

2

## APPEARANCES:



ALSO PRESENT:
Kelly Hugg, secretary
stuart Wiser, Planner
the South Seaside Park Homeowner and Voters
Association de-annexation petition hearing.
4 Attorney Joseph Michelini. And you may proceed.
(off the record.)
MR. MICHELINI: Good evening,
everyone. Joseph Michelini on behalf of the
petition signers for the South Seaside Park
Homeowner and Voters Association.
Tonight it was agreed among myself
and Mr. McGuckin, your attorney, that we would
discuss procedure. We tried to come to an agreement regarding procedure. We were unable to do that, so, therefore, you know, we need to place it on the record and then whatever the board decides the board decides.
(off the record.)
MR. MICHELINI: SO we're here tonight to discuss the procedure going forward. As I
understand where we are, the township -- wel1, we
presented our witnesses, the township presented its witnesses. The board, as I understand it, decided not to proceed with any witnesses, with the exception of Mr. Wiser, who is in the process of preparing a report. And at some point he would

1 present that report and, as he had previously
2 indicated, be subject to cross-examination. So, I
3 have requested and I believe the board is inclined
4 to hear rebuttal witnesses. I would like those
rebuttal witnesses to go on after Mr. Wiser because
6 part of the point of having them go on after is to
7 rebut his report, assuming that that report is not
8 favorable to our position. If the report is
favorable to our position, then I would not need to
put on rebuttal witnesses, but if it is not
favorable to our position, we would want to put on
those rebuttal witnesses after Mr. Wiser's report.
And the reason that we say that is because we have
the burden of proof. And even though this is not a
court of law, we have been handling it in some
respects very much like a court of law, where
witnesses are sworn in, where there is examination,
there's direct examination, cross examination,
redirect and recross. And in a situation where we have the burden under the statute, just like in a court case where the plaintiff has the burden, they get the first word and they get the last word. As matter of fairness and procedure that's how it's done. So I'm only requesting that by analogy the same procedure be followed in this case. I

1 public who have not had a chance to speak, to have 2 an opportunity to present any positions, comments, 3 testimony they wish to have. So I think that's the 4 first thing we need to address.
opportunity for the public, any other members of the
understand that Mr. McGuckin may have a different view and I will allow him to place, of course, his position on the record. My position, is what's the harm? I think we had Mr. Ebenau here, he testified what, four or five times, I don't know how many times, but the idea was, well, the board needs to get all the information possible so that they can make a good decision, or at least provide a report and possibly a recommendation. Well, the same logic then applies, why wouldn't we allow our experts to come in after your engineer and planner, who's been specially retained in this case, for this matter, provides a report, which I understand is going to be hundreds of pages long. And all I'm asking is the opportunity to take that report, of course, conduct cross-examination of Mr. Wiser, and then have my own experts comment on it, which I think would be the appropriate and the fair way to proceed.

## Mr. McGuckin?

MR. McGuckin: Well, Mr. Chairman, I did have a discussion with Mr. Michelini. We
discussed where we are at this stage. Before we get to that issue I think there's going to be, and I understand the board wanted to at least have an
whether or not the applicant gets a rebuttal shot to
present additional evidence in response to all the other witnesses. Mr. Michelini has indicated he thinks it's appropriate. I don't necessarily think it's inappropriate and as Mr. Michelini indicated, and the board has said previously, it's about getting all of the information. So if they wish to present rebuttal testimony I think that's
appropriate. But let's remember Mr. Wiser was the board in preparing a final recommendation to the governing body.

I know this has been done in some other municipalities, although there is no, quote, statutory procedure, rule or regulation as to how it would go. But, quite frankly, I believe Mr. Wiser's response and obligation to the board is to present all the sides and present all of the testimony, including any rebuttal testimony that Mr. Michelini may have. It may be if, for instance, Mr. Wiser's
report provides something new that has not been addressed, something new that has not yet been testified to, I think I would agree with Mr. Michelini that that would be appropriate to allow him to address that issue as a result of the that after the fact. But I think we need to bring this thing in for a landing and have a final procedure to get this thing done. And I don't think it's inappropriate to provide the public comment. I don't think -- I think at that point if Mr. Michelini wants to provide rebuttal testimony, I think that's appropriate. I think Mr. Wiser should be go last. That's my opinion.

MR. MICHELINI: If I might just comment briefly. I certainly agree that the public should comment. My approach would be to have the public comment probably be heard last, but -because that's how it's normally done in any hearing. But, you know, the only issue with the public comment is, chairman winward indicated that it probably should be announced because these hearings have been going on and I agree with that. So whether that occurs first or last I'm less concerned about that. I do believe that providing a recommendation is in the nature of an expert's
opinion and report. And in the normal course of events, we should have the opportunity to hear what that recommendation is, to hear what that report is, 4 and then to rebut it if it doesn't agree with us. It's not a matter -- it's not as if Mr. Wiser, with all due respect, will be acting independently. He's going to have an opinion. He's going to make a 8 recommendation. He's going to have a position, so to speak. Otherwise, if he doesn't have an opinion, then he's simply a scrivener, he's simply writing things down. And, quite frankly, the board can read the transcript and write things down for themselves. so he is going to be making some kind of a report with a recommendation. And I think we should have the opportunity to rebut that report, as we would in a court of law, in that type of proceeding. He's not the judge in this matter, who's going to gather all the testimony and then come up with a decision. He is going to be putting together some kind of a recommendation. So, that is an opinion, that's an 21 expert's opinion. Clearly he's an expert, otherwise 22 you wouldn't have retained him. You didn't retain
23 him as a layperson. And I think for the reasons
24 I've stated, I think I should have the last word and 25 have the opportunity to rebut that opinion, assuming

1 it is not favorable. 3 a ruling. I just want to make my objection clear on 4 the record with regard to the matter. And then the 5 next thing is for the board to -- after that perhaps 6 we can decide that issue, whether Mr. wiser goes 7 last or not, and then we can talk about where the 8 public goes and the other witnesses, rebuttal 9 witnesses.

MR. MCGUCKIN: Just a response to Mr. Michelini. He's going to have every opportunity to cross-examine him. He's going to have the report. It's not going to be a surprise to him. This is not going to be one of those reports that's handed out at the beginning of the meeting, like we've had in some other witnesses. And I'm sure we're going to have a month in between, between his testimony and cross examination. And Mr. Michelini is going to have a full and fair opportunity to cross-examine him if that's the case. And it's possible his recommendation will be in favor of him. But in that case, there would be no cross of Mr. Wiser, and nothing in the record as to that.

MR. MICHELINI: So if Mr. Wiser wants
to

10
MR. MCGUCKIN: Well, there could be other parties who may -- let's, for instance, let's assume Mr. Wiser recommends in favor of your clients. There may be others who dispute that opinion. And there'll be no record then of rebuttal of that witness. SO I think it is appropriate for the board to have all the testimony, all the rebuttal, before he presents his recommendation to the board. And he's going to be subject to cross. and as I said, and I think it would be appropriate, Mr. Chairman, if something in that report is
something that has not yet already been testified to, I would agree with Mr. Michelini. I think that would be fine. And give him a limited opportunity to address something that comes out. And he'll be able to tell us after his cross-examination, which he will have had a month at least to review the report. And after that if he feels he needs to present something because something's new, the board can then decide that is new and yes, you can have another shot. But let's get everything here. Let's get the information in the record. Let's get this thing moving and get it, like I said, bring it in for a landing.

MR. MICHELINI: Just a final
statement. I think that that's prejudicial to my position not to be able to put on the expert testimony after Mr. Wiser, given that I have the burden of proof in this case to rebut his opinion, should it come out that he is not in favor of the de-annexation or his report reflects that position.

MR. MCGUCKIN: And just on that issue to remind, we don't make the decision. All we do are make recommendations. The actual decision is made by the governing body, not this board. So, while counsel points about burden of proofs and whose responsibility and so forth, and the decision making, this not a final decision, this is simply a recommendation of the planning board.

MR. MICHELINI: But this is the record.

MR. MCGUCKIN: That's correct.
MR. WISER: I would also just add
that -- excuse me.
(Off the record.)
MR. WISER: I would also add that in planning board applications, typically, and I really haven't done an application before this board, but, typically, the board's professionals go after the applicant has presented their case. And there's --
unless there is some drastic reason, the applicants
are limited in having an interplay after they have
3 presented their case. The board asks the
4 professionals what their opinions are. And that's 5 then typically the last thing before the board 6 votes.

MR. WINWARD: Okay. Then I have a
question. When you give your report, is he allowed to cross-examine you on the record?

MR. WISER: I think as Mr. McGuckin
said, he would be able to cross-examine, and I will defer to the attorneys on this, but on new items.
But on items where I'm commenting as to what the
testimony was from the various witnesses, I think
that the cross-examination would have already
occurred at the time of those witnesses.
MR. MICHELINI: I think my cross should not be limited of Mr. Wiser in any respect whatsoever. I believe Mr. McGuckin would agree with that. The issue is whether or not I am allowed to prepare or provide rebuttal witnesses before or after Mr. Wiser's testimony and cross-examination, so --

MR. MCGUCKIN: Before we get to the next legal argument, let's stick to this one as to

1 the timing, and then we' 11 address how that -MR. MICHELINI: I just want to 3 respond to one thing Mr. Wiser said. There's 4 nothing typical about this. This isn't typical, okay, as one would have an application for a subdivision or something like that. And I'm fully expecting that Mr. wiser, based upon the hundreds of thousands of dollars that his firm has spent, much of it preparing a report over the last couple years when you look at the invoices, I fully expect that's going to be hundreds of pages long. And, with all due respect, I should have the opportunity to have my experts look at that report and provide testimony and rebut it, should they not agree with it, in the interest of having all the information before the board. How can I have experts rebut a report that I don't have. okay. So once I have the report, then I can go to my experts, then I can get more information before the board that I can't possibly present before the board until such time as I have that report.

Mr. McGuckin: we can go back and forth with surrebuttal and rebuttal and everything else. There's come a point where it has to be ended.

MR. MICHELINI: Absolutely, I agree. MR. McGuCKIN: And in this case what you're talking about is, and as I think Mr. wiser just indicated and as I indicated previously, if there's something new, I would certainly agree. But anything that's already been done, you know, I don't know why we would have another round of questioning and comments about something that's already been testified to. You'll have the chance on cross-examination to say that's not what they said. You have the transcripts. You can say that's not correct. I don't see the reason to have another round of rebuttal based on stuff that's already been direct testimony, cross-examination, more direct testimony, more cross-examination --

MR. MICHELINI: So what's the point of --

Mr. McGuckin: -- then we'll have rebuttal and surrebuttal. It could go on forever. and I think that's not appropriate.

MR. MICHELINI: So what's the point of Mr. wiser providing a report? Presumably he's going to provide some kind of the expert opinion when he's analyzing that testimony. And I'm entitled to provide my experts and have them testify

1 about the analysis of that testimony in rebuttal to his report.

4 he testifies to so.
examination of Mr. Michelini's witnesses.
Mr. Michelini has had the opportunity to
3 cross-examine any witness presented by the township.
4 There's no lawyer here opposite Mr. Michelini
cross-examining his witnesses. The testimony that
has been presented and the questioning that's been
done has been done by the board and board's
professionals. And that's a little bit different.
So, I think your question relating to Mr. Wiser's
testimony, and I think that's to be decided once it
is going to be heard, how much cross examination you will permit or authorize --

MR. WINwARD: Correct. But do we wait until the end?

MR. WISER: I would only request that I be allowed to present my full report, rather than getting interrupted.

MR. MICHELINI: I have no objection to that.

MR. WINwARD: Okay. That's how we've done it. We'll stick with that procedure.

MR. MICHELINI: For keeping the hearings as cohesive and short as possible, I have no objection to waiting until his testimony is done before I cross-examine him. I will note, however,

1 that in the testimony provided by my experts, they
2 were continuously interrupted especially in the
3 first year of these hearings by Mr. wiser, sometimes 4 by Mr. McGuckin. And that the nature of the 5 questions that were asked were in the nature of 6 cross-examination. So maybe Mr. McGuckin would say
7 that my witnesses haven't been cross-examined. I
8 take exception to that. You can read the record.
9 There were lots of times when they were trying to
present the report and they were interrupted and cross-examined in the middle.

Now, I don't think that that's the
most efficient way to go. And I also don't think it
was appropriate in those circumstances for that to
occur. And certainly objected to it then and object to it now, but for the ease of making these proceedings go forward with the least amount of interruption, in terms of Mr. wiser presenting his report, I think he should present it and then I should cross-examine. I agree with everyone on that. I don't think there's a dispute on that. The issue is whether my rebuttal witnesses come afterwards.

MR. WINwARD: I say let's deal with hould -- when we should hear from the public. Do we want to do that at the very end or do we want to do that at the next meeting? And how much time are we required to advertise? I assume we should put out some kind of notice so the public does know. And is the public South Seaside Park or the entire --

Mr. McGUCKIN: This is a public -the public would be any member of the public who wants to comment. I would urge you to have township residents first. There could be people from outside of town that may wish to comment. But you certainly can first have township residents, wherever they may live. And as to notice, I think that's appropriate. been doing this for an awful long time, and there's
been a lot of issues addressed, and it would be appropriate, I think, for the board to invite public comment from any residents who wish to comment and even, you know, like I said, nonresidents may show up, for all we know.

MR. WINWARD: So then we should decide when the timing of that meeting. If it's the next meeting we can decide that now. If it's not, then we don't know how many meetings Mr. Wiser's
testimony will take, or cross-examination will take. so, then we would have to --

MR. WISER: I would just argue based on the past practice that I've been involved in,
that the last testimony, as it were, be from the general public, then -- the last outside testimony be from the general public. So that would be next meeting. Then depending on what the board decides whether I go next or Mr. Michelini's rebuttal witnesses go next. Again, based on previous practice that I've been involved in, I have been the last speaker.

MR. WINWARD: How does the board feel about -- Nick, do you have a comment?

MR. MACKRES: Go ahead, Mr. Chairman, finish asking your question.

2 question is, how's the board members feel about when 3 the timing of public notice and when we should have the public speak.

MR. MACKRES: Well, for me, I'm
requesting that when the public does speak we have
for and against the applicant alternating back and 8 forth. And then only new topics or new items coming afterwards, because it could be the same matter, the same issue for 20,30 people all one side lined up, or the other side.

MR. WINWARD: That's a good point because we have had that issue. It hasn't happened much lately in the last few years, but we have had it, like I remember like with the Little League and then there was apartments on Route Nine that got shot down. But to have -- make it clear that after a topic is brought up, then only bring up new topics after that. I think that sounds fair. Although we may give an opportunity for people to voice their -a short, maybe a short opinion, we don't want to like gag anybody or say, hey, you can't speak, but I think it is a good idea if you don't want to beat something, the same topic over and over again.

MR. MACKRES: I think that's your

1 purview. Because we've had that before Route 9
2 traffic and it's the same like six times in a row. 3 But I am requesting --

MR. WINWARD: That's how we handled 5 it the last time.

MR. MACKRES: Then it was just
7 alternating back and forth. If there's no person on
8 the other side in line, then the other side keeps on
9 going until somebody shows up. So we'll have to
delineate that.
MR. ORIS: Through the chair.
MR. WINWARD: Yes.
MR. ORIS: I agree with you it might
provide a better balance for the board, but it's
somewhat problematic to decipher who's pro, against, or neutral in what their comments might be. I would just suggest to the board, don't try and segregate it out. I mean, it's going to be people are going to have an opportunity to speak. They'll sign in and they' 11 speak. And so, how that -- the mixture and how that's presented to the board is based on when they get here and when they -- and how they want to speak. And some people may choose not to speak. They may sign up and everybody else voices are heard or they have similar thoughts that have
been stated and they may not get up to speak anyway
or some people may come up five times. You just
don't know. You won't be able to really gauge that, so to speak.

MR. WINWARD: That's a good idea.
You're saying have like a sign-in sheet and then
maybe next to their name they can put like a topic.
MR. ORIS: I wouldn't even ask for a
topic. I would just sign in and anybody that would
like to speak on the matter of de-annexation and that would be the extent of it.

MR. MACKRES: We usually ask, you
know, normally -- this is not normal -- for or against the applicant. I mean, people kind of know in a regular application.

MR. ORIS: on a regular application I doubt -- I don't mean to disagree with you, but I
think that normally the application when the public
is asked to come to the podium, it's just simply to provide comment, not to provide for or against.
1 That's what I'm trying to say. They're coming to 2 the podium to provide comment. I think it kind of borders I don't -- I don't think you want to 4 encourage them to take a position. You want to hear their comment is all.

MR. WINWARD: Okay. Brian.
MR. GINGRICH: I think -- I don't see
why we can't use the same format that we use for
everything else. And as far as the people coming to the mike, put a time limit on it. But this time mean it, whatever the time limit is and mean it, or else be here for three years getting through what people want to say.

MR. WINWARD: We have -- just for the record we have been here three years.

MR. GINGRICH: I mean three more. I
mean three more. I'm not talking about the past.
I'm talking about if we don't establish some kind of
a time, we'll be here for who knows how long. But,
I mean, everybody says, yeah, okay, we'11 do that,
but this time I'm talking about meaning it.
MR. MICHELINI: Wel1, let's -- I
don't know that we need to go through all that
tonight. You can be guided by your attorney and
have that discussion and announce. I think the
issue is when is the public going to be heard right now.

MR. WINWARD: I think that's the issue we need to decide is when they're going to be heard, not necessarily the procedure.

2 that should be heard in the same -- at the same time.

MR. GINGRICH: oh, well.
MR. WINWARD: That's kind of what
we're trying to decide, if we should have them go
next and then Joe.
MR. GINGRICH: Well, you haven't
advertised it enough for them to be next; is that correct?

MR. WINWARD: We haven't advertised at all, but --

MR. GINGRICH: Right. But don't you have to put it in the paper.

MR. WINWARD: He just addressed that.
MR. MCGUCKIN: We don't have to. I
think it's appropriate to advertise it, however.
But we have a month, I mean there's plenty --
MR. MICHELINI: He can announce it
tonight and then put a notice out.
MR. WINWARD: Would we be able to get like the local paper, I guess the Berkeley times --

MR. MCGUCKIN: Sure.

2 Is that appropriate?

9 notice saying that anyone wishing to comment on the
1 issue of de-annexation --
MR. MICHELINI: I would stay away
from articles. I think a notice would be appropriate.
MR. WINWARD: A notice. Okay.
MR. MICHELINI: As Mr. McGuckin says.
MR. WINWARD: A notice. Okay.
MR. MICHELINI: AS Mr. McGuckin says.
So is that the next meeting or some
other meeting?
MR. MCGUCKIN: Still polling the 19 board.

MR. WINWARD: I wanted to get some
opinion from each member. Domenick, how do you feet?

MR. WINWARD: -- to print that out?

MR. MCGUCKIN: The web page, all

MR. WINWARD: Maybe they can have a
question is, should it be the last meeting --
MR. WINWARD: or the next meeting.
(off the record.)
MR. WINWARD: what did you guys --
how do you feel?
MR. GINGRICH: Last.
MR. WINWARD: Last. Nick?
MR. MACKRES: I'd rather just stick with -- just what we previously do with the other -in the past with other cases, other applications.

MR. WINWARD: See, that's a different story because they're all usually resolved in that one evening at that one meeting. This has been ongoing.

MR. MCGUCKIN: Just if I could, in most planning board applications the -- I think Mr. Wiser's correct. The applicant goes, the board professionals make comments, the board asks questions, the public then is permitted to make comments, after the comments are done the board and their professionals usually have a further
discussion and make a decision. Sometimes the applicant gets another chance to say something.
But, realistically, the last decision is the board and its professionals. That's the last discussion, after everything else is done, that's the usual procedure.

MR. WINWARD: So what you're saying is your position is you think it should be the next meeting.

MR. MCGUCKIN: I think the public
should go the next meeting. I think Mr. Michelini
should then be given the opportunity to rebut and I
think then the board should hear the matter with
their professionals and make your recommendation.
MR. MACKRES: AS we normally do.
MR. GINGRICH: That sounds good.
MR. WINWARD: Next meeting. Okay.
So that's two next. Domenick last. John.
MR. BACCHIONE: I wanted to say
something else before I got to that --
MR. WINWARD: Okay.
MR. BACCHIONE: -- decision.
I want to say that I feel
Mr. Michelini did a thorough professional job presenting this application to this board. on the
note with Mr. Wiser going on and giving his summary
of this whole case, I think it's problematic,
because Mr. Wiser, with all due respect to him, is
4 not -- doesn't carry all the credentials of all the 5 people that you may bring in to rebut him, such as, 6 the accountant you brought in, the -- or the
planner, whomever he was. Mr. Wiser I believe
doesn't carry those credentials. So to be rebutted by those people, he may not -- and I don't want to put him at a disadvantage because it wouldn't be fair to his case. But as far as rebutting Mr. Wiser with your professionals, I think it's going to be a problem. You on the other hand can rebut him, Mr. Michelini. I don't have a problem with that. But I do think that it's not fair to Mr. Wiser to have professionals that he's not part of with that certificate to rebut him.

MR. WISER: For the record, I am a
licensed planner. And so --
MR. BACCHIONE: Okay. My apologies
then.
MR. WISER: That's quite all right. (Off the record.)
MR. BACCHIONE: In regard to the public speaking, I think the public should go next
and then Mr. Wiser should have the last word.
MR. MICHELINI: I understand Mr.
3 wiser is a licensed engineer and licensed planner. MR. WISER: No, just a planner, not
5 an engineer.
6
licensed planner. But my answer to that --
MR. McGUCKIN: Well, Joe, I don't --
9 the board's kind of making a decision.
MR. MICHELINI: Okay, that's fine.
If you don't want me to respond, you know, but I
have a response to Mr. Bacchione, if you want to hear it.

MR. MICHELINI: The short response is if Mr. Wiser's not an expert, then he shouldn't be commenting about those areas in the first place. That would be my response. But if he goes ahead and
comments, then he's subject to not only
cross-examination but rebuttal witnesses.

Thank you.
MR. BACCHIONE: Wait. Then I have a
response to that response. So then we should bring
back our professionals in those regards to rebut?
MR. MICHELINI: If you want to.
MR. BACCHIONE: Your professionals
rebut of Mr. Wiser. I mean, this is what
Mr. McGuckin's been trying to say. We can go on and
on, you know, for a while.
MR. MICHELINI: No, you cut it off
after surrebuttal, which is normally what's done.
MR. BACCHIONE: I mean, I guess
you're looking for the edge. And I understand why. I get it.

MR. MICHELINI: It's because I have the burden of proof, and that's the way things are by analogy set up in a court, that's exactly how they're set up in a court.

MR. BACCHIONE: I understand. But I think we've heard a lot of the testimony. I think you put it on in a professional way, as I said.

MR. MICHELINI: Thank you.
MR. BACCHIONE: And I think it's

3 the reason why South seaside Park should de annex or
4 why it's a benefit to them. Unless there's
5 something new, like Mr. McGuckin has mentioned, I
6 feel that Mr. Wiser shouldn't be rebutted, that's my 7 case.

MR. WINWARD: Okay.
MR. MICHELINI: My objection stands and I'm not going to comment anymore.

MR. WINWARD: We have all this on the record now. Fred.

MR. BELL: Next meeting.
MR. WINWARD: Fred. And then Red.
MR. CALLAHAN: Next meeting.
MR. WINWARD: Next meeting. Okay. I was kind of in favor of that myself, so looks like we'll do that. So, Kelly, to confer with management and see what -- how the best way to proceed with that is, I guess, like Greg had suggested, public notice, just to make sure, you know, that it's out there. I would suggest maybe Berkeley times. I don't know about any other periodicals.

MR. MCGUCKIN: We'11 have to think about the township official newspapers or we'11
something that we all on this board we had enough
of. I don't know what else we can listen to about
the reason why South Seaside Park should de-annex or

1 discuss where it could be done.
MR. WISER: I would also recommend,
just because of some of the testimony we heard, the
4 Berkeley Times does not get delivered over to the
5 island that whatever periodicals or newspapers or
6 newsletters, or whatever you want to call them, that
7 you do, that the folks on the island do get receipt of the notice.

MR. MICHELINI: And then thereafter, after the public, the next meeting would be whom?

MR. MCGUCKIN: Rebuttal.
MR. MICHELINI: Rebuttal witnesses.
So whatever rebuttal witnesses I have, bring them at
the next meeting.
MR. MCGUCKIN: Yeah, and we'll
know -- I assume the public will be done in one
night, but we never know.
MR. MICHELINI: I would assume so
too.
MR. McGUCKIN: It may be a half hour.
Maybe we'll be surprised and nobody shows up.
MR. MICHELINI: And then after my rebuttal witnesses, then Mr. Wiser and cross-examination?

MR. MCGUCKIN: That's correct.

MR. WISER: We're looking at a phone

MR. WINWARD: Usually we don't. We
haven't. Applications usually we bring the board
out -- no, they bring their own board, easel and
their own large --
MR. MCGUCKIN: If you want to do a
PowerPoint it's on you.
MR. WISER: I want to do what the
board wants me to do.
MR. WINWARD: The PowerPoint might be a great idea, but you'd have to have something that could be visible, not just a laptop screen.

MR. WISER: Oh, no, obviously.
MR. WINWARD: It would have to be
some sort of --
MR. WISER: Why don't we -- not we.
24 why doesn't the board think about it. we'll revisit
25 it maybe next week or next month or, you know, when

1 it's
thing would be have a copy of the report.
MR. WISER: You will all have.
MR. WINWARD: That would be nice.
And then the summary, PowerPoint and a summary kind
of go hand-in-hand and a PowerPoint's nice because
8 its visual, but, like I said, there is some
9 logistics of how to effectively present it here.
You have to have a screen and a way of projecting
it, otherwise -- unless you did print it out
PowerPoints by hand, you know, like 20 pages and
handed them out to, that's another idea. so, that's
something you have to kind of decide which is going to be --

MR. WISER: That's fine.
MR. WiNwarD: -- the most effective
way for you to present it.
MR. WISER: That's fine then.
MR. WINWARD: And you've probably
done more of this, where none of us have any
experience with this previously.
MR. WISER: Thank you.
MR. WINWARD: Anybody else have any
comments from the board?
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MR. CALLAHAN: Yeah. Mr. Wiser is
offering his opinion, right, in his report?
MR. McGUCKIN: He's -- my
understanding is he's going to give a summary of all
the witnesses, a summary of all the testimony, the
exhibits and a recommendation to the board as well.
MR. CALLAHAN: His opinion of what
happened, that's all I'm saying. Then Mr. Michelini
should have a chance to rebut a particular point or
two if he doesn't believe --
MR. MCGUCKIN: If he presents
anything new that's not already been subject of
testimony and cross-examination, something new, he
comes up in his report and brings up something
that's not been discussed yet, Mr. Michelini would
have another opportunity to present evidence on that
issue. But before that he would have a chance to
review the report, cross-examination Mr. Wiser. And
if there's nothing new in there, then he would not.
MR. CALLAHAN: The only thing that
I'm saying is who knows what's new? After three years we probably forget an awful lot.

MR. MCGUCKIN: I'm sure Mr. Michelini
will know and I know Mr. Wiser will and I'm pretty
sure I will. But, yes, I'm sure if Mr. Michelini
7 everything based on it would be fair game for
8 rebuttal witness, but the board has already ruled on
9 that.
thinks there's something new in there, he'll be glad to tell us.

MR. WINWARD: I think he would be the first to let us know.

Mr. MICHELINI: My position is if he
everything based on it would be fair game for
rebuttal witness, but the board has already ruled on that.

MR. CALLAHAN: Another thing, how
about this, as Brian suggested, five minutes on clock there, when the public comes in there.

MR. McGuckin: The concern I have on
that, to be quite frank, is we've given everybody
and any person who's testified as much time as they
want to present their points and to limit the
public, while not limiting everybody else, to me is problematic. I agree on repetition. I agree on asking them to keep it short and recommend five minutes, but if you require it, I think that's a
little bit unfair when we've had people testify for two, three, four meetings.

MR. CALLAHAN: Okay.
MR. McGuckin: And I just think it

MR. CALLAHAN: Okay.
MR. WTNWARD: we'll just handle it
like we did previously, that apartments on
Route Nine, you know, we had 42 people wanted to say
the same thing about traffic on Route Nine. I said
we get it, you know, it's not necessary to, you
know. And I think all of us were in agreement about the traffic on Route Nine, nobody likes it.

And so, we'll just have to handle
that as the time comes if there's -- like, for
example, the drive from south Seaside Park to town hall, you know, we know it is what it is and -- but I don't think we should put a time limit on how people speak or have a scrabble egg timer or whatever, because, you know, there's going to be -there could be -- I don't know what to anticipate, but there could be some passionate testimony. on
the other hand, we might be worrying about nothing.
Maybe nobody will come. But you got to give the public the opportunity.

MR. McGuckin: I have one question of Mr. Michelini to hopefully avoid a problem later.
you represent the petitioners.
MR. MICHELINI: Correct.
MR. MCGUCKIN: So, if members who are
petitioners appear to testify, I'm not so sure the board should permit that to occur, since you've represented the petitioners and presented your case and I don't want to have a problem that night. So I don't know your thoughts on that. We can talk about it later.

MR. MICHELINI: We'11 talk about
that. I think we can probably work that out.
MR. MCGUCKIN: All right.
MR. BELL: Through the chair. My
question is for Mr. Wiser. Then your report is more of a review versus an opinion?

MR. WISER: I think it's probably
both. What I'm going to attempt to do is to present the issues that were testified to over the course of this time. And then provide my opinion thoughts on the matter.

MR. BELL: Thank you.
MR. WINWARD: Anybody else have any questions, comments, observations?

MR. BELL: will it be done by
Christmas?
MR. WINWARD: Be a nice Christmas
present. You didn't say christmas of what year
though. I remember making that joke back in 2015.
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MR. CALLAHAN: It's not that
farfetched.
MR. WINWARD: SO --
MR. MCGUCKIN: I think that's it.
MR. WINWARD: -- have we discussed
all the matters? so in that case. Do we need to do any public opinion tonight?

MR. MCGUCKIN: You don't, but -- I
wouldn't take any testimony on this issue, on the board, on this application, but if you want to open to the public for anything else.

MR. WINWARD: Is anybody here for anything else other than South Seaside Park? Seeing there is none --

MR. MACKRES: Mr. Chairman, I have a question on the advertisement and the notice. I'm sorry. The applicant -- we advertise and we bill
the applicant as we normally would? Because we said a lot of we's.

MR. MCGUCKIN: No, we do not. This is not an application where there is an escrow posted. The township pays the freight on the township side. The applicant pays their attorney and that's it. So any discussion of where we're advertising, so forth, is on Berkeley Township. And

1 actually -- but I think it's appropriate for the 2 board to spend that money to advise the public that 3 this is their chance after all these hearings.
.


.
23 5

MR. MICHELINI: See you next month.
MR. WINWARD: Yes. Seeing there is
MR. CALLAHAN: I so move.
MR. WINwARD: okay. All in favor of adjournment. ALL: Aye.
(Whereupon, the meeting was
adjourned.)
MR. MICHELINI: All right. Thank
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over [5] 13/9 20/24 20/24 32/4 39/15
own [3] 5/16 34/11 34/12
P
p.m [1] 1/8
page [1] 25/3
pages [3] 5/14 13/11 35/12
paper [2] 24/16 24/24
PARK [7] $1 / 3$ 3/2 $3 / 8$ 18/15 31/3 38/11 40/13
part [2] 4/6 28/16
particular [1] 36/9
parties [1] 10/2
passionate [1] 38/17
past [4] 15/17 19/13 23/12 26/14
pays [2] 40/22 40/23
people [14] 18/20 20/10 20/20 21/18
21/23 22/2 22/14 23/4 23/8 28/5 28/9
37/21 38/4 38/14
perhaps [1] 9/5
periodicals [2] 31/23 32/5
permit [2] 16/12 39/2
permitted [1] 26/23
person [2] 21/7 37/15
petition [3] 1/4 3/3 3/8
petitioners [4] $2 / 838 / 23$ 39/1 39/3
phone [3] 33/11 33/12 33/13
Pinewald [1] 1/6
place [4] 3/14 5/2 29/24 42/9
plaintiff [1] 4/21
planner [8] 2/13 2/13 5/11 28/7 28/19
29/3 29/4 29/7
planner's [1] 18/5
planning [5] 1/1 11/14 11/22 18/5
26/20
plenty [1] 24/20
podium [2] 22/19 22/22
point [8] 3/25 4/6 7/10 13/24 14/16
14/21 20/12 36/9
points [2] 11/11 37/16
polling [1] 25/18
position [11] 4/8 4/9 4/11 5/3 5/3 8/8
11/2 11/6 22/24 27/8 37/5
positions [1] 6/2
possible [3] 5/7 9/21 16/23
possibly [2] 5/9 13/19
posted [1] 40/22
PowerPoint [5] 33/19 34/2 34/14 34/17 35/6
PowerPoint's [1] 35/7
PowerPoints [1] 35/12
practice [2] 19/13 19/20
prejudicial [1] 11/1
prepare [1] 12/21
preparing [3] 3/25 6/16 13/9
present [18] 2/11 4/1 6/2 6/7 6/13 6/22
6/23 10/19 13/20 16/16 17/10 17/19
35/9 35/18 36/16 37/16 39/14 39/24
presentation [3] 33/18 33/19 33/22 presented [8] 3/21 3/21 11/25 12/3
16/3 16/6 21/21 39/3
presenting [2] 17/18 27/25
presents [2] 10/8 36/11
Presumably [1] 14/22
pretty [1] 36/24
previous [1] 19/19
previously [6] 4/1 6/11 14/4 26/13
35/22 38/3
print [2] 25/1 35/11
pro [1] 21/15
probably [7] 7/17 7/21 33/10 35/20 36/22 39/8 39/13
problem [4] 28/13 28/14 38/22 39/4
problematic [3] 21/15 28/2 37/18
procedure [12] 3/12 3/13 3/19 4/23
4/25 6/20 7/8 15/22 16/21 18/3 23/25 27/6
proceed [4] 3/4 3/23 5/18 31/19
proceeding [1] 8/16
proceedings [2] 17/17 42/7
process [1] 3/24
professional [2] 27/24 30/23
professionals [11] 11/24 12/4 16/8
26/22 26/25 27/4 27/14 28/12 28/16
30/6 30/8
projecting [1] 35/10
proof [3] 4/14 11/4 30/18
proofs [1] 11/11
provide [12] 5/8 7/9 7/11 12/21 13/13 14/23 14/25 21/14 22/20 22/20 22/22 39/16
provided [2] 15/25 17/1
provides [2] 5/13 7/1
providing [3] 7/24 14/22 33/21
public [38] 5/25 6/1 7/9 7/15 7/17 7/20 9/8 18/9 18/10 18/14 18/15 18/17 18/18 18/18 19/2 19/15 19/16 20/3 20/4 20/6 22/18 23/21 26/23 27/10 28/25 28/25 31/20 32/10 32/16 33/3 37/12 37/17 38/20 40/7 40/11 41/2 42/5 42/13
purposes [1] 6/15
purview [1] 21/1
put [11] $4 / 104 / 1111 / 218 / 1322 / 7$ 23/5 24/16 24/22 28/10 30/23 38/13
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## Q

question [10] 12/8 15/16 16/9 19/25 20/2 25/24 33/15 38/21 39/11 40/16
questioning [2] 14/7 16/6
questions [3] 17/5 26/23 39/20
quite [4] 6/21 8/11 28/22 37/14

| Q |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| quote [1] 6/ |  |  |
| R |  |  |
|  | review [3] 10/17 36/18 39/12 <br> revisit [1] 34/24 <br> Richard [1] 1/13 <br> right [8] 15/11 23/21 24/15 2 <br> 37/25 39/9 41/4 <br> River [1] 2/4 <br> Road [2] 1/6 2/3 <br> Robert [1] 1/11 <br> room [1] 34/8 <br> round [2] 14/7 14/13 <br> Route [5] 20/16 21/1 38/4 38 <br> Route Nine [3] 20/16 38/4 38 <br> row [1] 21/2 <br> rule [2] $6 / 209 / 25$ <br> ruled [1] 37/8 <br> ruling [1] $9 / 3$ | 25/16 25/20 32/3 34/4 34/22 35/8 38/17 <br> somebody [1] 21/9 <br> something [20] 7/1 7/2 10/11 10/12 <br> 10/15 10/19 13/6 14/5 14/8 20/24 27/2 <br> 27/20 31/1 31/5 33/16 34/18 35/14 <br> 36/13 36/14 37/1 <br> something's [1] 10/19 <br> sometimes [2] 17/3 27/1 <br> somewhat [1] 21/15 <br> sorry [1] 40/17 <br> sort [1] 34/22 <br> sounds [3] 20/19 27/16 34/3 <br> SOUTH [8] 1/3 1/24 $3 / 23 / 8$ 18/15 31/3 <br> 38/11 40/13 <br> South Seaside [4] 3/8 18/15 31/3 |
|  | S |  |
|  | said [12] 6/11 10/10 10/23 12/11 13/3 14/10 19/4 29/18 30/23 35/8 38/5 40/18 | speaker [1] 1 |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { same [12] } \\ 20 / 2421 / 2 \end{gathered}$ |  |
|  | say [15] 4 |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & 20 / 22 \text { 22/21 } 23 / 8 \\ & 30 / 1033 / 2338 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | spend [1] $41 / 2$ |
|  | saying [6] 22/6 24/1 25/ | 1] |
|  |  | state [3] 25/6 42 |
|  |  | stated [2] 8/24 2 |
|  | screen [4] 34/5 34/6 34/19 35/10 scrivener [1] 8/10 | statement [1] 1 statute [1] 4/20 |
|  | scrivener [1] 8/10 <br> SEASIDE [7] 1/3 3/2 $3 / 8$ 18/15 31/3 | statute [1] 4/20 statutory [1] 6/20 |
|  | SEASIDE [7] 1/3 3/2 3/8 18/15 31/3 $38 / 1140 / 13$ | [1 |
|  |  | nograph |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | segregate [1] 21/1 <br> set [3] 30/19 30/20 | Stuart [1] 2/13 stuff [1] 14/13 |
|  | shattering [1] 33/8 | subdivision [1] |
|  |  | bject [4] 4 |
|  | short [7] 9 | [2] |
|  | 2 | est [2] |
|  |  | suggested [2] |
|  | should [33] 7 | SULLIVAN [2] 1/23 |
|  | $\begin{array}{lll} 8 / 24 & 11 / 5 & 12 / 18 \\ 17 / 12 & 13 / 14 & 15 \\ 17 / 19 & 17 / 20 & 18 / 10 \\ 18 / 10 & 18 / 13 \end{array}$ | SULLIVAN-HILL [2] 1/23 42/4 <br> summary [7] 28/1 33/21 34/4 35/6 35/6 |
|  | $\text { 20/3 24/2 } 2$ | $36 / 436 / 5$ |
|  | 27/12 27/13 28/25 29/1 30/5 31/3 36/9 $38 / 13$ 39/2 | ly [1] 33/25 |
|  | shouldn't [2] 29/23 31/6 | sure [7] 9/16 24/25 31/21 36/23 36/25 36/25 39/1 |
|  | show [1] 19/4 shows [2] 21/9 32/21 | SURMAN [1] $2 / 6$ surprise [1] $9 / 13$ |
|  | side [5] 20/10 20/11 21/8 21/8 <br> sides [1] 6/23 <br> sign [4] 21/19 21/24 22/6 22/9 | rised [1] 32/21 <br> ebuttal [3] 13/23 14/19 30/13 |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { similar [1] } 21 / 25 \\ & \text { simply [4] } 8 / 108 / 1011 / 1322 / 19 \\ & \text { since [1] } 39 / 2 \\ & \text { sit [1] 33/20 } \\ & \text { situation [1] } 4 / 19 \end{aligned}$ | take [6] $5 / 15$ 17/8 19/10 19/10 22/24 $40 / 9$ taken [1] $42 / 8$ talk [3] $9 / 7 \quad 39 / 5 \quad 39 / 7$ talking [4] $14 / 3 \quad 23 / 12 \quad 23 / 13 \quad 23 / 16$ |


| T | 40 | 41/14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { tell [2] 10/16 37/2 } \\ & \text { terms [2] } 17 / 1833 / 17 \\ & \text { testified [6] } 5 / 47 / 3 \quad 10 / 12 \quad 14 / 9 \quad 37 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { too [2] 15/17 32/19 } \\ & \text { topic [4] 20/18 20/24 22/7 22/9 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { way [7] 5/18 17/13 30/18 30/23 31/1 } \\ & 35 / 1035 / 18 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | topics [2] 20/8 20/18 | we [97] |
|  | town [2] 18/21 38/1 | we'll [16] 13/1 14/18 16/21 21/9 23/1 |
| testifies [1] 15 | township [13] 1/1 3/20 | 23/15 29/19 31/18 31/24 31/25 32/15 |
| testify [3] 14/25 37/21 39/1 <br> testifying [1] 18/2 <br> testimony [31] 6/3 6/13 6/23 6/24 7/11 | 15/25 16/3 18/4 18/19 18/22 31/25 | 32/21 34/ |
|  |  |  |
|  | transcript [2] 8/12 42/7 | We's [1] 40/19 |
| 8/18 9/18 10/7 11/3 12/14 12/22 13/13 | $\text { transcripts [1] } 14 / 11$ | we've [9] 9/16 15 |
| 14/14 14/15 14/24 15/1 15/8 16/5 16/10 | $\text { tried [1] } 3 / 12$ | 21/1 30/22 37/14 37/21 |
| 30/22 32/3 36/5 36/13 38/17 40/9 | true [1] | web [1] |
| than [2] 16/16 40/13 | try [1] 21/1 | week [1] 3 |
| Thank [7] 30/3 30/24 33/1 35/23 39/18 41/4 41/6 |  |  |
|  | two [3] 27/18 36/10 37/2 | 18/4 20/5 23/17 24/6 24/10 29/8 29/1 |
| that [168] | type [2] 8/16 3 | 36/6 |
| that's [59] |  |  |
| their [15] 11/25 12/3 12/4 18/1 20/20 21/16 22/7 22/25 26/25 27/14 34/11 34/12 37/16 40/23 41/3 | $\begin{gathered} \text { typica } \\ 34 / 8 \end{gathered}$ | what [26] 5/5 8/2 8/3 12/4 12/13 14/2 |
|  | U |  |
| $\begin{array}{\|lllllllllll} \text { them [10] } & 4 / 6 & 14 / 25 & 22 / 24 & 24 / 8 & 24 / 11 \\ 31 / 4 & 32 / 6 & 32 / 13 & 35 / 13 & 37 / 19 \end{array}$ |  | 4/15 36/7 38/ |
| themselves [1] 8/12 | u | at's [5] 5/3 14/16 |
| then [59] | under [1] 4/20 understand [10] | whatever [6] 3/15 23/6 32/5 32/6 32/13 38/15 |
| $\left\|\begin{array}{\|cccc\|} \text { there } & {\left[\begin{array}{llll} 22 \end{array}\right.} & 4 / 17 & 6 / 19 \\ 12 / 1 & 9 / 22 & 10 / 1 & 10 / 4 \\ 17 / 9 & 18 / 20 & 20 / 16 & 31 / 22 \\ 33 / 7 & 33 / 20 \end{array}\right\|$ | 5/24 9/2 15/14 29 | whatsoev |
|  | understanding [2] 33/6 36 | when [18] 12/8 13/10 14/24 17/9 1 |
| 35/8 36/19 37/1 $37 / 12$ 37/12 38/16 38/17 40/14 40/21 41/8 | unfair [1] 37/ | 18/10 19/7 20/2 20/3 20/6 21/22 21/21 |
| there'll [1] 10/5 | unless [3] 12/1 | 22/18 23/21 23/24 34/25 37/12 37/2 |
| there's [17] 4/18 5/23 11/25 13/3 13/24 | until [4] 13/ | where [13] 3/20 4/16 4/17 4/19 4/2 |
|  | up [16] 3/1 8/18 19/5 20/10 20/18 | 5/22 9/7 12/13 13/24 32/1 35/21 40/21 |
| 14/5 16/4 17/21 18/24 18/25 21/7 24/20 31/4 36/19 37/1 38/10 38/15 | 20/18 21/9 21/24 22/1 22/2 29/14 | 40/ |
| thereafter [1] 32/9 | 30/20 32/21 36/14 3 | Whereupon [1] |
| therefore [2] 3/14 15/12 |  | wherever [1] |
|  |  | whether [6] 6/6 7/23 9 |
| they [23] 4/21 4/22 5/7 6/3 6/12 12/2 <br> 13/14 14/10 17/1 17/9 17/10 18/2 18/22 | $\text { use [2] } 23 / 3 \text { 23/3 }$ | which [7] 5/13 5/17 10/16 18/3 18/3 |
| 13/14 14/10 17/1 17/9 17/10 18/2 18/22 | usual [1] 27/5 | $30 / 1335 / 14$ |
| 21/22 21/22 21/22 21/24 21/25 22/1 | usually [5] 22/12 26/16 26/25 34 | while [3] 11/11 30/11 |
| they'll [2] 21/19 21/20 |  | who [10] 3/24 |
| they're [4] 22/21 23/24 26/16 30/20 | V |  |
| thing [12] 6/4 6/5 7/7 7/8 9/5 10/23 12/5 13/3 35/3 36/20 37/10 38/5 | va | whole [2] 28/2 33/2 |
| things [3] 8/1 | v | whom [1] 32/10 |
|  | versus [1] 39 | whomever [1] 28 |
|  | very [3] 4/16 18/11 | whose [1] 11/12 |
| thinks [2] | view [1] | why [8] 5/10 14/7 23/3 30/15 31/3 31/4 |
| thorough [1] 27/24 |  | 34/23 34/2 |
| those [9] 4/4 4/12 9/14 12/16 17/14 |  | 15 |
| 28/8 28/9 29/24 30/6 | voice [1] | 5/4 15/22 16/12 16/25 19/10 19/10 |
| though [2] 4/14 39/25 |  | 25/8 26/5 32/16 33/23 35/4 36/24 36/24 |
| thoughts [3] 21/25 39/5 39/16 thousands [1] 13/8 | $\text { votes [1] } 12 / 6$ | Winward [2] 1/11 7 |
|  | W | Wiser [35] 2/13 |
| three [6] 23/7 23/10 23/11 23/12 36/21 37/22 | wait [2] | $13 / 7 \text { 14/3 }$ |
| through [4] 21/11 23/7 23/18 39/10 | waiting [1] 16 | 28/3 28/7 28/11 28 |
| Thursday [1] 1/7 | want [25] 4/11 9/3 13/2 18/11 18/11 | $31 / 632 / 2333 / 436 / 136 / 1836 / 2439 / 11$ |
| time [16] 12/16 13/20 18/12 18/25 21/5 | 20/21 20/23 21/23 22/23 22/24 23/8 | Wiser's [9] 4/12 6/21 6/25 12/22 16/9 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 23 / 5 \quad 23 / 5 \quad 23 / 6 \quad 23 / 14 \quad 23 / 16 \quad 24 / 3 \quad 37 / 15 \\ & 38 / 1038 / 1339 / 1642 / 8 \end{aligned}$ | 27/23 28/9 29/11 29/12 29/20 30/7 32/6 | 18/3 19/9 26/21 29/23 |
|  | 33/18 33/22 34/13 34/15 37/16 | wish [5] 6/3 6/12 18/21 19/3 33/19 |
| timer [1] 38/14 | $40$ | wishing [1] 25/9 |
| times [8] 5/5 5/6 17/9 21/2 22/2 24/24 31/22 32/4 | wanted [4] 5/24 | witness [3] 10/6 16/3 37/8 |
| timing [3] 13/1 19/7 20/3 <br> together [1] 8/19 <br> tonight [6] 3/10 3/18 23/19 24/22 33/17 | was [12] $3 / 105 / 66 / 1412 / 1415 / 8$ 17/14 17/25 20/16 21/6 28/7 31/17 | 4/10 4/12 4/17 6/8 9/8 9/9 9/16 12/14 <br> 12/16 12/21 16/1 16/5 17/7 17/22 19/19 |

w
witnesses... [5] 30/2 32/12 32/13
32/23 36/5
won't [1] 22/3
word [5] 4/22 4/22 8/24 29/1 33/24
work [1] 39/8
worrying [1] 38/18
would [60]
wouldn't [6] 5/10 8/22 22/8 28/10
33/20 40/9
write [1] $8 / 12$
writing [1] $8 / 10$
$\mathbf{Y}$
yeah [3] 23/15 32/15 36/1
year [2] 17/3 39/24
years [5] 13/9 20/14 23/7 23/10 36/22
yes [5] 10/20 15/15 21/12 36/25 41/8
yet [3] 7/2 10/12 36/15
you [82]
you'd [2] 34/4 34/18
You'll [1] 14/9
you're[5] 14/3 22/6 27/7 30/15 33/24
you've [2] 35/20 39/2
your [18] 3/11 5/11 10/3 12/8 15/19
16/9 17/25 19/25 20/25 23/19 27/8
27/14 28/12 30/8 33/10 39/3 39/5 39/11

