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1
2 something very special on the agenda tonight. The
3 South Seaside Park Homeowners and Voters Association
4 De-annexation Petition Hearing. We have an
5 exclusive. So, you may proceed.
6 STANLEY SLACHETKA, previously sworn.
7
evening, everybody.
9 Stan Slachetka from T\&M Associates.
10 and I believe I was previously sworn, so I assume
11 that I continue to be sworn. So, I'm going to
12 continue with the presentation that I started at the
13 last meeting. And as I indicated at the last
14 meeting, this, my testimony, essentially, is
15 covering the points that were made and presented in
16 the planning report that was prepared by our office.
17 It's the Planning Report in the Matter of the
18 Petitioned De-annexation of South Seaside Park. And
19 it's dated July 3rd, 2017.
20
21 through the report. And I'm not going to go back in
and reiterate or summarize any of the previous
testimony, although if the, certainly, if the board
has any questions with regards to that or needs to
25 refresh its memory on certain things, I obviously

1 would be willing to go back.

3 the last time, the report is divided into several
4 parts and in, essentially, four sections. And those
5 four sections included municipal and community
6 overview, the planning efforts in Berkeley,
7 especially with regards to the recent history of
8 planning efforts, and then resiliency planning.
9 Both are components of the planning efforts in
Berkeley Township. And then the statutory criteria
that we need to analyze and address as part of the
evaluation with the proposed de-annexation petition.
and a conclusion and summary of the testimony.
And I got through the first section and then about halfway through the second section, planning efforts in Berkeley, talking about all the various recent planning efforts. And then I think we left off with me just about to start the discussion on, specifically, resiliency planning, which is part of the township's recent efforts. And that starts on the bottom of page 26 of the report in front of you.

So, I would put the water here but 23 24 it's tilted. And I do not trust myself with it, so 25 I apologize for reaching over and grabbing the water

## from time to time.

So, I guess I don't really have to
remind too many people here on the board with
regards to the impact of Superstorm Sandy in 2012.
But suffice it to say, there were fairly significant
impacts to the borough and its neighborhoods. And
as a result of those impacts, and not only the
impacts in Berkeley Township, but the impacts to
9 municipalities throughout the state, both beachfront
10 and shorefront communities and bayshore communities
1 in New Jersey, a significant amount of federal aid
and assistance has come into the state over the last
several years. Part of that aid and assistance that has come into the state included monies that were made available from the Community Development Block Grant Program of the federal government. And as part of that, monies, a certain amount of monies, several million dollars, were set aside for specifically planning activities to help communities plan for and to potentially in the future mitigate the impacts of similar storm events like Superstorm Sandy, God forbid anything much more significant than that.

So, that money was made available to communities through a pass through program that was
administered by and continues to be administered by
the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, their local planning services unit. And that program is the Post Sandy Planning Assistance Grant Program. And the township, because of the, you know, fairly significant or extensive impacts of Superstorm Sandy within the township and the specific losses that occurred and property damage that occurred within the township because of the Superstorm Sandy, the township was eligible to qualify for the grant monies that were provided under the Post Sandy Planning Assistance Grant Project. And as a result of that, received nearly a half million dollars. Excuse me. Nearly half a million dollars, 500,000 . I think it was about 500,000 , that -- of grant monies for a variety of different projects throughout the township.

And this money sort of came in in two
waves. The first big wave of -- and no pun intended -- of monies that came into the township, funded a series of different projects that helped inform the township and also help advance a number of planning initiatives within the community. And, as I mentioned before, one of the things to consider, and we'll talk about this thematically

1 through the rest of the testimony on the planning efforts, is that planning occurs on a continuum.

As we talked about the last time, there's been a series of master plans, specific plans addressing specific neighborhoods, redevelopment plans. Planning initiatives like the State Plan Endorsement that the township received from the State Planning Commission. And various related planning activities that have occurred over the course of the last decade or so within the township. One building upon the other in terms of addressing important community needs in a very, very comprehensive manner.

So, the monies that were specifically earmarked for these Post Sandy Planning Assist Grant Programs helped to supplement and further enhance that planning activities and function here in the township. But specifically as it related to issues of resiliency and recovery, which is -- was really the specific intent of those monies. And, ultimately, those grant monies were intended to, overall, as distributed throughout the state and specifically to Berkeley Township, was ultimately to provide opportunities for municipalities to, essentially, reduce losses in the future and to

1 mitigate against those potential losses as those 2 future storm events would occur.

So, the first component of the 4 township's comprehensive storm resiliency planning
5 efforts that were funded under the post Sandy
6 Planning Assistance Grant Program included a
7 strategic recovery planning report which was a
8 predicate to the township -- I'm popping my P's
9 again, I apologize -- which were a predicate to us
getting other grant monies, essentially, providing a
general overview of the impacts of Superstorm Sandy
and recommending a series of initiatives that the
township had recognized or identified as important
strategies to mitigate against future losses. And
so, essentially, that strategic planning report set
the groundwork, set the framework for our future post Sandy planning work.

And then as part of that, because the township obtained a grant to do the SRPR, the Strategic Recovery Planning Report, we were able to receive additional grant monies for master plan reexamination and master plan amendments, which I'll be talking about a little bit more comprehensively in a moment. An update to the Township's Floodplain Management Plan and Ordinance, automating and

Having undertaken those and being in 6 the process of undertaking those, there's a variety of different recommendations that came out of those plans, specifically the master plan, which, as I said, I'll get into in a moment. But because of the effort that the township undertook and its resources and ability, technical resources and staff ability and recognized successes in the Post Sandy Planning Assistance Grant Program, the township was able to obtain additional grant monies from the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs under the Post Sandy

Planning Assistance Grant Program. And that specifically funded a Neighborhood Plan for South Seaside Park and a Coastal Neighborhood Resiliency Plan, as well as ordinance -- ordinances implementing recommendations in the master plan, including the neighborhood plans that I just mentioned; a recertification of the Community Ratings System, the CRS that we talked about at the last meeting, and we'11 be talking a little bit more in detail in just a moment. And a Floodplain Management Capital Improvement Plan and Ordinance Development, which basically further implemented the Floodplain Management Plan recommendations. And as I mentioned, all, collectively, all these grants, essentially, took up to just about a half a million dollars worth of grant monies and provided the township with substantial planning resources and opportunities to do planning. And particularly planning for those portions of the township which were most seriously impacted by Superstorm Sandy, which included the South Seaside Park neighborhood.

And, again, the foundation of the planning work that was taking place before this was really the kind of opportunity that allowed us to

1 build upon that and use those grant monies
effectively to support and to provide opportunities
3 for improving the resiliency and improving and
4 making more efficient recovery for the residents of
all -- the citizens within Berkeley Township,
6 including, again, those neighborhoods that were
specifically impacted, those coastal neighborhoods, and the South Seaside Park neighborhood.
so, I just wanted, before getting
into some of the other details of the -- and I want to take some time to talk about the neighborhood plan in South seaside Park. But, essentially, as I mentioned previously, that the SRPR, which, by the way, was completed in 2014. Superstorm Sandy took place in 2012, late fall 2012, fall of 2012. And the Post Sandy Planning Assistance Grant Program got its -- got up and running in 2013 and we were able to get that grant money, complete our SRPR in 2014. And then undertake, as I mentioned, a variety of other planning projects in 2015, including the
Master Plan Reexamination Report. And I just -- and that's described in a little bit detail on page 28 of the report. But I just want to quote a specific section of that report and underline the importance of the Master Plan Reexamination Report and how it
continued to build on some of the other
2 recommendations that we're making, so. And, again, 3 quoting specifically from the report right under the 4 heading, 2015 Master Plan Reexamination Report and 5 Plan Element Amendments. Despite the 6 vulnerabilities exposed by Sandy, a reexamination of 7 Berkeley's existing planning framework in 2015 8 concluded that the township had the foundation 9 necessary to support its resiliency and recovery 0 objectives. Rather than a dramatic overhaul of the township's planning policies, the 2015 Reexamination Report recommended changes in the township's existing plans that would synthesize and coordinate its planning policies in support of resiliency and storm recovery.
and one of those recommendations that came out of the Master Plan Reexamination Report, was additional funding or efforts to improve the CRS rating, and specifically plans and approaches to address those in a planning manner, land use planning manner. The neighborhoods like South Seaside Park and other, the other coastal neighborhoods that, in fact, were the most significantly impacted. And really realizing that importance and realizing of getting down and taking

1 the more generalized recommendations expressed in
2 the 2015 Master Plan and the other planning
3 documents that have actually preceded the master
4 plan. The idea was, we had an opportunity, because
5 of the work we had done in the Post Sandy Planning
6 Assistance Grant Program, and our capacity to handle
7 additional grants that DCA recognized. We were able
8 to secure those monies to go and get monies to
actually conduct the more detailed planning efforts
that were actually recommended in the prior Master
Plan Reexamination Report to address the context sensitive analysis of the South Seaside Park neighborhood and also to address the other coastal neighborhoods as well.

So, I want to go into a bit of detail
with regards to, specifically, the south Seaside Park Neighborhood Plan, which was part of that resiliency effort. And I know that the board and the board members here, most of the board members, have spent a pretty significant amount of time and effort over the past number of months reviewing the South Seaside Park Neighborhood Plan and hearing public input on that plan and taking the effort that was necessary for the planning board to adopt that plan as part of the township's master plan. And why

1 that is significant, why that's important, is 2 because adopting it as part of the master plan, it 3 establishes the land use plan recommendations that 4 are embodied in the South Seaside Park Neighborhood 5 Plan, can then be implemented through zoning 6 ordinance changes. And, as I mentioned, the zoning 7 ordinance changes that are being worked on concurrently are, in fact, also being funded by that Post Sandy Planning Assistance Grant Program. So, I know that you've spent a lot of time and effort and probably a lot of the board members are familiar with it, but I think it's important to go through this, again. Maybe not in 100 percent detail but highlighting some of the key recommendations. And also, I think probably more importantly, highlighting the process that was undertaken to ensure that community involvement was provided and that the community and the public had significant opportunities to provide input into that plan. And, ultimately, resulting in fairly important changes that were identified by the community and, essentially, meets the community's needs, while at the same time, still ensuring that the overall goals and objectives of that plan in terms of community resiliency and recovery were in
community's input, but, at the same time, ensuring
that these plans -- and, as we talked about a lot at
the last meeting, these plans were developed in a
manner that recognized the comprehensive planning
efforts and goals and objectives of the township and
recognizing this planning board's responsibilities
and efforts to ensure that all Berkeley Township
neighborhoods are addressed in one shape or manner
with regards to your comprehensive planning efforts.
So, again, the 2015 Reexamination
Report recognized the need for additional study of
the land use plan in South Seaside Park. And
specifically focusing on what it categorizes as a
context sensitive residential and commercial
standards that also would provide for that
resilience, storm resilience that I mentioned.
As I said, there was a fairly
extensive public outreach effort that was involved
with the development of the plan. The first of
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So, one of the key things that the required and did do in this case and in all the cases, is, be very attentive to those details. And every one of the plans had to get approval from DCA that we did, in fact, follow the scope of services that were provided in the grants, grant agreement between the township and the department. So, we did the -- had fairly extensive research on impacts, land uses, zoning characteristics, land use
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1 characteristics in the South Seaside Park
2 neighborhood. And we presented some preliminary
3 findings to the planning board at the end of 2016,
4 in December of 2016, in anticipation, in advance of
5 two scheduled community meetings that were required
6 pursuant to the scope of services.
The first community meeting took
8 place on December 15, 2016 at the Tri-Boro First Aid
9 Building. And that meeting was advertised, publicly
which we began the plan -- we, being T\&M Associates working on behalf of the Township -- did the research.

I want to, by the way, note that all
these plans that I mentioned in terms of storm resiliency and recovery under the Post Sandy
Planning Assistance Grant Program, also have an additional review by the New Jersey Department of Community Affairs to ensure that the plans are being undertaken or the ultimate deliverables or the products, which are the plans and the ordinances, et cetera, are being done in a manner consistent with the scopes of work that have been submitted to the Department of Community Affairs with DCA as part of the application. planners and T\&M as the township planners are
 advertised. And there was public attendance at that meeting from the Seaside Park neighborhood. There were a variety of different working groups and activities that took place during that session that were designed to get community input on a variety of different planning issues. Many of those being related to, obviously, the need to address land use planning considerations and zoning in the area. And, obviously, all that's undergirding this, this process, is the storm resiliency and recovery issues that were required to be addressed pursuant to the DCA grant. So, we had the first community meeting in December of 2016.

Then there was a second meeting in January 12 -- on January 12 of 2017. And the participants in that -- that was also advertised.

And the participants in that meeting, the first meeting in December, were e-mailed the notification of the second follow-up meeting where we tested and affirmed some of the comments that took place in the first meeting.

On March 2, the Neighborhood Plan, as well as the Coastal Neighborhood Plan, which is the other planning document that I mentioned previously, were reviewed by the planning board. And the planning board approved that plan but conditioned on the need for greater protection to single family residential development in the plan. That there was a feeling that the plan needed to speak more directly to the protections for single family residential development.

And by the way, this is sort of -- this
process for the Neighborhood Plan is sort of a microcosm of the kind of broader theme that I've been talking to you about at the last meeting, and we'11 be talking more about this meeting, is that these plans and processes are evolutionary and ongoing. It's not like we just do one thing as planners and then we just end it and then we move on. There will be always new challenges and improvements and amendments. And as public input

1 takes place, there's going to be further revisions 2 and changes to any plans. So, these plans and the 3 planning process is ongoing and continues to be 4 ongoing and will be ongoing in the future, just as 5 the nature of the planning process and goals and objectives and policies change based on the new 7 challenges that they're faced. But at the same time, these issues and these concerns have been continually recognized as part of your planning 10 process and what you do as the planning board here. and, specifically, these issues that we discussed in the neighborhood in Seaside Park are, in their foundation, the germination of these recommendations come from the more general recommendations in the reexamination report on a need for the community to address concerns in South Seaside Park. So, again, in March of 2017, you considered the plan, adopted it, but with conditions, approved it with conditions. And then on March 27, there was a presentation to the governing body about the results of the plan. And both -- and we were there as the township planner. And there was a fairly substantial amount of public questions and additional public comment at that meeting with regards to the plan. And we talked about some of

1 somebody's -- somebody's house was damaged or 2 somebody's business was damaged and they needed to 3 rebuild, how could we do this in a much more 4 effective and efficient way. So, that was something 5 that we were trying to kind of balance out with 6 other concerns within the neighborhood. But also giving -- this gave us an opportunity and it gave us 8 the grant money to go even beyond that and address these things. So, it was a pretty comprehensive, you know, effort.
so, after the input that we got from the public, the township recognized that there was a need for further public input on this process. That they felt that there was -- it was critical that the community had further input into the crafting of this plan, given the importance of the plan to the community and to the township as a whole.
so, there was an additional public meeting in April 18, again, at the Tri-Boro. And people were, the residents were specifically notified by mail of that meeting. And my understanding is, it was fairly well-attended. And further public input was taken. And there were further revisions that were made to the plan.
the ways in which we were proposing to take the condition that was established by you as the planning board to address single family and look at ways and mechanisms to do that from a land use planning policy and a zoning perspective. And we talked about making certain uses conditional uses that were permitted in the area and providing specific conditions to ensure that there would be appropriate standards, design standards, that would be put in place to provide for protections to adjoining single family residential development.

Understanding that, at that time, one of our concerns was because the idea here was to build community resiliency and to provide pathways, more sufficient pathways for property owners that would be or potentially would be impacted by future storms to be able to rebuild. That was always a kind of fundamental concept and concern that was being always brought to the board's attention and to the council's attention in terms of the township's zonings and land -- zoning ordinances and land use recommendations.

I mentioned the permit automation process. streamline the permitting process to make it,

Then there was a second public hearing at the
planning board on June 1st of '17. It's hard to believe it's been, you know, a couple of months, but it's -- in fact, it took place just recently. And, again, there was individual notification to the public well advance. And because this is part of the master plan, there is a all -- initially, both for the March hearing and for the June hearing, the follow-up hearing, there was the required public
notice pursuant to the requirements of the Municipal
Land Use Law.
And as a result of fairly substantial input at that meeting, the planning board affirmatively changed the recommendations, the zoning recommendations in the plan, and adopted the neighborhood plan as part of the master plan. Where the two to four, permitted two to four-family residential development was eliminated as a land use, permitted land use within the land use plan of the plan. And the townhome district was also eliminated. There were other recommendations that were put in place as part of the plan.

So, on July 6 , at your last meeting, you
adopted a resolution that, essentially, formally
adopted that plan with the amendments and the revisions thereto.

I should point out that of the two plans, of the South Seaside Park Neighborhood Plan and of the plan that was, the coastal Neighborhood Plan, which was the other plan that was funded as part of the second wave of the Post Sandy Planning Assistance Grants, because of the complexities and the different issues that the south Seaside Park Neighborhood Plan needed to address, that there was significantly, significantly much more public involvement and opportunities for public input in that plan. And actually going well beyond, the township actually invested its own funds to go well beyond the scope, the required meetings and the scope of work under the New Jersey Department of Community affairs grant.

That's not to say that the Coastal Resiliency Plan or the Coastal Neighborhood Plan, gave short drift to those neighborhoods. AS I said, the issues were more defined and different for those neighborhoods than for the South Seaside Park Plan. But it is another example of the way that this board and the township has tailored its efforts to be very, very clearly conscious of the needs and concerns of its specific neighborhoods within the community.

We talked about different redevelopment plans addressing Manitou, other plans addressing other neighborhoods within the community. Every one of them, where they may have different components and different factors and are addressing different issues or concerns or have different factors to consider, they are still all done in a way that is sensitive to the neighborhood community needs. And the prime example of that is the plan that was prepared and adopted for the South Seaside Park Neighborhood Plan. And, again, not taking this out of the blue, but a plan that actually, in fact, had its genesis on recommendations that came out of the township's prior planning efforts that we would just -- because of the opportunities that we had to get the grant money, because of the work that the township had done, the resources the township was able to bring to bear to get that grant money and to use it effectively for other projects, we were able to, you know, to get funding for that effort that had been needed and had been recommended as part of your planning process.

And before leaving the South Seaside Park Neighborhood Plan, I think what's maybe just in a highlighting of some of the overall recommendations
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1 I think are important to kind of see. I mean, I've 2 talked a lot about the land use issues and some of 3 the zoning. But the plan also evaluates storm and 4 flood risks, you know, again, addressing the requirements of the grant. I mentioned we evaluated the existing land use, the existing land use plan and zoning for the neighborhood. It sets forth a series of -- the plan itself sets forth a series of broader goals and objectives. It talks about resiliency by providing a guide for green infrastructure techniques that could be used within the neighborhood. And it also establishes a Strategic Action Plan within -- for the implementation of the plan, including, as I mentioned, the zoning, the zoning recommendations.
so, there are five different goals that are promoted, general goals, which are, promoting stormwater management; ensuring the safety of buildings and structures; protecting natural resources and promoting shoreline management; facilitating faster recovery from future storm events. We talked about the ability to get people to get, you know, get approvals very quickly if they're affected by the -- by a storm like Superstorm Sandy. And then probably more, most
importantly is recognizing, in all that context and all those different approaches, recognizing and protecting the coastal island's neighborhood character, which is really the fundamental core of the planning concern that had been expressed.
so, in that context of those goals, more specifically, there was a discussion of mitigating impacts from future storms, clarifying development requirements. And one of the big things being uniform enforcement of property owners' efforts to make improvements to their properties. Recognizing and promoting the aesthetic recovery and resiliency benefits of the natural resources in the area. And I think that's -- and we talked about in some of the recommendations within the -- within the plan, where we get into more details about that. And those recommendations, by the way, the things that I'm reading into the record here are from pages 31 and 32 of the report. But there are two recommendations that I think further highlight the township's more comprehensive perspective on this and also ongoing planning efforts. Things don't stop just because we adopted the neighborhood plan. And one of the things that came out of our discussions and review from the neighbor -- from the members of the

28
1 community, from the public, was that the need for a
further assessment and evaluation and understanding
the opportunities for recreation within the
4 South Seaside Park neighborhood.
So, if you look at item number six on page 32
6 where we talk about enhanced recreational
7 facilities. Reading from the plan specific -- or
reading from the report, I should say, which quotes
the plan. This recommendation responds to resident
10 concerns regarding recreation opportunities in the
11 area, despite several existing publicly-owned parks
12 and open spaces, and include the preparation -- and
13 it includes, I should say -- the preparation of a
14 Neighborhood Recreation and Open Space Plan to
15 identify needs based on resident population and
16 community interest; investigate opportunities for
17 the State of New Jersey to permit cross-honoring of
18 local beach badge for boat launch and non-dockage
19 facilities at the 24th Avenue Marina; consider
20 establishing a local bike share program or
21 participating in a regional network with
22 neighboring -- neighboring shore communities; and
23 verify riparian grants to identify potential sites
24 for bayfront recreation, as well as investigate
25 whether the State of New Jersey would permit a lease

Essentially, the idea here is to look at existing facilities, seeing where, how they can be used most effectively and efficiently and how they can be multi-purposed, if necessary. But look at all the different opportunities.

Now, these are recommending some general ideas and thoughts. And, ultimately, a new plan, a new neighborhood recreation plan will be much more specific in terms of the kinds of things that it promotes. But, again, it's another example of the way that the community input basically affected the outcome of the plan to address the important, important concern of the community.

And then with regards to item number seven on page 32. And, again, quoting from the report, which, in turn, quotes from the plan. Identify opportunities to Cooperate with federal, state, county and local entities to promote resilience. These recommendations include: Pursuing grants to
fund permitting and construction of a living
shoreline; following up with the state to ensure
that stormwater outfall construction has been
properly stabilized and complete; encourage
continuing efforts to work with the Army Corps of
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1 Engineers to implement proper dune construction and
2 enhancement; and encourage the creation of a liaison
3 between the neighborhood, township and Island Beach
4 State Park to promote better communication and
5 coordination with respect to state park activities.
6 And, again, you know, addressing community concerns,
7 focusing on resilience, which is an important part
8 of it, and an identification that this process is
ongoing and continues and will continue moving forward.
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

25 the two neighborhoods, we did do the coastal
neighborhood resiliency plan. I won't get into detail in terms of the recommendations there. But these, again, were seven selected neighborhoods that were identified as having impacts along with the South Seaside Park neighborhood, that needed to be addressed. There was a public session in December of 2016, and a plan was drafted. And you ultimately adopted that plan as well as part of your master plan.

So, again, the idea here is that it wasn't that one specific neighborhood was singled out, but that neighborhoods that were impacted based on a reaction to an event that had a significant effect on the community's planning, land use planning policies, is Superstorm Sandy, that we were able to target those resources and align them effectively, you know, to address these neighborhoods that were impacted by the storm. And, God forbid, not impacted, and, hopefully, not impacted similarly in the future.

As part of that comprehensive approach -- I'm going to take another pause -- one of the things that the township was able to fund, and has been undertaken for quite some time and participating, is the Community Rating System, the CRS. CRS relates
to -- is a rating system that is connected and has a
relationship to the National Flood Insurance
3 Program. And it was implemented, started in 1990 as
4 a volunteer program for recognizing and encouraging
5 community floodplain management activities that
6 exceed the National Flood Insurance Program's
7 minimum standards. The idea here is that this
program establishes -- is a rating system, a numeric
rating system, and is -- a number of the factors
10 that are reviewed and analyzed to establish the
community's rating is, you know, planning activities
that address floodplain management, resources that
the community may have to actually provide for --
natural resources, I should say -- that the community may have that provides opportunities for
flood storage. And, again, related to the
minimization of impacts to the community and the reduction in loss.

So that communities that actively engage in these various programs that reduce flood damage or potentially reduce flood damage to insurable properties, basically, means that there's less payouts that are necessary. And so, there is a certain reward to the community and reward specifically to the property owners within the
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1 mainland, for that storage capacity, that, in fact, has boosted the CRS rating of the township.

The goal and objective through all the various activities and because of the post sandy activities, the Floodplain Management Plan, the 6 other activities that the township has undertaken as 7 part of its Post Sandy Planning Program, we are 8 anticipating, we are looking to further enhance the 9 rating of the township to a five in 2018. And that would result in a 25 percent reduction in the insurance cost.
so, I think that the resources and the capacity of the township, that Berkeley Township has, enhances some benefits clearly of not only south Seaside Park but all its, all its residents that are affected by the need to grant, get flood insurance. And certainly, in South Seaside Park, that's an important consideration as well.

I mentioned before the Geographic Information System, the GIS. Essentially, the GIS, for those who are not familiar.
(off the record.)
MR. SLACHETKA: AS I just mentioned, one of the projects being a GIS program for the township that was funded by Post Sandy Planning
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specifically the grant funding for, to create this
2 GIS. And this GIS is available and can be used by
3 the township's zoning and land use professionals and
4 officials, as well as used by its emergency
5 management personnel, and used by public works and
6 public works personnel to both plan for and to
7 effectively respond to the events like Superstorm Sandy.
I should point out that the modeling
10 also that the GIS system that Berkeley has, also has
information on flood hazard areas. It has
information on storm surges, specifically, mapping
some of the -- the extent of the Superstorm Sandy
surge. And has other basic modeling, what's called
slosh modeling, that is, that can map and identify
the extent of storm surges and various category
hurricanes, from category one through four. And
18 using that information, using that mapping
19 information and overlaying it on these various
20 community facilities, there will be -- the township
21 officials have the ability to understand and plan
22 for and respond to these events. And particularly
23 for those neighborhoods that are affected and have
24 been affected by storm surges and will continue to
25 be at risk, it's important for the community and for

1 the township to have effective response, in 2 particular, for -- you know, to the storm events. 3 It can be a plan for evacuations, plan for the 4 responses and allocating resources effectively.

Like I said, one of the -- Berkeley
6 Township is one of the few municipalities in the
7 state that were able to take advantage of that and
8 because of, again, because of the resources that we
9 have from a planning perspective, that we were able
10 to get that grant from the Department of Community
1 Affairs. And it will be continued to be used in the future.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24 25

Most -- even more significantly,
because that's an important tool and will continue
to be an important tool that will benefit the
township and South Seaside Park. The township,
because of the fact that it had one of these GIS programs in place, that it was also located along the New Jersey oceanfront and specifically had shoreline on the -- on Barnegat Bay, bayshore or bayfront coastal areas, and also had a barrier island beach, because of those factors, the township was selected as part of a further enhancement of the Post Sandy Planning Assistance Grant Program as one of two pilot communities, along with the Borough of
information that is provided by the SLOSH modeling, which simply shows the level of storm surge. Some of the -- again, without getting into too much detail and not getting into too much of the reason, but I think that the planning board will appreciate this. And I think it's an important factor in looking at the effects and some of the analysis that we have to do in terms of the application for the petition for de-annexation. Again, only one of two communities, in fact, is going to have this enhancement. Eventually, it may be expanded to other areas, but right now, the resources are just in place for both Berkeley Township and Keansburg. And some of the realtime information that is going to be part of the -- part of this enhanced system that's being developed by the

1 used for the GIS system, the DCA resources that we used to create the GIS system, I should say, we 3 would not be part of that pilot program. That 4 started in May this past year and will be continuing 5 on through June of 2018.

And I think that the fact that we're able to, you know, to get that, get that Notre Dame 8 pilot study, it's probably -- I would be, maybe -- I don't think I'm overreaching in saying that it's
University of Notre Dame -- which, by the way, builds on the GIS that we created as part of the Post Sandy Planning Assistance Grant Program. And, in fact, the people from Notre Dame were very complimentary of the capacity and the information that was in that GIS. That that will -- we will be able to look at the wind speeds. We will be able to look at storm surge. There will be a more enhanced and more subtle modeling of the impacts, of the potential impacts of those storms. And we'll be able to know, as these storms move up the coast or move in from the Atlantic, what we -- what responses, what level of response will be necessary because of the nature of the storms.

It also provides a long-term
enhancement of our modeling and our planning capabilities. Because we can run any number of different types of scenarios, storm scenarios. And, by the way, it's not only just for hurricanes, but also for, you know, for other types of coastal storms and nor'easters. It's a very subtle, very sophisticated and a very impressive system.

And, again, one of the things that we
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robably one of the most sophisticated analytical tools that are -- that's going to be made available to any community in the state, to be able to plan for and respond to those storms. And South Seaside Park is going to be part of that, part of that system. So, I think it's really, you know, critical and an important consideration in terms of the impacts on the township and the impacts on
South Seaside Park and the benefits that South Seaside Park has received from being part of the township, Berkeley Township as a whole.

I do want to -- I may conclude on this one section of the report, by again quoting from the report. I think it's on page 36 just before it says, Planning in South Seaside Park. It says -- and this, I think, encapsulates what the
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1 discounted flood insurance and increased resiliency 2 with services. I think that kind of encapsulates 3 some of the things that I've been talking about to 4 date.

I want to go on and talk a little bit about planning in south Seaside Park in relationship to the comprehensive planning and address some comments that have been made or were made by, in the --

MR. BACCHIONE: I'm sorry, Stan.
Through the chair. I just have a -- I just want to
get clarification on what you talked about with the
GIS system. with the implementation of this GIS
system in Berkeley Township, due to the fact that Berkeley Township has property on the barrier island, I would assume it will also help the surrounding municipalities with the information gathered by the GIS system.

> MR. SLACHETKA: Yeah.
> MR. BACCHIONE: Not only Berkeley

Township. So, this is not just for Berkeley
Township. I would assume Seaside Park, Seaside Heights and all the surrounding communities would learn from this information gathered by this system.

MR. SLACHETKA: Yeah. And that's a
efforts, you know, the resiliency planning efforts that have taken place and the importance of being part of those resiliency efforts by South seaside Park.
and quoting from the report. Berkeley Township's large size and varied environs (mainland and barrier island) give it increased flexibility when planning for resilience. Unlike Seaside Park Borough, the township is able to provide affordable housing and municipal facilities in areas where the threat of coastal flooding is limited.

Remember last time I did mention that having the municipal facilities outside of the coastal flooding areas is really an important, you know, benefit. We talked about the impact that occurred in South -- in Seaside Park when their facilities were impacted by superstorm Sandy and the amount of time it took to be able to get them, get them back up and running on the island.
so, again, quoting again from it, this geographic arrangement enables Berkeley Township to protect the established barrier island neighborhood character of South Seaside Park, while providing residents and businesses access to
sections ever since -- you know, that you can have in terms of evaluating wave action impacts and understanding where there may be dune weaknesses and other, other -- other potential concerns. So, there's going to be a little bit of overlap. But what's important to understand is, the active system, the use of the system and the -- is going to be limited to Berkeley Township. So, to the extent that Berkeley provides information to the adjoining communities, saying, hey, we've got this information of the impacts of what the storm is going to be. The application of that analysis is going to be specific to Berkeley Township, including South Seaside Park. And the GIS, the way in which our emergency

1 management and public works and planning and zoning
2 use that information is all predicated and based on
3 our own system that is confined to Berkeley
4 Township. So, being within that system, you know,
if South Seaside Park was someplace else, they were
6 in an adjoining community, they might be able to
benefit tangentially because we might have some
information, but the actual application of response
and immediate planning and response for the system
is going to be very unique and very, very specific to Berkeley Township.

MR. BACCHIONE: That's not to say, though -- Berkeley Township could share this information with --

MR. SLACHETKA: Yes.
MR. BACCHIONE: -- the surrounding municipalities.

MR. SLACHETKA: It could.
MR. BACCHIONE: If they choose to do so.

MR. SLACHETKA: Yeah. But what it won't be able to do is, we will be -- we have our, as part of the GIS, we have mapped our community facilities. And we've mapped other land use types and forms. So, we can apply the data on the storm.

1 we can apply it to specifically how that's going to
2 be affecting locations and places within Berkeley 3 Township.

5 adjoining municipalities with generalized 6 information, but they would need to have their own 7 GIS to say, okay, let's overlay that and let's map 8 that in relationship to our own community facilities and the like, so.

MR. WISER: Stan, if I may, just to
take that a little further. Just so I understand.
Maybe if I can understand it, some of the board
members can understand it. The information that's
going to be coming in as part of this GIS is based
specifically on the physical conditions and the data of Berkeley Township --

MS. hUGG: Mr. wiser, I'm sorry.
could you use your mike?
MR. WISER: Oh, I'm sorry.
MS. HUGG: I'm sorry.
MR. WISER: My bad. okay. The
information that is going to be developed as part of
this GIS is based on the physical geography of
Berkeley Township because that's the mapping that is part of it and the data, the physical

MR. SLACHETKA: That's correct. I'll
5 give you a specific example. Like, for example, if,
6 in the GIS, we have information, when you say
7 attributes, attributes is basically data that's
8 associated with a specific feature, like whether
9 it's a lot or a dwelling or a point or a location.
so, if we know and the police is, are aware of --
1 like, for example, if some mapping of physical
disabilities or other needs specific to that, you
know, property owner, that person who dwells in that
dwelling unit, and that the storm information
suggests that that dwelling or that lot is going to be significantly affected, then responses can be planned out and resources can be allocated.
so to that level, it's Berkeley
specific. However, I don't want to imply that Berkeley is going to just take the information and not share it with everybody. I think that Berkeley will be and has always been, continues to be generous, you know, in terms of its sharing and coordination with other communities. But the effective application in realtime is going to be
specific to the township and the use of that by the township's officials and responders, based on the information that's in Berkeley's GIS and as mapped based on the topographic features and then overlaying by the potential storm impacts.

MR. WISER: So, is it a correct statement to say that Berkeley would be able to say, hey, surrounding communities, these are the types of things that our GIS is showing us is going to happen
or is happening, but the other surrounding
communities are going to have to use their own judgment and interpretation as to how to respond, how to use that information --

MR. SLACHETKA: Yes.
MR. WISER: -- because it's not other
community specific.
MR. SLACHETKA: Yeah, and it's not in
the GI -- it's not -- they would have to have their
own GIS set up. And, unfortunately, the Post Sandy
Planning Assistance Grant Program has sort of run its course, so there're no new monies coming out of that.

As I mentioned, there is hope that
there may be some funding to bring this, if the
pilots are successful in Berkeley Township and
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Keansburg, to bring this out and expand it out 2 statewide, you know, to other communities. That's going to be dependent upon, obviously, the interest 4 and resources of the state to be able to make that happen. I will hope it does. I mean, I'm hopeful because I think it's -- it would benefit a lot of communities throughout the State of New Jersey to have that information. I think Berkeley is in a very unique position and advantageous position, because of the fact that it's the first of only two that, specifically, have that resource available to it now.

MR. WISER: And is it -- just one
last question. Is it also a correct statement to say that the farther you are away, if you're another community, the farther you are away from Berkeley, the usefulness of the data that Berkeley collects through its GIS, even if it's shared, dissipates?

MR. SLACHETKA: Yes. I mean, obviously, the further away you are, the -- and, again, the mapping and the modeling are going to be very specific to the future geographic features within Berkeley. So, if you don't have that connection between those, you know, the modeling and the understanding of the land forms in your

## quick ten-minute break.

(Recess was taken.)
MR. WINWARD: We're going to start
part two of the de-annexation hearing.
MR. SLACHETKA: I thought it was part
three. The, by the way, thank you for moving the
mike. I was told that it was a little hard to hear.
And so, please, if any of the board members or anybody in the public can't hear what I'm saying --

MR. McGUCKIN: we should probably
just have you start over, Stan.
MR. SLACHETKA: Starting on page one.
okay.
So, we ended around the resiliency
planning issues and going back into somewhat
generalized planning issues, only because there were
certain comments and testimony that was provided by
Mr. Bauman, the petitioners' planner, that I think
are important to be addressed.
We do have at the bottom of page 36, there's a excerpt from Mr. Bauman's report that sort of set forth a number of concerns that he had with regards to the way in which the township plan, as it may or may not affect South Seaside Park. And I'11
give Mr. Bauman the benefit of the doubt in the sense that some of these comments came before we entered into the fairly extensive planning efforts on the South -- with the South Seaside Park Neighborhood Plan. But I do think that he kind of brought, creates a or presents sort of a little bit more broad brush concern over what the township has done and how it -- in terms of its planning documents, and how it affects South Seaside Park. so, a couple of things that he states with regards to the -- of the township's efforts.
And, again, I'm quoting just a couple of bullets
from the bottom of page 36 . First of which he
states that there's no focus -- there are no focus initiatives or goals in the master plan that address South Seaside Park. The ten master plan goals -which he's quoting from the prior master plan -- set the stage for more pointed objectives and recommendations, encourage guidelines for new development, and support the preservation of residential character of neighborhoods. That's on page 18 of his report.

South Seaside Park and its residents
are not included in the master plan goals.
De-annexation will not cause significant injury to
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1 the Berkeley Township Master Plan. That's, again, from page 18 of his report. Then he states, the 3 nine master plan objectives do not individually or 4 collectively address the needs and concerns of the 5 residents of South Seaside Park, completing the 6 build-out of neighborhoods, encouraging development in Town Center and corridor nodes, and addressing the Route Nine corridor are addressed in the master plan objectives, but these are matters that are nowhere near South Seaside Park, nor do they affect the social and economic well-being of south Seaside park residents. And that comes from page 19 of his report.
and he also notes as well that, essentially, in his opinion, that the township is preoccupied with planning on the mainland, despite the fact we just went through a fairly extensive review of the township's planning efforts in South Seaside Park, but also as they related to recommendations and approaches that were recommended in the township's various planning documents. It's clear that the township and clear that this board has been attentive to all the neighborhoods within the township, including south Seaside Park, and specifically focused on areas where there are key

1 concerns or issues or planning, either
2 opportunities, objectives or possible issues that
3 need to be addressed in each of these neighborhoods.
We talked about the township being a
5 collection of neighborhoods. And it's recognized in
6 your planning documents and your, you know, planning
7 efforts recognize this diversity of neighborhoods.
8 And you've focused as needed on those specific
9 areas. And it's important to note, and I think this
is -- it undergirds the whole, you know, planning
process here, is that, you know, planning in one neighborhood does not necessarily mean that benefits don't accrue to all the neighborhoods in the community.

As we mentioned before, the township
took advantage of grants and loans when they became
available, and specifically because of an issue, a critical issue of concern to the township, the township as a whole, including South Seaside Park with regards to the impact of Superstorm Sandy. And those planning efforts, as we just talked about, very specifically targeted those neighborhoods. It doesn't mean that because those neighborhoods were targeted for the planning efforts that it somehow undermined or other -- and undermined the position
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of other neighborhoods or other neighborhoods within the township were being ignored.

The idea here, and the idea that you've effectuated constantly as part of your planning efforts, has been that the benefit to one area of the community benefits the community as a whole. The Manitou Redevelopment Plan, it's not -it clearly is targeted and benefits the Manitou Park, but it benefits the community as a whole and provides -- it provides a diversity of housing types. It does -- it provides improvements to the community's tax base. Every taxpayer, every resident of the township benefits when the township addresses a planning effort.

The redevelopment of the township's
town center, the designation of the town center
benefits the community by providing new tax ratables
in the community and provides for an opportunity for
a vibrant mixed use center and also provides an opportunity for areas within the township, environmentally sensitive areas within the township
to be protected through the use of a transfer development rights program that we talked about. Even though that $T$-- those TDR, the sending districts and receiving districts are not on

1 in piecemeal. It has to be seen within an
integrated whole, sorry for the new age terminology, 3 but holistic approach that the township has taken.
4 And the efforts that it's taken on the South Seaside 5 Park neighborhood and their planning efforts has been pretty significant.

And, as I mentioned before, and I
8 think what's really important and critical for all
9 of us to understand -- and then I'll give you
10
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another undergirding or foundation of this
process -- is that planning is an ongoing process.
You know, it's an evolving process. It's going to
continue. It's going to continue in south seaside Park from the township. And the township has the resources necessary to apply to the -- an ongoing, its ongoing planning efforts in that neighborhood. And it's going to continue. And it's going to be affected by any new circumstances that might impact the community.

You know, as I said, god forbid if
there's another storm and there's certain impacts, we are going to do what's necessary to respond to that. And that might be further revisions and updates of the land use policy that may affect South Seaside Park or may not, depending upon the

South Seaside Park, they still benefit the residents of South Seaside Park, as residents of the greater Berkeley Township community, by protecting important environmental resources, directing growth where it's appropriate in terms of the availability for infrastructure and opportunities for redevelopment.
But by protecting those environmental resources, as we talked about last time, those benefit not only Berkeley Township, but it benefits the region and it specifically benefits South Seaside Park because of its protection of the water quality, the Barnegat Bay Estuary and advances other environmental resources.

In fact, we talked about
preservation, how the open space preservation policies actually have benefited South Seaside Park residents, even though some of those preservation activities took place on the mainland through the CRS rating and the foundation that those efforts had or the impact that those efforts had on the CRS rating benefit, specifically, financially the residents of South Seaside Park. You cannot, from a comprehensive planning perspective, parse out and simply peel away and look at the community's planning efforts or any community's planning efforts
on page 42 of the report, we talk about these types of goals and objectives and approaches that, essentially, you know, have, when taken together, form a very, very sort of rich and compelling, you know, argument for the kinds of things that you do in this township in that way, in that comprehensive way.

I just want to read a couple of excerpts from things on page 42 that I think are relevant. And in the beginning, we talked about Manitou Park and TDR. But quoting from the report, planning goals and objectives that do not refer to one specific area or another are directly tied to the benefit of the
rv
impacts. And, hopefully, some of the land use policies and zoning that we've put in place now are going to help us not have to take such more significant changes to the zoning in that area. And given its level of resources, given its size, given its variety of neighborhoods and given its resources in the sense of having the support staff and the structures in place to respond in a comprehensive way, they, the township has been able to respond to these challenges from a planning perspective, from a resiliency perspective, in a manner that benefits the township as a whole and also very specifically South Seaside Park and other affected neighborhoods.

You, as a planning board, and I don't want to puff you up so much, but you're doing the right thing and have done the right thing in your planning approaches in this. And I think that maybe the issue that I take from Mr. Bauman's statements is that, somehow you've applied your resources and all you focused in one area. And it's clearly not. The record of your actions and the record of your activities as embodied and embedded in the land use planning documents that you've prepared, belies that and contradicts that very, very, very clearly.

## And in each one of these issues,
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Township as a whole. In Berkeley Township, this includes goals to improve view sheds throughout the township, whether this is billboard regulations, property maintenance, or streetscape improvements. It includes a comprehensive recreation system that targets all ages and ability levels, and land use and open space preservation strategies intended to improve the water quality of Barnegat Bay. The Township's focus on improving existing commercial centers and their integration with surrounding residential neighborhoods is something that is applicable to many of its distinct neighborhoods, including South Seaside Park.

And I should point out parenthetically that in crafting of the South Seaside Park Plan, that was an important consideration in terms of the balancing of those uses and providing those opportunities for the commercial uses that support the neighborhood. And I'll quote again from the report. To further address the concerns of neighborhood residents and property owners, specifically the South Seaside Park, Berkeley Township made the recommendation in its 2015 Master Plan Reexamination of the need to undertake an in-depth review of the land use plan of South Seaside Park. Acknowledging
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this recommendation in the Township's Reexamination
Report enhanced its ability to seek and obtain grant funding through the Post Sandy Planning Assistance
Grant Program to undertake this review and prepare a
neighborhood specific plan for South Seaside Park.
As part of this planning process, the township
created numerous opportunities for public
participation and input, through community meetings
on the barrier island, advertised public hearings,
status updates before the township's governing body
and planning board, individual mailings, as well as making its planning staff available for questions and comments.

It is important to note that public participation in the planning process can address many of the objections raised by the petitioners, such as the number of bicycle racks available, piers for crabbing, playgrounds for children and grandchildren, or a public boat launch. Rather than participate in the township's planning process to raise these issues directly, the petitioners have opted to seek de-annexation, presumably to then participate in the Borough of Seaside Park's planning process in order to pursue these goals.

Two important points here. First of which,
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1 issues. and not necessarily just continually
2 looking for opportunities for splitting communities
3 apart. I think working together is -- I'm providing
4 my own professional perspective on this -- working
together and listening to people, I think, is the, is the more appropriate approach.
so, getting into the basic, returning back to the statutory criteria and the three key concerns
from the standpoint of analyzing the proposed
de-annexation petition. First, the idea, the first
test or first part of that is to determine whether
the refusal to consent to the de-annexation by the governing body is arbitrary and unreasonable. And we talked a lot about all the various benefits that the township accrued by having south Seaside Park as part of its community and we talked about the benefits that south Seaside Park had. But I think what's important is, in evaluating this first test, is that the concern about keeping South Seaside Park is, within the township, is rationale. And it's based on sound planning principles and logic. And, you know, I'm not going to reiterate everything, but we've gone through a lot of, a lot of the information.

We talked about the socioeconomic and
cultural diversity of the community and specifically as it relates to South Seaside Park in relationship 3 to the community as a whole. First, de-annexation would separate two demographically distinct 5 communities and reduce the township's overall
6 diversity. We talked about the educational
7 attaimment of the residents of South Seaside Park.
we talked about its housing type in terms of the
relationship to the -- of the other housing types
0 within the township and the housing diversity that
results from that. We talked about the workforce
participation in that the township. The residents
of South Seaside Park are highly employed and to a
greater rate than the township as a whole. We talked about the household income where the township -- where the household income of the residents of South Seaside Park was higher than the township as a whole.

And it's an established neighborhood characterized by a large seasonal population versus the mainland with a largely year-round. But, more specifically, we talked about the unique characteristics of that neighborhood as being a barrier island beach community and that, essentially, its characteristics are not replicated
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and completely irreplaceable if, in fact, it left.
we talked about just recently this during the testimony tonight, about the resiliency planning efforts of the community and the storm and flood resilience and the benefits that, in fact, would accrue to the residents of South Seaside Park by its continuing participation as a component of Berkeley Township in the various plans and planning efforts, including the GIS and the resiliency planning that the community is taking.

In addition to that, we previously talked about the fact that the community facilities here in Berkeley Township are out of the flood hazard areas, that the township has that resources and the capacity to sustain recovery efforts, even with significant storm events that might impact some of the coastal neighborhoods, including, including South Seaside Park.
we talked about the CRS system and how that benefits specifically monetarily the residents of south seaside Park. And we talked about the half million a dollars' worth of Post Sandy Planning Assistance Grant money that the township had received because of the efforts that, and the resources and the capacity that the township had.
anticipated to even get better in Berkeley Township in comparison to Seaside Park.

Diminish resiliency, and that relates to the, what we were just talking about, with the community facilities, the resources and capacity to respond, which is all embodied in terms of the emergency
management personnel, the resources that the township has, being a larger, more varied community.
And the ability to take advantage of the GIS, that we talked about.

We did talk about the loss of senior services, specifically, the complimentary beach access, also affects the residents of the township as a whole, which we'll get into in a moment. And we talked about that in great detail at the last -the earlier part of the testimony.

Even though I emphasized significantly that the loss of South Seaside Park actually is an irreplaceable component of the community's geographic neighborhood diversity, Seaside Park benefits also -- residents -- also benefit from that diversity. And there's, I think it would be a material loss to be able -- to not be part of that diverse neighborhood or diverse collection of neighborhoods that Berkeley Township represents.

And I think that sensitivity that you have to that
kind of diversity of interests and concerns is
something that has benefited South Seaside Park,
4 very specifically benefited South Seaside Park.
and that, in turn, kind of gets me to the
6 next point, being the loss of comprehensive planning
services. The reason, you know, I don't want to say
it's us but the township, having the resources to
have a department of planning and to have -- to be
able to apply those resources and to do a variety of different planning projects. And think about all the things that you've been doing over the last, you know, decade or so and then certainly doing since we've been here in terms of your -- being your planning consultant, it really boggles the mind. I mean, it is something that you should applaud yourselves and the township should applaud itself for doing.

You know, between your TDR program, your comprehensive, series of comprehensive plans and reexaminations, your very targeted specific plans to all the neighborhoods and the redevelopment planning efforts that you've taken. The environment, the efforts and initiatives to protect important environmental resources. The obtaining state

## (off the record.)

MR. SLACHETKA: So, again, we talked
4 about that, in effect, would be a loss of prestige.
5 And, actually, that was supported in a great extent
6 by the lay testimony that, in fact, we heard from
7 the, you know, from the members of the community
8 itself in terms of its unique aspect, you know, of
9 South Seaside Park. And we talked again about the cultural and demographic changes. We would be
losing a neighborhood that's better educated, better
compensated and more likely to be employed, than the remaining portion of the township.

And there's been a lot of discussion about white Sands Beach, in particular, and the resource that it would be. And I know there's some question as to whether, during de-annexation, it would go to the -- go along with the South Seaside Park neighborhood or be retained within Berkeley Township. But I think what's important to understand is that the cultural resources and the resource that the South Seaside Park neighborhood represents, it's more than just the white Sands Beach. It's, we talked a lot about and we heard a lot about testimony from the lay -- lay testimony
that we heard earlier, about the shore, the culture of the shore, and why the residents of South Seaside Park were, in fact, attracted to this location and this neighborhood.

There's different type of housing at this location. It's seasonal. We did talk a little bit about the cost of the senior badges, in fact.
If, in fact, the white sands Beach is no longer part of Berkeley Township, there would be a specific economic impact to the senior community within the township. And, frankly, you know, we saw what happened over the Fourth of July weekend when Island Beach State Park closed down. Even though, you know, we heard a lot of testimony saying that, well, it's not so bad, if you lost white Sands Beach, you still retain Island Beach State Park. It is a state park. And it is, you know, controlled by the state. and the township does not control its use. It doesn't control its fees. It doesn't control its -when it's open and when it's not open. There'd be other times, hopefully not, in the future, that that resource would not be available to us for a short-term or long-term.

And in talking about the GIS project, we could have, in fact, not gotten the Notre Dame

1 GIS project if we did not have a barrier island component. A barrier island component with a 3 neighborhood in it and that was impacted specifically by superstorm Sandy. It's unfortunate 5 that the neighborhood was. But it also gave us the 6 opportunity and gave South Seaside Park the opportunity to participate in and take advantage of 8 an important technical resource to help plan for and to respond to these types of storms in the future. and having both the GIS, which, again, in turn, was because of the fact that we had the resources and we did it -- we had all these other projects that we undertook as part of the DCA PoSt Sandy Planning Assistance Grant Program. But we had the -- because of that, we had the GIS. And it was funded by the state. And the state saw us as having, because we had the GIS and we were on the Atlantic shoreline in ocean county and had both bayfront and oceanfront barrier island components that were impacted and affected by superstorm sandy, it put us in line for the Notre Dame pilot. And that would have been, you know, I think, in the long term, having that would be -- is a huge benefit. And it would have been unfortunate, in fact, if we did not have it.

Give me one second here. Just

1 turning a couple pages. So, to paraphrase
Dean Hughes from the Bloustein School, who heads the 3 planning, who's the Head of the Department of 4 Planning at the Bloustein School. So, that moment 5 that you have been longing for. In conclusion, 6 that -- he uses that line all the time, you know, it 7 never ceases to get a laugh.

I want to start the conclusion by 9 stating that, in my opinion, that there is -- that

1 understand these concepts and review them and review
2 the impact of de-annexation in a broader planning
3 context. And I think that's important. And I think
4 you have -- your important role, and why the
planning issues are important, is exactly because of
that. It goes beyond just, you know, straight
numbers or a dry fiscal analysis.
And I think that the long-term
comprehensive planning process that you have engaged in, has benefited the residents of South Seaside
Park. And by benefiting the residents of
South Seaside Park, benefited your community as a whole. And, in turn, the work that you've done in other areas of the community, in terms of planning and undertaking, you know, comprehensive planning efforts, including your resiliency planning, in turn, has benefited the residents in South Seaside Park. Because you are part of the same community. You have worked together. You have in many cases listened to each other. And that is really the correct venue and approach for addressing these issues and concerns.

When we start to fragment each other, we fragment our communities, and we stop listening to each other in that regard and stop looking at
things in a comprehensive way is when, I think, ultimately, in the long-term, we start to get into trouble.

You do not need to have leaders at
the national level come down and say, hey, this is
what you need to do or leaders at the state, what
you need to do -- this is what you need to do. Your decision-making process and your decision making
power and your recommendations on this are rooted in the fact that you are the, essentially, the representatives of the community. And you also are those people who are probably most concerned about the nature and the -- nature of your planning processes and the benefits that those planning processes accrued to your various residents in this town. So, it's very appropriate that you are reviewing the de-annexation question and making your recommendations to the governing body.
so, let me just read very briefly the, from the conclusion, which I think really kind of encapsulates all the things that we've talked about to this point. And then, you know, I will have completed my testimony. No applause, please. The proposed de-annexation would have detrimental social and economic impact on the

Township. Actually, let me start a little bit
2 further. The de-annexation of South Seaside Park
from Berkeley Township would have numerous
4 consequences for the township. Indeed, 5 de-annexation would not only result in the loss of 6 an established neighborhood, but also a highly
7 educated, prosperous and productive part of the
township's population, as well as increased
residential vacancy and reduced diversity in the
10 township's population and housing stock. Likewise, the departure from Berkeley Township would have numerous consequences for South seaside Park residents.

The proposed de-annexation would have a detrimental social and economic impact upon the township.

The proposed de-annexation would deprive Berkeley Township of its prestigious
oceanfront neighborhood, which is historically
linked to the township's development as a coastal community.

South Seaside Park contains a significant portion of the township's seasonal and year-round housing diversity relative to its size, and the demographics of neighborhood residents

1 suggest that South Seaside park is more affluent than the township as a whole. The dwellings, and their residents, contribute significantly to the diversity and the income mix of the township. The loss of white Sands Beach would result in increased costs for ocean access for
township residents. Seniors would lose their
complimentary access privileges.
The proposed de-annexation would have
detrimental social and economic impacts upon the
neighborhood of South Seaside Park.
Berkeley Township's efforts to
promote storm resiliency and its participation in
the community Rating System (CRS) entitle all
property owners to a 20 percent discount on their
flood insurance. Currently, Seaside Park Borough
property owners receive -- only receive a 15 percent
discount.
Property owners in south Seaside Park
would not only be protected by Berkeley Township and
its enhanced GIS program -- did I lose my last page
here? I think I lost my last page. Thank you.
So, the property owners in
South Seaside Park would not be protected by the
Berkeley Township Enhanced Geographic Information
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Systems Program, designed to promote long-term storm
operations.

Seniors in South Seaside Park would
lose their complimentary access as well to the
6 white Sands Beach, in addition to the loss of
7 discounted or complimentary recreational amenities on the mainland.
critical facilities on the mainland are protected
from flooding and hurricane storm surge projections,
ensuring continuity of services following extreme
weather.
And based on the above, that it's our opinion that, and we conclude that de-annexation
would have a detrimental impact to both Berkeley
Township and the neighborhood of South Seaside Park.
And that's my testimony. Thank you
very much for your -- thank you very much for your
patience and indulgence. And I'm sure you're tired of listening.

MR. WINwARD: We thank you so much, Stan, for your testimony.
24 At this time, because he concluded and took the meeting, we'll save any

1 cross-examination for the following meeting. so, at

13


#### Abstract




15



1





```
this time, I need a -- there's nothing else on the agenda, so I need a motion for adjournment.
MR. CALLAHAN: So moved.
MR. WINWARD: All in favor, say aye.
ALL: Aye.
(Meeting adjourned.)
this time, I need a -- there's nothing else on the
agenda, so I need a motion for adjournment.
```

| 1 | 41/19 44/6 44/22 45/4 47/7 | advantage [7] 33/14 33/16 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 48/4 49/7 57/10 65/3 67/23 | 37/7 53/16 65/3 67/9 72/7 |
| '17 [1] 23/1 | 68/10 69/23 | advantageous [1] 48/9 |
| 0 | about [78] $4 / 20$ 5/15 5/16 | advertised [4] 18/9 18/10 |
| 001 [1] 1/25 | $\begin{array}{lllll}5 / 18 & 7 / 15 & 7 / 25 & 8 / 3 & 9 / 2 \\ 11 / 9 & 11 / 16 & 12 / 11 & 16 / 8\end{array}$ |  |
| 08527 [1] 1/25 | 19/19 19/20 20/20 20/25 | $\text { affairs [6] } 7 / 2 \text { 10/25 } 17 / 9$ |
| 08723 [1] 2/7 | 21/6 25/1 $26 / 2 \quad 26 / 9$ 26/22 | $17 / 14 \quad 24 / 15 \quad 37 / 11$ |
| 08731 [1] 2/4 | 27/14 27/16 $28 / 6 \quad 30 / 12$ | affect [3] 50/25 52/10 |
| 1 | 30/18 35/25 41/16 42/3 | 56/24 |
| 100 percent [1] 15/14 | $\begin{array}{lllll}42 / 6 & 42 / 12 & 49 / 14 & 49 / 14 \\ 53 / 4 & 53 / 21 & 54 / 23 & 55 / 8\end{array}$ | affected |
| 12 [3] 18/24 18/24 35/25 | $53 / 4453 / 21$ |  |
| 15 [1] 18/8 | $\begin{array}{llll}55 / 14 & 58 / 13 & 58 / 22 & 61 / 6 \\ 62 / 14 & 62 / 16 & 62 / 19 & 62 / 25\end{array}$ | 46/16 49/6 $56 / 18$ 57/14 |
| 15 percent [2] 33/13 77/17 | 63/6 63/8 63/11 63/15 | 66/18 72/20 |
| 17 [1] 2/7 | 63/22 $64 / 2 \quad 64 / 3 \quad 64 / 12$ | affects [2] 51/9 67/13 |
| 18 [3] 22/19 51/22 52/2 |  | affirmatively [1] $23 / 12$ |
| 19 [1] 52/12 | $\begin{array}{lllll}65 / 16 & 65 / 17 & 66 / 7 & 66 / 23\end{array}$ | affirmed [1] 19/4 |
| 1990 [1] 32/3 | 67/4 67/10 67/11 67/15 | affluent [1] 77/1 |
| 1st [1] 23/1 | 68/11 69/25 70/4 70/9 | affordable [1] 41/10 |
| 2 | 70/15 70/24 70/25 71/1 |  |
| 20 percent [2] 33/6 77/15 | 71/7 $71 / 24$ 75/12 $75 / 22$ | 22/11 69/1 |
| 2012 [4] 6/4 12/15 12/15 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { above } \\ \text { access [7] } & \text { [7] } & 41 / 25 & 65 / 9\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 2 & 15 / 13 & 16 / 16 & 20 / 17\end{array}$ |
| 12/15 | $\begin{array}{rrrrrl}\text { 65/11 } & 67 / 13 & 77 / 6 & 77 / 8 & 78 / 5\end{array}$ | 22/19 $23 / 4 \quad 25 / 11 \quad 26 / 4$ |
| 2013 [1] 12/17 | accountants [1] 73/19 |  |
| 2014 [2] 12/14 12/18 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { accrue [2] } & 53 / 13 & 64 / 6\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll} & 31 / 10 & 32 / 16 & 37 / 8 & 38 / 12\end{array}$ |
| 2015 [7] 12/20 13/4 13/7 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { accrued [2] } & 62 / 15 & 75 / 15\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}38 / 18 & 39 / 23 & 40 / 22 & 41 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 13/11 14/2 16/16 59/23 | accurate [1] 80/7 |  |
| 2016 [5] 18/3 18/4 18/8 | Acknowledging [1] 59/25 | 59/19 61/11 65/12 66/18 |
| 18/22 31/7 | action [2] 26/13 43/12 | 70/3 70/9 72/10 |
| 2017 [5] 1/8 4/19 18/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { actions } & {[5]} & 33 / 3 & 33 / 4\end{array}$ | against [2] $9 / 1$ 9/14 |
| 20/17 80/16 | $\begin{array}{lll}\text { 49/11 57/22 } & 65 / 24\end{array}$ | age [1] 56/2 |
| 2018 [2] 34/9 40/5 | active [1] 43/16 | agencies [1] 69/2 |
| 2021 [1] 80/14 | actively [2] 32/19 61/21 | agenda [2] 4/2 79/3 |
| 21 [1] 80/16 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { activities } & {[14]} & 6 / 19 & 8 / 9\end{array}$ | ages [1] 59/6 |
| 24th [1] 28/19 | 8/17 $18 / 13$ 30/5 $32 / 5 \quad 32 / 11$ | agreement [1] 17/22 |
| 25 percent [1] 34/10 |  | aid [3] 6/11 $6 / 13$ 18/8 |
| 26 [2] 5/21 80/14 | $57 / 2365 / 12$ | $\text { align [1] } 31 / 16$ |
| 27 [1] 20/19 | actual [2] 44/8 66/19 | $\begin{array}{llllll}\text { a11 } & {[42]} & 5 / 16 & 11 / 14 & 11 / 15\end{array}$ |
| 28 [1] 12/22 | actually [13] 14/3 14/9 | $\begin{array}{llll}12 / 5 & 16 / 13 & 17 / 4 & 17 / 18\end{array}$ |
| 3 | 14/10 24/11 $24 / 12$ 25/12 | $\begin{array}{llllll}18 / 18 & 23 / 6 & 25 / 7 & 27 / 1 & 27 / 2\end{array}$ |
| 31 [1] 27/18 | 32/13 43/4 55/16 66/25 |  |
| $32[3] \quad 27 / 19 \quad 28 / 5 \quad 29 / 16$ | addition [2] 64/11 78/6 | $\begin{array}{lllll}53 / 13 & 56 / 8 & 57 / 21 & 58 / 5 & 59 / 6\end{array}$ |
| 36 [3] 40/23 50/21 51/13 | additiona7 [8] 9/21 10/24 | $62 / 14 \quad 65 / 20 \quad 66 / 1 \quad 66 / 10$ |
| $3 \mathrm{rd} \mathrm{[1]} \mathrm{4/19}$ | 13/18 14/7 $16 / 17{ }^{17 / 8}$ | 67/6 68/11 68/22 69/3 69/3 |
| 4 | 20/24 22/18 | 72/12 73/6 73/17 73/17 |
| 42 [2] 58/13 | address [20] 5/11 10/9 | 75/21 77/14 79/5 79/6 |
| 46 [1] 1/24 | 13/20 14/11 $14 / 1318 / 16$ | allocated [1] 46/17 |
| 5 | 20/16 $21 / 3$ 22/8 $24 / 8 \quad 29 / 13$ | allocating [1] 37/4 |
| 500,000 [2] 7/15 7/16 | 52/4 59/20 60/15 61/2 | allowing [2] 61/8 66 |
|  | 61/25 | along [6] 31/4 37/18 37/25 |
| 6 | addressed [6] 16/14 18/20 | 38/1 49/5 70/18 |
|  | 31/6 50/20 52/8 53/3 | also [35] $2 / 12$ 7/22 14/13 |
| 6:10[1] 1/9 | addresses [1] 54/14 | $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 8 & 15 / 15 & 16 / 21 & 17 / 7\end{array}$ |
| 7 | llals | 18/25 $22 / 6$ 23/19 $26 /$ |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 26/12 } & 27 / 21 & 30 / 19 & 35 / 15 \\ 36 / 10 & 36 / 10 & 37 / 18 & 37 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 732 [1] 1/25 | 52/7 61/22 $74 / 21$ |  |
| 8 | adjoining [5] 21/11 43/2 |  |
| 833-0001 [1] 1/25 | adjourned [1] 79/7 | 65/19 $67 / 13 \quad 67 / 21 \quad 67 / 21$ |
| A | adjournment [1] 79/3 | 69/25 72/5 75/11 76/6 |
| ability [8] 10/21 10/21 | adopt [1] 14/24 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll} a b 111 t y & 38 / 16 & 10 / 21 & 10 / 21 \\ 26 / 22 & 33 / 16 / 21 & 59 / 6 \end{array}$ | adopted [7] 20/18 23/14 | 21/19 46/22 |
| 60/2 67/9 | 23/23 23/24 25/10 27/23 | amendments [4] 9/22 13/5 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { able [29] } & 9 / 20 & 10 / 23 & 12 / 17\end{array}$ | 31/8 | 19/25 23/24 |
|  | adopting [1] 15/2 | amenities [1] 78/7 |
| $31 / 15$ 31/23 $37 / 7$ 37/9 $39 / 7$ | advance [3] 7/22 18/4 23/5 | amount [6] 6/11 6/17 14/20 |
| 39/7 39/11 40/7 40/12 41/9 | advances [1] 55/12 | 20/23 33/19 41/19 |

analysis [9] 14/12 38/16
43/3 43/6 $43 / 23$ 69/9 69/10 69/10 74/7
analytical [1] 40/10
analyze [1] 5/11
analyzed [1] 32/10
analyzing [1] 62/9
annex [1] 61/13
annexation [28] $1 / 5$ 4/4
$\begin{array}{llllll}4 / 18 & 5 / 12 & 10 / 14 & 38 / 18 & 50 / 5\end{array}$ 51/25 60/22 62/10 62/12 63/3 66/9 66/12 66/15 69/11 70/17 73/11 73/17 74/2 75/17 75/24 76/2 76/5 76/14 76/17 77/9 78/15
annexed [1] 66/21
another [9] 24/21 29/11 31/22 48/15 56/10 56/21 58/25 69/22 69/23
anticipated [1] 67/1 anticipating [1] 34/8 anticipation [1] 18/4 any [14] 4/22 4/24 20/2 $\begin{array}{llll}39 / 17 & 40 / 12 & 50 / 9 & 55 / 25\end{array}$ 56/18 61/4 61/4 61/13 61/16 61/16 78/25
anybody [1] 50/10
anything [1] 6/22
apart [1] 62/3
apologize [2] $5 / 25$ 9/9
APPEARANCES [1] 2/2
applaud [2] 68/16 68/17
applause [1] 75/23
applicable [1] 59/12
application [5] 17/15 38/17 43/23 44/8 46/25
applied [2] 43/8 57/20
apply [5] $44 / 25 \quad 45 / 1 \quad 56 / 15$ 58/7 68/10
appreciate [1] 38/14
approach [5] 31/21 56/3 61/25 62/6 74/21
approaches [7] 13/19 27/2 52/20 57/18 58/10 58/14 65/19
appropriate [4] 21/9 55/5 62/6 75/16
approval [1] 17/20
approvals [1] 26/23
approved [2] 19/10 20/18
April [1] 22/19
arbitrary [3] 62/13 66/3 66/12
are $\left[\begin{array}{lllll}71] & 4 / 7 & 5 / 9 & 10 / 3 & 15 / 4\end{array}\right.$ $\begin{array}{lllll}15 / 7 & 15 / 8 & 15 / 12 & 16 / 14 & 17 / 9\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{llll}17 / 11 & 17 / 12 & 17 / 17 & 19 / 21\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 11 & 25 / 5 & 25 / 7 & 26 / 1 & 26 / 16\end{array}$ 26/16 26/17 $27 / 18$ 27/19 29/7 $32 / 10 \quad 32 / 23 \quad 34 / 7 \quad 34 / 8$ $34 / 16 \quad 34 / 21 \quad 35 / 12 \quad 36 / 23$
 46/10 $47 / 8 \quad 47 / 11 \quad 47 / 25$ 48/15 48/16 48/20 48/21 50/20 51/14 51/24 52/8 52/9 52/9 52/25 54/25 56/22 $57 / 2 \quad 58 / 8 \quad 58 / 11$ 58/21 58/25 61/21 63/13 $63 / 25 \quad 64 / 13 \quad 65 / 18 \quad 66 / 8$ 74/5 74/18 75/9 75/10 75/11 75/12 75/16 78/10
area [12] $18 / 17 \quad 21 / 7 \quad 27 / 13$
$28 / 11 \quad 33 / 19 \quad 33 / 23 \quad 39 / 25$ 54/6 $57 / 4$ 57/21 58/24 61/16
areas [13] 33/10 33/23
$36 / 11 \quad 37 / 21 ~ 38 / 2141 / 11$
41/15 $52 / 25 \quad 53 / 9 \quad 54 / 20$
54/21 64/13 74/14
argument [1] 58/17
Army [1] 29/25
Army Corps [1] 29/25
around [1] 50/15
arrangement [1] 41/22
as [129]
aside [1] 6/18
aspect [2] 30/24 70/8
assessment [1] 28/2
assessors [1] 73/19
assistance [20] 6/12 6/13 $7 / 4 \quad 7 / 12 \quad 9 / 610 / 2311 / 1$ $\begin{array}{llllll}12 / 16 & 14 / 6 & 15 / 9 & 17 / 7 & 24 / 5\end{array}$ 30/16 35/1 $37 / 2439 / 3$
47/20 60/3 64/23 72/14 associated [1] 46/8
ASSOCIATES [3] $1 / 23$ 4/9 17/1
ASSOCIATION [2] 1/5 4/3
assume [3] 4/10 42/16 42/22
Atlantic [2] 39/12 72/17 $\begin{array}{lll}\text { attainment } & {[1]} & 63 / 7 \\ \text { attendance } & \text { [1] } & 18 / 10\end{array}$
attendance ${ }^{[1]}$ 18/10
attended [1]
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { attention [2] } & 21 / 19 & 21 / 20\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { attentive [2] } & 17 / 19 & 52 / 23\end{array}$
Attorneys [2] 2/5 2/8
attracted [1] 71/3
attributes [3] 46/1 46/7
46/7
August [2] 1/8 80/16
automating [1] 9/25
automation $[2] \quad 21 / 23 \quad 21 / 24$ availability [1] 55/5
available [9] 6/15 6/24
36/2 40/11 48/11 53/17
60/12 60/17 71/22
Avenue [1] 28/19
aware [1] 46/10
away [4] 48/15 48/16 48/20 55/24
aye [2] 79/5 79/6
B
Bacchione [1] 1/12
back [5] 4/21 5/1 41/20 50/16 62/7
bad [2] 45/21 71/15
badge [1] 28/18
badges [1] 71/7
balance [1] 22/5
balancing [1] 59/16
Barnegat [3] 37/20 55/11 59/8
Barnegat Bay [1] 59/8 barrier [12] 37/21 39/24 $\begin{array}{llll}41 / 7 & 41 / 23 & 42 / 15 & 43 / 9 \\ 49 / 5\end{array}$ 60/9 63/24 72/1 72/2 72/19 base [1] 54/12
based [11] 20/6 28/15
$31 / 12 \quad 33 / 12 \quad 44 / 2 \quad 45 / 14$
45/23 47/2 47/4 62/21
$78 / 14$
basic [2] 36/14 62/7
basically [5] 11/12 29/12 32/22 35/7 46/7
Bauman [3] 50/19 51/1 58/5
Bauman's [2] 50/22 57/19
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { Bay [3] } & 37 / 20 \quad 55 / 12 \quad 59 / 8\end{array}$
bayfront [3] 28/24 37/21 72/18
bayshore [3] 6/10 37/20 38/1
Bayville [1] 1/8
be [105]
beach [14] 28/18 30/3 37/22 39/24 63/24 67/12
70/15 70/24 71/8 71/13 71/15 71/16 77/5 78/6
beachfront [2] 6/9 43/9
bear [1] 25/18
Beaverson [1] 2/7
became [1] 53/16
because [41] 7/5 7/9 9/18 $\begin{array}{llllll}10 / 19 & 14 / 4 & 15 / 2 & 21 / 13 & 23 / 5\end{array}$
$\begin{array}{llll}24 / 6 & 25 / 15 & 25 / 16 & 27 / 22\end{array}$ 33/9 33/24 $34 / 4 \quad 37 / 8 \quad 37 / 8$ 37/14 37/17 37/22 39/14 39/17 44/7 45/24 47/15 48/6 48/10 $\quad 50 / 17$ 53/17 53/23 $\quad 55 / 10 \quad 64 / 24 \quad 69 / 4$ 72/11 72/14 72/16 73/23 73/24 74/5 74/18 78/24
been [30] 8/4 17/13 19/19
20/8 $23 / 2$ 25/21 25/21 27/5
29/23 $31 / 23 \quad 35 / 16 \quad 36 / 24$
38/3 $38 / 3 \quad 42 / 3$ 42/8 $46 / 22$ 49/17 49/18 52/23 54/5 56/6 57/9 61/21 68/12 68/14 70/14 72/21 72/23 73/5
before [13] 7/24 11/24 $\begin{array}{llll}12 / 9 & 25 / 23 & 34 / 19 & 40 / 24\end{array}$ 51/2 $53 / 15$ 56/7 60/10
73/12 73/13 80/8
began [1] 17/1
beginning [1] 58/22
behalf [1] 17/2
$\begin{array}{lllll}\text { being }[34] & 10 / 15 & 15 / 7 & 15 / 8\end{array}$ 17/1 17/9 17/12 $18 / 15$
$\begin{array}{lllll}21 / 18 & 27 / 9 & 33 / 14 & 33 / 22\end{array}$
33/22 34/24 38/2 $38 / 3$ $\begin{array}{llllll}38 / 25 & 40 / 19 & 41 / 2 & 43 / 7 & 44 / 4\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{lllll}49 / 6 & 49 / 11 & 52 / 11 & 53 / 4 & 54 / 2\end{array}$ 63/23 65/4 65/13 66/2 66/17 67/8 68/6 68/14 69/12
belies [1] 57/24
believe [3] 4/10 4/20 23/2
Be11 [1] 1/13
benefit [13] 37/15 41/16 44/7 $48 / 6 \quad 51 / 1 \quad 54 / 5 \quad 55 / 1$ 55/8 55/21 58/25 65/20 67/21 72/23
benefited [6] 55/16 68/3 68/4 74/10 74/12 74/17
benefiting [1] 74/11
benefits [22] 27/13 34/14 $35 / 2 \quad 35 / 2 \quad 35 / 340 / 18 \quad 53 / 12$ $\begin{array}{lllllll}54 / 6 & 54 / 8 & 54 / 9 & 54 / 13 & 54 / 17\end{array}$ 55/9 55/10 57/12 62/14 62/17 64/5 64/20 65/5 67/21 75/14
BERKELEY [61] 1/1 5/6 5/10

| B | 52/6 | 54/8 57/21 57/25 61/9 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| BERKELEY... [58] 5/16 6/8 | building [2] ${ }^{\text {bu/11 }}$ | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { closed [2] } \\ \text { coast [2] } & 39 / 11 & 49 / 4\end{array}$ |
|  | buildings [1] 26/19 | coasta1 [16] 11/3 12/7 |
| $34 / 13$ 35/24 36/10 37/5 | builds [1] 39/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 22 & 14 / 13 & 19 / 7 & 24 / 3\end{array}$ |
| 38/22 40/20 41/6 41/22 | built [2] 58/8 58/9 | 24/16 $24 / 17 \quad 27 / 3 \quad 30 / 25$ |
| 42/14 42/15 42/20 42/21 | bullets [1] 51/12 | 37/21 39/20 41/11 41/15 |
| 43/18 43/19 43/24 44/3 | business [1] 22/2 | 64/17 76/20 |
| 44/11 44/13 45/2 45/16 | businesses [1] 41/25 | collection [3] 53/5 67/24 |
| 45/24 46/2 46/18 46/20 |  | 69/19 |
| 46/21 47/7 47/25 48/8 | C | collectively [2] 11/15 |
| 48/16 48/17 $48 / 23$ 52/1 | calculating [1] 73/16 | 52/4 |
| 55/3 55/9 59/1 59/22 64/7 | cal1 [1] 30/13 | collects [1] 48/17 |
| 64/13 66/25 67/1 67/25 | Callahan [1] 1/14 | come [5] 6/12 6/14 20/14 |
| 69/15 70/19 71/9 76/3 | called [1] 36/14 | 73/12 75/5 |
| 76/11 76/18 77/12 77/20 | came [7] 7/18 7/20 10/17 | comes [1] 52 |
| 77/25 78/9 78/16 | 13/17 25/13 27/24 51/2 | coming [3] 45/14 47/21 |
| Berkeley Township's [1] | can [18] 15/5 29/3 29/5 | 49/4 |
| 77/12 | $35 / 12$ 36/2 36/15 37/3 | comment [1] 20 |
| Berkeley's [2] 13/7 47/3 | 39/17 43/11 44/25 45/1 | comments [5] 19/4 42/8 |
| better [6] 30/4 33/17 | 45/12 45/13 46/16 46/17 | 50/18 51/2 60/13 |
| 66/25 67/1 70/11 70/11 | 60/15 61/2 73/25 | commercial [3] 16/20 59/9 |
| between [4] 17/23 30/3 | can't [1] 50/10 | 59/18 |
| 48/24 68/19 | cannot [1] 55/22 | Commission [2] 8/8 |
| beyond [5] 22/8 24/11 | capabilities [2] 39/17 | commitment [3] 65/22 65/23 |
| 24/13 38/9 74/6 | 49/15 | 65/24 |
| bicycle [1] 60/17 | capacity [7] 14/6 34/1 | committee [1] |
| big [2] 7/19 27/9 | 34/13 39/5 64/15 64/25 | communication [1] 30 |
| bike [1] 28/20 | 67/5 | communities [21] 6/10 6/10 |
| billboard [1] 59/3 | capital [3] 10/8 10/8 | 6/19 6/25 28/22 32 |
| bit [12] 9/23 10/12 11/10 | 11/11 | 37/25 38/2 38/19 42/23 |
| 12/22 14/15 30/19 42/5 | case [1] 17/18 | 43/2 43/20 46/24 47/8 |
| 43/2 43/15 51/6 71/7 76/1 | cases [2] 17/19 74/19 | 47/11 48/2 48/7 61/15 62/2 |
| Block [1] 6/15 | categorizes [1] 16/19 | 63/5 74/24 |
| Blousteịn [2] 73/2 73/4 | category [3] 36/16 36/17 | communities' [2] 61/22 |
| Bloustein School [2] 73/2 | 49/3 | 61/24 |
| 73/4 | cause [2] 51/25 69/11 | community [85] |
| blue [1] 25/12 | ceases [1] 73/7 | Community Ratings [1] 11/8 |
| B7vd [1] 2/7 | center [4] 52/7 54/16 | community's [8] 15/22 16/7 |
| board [32] 1/1 2/5 4/23 | 54/16 54/19 | 31/14 $32 / 11 \quad 54 / 12 \quad 55 / 24$ |
| 6/3 14/18 14/19 14/19 | centers [1] 59/10 | 55/25 67/19 |
| 14/24 15/11 16/4 18/3 19/9 | certain [7] 4/25 6/17 21/6 | comparison [1] 67/2 |
|  | 32/24 35/9 50/18 56/21 | compelling [2] 58/16 66/8 |
| 23/12 24/21 35/6 38/14 | certainly [3] 4/23 34/17 | compensated [1] 70/12 |
| 45/12 50/9 52/22 57/15 | 68/13 | complete [2] 12/18 29/24 |
| 60/11 61/12 61/21 65/23 | certificates [1] 35/18 | completed [2] 12/14 75/23 |
| 66/5 66/7 73/12 73/24 | CERTIFIED [2] 1/24 80/5 | completely [1] 64/1 |
| board's [2] 16/12 21/19 | certify [1] 80/6 | completing [1] 52/5 |
| boat [2] 28/18 60/19 | cetera [1] 17/12 | complexities [1] 24/6 |
| body [7] 20/20 60/10 62/13 | Chair [1] 42/11 | complimentary [5] 39/5 |
| 66/16 73/14 73/22 75/18 | Chairman [1] 1/12 | 67/12 77/8 78/5 78/7 |
| boggles [1] 68/15 | challenges [3] 19/24 20/7 | component [6] 9/3 64/7 |
| boosted [1] 34 | 57/10 | 67/19 69/18 72/2 72/2 |
| Boro [2] 18/8 22/19 | change [1] 20/6 | components [4] 5/9 25/4 |
| borough [5] 6/6 37/25 41/9 | changed [1] 23/13 | 35/12 72/19 |
| 60/23 77/16 | changes [7] 13/12 15/6 | comprehensive [23] 8/13 |
| both [10] 5/9 6/9 20/21 | 15/7 15/21 20/2 57/4 70/10 | $\begin{array}{llllll}9 / 4 & 16 / 10 & 16 / 15 & 22 / 9 & 27 / 21\end{array}$ |
| 3/6 36/6 38/22 65/18 | character [4] 27/4 41/24 | 31/21 35/19 42/7 55/23 |
| 72/10 72/18 78/16 | 51/21 69/21 | 57/9 $58 / 4 \begin{array}{lllllllll} & 58 / 18 & 59 / 5 & 65 / 18\end{array}$ |
| bottom [3] 5/21 50/21 | characteristics [6] | 66/3 66/4 68/6 68/20 68/20 |
| 51/13 | 18/1 46/1 46/2 63/23 63/25 | 74/9 74/15 75/1 |
| break [1] 50/2 | characterized [1] 63/20 | comprehensively [1] 9/23 |
| Brian [1] 1/15 | CHERKOS [1] 2/3 | concept [1] 21/18 |
| Brick [1] 2/7 | [1] 49/18 | concepts [1] 74/1 |
| briefly [1] 75/19 | children [1] 60/18 | concern [6] 21/18 27/5 |
| bring [3] 25/18 47/24 48/1 | choose [1] 44/19 | 29/14 51/7 53/18 62/1 |
| road [1] 51/7 | circumstances [1] 56/18 | concerned [2] 66/7 75/12 |
| broader [3] 19/18 26/9 | citizens [1] 12/5 | concerns [20] 20/8 20/16 |
| 74/2 | clarification [1] 42/12 | 21/13 22/6 24/24 25/6 |
| brought [2] 21/19 51/6 brush [1] 51/7 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { clarifying }[1] 27 / 8 \\ & \text { clear }[3] \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} 28 / 10 & 30 / 6 & 43 / 14 \\ 52 / 4 & 53 / 1 & 59 / 20 \\ 51 / 3 & 61 / 5 \end{array}$ |


| C | course [2] $8 / 10 \quad 47 / 21$ | demographically [1] 63/4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concerns... [1] 74/22 | covering [1] 4/15 | demographics [1] $76 / 25$ <br> department $[10]$ $7 / 2$ $10 / 25$ |
| conclude [2] 40/21 78/15 | CPA [1] 2/14 | 17/8 17/14 17/23 24/14 |
| concluded [2] 13/8 78/24 | crabbing [1] 60/18 | 37/10 49/16 68/9 73/3 |
| conclusion [4] 5/13 73/5 | crafting [2] 22/15 59/15 | departure [1] 76/11 |
| 73/8 75/20 | create [2] 36/1 40/2 | dependent [1] 48/3 |
| concurrently [1] 15/8 | created [2] 39/2 60/7 | depending [1] 56/25 |
| condition [1] 21/2 | creates [1] 51/6 | deprive [1] 76/18 |
| conditional [1] 21/6 | creation [1] 30/2 | depth [1] 59/24 |
| conditioned [1] 19/10 | criteria [2] 5/10 62/8 | described [1] 12/22 |
| conditions [5] 20/18 20/19 | critical [5] 22/14 40/15 | design [1] 21/9 |
| 21/8 43/9 45/15 | 53/18 56/8 78/10 | designation [1] 54/1 |
| conduct [1] 14/9 | cross [4] 28/17 43/8 43/10 | designed [3] 18/14 58/3 |
| confined [1] 44/3 | 79/1 | 78/1 |
| connected [1] 32/1 | cross-examination [1] 79/1 | despite [3] 13/5 28/11 |
| connection [1] 48/24 | cross-honoring [1] 28/17 | 52/16 |
| connections [1] 49/8 | CRS [15] $11 / 8$ 13/18 $31 / 25$ | detail [8] 10/12 11/10 |
| CONNORS [1] $2 / 3$ | $31 / 25$ 33/5 33/11 33/17 | 12/22 14/15 15/14 31/2 |
| conscious [1] 24/23 | 33/20 34/2 55/19 55/20 | 38/13 67/15 |
| consent [2] 62/12 66/15 | 64/19 66/24 66/24 77/14 | detailed [1] 14/9 |
| consequences [2] 76/4 | cultural [3] 63/1 70/10 | details [3] 12/10 17/19 |
| 76/12 | 70/21 | 27/16 |
| consider [3] 7/25 25/7 | culture [1] 71/1 | determine [1] 62/ |
| 28/19 | current [3] 33/5 33/12 | detrimental [7] |
| consideration [4] 34/18 | 43/8 | 66/23 69/7 75/25 76/15 |
| 40/16 59/16 73/13 | Currently [1] 77/16 | 77/10 78/16 |
| considerations [1] 18/17 | D | developed [3] 16/9 38/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}\text { considered } \\ \text { consistent } & \text { [1] } & \text { 20/17 }\end{array}$ | damage [3] 7/8 32/20 32/21 | 45/22 |
| constantly [1] 54/4 | damaged [2] 22/1 22/2 | $\begin{array}{lllll} & 11 / 12 & 16 / 25 & 19 / 12 & 19 / 15\end{array}$ |
| construction [4] 10/1 | Dame [10] 30/18 38/5 39/1 | 21/11 23/17 27/8 51/20 |
| 29/21 29/23 30/1 | 39/4 40/7 43/4 43/7 65/5 | 52/6 54/23 76/20 |
| consultant [1] 68/15 | 71/25 72/21 | dialogue [1] 69/2 |
| contains [1] 76/22 | DASTI [1] 2/3 | Dickerson [1] 2/13 |
| context [6] 14/11 16/20 | data [5] 44/25 45/15 45/25 | did [12] 17/2 17/18 17/21 |
| 27/1 27/6 58/3 74/3 | 46/7 48/17 | 17/23 30/25 41/13 67/11 |
| continually [2] 20/9 62/1 | date [3] 42/4 43/10 80/9 | 71/6 72/1 72/12 72/24 |
| continue [8] 4/11 4/12 | dated [2] 4/19 80/16 | 77/21 |
| 30/9 36/24 37/14 56/13 | DCA [6] 14/7 17/14 17/20 | different [19] 7/17 7/21 |
| 56/13 56/17 | 18/21 40/1 72/13 | 10/17 18/12 18/15 24/7 |
| contịnued [2] 13/1 37/11 | de [30] $1 / 5$ |  |
| continues [4] 7/1 20/3 | 10/14 $38 / 18$ 50/5 51/25 |  |
| 30/9 46/22 | 60/22 61/13 62/10 62/12 | 61/20 68/11 71/5 |
| continuing [3] 29/25 40/4 | 63/3 66/9 66/12 66/15 | Diminish [1] 67/3 |
| 64/7 | 66/21 69/11 70/17 73/11 | directing [1] 55/4 |
| continuity [1] 78/12 | 73/17 74/2 75/17 75/24 | directly [3] 19/13 58/25 |
| continuum [1] 8/2 | 76/2 76/5 76/14 76/17 77/9 | 60/21 |
| contradicts [1] 57/25 | 78/15 | disabilities [1] 46/12 |
| contribute [1] 77/3 | de-annex [1] 61/13 | disallowing [1] 66/11 |
| control [3] 71/18 71/19 | de-annexation [28] $1 / 5$ 4/4 | discount [4] 33/6 33/13 |
| 71/19 | 4/18 5/12 10/14 38/18 50/5 | 77/15 77/18 |
| controlled [1] 71/17 | 51/25 60/22 62/10 62/12 | discounted [2] 42/1 78/7 |
| Cooperate [1] 29/18 | 63/3 66/9 66/12 66/15 | discussed [1] 20/11 |
| coordinate [1] 13/13 | 69/11 70/17 73/11 73/17 | discussion [4] 5/19 27/7 |
| coordination [2] 30/5 | 74/2 75/17 75/24 76/2 76/5 | 69/2 70/14 |
| 46/24 | 76/14 76/17 77/9 78/15 | discussions [1] 27/24 |
| core [1] 27/4 | de-annexed [1] 66/21 | dissipates [1] 48/18 |
| Corps [1] 29/25 | dealt [1] 30/24 | distinct [2] 59/12 63/4 |
| correct [5] 46/3 46/4 47/6 | Dean [1] 73/2 | distributed [1] 8/22 |
| 48/14 74/21 | Dean Hughes [1] 73/2 | district [1] 23/19 |
| corridor [2] 52/7 52/8 | Debris [1] 10/14 | districts [2] 54/25 54/25 |
| cost [2] 34/11 71/7 | decade [2] 8/10 68/13 | diverse [3] 67/24 67/24 |
| costs [2] 33/7 77/6 | December [5] 18/4 18/8 | 69/18 |
| could [6] 22/3 26/11 44/13 | 18/22 19/2 31/6 | diversity [12] 53/7 54/10 |
| 44/18 45/18 71/25 | December 15 [1] 18/8 | 63/1 63/6 63/10 65/13 |
| council's [1] 21/20 | decision [2] 75/875/8 | 67/20 67/22 68/2 76/9 |
| Councilman [1] 1/12 | decision-making [1] 75/8 | 76/24 77/4 |
| county [3] 29/19 38/1 | define [1] 69/20 | divided [1] 5/3 |
| 72/18 | defined [1] 24/19 | do [27] 5/24 9/19 11/19 |
| couple [6] 23/2 51/10 | deliverables [1] 17/10 | 17/18 19/22 20/10 21/4 |
| 51/12 58/20 73/1 73/19 | demographic [1] 70/10 | 22/3 30/25 38/17 40/21 |

do... [16] 43/8 44/19
44/22 $50 / 21 \quad 51 / 5 \quad 52 / 3$
52/10 56/22 58/17 58/24 68/10 75/4 75/6 75/7 75/7 80/6
dockage [1] 28/18
document [1] 19/8
documents [6] 14/3 51/9 52/21 53/6 57/24 61/23
does [4] 48/5 53/12 54/11 71/18
doesn't [3] 53/23 71/19 71/19
doing [6] 43/4 57/16 58/12 68/12 68/13 68/18
dollars [4] 6/18 7/14 7/15 11/16
dollars' [1] 64/22
Domenick [1] 1/13
don't [9] 6/2 27/22 40/9 46/19 48/23 53/13 57/15 58/7 68/7
done [10] $14 / 5$ 17/12 $25 / 7$ 25/17 $49 / 10 \quad 51 / 8 \quad 57 / 17$ 61/9 73/18 74/13
doubt [1] 51/1
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { down } & {[3]} & 13 / 25 & 71 / 13 \\ 75 / 5\end{array}$
drafted [1] 31/7
dramatic [1] 13/10
drift [1] 24/18
DRIVE [1] $1 / 24$
dry [1] 74/7
due [1] 42/14
dune [2] 30/1 43/13
dunes [1] 30/21
during [3] 18/13 64/2 70/17
dwelling [3] 46/9 46/14 46/15
dwellings [1] 77/2
dwells [1] 46/13
E
e-mailed [1] 19/2
each [5] 53/3 58/1 74/20 74/23 74/25
earlier [2] 67/16 71/1
earmarked [1] 8/15
economic [6] 52/11 66/17
71/10 75/25 76/15 77/10
educated [2] 70/11 76/7
educational [1] 63/6
effect [2] 31/13 70/4
effective [4] 10/2 22/4 37/1 46/25
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { effectively } & {[6]} & 12 / 2 & 25 / 19\end{array}$ 29/4 31/16 36/7 37/4
effects [1] 38/16
effectuated [1] 54/4
efficient [3] 10/2 12/4 22/4
efficiently [1] 29/4
effort [11] $10 / 20$ 14/18 14/21 14/23 15/11 16/3 16/24 22/10 25/20 30/20 54/14
efforts [45] 5/6 5/8 5/9 5/16 $5 / 17$ 5/20 8/2 9/5 13/18 $14 / 9 \quad 16 / 1116 / 13$ 16/15 24/22 25/14 27/10
$\begin{array}{lllll}27 / 22 & 29 / 25 & 33 / 2 & 41 / 1\end{array}$
$41 / 3 \quad 51 / 3 \quad 51 / 1152 / 18 \quad 53 / 7$
53/21 53/24 54/5 55/19
55/20 55/25 55/25 56/4
56/5 56/16 64/4 64/8 64/15
64/24 68/23 68/24 69/3
74/16 77/12
either [2] 33/22 53/1
electronic [1] 35/8
electronically [1] 35/20
Element [1] 13/5
elements [1] 35/14
elevation [1] 35/18
eligible [1] 7/10
eliminated [2] 23/17 23/20
else [2] 44/5 79/2
embedded [1] 57/23
embodied [3] 15/4 57/23 67/6
emergency [6] 10/6 36/4
43/25 49/17 67/6 78/2
emphasized [1] 67/17
employed [2] 63/13 70/12
enables [1] 41/22
encapsulates [3] 40/25
42/2 75/21
encourage [3] 29/24 30/2 51/19
encouraging [3] 32/4 52/6 61/8
end [2] 18/3 19/23
ended [1] 50/15
endorsement [2] 8/7 69/1
enforcement [1] 27/10
engage [1] 32/19
engaged [3] 49/18 61/22 74/9
Engineer [1] 2/15
Engineers [1] 30/1
enhance [4] 8/16 30/17 34/8 38/6
$\begin{array}{llll}\text { enhanced [6] } & 28 / 6 \quad 38 / 25\end{array}$ 39/8 60/2 77/21 77/25
enhancement [4] 30/2 37/23 38/20 39/16
enhances [1] 34/14
enhancing [1] 38/6
ensure [6] 15/17 16/4
16/13 17/9 21/8 29/22
ensuring [4] 15/23 16/7
26/18 78/12
entered [1] 51/3
entities [1] 29/19
entitle [1] 77/14
environment [1] 68/23
environmental [4] 55/4
55/7 55/12 68/25
environmentally [1] 54/21 environs [1] 41/6
Ernie [1] 2/15
especially [2] 5/7 49/5
ESQ [2] 2/5 2/8
ESQS [2] 2/3 2/6
essentially [17] 4/14 5/2 $\begin{array}{llllll}5 / 4 & 8 / 25 & 9 / 10 & 9 / 15 & 11 / 15\end{array}$
12/12 15/22 23/23 29/2
34/20 35/10 52/15 58/15
63/25 75/10
establish [1] 32/10
established [4] 21/2 41/23 63/19 76/6
establishes [3] 15/3 26/12
$32 / 8$
establishing [1] 28/20
Estuary [1] 55/12
et [1] 17/11
evacuations [1] 37/3
evaluate [1] 66/15
evaluated [1] 26/5
evaluates [1] 26/3
evaluating [3] 43/12 49/19 62/18
evaluation [3] 5/12 28/2 66/3
even [9] 22/8 37/13 48/18 54/24 55/17 64/15 67/1 67/17 71/13
evening [1] $4 / 8$
event [1] 31/13
events [12] $6 / 21$ 9/2 10/4 26/22 $35 / 15 \quad 35 / 17$ 36/7 $36 / 22 \quad 37 / 2 \quad 38 / 8 \quad 38 / 9 \quad 64 / 16$
Eventually [1] 38/20
ever [1] 43/11
every [4] 17/20 25/3 54/12 54/12
everybody [3] 4/8 46/21 49/20
everything [1] 62/22
evolutionary [1] 19/21
evolving [1] 56/12
exactly [1] 74/5
examination [1] 79/1
example [6] 24/21 25/9
29/11 46/5 46/5 46/11
exceed [1] 32/6
excerpt [1] 50/22
$\begin{array}{ll}\text { excerpts [1] } & 58 / 20 \\ \text { exciting [1] } & 49 / 12\end{array}$
exclusive [1] 4/5
excuse [3] 7/14 10/7 69/18
existing [7] 13/7 13/13 26/6 26/6 28/11 29/3 59/9
expand [1] 48/1
expanded [1] 38/20
$\begin{array}{lll}\text { experts [1] } & 73 / 20 \\ \text { expires }[1] & 80 / 14\end{array}$
explained [1] 5/2
exposed [1] 13/6
expressed [3] 14/1 27/5 65/23
extensive [6] 7/6 16/24 17/24 51/3 $\quad 52 / 17 \quad 69 / 1$
extent [7] 33/21 33/21 $\begin{array}{llllll}36 / 13 & 36 / 16 & 43 / 19 & 61 / 18\end{array}$ 70/5
extreme [1] 78/12
F
faced [1] 20/7
facilitating [1] 26/21
facilities [15] 28/7 28/19
29/3 35/11 $35 / 21 \quad 35 / 22$
36/20 41/10 $41 / 14$ 41/18
44/24 45/8 64/12 67/5 78/10
fact [33] 13/23 15/8 17/21
23/3 25/12 $33 / 15 \quad 34 / 1$
37/17 38/19 39/4 40/6
42/14 48/10 52/17 55/14
64/1 $64 / 5 \quad 64 / 12 \quad 66 / 11$
66/20 66/22 66/23 69/5
69/6 69/13 $70 / 6 \quad 71 / 3$ 71/7
71/8 71/25 72/11 72/24

| F | 23/16 36/17 | $22 / 8 \quad 24 / 12$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| fact... [1] 75/10 | Fourth [1] 71/12 | $\begin{gathered} 42 / 5 \quad 70 / 1870 / 18 \\ \text { goal } \quad 34 / 3 \end{gathered}$ |
| factor [1] 38/15 | fragment [2] 74/23 74/24 | goals [17] 15/24 16/11 |
| factors [4] 25/5 25/6 32/9 | framework [2] 9/16 13/7 | 20/5 26/9 26/16 26/17 $27 / 6$ |
| 37/22 | frankly [1] 71/11 | 51/15 51/16 51/24 58/4 |
| fairly [12] 6/5 7/6 15/20 | Frederick [1] 1/13 | 58/6 58/9 58/14 58/23 59/2 |
| 16/2 $16 / 23$ 17/24 $20 / 22$ | front [1] 5/22 | 60/24 |
| 22/22 23/11 51/3 52/17 | function [1] 8/17 | God [3] $6 / 22$ 31/18 $56 / 20$ |
| /1 | fund [2] 29/21 31/23 | goes [1] 74/6 |
| fall [2] 12/15 12/15 | fundamental [2] 21/18 27/4 | going [41] 4/11 4/21 20/1 |
| familiar [2] 15/12 34/21 | funded [8] 7/21 9/5 11/2 | 24/11 $31 / 2238 / 19$ 38/24 |
| family [5] 19/11 19/14 | 15/8 24/4 30/15 34/25 | 40/11 $40 / 14$ 43/10 $43 / 15$ |
| 1/3 21/11 23/16 | 72/15 |  |
| far [1] 35/5 | funding [5] 13/18 25/20 | 45/1 45/14 45/22 46/15 |
| farther [2] 48/15 48/16 | 36/1 47/24 60/3 | 46/20 46/25 47/9 47/11 |
| faster [1] 26/21 | funds [1] 24/12 | 48/3 48/21 49/1 49/6 50/1 |
| favor [1] 79/5 | further [18] 8/16 11/12 | 50/4 50/16 56/12 56/13 |
| feature [1] 46/8 |  | 56/17 56/17 56/22 57/3 |
| features [3] 35/9 47/4 | 22/23 27/20 28/2 30/17 | 62/22 65/3 69/21 69/22 |
| 48/22 | 30/19 34/8 37/23 45/11 | 73/13 |
| federal [3] 6/11 6/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}48 / 20 & 56 / 23 & 59 / 20 & 76 / 2\end{array}$ | gone [1] 62/23 |
| 29/18 | future [15] 6/20 8/25 9/2 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { good [2] } & 4 / 7 & 43 / 1\end{array}$ |
| feeling [1] 19/12 | 9/14 9/16 10/4 20/4 21/16 |  |
| fees [1] 71/19 | 26/21 27/8 31/20 37/12 | 12/17 22/11 43/21 58/6 |
| 1t [1] 22/14 | 48/22 71/21 72/9 | gotten [1] 71/25 |
| w [1] 37/6 | G | governing [7] 20/20 60/10 |
| final [2] 69/9 69/9 |  | 62/13 66/16 73/14 73/22 |
| finally [2] 30/23 65/17 | game [1] 73/14 | 75/18 |
| financial [2] 73/15 73/20 | gathered [2] 42/18 42/24 | government [1] 6/16 |
| nancially [1] 55/21 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { gave [5] } & 22 / 7 & 22 / 7 & 24 / 17\end{array}$ | governs [1] 73/11 |
| findings [1] 18/3 | 72/5 72/6 | grabbing [1] 5/25 |
| first [19] 5/14 7/19 9/3 | general [5] 9/11 20/14 | grandchildren [1] 60/19 |
| 16/25 18/7 18/8 18/21 19/1 | 26/17 29/7 58/6 | grant [40] 6/16 7/4 7/11 |
| 19/5 43/1 48/10 51/13 | generalized [3] 14/1 45/5 | 7/12 7/16 8/15 8/21 9/6 |
| 60/25 62/10 62/10 62/11 | 50/17 | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll} & 9 / 10 & 9 / 19 & 9 / 21 & 10 / 23 & 10 / 24\end{array}$ |
| 62/18 63/3 66/1 | generous [1] 46/23 |  |
| fiscal [2] 73/17 74/7 | genesis [1] 25/13 | 12/18 $14 / 615 / 917 / 717 / 22$ |
| five [2] 26/16 34/9 | geographic [9] 10/10 30/12 | 18/21 22/8 24/15 $25 / 16$ |
| flexibility [1] 41/8 | 34/19 41/22 48/22 65/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 25 / 18 & 26 / 5 & 30 / 16 & 34 / 16\end{array}$ |
| f1ood [18] 26/4 32/2 32/6 | 65/14 67/20 77/25 | 35/1 36/1 37/10 37/24 39/3 |
| 32/16 $32 / 20 \quad 32 / 21 \quad 33 / 7$ | geography [1] 45/23 | 47/20 60/2 60/4 64/23 |
| $33 / 7$ 33/8 33/10 $33 / 23$ | germination [1] 20/13 | 72/14 |
| 33/24 34/16 $36 / 11$ 42/1 | get [25] $10 / 19$ 12/18 $14 / 8$ | grants [7] 11/15 14/7 |
| 64/4 64/13 77/16 | 17/20 18/14 $25 / 16$ 25/18 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 22 & 24 / 6 & 28 / 23 & 29 / 20\end{array}$ |
| flooding [3] 41/11 41/15 | $\begin{array}{lllll} & 25 / 20 & 26 / 22 & 26 / 23 & 26 / 23\end{array}$ | 53/16 |
| 78/11 |  | great [3] 61/18 67/15 70/5 |
| floodp7ain [6] 9/24 11/11 | 37/10 40/7 40/7 41/19 | greater [3] 19/11 55/2 |
| 11/13 32/5 32/12 34/5 | 41/19 42/12 67/1 67/14 | 63/14 |
| focus [3] 51/14 51/14 59/9 | 73/7 75/2 | green [1] 26/10 |
| focused [3] 52/25 53/8 | gets [1] 68/5 | GREGORY [1] 2/5 |
| 57/21 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { getting [7] } & 9 / 10 & 10 / 12\end{array}$ | groundwork [1] 9/16 |
| focusing [4] 16/19 30/7 |  | groups [1] 18/12 |
| 61/12 66/19 | 62/7 | growth [1] 55/4 |
| follow [3] 17/21 19/3 23/8 | GI [1] 47/18 | guess [1] 6/2 |
| follow-up [2] 19/3 23/8 | Gingrich [1] 1/15 | guide [1] 26/10 |
| following [3] 29/22 78/12 | GIS [41] 30/13 30/13 30/14 | guidelines [1] 51/19 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}79 / 1 \\ \text { forbid } & \text { [3] } & 6122 & 31 / 18\end{array}$ |  | H |
| forbid [3] 6/22 31/18 | $35 / 4 \quad 35 / 7 \quad 36 / 2 \quad 36 / 2 \quad 36 / 10$ |  |
| foregoing [1] 80 |  | had $\begin{array}{llllll} \\ 14 / 53 & 15 / 18 & 13 & 13 / 20 & 17 / 24\end{array}$ |
| Forked [1] 2/4 |  | 18/21 $22 / 15 \quad 25 / 12 \quad 25 / 15$ |
| form [1] 58/16 | 45/23 46/6 47/3 47/9 47/19 | 25/17 25/21 $25 / 21 \quad 27 / 5$ |
| formally [1] 23/23 | 48/18 49/10 64/9 65/1 67/9 | 31/13 37/17 $37 / 19$ 37/21 |
| forms [3] 35/21 44/25 | 71/24 72/1 72/10 72/15 | 50/23 $55 / 19 \quad 55 / 20 \quad 62 / 17$ |
| 48/25 | 72/17 77/21 | 64/23 64/25 65/23 69/4 |
| forth [4] 26/7 26/8 50/23 | give [5] 41/7 46/5 51/1 | 72/11 72/12 72/14 72/15 |
| 80/9 | 56/9 72/25 | 72/17 72/18 |
| forward [2] 30/10 49/20 | given [6] 22/16 57/5 57/6 | Haines [1] 2/ |
| foundation [6] 11/23 13/8 | 57/6 57/7 73/18 | half [4] 7/14 7/14 11/16 |
| 20/13 33/20 55/19 56/10 | giving [1] 22/7 | 64/21 |
| four [5] 5/4 5/5 23/16 | go [10] 4/21 5/1 $14 / 8$ | halfway [2] 4/20 5/15 |


| H | $\begin{aligned} & \text { highly }{ }^{[2]} \text { [2] } 63 / 13 \text { 76/6 } 1 / 2380 / 4 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{lll} \text { imply [1] } & 46 / 19 \\ \text { importance [4] } & 12 / 24 & 13 / 25 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| handle [1] 14/6 | his [4] $\quad 51 / 22$ 52/2 $52 / 12$ | 22/16 41/2 |
| happen [2] 47/9 48/5 | 52/15 | important [32] 8/12 9/13 |
| happened [1] 71/12 | historically [1] 76/19 | 15/1 15/13 15/21 26/1 |
| happening [1] 47/10 | history [1] 5/7 | 29/13 29/14 $30 / 7 \quad 34 / 18$ |
| hard [2] 23/1 50/8 | holistic [1] 56/3 | $35 / 6$ 36/25 37/14 37/15 |
| has [43] $4 / 24$ 6/12 6/14 | HOMEOWNERS [2] 1/4 4/3 | 38/15 40/16 41/15 43/16 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 22 & 29 / 23 & 31 / 23 & 32 / 1\end{array}$ | honoring [1] 28/17 | 50/20 53/9 $55 / 3$ 56/8 $59 / 16$ |
| $33 / 11$ 33/15 $33 / 1634 / 2$ | hope [2] 47/23 48/5 | 60/14 60/25 62/18 68/24 |
| $34 / 6$ 34/14 $35 / 1 \quad 36 / 10$ | hopeful [1] 48/5 | 70/20 72/8 74/3 74/4 74/5 |
| $36 / 10$ 36/11 36/14 38/2 | hopefully [3] 31/19 57/1 | importantly [2] 15/16 27/1 |
| 40/19 42/15 46/22 47/20 | 71/21 | impressive [1] 39/22 |
|  | house [1] 22/1 | improve [3] 13/18 59/2 |
| 52/23 54/5 56/1 $56 / 3 \quad 56 / 5$ | household [2] 63/15 63/16 | 59/8 |
| 56/14 $57 / 9$ 61/5 64/14 | housing [8] 41/10 54/11 | improvement [2] 10/8 11/11 |
| 65/22 65/23 66/5 67/8 68/3 | 63/8 63/9 63/10 71/5 76/10 | improvements [4] 19/25 |
| 74/10 74/17 | 76/24 | 27/11 54/11 59/4 |
| have [76] $4 / 1$ 4/4 $6 / 28 / 9$ | how [12] $4 / 7$ 12/25 $22 / 3$ | improving [3] 12/3 12/3 |
| 14/3 $14 / 20017 / 7 \quad 17 / 13130 / 8$ | 29/3 $29 / 4$ 45/1 47/12 47/13 | 59/9 |
| 25/4 $25 / 6$ | 51/8 51/9 55/15 64/19 | in-depth [1] 59/24 |
| $32 / 15$ 33/23 35/16 36/21 | However [1] 46/19 | include [3] 28/12 29/20 |
| 36/23 37/1 $37 / 9$ 38/3 38/17 | Hudak [1] 1/15 | 35/12 |
| 38/19 41/2 42/8 42/11 | huge [1] 72/23 | included [5] 5/5 6/14 9/6 |
| 43/10 43/11 44/7 44/22 | Hugg [1] 2/13 | 11/21 51/24 |
| 44/23 45/6 46/6 47/11 | Hughes [1] 73/2 | includes [3] 28/13 59/2 |
| 47/18 $47 / 18$ 48/8 48/11 | hurricane [1] 78/11 | 59/5 |
| 48/23 $50 / 12$ 50/21 55/16 | hurricanes [2] 36/17 $39 / 19$ | including [15] 11/6 12/6 |
| 57/3 57/17 58/15 60/21 | I | 12/20 26/14 $35 / 13$ 43/24 |
| 61/21 65/9 65/11 66/14 |  | 52/24 53/19 $59 / 13 \quad 64 / 9$ |
| 68/1 68/9 68/9 69/3 69/4 | I'11 [6] 9/22 10/19 46/4 |  |
| 71/25 72/1 72/21 72/23 | 50/25 56/9 59/19 | 74/16 |
| 72/24 $73 / 5$ 73/18 $73 / 18$ | I'm [19] 4/11 4/21 9/8 | income [3] 63/15 63/16 |
| 73/20 74/4 74/9 74/19 | 27/17 31/21 35/5 40/9 | 77/4 |
| 74/19 75/4 75/23 75/24 | 42/10 45/17 45/19 45/20 | increased [4] 41/7 42/1 |
| 76/3 76/11 76/14 77/9 | 48/5 49/13 49/13 50/10 | 76/8 77 |
| 78/16 | 51/12 62/3 62/22 78/20 | Indeed [1] 76/ |
| having [12] 10/15 31/4 | I've [3] 19/18 26/1 42/3 | indicated [1] 4/13 |
| 39/25 41/14 49/10 49/20 | ì ceberg [1] 49/14 | individual [2] 23/4 60/11 |
| 57/7 62/15 68/8 72/10 | idea [10] $14 / 4$ 21/13 $29 / 2$ | individually [1] 52/3 |
| 72/16 72/22 | 31/10 $32 / 7 \quad 54 / 3 \quad 54 / 3 \quad 61 / 20$ | indulgence [1] 78/20 |
| hazard [5] 10/5 33/10 | 62/10 65/13 | inform [1] 7/22 |
| 33/23 36/11 64/13 | ideas [1] 29/8 | information [29] 10/10 |
| he [8] 50/23 51/5 51/10 | identification [1] 30/8 |  |
| 51/13 52/2 52/14 73/6 | identified [3] 9/13 15/21 | $\begin{array}{lllll}36 / 12 & 36 / 18 & 36 / 19 & 38 / 10\end{array}$ |
| 78/24 | 31/4 | 38/23 39/5 42/17 42/24 |
| he's [1] 51/17 | identifies [2] 35/11 35/16 | 43/20 43/21 44/2 44/8 |
| Head [1] 73/3 | identify [4] 28/15 28/23 | 44/14 45/6 45/13 45/22 |
| heading [1] 13/4 | 29/17 36/15 | 46/6 46/14 46/20 47/3 |
| heads [1] 73/2 | identifying [1] 10/7 | 47/13 48/8 62/24 77/25 |
| hear [2] 50/8 50/10 | ignored [1] 54/2 | infrastructure [4] 26/11 |
| heard [4] 70/6 70/24 71/1 | immediate [1] $44 /$ | 35/13 35/14 55/6 |
| 71/14 | impact [13] 6/4 41 | inherent [1] 61/7 |
| hearing [8] 1/5 4/4 14/22 | 53/20 55/20 56/18 64/16 | initially [1] 23/6 |
| 22/25 23/7 $23 / 7$ 23/8 50/5 | 66/19 66/24 71/10 74/2 | initiatives [7] 7/23 8/6 |
| hearings [1] 60/9 | 75/25 76/15 78/16 | 9/12 51/15 65/17 65/18 |
| Heights [1] 42/23 | impacted [12] 11/21 12/7 | 68/24 |
| help [6] 6/19 7/22 42/16 | $\begin{array}{lllll}13 / 24 & 21 / 16 & 31 / 12 & 31 / 18\end{array}$ | injury [3] 51/25 69/12 |
| 57/3 61/2 72/8 | 31/19 31/19 35/15 41/18 | 69/14 |
| helped [2] 7/21 8/16 | 72/3 72/19 | input [14] 14/23 15/19 |
| here [19] 5/23 6/3 8/17 | impacts [24] 6/6 6/7 6/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}16 / 5 & 16 / 7 & 18 / 14 & 19 / 25\end{array}$ |
| 14/19 20/10 $21 / 13$ 27/18 | 6/8 6/21 7/6 9/11 17/24 | $\begin{array}{lllll}22 / 11 & 22 / 13 & 22 / 15 & 22 / 22\end{array}$ |
| 29/2 31/10 32/7 53/11 54/3 | 27/8 31/4 $32 / 17 \quad 38 / 8 \quad 39 / 9$ | 23/11 24/10 29/12 60/8 |
| 60/25 61/12 61/20 64/12 | 39/10 40/17 40/17 43/12 | insurable [1] 32/21 |
| 68/14 72/25 77/22 | 43/22 47/5 56/21 57/1 | insurance [9] 32/2 32/6 |
| hereby [1] 80/6 | 73/15 73/17 77/10 | 33/7 33/7 $33 / 9 \begin{array}{lllll} & 34 / 11 & 34 / 17\end{array}$ |
| hereinbefore [1] 80/9 | implement [2] 30/1 58/11 | 42/1 77/16 |
| hey [3] 43/21 47/8 75/5 | implementation [3] 26/14 | integral [2] 69/17 69/18 |
| higher [1] 63/17 | 42/13 49/21 | integrated [1] 56/2 |
| light [1] 27/20 | implemented [3] 11/13 15/5 | integration [1] 59/10 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { highlighting } \\ & 15 / 16 \text { 25/25 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{llll} 32 / 3 \\ \text { implementing [2] } & 11 / 5 & 33 / 3 \end{array}$ | intended  <br> $49 / 13$ $59 / 7$$\quad 7 / 208 / 21$ |


| I | $\text { John [2] } 1 / 12 \text { 1/1 }$ | 17aunch [2] 28/18 60/19 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| intent [2] 8/20 38/6 | judgment [1] ${ }^{\text {J/8 }}$ 47/12 | Law $[1]$ $23 / 10$ $70 / 25$ $70 / 25$ |
| interest [2] 28/16 48/3 | July [3] 4/19 23/22 71/12 | 1 eaders [2] 75/4 75/6 |
| interests [1] 68/2 | July 3rd [1] 4/19 | 1earn [1] 42/24 |
| interpretation [1] 47/12 | July 6 [1] 23/22 | 1ease [1] 28/25 |
| invested [1] 24/12 | June [3] 23/1 23/7 40/5 | 1eaving [1] 25/23 |
| investigate [2] 28/16 | June 1st [1] 23/1 | 1 eft [2] 5/18 64/1 |
|  | jurisdictions [1] 61/20 | 1ess [1] 32/2 |
| involved [5] 16/24 49/17 | just [38] 5/18 11/6 11/10 | $1 \mathrm{et} \mathrm{[2]} \mathrm{75/19} \mathrm{76/1}$ |
| 49/18 73/23 73/24 | $\begin{array}{llll}11 / 16 & 12 / 9 & 12 / 21 & 12 / 23\end{array}$ | 1et's [2] 45/7 45/7 |
| involvement [2] 15/17 | $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 22 & 19 / 23 & 20 / 4 & 23 / 3\end{array}$ | 1eve1 [6] 38/11 39/13 |
| 24/10 | 25/15 25/24 27/22 34/23 | 46/18 57/5 69/10 75/5 |
| involves [1] 38/5 | 38/21 39/19 40/23 42/11 | 1evels [1] 59/6 |
| involving [2] 38/4 61/23 | 42/11 42/21 $45 / 10$ 45/11 | 1iaison [1] 30/2 |
| irreplaceable [4] 64/1 |  | 1ike [12] 6/21 8/6 |
| 67/19 69/17 69/21 | 52/17 53/21 58/20 62/1 | 19/22 26/24 36/7 37/5 45/9 |
| is [147] | 64/2 66/10 67/4 70/23 | 46/5 46/8 46/11 69/23 |
| island [15] 30/3 37/22 | 72/25 74/6 75/19 | likely [1] 70 |
| 39/25 41/7 41/20 41/23 | K | Likewise [1] 76/10 |
| 42/16 43/9 60/9 63/24 | K | 1imited [3] 41/12 43/18 |
| 71/12 71/16 72/1 72/2 | Keansburg [3] 38/1 38/22 | 46/2 |
| 72/19 | 48/1 | LINDA [2] 1/23 80/4 |
| island's [1] 27/3 | keeping [1] 62/19 | line [3] 30/11 72/20 73/6 |
| islands [1] 49/5 | Kelly [1] 2/13 | linked [1] 76/20 |
| issue [4] 53/17 53/18 | Keswick [1] 1/7 | 1isten [1] 65/25 |
| 57/19 73/12 | key [4] 15/14 17/16 52/25 | 1istened [1] 74/20 |
| issues [20] 8/18 10/9 | 62/8 | 1istening [3] 62/5 74/24 |
| 18/15 18/19 20/8 20/11 | kind [10] 11/25 19/18 | 78/21 |
| 24/7 24/18 25/6 26/2 50/16 | 21/17 22/5 26/1 42/2 51/5 | little [13] 9/23 10/12 |
| 50/17 53/1 53/2 58/1 60/21 | 68/2 68/5 75/20 | 11/10 12/22 30/19 42/5 |
| 61/3 62/1 74/5 74/22 | kinds [3] 29/10 58/11 | 43/2 43/15 45/11 50/8 51/6 |
| it [107] | 58/17 | 71/6 76/1 |
| it's [62] 4/17 4/19 5/24 | know [60] 7/6 10/11 14/18 | living [1] 29/21 |
| 15/12 19/22 $23 / 1 \quad 23 / 2 \quad 23 / 3$ | 15/10 16/5 $22 / 10$ 23/2 | loans [1] 53/16 |
| 29/11 35/4 $35 / 6$ 35/18 |  | 1ocal [4] 7/3 28/18 28/20 |
| 36/25 38/15 39/19 39/21 | 31/17 32/11 33/3 35/10 | 29/19 |
| 40/8 40/9 40/15 40/23 46/9 | 35/16 37/2 39/11 39/20 | 1ocated [2] 37/18 69/13 |
| 46/18 47/15 47/17 47/18 | 40/7 $40 / 15$ 41/1 41/16 | 1ocation [5] 33/9 46/9 |
| 48/6 48/10 48/18 49/1 49/6 | 43/11 44/4 46/10 46/13 | 71/3 71/6 78/9 |
| 49/9 49/12 $52 / 21 \quad 53 / 5 \quad 53 / 9$ | 46/23 48/2 $48 / 24$ 49/5 | locations [2] 35/11 45/2 |
| 54/7 55/4 $56 / 4 \quad 56 / 12 \quad 56 / 12$ | 49/10 49/16 53/6 53/10 | 1ogic [1] 62/21 |
|  | 53/11 56/12 56/20 58/6 | 1ong [7] 39/15 69/7 71/23 |
| 61/14 61/15 62/20 63/19 | 58/15 58/17 61/15 62/22 | 72/22 74/8 75/2 78/1 |
| 66/10 68/8 69/13 69/24 | 66/2 68/7 68/13 68/19 70/7 | 1ong-term [5] 39/15 71/23 |
| 69/25 70/23 70/24 71/6 | 70/8 70/16 71/11 71/14 | 74/8 75/2 78/1 |
| 71/15 71/20 71/20 72/4 | 71/17 72/22 73/6 73/16 | longer [1] 71/8 |
| 75/16 78/14 | 73/16 74/6 74/15 75/22 | 1onging [1] 73/5 |
| item [2] 28/5 29/15 | L | 100k [7] 21/3 28/5 29/2 |
| items [1] 35/20 |  | 39/7 39 |
| its [42] 4/25 6/6 10/20 | Lacey [1] 2/4 | 10oking [8] 10/3 21/24 |
| 12/17 $13 / 9$ 13/14 $24 / 12$ | LAKEVIEW [1] 1/24 | 34/8 $38 / 16$ 49/20 62/2 |
| 24/22 $24 / 24 \quad 25 / 13$ 34/7 | 7 land [32] 13/20 15/3 16/18 | 73/15 74/25 |
| 34/15 34/15 36/4 46/23 | $\begin{array}{lllll}17 / 25 & 17 / 25 & 18 / 16 & 21 / 4\end{array}$ | Lorelli [1] |
| 47/21 48/18 51/8 51/23 | $\begin{array}{llll}\text { 21/21 } & 21 / 21 & 23 / 10 & 23 / 17\end{array}$ | 1ose [3] 77/7 77/21 78/5 |
| 55/11 56/16 57/5 57/6 57/6 | 23/18 23/18 26/2 26/6 $26 / 6$ | 1osing [1] 70/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}57 / 7 & 59 / 12 & 59 / 23 & 60 / 2\end{array}$ | 31/14 $33 / 21$ 35/20 35/21 | 1oss [11] 32/18 67/11 |
| 60/12 62/16 63/8 63/25 | 36/3 44/24 48/25 56/24 | 67/18 67/23 68/6 69/5 |
| 64/6 65/24 70/8 71/18 | 57/1 57/23 59/6 59/25 61/2 | 69/25 70/4 76/5 77/5 78/6 |
| 71/19 71/19 76/18 76/24 | 61/11 66/18 69/13 | 1osses [4] 7/8 8/25 9/1 |
| 77/13 77/21 | 1 and use [1] 16/18 | 9/14 |
| itself [3] 26/8 68/17 70/8 | lands [2] 33/19 33/25 | 1ost [2] 71/15 77/22 |
| J | large [2] 41/6 63/20 | 1ot [15] 15/10 15/11 16/8 |
|  | 1argely [1] 63/21 | 26/2 46/9 46/15 48/6 49/4 |
| JACKSON $[1]$ $1 / 25$  <br> 18    | 1arger [1] 67/8 | 62/14 62/23 62/23 70/14 |
| January [3] 18/24 18/24 | 1ast [18] 4/13 4/13 5/3 | 70/24 70/25 71/14 |
| 80/14 | 6/12 $8 / 3$ 8/10 $11 / 9$ 16/9 | lots [1] 35/10 |
| January 12 [1] 18/24 | 19/19 23/22 41/13 48/14 |  |
| Jersey [15] 1/8 1/25 2/4 | 55/8 61/18 67/15 68/12 | M |
| 2/7 $6 / 11$ 7/2 10/24 17/8 | 77/21 77/22 | Mackres [1] 1/14 |
| 24/14 28/17 28/25 37/19 | 7ate [1] 12/15 | made [8] 4/15 6/15 6/24 |
| 48/7 80/6 80/13 | 1augh [1] 73/7 | $22 / 24 \quad 40 / 11 \quad 42 / 8 \quad 42 / 8$ |



| N | obtaining [1] 68/2 | out [22] $10 / 17 \quad 13 / 17 \quad 22 / 5$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| new... [21] 6 6/11 7/2 10/8 | - $18 / 18$ [18/3 48/20 | $\begin{array}{lllll}24 / 1 & 25 / 11 & 25 / 13 & 27 / 24 \\ 31 / 11 & 33 / 8 & 33 / 11 & 33 / 18\end{array}$ |
| 10/24 17/8 19/24 20/6 | occur [1] 9/2 | 33/22 33/22 36/9 46/17 |
| 24/14 $28 / 17$ 28/25 $29 / 8$ | occurred [4] 7/8 7/9 8/9 | 47/21 48/1 48/1 52/6 55/23 |
| 29/9 37/19 47/21 48/7 | 41/17 | 59/14 64/13 |
| 51/19 54/17 56/2 56/18 | occurs [1] 8/2 | outcome [1] 29/13 |
| 80/6 80/13 | ocean [2] 72/18 77/6 | outfall [1] 29/23 |
| New Jersey [8] 6/11 7/2 | oceanfront [3] 37/19 72/18 | outreach [1] 16/24 |
| 10/24 17/8 24/14 28/25 | 76/19 | outside [1] 41/14 |
| 37/19 48/7 | off [4] 5/18 34/22 49/25 | over [9] 5/25 6/12 8/9 |
| next [1] 68/6 | 70/2 | 14/21 50/12 51/7 68/12 |
| Nick [2] 1/14 2/13 | office | 71/12 73/21 |
| nine [2] 52/3 52/8 | officials [3] 36/4 36/21 | overal1 [5] 8/22 15/24 |
| no [7] 7/19 47/21 49/13 | 47/2 | 25/25 58/9 63/5 |
| 51/14 51/14 71/8 75/23 | Oh [1] 45/19 | overhaut [1] |
| nodes [1] 52/7 | okay [4] 4/1 45/7 45/21 | overlap [2] 43/2 43/15 |
| non [1] 28/18 | 50/14 | overlay [1] 45/7 |
| non-dockage [1] 28/18 | one [35] 7/24 8/11 13/16 | overlaying [2] 36/19 47/5 |
| nor'easters [1] 39/21 | 16/14 17/16 17/20 19/22 | overreaching [1] 40/9 |
| northwestern [1] 61/16 | 21/12 25/3 27/9 27/23 | overview [2] 5/6 9/11 |
| not [60] 4/21 5/24 6/7 | 31/11 31/22 34/24 35/24 | own [7] 24/12 44/3 45/6 |
| 15/13 19/22 $24 / 16$ 25/11 | 36/17 $37 / 5 \quad 37 / 6 \quad 37 / 17$ | 45/8 47/11 47/19 62/4 |
| 31/18 31/19 34/14 34/21 | 37/24 38/2 38/18 39/23 | owned [1] 28/11 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 2 & 35 / 5 & 35 / 15 & 38 / 13\end{array}$ | 40/10 40/22 $43 / 4 \begin{array}{llll} & 43 / 5\end{array}$ | owner [1] 46/13 |
| 39/19 40/3 42/20 42/21 | 48/13 50/13 53/11 54/5 | owners [8] 21/15 32/25 |
| 44/12 46/21 47/15 47/17 | 57/21 58/1 58/24 72/25 | 33/8 59/21 77/15 77/17 |
| 47/18 49/1 50/25 51/24 | ongoing [11] 19/22 20/3 | 77/19 77/23 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}51 / 25 & 52 / 3 & 53 / 12 & 54 / 7\end{array}$ | 20/4 20/4 27/21 30/9 56/11 | owners' [1] 27/10 |
| $\begin{array}{lllllll}54 / 25 & 55 / 8 & 56 / 25 & 57 / 3\end{array}$ | 56/15 56/16 65/22 65/23 | P |
| 57/21 58/24 62/1 62/22 | only [15] 6/7 33/13 34/14 | P |
| 63/25 65/15 66/9 66/11 | 35/2 38/18 $39 / 19$ 42/20 | P's [1] 9/8 |
| 66/12 67/23 69/11 69/21 | 48/10 49/13 49/13 50/17 | p.m [1] 1/9 |
| 69/22 71/15 71/18 71/20 | 55/8 76/5 77/17 77/20 | page [16] 3/2 5/21 12/22 |
| 71/21 71/22 71/25 72/1 | open [7] 28/12 28/14 33/25 | 28/5 29/16 40/23 50/13 |
| 72/24 75/4 76/5 77/20 | 55/15 59/7 71/20 71/20 | 50/21 51/13 51/22 52/2 |
| 77/24 | Operating [1] 10/6 | 52/12 58/13 58/21 77/21 |
| Notary [2] 80/4 80 | operations [1] 78/3 | 77/22 |
| note [4] 17/4 39/24 53/9 | opinion [7] 52/15 66/11 | page 18 |
| 60/14 | 66/22 69/14 73/9 73/23 | pages [2] 27/18 73/1 |
| notes [1] 52/ | 78/15 | paraphrase [1] |
| nothing [1] 79/2 | opportunities [18] 8/24 | parcels [1] 35/9 |
| notice [1] 23/9 | 11/18 12/2 $15 / 19$ 24/10 | parenthetically [1] 59/14 |
| notification [2] 19/2 23/4 | 25/15 28/3 28/10 28/16 | park [122] |
| notified [1] 22/20 | 29/6 $29 / 18 \quad 32 / 15$ 33/24 | Park's [1] 60/23 |
| Notre [10] 30/18 38/5 39/1 | 53/2 55/6 $59 / 17$ 60/7 62/2 | parks [3] 28/11 65/10 |
| 39/4 40/7 43/4 43/7 65/5 | opportunity [9] 11/25 14/4 | 65/11 |
| 71/25 72/21 | 22/7 $30 / 16$ 33/16 $44 / 18$ | parse [1] 55/23 |
| Notre Dame [8] 38/5 39/1 | 54/20 72/6 72/7 | part [50] 5/11 5/20 6/13 |
| 39/4 40/7 43/4 65/5 71/25 | opted [1] 60/22 | 6/17 $17 / 1814 / 1714 / 2515 / 2$ |
| 72/21 | option [1] 29/1 | 16/3 17/14 20/9 23/5 $23 / 15$ |
| now [6] 29/7 30/16 38/21 | order [1] 60/24 | 23/21 24/4 25/21 30/7 31/8 |
| 48/12 49/9 57/2 | ordinance [5] 9/25 11/4 | $31 / 21$ 34/7 37/23 38/24 |
| nowhere [1] 52/10 | 11/12 15/6 15/7 | 38/24 39/2 $40 / 3$ 40/14 |
| number [8] $7 / 2214 / 21 \quad 28 / 5$ | ordinances [3] 11/4 17/11 | 40/14 40/19 41/3 43/6 |
| 29/15 32/9 39/17 50/23 | 21/21 | 44/23 45/14 45/22 45/25 |
| 60/17 | other [43] $8 / 11$ 9/10 12/10 | 50/5 $50 / 6 \quad 54 / 4 \quad 60 / 6 \quad 62 / 11$ |
| numbers [2] 73/14 74/7 |  | 62/16 65/3 66/1 66/14 |
| numeric [1] 32/8 | $\begin{array}{llllll}14 / 2 & 14 / 13 & 19 / 7 & 22 / 6 & 23 / 20\end{array}$ | 67/16 67/23 69/10 71/8 |
| numerous [3] 60/7 76/3 |  | 72/13 74/18 76/7 |
| 76/12 | 35/14 $36 / 14$ 38/21 $39 / 20$ | participants [2] 18/25 |
| 0 | 43/14 43/14 43/14 44/24 | 19/1 |
| $0 '$ |  | participa |
| objections [1] | $\begin{array}{llll} \\ 57 / 13 & 63 / 9 & 71 / 21 & 72 / 12\end{array}$ | participating [2] 28/21 |
| objective | 73/20 74/14 74/20 74/23 | 31/24 |
| objectives [12] 13/10 | 74/25 | participation [7] 60/8 |
| 15/24 16/11 20/6 26/9 | our [17] 4/16 9/16 12/18 | 60/15 61/2 61/9 63/12 64/7 |
| 51/18 52/3 52/9 53/2 58/4 | 14/6 21/12 27/24 39/16 | 77/13 |
| 58/14 58/24 | 39/16 $43 / 2544 / 3$ 44/22 | particular [2] 37/2 70/15 |
| obtain [2]  <br> obtained [1] 10/24 <br> $9 / 19$  | $\begin{array}{lll} 44 / 23 & 45 / 8 & 47 / 9 \\ 74 / 24 & 78 / 14 \end{array}$ | ```particularly [3] 11/19 30/20 36/22``` |


| P | population [4] 28/15 63/20 | $\begin{array}{llll} 32 / 3 & 32 / 4 & 32 / 8 & 34 / 7 \end{array} 34 / 24$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| partnership [1] 30/17 | portion [3] 61/16 70/13 | $\begin{array}{lll} 35 / 1 & 35 / 4 & 35 / 7 \\ 35 / 8 & 37 \\ 39 / 3 & 40 / 3 & 47 / 20 \\ 49 / 21 \end{array}$ |
| parts [1] 5/4 | 76/23 | 54/23 60/4 65/2 65/2 68/19 |
| pass [1] 6/25 | portions [2] 11/20 61/13 | 72/14 77/21 78/1 |
| past [2] 14/21 40/4 | position [4] 48/9 48/9 | Program's [1] 32/6 |
| pathways [2] 21/14 21/15 | 49/9 53/25 | programs [4] 8/16 32/20 |
| patience [1] 78/20 | possible [1] 53/2 | 37/18 65/10 |
| pause [1] 31/22 | post [23] 7/4 7/12 8/15 | project [7] |
| payouts [1] 32/23 | $\begin{array}{llllll}9 / 5 & 9 / 17 & 10 / 3 & 10 / 22 & 10 / 25\end{array}$ | 38/4 38/4 65/4 71/24 72/1 |
| pee1 [1] 55/24 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}12 / 16 & 14 / 5 & 15 / 9 & 17 / 6 & 24 / 5\end{array}$ | projections [1] 78/11 |
| people [8] 6/3 10/2 22/19 | $\begin{array}{lllllll}30 / 15 & 34 / 4 & 34 / 7 & 34 / 25\end{array}$ | projects [8] 7/17 7/21 |
| 26/22 39/4 49/4 62/5 75/12 | 37/24 39/3 47/19 60/3 | 10/8 12/20 25/19 34/24 |
| percent [6] 15/14 33/6 | 64/22 72/13 | 68/11 72/12 |
| 33/13 34/10 77/15 77/17 | potential [6] 9/1 10/4 | promote [4] 29/19 30/4 |
| permit [5] 10/1 21/23 | 28/23 39/10 43/14 47/5 | 77/13 78/1 |
| 21/24 28/17 28/25 | potentially [3] 6/20 21/16 | promoted [1] 26/17 |
| permitted [3] 21/7 23/16 | 32/21 | promotes [1] 29/11 |
| 23/18 | power [1] | promoting [3] 26/17 26/20 |
| permitting [2] 21/25 29/21 | preceded [1] 14/3 | 27/12 |
| person [1] 46/13 | predicate [2] 9/8 9/9 | proper [3] 30/1 61/24 |
| personnel [3] 36/5 36/6 | predicated [1] 44/2 | 61/25 |
| 67/7 | preferable [1] 61/10 | properly [1] |
| perspective [8] 21/5 27/21 | preliminary [1] 18/2 | properties [4] 27/11 32/22 |
| 37/9 55/23 57/11 57/11 | preoccupied [1] 52/16 | 33/10 35/16 |
| 61/11 62/4 | preparation [2] 28/12 | property [13] 7/8 21/15 |
| Peters [1] 2/15 | 28/13 | 27/10 32/25 33/8 42/15 |
| petition [6] 1/5 4/4 5/12 | prepare [1] 60/4 | 46/13 59/4 59/21 77/15 |
| 10/13 38/18 62/10 | prepared [4] 4/16 25/10 | 77/17 77/19 77/23 |
| Petitioned [1] 4/18 | 57/24 73/21 | proposed [7] 5/12 10/13 |
| petitioners [3] 2/8 60/16 | PRESENT [1] 2/12 | 62/9 75/24 76/14 76/17 |
| 60/21 | presentation [2] 4/12 |  |
| petitioners' [1] | 20/20 | proposing |
| physical [5] 45/15 45/23 | presented [2] 4/15 18/2 | prosperous [1] 76/7 |
| 45/25 46/2 46/11 | presents [1] 51/6 | protect [2] 41/23 68/24 |
| piecemeal [1] 56/1 | preservation [5] 51 | protected [4] 54/22 77/20 |
| piers [1] 60/17 | 55/15 55/15 55/17 59/7 | 77/24 78/10 |
| pilot [6] 37/25 38/3 40/3 | preserved [2] 33/19 33/25 | protecting [4] 26/19 27/3 |
| 40/8 65/4 72/21 | prestige [2] 70/1 70/4 | 55/3 55/7 |
| pilots [1] 47/25 | prestigious [1] 76/18 | protection [2] 19/11 55/11 |
| Pinewald [1] 1/7 | presumably [1] 60/22 | protections [2] 19/14 |
| place [24] 11/24 12/15 | pretty [3] 14/20 22/9 56/6 | 21/10 |
| 16/1 18/8 18/13 $19 / 4 \quad 20 / 1$ | previous [1] 4/22 | provide [10] 8/24 |
| 21/10 23/3 23/21 37/18 | previously [5] 4/6 4/10 | 15/19 16/21 $21 / 10$ 21/14 |
| 38/22 $41 / 243 / 649 / 12$ | 12/13 19/8 64/11 | 32/13 38/7 41/10 45/4 |
| 55/18 57/2 57/8 61/25 | prime [1] 25/9 | provided [8] 7/11 11/17 |
| 65/14 69/4 69/4 69/23 80/9 | principles [1] 62/21 | 15/18 16/5 17/22 38/10 |
| places [1] 45/2 | prior [4] 14/10 25/14 | 50/18 65/8 |
| plan [110 | 51/17 73/13 | provides [11] 32/15 33/6 |
| planned [1] 46/17 | privileges [1] 77/8 |  |
| planner [5] 2/13 2/14 2/15 | probably [7] 15/11 15/15 | 54/10 54/10 54/11 54/18 |
| 20/22 50/19 | 26/25 40/8 40/10 50/11 | 54/19 |
| planners [3] 17/17 17/17 | 75/12 | providing [7] 9/10 21/7 |
| 19/23 | proceed [1] 4/5 | 26/10 $41 / 25 \quad 54 / 17$ 59/17 |
| planning [158] | proceedings [1] 80/7 | 62/3 |
| plans [24] 8/4 8/5 8/6 | process [29] 10/1 10/16 | public [33] 14/23 15/18 |
| 10/18 $11 / 6$ 13/13 $13 / 19$ | 15/16 16/5 18/19 19/17 | 16/5 16/24 18/10 19/25 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}16 / 8 & 16 / 9 & 17 / 5 & 17 / 9 & 17 / 11\end{array}$ | 20/3 20/5 20/10 21/23 | 20/23 20/24 22/12 22/13 |
| 17/20 19/21 20/2 20/2 24/1 | 21/24 21/25 $22 / 13$ 25/22 | 22/18 22/22 22/25 23/5 |
| 25/1 25/2 58/2 61/6 64/8 | 30/8 53/11 56/11 56/11 | 23/8 24/9 24/10 28/1 31/6 |
| 68/20 68/21 | 56/12 60/6 60/15 60/20 | 35/21 36/5 36/6 44/1 49/16 |
| playgrounds [1] 60/18 | 60/24 61/6 61/8 61/10 | 50/10 60/7 60/9 60/14 |
| please [2] 50/9 75/23 | 73/11 74/9 75/8 | 60/19 61/1 61/9 80/5 80/13 |
| point [8] $24 / 1133 / 11$ 33/18 | processes [3] 19/21 75/14 | publicly [2] 18/9 28/11 |
| 36/9 46/9 59/14 68/6 75/22 | 75/15 | publicly-owned [1] 28/11 |
| pointed [1] 51/18 | productive [1] 76/7 | puff [1] 57/16 |
| points [3] 4/15 43/1 60/25 | products [1] 17/11 | pun [2] 7/19 49/13 |
| police [1] 46/10 | professional [1] 62/4 | purposed [1] 29/5 |
| policies [6] 13/11 13/14 | professionals [1] 36/3 |  |
| 20/6 31/15 $55 / 16$ 57/2 | program [35] 6/16 6/25 7/4 | 23/9 |
| policy [2] 21/5 56/24 | $7 / 5$ 9/6 10/11 10/23 11/1 | pursue [1] 60 |
| popping [1] 9/8 | 12/16 14/6 15/9 17/7 28/20 | Pursuing [1] 29/20 |




| S | sufficient [1] $21 / 15$ | ${ }_{68 / 21}^{53 / 22}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SRPR [3] 9/19 12/13 12/18 | suggests [1] 46/15 | targets [1] 59/6 |
| stabilized [1] 29/24 | SULLIVAN [2] 1/23 80/4 | tax [3] 54/12 54/17 73/19 |
| staff [3] 10/21 57/8 60/12 | SULLIVAN-HILL [2] 1/23 | taxpayer [1] 54/12 |
| stage [1] 51/18 | 80/4 | taxpayers [1] 33/1 |
| Stan [5] 4/9 42/10 45/10 | summarize [1] 4/22 | TDR [3] 54/24 58/22 68/19 |
| 50/12 78/23 | summary [1] | technical [3] 10/21 43/6 |
| standards [4] 16/21 21/9 | Superstorm [16] 6/4 6/2 |  |
| 21/9 32/7 | 7/7 7/10 9/11 10/10 11/2 | techniques [1] 26 |
| standpoint |  | ten [2] 50/2 51/1 |
| Stanley [3] 2/15 3/3 4/6 | 36/13 41/18 53/20 72/4 | ten-minute [1] 50/2 |
| start [7] 5/18 50/4 50/12 | 72/20 | term [8] 39/15 69/7 |
| 73/8 74/23 75/2 76/1 | supplement [1] 8/16 | 71/23 72/22 74/8 75/2 78/1 |
| started [3] $4 / 12$ 32/3 40/4 | support [6] 12/2 13/9 | terminology [1] 56/2 |
| Starting [1] 50/13 | 13/14 51/20 57/8 59/18 | terms [20] 8/11 15/25 17/5 |
| starts [1] 5/21 | supported [1] 70/5 | 21/20 29/10 31 |
| state [29] 6/9 6/12 6/14 | sure [1] 78/20 | 40/16 43/3 43/12 46/23 |
|  | surge [4] 36/14 38/11 39/8 | 51/8 $55 / 5$ 59/16 $63 / 8 \quad 65 / 6$ |
| 29/18 29/22 30/4 30/5 | 78/11 | 67/6 68/14 70/8 |
| 35/25 37/7 40/12 48/4 48/7 | surges [3] 36/12 36/16 | test [4] 62/11 62/18 66/14 |
| 61/17 68/25 69/2 71/13 | 36/24 | 69/9 |
| 71/16 71/16 71/17 72/16 | SURMAN [1] 2/6 | tested [1] |
| 72/16 75/6 80/5 80/13 | surrounding [6] 42/17 | testimony [14] 4/14 4/23 |
| stated [1] 66/10 | 42/23 44/16 47/8 47/10 | 5/13 8/1 50/18 64/3 67/16 |
| statement [2] 47/7 48/1 | 59/10 | 70/6 70/25 70/25 71 |
| statements [1] 57/19 | sustain | 75/23 78/18 78/23 |
| states [3] 51/10 51/14 | sworn [3] 4/6 4/10 4/11 | than [10] 6/23 13/10 24/20 |
|  | synthesize [1] 13/13 | $60 / 19$ 61/12 63 |
| statewide [1] 48/2 | system [29] 10/10 11/8 | 70/12 70/23 77/2 |
| stating [1] 73/9 | $30 / 12$ 30/13 30/14 31/25 | thank [6] 49/23 50/7 77/22 |
| status [1] 60/10 | 32/1 32/8 32/9 34/20 36/10 | 78/18 78/19 78/22 |
| statute [1] 73/10 | 38/7 38/25 39/22 40/1 40/2 | that [487] |
| statutory [2] 5/10 62/8 |  | that's [26] 12/22 15/1 |
| stenographically [1] 80/8 | 42/24 43/17 43/17 44/3 | 18/18 24/16 $27 / 14$ 34/18 |
| stil1 [4] 15/23 25/7 55/1 | 44/4 44/9 59/5 64/19 77/14 | 37/14 38/25 40/11 42/25 |
| 71/16 | systems [2] 35/14 78/1 | 43/5 44/12 45/1 45/13 |
| stock [1] | T | 45/24 46/4 46/7 47/3 48/2 |
| stop [3] 27/22 74/24 74/25 |  | 49/23 51/21 52/1 61/7 |
| storage [3] 32/16 33/24 | tailor [1] 49/ | 70/11 74/3 78/18 |
| 34/1 | tailored [1] 24/22 | their [14] 7/3 20/12 27/11 |
| storm [34] 6/21 9/2 9/4 |  | 33/9 41/17 45/6 47/11 |
| 13/15 $16 / 22$ 17/5 $18 / 19$ | 33/2 $33 / 8$ 33/16 37/7 45/11 | 47/18 $56 / 5$ 59/10 77/3 77/7 |
| 26/3 26/21 $26 / 24$ 31/18 | 46/20 50/1 57/3 57/19 | 77/15 78/5 |
| $35 / 13$ 35/15 $35 / 17 \quad 36 / 12$ | 58/10 58/10 65/3 67/9 72/7 | them [5] 25/4 31/16 41/19 |
| 36/16 36/24 37/2 38/7 38/8 | taken [11] $22 / 23$ 41/2 43/5 | 41/20 74/1 |
| 38/11 $39 / 8$ 39/18 $43 / 22$ | 50/3 56/3 56/4 58/15 68/23 | thematically [1] 7/25 |
| 44/25 $46 / 14$ 47/5 49/3 | 69/3 69/4 80/8 | theme [1] 19/18 |
| 56/21 64/4 64/16 77/13 | takes [1] 20/1 | then [24] 5/8 5/10 5/15 |
| 78/1 78/11 | taking [7] 11/24 13/25 | 5/17 $9 / 18$ 12/19 15/5 18/23 |
| storms [8] 21/16 27/8 | 14/23 25/11 33/4 33/14 | $\begin{array}{llllllllll}\text { 19/23 } & 19 / 23 & 20 / 19 & 22 / 25\end{array}$ |
| 39/10 39/11 39/14 39/21 | 64/10 | 26/25 29/15 46/16 47/4 |
| 40/13 72/9 | talk [8] 7/25 12/11 28/6 | 52/2 56/9 60/22 65/7 65/16 |
| stormwater [2] 26/18 29/23 | 30/18 42/5 58/13 67/11 | 68/13 69/9 75/22 |
| straight [1] 74/6 | 71/6 | there [43] 6/5 16/23 18/10 |
| strategic [4] 9/7 9/15 | talked [42] 8/3 $11 / 8$ 16/8 | $\begin{array}{lllll}18 / 11 & 18 / 23 & 19 / 12 & 19 / 24\end{array}$ |
| 9/20 26/13 | 20/25 21/6 25/1 26/2 26/22 | $\begin{array}{llll}18 / 19 & 18 / 21 & 20 / 22 & 21 / 8\end{array}$ |
| strategies [4] 9/14 58/9 | 27/14 41/16 $42 / 12$ 53/4 | $\begin{array}{llllll}22 / 12 & 22 / 14 & 22 / 18 & 22 / 23\end{array}$ |
| 59/7 61/13 | 53/21 54/23 55/8 55/14 | 22/25 $23 / 4 \quad 23 / 6 \quad 23 / 8$ 23/20 |
| streamline [1] 21/25 | 58/22 61/18 62/14 62/16 | 24/8 26/16 27/7 27/19 31/2 |
| streetscape [1] 59/4 | 62/25 63/6 63/8 63/11 |  |
| structures [2] 26/19 57/8 | 63/15 63/22 64/2 64/11 | 43/13 47/23 47/24 50/17 |
| Stuart [1] 2/14 | 64/19 64/21 65/1 65/7 | 51/14 52/25 66/3 66/8 |
| study [2] 16/17 40/8 | 65/16 65/17 66/23 67/10 | 69/14 71/9 73/9 73/10 |
| submitted [1] 17/13 | 67/15 69/25 $70 / 3 \quad 70 / 9$ | 73/22 |
| substantia] [5] 11/18 16/2 | 70/24 75/21 | There'd [1] 71/20 |
| 20/23 23/11 35/19 | talking [10] 5/16 9/23 | there're [1] 47/21 |
| subtle [2] 39/9 39/21 | 11/9 19/19 19/20 30/12 | there's [20] 8/4 10/16 |
| successes [1] 10/22 | 42/3 49/13 67/4 71/24 | 20/1 32/22 33/24 43/15 |
| successful [2] 47/25 49/21 | talks [1] 26/9 | 49/2 49/2 $49 / 3$ 49/4 $50 / 22$ |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { tangentially } \\ & \text { target }[1] \end{aligned}{ }_{31 / 16} 44 / 7$ | $\begin{array}{llll} 51 / 14 & 56 / 21 & 56 / 21 & 67 / 22 \\ 70 / 14 & 70 / 16 & 71 / 5 & 73 / 10 \end{array}$ |


| T | Thursday [1] | \|understanding [6] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| there's... [1] 79/2 | tilted [1] 5/24 |  |
| thereto [1] 23/25 | time [19] 5/3 6/1 6/1 8/3 | undertake [3] 12/19 59/24 |
| these [40] 8/15 11/15 16/8 | 12/11 14/20 15/11 15/23 | 60/ |
| 16/9 17/5 19/21 |  | undertaken [5] 10/15 15/17 |
| 20/8 $20 / 11$ 20/13 $22 / 929 / 7$ | 41/13 41/19 55/8 73/6 | 17/10 31/24 34/6 |
| 29/20 31/3 31/17 32/20 | 78/24 79/2 80/8 | undertaking [2] 10/16 |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}33 / 3 & 33 / 4 & 36 / 19 & 36 / 22\end{array}$ | times [1] 71/21 | 74/15 |
| 37/17 39/11 47/8 49/14 | tip [1] 49/14 | undertook [2] 10/20 72/13 |
| 51/2 52/9 53/3 57/10 58/1 | tired [1] 78/20 | unfortunate [2] 72/4 72/24 |
| 58/6 58/13 60/21 60/24 | together [4] 58/15 62/3 | unfortunately [1] 47/19 |
| 61/24 61/25 72/9 72/12 | 62/5 74/19 | uniform [1] |
| 74/1 74/21 | told [1] 50/8 | unique [7] 44/10 48/9 49/9 |
| they [19] 22/2 22/14 25/4 | tonight [2] 4/2 64/3 | 63/22 65/14 65/14 70/8 |
| 25/7 $29 / 3$ 29/4 44/5 44/6 | too [4] 6/3 35/5 38/12 | unit [2] 7/3 46/ |
| 44/19 45/6 47/18 52/10 | 38/13 | University [6] 30/18 38/5 |
| 52/19 53/16 55/1 57/9 58/6 | took [12] $11 / 15$ 12/14 $16 / 2$ | 39/1 43/3 43/7 65/4 |
| 66/20 73/20 | 18/7 18/13 $19 / 4 \quad 23 / 3$ 41/19 | University of [3] 38/5 |
| they're [5] 20/7 26/24 | 49/12 53/16 55/18 78/25 | 39/1 65/4 |
| 49/6 49/11 58/8 | tool [2] 37/14 37/15 | Un7ike [1] 41/8 |
| thing [3] 19/22 57/17 | tools [1] 40/11 | unreasonable [3] 62/13 |
| 57/17 | topographic [1] 47 | 66/2 66/13 |
| things [25] 4/25 7/24 | town [4] 52/7 54/16 54/16 | up [12] 11/15 12/17 19/3 |
| 17/16 22/9 27/9 27/17 | 75/16 | 23/8 29/22 38/1 39/11 |
| 27/22 $27 / 24$ 29/10 $31 / 22$ | townhome [1] 23/19 | 41/20 43/10 47/19 49/4 |
| 35/17 39/23 42/3 43/4 43/5 | township [152] | 57/16 |
| 47/99 51/10 58/5 58/11 | township's [31] 5/20 9/4 | up-to-date [1] 43/10 |
| 58/17 58/21 68/12 69/3 | 9/24 10/5 10/6 13/11 13/12 | update [1] 9/24 |
| 75/1 75/21 | 14/25 21/20 25/14 27/20 | updates [2] 56/24 60/10 |
| think [45] 5/17 7/15 15/12 | 33/5 36/3 38/6 41/6 47/2 | updating [5] 10/1 10/4 |
| 15/15 25/24 26/1 27/14 | 51/11 52/18 52/21 54/15 | 10/5 10/6 10/7 |
| 27/20 30/11 34/12 35/6 | 59/9 60/1 60/10 60/20 63/5 | upon [8] 8/11 12/1 48/3 |
| 38/14 38/15 40/6 40/9 | 76/8 76/10 76/20 76/23 | 56/25 58/8 58/9 76/15 |
| 40/15 $40 / 23$ 40/25 42/2 | 77/12 78/9 | 77/10 |
| 46/21 48/6 48/8 49/10 | tracking [1] 38/7 | us [12] 9/9 11/25 22/7 |
| 50/19 51/5 53/9 56/8 57/18 | transcript [1] 80/7 | 22/7 47/9 56/9 57/3 68/8 |
| 58/21 62/3 62/5 62/17 66/7 | transfer [1] 54/22 | 71/22 72/5 72/16 72/20 |
| 67/22 68/1 68/11 69/6 | Tri [2] 18/8 22/19 | use [37] 12/1 13/20 15/3 |
| 70/20 72/22 74/3 74/3 74/8 | Tri-Boro [2] $18 / 8$ 22/19 | 16/18 $17 / 2518 / 16{ }^{1} 17 / 4$ |
| 75/1 75/20 77/22 | trouble [1] 75/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { 21/21 } & 23 / 10 & 23 / 18 & 23 / 18\end{array}$ |
| this [84] | true [1] 80/7 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 23 / 18 & 25 / 19 & 26 / 2 & 26 / 6 & 26 / 6\end{array}$ |
| those [56] 5/4 6/7 8/20 | trust [1] 5/24 | 31/14 35/20 35/21 36/3 |
| 8/21 9/1 9/1 10/15 10/16 | trying [1] 22/5 | 43/17 44/2 44/24 45/18 |
| 10/17 $11 / 1912 / 112 / 612 / 7$ | turn [5] 29/17 68/5 72/10 | 47/1 47/11 47/13 54/19 |
| 13/16 13/20 14/8 17/19 | 74/13 74/17 | 54/22 56/24 57/1 57/23 |
| 18/15 24/18 24/19 27/2 | turning [1] 73/1 | 59/6 59/25 61/2 61/11 |
| 27/6 27/16 31/16 33/23 | two [15] 7/18 18/5 23/16 | 71/18 |
| 34/20 36/23 37/22 39/10 | 23/16 24/1 $27 / 19$ 30/25 | used [11] 26/11 29/4 36/2 |
| 40/13 41/3 $46 / 148 / 24$ 49/7 |  | 36/4 36/5 37/11 $38 / 2$ 38/3 |
| 53/8 53/21 53/22 53/23 | 48/10 50/5 60/25 63/4 | 40/1 40/2 43/8 |
| 54/24 55/7 55/8 55/17 | type [3] 38/9 63/8 71/5 | useful [1] 49/1 |
| 55/19 55/20 58/2 58/5 | types [12] 35/9 35/20 38/9 | usefulness [1] 48/17 |
| 58/10 58/11 59/17 59/17 | 39/18 39/20 44/24 47/8 | uses [6] 17/25 21/6 21/6 |
| 68/10 69/3 69/3 69/5 75/12 | 54/11 58/14 61/20 63/9 | 59/17 59/18 73/6 |
| 75/14 | 72/9 | using [2] 36/18 36/18 |
| though [5] 55 44/13 $54 / 24$ | U | V |
| thought [1] 50/6 | ULAKY | vacan |
| thoughts [1] 29/8 | ultimate [1] 17/ | varied [2] 41/6 67/8 |
| threat [1] 41/11 | ultimately [7] 8/21 8/23 | variety [9] 7/16 10/16 |
| three [4] 49/3 50/7 62/8 | 15/20 16/6 $29 / 8$ 31/7 75/2 | 12/19 18/12 18/14 57/6 |
| 69/10 | under [6] $7 / 12$ 9/5 10/25 | 65/7 65/8 68/10 |
| three-part [1] 69/10 | 13/3 17/6 24/14 | various [15] 5/17 8/8 |
| through [20] 4/21 5/14 | undergirding [2] 18/18 | 32/20 34/4 35/12 35/14 |
| 5/15 6/25 6/25 8/1 15/5 | 56/10 | 35/20 36/16 36/19 46/1 |
| 15/13 30/17 $34 / 3$ 36/17 | undergirds [1] 53/10 | 52/21 62/14 64/8 69/2 |
| 40/5 42/11 48/18 52/17 | underline [1] 12/24 | 75/15 |
| 54/22 55/18 60/3 60/8 | undermined [2] $33 / 25 \quad 53 / 25$ | venue [1] 74/21 |
| 62/23 |  | verify [1] 28/23 |
| throughout 8/22 $48 / 7$ $59 / 2$ | 43/16 45/11 45/12 45/13 56/9 70/21 74/1 | versus $[1]$ $63 / 20$   <br> very $[41]$ $4 / 2$ $8 / 12$ $8 / 12$ |


| V | $\begin{gathered} \text { 73/16 } \\ \text { what }[18] \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{49 / 17}{\underset{\text { works }}{ }}[4] \quad 36 / 5 \quad 36 / 6 \quad 44 / 1$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| very... [38] 17/19 24/23 | 30/13 $35 / 7 \begin{array}{llll} & 39 / 12 & 39 / 12\end{array}$ | worth [2] 11/16 64/22 |
| $\begin{array}{llll}24 / 23 & 26 / 23 & 35 / 1 & 35 / 3\end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{lllll}39 / 13 & 40 / 25 & 42 / 12 & 43 / 22\end{array}$ | would [56] 5/1 5/23 9/2 |
| $\begin{array}{lllll}35 / 18 & 35 / 19 & 39 / 4 & 39 / 21\end{array}$ | 44/21 50/10 51/7 67/4 | 13/13 16/21 21/8 21/9 |
| 39/21 39/22 44/10 44/10 | 71/11 75/6 75/6 75/7 | 21/15 $21 / 16$ 25/14 $28 / 25$ |
| 44/10 48/9 48/22 49/12 | what's [7] 25/24 36/14 | 30/13 34/10 40/3 40/8 |
| 53/22 $57 / 13$ 57/25 $57 / 25$ | 43/16 $56 / 8$ 56/22 62/18 | 42/16 42/22 42/23 45/6 |
| 57/25 58/16 58/16 61/9 | 70/20 | 47/7 $47 / 18$ 48/6 63/4 64/5 |
| 65/1 65/5 65/19 65/22 66/8 | when [11] 41/8 41/17 46/6 | 66/7 66/9 66/12 66/22 |
| 68/4 68/21 69/14 75/16 | 53/16 54/13 58/15 71/12 | 67/22 69/6 69/11 69/14 |
| 75/19 78/19 78/19 | 71/20 71/20 74/23 75/1 | 70/4 $70 / 10$ 70/16 70/18 |
| vibrant [1] 54/19 | where [13] 19/3 $23 / 15$ 25/4 | 71/9 71/22 72/21 72/22 |
| view [1] 59/2 | 27/15 $28 / 6$ 29/3 $35 / 11$ | 72/23 73/18 73/20 75/24 |
| volunteer [1] 32/4 | 41/11 43/13 52/25 55/4 | 76/3 76/5 76/11 76/14 |
| VOTERS [2] 1/5 4/3 | 63/15 63/16 | 76/17 $77 / 5$ 77/7 $77 / 9$ 77/20 |
| vulnerabilities [1] 13/6 | whether [7] 28/25 46/8 | 77/24 78/4 78/16 |
| W | 59/3 61/14 61/14 62/11 | Y |
| want [13] 12/10 12/23 | which [36] 5/20 8/19 9/7 | Yeah [4] 42/19 42/25 44/21 |
| 14/15 17/4 40/21 42/5 | W/9 9/22 $10 / 11$ 10/18 $11 / 12$ | 47/17 |
| 42/11 46/19 57/16 58/20 | 11/20 $11 / 21 \quad 12 / 1314 / 17$ | year [3] 40/4 63/21 76/ |
| 66/9 68/7 73/8 | 17/1 $17 / 11$ 19/7 $21 / 1 \quad 24 / 3$ | year-round [2] 63/21 76/24 |
| want to [1] 40/21 | $\begin{array}{lllllll} & 26 / 17 & 27 / 4 & 28 / 8 & 29 / 17 & 30 / 7\end{array}$ | years [1] 6/13 |
| wanted [1] 12/9 | 38/11 39/1 43/1 43/25 | Yes [3] 44/15 47/14 48/19 |
| was [84] | 50/24 51/13 51/17 60/25 | you [112] |
| wasn't [1] 31/10 | 67/6 67/14 69/13 72/10 | you're [8] 48/15 57/16 |
| water [4] 5/23 5/25 55/11 | 75/20 76/19 | 58/12 69/21 69/22 73/23 |
| 59/8 | while [2] 15/23 41/24 | 73/23 78/20 |
| wave [3] $7 / 19$ 24/5 43/12 | White [6] 70/15 70/23 $71 / 8$ | you've [9] $15 / 10$ 53/8 $54 / 4$ |
| waves [1] 7/19 | 71/15 77/5 78/6 | 57/20 57/24 58/6 68/12 |
| way [17] 12/14 $17 / 419 / 16$ | White Sands [2] 71/15 78/6 | 68/23 74/13 |
| 22/4 $24 / 21$ 25/7 27/17 | who [5] 10/3 34/21 46/13 | your [39] 16/15 20/9 23/22 |
| 29/12 39/1 39/19 43/25 | 73/2 75/12 | 25/22 31/8 45/18 48/25 |
| 50/7 50/24 57/9 58/18 | who's [1] 73/3 | $\begin{array}{lllll}53 / 6 & 53 / 6 & 54 / 4 & 57 / 17 & 57 / 20\end{array}$ |
| 58/19 75/1 | whole [17] 22/17 35/3 | 57/22 57/22 58/4 58/9 |
| ways [3] 21/1 21/4 21/24 | 40/20 $053 / 10 \quad 53 / 19$ 54/7 | 61/12 61/23 68/14 68/14 |
| we [134] | 54/10 $56 / 2$ 57/12 $59 / 1 \quad 63 / 3$ | 68/19 68/19 68/21 69/19 |
| we'11 [8] $7 / 25$ 11/9 19/20 | 63/14 63/18 65/13 67/14 | 69/20 69/24 73/12 74/4 |
| 30/11 30/18 39/10 67/14 | 74/13 77/2 | 74/12 74/16 75/7 75/8 75/9 |
| 78/25 | why [6] $14 / 25$ 15/1 $66 / 9$ | 75/13 75/15 75/17 78/19 |
| we're [5] 13/2 40/6 43/10 | 71/2 73/10 74/4 | 78/19 78/23 |
| 50/1 50/4 | wi 17 [24] 10/11 19/24 20/4 | yourselves [1] 68/17 |
| $\begin{gathered} \text { we've } \begin{array}{llll} {[7]} & 43 / 21 & 44 / 24 & 57 / 2 \\ 61 / 18 & 62 / 23 & 68 / 14 & 75 / 21 \end{array} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29 / 930 / 9 \\ & 36 / 24 \quad 37 / 11 \quad 37 / 1436 / 20 \\ & 37 / 15 \end{aligned}$ | Z |
| weaknesses [1] 43/13 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 38 / 14 & 39 / 6 & 39 / 6 & 39 / 7 & 39 / 8\end{array}$ | zoning [16] 10/1 15/5 15/6 |
| weather [1] 78/13 | 39/13 40/4 42/16 44/22 | 17/25 $18 / 17$ 21/5 $21 / 21$ |
| weekend [1] 71/12 | 46/22 48/5 51/25 75/22 | 23/13 $26 / 3$ 26/7 $26 / 15$ |
| wel1 [22] 11/4 14/14 16/3 | wiliing [1] 5/1 | $26 / 15 \quad 36 / 3 \quad 44 / 1 \quad 57 / 2 \quad 57 / 4$ |
| 19/6 $22 / 22$ 23/5 24/11 | wind [1] 39/7 | zonings [1] 21/21 |
| 24/12 $28 / 24$ 31/8 $34 / 18$ | Winward [1] 1/12 |  |
| 36/4 38/9 52/11 52/14 | Wiser [2] 2/14 45/17 |  |
| 60/11 66/17 69/12 71/14 | within [36] 7/7 7/9 7/23 |  |
| 76/8 78/2 78/5 | 8/10 $12 / 5 \quad 22 / 6 \quad 23 / 18$ 24/24 |  |
| we11-attended [1] 22/22 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 25 / 3 & 26 / 11 & 26 / 13 & 27 / 15\end{array}$ |  |
| we11-being [3] 52/11 66/17 | $\begin{array}{lllll} \\ 27 / 15 & 28 / 3 & 30 / 21 & 32 / 25\end{array}$ |  |
| 69/12 | 33/14 35/10 35/22 35/22 |  |
| went [1] 52/17 | 44/4 $45 / 2 \begin{array}{lllll} & 48\end{array}$ |  |
| were [61] $4 / 15$ 6/5 6/14 | $\begin{array}{llllll} & 54 / 20 & 54 / 21 & 56 / 1 & 61 / 5 & 61 / 6\end{array}$ |  |
| 6/18 7/11 8/14 8/21 9/5 | 62/20 63/10 65/20 69/24 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}9 / 9 & 9 / 20 & 11 / 20 & 12 / 6 & 12 / 17\end{array}$ | 70/19 71/10 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llll}13 / 23 & 14 / 7 & 14 / 10 & 15 / 21\end{array}$ | without [3] 38/12 39/24 |  |
| 15/25 16/9 17/22 18/5 | 39/25 |  |
| 18/12 $18 / 14$ 18/20 19/2 | WITNESS [1] 3/2 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}19 / 8 & 20 / 21 & 21 / 1 & 21 / 7 & 22 / 5\end{array}$ | won't [3] 31/1 $35 / 5$ 44/22 |  |
| 22/19 22/20 $22 / 23$ 22/23 | work [8] 9/17 11/24 14/5 |  |
| $\begin{array}{llllll}23 / 20 & 23 / 21 & 24 / 19 & 25 / 19\end{array}$ | 17/13 24/14 25/16 29/25 |  |
| 31/3 31/4 $31 / 12$ 31/15 | 74/13 |  |
| 31/17 $37 / 7$ 37/9 $31 / 41818$ | worked [2] 15/7 74/19 |  |
| 42/8 $44 / 5$ 50/17 $52 / 20$ | workforce [1] 63/11 |  |
| 53/23 54/2 65/8 66/20 67/4 | working [4] 17/2 18/12 |  |
| 71/3 72/17 72/19 73/15 | $62 / 3 \quad 62 / 4$ |  |

