 16$ 40/7 |



