




TOWNSHIP OF BERKELEY

IN THE MATTER OF:
SOUTH SEASIDEPARKHOMEOWNERS
ANDVINEXASIONSETATION HEARING

> Pinewald Keswick Road Bayville, New Jersey. †:ursday, January 9,2020 6:30 p.m.

BEFORE:
Robert Winward, Chairman
John Bacchione, Councilman
Nick Mackres Menber
Richard Callahan, Member
Richard Callahan, Member
Back Gegarnel, Member
Brian Ginchenber
rederick Bell, Member
bomenick Lorelli, Member


3
MR. WINWARD: Well, now we have the
headliner, our only application for the evening.
South Seaside Park Homeowners and Voters Association
de-annexation petition hearing.
MR. MICHELINI: Good evening.
Joseph Michelini on behalf of the petition signers.
This is your show tonight. The meetings are -- the
testimony is concluded. The public portion has been
closed. And I believe that, in accordance with what
occurred last time, the board is prepared to make a
recommendation.
MR. CAMERA: Through the Chair.
MR. WINWARD: Yes.
MR. CAMERA: Could I just ask, just
for the protocol. Obviously, I'm not going to
participate in this. But should I sit at the dais
or should I step down during these discussions?
MR. McGUCKIN: You're not in
conflict, so there's no reason for you to step down.
But I don't imagine you'll have a lot to say.
MR. CAMERA: I don't intend to
participate. Thank you.
MR. McGUCKIN: Unless Mr. Michelini
has no objection to you voting.
MR. MICHELINI: Well, how are you
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## ALSO PRESENT:

Kelly Hugg, Secretary Ernie Petiers, Enginee Stuart B. Wiser, Planner
going to vote, John?
MR. McGUCKIN: Just kidding. Just
kidding.
MR. WINWARD: Do you have a copy of
the agenda, I assume, Greg? It says, action, public
hearing and discussion. Are we opening this up to
the public?
MR. McGUCKIN: No, Mr. Chairman, the
public hearing is essentially closed. Tonight --
MR. WINWARD: Okay.
MR. McGUCKIN: -- as you may recall
back in the December meeting, the first issue we
wanted to address was who was eligible to vote. And
I think we've clarified and determined who that
would be. So, anyone who has not reviewed all of
the transcripts or participated at each of the
hearings or listened to the audio recordings of
those meetings, would not be eligible to vote. Only
those individuals who were here for each and every
meeting or reviewed those transcripts or audio
recordings would be eligible to vote.
Under the statute, the role of the
planning board in this function is really a planning
advisory nature. It's unlike our normal application
process where we act in a quasi judicial function to

## it, planning board responsibilities.

So, before we get to any kind of
recommendations or anything like that, I'm sure some
of the board members have questions and comments and
they want to put things on the record. So, I guess
we'll start at that end. Nick, do you have some
things you'd like to say?
MR. MACKRES: I do. I'm assuming --
are we going to be -- is there going to be a motion
and then do it like we normally do it, put a motion
in and somebody would second --
MR. McGUCKIN: That would be correct.
My thought would be, if there's a motion and a
second and it passes, whatever that is, I would then
prepare a resolution outlining the decision that was
made and would provide documentation from within the
transcripts and the record with respect to that recommendation.

MR. MACKRES: Now if it's the
opposite, what we would normally do, we would -- you
would give your reasons why.
MR. McGUCKIN: It is not -- this is
not a hearing, quasi judicial hearing. You
certainly can give your reasons why. You can
indicate that, based on the record, that's your
you have heard everything. And it's this board, I
think, that would want to, having reviewed that, give its opinion and recommendation to the governing body.

My intention is, assuming the board,
if you wish to have a discussion this evening
amongst yourselves, that would be certainly appropriate. If there's any questions any of the board members have, that's also appropriate at this point, if you wish to discuss with me.

Again, the hearing is, essentially, closed, but if there are any exhibits or testimony any of the board members wish to review, which you have not already done so, and you think that's important enough that you need to do that, then we would have to have a vote at the next meeting. But that's really what's in front of you. You've received hundreds of pages of documents. You've received testimony from various witnesses. You've sat through these meetings. And now, essentially, it's in front of you. So, it's your pleasure as to what the board would like to do. MR. WINWARD: Thank you. For the other board members that have Stuart Wiser's report, it's on page 54 into 55 about, if you want to reread
reason for your decision. Based upon the testimony, you found this testimony to be important to you and think it's of critical importance. You thought that testimony was not as good. You could say, you know, any of those -- any of that testimony that struck you as being important to your decision and your recommendation, would be appropriate to talk about.
If you don't wish to recap the entire testimony or anything else, you would indicate that based on everything you've heard, that you would be recommending this or that. That's also appropriate, if that's what you choose to do.

MR. MACKRES: Thank you.
MR. McGUCKIN: The resolution would
then set forth, once the board makes a decision, I
would prepare a resolution outlining those reasons
as well.
MR. WINWARD: Do you have anything
else, Nick?
MR. MACKRES: I'll make my comments
depending on the resolution.
MR. WINWARD: Oh, okay. We're not there yet, so.

MR. MACKRES: If we're ready to go.
I have no other additional documents to review. anything.
l've got a lot of notes. So, if any other board
member has something to bring, I'd like to hear it.
MR. WINWARD: We'll just go right
down the row there. Brian, what would you like to
say about the -- any questions or clarifications?
MR. GINGRICH: Well, like
Mr. McGuckin has said, we've sat here for five
years. And I believe that if there's any board
member, after five years, that doesn't have a
direction, well, then I don't know what to say. I
have a direction. And I'm hoping the rest of my
board members do. Thank you.
MR. WINWARD: Domenick, you're on

MR. LORELLI: I think we've heard
quite a bit. And I don't know what else we could possibly put in the pot that would mix. It's been a long time, five years is a long time to listen to both sides of the story. And I don't think anything we can say now would change anybody's mind or sway

MR. WINWARD: Okay. You're up, John.
MR. BACCHIONE: Certainly was a long
time, five years. But we saw it through and we
listened and you guys presented. And I want to say
burden of proof, then you would have to answer both
of those questions indicating that refusal to
consent is detrimental to the potential well-being
of the majority of the residents of South Seaside
Park and de-annexation will not cause a significant
injury to the well-being of Berkeley Township.
That's the two prongs that you would have to reach,
to reach that determination.
If either one of those, for instance,
if, under A, refusal to de-annex is not detrimental,
then you would be determining that they've not met
their burden to establish. If you determine under
B, that it would cause a significant injury to
Berkeley Township, even though you may agree that it
would be appropriate under $A$, then, again, the
applicant has not met their burden and your
recommendation would be to -- against the
de-annexation.
MR. WINWARD: Okay. And before you
said there's three different types of -- so, I just
want to clarify for the rest of the board. There's
three different types of direction we can go. We
can recommend that de-annexation be approved. If
that were the case, what happens next on that? I
just want to ask about next steps.
that the petitioners and Mr. Michelini did a great
job in presenting the petition. A lot of
information, a lot of concerns that the residents --
that members of this petition presented. And I, for
one, have taken all of it into consideration, and
have decided on a decision in my mind. So, l'll
wait for the rest of the board to speak and then
we'll get to the vote.
MR. WINWARD: Okay. I must say,
first of all, the presentation has been fantastic,
you know, the testimony, everything. A very strong
case was made. It's tough, too, because we're all
residents, too, you know, and some of us have
worries about taxes going up and things like that.
And there's a lot of issues to consider.
I did want to ask Greg. Greg, I see
you have the book open. Are you at the page 54 and 55?

MR. McGUCKIN: Yes.
MR. WINWARD: Because at the top of
55 , I guess, it gives two things, $A$ and $B$. And it
says, both must be met for de-annexation to be affirmed.

MR. McGUCKIN: Correct. If the board
were to determine that the applicants have met their
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the seven members.
    MR. McGUCKIN: If the seven members
are eligible, then he would not be able to.
    MS. HUGG: Right.
    MR. WINWARD: Is it because of the
position he has or because he's a member -- because
he lives in South Seaside Park?
    MR. McGUCKIN: No. It's, the board
is made up of seven members and two alternates.
    MR. WINWARD: Okay.
    MR. McGUCKIN: So, the regular
members would vote. The only way an alternate would
vote is in the event a regular member was not
available.
    MR. WINWARD: Okay. That leaves Jack
all the way at the end there. I'm sure you might
have some questions or clarification --
    MR. WIEGARTNER: Just to repeat, I
know that everybody here has been here for a while.
It's been a long five years. It's been a good five
years, though. We've picked up and learned a lot.
Working for the town, I had the advantage of getting
to see things firsthand, where I know a lot of the
board members probably didn't. It was very
interesting.
```

MR. WINWARD: Okay. Do we have

MR. GINGRICH: Correct.
MR. MACKRES: I second.
MS. HUGG: Mr. Mackres.
MR. WINWARD: Hold on a second.
MS. HUGG: Oh, sorry.
MR. WINWARD: The vote now, yes means
you're agreeing with the motion, no means you don't
agree with the motion, or is it the other way
around?
MR. McGUCKIN: Correct. The motion
has been made indicating that the recommendation
would be to the governing body to not recommend
de-annexation. So, a yes vote would be to deny
de-annexation, to recommend denying de-annexation.
MR. WINWARD: Okay. And a no vote
would be, you know, you think they should --

MR. McGUCKIN: Just that you -MR. WINWARD: Yeah, that you think it
should be recommended.
MR. McGUCKIN: It doesn't mean that.
It could be no recommendation. So, it's simply a
question of whether you believe that they've not met
their burden of proof or not.
MR. MACKRES: Discussion.
MR. WINWARD: What's that?
MR. MACKRES: Discussion.
MR. WINWARD: Oh, you need -- If
there's anything you want to discuss, go right ahead.

MR. MACKRES: No.
MR. BACCHIONE: We have a motion now.
MR. WINWARD: Okay. So, we have a
motion of not recommending de-annexation. And then we just need the vote on it, Kelly.

MS. HUGG: Mr. Mackres.
MR. MACKRES: Yes. And I will state
I want to thank Mr. Michelini and how
he presented himself. I think he did a phenomenal
job, you know. And I think all of our professionals
also did a very professional job. Other than that,
I can just say it's been a long five years, you
know, and that's really all I can say, Bob.
MR. WINWARD: Okay. So, nobody else
has any other questions or anything. So, I guess at
this time, nobody has anything else, we'll do a
motion, if somebody can craft a motion. I don't
have an opinion yet on a resolution of how to
craft -- any idea how to craft it. But, like, for
example, on A there on page 55 , I agree that they
have made a significant case. That us refusing
de-annexation would be detrimental to the residents of South Seaside Park.

On the other hand, part B, I believe
it will cause a significant injury to the well-being
of Berkeley Township for some time. So, that's the,
kind of, the dilemma there of what we have.
So, how should we do this, do a vote
or do a recomm --
MR. McGUCKIN: Well, Mr. Chairman, I
think it would be appropriate if whoever wants to
make any motion, they could make a motion.
years, understanding the common and universal
complaints of the petitioners, while questioning
some of the reasonings and their subject matter
experts. As this petition moved forward with
evermore testimonies, information provided --
(Off the record.)
MR. MACKRES: I am voting no -- or
I'm voting yes for two majors reasons.
The petitioners have drastically
failed to show a detrimental impact of their
economic and social well-being. And there will be a
significant injury to the well-being of the
remaining Berkeley Township residents with a 14.1
percent increase in taxes, pushing for a reduction
of services, especially to the Berkeley Township
School District, of almost two and a half thousand children.

Many of your arguments are illogical.
You state that this is not a big deal for an average homeowner of 183,000, to have their taxes increased
a couple hundred dollars, but then complain those with a significantly -- significantly higher economic demographic from South Seaside Park that can't afford the extra $\$ 4.14$ to travel to a municipal building. And then use that statement as a reason why you should pull out of Berkeley
Township. You do have a choice to come to a municipal meeting, which many people do not make.
residents need to know that clubhouses were built by homeowners associations or developer and not by the taxpayers, and, therefore, if South Seaside Park residents want a clubhouse, they should purchase property and build it themselves, just like the others did.

Once again, this proves that South
Seaside Park residents want more services, and are
demanding more things, even though their area and population does not support it or have volunteered to pay for those additional expenses or to fundraising.

Through public records and personal experience, Seaside Park has been trying to withdraw from Central Regional School District for almost two decades, spending about $\$ 100,000$ per year on both
sides. Why? It's about the school taxes. Funding
for such lawsuits on behalf of Seaside Park have
also been questioned and court mandates have been
issued against them. You can read these as well.
We have questioned the funding at
our -- the township has paid for in defense of this
and with their expert witnesses, but we haven't
questioned the motives and the funding from the
residents who have put in this petition. We have

But you are forced to pay taxes with serious
consequences. A fraction of one percent attend such meetings, but everyone has to pay their taxes.

Interestingly, the abstract of ratables for Seaside Park, and if you compare this to your property values, the average homeowner from
South Seaside Park will pay around $\$ 500$ more in local taxes.

Why is there a financial incentive to de-annex its school taxes? It's the biggest part of the budget. Yet almost all of the complaints by the petitioners have been about the township not providing enough services. Not once do I recall petitioners asking to pay higher taxes in exchange for more services, not once. If you want more services, I'm sure the township can come up with additional assessments for South Seaside Park residents for more police, fire, rescue, snow plowing, et cetera.

One registered voter from South
Seaside Park complained about recreational transportation not coming out to South Seaside Park because they only go to the clubhouses in wards three and four. She publically stated that she had asked the town, where is her clubhouse. I think the
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been questioned on e-mails, information and so
forth, so I'm not sure where this has come, but that's neither here nor there. I will stick to the economic values.

The economic scenarios. Taxes would go up around 14.1, and home values would be pushed down with millions of dollars in value destruction. With lower values and the same tax levy by dollar to maintain the same services, the tax rate will go up. And now comes the debt spiral. Higher tax rates will push the home values further down and it is inevitable that services will be cut. And now we have a high tax rate with lower services, equating to lower levels that most people do not want to come in to with -- in local competition of neighboring towns offering more.

Where does my 14.1 percent come from?
If there is a 10.6 percent reduction in revenue,
while you increase the standard two percent in
expenses for inflation, that's your 14.1., for those
who remain behind to pick up the difference to have
the same services. We have heard many times that
the expenses will barely be reduced, especially when
we still have to support Pelican Island, and the
schools will not be impacted with the reductions.

The petitioners' CMFO, Mr. Moore, he did a very nice, common sense approach to try to do activity based costing with actual figures vice budgeted, but his outside information compared to the township's CMFO pales in great comparison. The township's CMFO is a full-time employee employed for many years with corporate knowledge. For example,
Mr. Moore's major point about South Seaside Park de-annexation relates to the elimination of one police car verse two police cars, making the transition a cash flow positive. The township's testimony speaks about Pelican Island, which will remain a part of Berkeley Township. And this will still have to be patrolled, negating the police car reduction to zero. Mr. Moore did not know of Pelican Island, which is a major factor in assessing the township's operating cost. And if he missed an entire island, then what else is he missing?

> What is interesting is that Mr. Moore seems to be correct when he figured out that the petitioners are going to save around 40 percent on their taxes if de-annexation occurs. If South Seaside Park de-annexation is awarded the beach, they must pay fair market value, not only of the property, but also of the Situs value to all South

Seaside Park. For example, a house of the same size and lot will be X dollars on the mainland, but it's worth $Y$ because of the beach, therefore, the compensation of the beach should be the value of the land itself, plus Y minus X .

There is policy trying to be put
forth from the State of merging towns of less than
5,000 people. Seaside Heights' population is 1,635 .
We have heard about the merging and what would happen, but I haven't seen a plan if this does go through, especially for those residents who have not signed the petition. Would this happen overnight? When would the police be transitioned? When would fire, EMS, when would these services be cut off and moved over? And how quickly will it be done? Would your mail change? Would other factors take into effect? We call this in the military a battle handover, and it is the most critical and difficult part of transition. That burden has not been shown.

I do understand some of the concerns of the residents about services, but South Seaside Park is predominantly built out. The township would have to purchase many small lots for a high price or take property via eminent domain to create the facilities the current petitioners are demanding.

If some of the petitioners care so much, they can donate their property in the future or current, or they can deed restrict for open space and recreational use.

I believe your planner's testimony was conflicted. Numerous times she stated we, when referencing to Seaside Park, since she was a former employee there. She was definitive in her reasons for de-annexation but dodgy and squirmy when challenged. The example of not having a bus stop is not a valid reason. It's a moot point because if South Seaside Park joins Seaside Park, they wouldn't get a bus stop anyway. And adding a bus stop goes against the petitioners' complaint of the time and distance to the mainland, since buses take much longer to travel, and not in the most direct route from a person's home to the location they want to go with respect to personal transportation.

De-annexation would cause an even
greater concern for the homeowners of South Seaside
Park since the numbering of the streets would be
repetitive. Either Seaside Park or South Seaside
Park would have to renumber all of their streets.
The same issue occurs on Long Beach Island, yet they
have different municipalities. I asked for numerous
examples, both for and against her reasoning from a
local to a national level, but she evaded the answers. She may have been credentialed to be a planner, but her expert advice is null and void, not only with the postal addresses and identity, but also with COAH and affordable housing.

I'm going to go through a list of bulleted items. The police, there is about one officer for every 600 residents for coverage. Police chief says excellent coverage. And during Hurricane Sandy, there was no -- the residents declined military support. Testimony has also been given that coverage has been increased. And we've heard from the chief that this action takes years to implement, with the class I program starting in 2014, but actually budgeted in 2011. Do not forget that with the six times bigger police force, you can surge capability, and that also includes with fire. EMS, we've heard no change. Snow plowing, I don't think I know anybody who complains that they've been snowplowed too much and too quickly. This is a constant complaint across many people I know and all parts of the town. The dunes, they survived very well, while Island Beach State Park's went. This
was a big investment from all across. And the
resiliency of that was also a complaint that we are doing more now than before.

The sanitation of the new robo cans.
Robo cans are great. I'm sorry you don't have them
yet. I know when we started, Holiday City didn't
even have them. I think they do now.
MR. GINGRICH: No. No. MR. MACKRES: They still don't have
them. And there's neighboring towns that also do not have them.

Parks, I counted that two of the 15 parks listed on a flyer belong in your ward, yet wards three and four, which is about half the township, has one park with two fields. So, if anybody was complaining about parks, they really -wards three and four should be the biggest of all. We talked about taking property by eminent domain and land, you can donate that. I sincerely doubt we're going to do eminent domain. I really do believe that maybe we can ask Island Beach State Park to donate some land on your border and try to do something there with grants. I do understand your complaints. I'm a big fan of parks and recreations. And if we can do something like that, especially to some of the governing body
members who are present here, I think that would be a great idea. And, hopefully, that can be done to alleviate some of your park concerns. Because once
Island Beach State Park gets filled up, they are right there. So, if they can make something, that would be great, with a partnership.

Roads, we've talked about that South
Seaside Park has two and a half percent of the
roads, yet 20 percent of the funding for repaving from 2012 has gone to South Seaside Park. This equates to around three times more service with the testimony provided.

There was talk about churches. I
think we've all agreed that you're not going to
build a church if you go -- if you merge with
Seaside Park. And we assumed you're going to be merging with Seaside Park. We don't even know if that's going to be true. Will they take you or not. And if they say no, no plan has been offered. Would you stand on your own and make your own township? And then the cost would be severe. And you'd have to launch all those new programs. And how would that, once again, that battle handover occur, if you did your own township.

We heard some major complaints about

Hurricane Sandy, especially with Mrs. Erdman never
being told about Hurricane Sandy. And then
signatures provided that someone signed from that house, being notified. We questioned this. Zip codes, with the postal addresses, that's a moot point. We understand it's a federal issue and they assign the zip codes.

There was a question about
commercial. Commerce will put wherever they want, that makes commercial sense to them, you know.
There has been a zoning change. We've seen those
come in here. You're willing to start your own
business out there, I don't know how many of the
petitioners have tried that, and if there was a
complaint about the zoning or not.
We spoke about the replacement of the
loss in revenue. And, really, it's revenue minus
expenses is the profit. And so, I'd like to put on
the record, and we spoke about this before, is if
the township does approve for this to occur, and
1 de-annexation, if we keep the beach, there must be a
2 statement on what, you know, it will be our township
still and the items we can do on the beach to regain
those lost revenues. And we spoke about that in
5 testimony and discussion on highrises, wind mills,
increasing badge prices, whatever to do to alleviate that concern.

There was an issue about social
community. Your home and your community is what you
make of it. I think you have that out there, right?
We've seen it with this petition. I'm not sure
Seaside Park, how they will accept you if you go to
them. Their demographics are a little bit
different. So, if you do go, I do fear for that, for those who haven't signed the petition. How would they think of you? Are they just using you or will they take you in with open arms?

There was a question about communication, that we're not communicating enough.
I think that's a concern for many towns. And it's generalized across, from what l've seen. How do you communicate, other than having a PR person on payroll, and doing your own Facebook groups. I don't know how to rectify that. And I have not seen that to be a detriment in this town, especially with all the mailers and flyers that we have.

Beaches, there was a complaint of cleanliness in roads and access in 2015. And then there was another complaint that too much was -- too
much more is being done to undermine the original
complaint, as if more cleaning was being done than before. There was a big issue about, November 5, 2015, about the value and that South Seaside Park is built out. And instituting or stating that because the remainder of the township is not built out, people can build and you can make more money, since South Seaside Park is built out, therefore, there is no growth and there is no value. This is absolutely wrong. It's a guaranteed cash flow. Okay. It's a guaranteed cash flow for speculation of future growth. And what's valued on Wall Street is guaranteed value. And when it comes to governments, we are risk averse and we cannot be gambling on the future.

The debt must be passed and/or paid off, and that's for PERS, PFRS, TPAF and other pension liabilities. And our bonding capacity will be greatly reduced. I request that there be a clawback for up to 30 years on all such pensions, liabilities, lawsuits, workers' compensation, disability, health care. Why do I say that is because it has happened before. Where the State would give a loan, and they would do -- take the interest and then years later said, no, you're going to pay for it now. If you do break away and the

State changes something or something like that occurs, we must be able to clawback and pay for that difference.

I believe that if South Seaside Park de-annexes the cost efficiency will decrease for the remainder of the residents, because we still have
fixed expenses, we still have to pay for the
utilities for running this building, payroll, the
custodians. And a ten percent reduction is a major change.

My last topic concerns the Berkeley Township School District. The recommendation made today and the decision by the township will not only have a grave effect to our 2,500 children, but also take the elected school boards' authority and right for self-defense away. It's not moral to make a decision that affects the fair and equitable education of so many, when I believe they have no idea of the impact.

After numerous requests that I
personally made to this board for the school district to attend, all we have is a one page memo from the school business administrator, basically saying there will be no impact. The chief school administrator did not respond. And certainly, there
is no board resolution acknowledging this petition
or approving the school business administrator's
response. They are basically waiving their legal rights and public voice.

In actuality, the petitioner has a
burden of proof that there will not be a detrimental
impact to the remaining residents, and they have not
brought any evidence whatsoever. There are only a
handful of children from South Seaside Park attending Berkeley Township elementary school. This is not even enough to fire one teacher. There will be no impact to the staff, and the one bus still has
to service Pelican Island. Therefore, the business administrator is correct, that there will be no impact on the revenues or expenses, but when the public gets nailed with a 14.1 percent increase in property taxes the next school year, I guarantee you that the board will care, as well as the public.

The local tax levy is currently more
than $\$ 31$ million. This is no trivial matter. We
are talking about several millions of dollars. This
will push an extreme cut in teachers and support
services for our children. And our township is
already a district factor group of a B. The second
lowest in the state. A step above cities like

Asbury Park, Camden, Newark and Atlantic City. We
have heard our neighboring townships losing state
aid and the major cuts they are doing, towns like
Lacey, Brick and Toms River. When half of our
township is on a fixed income, the pressure to cut
staff and services will be immense. Our elementary
schools rank in the bottom 30 percent. The pending
cuts will make it even worse for our children, while
they are trying to receive a fair and equitable education.

MS. HUGG: Mr. Gingrich.
MR. GINGRICH: Many things that my
fellow -- my colleague here to my right has said is
very good, very good structured points. I sat here for five years and heard so many times, well, it
cost so much for us to get here to a meeting. Well,
if it weren't for these proceedings, how often would
you be sitting in that seat. That being said,
that's like when I go to the beach, I should say,
well, you know what, move the beach closer to my
house, it cost me so much to go to the beach.
You have picked where you -- you've
chosen where you want to live, and that's great. If
there are any problems that were so bad or so out of line, that's your due diligence to go through
everything before you pick where you want to live.
That's like me living in New Brunswick and all of a
sudden I'll say, hey, you know what, I like North
Brunswick a lot better. Hey, this is going to be
North Brunswick from now on. You can't do that. You chose where you wanted to be. It cost me more to go to the beach than you to come here, because I go to the beach more than you come here. So, that's like a ludicrous point, as far as I'm concerned.
When and where you buy is up to you. And then if
you go through these reports and you realize what a wonderful town we have. And I feel that taking it apart may be detrimental to us. And then you read other portions and you say, well, maybe it's a good idea. But on a whole, I think -- I think losing Seaside would be sort of detrimental to us. And I can go through all the points, but I'm not going to go through these reports and files again. So, I'm just going to let it stay at that. That I think we have something nice and I don't think we should change it.

MS. HUGG: Mr. Bell. MR. BELL: I'm simply going to say

MS. HUGG: Mr. Wiegartner. MR. WIEGARTNER: If I can just say
one thing. Talking about the people that live over
there that have to travel to come over here. I've
lived -- I bought my first house in Bayville in
1977, so I've been here quite a few years. After
that, I moved out to Holiday City. Not that I
wanted to. But anyways, to go from my house to my
office in this building took me 25 minutes to 30 ,
depending on traffic. Now, my yard backs into
Manchester Township in Holiday City. So, I guess my
point is that I see both sides of everything. But I also understand that the amount of time it took you over on the island to get here, takes me the same amount of time to get from my house in Holiday City to this building. So, there was no difference in the time.

Again, you know, I understand both
sides of everything. I really do. I looked at it
openly. But I don't see where there's an advantage to leaving South Seaside Park to become Seaside Park. So, at that point, I'd have to say yes. MS. HUGG: Chairman Winward. MR. WINWARD: Okay. This is really a
tough decision, too, because l've been reading the requirements and everything. And I think the refusal to consent to de-annexation is detrimental to the economic and social well-being of the majority of the residents of South Seaside Park. And I do agree with that. That they've brought up some really great issues and things like that. The only thing is, when you sit through these proceedings and you hear some of these complaints and stuff like that -- I remember the complaint of the guy getting up and saying, everybody in the town has a robo can for recycling except for South
said, I agree that it is detrimental if South
Seaside Park doesn't de-annex from Berkeley.
However, on the flip side, on part B,
I disagree that it will not cause a significant
injury to the well-being of Berkeley Township. I
don't know if Nick's figures are right. I've heard
all kinds of different numbers on tax increases.
But it seems like every number I did hear was anywhere from ten to 14 , in that range. And I don't think anybody really knows what the range. And as a resident of Berkeley and a taxpayer, I'm concerned, too, about my tax rate. But I think that because there's service issues in other parts of the town, it's not that South Seaside Park got singled out or slighted.

I think with any township services, it all comes down to budget and things like that.
But I do believe that there are issues that were raised, and I would like to think there were improvements since these issues were raised, like with the better police coverage and better communications. But I think there's some issues that could be worked out, like, for example, meetings. Perhaps with new technology, meetings could be streamed. I've been on three calls this

Seaside Park. At that time, I didn't either. But
after five years they finally got around to me, so, I just rolled it out tonight.

But there's other issues in other parts of the township, too. Like when I first moved to Berkeley in 2002 -- I live on a point on the bay right across from South Seaside Park. I have to go through Ocean Gate every day, every time I leave my house, every time I come home. And during the wintertime, Ocean Gate is now plowed by the county.
But when I get to my street, it seems like we're
always the last in Berkeley to get plowed. I don't
know. Especially when the democrats were in power
when I first moved to Berkeley. It's been getting
better over the years. But I remember a blizzard last year where the county pushed all the snow, and
it had to be at least -- I have a picture of it, I
put it on Facebook, too -- at least ten feet high in a couple spots. And we were stuck in the neighborhood for two days. It was impassable. And Berkeley did bring -- had to bring special equipment in to dig it out and everything. And can we blame that on Berkeley? It was the county that pushed the snow there. But there's issues in the township. I don't think any township is perfect. But with that
week for my work. I work for a national company.
And I was on three calls this week where, through
Skype, where I was a participant. And when they asked for anybody had questions, you could unmute and ask your question, things like that. So, I think with some new technology, perhaps that could solve some of the travel issues. But even where I live, the traffic this evening was horrendous on Route 9. It took me 20 minutes to get here from my part of Berkeley, or, actually, Bayville.

But I also believe, too, that perhaps
the township -- and I'm kind of throwing some ideas
out here, too, for the town if they want to rectify these issues that South Seaside Park's complaining about, perhaps there could be shared services. I know -- I think I remember one time there was a substation for Berkeley Police in South Seaside
Park. Also, maybe they could rent some space in
Seaside Park or Seaside Heights' town hall, maybe
for one day where people can go get dog licenses or maybe, you know, take care of some business that way.

I mean, I'm a Berkeley resident. The only time I come to town hall usually is just for
this monthly meeting. But if I wasn't on the board,

I don't know how many times l'd be coming here. But I think that's one way -- another way to solve the problem, stream meetings, have shared services with maybe another town, because we -- I don't understand why they can't -- we can't get some space in one of those town halls over there on the island, when we do shared services like with the police department and the Tri-Boro First Aid.

So, I believe there is things that can be worked out. And I think it was a very positive thing, overall, the de-annexation, because it did point out ways the township can improve. But make a long story short, because I agree to part A, but I disagree with part B, so I guess that would make my vote a yes.

MR. McGUCKIN: That's correct. MR. WINWARD: But I just want to clarify that for the record.

MS. HUGG: Councilman Bacchione?
MR. BACCHIONE: Over the years of
this petition, I made some bullet points as the petitioners got up to give their testimony. And I just wanted to go through some bullet points. It's probably the best way for me to describe what my vote is going to be.
the petitioners that I think, I believe the increase
was approximately $\$ 200$ a year. To someone living in
Holiday City or Silver Ridge, that's a serious
effect on their property taxes.
Also, it was mentioned this evening
the ownership interest in White Sands Beach.
Berkeley Township has a piece of the Atlantic Ocean
in the form of White Sands Beach. And there are
many residents in Berkeley Township, not only on this side, but on South Seaside Park side, that enjoy the amenity of White Sands Beach.

In my opinion, there wasn't enough
testimony on which way that beach would go, should
the de-annexation occur. The petitioners' legal
representative, Mr. Michelini, mentioned that it
would go with the petitioners to Seaside Park. The
planning board's attorney, Greg McGuckin, said that
it would not. But I don't -- in my opinion, this
wasn't enough conversation about it for me to feel
comfortable that Berkeley Township would keep
ownership of what they own now, White Sands Beach.
I think it's an important asset to Berkeley
Township. It, if you'll excuse the expression, puts
Berkeley Township on the map.
What is Berkeley Township? Berkeley

On a lighter side, there was a
petitioner who said that there is no winter
basketball league in Berkeley Township, so he has to
go to Seaside Park to play basketball. Also said
that there are no tennis courts in South Seaside
Park, so he has to go to Seaside -- South Seaside
Park, to go to Seaside Park to play tennis.
Certainly not a reason for de-annexation, obviously.
Couple other points, bullet points
that I wrote down or narratives was, the petitioners
complained that they have to drive 15.2 miles to get to the Cedar Creek Golf Course. Well, if the de-annexation should occur, nothing changes, still 15.2 miles. They also mentioned in the testimony that they have to travel to go to their choice of religious worship. Well, again, nothing changes if the de-annexation should occur. So, I found them to be weak points for de-annexation.

Some of the more serious points that they made, I want to comment on. It was mentioned by a couple of other board members tonight, the possibility of the -- after de-annexation should occur, that property taxes will rise here on the remaining Berkeley Township residents. I happen to agree with that statement. There was testimony by

Township does have a Dairy Queen, and we have White
Sands Beach currently, which is on the Atlantic
Ocean. So, it's a serious amenity that
Berkeley Township can't afford to lose.
The snow removal issue that was mentioned by a number of the members here on the dais, I believe it's not a big enough issue to cause a de-annexation. Yes, we have storms. We have -- I grew up in New Jersey. I know what's capable here in New Jersey as far as snowstorms. And sometimes
it's two feet, sometimes it's two inches. Whatever the results of the storm is, the townships all around the State get to it as quickly as they possibly can. And I don't think there was enough testimony here in this narrative to convince me that
Berkeley Township did not do a good job plowing the streets in South Seaside Park.

A big issue that sort of like hit me like a cold bucket of water was the police coverage.
20 Since 2015, I believe the month was July, there have
21 been two police officers around the clock in South
22 Seaside Park. That's more coverage than we give
23 to -- than the township gives to Holiday City,
24 Silver Ridge, any given hour of the day. So, I
25 think the police coverage is adequate for the square
miles Seaside Park presents. There was some testimony regarding police incidents. The chief of police in her testimony refuted the testimony of the petitioners and disagreed with what the petitioners said about the time frame as to when the police reported to a particular incident.

The engineering costs, the engineering that goes on in South Seaside Park, I
think is above and beyond what happens on the other side of the bay in Berkeley Township. And
Mr. Mackres made mention of the road pavements. And
I have the numbers here, as per Remington \& Vernick,
the town engineers, that $97-$-- 9 -- let me correct
it. Let me go slower for Linda. 9.7 percent of the
paved roads outside of South Seaside Park were paved
in Berkeley Township. 27 percent of the roads in
South Seaside Park were paved. Again, a lot of
attention from the engineering division paid to
South Seaside Park.
The beach on the bay, and I believe
it's, I guess, 20th Street to 23rd Street, whatever streets it's on, I don't think it presents an adequate bathing beach, but I don't know if it was meant to be a bathing beach. There's a lot of old tar that washed up on the beach, that, once brought
ratables, the burden is going to be always on the 1
residential taxpayers. 2
So, for reasons that l've mentioned, 3
and there probably are more, but, I mean, I know a
few of us have talked a lot up here on the dais, but
it's a serious issue and we took it seriously. I
think South Seaside Park is a very important asset
to Berkeley Township in many different ways. And I vote yes against the de-annexation. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. WINWARD: Okay. Thank you. MR. McGUCKIN: Mr. Chairman, I count
$7-0$ in favor of the motion, so the motion is
adopted. At this point, I'll prepare a resolution
for our next meeting. And once adopted, we'll
forward the entire package to the township.
MR. WINWARD: Okay. Thank you.
(Matter concluded.)
to the attention of the park or recreation department here in Berkeley Township, was cleaned up. I saw pictures of a rusty can on the beach, cleaned up. Whatever problems the residents in South Seaside Park had or still have, it's addressed right away. It's addressed by the appropriate departments in Berkeley Township. Again, is that a reason for de-annexation?

The most, the most important issue, and $I$ raised in a question to Stuart Wiser when he -- after he gave his testimony, is about the median household income. Currently, I believe it's approximately $\$ 41,000$ in Berkeley Township. It was argued, and I happen to agree, that the highest income of the residents of Berkeley Township are the South Seaside Park residents. If Berkeley Township should lose South Seaside Park, then, obviously, the household median income will drop. What that does is, it causes an adverse effect for retail shops, box stores, if we still believe in box stores, to come to Berkeley Township, which it will have an adverse effect on the residents of Berkeley Township, the property owners, who pay the property taxes, who pay a large portion that fund our budget in Berkeley Township. Without the commercial
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$\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 19 & 20 / 1 & 22 / 19 & 24 / 3 & 24 / 12\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}24 / 13 & 24 / 20 & 26 / 19 & 27 / 11\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 23 & 36 / 20 & 37 / 14 & 38 / 14\end{array}$
39/25 44/21
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { before }[10] & 5 / 13 & 7 / 2 & 11 / 19\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}25 / 2 & 27 / 19 & 29 / 2 & 29 / 22 & 33 / 4\end{array}$
34/16 48/8
behalf [2] 3/6 19/18
behind [1] 20/21
being $\left[\begin{array}{lll}15] & 8 / 6 & 11 / 3 \\ 14 / 11 / 6 & 17 / 8 & 17 / 9 \\ 17 / 2 & 27 / 4\end{array}\right)$
$\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 18 & 17 / 8 & 17 / 9 & 27 / 2 & 27 / 4 \\ 28 / 25 & 29 / 1 & 33 / 14 & 33 / 15 & 34 / 8\end{array}$
37/17 39/5
believe [19] $3 / 9 \quad 9 / 8 \quad 12 / 6$
$\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 25 & 14 / 17 & 16 / 6 & 23 / 5 & 25 / 20\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 4 & 30 / 19 & 39 / 18 & 40 / 11 & 41 / 9\end{array}$
$43 / 1 \quad 44 / 7 \quad 44 / 20 \quad 45 / 20 \quad 46 / 12$
46/20
Be11 [2] 1/15 36/12
belong [1] 25/12
$\begin{array}{llll}B E R K E L E Y & {[46]} & 1 / 1 & 5 / 9 \\ 11 / 6\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}11 / 14 & 14 / 19 & 17 / 10 & 17 / 12\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}17 / 23 & 21 / 13 & 30 / 12 & 31 / 10 & 33 / 9\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}13 & 33 & 38 / 6 & 38 / 12 & 38 / 14\end{array} 38 / 21$
$\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 23 & 39 / 2 & 39 / 5 & 39 / 11 & 40 / 10 \\ 40 / 17 & 40 / 23 & 42 / 3 & 42 / 24 & 43 / 7\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 17 & 40 / 23 & 42 / 3 & 42 / 24 & 43 / 7\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}43 / 9 & 43 / 20 & 43 / 22 & 43 / 24 & 43 / 25\end{array}$
43/25 44/4 44/16 45/10 45/16
$46 / 2$ 46/7 46/13 46/15 46/16
$46 / 21 \quad 46 / 22 \quad 46 / 25$ 47/8
Berkeley Township [30] 5/9
$\begin{array}{lllll}11 / 6 & 14 / 19 & 17 / 10 & 17 / 12 & 21 / 13\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllll}30 / 12 & 31 / 10 & 33 / 9 & 33 / 16 & 39 / 5 \\ 42 / 3 & 42 / 24 & 43 / 7 & 43 / 9 & 43 / 20\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 3 & 42 / 24 & 43 / 7 & 43 / 9 & 43 / 20 \\ 43 / 24 & 43 / 25 & 44 / 4 & 44 / 16 & 45 / 10\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}45 / 16 & 46 / 2 & 46 / 7 & 46 / 13 & 46 / 15\end{array}$
46/16 46/21 46/25 47/8
best [1] 41/24
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { better } & {[5]} & 32 / 18 & 34 / 19 & 38 / 15\end{array}$
39/21 39/21
betterment [1] 32/25
beyond [1] 45/9
big [6] 17/16 24/25 25/23
$\begin{array}{ccc}29 / 2 & 44 / 7 & 44 / 18\end{array}$
bigger [1] 24/17
biggest [3] 18/10 25/16
35/13


$\begin{array}{llllll}6 / 24 & 7 / 1 & 7 / 4 & 8 / 15 & 9 / 1 & 9 / 8\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 12 & 10 / 7 & 10 / 24 & 11 / 21 & 12 / 2\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 3 & 13 / 8 & 13 / 24 & 30 / 21 & 31 / 1\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}31 / 18 & 40 / 25 & 42 / 21\end{array}$
board's [1] 43/17
boards [1] 5/4
boards' [1] 30/16
Bob [1] $14 / 6$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { body [7] } & 5 / 19 & 5 / 24 & 6 / 4 & 12 / 4\end{array}$
12/4 15/21 25/25
bonding [1] 29/17
book [1] 10/17
border [1] $25 / 21$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { Boro [1] } & 41 / 8 & & \\ \text { both [7] } & 9 / 19 & 10 / 22 & 11 / 1\end{array}$
19/16 $24 / 1 \quad 37 / 1 \quad 37 / 7$
bottom [1] 32/7
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { bought } & {[2]} & 35 / 9 & 36 / 19 \\ \text { box [2] } & 46 / 20 & 46 / 20\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llllllll}\text { bring [3] } & 9 / 2 & 38 / 21 & 38 / 21\end{array}$
brought [3] 31/8 37/19 45/25 Brunswick [3] 34/17 34/19 34/20
bucket [1] 44/19
$\begin{array}{llll} \\ \text { budget [3] } & 18 / 11 & 39 / 17 & 46 / 24\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { budgeted [2] } & 21 / 4 & 24 / 16 \\ \text { build [3] } & 19 / 5 \text { 26/15 } & 29 / 6\end{array}$
building [4] 17/22 30/8
36/23 37/5
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { built } & {[6] \text { 19/1 }} & 22 / 22 & 29 / 4\end{array}$ 29/5 29/7 32/23
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { bullet [3] 41/21 } & 41 / 23 & 42 / 9\end{array}$
bulleted [1] 24/8
burden [7] $11 / 1 \quad 11 / 12 \quad 11 / 16$ $16 / 7 \quad 22 / 19 \quad 31 / 647 / 1$
bus [4] 23/10 23/13 23/13 31/12
buses [1] 23/15
business [5] 27/13 30/23
$31 / 231 / 1340 / 21$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { buy [2] } & 34 / 25 \quad 35 / 7\end{array}$

## C

cal1 [1] 22/17
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Callahan } & {[2] \quad 1 / 13} & 12 / 23 \\ \text { calls [2] } 39 / 25 \quad 40 / 2\end{array}$
Camden [1] 32/1
can [32] 7/24 7/24 9/20
$11 / 22 \quad 11 / 23 \quad 14 / 5 \quad 14 / 6 \quad 14 / 10$
$\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 16 & 19 / 20 & 23 / 1 & 23 / 3 & 24 / 17\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}18 & 16 / 18 & 25 / 20 & 25 / 24\end{array} 26 / 2 \quad 26 / 5$
$\begin{array}{llllll}27 / 23 & 29 / 6 & 29 / 6 & 33 / 8 & 33 / 20\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 7 & 36 / 16 & 37 / 25 & 38 / 22 & 40 / 20\end{array}$
$41 / 10$ 41/12 44/14 46/3
can't [5] $17 / 21$ 34/20 $41 / 5$
41/5 44/4
cannot [1] 29/13
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { cans [2] } & 25 / 3 & 25 / 4\end{array}$
capability [1] 24/18
capable [1] 44/9
capacity [1] 29/17
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { care [4] } & 23 / 1 & 29 / 21 & 31 / 18\end{array}$ 40/21
Carmen [1] 35/3
Carmen Amato [1] 35/3
cars [1] 21/10
case [4] 5/6 10/12 11/24
14/14
cash [3] 21/11 29/9 29/10
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { catch }[1] & 32 / 21 & \\ \text { cause }[7] & 11 / 5 & 11 / 13 & 14 / 18\end{array}$
23/19 32/16 39/4 44/7
causes [1] 46/19
Cedar [1] 42/12
Central [1] 19/15
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { century [1] } & 32 / 24 & & \\ \text { certainty [5] } & 6 / 7 & 7 / 24 & 9 / 23\end{array}$
30/25 42/8
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { CERTIFIED [2] } & 1 / 24 & 48 / 5\end{array}$
certify [1] 48/6
cetera[2] 12/9 18/19
Chair [1] 3/12
Chairman [6] $1 / 12 \quad 4 / 8 \quad 14 / 23$
$37 / 1247 / 1047 / 12$
cha1lenged [1] 23/10
change [6] 9/20 22/16 24/19
27/11 30/10 36/11
changes [4] 30/1 32/11 42/13
42/16
cheat [1] 33/6
CHERKOS [1] $2 / 3$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { chief }[4] & 24 / 10 & 24 / 14 & 30 / 24\end{array}$
45/2
children [7] 17/14 30/15

| C | constant [1] 24/22 | 37/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| children... [5] 31/9 31/23 | conversation [1] 43/19 | decisions |
| $\begin{array}{llll} & 32 / 8 & 32 / 20 & 33 / 22\end{array}$ | convince [1] 44 | declined |
| choice [2] 17/24 42/15 | copy [1] 4/4 21/7 | decrease [1] deed [1] 23/3 |
| choose [1] 8/12 |  | defense [2] 19/22 30/16 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { chose [1] } & 34 / 21 \\ \text { chosen } & \text { [1] }\end{array}$ | $15 / 10 \quad 15 / 19 \quad 21 / 20 \quad 31 / 14$ | definitive [1] 23/8 |
| chosen [1] church [1] | 41/16 45/13 | demanding [2] 19/9 22/25 |
| church [1] 26/15 $26 / 13$ | cost [6] 21/17 26/21 30/5 | democrats [1] 38/13 |
| cities [1] 31/25 | 34/6 34/11 34/21 | demographic [1] 17/20 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { City [7] } & 25 / 5 \\ \end{array}$ | costing [1] 21/3 | demographics [1] 28/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 36 / 25 & 37 / 4 & 43 / 3 & 44 / 23\end{array}$ | costs [1] 45 |  |
| Civics [1] 35/25 | $\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 16 & 14 / 25 & 16 / 5 & 39 / 23 & 39 / 25\end{array}$ | department [2] 41/7 46/2 |
| clarification [1] 13/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 40 / 4 & 40 / 6 & 40 / 15 & 40 / 18 \end{array}$ | departments [1] 46/7 |
| clarifications [1] 9/5 | council [1] 35/4 |  |
| clarified [1] 4/14 clarify [3] | Councilman [2] 1/12 41/19 | describe [1] 41/24 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { clarity } \\ 41 / 18 \end{gathered}$ | count [1] 47/12 | destruction [1] 20/7 |
| class [1] 24/15 | counted [1] 25/11 | determination [3] 11 |
| clawback [2] 29/19 | county [4] 33/7 38/10 38/16 | 12/8 |
| cleaned [2] 46/2 46/4 | couple [4] 17/18 38/19 42/9 | determined [1] 4/14 |
| cleaning [1] | 42/21 [4] 17/18 38/19 42/9 | determining [1] 11/11 |
|  | Course [1] 42/12 | detriment [1] 28/20 |
| closed [3] 3/9 4/9 | court [3] 1/24 19/19 48/5 | detrimental [11] 11/3 11/10 |
| closer [1] 34/10 | S [1] | 7 $731 / 6$ 32/14 $33 / 13$ |
| clubhouse [2] 18/25 19/4 | coverage $24 / 13$ 3912144 44 |  |
| clubhouses [2] 18/23 19/1 | $44 / 25$ | did [13] $10 / 1$ 10/16 $14 / 2$ |
|  | craft [3] 14/10 14/12 14/12 | 14/4 19/6 21/2 $21 / 15$ 26/24 |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { COAH [1] } \\ \text { codes [2] } & 24 / 6 \\ 27 / 5 & 27 / 7\end{array}$ | create [1] 22/24 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 30 / 25 & 38 / 21 & 39 / 8 & 41 / 12 & 44 / 16\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{ll}\text { codes [2] } & \text { 27/5 } \\ \text { cold [1] } & 44 / 19\end{array}$ | credentiajed [1] 24/3 | didn't [3] 13/24 25/5 38/1 |
| old [1] 44/19 | Creek [1] 42/12 | difference [3] 20/21 30/3 |
| colleague | criteria [1] 5/12 | 37/5 |
| come [13] 5/12 17/24 18 | critical [2] 8/3 22/18 | different [6] 11/20 11/22 |
|  | current [2] 22/25 23/2 | 23/25 28/9 39/7 47/8 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} & 34 / 23 & 36 / 18 & 38 / 9 & 40 / 24 \\ 46 / 21\end{array}$ | currently [3] 31/19 44/2 | difficult [1] 22/18 |
| comes [3] 20/10 29/12 39/17 |  |  |
| comfortable [1] 43/20 | custodians | nc |
| coming [2] 18/22 41/1 |  | direct [1] 23/16 |
| comment [1] 42/20 | cuts [2] 32/3 32/8 | direction [3] 9/10 9/11 |
| Commerce | D |  |
| commercial [3] 27/9 27/10 | Dairy [1] 44 | sagree [3] $12 / 9$ 39/4 $41 / 14$ |
| Commission [1] 48/ | dais [3] $3 / 16$ 44/7 $47 / 5$ | disagreed [1] 45/4 |
| common [2] 16/23 21 | DASTI [1] 2/3 | discuss [2] 6/10 16 |
| communicate [1] 28/17 | date [1] 48/9 | discussion [5] 4/6 6/6 16/8 |
| communicating [1] 28/14 |  | discussions |
| communication [1] 28/14 | $\text { days [1] } 38 / 20$ | disgusted [1] 33/18 |
| communications [1] 39/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \mathrm{de}[37] & 1 / 5 & 3 / 4 & 5 / 21 & 5 / 22 \end{array}$ | distance [1] 23/15 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { community [2] } & \text { 28/4 } & \text { 28/4 }\end{array}$ | $10 / 22 \quad 11 / 5 \quad 11 / 10 \quad 11 / 18 \quad 11 / 23$ | district [5] $17 / 13$ 19/15 |
| $\begin{array}{lll}\text { company [1] } & 40 / 1 \\ \text { compare }\end{array}$ | $12 / 6 \quad 14 / 15 \quad 15 / 9 \quad 15 / 22 \quad 15 / 23$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 30/12 } & 30 / 22 & 31 / 24\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lc}\text { compare } \\ \text { compared } & \text { [1] } \\ \text { [1] } & 18 / 5 \\ 21 / 4\end{array}$ |  | districts [1] 32/17 |
| compared [1] 21/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 23 & 23 / 9 & 23 / 19 & 27 / 21 & 30 / 5\end{array}$ | dividends [1] 33/1 |
| mparison [1] |  | division [1] 45/18 |
| mpensation | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 42 / 13 & 42 / 17 & 42 / 18 & 42 / 22\end{array}$ | do [47] $4 / 4$ 5/15 $6 / 15$ 6/22 |
| competition complain [1] | 43/14 44/8 46/8 47/9 | 7/6 7/8 7/10 7/10 7/20 8/12 |
| complained [2] | de-annex [3] 11/10 18/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}8 / 18 & 9 / 12 & 14 / 9 & 14 / 21 & 14 / 21\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { complained } \\ \text { complaining [2] } & \text { 25/15 } & 40 / 14\end{array}$ | 39/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 22 & 15 / 1 & 17 / 24 & 17 / 25 & 18 / 13\end{array}$ |
| complaining complains [1] 24/20 | de-annexation [33] 1/5 3/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { 20/14 } & 21 / 2 & 22 / 20 & 24 / 16 & 25 / 6\end{array}$ |
| complaint [8] 23/14 24/22 | 5/21 5/22 10/22 11/5 11/18 | $\begin{array}{llllll}25 / 9 & 25 / 19 & 25 / 20 & 25 / 22 & 25 / 22\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \\ 25 / 1 & 27 / 15 \quad 28 / 22 \quad 28 / 24 ~ 29 / 1\end{array}$ | 11/23 $12 / 614 / 1515 / 915 / 22$ | 25/24 $27 / 23$ 28/1 $28 / 9$ 28/9 |
| 37/23 $27 / 15$ 28/22 28/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 23 & 15 / 23 & 16 / 17 & 21 / 9 & 21 / 22\end{array}$ | 28/16 29/21 29/23 29/25 |
|  | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 23 & 23 / 9 & 23 / 19 & 27 / 21 & 32 / 19\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}34 / 20 & 35 / 6 & 37 / 8 & 37 / 19 & 39 / 18\end{array}$ |
| $25 / 23 \quad 26 / 25 \quad 37 / 22$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 16 & 41 / 11 & 42 / 8 & 42 / 13 & 42 / 17\end{array}$ | 41/7 44/16 48/6 |
| concern [3] 23/20 28/2 28/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 18 & 42 / 22 & 43 / 14 & 44 / 8 & 46 / 8\end{array}$ | documentation [1] |
| concerned [2] 34/24 39/11 | 47/9 [1] 30/5 | documents [2] 6/19 8/25 |
| concerns [4] 10/3 22/20 26/3 | de-annexes [1] 30/5 | dodgy [1] 23/9 |
| 30/11 | deal [1] 17/16 | does [8] 19/10 20/1 |
| concluded [2] 3/8 47/18 | debt [2] 20/10 29/15 | 27/20 35/12 35/13 44/1 46/18 |
| conflict [1] 3/19 | decades [1] 19/16 | doesn t [3] 9/9 |
| conflicted [1] 23/6 | December [1] 4/12 | dog [1] 40/ |
| CONNORS [1] 2/3 | 5/15 | doing [3] 25 |
| consent [3] 11/3 15/8 37/16 | decides [2] 12/2 $12 / 3$ | dollars [4] 17/18 20/7 |
| consequences [1] 18/2 | decision [9] 7/15 8/1 8/6 | 31/21 [4] 17/18 20/7 |
| consider [1] 10/15 | $\begin{array}{llllll} 8 / 15 & 10 / 6 & 12 / 10 & 30 / 13 & 30 / 17 \end{array}$ | domain [3] 22/24 25/18 25/19 |


how [16] $3 / 25$ 14/1 $14 / 11$ $\begin{array}{llll}14 / 12 & 14 / 21 & 22 / 15 & 26 / 22\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}27 / 13 & 28 / 7 & 28 / 10 & 28 / 16 & 28 / 19\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}34 / 7 & 35 / 14 & 35 / 15 & 41 / 1\end{array}$ However [2] 5/25 39/3 Hugg [1] $2 / 13$
hundred [1] 17/18
hundreds [1] 6/18
Hurricane [3] 24/11 27/1
27/2
Hurricane Sandy [1] 27/1

## I

I want [1] 35/9
I'd [4] $9 / 2 \quad 27 / 18 \quad 37 / 11 \quad 41 / 1$ I'17 [5] 8/20 10/6 $15 / 6$ $34 / 1847 / 14$
I'm [23] $3 / 15$ 7/3 $7 / 8$ 9/11
12/20 $13 / 16$ 17/5 $18 / 16$ 20/2
24/7 25/4 25/23 28/6 33/18
$33 / 24 \quad 34 / 24 \quad 35 / 15 \quad 36 / 7 \quad 36 / 8$
$36 / 13 \quad 39 / 11 \quad 40 / 12 \quad 40 / 23$
I've [9] $9 / 1 \quad 28 / 1635 / 22$
$36 / 18 \quad 36 / 20 \quad 37 / 14 \quad 39 / 6 \quad 39 / 25$ 47/3
idea [4] 14/12 26/2 30/19
36/5
ideas [1] ${ }^{40 / 12}$
identity [1] $24 / 5$
illogical [1] 17/15
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { imagine [1] } & 3 / 20 \\ \text { immense [1] } & 32 / 6\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { impact } & {[8]} & 17 / 7 & 30 / 19 & 30 / 24\end{array}$
$31 / 7 \quad 31 / 12 \quad 31 / 15 \quad 32 / 13 \quad 33 / 13$
impacted [1] 20/25
i
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { impassable } \\ \text { implement } & {[1]} \\ \text { [1] } & 38 / 15\end{array}$
importance [1] 8/3
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { important [6] } & 6 / 15 & 8 / 2 & 8 / 6\end{array}$
43/22 46/9 47/7
improve [1] 41/12
improvements [1] 39/20
incentive [1] 18/9
inches [1] 44/11
incident [1] 45/6
incidents [1] 45/2
includes [1] 24/18
income [4] 32/5 46/12 46/15 46/18
increase [7] $17 / 11 \quad 20 / 19$
$31 / 16 \quad 32 / 12 \quad 32 / 18 \quad 33 / 17$ 43/1
increased [2] 17/17 24/13
increases [1] 39/7
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { increasing [1] } & 28 / 1 \\ \text { incredible }\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { incredible } \\ \text { indicate }[2] \quad 33 / 1 \\ 7 / 25 & 8 / 9\end{array}$
indicating [2] $11 / 2$ 15/20
individuals [1] 4/19
inevitable [1] 20/12
$\begin{array}{lllllllllllll}\text { inflation [1] } \\ \text { information [4] } & 20 / 20 & \\ 10 / 3 & 17 / 2\end{array}$
20/1 21/4
injury [6] 11/6 11/13 14/18
17/9 33/15 $39 / 5$
instance [1] 11/9
instead [1] 35/5
instituting [1] 29/4
intend [1] $3 / 21$
intention [1] 6/5
interest [2] 29/24 43/6
interesting [2] 13/25 21/19
Interestingly [1] 18/4
investment [1] 24/25
is [96]
island [11] $\quad 20 / 24 \quad 21 / 12$
$\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 16 & 21 / 18 & 23 / 24 & 24 / 24\end{array}$
25/20 26/4 31/13 37/3 41/6
issue [11] $4 / 12$ 5/6 23/24
27/6 $28 / 3 \quad 29 / 2 \quad 44 / 5 \quad 44 / 7$

44/18 46/9 47/6
issued [1] 19/20
$\begin{array}{lrrr}\text { issues }[11] & 5 / 11 & 10 / 15 & 37 / 20 \\ 38 / 4 & 38 / 24 & 39 / 13 & 39 / 18 \\ 39 / 20\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}38 / 4 & 38 / 24 & 39 / 13 & 39 / 18 & 39 / 20\end{array}$
39/22 40/7 40/14
it [86]
it's [40] $4 / 24$ 5/14 6/1 $6 / 21$ $6 / 21 \quad 6 / 25 \quad 7 / 19 \quad 8 / 3 \quad 9 / 17$
$\begin{array}{lllll}10 / 12 & 13 / 8 & 13 / 20 & 13 / 20 & 14 / 5\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 5 & 18 / 10 & 19 / 17 & 22 / 2 & 23 / 11\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}27 / 6 & 27 / 17 & 28 / 15 & 29 / 9 & 29 / 9\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}30 / 17 & 36 / 4 & 38 / 14 & 39 / 14 & 41 / 23\end{array}$ $43 / 22 \quad 44 / 3 \quad 44 / 7 \quad 44 / 1144 / 11$ $\begin{array}{llllll}45 / 21 & 45 / 22 & 46 / 5 & 46 / 6 & 46 / 12\end{array}$ 47/6
items [2] 24/8 27/23
its [2] 6/3 18/10
itself [1] 22/5

Jack [2] 1/14 13/15
JACKSON [1] $1 / 25$
James [1] 2/14
January [2] $1 / 8 \quad 48 / 14$
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Jersey }[9] & 1 / 8 & 1 / 25 & 2 / 4 & 2 / 7\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll} & 5 / 5 & 44 / 9 & 44 / 10 & 48 / 6\end{array} 48 / 13$
job [4] $10 / 2$ 14/3 $14 / 4$ 44/16
John [4] $1 / 12$ 4/1 $9 / 22 \quad 12 / 19$
joins [1] 23/12
JOSEPH [2] 2/8 3/6
Joseph Michelini [1] 3/6
judicial [2] 4/25 7/23
Ju7y [1] 44/20
just [21] $3 / 14$ 3/14 $4 / 2$ 4/2 $\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 3 & 11 / 20 & 11 / 25 & 12 / 17 & 13 / 18\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 5 & 16 / 1 & 16 / 18 & 19 / 5 & 28 / 11\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llllll}32 / 18 & 36 / 9 & 36 / 16 & 38 / 3 & 40 / 24\end{array}$ 41/17 41/23

## K

| keep [2] | $27 / 21$ | $43 / 20$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ke17y [2] | $2 / 13$ | $16 / 18$ |  |
| Keswick [1] | $1 / 7$ |  |  |
| kidding | [2] | $4 / 2$ | $4 / 3$ |
| kind [3] | $7 / 2$ | $14 / 20 \quad 40 / 12$ |  |
| kinds [1] | $39 / 7$ |  |  |
| know [32] | $8 / 4$ | $9 / 10$ | $9 / 16$ |

$\begin{array}{llllll}\text { know } & {[32]} & 8 / 4 & 9 / 10 & 9 / 16 \\ 10 / 11 & 10 / 13 & 13 / 19 & 13 / 23 & 14 / 3\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}14 / 6 & 15 / 25 & 19 / 1 & 21 / 15 & 24 / 20\end{array}$
24/22 $25 / 5 \quad 26 / 17 \quad 27 / 10 \quad 27 / 13$
$\begin{array}{lllll}27 / 22 & 28 / 19 & 34 / 10 & 34 / 18\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 22 & 37 / 7 & 38 / 13 & 39 / 6 & 40 / 16\end{array}$
40/21 41/1 44/9 45/23 47/4
knowledge [1] 21/7
knows [1] 39/10

## L

$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Lacey [2] } & 2 / 4 & 32 / 4 \\ \text { LAKEVIEW [1] } & 1 / 24\end{array}$
1 and [3] 22/5 25/18 25/21
large [1] 46/24
1ast [5] 3/10 5/8 30/11
38/12 38/16
1ater [1] 29/24
launch [1] 26/22
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { law [1] 5/6 } & \\ \text { lawsuits [2] } & 19 / 18 & 29 / 20 \\ \text { league [1] } & 42 / 3\end{array}$
league [1] $42 / 3$
least [2] 38/17 38/18
leave [3] $35 / 6 \quad 35 / 6 \quad 38 / 8$
leaves [1] $13 / 15$
leaving [1] $37 / 10$
legal [2] $31 / 3 \quad 43 / 14$
less [1] $22 / 7$
let [3] $36 / 9 \quad 45 / 1345 / 14$
level [1] $24 / 2$
leve1s [1] $20 / 14$
levy [2] $20 / 8 \quad 31 / 19$




| S | $3 / 17 \quad 3 / 19 \quad 12 /$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| significantly... [1] 17/19 |  | $\begin{array}{rllll} \text { thank } & {[11]} & 3 / 22 & 6 / 23 & 8 / 13 \\ 9 / 12 & 12 / 18 & 14 / 1 & 33 / 22 & 35 / 16 \end{array}$ |
| Silver [2] $43 / 3$ 44/24 | steps [1] stick [1] $20 / 3$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}9 / 12 & 12 / 18 & 14 / 1 & 33 / 22 & 35 / 16\end{array}$ <br> 47/9 47/11 47/17 |
| simply [2] |  | that [194] |
| since [7] 5/8 23/7 23/15 | $25 / 8 \quad 27 / 23 \quad 30 / 6 \quad 30 / 7 \quad 31 / 12$ | that's [30] 6/9 6/14 6/17 |
| $\begin{array}{lll} 23 / 21 & 29 / 6 & 39 / 20 \\ \text { sincerely }[1] & 25 / 19 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 42 / 13 & 46 / 5 & 46 / 20\end{array}$ | 7/25 8/11 8/12 11/7 12/10 |
| sincere y 1 singled $39 / 14$ | stop [3] 23/10 23/13 23/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 16 & 12 / 18 & 14 / 6 & 14 / 19 & 20 / 3\end{array}$ |
| sit [3] 3/16 15/6 37/21 | stores [2] 46/20 46/20 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}120 / 20 & 26 / 18 & 27 / 5 & 28 / 15 & 29 / 16\end{array}$ |
| site [1] 5/1 | storm [1] 44/12 | $\begin{array}{llllllll}34 / 9 & 34 / 13 & 34 / 15 & 34 / 17 & 34 / 2\end{array}$ |
| sitting [1] | storms [1] 44/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 13 & 35 / 19 & 35 / 21 & 41 / 2 & 41 / 16\end{array}$ |
| Situs [1] | story [2] 9/19 41/13 |  |
| six [1] $24 / 17$ | stream [1] 41/3 | lheir [23] 10/25 11/12 11/16 |
| size [1] 22/1 | streamed [1] 39/ | $\begin{array}{lllllll}12 / 10 & 16 / 7 & 16 / 25 & 17 / 7 & 17 / 17\end{array}$ |
| Skype [1] 40/3 | street [4] 29/11 38/11 45/21 |  |
| slighted [1] 39/1 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { streets [4] } & \text { 23/21 } & 23 / 23\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}23 / 23 & 28 / 8 & 31 / 3 & 32 / 23 & 33 / 4 \\ 33 / 8 & 33 / 14 & 41 / 22 & 42 / 15 & 43 / 4\end{array}$ |
| slower [1] 45/14 | 44/17 45/22 | them [9] 19/20 25/4 25/6 |
| sma11 [1] 22/23 | strictly [1] | $\begin{array}{lllll} & 25 / 9 & 25 / 10 & 27 / 10 & 28 / 8\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { snow }{ }^{[5]} \quad 18 / 48 / 5 \\ 38 / 24 \end{gathered}$ | strong [1] 10/11 | 42/17 |
| snowplowed [1] | struck [1] 8/5 | themselves [1] 19/5 |
| snowstorms [1] 44 | structured [1] 34/4 | then [25] 6/15 7/10 7/14 |
| so [56] | Stuart [3] 2/14 6/24 46/10 |  |
| social [4] 17/8 28/3 $33 / 14$ | Stuart Wiser's [1] 6/24 | 16/17 17/18 17/22 21/18 |
| 37/17 ${ }^{\text {colve }}$ [2] 40/7 | stuck [1] 38/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 17 & 27 / 1 & 28 / 23 & 29 / 24 & 34 / 25\end{array}$ |
| solve [2]  <br> some $[25]$ $7 / 3$ | stuff [1] 37/ | 35/1 36/3 46/17 |
| 13/17 $14 / 19$ 16/25 | subject [1] 16/2 | there [62] |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 121 & 14 / 25 & 26 / 3 & 26 / 25 & 37 / 20\end{array}$ | substation [1] 40/17 | there's [16] 3/19 5/7 6/8 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 37 / 22 & 39 / 22 & 40 / 6 & 40 / 7 & 40 / 12\end{array}$ | such [3] 18/2 19/18 29/19 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}7 / 13 & 9 / 8 & 10 / 15 & 11 / 20 & 11 / 21\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll} & 40 / 18 & 40 / 21 & 41 / 5 & 41 / 21\end{array}$ | sudden [1] 34/18 | $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 12 & 25 / 9 & 37 / 9 & 38 / 4 & 38 / 24\end{array}$ |
| 42/19 45/1 | SULLIVAN [2] 1/23 48/4 | $\begin{array}{cc}16 / 123 & 39 / 22 ~ 45 / 24\end{array}$ |
| somebody [3] 7/11 14/10 | SULLIVAN-HILL [2] $1 / 23$ 48/4 | therefore [4] 19/3 |
| someone | support [4] 19/10 20 | these [15] 3/17 6/20 19/20 |
| someone [2] | 24/12 31/22 | 22/14 $33 / 2 \begin{array}{lllll} & 34 / 7 & 35 / 16 & 35 / 23\end{array}$ |
| something [7] |  | $\begin{array}{llllll}35 / 23 & 36 / 1 & 36 / 8 & 37 / 21 & 37 / 22\end{array}$ |
| sometimes [2] 44/10 44/11 | 20/2 28/6 | 39/20 40/14 |
| sorry [3] 15/14 25/4 33/25 | surge SURMAN |  |
| sort [2] 36/6 44/18 | $\text { survived[1] } 24 / 23$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}12 / 4 & 14 / 13 & 14 / 2 & 23 / 1 & 23 / 3\end{array}$ |
| SOUTH [47] $1 / 41 / 24$ 3/3 $11 / 4$ | sway [1] 9/20 | $\begin{array}{llllll}19 & \\ 23 / 17 & 23 / 24 & 24 / 23 & 25 / 6 & 25 / 8\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 7 & 14 / 16 & 17 / 20 & 18 / 7 & 18 / 17\end{array}$ | $\text { system [2] } 32 / 23 \quad 32 / 25$ | $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 25 / 15 & 26 / 4 & 26 / 5 & 26 / 18 & 26 / 19\end{array}$ |
| 18/20 18/22 19/3 19/7 21/8 |  | 27/6 27/9 28/7 28/11 28/11 |
|  | T | 28/12 $29 / 23$ 30/19 $31 / 3$ 31/7 |
| $\begin{array}{llllllll} & 29 / 7 & 30 / 4 & 31 / 9 & 37 / 10 & 37 / 18\end{array}$ | take [8] 22/16 22/24 23/15 | $32 / 3 \quad 32 / 9 \quad 33 / 8 \quad 38 / 2 \quad 40 / 3$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}37 / 25 & 38 / 7 & 39 / 1 & 39 / 14 & 40 / 14\end{array}$ |  | 40/13 $40 / 18$ 41/5 42/11 42/14 |
|  |  | 15 42/20 $43 / 2144 / 13$ |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}44 / 21 & 45 / 8 & 45 / 15 & 45 / 17 & 45 / 19\end{array}$ | taken $[2]$ $10 / 548 / 8$ <br> takes $24 / 1437 / 3$ |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll}46 / 5 & 46 / 16 & 46 / 17 & 47 / 7\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { taking }[3] \quad 25 / 17 & 35 / 25 \quad 36 / 2\end{array}$ | thing [4] 35/13 36/17 37/21 |
| space [3] 23/3 $40 / 18$ 41/5 | $\operatorname{ta1k}[2] \quad 8 / 7 \quad 26 / 13$ | 41/11 |
| speak [1] $10 / 7$ <br> speaks $[1]$ <br> $21 / 12$  | talked [3] $25 / 17 \quad 26 / 7 \quad 47 / 5$ | things [11] $7 / 5$ 7/7 10/14 |
| speaks [1] $21 / 12$ <br> special [1] | talking [2] 31/21 36/17 | 10/21 13/23 $19 / 9$ 34/2 37/20 |
| speculation [1] 29/10 | tar [1] 45/25 | 39/17 40/5 41/9 |
| spending [1] 19/16 | tax [8] 20/8 20/9 20/10 | think [46] 4/14 5/10 5/25 |
| spiral [1] 20/10 | 20/13 $31 / 19$ 33/7 $39 / 7 \begin{array}{llll} & 39 / 12\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llllll}6 / 2 & 6 / 14 & 8 / 3 & 9 / 15 & 9 / 19 & 14 / 2\end{array}$ |
| spoke [3] 27/16 27/19 27/24 | taxes [18] 10/14 17/11 17/17 | $14 / 3$ 14/24 $15 / 2516 / 2{ }^{18 / 25}$ |
| spots [1] 38/19 | $18 / 1{ }^{18 / 3} 18 / 818 / 1018 / 14$ | 24/20 $25 / 6 \quad 26 / 1 \quad 26 / 14 \quad 28 / 5$ |
| square [1] 44/25 |  | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 35 / 11 & 28 / 15 & 35 / 11 & 35 / 11\end{array}$ |
| squirmy [1] 23/9 | taxpayer [1] 39/11 | $\begin{array}{llll}37 / 15 & 38 / 25 & 39 / 1\end{array}$ |
|  | taxpayers [2] 19/3 47/2 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}39 / 16 & 39 / 19 & 39 / 22 & 40 / 6 & 40 / 16\end{array}$ |
| stand [1] 26/20 | teacher [1] 31/11 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 41 / 2 & 41 / 10 & 43 / 1 & 43 / 22 & 44 / 14\end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{lll} \text { standard } \\ \text { start }[2] & {[1]} & 20 / 19 \\ \hline 27 / 12 \end{array}$ | teachers [1] 31/22 | 44/25 45/9 $45 / 22$ 47/7 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { art [2] } 7 / 6 \text { 27/12 } \\ & \text { arted }[1], 25 / 5 \end{aligned}$ | technology [2] 39/24 40/6 | think they [1] 15/25 |
| rting [1] 24 | ten [3] 30/9 38/18 $39 / 9$ | third [1] 5/23 |
| state [14] 5/4 16/20 17/16 | ten feet [1] 38/18 | this |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 22 / 7 & 24 / 24 & 25 / 21 & 26 / 4 & 29 / 22\end{array}$ | ten percent [1] 30/9 | those [17] 4/18 4/19 4/20 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll} & 30 / 1 & 31 / 25 & 32 / 2 & 44 / 13 & 48 / 5\end{array}$ | tennis [2] 42/5 42/7 | 8/5 8/16 11/2 11/9 17/18 |
| 48/13 | testimonies [1] 17/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}19 / 11 & 20 / 20 & 22 / 11 & 26 / 22\end{array}$ |
| stated [2] 18/24 23/6 | testimony [25] 3/8 5/11 5/25 | 27/11 $27 / 24$ 28/10 $33 / 3141 / 6$ |
| statement [3] 17/22 27/22 | 6/12 6/19 $6 / 1$ | though [3] 11/14 13/21 19/9 |
| 42/25 | $\begin{array}{llllll}8 / 8 & 10 / 11 & 21 / 12 & 23 / 5 & 24 / 12\end{array}$ | thought [2] 7/13 8/3 |
| stating [1] 29/4 | $\begin{array}{lllll}26 / 12 & 27 / 25 & 41 / 22 & 42 / 14\end{array}$ | ousand |
| statute [4] 4/22 5/3 5/7 | lin | [11 |
| $5 / 12$ | than [10] ${ }^{14 / 4} 122 / 7 \quad 25 / 2$ | 25/16 $26 / 11$ 39/25 40/2 |
| stenographically [1] 48/8 | 28/17 $29 / 1$ 31/20 34/22 34/23 | through [17] 3/12 5/5 5/9 |





[^0]:    MR. McGUCKIN: The next step, no
    matter what the board decides, then whatever this
    board decides, would then be forwarded to the
    township's governing body. And the governing body
    makes the ultimate determination as to whether or
    not they believe de-annexation should or should not
    occur. But they will be using your recommendation
    to reach that determination. They may agree with
    you, they may disagree with you, et cetera. But
    that's their decision to make.
    MR. WINWARD: Okay. So, no matter
    which one of the three, it still goes to the
    township even like no --
    MR. McGUCKIN: Yes.
    MR. WINWARD: Okay.
    MR. McGUCKIN: That's correct.
    MR. WINWARD: Okay. I just wanted to
    clarify that. Thank you. That's all I have to say.
    We'll pass John, go to Fred.
    MR. BELL: I'm good.
    MR. WINWARD: Go from Fred to Red.
    MR. McGUCKIN: As I understand it,
    Mr. Callahan is not -- is he eligible to vote or no?
    MS. HUGG: No. He's the alternate,
    so, I don't believe he's eligible to vote if we have

