	1	3
	1	
1	2	<u>INDEX</u>
1 VILLAGE OF RIDGEWOOD		INDEX
PLANNING BOARD 2 TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 2010	3	S PEAKERS:
COMMENCING AT 8:44 P.M. 3	4	
4 VALLEY HOSPITAL : TRANSCRIPT OF PRESENTATION ON H-ZONE : PROCEEDINGS	5	LAURENCE W. KELLER, P.E. 10
5	3	Questions by the Board: 29
6 BEFORE:	6	
7 VILLAGE OF RIDGEWOOD PLANNING BOARD THERE BEING PRESENT:	7	
8		RAYMOND SKORUPA 43
9 DAVID NICHOLSON, CHAIRMAN	8	Questions by the Board: 71
DAVID PFUND, MAYOR	9	
11 ANNE ZUSY, COUNCILWOMAN 12	10	
JIM BOMBACE, FIRE CHIEF		
ALBERT PUCCIARELLI, MEMBER (RECUSED) 14	11	
MORGAN HURLEY, MEMBER	12	
ANNE WARD, MEMBER 16	13	EVHIDITC
TOM RICHE, ALTERNATE MEMBER 17	"	<u>EXHIBITS</u>
CHARLES NALBANTIAN, ALTERNATE MEMBER 18	14	
19	15	NUMBER DESCRIPTION EVID.
20	40	(NO EXHIBITS MARKED)
21	-01:-09	
LAURA A. CARUCCI, C.S.R., R.P.R., L.L.C.	-01:-09 17	
CERTIFIED COURT REPORTERS P.O. BOX 505	18	
24 SADDLE BROOK, NEW JERSEY 07663 (201) 641-1812	20	
25 (201) 487-0036 FAX laccsr2@aol.com	21	
	23	
	24 25	
2	1	4
1 ALSO PRESENT:	1	
2 BLAIS BRANCHEAU, PP, VILLAGE PLANNER CHRIS RUTISHAUSER, PE, VILLAGE ENGINEER		
BARBARA CARLTON, RECORDING SECRETARY RAYMOND SKORUPA, Medical Planning and Research	2	3 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
4 International LARRY KELLER, Whitestone Associates	3	has recused himself on the H-Zone issue and is
5	4	leaving us.
6	5	Good night.
7	6	(W hereupon, Mr. Pucciarelli is recused
APPEARANCES:	7	and has left the hearing room.)
9 PRICE, MEESE, SHULMAN & D'ARMINIO, P.C.	8	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: For the benefit of
BY: GAIL PRICE, ESQ.	9	the members of the public who are with us tonight,
10 50 Tice Boulevard Woodcliff Lake, New Jersey 07677	10	
11 Counsel for the Planning Board	11	
12 CHARLES C. COLLINS, JR., ESQ.		
13 135 Prospect Street	00:-11 12	·
Ridgewood, NJ 07450 14 Counsel for The Valley Hospital	13	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
15	14	of 2009, in the midst of our public hearing session
16	15	relative to our H-Zone amendment, the Board decided
17	16	to suspend the public testimony and engage a hospital
	17	planning consultant, and we subsequently engaged Mr.
18	18	Skorupa, who is here with us tonight, who gave us a
19	19	preliminary report on his findings in the fall. And
20	00:-11 20	
21	00:-11 21	·
	**. **	zz s. out.o o det den me, the bourd o professionals,
22	00:44 22	and the Hospital's professionals and that
	00:-11 22	, ,
22	00:-11 23	conversation led the Board to the conclusion that the
22 23		conversation led the Board to the conclusion that the

5 00:-06 1 expertise in geotechnical matters, to opine on 1 northeastern corner of the North Building property. 00:-10 00:-10 several matters that were raised in Mr. Skorupa's 00:-06 2 So that's the plan that we looked at 00:-10 3 report. 00:-06 3 and we discussed and was before the Board, was before the public at the hearings. And so then we'll be 00:-10 4 So on our agenda tonight is to hear 00:-06 4 5 from both gentlemen on their preliminary reports, and 00:-06 5 referring to that. 00:-10 at the end of the evening it is our hope that we can 00:-06 6 What's also been reviewed and what will 00:-10 6 00:-10 7 move forward to public hearing, where those reports 00:-06 7 be referred to is what's shown as five story proposed 00:-10 8 are formally presented, and we will then get back 00:-06 8 Phase I. And the difference here -- Ray, could you 9 into the process that we left off with late last 00:-06 9 just flip to the five story Phase I. Oh, all right, 00:-10 00:-10 10 spring. 00:-06 10 you want to go back for a second. 00:-10 11 00:-06 11 So gentlemen --This is the bird's eye of what I just 00:-10 12 MS. PRICE: I think it's me first. 00:-06 12 detailed. 00:-10 13 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: You first, very 00:-06 13 MR. SKORUPA: Gail, the sequence is 00:-10 **14** 00:-06 14 four story -- okay. well. 00:-06 15 00:-10 15 MS. PRICE: But this is the phase, MS. PRICE: Just by further 00:-09 16 amplification and elaboration on what Chairman 00:-05 16 okay. That's the bird's eye. 00:-09 17 Nicholson said, this evening we're going to just get 00:-05 17 And that's the bird's eye of Phase II 00:-09 **18** back up-to-speed in terms of where we were, and then 00:-05 18 for the four story original. 00:-09 19 have Mr. Keller first take us through some 00:-05 19 Okay. So now let's go to the 00:-09 **20** geotechnical background on the site, and then we'll 00:-05 **20** five story. 00:-09 **21** go back to Mr. Skorupa on the overall planning issues 00:-05 21 All right. So the five story, the 00:-09 **22** difference here is that you start, once again, south relative to the hospital layout and where we were 00:-05 22 00:-09 23 when we heard some initial recommendations following 00:-05 23 and move in a northerly direction. The Linwood 00:-05 **24** 00:-09 **24** his review of what the hospital layout plan was, as Garage is now one story at grade, two stories below, 00:-09 **25** well as the Master Plan language itself. 00:-05 25 661 cars. Phillips is three stories above, one story 6 00:-09 1 The Board has before it draft copies of 00:-05 1 at grade, two stories below, 822 cars. And then the 2 reports from two professionals for the Board, as well 00:-05 2 North Building, five stories plus penthouse. 00--09 3 as some larger-sized plans that have been provided to 00:-05 3 If you go on the western side of the 00:-08 00:-08 4 us by the Hospital. And I think that both of our 00:-04 4 North Building, there is a green roof area, which is 00:-08 5 experts are going to refer to certain of these 00:-04 5 depicted out towards Van Dien, in front of the North 6 layouts, not in terms of what the layouts profess to 00:-04 6 Building. And the setback to the North Building at 00:-08 7 7 be vis-a-vis Valley's intentions, because Valley will 00:-04 that point has been increased to the building from 80-:00 have the opportunity to fully address what they feel 47 feet to 120 feet. So that's the setback 8 00:-04 8 00:-08 9 they can do or not do on the site, but I just want to 00:-04 9 differential at that location. 00:-08 00:-08 10 00:-04 10 acclimate the public and the Board as to where we MAYOR PFUND: But there's one level at 00:-08 11 00:-04 11 47 feet, is that what you're saying, and then a green 00:-04 12 roof? 00:-08 12 On the screen, what is shown is the 00:-04 13 00:-08 **13** original Phase I layout for the site. And that will MS. PRICE: Correct. 00:-08 14 show, if you start south to north on Linwood Avenue, 00:-04 14 MAYOR PFUND: The building still comes 00:-07 **15** the proposed one story above, one story at grade, and 00:-04 **15** out 47 feet, but without the height? 00:-07 16 then the garage, then the Phillips Garage. The 00:-04 16 MS. PRICE: Right. And in the back 00:-07 17 Linwood Garage is 865 cars, the Phillips Garage at 00:-04 17 there's a green roof area, as well as there's a green 00:-07 18 815. And that's at three stories above, one story at 00:-04 18 roof internal. And Ray will go through this in 00:-07 19 grade, two stories below. 00:-04 19 greater detail, but in the rear there's a green roof 00:-07 20 And then moving forward, towards the 00:-04 **20** area as well as a screen wall which now shields, on 00:-07 **21** north, the plan shows the four story plus penthouse. 00:-04 21 this layout, the entire trucking area in the back, 00:-07 22 The plans shows a 47-foot setback along Van Dien that 00:-04 22 which on the prior plan had been a much more open 00:-03 23 00:-07 23 was discussed, together with the 10-foot easement area. So that trucking area is now covered by that 00:-07 24 area along Linwood, and the setback along there. 00:-03 24 green roof, and there is a green landscape berm with 00:-06 25 Off-loading was also shown in the 00:-03 25 an acoustical barrier wall shown along that entire

	9			11
00:-03 1	area, where on the screen it's being shown there,	00:00	1	geotechnical firm. I'm the director of geotechnical
00:-03 2	that entire length. So that northeastern corner has	00:00	2	engineering at Whitestone.
00:-03 3	been treated differently.	00:00	3	I have a bachelor's of civil
00:-03 4	And so the bird's eye view of this	00:00	4	engineering from Penn State. I have a master's in
00:-03 5	layout is there, and then that space too of this	00:00	5	environmental from Johns Hopkins.
00:-03 6	plan.	00:00	6	I've been practicing 17, 18 years now.
00:-03 7	The green roof, though, the actual	00:00	7	And I have testified and been accepted in front of
00:-02 8	building comes let me just explain that. The	00:00	8	various boards. And I work with various boards in
00:-02 9	building was rotated around on the side.	00:00	9	the area of Hillsdale, I think is one that's close
00:-02 10	Ray, can you just move the cursor over	00:00	10	by.
00:-02 11	to the side closest to the yes. The building was	00:00	11	Can everyone hear me all right?
00:-02 12	moved on the northern side to be able to increase the	00:00	12	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I think you need to
00:-02 13	buffer on Van Dien. So the building, itself, was	00:00	13	speak up.
00:-02 14	moved out of the setback, along the Van Dien section,	00:00	14	MR. RICHE: Is the light on on the mic?
00:-02 15	and there's a one-story building on the side, on the	00:00	15	MR. KELLER: Yes, it is on.
00:-02 16	northern side.	00:00	16	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Hold it close to
00:-02 17	MAYOR PFUND: So on Van Dien it is	00:00	17	your mouth, please.
00:-02 18	120 feet with the setback?	00:00	18	MS. CARLTON: The hand-held is out
00:-02 19	MS. PRICE: Right.	00:00	19	there too on the table. The hand-held is out there
00:-02 20	MAYOR PFUND: Got you. Thanks.	00:00	20	on the table.
00:-02 21	MS. PRICE: And on this particular	00:01	21	MR. KELLER: All right. I'll take it
00:-02 22	plan, there's an increased green area along Linwood	00:01	22	from the top. My name is Larry Keller. I am the
00:-02 23	as well with the parking.	00:01	23	director of geotechnical engineering at Whitestone
00:-02 24	So that's it in a nutshell, far from	00:01	24	Associates. We're an environmental/geotechnical
00:-02 25	being a lot of details, and I don't want to put a lot	00:01	25	consulting engineering firm.
	10			12
00:-01 1	of details in play at the moment, because we'll talk	00:01	1	I have a bachelor's of civil
00:-01 2	about some of the individual things that were	00:01	2	engineering from Penn State, a master's of
00:-01 3	reviewed and hear from Ray.	00:01	3	environmental engineering from Johns Hopkins.
00:-01 4	One of the things that the Board wanted	00:01	4	I've been practicing 18 years, and I
00:-01 5	to look at, having heard from Ray several months ago	00:01	5	have been providing support for boards similar to
00:-01 6	and hearing about the underground parking concept and	00:01	6	yours, such as up in Hillsdale. I've done work for
00:-01 7	issues related with that was: A; are there geotech	00:01	7	the board in Princeton.
00:-01 8	concerns on this site? If there are, what is the	00:01	8	And we've had a chance to take a look
00:-01 9			^	
00:-01 10	extent of those geotech concerns? Are they limited	00:01	9	at The Valley's Renewal plan. And I'm here tonight
00:-01 11	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations	00:01	10	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody
	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they	00:01 00:01	10 11	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it.
00:-01 12	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that	00:01 00:01 00:01	10 11 12	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody
00:00 13	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play.	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01	10 11 12 13	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation.
00:00 13 00:00 14	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01	10 11 12 13 14	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay.
00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was retained. Mr. Keller is here, and he's had an	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01	10 11 12 13 14 15	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. KELLER: The discussion tonight is
00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15 00:00 16	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was retained. Mr. Keller is here, and he's had an opportunity to review all of the information that was	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:02 00:02	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. KELLER: The discussion tonight is primarily below grade structures.
00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15 00:00 16 00:00 17	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was retained. Mr. Keller is here, and he's had an opportunity to review all of the information that was has been prepared and supplied to date, including	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:02 00:02	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. KELLER: The discussion tonight is primarily below grade structures. I've taken a look at some of the
00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15 00:00 16 00:00 17 00:00 18	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was retained. Mr. Keller is here, and he's had an opportunity to review all of the information that was has been prepared and supplied to date, including going back since when we started.	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. KELLER: The discussion tonight is primarily below grade structures. I've taken a look at some of the Hospital's geotechnical consultant's information.
00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15 00:00 16 00:00 17 00:00 18 00:00 19	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was retained. Mr. Keller is here, and he's had an opportunity to review all of the information that was has been prepared and supplied to date, including going back since when we started. Larry, for purposes of the members of	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. KELLER: The discussion tonight is primarily below grade structures. I've taken a look at some of the Hospital's geotechnical consultant's information. There's been a number of test borings, subsurface
00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15 00:00 16 00:00 17 00:00 18 00:00 19 00:00 20	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was retained. Mr. Keller is here, and he's had an opportunity to review all of the information that was has been prepared and supplied to date, including going back since when we started. Larry, for purposes of the members of the Board who have not met you and the members of the	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. KELLER: The discussion tonight is primarily below grade structures. I've taken a look at some of the Hospital's geotechnical consultant's information. There's been a number of test borings, subsurface information generated to the site. I reviewed
00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15 00:00 17 00:00 18 00:00 19 00:00 20 00:00 21	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was retained. Mr. Keller is here, and he's had an opportunity to review all of the information that was has been prepared and supplied to date, including going back since when we started. Larry, for purposes of the members of the Board who have not met you and the members of the audience, maybe you could just give a little bit of	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. KELLER: The discussion tonight is primarily below grade structures. I've taken a look at some of the Hospital's geotechnical consultant's information. There's been a number of test borings, subsurface information generated to the site. I reviewed various geotechnical reports dating back to PS&S back
00:00 13 00:00 15 00:00 16 00:00 17 00:00 18 00:00 20 00:00 21 00:00 22	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was retained. Mr. Keller is here, and he's had an opportunity to review all of the information that was has been prepared and supplied to date, including going back since when we started. Larry, for purposes of the members of the Board who have not met you and the members of the audience, maybe you could just give a little bit of background about yourself and about the firm.	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. KELLER: The discussion tonight is primarily below grade structures. I've taken a look at some of the Hospital's geotechnical consultant's information. There's been a number of test borings, subsurface information generated to the site. I reviewed various geotechnical reports dating back to PS&S back in the '90s, and as far as recently there's CMX, and
00:00 13 00:00 14 00:00 15 00:00 16 00:00 17 00:00 18 00:00 19 00:00 20 00:00 21	to drainage issues? Will they affect the foundations of the buildings? Are they on-site, are they off-site? There are a whole realm of issues that could come into play. To that end, Whitestone Associates was retained. Mr. Keller is here, and he's had an opportunity to review all of the information that was has been prepared and supplied to date, including going back since when we started. Larry, for purposes of the members of the Board who have not met you and the members of the audience, maybe you could just give a little bit of	00:01 00:01 00:01 00:01 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02 00:02	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	to give you some of my thoughts and talk to everybody else about it. If there's any other questions anybody has right now? If not, I'll go to the presentation. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. KELLER: The discussion tonight is primarily below grade structures. I've taken a look at some of the Hospital's geotechnical consultant's information. There's been a number of test borings, subsurface information generated to the site. I reviewed various geotechnical reports dating back to PS&S back

	13		15
00:02 1	The existing conditions, when I say	00:05 1	bedrock depth, on the east side you're at 100, and
00:02 2	"existing conditions," I go through it, this is	00:05 2	the northeast bedrock was around elevation 60 at the
00:02 3	obviously early in the planning stages, from the	00:05 3	lowest, it's a 40-foot depth the bedrock.
00:02 4	information that I've seen. So if I say something is	00:05 4	Next to Van Dien, where you have
00:02 5	at elevation 85, it might be 85.6 somewhere else in	00:05 5	elevations, the bedrock is high as 85, the ground
00:02 6	the documents, but it's generally close enough.	00:05 6	elevation is again between that 100 and 105 level, so
00:02 7	There's some subsurface construction	00:05 7	you're looking at about a 20-foot depth of bedrock.
00:03 8	concepts that I'll talk about, below grade	00:05 8	If I'm going too fast, I see some folks looking up.
00:03 9	design/construction considerations. There's been	00:05 9	Okay. So The Valley Hospital property,
00:03 10	substantial, we could say "substantial," but there's	00:06 10	it currently has two below-grade structures, there's
00:03 11	been some discussion on adding levels below grade. I	00:06 11	a 195x445 feet long southern parking garage, the
00:03 12	think that's one of the planning objectives, to get	00:06 12	Linwood Garage.
00:03 13	as much below grade as possible.	00:06 13	Based on the information that we've
00:03 14	I'll touch on the stormwater	00:06 14	been able to review, it looks like the elevation is
00:03 15	management, and we'll wrap it up.	00:06 15	at 94 feet for the upper, for the first below grade
00:03 16	So the subsurface conditions at the	00:06 16	level, and 85 for the second below grade level on the
00:03 17	site are basically glacial soils overlying sandstone	00:06 17	southern portion of the site.
00:03 18	bedrock. It's common in the area. There's some	00:06 18	Now, when you take a look at the
00:03 19	cobbles to it, but it's generally grandular, sandy	00:06 19	northern portion of the site, it's 390 feet long, and
00:03 20	soil.	00:06 20	then it tapers from 230 on the west to about 150 on
00:03 21	The top of bedrock varied, somewhere	00:06 21	the east. You have one below grade floor at
00:03 22	between elevation 85 closer to Van Dien, and then	00:06 22	elevation 95, plus or minus.
00:03 23	there's a little below elevation 60 in the	00:06 23	So the subsurface construction concepts
00:03 24	northeastern site area.	00:06 24	that we've touched on in the beginning of this
00:03 25	Groundwater varies as well, from	00:06 25	presentation, I think Gail went through, there's a
	14	_	16
00:03 1	elevation 88 to 81. CMX had recommended at one point	00:07 1	new North Building, a West Building, a South
00:04 2	the design elevation of 90 feet amsl, which means	00:07 2	Building. And the conceptual North and West
00:04 3	above median sea level.	00:07 3	Buildings are considering two below grade levels,
00:04 4	There are wells that recently have been	00:07 4	with an upper level at 89 and a lower level at 75.
00:04 5	installed, so the groundwater information will	00:07 5	And I have a couple of slides to kind
00:04 6	change. I would expect that the Hospital would come	00:07 6	of illustrate this a little bit better, I know I'm
00:04 7	back with some additional information. This is a bedrock subsurface contour	00:07 7	just running through numbers right now, but hopefully
00:04 8		00:07 8	that will help you visualize it.
00:04 9 00:04 10	map. What I tried to do is give you some colors, I	00:07 9 00:07 10	The bottom of the conceptual North and
00:04 10	figured it would be hard to read from where you were,	00:07 10	West Buildings foundations is estimated to be as low as elevation 69. That information was provided to us
00:04 11	but if you take a look at the top of the page, there's the red, which represents bedrock in the area	00:07 11	by the project architect.
00:04 12	of 80 to 85. There's a yellow zone running through	00:07 12	And the new Phillips Garage and
00:04 14	the site that's about 70 to 75. And then below 70 is	00:07 13	possibly the new South Building are also considered
00:04 15	green, which is on the northern portion of the site.	00:07 15	two levels below grade.
00:04 16	The way these maps are laid out, their	00:07 16	So what are our greatest considerations
00:04 17	north is to the right.	00:07 17	below grade? It boils down to three. It's where the
00:04 17	So you can see how it grades from the	00:07 17	groundwater is, where the bedrock is, and excavation
00:04 19	site, there's a couple of knolls, when I say a	00:07 10	support/shoring. Whenever you're going to look at
00:05 20	bedrock knoll at 85, adjacent to Van Dien, central	00:08 20	construction below grade, and I've mentioned this in
00:05 21	site west, and then the low elevation in the	00:08 21	some of the previous meetings, this is where the bulk
00:05 22	northeast.	00:08 22	of the focus is.
00:05 23	All right. The existing ground surface	00:08 23	So in terms of groundwater, looking at
00:05 24	ranges from about 105 to elevation 100. So just	00:08 24	that first, during construction you're going to have
00:05 25	taking a step back and looking at that in terms of	00:08 25	to dewater, and then once you get in, after

	17		19
00:08 1	construction is over with, then you have to deal with	00:11 1	installed to try to refine that groundwater table and
00:08 2	the groundwater and the pressures on the building,	00:11 2	issue. And this would be a two story below grade
00:08 3	how you're going to handle the groundwater that can	00:11 3	concept.
00:08 4	seep into the building.	00:11 4	And, like I said previously,
00:08 5	During construction, there's sump pumps	00:11 5	installation of pumps to lower the groundwater table
00:08 6	for shallower excavations, lower seepage rates, and	00:11 6	to get it away from the building is also going to
00:08 7	the deeper you go, the farther below the groundwater	00:11 7	draw it from somewhere else. When you draw it from
00:08 8	table, you typically see extraction wells, a series	00:11 8	somewhere else, a lot of times the radius of the
00:08 9	of wells that have been constructed around an	00:11 9	influence of that pumping action can be hundreds of
00:08 10	excavation. The water is pumped out, and that's how	00:11 10	feet, if not more. And what ends up happening is
00:08 11	the water is lowered so it doesn't get into your	00:11 11	when you lower the groundwater table, soil that at
00:08 12	excavation.	00:11 12	one point was floating in the groundwater, the
00:08 13	After construction, you have a building	00:11 13	groundwater is lowered, the soil is now heavy and
00:08 14	in place, you have to waterproof the building or	00:11 14	saturated, it's no longer floating, and it can induce
00:09 15	lower the groundwater table below the building.	00:11 15	settlement in structures that are within that radius
00:09 16	Those are typically your options. A lot of times	00:12 16	of influence.
00:09 17	what you'll see is a combination of both, because it	00:12 17	So some additional attention to
00:09 18	can be expensive to try to resist water pressure. So	00:12 18	groundwater pumping and how it is going to be handled
00:09 19	you'll artificially lower the groundwater to a	00:12 19	needs to have a little bit of focus.
00:09 20	certain level, and then you'll apply waterproofing	00:12 20	The current planning doesn't identify
00:09 21	and so forth to resist the rest.	00:12 21	groundwater control impacts, the radius of influence,
00:09 22	The one thing that I haven't seen with	00:12 22	discharge location, quantity and quality of water.
00:09 23	groundwater so far is that there are going to be some	00:12 23	Moving on to bedrock, the site bedrock
00:09 24	excavations as far as 17 feet below the groundwater	00:12 24	is primarily sandstone. It's a conglomerate. The
00:09 25	table, based on two levels below grade. That's a lot	00:12 25	core boring data indicated rock recovery of
	18		20
00:09 1	of water to deal with, especially for these large,	00:12 1	82 percent, which means every time rock was sampled,
00:09 2	open excavations. There hasn't been a lot of	00:12 2	it's typically sampled in five-foot runs, they drove
00:09 3	discussion to this point on how that water would be	00:12 3	five feet at a time, and 82 percent of it came back,
00:09 4	handled, where it would go, what impacts it would	00:12 4	which is pretty good. All in all, the rock quality
00:09 5	have when you start to draw that water from	00:12 5	was at 60 percent. The UCC tests means the
00:09 6	somewhere.	00:12 6	Unconfined Compressive Strength test. They range
00:09 7	So I think that part of this plan needs	00:13 7	6 1 2 5 5 7 9 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1
00:09 8			from about 3,500 to 5,700, which is similar to
	to have an assessment of the quantity and quality of	00:13 8	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's
00:10 9	to have an assessment of the quantity and quality of the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's	00:13 8 00:13 9	
00:10 9 00:10 10		_	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's
	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's	00:13 9	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock.
00:10 10	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's	00:13 9 00:13 10	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these
00:10 10 00:10 11	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now,	00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you	00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it.	00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated.
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the	00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 14	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14 00:10 15	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the illustrations that I talked about, this is a little	00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 14 00:13 15	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations and some of the concepts right now, the majority of
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14 00:10 15 00:10 16	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the illustrations that I talked about, this is a little difficult to see, but this is looking at the North	00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 14 00:13 15 00:13 16	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations and some of the concepts right now, the majority of the lowest below grade levels, conceptual hospital
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14 00:10 15 00:10 16 00:10 17	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the illustrations that I talked about, this is a little difficult to see, but this is looking at the North Building. I don't know if this can help, but this is	00:13	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations and some of the concepts right now, the majority of the lowest below grade levels, conceptual hospital buildings, the parking garages, are positioned above
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14 00:10 15 00:10 16 00:10 17 00:10 18	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the illustrations that I talked about, this is a little difficult to see, but this is looking at the North Building. I don't know if this can help, but this is the bottom of mat slab foundation, it's elevation 69,	00:13	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations and some of the concepts right now, the majority of the lowest below grade levels, conceptual hospital buildings, the parking garages, are positioned above the bedrock to the extent that it's feasible. Again,
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14 00:10 15 00:10 16 00:10 17 00:10 18 00:10 19	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the illustrations that I talked about, this is a little difficult to see, but this is looking at the North Building. I don't know if this can help, but this is the bottom of mat slab foundation, it's elevation 69, and you have groundwater that was encountered in some	00:13	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations and some of the concepts right now, the majority of the lowest below grade levels, conceptual hospital buildings, the parking garages, are positioned above the bedrock to the extent that it's feasible. Again, there are some knolls in the northern portion of the
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14 00:10 15 00:10 16 00:10 17 00:10 18 00:10 19 00:10 20	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the illustrations that I talked about, this is a little difficult to see, but this is looking at the North Building. I don't know if this can help, but this is the bottom of mat slab foundation, it's elevation 69, and you have groundwater that was encountered in some of the borings right now at an elevation of about	00:13	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations and some of the concepts right now, the majority of the lowest below grade levels, conceptual hospital buildings, the parking garages, are positioned above the bedrock to the extent that it's feasible. Again, there are some knolls in the northern portion of the site, the western portion of the site, but for the
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14 00:10 15 00:10 16 00:10 17 00:10 18 00:10 19 00:10 20 00:10 21	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the illustrations that I talked about, this is a little difficult to see, but this is looking at the North Building. I don't know if this can help, but this is the bottom of mat slab foundation, it's elevation 69, and you have groundwater that was encountered in some of the borings right now at an elevation of about 17 feet above 69, so that puts us at 86, right here	00:13	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations and some of the concepts right now, the majority of the lowest below grade levels, conceptual hospital buildings, the parking garages, are positioned above the bedrock to the extent that it's feasible. Again, there are some knolls in the northern portion of the site, the western portion of the site, but for the most part that's where the current concepts are
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14 00:10 15 00:10 16 00:10 17 00:10 18 00:10 19 00:10 20 00:10 21 00:10 22	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the illustrations that I talked about, this is a little difficult to see, but this is looking at the North Building. I don't know if this can help, but this is the bottom of mat slab foundation, it's elevation 69, and you have groundwater that was encountered in some of the borings right now at an elevation of about 17 feet above 69, so that puts us at 86, right here (indicating).	00:13 9 00:13 10 00:13 11 00:13 12 00:13 13 00:13 15 00:13 16 00:13 17 00:13 18 00:13 19 00:13 20 00:13 21 00:13 22	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations and some of the concepts right now, the majority of the lowest below grade levels, conceptual hospital buildings, the parking garages, are positioned above the bedrock to the extent that it's feasible. Again, there are some knolls in the northern portion of the site, the western portion of the site, but for the most part that's where the current concepts are showing the base of the buildings.
00:10 10 00:10 11 00:10 12 00:10 13 00:10 14 00:10 15 00:10 16 00:10 17 00:10 18 00:10 19 00:10 20 00:10 21 00:10 22 00:10 23	the groundwater to be pumped, regardless if it's one-story below grade, two or three. I think that's an assessment that would be worthwhile to know now, rather than when you're under construction and you have nowhere to put it. All right. And here's one of the illustrations that I talked about, this is a little difficult to see, but this is looking at the North Building. I don't know if this can help, but this is the bottom of mat slab foundation, it's elevation 69, and you have groundwater that was encountered in some of the borings right now at an elevation of about 17 feet above 69, so that puts us at 86, right here (indicating). The design elevation may be a little higher than that. There are, as I said in the beginning, some additional wells that are being	00:13	concrete; however, in terms of rock mechanics, that's a soft rock. At the end of the day, what all these numbers and statistics mean to me is that it's fairly continuous rock, it's fairly solid; however, it can be excavated. When I look at the bedrock elevations and some of the concepts right now, the majority of the lowest below grade levels, conceptual hospital buildings, the parking garages, are positioned above the bedrock to the extent that it's feasible. Again, there are some knolls in the northern portion of the site, the western portion of the site, but for the most part that's where the current concepts are showing the base of the buildings. Excavation of bedrock requires a

21 23 00:14 1 is excavated by drilling and blasting, ripping with a 00:17 1 it's typically done is you go to every structure, you 00:17 00:14 bulldozer and fracturing with a pneumatic hammer. I go through every room of every structure, you take a 3 00:14 3 am sure everybody has seen one of these pneumatic 00:17 picture of every wall, every crack, every crevice, and you have a record, and if there is an existing 00:14 4 hammers. Beating on rock continuously, it can get a 00:17 4 00:14 5 little monotonous. Then there are other methods, 00:17 5 crack, you may put a crack marker on it just to see 6 6 expansive chemicals and so forth. 00:17 if there's any movement during blasting. 00:14 00:14 7 The site's bedrock-quality and strength 00:17 7 At the end of the day, at the end of 00:14 8 data indicate that you could rip it, you wouldn't 00:17 8 the construction, at the end of the blasting, 9 necessarily have to blast it. In smaller trench 00:17 9 whenever that may be, you go back through those same 00:14 00:14 10 00:17 10 excavations, yeah, maybe you'll get into a little roads, same locations, you take a picture again, and 00:14 11 00:17 11 more difficulty excavating, but when you have a you see where you ended up. That's one way it's 00:14 12 wide-open excavation for a basement, what I've seen 00:17 12 addressed. 00:17 13 00:14 13 in the area is that you can rip it or you could blast Gail, does that answer what you were 00:14 **14** 00:17 **14** looking for? it, to speed things up. 00:14 15 00:17 15 MS. PRICE: Yes. Now, I understand the Village typically 00:14 16 would not want to have blasting, but controlled 00:17 16 MR. KELLER: All right. 00:15 17 blasting, it has happened, it does occur in developed 00:17 17 The third item for below grade 00:18 18 00:15 **18** areas. If the charges are small and it helps -- the consideration was the excavation support and shoring. benefit to that is you can excavate faster, and it 00:15 19 00:18 19 Conceptual excavations for the lower-most levels of 00:15 **20** may allow for a condensed construction schedule. 00:18 20 Phillips Garage and the North and West Buildings will 00:15 21 The flip side of that is whenever you 00:18 21 be about 25 to 35 feet deep. These excavations 00:15 22 blast, you have vibration issues, you have sounds, 00:18 22 obviously will have to be shored, braced. There's no 00:15 **23** and it can be heard for quite a distance. What that 00:18 23 room on this site for general laid back excavation. 00:15 24 distance is depends on, a lot of times you look at a 00:18 24 OSHA requirements, if it was a sandy soil, you may 00:15 **25** scale distance, what that means is the size of the 00:18 25 have a 1:1 back slope or a 1.5:1, so if you're 25 22 24 00:15 1 charge that you're going to use, the delays in the 00:18 1 feet down, you'd have to be 25 feet back from the 00:15 2 charge, and so forth. 00:18 2 face of the excavation. There's not a lot of room on 00:15 3 00:18 3 So if you do get involved with this site to do that, so you would need some type of 00:15 4 blasting, one of the things that you want to do is 00:18 4 shoring, you would need some type of bracing. 00:15 5 you want to have a pre-blast survey and a post-blast 00:18 5 Typically what you see in this type of construction 00:15 6 survey. And what I would expect or what we've done 00:18 6 is called top-down construction, where you start the 7 00:16 7 in the past is, prior to construction, you have a 00:18 excavation from the top and you work your way down, you end up with some type of soldier pile and landing 00:16 8 baseline survey of residences within that scale 00:18 8 00:16 9 distance. You go through construction, and then you 00:19 9 system that would be tied back into the soil. I got 00:16 **10** have a similar survey at the end. 00:19 10 an illustration of that. 00:16 11 And you would also have some vibration 00:19 11 And this is a cross section along the 00:16 **12** monitoring in place during the blasting. And what 00:19 12 rear property line looking north. This would be the 00:16 13 00:19 13 proposed North Building, first floor elevation, 105; the vibration monitoring allows you to do is you can 00:16 14 measure peak particle vibrations, and there's 00:19 14 basement, 89; sub-basement 75; a mat elevation of 69. 00:16 **15** 00:19 15 correlations between the vibration, the frequency, There's a pinch point in the northeast 00:16 **16** and what type of damage it can do. So if you exceed 00:19 16 corner that is about 20 feet from the property line. 00:19 17 00:16 17 a threshold limit, you can back off your method of And to install this wall, you would first excavate 00:16 18 blasting. 00:19 18 down to this first bracing line, and then you would 00:16 19 In the third below grade 00:19 19 install the tieback. This is the tieback. And the 00:16 **20** consideration --00:19 20 important thing about the tieback is it needs to be 00:16 **21** MS. PRICE: Before you go forward, on 00:19 21 outside of this -- this is the potential failure 00:16 22 that pre and post interior and exterior survey of 00:20 22 surface; it needs to be outside of that before it can 00:16 23 00:20 23 adjacent structures, can you just elaborate on that a start the work. Obviously if you tied back into this 00:17 24 little bit as to what you've seen or what you made --00:20 24 area here, the whole face would just fall forward. MR. KELLER: What we've done, the way 00:17 25 00:20 25 So you need to be behind.

	25		27
00:20 1	There's a couple of ways of doing that,	00:22 1	let's look at the sub basement elevation is about 86,
00:20 2	a lot of times you'll see somewhat of a shallow	00:23 2	you have a 74, this would be an additional lower
00:20 3	angle, maybe 15 to 20 degrees, you can't have this	00:23 3	level. And you're really getting into the rock, the
00:20 4	thing very steep. It would be difficult, though, to	00:23 4	wedge of it, about half the Phillips Garage.
00:20 5	make it straight to the bedrock in some of these	00:23 5	And I've got some calculations that you
00:20 6	pinch point locations.	00:23 6	could run through, how we came up with what the
00:20 7	So you could shore from the inside with	00:23 7	quantity was. There's a bulking factor in there that
00:20 8	breakers. It slows down construction, it's difficult	00:23 8	you have to consider. When the soil is in place,
00:20 9	to do, so it's a trade-off; you're either potentially	00:23 9	it's about as dense as it's going to be. When you
00:20 10	crossing the property line or you're working inside.	00:23 10	pull it out of the ground, it loosens, there's more
00:20 11	In terms of adding levels below grade,	00:23 11	void space, you have more trucks. This type of rock
00:20 12	we've looked at some of the considerations, the	00:23 12	will bulk 30 to 40 percent. We used 30 percent here.
00:20 13	bedrock, the groundwater, the shoring. The current	00:23 13	So adding a third lower level to the
00:20 14	hospital concepts indicate two levels below grade.	00:23 14	Phillips Garage, it's technically feasible, you can
00:21 15	The planning objectives suggest consideration of	00:23 15	excavate the rock, you can design enough pumps to
00:21 16	additional levels below grade.	00:23 16	dewater, you can place shoring, there's no question
00:21 17	We could look at each building	00:23 17	about that, it can be done. It wouldn't be
00:21 18	individually. What I've done is I've looked at the	00:23 18	monumental or it would not be groundbreaking to say
00:21 19	Phillips Garage, it's a better case example, and it's	00:24 19	that it hasn't been done before. However, adding
00:21 20	similar to if you took a look at the West Building,	00:24 20	that third lower level, it imposes substantial
00:21 21	the North Building, et cetera anytime you're going to	00:24 21	construction efforts, it certainly adds length to the
00:21 22	excavate another level below grade, you've got more	00:24 22	construction schedule. Part of these are just all
00:21 23	soil, you got more trucks to deal with, so we can	00:24 23	those considerations we just went through, the
00:21 24	take that across some of the other buildings.	00:24 24	excavation of bedrock, the implementation of
00:21 25	So the option of adding a third lower	00:24 25	temporary and permanent groundwater control, and in
	26		28
00:21 1	level to the conceptual Phillips Garage, it's been	00:24 1	the case of the Linwood Garage, if we went back to
00:21 2	discussed. Torcon has indicated about 15,000 cubic	00:24 2	the bottom elevation of the Linwood Garage, it would
00:21 3	yards of rock removal, and I think that was prior to	00:24 3	still be a floor higher than adding for a sub floor
00:21 4	some of the latter boring data that we just received	00:24 4	to the Phillips Garage. So in that case, you'd have
00:21 5	at the end of January. Torcon has also indicated	00:24 5	to now underpin the garage. And then also the third
00:21 6	2,300 trucks would be necessary to remove the soil	00:24 6	level would add additional truck traffic, you'd have
00:21 7	and rock, if you added the third level to the	00:24 7 00:24 8	to haul material off-site, you have impacts to the
00:21 8 00:22 9	Phillips Garage, with a duration of about 14 months.	00:24 8	pavements, you'd lessen the lives. But at the end of the day, the third level would more closely meet
00:22 10	Based on the current data, it looks like it would be a little bit less rock, but where	00:25 10	planning objectives.
00:22 10	it's less rock, still that rock is now replaced by	00:25 11	And then this is more of a sidenote on
00:22 11	soil. So when I looked at it with the new data, it's	00:25 11	stormwater management. There is one plan, and I
00:22 12	about 8,700 cubic yards of rock, about 580 trucks.	00:25 12	apologize that I cannot reference the exact plan, but
00:22 14	That's not to say that 2,300 trucks that Torcon has	00:25 14	there was a box drawn for stormwater management in
00:22 15	estimated doesn't exist, because now instead of rock	00:25 15	the northeastern portion of the site.
00:22 16	it's soil.	00:25 16	I think with all the dewatering and all
00:22 17	I think it could be done in about two	00:25 17	of the limited I shouldn't say all of the limited
00:22 18	to three months, from the rock excavation standpoint.	00:25 18	site area there hasn't been any discussion that
00:22 19	You would still have to install shoring, you would	00:25 19	I've seen on stormwater management. You would think
00:22 20	still have to dewater, and the soil removal isn't the	00:25 20	if you're going to add green space, you would
00:22 21	only part that happens, but you would have to stage	00:25 21	probably reduce some of the impervious. I'm not a
00:22 22	your construction process to shorten the schedule as	00:25 22	stormwater expert, but the only reason that I bring
00:22 23		l	
	far as you could.	00:25 23	it up is because if you have a large stormwater basin
00:22 24	far as you could. This is a cross section of the Phillips	00:25 23 00:25 24	or an infiltration facility next to a dewatering

	29		31
00:25 1	dewatering system.	00:28 1	look at the original proposal presented to the Board
00:26 2	So in summary, the important takeaways	00:29 2	and counsel by the Hospital, there was considerable
00:26 3	that I get from this is that the groundwater control	00:29 3	dewatering required for some of the deeper basements
00:26 4	and discharge means and methods should be presented	00:29 4	of the buildings, but not for the parking garages.
00:26 5	to the Village, since the associated impacts, they're	00:29 5	Is that a correct statement?
00:26 6	going to affect how the improvements take place.	00:29 6	MR. KELLER: Well, no, I would say that
00:26 7	Bedrock excavation may be necessary in	00:29 7	the groundwater elevation throughout is somewhere
00:26 8	the North Building. It appears feasible by ripping.	00:29 8	within that 81 to 88 elevation. So if you go two
00:26 9	Deep excavations are going to need some	00:29 9	levels below grade let me see if I can go back,
00:26 10	type of shoring, whether it's underpinning to	00:29 10	skim through here in the beginning.
00:26 11	existing structures, whether it's a tie-back system,	00:29 11	For instance, if you look at the
00:26 12	and areas that are closest to the property line must	00:29 12	conceptual North and West Buildings' foundation, it's
00:26 13	consider impacts to adjacent projects' properties.	00:29 13	estimated at elevation 69. The Phillips Garage was
00:26 14	And then we just talked about the stormwater	00:29 14	looking at an elevation of 85.
00:26 15	management and how it can impact the dewatering	00:29 15	So 85 right now is just within where
00:26 16	systems.	00:29 16	some of the groundwater data is being shown.
00:26 17	So that is a 30,000-foot view of the	00:30 17	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay.
00:27 18	concepts that were presented and some of the	00:30 18	MR. KELLER: The slide that I had up
00:27 19	important considerations from the below grade	00:30 19	for the North Building showed it at elevation 86.
00:27 20	construction perspective.	00:30 20	Some of the readings ranged from 81 to 88.
00:27 21	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. That was a	00:30 21	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: The issue of
00:27 22	lot. Does anybody have any questions?	00:30 22	shoring along the Steilen Avenue properties is clear.
00:27 23	MS. WARD: I got a question.	00:30 23	That would also be required obviously on the garage
00:27 24	When you talk about adjacent	00:30 24	that's along Linwood as well, wouldn't it, and that
00:27 25	properties, you know, when you're talking about	00:30 25	that would go underneath the street?
	30		32
00:27 1	30 blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent	00:30 1	32 MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's
00:27 1 00:27 2		00:30 1 00:30 2	
	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent		MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's
00:27 2	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are	00:30 2	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts.
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts.
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital.	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 14	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 14 00:31 15	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15 00:28 16	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the blasting program. So you'd want to know what the	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 14 00:31 15 00:31 16	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows construction down, so it's tough to work around, but
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15 00:28 16 00:28 17	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the blasting program. So you'd want to know what the blasting program is, so you could set that up.	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 14 00:31 15 00:31 16 00:31 17	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows construction down, so it's tough to work around, but it can be done.
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15 00:28 16 00:28 17 00:28 18	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the blasting program. So you'd want to know what the blasting program is, so you could set that up. MS. WARD: Okay. Thank you.	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 15 00:31 16 00:31 17 00:31 18	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows construction down, so it's tough to work around, but it can be done. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else?
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15 00:28 16 00:28 17 00:28 18 00:28 19	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the blasting program. So you'd want to know what the blasting program is, so you could set that up. MS. WARD: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else?	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 14 00:31 15 00:31 16 00:31 17 00:31 18 00:31 19	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows construction down, so it's tough to work around, but it can be done. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? MAYOR PFUND: I don't know if now is
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15 00:28 16 00:28 17 00:28 18 00:28 19 00:28 20	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the blasting program. So you'd want to know what the blasting program is, so you could set that up. MS. WARD: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I have a question.	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 14 00:31 15 00:31 16 00:31 17 00:31 18 00:31 19 00:31 20	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows construction down, so it's tough to work around, but it can be done. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? MAYOR PFUND: I don't know if now is the time for it or if I need to digest what I heard,
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15 00:28 16 00:28 17 00:28 18 00:28 19 00:28 20 00:28 21	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the blasting program. So you'd want to know what the blasting program is, so you could set that up. MS. WARD: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I have a question. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Well, just	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 15 00:31 16 00:31 17 00:31 18 00:31 19 00:31 20 00:31 21	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows construction down, so it's tough to work around, but it can be done. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? MAYOR PFUND: I don't know if now is the time for it or if I need to digest what I heard, but I'm trying to get a sense of where the shoring
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15 00:28 16 00:28 17 00:28 18 00:28 19 00:28 20 00:28 21	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the blasting program. So you'd want to know what the blasting program is, so you could set that up. MS. WARD: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I have a question. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Well, just generally speaking, you hit groundwater long before	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 14 00:31 15 00:31 15 00:31 17 00:31 18 00:31 19 00:31 20 00:31 21 00:31 22	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows construction down, so it's tough to work around, but it can be done. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? MAYOR PFUND: I don't know if now is the time for it or if I need to digest what I heard, but I'm trying to get a sense of where the shoring is, based on the plans that you have. So we know
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:27 8 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15 00:28 16 00:28 17 00:28 18 00:28 19 00:28 20 00:28 21 00:28 22	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the blasting program. So you'd want to know what the blasting program is, so you could set that up. MS. WARD: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I have a question. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Well, just generally speaking, you hit groundwater long before you hit rock?	00:30	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows construction down, so it's tough to work around, but it can be done. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? MAYOR PFUND: I don't know if now is the time for it or if I need to digest what I heard, but I'm trying to get a sense of where the shoring is, based on the plans that you have. So we know it's not on the garage, because that's existing. It
00:27 2 00:27 3 00:27 4 00:27 5 00:27 6 00:27 7 00:28 9 00:28 10 00:28 11 00:28 12 00:28 13 00:28 14 00:28 15 00:28 16 00:28 17 00:28 18 00:28 19 00:28 20 00:28 21	blasting or tiebacks, what do you mean by "adjacent properties"? Do you mean those properties that are the hospital buildings, do you mean across the street, do you mean five blocks away? MR. KELLER: Yes, from a tieback perspective, the tiebacks may be 50 feet from the excavation face. So when I say "adjacent properties," it would mean immediately adjacent properties to the property line of the Hospital. From a blasting perspective, it depends on how the blasting program is handled. In other words, if you have large charges or a different delay scheme, it may impact farther, than if you have different delays. So, in other words, it could be 100 feet, it could be 300 feet, it depends on the blasting program. So you'd want to know what the blasting program is, so you could set that up. MS. WARD: Okay. Thank you. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I have a question. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Well, just generally speaking, you hit groundwater long before	00:30 2 00:30 3 00:30 4 00:30 5 00:30 6 00:30 7 00:31 8 00:31 9 00:31 10 00:31 11 00:31 12 00:31 13 00:31 14 00:31 15 00:31 15 00:31 17 00:31 18 00:31 19 00:31 20 00:31 21 00:31 22	MR. KELLER: Well, the garage that's along Linwood, there isn't any proposed additional subsurface levels right now. What's proposed right now is to keep the existing garage and possibly add one deck above it in some of the concepts. So if you went three levels below grade along Linwood and you were right on the property line, the same mechanics would apply. If you had a 30-foot excavation, you would need at least 50 feet to install tiebacks. And that's if you used your shoring on the outside of the excavation. If you shored on the inside of the excavation through breakers, and that concept isn't necessarily shown right now, that is basically a beam that extends from the wall to the inside of the excavation. That slows construction down, so it's tough to work around, but it can be done. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Anybody else? MAYOR PFUND: I don't know if now is the time for it or if I need to digest what I heard, but I'm trying to get a sense of where the shoring is, based on the plans that you have. So we know

	33		35
00:32 1	MR. KELLER: Yes, that is correct, yes.	00:34 1	MR. KELLER: Correct.
00:32 2	MAYOR PFUND: So as proposed you now	00:34 2	MS. PRICE: Okay. I don't have a red
00:32 3	said the shoring could possibly go inside. Does it	00:34 3	light, so maybe you could use your red light and just
00:32 4	have to go into the properties on Steilen Avenue?	00:34 4	show that area.
00:32 5	MR. KELLER: It would not have, no. In	00:34 5	MR. KELLER: Well, right now this is
00:32 6	other words, you could shore from the inside. It's a	00:34 6	the limit of the North Building, and there's a little
00:32 7	total process, that's all.	00:34 7	bit of a buffer here between the property line. This
00:32 8	MAYOR PFUND: Where else would you	00:35 8	isn't to scale, or at least from what I'm looking at
00:32 9	anticipate that the shoring would have to be, besides	00:35 9	right now on this drawing, because this has been
00:32 10	along the North Building on the Steilen side?	00:35 10	distorted so it's not necessarily the drawing is
00:32 11	MR. KELLER: It depends on the final	00:35 11	to scale but the actual print isn't.
00:32 12	concept. In other words, if the West Building has	00:35 12	So there's a distance here. There's an
00:32 13	three levels below grade and it runs right to the	00:35 13	excavation right here about 25 to 30 feet. In this
00:32 14	property line along Van Dien, then you have that	00:35 14	area here, if you went with the conventional tieback
00:32 15	issue. Same with the North Building along the Ben	00:35 15	system, H-pile lagging with tiebacks, you're looking,
00:32 16	Franklin property line, where if the basements are	00:35 16	maybe you'd need 50 feet from the face of that
00:32 17	extended, you still have shoring that needs to take	00:35 17	excavation. These are round numbers, I haven't done
00:32 18	place.	00:35 18	any calculations specifically, outside of that sketch
00:32 19	Now, you may have more than 20 feet,	00:35 19	that I showed you.
00:33 20	maybe you have 30 feet, depending on where that	00:35 20	The sketch that we looked at with the
00:33 21	building ends up.	00:35 21	tiebacks, right here, this is in essence that
00:33 22	MAYOR PFUND: So beyond two sub grade	00:35 22	location, the northeast corner where the North
00:33 23	levels, that's when you need it?	00:35 23	Building stands close to the property line.
00:33 24	MR. KELLER: No, not necessarily. I	00:35 24	Here is the North Building, here's the
00:33 25	would say, if you don't have room to bench back an	00:35 25	property line, here's your failure wedge. You
	0.4		00
00:22 1	34	00:26 1	36
00:33 1	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends	00:36 1	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a
00:33 2	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean	00:36 2	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and
00:33 2 00:33 3	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically	00:36 2 00:36 3	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 4	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be
00:33 2 00:33 3	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have	00:36 2 00:36 3	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 4 00:33 5	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 4 00:33 5 00:33 6	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating).
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 4 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring.	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch,
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 4 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 8	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you.	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's
00:33	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet.
00:33	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating).
00:33	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line?
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 4 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 8 00:33 9 00:33 10 00:33 11 00:33 12	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 8 00:33 9 00:33 10 00:33 12 00:33 12 00:33 13 00:34 14 00:34 15	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question.	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 8 00:33 10 00:33 11 00:33 12 00:33 13 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question. MR. KELLER: Yes, it depends. It	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing residential property to the east. This would be The
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 9 00:33 10 00:33 12 00:33 12 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question. MR. KELLER: Yes, it depends. It depends on the concept that we're looking at as well. MS. PRICE: Well, there's underground construction proposed, as I understand it, or	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:36 15 00:36 16 00:36 17	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing residential property to the east. This would be The Valley Hospital property to the west (indicating).
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 9 00:33 10 00:33 12 00:33 12 00:33 13 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question. MR. KELLER: Yes, it depends. It depends on the concept that we're looking at as well. MS. PRICE: Well, there's underground construction proposed, as I understand it, or contemplated in the northeastern corner of the	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:36 15 00:36 16 00:36 17 00:36 18	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing residential property to the east. This would be The Valley Hospital property to the west (indicating). MS. PRICE: So under this exhibit, this shows basically an encroachment that would be required into off-site properties, if tiebacks were
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 9 00:33 10 00:33 12 00:33 12 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question. MR. KELLER: Yes, it depends. It depends on the concept that we're looking at as well. MS. PRICE: Well, there's underground construction proposed, as I understand it, or contemplated in the northeastern corner of the property by the loading zone?	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 15 00:36 15 00:36 17 00:36 18 00:36 19	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing residential property to the east. This would be The Valley Hospital property to the west (indicating). MS. PRICE: So under this exhibit, this shows basically an encroachment that would be required into off-site properties, if tiebacks were required? But it's my understanding that there may
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 8 00:33 10 00:33 12 00:33 12 00:33 13 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question. MR. KELLER: Yes, it depends. It depends on the concept that we're looking at as well. MS. PRICE: Well, there's underground construction proposed, as I understand it, or contemplated in the northeastern corner of the property by the loading zone? MR. KELLER: Right.	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:36 15 00:36 16 00:36 17 00:36 18 00:36 19 00:37 20	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing residential property to the east. This would be The Valley Hospital property to the west (indicating). MS. PRICE: So under this exhibit, this shows basically an encroachment that would be required into off-site properties, if tiebacks were required? But it's my understanding that there may in fact be other possibilities, including breakers,
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 9 00:33 10 00:33 12 00:33 13 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20 00:34 21	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question. MR. KELLER: Yes, it depends. It depends on the concept that we're looking at as well. MS. PRICE: Well, there's underground construction proposed, as I understand it, or contemplated in the northeastern corner of the property by the loading zone? MR. KELLER: Right. MS. PRICE: And that underground	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:36 15 00:36 16 00:36 17 00:36 18 00:36 19 00:37 20 00:37 21	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing residential property to the east. This would be The Valley Hospital property to the west (indicating). MS. PRICE: So under this exhibit, this shows basically an encroachment that would be required into off-site properties, if tiebacks were required? But it's my understanding that there may in fact be other possibilities, including breakers, to look into
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 8 00:33 10 00:33 12 00:33 12 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20 00:34 21 00:34 22	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question. MR. KELLER: Yes, it depends. It depends on the concept that we're looking at as well. MS. PRICE: Well, there's underground construction proposed, as I understand it, or contemplated in the northeastern corner of the property by the loading zone? MR. KELLER: Right. MS. PRICE: And that underground construction will necessitate certain structural	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 15 00:36 15 00:36 15 00:36 17 00:36 18 00:36 19 00:37 20 00:37 21	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing residential property to the east. This would be The Valley Hospital property to the west (indicating). MS. PRICE: So under this exhibit, this shows basically an encroachment that would be required into off-site properties, if tiebacks were required? But it's my understanding that there may in fact be other possibilities, including breakers, to look into MR. KELLER: Right.
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 9 00:33 10 00:33 12 00:33 12 00:34 15 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 19 00:34 20 00:34 21 00:34 23	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question. MR. KELLER: Yes, it depends. It depends on the concept that we're looking at as well. MS. PRICE: Well, there's underground construction proposed, as I understand it, or contemplated in the northeastern corner of the property by the loading zone? MR. KELLER: Right. MS. PRICE: And that underground construction will necessitate certain structural elements to be secure along the eastern property line	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:36 15 00:36 16 00:36 17 00:36 18 00:36 19 00:37 20 00:37 21 00:37 22	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing residential property to the east. This would be The Valley Hospital property to the west (indicating). MS. PRICE: So under this exhibit, this shows basically an encroachment that would be required into off-site properties, if tiebacks were required? But it's my understanding that there may in fact be other possibilities, including breakers, to look into MR. KELLER: Right. MS. PRICE: which may or may not
00:33 2 00:33 3 00:33 5 00:33 6 00:33 7 00:33 8 00:33 10 00:33 12 00:33 12 00:34 14 00:34 15 00:34 16 00:34 17 00:34 18 00:34 19 00:34 20 00:34 21 00:34 22	excavation, then you need to shore it. So what ends up happening when I say "bench back," what I mean by that, say you had to go down 10 feet, typically you would have to go back 10 to 15 feet. So if you don't have 10 to 15 feet in the horizontal, you have to shore it at some point and you'd have to install some shoring. MAYOR PFUND: All right. Thank you. MS. PRICE: I think, you know, on that question, maybe it would just be helpful to bring up the map, just show the areas that we're talking about, because it's not necessarily all the sides of the property in question. MR. KELLER: Yes, it depends. It depends on the concept that we're looking at as well. MS. PRICE: Well, there's underground construction proposed, as I understand it, or contemplated in the northeastern corner of the property by the loading zone? MR. KELLER: Right. MS. PRICE: And that underground construction will necessitate certain structural	00:36 2 00:36 3 00:36 4 00:36 5 00:36 6 00:36 7 00:36 8 00:36 9 00:36 10 00:36 11 00:36 12 00:36 13 00:36 14 00:36 15 00:36 15 00:36 17 00:36 18 00:36 19 00:37 20 00:37 21	actually have a little bit of a this calls for a factor of safety beyond that failure wedge, and that's where your grout, this is grout, it's concrete, it's pumped into the ground, may be pressurized, may not, and then this is a reinforcing steel that runs to the face (indicating). MS. PRICE: And in this sketch, everything to the right of the solid line that's dashed every, I don't know, so many feet. MR. KELLER: This (indicating). MS. PRICE: That's the property line? MR. KELLER: Right, this right here is the property line. This would be an existing residential property to the east. This would be The Valley Hospital property to the west (indicating). MS. PRICE: So under this exhibit, this shows basically an encroachment that would be required into off-site properties, if tiebacks were required? But it's my understanding that there may in fact be other possibilities, including breakers, to look into MR. KELLER: Right.

	37		39
00:37 1	MR. KELLER: Correct, right. So in	00:40 1	probably going to be more trucks because it bulks a
00:37 2	other words, these members right here, the soil was	00:40 2	little bit more, and the deeper you go, there's more
00:37 3	pushing on this wall, this act of tension, you could	00:40 3	water that you have to handle, that you have to
00:37 4	place a beam from the base of the excavation to the	00:40 4	discharge, you have to put somewhere.
00:37 5	shoring point. It slows down the process. It's	00:40 5	So, yes, the specific costs, I would
00:37 6	difficult to work around (indicating).	00:40 6	have to go through each scenario, I haven't
00:37 7	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay.	00:40 7	specifically done that at this time, but I would
00:37 8	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So your headline	00:40 8	think it would be substantial.
00:37 9	is, this is a feasible plan, we can actually do what	00:40 9	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: It just re-defines
00:37 10	is being proposed to do if we wanted to?	00:40 10	the project.
00:37 11	MR. KELLER: It's technically feasible.	00:40 11	Thank you.
00:37 12	I mean, it can be done. The level of effort and the	00:40 12	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Any other
00:37 13	value of that level of effort, I couldn't weigh.	00:40 13	questions?
00:38 14	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: It sounds like a	00:40 14	Blais or Chris?
00:38 15	lot of different parties who are interested parties	00:40 15	MR. BRANCHEAU: No.
00:38 16	have to consider a lot of possibilities, perhaps	00:40 16	MR. RUTISHAUSER: I have none from me.
00:38 17	trade-offs in terms of a building which is not so	00:40 17	Thank you.
00:38 18	physically evident above ground would require a	00:40 18	MS. PRICE: Can I just ask Larry one
00:38 19	sensitivity into a lot of issues, including the	00:40 19	thing?
00:38 20	groundwater, the bedrock, the installation of	00:40 20	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Sure.
00:38 21	supports, and the stormwater management vis-a-vis how	00:40 21	MS. PRICE: Larry, in connection with
00:38 22	it's going to affect not only the houses but the	00:40 22	the dewatering, do you have an opinion as to whether
00:38 23	school, and that's in terms of the duration of the	00:40 23	that process is required regardless of the proposal,
00:38 24	work and in terms of the level of the noise or the	00:40 24	either the original proposal or the increased below
00:38 25	hassle of the project and the possibility that there	00:41 25	grade construction?
	38		40
00:38 1		00:41 1	
	38	_	40
00:38 1	38 may be physical ramifications in the afterworld.	00:41 1	40 MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering
00:38 1 00:38 2	38 may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of	00:41 1 00:41 2	40 MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur.
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3	38 may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4	38 may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table.
00:38	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks.	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 9 00:39 10	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 9 00:39 10 00:39 11	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for"	00:41 1 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor?
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly.
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board.	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 11	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time,
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 16	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more physical space on top of the ground, can you comment	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15 00:41 16	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should continue to be professional oversight with regard to
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 9 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 16 00:39 17	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more physical space on top of the ground, can you comment to that?	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15 00:41 15 00:41 17	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should continue to be professional oversight with regard to those kind of issues?
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 16 00:39 17 00:39 18	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more physical space on top of the ground, can you comment to that? MR. KELLER: I can talk a little bit to	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15 00:41 16 00:41 17 00:41 18	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should continue to be professional oversight with regard to those kind of issues? MR. KELLER: I think you would want to
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 16 00:39 17 00:39 18 00:39 19	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more physical space on top of the ground, can you comment to that? MR. KELLER: I can talk a little bit to	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15 00:41 16 00:41 17 00:41 18 00:41 19	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should continue to be professional oversight with regard to those kind of issues? MR. KELLER: I think you would want to have where you're drawing groundwater, if the
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 16 00:39 17 00:39 18 00:39 19 00:39 20	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more physical space on top of the ground, can you comment to that? MR. KELLER: I can talk a little bit to the cost. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Just generally.	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15 00:41 15 00:41 16 00:41 17 00:41 18 00:41 18 00:41 19	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should continue to be professional oversight with regard to those kind of issues? MR. KELLER: I think you would want to have where you're drawing groundwater, if the final design is to pump the groundwater away rather
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 16 00:39 17 00:39 18 00:39 19 00:39 20 00:39 21	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more physical space on top of the ground, can you comment to that? MR. KELLER: I can talk a little bit to the cost. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Just generally. MR. KELLER: Generally, the cost would	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15 00:41 15 00:41 16 00:41 17 00:41 18 00:41 19 00:42 20 00:42 21	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should continue to be professional oversight with regard to those kind of issues? MR. KELLER: I think you would want to have where you're drawing groundwater, if the final design is to pump the groundwater away rather than just do it well, even during construction you
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 15 00:39 17 00:39 18 00:39 19 00:39 20 00:39 21 00:39 22	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more physical space on top of the ground, can you comment to that? MR. KELLER: I can talk a little bit to the cost. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Just generally. MR. KELLER: Generally, the cost would increase substantially. You're going from a rock	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15 00:41 16 00:41 17 00:41 18 00:41 19 00:42 20 00:42 21 00:42 22	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should continue to be professional oversight with regard to those kind of issues? MR. KELLER: I think you would want to have where you're drawing groundwater, if the final design is to pump the groundwater away rather than just do it well, even during construction you would want to have some kind of oversight of the
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 16 00:39 17 00:39 17 00:39 18 00:39 19 00:39 20 00:39 21 00:39 22 00:39 23	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more physical space on top of the ground, can you comment to that? MR. KELLER: I can talk a little bit to the cost. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Just generally. MR. KELLER: Generally, the cost would increase substantially. You're going from a rock in other words, whenever you're going into the rock,	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15 00:41 15 00:41 16 00:41 17 00:41 18 00:41 19 00:42 20 00:42 21 00:42 23	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should continue to be professional oversight with regard to those kind of issues? MR. KELLER: I think you would want to have where you're drawing groundwater, if the final design is to pump the groundwater away rather than just do it well, even during construction you would want to have some kind of oversight of the pre-construction survey, you would want to have some
00:38 1 00:38 2 00:38 3 00:38 4 00:39 5 00:39 6 00:39 7 00:39 8 00:39 10 00:39 11 00:39 12 00:39 13 00:39 14 00:39 15 00:39 15 00:39 17 00:39 18 00:39 19 00:39 20 00:39 21 00:39 22	may be physical ramifications in the afterworld. MR. KELLER: Yes, there's a lot of trucks. For a 40,000-square foot facility, for every foot that you go below grade when I say 40,000 square foot, in plan area, a footprint of 40,000 square feet, you're looking at maybe somewhere in the neighborhood of 150 trucks. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So what you're telling us is while this is feasible, this report also in essence opens up a new can of worms for us because it offers all these other "yeah-but-for" various parties to consider, including the Planning Board. How about the expense of this proposal compared to what we were looking at with much more physical space on top of the ground, can you comment to that? MR. KELLER: I can talk a little bit to the cost. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Just generally. MR. KELLER: Generally, the cost would increase substantially. You're going from a rock	00:41 1 00:41 2 00:41 3 00:41 4 00:41 5 00:41 6 00:41 7 00:41 8 00:41 9 00:41 10 00:41 11 00:41 12 00:41 13 00:41 14 00:41 15 00:41 16 00:41 17 00:41 18 00:41 19 00:42 20 00:42 21 00:42 22	MR. KELLER: Right, the dewatering would still need to occur. If I go back to the these are tough sketches, but this is basically two below grade levels in the North Building, with a bottom map elevation of 69 that the Hospital's architect provided to us. And when you look at that, you're about 17 feet below the groundwater table. MS. PRICE: So certain steps would need to be taken regardless of the actual design, based upon that factor? MR. KELLER: Certainly. MS. PRICE: Do you as a professional have an opinion as to whether at some point in time, if this project were approved, whether there should continue to be professional oversight with regard to those kind of issues? MR. KELLER: I think you would want to have where you're drawing groundwater, if the final design is to pump the groundwater away rather than just do it well, even during construction you would want to have some kind of oversight of the

	41		43
00:42 1	So you'd want some monitoring. I would suggest some	00:44 1	correlate their water readings with precipitation
00:42 1 00:42 2	long-term oversight, but long-term oversight could	00:44 1	data. I think that's great. I think, in my opinion,
00:42 3	just be a couple of monitoring points that a surveyor	00:45 3	the seasonal high evaluation is just as important.
00:42 4	picks up, it could be a crack monitor on a building,	00:45 4	MR. RICHE: I'm not sure you answered
00:42 5	it wouldn't have to be that involved.	00:45 5	the question, but I'll try to ask it again. So if
00:42 6	MS. PRICE: Would the dewatering	00:45 6	80 what's the high water, 80 something?
00:42 7	process tie in with the overall stormwater management	00:45 7	MR. KELLER: 88 was the highest that I
00:42 8	review in connection with ensuring the necessary	00:45 8	saw.
00:42 9	separation of the two calculations, recognizing that	00:45 9	MR. RICHE: What's the lowest?
00:42 10	you're not an expert in stormwater management?	00:45 10	MR. KELLER: 81.
00:43 11	MR. KELLER: Well, from the standpoint	00:45 11	MR. RICHE: Okay. Thanks.
00:43 12	of where I get involved with stormwater management a	00:45 12	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Any other
00:43 13	lot is infiltration and then mounding. If you have a	00:45 13	questions?
00:43 14	lot of water running to one place and you start to	00:45 14	(NO RESPONSE.)
00:43 15	create a groundwater mound, would that impact one of	00:45 15	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Thank you,
00:43 16	the buildings, if the stormwater facility was next to	00:45 16	Mr. Keller. Don't go away, though.
00:43 17	the building? That's where I see the two coming	00:45 17	So, Ray, we'll turn to you now.
00:43 18	together.	00:45 18	MR. SKORUPA: Okay. Thank you. It's
00:43 19	MR. RICHE: Do the groundwater levels	00:45 19	good to be in Ridgewood. And I'm amazed at the
00:43 20	change substantially at different times during the	00:45 20	versatility of this Planning Board, starting out the
00:43 21	year?	00:45 21	evening with shutters on windows and underground
00:43 22	MR. KELLER: Certainly, yeah.	00:45 22	utilities, and now we're looking at creating a Master
00:43 23	MR. RICHE: Can you give us an example?	00:46 23	Plan for the Hospital Zone, so it's quite a range of
00:43 24	Are these calculations here based on	00:46 24	tasks.
00:43 25	highest water levels or	00:46 25	Let me give a context to, I think the
	42		4.4
	42		44
00:43 1	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off	00:46 1	best example to put what we're considering tonight
00:43 1 00:43 2		00:46 1 00:46 2	
	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off		best example to put what we're considering tonight
00:43 2	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background,	00:46 2	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original
00:43 2 00:43 3	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs,	00:46 2 00:46 3	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater.	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal,
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine.	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86?	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10 00:44 11	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do.	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:46 11	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10 00:44 11 00:44 12	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:46 11 00:47 12	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10 00:44 11 00:44 12 00:44 13	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:47 12 00:47 13	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much
00:43 2 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10 00:44 11 00:44 12 00:44 13 00:44 14	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor the groundwater, I believe they stated over a	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:46 11 00:47 12 00:47 13 00:47 14	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much dewatering, et cetera.
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10 00:44 11 00:44 12 00:44 13 00:44 14 00:44 15	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor the groundwater, I believe they stated over a 10-month period, to get a better sense.	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:46 11 00:47 12 00:47 13 00:47 14 00:47 15	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much dewatering, et cetera. So the issues that Larry addressed are
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 10 00:44 11 00:44 12 00:44 13 00:44 14 00:44 15 00:44 16	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor the groundwater, I believe they stated over a 10-month period, to get a better sense. I'm a big fan of what's called	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:46 11 00:47 12 00:47 13 00:47 14 00:47 15 00:47 16	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much dewatering, et cetera. So the issues that Larry addressed are present for the project, and I think what we had
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 5 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 11 00:44 12 00:44 13 00:44 14 00:44 15 00:44 16 00:44 18 00:44 19	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor the groundwater, I believe they stated over a 10-month period, to get a better sense. I'm a big fan of what's called "seasonal high groundwater evaluation," because in my	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:46 11 00:47 12 00:47 13 00:47 14 00:47 15 00:47 16 00:47 17	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much dewatering, et cetera. So the issues that Larry addressed are present for the project, and I think what we had suggested in the Master Plan recommendations would actually impinge upon those in a greater way, because we had recommended putting more things below ground.
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 4 00:43 5 00:43 6 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10 00:44 11 00:44 12 00:44 13 00:44 14 00:44 15 00:44 15 00:44 17 00:44 18 00:44 19 00:44 20	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor the groundwater, I believe they stated over a 10-month period, to get a better sense. I'm a big fan of what's called "seasonal high groundwater evaluation," because in my opinion if they monitor groundwater for 10 months and	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:47 12 00:47 13 00:47 14 00:47 15 00:47 16 00:47 17 00:47 18 00:47 19 00:47 20	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much dewatering, et cetera. So the issues that Larry addressed are present for the project, and I think what we had suggested in the Master Plan recommendations would actually impinge upon those in a greater way, because we had recommended putting more things below ground. So it's really a continuum, and that leads us to sort
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 5 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 10 00:44 11 00:44 12 00:44 13 00:44 15 00:44 16 00:44 18 00:44 19 00:44 20 00:44 21	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor the groundwater, I believe they stated over a 10-month period, to get a better sense. I'm a big fan of what's called "seasonal high groundwater evaluation," because in my opinion if they monitor groundwater for 10 months and this is a dry year for one reason or another, you never know what's going to happen next year. There's signs in the soil, soil mottling, discoloration in	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:47 12 00:47 13 00:47 14 00:47 15 00:47 16 00:47 17 00:47 18 00:47 19 00:47 20 00:47 21	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much dewatering, et cetera. So the issues that Larry addressed are present for the project, and I think what we had suggested in the Master Plan recommendations would actually impinge upon those in a greater way, because we had recommended putting more things below ground. So it's really a continuum, and that leads us to sort of giving you a context of what we're doing.
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 5 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10 00:44 12 00:44 13 00:44 14 00:44 15 00:44 16 00:44 17 00:44 19 00:44 20 00:44 21 00:44 22	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor the groundwater, I believe they stated over a 10-month period, to get a better sense. I'm a big fan of what's called "seasonal high groundwater evaluation," because in my opinion if they monitor groundwater for 10 months and this is a dry year for one reason or another, you never know what's going to happen next year. There's signs in the soil, soil mottling, discoloration in the soil, that will kind of give you a high	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:47 12 00:47 13 00:47 14 00:47 15 00:47 16 00:47 17 00:47 18 00:47 19 00:47 20 00:47 21	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much dewatering, et cetera. So the issues that Larry addressed are present for the project, and I think what we had suggested in the Master Plan recommendations would actually impinge upon those in a greater way, because we had recommended putting more things below ground. So it's really a continuum, and that leads us to sort of giving you a context of what we're doing. On October 5th, I made a presentation
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 5 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10 00:44 12 00:44 13 00:44 15 00:44 16 00:44 17 00:44 19 00:44 20 00:44 21 00:44 23	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor the groundwater, I believe they stated over a 10-month period, to get a better sense. I'm a big fan of what's called "seasonal high groundwater evaluation," because in my opinion if they monitor groundwater for 10 months and this is a dry year for one reason or another, you never know what's going to happen next year. There's signs in the soil, soil mottling, discoloration in the soil, that will kind of give you a high watermark. And that's done through test pits more so	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:47 12 00:47 13 00:47 14 00:47 15 00:47 16 00:47 17 00:47 18 00:47 19 00:47 20 00:47 21 00:47 22	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much dewatering, et cetera. So the issues that Larry addressed are present for the project, and I think what we had suggested in the Master Plan recommendations would actually impinge upon those in a greater way, because we had recommended putting more things below ground. So it's really a continuum, and that leads us to sort of giving you a context of what we're doing. On October 5th, I made a presentation to this board, and what we agreed to do at that
00:43 2 00:43 3 00:43 5 00:43 7 00:44 8 00:44 9 00:44 10 00:44 12 00:44 13 00:44 14 00:44 15 00:44 16 00:44 17 00:44 19 00:44 20 00:44 21 00:44 22	MR. KELLER: No, this is based off of you can it's very faint in the background, but these are subsurface profiles with boring logs, actually it's from a CMX report. There is a supplemental geotechnical engineering report, and this is where they encounter groundwater. Is that a design level groundwater? I think that's going to be something that the Hospital's consultant will ultimately determine. Do I think it will get above the 86? Sure I do. CMX has installed permanent monitoring wells or semipermanent monitoring wells to monitor the groundwater, I believe they stated over a 10-month period, to get a better sense. I'm a big fan of what's called "seasonal high groundwater evaluation," because in my opinion if they monitor groundwater for 10 months and this is a dry year for one reason or another, you never know what's going to happen next year. There's signs in the soil, soil mottling, discoloration in the soil, that will kind of give you a high	00:46 2 00:46 3 00:46 4 00:46 5 00:46 6 00:46 7 00:46 8 00:46 9 00:46 10 00:47 12 00:47 13 00:47 14 00:47 15 00:47 16 00:47 17 00:47 18 00:47 19 00:47 20 00:47 21	best example to put what we're considering tonight has to do with a question of degree. The original proposal that was put forth by Valley Hospital envisioned things underground and things above ground. What we had proposed was maybe putting more things underground than the original TVH proposal, and I think that's why the things that Larry talked about have greater significance, because, for example, we suggested putting more parking below grade, we suggested putting it closer to the property edges, and in turn that raises those questions about what's the setbacks required from the edge of the property, what shoring is required, how much dewatering, et cetera. So the issues that Larry addressed are present for the project, and I think what we had suggested in the Master Plan recommendations would actually impinge upon those in a greater way, because we had recommended putting more things below ground. So it's really a continuum, and that leads us to sort of giving you a context of what we're doing. On October 5th, I made a presentation

45 47 00:47 1 manager and other consultants, and see if we could 00:51 1 and this is where we now get into some of the 00:48 2 create a scheme that better fulfilled some of the 00:51 2 principles in terms of mitigation of that impact on 3 00.48 3 principles that we had enunciated in terms of 00:51 the current site, and there were several things that we had proposed. One was, and we had said let's 00:48 4 long-term things that we thought the Master Plan 00:51 4 00:48 5 should envision. And tonight we're going to present 00:51 5 create a green zone around the edge of the Hospital 6 to you the work that was done as we tried to move 00:51 6 on the three main fronts, that is, on Van Dien, on 00:48 00:48 7 from the original proposal to proposals that actually 00:51 7 Linwood, and on Steilen, and we said let's make that 00:51 00:48 8 came closer to meeting some of the criteria in the 8 that a 130-foot setback. And the reason that we did 9 Master Plan that we had presented. 00:51 9 that was, first of all, to preserve one of the strong 00:48 00:48 10 00:51 10 Let me take a moment to go back and characteristics of this community, which is the 00:48 11 00:51 11 enumerate some of the principles that we had stated greenbelt that goes between the street and buildings 00:48 12 at our October 5th meeting. And I'm not going to go 00:51 12 along those streets, and it varies a little bit, 00:48 13 through the whole list of those, but I'm going to hit 00:51 13 depending on what part of Ridgewood that you happen 00:48 **14** the highlights of those. 00:51 14 00:48 15 00:51 15 The first thing that we said was we The second thing that we said was we 00:48 16 agreed that the inpatient facility should remain here 00:51 16 want to put as much as we can underground, both 00:48 17 and that we would limit it to 454 beds; that other 00:51 17 parking and hospital functions so that we minimize 00:49 18 functions, such as outpatient functions, support 00:51 18 the massing impact that this facility has on the 00:49 19 00:52 19 neighborhood. And we said what we recommended was functions, which the Hospital is currently doing, 00:49 **20** those would remain on off-site campuses. And 00:52 20 40 percent above grade and 60 percent below grade. 00:49 **21** currently the Hospital, I believe, is operating in 00:52 21 So in rough numbers, that's about 620,000 above grade 00:49 22 00:52 22 the range of about 300 or so thousand square feet in and a million square feet below grade. 00:49 23 other locations not on the main site. The current 00:52 23 The fourth principle that we enunciated 00:49 **24** campus has about 560,000 square feet. 00:52 24 was let's put above grade those hospital functions so 00:49 25 00:52 25 they can get the benefit, the staff, visitors, The second thing that we enunciated was 48 00:49 1 we thought that for a modern 21st century hospital, 00:52 1 patients can get the benefit of daylight, those 00:49 2 that we should allow about a million square feet of 00:52 2 things should go above ground, and the candidates 00:52 3 00:49 3 hospital space, including mechanical, including that don't need daylight, such as parking, such as 00:49 circulation, including public spaces. In our view, 00:52 4 mechanical, should go below grade. So that was a 00:49 5 that would be an adequate parameter for the Hospital 00:52 5 substantial shift in terms of what goes above grade, 6 00:49 6 to do a first-rate, world-class, 21st century 00:52 what goes below grade. 7 00:52 7 00:49 hospital. So those were some of the positive things Some other issues that we touched upon that we said about the Hospital itself. 00:50 8 00:52 8 were mitigation of noise and disruptive activities. 00:50 Another big issue was parking, and we 00:53 9 We said let's put the service dock enclosed. Let's 00:53 10 00:50 10 said that we thought there should be about 2,000 put the emergency room access and drop-off enclosed, 00:50 11 parking spaces, and we said in structured parking, 00:53 11 that's a 7/24 activity, can occur at three in the and we'll go into that a little bit more, and some 00:53 12 morning, no reason why we cannot put those under 00:50 12 incidental on-grade parking, we said maybe 10 percent 00:50 **13** 00:53 **13** cover, so that the noise and light and activity 00:50 14 of that for drop-off and for pick-up and things of 00:53 14 that's generated by those activities would be under 00:50 **15** that sort. 00:53 **15** cover. 00:50 16 And we also said that if we put the 00:53 16 We also looked at some green issues. 00:50 17 hospital parking in structures, that we would need 00:53 17 We wanted to create more green roofs. We wanted to 00:50 18 about 700,000 square feet of space to accommodate 00:53 18 create an irrigation system, which retains water that 00:50 19 structured parking. We had recommended that we have 00:53 19 comes onto the site, to really sustain the green 00:50 20 very little on-grade parking, that parking be 00:53 20 neighborhood that we want to create either in the 00:50 **21** essentially in a structure, either above ground or 00:53 21 buffer zones or on the green roofs. 00:50 22 below ground. 00.53 22 And we also wanted to create more 00:50 23 00:53 23 internal courts. I think one of the comments that we So we recommended that the total 00:50 24 development on the Hospital would be 1.7 million 00:53 24 made about some of the internal planning of the 00:50 **25** square feet of space. We also said that we think, 00:53 25 hospital in the proposal that the Hospital had

	49		51
00:54 1	developed through its architectural and engineering	00:56 1	not along the Steilen properties but off of Van Dien
00:54 2	team was we felt as though there was not enough	00:56 2	at the north end so that we can free up the zone
00:54 3	daylight, especially in the basement level, which was	00:56 3	space between the existing hospital and the Steilen
00:54 4	the heart of the Hospital.	00:56 4	properties for more hospital-related functions and
00:54 5	I think we pointed out that the heart	00:56 5	for more parking functions.
00:54 6	of the Hospital was the basement level, had all of	00:56 6	So those in brief were the principles
00:54 7	the operating rooms, all of the cardiac cath rooms,	00:56 7	that we had enunciated at part of the Master Plan.
00:54 8	all of the endoscopy rooms, into an integrated	00:57 8	We also tested upon options that the
00:54 9	facility but had very little daylight. And we	00:57 9	Hospital has in terms of the long-range strategy, we
00:54 10	thought those functions would be better served, both	00:57 10	said there are a number of those. We really
00:54 11	for patients and staff and visitors, if they were	00:57 11	generated seven options. Really for tonight I want
00:54 12	above grade with daylight as opposed to below grade.	00:57 12	to touch only upon two.
00:54 13	And one way to do that would be to introduce into the	00:57 13	These options range from complete
00:54 14	complex more courtyards.	00:57 14	replacement of just the inpatient facility to
00:54 15	In terms of building height, we	00:57 15	complete replacement of the hospital at another
00:54 16	proposed three options, and we favored the third one,	00:57 16	hospital, to renewal in place, which the Hospital has
00:54 17	which was to have a six story hospital function above	00:57 17	actually embarked upon; to, for example, purchasing
00:54 18	grade, its total height would be 84 feet, and below	00:57 18	another hospital and having two site locations.
00:54 19	grade would be mechanical.	00:57 19	And of those seven options, we think
00:55 20	One of the things that we took issue	00:57 20	the two that really make more sense are the
00:55 21	with was the current zoning parameters, which permits	00:57 21	replacement of the inpatient facility at another
00:55 22	four levels of habited space and then one level of	00:57 22	facility, at another location, or renewal in place.
00:55 23	mechanical penthouse. And we said, put the penthouse	00:57 23	And what we've done in these next two
00:55 24	below, put the mechanical below grade, bring fresh	00:57 24	slides, if you look at these, are looking at the
00:55 25	air into that, snorkel that, and then put above grade	00:58 25	relative cost of those replacements. And there are a
	50		50
			52
00:55 1	those Hospital functions which really deserve	00:58 1	couple of things I want to point out in these two
00:55 2	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight.	00:58 2	couple of things I want to point out in these two options.
00:55 2 00:55 3	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle	00:58 2 00:58 3	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking.	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 6	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5 00:58 6	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once,
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and,
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase,
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 9	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight.	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 9 00:58 10	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 9 00:58 10 00:58 11	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 9 00:58 10 00:58 11 00:58 12	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it,
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 4 00:58 5 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 9 00:58 10 00:58 11 00:58 12 00:58 13	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:56 14	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet and 100 percent within 500 feet.	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 9 00:58 10 00:58 11 00:58 12 00:58 13 00:58 14	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it, replacing some of it over time.
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:56 14 00:56 15	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet and 100 percent within 500 feet. The scheme that we looked at had most	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 9 00:58 10 00:58 11 00:58 12 00:58 13 00:58 14 00:58 15	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it, replacing some of it over time. So when you look at the two options
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 4 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 11 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:56 14 00:56 15 00:56 16	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet and 100 percent within 500 feet. The scheme that we looked at had most of the parking on the south end of the campus, and	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 10 00:58 11 00:58 12 00:58 13 00:58 14 00:58 15 00:58 16	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it, replacing some of it over time. So when you look at the two options then, you see that option one, everything has to be
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 12 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:56 14 00:56 15 00:56 16 00:56 17	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet and 100 percent within 500 feet. The scheme that we looked at had most of the parking on the south end of the campus, and most of the hospital functions on the north end,	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 9 00:58 10 00:58 12 00:58 12 00:58 13 00:58 14 00:58 15 00:58 16 00:58 17	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it, replacing some of it over time. So when you look at the two options then, you see that option one, everything has to be done in a new facility, including land, including
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 12 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:56 14 00:56 15 00:56 16 00:56 17 00:56 18	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet and 100 percent within 500 feet. The scheme that we looked at had most of the parking on the south end of the campus, and most of the hospital functions on the north end, which meant that patients, visitors, the elderly, the	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 10 00:58 11 00:58 12 00:58 13 00:58 14 00:58 15 00:58 16 00:58 17 00:58 18	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it, replacing some of it over time. So when you look at the two options then, you see that option one, everything has to be done in a new facility, including land, including doing all of that in a single step, whereas in option
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 12 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:56 14 00:56 15 00:56 16 00:56 17 00:56 18 00:56 19	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet and 100 percent within 500 feet. The scheme that we looked at had most of the parking on the south end of the campus, and most of the hospital functions on the north end, which meant that patients, visitors, the elderly, the handicapped, have a much farther distance to travel.	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 9 00:58 10 00:58 12 00:58 13 00:58 14 00:58 15 00:58 16 00:58 17 00:58 18 00:59 19	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it, replacing some of it over time. So when you look at the two options then, you see that option one, everything has to be done in a new facility, including land, including doing all of that in a single step, whereas in option 4C, which is the renewal in place, some of the
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 12 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:56 14 00:56 15 00:56 16 00:56 17 00:56 18 00:56 19 00:56 20	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet and 100 percent within 500 feet. The scheme that we looked at had most of the parking on the south end of the campus, and most of the hospital functions on the north end, which meant that patients, visitors, the elderly, the handicapped, have a much farther distance to travel. And the last thing that we suggested	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 10 00:58 11 00:58 12 00:58 13 00:58 14 00:58 15 00:58 16 00:58 17 00:58 18 00:59 19 00:59 20	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it, replacing some of it over time. So when you look at the two options then, you see that option one, everything has to be done in a new facility, including land, including doing all of that in a single step, whereas in option 4C, which is the renewal in place, some of the existing can be retained.
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 12 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:56 14 00:56 15 00:56 16 00:56 17 00:56 18 00:56 19 00:56 20 00:56 21	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet and 100 percent within 500 feet. The scheme that we looked at had most of the parking on the south end of the campus, and most of the hospital functions on the north end, which meant that patients, visitors, the elderly, the handicapped, have a much farther distance to travel. And the last thing that we suggested was vehicular separation. We said separate service	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 8 00:58 10 00:58 11 00:58 12 00:58 13 00:58 14 00:58 15 00:58 16 00:58 17 00:58 18 00:59 19 00:59 20 00:59 21	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it, replacing some of it over time. So when you look at the two options then, you see that option one, everything has to be done in a new facility, including land, including doing all of that in a single step, whereas in option 4C, which is the renewal in place, some of the existing can be retained. In Phase I, which is actually proposed,
00:55 2 00:55 3 00:55 5 00:55 6 00:55 7 00:55 8 00:55 9 00:55 10 00:55 12 00:55 12 00:55 13 00:56 14 00:56 15 00:56 16 00:56 17 00:56 18 00:56 19 00:56 20 00:56 21 00:56 22	those Hospital functions which really deserve daylight. And the same thing, the same principle we thought, applied to parking. The proposal that we saw had, in the current Phillips footprint, four levels of parking above grade. And we said we think that was the wrong priority, take that parking, put it below grade, and substitute above grade space for habited functions that need the daylight. Another thing that we commented on was the travel distances for parking. We suggested that 50 percent of the parking needs to be within 250 feet and 100 percent within 500 feet. The scheme that we looked at had most of the parking on the south end of the campus, and most of the hospital functions on the north end, which meant that patients, visitors, the elderly, the handicapped, have a much farther distance to travel. And the last thing that we suggested was vehicular separation. We said separate service from emergency. And this is a very important point,	00:58 2 00:58 3 00:58 5 00:58 6 00:58 7 00:58 9 00:58 10 00:58 12 00:58 12 00:58 14 00:58 15 00:58 16 00:58 17 00:58 18 00:59 19 00:59 20 00:59 21 00:59 22	couple of things I want to point out in these two options. Option one on the left says if you built a completely new replacement hospital at a new location, there are two problems, it seems like to me. One is that you have to do everything at once, there's no way that you can phase that, and, therefore, the cost of doing that in a single phase, we think, would be prohibitive and, therefore, we think that's probably one of the main reasons that the Hospital embarked upon option 4C, which is to stay in place and to take advantage of the existing facility that they have, replacing some of it, replacing some of it over time. So when you look at the two options then, you see that option one, everything has to be done in a new facility, including land, including doing all of that in a single step, whereas in option 4C, which is the renewal in place, some of the existing can be retained. In Phase I, which is actually proposed, a substantial amount of upgrading can be done, and

	53		55
00.50 4		04:00 4	
00:59 1	So that makes this a very attractive	01:02 1	structure, Bergen remains in place, a new North Wing,
00:59 2 00:59 3	option in terms of renewing the facility. And in the context of what we've been	01:02 2 01:02 3	a new connector into what we're calling the North
00:59 3	talking about in terms of the Master Plan principles,	01:02 3	Wing Atrium, and a renovated Cheel Building. And then in Phase II, this is the new
00:59 5	we recognize that what we've asked for add additional	01:02 5	North Building, the new West Building, and the new
00:59 6	costs to the project and could add additional	01:02 6	South Building, with an extension of the connector,
00:59 7	construction time to the project. And we'll talk	01:02 7	the North Wing connector.
00:59 8	about both of those in a little bit more later in	01:03 8	And then this is a bird's eye view of
00:59 9	this presentation.	01:03 9	it, looking from the southwest to the northeast.
00:59 10	And in dark green, we've shown some	01:03 10	This is Van Dien. This is Linwood. This would be
00:59 11	incremental costs, saying okay, we're going to spend	01:03 11	the new four story North Wing with the mechanical on
00:59 11	\$200 million to do this, and there will be an	01:03 11	top, a new connector connecting into Cheel and to
01:00 13	incremental cost if we implement some or all of those	01:03 13	Bergen. And then Phillips is currently here.
01:00 14	Master Plan proposals. For example, if we put more	01:03 14	Phillips would come down, and then in place of that
01:00 15	things below grade, we now know that, depending on	01:03 15	would be built a new three story parking structure
01:00 16	what the location is on the campus, we may have to	01:03 16	above grade, two levels below grade, matching up the
01:00 17	excavate, although there's very little rock in the	01:03 17	elevations of the existing parking structure, which
01:00 17	elevations that we talked about, so it's not a big	01:03 18	is the Linwood parking structure here, and then in
01:00 19	likelihood. We know that we have dewatering to deal	01:03 19	both cases parking on the roofs of the structure.
01:00 20	with. And when we had proposed building parking, for	01:03 20	This would be a one story addition to
01:00 21	example, at the north end of the campus close to the	01:03 21	the existing parking structure, the Linwood parking
01:00 21	property line, then that raises the issue of shoring	01:03 21	structure, with one level of parking which is
01:00 23	and excavation and tiebacks or some other method,	01:03 23	currently at grade and then one level of parking on
01:00 24	because we're now getting very close to the edge of	01:04 24	the roof.
01:00 25	the property and, for example, we have to introduce	01:04 25	And this is the South Building, and
01:00 1	54 tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen	01:04 1	56
01:00 1 01:00 2	54 tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen	_	56 this is the West Building.
	54	01:04 1	56
01:00 2	54 tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks	01:04 1 01:04 2	56 this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot
01:00 2 01:01 3	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus.	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien.
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4	56 this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are:	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5	56 this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review.	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9 01:04 10	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9 01:04 10 01:04 11	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking.	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13 01:01 14	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking. And then options 3A and 3B, we grouped	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13 01:04 14	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the Phillips location is identical to the previous
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13 01:01 14 01:01 15 01:01 16 01:01 17	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking. And then options 3A and 3B, we grouped them together because they're both five story proposals, and in turn pulled the buildings farther back from the edge of the property, and, in the case	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13 01:04 14 01:04 15 01:05 16	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the Phillips location is identical to the previous scheme. And then this is Phase II with the new buildings, the South Building, the West Building
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13 01:01 14 01:01 15 01:01 16 01:01 17 01:01 18	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking. And then options 3A and 3B, we grouped them together because they're both five story proposals, and in turn pulled the buildings farther back from the edge of the property, and, in the case of option 3B, put more parking underground.	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13 01:04 14 01:04 15 01:05 16 01:05 17 01:05 18	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the Phillips location is identical to the previous scheme. And then this is Phase II with the new buildings, the South Building, the West Building added in.
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13 01:01 14 01:01 15 01:01 16 01:01 17	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking. And then options 3A and 3B, we grouped them together because they're both five story proposals, and in turn pulled the buildings farther back from the edge of the property, and, in the case of option 3B, put more parking underground. So I'm going to take a few minutes and	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13 01:04 14 01:04 15 01:05 16	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the Phillips location is identical to the previous scheme. And then this is Phase II with the new buildings, the South Building, the West Building added in. Option 3A is a five story scheme. And
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13 01:01 14 01:01 15 01:01 16 01:01 17 01:01 18 01:02 19 01:02 20	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking. And then options 3A and 3B, we grouped them together because they're both five story proposals, and in turn pulled the buildings farther back from the edge of the property, and, in the case of option 3B, put more parking underground. So I'm going to take a few minutes and just go a little bit more into detail than Gail did,	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 9 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13 01:04 14 01:04 15 01:05 16 01:05 17 01:05 18 01:05 20	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the Phillips location is identical to the previous scheme. And then this is Phase II with the new buildings, the South Building, the West Building added in. Option 3A is a five story scheme. And as Gail pointed out, the major difference is the
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13 01:01 14 01:01 15 01:01 16 01:01 17 01:01 18 01:02 19 01:02 20 01:02 21	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking. And then options 3A and 3B, we grouped them together because they're both five story proposals, and in turn pulled the buildings farther back from the edge of the property, and, in the case of option 3B, put more parking underground. So I'm going to take a few minutes and just go a little bit more into detail than Gail did, but I want to do it quickly, because I know it's	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13 01:04 14 01:04 15 01:05 16 01:05 17 01:05 18 01:05 20 01:05 21	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the Phillips location is identical to the previous scheme. And then this is Phase II with the new buildings, the South Building, the West Building added in. Option 3A is a five story scheme. And as Gail pointed out, the major difference is the setback is 120 feet here. I believe in the
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13 01:01 14 01:01 15 01:01 16 01:01 17 01:01 18 01:02 19 01:02 20 01:02 21 01:02 22	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking. And then options 3A and 3B, we grouped them together because they're both five story proposals, and in turn pulled the buildings farther back from the edge of the property, and, in the case of option 3B, put more parking underground. So I'm going to take a few minutes and just go a little bit more into detail than Gail did, but I want to do it quickly, because I know it's getting late.	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13 01:04 14 01:04 15 01:05 16 01:05 17 01:05 18 01:05 20 01:05 21 01:05 22	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the Phillips location is identical to the previous scheme. And then this is Phase II with the new buildings, the South Building, the West Building added in. Option 3A is a five story scheme. And as Gail pointed out, the major difference is the setback is 120 feet here. I believe in the conversations with the architectural team, I believe
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 4 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13 01:01 14 01:01 15 01:01 16 01:01 17 01:01 18 01:02 19 01:02 20 01:02 21 01:02 23	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking. And then options 3A and 3B, we grouped them together because they're both five story proposals, and in turn pulled the buildings farther back from the edge of the property, and, in the case of option 3B, put more parking underground. So I'm going to take a few minutes and just go a little bit more into detail than Gail did, but I want to do it quickly, because I know it's getting late. This is the original four story	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13 01:04 14 01:04 15 01:05 16 01:05 17 01:05 18 01:05 20 01:05 21 01:05 22	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the Phillips location is identical to the previous scheme. And then this is Phase II with the new buildings, the South Building, the West Building added in. Option 3A is a five story scheme. And as Gail pointed out, the major difference is the setback is 120 feet here. I believe in the conversations with the architectural team, I believe the building does, on the lower levels, extend below
01:00 2 01:01 3 01:01 5 01:01 6 01:01 7 01:01 8 01:01 9 01:01 10 01:01 11 01:01 12 01:01 13 01:01 14 01:01 15 01:01 16 01:01 17 01:01 18 01:02 19 01:02 20 01:02 21 01:02 22	tiebacks into Van Dien or if we did it on the Steilen side, for example, we may have to introduce tiebacks into those houses along the east end of the campus. The next slide showed the four options that we looked at. And the four options are: Option one, which is the original Master Plan proposal, which was the proposal that we looked at back in the summer, the one that was submitted some months ago to the Planning Board for review. Option two is a revision to a four story scheme in which the main change to that was some modifications of the parking. And then options 3A and 3B, we grouped them together because they're both five story proposals, and in turn pulled the buildings farther back from the edge of the property, and, in the case of option 3B, put more parking underground. So I'm going to take a few minutes and just go a little bit more into detail than Gail did, but I want to do it quickly, because I know it's getting late.	01:04 1 01:04 2 01:04 3 01:04 4 01:04 5 01:04 6 01:04 7 01:04 8 01:04 10 01:04 11 01:04 12 01:04 13 01:04 14 01:04 15 01:05 16 01:05 17 01:05 18 01:05 20 01:05 21 01:05 22	this is the West Building. Both of these, I believe, have 47-foot setbacks from Van Dien. Then option two, which we call the revised four story scheme, is similar in terms of the North Building renovation, existing Bergen, parking here, new West Building, new South Building. I think actually it shows more when you look at the aerial views. So this is an identical North Building, still at the 47-foot setback, the connector here. And the main difference between this scheme and the previous scheme was the elimination of one level of parking along Linwood, and the parking structure for the Phillips location is identical to the previous scheme. And then this is Phase II with the new buildings, the South Building, the West Building added in. Option 3A is a five story scheme. And as Gail pointed out, the major difference is the setback is 120 feet here. I believe in the conversations with the architectural team, I believe

	57		59
01:05 1	H-room connection here, and then parking at the south	01:08 1	adapting some of the other principles, but in our
01:05 2	end.	01:08 2	view, we think it should go further, that more of the
01:05 3	Phase II has a new West Building set	01:08 3	principles should be adopted.
01:05 4	back farther, I believe it's 100-foot setback for	01:08 4	One of the things I should point out,
01:05 5	this building, and then a new South Building and a	01:08 5	Gail did it but I forgot to mention, is that in
01:05 6	slightly different configuration.	01:08 6	options 5A and 5B, there is a covered area for the
01:05 7	And then the aerial view for 3A is a	01:08 7	service dock in the back, where unloading and so
01:05 8	new five story building, and then shown in color	01:09 8	forth takes place under cover, the Dumpsters and so
01:06 9	would be the additional hospital function floor, the	01:09 9	forth are put under cover, and as she mentioned,
01:06 10	one story setback here, and the green roof with	01:09 10	there's an additional buffer zone along the back.
01:06 11	habited space, hospital space below. I think this	01:09 11	What we did next then was to do a
01:06 12	goes two levels below. Main drop-off here, Cheel	01:09 12	comparative analysis, and we have a summary sheet at
01:06 13	Building here, Bergen here, and then parking,	01:09 13	the end of this, we did an analysis of some of the
01:06 14	Phillips parking here, and additional parking here,	01:09 14	major features of the project and you'll see the same
01:06 15	and then a setback from Linwood.	01:09 15	sort of format. We did four things, we did area
01:06 16	And then Phase II shows the addition of	01:09 16	comparison, parking comparison, height comparison,
01:06 17	the two new buildings.	01:09 17	and setback comparisons, and unfortunately the
01:06 18	And of the four options that we looked	01:09 18	preliminary that we gave to the Board did not have
01:06 19	at, in our view this one makes the most progress in	01:09 19	these four slides in it, so this is an addition, it
01:06 20	terms of trying to achieve some of the functions that	01:09 20	was an Oscar announcement addition that we put in
01:06 21	we wanted to get in terms of the Master Plan. And,	01:09 21	today.
01:06 22	again, it's a similar configuration, same setbacks,	01:09 22	So this is the current, this is option
01:06 23	basically the North Building remains the same, the	01:09 23	one, option two, option 3A, option 3B, and then on
01:06 24	main changes are the parking structure to the south.	01:10 24	the right-hand side is what we had proposed under the
01:06 25	I'll go to the aerial overview.	01:10 25	Master Plan.
01:07 1	58	01:10 1	60
01:07 1 01:07 2	So this is the five story North Wing, mechanical on top, cooling tower and so forth back in	01:10 1 01:10 2	In this chart we're looking at the total area. Currently there's about 560,000 and
01:07 2	here, the one story addition on the Benjamin Franklin	01:10 2	change square feet existing on the Hospital. The
01:07 4	edge, and then the setbacks along Van Dien.	01:10 4	dark color indicates what is above grade, and the
01:07 5	The difference between this and the	01:10 5	blueish color indicates what is below grade.
01:07 6	previous scheme is one story higher of parking here	01:10 6	
01:07 7			Now, this does not include parking,
l _	and no parking structure here; the existing Linwood	01:10 7	Now, this does not include parking, this is just hospital function, would include ORs,
01:07 8	parking structure here; the existing Linwood parking structure, which would be two levels below		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
01:07 8 01:07 9		01:10 7	this is just hospital function, would include ORs,
	parking structure, which would be two levels below	01:10 7 01:10 8	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any
01:07 9	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that
01:07 9 01:07 10	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade.	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there.
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two,	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14 01:07 15	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B.	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B. In our view, and we'll see a little bit	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13 01:10 14	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see that's constant throughout, that that has been the
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14 01:07 15 01:07 16 01:07 17	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B. In our view, and we'll see a little bit more of this in detail, we clearly recognize that there was progress made in terms of movement from the scheme that we looked at in the spring of the year,	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13 01:10 14 01:10 15 01:10 16 01:11 17	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see that's constant throughout, that that has been the proposal, which is a little bit in excess of the million square feet that we had proposed as being an adequate area for the Hospital to be a 21st century
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14 01:07 15 01:07 16 01:07 17 01:08 18	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B. In our view, and we'll see a little bit more of this in detail, we clearly recognize that there was progress made in terms of movement from the scheme that we looked at in the spring of the year, in the summer of this year, and we would favor option	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13 01:10 14 01:10 15 01:11 17 01:11 18	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see that's constant throughout, that that has been the proposal, which is a little bit in excess of the million square feet that we had proposed as being an adequate area for the Hospital to be a 21st century hospital.
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14 01:07 15 01:07 16 01:07 17 01:08 18 01:08 19	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B. In our view, and we'll see a little bit more of this in detail, we clearly recognize that there was progress made in terms of movement from the scheme that we looked at in the spring of the year, in the summer of this year, and we would favor option 3B as the one that we think makes the most progress	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13 01:10 14 01:10 15 01:11 17 01:11 18 01:11 19	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see that's constant throughout, that that has been the proposal, which is a little bit in excess of the million square feet that we had proposed as being an adequate area for the Hospital to be a 21st century hospital. And then what's interesting, though, is
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14 01:07 15 01:07 16 01:07 17 01:08 18 01:08 19 01:08 20	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B. In our view, and we'll see a little bit more of this in detail, we clearly recognize that there was progress made in terms of movement from the scheme that we looked at in the spring of the year, in the summer of this year, and we would favor option 3B as the one that we think makes the most progress in terms of achieving some of the objectives that we	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13 01:10 14 01:10 15 01:11 17 01:11 18 01:11 19 01:11 20	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see that's constant throughout, that that has been the proposal, which is a little bit in excess of the million square feet that we had proposed as being an adequate area for the Hospital to be a 21st century hospital. And then what's interesting, though, is the variation then in terms of what's underground.
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14 01:07 15 01:07 16 01:07 17 01:08 18 01:08 19 01:08 20 01:08 21	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B. In our view, and we'll see a little bit more of this in detail, we clearly recognize that there was progress made in terms of movement from the scheme that we looked at in the spring of the year, in the summer of this year, and we would favor option 3B as the one that we think makes the most progress in terms of achieving some of the objectives that we had enunciated in the Master Plan proposal.	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13 01:10 14 01:10 15 01:11 17 01:11 18 01:11 19 01:11 20 01:11 21	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see that's constant throughout, that that has been the proposal, which is a little bit in excess of the million square feet that we had proposed as being an adequate area for the Hospital to be a 21st century hospital. And then what's interesting, though, is the variation then in terms of what's underground. This jumps to about 380,000 square feet, and it's
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14 01:07 15 01:07 16 01:07 17 01:08 18 01:08 19 01:08 20 01:08 21 01:08 22	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B. In our view, and we'll see a little bit more of this in detail, we clearly recognize that there was progress made in terms of movement from the scheme that we looked at in the spring of the year, in the summer of this year, and we would favor option 3B as the one that we think makes the most progress in terms of achieving some of the objectives that we had enunciated in the Master Plan proposal. However, it's our view that this still	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13 01:10 15 01:10 16 01:11 17 01:11 18 01:11 19 01:11 20 01:11 21	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see that's constant throughout, that that has been the proposal, which is a little bit in excess of the million square feet that we had proposed as being an adequate area for the Hospital to be a 21st century hospital. And then what's interesting, though, is the variation then in terms of what's underground. This jumps to about 380,000 square feet, and it's more or less constant for the option one, option two,
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14 01:07 15 01:07 16 01:07 17 01:08 18 01:08 19 01:08 20 01:08 21 01:08 22 01:08 23	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B. In our view, and we'll see a little bit more of this in detail, we clearly recognize that there was progress made in terms of movement from the scheme that we looked at in the spring of the year, in the summer of this year, and we would favor option 3B as the one that we think makes the most progress in terms of achieving some of the objectives that we had enunciated in the Master Plan proposal. However, it's our view that this still does not go far enough. We were disappointed with	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13 01:10 14 01:10 15 01:10 16 01:11 17 01:11 18 01:11 19 01:11 20 01:11 21 01:11 22 01:11 23	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see that's constant throughout, that that has been the proposal, which is a little bit in excess of the million square feet that we had proposed as being an adequate area for the Hospital to be a 21st century hospital. And then what's interesting, though, is the variation then in terms of what's underground. This jumps to about 380,000 square feet, and it's more or less constant for the option one, option two, option 3A and option 3B.
01:07 9 01:07 10 01:07 11 01:07 12 01:07 13 01:07 14 01:07 15 01:07 16 01:07 17 01:08 18 01:08 19 01:08 20 01:08 21 01:08 22	parking structure, which would be two levels below grade, which it currently is, and then one level of parking at grade. So that's a quick overview of the four options that we looked at: Option one, option two, options 3A and 3B. In our view, and we'll see a little bit more of this in detail, we clearly recognize that there was progress made in terms of movement from the scheme that we looked at in the spring of the year, in the summer of this year, and we would favor option 3B as the one that we think makes the most progress in terms of achieving some of the objectives that we had enunciated in the Master Plan proposal. However, it's our view that this still	01:10 7 01:10 8 01:10 9 01:10 10 01:10 11 01:10 12 01:10 13 01:10 15 01:10 16 01:11 17 01:11 18 01:11 19 01:11 20 01:11 21	this is just hospital function, would include ORs, patient rooms, mechanical equipment, the kitchen, any enclosed area within the current four buildings that are there. And then option one, which was the original four story proposal, envisions at the end of Phase II 1.170 million square feet. And you'll see that's constant throughout, that that has been the proposal, which is a little bit in excess of the million square feet that we had proposed as being an adequate area for the Hospital to be a 21st century hospital. And then what's interesting, though, is the variation then in terms of what's underground. This jumps to about 380,000 square feet, and it's more or less constant for the option one, option two,

	61		63
01:11 1	functions. And that's mainly due to the fact that we	01:14 1	similar, with this amount of parking below grade. So
01:11 2	had suggested moving mechanical from above grade to	01:15 2	there was an increase. And I think this is one of
01:11 3	below grade, and mechanical is about 100,000 or	01:15 3	the positive things that we noted in our work
01:11 4	125,000 square feet, so it's a substantial amount of	01:15 4	sessions with the architects, that there was a
01:11 5	square footage. And so, for example, if we were to	01:15 5	movement of more parking below grade. This is the
01:11 6	indicate where mechanical is, in most of these	01:15 6	parking at grade. And then this is parking in
01:12 7	schemes there is a fair amount somewhere up above	01:15 7	structured parking.
01:12 8	grade, typically on top of the building and then	01:15 8	What we had proposed was about 2,000
01:12 9	there is some of this down below. For example, in	01:15 9	cars, 1,700 of those below grade and about 300 of
01:12 10	every scheme there was a boiler plant, there were	01:15 10	those above grade and parking structure. We think
01:12 11	electrical switch gear, there were pumps, you know, a	01:15 11	mainly along the Steilen face of the property is a
01:12 12	fairly substantial, maybe 30 percent, 40 percent of	01:15 12	very good place for parking of that sort to be above
01:12 13	the total space was below grade.	01:15 13	grade.
01:12 14	So the takeaway from this is two	01:15 14	Let me go back to say the takeaway.
01:12 15	points. One is that we believe that what's proposed	01:15 15	The takeaway then is we roughly agree on the amount
01:12 16	in Phase I and II is in excess of what we think is	01:15 16	of parking that's needed. The major difference is
01:12 17	adequate for complete development of the site.	01:15 17	that we had recommended much more parking going below
01:12 18	And two is: We'd like to see more of	01:15 18	grade and then the remaining part being in structured
01:12 19	the hospital space be below grade and done primarily	01:15 19	parking above grade, but no parking on the roof. One
01:12 20	through moving mechanical space below grade.	01:16 20	of the things that we had suggested is no parking on
01:12 21	The second one and unfortunately	01:16 21	the roof, the roof needs to be covered, and the roof
01:12 22	these colors are a little faded here but if we had	01:16 22	would be turned into a green roof.
01:13 23	good color rendition, we looked at four different	01:16 23	The third thing that we looked at
01:13 24	types of parking: There's parking below grade, which	01:16 24	MS. PRICE: Ray, before you go on.
01:13 25	is this color. Parking at grade, which is this	01:16 25	MR. SKORUPA: Yes.
	22		
	62		64
01:13 1	color. And then parking above grade that is in a	01:16 1	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the
01:13 2	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one.	01:16 2	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II
01:13 2 01:13 3	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the	01:16 2 01:16 3	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct?
01:13 2 01:13 3 01:13 4	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently,	01:16 2	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of
01:13 2 01:13 3 01:13 4 01:13 5	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below	01:16 2 01:16 3 01:16 4 01:16 5	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II.
01:13 2 01:13 3 01:13 4 01:13 5 01:13 6	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost	01:16 2 01:16 3 01:16 4 01:16 5 01:16 6	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay.
01:13 2 01:13 3 01:13 4 01:13 5 01:13 6 01:13 7	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700.	01:16 2 01:16 3 01:16 4 01:16 5 01:16 6 01:16 7	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total
01:13 2 01:13 3 01:13 4 01:13 5 01:13 6 01:13 7 01:13 8	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one	01:16 2 01:16 3 01:16 4 01:16 5 01:16 6 01:16 7 01:16 8	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan.
01:13 2 01:13 3 01:13 4 01:13 5 01:13 6 01:13 7 01:13 8 01:13 9	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official	01:16 2 01:16 3 01:16 4 01:16 5 01:16 6 01:16 7 01:16 8 01:16 9	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to
01:13 2 01:13 3 01:13 4 01:13 5 01:13 6 01:13 7 01:13 8 01:13 9 01:13 10	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking	01:16 2 01:16 3 01:16 4 01:16 5 01:16 6 01:16 7 01:16 8 01:16 9 01:16 10	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of	01:16 2 01:16 3 01:16 4 01:16 5 01:16 6 01:16 7 01:16 8 01:16 9 01:16 10 01:16 11	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers,
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure.	01:16 2 01:16 3 01:16 4 01:16 5 01:16 6 01:16 7 01:16 8 01:16 9 01:16 10 01:16 11	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers.
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right.
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal was moving parking off-site, 111 cars would be moved	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project that's going to be done immediately, but in a Master
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal was moving parking off-site, 111 cars would be moved permanently off-site, not to be housed on the campus.	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project that's going to be done immediately, but in a Master Plan scenario one has to think of the end product.
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal was moving parking off-site, 111 cars would be moved permanently off-site, not to be housed on the campus. And then about the same number of parking structure,	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project that's going to be done immediately, but in a Master Plan scenario one has to think of the end product. So that's why we looked at everything from the point
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal was moving parking off-site, 111 cars would be moved permanently off-site, not to be housed on the campus. And then about the same number of parking structure, because these are parking that's below grade, and	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project that's going to be done immediately, but in a Master Plan scenario one has to think of the end product. So that's why we looked at everything from the point of view of at the end of Phase II.
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal was moving parking off-site, 111 cars would be moved permanently off-site, not to be housed on the campus. And then about the same number of parking structure, because these are parking that's below grade, and then parking that's structured, and then parking that	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project that's going to be done immediately, but in a Master Plan scenario one has to think of the end product. So that's why we looked at everything from the point of view of at the end of Phase II. The third chart that we looked at is of
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal was moving parking off-site, 111 cars would be moved permanently off-site, not to be housed on the campus. And then about the same number of parking structure, because these are parking that's below grade, and then parking that's structured, and then parking that is I'm sorry, parking that's on grade and then	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project that's going to be done immediately, but in a Master Plan scenario one has to think of the end product. So that's why we looked at everything from the point of view of at the end of Phase II. The third chart that we looked at is of building height. And, again, it's the current, 1, 2,
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal was moving parking off-site, 111 cars would be moved permanently off-site, not to be housed on the campus. And then about the same number of parking structure, because these are parking that's below grade, and then parking that's structured, and then parking that is I'm sorry, parking that's on grade and then parking in structure. So we have about 600, 500,	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project that's going to be done immediately, but in a Master Plan scenario one has to think of the end product. So that's why we looked at everything from the point of view of at the end of Phase II. The third chart that we looked at is of building height. And, again, it's the current, 1, 2, 3A, 3B, Master Plan. Blue indicates habited
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal was moving parking off-site, 111 cars would be moved permanently off-site, not to be housed on the campus. And then about the same number of parking structure, because these are parking that's below grade, and then parking that's structured, and then parking that is I'm sorry, parking that's on grade and then parking in structure. So we have about 600, 500, 600, to give us a total of a little less than 2,000	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project that's going to be done immediately, but in a Master Plan scenario one has to think of the end product. So that's why we looked at everything from the point of view of at the end of Phase II. The third chart that we looked at is of building height. And, again, it's the current, 1, 2, 3A, 3B, Master Plan. Blue indicates habited functions, and then the darker color indicates
01:13	color. And then parking above grade that is in a structure or on a rooftop, that would be the top one. And the numbers that are indicated here are the numbers in each of the five schemes. Currently, there is I can't read the numbers 661 below grade, and a little over 1,000 above grade, almost 1,100, for a total of about 1,700. The fourth one, which is only one scheme, is off-site. There is currently no official off-site parking and there's no structured parking above grade, all the parking is on grade or on top of a roof of a parking structure. In then option one, the number goes up to a little less than 2,000 cars in total, with 111 and this was a major change in the proposal was moving parking off-site, 111 cars would be moved permanently off-site, not to be housed on the campus. And then about the same number of parking structure, because these are parking that's below grade, and then parking that's structured, and then parking that is I'm sorry, parking that's on grade and then parking in structure. So we have about 600, 500,	01:16	MS. PRICE: Just for purposes of the record, those numbers are at the end of Phase II numbers, correct? MR. SKORUPA: Yes, that's the end of Phase II. Everything I'm showing you is Phase II. MS. PRICE: Okay. MR. SKORUPA: Right, it's the total Master Plan. MS. PRICE: The Board needs to understand that and the public needs to understand that too, that these numbers are not Phase I numbers, these are at the end of the entire plan, Phase II numbers. MR. SKORUPA: Right. Phase I is the part of the project that's going to be done immediately, but in a Master Plan scenario one has to think of the end product. So that's why we looked at everything from the point of view of at the end of Phase II. The third chart that we looked at is of building height. And, again, it's the current, 1, 2, 3A, 3B, Master Plan. Blue indicates habited

	65		67
01:17 1	currently the building height is about 65 feet.	01:20 1	setback on Steilen Avenue, and fairly close at one
01:17 2	What's proposed under option one would be four	01:20 2	corner on Van Dien.
01:17 3	stories, about 56 feet, and then a slightly taller	01:20 3	And on the option 3B, the setback is
01:17 4	mechanical space of 24 feet, giving us a total of	01:20 4	better along Linwood because we eliminated the
01:17 5	80 feet.	01:20 5	parking structure that was proposed there. If you
01:17 6	Option two was identical.	01:20 6	recall, this scheme had a one story parking structure
01:17 7	And then option 3A and 3B, because we	01:20 7	and, therefore, it was very close to the property,
01:17 8	had suggested and the architects liked the idea of	01:20 8	and this one had no parking except for the new
01:17 9	putting an additional level, so this is five levels	01:21 9	Phillips one, so it's much farther back. We had
01:17 10	at 14 feet, and a similar height in terms of the	01:21 10	recommended, quite simply, 130 along three faces, and
01:18 11	mechanical penthouse on the top, and these are a	01:21 11	then along Benjamin Franklin a 40-foot setback.
01:18 12	total of 94 feet.	01:21 12	So having looked at those major
01:18 13	What we had recommended was no	01:21 13	functions then, this chart put those issues together,
01:18 14	significant mechanical space above grade, all of that	01:21 14	and about 32 issues, and I'm not going to go through
01:18 15	would be below grade, and then six stories of	01:21 15	each of these, but I want to give you a sense of what
01:18 16	hospital space, giving us a total height of 84 feet.	01:21 16	this means.
01:18 17	And this is a comparison of the	01:21 17	This is the current.
01:18 18	setbacks, currently, 1, 2, 3, 3B, and Master Plan,	01:21 18	This is option one.
01:18 19	and there are four faces to the site; the first one	01:21 19	Option two.
01:18 20	is Van Dien, second one is Linwood, third one is	01:21 20	Option three.
01:18 21	Steilen, fourth one is Ben Franklin.	01:21 21	And Master Plan.
01:18 22	So currently the setback from Van Dien	01:21 22	And these are 33 32 criteria that we
01:18 23	is 122 feet. And, again, along Van Dien it's a	01:21 23	used in terms of looking at the scheme, and we choose
01:18 24	little difficult, because we got several buildings	01:21 24	a qualitative way of looking at this rather than a
01:18 25	and we choose the 122 feet, some of them are actually	01:21 25	quantitative. And, unfortunately, the color
	66		68
01:19 1	greater setback.	01:21 1	68 rendition on the screen is not so good.
01:19 1 01:19 2		01:21 1 01:21 2	
	greater setback.		rendition on the screen is not so good.
01:19 2	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to	01:21 2	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good,
01:19 2 01:19 3	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to	01:21 2 01:21 3	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good.
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet.	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet.	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red.
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin,	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less.
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade.
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14 01:19 15	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood.	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14 01:19 15 01:19 16	greater setback. And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood. And then the same for option two.	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15 01:22 16	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't been met, that could be met.
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14 01:19 15 01:19 16 01:19 17	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood. And then the same for option two. And then some real progress here, which	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15 01:22 16 01:22 17	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't been met, that could be met. Let me talk in general now about the
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14 01:19 15 01:19 16 01:19 17 01:19 18	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood. And then some real progress here, which option three along Van Dien goes to 80 feet, and this	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15 01:22 16 01:22 17 01:22 18	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't been met, that could be met. Let me talk in general now about the bottom four, because these are the things that Larry
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14 01:19 15 01:19 16 01:19 17 01:19 18 01:20 19	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood. And then the same for option two. And then some real progress here, which option three along Van Dien goes to 80 feet, and this came from the parking structure, not from the	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15 01:22 16 01:22 17 01:22 18 01:22 19	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't been met, that could be met. Let me talk in general now about the bottom four, because these are the things that Larry touched upon.
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 15 01:19 15 01:19 16 01:19 17 01:19 18 01:20 19	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood. And then the same for option two. And then some real progress here, which option three along Van Dien goes to 80 feet, and this came from the parking structure, not from the building that was proposed. As you recall, the	01:21 2 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15 01:22 16 01:22 17 01:22 18 01:22 19 01:22 20	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't been met, that could be met. Let me talk in general now about the bottom four, because these are the things that Larry touched upon. We've got issues here having to do with
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14 01:19 15 01:19 16 01:19 17 01:19 18 01:20 19 01:20 20 01:20 21	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood. And then some real progress here, which option three along Van Dien goes to 80 feet, and this came from the parking structure, not from the building that was proposed. As you recall, the building, the North Wing was proposed at 120, but as	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15 01:22 16 01:22 17 01:22 18 01:22 19 01:22 20 01:22 21	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't been met, that could be met. Let me talk in general now about the bottom four, because these are the things that Larry touched upon. We've got issues here having to do with cost of construction, length of construction. The
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14 01:19 15 01:19 16 01:19 17 01:19 18 01:20 19 01:20 20 01:20 21	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood. And then the same for option two. And then some real progress here, which option three along Van Dien goes to 80 feet, and this came from the parking structure, not from the building that was proposed. As you recall, the building, the North Wing was proposed at 120, but as we measured it from the plan, the distance from Van	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15 01:22 16 01:22 17 01:22 18 01:22 19 01:22 20 01:22 21	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't been met, that could be met. Let me talk in general now about the bottom four, because these are the things that Larry touched upon. We've got issues here having to do with cost of construction, length of construction. The bottom four, the top one is lower construction costs,
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14 01:19 15 01:19 16 01:19 17 01:19 18 01:20 20 01:20 21 01:20 22	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood. And then the same for option two. And then some real progress here, which option three along Van Dien goes to 80 feet, and this came from the parking structure, not from the building that was proposed. As you recall, the building, the North Wing was proposed at 120, but as we measured it from the plan, the distance from Van Dien to the face of the three story parking structure	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15 01:22 16 01:22 17 01:22 18 01:22 19 01:22 21 01:23 21 01:23 23	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't been met, that could be met. Let me talk in general now about the bottom four, because these are the things that Larry touched upon. We've got issues here having to do with cost of construction, length of construction. The bottom four, the top one is lower construction costs, which is this one, and you'll see that these score
01:19 2 01:19 3 01:19 4 01:19 5 01:19 6 01:19 7 01:19 8 01:19 9 01:19 10 01:19 11 01:19 12 01:19 13 01:19 14 01:19 15 01:19 16 01:19 17 01:19 18 01:20 19 01:20 20 01:20 21	And then along Linwood, the setback to the building, because there is no it would be to the south face of Phillips, so it's 222 or 223 feet. And then the setback along Steilen is a little over 100 feet. And the setback at Ben Franklin, because there's really the parking structure and so forth in between, is 200 feet. And then this is what was proposed under option one, a setback, at least we're compliant with the current Master Plan. The Master Plan has 47 feet general I'm sorry, 48 feet, so each of these is roughly in the 40 or slightly less, I think this one was 40 feet along Linwood. And then the same for option two. And then some real progress here, which option three along Van Dien goes to 80 feet, and this came from the parking structure, not from the building that was proposed. As you recall, the building, the North Wing was proposed at 120, but as we measured it from the plan, the distance from Van	01:21 2 01:21 3 01:22 4 01:22 5 01:22 6 01:22 7 01:22 8 01:22 9 01:22 10 01:22 11 01:22 12 01:22 13 01:22 14 01:22 15 01:22 16 01:22 17 01:22 18 01:22 19 01:22 20 01:22 21	rendition on the screen is not so good. We choose three colors, green is good, yellow is okay, and red is not good. So you can see that when we looked at the current, the original proposal, option one, there was a fair amount of red. Option two, just a little bit less. But then when we get to options 3A and 3B, there are some green areas showing movement mainly in terms of setback, mainly in terms of more parking going below grade. Then the last column is the Master Plan, and in our view, we still think that there are some valid issues that we've enunciated in the Master Plan recommendations that could be met; that haven't been met, that could be met. Let me talk in general now about the bottom four, because these are the things that Larry touched upon. We've got issues here having to do with cost of construction, length of construction. The bottom four, the top one is lower construction costs,

	69		71
01:23 1	we're proposing certain things that we think offer	01:26 1	the project that are a benefit to I think most of the
01:23 2	long-term benefits for the community and in some	01:26 2	Hospital and the community at-large.
01:23 3	cases long-term benefits for the Hospital, but they	01:26 3	So that's the end of my presentation to
01:23 4	come at some costs.	01:26 4	you this evening. I certainly would be glad to
01:23 5	And so the four issues that we see	01:26 5	answer questions.
01:23 6	would be: Construction cost, length of construction,	01:26 6	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Thank you, Ray.
01:23 7	the amount of excavation, and the amount of	01:26 7	MAYOR PFUND: I have one.
01:23 8	underground water that we have to take care of either	01:26 8	Did your proposal change at all after
01:23 9	during the construction process or permanently	01:26 9	you got the geotechnical report?
01:23 10	because we're going deeper.	01:26 10	MR. SKORUPA: No, it has not. I think
01:24 11	So the takeaway from this is, we're	01:26 11	I have a better there are two things that came out
01:24 12	dealing with a very complex situation, which there	01:27 12	in terms of looking at the geotechnical. It had to
01:24 13	are a number of factors. We're dealing with	01:27 13	do with having a much better sense of what the actual
01:24 14	short-term issues versus long-term issues. We're	01:27 14	impacts are so that one may be able to, and I don't
01:24 15	dealing with cost issues, mainly borne by the	01:27 15	think we've done this yet, one may be able to
01:24 16	Hospital in terms of, for example, we know that if we	01:27 16	determine what are the costs of doing some of these
01:24 17	park on-grade, that's relatively inexpensive. If we	01:27 17	things.
01:24 18	put it in a structure, that gets much more expensive.	01:27 18	So my objectives have not changed, but
01:24 19	If we put the structure below grade, it gets more	01:27 19	I think I have a better understanding of some of the
01:24 20	expensive. And if we go deeper, if we have two	01:27 20	impediments for reaching maybe 100 percent of those,
01:24 21	levels of parking versus three levels of parking,	01:27 21	maybe it's not getting to 100 percent but maybe it's
01:24 22	those certainly cost more because of the conditions	01:27 22	85 percent.
01:24 23	that Larry has touched upon. So that would be one	01:27 23	MAYOR PFUND: That's what I'm
01:24 24	thing. We're dealing with a very complex situation.	01:27 24	wondering, if your objective may decrease some,
01:24 25	The second thing, the takeaway from	01:27 25	because although the ability is technically there,
	70		72
0404 4			
01:24 1	this is that our work session did make progress. We	01:27 1	I've gotten the sense that it is not necessarily an
01:25 2	did see movement in terms of some of the principles	01:27 2	easy project.
01:25 2 01:25 3	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the	01:27 2 01:27 3	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you.
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9 01:25 10	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report.
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9 01:25 10 01:25 11	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there.	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10 01:28 11	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you.
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9 01:25 10 01:25 11	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10 01:28 11 01:28 12	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10 01:28 11 01:28 12 01:28 13	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment.
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12 01:25 13	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those	01:27	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12 01:25 13 01:25 14 01:25 15	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those things have a cost penalty, a construction duration	01:27	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past four months, we've had several meetings with The
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 4 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12 01:25 13	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those	01:27	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12 01:25 13 01:25 14 01:25 15 01:25 16	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those things have a cost penalty, a construction duration penalty, possibly a phasing penalty, are those things	01:27	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past four months, we've had several meetings with The Valley Hospital and its team, and I think
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12 01:25 13 01:25 14 01:25 15 01:25 16 01:25 17	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those things have a cost penalty, a construction duration penalty, possibly a phasing penalty, are those things worth it to the community at-large in the long-term?	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10 01:28 11 01:28 12 01:28 13 01:28 14 01:28 15 01:28 16 01:28 17	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past four months, we've had several meetings with The Valley Hospital and its team, and I think collectively we've gotten a lot of input back from
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12 01:25 13 01:25 14 01:25 15 01:25 16 01:26 18	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those things have a cost penalty, a construction duration penalty, possibly a phasing penalty, are those things worth it to the community at-large in the long-term? It's a question of what are the	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10 01:28 11 01:28 12 01:28 13 01:28 14 01:28 15 01:28 16 01:28 17 01:28 17	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past four months, we've had several meetings with The Valley Hospital and its team, and I think collectively we've gotten a lot of input back from them in terms of the things that they believe they
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12 01:25 13 01:25 14 01:25 15 01:25 16 01:25 17 01:26 18 01:26 19	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those things have a cost penalty, a construction duration penalty, possibly a phasing penalty, are those things worth it to the community at-large in the long-term? It's a question of what are the short-term penalties	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10 01:28 11 01:28 12 01:28 13 01:28 14 01:28 15 01:28 16 01:28 17 01:28 18 01:28 19	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past four months, we've had several meetings with The Valley Hospital and its team, and I think collectively we've gotten a lot of input back from them in terms of the things that they believe they can make accommodation on and the things that they
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9 01:25 10 01:25 12 01:25 13 01:25 14 01:25 15 01:25 16 01:25 17 01:26 18 01:26 19 01:26 20	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those things have a cost penalty, a construction duration penalty, possibly a phasing penalty, are those things worth it to the community at-large in the long-term? It's a question of what are the short-term penalties versus the long-term benefits. And that's a	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10 01:28 11 01:28 12 01:28 13 01:28 14 01:28 15 01:28 16 01:28 17 01:28 18 01:28 19 01:28 20	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past four months, we've had several meetings with The Valley Hospital and its team, and I think collectively we've gotten a lot of input back from them in terms of the things that they believe they can make accommodation on and the things that they think are going to be difficult to do. What we
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12 01:25 13 01:25 14 01:25 15 01:25 16 01:26 18 01:26 19 01:26 20 01:26 21	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those things have a cost penalty, a construction duration penalty, possibly a phasing penalty, are those things worth it to the community at-large in the long-term? It's a question of what are the short-term penalties versus the long-term benefits. And that's a continuum.	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10 01:28 11 01:28 12 01:28 13 01:28 14 01:28 15 01:28 16 01:28 17 01:28 18 01:28 19 01:28 20 01:28 21	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past four months, we've had several meetings with The Valley Hospital and its team, and I think collectively we've gotten a lot of input back from them in terms of the things that they believe they can make accommodation on and the things that they think are going to be difficult to do. What we haven't heard, and which I think is an important part
01:25 2 01:25 3 01:25 5 01:25 6 01:25 7 01:25 8 01:25 9 01:25 10 01:25 11 01:25 12 01:25 13 01:25 14 01:25 15 01:25 16 01:25 17 01:26 18 01:26 20 01:26 21 01:26 21 01:26 22	did see movement in terms of some of the principles being taken onboard. If you recall, at the presentation I said the ideas that I presented were just concepts and that for this to work, the architectural team, Valley Hospital, has to take these on. And I think that's what has been attempted to do over the last four months is to attempt to get the Hospital and its professional team to take some of those things on, and there has been progress there. The question that we have is if we put more parking underground, if we put mechanical underground, if we cover certain things, and those things have a cost penalty, a construction duration penalty, possibly a phasing penalty, are those things worth it to the community at-large in the long-term? It's a question of what are the short-term penalties versus the long-term benefits. And that's a continuum. You know, maybe we started here, maybe	01:27 2 01:27 3 01:28 4 01:28 5 01:28 6 01:28 7 01:28 8 01:28 9 01:28 10 01:28 11 01:28 12 01:28 13 01:28 14 01:28 15 01:28 16 01:28 17 01:28 18 01:28 19 01:28 20 01:28 21	easy project. MR. SKORUPA: I'm sorry, I didn't hear you. MAYOR PFUND: It's not an easy project to go farther underground as you're proposing, and there are significant obstacles to doing so. So I wonder if the next time we meet, if you might be at 85 percent or where you will be, considering the geotechnical report. Okay. That's my question. Thank you. MR. SKORUPA: Well, let me just add sort of a broad comment. You know, we've worked over the past four months, we've had several meetings with The Valley Hospital and its team, and I think collectively we've gotten a lot of input back from them in terms of the things that they believe they can make accommodation on and the things that they think are going to be difficult to do. What we haven't heard, and which I think is an important part of this equation, for example, much of what we've

	72		76
01:00 4	73	04:04	75
01:29 1	the Hospital had to do with the additional cost or	01:31 1	this time, but solicit the comments of The
01:29 2	the impact on construction or phasing issues, things	01:31 2	Valley Hospital and the public concerning one
01:29 3	of that sort, and we got a clear sense, I think, of	01:32 3	or more of the current schemes, before
01:29 4	where they stand in terms of their response to these	01:32 4	determining a course of action."
01:29 5	things.	01:32 5	I don't know if it's a question for
01:29 6	What we haven't heard, though, is what	01:32 6	you, Gail, but when are we going to get to that
01:29 7	the community thinks, for example, of the trade-off	01:32 7	stage? When are they going to have an opportunity
01:29 8	between going deeper, having less mass above grade,	01:32 8	the let us hear what they have to say?
01:29 9	but having to endure a construction project, for	01:32 9	MS. PRICE: Okay.
01:29 10	example, that may be longer or there may be more	01:32 10	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: I'll answer that.
01:29 11	trucks on the street. I have no sense of whether or	01:32 11	Well, the short answer is as soon as
01:29 12	not that's a trade-off that the community, for	01:32 12	possible. But in some of our prior conversations, we
01:29 13	example, would be willing to tolerate.	01:32 13	have all expressed a desire to do in fact the
01:29 14	I mean, it could very well be the	01:32 14	opposite of what Ray is suggesting, and that is, come
01:29 15	community says no, we favor construction projects	01:32 15	away from this process with Ray and Larry with a firm
01:29 16	which are shorter, and which is not what I had	01:32 16	scheme to react to rather than options.
01:30 17	assumed in my own sort of trying to figure out what	01:32 17	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I don't know how
01:30 18	would be the reaction of the community to certain	01:32 18	you can do that, given what I referred to the can of
01:30 19	things that we had proposed.	01:32 19	worms which has just been opened tonight. We have to
01:30 20	MAYOR PFUND: Well, we'll hear their	01:32 20	hear from both the Hospital authorities and neighbors
01:30 21	reaction and we'll guide, as members of this board,	01:33 21	and the Board of Education on the pros and cons of
01:30 22	as to what we think the reaction is, coupled with	01:33 22	all of these realities, were we to take the project
01:30 23	what we hear obviously. But I do have some concerns	01:33 23	in that direction. So I don't know how we could
01:30 24	about blasting and shoring on other people's	01:33 24	possibly do that without input from varying members
01:30 25	property.	01:33 25	of the public.
	74		76
01:30 1	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put	01:33 1	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other
01:30 2	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context.	01:33 2	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that?
01:30 2 01:30 3	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about	01:33 2 01:33 3	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in?
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the	01:33 2 01:33 3 01:33 4	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead.
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4 01:30 5	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you	01:33 2 01:33 3 01:33 4 01:33 5	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4 01:30 5 01:30 6	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for	01:33 2 01:33 3 01:33 4 01:33 5 01:33 6	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4 01:30 5 01:30 6 01:30 7	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property,	01:33 2 01:33 3 01:33 4 01:33 5 01:33 6 01:33 7	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4 01:30 5 01:30 6 01:30 7 01:30 8	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more	01:33 2 01:33 3 01:33 4 01:33 5 01:33 6 01:33 7 01:33 8	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4 01:30 5 01:30 6 01:30 7 01:30 8 01:30 9	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all	01:33 2 01:33 3 01:33 4 01:33 5 01:33 6 01:33 7 01:33 8 01:33 9	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4 01:30 5 01:30 6 01:30 7 01:30 8 01:30 9 01:30 10	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4 01:30 5 01:30 6 01:30 7 01:30 8 01:30 9 01:30 10 01:31 11	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose.	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4 01:30 5 01:30 6 01:30 7 01:30 8 01:30 9 01:30 10 01:31 11 01:31 12	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that.	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes.	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay.	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Gail, can I read	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can either spread that footprint out again or you can go
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 4 01:30 5 01:30 6 01:30 8 01:30 9 01:30 10 01:31 11 01:31 12 01:31 13 01:31 14 01:31 15 01:31 16 01:31 17	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Gail, can I read from the draft report that we got? Am I allowed to	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can either spread that footprint out again or you can go a little bit higher.
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Gail, can I read from the draft report that we got? Am I allowed to do that?	01:33 2 01:33 3 01:33 5 01:33 6 01:33 7 01:33 8 01:33 10 01:33 11 01:33 12 01:33 13 01:33 14 01:33 15 01:34 16 01:34 17 01:34 18	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can either spread that footprint out again or you can go a little bit higher. Can you come back to us with some sort
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Gail, can I read from the draft report that we got? Am I allowed to do that? MS. PRICE: Sure.	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can either spread that footprint out again or you can go a little bit higher. Can you come back to us with some sort of scenario that looks at both of those things?
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Gail, can I read from the draft report that we got? Am I allowed to do that? MS. PRICE: Sure. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Okay.	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can either spread that footprint out again or you can go a little bit higher. Can you come back to us with some sort of scenario that looks at both of those things? I think when you came to us with your
01:30 2 01:30 3 01:30 5 01:30 6 01:30 8 01:30 9 01:30 10 01:31 11 01:31 12 01:31 13 01:31 15 01:31 16 01:31 17 01:31 18 01:31 19 01:31 20 01:31 21	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Gail, can I read from the draft report that we got? Am I allowed to do that? MS. PRICE: Sure. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Okay. The draft report, which we all got this	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can either spread that footprint out again or you can go a little bit higher. Can you come back to us with some sort of scenario that looks at both of those things? I think when you came to us with your models, it brought the whole process to a point. So
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Gail, can I read from the draft report that we got? Am I allowed to do that? MS. PRICE: Sure. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Okay. The draft report, which we all got this weekend, playing into what you just said and what	01:33 2 01:33 3 01:33 5 01:33 6 01:33 7 01:33 8 01:33 10 01:33 11 01:33 12 01:33 14 01:33 15 01:34 16 01:34 17 01:34 18 01:34 19 01:34 20 01:34 21 01:34 22	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can either spread that footprint out again or you can go a little bit higher. Can you come back to us with some sort of scenario that looks at both of those things? I think when you came to us with your models, it brought the whole process to a point. So let's just assume for a second, I don't want to speak
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Gail, can I read from the draft report that we got? Am I allowed to do that? MS. PRICE: Sure. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Okay. The draft report, which we all got this weekend, playing into what you just said and what Dave brought up, actions available to Planning Board	01:33	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can either spread that footprint out again or you can go a little bit higher. Can you come back to us with some sort of scenario that looks at both of those things? I think when you came to us with your models, it brought the whole process to a point. So let's just assume for a second, I don't want to speak for any other board member here, but let's just
01:30	MR. SKORUPA: Well, but let me just put this in the proper context. Much of what Larry has talked about applies to any project that's going to be done on the campus. For example, it could be worse. I mean, you could propose certain things, if we go deeper, for example, build closer to the edge of the property, that could make those things worse, or if we put more excavation in, therefore go deeper. But I think all the things he talked about are true, regardless of what project we choose. MAYOR PFUND: With varying degrees of magnitude. We understand that. MR. SKORUPA: Yes. MAYOR PFUND: Certainly. Okay. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Gail, can I read from the draft report that we got? Am I allowed to do that? MS. PRICE: Sure. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Okay. The draft report, which we all got this weekend, playing into what you just said and what	01:33 2 01:33 3 01:33 5 01:33 6 01:33 7 01:33 8 01:33 10 01:33 11 01:33 12 01:33 14 01:33 15 01:34 16 01:34 17 01:34 18 01:34 19 01:34 20 01:34 21 01:34 22	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: How do other members of the Board feel about that? MR. RICHE: Can I jump in? CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Go ahead. MR. RICHE: What I would like to see, I mean as this process is evolving here, you know, we all got excited about your plan back a while ago, now we've heard some testimony that just on the surface says some of it is impractical in terms of cost and duration, and it's going to extend the project, maybe cause more disruption to the neighborhood. So somewhere along that line you talked about there's a compromise to this whole thing. So if we can't go as deep as we want to go, the option becomes that some of it is going to be above the ground. You can either spread that footprint out again or you can go a little bit higher. Can you come back to us with some sort of scenario that looks at both of those things? I think when you came to us with your models, it brought the whole process to a point. So let's just assume for a second, I don't want to speak

0134 1 originally suspected for a lot of reasons, so now 0137 1 were going to be a little more above ground than we 0137 2 that's the major element, you know. 0137 3 thought, both with the parking and with the 0137 3 with the 0134 4 structure. It's got to go somewhere, it's either got 0134 5 to go out or up. 0137 6 to go out or up. 0137 6 to go out or up. 0137 7 that for a fect at this point and I am personally - 0137 7 that for a fect at this point and I am personally - 0137 7 that for a fect at this point and I am personally - 0137 8 MR. RICHE: Can I finish? 0134 9 COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I'm sorry, I was 0137 10 taking. 0134 10 taking. 0133 11 up or a combination of both, as opposed to getting 0135 14 back into public testimony again where we just start 0135 15 resisting all of these things over and over again. 0138 15 whatever that might be, I think that would focus 0135 18 7, whatever that might be, I think that would focus 0138 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0138 20 back. 0139 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0138 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0138 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0138 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 24 MR. RICHE: Yenh, conceptually. 0138 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 0138 21 the hospital would be important, I think. 0138 3 hunch of concepts to the table. I'd link that would focus 0138 24 method of the decides of the original 0139 10 that. Challength with the Hospital would one of 0139 10 that. Challength with the Hospital would 0139 10 that. Challength with the Hospital would 0139 10 that. Of 013		77		79
1934 2 we're going to be a little more above ground than we on 134 thought, both with the parking and with the par	01:34 1		01:37 1	
1934 3 thought, both with the parking and with the 1938 4 structure. It's got to go somewhere, it's either got 1934 5 tog out or up. 1934 6 COUNCILWOMAN SUZY: But we don't know 1934 7 that for a fact at this point and I am personally 1934 7 that for a fact at this point and I am personally 1934 8 MR. RICHE: Can I finish? 1934 9 COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I'm sorry, I was 1934 10 taking. 1934 10 taking. 1934 11 taking. 1934 12 two scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or 1934 12 two scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or 1934 13 back into public testimony again where we just start 1938 14 back into public testimony again where we just start 1938 15 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 1938 17 versiting all of these things over and over again. 1938 18 7, whatever that might be, I think that would focus 1938 21 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 1938 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 1938 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 1938 24 Dack. 1938 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 1938 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 1938 26 Dack 1938 27 Dack 1938 29 Dack	01:34 2		01:37 2	
0134 5 to go out or up. 0134 6 COUNCILWOMAN SUZY: But we don't know 0136 7 MR. SKORUPA: Of 3B, okay. 0137 7 MR. SKORUPA: Of 3B, okay. 0137 8 MR. RICHE: Can I finish? 0134 9 COUNCILWOMAN ZUZY: I'm sorry, I was 0134 10 taking. 0134 11 MR. RICHE: I'd like to see, you know, 0137 10 MR. SKORUPA: This is 3B and the Phase 0135 13 up or a combination of both, as opposed to getting 0135 13 up or a combination of both, as opposed to getting 0135 15 vivo scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or 0135 16 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 0135 17 something to look at, another option, an option 6 or 0136 18 y us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0135 20 back. 0136 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0135 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 0136 3 develop, is that what you did a great plob at bringing 0135 4 banch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 0136 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0136 17 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 0136 17 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 0136 17 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 0136 18 to concept you put forward about underground versus 0136 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 0136 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0136 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 0136 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0136 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0136 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0136 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0136 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0136 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0137 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0138 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0139 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative	01:34 3		01:37 3	
0134 6 COUNCILWOMAN SUZY: But we don't know 0137 7 that for a fact at this point and I am personally 0137 7 MS. PRICE: on the screen. I just 0137 19 MR. RLCHE: Chall finish? 0137 19 Standpoint, whatever the Board wants to do 0138 11 talking. 0137 11 II. 0134 12 two scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or 0138 11 yo or a combination of both, as opposed to getting 0138 14 back into public testimony again where we just start or 0138 15 revisiting all of these things over and over again. 0135 16 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 0138 17 sworthing to look at, another option, an option 6 or 0138 18 7, whatever that might be, I think that would focus 0138 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0138 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 0138 21 Option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0138 22 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 24 MR. RLCHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0138 2 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 2 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 2 hut. If the Board feels as though that is the 0138 1 open onceptually, certainly we could do 1336 6 had tonight. 0139 1 that. 0139 1 that would only the valuable for the Board to get another take of 1339 15 form you, not in conjunction with, not in 0139 15 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 0139 15 to put forward about that is the 0139 16 to colleboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 0139 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 0139 10 that. 0139 10 that only report and both that I think it 0139 11 your reaction to	01:34 4	structure. It's got to go somewhere, it's either got	01:37 4	that, Mr. Chairman?
0134 7 that for a fact at this point and I am personally 0134 8 MR. RICHE: Can I finish? 0134 10 talking. 0134 11 MR. RICHE: I'd like to see, you know, 0134 11 MR. RICHE: I'd like to see, you know, 0134 12 Wo scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or 0136 13 up or a combination of both, as opposed to getting 0136 14 back into public testimony again where we just start 0136 15 revisiting all of these things over and over again. 0136 16 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 0135 15 ry, whatever that might be, I think that would focus 0136 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0135 12 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0136 21 Oxford that collectively we with the Hospital would 0137 12 where that might be, I think that would focus 0138 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0136 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0137 15 Use of the spital would be important, I think. 0138 2 the hospital would be important, I think. 0138 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 0136 4 balt oncoeptually, certainly we could do 0137 15 MS. PRICE: - on the sereen. I just 0137 18 want to see five can, because from a procedural steps in the ward wants to do 0137 16 MS. PRICE: Okay, so before I talk 0137 13 about that, you know, when the Board comes out of 118 in this, you know, when the Board decides to amend 0137 15 the Hospital would only a have to re-notice and 0137 16 the Hospital would only a large of taking five steps 0138 15 treating process again, at which point in 0139 12 the Hospital, would surple from CRR 0138 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0139 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0138 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of firm on a lot of 0139 26 had tonight. 0139 3 Think you did a great job at bringing 0139 4 bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 0139 5 I think you did a great job at bringing 0139 6 had tonight. 0139 6 had tonight. 0139 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 0139 17 Shan you only the you	01:34 5	to go out or up.	01:37 5	Can you put a picture of 3B
0134 8 MR. RICHE: Can I finish? 0134 19 COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I'm sorry, I was 0137 9 0134 11 talking. 0134 11 talking. 0136 12 talking. 0137 10 MR. SKORUPA: This is 3B and the Phase 0137 10 MR. SKORUPA: This is 3B and the Phase 0137 11 II. 0136 12 tow scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or 0137 13 about that, you know, when the Board comes out of 0137 13 tow scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or 0137 13 about that, you know, when the Board comes out of 0137 14 about that, you know, when the Board decides to amend 0137 15 revisiting all of these things over and over again. 0135 14 back into public testimony again where we just start 0135 16 wear native servisiting all of these things over and over again. 0138 16 vac an talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 0137 15 something to look at, another option, an option 6 or 0138 19 us on an an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0138 19 back. 0138 12 back. 0138 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 0138 22 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0138 25 certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 0138 25 like the spital would be important, I think. 0138 15 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 0138 2 in the spital would be important, I think. 0138 16 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 0138 2 in the spital would be important, I think. 0138 17 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 0138 2 in the spital would be important, I think. 0139 18 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 0138 19 us a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0138 19 us a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0138 19 us a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0138 19 us a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0138 19 us a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0138 19 us a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0139 10 that. 0139 10 that. 0139 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 0139 11 CHAIRMAN	01:34 6	COUNCILWOMAN SUZY: But we don't know	01:37 6	MR. SKORUPA: Of 3B, okay.
01:34 19 COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I'm sorry, I was 01:37 19 Standpoint, whatever the Board wants to do—01:37 11 II. MS. SKORUPA: This is 38 and the Phase 01:37 11 II. MS. PRICE: Okay, so before I talk 01:37 11 II. MS. PRICE: Okay, so before I talk 01:37 11 II. MS. PRICE: Okay, so before I talk 01:37 11 II. MS. PRICE: Okay, so before I talk 01:37 12 back into public testimony again where we just start 01:37 14 back into public testimony again where we just start 01:37 15 whether the decides to amend 01:37 15 whether the something to look at, another option, an option 6 or 01:38 17 ywhatever that might be, I think that would focus 01:38 18 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 01:38 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 01:38 12 obsc. 01:38 12	01:34 7	that for a fact at this point and I am personally	01:37 7	MS. PRICE: on the screen. I just
01:34 10 talking. MR. RICHE: I'd like to see, you know, on:34 12 wo scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or 01:37 12 MS. PRICE: Okay, so before I talk about that, you know, when the Board comes out of 01:37 13 to 01:37 14 back into public testimony again where we just start 01:35 15 wo can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 01:35 16 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 01:35 16 wo can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 01:35 17 whatever that might be, I think that would focus 01:35 18 what's pending, we're going to have to re-notice and start the hearing process again, at which point in 01:35 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 01:35 20 back. 01:35 21 what was pending where we're 01:35 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 01:35 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 01:35 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think would de a great job at bringing 01:35 4 abunch of concepts to the table. Tell like to see 01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:35 6 had tonight. 01:35 17 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:35 17 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that the 01:35 18 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:35 16 my our, not in conjunction with, not in 01:35 17 my our, not in conjunction with, not in 01:35 17 my our action to larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:35 17 wor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:35 18 my or and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:35 18 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:35 16 wor would not to arry's report, and evaluate some of 01:35 17 wor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:35 18 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:35 19 wor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:35 16 wor and Tom have said, and that is that I think	01:34 8	MR. RICHE: Can I finish?	01:37 8	want to see if we can, because from a procedural
0134 11 MR. RICHE: I'd like to see, you know, 0135 12 to occaminos that push it up a little bit and out or 0135 13 bock into public testimony again where we just start 0135 14 bock into public testimony again where we just start 0135 16 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 0135 17 to something to look at, another option, an option 6 or 0135 18 value of the see things over and over again. 0135 19 we on talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 0135 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0135 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 0135 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0135 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0135 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0135 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 0135 3 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0135 3 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 0135 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 0135 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0136 6 had tonight. 0136 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 0136 11 Wayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it would be valuable for the Board to get another take 0136 17 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do that. 0136 18 What's pending, we're going to have to re-notice and that, you khat's pending, we're going to have to re-notice and ontart the hearing process again, at which point in 0138 18 to in-depth the Board with testimony and professional ontart the Hearing process again, at which point in 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional ontart the hearing process again, at which point in 0138 10 time the Hospital's volud that you derive to re-notice and ontart the hearing process again, at which point in 0138 17 time the Heaping process again, at which point in 0138 18 to in-depth the Board decides to amend 0137 15 this work session, if the Board decides to amend 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional on that we heaving process again, at which point in 0138 18 to in-depth the Board with test	01:34 9	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I'm sorry, I was	01:37 9	standpoint, whatever the Board wants to do
10134 12 two scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or 10135 13 up or a combination of both, as opposed to getting 10135 14 back into public testimony again where we just start 10135 17 two simple propriets that what you're suggesting? 10135 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 10135 21 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 10135 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 50135 24 or 10135 24 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 10135 25 or 10135 26 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 50135 27 or 10135 28 or 10135 28 or 10135 29 or 10135 29 or 10135 21 or 10135 20 or 10135 21 or	01:34 10	talking.	01:37 10	MR. SKORUPA: This is 3B and the Phase
0135 13 up or a combination of both, as opposed to getting 0135 14 back into public testimony again where we just start 0135 16 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 0135 18 or whatever that might be, I think that would focus 0135 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0135 20 back. 0135 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0135 22 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0135 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0135 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0135 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 0135 3 Unit have to concepts to the table. I'd like to see 0135 3 Unit have to concepts to the table. I'd like to see 0136 10 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 0136 11 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly where we've 0136 10 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 0136 11 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 0136 11 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly which what the 0136 11 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it would be valuable for the Board to get another take 0136 17 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we can do 0137 16 MR. SKORUPA: Detail where we've 0138 19 Input and plans and exhibits. We may hear from CRR 0138 20 In terms of a formal submission, and Trm sure we're 0138 21 In the He Hospital will want to address, I'm sure, 0138 12 In the He Hospital will want to address, I'm sure, 0138 12 In the He Hospital will want to address, I'm sure, 0138 17 It the the Hospital will want to address and with teth Hospitals would 0138 12 In the He Hospital will want to address. I'm sure, 0138 12 In the He Hospital will want to address, I'm sure, 0138 18 In-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 12 In the He Hospital will want to address. I'm sure, 0138 12 In the He Hospital will want to add	01:34 11	MR. RICHE: I'd like to see, you know,	01:37 11	II.
10135 14 back into public testimony again where we just start 10135 15 revisiting all of these things over and over again. 10135 16 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 10135 17 something to look at, another option, an option 6 or 10135 18 7, whatever that might be, I think that would focus 10135 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 10135 20 back. 10135 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 10135 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 10135 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 10135 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually, 10135 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 10135 3 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 10135 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 10135 5 had tonight. 10136 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 10136 8 that. If the Board decides to amend 10137 15 what's pending, we're going to have to re-notice and 10136 17 time the Hospital would that be an on the Hospital would that be an on the Hospital would that be an on the Hospital would to start the hearing sagain, at which point in time the Hospital would the Hospital would be imported that be an on the Hospital would to some the Public. 10136 10 that toollectively we with the Hospital would 10136 12 the Hospital would be important, I think. 10136 13 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 10136 14 or the Hospital would be important, I think. 10136 15 the Hospital would be important, I think. 10137 15 time the Hospital would be important in the Hospital would be important in the Hospital would be important. 10138 12 I think you did a great job at bringing 10138 12 I think you down the we're 10138 12 input and plans and exhibits. We may hear from CRR 10138 12 going to hear from a bunch of members of the public. 10138 12 So before we notice, there should be 10138 12 input and plans and exhibits. We may hear from CRR 10138 12 Unit and plans and exhibits. We may hear from CRR 10138 12 Unit and plans and exhibits. We may hear from CRR 10138 12 Unit and	01:34 12	two scenarios that push it up a little bit and out or	01:37 12	MS. PRICE: Okay, so before I talk
0135 15 revisiting all of these things over and over again. 0136 18 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 0136 17 something to look at, another option, an option 6 or 0137 18 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0138 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0138 20 back. 0138 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 0139 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0138 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0138 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 0138 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 0138 3 1 I think you did a great job at bringing 0138 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 0138 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0138 6 had tonight. 0138 6 had tonight. 0139 19 Wata's pending, we're going to have to re-notice and 0139 18 time the Hospital will what the 0138 17 time the Hospital will wat the testimony and professional 0138 18 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 input and plans and exhibits. We may hear from CRR 0138 20 going to have to re-notice and 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 19 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 12 going to hear from a bunch of members of the public. 0138 22 But we do have procedural steps that we have to 0138 22 But we do have procedural steps that we have to 0138 22 But we do have procedural steps that we have to 0138 24 So before we notice	01:35 13	up or a combination of both, as opposed to getting	01:37 13	about that, you know, when the Board comes out of
0135 16 We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have 0135 17 something to look at, another option, an option 6 or 0135 18 7, whatever that might be, I think that would focus 0135 18 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0135 20 back. 0135 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 0135 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0138 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0138 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0135 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0135 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 0138 25 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 0138 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 0135 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 0135 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 0135 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0136 6 had tonight. 0136 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 0136 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 0136 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 0136 16 rollaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 0136 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 0138 18 the concepts again, at which point in 0138 17 time the Hospital will want to address, I'm sure, 10138 18 in-depth the Board with testimony and professional 0138 18 in-depth the Board with testimony and an all should be important, I'd would be important prom 0138 20 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 22 but we do have procedural steps that we have to 0138 21 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 0138 25 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 0138 25 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 0138 25 some more resolution, but just so we know where we're 0138 13 pust and plans and exhibits. We may hear from CRR 0138 20 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 22 but we do have procedural steps that we have to 0138 25 observe the Municipal Land Use Law. 0138 25 observe the Municipal Land Use Law. 0138 25 observe the Mu	01:35 14	back into public testimony again where we just start	01:37 14	this work session, if the Board decides to amend
0135 17 something to look at, another option, an option 6 or 0136 18 7, whatever that might be, I think that would focus 0135 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0135 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 0135 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 0136 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 0135 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 0138 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 0138 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 0136 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 0135 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 0135 3 labinate of the table. I'd like to see 0135 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 0135 6 had tonight. 0136 10 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 0136 10 that. 0136 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 0136 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 0136 16 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 0136 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 0136 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 0136 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 0138 20 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure, 0138 18 in-depth the Board the Board to sking five steps 0138 19 input and plans and exhibits. We may hear from CRR 0138 29 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 29 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 29 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 29 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 22 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 24 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 24 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 24 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 24 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 24 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 25 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 0138 24 where on the wold of some more remail spoint on the work session, just to get on the submission, and I'm sure	01:35 15	revisiting all of these things over and over again.	01:37 15	what's pending, we're going to have to re-notice and
01:35 18 7, whatever that might be, I think that would focus 01:35 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 01:35 20 back. 01:35 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 01:35 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 01:35 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 01:35 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 01:35 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:35 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:35 6 had tonight. 01:36 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 01:36 10 that. 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 10 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:36 20 bit near from a bunch of members of the public. 01:38 22 but we do have procedural steps that we have to 01:38 22 but we do have procedural steps that we have to 01:38 22 but we do have procedural steps that we have to 01:38 22 but we do have procedural steps that we have to 01:38 22 but we do have procedural steps that we have to 01:38 23 address per the Municipal Land Use Law. 01:38 24 So before we notice, there should be 01:38 25 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 01:38 25 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 01:38 26 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 01:38 27 a handle on that. And you don't have to come to a 01:38 28 in-depth the Board upon the residual upon don't have to come to a 01:38 29 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm surve to on the tomorical they be possion and darks in the Hospital would be valuation on the very process of the some or instance of the public. 01:38 26 in terms of a formal submission, and I'm surve to	01:35 16	We can talk ourselves into oblivion here. If we have	01:37 16	start the hearing process again, at which point in
01:35 19 us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps 01:35 20 back. 01:35 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 01:35 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 01:35 23 odevelop, is that what you're suggesting? 01:35 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 01:35 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 01:35 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:35 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:35 6 had tonight. 01:35 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:36 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 01:36 10 that. 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 10 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, on the reversible in the work serving on the other buildings	01:35 17	something to look at, another option, an option 6 or	01:38 17	time the Hospital will want to address, I'm sure,
01:35 20 back. 01:35 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an 01:35 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 01:35 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 01:35 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 01:35 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 01:36 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 01:35 1 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:35 1 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:35 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:35 6 had tonight. 01:36 6 had tonight. 01:36 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:38 10 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:38 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:38 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:36 20 linterms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're 01:38 21 going to hear from a bunch of members of the public. 01:38 22 but we do have procedural steps that we have to 01:38 23 address per the Municipal Land Use Law. 01:38 24 So before we notice, there should be obaders per we n	01:35 18	7, whatever that might be, I think that would focus	01:38 18	in-depth the Board with testimony and professional
01:35 21 MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an O1:36 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 01:35 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 01:36 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 01:38 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 01:38 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 01:38 25 Some more resolution in the work session, just to get 01:38 1 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:35 1 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:35 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:36 6 had tonight. 01:36 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:36 10 that. 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:36 16 rom you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 10 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 10 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 10 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 20 bit perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 20 bit perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 20 bit perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 20 bit perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 21 to 10:39 20 bit perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 21 bit we do have procedural steps that we have to 01:38 22 but we do have procedural steps that we have to 01:38 24 address per the Municipal Land Use dawders procedural steps that we have to 01:38 25 address per the Municipal Land Use Law. 01:38 24 So before we notice, there should be values and retice, there should be 01:38 25 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 01:38 25 flanders per the Municipal Land Use Law. 01:38 25 flanders per the Municipal La	01:35 19	us on an footprint, instead of taking five steps	01:38 19	input and plans and exhibits. We may hear from CRR
01:35 22 option that collectively we with the Hospital would 01:35 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? 01:35 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 01:35 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 01:35 26 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 01:35 27 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:35 28 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:35 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:35 6 had tonight. 01:36 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 01:36 10 that. 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:36 20 potton that collectively we with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:36 20 potton that collective, is that we have to 01:38 23 address per the Municipal Land Use Law. 01:38 24 So before we notice, there should be 01:38 24 So before we notice, there should be 01:38 24 so before we notice, there should be 01:38 24 so before we notice, there should be 01:38 25 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 01:38 24 so before we notice, there should be 01:38 24 so before we notice, there should be 01:38 24 so before we notice, there should be 01:38 24 so before we notice, there should be 01:38 25 in alderain yeu to get 01:38 24 so before we notice, there should be 01:38 26 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 01:38 26 in al darkers per the Municipal Land Use Law. 01:38 26 some more resolution in the work session, just to get 01:38 26 in al handle on that. And you don't have to come to a 01:38 3 going when we go out of work session and back into 01:38 1 a handle on	01:35 20	back.	01:38 20	in terms of a formal submission, and I'm sure we're
O1:35 23 develop, is that what you're suggesting? O1:38 24 So before we notice, there should be O1:38 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of O1:38 25 O1:38 21 So before we notice, there should be O1:38 25 So before we notice, there should be O1:38 26 D1:38 12 So before we notice, there should be O1:38 25 O1:38 14 D1:38 14 D1:38 15 So in the noth, And you don't have to come to a O1:38 2 D1:38 2 So in the noth, And you don't have to come to a O1:38 2 D1:38 2 So in the noth, And you	01:35 21	MR. SKORUPA: Tom, would that be an	01:38 21	going to hear from a bunch of members of the public.
01:35 24 MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually. 01:35 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 78 01:38 1 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:35 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:35 6 had tonight. 01:36 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:36 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 01:36 10 that. 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:37 0	01:35 22	option that collectively we with the Hospital would	01:38 22	But we do have procedural steps that we have to
01:35 25 Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of 78 01:35 1 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:35 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:35 6 had tonight. 01:36 6 had tonight. 01:37 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:38 1 a handle on that. And you don't have to come to a 01:38 2 final resolution, but just so we know where we're 01:38 3 going when we go out of work session and back into 01:38 4 the public hearing. And I'd just like to get some 01:38 5 input on this plan, 3B shows the 120-foot setback on 01:38 6 had tonight. 01:39 6 the buildings on the north, and no parking it 01:39 7 shows the green buffer on Linwood, because the 01:39 8 parking area closest to Linwood has been removed 01:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 01:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer along Linwood, 01:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 01:39 13 been eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing 01:39 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:38 2 final resolution, but just so we know where we're 01:38 3 going when we go out of work session and back into 01:38 4 the public hearing. And I'd just like to get some 01:38 5 input on this plan, 3B shows the 120-foot setback on 01:39 7 shows the green buffer on Linwood, because the 01:39 8 parking area closest to Linwood has been removed 01:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 01:39 11 when the foot in the work session and back into 01:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 01:39 13 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 01:39 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:39 16 MS.	01:35 23	develop, is that what you're suggesting?	01:38 23	address per the Municipal Land Use Law.
01:35 1 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:36 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 01:36 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:35 6 had tonight. 01:36 6 had tonight. 01:37 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:38 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 01:39 9 appropriate thing to do, then certainly we can do 01:36 10 that. 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:36 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:38 10 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:38 12 a handle on that. And you don't have to come to a 01:38 2 final resolution, but just so we know where we're 01:38 3 going when we go out of work session and back into 01:38 4 the public hearing. And I'd just like to get some 01:38 5 input on this plan, 3B shows the 120-foot setback on 01:39 6 the buildings on the north, and no parking it 01:39 7 shows the green buffer on Linwood, because the 01:39 9 under this scenario, existing parking, who's got the 01:39 9 under this scenario, existing parking, who's got the 01:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 01:39 11 an handle on that. And you don't have to come to a 01:38 2 final resolution, but just so we know where we're 01:38 4 the public hearing. And I'd just like to get some 01:38 5 input on this plan, 3B shows the 120-foot setback on 01:39 6 the buildings on the north, and no parking it 01:39 7 shows the green buffer on Linwood, because the 01:39 9 under this scenario, existing parking, who's got the 01:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 01:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer		MR. RICHE: Yeah, conceptually.	01:38 24	So before we notice, there should be
1 detail, but conceptually, certainly the input from 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 01:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 01:35 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:38 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:35 6 had tonight. 01:35 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:36 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 01:36 9 appropriate thing to do, then certainly we can do 01:36 10 that. 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:38 10 in the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 10 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:38 10 in this plan, 3B shows the 120-foot setback on 01:38 5 input on this plan, 3B shows the 120-foot setback on 01:38 5 input on this plan, 3B shows the 120-foot setback on 01:38 5 input on this plan, 3B shows the 120-foot setback on 01:39 6 the buildings on the north, and no parking it shows the green buffer on Linwood, because the 01:39 8 parking area closest to Linwood has been removed 01:39 9 under this scenario, existing parking, who's got the 01:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 01:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer along Linwood, 01:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer along Linwood, 01:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 01:39 13 with Phillips (indicating). 01:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. 01:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 01:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the 01:39 18 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the	01:35 25	Certainly you could spend a lot of time on a lot of	01:38 25	some more resolution in the work session, just to get
101:35 2 the Hospital would be important, I think. 101:35 3 I think you did a great job at bringing 101:35 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see 101:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 101:36 6 had tonight. 101:37 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 101:38 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 101:39 9 appropriate thing to do, then certainly we can do 101:39 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 101:39 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 101:39 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 101:39 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 101:39 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 101:39 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 101:39 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 101:39 19 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 101:39 20 in lot with the Hospitalign on the north, and no parking. And I'd just like to get some 101:38 3 going when we go out of work session and back into 101:38 4 the public hearing. And I'd just like to get some 101:38 5 input on this plan, 3B shows the 120-foot setback on 101:39 5 the buildings on the north, and no parking it 101:39 7 shows the green buffer on Linwood, because the 101:39 8 parking area closest to Linwood has been removed 101:39 9 under this scenario, existing parking, who's got the 101:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 101:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer along Linwood, 101:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 101:39 13 with Phillips (indicating). 101:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. 101:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 101:39 17 shows the green buffer on Linwood has been removed 101:39 18 pen eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing 101:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 101:39 17 seport and beautiful and the the deck has 101:39 18 phillips (ariaciang). 101:39 18 phillips (ariaciang). 101:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 101:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a pa				
O1:35 3 It hink you did a great job at bringing O1:36 4 a bunch of concepts to the table. I'd like to see O1:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've O1:36 6 had tonight. O1:37 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do O1:38 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the O1:39 9 appropriate thing to do, then certainly we can do O1:36 10 that. O1:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up O1:39 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my O1:39 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the O1:39 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it O1:39 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take O1:39 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in O1:39 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather O1:39 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus O1:39 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, O1:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up O1:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has O1:39 13 been eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing O1:39 14 with Phillips (indicating). O1:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. O1:39 17 Scorarios that's also out there is to make the O1:39 18 biuilding, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and O1:39 10 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative O1:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and O1:39 10 bit looks like any one of the other buildings on the			_	·
of 1:35				-
01:35 5 just a couple more, based upon the testimony we've 01:36 6 had tonight. 01:37	_		_	
01:35 6 had tonight. 01:36 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:36 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 01:36 9 appropriate thing to do, then certainly we can do 01:36 10 that. 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:36 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:39 20 the buildings on the north, and no parking it 01:39 7 shows the green buffer on Linwood, because the 01:39 7 shows the green buffer on Linwood, because the 01:39 8 parking area closest to Linwood has been removed 01:39 9 under this scenario, existing parking, who's got the 01:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 01:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer along Linwood, 01:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 01:39 13 been eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing 01:39 14 with Phillips (indicating). 01:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. 01:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 01:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the 01:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 10 that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 01:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer along Linwood, 01:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 01:39 13 been eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing 01:39 14 with Phillips (indicating). 01:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. 01:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 01:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the 01:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a parking dock and 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking dock and		·		
01:35 7 MR. SKORUPA: Certainly we could do 01:36 8 that. If the Board feels as though that is the 01:36 9 appropriate thing to do, then certainly we can do 01:39 10 that. 01:39 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:39 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 01:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer along Linwood, 01:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 01:39 13 been eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing 01:39 14 with Phillips (indicating). 01:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. 01:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 01:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the				
that. If the Board feels as though that is the 01:36		•		
on appropriate thing to do, then certainly we can do that. On the that. On				-
01:36 10 that. 01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:36 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 10 hand that, is that you, Ray? Just move your hand up 01:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer along Linwood, 01:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 01:39 13 been eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing 01:39 14 with Phillips (indicating). 01:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. 01:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 01:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the 01:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the				
01:36 11 CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: From my 01:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the 01:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:36 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 11 and down there. See the green buffer along Linwood, 01:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has 01:39 13 been eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing 01:39 14 with Phillips (indicating). 01:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. 01:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 01:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the 01:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the				
o1:36 12 perspective, Ray, I agree actually with what the o1:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it o1:36 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take o1:36 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in o1:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather o1:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of o1:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus o1:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, o1:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative o1:37 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has o1:39 12 that row of parking is removed, and then the deck has o1:39 13 been eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing o1:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. o1:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the o1:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the o1:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a o1:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and o1:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the				
01:36 13 Mayor and Tom have said, and that is that I think it 01:36 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:36 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 13 been eliminated to the north. So we're just dealing 01:39 14 with Phillips (indicating). 01:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. 01:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 01:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the 01:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the		,		
01:36 14 would be valuable for the Board to get another take 01:36 15 from you, not in conjunction with, not in 01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:37 14 with Phillips (indicating). 01:39 15 MR. SKORUPA: This is existing. 01:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 01:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the 01:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 10 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the				
01:36 16 collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather 01:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of 01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 16 MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the 01:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the 01:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the			01:39 14	
o1:36 17 your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of the concepts you put forward about underground versus above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative o1:39 17 scenarios that's also out there is to make the O1:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a O1:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and O1:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the	01:36 15	from you, not in conjunction with, not in	01:39 15	MR. SKORUPA: This is existing.
01:36 18 the concepts you put forward about underground versus 01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:38 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 18 Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the	01:36 16	collaboration with the Hospital's team, but rather	01:39 16	MS. PRICE: Okay. But one of the
01:36 19 above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts, 01:39 19 building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and 01:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the	01:36 17	your reaction to Larry's report, and evaluate some of	01:39 17	scenarios that's also out there is to make the
01:36 20 but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative 01:39 20 it looks like any one of the other buildings on the	01:36 18	the concepts you put forward about underground versus	01:39 18	Phillips Garage bigger and make it look like a
	01:36 19	above ground, not to abandon any of those concepts,	01:39 19	building, so it doesn't look like a parking deck and
01:37 21 weights. 01:39 21 campus.	01:36 20	but perhaps again to re-evaluate their relative	01:39 20	it looks like any one of the other buildings on the
	01:37 21	weights.	01:39 21	campus.
01:37 22 Actually when I look at some of your 01:39 22 MR. SKORUPA: There is additional new	01:37 22	Actually when I look at some of your	01:39 22	MR. SKORUPA: There is additional new
01:37 23 comparison graphics, they're not so far apart between 01:39 23 parking underground here.	01:37 23	comparison graphics, they're not so far apart between	01:39 23	parking underground here.
01:37 24 you and 3B. 01:40 24 MS. PRICE: Right. I'm just talking		you and 3B.	01:40 24	MS. PRICE: Right. I'm just talking
01:37 25 MR. SKORUPA: Well, I think the biggest 01:40 25 for a minute on the Phillips Garage.				

	81		83
01:40 1	So that that Phillips Garage would not	01:42 1	something or else you get a smaller hospital. You
01:40 2	look like a structure, structured parking, and it	01:42 2	know, that would certainly be an option too. If you
01:40 3	would feasibly be capable of looking like a building.	01:42 3	stay where you are, you have much more flexibility in
01:40 4	None of the rooftop parking would be visible from Van	01:42 4	terms of doing things.
01:40 5	Dien or from Linwood, it would just look like an	01:42 5	And the Phase III is a possibility of
01:40 6	additional building. And that's another concept that	01:42 6	not doing it. Don't do it, you don't pay for it.
01:40 7	may be in the middle of more below ground, less above	01:43 7	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Okay. When I was
01:40 8	ground, for the Board's consideration.	01:43 8	talking about different groups, I apologize because I
01:40 9	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I wanted to say, as	01:43 9	should have included the Hospital as well, along with
01:40 10	you explained it, Dave, I'm all for Ray coming back	01:43 10	residents and Board of Education.
01:40 11	to us with another appraisal of this report, and I'm	01:43 11	Thank you.
01:40 12	not in any way, shape or form suggesting that we go	01:43 12	MAYOR PFUND: Can I make a comment too?
01:40 13	back to square one in terms of talking ourselves into	01:43 13	This is more concessions. I'm trying
01:40 14	oblivion, but I don't know how you cannot allow for	01:43 14	to think out loud here. But what I liked about Ray's
01:41 15	these groups that I already mentioned, the Board of	01:43 15	presentation when he first came to us at the public
01:41 16	Education, the neighborhood, the residents, and	01:43 16	hearing is that he showed us his models and, frankly,
01:41 17	others will be directly affected, how we cannot give	01:43 17	he wasn't saying you know, I'm not an architect,
01:41 18	them the opportunity to tell us how they feel, given	01:43 18	these are different types of concepts that we can
01:41 19	this whole reconfiguration here. So that's all I'm	01:43 19	consider. And I thought that was an excellent
01:41 20	saying.	01:43 20	approach, to then bring to this board different
01:41 21	And the other question I had about your	01:43 21	concepts to consider, with input from the Hospital
01:41 22	report, Ray, was you say on page five at the bottom:	01:43 22	and the public at-large.
01:41 23	"The major advantages of option 4C are	01:43 23	So I'm a little more concerned that
01:41 24	its lower cost, since some of the existing is	01:44 24	perhaps we're giving the direction of Ray not coming
01:41 25	retained, and the possibility of spreading the	01:44 25	to us with varying options on a sliding scale, if you
	82	04.44.4	84
01:41 1 01:41 2	cost over several phases, and the possibility	01:44 1	will, but now what is his one desire, you know, that 100 percent over there.
01:41 2 01:41 3	of deferring some of the costs by not doing a second phase."	01:44 2 01:44 3	You know, we have to assess based on
01:41 4	What's that all about, not doing a	01:44 4	the feasibility of it, what's best for the Village,
01:41 5	second phase?	01:44 5	what's best for the residents, based on the totality
01:41 6	MR. SKORUPA: Well, for example, the	01:44 6	of all of that, and I think ultimately pick one of
01:41 7	current plan is, there is a plan to actually	01:44 7	the options, which is maybe a combination of all of
01:41 8	implement a Phase I project, and we've been looking	01:44 8	them. So I hesitate asking the professional to say
01:41 9	in great detail at a Phase I project, which is a new	01:44 9	what is the end-all in your opinion that we should be
01:41 10	North Wing, the North Wing Atrium, and substantial	01:44 10	doing. I want to hear the options, and then with the
01:42 11	renovation to the Cheel Building, and the architects	01:44 11	options, what are the advantages and disadvantages of
01:42 12	have been working on that.	01:45 12	A, B, C, D, so that then we ultimately decide. You
01:42 13	What's less defined is what's the	01:45 13	know, there are several threshold questions that
01:42 14	content of Phase II. I mean, there have been	01:45 14	needed to be answered, which were, such as the size
01:42 15	indications of the amount of square footage and some	01:45 15	and things of that nature.
01:42 16	indications about what goes on in those buildings,	01:45 16	With that said, I am interested in
01:42 17	but that's something that realistically may happen or	01:45 17	hearing any modification that there may be, based on
01:42 18	may not happen. And I don't think anyone knows, I'm	01:45 18	your review of the geotechnical report, because, as I
01:42 19	sure the Hospital doesn't know for sure when they	01:45 19	said before and not to repeat myself, I don't think
01:42 20	will do Phase II.	01:45 20	it's as feasible just to put everything underground,
01:42 21	So if you don't do a project, you're	01:45 21	based on what we've heard. I just don't think it's
01:42 22	not paying for it, I mean, and you have that	01:45 22	practical. If we could just snap our fingers,
01:42 23	flexibility. I tried to put it in the context if you	01:45 23	everything would be underground, it would be one
01:42 24	picked up The Valley Hospital and built it in a new	01:45 24	level, it would be fine, but it's just not the
01:42 25	location, you have to do everything, you can't defer	01:45 25	reality of things.

	85		87
01:45 1	So I guess I would like to hear where	01:49 1	MS. PRICE: What we've already done.
01:45 1 01:46 2	you're at based on that, hear the different options,	01:49 1 01:49 2	MR. SKORUPA: Back in spring of last
_	•	_	
01:46 3 01:46 4	hear why each have some advantages and disadvantages, and then we need to decide, after we get public	01:49 3 01:49 4	year? MS. PRICE: Correct.
01:46 5	input. That's the way I'm looking at it, but, I	01:49 5	
			CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Which it certainly
	don't know, was he charged differently than what I'm	01:49 6 01:49 7	would be, I think.
	thinking?		MR. SKORUPA: Right.
01:46 8	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: No.	01:49 8	MAYOR PFUND: Gail, if I could ask,
01:46 9	First, I guess, my request to Ray	01:49 9	procedurally, let's say we as a collective board said
01:46 10	earlier wasn't that I wanted Ray to give us something	01:49 10	this option is up here, and for the record what does
01:46 11	that we should adopt as our own, present it to the	01:49 11	that option say?
01:46 12	public, because that's not what he was engaged to do	01:49 12	MS. PRICE: 3B.
01:46 13	and I don't want to do that.	01:49 13	MAYOR PFUND: 3B. Let's say we say,
01:46 14	MAYOR PFUND: Yes.	01:49 14	you know, we like 3B, that's the one we think we
01:46 15	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: It's just that our	01:49 15	really need to pursue at this point, and we get input
01:46 16	original proposal that was put out for public hearing	01:49 16	from the public or Hospital that, you know, there's
01:46 17	was not the Hospital's, nor would the second one we	01:49 17	something that's not quite feasible about it or needs
01:46 18	put out be Ray's.	01:49 18	a change, and there's an evolution of it during the
01:47 19	I just don't feel, Ray, that I've	01:49 19	public hearing. Do we then have to start over again?
01:47 20	gotten your reaction to Larry's report, and I think	01:49 20	MS. PRICE: You have to it might
01:47 21	you really do have to react to it.	01:49 21	require another amendment.
01:47 22	How we proceed to public hearing, we	01:49 22	MAYOR PFUND: But with an amendment we
01:47 23	certainly can discuss, because I think that all the	01:50 23	can still incorporate what we did previously, right?
01:47 24	options have been put out in public session, the	01:50 24	MS. PRICE: Oh, absolutely, it just has
01:47 25	Hospital's heard our conversation, they've heard our	01:50 25	to be re-noticed.
-			
	86		88
01:47 1	86 professionals, they've heard our questions, as has	01:50 1	88 MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood
01:47 1 01:47 2		01:50 1 01:50 2	
_	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has		MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood
01:47 2	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned	01:50 2	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start
01:47 2 01:47 3	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public	01:50 2 01:50 3	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this,
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months.
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4 01:47 5	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4 01:47 5 01:48 6	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4 01:47 5 01:48 6 01:48 7	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4 01:47 5 01:48 6 01:48 7 01:48 8	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4 01:47 5 01:48 6 01:48 7 01:48 8 01:48 9	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision,	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4 01:47 5 01:48 6 01:48 7 01:48 8 01:48 9 01:48 10	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4 01:47 5 01:48 6 01:48 7 01:48 8 01:48 9 01:48 10 01:48 11	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear.
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4 01:47 5 01:48 6 01:48 7 01:48 8 01:48 9 01:48 10 01:48 11	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay.
01:47	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything.	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important
01:47	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything. MAYOR PFUND: Good.	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12 01:50 13 01:50 14	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important for people to understand.
01:47	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything. MAYOR PFUND: Good. So, in essence, we then in a work	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12 01:50 13 01:50 14 01:50 15	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important for people to understand. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Can I ask for a
01:47	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything. MAYOR PFUND: Good. So, in essence, we then in a work session have to determine, when we go back to public	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12 01:50 13 01:50 14 01:50 15 01:50 16	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important for people to understand. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Can I ask for a clarification?
01:47	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything. MAYOR PFUND: Good. So, in essence, we then in a work session have to determine, when we go back to public hearing, whether or not we are going to be pursuing	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12 01:50 13 01:50 14 01:50 15 01:50 16 01:50 17	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important for people to understand. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Can I ask for a clarification? Are you saying we would take a
01:47	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything. MAYOR PFUND: Good. So, in essence, we then in a work session have to determine, when we go back to public hearing, whether or not we are going to be pursuing that option or the additional setback's higher or	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12 01:50 13 01:50 14 01:50 15 01:50 16 01:50 17 01:50 18	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important for people to understand. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Can I ask for a clarification? Are you saying we would take a definitive stand on which option we prefer, before we
01:47	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything. MAYOR PFUND: Good. So, in essence, we then in a work session have to determine, when we go back to public hearing, whether or not we are going to be pursuing that option or the additional setback's higher or where we were or something else?	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12 01:50 13 01:50 14 01:50 15 01:50 16 01:50 17 01:50 18 01:50 19	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important for people to understand. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Can I ask for a clarification? Are you saying we would take a definitive stand on which option we prefer, before we would be talking to the public?
01:47	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything. MAYOR PFUND: Good. So, in essence, we then in a work session have to determine, when we go back to public hearing, whether or not we are going to be pursuing that option or the additional setback's higher or where we were or something else? MS. PRICE: Right, and if it's anything	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12 01:50 13 01:50 14 01:50 15 01:50 16 01:50 17 01:50 18 01:50 19 01:50 20	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important for people to understand. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Can I ask for a clarification? Are you saying we would take a definitive stand on which option we prefer, before we would be talking to the public? No, right? We would be saying what we
01:47 2 01:47 3 01:47 4 01:47 5 01:48 6 01:48 7 01:48 8 01:48 9 01:48 10 01:48 11 01:48 12 01:48 13 01:48 14 01:48 15 01:48 16 01:48 17 01:48 18 01:48 19 01:48 20 01:48 21	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything. MAYOR PFUND: Good. So, in essence, we then in a work session have to determine, when we go back to public hearing, whether or not we are going to be pursuing that option or the additional setback's higher or where we were or something else? MS. PRICE: Right, and if it's anything than the original, anything other than the original,	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 4 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 9 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12 01:50 13 01:50 14 01:50 15 01:50 16 01:50 17 01:50 18 01:50 19 01:50 20 01:50 21	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important for people to understand. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Can I ask for a clarification? Are you saying we would take a definitive stand on which option we prefer, before we would be talking to the public? No, right? We would be saying what we feel at the moment what we like the best, but then we
01:47	professionals, they've heard our questions, as has the public and the representatives, and the Concerned Residents of Ridgewood. And if we go back to public hearing without something on paper saying this is what we propose as a board, then we will not move forward as quickly as we could. If we spend one more meeting actually putting on paper what we think, it still means that we can listen to reaction, people can still come to us and say you made this decision, you made this evaluation between disruption and the final product, we disagree with you. But at least we have something on paper that we can modify, otherwise we don't really have anything. MAYOR PFUND: Good. So, in essence, we then in a work session have to determine, when we go back to public hearing, whether or not we are going to be pursuing that option or the additional setback's higher or where we were or something else? MS. PRICE: Right, and if it's anything than the original, anything other than the original, we have to do an amendment and a re-notice.	01:50 2 01:50 3 01:50 5 01:50 6 01:50 7 01:50 8 01:50 10 01:50 11 01:50 12 01:50 13 01:50 14 01:50 15 01:50 16 01:50 17 01:50 18 01:50 19 01:50 20 01:51 21 01:51 22	MAYOR PFUND: So it's understood MS. PRICE: You know, you don't start from square one, especially in a process like this, where people have been talking for months and months. MAYOR PFUND: So I think it's important for the Hospital and for the residents and other concerned individuals to realize that even if we as a board say we like this one particular scenario and that's what we are going forward with, we're still amenable to hearing things and making adjustments based on those positions that we might hear. CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Okay. MAYOR PFUND: I think that's important for people to understand. COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Can I ask for a clarification? Are you saying we would take a definitive stand on which option we prefer, before we would be talking to the public? No, right? We would be saying what we feel at the moment what we like the best, but then we would have input from the public and we could change

	89		91
01:51 1	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So it won't be	01:53 1	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Okay, then I'm fine
01:51 2	written in stone, if we say this board thinks that	01:53 2	with that wiggle room.
01:51 3	plan 3B is the way to go, and then we hear from the	01:53 3	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: And just for the
01:51 4	public and they say they want option three, we're	01:53 4	benefit of the Hospital's representatives and the
01:51 5	open to that possibility, right?	01:53 5	concerned residents' representatives and independent
01:51 6	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Well,	01:53 6	members of the community who are here, once we do
01:51 7	specifically, the way I see it going, is that we hear	01:53 7	recommence the public hearing, just to go back and
01:51 8	additional input from Ray, and after a work session,	01:53 8	refresh our memories, the procedure we will follow is
01:51 9	internal discussion, we will instruct Blais to	01:53	that the Hospital will have an opportunity to make a
01:51 10	distill that decision into language of the Master	01:53 10	presentation concerning it, the Concerned Residents
01:51 11	Plan, and that's what we put forth, and then continue	01:54 11	of Ridgewood will have an opportunity, and then we
01:51 12	to discuss with the public at a public session.	01:54 12	will pick up on our list of speakers where we let
01:51 13	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I have a problem	01:54 13	off. No one is going to be deprived of their
01:51 14	with coming to terms with the definite approach to	01:54 14	opportunity to speak.
01:51 15	the Master Plan without having input from the public,	01:54 15	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: Speakers who are
01:52 16	given everything that has been discussed tonight and	01:54 16	not on that list may add their names to that list?
01:52 17	given what Ray will more than likely say when he	01:54 17	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Absolutely. The
01:52 18	meets with us, that you requested, he give us a	01:54 18	list is open.
01:52 19	reaction to the report. I don't know how we can go	01:54 19	And particularly since presumably the
01:52 20	forward with adopting a plan, without having input	01:54 20	document would have changed, people would have
01:52 21	from the public on these issues that were raised	01:54 21	already had an opportunity to comment will have
01:52 22	tonight.	01:54 22	another opportunity to comment on the specific
01:52 23	MAYOR PFUND: But, Anne, I think, if I	01:54 23	changes.
01:52 24	may, Mr. Chairman, I think in order to go through	01:54 24	MS. PRICE: And we're going to have
01:52 25	with the public hearing, we have to have something	01:54 25	sworn testimony from the professionals.
	90		92
01:52 1	that the public hearing is based on. So, therefore,	01:54 1	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Right, so a bunch
01:52 2	we need as a board to say this is what at the moment	01:54 2	of steps yet to take. But I think the next one, Ray,
01:52 3	we think is best, have the public hearing, and then	01:54 3	I'm going to put you on the spot, the next one is to
01:52 4	use the input that we get at the public hearing to	01:54 4	get your reaction to what's been discussed tonight
01:52 5	change or modify what we're going forward with.	01:54 5	and be prepared to speak about it in two weeks.
01:52 6	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: I'm totally cool	01:54 6	MR. SKORUPA: Specifically about the
01:52 7	with that, as long as you're telling me that we have	01:55 7	subsoils report, is that what you're saying?
01:52 8	a caveat that it's not a done deal and that we can	01:55 8	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: I'm sorry, in
01:52 9	change it or alter	01:55 9	three weeks.
01:52 10	MS. PRICE: Well, it's not a done deal	01:55 10	MR. SKORUPA: In three weeks, okay.
01:52 11	until the vote is taken at the very end.	01:55 11	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: We've postponed
01:52 12	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: But it can be	01:55 12	our next meeting because it's the school holiday, so
01:52 13	changed?	01:55 13	we postponed it to the following week.
01:52 14	MS. PRICE: Yes, that document, that	01:55 14	MR. SKORUPA: So three weeks from
01:53 15	amendment can be amended, just like we're talking	01:55 15	today.
01:53 16	about amending it now, potentially at any point in	01:55 16	MS. PRICE: From yesterday.
01:53 17	time.	01:55 17	MR. SKORUPA: From yesterday.
01:53 18	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: When I say	01:55 18	Yesterday was supposed to have been the meeting.
01:53 19	"public," I'm talking about the Hospital as well.	01:55 19	MS. CARLTON: The 22nd.
01:53 20	MS. PRICE: Oh, absolutely. I think	01:55 20	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Monday the 22nd.
01:53 21	the concern is just to go out, because right now all	01:55 21	MR. SKORUPA: Can I go back? Dave, I
01:53 22	we have right now is the original amendment. So if	01:55 22	want to go back to your comment.
01:53 23	we went back to public hearing next week, we would be	01:55 23	You asked me earlier, you know, what
01:53 24	going back to public hearing on that original	01:55 24	was my reaction to Larry's study in terms of the
01:53 25	amendment.	01:55 25	subsoil condition. I don't think I'm convinced that

	93		95
01:55 1	the principles we enunciated still are not doable, I	01:58 1	proceedings until our next meeting, when we'll hear
01:55 2	think what I don't know is what is the cost of those	01:58 2	from Ray, and then the Board will continue in work
01:55 3	things, that's the problem, you know, cost either in	01:58 3	session about our next steps.
01:56 4	terms of actual money cost due to increased	01:58 4	Also for the members of the public, we
01:56 5	construction cost or what impact does it have on a	01:58 5	have reserved the Benjamin Franklin for March 3rd
01:56 6	phasing construction plan. Those things, to my mind,	01:58 6	(sic) in anticipation of further meetings on the
01:56 7	have not been clearly enunciated by anyone.	01:59 7	H-Zone, and it's our intention to hold our March 2nd
01:56 8	MAYOR PFUND: No, I think the word was	01:59 8	meeting there and move this matter forward.
01:56 9	"substantial."	01:59 9	How about a motion to adjourn?
01:56 10	MR. SKORUPA: Well, what is	01:59 10	COUNCILWOMAN ZUSY: So moved.
01:56 11	"substantial"?	01:59 11	MR. RICHE: Second.
01:56 12	MAYOR PFUND: You guys can talk in the	01:59 12	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: All in favor?
01:56 13	next couple of weeks maybe.	13	(All present Board Members respond in
01:56 14	MR. SKORUPA: Right.	14	the affirmative.)
01:56 15	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Let me say this,	15	(Whereupon the meeting is adjourned at
01:56 16	that the scope of work that was described for the	16	10:55 p.m.)
01:56 17	deeper excavations, not only for the Hospital's	17	
01:56 18	original plan but for the plan that added additional	18	
01:56 19	subterranean levels, would be on the order of	19	
01:56 20	magnitude of many, many times any project that's ever	20	
01:56 21	been conducted within the borders of this Village.	21	
01:56 22	That's why I think you really need to	22	
01:56 23	react to it. It's a matter of course in other	23	
01:57 24	communities, certainly in New York, but not here in	24	
01:57 25	Ridgewood.	25	
	94		96
01:57 1	MR. SKORUPA: Does that mean in terms	1	<u>CERTIFICATION</u>
01:57 2	of just the impact it has on the community, is that	2	
01:57 3	what you're alluding to?	3	
01:57 4	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: The amount of	4 5	
01:57 5	material to be removed, the amount of groundwater to	6	
01:57 6	be dealt with, yes.	7	I, KIM O. FURBACHER, License No.
01:57 7	MR. SKORUPA: All right.	8	XIO1042, a Certified Court Reporter, Registered
01:57 8	I mean, the cost of the project, I mean	9	Professional Reporter, Certified Realtime Court
01:57 9	the construction cost is mainly a Valley Hospital	10	Reporter, and Notary Public of the State of New
01:57 10	issue, and the impact in terms of construction	11	Jersey, certify that the foregoing is a true and
01:57 11	lengths, truck traffic, those are things that are	12	accurate transcript of my stenographic notes.
01:57 12	borne by the community. So we have sort of two	13 14	
01:57 13	different sets of costs that we have to try to	15	
01:57 14	quantify in some way.	16	
01:58 15	MAYOR PFUND: Yes.	17	
01:58 16	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Can we set the	18	
01:58 17	date?	19	
01:58 18	MR. SKORUPA: Three weeks, we got it,		A Notary Public of New Jersey
01:58 19	from yesterday.	20	
01:58 20	CHAIRMAN NICHOLSON: Everybody okay		
01:58 21	with that?	21	My Commission Expires:
01:58 22	Given the lateness of the hour then, we	22	7/11/14
Ī			
01:58 23	are essentially going to, the word I'm looking for	23	I I
01:58 23 01:58 24	are essentially going to, the word I'm looking for MS. PRICE: Carry.	23 24	

	T	1	1	
\$	2	61:12, 66:14, 66:15	8	adapting [1] - 59:1
*	_	40,000 [2] - 38:5, 38:6		add [7] - 28:6, 28:20,
		40,000-square [1] -		32:4, 53:5, 53:6,
\$200 [1] - 53:12	2 [4] - 1:2, 62:25,	38:3	8,700 [1] - 26:13	72:12, 91:16
	64:21, 65:18	40-foot [2] - 15:3,	80 [5] - 14:13, 43:6,	added [3] - 26:7,
•	2,000 [4] - 46:10,	67:11	65:5, 66:18	56:18, 93:18
	62:14, 62:23, 63:8	43 [1] - 3:7	81 [4] - 14:1, 31:8,	adding [6] - 13:11,
'90s [1] - 12:22	2,300 [2] - 26:6, 26:14	454 [1] - 45:17	31:20, 43:10	25:11, 25:25, 27:13,
305[1] - 12.22	20 [3] - 24:16, 25:3,	47 [4] - 8:8, 8:11, 8:15,	815 [1] - 6:18	27:19, 28:3
^	33:19	66:13	82 [2] - 20:1, 20:3	addition [6] - 55:20,
0	20-foot [1] - 15:7	47-foot [3] - 6:22,	822 [1] - 8:1	56:24, 57:16, 58:3,
	200 [1] - 66:9	56:2, 56:10	84 [2] - 49:18, 65:16	59:19, 59:20
07450 [1] - 2:13	2009 [1] - 4:14	48 [1] - 66:13	85 [10] - 13:5, 13:22,	additional [21] - 4:24,
07663 [1] - 1:24	201 [2] - 1:24, 1:25	487-0036 [1] - 1:25	14:13, 14:20, 15:5,	14:7, 18:25, 19:17,
07677 [1] - 2:10	2010 [1] - 1:2	4C [3] - 52:11, 52:19,	15:16, 31:14, 31:15,	25:16, 27:2, 28:6,
0/0//[[1] - 2.10	21st [3] - 46:1, 46:6,	81:23	71:22, 72:9	28:25, 32:2, 53:5,
1	60:17	01.20	85.6 [1] - 13:5	53:6, 57:9, 57:14,
1	222 [1] - 66:4	E	86 [4] - 18:21, 27:1,	59:10, 65:9, 73:1,
	223 [1] - 66:4	5	31:19, 42:10	80:22, 81:6, 86:18,
1 [2] - 64:21, 65:18	22nd [2] - 92:19, 92:20		865 [1] - 6:17	89:8, 93:18
1,000 [1] - 62:6		5,700 [1] - 20:7	88 [5] - 14:1, 31:8,	
1,100 [1] - 62:7	230 [1] - 15:20	50 [5] - 2:10, 30:6,		address [3] - 6:8,
	24 [1] - 65:4	32:9, 35:16, 50:13	31:20, 43:7, 66:24	79:17, 79:23
1,700 [2] - 62:7, 63:9	25 [4] - 23:21, 23:25,	500 [2] - 50:14, 62:22	89 [2] - 16:4, 24:14	addressed [2] - 23:12,
1.170 [1] - 60:13	24:1, 35:13		8:44 [1] - 1:2	44:15
1.5:1 [1] - 23:25	250 [1] - 50:13	505 [1] - 1:23		adds [1] - 27:21
1.7 [1] - 46:24	29 [1] - 3:5	56 [1] - 65:3	9	adequate [3] - 46:5,
10 [6] - 3:4, 34:3, 34:4,	2nd [1] - 95:7	560,000 [2] - 45:24,		60:17, 61:17
34:5, 42:18, 46:13		60:2	90 [1] - 14:2	adjacent [7] - 14:20,
10-foot [1] - 6:23	3	580 [1] - 26:13		22:23, 29:13, 29:24,
10-month [1] - 42:15		5A [1] - 59:6	94 [2] - 15:15, 65:12	30:1, 30:7, 30:8
100 [9] - 14:24, 15:1,		5B [1] - 59:6	95 [1] - 15:22	adjourn [1] - 95:9
15:6, 30:15, 50:14,	3 [1] - 65:18	5th [2] - 44:22, 45:12		adjourned [1] - 95:15
66:6, 71:20, 71:21,	3,500 [1] - 20:7		_	adjustments [1] -
84:2	30 [5] - 27:12, 33:20,	6		88:10
100,000 [1] - 61:3	35:13, 61:12		abandon [1] - 78:19	adopt [1] - 85:11
100-foot [1] - 57:4	30,000-foot [1] - 29:17	0 77 47	ability [1] - 71:25	adopted [1] - 59:3
105 [3] - 14:24, 15:6,	30-foot [1] - 32:9	6 [1] - 77:17	able [5] - 9:12, 15:14,	adopting [1] - 89:20
24:13	300 [3] - 30:15, 45:22,	60 [4] - 13:23, 15:2,	71:14, 71:15, 76:25	advantage [1] - 52:12
10:55 [1] - 95:16	63:9	20:5, 47:20		advantages [3] -
111 [2] - 62:15, 62:16	32 [2] - 67:14, 67:22	600 [2] - 62:22, 62:23	absolutely [3] - 87:24, 90:20, 91:17	81:23, 84:11, 85:3
120 [4] - 8:8, 9:18,	33 [1] - 67:22	620,000 [1] - 47:21	<i>'</i>	aerial [3] - 56:8, 57:7,
56:21, 66:21	35 [1] - 23:21	641-1812 [1] - 1:24	accept [1] - 74:25	57:25
120-foot [1] - 80:5	380,000 [1] - 60:21	65 [1] - 65:1	accepted [1] - 11:7	affect [3] - 10:10,
122 [2] - 65:23, 65:25	390 [1] - 15:19	661 [2] - 7:25, 62:5	access [1] - 48:10	29:6, 37:22
125,000 [1] - 61:4	3A [10] - 54:14, 56:19,	69 [6] - 16:11, 18:18,	acclimate [1] - 6:10	affected [1] - 81:17
130 [1] - 67:10	57:7, 58:13, 59:23,	18:21, 24:14, 31:13,	accommodate [1] -	
130-foot [1] - 47:8	60:23, 62:25, 64:22,	40:6	46:18	afterworld [1] - 38:1
135 [1] - 2:13	65:7, 68:8		accommodation [1] -	agenda [2] - 4:12, 5:4
	3B [21] - 54:14, 54:18,	7	72:19	ago [3] - 10:5, 54:9,
14 [2] - 26:8, 65:10	58:13, 58:19, 59:23,		accurate [1] - 96:12	76:7
15 [3] - 25:3, 34:4,	60:23, 62:25, 64:22,		achieve [1] - 57:20	agree [2] - 63:15,
34:5	65:7, 65:18, 67:3,	7 [1] - 77:18	achieving [1] - 58:20	78:12
15,000 [1] - 26:2	68:9, 78:24, 79:5,	7/11/14 [1] - 96:21	acoustical [1] - 8:25	agreed [2] - 44:23,
150 [2] - 15:20, 38:7	79:6, 79:10, 80:5,	7/24 [1] - 48:11	act [1] - 37:3	45:16
17 [4] - 11:6, 17:24,	87:12, 87:13, 87:14,	70 [2] - 14:14	action [2] - 19:9, 75:4	ahead [1] - 76:4
18:21, 40:8	89:3	700,000 [1] - 46:18	actions [1] - 74:23	air [1] - 49:25
18 [2] - 11:6, 12:4	3rd [1] - 95:5	71 [1] - 3:8	activities [2] - 48:8,	ALBERT [1] - 1:13
195x445 [1] - 15:11	յա լդ- ઝ ວ.၁	74 [1] - 27:2	48:14	allow [3] - 21:20, 46:2,
1:1 [1] - 23:25		75 rot 14:14 16:4		81:14
• •	A	75 [3] - 14:14, 16:4,	activity 2 - 40.11.	
• •	4	24:14	activity [2] - 48:11, 48:13	allowed [1] - 74:17
	4		48:13	
	40 [5] - 27:12, 47:20,		48:13 actual [5] - 9:7, 35:11,	allowed [1] - 74:17
			48:13	allowed [1] - 74:17 allows [1] - 22:13

almost [1] - 62:6 alter [1] - 90:9 ALTERNATE [2] -1:16, 1:17 amazed [1] - 43:19 amenable [1] - 88:10 amend [1] - 79:14 amended [1] - 90:15 amending [1] - 90:16 Amendment [1] - 4:11 amendment [7] - 4:15, 86:22, 87:21, 87:22, 90:15, 90:22, 90:25 amount [11] - 52:22, 61:4, 61:7, 63:1, 63:15, 68:6, 69:7, 82:15, 94:4, 94:5 amplification [1] -5:16 amsl [1] - 14:2 analysis [2] - 59:12, 59:13 angle [1] - 25:3 **ANNE** [2] - 1:11, 1:15 Anne [1] - 89:23 announcement [1] -59:20 answer [4] - 23:13, 71:5, 75:10, 75:11 answered [2] - 43:4, 84:14 anticipate [1] - 33:9 anticipation [1] - 95:6 anytime [1] - 25:21 apart [1] - 78:23 apologize [2] - 28:13, 83:8 applied [1] - 50:4 applies [1] - 74:4 apply [2] - 17:20, 32:8 appraisal [1] - 81:11 approach [2] - 83:20, 89:14 appropriate [1] - 78:9 approved [1] - 40:15 architect [3] - 16:12, 40:6, 83:17 architects [4] - 44:25, 63:4, 65:8, 82:11 architectural [3] -49:1, 56:22, 70:6 architectural/ engineering [1] -50:24 area [25] - 6:24, 8:4, 8:17, 8:20, 8:21, 8:23, 9:1, 9:22, 11:9, 13:18, 13:24, 14:12, 21:13, 24:24, 28:18, 35:4, 35:14, 38:5,

60:9, 60:17, 80:8 areas [4] - 21:18, 29:12, 34:11, 68:9 artificially [1] - 17:19 assess [1] - 84:3 assessment [2] - 18:8, 18:11 associated [1] - 29:5 **Associates** [4] - 2:4, 10:14, 10:25, 11:24 assume [2] - 76:22, 76:24 assumed [1] - 73:17 AT [1] - 1:2 at-large [3] - 70:17, 71:2, 83:22 atrium [2] - 55:3, 82:10 attempt [1] - 70:8 attempted [1] - 70:7 attention [1] - 19:17 attractive [1] - 53:1 audience [1] - 10:21 **authorities** [1] - 75:20 available [1] - 74:23 Avenue [4] - 6:14, 31:22, 33:4, 67:1

В

bachelor's [2] - 11:3, 12:1 background [3] -5:20, 10:22, 42:2 bad [2] - 40:25 **BARBARA** [1] - 2:3 barrier [1] - 8:25 base [2] - 20:22, 37:4 based [15] - 15:13, 17:25, 26:9, 32:22, 40:10, 41:24, 42:1, 78:5, 84:3, 84:5, 84:17, 84:21, 85:2, 88:11, 90:1 **baseline** [1] - 22:8 basement [6] - 21:12, 24:14, 27:1, 49:3, 49.6 basements [2] - 31:3, 33:16 basic [1] - 72:25 basin [1] - 28:23 beam [2] - 32:14, 37:4 beating [1] - 21:4 becomes [1] - 76:14 bedrock [24] - 13:18, 13:21, 14:8, 14:12, 14:20, 15:1, 15:2, 15:3, 15:5, 15:7, 16:18, 19:23, 20:14,

20:18, 20:23, 20:25, 21:7, 25:5, 25:13, 26:25, 27:24, 29:7, 37:20 bedrock-quality [1] -21:7 beds [1] - 45:17 beginning [3] - 15:24, 18:25, 31:10 behind [1] - 24:25 **BEING** [1] - 1:7 below [73] - 6:19, 7:24, 8:1, 12:16, 13:8, 13:11, 13:13, 13:23, 14:14, 15:10, 15:15, 15:16, 15:21, 16:3, 16:15, 16:17, 16:20, 17:7, 17:15, 17:24, 17:25, 18:10, 19:2, 20:16, 22:19, 23:17, 25:11, 25:14, 25:16, 25:22, 29:19, 31:9, 32:6, 33:13, 38:4, 39:24, 40:4, 40:8, 44:9, 44:19, 46:22, 47:20, 47:22, 48:4, 48:6, 49:12, 49:18, 49:24, 50:8, 53:15, 55:16, 56:23, 57:11, 57:12, 58:8, 60:5, 61:3, 61:9, 61:13, 61:19, 61:20, 61:24, 62:5, 62:19, 63:1, 63:5, 63:9, 63:17, 65:15, 68:11, 69:19, 81:7 15:10 66:7 34:2 21:19, 47:25, 48:1, 71:1, 91:4

below-grade [1] -Ben [3] - 33:15, 65:21, bench [2] - 33:25, benefit [6] - 4:8, benefits [3] - 69:2, 69:3, 70:20 Benjamin [3] - 58:3, 67:11, 95:5 Bergen [4] - 55:1, 55:13, 56:6, 57:13 berm [1] - 8:24 best [5] - 44:1, 84:4, 84:5, 88:21, 90:3 better [9] - 16:6, 25:19, 42:15, 45:2, 49:10, 67:4, 71:11, 71:13, 71:19

73:8, 78:23, 86:10 beyond [2] - 33:22, 36:2 **BF** [1] - 34:24 big [4] - 42:16, 46:9, 53:18, 66:25 bigger [1] - 80:18 biggest [1] - 78:25 bird's [5] - 7:11, 7:16, 7:17, 9:4, 55:8 bit [20] - 10:21, 12:23, 16:6, 19:19, 22:24, 26:10, 35:7, 36:1, 38:18, 39:2, 46:12, 47:12, 53:8, 54:20, 58:14, 60:15, 60:25, 68:7, 76:17, 77:12 **BLAIS** [1] - 2:2 Blais [2] - 39:14, 89:9 blast [5] - 21:9, 21:13, 21:22, 22:5 blasting [15] - 21:1, 21:16, 21:17, 22:4, 22:12, 22:18, 23:6, 23:8, 30:1, 30:10, 30:11, 30:16, 30:17, 38:25. 73:24 blocks [1] - 30:4 blue [1] - 64:22 blueish [1] - 60:5 BOARD [2] - 1:1, 1:7 board [10] - 12:7, 44:23, 73:21, 76:23, 83:20, 86:5, 87:9, 88:8, 89:2, 90:2 Board [30] - 2:11, 3:5, 3:8, 4:15, 4:23, 6:1, 6:2, 6:10, 7:3, 10:4, 10:20, 31:1, 38:13, 43:20, 54:9, 59:18, 64:9, 74:23, 75:21, 76:2, 78:8, 78:14, 79:9, 79:13, 79:14, 79:18, 81:15, 83:10, 95:2, 95:13 Board's [2] - 4:21, 81:8 boards [3] - 11:8, 12:5 boiler [1] - 61:10 boils [1] - 16:17 **BOMBACE** [1] - 1:12 borders [1] - 93:21 boring [3] - 19:25, 26:4, 42:3 borings [3] - 12:19,

18:20. 42:24

94:12

borne [2] - 69:15,

bottom [7] - 16:9,

18:18, 28:2, 40:5,

Boulevard [1] - 2:10 **BOX** [1] - 1:23 box [1] - 28:14 braced [1] - 23:22 bracing [2] - 24:4, 24:18 **BRANCHEAU** [2] -2:2, 39:15 breakers [3] - 25:8, 32:13, 36:20 **brief** [1] - 51:6 bring [4] - 28:22, 34:10, 49:24, 83:20 **bringing** [1] - 78:3 broad [1] - 72:13 **BROOK** [1] - 1:24 brought [2] - 74:23, 76:21 buffer [6] - 9:13, 35:7, 48:21, 59:10, 80:7, 80:11 build [1] - 74:7 Building [37] - 7:1, 8:2, 8:4, 8:6, 16:1, 16:2, 16:14, 18:17, 24:13, 25:21, 29:8, 31:19, 32:25, 33:10, 33:12, 33:15, 35:6, 35:23, 35:24, 40:5, 55:3, 55:5, 55:6, 55:25, 56:1, 56:6, 56:7, 56:9, 56:17, 57:3, 57:5, 57:13, 82:11 building [36] - 8:7, 8:14, 9:8, 9:9, 9:11, 9:13, 9:15, 17:2, 17:4, 17:13, 17:14, 17:15, 19:6, 25:17, 25:20, 33:21, 37:17, 41:4, 41:17, 49:15, 53:20, 56:7, 56:23, 56:25, 57:5, 57:8, 57:23, 61:8, 64:21, 65:1, 66:3, 66:20, 66:21, 80:19, 81:3, **buildings** [16] - 10:11, 20:17, 20:22, 25:24, 30:3, 31:4, 41:16, 47:11, 54:16, 56:17, 57:17, 60:9, 65:24, 80:6, 80:20, 82:16 Buildings [3] - 16:3, 16:10, 23:20 **Buildings'** [1] - 31:12 built [3] - 52:4, 55:15, 82:24 **bulk** [2] - 16:21, 27:12

bulking [1] - 27:7

between [13] - 4:21,

13:22, 15:6, 22:15,

bulldozer [1] - 21:2 bunch [3] - 78:4, 79:21, 92:1 BY [1] - 2:9

C.S.R [1] - 1:22

41:24

80:21

calculations [4] -

27:5, 35:18, 41:9,

campus [8] - 45:24,

54:3, 62:17, 74:5,

campuses [1] - 45:20

50:16, 53:16, 53:21,

C

candidates [1] - 48:2 cannot [5] - 28:13, 48:12, 52:23, 81:14, 81:17 capable [1] - 81:3 cardiac [1] - 49:7 care [1] - 69:8 **CARLTON** [3] - 2:3, 11:18, 92:19 carry [2] - 94:24, 94:25 cars [7] - 6:17, 7:25, 8:1, 62:14, 62:16, 62:24, 63:9 **CARUCCI** [1] - 1:22 case [4] - 25:19, 28:1, 28:4, 54:17 cases [2] - 55:19, 69:3 catch [1] - 40:24 cath [1] - 49:7 caveat [1] - 90:8 central [1] - 14:20 century [3] - 46:1, 46:6, 60:17 certain [8] - 6:5, 17:20, 34:22, 40:9, 69:1, 70:14, 73:18, 74:6 certainly [15] - 27:21, 40:12, 41:22, 68:25, 69:22, 71:4, 74:15, 77:25, 78:1, 78:7, 78:9, 83:2, 85:23, 87:5, 93:24 **CERTIFIED** [1] - 1:23 Certified [2] - 96:8, 96:9 certify [1] - 96:11 cetera [2] - 25:21, 44:14 Chairman [3] - 5:16, 79:4, 89:24 CHAIRMAN [40] - 1:9, 4:1, 4:8, 5:13, 11:16, 29:21, 30:19, 30:21,

30:25, 31:17, 31:21, 32:18, 37:7, 39:12, 39:20, 43:12, 43:15, 71:6, 75:10, 76:1, 76:4, 78:11, 85:8, 85:15, 87:5, 88:12, 88:24, 89:6, 91:3, 91:17, 92:1, 92:8, 92:11, 92:20, 93:15, 94:4, 94:16, 94:20, 94:25, 95:12 chance [1] - 12:8 change [10] - 14:6, 41:20, 54:12, 60:3, 62:15. 71:8. 87:18. 88:22, 90:5, 90:9 changed [3] - 71:18, 90:13, 91:20 changes [2] - 57:24, 91:23 changing [1] - 88:25 characteristics [1] -47:10 charge [2] - 22:1, 22:2 charged [1] - 85:6 charges [2] - 21:18, 30:12 CHARLES [2] - 1:17, 2:12 chart [3] - 60:1, 64:20, 67:13 Cheel [4] - 55:3, 55:12, 57:12, 82:11 chemicals [1] - 21:6 CHIEF [1] - 1:12 choose [4] - 65:25, 67:23, 68:2, 74:11 Chris [1] - 39:14 **CHRIS** [1] - 2:2 circulation [1] - 46:4 civil [2] - 11:3, 12:1 clarification [1] -88:16 clarify [1] - 86:25 **class** [1] - 46:6 clear [2] - 31:22, 73:3 clearly [2] - 58:15, 93:7 close [8] - 11:9, 11:16, 13:6, 35:23, 53:21, 53:24, 67:1, 67:7 closely [1] - 28:9 **closer** [4] - 13:22, 44:10, 45:8, 74:7 closest [3] - 9:11, 29:12, 80:8

CMX [5] - 12:22, 14:1,

42:4, 42:12, 42:25

cobbles [1] - 13:19

collaboration [1] -

78:16

collective [1] - 87:9 collectively [2] -72:17, 77:22 **COLLINS** [1] - 2:12 color [8] - 57:8, 60:4, 60:5, 61:23, 61:25, 62:1, 64:23, 67:25 colors [3] - 14:9, 61:22, 68:2 column [1] - 68:12 combination [3] -17:17, 77:13, 84:7 coming [4] - 41:17, 81:10, 83:24, 89:14 **COMMENCING** [1] -1:2 comment [6] - 38:16, 72:13, 83:12, 91:21, 91:22, 92:22 commented [1] -50:11 comments [2] - 48:23, 75:1 Commission [1] -96:21 common [1] - 13:18 communities [1] -93:24 community [11] -47:10, 69:2, 70:17, 71:2, 73:7, 73:12, 73:15, 73:18, 91:6, 94:2, 94:12 comparative [1] -59:12 compared [2] - 20:24, 38:15 comparison [5] -59:16, 65:17, 78:23 comparisons [1] -59:17 complete [3] - 51:13, 51:15, 61:17 completely [1] - 52:4 complex [3] - 49:14, 69:12, 69:24 compliant [1] - 66:11 compressive [1] -20:6 compromise [2] -76:13, 76:24 concept [6] - 10:6, 19:3, 32:13, 33:12, 34:15, 81:6 concepts [13] - 13:8, 15:23, 20:15, 20:21, 25:14, 29:18, 32:5, 70:5, 78:4, 78:18, 78:19, 83:18, 83:21

26:1. 31:12 conceptually [2] -77:24, 78:1 concern [1] - 90:21 concerned [5] - 83:23, 86:2, 88:7, 91:5, 91:10 concerning [2] - 75:2, 91:10 concerns [3] - 10:8, 10:9, 73:23 concessions [1] -83:13 **conclusion** [1] - 4:23 concrete [2] - 20:8, condensed [1] - 21:20 condition [1] - 92:25 conditions [5] - 12:24, 13:1, 13:2, 13:16, 69:22 conducted [1] - 93:21 configuration [2] -57:6, 57:22 conglomerate [1] -19:24 conjunction [1] -78:15 connecting [1] - 55:12 connection [3] -39:21, 41:8, 57:1 connector [5] - 55:2, 55:6, 55:7, 55:12, 56:10 cons [1] - 75:21 consider [6] - 27:8, 29:13, 37:16, 38:12, 83:19. 83:21 considerable [1] -31:2 consideration [5] -4:10, 22:20, 23:18, 25:15, 81:8 considerations [5] -13:9, 16:16, 25:12, 27:23, 29:19 considered [1] - 16:14 considering [3] - 16:3, 44:1, 72:9 constant [2] - 60:14, 60:22 constructed [1] - 17:9 construction [42] -13:7, 15:23, 16:20, 16:24, 17:1, 17:5, 17:13, 18:12, 21:20, 22:7, 22:9, 23:8, 24:5, 24:6, 25:8, 26:22, 27:21, 27:22, 29:20, 32:16, 34:17, 34:22, 36:25, 39:25,

40:21, 40:23, 44:25, 53:7, 68:21, 68:22, 69:6, 69:9, 70:15, 73:2, 73:9, 73:15, 93:5, 93:6, 94:9, 94:10 consultant [2] - 4:17, 42:9 consultant's [1] -12:18 consultants [1] - 45:1 **consulting** [1] - 11:25 contemplated [1] -34:18 content [1] - 82:14 context [5] - 43:25, 44:21, 53:3, 74:2, 82:23 continue [3] - 40:16, 89:11, 95:2 continuous [1] - 20:12 continuously [1] -21:4 continuum [2] - 44:20, 70:21 contour [1] - 14:8 control [3] - 19:21, 27:25, 29:3 controlled [1] - 21:16 conventional [1] -35:14 conversation [2] -4:23, 85:25 conversations [3] -4:21, 56:22, 75:12 convinced [2] - 50:25, 92:25 cool [1] - 90:6 cooling [1] - 58:2 copies [1] - 6:1 core [1] - 19:25 corner [6] - 7:1, 9:2, 24:16, 34:18, 35:22, correct [8] - 8:13, 31:5, 33:1, 34:25, 35:1, 37:1, 64:3, 87:4 correlate [1] - 43:1 correlations [1] -22:15 cost [20] - 38:19, 38:21, 51:25, 52:8, 53:13, 68:21, 69:6, 69:15, 69:22, 70:15, 73:1, 76:9, 81:24, 82:1, 93:2, 93:3, 93:4, 93:5, 94:8, 94:9 costs [9] - 39:5, 53:6, 53:11, 68:22, 69:4,

conceptual [6] - 16:2,

16:9, 20:16, 23:19,

70:19, 71:16, 82:2, 94:13 COUNCILWOMAN [24] - 1:11, 11:12, 30:20, 37:8, 37:14, 38:8, 38:20, 39:9, 74:16, 74:20, 75:17, 77:6, 77:9, 81:9, 83:7, 88:15, 89:1, 89:13, 90:6, 90:12, 90:18, 91:1, 91:15, 95:10 counsel [1] - 31:2 Counsel [2] - 2:11, 2:14 couple [7] - 14:19, 16:5, 25:1, 41:3, 52:1, 78:5, 93:13 coupled [1] - 73:22 course [2] - 75:4, 93:23 COURT [1] - 1:23 Court [2] - 96:8, 96:9 courts [1] - 48:23 courtyards [1] - 49:14 cover [5] - 48:13, 48:15, 59:8, 59:9, 70:14 covered [3] - 8:23, 59:6, 63:21 crack [4] - 23:3, 23:5, 41:4 create [7] - 41:15, 45:2, 47:5, 48:17, 48:18, 48:20, 48:22 creating [1] - 43:22 crevice [1] - 23:3 criteria [2] - 45:8, 67:22 cross [2] - 24:11, 26:24 crossing [1] - 25:10 **CRR** [1] - 79:19 **cubic** [2] - 26:2, 26:13 current [16] - 19:20, 20:21, 25:13, 26:9, 45:23, 47:3, 49:21, 50:6, 59:22, 60:9, 64:21, 66:12, 67:17, 68:5, 75:3, 82:7 **cursor** [1] - 9:10

D

D'ARMINIO [1] - 2:9 damage [1] - 22:16 dark [2] - 53:10, 60:4 darker [1] - 64:23 dashed [1] - 36:9 data [7] - 19:25, 21:8, 26:4, 26:9, 26:12,

31:16. 43:2 date [2] - 10:17, 94:17 dating [1] - 12:21 Dave [3] - 74:23, 81:10, 92:21 **DAVID** [2] - 1:9, 1:10 daylight [7] - 48:1, 48:3, 49:3, 49:9, 49:12, 50:2, 50:10 deal [6] - 17:1, 18:1, 25:23, 53:19, 90:8, 90:10 dealing [5] - 69:12, 69:13, 69:15, 69:24, 80:13 dealt [1] - 94:6 decide [2] - 84:12, 85:4 decided [1] - 4:15 decides [1] - 79:14 decision [2] - 86:9, 89:10 $\boldsymbol{\text{deck}}\, {\tiny [3]} - 32{:}5,\, 80{:}12,$ 80:19 decrease [1] - 71:24 **deep** [4] - 23:21, 29:9, 76:14, 76:25 deeper [10] - 17:7, 31:3, 39:2, 69:10, 69:20, 72:24, 73:8, 74:6, 74:9, 93:17 defer [2] - 52:24, 82:25 deferring [1] - 82:2 defined [1] - 82:13 defines [1] - 39:9 definite [1] - 89:14 definitive [1] - 88:18 degree [1] - 44:2 degrees [2] - 25:3, 74:12 delay [1] - 30:12 delays [2] - 22:1, 30:14 dense [1] - 27:9 DePalma [1] - 12:23 depicted [1] - 8:5 **deprived** [1] - 91:13 depth [4] - 15:1, 15:3, 15:7, 79:18 **described** [1] - 93:16 **DESCRIPTION** [1] -3:14 deserve [1] - 50:1 design [7] - 14:2, 18:23, 27:15, 40:10, 40:20, 42:7, 44:24 design/construction detail [5] - 8:19, 54:20, 58:15, 78:1, 82:9 detailed [1] - 7:12 details [2] - 9:25, 10:1 determine [3] - 42:9, 71:16, 86:16 determining [1] - 75:4 develop [1] - 77:23 developed [2] - 21:17, 49:1 development [2] -46:24, 61:17 dewater [3] - 16:25, 26:20, 27:16 dewatering [10] -28:16, 28:24, 29:1, 29:15, 31:3, 39:22, 40:1, 41:6, 44:14, 53:19 Dien [22] - 6:22, 8:5, 9:13, 9:14, 9:17, 13:22, 14:20, 15:4, 33:14, 47:6, 51:1, 54:1, 55:10, 56:3, 58:4, 65:20, 65:22, 65:23, 66:18, 66:23, 67:2. 81:5 difference [6] - 7:8, 7:22, 56:11, 56:20, 58:5, 63:16 different [12] - 30:12, 30:14, 37:15, 41:20, 57:6, 61:23, 83:8, 83:18, 83:20, 85:2, 86:25, 94:13 differential [1] - 8:9 differently [2] - 9:3, 85:6 difficult [6] - 18:16, 25:4, 25:8, 37:6, 65:24, 72:20 difficulty [1] - 21:11 digest [1] - 32:20 direction [3] - 7:23, 75:23, 83:24 directly [1] - 81:17 director [2] - 11:1, 11:23 disadvantages [2] -84:11, 85:3 disagree [1] - 86:11 disappointed [1] -58:23 discharge [3] - 19:22,

92:4 discussion [5] -12:15, 13:11, 18:3, 28:18, 89:9 disruption [2] - 76:11, 86:10 disruptive [1] - 48:8 distance [7] - 21:23, 21:24, 21:25, 22:9, 35:12, 50:19, 66:22 distances [1] - 50:12 distill [1] - 89:10 **distorted** [1] - 35:10 doable [1] - 93:1 dock [2] - 48:9, 59:7 document [2] - 90:14, 91:20 documents [1] - 13:6 done [24] - 12:6, 22:6, 22:25, 23:1, 25:18, 26:17, 27:17, 27:19, 32:17, 35:17, 37:12, 39:7, 42:23, 45:6, 51:23, 52:17, 52:22, 61:19, 64:16, 71:15, 74:4, 87:1, 90:8, 90:10 down [12] - 16:17, 24:1, 24:6, 24:7, 24:18, 25:8, 32:16, 34:3, 37:5, 55:14, 61:9, 80:11 draft [3] - 6:1, 74:17, 74:21 drainage [1] - 10:10 draw [3] - 18:5, 19:7 drawing [3] - 35:9, 35:10, 40:19 drawn [1] - 28:14 drilling [1] - 21:1 drop [3] - 46:14, 48:10, 57:12 drop-off [3] - 46:14, 48:10, 57:12 drove [1] - 20:2 dry [1] - 42:19 due [2] - 61:1, 93:4 **Dumpsters** [1] - 59:8 duration [4] - 26:8, 37:23, 70:15, 76:10 during [8] - 16:24, 17:5, 22:12, 23:6, 40:21, 41:20, 69:9, 87:18 Ε

early [1] - 13:3 earth [1] - 20:25 easement [1] - 6:23 east [4] - 15:1, 15:21,

36:14. 54:3 eastern [1] - 34:23 easy [2] - 72:2, 72:5 edge [6] - 44:12, 47:5, 53:24, 54:17, 58:4, edges [1] - 44:11 **Education** [3] - 75:21, 81:16, 83:10 effort [3] - 20:24, 37:12, 37:13 efforts [1] - 27:21 either [8] - 25:9, 39:24, 46:21, 48:20, 69:8, 76:16, 77:4, 93:3 elaborate [1] - 22:23 elaboration [1] - 5:16 elderly [1] - 50:18 electrical [1] - 61:11 element [1] - 79:2 elements [1] - 34:23 elevation [25] - 13:5, 13:22, 13:23, 14:1, 14:2, 14:21, 14:24, 15:2, 15:6, 15:14, 15:22, 16:11, 18:18, 18:20, 18:23, 24:13, 24:14, 27:1, 28:2, 31:7, 31:8, 31:13, 31:14, 31:19, 40:6 elevations [4] - 15:5, 20:14, 53:18, 55:17 eliminated [2] - 67:4, 80:13 **elimination** [1] - 56:12 embarked [2] - 51:17, 52:11 emergency [2] -48:10, 50:22 enclosed [3] - 48:9, 48:10, 60:9 **encounter** [1] - 42:6 encountered [1] -18:19 encroachment [1] -36:17 end [26] - 5:6, 10:14, 20:10, 22:10, 23:7, 23:8, 24:8, 26:5, 28:8, 50:16, 50:17, 51:2, 53:21, 54:3, 57:2, 59:13, 60:12, 64:2, 64:4, 64:12, 64:17, 64:19, 71:3, 84:9, 90:11 end-all [1] - 84:9 ended [1] - 23:11 endoscopy [1] - 49:8 ends [3] - 19:10,

33:21, 34:1

28 of 38 sheets

[1] - 13:9

84:1

desire [2] - 75:13,

29:4, 39:4

42:21

discoloration [1] -

discuss [3] - 12:24,

discussed [5] - 6:23,

7:3, 26:2, 89:16,

85:23, 89:12

endure [1] - 73:9 engage [1] - 4:16 engaged [2] - 4:17, 85:12 engagement [1] - 4:24 engaging [1] - 4:25 **ENGINEER** [1] - 2:2 engineering [8] - 11:2, 11:4, 11:23, 11:25, 12:2, 12:3, 42:5, 49:1 engineers [1] - 44:25 ensuring [1] - 41:8 entire [4] - 8:21, 8:25, 9:2, 64:12 enumerate [1] - 45:11 enunciated [8] - 45:3, 45:25, 47:23, 51:7, 58:21, 68:14, 93:1, 93:7 environmental [3] -10:25, 11:5, 12:3 environmental/ geotechnical [1] -11:24 envision [1] - 45:5 envisioned [1] - 44:4 envisions [1] - 60:12 equation [1] - 72:22 **equipment** [1] - 60:8 especially [3] - 18:1, 49:3, 88:3 ESQ [2] - 2:9, 2:12 essence [3] - 35:21, 38:10, 86:15 essentially [2] - 46:21, 94:23 estimated [3] - 16:10, 26:15, 31:13 et [2] - 25:21, 44:14 evaluate [2] - 78:17, 78:20 evaluation [3] - 42:17, 43:3, 86:10 evening [4] - 5:6, 5:17, 43:21, 71:4 **EVID** [1] - 3:14 evident [1] - 37:18 evolution [1] - 87:18 evolving [1] - 76:6 exact [1] - 28:13 example [20] - 25:19, 41:23, 44:1, 44:9, 51:17, 53:14, 53:21, 53:25, 54:2, 61:5, 61:9, 69:16, 72:22, 72:23, 73:7, 73:10, 73:13, 74:5, 74:7, 82:6 excavate [5] - 21:19, 24:17, 25:22, 27:15,

53:17 excavated [2] - 20:13, 21:1 **excavating** [1] - 21:11 excavation [26] -16:18, 17:10, 17:12, 20:23, 20:25, 21:12, 23:18, 23:23, 24:2, 24:7, 26:18, 27:24, 29:7, 30:7, 32:9, 32:11, 32:12, 32:15, 34:1, 35:13, 35:17, 37:4, 38:24, 53:23, 69:7, 74:9 excavations [8] - 17:6, 17:24, 18:2, 21:10, 23:19, 23:21, 29:9, 93:17 exceed [1] - 22:16 excellent [1] - 83:19 except [1] - 67:8 excess [2] - 60:15, 61:16 excited [1] - 76:7 exhibit [1] - 36:16 exhibits [1] - 79:19 **EXHIBITS** [1] - 3:15 exist [1] - 26:15 existing [19] - 13:1, 13:2, 14:23, 23:4, 29:11, 32:4, 32:23, 36:13, 51:3, 52:12, 52:20, 55:17, 55:21, 56:6, 58:7, 60:3, 80:9, 80:15, 81:24 expansive [1] - 21:6 expect [2] - 14:6, 22:6 **expense** [1] - 38:14 **expensive** [3] - 17:18, 69:18, 69:20 expert [2] - 28:22, 41:10 **expertise** [1] - 5:1 **experts** [1] - 6:5 Expires [1] - 96:21 explain [1] - 9:8 explained [1] - 81:10 expressed [1] - 75:13 extend [2] - 56:23, 76:10 **extended** [1] - 33:17 extends [1] - 32:14 **extension** [1] - 55:6 extent [3] - 10:9, 20:18, 79:1 exterior [1] - 22:22

extraction [1] - 17:8

eye [5] - 7:11, 7:16,

7:17, 9:4, 55:8

F face [8] - 24:2, 24:24, 30:7, 35:16, 36:6, 63:11, 66:4, 66:23 faces [2] - 65:19, 67:10 facility [12] - 28:24, 38:3, 41:16, 45:16, 47:18, 49:9, 51:14, 51:21, 51:22, 52:13, 52:17, 53:2 fact [4] - 36:20, 61:1, 75:13, 77:7 factor [3] - 27:7, 36:2, 40:11 factors [1] - 69:13 faded [1] - 61:22 failure [3] - 24:21, 35:25, 36:2 faint [1] - 42:2 fair [2] - 61:7, 68:6 fairly [6] - 20:11, 20:12, 61:12, 66:25, 67:1, 68:24 **fall** [2] - 4:19, 24:24 fan [1] - 42:16 far [7] - 9:24, 12:22, 17:23, 17:24, 26:23, 58:23, 78:23 fast [1] - 15:8 faster [1] - 21:19 favor [3] - 58:18, 73:15, 95:12 favored [1] - 49:16 **FAX** [1] - 1:25 feasibility [1] - 84:4 feasible [8] - 20:18, 27:14, 29:8, 37:9, 37:11, 38:9, 84:20, 87:17 feasibly [1] - 81:3 features [1] - 59:14 **FEBRUARY** [1] - 1:2 feet [63] - 8:8, 8:11, 8:15, 9:18, 14:2, 15:11, 15:15, 15:19, 17:24, 18:21, 19:10, 20:3, 23:21, 24:1, 24:16, 30:6, 30:15, 32:9, 33:19, 33:20, 34:3, 34:4, 34:5, 35:13, 35:16, 36:9, 38:6, 40:8, 45:22, 45:24, 46:2, 46:18, 46:25, 47:22, 49:18, 50:13, 50:14, 56:21, 60:3, 60:13, 60:16, 60:21, 61:4, 65:1, 65:3, 65:4, 65:5,

65:23, 65:25, 66:4, 66:6, 66:9, 66:13, 66:15, 66:18, 66:24 felt [1] - 49:2 few [1] - 54:19 figure [1] - 73:17 figured [1] - 14:10 final [4] - 33:11, 40:20, 80:2, 86:11 findings [1] - 4:19 fine [2] - 84:24, 91:1 fingers [1] - 84:22 finish [1] - 77:8 FIRE [1] - 1:12 firm [4] - 10:22, 11:1, 11:25, 75:15 first [14] - 5:12, 5:13, 5:19, 15:15, 16:24, 24:13, 24:17, 24:18, 45:15, 46:6, 47:9, 65:19, 83:15, 85:9 first-rate [1] - 46:6 five [17] - 7:7, 7:9, 7:20, 7:21, 8:2, 20:2, 20:3, 30:4, 54:15, 56:19, 56:25, 57:8, 58:1, 62:4, 65:9, 77:19, 81:22 five-foot [1] - 20:2 flexibility [2] - 82:23, 83:3 flip [2] - 7:9, 21:21 floating [2] - 19:12, 19:14 floor [5] - 15:21, 24:13, 28:3, 57:9 focus [3] - 16:22, 19:19. 77:18 folks [1] - 15:8 **follow** [1] - 91:8 following [2] - 5:23, 92:13 foot [4] - 20:2, 38:3, 38:4, 38:5 footage [2] - 61:5, 82:15 footprint [5] - 38:5, 50:6, 54:25, 76:16, 77:19 foregoing [1] - 96:11 forgot [1] - 59:5 form [1] - 81:12 formal [1] - 79:20 formally [1] - 5:8 format [1] - 59:15 forth [9] - 17:21, 21:6, 22:2, 44:3, 58:2, 59:8, 59:9, 66:9, 89:11 forward [10] - 5:7,

6:20, 22:21, 24:24,

78:18. 86:6. 88:9. 89:20, 90:5, 95:8 foundation [2] -18:18, 31:12 foundations [2] -10:10, 16:10 four [25] - 6:21, 7:14, 7:18, 49:22, 50:6, 54:4, 54:5, 54:12, 54:23, 55:11, 56:5, 57:18, 58:11, 59:15, 59:19, 60:9, 60:12, 61:23, 65:2, 65:19, 68:18, 68:22, 69:5, 70:8, 72:15 fourth [3] - 47:23, 62:8, 65:21 fracturing [1] - 21:2 Franklin [6] - 33:16, 58:3, 65:21, 66:7, 67:11, 95:5 frankly [1] - 83:16 free [1] - 51:2 frequency [1] - 22:15 fresh [1] - 49:24 front [2] - 8:5, 11:7 fronts [1] - 47:6 fulfilled [1] - 45:2 fully [1] - 6:8 function [3] - 49:17, 57:9, 60:7 functions [15] - 45:18, 45:19, 47:17, 47:24, 49:10, 50:1, 50:9, 50:17, 51:4, 51:5, 57:20, 61:1, 64:23, 67:13 FURBACHER [1] -96:7 future [1] - 52:25

G

Gail [10] - 7:13, 15:25, 23:13, 54:20, 56:20, 59:5, 74:16, 75:6, 86:24, 87:8 **GAIL** [1] - 2:9 garage [8] - 6:16, 15:11, 15:12, 28:5, 31:23, 32:1, 32:4, 32:23 Garage [19] - 6:16, 6:17, 7:24, 16:13, 23:20, 25:19, 26:1, 26:8, 26:25, 27:4, 27:14, 28:1, 28:2, 28:4, 31:13, 80:18, 80:25, 81:1 garages [2] - 20:17, 31:4

65:10, 65:12, 65:16,

geotech [2] - 10:7, geotechnical [12] -5:1, 5:20, 11:1, 11:23, 12:18, 12:21, 42:5, 71:9, 71:12, 72:10, 84:18 given [5] - 75:18, 81:18, 89:16, 89:17, 94:22 glacial [1] - 13:17 glad [1] - 71:4 grade [92] - 6:15, 6:19, 7:24, 8:1, 12:16, 13:8, 13:11, 13:13, 15:10, 15:15, 15:16, 15:21, 16:3, 16:15, 16:17, 16:20, 17:25, 18:10, 19:2, 20:16, 22:19, 23:17, 25:11, 25:14, 25:16, 25:22, 29:19, 31:9, 32:6, 33:13, 33:22, 38:4, 39:25, 40:4, 44:10, 46:13, 46:20, 47:20, 47:21, 47:22, 47:24, 48:4, 48:5, 48:6, 49:12, 49:18, 49:19, 49:24, 49:25, 50:7, 50:8, 50:9, 53:15, 55:16, 55:23, 56:24, 58:9, 58:10, 60:4, 60:5, 61:2, 61:3, 61:8, 61:13, 61:19, 61:20, 61:24, 61:25, 62:1, 62:6, 62:11, 62:19, 62:21, 63:1, 63:5, 63:6, 63:9, 63:10, 63:13, 63:18, 63:19, 65:14, 65:15, 68:11, 69:17, 69:19, 73:8 grades [1] - 14:18 grandular [1] - 13:19 graphics [1] - 78:23 great [3] - 43:2, 78:3, 82:9 greater [5] - 8:19, 20:24, 44:8, 44:18, greatest [1] - 16:16 green [23] - 8:4, 8:11,

gear [1] - 61:11

66:13, 68:17

48:14, 51:11

5:11

general [3] - 23:23,

generally [5] - 13:6,

13:19, 30:22, 38:20,

generated [3] - 12:20,

gentlemen [2] - 5:5,

8:17, 8:19, 8:24, 9:7, 9:22, 14:15, 28:20, 47:5, 48:16, 48:17, 48:19, 48:21, 53:10, 57:10, 63:22, 68:2, 68:9, 80:7, 80:11 greenbelt [1] - 47:11 ground [16] - 14:23, 15:5, 27:10, 36:4, 37:18, 38:16, 44:5, 44:19, 46:21, 46:22, 48:2, 76:15, 77:2, 78:19, 81:7, 81:8 groundbreaking [1] -27:18 groundwater [38] -13:25, 14:5, 16:18, 16:23, 17:2, 17:3, 17:7, 17:15, 17:19, 17:23, 17:24, 18:9, 18:19, 19:1, 19:5, 19:11, 19:12, 19:13, 19:18, 19:21, 25:13, 27:25, 29:3, 30:22, 31:7, 31:16, 37:20, 40:8, 40:19, 40:20, 41:15, 41:19, 42:6, 42:7, 42:14, 42:17, 42:18, 94:5 grouped [1] - 54:14 **groups** [2] - 81:15, 83:8 grout [2] - 36:3 guess [2] - 85:1, 85:9 guide [1] - 73:21 guys [1] - 93:12

Н

H-pile [1] - 35:15 H-room [1] - 57:1 H-ZONE [1] - 1:4 **H-Zone** [4] - 4:3, 4:11, 4:15, 95:7 habited [4] - 49:22, 50:9, 57:11, 64:22 half [1] - 27:4 hammer [1] - 21:2 hammers [1] - 21:4 hand [5] - 11:18, 11:19, 59:24, 80:10 hand-held [2] - 11:18, 11:19 handicapped [1] -50:19 handle [3] - 17:3, 39:3, 80:1 handled [3] - 18:4, 19:18, 30:11 hard [1] - 14:10

hassle [1] - 37:25

haul [1] - 28:7 headline [1] - 37:8 hear [18] - 5:4, 10:3, 11:11, 72:3, 73:20, 73:23, 75:8, 75:20, 79:19, 79:21, 84:10, 85:1, 85:2, 85:3, 88:11, 89:3, 89:7, 95:1 heard [11] - 5:23, 10:5, 21:23, 32:20, 72:21, 73:6, 76:8, 84:21, 85:25, 86:1 hearing [21] - 4:7, 4:14, 5:7, 10:6, 79:16, 80:4, 83:16, 84:17, 85:16, 85:22, 86:4, 86:17, 87:19, 88:10, 89:25, 90:1, 90:3, 90:4, 90:23, 90:24, 91:7 hearings [1] - 7:4 heart [2] - 49:4, 49:5 heavy [1] - 19:13 height [8] - 8:15, 49:15, 49:18, 59:16, 64:21, 65:1, 65:10, 65:16 **held** [2] - 11:18, 11:19 help [2] - 16:8, 18:17 helpful [1] - 34:10 helps [1] - 21:18 hesitate [1] - 84:8 **high** [5] - 15:5, 42:17, 42:22, 43:3, 43:6 higher [6] - 18:24, 28:3, 54:25, 58:6, 76:17, 86:18 highest [2] - 41:25, 43:7

highlights [1] - 45:14 Hillsdale [2] - 11:9, 12:6 himself [1] - 4:3 hit [3] - 30:22, 30:23, 45:13 hold [2] - 11:16, 95:7 holiday [1] - 92:12 hope [1] - 5:6 hoped [1] - 58:25 hopefully [1] - 16:7 Hopkins [2] - 11:5, 12:3 **horizontal** [1] - 34:5 **HOSPITAL** [1] - 1:4

49:4. 49:6. 50:1. 51:9, 51:16, 52:11, 60:3, 60:17, 60:25, 69:3, 69:16, 70:6, 70:9, 71:2, 72:16, 72:24, 73:1, 75:2, 75:20, 77:22, 78:2, 79:17, 82:19, 82:24, 83:9, 83:21, 87:16, 88:6, 90:19, 91:9, 94:9 hospital [28] - 4:16, 5:22, 5:24, 20:16, 25:14, 30:3, 46:1, 46:3, 46:7, 46:17, 47:17, 47:24, 48:25, 49:17, 50:17, 51:3, 51:4, 51:15, 51:16, 51:18, 52:4, 57:9, 57:11, 60:7, 60:18, 61:19, 65:16, 83:1 Hospital's [9] - 4:22, 12:18, 40:6, 42:9, 78:16, 85:17, 85:25, 91:4, 93:17 hospital-related [1] -51:4 hour[1] - 94:22 housed [1] - 62:17 houses [2] - 37:22, 54:3 hundreds [1] - 19:9 HURLEY [1] - 1:14

ı

idea [1] - 65:8 ideas [1] - 70:4 identical [3] - 56:9, 56:14, 65:6 identify [1] - 19:20 **II** [18] - 7:17, 52:23, 52:24, 55:4, 56:16, 57:3, 57:16, 60:13, 61:16, 64:2, 64:5, 64:12, 64:19, 79:11, 82:14, 82:20 **III** [1] - 83:5 illustrate [1] - 16:6 illustration [1] - 24:10 illustrations [1] -18:15 immediately [2] -30:8, 64:16 impact [9] - 29:15, 30:13, 41:15, 47:2, 47:18, 73:2, 93:5, 94:2, 94:10 impacts [7] - 18:4, 19:21, 28:7, 28:25, 29:5, 29:13, 71:14

impediments [1] -71:20 impervious [1] - 28:21 impinge [1] - 44:18 implement [2] - 53:13, implementation [1] -27:24 important [9] - 24:20, 29:2, 29:19, 43:3, 50:22, 72:21, 78:2, 88:5, 88:13 imposes [1] - 27:20 impractical [1] - 76:9 improvements [1] -29:6 IN [1] - 1:3 in-depth [1] - 79:18 incidental [1] - 46:13 include [3] - 60:6, 60:7, 74:24 included [1] - 83:9 including [9] - 10:17, 36:20, 37:19, 38:12, 46:3, 46:4, 52:17 incorporate [1] -87:23 increase [3] - 9:12, 38:22, 63:2 increased [4] - 8:7, 9:22, 39:24, 93:4 increasing [1] - 36:24 incremental [2] -53:11, 53:13 independent [1] - 91:5 indicate [3] - 21:8, 25:14, 61:6 indicated [4] - 19:25, 26:2, 26:5, 62:3 indicates [4] - 60:4, 60:5, 64:22, 64:23 indicating) [6] - 18:22, 36:6, 36:10, 36:15, 37:6, 80:14 indications [2] -82:15, 82:16 individual [1] - 10:2 individually [1] -25:18 **individuals** [1] - 88:7 induce [1] - 19:14 inexpensive [1] -69:17 **infiltration** [2] - 28:24, 41:13 influence [3] - 19:9,

19:16, 19:21

information [9] -

10:16, 12:18, 12:20,

12:23, 13:4, 14:5,

14:7, 15:13, 16:11

Hospital [48] - 2:14,

6:4, 14:6, 15:9, 30:9,

31:2, 36:15, 43:23,

44:3, 44:24, 45:19,

45:21, 46:5, 46:8,

46:24, 47:5, 48:25,

initial [1] - 5:23 inpatient [3] - 45:16, 51:14, 51:21 input [13] - 72:17, 75:24, 78:1, 79:19, 80:5, 83:21, 85:5, 87:15, 88:22, 89:8, 89:15, 89:20, 90:4 inside [6] - 25:7, 25:10, 32:12, 32:15, 33:3, 33:6 install [5] - 24:17, 24:19, 26:19, 32:10, 34:6 installation [2] - 19:5, 37:20 installed [3] - 14:5, 19:1, 42:12 instance [1] - 31:11 instead [2] - 26:15, 77:19 instruct [1] - 89:9 integrated [1] - 49:8 intention [1] - 95:7 intentions [1] - 6:7 interested [2] - 37:15, 84:16 interesting [1] - 60:19 interior [1] - 22:22 internal [4] - 8:18, 48:23, 48:24, 89:9 International [1] - 2:4 introduce [3] - 49:13, 53:25, 54:2 involve [1] - 36:24 involved [3] - 22:3, 41:5, 41:12 irrigation [1] - 48:18 issue [8] - 4:3, 19:2, 31:21, 33:15, 46:9, 49:20, 53:22, 94:10 issues [20] - 5:21, 10:7, 10:10, 10:12, 21:22, 37:19, 40:17, 44:15, 48:7, 48:16, 67:13, 67:14, 68:14, 68:20, 69:5, 69:14, 69:15, 73:2, 89:21 item [1] - 23:17 itself [3] - 5:25, 9:13, 46:8

J

January [1] - 26:5 JERSEY [1] - 1:24 Jersey [3] - 2:10, 96:11, 96:19 JIM [1] - 1:12 job [1] - 78:3 Johns [2] - 11:5, 12:3 JR [1] - 2:12 jump [1] - 76:3 jumps [1] - 60:21

K

keep [1] - 32:4 **KELLER** [37] - 2:4, 3:4, 10:23, 11:15, 11:21, 12:15, 22:25, 23:16, 30:5, 30:24, 31:6, 31:18, 32:1, 33:1, 33:5, 33:11, 33:24, 34:14, 34:20, 35:1, 35:5, 36:10, 36:12, 36:22, 37:1, 37:11, 38:2, 38:18, 38:21, 40:1, 40:12, 40:18, 41:11, 41:22, 42:1, 43:7, 43:10 Keller [5] - 5:19, 10:15, 10:24, 11:22, 43:16 KIM [1] - 96:7 **kind** [4] - 16:5, 40:17, 40:22, 42:22 kitchen [1] - 60:8 knoll [1] - 14:20 knolls [2] - 14:19, 20:19 knows [1] - 82:18

L

L.L.C [1] - 1:22

laccsr2@aol.com[1] -1:25 lagging [1] - 35:15 laid [2] - 14:16, 23:23 Lake [1] - 2:10 land [1] - 52:17 Land [1] - 79:23 landing [1] - 24:8 landscape [1] - 8:24 language [2] - 5:25, 89:10 large [6] - 18:1, 28:23, 30:12, 70:17, 71:2, 83:22 larger [1] - 6:3 larger-sized [1] - 6:3 Larry [11] - 10:19, 10:24, 11:22, 39:18, 39:21, 44:7, 44:15, 68:18, 69:23, 74:3, 75:15 **LARRY** [1] - 2:4 **Larry's** [3] - 78:17, 85:20, 92:24

last [6] - 5:9, 50:20, 68:12, 70:8, 74:24, 87:2 late [3] - 4:13, 5:9, 54:22 lateness [1] - 94:22 latter [1] - 26:4 **LAURA** [1] - 1:22 **LAURENCE** [1] - 3:4 Law [1] - 79:23 layout [5] - 5:22, 5:24, 6:13, 8:21, 9:5 layouts [2] - 6:6 leads [1] - 44:20 least [4] - 32:9, 35:8, 66:11, 86:11 leaving [1] - 4:4 led [1] - 4:23 left [3] - 4:7, 5:9, 52:3 length [4] - 9:2, 27:21, 68:21. 69:6 lengths [1] - 94:11 less [10] - 26:10, 26:11, 60:22, 62:14, 62:23, 66:14, 68:7, 73:8, 81:7, 82:13 lessen [1] - 28:8 level [29] - 8:10, 14:3, 15:6, 15:16, 16:4, 17:20, 25:22, 26:1, 26:7, 27:3, 27:13, 27:20, 28:6, 28:9, 37:12, 37:13, 37:24, 42:7, 49:3, 49:6, 49:22, 55:22, 55:23, 56:12, 58:9, 65:9, 84:24 levels [27] - 13:11,

32:3, 32:6, 33:13, 33:23, 40:5, 41:19, 41:25, 49:22, 50:6, 55:16, 56:23, 57:12, 58:8, 65:9, 69:21, 93:19 License [1] - 96:7 **light** [4] - 11:14, 35:3, 48:13 likelihood [1] - 53:19 likely [1] - 89:17 limit [3] - 22:17, 35:6, 45:17 limited [3] - 10:9, 28:17 line [19] - 24:12, 24:16, 24:18, 25:10, 29:12, 30:9, 32:8, 33:14, 33:16, 34:23,

16:3, 16:15, 17:25,

20:16, 23:19, 25:11,

25:14, 25:16, 31:9,

36:13, 53:22, 76:12 Linwood [27] - 6:14, 6:17, 6:24, 7:23, 9:22, 15:12, 28:1, 28:2, 31:24, 32:2, 32:7, 47:7, 54:24, 55:10, 55:18, 55:21, 56:13, 57:15, 58:7, 65:20, 66:2, 66:15, 67:4, 80:7, 80:8, 80:11, 81:5 list [5] - 45:13, 91:12, 91:16, 91:18 listen [1] - 86:8 lives [1] - 28:8 loading [2] - 6:25, 34:19 location [8] - 8:9, 19:22, 35:22, 51:22, 52:5, 53:16, 56:14, 82:25 locations [4] - 23:10, 25:6, 45:23, 51:18 logs [1] - 42:3 long-range [1] - 51:9 long-term [8] - 41:2, 45:4, 69:2, 69:3, 69:14, 70:17, 70:20 look [24] - 10:5, 12:8, 12:17, 14:11, 15:18, 16:19, 20:14, 21:24, 25:17, 25:20, 27:1, 31:1, 31:11, 36:21, 40:7, 51:24, 52:15, 56:8, 77:17, 78:22, 80:18, 80:19, 81:2, 81:5 looked [18] - 7:2, 25:12, 25:18, 26:12, 35:20, 48:16, 50:15, 54:5, 54:8, 57:18, 58:12, 58:17, 61:23, 63:23, 64:18, 64:20, 67:12, 68:4 looking [24] - 14:25, 15:7, 15:8, 16:23, 18:16, 23:14, 24:12, 31:14, 34:15, 35:8, 35:15, 38:6, 38:15, 43:22, 51:24, 55:9, 60:1, 67:23, 67:24, 71:12, 81:3, 82:8, 85:5, 94:23 looks [4] - 15:14, 26:9, 76:19, 80:20 loosens [1] - 27:10 loud [1] - 83:14

low [2] - 14:21, 16:10

lower [14] - 16:4, 17:6,

17:15, 17:19, 19:5,

19:11, 23:19, 25:25,

35:25, 36:8, 36:11,

27:2, 27:13, 27:20, 56:23, 68:22, 81:24
lower-most [1] - 23:19
lowered [2] - 17:11, 19:13
lowest [3] - 15:3, 20:16, 43:9

М

magnitude [2] - 74:13, 93:20 **main** [7] - 45:23, 47:6, 52:10, 54:12, 56:11, 56:25, 57:24 Main [1] - 57:12 major [7] - 56:20, 59:14, 62:15, 63:16, 67:12, 79:2, 81:23 majority [1] - 20:15 management [9] -13:15, 28:12, 28:14, 28:19, 29:15, 37:21, 41:7, 41:10, 41:12 manager [1] - 45:1 map [3] - 14:9, 34:11, 40:5 maps [1] - 14:16 March [2] - 95:5, 95:7 MARKED [1] - 3:15 marker [1] - 23:5 mass [1] - 73:8 massing [1] - 47:18 Master [24] - 4:11, 5:25, 43:22, 44:17, 45:4. 45:9. 51:7. 53:4, 53:14, 54:7, 57:21, 58:21, 59:25, 64:8, 64:16, 64:22, 65:18, 66:12, 67:21, 68:12, 68:14, 89:10, 89:15 master's [2] - 11:4, 12:2 mat [2] - 18:18, 24:14 matching [1] - 55:16 material [2] - 28:7, 94:5 matter [2] - 93:23, 95:8 **MATTER** [1] - 1:3 matters [2] - 5:1, 5:2 mayor[1] - 78:13 MAYOR [30] - 1:10, 8:10, 8:14, 9:17, 9:20, 32:19, 33:2, 33:8, 33:22, 34:8, 71:7, 71:23, 72:5, 73:20, 74:12, 74:15, 83:12, 85:14, 86:14,

86:23, 87:8, 87:13,

34:24, 35:7, 35:23,

87:22, 88:1, 88:5, 88:13, 89:23, 93:8, 93:12, 94:15 mean [16] - 20:11, 30:1, 30:2, 30:3, 30:4, 30:8, 34:2, 37:12, 73:14, 74:5, 76:6, 82:14, 82:22, 94:1, 94:8 means [7] - 14:2, 20:1, 20:5, 21:25, 29:4, 67:16, 86:8 meant [1] - 50:18 measure [1] - 22:14 measured [1] - 66:22 mechanical [17] -46:3, 48:4, 49:19, 49:23, 49:24, 55:11, 58:2, 60:8, 61:2, 61:3, 61:6, 61:20, 64:24, 65:4, 65:11, 65:14, 70:13 mechanics [2] - 20:8, 32:8 median [1] - 14:3 Medical [1] - 2:3 **MEESE** [1] - 2:9 meet [2] - 28:9, 72:8 meeting [9] - 44:24, 45:8, 45:12, 86:7, 92:12, 92:18, 95:1, 95:8, 95:15 meetings [3] - 16:21, 72:15, 95:6 meets [1] - 89:18 member [1] - 76:23 MEMBER [5] - 1:13, 1:14, 1:15, 1:16, 1:17 **Members** [1] - 95:13 members [10] - 4:9, 10:19, 10:20, 37:2, 73:21, 75:24, 76:2, 79:21, 91:6, 95:4 memories [1] - 91:8 mention [1] - 59:5 mentioned [3] - 16:20, 59:9, 81:15 merits [1] - 50:25 met [4] - 10:20, 68:15, 68:16 method [2] - 22:17, 53:23 methods [2] - 21:5, 29:4 mic [1] - 11:14 middle [1] - 81:7 midst [1] - 4:14 might [5] - 13:5, 72:8, 77:18, 87:20, 88:11 million [6] - 46:2,

46:24, 47:22, 53:12, 60:13, 60:16 mind [1] - 93:6 minds [1] - 88:25 minimize [1] - 47:17 minus [1] - 15:22 minute [1] - 80:25 minutes [1] - 54:19 mitigation [2] - 47:2, 48:8 models [2] - 76:21, 83:16 modern [1] - 46:1 modification [1] -84:17 modifications [1] -54:13 modify [2] - 86:12, 90:5 moment [4] - 10:1, 45:10, 88:21, 90:2 Monday [1] - 92:20 money [1] - 93:4 monitor [3] - 41:4, 42:13, 42:18 monitoring [7] -22:12, 22:13, 40:24, 41:1, 41:3, 42:12, 42:13 monotonous [1] -21:5 months [9] - 10:5, 26:8, 26:18, 42:18, 54:9, 70:8, 72:15, 88:4 monumental [1] -27:18 MORGAN [1] - 1:14 morning [1] - 48:12 most [8] - 20:21, 23:19, 50:15, 50:17, 57:19, 58:19, 61:6, 71:1 motion [1] - 95:9 mottling [1] - 42:21 mound [1] - 41:15 **mounding** [1] - 41:13 mouth [1] - 11:17 move [7] - 5:7, 7:23, 9:10, 45:6, 80:10, 86:5, 95:8 moved [4] - 9:12, 9:14, 62:16, 95:10 movement [7] - 23:6, 58:16, 58:24, 58:25, 63:5, 68:9, 70:2 moving [7] - 6:20, 19:23, 50:25, 61:2, 61:20, 62:16, 68:25 MR [81] - 7:13, 10:23,

11:14, 11:15, 11:21,

12:15, 22:25, 23:16, 30:5, 30:24, 31:6, 31:18, 32:1, 33:1, 33:5, 33:11, 33:24, 34:14, 34:20, 35:1, 35:5, 36:10, 36:12, 36:22, 37:1, 37:11, 38:2, 38:18, 38:21, 39:15, 39:16, 40:1, 40:12, 40:18, 41:11, 41:19, 41:22, 41:23, 42:1, 43:4, 43:7, 43:9, 43:10, 43:11, 43:18, 63:25, 64:4, 64:7, 64:14, 71:10, 72:3, 72:12, 74:1, 74:14, 76:3, 76:5, 77:8, 77:11, 77:21, 77:24, 78:7, 78:25, 79:6, 79:10, 80:15, 80:22, 82:6, 86:24, 87:2, 87:7, 92:6, 92:10, 92:14, 92:17, 92:21, 93:10, 93:14, 94:1, 94:7, 94:18, 95:11 MS [51] - 5:12, 5:15, 7:15, 8:13, 8:16, 9:19, 9:21, 11:18, 12:14, 22:21, 23:15, 29:23, 30:18, 34:9, 34:16, 34:21, 35:2, 36:7, 36:11, 36:16, 36:23, 39:18, 39:21, 40:9, 40:13, 41:6, 63:24, 64:1, 64:6, 64:9, 74:19, 75:9, 79:3, 79:7, 79:12, 80:16, 80:24, 86:20, 87:1, 87:4, 87:12, 87:20, 87:24, 88:2, 90:10, 90:14, 90:20, 91:24, 92:16, 92:19, 94:24 Municipal [1] - 79:23

N

must [1] - 29:12

92:8, 92:11, 92:20, 93:15, 94:4, 94:16, 94:20, 94:25, 95:12 NALBANTIAN [1] -Nicholson [1] - 5:17 1:17 **night** [1] - 4:5 name [2] - 10:24, **NJ** [1] - 2:13 11:22 **NO** [2] - 3:15, 43:14 **names** [1] - 91:16 noise [3] - 37:24, 48:8, nature [1] - 84:15 48:13 necessarily [6] - 21:9, none [2] - 39:16, 81:4 32:13, 33:24, 34:12, north [16] - 6:14, 6:21, 35:10, 72:1 14:17, 16:2, 16:9, necessary [3] - 26:6, 23:20, 24:12, 31:12, 29:7, 41:8 50:17, 51:2, 53:21, necessitate [1] - 34:22 57:23, 80:6, 80:13,

39:12, 39:20, 43:12,

43:15, 71:6, 75:10,

76:1, 76:4, 78:11,

85:8, 85:15, 87:5,

88:12, 88:24, 89:6,

91:3, 91:17, 92:1,

need [19] - 11:12, 82:10 24:3, 24:4, 24:25, North [27] - 7:1, 8:2, 29:9, 32:9, 32:20, 8:4, 8:5, 8:6, 16:1, 33:23, 34:1, 35:16, 18:16, 24:13, 25:21, 40:2, 40:9, 46:17, 29:8, 31:19, 32:24, 48:3, 50:10, 85:4, 33:10, 33:15, 35:6, 87:15, 90:2, 93:22 35:22, 35:24, 40:5, needed [2] - 63:16, 55:1, 55:2, 55:5, 84:14 55:7, 55:11, 56:6, needs [10] - 18:7, 56:9, 58:1, 66:21 19:19, 24:20, 24:22, northeast [5] - 14:22, 33:17, 50:13, 63:21, 15:2, 24:15, 35:22, 55:9 64:9, 64:10, 87:17 northeastern [5] - 7:1, neighborhood [5] -9:2, 13:24, 28:15, 38:7, 47:19, 48:20, 34:18 76:11, 81:16 neighbors [1] - 75:20 northerly [1] - 7:23 never [1] - 42:20 northern [5] - 9:12, 9:16, 14:15, 15:19, **NEW** [1] - 1:24 20:19 new [27] - 16:1, 16:13, 16:14, 26:12, 38:10, Notary [2] - 96:10, 96:19 52:4, 52:17, 55:1, 55:2, 55:4, 55:5, note [1] - 4:2 55:11, 55:12, 55:15, noted [1] - 63:3 56:7, 56:16, 57:3, notes [1] - 96:12 57:5, 57:8, 57:17, notice [3] - 79:15, 67:8, 80:22, 82:9, 79:24. 86:22 82:24 noticed [1] - 87:25 New [4] - 2:10, 93:24, nowhere [1] - 18:13 96:10, 96:19 **NUMBER** [1] - 3:14 next [15] - 15:4, 28:24, number [5] - 12:19, 41:16, 42:20, 51:23, 51:10, 62:13, 62:18, 54:4, 59:11, 72:8, 69:13 90:23, 92:2, 92:3, numbers [12] - 16:7, 92:12, 93:13, 95:1, 20:11, 35:17, 47:21, 95:3 62:3, 62:4, 62:5, NICHOLSON [40] -64:2, 64:3, 64:11, 1:9, 4:1, 4:8, 5:13, 64:13 11:16, 29:21, 30:19, nutshell [1] - 9:24 30:21, 30:25, 31:17, 31:21, 32:18, 37:7, O

objective [1] - 71:24 objectives [5] - 13:12, 25:15, 28:10, 58:20, 71:18 oblivion [2] - 77:16, 81:14 **obstacles** [1] - 72:7 obviously [5] - 13:3, 23:22, 24:23, 31:23, 73:23 occur [3] - 21:17, 40:2, 48:11 October [2] - 44:22, **OF** [4] - 1:1, 1:3, 1:4, 1:7 off-loading [1] - 6:25 off-site [8] - 10:12, 28:7, 36:18, 45:20,

		<u> </u>		
62:9, 62:10, 62:16,	10:16, 75:7, 81:18,	P.E [1] - 3:4	70:16	80:18, 80:25, 81:1
62:17	91:9, 91:11, 91:14,	P.M [1] - 1:2	pending [1] - 79:15	physical [2] - 38:1,
offer [1] - 69:1	91:21, 91:22	p.m [1] - 95:16	Penn [2] - 11:4, 12:2	38:16
offers [1] - 38:11	opposed [2] - 49:12,	P.O [1] - 1:23	penthouse [6] - 6:21,	physically [1] - 37:18
official [1] - 62:9	77:13	page [2] - 14:11, 81:22	8:2, 49:23, 64:24,	pick [3] - 46:14, 84:6,
offs [1] - 37:17	opposite [1] - 75:14	paper [3] - 86:4, 86:7,	65:11	91:12
old [1] - 54:25	option [50] - 25:25,	86:12	people [4] - 86:8,	pick-up [1] - 46:14
ON [1] - 1:4	52:3, 52:11, 52:16,	parameter [1] - 46:5	88:4, 88:14, 91:20	picked [1] - 82:24
on-grade [3] - 46:13,	52:18, 53:2, 54:6,	parameters [1] - 49:21	people's [1] - 73:24	picks [1] - 41:4
46:20, 69:17	54:11, 54:18, 56:4,	park [1] - 69:17	per[1] - 79:23	picture [3] - 23:3,
on-site [1] - 10:11	56:19, 58:12, 58:18,	parking [97] - 9:23,	percent [17] - 20:1,	23:10, 79:5
onboard [1] - 70:3	59:22, 59:23, 60:11,	10:6, 15:11, 20:17,	20:3, 20:5, 27:12,	pile [2] - 24:8, 35:15
once [4] - 7:22, 16:25,	60:22, 60:23, 62:13,	31:4, 44:9, 46:9,	46:13, 47:20, 50:13,	pinch [2] - 24:15, 25:6
52:6, 91:6	64:25, 65:2, 65:6,	46:11, 46:13, 46:17,	50:14, 61:12, 71:20,	pits [1] - 42:23
one [99] - 6:15, 6:18,	65:7, 66:11, 66:16,	46:19, 46:20, 47:17,	71:21, 71:22, 72:9,	place [16] - 17:14,
7:24, 7:25, 8:10,	66:18, 67:3, 67:18,	48:3, 50:4, 50:6,	84:2	22:12, 27:8, 27:16,
9:15, 10:4, 11:9,	67:19, 67:20, 68:5,	50:8, 50:12, 50:13,	perhaps [3] - 37:16,	29:6, 33:18, 37:4,
13:12, 14:1, 15:21,	68:7, 74:25, 76:14,	50:16, 51:5, 53:20,	78:20, 83:24	41:14, 51:16, 51:22,
17:22, 18:10, 18:14,	77:17, 77:22, 81:23,	54:13, 54:18, 54:24,	period [1] - 42:15	52:12, 52:19, 55:1,
19:12, 21:3, 22:4,	83:2, 86:18, 87:10,	54:25, 55:15, 55:17,	permanent [2] - 27:25,	55:14, 59:8, 63:12
23:11, 28:12, 32:5,	87:11, 88:18, 88:25,	55:18, 55:19, 55:21,	42:12	plan [23] - 5:24, 6:21,
39:18, 41:14, 41:15,	89:4	55:22, 55:23, 56:6,	permanently [2] -	7:2, 8:22, 9:6, 9:22,
42:19, 47:4, 47:9,	options [24] - 17:16,	56:12, 56:13, 57:1,	62:17, 69:9	12:9, 18:7, 28:12,
48:23, 49:13, 49:16,	49:16, 51:8, 51:11,	57:13, 57:14, 57:24,	permits [1] - 49:21	28:13, 37:9, 38:5,
49:20, 49:22, 52:3,	51:13, 51:19, 52:2, 52:15, 54:4, 54:5,	58:6, 58:7, 58:8,	personally [1] - 77:7	64:12, 66:22, 76:7,
52:6, 52:10, 52:16,	54:14, 57:18, 58:12,	58:10, 59:16, 60:6,	perspective [4] -	80:5, 82:7, 89:3,
54:6, 54:8, 55:20,	58:13, 59:6, 62:25,	61:24, 61:25, 62:1,	29:20, 30:6, 30:10,	89:20, 93:6, 93:18
55:22, 55:23, 56:12, 56:24, 57:10, 57:19,	68:8, 75:16, 83:25,	62:10, 62:11, 62:12, 62:16, 62:18, 62:19,	78:12	Plan [24] - 4:11, 5:25,
58:3, 58:6, 58:9,	84:7, 84:10, 84:11,	62:20, 62:21, 62:22,	PFUND [30] - 1:10,	43:23, 44:17, 45:4, 45:9, 51:7, 53:4,
58:12, 58:19, 59:4,	85:2, 85:24	63:1, 63:5, 63:6,	8:10, 8:14, 9:17,	53:14, 54:7, 57:21,
59:23, 60:11, 60:22,	order [2] - 89:24,	63:7, 63:10, 63:12,	9:20, 32:19, 33:2, 33:8, 33:22, 34:8,	58:21, 59:25, 64:8,
61:21, 62:2, 62:8,	93:19	63:16, 63:17, 63:19,	71:7, 71:23, 72:5,	64:17, 64:22, 65:18,
62:13, 63:2, 63:19,	organized [1] - 4:2	63:20, 66:8, 66:19,	73:20, 74:12, 74:15,	66:12, 67:21, 68:13,
64:17, 64:25, 65:2,	original [17] - 6:13,	66:23, 67:5, 67:6,	83:12, 85:14, 86:14,	68:15, 89:11, 89:15
65:19, 65:20, 65:21,	7:18, 31:1, 39:24,	67:8, 68:11, 69:21,	86:23, 87:8, 87:13,	PLANNER [1] - 2:2
66:11, 66:15, 67:1,	44:2, 44:6, 45:7,	70:13, 77:3, 79:1,	87:22, 88:1, 88:5,	PLANNING [2] - 1:1,
67:6, 67:8, 67:9,	54:6, 54:23, 60:12,	80:6, 80:8, 80:9,	88:13, 89:23, 93:8,	1:7
67:18, 68:5, 68:22,	68:5, 85:16, 86:21,	80:12, 80:19, 80:23,	93:12, 94:15	planning [8] - 4:17,
68:23, 68:24, 69:23,	90:22, 90:24, 93:18	81:2, 81:4	Phase [28] - 6:13, 7:8,	5:21, 13:3, 13:12,
71:7, 71:14, 71:15,	originally [1] - 77:1	part [10] - 18:7, 20:21,	7:9, 7:17, 52:21,	19:20, 25:15, 28:10,
74:24, 75:2, 80:16,	ORs [1] - 60:7	26:21, 27:22, 47:13,	52:23, 52:24, 54:24,	48:24
80:20, 81:13, 84:1,	Oscar [1] - 59:20	51:7, 63:18, 64:15,	55:4, 56:16, 57:3,	Planning [6] - 2:3,
84:6, 84:23, 85:17,	OSHA [1] - 23:24	72:21, 79:1	57:16, 60:13, 61:16,	2:11, 38:12, 43:20,
86:6, 87:14, 88:3,	otherwise [1] - 86:12	particle [1] - 22:14	64:2, 64:5, 64:11,	54:9, 74:23
88:8, 91:13, 92:2,	ourselves [2] - 77:16,	particular [2] - 9:21,	64:12, 64:15, 64:19,	plans [4] - 6:3, 6:22,
92:3	81:13	88:8	79:10, 82:8, 82:9,	32:22, 79:19
One [1] - 61:15 one-story [2] - 9:15,	outpatient [1] - 45:18 outside [4] - 24:21,	particularly [1] - 91:19 parties [3] - 37:15,	82:14, 82:20, 83:5	plant [1] - 61:10
18:10	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	38:12	phase [5] - 7:15, 52:7,	play [2] - 10:1, 10:13
open [5] - 8:22, 18:2,	24:22, 32:11, 35:18 overall [2] - 5:21, 41:7	past [2] - 22:7, 72:14	52:8, 82:3, 82:5 phases [1] - 82:1	playing [1] - 74:22
21:12, 89:5, 91:18	overlying [1] - 13:17	patient [1] - 60:8	phasing [3] - 70:16,	plus [3] - 6:21, 8:2,
opened [1] - 75:19	oversight [4] - 40:16,	patients [3] - 48:1,	73:2, 93:6	15:22
opens [1] - 38:10	40:22, 41:2	49:11, 50:18	Phillips [25] - 6:16,	pneumatic [2] - 21:2, 21:3
operating [2] - 45:21,	overview [2] - 57:25,	pavements [1] - 28:8	6:17, 7:25, 16:13,	point [18] - 8:7, 14:1,
49:7	58:11	pay [1] - 83:6	23:20, 25:19, 26:1,	18:3, 19:12, 24:15,
opine [1] - 5:1	own [2] - 73:17, 85:11	paying [1] - 82:22	26:8, 26:24, 27:4,	25:6, 34:6, 37:5,
opinion [5] - 39:22,	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,	PE [1] - 2:2	27:14, 28:4, 31:13,	40:14, 50:22, 52:1,
40:14, 42:18, 43:2,	Р	peak [1] - 22:14	50:6, 54:25, 55:13,	59:4, 64:18, 76:21,
84:9	-	penalties [1] - 70:19	55:14, 56:14, 57:14,	77:7, 79:16, 87:15,
opportunity [9] - 6:8,	B.O.	penalty [3] - 70:15,	66:4, 67:9, 80:14,	90:16
	P.C [1] - 2:9			

pointed [2] - 49:5, 56:20 points [3] - 40:24, 41:3, 61:15 portion [6] - 14:15, 15:17, 15:19, 20:19, 20:20, 28:15 **pose** [1] - 28:25 positioned [1] - 20:17 positions [1] - 88:11 positive [2] - 46:7, possibilities [2] -36:20, 37:16 possibility [5] - 37:25, 81:25, 82:1, 83:5, 89:5 possible [2] - 13:13, 75:12 possibly [5] - 16:14, 32:4, 33:3, 70:16, 75:24 post [2] - 22:5, 22:22 post-blast [1] - 22:5 postponed [2] - 92:11, 92:13 potential [1] - 24:21 potentially [2] - 25:9, 90:16 **PP** [1] - 2:2 practical [1] - 84:22 practicing [2] - 11:6, 12:4 pre [3] - 22:5, 22:22, 40:23 pre-blast [1] - 22:5 pre-construction [1] -40:23 precipitation [1] -43:1 prefer [1] - 88:18 preliminary [3] - 4:19, 5:5, 59:18 prepared [2] - 10:17, 92:5 present [4] - 44:16, 45:5, 85:11, 95:13 **PRESENT** [1] - 1:7 presentation [9] -4:20, 12:13, 15:25, 44:22, 53:9, 70:4, 71:3, 83:15, 91:10 PRESENTATION [1] presented [6] - 5:8, 29:4, 29:18, 31:1, 45:9 70:4 preserve [1] - 47:9 pressure [1] - 17:18 pressures [1] - 17:2 pressurized [1] - 36:5

presumably [1] -91:19 pretty [1] - 20:4 previous [4] - 16:21, 56:11, 56:14, 58:6 previously [2] - 19:4, 87:23 **PRICE** [49] - 2:9, 2:9, 5:12, 5:15, 7:15, 8:13, 8:16, 9:19, 9:21, 12:14, 22:21, 23:15, 34:9, 34:16, 34:21, 35:2, 36:7, 36:11, 36:16, 36:23, 39:18, 39:21, 40:9, 40:13, 41:6, 63:24, 64:1, 64:6, 64:9, 74:19, 75:9, 79:3, 79:7, 79:12, 80:16, 80:24, 86:20, 87:1, 87:4, 87:12, 87:20, 87:24, 88:2, 90:10, 90:14, 90:20, 91:24, 92:16, 94:24 primarily [3] - 12:16, 19:24, 61:19 **Princeton** [1] - 12:7 principle [2] - 47:23, 50:3 principles [9] - 45:3, 45:11, 47:2, 51:6, 53:4, 59:1, 59:3, 70:2, 93:1 print [1] - 35:11 priority [1] - 50:8 problem [2] - 89:13, 93:3 problems [1] - 52:5 procedural [2] - 79:8, procedurally [1] - 87:9 **procedure** [1] - 91:8 proceed [1] - 85:22 PROCEEDINGS [1] proceedings [1] - 95:1 process [12] - 5:9, 26:22, 33:7, 37:5, 39:23, 41:7, 69:9, 75:15, 76:6, 76:21, 79:16, 88:3 product [2] - 64:17, 86:11 profess [1] - 6:6 professional [5] -40:13, 40:16, 70:9, 79:18, 84:8 Professional [1] -96:9 professionals [5] -

4:21, 4:22, 6:2, 86:1,

91:25 profiles [1] - 42:3 program [3] - 30:11, 30:16, 30:17 progress [6] - 57:19, 58:16, 58:19, 66:17, 70:1, 70:10 prohibitive [1] - 52:9 project [22] - 16:12, 37:25, 39:10, 40:15, 44:16, 53:6, 53:7, 59:14, 64:15, 71:1, 72:2, 72:5, 73:9, 74:4, 74:11, 75:22, 76:10, 82:8, 82:9, 82:21, 93:20, 94:8 projects [1] - 73:15 projects' [1] - 29:13 proper [1] - 74:2 properties [11] -29:13, 29:25, 30:2, 30:8, 30:9, 31:22, 33:4, 36:18, 51:1, 51:4 property [30] - 7:1, 15:9, 24:12, 24:16, 25:10. 29:12. 30:9. 32:7, 33:14, 33:16, 34:13, 34:19, 34:23, 34:24, 35:7, 35:23, 35:25, 36:11, 36:13, 36:14, 36:15, 44:10, 44:13, 53:22, 53:25, 54:17, 63:11, 67:7, 73:25, 74:7 proposal [19] - 31:1, 38:14, 39:23, 39:24, 44:3, 44:6, 45:7, 48:25, 50:5, 54:7, 58:21, 60:12, 60:15, 60:24, 62:15, 68:5, 71:8, 85:16 proposals [3] - 45:7, 53:14, 54:16 propose [2] - 74:6, 86:5 proposed [26] - 6:15, 7:7, 24:13, 32:2, 32:3, 33:2, 34:17, 37:10, 44:5, 47:4, 49:16, 52:21, 53:20, 59:24, 60:16, 61:15, 63:8, 65:2, 66:10, 66:20, 66:21, 67:5, 70:23, 72:23, 73:19 proposing [2] - 69:1, 72:6 **pros** [1] - 75:21 Prospect [1] - 2:13 **provided** [3] - 6:3,

4:16, 5:7, 6:10, 7:4, 46:4, 64:10, 75:2, 75:25, 77:14, 79:21, 80:4, 83:15, 83:22, 85:4, 85:12, 85:16, 85:22, 85:24, 86:2, 86:3, 86:16, 87:16, 87:19, 88:19, 88:22, 89:4, 89:12, 89:15, 89:21, 89:25, 90:1, 90:3, 90:4, 90:19, 90:23, 90:24, 91:7, 95:4 **Public** [2] - 96:10, 96:19 PUCCIARELLI [1] -1:13 Pucciarelli [2] - 4:2, pull [1] - 27:10 **pulled** [1] - 54:16 pump [1] - 40:20 pumped [3] - 17:10, 18:9, 36:4 pumping [2] - 19:9, 19:18 **pumps** [4] - 17:5, 19:5, 27:15, 61:11 purchasing [1] - 51:17 purposes [2] - 10:19, pursue [1] - 87:15 **pursuing** [1] - 86:17 push [2] - 52:24, 77:12 pushing [1] - 37:3 put [36] - 9:25, 18:13, 23:5, 39:4, 44:1, 44:3, 46:16, 47:16, 47:24, 48:9, 48:10, 48:12, 49:23, 49:24, 49:25, 50:8, 53:14, 54:18, 59:9, 59:20, 67:13, 69:18, 69:19, 70:12, 70:13, 74:1, 74:8, 78:18, 79:5, 82:23, 84:20, 85:16, 85:18, 85:24, 89:11, 92:3 puts [1] - 18:21 putting [7] - 44:5, 44:9, 44:10, 44:19,

PS&S [1] - 12:21

public [41] - 4:9, 4:14,

Q

65:9, 72:24, 86:7

qualitative [1] - 67:24 quality [4] - 18:8, 19:22, 20:4, 21:7 quantify [1] - 94:14 quantitative [1] -67:25 quantity [3] - 18:8, 19:22, 27:7 Questions [2] - 3:5, questions [8] - 12:12, 29:22, 39:13, 43:13, 44:11, 71:5, 84:13, 86:1 quick [1] - 58:11 quickly [2] - 54:21, 86:6 quite [5] - 12:23, 21:23, 43:23, 67:10, 87:17

R

R.P.R [1] - 1:22 radius [3] - 19:8, 19:15, 19:21 raised [2] - 5:2, 89:21 raises [2] - 44:11, 53:22 ramifications [1] -38:1 range [5] - 20:6, 43:23, 45:22, 51:9, 51:13 ranged [1] - 31:20 ranges [1] - 14:24 rate [1] - 46:6 rates [1] - 17:6 rather [5] - 18:12, 40:20, 67:24, 75:16, 78:16 **Ray** [22] - 7:8, 8:18, 9:10, 10:3, 10:5, 43:17, 63:24, 71:6, 75:14, 75:15, 78:12, 80:10, 81:10, 81:22, 83:24, 85:9, 85:10, 85:19, 89:8, 89:17, 92:2, 95:2 Ray's [2] - 83:14, 85:18 **RAYMOND** [2] - 2:3, 3:7 re [5] - 39:9, 78:20, 79:15, 86:22, 87:25 re-defines [1] - 39:9 re-evaluate [1] - 78:20 re-notice [2] - 79:15, 86:22 re-noticed [1] - 87:25 reaching [1] - 71:20 react [3] - 75:16, 85:21, 93:23

reaction [9] - 73:18,

providing [1] - 12:5

16:11, 40:7

73:21, 73:22, 78:17, 85:20, 86:8, 89:19, 92:4, 92:24 read [3] - 14:10, 62:5, 74:16 readings [2] - 31:20, 43:1 real [1] - 66:17 realistically [1] - 82:17 realities [1] - 75:22 reality [1] - 84:25 realize [1] - 88:7 really [13] - 27:3, 44:20, 48:19, 50:1, 50:24, 51:10, 51:11, 51:20, 66:8, 85:21, 86:13, 87:15, 93:22 realm [1] - 10:12 **Realtime** [1] - 96:9 rear [2] - 8:19, 24:12 reason [4] - 28:22, 42:19, 47:8, 48:12 reasons [2] - 52:10, 77:1 recap [1] - 4:10 received [1] - 26:4 recently [2] - 12:22, 14:4 recognize [3] - 53:5, 58:15, 58:24 recognizing [1] - 41:9 recommence [1] -91:7 recommendations [3] - 5:23, 44:17, 68:15 recommended [8] -14:1, 44:19, 46:19, 46:23, 47:19, 63:17, 65:13, 67:10 reconfiguration [1] -81:19 record [3] - 23:4, 64:2, 87:10 **RECORDING** [1] - 2:3 recovery [1] - 19:25 **RECUSED** [1] - 1:13 recused [2] - 4:3, 4:6 red [7] - 14:12, 26:25, 35:2, 35:3, 68:3, 68:6, 68:24 reduce [1] - 28:21 refer [1] - 6:5 reference [1] - 28:13 referred [2] - 7:7, 75:18 referring [1] - 7:5 refine [1] - 19:1 refresh [1] - 91:8 regard [1] - 40:16 regardless [4] - 18:9, 39:23, 40:10, 74:10

Registered [1] - 96:8 Research [1] - 2:3 reinforcing [1] - 36:5 reserved [1] - 95:5 reject [1] - 74:25 related [2] - 10:7, 51:4 relative [4] - 4:15, 5:22, 51:25, 78:20 relatively [1] - 69:17 remain [2] - 45:16, 45:20 **remaining** [1] - 63:18 remains [2] - 55:1, 57:23 removal [2] - 26:3, 26:20 remove [1] - 26:6 removed [3] - 80:8, 80:12, 94:5 rendition [2] - 61:23, 68:1 Renewal [1] - 12:9 renewal 131 - 51:16. 51:22, 52:19 renewing [1] - 53:2 renovated [1] - 55:3 renovation [2] - 56:6, 82:11 repeat [1] - 84:19 replaced [1] - 26:11 replacement [4] -51:14, 51:15, 51:21, 52:4 replacements [1] -51:25 replacing [2] - 52:13, 52:14 report [16] - 4:19, 5:3, 38:9, 42:4, 42:5, 71:9, 72:10, 74:17, 74:21, 78:17, 81:11, 81:22, 84:18, 85:20, 89:19, 92:7 **Reporter** [3] - 96:8, 96:9, 96:10 REPORTERS [1] -1:23 reports [4] - 5:5, 5:7, 6:2, 12:21 representatives [3] -86:2, 91:4, 91:5 represents [1] - 14:12 request [1] - 85:9 requested [1] - 89:18 require [2] - 37:18, 87:21 required [8] - 4:24, 31:3, 31:23, 36:18, 36:19, 39:23, 44:12,

44:13

23:24

requirements [1] -

requires [1] - 20:23

residences [1] - 22:8 residential [1] - 36:14 residents [6] - 81:16, 83:10, 84:5, 86:3, 88:6, 91:10 residents' [1] - 91:5 resist [2] - 17:18, 17:21 resolution [2] - 79:25, 80:2 respond [1] - 95:13 response [2] - 72:25, 73:4 RESPONSE [1] -43:14 rest [1] - 17:21 retained [3] - 10:15, 52:20, 81:25 retains [1] - 48:18 review [6] - 5:24, 10:16, 15:14, 41:8, 54:10, 84:18 reviewed [3] - 7:6, 10:3, 12:20 revised [1] - 56:5 revision [1] - 54:11 revisiting [1] - 77:15 **RICHE** [13] - 1:16, 11:14, 41:19, 41:23, 43:4, 43:9, 43:11, 76:3, 76:5, 77:8, 77:11, 77:24, 95:11 Ridgewood [6] - 2:13, 43:19, 47:13, 86:3, 91:11, 93:25 RIDGEWOOD [2] -1:1, 1:7 right-hand [1] - 59:24 **rip** [2] - 21:8, 21:13 ripping [3] - 21:1, 29:8, 38:25 roads [1] - 23:10 rock [23] - 19:25, 20:1, 20:4, 20:8, 20:9, 20:12, 21:4, 26:3, 26:7, 26:10, 26:11, 26:13, 26:15, 26:18, 27:3, 27:11, 27:15, 30:23, 38:22, 38:23, 38:24, 53:17 roof [15] - 8:4, 8:12, 8:17, 8:18, 8:19, 8:24, 9:7, 55:24, 57:10, 62:12, 63:19, 63:21, 63:22 roofs [3] - 48:17, 48:21, 55:19

room [9] - 4:7, 23:2, 23:23, 24:2, 33:25, 48:10, 57:1, 70:25, 91:2 rooms [4] - 49:7, 49:8, 60:8 rotated [1] - 9:9 rough [1] - 47:21 roughly [2] - 63:15, 66:14 round [1] - 35:17 row [1] - 80:12 run [1] - 27:6 running [3] - 14:13, 16:7, 41:14 runs [3] - 20:2, 33:13, 36:6 RUTISHAUSER [2] -2:2, 39:16

S

SADDLE [1] - 1:24 safety [1] - 36:2 sampled [2] - 20:1, 20:2 sandstone [2] - 13:17, 19:24 sandy [2] - 13:19, 23:24 saturated [1] - 19:14 saw [2] - 43:8. 50:5 scale [5] - 21:25, 22:8, 35:8, 35:11, 83:25 scenario [5] - 39:6, 64:17, 76:19, 80:9, 8:88 scenarios [2] - 77:12, 80:17 schedule [3] - 21:20, 26:22, 27:22 scheme [16] - 30:13, 45:2, 50:15, 54:12, 56:5, 56:11, 56:12, 56:15, 56:19, 58:6, 58:17, 61:10, 62:9, 67:6, 67:23, 75:16 schemes [3] - 61:7, 62:4. 75:3 **school** [2] - 37:23, 92:12 Schoor [1] - 12:23 scope [1] - 93:16 score [1] - 68:23 screen [5] - 6:12, 8:20, 9:1, 68:1, 79:7 sea [1] - 14:3 seasonal [2] - 42:17, 43:3

second [12] - 7:10,

15:16. 45:25. 47:15. 61:21, 65:20, 69:25, 76:22, 82:3, 82:5, 85:17, 95:11 **SECRETARY** [1] - 2:3 section [3] - 9:14, 24:11, 26:24 secure [1] - 34:23 **see** [28] - 14:18, 15:8, 17:8, 17:17, 18:16, 23:5, 23:11, 24:5, 25:2, 31:9, 41:17, 45:1, 50:23, 52:16, 58:14, 59:14, 60:13, 61:18, 68:4, 68:23, 69:5, 70:2, 76:5, 77:11, 78:4, 79:8, 80:11, 89:7 seep [1] - 17:4 seepage [1] - 17:6 semipermanent [1] -42:13 sense [8] - 32:21, 42:15, 51:20, 67:15, 71:13, 72:1, 73:3, 73:11 **sensitivity** [1] - 37:19 separate [1] - 50:21 **separation** [2] - 41:9, 50:21 **sequence** [1] - 7:13 series [1] - 17:8 served [1] - 49:10 service [4] - 48:9, 50:21, 50:25, 59:7 session [11] - 4:14, 50:23, 70:1, 79:14, 79:25, 80:3, 85:24, 86:16, 89:8, 89:12, sessions [1] - 63:4 **set** [3] - 30:17, 57:3, 94:16 setback [24] - 6:22, 6:24, 8:6, 8:8, 9:14, 9:18, 47:8, 56:10, 56:21, 57:4, 57:10, 57:15, 59:17, 65:22, 66:1, 66:2, 66:5, 66:7, 66:11, 67:1, 67:3, 67:11, 68:10, 80:5 setback's [1] - 86:18 setbacks [5] - 44:12, 56:3, 57:22, 58:4, 65:18 sets [1] - 94:13 **settlement** [1] - 19:15 seven [2] - 51:11, 51:19

several [7] - 5:2, 10:5,

rooftop [2] - 62:2,

81:4

47:3, 65:24, 72:15,	
82:1, 84:13	
shallow [1] - 25:2	
shallower [1] - 17:6	
shape [1] - 81:12	
sheet [1] - 59:12	
shields [1] - 8:20	
shift [1] - 48:5	
shore [4] - 25:7, 33:6,	
34:1, 34:6	
shored [2] - 23:22,	
32:12	
shoring [17] - 23:18,	
24:4, 25:13, 26:19, 27:16, 29:10, 31:22,	
32:11, 32:21, 33:3,	
33:9, 33:17, 34:7,	
37:5, 44:13, 53:22,	
73:24	
short [4] - 69:14,	
70:19, 75:11	
short-term [3] - 69:14,	
70:19	
shorten [1] - 26:22	
shorter [1] - 73:16	
show [3] - 6:14, 34:11,	
35:4	
showed [4] - 31:19,	
35:19, 54:4, 83:16	
showing [3] - 20:22,	
64:5, 68:9	
shown [9] - 6:12, 6:25,	
7:7, 8:25, 9:1, 31:16,	
32:13, 53:10, 57:8	
shows [7] - 6:21, 6:22,	
36:17, 56:8, 57:16,	
80:5, 80:7	
SHULMAN [1] - 2:9	
shutters [1] - 43:21	
sic [1] - 95:6 side [13] - 8:3, 9:9,	
9:11, 9:12, 9:15,	
9:16, 15:1, 21:21,	
32:24, 33:10, 54:2,	
54:24, 59:24	
sidenote [1] - 28:11	
sides [1] - 34:12	
significance [1] - 44:8	
significant [2] - 65:14,	
72:7	
signs [1] - 42:21	
similar [9] - 12:5,	
20:7, 22:10, 25:20,	
56:5, 56:25, 57:22,	
63:1, 65:10	
simply [1] - 67:10	
single [2] - 52:8, 52:18	
site [36] - 5:20, 6:9,	
6:13, 10:8, 10:11,	
10:12, 12:20, 12:25,	
13:17, 13:24, 14:14,	

14:15, 14:19, 14:21, 15:17, 15:19, 19:23, 20:20, 23:23, 24:3, 28:7, 28:15, 28:18, 36:18, 45:20, 45:23, 47:3, 48:19, 51:18, 61:17, 62:9, 62:10,
62:16, 62:17, 65:19 site's [1] - 21:7
situation [3] - 68:25, 69:12, 69:24 situations [1] - 36:24
six [2] - 49:17, 65:15 size [2] - 21:25, 84:14
sized [1] - 6:3 sketch [3] - 35:18, 35:20, 36:7
sketches [1] - 40:4 skim [1] - 31:10
SKORUPA [34] - 2:3, 3:7, 7:13, 43:18, 63:25, 64:4, 64:7, 64:14, 71:10, 72:3, 72:12, 74:1, 74:14, 77:21, 78:7, 78:25,
79:6, 79:10, 80:15, 80:22, 82:6, 86:24, 87:2, 87:7, 92:6, 92:10, 92:14, 92:17, 92:21, 93:10, 93:14,
94:1, 94:7, 94:18 Skorupa [2] - 4:18, 5:21
Skorupa's [1] - 5:2 slab [1] - 18:18 slide [2] - 31:18, 54:4
slides [3] - 16:5, 51:24, 59:19
sliding [1] - 83:25 slightly [3] - 57:6, 65:3, 66:14
slope [1] - 23:25 slower [2] - 20:24, 38:25
slows [3] - 25:8, 32:15, 37:5 small [1] - 21:18
smaller [2] - 21:9, 83:1
snap [1] - 84:22 snorkel [1] - 49:25 soft [1] - 20:9 soil [15] - 13:20,
19:11, 19:13, 23:24, 24:9, 25:23, 26:6, 26:12, 26:16, 26:20, 27:8, 37:2, 42:21, 42:23

42:22

soils [1] - 13:17

soldier [1] - 24:8

solicit [1] - 75:1

solid [2] - 20:12, 36:8 somewhat [1] - 25:2 somewhere [12] -13:5, 13:21, 18:6, 19:7, 19:8, 31:7, 38:6, 39:4, 61:7, 76:12, 76:24, 77:4 soon [1] - 75:11 sorry [6] - 62:21, 64:25, 66:13, 72:3, 77:9, 92:8 **sort** [9] - 44:20, 46:15, 59:15, 63:12, 72:13, 73:3, 73:17, 76:18, 94:12 sounds [2] - 21:22, 37:14 south [7] - 6:14, 7:22, 50:16, 56:7, 57:1, 57:24, 66:4 South [6] - 16:1, 16:14, 55:6, 55:25, 56:17, 57:5 southern [2] - 15:11, 15:17 **southwest** [1] - 55:9 **space** [18] - 9:5, 27:11, 28:20, 38:16, 46:3, 46:18, 46:25, 49:22, 50:9, 51:3, 57:11, 61:13, 61:19, 61:20, 65:4, 65:14, 65:16 spaces [2] - 46:4, 46:11 speakers [2] - 91:12, 91:15 speaking [1] - 30:22 specialist [1] - 4:24 specific [2] - 39:5, 91:22 specifically [4] -35:18, 39:7, 89:7, 92:6 speed [2] - 5:18, 21:14 spend [3] - 53:11, 77:25, 86:6 spot [1] - 92:3 spread [1] - 76:16 spreading [1] - 81:25 **spring** [4] - 4:13, 5:10, 58:17, 87:2 **square** [17] - 38:5, 38:6, 45:22, 45:24, 46:2, 46:18, 46:25, 47:22, 60:3, 60:13, 60:16, 60:21, 61:4, 61:5, 81:13, 82:15, 88:3 staff [2] - 47:25, 49:11

stages [1] - 13:3 stand [2] - 73:4, 88:18 standpoint [3] - 26:18, 41:11, 79:9 **stands** [1] - 35:23 start [10] - 6:14, 7:22, 18:5, 24:6, 24:23, 41:14, 77:14, 79:16, 87:19, 88:2 started [2] - 10:18, 70:22 starting [2] - 43:20, 54:24 State [3] - 11:4, 12:2, 96:10 **statement** [1] - 31:5 statistics [1] - 20:11 stay [2] - 52:12, 83:3 steel [1] - 36:6 steep [1] - 25:4 Steilen [12] - 31:22, 32:24, 33:4, 33:10, 47:7, 51:1, 51:3, 54:1, 63:11, 65:21, 66:5, 67:1 stenographic [1] -96:12 step [2] - 14:25, 52:18 steps [5] - 40:9, 77:19, 79:22, 92:2, 95:3 still [16] - 8:14, 26:11, 26:19, 26:20, 28:3, 33:17, 40:2, 56:9, 58:22, 68:13, 70:24, 86:8, 86:9, 87:23, 88:9, 93:1 stone [1] - 89:2 stories [8] - 6:18, 6:19, 7:24, 7:25, 8:1, 8:2, 65:3, 65:15 stormwater [12] -13:14, 28:12, 28:14, 28:19, 28:22, 28:23, 29:14, 37:21, 41:7, 41:10, 41:12, 41:16 story [34] - 6:15, 6:18, 6:21, 7:7, 7:9, 7:14, 7:18, 7:20, 7:21, 7:24, 7:25, 9:15, 18:10, 19:2, 49:17, 54:12, 54:15, 54:23, 55:11, 55:15, 55:20, 56:5, 56:19, 56:24, 56:25, 57:8, 57:10, 58:1, 58:3, 58:6, 60:12, 66:23, 67:6 straight [1] - 25:5 strategy [1] - 51:9 street [4] - 30:4, 31:25, 47:11, 73:11

Street [1] - 2:13

streets [1] - 47:12 strength [2] - 20:6, 21:7 **strong** [1] - 47:9 **structural** [1] - 34:22 structure [28] - 23:1, 23:2, 46:21, 55:1, 55:15, 55:17, 55:18, 55:19, 55:21, 55:22, 56:13, 57:24, 58:7, 58:8, 62:2, 62:12, 62:18, 62:22, 63:10, 66:8, 66:19, 66:23, 67:5, 67:6, 69:18, 69:19, 77:4, 81:2 structured [7] - 46:11, 46:19, 62:10, 62:20, 63:7, 63:18, 81:2 structures [6] - 12:16, 15:10, 19:15, 22:23, 29:11, 46:17 study [1] - 92:24 sub [4] - 24:14, 27:1, 28:3, 33:22 sub-basement [1] -24:14 submission [1] -79:20 **submitted** [1] - 54:9 subsequent [1] - 4:20 subsequently [1] -4:17 subsoil [1] - 92:25 subsoils [1] - 92:7 substantial [11] -13:10, 27:20, 39:8, 48:5, 52:22, 61:4, 61:12, 82:10, 93:9, 93:11 substantially [2] -38:22, 41:20 **substitute** [1] - 50:9 subsurface [8] -12:19, 12:24, 13:7, 13:16, 14:8, 15:23, 32:3, 42:3 subterranean [1] -93:19 suggest [2] - 25:15, 41:1 suggested [9] - 44:9, 44:10, 44:17, 50:12, 50:20, 60:25, 61:2, 63:20, 65:8 suggesting [3] -75:14, 77:23, 81:12 **summary** [2] - 29:2, 59:12 summer [2] - 54:8, 58:18

sump [1] - 17:5

stage [2] - 26:21, 75:7

supplemental [1] -42:5 supplied [1] - 10:17 support [3] - 12:5, 23:18, 45:18 support/shoring [1] -16:19 **supports** [1] - 37:21 **supposed** [1] - 92:18 surface [3] - 14:23, 24:22, 76:8 survey [6] - 22:5, 22:6, 22:8, 22:10, 22:22, 40:23 surveyor [1] - 41:3 suspected [1] - 77:1 suspend [1] - 4:16 sustain [1] - 48:19 **SUZY** [1] - 77:6 switch [1] - 61:11 sworn [1] - 91:25 system [6] - 24:9, 28:25, 29:1, 29:11, 35:15, 48:18 systems [1] - 29:16

T

table [10] - 11:19, 11:20, 17:8, 17:15, 17:25, 19:1, 19:5, 19:11, 40:8, 78:4 takeaway [5] - 61:14, 63:14, 63:15, 69:11, 69:25 takeaways [1] - 29:2 taller [1] - 65:3 tapers [1] - 15:20 tasks [1] - 43:24 team [8] - 44:25, 49:2, 50:24, 56:22, 70:6, 70:9, 72:16, 78:16 technically [3] - 27:14, 37:11, 71:25 temporary [1] - 27:25 tension [1] - 37:3 term [11] - 41:2, 45:4, 69:2, 69:3, 69:14, 70:17, 70:19, 70:20 terms [41] - 5:18, 6:6, 14:25, 16:23, 20:8, 25:11, 37:17, 37:23, 37:24, 45:3, 47:2, 48:5, 49:15, 51:9, 53:2, 53:4, 56:5, 57:20, 57:21, 58:16, 58:20, 58:25, 60:20, 65:10, 67:23, 68:10, 69:16, 70:2, 71:12, 72:18, 73:4, 76:9, 79:20, 81:13, 83:4,

94:1, 94:10 test [3] - 12:19, 20:6, 42:23 tested [1] - 51:8 testified [1] - 11:7 testimony [6] - 4:16, 76:8, 77:14, 78:5, 79:18, 91:25 tests [1] - 20:5 THE [1] - 1:3 THERE [1] - 1:7 therefore [5] - 52:8, 52:9, 67:7, 74:9, 90:1 they've [2] - 85:25, 86:1 thinking [1] - 85:7 thinks [2] - 73:7, 89:2 third [12] - 22:19, 23:17, 25:25, 26:7, 27:13, 27:20, 28:5, 28:9, 49:16, 63:23, 64:20, 65:20 thoughts [1] - 12:10 thousand [1] - 45:22 three [22] - 6:18, 7:25, 16:17, 18:10, 26:18, 32:6, 33:13, 47:6, 48:11, 49:16, 55:15, 66:18, 66:23, 67:10, 67:20, 68:2, 69:21, 89:4, 92:9, 92:10, 92:14, 94:18 threshold [2] - 22:17, 84:13 throughout [2] - 31:7, 60:14 Tice [1] - 2:10 tie [2] - 29:11, 41:7 tie-back [1] - 29:11 tieback [5] - 24:19, 24:20, 30:5, 35:14 tiebacks [9] - 30:1, 30:6, 32:10, 35:15, 35:21, 36:18, 53:23, 54:1, 54:2 tied [2] - 24:9, 24:23 today [2] - 59:21, 92:15 together [4] - 6:23, 41:18, 54:15, 67:13 tolerate [1] - 73:13 tom [1] - 77:21 **TOM** [1] - 1:16 Tom [1] - 78:13 tonight [13] - 4:9,

4:18, 5:4, 12:9,

12:15, 44:1, 45:5,

51:11, 75:19, 78:6,

89:16, 89:22, 92:4

89:14, 92:24, 93:4,

top [13] - 11:22, 13:21, 14:11, 24:6, 24:7, 38:16, 55:12, 58:2, 61:8, 62:2, 62:11, 65:11, 68:22 top-down [1] - 24:6 Torcon [3] - 26:2, 26:5, 26:14 total [12] - 33:7, 46:23, 49:18, 60:2, 61:13, 62:7, 62:14, 62:23, 64:7, 65:4, 65:12, 65:16 totality [1] - 84:5 totally [1] - 90:6 touch [2] - 13:14, 51:12 touched [4] - 15:24, 48:7, 68:19, 69:23 tough [2] - 32:16, 40:3 towards [2] - 6:20, 8:5 tower [1] - 58:2 trade [5] - 25:9, 37:17, 68:25, 73:7, 73:12 trade-off [4] - 25:9, 68:25, 73:7, 73:12 trade-offs [1] - 37:17 traffic [2] - 28:6, 94:11 transcript [1] - 96:12 **TRANSCRIPT** [1] - 1:4 travel [2] - 50:12, 50:19 treated [1] - 9:3 trench [1] - 21:9 tried [3] - 14:9, 45:6, 82:23 truck [2] - 28:6, 94:11 trucking [2] - 8:21, 8:23 trucks [9] - 25:23, 26:6, 26:13, 26:14, 27:11, 38:3, 38:7, 39:1, 73:11 true [3] - 30:24, 74:10, 96:11 try [4] - 17:18, 19:1, 43:5, 94:13 trying [4] - 32:21, 57:20, 73:17, 83:13 **TUESDAY** [1] - 1:2 turn [3] - 43:17, 44:11, 54:16 turned [1] - 63:22 TVH [1] - 44:6 two [44] - 6:2, 6:19, 7:24, 8:1, 15:10, 16:3, 16:15, 17:25, 18:10, 19:2, 25:14, 26:17, 31:8, 33:22,

took [2] - 25:20, 49:20

51:12, 51:18, 51:20, 51:23, 52:1, 52:5, 52:15, 54:11, 55:16, 56:4, 57:12, 57:17, 58:8, 58:12, 59:23, 60:22, 61:14, 61:18, 65:6, 66:16, 67:19, 68:7, 69:20, 71:11, 77:12, 92:5, 94:12 type [7] - 22:16, 24:3, 24:4, 24:5, 24:8, 27:11, 29:10 types [2] - 61:24, 83:18 typically [8] - 17:8, 17:16, 20:2, 21:15, 23:1, 24:5, 34:3, 61:8

U

UCC [1] - 20:5 ultimately [3] - 42:9, 84:6, 84:12 unconfined [1] - 20:6 unconsolidated [1] -20:25 under [10] - 18:12, 36:16, 48:12, 48:14, 59:8, 59:9, 59:24, 65:2, 66:11, 80:9 underground [19] -10:6, 34:16, 34:21, 43:21, 44:4, 44:6, 47:16, 54:18, 60:20, 69:8, 70:13, 70:14, 72:6, 72:25, 78:18, 79:1, 80:23, 84:20, 84:23 underneath [1] -31:25 underpin [1] - 28:5 underpinning [1] -29:10 understood [1] - 88:1 unfortunately [3] -59:17, 61:21, 67:25 unloading [1] - 59:7 up [32] - 5:18, 11:13, 12:6, 13:15, 15:8, 19:10, 21:14, 23:11, 24:8, 27:6, 28:23, 30:17, 31:18, 33:21, 34:2, 34:10, 38:10, 41:4, 46:14, 51:2, 55:16, 60:25, 61:7, 62:13, 74:23, 77:5, 77:12, 77:13, 80:10, 82:24, 87:10, 91:12 up-to-speed [1] - 5:18 **upgrading** [1] - 52:22

upper [2] - 15:15, 16:4 **utilities** [1] - 43:22

V

valid [1] - 68:14 **VALLEY** [1] - 1:4 Valley [12] - 2:14, 6:7, 15:9, 36:15, 44:3, 44:24, 70:6, 72:16, 72:24, 75:2, 82:24, 94:9 Valley's [2] - 6:7, 12:9 valuable [1] - 78:14 value [1] - 37:13 Van [22] - 6:22, 8:5, 9:13, 9:14, 9:17, 13:22, 14:20, 15:4, 33:14, 47:6, 51:1, 54:1, 55:10, 56:3, 58:4, 65:20, 65:22, 65:23, 66:18, 66:22, 67:2, 81:4 variation [1] - 60:20 varied [1] - 13:21 varies [2] - 13:25, 47:12 various [4] - 11:8, 12:21, 38:12 varying [3] - 74:12, 75:24, 83:25 vehicular [1] - 50:21 versatility [1] - 43:20 versus [4] - 69:14, 69:21, 70:20, 78:18 vibration [4] - 21:22, 22:11, 22:13, 22:15 vibrations [1] - 22:14 view [12] - 9:4, 29:17, 46:4, 55:8, 57:7, 57:19, 58:14, 58:22, 59:2, 64:19, 68:13, 70:24 views [1] - 56:9 VILLAGE [4] - 1:1, 1:7, 2:2, 2:2 village [4] - 21:15, 29:5, 84:4, 93:21 vis [4] - 6:7, 37:21 **vis-a-vis** [2] - 6:7, 37:21 visible [1] - 81:4 visitors [3] - 47:25, 49:11, 50:18 visualize [1] - 16:8 void [1] - 27:11

vote [1] - 90:11

40:4, 41:9, 41:17,

W

wall [6] - 8:20, 8:25, 23:3, 24:17, 32:15, 37:3 wants [1] - 79:9 WARD [3] - 1:15, 29:23, 30:18 water [14] - 17:10, 17:11, 17:18, 18:1, 18:3, 18:5, 19:22, 39:3, 41:14, 41:25, 43:1, 43:6, 48:18, 69:8 watermark [1] - 42:23 waterproof [1] - 17:14 waterproofing [1] -17:20 ways [1] - 25:1 wedge [3] - 27:4, 35:25, 36:2 week [2] - 90:23, 92:13 weekend [1] - 74:22 weeks [6] - 92:5, 92:9, 92:10, 92:14, 93:13, 94:18 weigh [1] - 37:13 weights [1] - 78:21 wells [6] - 14:4, 17:8, 17:9, 18:25, 42:13 West [11] - 16:1, 16:2, 16:10, 23:20, 31:12, 33:12, 55:5, 56:1, 56:7, 56:17, 57:3 west [4] - 14:21, 15:20, 25:20, 36:15 western [2] - 8:3, 20:20 whereas [1] - 52:18 Whitestone [6] - 2:4, 4:25, 10:14, 10:25, 11:2, 11:23 whole [6] - 10:12, 24:24, 45:13, 76:13, 76:21, 81:19 wide [1] - 21:12 wide-open [1] - 21:12 wiggle [1] - 91:2 willing [1] - 73:13 windows [1] - 43:21 wing [2] - 82:10 Wing [6] - 55:1, 55:3, 55:7, 55:11, 58:1, 66:21 wonder [1] - 72:8 wondering [1] - 71:24 **Woodcliff** [1] - 2:10 word [2] - 93:8, 94:23 words [6] - 30:12,

30:14, 33:6, 33:12, 37:2, 38:23 world [1] - 46:6 world-class [1] - 46:6 worms [2] - 38:10, 75:19 worse [2] - 74:5, 74:8 worth [1] - 70:17 worthwhile [1] - 18:11 wrap [2] - 13:15, 34:24 written [1] - 89:2

X

XIO1042 [1] - 96:8

Υ

yards [2] - 26:3, 26:13 yeah-but-for [1] -38:11 year [6] - 41:21, 42:19, 42:20, 58:17, 58:18, 87:3 years [2] - 11:6, 12:4 yellow [2] - 14:13, 68:3 yesterday [4] - 92:16, 92:17, 92:18, 94:19 York [1] - 93:24 yourself [1] - 10:22

Ζ

ZONE [1] - 1:4 **Zone** [5] - 4:3, 4:11, 4:15, 43:23, 95:7 **zone** [5] - 14:13, 34:19, 47:5, 51:2, 59:10 zones [1] - 48:21 zoning [1] - 49:21 **ZUSY** [23] - 1:11, 11:12, 30:20, 37:8, 37:14, 38:8, 38:20, 39:9, 74:16, 74:20, 75:17, 77:9, 81:9, 83:7, 88:15, 89:1, 89:13, 90:6, 90:12, 90:18, 91:1, 91:15, 95:10