BEFORE THE CITY OF WHEELING, WEST VIRGINIA PLANNING COMMISSION

In re:

GC&P Development, LLC - Bethany Pike, WV 88

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

* * *

* * *

Monday, April 6, 2020 5:55 p.m. - 6:38 p.m.

All Attendees Appearing Via Zoom Teleconferencing

Planning Commission Members in Attendance

James "Jeff" Mauck, Jr., Chairperson
Martha Wright, Vice Chairperson
Christina Schessler
Wendy Scatterday
William Schwarz
Russell Jebbia
Howard Monroe
Thomas Conner
Jeremy West

Also in Attendance

Rosemary Humway-Warmuth, Esquire, City Solicitor Thomas Connelly, AICP Michael Hooper, Esquire

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

16

17 **I**

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Unfinished business.

Let's call forward Mr. Hooper, which is right there.

Mr. Hooper, give us a brief overview of where you are with the Traffic Impact Study, your dealings with the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection, and your geotechnical analysis by Thrasher. It's your turn.

MR. HOOPER: Thank you.

Can you hear me clearly enough now?

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Yeah. You're good.

MR. CONNELLY: Yes.

MR. HOOPER: Wonderful.

Well, actually, I spoke with our traffic engineering company probably about a half an hour before we started this meeting, and they have advised me that they believe that because of the obvious delays, they're not in a position to have a final report until -- their words -- the end of the month, which I take that to be April 30th or May 1st. So we have that issue. That takes care of the traffic status report.

As far as the geotech side of things, we did see some comments that were submitted to the City that we would like our geotech to respond to specifically. Obviously there

I

are plenty of references online in terms of GC&P and stormwater which are very misplaced, inaccurate, and each one will need to be rebutted.

Just to make it very clear, the bulk of the flooding actually happened over on the Edgington Lane side, which is beneath property owned by Oglebay and I believe 50 percent by the City of Wheeling, which I think very clearly is a cause of the lack of the separation of stormwater and sewer and has nothing to do with any of the tree removal that was done on the other side of the hill by GC&P. So that's an important issue and something that we'll be talking about.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Can I interrupt you just for a minute? This is Martha.

I do have a little bit of a concern, which I don't know if it fits in here. When we had received the traffic study on the Edgewood Lutheran Church building, there was concerns by citizens that said, well, that's not really a fair traffic study because it was Martin Luther King Day, so there was no school traffic there. I'm a little concerned, I guess maybe on your behalf, that there will be some pushback and they will say, well, this was during the pandemic, so there was not -- that doesn't really represent the adequate -- the usual amount of traffic on that route. Not that I

want anything else delayed, but that's just a thought that I had.

MR. HOOPER: Well, I can assure you that it was done before -- the initial traffic study counts were done, at least the ones that we have so far, were done before the pandemic.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Okay.

MR. HOOPER: A fair number of them, we are trying to get from the West Virginia DOH. I'm advised that our traffic engineering company has been in touch with them, but we're still missing some important data for that.

Once we have that, we also need to adjust for Oglebay events and that sort of thing because that is sporadic traffic but on a very regular basis. It's amazing now accurate Oglebay is, but it doesn't happen all the time. So that certainly needs to be factored in.

So this is a very, very complicated traffic study. It takes into account a number of variables. The DOH had us expand the number of intersections that were to be surveyed.

So I can assure we are in as much of a hurry as you are to get this done, but it also needs to be done right. As you said, it needs to be adjusted so that we don't have variables such as pandemics and that sort of thing. We want it to be a good product for everybody.

1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | p | 4 | t | 5 | 0 | 6 | t | 7 | w | 6 | d | 6 |

9

11 12

10

14

13

16

15

18

17

19

20

22

21

2324

As far as West Virginia DEP, we are working with our engineering company there. We have lots of engineers, pretty much full employment right now, working with DEP in terms of the proper way to move forward. We're going to rely on them to tell us, be that a quarry permit or be it whatever they advise us to do. They have the experience in that, and we're going to do what they tell us so do. It's going to be done properly. It's going to be done in conjunction with all applicable rules and regulations.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Mike, can I come in for a moment?

Tom, I talked with you earlier. I did receive the information from you from the legal department as to -- although it wasn't you, there were other persons from either the developer or Thrasher, and they said the City is going to be sending out communication so that we can be within the loop to provide that information to the Commission and to the City in general in regard to what those communications have been.

MR. HOOPER: Okay.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Thank you.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. I don't recall that we specifically spoke about that, but if that's what the City requires, that's what we're going to do.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Well, we've talked about that at several meetings in regard to assurances about what the communication is because the developer has stated -- you have stated, on behalf of your developer, that you believe that it was simply site plan development, but removing that vast amount of overburden that might take five to whatever amount of years, is that not mining? So I think that's probably a pivotal concern. So I'm just -- I have talked with you about that, and we have talked about that within those commissions.

I didn't want to interrupt, but I want it on record as well to state that this has been an ongoing concern so that we are in the loop for what information has been supplied to the DEP so that we are knowledgeable enough to comment back.

MR. HOOPER: I understand. I understand that. And from our standpoint, in addition to that, we are going to be submitting additional reports from them. We also spoke about -- we want them to have the opportunity to explain their reports in front of this body and to also have the opportunity to field questions at the meeting as well, but I was told this meeting was going to be short, sweet and casual. So that's why --

(indiscernible cross-talk)

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Thank you. That's wonderful.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Do you have any more to report, Mike? 2 3 MR. HOOPER: I think that really pretty much gets us up to date. Again, I can summarize our position on 4 stormwater, and I can talk to you in detail about anything you want, but I don't think that was the intent of the 6 meeting as I was advised. So we can save that for another 8 date. 9 I do apologize for the delay. We want to get this done just as quickly as you do, but prudence in the current 10 11 situation just dictates that that's not going to happen. CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Well, let's see what the 12 commissioners say. 13 Questions, Commissioners? 14 15 COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: I have a question. is Wendy. 16 17 Mr. Hooper, you mentioned supplying additional reports. So what is the schedule for those additional 18 19 reports? MR. HOOPER: They will be in long before the 20 21 traffic study is complete. I don't have a specific date. 22 COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: Well, would it be -- I 23 would say -- and others can comment -- in terms of having an

idea of the day in terms of -- we're trying to assess the

24

information and the materials that are going to be available ahead of the public hearing and the timeline. So I'm trying to understand what all you're going to still be providing and when those things are going to fall into the queue knowing that we've got to have 30 days ahead of the public hearing.

MR. HOOPER: Well, in terms having things submitted 30 days in advance of May 11th, that's probably not going to happen, especially for the traffic study.

Again, as the mayor said I think most recently said in the Intelligencer report, we've having hundred-year rains pretty much every year now. So there have been assertions and there have been references that GP&C had something to do with that flooding. We want to make sure that we specifically address that. That's something that is pretty acute and certainly in the public eye, and we want to make it very clear that that has nothing to do with GC&P or anything that they have done on their property.

So what I can tell you is from my standpoint, they are moving as quickly as they can. If you want me to solicit dates and more specifics on that, I'll have to do that, but I'm not going to -- I can't speak off the top of my head for when that's actually going to happen.

COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: Okay. The reports we're talking about I thought were in reference to the DEP's

information. That's what I was asking about.

2

3

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. HOOPER: That as well. That as well. We are working with the engineering company, and I have not received any report or recommendation from them yet. They are aware of May 11th being the next possible date, and we're trying to do everything we can to get everything in on time.

But as I said, this is a complex issue. We don't want to shoot from the hip. We want it to be accurate, and we want it to be complete, and that's what has to be done. At least that's what we want to do.

COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: Sure. I appreciate all that. These aren't questions that are critical. These are questions that are practical, and I'm just asking for information.

MR. HOOPER: You know all that I know.

COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: Right.

So my question is to the extent that there is a expectation or targeted date for these additional materials -- that's the question that I'm asking is targets.

MR. HOOPER: I thought I answered that, which is as soon as we possibly can.

COMMISSIONER MONROE: Tom -- or Mike -- I'm sorry -- you said the traffic study you hope to have done by the end of the month?

MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.

2

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 **I**

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

COMMISSIONER MONROE: Since you said you thought these other reports would be in before the traffic study, you hope they will be in by the end of the month as well if I'm understanding you correctly?

MR. HOOPER: Yes. You're absolutely correct.

COMMISSIONER MONROE: I didn't mean to interrupt, wendy. I'm sorry.

COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: No. That's all I'm trying to get to is some kind of actual point on a calendar.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Other questions, Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZ: Yeah, I have a question -- this is Bill -- for Mr. Hooper.

If I'm understanding correct, did you say the DEP will provide some analysis or reports of their own after evaluating the site or the property, and that's what you'll be providing prior to the meeting this month? Am I understanding you correctly there?

MR. HOOPER: No, sir. I don't know what they are going to submit yet or how they are going to submit. We are waiting for our engineering company that is working with DEP to analyze the situation and give us the best advice on how to practically proceed.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZ: I see. So that being

Larson?

2

MR. HOOPER: Yes.

3

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZ: Correct?

MR. HOOPER: Correct.

5

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZ: Okav.

6

MR. HOOPER: My non-relative, David Hooper, who is

7

our contact there.

8

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZ: Okay. I understand.

9

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Any other comments? Go ahead.

10

COMMISSIONER MONROE: Tom or Rose -- and I think,

11

Rose, you may have sort of implied this earlier -- have we,

12

as a city or as a commission, received any kind of comments

13

officially on this from the DEP?

14

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Tom can address this because

we have started sending e-mails. Well, my goodness. We did

16

them a few years ago, but for purposes of this initial

17 **I**

Planning Commission action in August, Tom, I think you can

18

address the e-mails that we have sent through your office,

19

and now I'm going to obviously have to step it up to find out

20 perhaps some more communication.

21

22

23

24

MR. CONNELLY: Yes. Howard, I have not heard anything. The last few times I checked in with a gentleman out of -- I think it's Philippi -- they had not received any of the paperwork. So in March --

COMMISSIONER MONROE: I'm sorry. I don't mean to interrupt. Any paperwork from whom?

MR. CONNELLY: From the applicant.

COMMISSIONER MONROE: Okay.

MR. CONNELLY: So in March, Mr. Hooper provided a contact name to the City, and so that's who we will be following up with to determine what's all being reviewed.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Tom, correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe our initial threshold step was that you had communications with them that stated that if they were going to -- if there was going to be some form of a review period, it would be triggered by an application that would -- and the ultimate decision upon whether or not a permit for quarrying and mineral extraction lied within the State.

MR. CONNELLY: Yeah. They really didn't want to comment on anything that I had provided. They simply said they were withholding comment until an application had been submitted. So I shared with them the information available on the project website we have. Their response was just we really don't know which direction this is going to go. We need to look at an application, and then once we review the application, we'll make a determination as to what permits and processes would be required.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: I believe, through your

MR. CONNELLY: Yes. I sent an e-mail -- I forget if it was from December or January -- that just said the City has an interest in this project and so whatever opportunities there are for input --

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Right. I believe that there was also a follow-up from this Planning Commission's various meetings if I am correct.

MR. CONNELLY: All those e-mails are on the project website, if you go to -- whether you look at the Department of Highways or the Department of Environmental Protection, any of the e-mails back and forth, but there hasn't been anything official because the DEP simply said until we get an application, we don't have any comment.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Right. And I know that you have included them in all of the information and transcripts.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Go ahead, Mike.

MR. HOOPER: Yeah. I just wanted to make it clear, we're also working with DEP on anything having to do in that realm with Ascent Engineering. I just wanted to make sure that you understood that we're doing that as well.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Okay.

24

2

3

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

COMMISSIONER MONROE: Excuse me. Mike, you have not yet -- your client has not yet determined what kind of permit they want to apply for; is that correct?

MR. HOOPER: That's correct.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Jeremy, did you have a question, or are you swatting flies?

COMMISSIONER WEST: Just changing my views.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: All right. Other comments,

Commissioners?

COMMISSIONER MONROE: With Mr. Hooper there, I'm wondering if this is an appropriate time to talk about the thought that some of us have had that we should ask for an independent review of that geotechnical report.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Would you like to weigh in on that, Wendy?

COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: Well, I had suggested that an independent analysis would benefit the Commission, benefit the City and benefit the citizens so that there would be an objective review of the materials from an engineering consultant that would be an expert in the type of work that is being proposed, and that way having that outside objective assessment of the materials provided and really to help guide the Commission and the City, in general, all the City and the staff --

1	COMMISSIONER MONROE: She froze.
2	COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: This is Martha.
3	Tom, I think long ago I sent you a long and
4	exasperated e-mail trying to sort out this complicated issue.
5	At that time, I expressed that I was in favor of having an
6	independent review. I think for everybody's sake, that
7	that's a good step.
8	COMMISSIONER MONROE: Tom, that is something
9	that falls within our purview; is that correct?
10	MR. CONNELLY: You can request it, and then the
11	authority would come from the City Manager.
12	COMMISSIONER MONROE: But you've had conversation
13	with him? Do you feel that he would be amenable to that?
14	MR. CONNELLY: Yes.
15	COMMISSIONER MONROE: I know you can't speak for
16	him, but your sense is that he would be amenable to that?
17	MR. CONNELLY: That's correct.
18	COMMISSIONER MONROE: I certainly concur with
19	Martha and I think what Wendy was saying before she froze.
20	COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: All right.
21	COMMISSIONER MONROE: That's all right.
22	To me, it's a very good thing. I read the report,
23	and I analyzed it the best I can. I see a lot of comments
24	from people who seem to have credentials via e-mail and so

I

on. I really would feel very much more comfortable with seeing an independent analysis of that.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Okay. I'm going to break in for a moment. It's very similar to an outside opinion for counsel that is well-versed in very particular areas.

Also, Tom and I have spoken with this, that it's also very similar in the technical areas, like telecommunications and cell towers, which we did insert that language in regard to the expert reviews for that.

So as far as that goes, that is something that should the Commission want to move forward with -- and I've spoken with Assistant Director Connelly on that -- it would be something that this board would recommend.

Obviously City Manager Herron would be the ultimate person holding discretion in regard to any contract and analysis, but I know that Assistant Director Connelly has talked about that and has looked at the potential for such expertise to assist us and knowing that it is also on a short-term basis what we received from the geotech from GC&P Development.

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZ: I have thoughts on this. I understand providing -- this is Bill. Sorry. I understand the idea of providing some analysis to break this report down into laymen's terms so to speak to provide a collective

10 II

I

summary of it, and if there is any questions that the Commissioners have regarding the technical jargon and so forth that's in there, that it can be explained.

But I guess the problem that I have is we're talking about an independent expert. I guess my question is: Who is to say an independent, as a third party, any smarter than Larson as far as who is right? Say we bring a third party in and they have some disagreement with what's presented in Larson's report. Then who is correct? Is that what we're looking for? I'm saying that may introduce some more confusion into the matter, but I do agree with the fact — or the idea of providing a breakdown of this into laymen's terms so we can all understand what it's saying.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Go ahead, Howard.

COMMISSIONER MONROE: It would seem to me that actually if an independent -- it's kind of getting a second doctor's opinion. I'm not implying the first doctor isn't really good. I just want to hear another good doctor's opinion. And if they concur, life is good, and if the second opinion gives us some additional issues to probe into, that to me is important information to have. So to me it makes some sense.

Apparently, to answer the direct question, who would make the determination, clearly that's the City

I

Manager's decision. But to me it's a tool that would be very helpful, I think, for us to have. Hopefully they say, boy, this report is perfect and there is no real concerns that we have. If we have two people saying the same thing, that's good. I feel better. Maybe they will raise some questions which we then could ask both sides to help us understand more. That's my take on it at least.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Rosemary, do you have any comments here?

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: No. That's pretty much what that is. It is an independent decision. We want someone to take a look at that, basically put it in plain English for our Commission, review that. If there's some of the areas of the geotech that they find are over and above, we want them to note that. If there are some areas where they think maybe there could be some other things or they question some of the outcomes — they may also give us some recommendations. I would suggest that if the plan for the development comes to fruition, then what are the outcomes? Like how long will it take to remove that overburden? What will that take, et cetera? These are types of recommendations you can ask.

But basically to review the initial geotech is well going to -- it will lead to some further questions, but the independent decision and opinion is really, from the

Commission's side, due diligence.

10 ll

I

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Wendy?

COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: Thank you, sir. This is wendy Scatterday.

Commissioners, just on a -- just as a reminder, the Commission and the City, the City staff, this step has already actually been engaged and already been taken on the part of the water department staff and also the water pollution control staff. In each case, both of the directors of both departments, and obviously under Mr. Jebbia in his direction, they, each independently, reached out to their outside consulting design firms that facilitate the work of the sewer and stormwater systems, as well as the water supply systems.

In our packets and in our materials, we already have information provided from an outside independent engineering firm called CT Consulting. The City has an ongoing contract with that firm for civil engineering and other engineering work associated with the water and sewer and stormwater systems.

So we've already done that. So really this is -the idea of the analysis of geotech falls in line with what
we've already done. It's just a different expertise, the
fact that we don't -- the City doesn't have an ongoing

trying to stay quiet.

contract with a geotech consultant at this time because it's not part of their regular course of work on a day-to-day basis.

Do I have that correct, Mr. Jebbia?

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: I can't hear you, Rusty.

COMMISSIONER JEBBIA: Sorry. I was muted. I was

Yeah, you're absolutely right, Wendy.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Any additional comments, Rusty?

COMMISSIONER JEBBIA: No, sir.

COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: I think the question would be is if CT Consulting would be the appropriate entity that could also provide that. I'm not familiar with all the services that they provide with their firm or if an outside — a separate and different engineering firm that has an expertise in mining and geotech — there's a variety of firms that does that type of work and other soil-related type of work.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: The legal department's opinion -- and we've talked a little bit about that in regard to the question -- is that the reports from CT and the information that CT has been provided would certainly be provided to a geotech, but it would be an independent consultant, because the reports that we do have, that we have had and that are

part of the record and will continue to be -- that's a continuing thing. An independent consultant at the top of the pyramid can then talk with persons from the developer, as well as our consultants, to mesh the report.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: If we approve this, we would leave it up to Tom and Rosemary and the City Manager and whoever else in the City has knowledge to contract with one of them. We wouldn't be a part of that process?

COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: Correct.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: And I will only approve the legal documents, not the policy.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Go ahead, Howard.

COMMISSIONER MONROE: First of all, I want to be real clear so nobody misunderstands, especially Mr. Hooper and his clients. I'm not criticizing any of the work that has been done, nor am I suggesting anything is incorrect or inappropriate about it. I'm just looking for something to layer on top of that for my perspective. I hope it doesn't come across, at least from my perspective, in any way as a criticism.

If Mr. Hooper is still with us, I'm wondering if he has any thoughts on the idea of the Commission doing an independent analysis.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: He is.

Go ahead, Mike.

I

they do.

MR. HOOPER: Sure. I can tell you that we've got some of the top geologists in the country working on this, as well as four of the best engineering consulting firms. So we feel pretty comfortable with who we have. I absolutely understand where you're coming from. And if nothing else, I think it may actually help to have a better overall understanding. So that's fine by me.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Okay. Does that answer your question, Howard?

COMMISSIONER MONROE: It does.

Would it be appropriate to make a motion here?

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZ: Just one more question. So the report that Larson provided right now is a preliminary report. So I'm assuming that means that there will be future further detailed reports provided. So I'm wondering would we follow the same procedure with the future detailed reports that Larson would provide as far as having them evaluated by our independent engineer? I don't know that we can really tell at this point, but I'm just wondering for --

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Rosemary? Tom?

COMMISSIONER SCHWARZ: -- for future reports that

MR. CONNELLY: My thought would be to review this

10 l

I

report because that's what we have in front of us, and if future reports come our way, if we need that next level of explanation or clarity, we can pursue that likewise.

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Yeah. That's a similar process like within environmental consultation, especially because this is environmental consultation on a different plain. But when our review would come back and that independent evaluator takes a look at that, then there may be parts of their geotech that they question, they provide to us in plain English why they are questioning it, and there might be more either tests or explanations. So it is a little bit of an ongoing process. There would be an end point to that, but there is a little bit of a give and take back because one opinion might be -- like our -- the opinion from our consultant may come out. There may need to be some explanation that then could be communicated through basic writing, et cetera, and telephone calls with their expert. So there is going to be some give and take on that.

And there may need to be some further excavations and further testing. There may need to be that, along with the explanation. Maybe not.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: With that said, could we go ahead -- and I don't know where we're going, how fast we're going, but could we go ahead and schedule a public hearing

before we get this report back?

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Tom, we talked about that. You might want to handle that one.

MR. CONNELLY: Yeah. I mean, there is two topics there. One is the scheduling of the public hearing and, two, waiting on this report. Our idea was this information is out there. We requested this, the traffic study, and some DEP information. That was kind of the line that we had waiting to scheduling a public hearing. Now, to say we need the secondary report before we continue that, I think you just keep pushing that and then they come back with another, and when do you wrap up the hearing?

I think the three pieces of information we were awaiting, DEP, Department of Highways, and some geotech, we still don't have those. So if we're talking about April 30th for a Traffic Impact Study, that's 10 or 11 days before the public hearing. And at this time, we don't even know if that public hearing is still going to go on as scheduled just because of travel restraints and meeting in groups and those types of things.

So the first thing that -- two things I wanted to get accomplished tonight was whether or not the Commission wanted to proceed with having that secondary review or that review of that report, and once that was out of the way, then

looking at scheduling a meeting, running a public hearing ad, and having a disclaimer in there that — because we need to run it. I need to get it in the newspaper tomorrow so that it runs in Saturday's paper. But just having a disclaimer that pending certain current events, it could be postponed or moved. One, as of now, Northern is no longer having events in their building, and come May their semester will likely be over. I'm not sure if we need to look for another facility, and, two, I don't know if we'll be able to meet.

So the idea was to advertise that we would meet on May 11th and then change if necessary. Knowing we don't have the Traffic Impact Study -- I understand the reason why, but knowing we won't have it until April 30th -- and I think that is one thing that a lot of people would like to look at before the hearing is knowing what the outcomes of the traffic study are.

You know, that information was just gained tonight.

So maybe we automatically push that meeting back from

May 11th. But if we could separate the two issues, one, take
a vote on whether or not the Commission agrees to get a

second look at the --

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: On the geotech.

MR. CONNELLY: Then we can talk about whether we want to schedule a meeting.

3

7

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

June 8th is our meeting in June. That would definitely give 30 days -- give 38 days. We can call a meeting special meeting for May 30th or May 29th or wait another week. I know members of the community want to have their input. We've been waiting on information. We have this unbelievable incidence of a lockdown. So those are the two things that we need to determine tonight.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Tom, this is Martha. If it is a matter -- if we need to put a motion on the floor for the second review of the geotech study, I am happy to make that motion right now.

MR. CONNELLY: Okay.

COMMISSIONER MONROE: You beat me to it. I was going to try to and somebody interrupted me. That's okay. I will second that motion.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: It's been moved by Martha and seconded by Howard to delve into an independent study on the geotech. All in favor, raise your hand. One, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight. Eight, Tom.

MR. CONNELLY: Okay. I got it.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Zero opposed.

MR. CONNELLY: I'll work with the City Manager and the legal department on that.

Then the next topic is what do we want to do about

our meeting date. Knowing that April 30th deadline is the target date, we can discuss that.

CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Howard?

COMMISSIONER MONROE: Tom, I will concur with you that we don't necessarily have to have the geotech review done by the public hearing. There's enough information out there or hopefully will be coming out there to continue with it.

However, I think there is an awful lot of question marks around that public hearing, that if we don't get that traffic study done -- and I'm not criticizing anyone. I understand why nothing is getting done right now. Will there even be a way to have a meeting on May 11th? I tend to think that particular public hearing will need to be open -- I don't think we can do that by Zoom. I mean, I think there's going to be a long comment period on that.

If I was a betting man, which I'm not, but if I was a betting man, I would bet that we will not have access to that building on May 11th, even if we wanted to. I'm not really sure what the recommendation I have here is, except I think it's very iffy. I hate like heck to keep pushing this back. I really, really do, but, again, who would have guessed we were in the midst of a worldwide pandemic and be under orders to stay home.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I'm sorry, Howard, to interrupt. This is Martha. My tradition.

I am inclined -- I understand people are impatient and I understand people want answers, but on the other hand, I'm sort of the mind that if we do go to June 8th, which is arguably a safer bet, it's a good chance that we would not only have the traffic study with adequate time for the public to look at, but there is a possibility that we would have some kind of secondary review study.

COMMISSIONER MONROE: I don't disagree. It makes sense to me -- again, I hate to make it sound as if we are continually dragging this out. I don't want to do that, but I think full information is important, and more importantly, I just don't think we're going to be able to hold a public hearing on May 11th. That's just my best guess.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I don't think so either.

I think there it will be an expectation from the public that we do have some review of that. I remember clearly and was honestly a little surprised that even during the Edgewood Lutheran Church traffic study, that there were people that called into question the validity of that study, which I did not because certainly those contractors take their reputation and the licensing very seriously. I think that this is a very charged issue, and I think that we are

going to have to take that step.

I

MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: For the purpose of the record, the Planning Commission has always, always done traffic studies. A geotech study is a horse of a different color, if you will. It is a different beast, and it is something that may merit that extra layer.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I concur, Rose.

COMMISSIONER MONROE: Tom, what is your thought about the public hearing, your personal opinion? What do you think is the smartest move?

MR. CONNELLY: Well, yes. Knowing that April 30th is when we can expect the traffic study, I think at the earliest if I'm not mistaken, I think that then that having it at the regular meeting in June would make the most sense. If the college is out and we can't use that room, there's facilities, possibly the arena, whether the meeting room downstairs. There are other large venues that are bigger than city council chambers. It's just a matter of finding that.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: Tom, I also note that -- did we not change the start time for that meeting, for that public hearing, to 6:00?

MR. CONNELLY: We were going to advertise that, yes.

COMMISSIONER WRIGHT: I think that if we are moving towards the June meeting, I feel that we should do that same thing in order to make sure that the people feel like they MR. CONNELLY: The more I think about it, the White COMMISSIONER MONROE: Again, I would like to get thoughts from Mr. Hooper since he is listening in. Mike, do you have any thoughts on this? MR. HOOPER: I really think that's up to your discretion. We're going to move as quickly as we can. We want to some get some finality to this, but I do agree it's going to take time for your person to review things, and they may very well have questions. So from that standpoint, I MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Mike, if I can, Counselor Hooper, you wish to, on behalf of the developer, to also prepare for the date of the public hearing, a full presentation in regard to the development in regard to your expert, and the information that has been supplied by

1	MR. HOOPER: Yes, sir.
2	COMMISSIONER MONROE: If there is no other
3	objections, Commissioners, I recommend that we cancel the
4	plans for the May 11th public hearing and go with June 8th at
5	6:00 p.m.
6	CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Could we have a vote on that?
7	MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Sure.
8	CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Do you have a second? How
9	about a second?
10	COMMISSIONER SCATTERDAY: Second.
11	CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Wendy seconds to move the
12	public hearing to June 6th.
13	MR. CONNELLY: June 8th.
14	CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: June 8th.
15	All in favor, raise your hand.
16	Eight to nothing. No opposed.
17	Are we done with that item?
18	MR. CONNELLY: Yes.
19	I have two people that have been texting, waiting
20	still in the waiting room for the next application.
21	CHAIRPERSON MAUCK: Thank you, Mike. I appreciate
22	it.
23	MS. HUMWAY-WARMUTH: Thanks, Mike. See you in the
24	future.

1	STATE OF WEST VIRGINIA:
2	SS: CERTIFICATE COUNTY OF OHIO:
3	I, Susan Sommer LeCron, Registered Professional Reporter and Commissioner within and for the State of West Virginia, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify
567	that the foregoing Transcript of Proceedings is a transcript of verbatim stenotype notes taken during the proceeding and said Transcript of Proceedings constitutes all the testimony taken during this proceeding.
8	I do further certify that this hearing was taken at the date and time in the foregoing caption specified.
9 O	I do further certify that I am not a relative, counsel or attorney of either party, or otherwise interested in the event of this action.
11	IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal of office at St. Clairsville, Ohio, on the 20th day of April, 2020.
3	
4	
15	
6	Susan Sommer LeCron, RPR
17	Commissioner within and for the State of West Virginia
8	My commission expires: 6/7/2022
0	
21	
22	
23	
24	

10 [1] - 24:16 **11** [1] - 24:16 11th [8] - 8:7, 9:5, 25:11, 25:19, 27:13, 27:19, 28:15, 31:4 29th [1] - 26:3 **30** [3] - 8:5, 8:7, 26:2 **30th** [5] - 24:15, 25:13, 26:3, 27:1, 29:11 **38** [1] - 26:2 **6:00** [2] - 29:22, 31:5 6th [1] - 31:12 8th [5] - 26:1, 28:5, 31:4, 31:13, 31:14 able [2] - 25:9, 28:14 absolutely [3] - 10:6, 20:8, 22:5 access [1] - 27:18 accommodated [1] -30:4 accomplished [1] -24:22 accurate [1] - 9:8 action [1] - 11:17 actual [1] - 10:10 acute [1] - 8:15 ad [1] - 25:1 addition [1] - 6:16 additional [6] - 6:17, 7:17, 7:18, 9:18, 17:20, 20:9 address [3] - 8:14, 11:14, 11:18 adequate [1] - 28:7 advance [1] - 8:7 advertise [2] - 25:10, 29:23 advice [1] - 10:22 advise [1] - 5:6 advised [1] - 7:7 ago [2] - 11:16, 15:3 agree [2] - 17:11, 30:13 agreement [1] - 30:24 agrees [1] - 25:20 ahead [9] - 8:2, 8:5, 11:9, 13:19, 17:14, 21:12, 22:1, 23:23, 23:24 amenable [2] - 15:13, 15:16 amount [2] - 6:6 analysis [7] - 10:15, 14:17, 16:2, 16:16, 16:23, 19:22, 21:23 analyze [1] - 10:22 analyzed [1] - 15:23 answer [2] - 17:23, 22:9 answered [1] - 9:20 answers [1] - 28:4 **apologize** [1] - 7:9 applicable [1] - 5:9 applicant [1] - 12:3 application [7] - 12:12, 12:17, 12:21, 12:22, 13:3, 13:16, 31:20

apply [1] - 14:3 appreciate [2] - 9:11, 31:21 appropriate [3] - 14:11, 20:12, 22:12 approve [2] - 21:5, 21:10 **April** [4] - 24:15, 25:13, 27:1, 29:11 areas [4] - 16:5, 16:7, 18:13, 18:15 arena [1] - 29:16 arguably [1] - 28:6 Ascent [1] - 13:22 assertions [1] - 8:11 assess [1] - 7:24 assessment [1] - 14:22 assist [1] - 16:18 assistant [2] - 16:12, 16:16 associated [1] - 19:19 assuming [1] - 22:15 assurances [1] - 6:2 August [1] - 11:17 authority [1] - 15:11 automatically [1] -25:18 available [2] - 8:1, 12:18 awaiting [1] - 24:14 aware [1] - 9:4 awful [1] - 27:9 basic [1] - 23:16 basis [2] - 16:19, 20:3 beast [1] - 29:5 beat [1] - 26:13 behalf [2] - 6:4, 30:18 benefit [3] - 14:17, 14:18 best [4] - 10:22, 15:23, 22:4, 28:15 bet [2] - 27:18, 28:6 better [2] - 18:5, 22:7 betting [2] - 27:17, 27:18 bigger [1] - 29:17 Bill [2] - 10:13, 16:22 **bit** [3] - 20:20, 23:11, 23:13 **board** [1] - 16:13 body [1] - 6:19 **boy** [1] - 18:2 break [2] - 16:3, 16:23 breakdown [1] - 17:12 bring [1] - 17:7 **bringing** [1] - 32:2 **building** [2] - 25:7, 27:19 calendar [1] - 10:10 cancel [1] - 31:3 case [1] - 19:9 casual [1] - 6:22 cell [1] - 16:8 certain [1] - 25:5 certainly [4] - 8:15,

15:18, 20:22, 28:22

cetera [2] - 18:21, 23:17

CHAIRPERSON [28] -7:1, 7:12, 10:11, 11:9, 13:19, 14:5, 14:8, 14:14, 17:14, 18:8, 19:2, 20:5, 20:9, 21:5, 21:12, 21:24, 22:9, 22:21, 23:22, 26:16, 26:21, 27:3, 30:24, 31:6, 31:8, 31:11, 31:14, 31:21 **chambers** [1] - 29:18 **chance** [1] - 28:6 change [2] - 25:11, 29:21 changing [1] - 14:7 charged [1] - 28:24 checked [1] - 11:22 **church** [1] - 28:20 citizens [1] - 14:18 city [6] - 11:12, 15:11, 16:14, 21:7, 26:22, 29:18 City [14] - 5:15, 5:18, 5:23, 12:6, 13:5, 14:18, 14:23, 17:24, 19:6, 19:17, 19:24, 21:6 civil [1] - 19:18 **clarity** [1] - 23:3 **clear** [4] - 8:16, 13:1, 13:20, 21:14 clearly [2] - 17:24, 28:19 client [1] - 14:2 clients [1] - 21:15 collective [1] - 16:24 college [1] - 29:15 color [1] - 29:4 comfortable [2] - 16:1, 22:5 coming [2] - 22:6, 27:7 comment [6] - 6:14, 7:23, 12:16, 12:17, 13:16, 27:16 comments [7] - 11:9, 11:12, 13:2, 14:8, 15:23, 18:9, 20:9 Commission [10] - 5:17, 11:17, 14:17, 14:23, 16:11, 19:6, 21:22, 24:22, 25:20, 29:3 **commission** [2] - 11:12, 18:13 Commission's [2] -13:9, 19:1 commissioner [1] -19:3 COMMISSIONER [52] -7:15, 7:22, 8:23, 9:11, 9:16, 9:22, 10:2, 10:7, 10:9, 10:12, 10:24, 11:3, 11:5, 11:8, 11:10, 12:1, 12:4, 14:1, 14:7, 14:10,

14:16, 15:1, 15:2,

15:8, 15:12, 15:15,

15:18, 15:20, 15:21, 16:21, 17:15, 20:6, 20:10, 20:11, 21:9, 21:13, 22:11, 22:13, 22:22, 26:8, 26:13, 27:4, 28:1, 28:10, 28:16, 29:7, 29:8, 29:20, 30:1, 30:8, 31:2, 31:10 Commissioners [5] -10:11, 14:9, 17:2, 19:5, 31:3 commissioners [2] -7:13, 7:14 commissions [1] - 6:9 communicated [1] -23:16 communication [3] -5:16, 6:3, 11:20 communications [2] -5:18, 12:10 community [1] - 26:4 company [3] - 5:2, 9:3, 10:21 complete [2] - 7:21, 9:9 complex [1] - 9:7 complicated [1] - 15:4 concern [2] - 6:8, 6:11 concerns [2] - 13:2, 18:3 concur [4] - 15:18, 17:19, 27:4, 29:7 confusion [1] - 17:11 conjunction [1] - 5:8 CONNELLY [21] - 11:21, 12:3, 12:5, 12:15, 13:4, 13:11, 15:10, 15:14, 15:17, 22:24, 24:4, 25:23, 26:12, 26:20, 26:22, 29:11, 29:23, 30:5, 31:13, 31:18. 32:2 Connelly [2] - 16:12, 16:16 consultant [5] - 14:20, 20:1, 20:23, 21:2, 23:15 consultants [1] - 21:4 consultation [2] - 23:5, 23:6 consulting [4] - 19:12, 19:17, 20:12, 22:4 contact [2] - 11:7, 12:6 continually [1] - 28:12 continue [3] - 21:1, 24:10, 27:7 **continuing** [1] - 21:2 contract [4] - 16:15, 19:18, 20:1, 21:7 contractors [1] - 28:22 control [1] - 19:9 conversation [1] - 15:12 correct [14] - 10:6, 10:14, 11:3, 11:4, 12:8, 13:10, 14:3,

14:4, 15:9, 15:17, 17:9, 20:4, 21:9, 30:23 correctly [2] - 10:5, 10:18 council [1] - 29:18 counsel [1] - 16:5 counselor [1] - 30:17 country [1] - 22:3 course [1] - 20:2 credentials [1] - 15:24 critical [1] - 9:12 criticism [1] - 21:20 criticizing [2] - 21:15, 27:11 cross [1] - 6:23 cross-talk [1] - 6:23 **CT** [4] - 19:17, 20:12, 20:21, 20:22 current [2] - 7:10, 25:5 date [8] - 7:4, 7:8, 7:21, 9:5, 9:18, 27:1, 27:2, 30:19 dates [1] - 8:20 David [1] - 11:6 day-to-day [1] - 20:2 days [5] - 8:5, 8:7, 24:16. 26:2 deadline [1] - 27:1 **December** [1] - 13:5 decision [5] - 12:13, 18:1, 18:11, 18:24, 30:16 defer [1] - 30:16 **definitely** [1] - 26:2 delay [1] - 7:9 delve [1] - 26:17 **DEP**[10] - 5:1, 5:3, 6:13, 10:14, 10:21, 11:13, 13:15, 13:21, 24:7, 24:14 **DEP's** [1] - 8:24 department [4] - 5:13, 13:13, 19:8, 26:23 **Department** [2] - 13:12, 24.14 department's [1] - 20:19 departments [1] - 19:10 design [1] - 19:12 detail [1] - 7:5 detailed [2] - 22:16, 22:17 determination [2] -12:22, 17:24 determine [2] - 12:7, 26:7 determined [1] - 14:2 **developer** [5] - 5:15, 6:3, 6:4, 21:3, 30:18 development [4] - 6:5, 16:20. 18:18. 30:20 dictates [1] - 7:11 different [5] - 19:23, 20:15, 23:6, 29:4, 29:5 diligence [1] - 19:1 direct [1] - 17:23

direction [2] - 12:20, 19:11 director [2] - 16:12, 16:16 directors [1] - 19:9 disagree [1] - 28:10 disagreement [1] - 17:8 disclaimer [2] - 25:2, 25:4 discretion [2] - 16:15, 30:12 discuss [1] - 27:2 doctor [1] - 17:17 doctor's [2] - 17:17, 17:18 documents [2] - 21:11, 30:22 done [14] - 5:8, 7:10, 8:17, 9:9, 9:23, 19:21, 19:23, 21:16, 27:6, 27:11, 27:12, 29:3, 31:17 down [1] - 16:23 downstairs [1] - 29:17 dragging [1] - 28:12 due [1] - 19:1 during [1] - 28:19 e-mail [3] - 13:4, 15:4, 15:24 e-mails [4] - 11:15, 11:18, 13:11, 13:14 earliest [1] - 29:13 Edgewood [1] - 28:20 eight [3] - 26:19, 31:16 either [3] - 5:14, 23:11, 28:16 employment [1] - 5:3 end [3] - 9:24, 10:4, 23:12 engaged [1] - 19:7 engineer [1] - 22:19 engineering [10] - 5:2, 9:3, 10:21, 13:22, 14:19, 19:17, 19:18, 19:19, 20:15, 22:4 engineers [1] - 5:2 English [2] - 18:12, 23:10 entity [1] - 20:12 Environmental [1] -13:13 environmental [2] -23:5, 23:6 especially [3] - 8:8, 21:14, 23:5 et [2] - 18:20, 23:17 evaluated [1] - 22:18 evaluating [1] - 10:16 evaluator [1] - 23:8 events [2] - 25:5, 25:6 exasperated [1] - 15:4 excavations [1] - 23:19 except [1] - 27:20 excuse [1] - 14:1 expect [1] - 29:12

expectation [2] - 9:18, 28:17 experience [1] - 5:6 expert [5] - 14:20, 16:9, 17:5, 23:17, 30:21 expertise [3] - 16:18, 19:23, 20:16 explain [1] - 6:18 explained [1] - 17:3 explanation [3] - 23:3, 23:16, 23:21 explanations [1] - 23:11 expressed [1] - 15:5 extent [1] - 9:17 extra [1] - 29:6 extraction [1] - 12:14 eye [1] - 8:15 facilitate [1] - 19:12 facilities [1] - 29:16 facility [1] - 25:8 fact [2] - 17:11, 19:24 fall [1] - 8:4 falls [2] - 15:9, 19:22 familiar [1] - 20:13 **far** [4] - 5:1, 16:10, 17:7, 22:18 fast [1] - 23:23 favor [3] - 15:5, 26:18, 31:15 few [2] - 11:16, 11:22 field [1] - 6:20 finality [1] - 30:13 fine [1] - 22:8 **firm** [4] - 19:17, 19:18, 20:14, 20:15 **firms** [3] - 19:12, 20:16, 22:4 first [3] - 17:17, 21:13, 24:21 five [2] - 6:6, 26:19 flies [1] - 14:6 flooding [1] - 8:13 floor [1] - 26:9 follow [2] - 13:9, 22:17 follow-up [1] - 13:9 following [1] - 12:7 forget [1] - 13:4 form [1] - 12:11 forth [2] - 13:14, 17:3 forward [2] - 5:4, 16:11 four [2] - 22:4, 26:19 front [2] - 6:19, 23:1 froze [2] - 15:1, 15:19 fruition [1] - 18:19 full [3] - 5:3, 28:13, 30:19 future [5] - 22:15, 22:17, 22:22, 23:2, 31:24 gained [1] - 25:17 GC&P [2] - 8:16, 16:19 general [2] - 5:18, 14:23 gentleman [1] - 11:22 **geologists** [1] - 22:3 geotech [14] - 16:19,

18:14, 18:22, 19:22,

20:1, 20:16, 20:23, 23:9, 24:14, 25:22, 26:10, 26:18, 27:5, 29:4 geotechnical [1] - 14:13 goodness [1] - 11:15 GP&C [1] - 8:12 groups [1] - 24:19 guess [3] - 17:4, 17:5, 28:15 guessed [1] - 27:22 **guide** [1] - 14:22 hand [3] - 26:18, 28:4, 31:15 handle [1] - 24:3 happy [1] - 26:10 hate [2] - 27:21, 28:11 head [1] - 8:21 hear [2] - 17:18, 20:5 heard [2] - 11:21, 13:2 hearing [19] - 8:2, 8:5, 23:24, 24:5, 24:9, 24:12, 24:17, 24:18, 25:1, 25:15, 27:6, 27:10, 27:14, 28:15, 29:9, 29:22, 30:19, 31:4, 31:12 heck [1] - 27:21 help [3] - 14:22, 18:6, 22:7 helpful [1] - 18:2 Herron [1] - 16:14 Highways [2] - 13:13, 24:14 **hip** [1] - 9:8 hold [1] - 28:14 **holding** [1] - 16:15 home [1] - 27:24 honestly [1] - 28:19 HOOPER [21] - 5:20, 5:22, 6:15, 7:3, 7:20, 8:6, 9:2, 9:15, 9:20, 10:1, 10:6, 10:19, 11:2, 11:4, 11:6, 13:20, 14:4, 22:2, 30:11, 30:23, 31:1 Hooper [9] - 7:17, 10:13, 11:6, 12:5, 14:10. 21:14, 21:21, 30:9, 30:18 hope [3] - 9:23, 10:4, 21:18 hopefully [2] - 18:2, 27:7 horse [1] - 29:4 Howard [7] - 11:21, 17:14, 21:12, 22:10, 26:17, 27:3, 28:1 HUMWAY [22] - 5:10, 5:21, 6:1, 6:24, 11:14, 12:8, 12:24, 13:8, 13:17, 13:24, 16:3, 18:10, 20:19, 21:10, 23:4, 24:2, 25:22, 29:2, 30:7, 30:17,

31:7, 31:23 **HUMWAY-WARMUTH** [22] - 5:10, 5:21, 6:1, 6:24, 11:14, 12:8, 12:24, 13:8, 13:17, 13:24, 16:3, 18:10, 20:19, 21:10, 23:4, 24:2, 25:22, 29:2, 30:7, 30:17, 31:7, 31:23 hundred [1] - 8:10 hundred-year [1] - 8:10 idea [7] - 7:24, 16:23, 17:12, 19:22, 21:22, 24:6, 25:10 iffy [1] - 27:21 impact [2] - 24:16, 25:12 impatient [1] - 28:3 implied [1] - 11:11 implying [1] - 17:17 important [2] - 17:21, 28:13 **importantly** [1] - 28:13 inappropriate [1] -21:17 incidence [1] - 26:6 inclined [1] - 28:3 included [1] - 13:18 incorrect [1] - 21:16 independent [16] -14:13, 14:17, 15:6, 16:2, 17:5, 17:6, 17:16, 18:11, 18:24, 19:16, 20:23, 21:2, 21:23, 22:19, 23:8, 26:17 independently [1] -19.11 indiscernible [1] - 6:23 **information** [19] - 5:13, 5:17, 6:12, 8:1, 9:1, 9:14, 12:18, 13:18, 17:21, 19:16, 20:21, 24:6, 24:8, 24:13, 25:17, 26:5, 27:6, 28:13, 30:21 initial [3] - 11:16, 12:9, 18:22 input [2] - 13:7, 26:5 insert [1] - 16:8 intelligencer [1] - 8:10 intent [1] - 7:6 interest [1] - 13:6 interrupt [4] - 6:10, 10:7, 12:2, 28:2 interrupted [1] - 26:14 introduce [1] - 17:10 issue [3] - 9:7, 15:4, 28:24 issues [2] - 17:20, 25:19 item [1] - 31:17 **January** [1] - 13:5 jargon [1] - 17:2 Jebbia [2] - 19:10, 20:4 **JEBBIA** [2] - 20:6, 20:10

Jeremy [1] - 14:5 June [9] - 26:1, 28:5, 29:14, 30:2, 31:4, 31:12, 31:13, 31:14 keep [2] - 24:11, 27:21 kind [6] - 10:10, 11:12, 14:2, 17:16, 24:8, 28:9 **knowing** [7] - 8:4, 16:18, 25:11, 25:13, 25:15, 27:1, 29:11 knowledge [1] - 21:7 knowledgeable [1] -6:13 language [1] - 16:9 large [1] - 29:17 Larson [4] - 11:1, 17:7, 22:14, 22:18 Larson's [1] - 17:9 last [1] - 11:22 layer [2] - 21:18, 29:6 laymen's [2] - 16:24, 17:12 lead [1] - 18:23 least [3] - 9:10, 18:7, 21:19 leave [1] - 21:6 legal [4] - 5:13, 20:19, 21:11, 26:23 level [1] - 23:2 licensing [1] - 28:23 lied [1] - 12:14 life [1] - 17:19 likely [1] - 25:7 likewise [1] - 23:3 line [2] - 19:22, 24:8 listening [1] - 30:9 lockdown [1] - 26:6 look [8] - 12:21, 13:12, 18:12, 23:8, 25:8, 25:14, 25:21, 28:8 looked [1] - 16:17 looking [3] - 17:10, 21:17, 25:1 loop [2] - 5:17, 6:12 Lutheran [1] - 28:20 mail [3] - 13:4, 15:4, 15:24 mails [4] - 11:15, 11:18, 13:11, 13:14 man [2] - 27:17, 27:18 manager [4] - 15:11, 16:14, 21:6, 26:22 manager's [1] - 18:1 March [2] - 11:24, 12:5 marks [1] - 27:10 Martha [5] - 15:2, 15:19, 26:8, 26:16, 28:2 materials [5] - 8:1, 9:19, 14:19, 14:22, 19:15 matter [3] - 17:11, 26:9, 29:18 **MAUCK** [28] - 7:1, 7:12, 10:11, 11:9, 13:19, 14:5, 14:8, 14:14, 17:14, 18:8, 19:2,

20:5, 20:9, 21:5, 21:12, 21:24, 22:9, 22:21, 23:22, 26:16, 26:21, 27:3, 30:24, 31:6, 31:8, 31:11, 31:14, 31:21 mayor [1] - 8:9 mean [4] - 10:7, 12:1, 24:4, 27:15 means [1] - 22:15 meet [2] - 25:9, 25:10 meeting [17] - 6:20, 6:21, 7:7, 10:17, 24:19, 25:1, 25:18, 25:24, 26:1, 26:3, 27:1, 27:13, 29:14, 29:16, 29:21, 30:2 meetings [2] - 6:2, 13:10 members [1] - 26:4 mentioned [1] - 7:17 merit [1] - 29:6 mesh [1] - 21:4 midst [1] - 27:23 might [5] - 6:6, 23:10, 23:14, 24:3, 30:6 **Mike** [10] - 5:10, 7:2, 9:22, 13:19, 14:1, 22:1, 30:10, 30:17, 31:21, 31:23 mind [1] - 28:5 mineral [1] - 12:14 mining [2] - 6:7, 20:16 mistaken [1] - 29:13 misunderstands [1] -21:14 moment [2] - 5:11, 16:4 **MONROE** [23] - 9:22, 10:2, 10:7, 11:10, 12:1, 12:4, 14:1, 14:10, 15:1, 15:8, 15:12, 15:15, 15:18, 15:21, 17:15, 21:13, 22:11, 26:13, 27:4, 28:10, 29:8, 30:8, 31:2 month [3] - 9:24, 10:4, 10:17 most [2] - 8:9, 29:14 motion [4] - 22:12, 26:9, 26:11, 26:15 move [6] - 5:4, 16:11, 29:10, 30:12, 31:11, 32:1 moved [2] - 25:6, 26:16 moving [2] - 8:19, 30:1 MR [42] - 5:20, 5:22, 6:15, 7:3, 7:20, 8:6, 9:2, 9:15, 9:20, 10:1, 10:6, 10:19, 11:2, 11:4, 11:6, 11:21, 12:3, 12:5, 12:15, 13:4, 13:11, 13:20, 14:4, 15:10, 15:14, 15:17, 22:2, 22:24, 24:4, 25:23, 26:12, 26:20, 26:22, 29:11,

29:23, 30:5, 30:11, 30:23, 31:1, 31:13, 31:18, 32:2 **MS** [22] - 5:10, 5:21, 6:1, 6:24, 11:14, 12:8, 12:24, 13:8, 13:17, 13:24, 16:3, 18:10, 20:19, 21:10, 23:4, 24:2, 25:22, 29:2, 30:7, 30:17, 31:7, 31:23 muted [1] - 20:6 name [1] - 12:6 necessarily [1] - 27:5 necessary [1] - 25:11 need [12] - 12:21, 23:2, 23:15, 23:19, 23:20, 24:9, 25:2, 25:3, 25:8, 26:7, 26:9, 27:14 newspaper [1] - 25:3 next [4] - 9:5, 23:2, 26:24, 31:20 nobody [1] - 21:14 non [1] - 11:6 non-relative [1] - 11:6 Northern [1] - 25:6 **note** [2] - 18:15, 29:20 nothing [4] - 8:16, 22:6, 27:12, 31:16 objections [1] - 31:3 **objective** [2] - 14:19, 14:21 **Obviously** [1] - 16:14 obviously [2] - 11:19, 19:10 office [2] - 11:18, 13:1 official [1] - 13:15 officially [1] - 11:13 once [2] - 12:21, 24:24 One [1] - 25:6 one [8] - 21:7, 22:13, 23:13, 24:3, 24:5, 25:14, 25:19, 26:18 ongoing [4] - 6:11, 19:18, 19:24, 23:12 open [1] - 27:14 opinion [9] - 16:4, 17:17, 17:19, 17:20, 18:24, 20:19, 23:14, 29:9 opportunities [1] - 13:6 **opportunity** [2] - 6:18, 6:20 opposed [2] - 26:21, 31:16 order [1] - 30:3 orders [1] - 27:23 outcomes [3] - 18:17, 18:19, 25:15 outside [5] - 14:21, 16:4, 19:12, 19:16, 20:14 overall [1] - 22:7

overburden [2] - 6:6,

18:20

own [1] - 10:15 p.m [1] - 31:5 packets [1] - 19:15 Palace [1] - 30:6 pandemic [1] - 27:23 **paper** [1] - 25:4 paperwork [2] - 11:24, 12:2 part [4] - 19:8, 20:2, 21:1, 21:8 particular [2] - 16:5, 27:14 parts [1] - 23:9 party [2] - 17:6, 17:8 pending [1] - 25:5 people [8] - 15:24, 18:4, 25:14, 28:3, 28:4, 28:21, 30:3, 31:19 perfect [1] - 18:3 perhaps [1] - 11:20 period [2] - 12:11, 27:16 permit [3] - 5:5, 12:13, 14:3 permits [1] - 12:22 person [2] - 16:15, 30:14 personal [1] - 29:9 persons [2] - 5:14, 21:3 perspective [2] - 21:18, 21:19 Philippi [1] - 11:23 pieces [1] - 24:13 **pivotal** [1] - 6:8 plain [3] - 18:12, 23:7, 23:10 plan [2] - 6:5, 18:18 **Planning** [3] - 11:17, 13:9, 29:3 **plans** [1] - 31:4 point [3] - 10:10, 22:20, 23:12 policy [1] - 21:11 **pollution** [1] - 19:9 position [1] - 7:4 possibility [1] - 28:8 possible [2] - 9:5, 30:4 possibly [2] - 9:21, 29:16 **postponed** [1] - 25:5 potential [1] - 16:17 practical [1] - 9:13 practically [1] - 10:23 preliminary [1] - 22:14 prepare [1] - 30:19 presentation [1] - 30:20 presented [1] - 17:9 pretty [6] - 5:3, 7:3, 8:11, 8:14, 18:10, 22:5 probe [1] - 17:20 problem [1] - 17:4 procedure [1] - 22:17 proceed [2] - 10:23, 24.23

process [3] - 21:8, 23:5,

23:12

processes [1] - 12:23 project [3] - 12:19, 13:6, 13:11 proper [1] - 5:4 properly [1] - 5:8 property [2] - 8:17, 10:16 proposed [1] - 14:21 protection [1] - 13:13 **provide** [7] - 5:17, 10:15, 16:24, 20:13, 20:14, 22:18, 23:9 provided [8] - 12:5, 12:16, 14:22, 19:16, 20:22, 22:14, 22:16 providing [5] - 8:3, 10:17, 16:22, 16:23, 17:12 prudence [1] - 7:10 public [20] - 8:2, 8:5, 8:15, 23:24, 24:5, 24:9, 24:17, 24:18, 25:1, 27:6, 27:10, 27:14, 28:7, 28:14, 28:18, 29:9, 29:22, 30:19, 31:4, 31:12 purpose [1] - 29:2 purposes [1] - 11:16 pursue [1] - 23:3 purview [1] - 15:9 push [1] - 25:18 pushing [2] - 24:11, 27:21 put [2] - 18:12, 26:9 pyramid [1] - 21:3 quarry [1] - 5:5 quarrying [1] - 12:13 questioning [1] - 23:10 questions [9] - 6:20, 7:14, 9:12, 9:13, 10:11, 17:1, 18:5, 18:23, 30:15 queue [1] - 8:4 quickly [3] - 7:10, 8:19, 30:12 quiet [1] - 20:7 rains [1] - 8:10 raise [3] - 18:5, 26:18, 31:15 reached [1] - 19:11 read [1] - 15:22 real [2] - 18:3, 21:14 really [14] - 7:3, 12:15, 12:20, 14:22, 16:1, 17:18, 18:24, 19:21, 22:19, 27:19, 27:22, 30:11, 32:1 realm [1] - 13:22 reason [1] - 25:12 receive [1] - 5:12 received [5] - 9:3, 11:12, 11:23, 13:2, 16:19 recently [1] - 8:9 recommend [2] - 16:13, 31:3

recommendation [2] -9:4, 27:20 recommendations [2] -18:17, 18:21 record [3] - 6:10, 21:1, 29:2 reference [1] - 8:24 **references** [1] - 8:12 regard [7] - 5:18, 6:2, 16:9, 16:15, 20:20, 30:20 regarding [1] - 17:2 regular [2] - 20:2, 29:14 regulations [1] - 5:9 related [1] - 20:17 **relative** [1] - 11:6 rely [1] - 5:4 remember [1] - 28:18 reminder [1] - 19:5 remove[1] - 18:20 removing [1] - 6:5 report [16] - 7:1, 8:10, 9:4, 14:13, 15:22, 16:23, 17:9, 18:3, 21:4, 22:14, 22:15, 23:1, 24:1, 24:6, 24:10, 24:24 reports [13] - 6:17, 6:19, 7:18. 7:19. 8:23. 10:3. 10:15, 20:21, 20:24, 22:16, 22:17, 22:22, 23:2 reputation [1] - 28:23 request [1] - 15:10 requested [1] - 24:7 required [1] - 12:23 requires [1] - 5:24 response [1] - 12:19 restraints [1] - 24:19 review [16] - 12:11, 12:21, 14:13, 14:19, 15:6, 18:13, 18:22, 22:24, 23:7, 24:23, 24:24, 26:10, 27:5, 28:9, 28:18, 30:14 reviewed [1] - 12:7 reviews [1] - 16:9 room [3] - 29:15, 29:16, 31.20 Rose [3] - 11:10, 11:11, 29:7 Rosemary [3] - 18:8, 21:6, 22:21 rules [1] - 5:9 run [1] - 25:3 running [1] - 25:1 runs [1] - 25:4 rusty [1] - 20:5 Rusty [1] - 20:9 safer [1] - 28:6 **sake** [1] - 15:6 Saturday's [1] - 25:4 save [1] - 7:7 Scatterday [1] - 19:4 SCATTERDAY[12] -

7:15, 7:22, 8:23, 9:11, 9:16, 10:9, 14:16, 15:20, 19:3, 20:11, 21:9, 31:10 schedule [3] - 7:18, 23:24, 25:24 scheduled [1] - 24:18 scheduling [3] - 24:5, 24:9, 25:1 **SCHWARZ** [8] - 10:12, 10:24, 11:3, 11:5, 11:8, 16:21, 22:13, 22.22 second [8] - 17:16, 17:19, 25:21, 26:10, 26:15, 31:8, 31:9, 31.10 secondary [3] - 24:10, 24:23, 28:9 seconded [1] - 26:17 seconds [1] - 31:11 see [4] - 7:12, 10:24, 15:23, 31:23 seeing [1] - 16:2 seem [2] - 15:24, 17:15 semester [1] - 25:7 sending [2] - 5:16, 11:15 sense [4] - 15:16, 17:22, 28:11, 29:14 sent [3] - 11:18, 13:4, separate [2] - 20:15, 25:19 seriously [1] - 28:23 services [1] - 20:14 seven [1] - 26:19 several [1] - 6:2 sewer [2] - 19:13, 19:19 shared [1] - 12:18 shoot [1] - 9:8 **short** [2] - 6:21, 16:19 short-term [1] - 16:19 side [1] - 19:1 sides [1] - 18:6 **similar** [3] - 16:4, 16:7, 23:4 simply [3] - 6:5, 12:16, 13:15 site [2] - 6:5, 10:16 situation [2] - 7:11, 10:22 six [1] - 26:19 smarter [1] - 17:6 smartest [1] - 29:10 soil [1] - 20:17 soil-related [1] - 20:17 solicit [1] - 8:19 someone [1] - 18:11 soon [1] - 9:21 sorry [6] - 9:22, 10:8, 12:1, 16:22, 20:6, 28:1 sort [3] - 11:11, 15:4, 28:5 sound [1] - 28:11

special [1] - 26:3 specific [1] - 7:21 specifically [2] - 5:23, 8:14 **specifics** [1] - 8:20 **spoken** [2] - 16:6, 16:12 staff [4] - 14:24, 19:6, 19:8, 19:9 **standpoint** [3] - 6:16, 8:18, 30:15 start [1] - 29:21 **started** [1] - 11:15 state [2] - 6:11, 12:14 stay [2] - 20:7, 27:24 step [5] - 11:19, 12:9, 15:7, 19:6, 29:1 **still** [5] - 8:3, 21:21, 24:15, 24:18, 31:20 **stormwater** [3] - 7:5, 19:13, 19:20 studies [1] - 29:4 study [17] - 7:21, 8:8, 9:23, 10:3, 24:7, 24:16, 25:12, 25:16, 26:10, 26:17, 27:11, 28:7, 28:9, 28:20, 28:21, 29:4, 29:12 submit [2] - 10:20 submitted [2] - 8:6, 12:18 **submitting** [1] - 6:17 suggest [1] - 18:18 **suggested** [1] - 14:16 **suggesting** [1] - 21:16 **summarize** [1] - 7:4 **summary** [1] - 17:1 supplied [2] - 6:13, 30:21 **supply** [1] - 19:13 **supplying** [1] - 7:17 surprised [1] - 28:19 **swatting** [1] - 14:6 sweet [1] - 6:21 systems [3] - 19:13, 19:14, 19:20 target [1] - 27:2 targeted [1] - 9:18 targets [1] - 9:19 technical [2] - 16:7, 17:2 telecommunications [1] - 16·8 telephone [1] - 23:17 tend [1] - 27:13 term [1] - 16:19 terms [6] - 5:4, 7:23, 7:24, 8:6, 16:24, 17:13 testing [1] - 23:20 tests [1] - 23:11 texting [1] - 31:19 third [2] - 17:6, 17:7 thoughts [4] - 16:21, 21:22, 30:9, 30:10 Thrasher [1] - 5:15

three [2] - 24:13, 26:18

threshold [1] - 12:9

31:7, 31:23

timeline [1] - 8:2 Tom [18] - 5:12, 9:22, 11:10, 11:14, 11:17, 12:8, 15:3, 15:8, 16:6, 21:6, 22:21, 24:2, 26:8, 26:19, 27:4, 29:8, 29:20, 32:1 tomorrow [1] - 25:3 tonight [3] - 24:22, 25:17, 26:7 tool [1] - 18:1 **top** [4] - 8:21, 21:2, 21:18, 22:3 topic [1] - 26:24 topics [1] - 24:4 towards [1] - 30:2 towers [1] - 16:8 tradition [1] - 28:2 traffic [13] - 7:21, 8:8, 9:23, 10:3, 24:7, 24:16, 25:12, 25:16, 27:11, 28:7, 28:20, 29:3. 29:12 **transcripts** [1] - 13:18 travel [1] - 24:19 triggered [1] - 12:12 try [1] - 26:14 trying [6] - 7:24, 8:2, 9:5, 10:10, 15:4, 20:7 two [9] - 18:4, 24:4. 24:5, 24:21, 25:9, 25:19, 26:7, 26:18, 31:19 type [3] - 14:20, 20:17 **types** [2] - 18:21, 24:20 ultimate [2] - 12:13, 16:14 unbelievable [1] - 26:6 under [2] - 19:10, 27:23 understood [1] - 13:23 **up** [7] - 7:4, 11:19, 12:7, 13:9, 21:6, 24:12, 30:11 validity [1] - 28:21 variety [1] - 20:16 various [1] - 13:9 vast [1] - 6:5 venues [1] - 29:17 versed [1] - 16:5 via [1] - 15:24 views [1] - 14:7 Virginia [1] - 5:1 vote [2] - 25:20, 31:6 wait [1] - 26:3 waiting [6] - 10:21, 24:6, 24:8, 26:5, 31:19, 31:20 **WARMUTH** [22] - 5:10, 5:21, 6:1, 6:24, 11:14, 12:8, 12:24, 13:8, 13:17, 13:24, 16:3, 18:10, 20:19, 21:10, 23:4, 24:2, 25:22, 29:2, 30:7, 30:17,

water [4] - 19:8, 19:13, 19:19 website [2] - 12:19, 13:12 week [1] - 26:4 weigh [1] - 14:14 well-versed [1] - 16:5 Wendy [8] - 7:16, 10:8, 14:15, 15:19, 19:2, 19:4, 20:8, 31:11 West [1] - 5:1 WEST [1] - 14:7 white [1] - 30:5 wish [1] - 30:18 withholding [1] - 12:17 wonderful [1] - 6:24 wondering [4] - 14:11, 21:21, 22:16, 22:20 worldwide [1] - 27:23 wrap [1] - 24:12 **WRIGHT** [7] - 15:2, 26:8, 28:1, 28:16, 29:7, 29:20, 30:1 writing [1] - 23:17 year [2] - 8:10, 8:11 years [2] - 6:7, 11:16 you-all [1] - 30:16 zero [1] - 26:21 **Zoom** [1] - 27:15