

BEFORE THE VILLAGE BOARD
OF THE VILLAGE OF ROUND LAKE PARK
SITTING AS A POLLUTION CONTROL FACILITY
SITING AUTHORITY

IN RE: APPLICATION FOR LOCAL SITING)
APPROVAL FOR GROOT INDUSTRIES) 03-01
LAKE TRANSFER STATION,)

Transcript of proceedings at the
hearing of the above-entitled cause on the 2nd day
of October, 2013, at the hour of 12:00 p.m.
(Concluded at 3:10 p.m.)

REPORTED BY: JENNIFER A. LANG
LICENSE NO.: 084-003293

1 APPEARANCES:

2 SCHIROTT, LUETKEHANS & GARNER, LLC,

3 BY: MR. PHILLIP A. LUETKEHANS

4 The Hearing Officer;

5

6 HINSHAW & CULBERTSON,

7 BY: MR. RICHARD S. PORTER

8 On behalf of Groot Industries;

9

10 THE LAW OFFICES OF RUDOLPH F. MAGNA,

11 BY: MR. PETER S. KARLOVICS

12 On behalf of Board of Trustees of the

13 Village of Round Lake Park;

14

15 THE SECHEN LAW GROUP, P.C.,

16 BY: MR. GLENN C. SECHEN

17 On behalf of Village of Round Lake Park;

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1 APPEARANCES (CONT'D):

2 TRESSLER, LLP,

3 BY: MR. STEPHEN T. GROSSMARK

4 On behalf of the Village of Round Lake;

5

6 JEEP & BLAZER, LLC,

7 BY: MR. MICHAEL S. BLAZER

8 On behalf of Timber Creek

9 Homes, Inc.;

10

11 MR. LARRY M. CLARK

12 On behalf of the Solid Waste Agency

13 of Lake County, Illinois.

14

15 MR. ROBERT CERRETTI, SR.,

16 Village of Round Lake Park Trustee;

17 MS. JEAN McCUE,

18 Village of Round Lake Park Trustee;

19 And other Trustee's previously listed.

20

21

22

23

24

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

I N D E X

WITNESS:	PAGE
DALE J. KLESZYNSKI	
Direct Examination by Mr. Sechen	6
Cross Examination by Mr. Clark	36
Cross Examination by Mr. Grossmark	49
Cross Examination by Mr. Blazer	53
Examination by Hearing Officer Luetkehans	123
Redirect Examination by Mr. Sechen	128
Cross Examination by Mr. Porter	132
Recross Examination by Mr. Clark	40
Recross Examination by Mr. Blazer	141

E X H I B I T S

	PAGE
	EVD
Round Lake Park No. 1	36
Round Lake Park No. 2	36
TCH No. 45	145
TCH No. 46	146
TCH No. 47	146
TCH No. 51	146

1 THE HEARING OFFICER: I will call
2 application for Groot Industries for Siting
3 Approval, the hearing Before the Village Board of
4 the Village of Round Lake Park Sitting as a
5 Pollution Control Facility Siting Authority to
6 order.

7 Gentlemen, would you introduce
8 yourselves.

9 MR. CLARK: Larry Clark on behalf of the
10 Solid Waste Agency of Lake County, Illinois.

11 MR. GROSSMARK: Steve Grossmark for the
12 Village of Round Lake.

13 MR. BLAZER: Michael Blazer for Timber
14 Creek Homes.

15 MR. KARLOVICS: Peter Karlovics
16 representing the Village Board, the Village of Round
17 Lake Park. Present with me today are Trustee Bob
18 Ceretti and Trustee Jean McCue.

19 MR. SECHEN: Glenn Sechen on behalf of the
20 Village of Round Lake Park.

21 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Identify
22 yourself, Mr. Porter.

23 MR. PORTER: Good afternoon, Rick Porter
24 on behalf of the Applicant Groot.

1 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Thank you.

2 Let's start off with public comment.

3 Is anyone here for public comment?

4 Hearing none, we will proceed.

5 Is there anyone who has any
6 preliminary matters before we start with the direct
7 of Mr. Kleszynski?

8 MR. SECHEN: I have two things, very
9 briefly. First thing is is the record should
10 reflect that Mr. Smith is not present.

11 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Yes.

12 MR. SECHEN: And second thing is with
13 respect to my examination of Mr. Kleszynski, I have
14 marked two exhibits, RLP, Round Lake Park No. 1 and
15 No. 2. You only have No. 1 in front of you or
16 excuse me, No. 2 in front of you because number with
17 is really the statement of qualifications which is
18 also attached to No. 2.

19 So you have everything

20 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Just I'm
21 clear on the document before me, Mr. Sechen, pages
22 19 through 24, I assume, are what will be Round Lake
23 Park Exhibit 1?

24 MR. SECHEN: Exactly. I'm also leaving it
6

1 attached to No. 2.

2 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: That's fine.
3 So we know exactly what it is you're referring to.

4 Mr. Sechen, you may begin.

5 MR. SECHEN: The Village will call Dale
6 Kleszynski.

7 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Swear in the
8 witness, please.

9 (Witness sworn.)

10 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: You may
11 proceed.

12 DALE KLESZYNSKI,
13 called as a witness herein, having been first duly
14 sworn, was examined and testified as follows:

15 DIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. SECHEN:

17 Q. Sir, would you state your name and spell
18 your last name for the benefit of the court
19 reporter, please?

20 A. My name is is Dale Kleszynski.
21 K-L-E-S-Z-Y-N-S-K-I.

22 Q. And Mr. Kleszynski, could you tell us what
23 your employment or occupation is, sir?

24 A. I am the president and chief appraiser for

7

1 Associated Property Counselors Limited. It's a real
2 estate appraisal and consulting firm.

3 Q. I show what you has been marked as RLP No.
4 1 for identification. And I ask that you take a
5 look at it.

6 A. The document that you handed me is a
7 photocopy of my statement of professional
8 qualifications.

9 Q. And, Mr. Kleszynski, does that statement
10 of professional qualifications truly and accurately
11 reflect your background and expertise?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. And can you tell us just briefly about
14 your education, sir?

15 A. My educational background is I am a
16 graduate of Loyola University in Chicago with a
17 Bachelor of Arts degree in 1971. Subsequent to
18 graduating from Loyola and working in the field of
19 real estate appraisal I began to take all of the
20 courses that would allow me to be awarded both my
21 SRA and MAI designations as are awarded by the
22 Appraisal Institute. And have continued in terms of
23 education to complete continuing education
24 requirements for the states in which I am licensed

8

1 as well as for the Appraisal Institute.

2 Q. And, sir, could you tell us what the MAI
3 designation is?

4 A. MAI designation, the nomenclature is
5 basically that I am a member of the Appraisal
6 Institute. That designation is awarded by the
7 Appraisal Institute after an individual has
8 demonstrated expertise in the area of real estate
9 valuation or questions associated with real estate
10 valuations that might arise in the normal course of
11 business.

12 Q. Can you tell me what it was that you did
13 to receive that designation?

14 A. The criterion to complete the requirements
15 of that designation were basically that I had to
16 take a number of classes, and I believe it was ten,
17 approximately ten classes. I had to additionally
18 produce the demonstration appraisal report that was
19 reviewed by the Appraisal Institute. I had to
20 supply the Appraisal Institute with a sampling of
21 five years' worth of work to be reviewed by people
22 who were serving in the admissions area at that
23 particular time. And additionally I had to pass a
24 comprehensive examination.

1 Q. And in what year did you receive your MAI
2 designation?

3 A. I received my MAI designation in 1984.

4 Q. And can you just briefly tell us what the
5 SRA designation is?

6 A. The SRA designation nomenclature stands
7 for senior residential appraisal. It's a
8 designation that is awarded to individuals who have
9 demonstrated expertise in the area of residential
10 real estate valuation.

11 Q. You mentioned other jurisdictions, can you
12 tell us in which states you are licensed?

13 A. I am currently licensed in Illinois,
14 Indiana, and Michigan.

15 Q. And can you tell us what, if any, teaching
16 experience you have?

17 A. My teaching experience is basically with
18 the Appraisal Institute, and subsequent to -- or I
19 guess ongoing with becoming designated, I spend a
20 great deal of time, have spent a great deal of time
21 teaching classes for the Appraisal Institute to
22 date, and over the years I have taught virtually
23 every course that the Appraisal Institute offers
24 including courses in terms -- courses in seminars on

10

1 the issue of detrimental conditions. I am currently
2 qualified by the Appraisal Foundation to be an
3 instructor for the course work that deals with what
4 is called Uniform Standards of Professional
5 Appraisal Practice or USPAP guidelines, so I do some
6 instructing for the Appraisal Foundation in the area
7 of those guidelines, as well as professional ethics
8 for the Appraisal Institute.

9 Q. And how long have you been in the real
10 estate appraisal field?

11 A. I have been a real estate appraiser since
12 1977.

13 Q. Could you tell us, sir, in your practice,
14 do you have any specialization or things that you do
15 more than other things?

16 A. Basically my practice is, I guess I would
17 divide it up this way; of the hundred percent of the
18 time that we spend Associated Property Counselors
19 spends in the area of real estate appraisal and
20 consulting, approximately 70 percent of that time is
21 in the area of litigation support in one way or
22 another, meaning that a large portion of our
23 clientele is -- or consists of law firms or the
24 people who those law firms represent with the --

11

1 with many of the situations that we involve
2 ourselves in having the potential of being litigated
3 at some point in time.

4 Q. Mr. Kleszynski, regarding the matter that
5 you're here today concerning, did you receive an
6 assignment?

7 A. I did.

8 Q. Could you briefly describe that
9 assignment?

10 A. My assignment in this particular instance
11 was to act in the capacity of a review appraiser, to
12 review the work that was done by Poletti and
13 Associates to determine whether or not the work that
14 in the context of the assignment that they had or to
15 determine whether or not they had, in fact, rendered
16 a credible opinion in this matter. And so basically
17 for us, an appraisal, what that means is, is that
18 the assignment that I had was to take a look at
19 their work and determine whether or not that work
20 within the context of the assignment that they had
21 was done appropriately and completely so that they
22 resulted or determined whether or not they resulted
23 in a credible opinion. So, in other words, what my
24 job was, was to determine whether or not Poletti

12

1 had, in fact, formulated or done the work that was
2 necessary to formulate a credible opinion and
3 formulate any reasons for agreement or disagreement
4 that I might have with the work that was done.

5 For us -- and I don't mean to
6 interrupt you, but for us that's called a Standard 3
7 review under Uniform Standards of Professional
8 Appraisal Practice.

9 Q. You anticipated my next question.

10 A. Okay.

11 Q. Could you tell us how that compares, if it
12 a compares at all, to what is commonly referred to
13 as a peer review?

14 A. A peer review is, the significant
15 difference between a peer review and a Standard 3
16 review, it's related to the amount of work that's
17 done in order to check on the work of the appraiser
18 that you are -- for the assignment that's under
19 review. So in a peer review, might be, for example,
20 that I would review someone's work, and basically
21 what I would do is I would come back to an attorney
22 such as yourself and say, well, I think that this
23 report is weak here and identify areas of weakness.

24 A Standard 3 review, Standard 3 under

1 the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal
2 Practice actually has an outline of the steps that
3 the reviewing appraiser must take in order to
4 formulate the opinions that they formulate, and it
5 also has a portion of that standard which address
6 the issue of how their results are to be
7 communicated. So I think that it's a, for lack of a
8 better term, a higher standard than the idea of just
9 a peer review.

10 Q. Now, Mr. Kleszynski, did you have an
11 occasion to prepare a report?

12 A. I did.

13 Q. I show you what has been marked as RLP No.
14 2 for identification. Could you tell us what that
15 is, sir?

16 A. This is a copy of the report that I
17 produced in this matter.

18 Q. And is it a true and accurate copy of that
19 report?

20 A. It appears to be.

21 Q. Could you tell us some of the things that
22 you did in proceeding with your assignment in
23 preparing that report?

24 A. In order to complete my review assignment

1 in this matter, I first read through the section
2 marked Criterion 3 in the Application that was
3 presented to me in the Application for siting in
4 Round Lake Park for Groot Industries.

5 Section 3 included two documents,
6 basically those documents consisted of the Lannert
7 report and they also consisted of the Poletti
8 report. So I read through those documents to
9 familiarize myself with the, for lack of a better
10 term, review or valuation question that would be
11 posed to me in this matter.

12 Q. And you're referring to Section 3 of the
13 Groot Application?

14 A. I am.

15 Q. And that section, does that deal with
16 Criterion number 3 of Section 39.2 of the
17 Environmental Protection Act?

18 A. I just know it as Criterion 3, the rest I
19 presume is correct.

20 Q. Fair enough Mr. Kleszynski.

21 Could you tell us what you did next?

22 A. What I did next after reviewing the
23 appraisal and the land planning reports that were
24 identified in that section of the document, I

1 visited the subject property and inspected the
2 subject property as well as the area photographs
3 that I presented in the body of my report. I
4 identified my, I would call my cataloging of the
5 subject property and the subject area on Porter
6 Drive starting at the southern terminus and working
7 its way all the way up to and including the north
8 terminus and then coming back to Belvidere Road.

9 Q. Can you tell us how you documented what
10 you saw during the site visits?

11 A. During the site visit I documented the
12 applications that were there through digital
13 photography.

14 Q. And do any of those photographs, sir,
15 appear in your report?

16 A. Yes, all of them -- well, a sampling of
17 them do. I had taken more photographs than are
18 presented here, but it was in completing the report,
19 these were the photographs that I selected for
20 presentation.

21 Q. There is an aerial photograph in your
22 report, sir. I take it that you did not take that
23 one?

24 A. No, that was provided by Google Earth.

1 Q. Can could you tell us, sir, what you did
2 after driving the subject property?

3 A. After identifying the subject property and
4 inspecting it and the subject area, I then expanded
5 my inspection of the area to the uses that are
6 located along Main Street as well as Belvidere Road
7 and to the south and west of the subject property,
8 some of the residential subdivisions that existed
9 and went additionally to the east to see the
10 applications that were located, for lack of a better
11 term, near the intersection of Belvidere Road and
12 Route 83, as well as Main Street. So that was done
13 predominately in order to familiarize myself with
14 the uses that existed in the subject area. And that
15 might, in fact, be influenced by the establishment
16 of the Lake Transfer Station.

17 Q. And could you tell us, sir, what did you
18 after that?

19 A. After I that I visited the three case
20 study sites that were included in the Poletti
21 report. And I inspected those sites as well as the
22 target and control areas that were identified in the
23 Poletti report.

24 Q. And, sir, could you tell us the names of

1 those subject sites or how they are referred to?

2 A. They were referred to in the body of the
3 Poletti report I believe as the Glenview site. The
4 Glenview Transfer Station, the Elburn Transfer
5 Station, and the Bluff City Transfer Station.

6 Q. And could you tell us, pick any one you
7 like, and tell us what you observed?

8 A. Actually, the observation of all of them
9 were basically pretty consistent.

10 What I did was I went to each site, I
11 drove or circulated on the property where it was
12 available to me. The best example of that would be
13 at the Glenview site. I followed the track pattern
14 onto the site as well as circulated throughout the
15 site to see how the traffic would be ingressing and
16 egressing the building.

17 I then proceeded up and down the
18 primary roadways as well as the roadways of both the
19 target and the control areas that were identified in
20 the Poletti report.

21 Q. And did you see any vehicles?

22 A. Sure.

23 Q. Did you see any transfer trailers at any
24 of these sites?

1 A. Sure.

2 Q. And did you see how they moved about the
3 sites and off the sites?

4 A. Yes. I was able to observe, in particular
5 I was able to observe at the Glenview station and in
6 the Bluff City station, I was able to observe truck
7 traffic there. When I got into the Elburn station,
8 the facility was, the facility was closed at that
9 particular point in time. But for the other two
10 facilities, I was able to observe their ingress
11 routes and their egress roots both within the
12 circulation of the property itself as well as the
13 circulation to the roadways that service the area.

14 Q. Could you tell us, sir, what you did
15 thereafter?

16 A. After that basically the work came down
17 to, for lack of a better term, drilling down on the
18 work that was completed by Poletti in this matter.
19 And so for each of these transfer station's case
20 studies, what I did was I took the data that -- I
21 guess I should back up and say it this way; because
22 the Standard 3 review requires that I determine
23 whether or not the appraiser or the analyst who has
24 presented the report that is under review had done

19

1 it correctly, the first thing that is -- the first
2 thing that I do is I review the data that they
3 present within the body of their report. So in this
4 particular instance, the Poletti report had a number
5 of sales that they listed as being located,
6 residential sales that they listed as being located
7 within the target and control areas. What I did was
8 using public record, I went back and using the
9 Permanent Index Numbers that they identified, I
10 pulled up those records to determine whether or not
11 the sales had, in fact, were accurately presented.
12 And by that I mean I took a random sample using, as
13 I said the public record, was able to determine from
14 that review of the initial day that Poletti
15 presented that the information that they were basing
16 their opinion on or that they were basing their
17 opinion on, was, in fact, appropriately presented
18 and accurately presented from my standpoint.

19 Q. And could you tell us, sir, did you make
20 any other findings and reach any conclusions
21 regarding what you have done?

22 A. Sure. What I did additionally, because
23 the determination of credible opinion under Standard
24 3 review, is for -- the easiest way to explain it is

20

1 that it is also tied to what other appraisers would
2 do if presented with the same problem.

3 So, in other words, credibility
4 doesn't just come from mathematical accuracy, but
5 the determination has to be made as to whether or
6 not other appraisers or other professionals
7 presented with the same problem would go about
8 solving that problem or analyzing that problem in
9 the same manner. So what I did in that -- what I
10 did in order to determine that, was I contacted or
11 reviewed several text materials that are published
12 by the Appraisal Institute, which included the
13 detrimental conditions text material, and in
14 addition to that, I reviewed text material from the
15 13th Edition of the Appraisal of Real Estate, and as
16 well as specialized articles at our library at the
17 Appraisal Institute. That's an online -- for
18 members of the Appraisal Institute it's an online --
19 you can access those records online.

20 So subsequent to that -- so I
21 reviewed -- I additionally contacted Integra Realty
22 resources and asked them if they would be kind
23 enough to submit to me the three articles or the
24 three reports that were referenced in the Poletti

1 document about documents that he relied on, and they
2 were kind enough to submit to me PDF copies of the
3 analyses that they had produced in similar sitings.

4 I additionally contacted three MAI
5 designated appraisers who were also instructors or
6 former instructors for the Appraisal Institute to
7 determine whether or not they would have gone about
8 and applied the same methodologies in order to
9 determine whether or not the Criterion 3 to minimize
10 the effect on values of surrounding properties have
11 been met. So I contacted them and discussed the
12 options that an appraiser might have in terms of
13 solving that valuation question, solving that
14 question in real estate.

15 Q. Is this something that would be ordinarily
16 and customarily done in the Standard 3 review?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Now, could you tell us, what, if anything,
19 you concluded thereafter?

20 A. After going through the steps that I have
21 identified, I additionally did an analysis of the
22 data that was in the Poletti report to make a
23 determination just from the use of the average price
24 per square foot analysis that they completed to see

22

1 if it was done mathematically accurately and whether
2 or not that conclusion, those conclusions were
3 supportable. So I did the arithmetic, so to speak,
4 as far as those particular sales were concerned and
5 found that Dr. Poletti had, in fact, done his
6 mathematical calculations correctly.

7 Q. Now, what do you call the type of analysis
8 that Professor Poletti did?

9 A. The analytical technique that was applied
10 by Dr. Poletti in this instance is basically called
11 a target and control survey of property pricings.

12 Q. Is that at all referred to as a paired
13 analysis?

14 A. Actually it's a different than a paired
15 analysis.

16 Q. Explain the difference.

17 A. Appaired analysis in real estate appraisal
18 is where an appraiser uses sales data in order to
19 extract contributory value. Most commonly is done
20 in order to abstract contributory value of specific
21 components so they could make appropriate
22 adjustments when applying either the cost market or
23 income approach as to value. So by -- it's best
24 explained through an example of saying, if I were

1 going to do a study to find out how much a two-car
2 garage contributes to the overall value of a
3 residential piece of real estate, what I would do is
4 find sales of similar type buildings, one of which
5 that has a two-car garage and several of which have
6 a two-car garage, several of which do not have a two
7 car garage, I would try and isolate variables. And
8 then basically what I would do is I would be able to
9 say that a two-car garage has a contributory value
10 of, I am going to use a number of \$4,000 to \$6,000
11 in this particular location. And then I would have
12 support for making an adjustment that I might make
13 in doing that residential appraisal.

14 The analysis that's done by Poletti
15 in this particular instance is referred to as a
16 target and control area analysis, and more simply,
17 basically it's identified in the profession as being
18 a near and far analysis. And what you're doing by
19 setting up your control, your target areas and your
20 control areas, is that you're gathering data from
21 those areas in order to determine how those sales
22 prices or how the interactions of buyers and sellers
23 in that market place have reacted to a use that is
24 called into question as being a detrimental

1 condition to the surrounding properties. And the
2 term detrimental condition doesn't refer, in my
3 opinion, to this particular siting or this
4 particular project. But it's nomenclature for that
5 we use in the text material and in identifying
6 damages or analyzing damages.

7 So what you're basically doing under
8 that scenario is you're gathering multitudes of
9 sales in that area and then you are applying any one
10 or more of several analytical techniques that are
11 available to you. Those techniques would be, by way
12 of example, they would be the average sale price per
13 square foot that's applied in the Poletti report,
14 other appraisers, and in the instances where I have
15 done these studies, the technique might be applied
16 where you would select target sales, and I am going
17 to use the term drill down on those target sales for
18 an extended period of time.

19 So, for example, go back 10, 15, 20
20 years for that one particular property and determine
21 its various pricing points at various times and
22 determine how that sale reacted in the market.

23 What you would do then, you would
24 obviously use several of those in the target area

25

1 and then you would do the same thing in the control
2 area and make a determination as to whether or not
3 the pricing patterns were similar or identical or
4 not or very, very different, and then make a
5 determination as to why those variances existed.
6 Those would be examples of the tools that were
7 available to Dr. Poletti in this particular
8 instance.

9 Q. And what did Poletti end up utilizing?

10 A. What the analytical tool that Poletti,
11 Dr. Poletti elected to apply in this instance was
12 his observational, his observational input, which
13 was to view the sales and collect the data about
14 each one of those sales. And the first thing he did
15 was he made a determination as or he applied the
16 average price per square foot analysis. And so
17 essentially what he did was he calculated the
18 average price per square foot in the target area as
19 well as in the control area and made a visual
20 comparison as to whether or not there were
21 significant differences between those pricing
22 patterns.

23 And in his particular instance, in
24 the three case studies that he presented, he found

1 that there was no significant difference between
2 those pricing patterns, both near the condition or
3 near the siting or the stations that he selected and
4 away from the stations that he had selected.

5 Q. What, if anything, else did Professor
6 Poletti do to verify what he had determined to that
7 point?

8 A. Professor Poletti then applied a multiple
9 regression analysis technique to determine -- and
10 basically what he did in the multiple regression
11 analysis technique was that he took the sales
12 day-to-day that he had developed and then he
13 identified, for lack of a better term, fundamental
14 characteristics of the real estate so that he could
15 -- physical characteristics of the real estate so
16 that he could categorize them further. And those
17 would be identified in my opinions as variables.

18 So what he did was he, for example,
19 applied, he took the size of the buildings, he
20 counted the number of bedrooms that were reported
21 and public record, the number of bathrooms, basement
22 areas, as well as I think it was a bathroom basement
23 areas and a couple other variables that he cited in
24 the body of his report. He then basically plugged

27

1 that data into a, I would presume either a software
2 that he developed or a preprogrammed software in
3 order to get a statistical analysis as to whether or
4 not there was a statistically identifiable variation
5 between the target areas and the control areas.

6 Q. What did Professor Poletti find?

7 A. He found that there was no -- that his
8 observational analysis and the analysis of the data
9 on the price per -- the average price per square
10 foot was supported statistically through those
11 activities.

12 Q. Do you take issue in any way with respect
13 to what Professor Poletti did?

14 A. No. As a matter of peer fact, what I did
15 in this particular instance in trying to determine
16 whether or not his opinion was credible is I shipped
17 the long portions of the Poletti report to a Ph.D.
18 at Texas A and M University who's also an appraiser
19 who I serve on several committees with, in order to
20 determine what I would call a second opinion for
21 myself as to whether or not the study had been done
22 correctly. I didn't have any familiarity with the
23 program, the software program that he might have
24 used, nor did I contact Dr. Poletti in this

1 particular instance in order to determine which one
2 he used.

3 So I wanted to satisfy myself that
4 the, not only the methodology, but that the, for
5 example, the identification of the variables and
6 things like that were typically found or typically
7 done by other appraisers in our profession. And I
8 found that the categorization of the variables as
9 well as the use of the amount of data and things of
10 that character were appropriate to run the
11 statistical analysis and the multiple progression
12 analysis.

13 Q. Could you tell us what the advantages are
14 of multiple progression analyses, if, in fact, there
15 are any?

16 A. I think that in a case like this, because
17 there are so few variables, when I say variables,
18 there are still few decisions to make based on the
19 amount of data that's available to you, or was
20 available to Dr. Poletti in this particular
21 instance, what I found was, is that the use of the
22 multiple regression analysis was an appropriate
23 analytical technique, predominantly because of the
24 fact there's really no decisions to be made.

1 Basically it's data input in allowing the software
2 that he used to make a determination as to whether
3 or not there's any statistical variation.

4 Let me explain what that means a
5 little bit. By taking, for example, by taking --
6 what you have here is what I would consider to be
7 basically pure data, and that basically pure data is
8 you have a sales price that's a recorded price, you
9 have an identification of the size of the building
10 through a public record service, you have the
11 identification of how many bedrooms there are and
12 how many bathrooms and things that are physically
13 identified in real estate and you break those down.
14 That's all, for a lack of a better term, it's
15 reasonably simple data categorizations, in my
16 opinion. And by using the multiple regression
17 analysis, what appeared to have occurred here was
18 that there was, in fact, no, again, statistical
19 variation between the target areas and the control
20 areas allowing Dr. Poletti to conclude that the
21 construction of the Groot facility, the Lake
22 Transfer Station, that the impact on real estate
23 would be similar or identical.

24 Q. What, if anything, did you do or conclude

1 thereafter?

2 A. After that I -- because I had done both a
3 checking of his data and analysis of the data that
4 he utilized, I went back to the multiple listing
5 service for the areas in which the target and
6 control areas were located, to check to see whether
7 or not there was any additional data that should be
8 concluded. I rechecked the average pricing as it
9 was presented.

10 Then I formulated -- my, I formulated
11 several opinions about the work that Dr. Poletti had
12 done. Those opinions basically are identified on
13 Page 1 of my report. And the summary of that
14 basically is that Dr. -- within the context of the
15 assignment that Dr. Poletti was given, he had
16 done -- he had applied analytical techniques that
17 were appropriate, that he had gone through the steps
18 from a professional perspective to complete the work
19 in a professional manner, and that the resultant
20 opinions that he had formulated were, in fact,
21 credible to determine that the Lake Transfer Station
22 is located so as to minimize the effect on value of
23 surrounding properties.

24 Personally I think it would have been

31

1 safe to formulate the conclusion that there would be
2 no impact on value market, no impact on value of the
3 surrounding properties if the development of the
4 Lake Transfer Station is completed.

5 Q. Now, did you have occasion to formulate
6 some of your own opinions related to the Lake
7 Transfer Station?

8 A. I did.

9 Q. And to a reasonable degree of certainty,
10 as utilized in your profession and based on your
11 background and experience, did you have occasion to
12 formulate an opinion as to whether the Lake Transfer
13 Station is located as to minimize the effect on the
14 value of surrounding property?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. What is that opinion?

17 A. My opinion concurs with Dr. Poletti in the
18 sense that I believe that the property will be
19 located and will have no, in my opinion, have no
20 effect on the surrounding property values in the
21 area if the development is, in fact, completed.

22 Q. Now, Mr. Kleszynski, did you also have
23 occasion to review a report prepared by Mr. MaRous?

24 A. I did.

1 Q. Were you present when Mr. MaRous testified
2 in this matter?

3 A. I was.

4 Q. And could you tell us what, if anything,
5 you did with respect to Mr. MaRous report?

6 A. I did what would be more identified as a
7 peer review of the report. I did not do a Standard
8 3 review of Mr. MaRous's report predominately
9 because of the timing issues associated with
10 receiving that particular report. So I read through
11 his report and the criticisms of both the Lannert
12 report and the Poletti report that Mr. MaRous
13 presented, and yesterday I was here during the
14 course of his testimony.

15 Q. Now, you mentioned criticisms in
16 Mr. MaRous's report regarding Mr. Lannert and
17 Mr. Poletti, does Mr. MaRous's report rise to the
18 level of a Standard 3 report as your profession
19 uses?

20 A. No, actually what I think in the MaRous I
21 think that the MaRous report on its face is, for
22 lack of a better term, is mischaracterized within
23 the body of the report.

24 Mr. MaRous says that what he

1 completed was a consulting report, and that I
2 thought was inconsistent with the testimony that I
3 heard yesterday which is where he identified that
4 his function in this instance was to review the work
5 of the Poletti report. When he identifies in the
6 body of his report that he adhered to Standard 4 of
7 the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal
8 Practice as it relates to the completion of a
9 consulting report, he mischaracterized what, in
10 fact, his scope of work actually was. And when that
11 scope of work is mischaracterized, in my opinion --
12 I guess the easiest way to say it is that in my
13 opinion the MaRous report does not meet the standard
14 of Standard 3 or Standard 4 because of the
15 conclusions that lapsed.

16 Q. Now, you mentioned Standard 4, can you
17 tell us what that is?

18 A. Standard 4 in the Uniform Standards of
19 Professional Appraisal Practice is the standard that
20 governs the development and the communication of a
21 credible consulting report.

22 In the body of the MaRous report, he
23 says that this report meets the standard of Standard
24 4 of the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal

34

1 Practice. I disagree with that characterization
2 predominately because of the fact that I don't
3 believe based on the testimony that I heard and the
4 document that I reviewed, that he, in fact, was
5 asked a consulting question. What he was asked to
6 do was to review both the Lannert report and the
7 Poletti report which would carry him on to Standard
8 3. And if it carried him on to Standard 3, he was
9 required by that standard to develop any reasons for
10 disagreement with the Poletti report and the Lannert
11 report and offer conclusions that would be
12 identified within the body of that report.

13 Q. And did he do what you suggest is required
14 by Standard 3?

15 A. In my opinion, the report that I read does
16 not meet the standard predominately due to the lack
17 of conclusions presented in the body of that report.

18 Q. Was his testimony lacking in that respect
19 as well?

20 A. His testimony, in my opinion, mirrored the
21 report itself and, therefore, in my opinion, didn't
22 meet that standard either.

23 MR. SECHEN: This may be a little bit
24 premature, so subject to cross examination, the

1 Village would move admission of both Exhibits No. 1
2 and No. 2, striking the identification marks
3 thereon.

4 MR. BLAZER: No objection.

5 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Round Lake
6 Park Exhibits 1 and 2 would be admitted.

7 MR. SECHEN: Thank you. I will tender the
8 witness at this point.

9 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Why don't we
10 start with Mr. Porter. Do you have anything, do you
11 have any questions.

12 MR. PORTER: No questions. Thank you.

13 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr. Clark?

14 MR. CLARK: Yes.

15 CROSS EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. CLARK:

17 Q. Good morning.

18 A. Good morning.

19 Q. How much time did you spend at the
20 Glenview Transfer Station?

21 A. I think probably a total of probably not
22 more than a half hour.

23 Q. And you said you went on-site; is that
24 correct?

1 A. I did.

2 Q. You observed the collection vehicles
3 entering the facility and leaving the facility?

4 A. I did.

5 Q. When you observed those vehicles go in and
6 out of the facility, were there doors that were open
7 or did the doors open and close for each vehicle?

8 A. The doors that I saw at the time that I
9 was at that site were open.

10 Q. And they remained open?

11 A. Yes, to the best of -- to the best of my
12 recollection, those doors were open during my
13 on-site visit.

14 Q. What time of day was that?

15 A. I'm going to guess that it was between
16 10:00 and 2:00. That's 10:00 in the morning and
17 2:00 in the afternoon.

18 Q. Now, first of all, Mr. Poletti, you keep
19 referring to him as doctor; is that correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Do you know what his doctorate is in?

22 A. My recollection is that it's --

23 Q. Philosophy?

24 A. Philosophy.

1 Q. And his Masters is in Geography?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And his Bachelors is in Forest Management;
4 is that correct?

5 A. That's the best of my recollection of his
6 resume.

7 Q. Did you look at the properties that
8 Mr. Poletti discarded for one reason or another?

9 A. When you say "look at," are you talking
10 did I physically visit those particular addresses or
11 did I look at the data that was associated with the
12 ones that he discarded?

13 Q. Did you look at the data?

14 A. I don't have a recollection of the Poletti
15 report identifying the specific addresses that were,
16 I will use the term discarded. But I do have a
17 recollection in looking at the Multiple Listing
18 Service for that period of time that showed that
19 there were short sales or foreclosure sales that
20 were included in the dataset that he elected to
21 discard based on his definition of arm's length
22 transaction, which was the primary dataset that he
23 had.

24 Q. He discarded properties other than

1 foreclosures and short sales, didn't he?

2 A. I would have to go back and look at his
3 report, but that was, in my recollection, the
4 predominant -- my recollection, I guess a better way
5 to say it is, my recollection is, is that he
6 identified a definition of arm's length transaction
7 and then discarded transactions that he felt did not
8 meet that test or meet that definition, and then
9 identified that some of those were foreclosure or
10 short sale transaction. That's my recollection of
11 his report.

12 Q. As you stand here today, you don't
13 recollect if he discarded for reasons other than
14 short sale or foreclosures?

15 A. Not without going back and reviewing his
16 specific language.

17 Q. Would that make a difference to the data?

18 A. Actually, I don't -- in the overall
19 scheme, it would make a difference in terms of the
20 number of pieces of data that would be analyzed, but
21 from my perspective as an analyst, I would say that
22 that's where it would be limited in that -- or it
23 would be limited to that variation, predominately
24 because of the fact that the report itself tells you

39

1 specifically that I am not considering certain data.
2 And when he does not consider that certain data, you
3 know, he goes along with his analysis and his
4 categorizations of the data and data selection and
5 does his -- applies his analytical technique. And
6 so whether or not the inclusion or exclusion of that
7 data and the technique that he applied had an impact
8 on the result, I do not know.

9 Q. And you didn't review that, correct?

10 A. Well, again, the only thing that I
11 reviewed in terms of it, by going to the multiple
12 listing service, was tied specifically to the idea
13 that the Poletti report was consistent in that there
14 were, in fact, short sales and foreclosure sales,
15 and I just presumed that those were the ones that
16 were eliminated.

17 Q. So if that presumption wasn't correct,
18 would that change your opinion?

19 A. It would not.

20 Q. Why not?

21 A. It would not because it was my -- it's my
22 opinion that the amount of data that was presented
23 in the analysis that Poletti did was sufficient in
24 order to result in a reasonably and a credible

1 opinion.

2 Q. How can you come to that conclusion when
3 you don't know the data that was discarded?

4 A. As I said, it is judged from the context
5 of the assignment that he completed and in the
6 question that he was asked. And what that means to
7 me from a reviewer's perspective is, is that Poletti
8 identified that there was certain data that was not
9 included in the analysis and he gave what I would
10 consider to be solid reasons for their exclusion, is
11 my recollection, and did exactly what he had said he
12 was going to do and resulted in, resulted in an
13 opinion.

14 Q. Your recollection, again, only goes to
15 foreclosures and short sales, correct?

16 A. That is correct.

17 Q. Now, and is it fair to say that when you
18 analyzed Mr. Poletti's data, you took the properties
19 that he gave as coming from the control area or the
20 target area, you took those and you verified that
21 data, correct?

22 A. I didn't verify all of that data. I
23 selected out of the population of data that he
24 presented in the body of his report, I spot checked

41

1 various transactions to determine whether or not
2 they were accurately presented.

3 Q. And I assume that they were, correct?

4 A. The ones that I looked at were accurately
5 presented in the Poletti report.

6 Q. And then you took those numbers and you
7 independently crunched those, just like Mr. Poletti
8 did, correct?

9 A. Actually, I think he did a better job than
10 I did because I am not a -- I know enough about
11 statistics to make me extremely dangerous, I guess
12 is the easiest way to say it.

13 Normally what I would do under those
14 circumstances is, for lack of a bet term firm,
15 appeal to a higher authority.

16 Q. Did you make any sort of independent
17 determination as to whether or not the property that
18 Mr. Poletti had identified as target or control
19 areas were properly picked?

20 A. Yes, I did, as a matter of fact.

21 Q. You didn't testify to that on direct
22 though, did you?

23 A. I don't think I was asked that on direct.

24 Q. Wouldn't that be the single most important

1 thing to look at, the very first that you would look
2 at?

3 A. Well, had Mr. Sechen asked me that
4 question, my answer would have been that as part of
5 my analysis what I did was I physically measured the
6 distance between the station using Google Earth to
7 determine whether or not they were, for lack of a
8 better term, reasonably similar to the subject
9 circumstances and I formulated the opinion that they
10 were. And then when I inspected both the target and
11 the control areas for each of those stations, I felt
12 that those areas, given the location of the transfer
13 stations tested, were appropriate selections by
14 Dr. Poletti.

15 Q. So your single guideline was distance,
16 then?

17 A. No, my single -- no, that misrepresents
18 what I am saying.

19 Q. I am asking you.

20 A. Okay. My guidelines were basically to,
21 first all, first question that I asked myself, were
22 these target and control areas reasonably similar to
23 the target and control -- to the subject location in
24 terms of where single-family residential units were

43

1 located, as those were the basis of the testing.
2 And from my measurements, again, as crude as it is,
3 using Google Earth and driving those locations, I
4 determined that they were reasonably similar so as
5 to not to be distorted.

6 Q. And, in fact, in the case of Glenview, the
7 two areas are adjacent to each other, are they not?

8 A. Absolutely.

9 Q. And, in fact, some of the target areas are
10 further away than some of the control areas; is that
11 correct?

12 A. Some of the target areas, well, my
13 recollection on the Glenview station is that the
14 target area that Poletti used was a specific block
15 of housing units, I forget the streets that they
16 were bounded by, but a specific block of housing
17 units, and then the control area was to the north of
18 that location. So I would suspect that the ones
19 that were located on the northern portion of it
20 were, in fact, were further away than the ones that
21 were on the southern portion of the target area.

22 Q. Did you look at the map in Dr. Poletti's
23 presentation?

24 A. I did.

1 Q. And, in fact, aren't some of the target
2 areas further away than some of the control areas?
3 It's a pretty simple measurement, isn't it?

4 A. I would have to look at it, but that
5 doesn't surprise me.

6 Q. And isn't -- strike that.

7 So would it be fair -- did you look
8 at things like flood plain to determine if some of
9 the properties were located in a target area or
10 control area, were in a flood plain or not?

11 A. Sure. I looked at flood hazard, what I
12 would call the FEMA maps for the target areas and
13 the control areas, and again, in an attempt to
14 familiarize myself with those locations.

15 Q. Did you look to see if they were in the
16 same school districts?

17 A. I did not look at different school
18 districts.

19 Q. Can that have an impact on the prices?

20 A. Can school -- if you're asking me
21 generically can school districts have an impact on
22 the price that people pay for homes, the answer to
23 that question would be, yes, oftentimes the school
24 district will have an impact on the price.

1 Q. Now in your conclusion, you're concurring
2 with Mr. Poletti that you don't see any impact on
3 the -- on the value of the property by the operation
4 of the proposed facility; is that correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Okay. Were you aware that this facility
7 is proposed to operate 24/7?

8 A. I learned that in the course of attending
9 some of this, some of this hearing. I am not sure
10 if I knew that by reviewing the Application.

11 Q. So did you consider that in your report?

12 A. I guess the answer to that question is
13 there was no need to consider that in the body of
14 the report because my report is a review of the
15 Poletti document and that, for lack of a better
16 term, wasn't one of the variables that was presented
17 in terms of the analysis. So within the scope of
18 the analysis, within the scope of the inputting of
19 the data, I am just not sure that hours of
20 operation -- well, I know that hours of operation
21 weren't identified as any variable that could be
22 measured.

23 Q. Well, now that you're aware that this
24 proposed facility may operate 24 hours a day, 7 days

1 a week, does that impact your analysis?

2 A. It does not.

3 Q. It does not. Do you live within a mile of
4 a transfer station?

5 A. Do I live within a mile of a transfer
6 station?

7 Q. Yes.

8 A. I live in Palos Heights, so I am not sure
9 where the nearest transfer station is to Palos
10 Heights.

11 Q. I find it somewhat incredulous that you
12 can say that has no impact.

13 A. The difference is that I actually reviewed
14 the data and the techniques applied, and as
15 incredulous as you may find it, as a professional
16 real estate appraiser, I am able to formulate that
17 opinion.

18 Q. By determining what factors you
19 subjectively determine are important, correct?

20 A. No, I didn't make any determinations about
21 what factors were important. What I did was I
22 looked at the work that was done by Poletti in this
23 particular instance and determined that he had done
24 that work correctly and that he had, in fact,

1 applied the appropriate analytical techniques that
2 are both acceptable by the Appraisal Institute and
3 applied by Pearse who do similar studies and that.

4 Q. And that --

5 A. Can I --

6 Q. I am sorry. Yes.

7 A. And that based on that, it is reasonable
8 to -- it is reasonable to determine that the
9 construction of this particular facility, if it is,
10 in fact, developed, will have a similar impact on
11 the surrounding real estate, which in these three
12 test cases was none.

13 Q. So you have taken Mr. Poletti's data and
14 crunched it and come to the same conclusion,
15 correct?

16 A. Again, it would be inappropriate for me to
17 say that I did the same amount of work as was done
18 by Poletti. What I did was I tested that data based
19 on the observations -- based on the data that he
20 presented as well as additional work that I did.

21 Q. And the data that you took from
22 Mr. Poletti you assumed to be true, correct?

23 A. Well, not only did I assume it to be true,
24 on the ones that I, in fact, checked appeared to be

1 true based on public record.

2 Q. The sampling that you did was correct?

3 A. The sampling.

4 Q. But you didn't independently determine if
5 he selected the correct properties, did you?

6 A. I guess I have to answer that question no,
7 I did not independently determine if he selected the
8 correct properties. What I did determine was that
9 in the observation of the properties that were
10 selected over the period of time using the sources
11 that were available, being public record as well as
12 the Multiple Listing Service, it appeared as though
13 his sampling was appropriate to formulate a credible
14 opinion.

15 MR. CLARK: I don't have anything further.

16 Thank you.

17 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr.
18 Grossmark?

19 CROSS EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. GROSSMARK:

21 Q. Sir, do you note hours of operation of the
22 three transfer stations that were included in
23 Mr. Poletti's report?

24 A. From memory do not.

49

1 Q. Do they operate 24 hours day, 7 days a
2 week?

3 A. To the best of my knowledge, they do not.

4 Q. It's your understanding that Mr. Poletti
5 relied on Mr. Lannert's report?

6 A. For certain things, yes, I understand that
7 for certain aspects of his analysis, Dr. Poletti
8 relied on Mr. Lannert's report.

9 Q. And Mr. Lannert assumed certain hours of
10 operation of the proposed site?

11 A. Yes --

12 Q. If you know?

13 A. -- I was here when Mr. Lannert testified
14 that in his report he assumed certain hours of
15 operation.

16 Q. So your report and your testimony is
17 limited to the scope of Mr. Poletti' report and
18 opinions and Mr. Lannert's report and opinions,
19 correct?

20 A. It is limited to the review of the Poletti
21 report and the data that he utilized as well as the
22 additional work that I did. I guess the easiest way
23 to explain it is this, in this particular
24 instance --

1 Q. You don't have to explain it because I
2 want to ask you a question and it's a particular
3 question. If you have a problem with the question,
4 let me know.

5 A. Sure.

6 Q. And that is, both the Lannert report and
7 opinions and the Poletti report and opinions have a
8 certain scope or boundary?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And so your report and your opinions are
11 limited to the scopes and boundaries of the Lannert
12 and Poletti reports, correct --

13 A. I guess --

14 Q. -- and opinions, correct?

15 A. I have to answer that question yes.

16 Q. Where did Mr. Poletti, if you know, get
17 his data regarding the three sites that he looked at
18 and opined about, if you know?

19 A. Which data are you referring to?

20 Q. The data about the homes or residences or
21 buildings?

22 A. I would have to go back and look at the
23 Poletti report, but my recollection is that he
24 identifies the Multiple Listing Service and public

1 record as being the primary sources for his data.

2 Q. What would be the public records that he
3 would have looked at or did look at, if you know?

4 A. The public record that he would have
5 looked at in Cook County would have been the
6 transfer declarations or visitation to the Recorder
7 of Deed's website, and I believe that that would
8 hold true for the other counties in which the
9 competitive or the other facilities in the case
10 study were used, that were used.

11 Q. Do those two sources, the MLS and the
12 county, have the same or identical sense of data or
13 information?

14 A. No.

15 Q. So based on your knowledge -- strike that.

16 Each has a certain set of information
17 or data, correct?

18 A. If I can explain what I mean by that,
19 the --

20 Q. No. You can answer my question.

21 They each have a certain set of
22 information or data, correct?

23 A. Yes, the MLS --

24 Q. That's --

1 A. I just want to make sure that it's clear.

2 Q. Okay.

3 A. The MLS has, for lack of a better term,
4 different data than the assessor's record or even
5 the transfer declarations might demonstrate.

6 Q. The assessor's information is different
7 from the transfer records?

8 A. Yes, in some instance it can be.

9 Q. Do you know whether Mr. Poletti used one
10 or two or all three of those sources, the assessor's
11 information, the transfer records, and the MLS?

12 A. I would have to go back and look at
13 exactly what he says in his document. But my
14 recollection is that he used either two or all three
15 of those sources.

16 MR. GROSSMARK: Thank you. I have no more
17 questions right now.

18 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr. Blazer.

19 CROSS EXAMINATION

20 BY MR. BLAZER:

21 Q. Good morning. Good afternoon?

22 A. Good afternoon.

23 Q. How are you?

24 A. Fine, thank you.

1 Q. Do you have RLP Exhibit 1 there or i guess
2 the back half of Exhibit 2, your statement of
3 qualifications?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. The very last page you list professional
6 law firms that you have worked for or you have done
7 work for?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. I have to admit I am hurt, you didn't
10 include my firm.

11 A. You know what when I was reading through
12 this, I was going to pencil that in and put your
13 firm in there, but I elected not to, I elected not
14 to do that. So I apologize. I knew we would get to
15 the part where I would end up apologizing to you for
16 that omission.

17 Q. You have done one assignment for my firm,
18 correct?

19 A. That is correct.

20 Q. About two years ago?

21 A. Approximately.

22 Q. All right. We will talk about that a
23 little bit later.

24 Now, your report has an effective

1 date of September 5, correct?

2 A. I think it has an effective date of
3 September 10, which is the letter of transmittal.

4 Q. If you look at page 11 of your report, it
5 says, here effective date of the review report --
6 the effective date of this review and report is
7 September 5, 2013?

8 A. The document that I am looking at is --
9 here. My page 11 says the effective date of this
10 review and report is September 10, 2013.

11 Q. It's possible I was imagining this.
12 Here's I guess the problem I have.

13 MR. BLAZER: Maybe we will just mark this
14 as TFLP 51, if I may, Mr. Hearing Officer. I
15 unfortunately don't have multiple copies?

16 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: What do you
17 want to label it.

18 MR. BLAZER: TFLP, 51.

19 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: TFLP? TCH.

20 MR. BLAZER: TCH?

21 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: You can show
22 him that one because I have the exact same one you
23 have as well.

24 MR. BLAZER: I think you know where I am

1 going with this.

2 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: For the
3 record, just so everybody who doesn't see it, this
4 is the one that we received Sunday from Mr. Sechen.

5 BY MR. BLAZER:

6 Q. Hopefully you can hear me because the cord
7 isn't long enough. I am going to show you,
8 Mr. Kleszynski, the report that was e-mailed to all
9 of the parties in this matter by Mr. Sechen on this
10 past Sunday, as the hearing officer just indicated.

11 And what does that report show as the
12 effective date of the review of report?

13 A. The report shows the effective date of the
14 review of report as September 5.

15 Q. Is it correct then sometime between Sunday
16 and today, you revised this report?

17 A. No. I think that that's a typographical
18 that was, I believe, should have been corrected
19 prior to the submission of the September 10 report.

20 Q. So it was revised sometime after Sunday;
21 is that correct?

22 A. No. My file document says September 10,
23 and quite frankly, I may have transmitted an earlier
24 version to Mr. Sechen in a PDF that was transmitted

56

1 to you that would reflect this, but I would view
2 that as a typographical error.

3 Q. Well, when was that typographical error
4 changed?

5 A. I finalized this report on September 10
6 and that typographical error would have been changed
7 either on or near September 10, because the way I
8 produced this document is that as I am going through
9 it and making my revisions and doing proofreading
10 and things of that character or having my assistant
11 do proofreading, some items like that would get
12 caught and then changed.

13 Q. The cover letter of this thing indicates
14 that you sent it to the Village of Round Lake Park
15 care of Glenn C. Sechen, correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And the one that was sent to all of us on
18 Sunday indicates a date on the letter of
19 September 10, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. But as we have indicated, the effective
22 date as, at least on the version that Mr. Sechen
23 gave all of us, says September 5, correct?

24 A. In the body of the report that's

1 inconsistent, yes.

2 Q. How many versions of this report have you
3 sent to Mr. Sechen?

4 A. I believe I sent two to Mr. Sechen and
5 possibly, yeah, I believe it was two.

6 Q. Is one of them the one that is now RLP No.
7 2?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Is one of them the one that is now TCH 51?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. Are there any others?

12 A. No, to the best of my knowledge, there are
13 not.

14 Q. What do you mean to the best of your
15 knowledge?

16 A. Well, prior to -- I mean, the chain of
17 events is prior to the finalization of the report, I
18 sent along a report to Mr. Sechen so that I could
19 show him what the conclusions were.

20 Q. And when did that occur?

21 A. My suspicion would be is that it was
22 around September 5th based on that date.

23 Q. Could it have been sooner than that?

24 A. Maybe, but I am not sure.

1 Q. Were you the only one at your office who
2 was working on this project for Mr. Sechen or for
3 the Village?

4 A. The answer to that question would be, yes,
5 prior to it going through what would be identified
6 as a final proofreading.

7 Q. And how many people conducted the final
8 proofreading?

9 A. One.

10 Q. Who was that?

11 A. Susan Newman, who's the administrative
12 assistant at my office.

13 Q. Did she transmit any versions of this
14 report to Mr. Sechen?

15 A. She did not, at least to the best of my
16 knowledge, she did not.

17 Q. So she might have, but you don't know?

18 A. It would be -- I guess the easiest way to
19 say that, it would be uncharacteristic if that
20 occurred.

21 Q. And when you sent what you recall to be
22 the first draft of this report to Mr. Sechen, did
23 you receive any comments back?

24 A. Sure.

1 Q. All right. And where are his comments?

2 A. There weren't any. I mean, I received
3 comments back and since that Mr. Sechen read through
4 the report, we had discussion relative to the
5 language about Criterion 3, about the minimization,
6 we had some conversation relative to my conclusions
7 that the development of the property would not have
8 a deleterious impact on value or was placed in such
9 a position to minimize an impact on surrounding
10 value, and those were pretty much the verbal
11 comments that were made.

12 Q. And how many conversations did you have
13 with Mr. Sechen?

14 A. Over the time that I was working on this
15 assignment, I probably had three to five discussions
16 with Mr. Sechen.

17 Q. When did you start work on this
18 assignment?

19 A. I started working on this assignment, we
20 opened our file on September 9, which means that we
21 formerly opened that file, but my actual work on
22 this file began sometime in June, after June 21st,
23 when I received my contract back from the Village
24 Clerk of Round Lake Park.

1 Q. But you didn't open a file on this until
2 September 9?

3 A. I didn't formally open the file, I had --
4 for lack of a better term, I had the Application
5 that was presented to me after we were hired and,
6 quite honestly, it just sat in my conference room
7 and didn't open the file until I instructed my
8 assistant to open the file.

9 Q. So you opened your file after you had had
10 conversations with Mr. Sechen?

11 A. As far as that date is concerned on the
12 jacket of that file, that would be true. That would
13 not --

14 Q. I am sorry.

15 A. That would not describe when the actual
16 work on this file began.

17 Q. I understand.

18 And you opened your file after you
19 had transmitted to Mr. Sechen at least one draft of
20 your report, correct?

21 A. Yeah, technically speaking, that's
22 correct.

23 Q. If I asked you this, I apologize. I am
24 sure I will hear an objection if I did.

1 How many conversations did you have
2 with Mr. Sechen regarding the content in your
3 report?

4 MR. SECHEN: It was asked and answered.
5 Three to five.

6 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Actually, I
7 don't think it was.

8 MR. BLAZER: I couldn't remember.

9 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: That was
10 slightly different question. The first question was
11 how many overall conversations is what was answered.
12 That was a slightly different question. So I will
13 let the question stand.

14 BY MR. BLAZER:

15 Q. How many conversations did you have with
16 Mr. Sechen regarding the content of your report?

17 A. During what time period?

18 Q. The entire time period from the beginning
19 of your assignment until today?

20 A. I would have to guess that my interaction
21 with Mr. Sechen in this matter included probably ten
22 conversations from the time that I received the
23 application to the completion of the report.

24 Q. And you said, at least in the

1 conversations, that you received comments from
2 Mr. Sechen regarding the content of your report; is
3 that correct?

4 A. No, what I think I said was that when I
5 completed the draft of the report or the, what I
6 would call what's identified as the September 5th
7 draft of the report, I did receive comments from
8 Mr. Sechen as it related to the conclusions because
9 that's when the conclusions were formulated.

10 Q. Did the first version of this report,
11 whenever it was transmitted to Mr. Sechen, include
12 your independent opinion, separate and apart from
13 your review of the Poletti report?

14 A. Yes. To the -- again, yes, the answer to
15 that question is yes.

16 Q. And you never received any written
17 comments back from Mr. Sechen regarding what you
18 were doing?

19 A. Not a one.

20 Q. They were all verbal?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Have you ever spoken to any other person
23 on behalf of the Village of Round Lake Park?

24 A. I have not.

1 Q. As I understand it, as indicated in your
2 report, your assignment was completed in accordance
3 or in compliance with USPAP, correct?

4 A. It was.

5 Q. And that's the Uniform Standards of
6 Professional Appraisal Practice and the Code of
7 Ethics of the Appraisal Institute, correct?

8 A. That is correct.

9 Q. And you're aware that under that Code of
10 Ethics, an appraiser must not advocate the cause or
11 interest of any party or issue, correct?

12 A. I am absolutely aware of that part of the
13 Code of Ethics, as well as the Uniform Standards.

14 Q. You're also aware then that an appraiser
15 must not accept an assignment that includes the
16 reporting of predetermined opinions and conclusions,
17 correct?

18 A. That is absolutely correct. But that is
19 part of both of the Code of Ethics as well as USPAP.

20 Q. A couple of more that I think we're going
21 to agree on.

22 You're also aware that an appraiser
23 must not misrepresent his or her role when providing
24 valuation services that are outside of appraisal

1 practice, correct?

2 A. We would agree on that also.

3 Q. Here's another one, an appraiser must not
4 communicate assignment results with the intent to
5 mislead or to defraud, correct?

6 A. That would also be true.

7 Q. And then finally, an appraiser must not
8 use or communicate a report that is known by the
9 appraiser to be misleading or fraudulent, correct?

10 A. That is also true.

11 Q. You testified that your assignment in this
12 matter was to act in the capacity of a review
13 appraiser to determine if Poletti rendered a
14 credible opinion, did I restate your testimony
15 correctly?

16 A. I think you did.

17 Q. And the review you conducted was under
18 Standard 3 of USPAP, correct?

19 A. That is correct.

20 Q. When did your assignment expand to include
21 a critique of the MaRous report?

22 A. Upon receipt of the MaRous report.

23 Q. On September 12th?

24 A. I don't remember the day that that was

1 transmitted to me, but it was sometime after, it was
2 sometime after my review work had been done.

3 Q. So sometime after you generated your
4 initial report, someone said to you, I want you to
5 review the MaRous report, correct?

6 A. That would be a correct -- well, I think
7 more specifically what transpired was, is that the
8 MaRous report was transmitted to me and I was asked
9 to read it.

10 Q. Were you asked to conduct a Standard 3
11 review?

12 A. I was not asked to conduct a Standard 3
13 review, nor did I offer to conduct a Standard 3
14 review in this instance.

15 Q. And, in fact, you didn't conduct a
16 Standard 3 review of the MaRous report, correct?

17 A. That is correct.

18 Q. And I think it's safe to assume, but I
19 have to ask you any way, the person who asked you to
20 expand your assignment to include a review of the
21 MaRous report was Mr. Sechen, correct?

22 A. That would be a correct statement.

23 Q. On behalf of the Village of Round Lake
24 Park?

1 A. Well --

2 Q. Correct.

3 A. I presume that it was acting on behalf of
4 the Village of Round Lake Park, but that was the
5 question he asked me, he asked me to review the
6 MaRous document.

7 Q. When did your assignment expand beyond a
8 review of the Poletti report to include your own
9 independent opinion regarding impact on value to the
10 surrounding area?

11 A. I consider that to be part of the review
12 or part of the review. I don't think I was ever
13 truly ever asked specifically to formulate that
14 opinion, but offered that opinion after completing
15 my work. It was sort of an add on, so to speak,
16 because I was convinced after doing the work that I
17 had done that the conclusion was solid.

18 Q. And what did Mr. Sechen tell you when he
19 saw your opinion regarding your independent opinion
20 regarding the value of surrounding property?

21 A. He was okay with it.

22 Q. He was okay with it?

23 A. Yeah.

24 Q. What did he tell you?

1 A. He noted that I had formulated my own
2 opinion and asked me if I was comfortable with doing
3 that, and I said I was.

4 Q. Now, in the context of your report,
5 whichever version you're looking at, in your
6 testimony here today, are you speaking on behalf of
7 the Village of Round Lake Park?

8 MR. SECHEN: Move to strike the comment.

9 MR. BLAZER: It wasn't a comment --

10 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Rephrase the
11 question.

12 BY MR. BLAZER:

13 Q. In the context of your report,
14 Mr. Kleszynski, whether it's the September 5 version
15 or the September 10 version.

16 A. Actually they're both September 10 version
17 because that's the date it's transmitted. The
18 typographical error in the report is on page 11
19 where it should have read 10.

20 Q. We will accept September 10, it's really
21 not that big of a deal at this point.

22 In the context of that report in your
23 testimony here today, are you speaking on behalf of
24 the Village of Round Lake Park?

1 A. I am speak on behalf of Dale Kleszynski as
2 a review appraiser who was given a professional
3 assignment in order to determine whether or not the
4 person whose work I reviewed met the standards of
5 professional practice and formulated a credible
6 opinion. I'm talking on this issue based on my work
7 and not on behalf of anyone else.

8 Q. So your client is not the Village of Round
9 Lake Park?

10 A. Sure. My client is -- my client is the
11 Village of Round Lake Park in care of Mr. Sechen's
12 law firm.

13 Q. And Mr. Sechen is not paying your bills,
14 the Village of Round Lake Park is, correct?

15 A. I would presume that somebody is paying my
16 bills whether it is Mr. Sechen or the Village of
17 Round Lake Park. My presumption is that a bill will
18 be sent and that it will be paid.

19 Q. So are you saying that acting on behalf of
20 the Village of Round Lake Park is not in the scope
21 of your retention?

22 A. I take exception to the terminology where
23 you imply that I am acting on behalf of anyone. In
24 this particular instance and in every instance that

69

1 an appraiser is hired to formulate an opinion and
2 they claim or are doing it in accordance with the
3 professional ethics and the Uniform Standards of
4 Professional Appraisal Practice, independence of
5 that opinion is presumed if the appraiser is doing
6 their job correctly, and that's what occurred in
7 this instance.

8 Q. Let's try it this way: One of your
9 opinions, I think as we discussed, is that the
10 subject facility will not have an impact on the
11 value of surrounding property, correct?

12 A. That is my opinion.

13 Q. And you have indicated in your report,
14 it's on page 11, last paragraph, in addition to
15 reviewing the Poletti report, the client requested
16 that I use the data in the Poletti report and other
17 information to formulate an independent opinion and
18 determine if the Groot Industries Inc. Lake Transfer
19 Station is located to minimize the effect on the
20 value of surrounding property; did I read that
21 correctly?

22 A. You did.

23 Q. So it sounds to me, based on what you
24 wrote in your report, that rather than volunteering

1 your independent opinion, in fact, the client asked
2 to you do that; isn't that right?

3 A. Actually, I guess I would have to answer
4 that yes and no. And whether or not that's artfully
5 stated in the body of my report, under the uniform
6 standards, for example, I am entitled formulate that
7 opinion and I elected to do so.

8 Q. But that's not what you said in your
9 report, isn't it?

10 A. My report says that they requested.

11 Q. And who requested it?

12 A. In the safety of -- no one requested it
13 specifically. I formulated that opinion independent
14 after doing my work.

15 Q. So that's another typo?

16 A. I wouldn't consider it to be a typo, I
17 would consider it if I had, like many of these
18 documents, if I had the opportunity to review it
19 after a question such as that, I might have written
20 it differently.

21 Q. But you reviewed this report with
22 Mr. Sechen multiple times, right?

23 A. Right, I reviewed the report with
24 Mr. Sechen one time and I reviewed it internally

1 multiple times.

2 Q. And he certainly expressed no disagreement
3 with the statement that your client had asked you to
4 generate an independent opinion regarding
5 minimization on the effect -- excuse me, minimizing
6 the effect on value of surrounding property,
7 correct?

8 A. I would agree with you that he did not
9 express any objection to my formulating that
10 opinion.

11 Q. You reference in the same paragraph that
12 you were asked by your client to use the data in the
13 Poletti report and other information to formulate
14 your independent opinion, correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Okay. What other information were you
17 asked to look at?

18 A. Well, again, that portion of the document
19 suffers from the inartful, my inartful authoring of
20 that terminology. I elected to use the data that I
21 looked at from the Multiple Listing Service as well
22 as the public record search that I did to verify
23 that information.

24 Q. Is this paragraph stock language that you

72

1 use in every report?

2 A. I don't think it's stock language. I
3 just, as I said, I think it's not as artfully
4 written as I would like to have done in the safety
5 of retrospect.

6 Q. How many other Poletti reports have you
7 reviewed in your career?

8 A. None.

9 Q. So when we see a reference here in this
10 paragraph to using the data in the Poletti report,
11 this is the only time you have ever used that
12 language, correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. And then further in the same paragraph,
15 Mr. Kleszynski, you say, further the client
16 requested that I determine using the information in
17 the Poletti report and other information, if the
18 Groot Lake Industries Transfer Station will have an
19 impact on nearby properties. Did I read that
20 correctly?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Is that also inartful drafting?

23 A. I would say yes.

24 Q. Could you turn to page 14 of your report,

1 paragraph, the fourth paragraph?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. You say here, the information contained in
4 the report is specific to the needs of the client.
5 Did I read that correctly?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And the client is the Village of Round
8 Lake Park, correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. And the Village's needs in the context of
11 your report were expressed to you, correct?

12 A. No. The Village's needs were not directed
13 to me. What this underlying assumption and limiting
14 condition says is that the information contained in
15 the report is specific to the needs of the client as
16 it -- well, and it's intended to imply that it's
17 tied to the scope of work that was -- that was --
18 and the valuation question that I was asked to
19 answer or asked to address.

20 Q. And the needs of your client are reflected
21 in your report, correct?

22 A. The needs of the client are reflected in
23 my report to the extent that it references the data
24 utilized and the methodologies applied.

1 Q. So your conclusions were not part of the
2 needs of the client?

3 A. My conclusions were not part of the needs
4 of the client.

5 Q. Well, what did you mean when you -- strike
6 that.

7 Is this canned language, stock
8 language?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. So when you included this language through
11 the multiple revisions of your report, you never
12 considered the needs of the Village of Round Lake
13 Park, the specific needs?

14 A. I did not.

15 Q. Okay. Page 15, paragraph 11, you say
16 here, all data provided by the client or research
17 from public records is deemed reliable. Do you see
18 that?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. What data did the Village provide you?

21 A. Through Mr. Sechen the Village provided me
22 with the Application which included the Lannert and
23 Poletti report.

24 Q. That's the only thing he provided you?

1 A. Yes.

2 Q. So the client never provided you any other
3 information?

4 A. None.

5 Q. And you have determined that the entire
6 Application is reliable?

7 A. No, I determined that within the specific
8 scope of my assignment, which was the Lannert, the
9 section under Criterion 3, that that was reliable.

10 Q. Did anyone on behalf of the Village tell
11 you that Groot bought the subject property in
12 May 2010?

13 A. No.

14 Q. You did public records research in
15 connection with your assignment, correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. Did you confirm independently that Groot
18 bought the subject property in May 2010?

19 A. I believe I did.

20 Q. Page 12, second paragraph, please. This
21 is the section on identification of extraordinary
22 assumptions applied in the review of the Poletti
23 report, do you see that?

24 A. Yes.

1 Q. You say in this assignment, I have
2 inspected, but did not verify all of the data
3 presented?

4 A. That is correct.

5 Q. All right. Which data are you talking
6 about here that you didn't verify?

7 A. There were portions of the data presented
8 in the Poletti sales that I did not specifically
9 look up on public record or the Multiple Listing
10 Service. That is there to identify that I did not
11 look at every single sale in the public record or
12 Multiple Listing Service of every single sale that
13 was presented in the Poletti report.

14 Q. So you didn't independently verify any of
15 that, correct?

16 A. I disagree with that. I used as the basis
17 for the verification that I went through, the
18 listings of sales that Poletti had presented in his
19 chart at the back and in the addendum of his report,
20 as he identified that as being the data that he
21 utilized, I spot checked that data to determine
22 whether or not the transactions had, in fact,
23 report.

24 Q. So you spot checked?

1 A. Yeah, that's what I said.

2 Q. So let's work backwards for a moment. The
3 ones you didn't spot check, you didn't independently
4 verify, correct?

5 A. That would be a correct statement.

6 Q. How many did you spot check?

7 A. My recollection is, is that within each of
8 the sampled areas for the case studies that I looked
9 up between 25 and 40 of those PIN numbers that were
10 presented by Poletti.

11 Q. How many did Poletti use in total?

12 A. I don't know. I would have to count them,
13 but it seemed to me to be well over a couple of
14 hundred.

15 Q. Now, it's also your opinion that the
16 construction of the subject facility will not have
17 an impact on the value of surrounding property,
18 correct?

19 A. That is correct.

20 Q. And that's your independent opinion
21 separate and apart from whatever Poletti said,
22 correct?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Now, you said at some point, and I think

1 it was during direct examination, that you
2 familiarized yourself with the area around the site,
3 correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. You actually drove around and walked
6 around and looked at the area around the site?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. How far did you go from the site?

9 A. My inspection of the site started at the
10 site and then proceeded north to Main Street, then
11 back through the -- back south towards the uses that
12 are located on the west side of the street. I drove
13 through Timber Creek mobile home park, the
14 manufactured home park, proceeded south to Belvidere
15 Road, then drove west.

16 Q. So you did go over a thousand feet from
17 the subject site, correct?

18 A. I believe I did, yes.

19 Q. Why did you do that?

20 A. Because I wanted to familiarize myself
21 with the applications that are located surrounding
22 the surrounding subject property.

23 Q. How much more than a thousand feet did you
24 go?

1 A. How much more than a thousand feet did I
2 go?

3 Q. Yes.

4 A. I think went I think I went in every
5 direction at least a couple of miles clearly.

6 Q. Now, going back to your independent
7 opinion in your report, where is the target and
8 control area analysis that you independently
9 conducted?

10 A. That I independently completed?

11 Q. Yes.

12 A. I didn't, I did not identify a target or
13 control area for the independent analysis.

14 Q. So you didn't do a target and control area
15 analysis for your independent --

16 A. I did not.

17 Q. Did you ever tell that to any members of
18 the Round Lake Park Village Board?

19 A. I never spoke to any members of the Round
20 Lake Park Village Board.

21 Q. Did you ever tell that to Mr. Sechen?

22 A. Yes, I believe I did that tell that to
23 Mr. Sechen.

24 Q. And he was still okay with your report?

80

1 MR. SECHEN: Objection.

2 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Basis?

3 MR. SECHEN: He never told it to me, how
4 could he know that I would be okay with it? This
5 whole line of questioning --

6 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: I am going to
7 sustain the objection for a couple of reasons. But
8 that's fine.

9 BY MR. BLAZER:

10 Q. Did Mr. Sechen ever ask you if you had
11 done a target and control area analysis to support
12 your independent opinion?

13 A. No.

14 Q. Where is the multiple regression analysis
15 that you independently conducted?

16 A. I didn't do a multiple regression
17 analysis.

18 Q. Did you ever tell Mr. Sechen that?

19 A. No.

20 Q. Did the subject of a multiple regression
21 analysis ever come up in your discussions with
22 Mr. Sechen?

23 A. I am sure they did.

24 Q. Did the subject of a target and control

1 area analysis ever come up in your conversations
2 with Mr. Sechen?

3 A. I am sure they did.

4 Q. Let's go back to the Poletti report for a
5 moment. Poletti's report identified four studies of
6 transfer stations, correct, do you remember that?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And all four of those reports concluded
9 that the facility that they were talking about did,
10 in fact, minimize the impact on the property values,
11 correct?

12 A. Well, I never read the McCann report, but
13 the three Integra reports I believe had that
14 conclusion.

15 Q. You never got the McCann report?

16 A. I never got the McCann report.

17 Q. Why didn't you ask Poletti for it?

18 A. Because I wasn't -- I specifically, so
19 that there would be no appearance of conclusion,
20 elected not to talk to Dr. Poletti under any
21 circumstances, that the report was going to be
22 judged on its own weight and faith and its own merit
23 he.

24 Q. You just -- Mr. Clark pointed out that you

1 keep referring to Mr. Poletti as Dr. Poletti and, in
2 fact, his doctorate is in philosophy, who told you
3 to keep referring to him as doctor?

4 A. No one told me to keep referring to him as
5 doctor.

6 Q. Have you ever met him before this
7 proceeding?

8 A. No.

9 Q. Now, let's talk about the other three
10 reports, the three Integra Realty Resources reports.
11 All of those, along with the McCann report, were
12 done for companies that were seeking, waste
13 companies that were seeking siting approval,
14 correct?

15 A. That's my recollection.

16 Q. And you read that obviously in the three
17 Integra reports that you did have, correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. They were on behalf of the waste companies
20 that were seeking approval of the three transfer
21 stations, correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And I believe you indicated in response to
24 Mr. Clark's questions that you did not need to

1 review the hours of operation with respect to this
2 facility because they were not addressed in
3 Poletti's report, correct?

4 A. I believe that that was my testimony.

5 Q. And did you also determine that you did
6 not need to review the fact that the doors of this
7 facility will be open 20 hours a day because it was
8 not addressed in Poletti's report?

9 A. That would also be correct.

10 Q. And I believe Mr. Grossmark asked you a
11 question regarding the hours of operation of the
12 three transfer stations that Poletti reviewed, and I
13 believe you indicated that you didn't know what the
14 hours are?

15 A. I said that I didn't have them memorized.

16 Q. Do you know if Glenview, Elburn and Bluff
17 City have their truck bay doors open 20 hours a day?

18 A. I do not know specifically how many hours
19 a day those truck doors, the truck doors are open at
20 the facilities that you mentioned.

21 Q. Now, let me see if I could refresh your
22 recollection about their operating hours.

23 Glenview, Monday through Friday --

24 MR. SECHEN: Objection. There's no

1 showing that his recollection is exhausted.

2 MR. BLAZER: He just said he doesn't
3 recall.

4 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: I want to
5 hear how the question is asked.

6 BY MR. BLAZER:

7 Q. I want to see if this refreshes your
8 recollection about their operating hours from -- you
9 know what the IEPA landfill or IEPA capacity reports
10 are, they have been discussed in this case?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Glenview, Monday to Friday 6:00 a.m. to
13 9:00 p.m., Saturday 6:00 a.m. to noon, no Sunday
14 hours. Does that sound right to you?

15 A. It sounds familiar. Again, I would have
16 to look back at the documents, but I have no reason
17 to doubt that that's correct.

18 Q. Elburn, Monday to Saturday 6:00 a.m. to
19 6:00 p.m., no Sunday hours. Does that sound right?

20 A. That my answer would be the same.

21 Q. And then finally Bluff City Monday to
22 Saturday, 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m., no Sunday hours.
23 Does that sound familiar?

24 A. My answer would be the same.

1 Q. But you didn't consider any of that in
2 coming to your independent conclusion or in your
3 review of Poletti's report, correct?

4 A. I did not.

5 Q. Because he didn't consider it, right?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. Independent of what's in Poletti report,
8 did you review any reports for any project in
9 Illinois that weren't written by people that weren't
10 working for waste companies?

11 A. No.

12 Q. Did you review any other reports for any
13 transfer station projects in Illinois?

14 A. I presume we're talking about impact
15 reports?

16 Q. Any kind of reports?

17 A. I would have -- can I have the question
18 back, just to be positive?

19 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: You have to
20 read two questions back.

21 (Record was read back.)

22 THE WITNESS: No.

23 BY MR. BLAZER:

24 Q. Did you review any other reports for any

1 transfer station project in Illinois?

2 A. No.

3 Q. So you limited yourself exclusively to
4 what Poletti looked at, correct?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. And your conversations with Mr. Sechen and
7 the context of reviewing the two drafts of your
8 report that we're aware of here, did he ever tell
9 you that the contents of your report were not
10 consistent with the needs of your mutual client, the
11 Village of Round Lake Park?

12 A. That discussion never occurred.

13 Q. He never told you that?

14 A. No.

15 Q. And did you ever telling Mr. Sechen that
16 you never reviewed any other reports for any other
17 transfer station projects in Illinois?

18 A. That discussion never occurred.

19 Q. Did he ask you if you reviewed any other
20 reports for any other transfer station in Illinois?

21 A. No.

22 Q. Let's go to your report page 2, third
23 paragraph. Are you there on page 2, Mr. Kleszynski?

24 A. I am.

1 Q. Within the overall -- you say here, I am
2 sorry, within the overall context of analyzing an
3 alleged detrimental condition, and you talked about
4 detrimental conditions when Mr. Sechen was
5 questioning you, correct?

6 A. I didn't hear the last part. I was trying
7 to read this. I apologize.

8 Q. You're referring to here to detrimental
9 conditions, correct?

10 A. Yes. That paragraph comes from the
11 heading or under the heading discussion and
12 definition of a detrimental condition.

13 Q. Right. And what you say here is, within
14 the overall context of analyzing an alleged
15 detrimental condition, the impact can range from no
16 impact or benign up to and including a complete loss
17 or a liability to the owner. When identified,
18 damages caused by a detrimental condition are
19 typically measured against a baseline value or a
20 comparison of data where a similar situation slash
21 condition is known to exist. The analysis of the
22 data allows the analyst to formulate an opinion
23 about the condition and identify if the impact is
24 measurable, real or perceived. Did I read that

1 correctly?

2 A. You did.

3 Q. And the detrimental condition in this case
4 is the transfer station, correct? Whether or not
5 you agree that it's detrimental, in the context of
6 valuation services, the generic term detrimental
7 condition is applied to the condition that has a
8 potential impact on value of surrounding properties,
9 correct?

10 A. I would have to agree with that. And you
11 are correct that the term detrimental condition is
12 the text terminology that identifies the imposition
13 of anything into an area that could be perceived or
14 identified as possibly or really having an impact on
15 value.

16 Q. Could be rendering plant?

17 A. Could be a new light post that shines in
18 somebody's backyard.

19 Q. Could be anything that might impact the
20 value, right?

21 A. Yes. That's the broad definition of
22 detrimental condition.

23 Q. So in this case the potential detrimental
24 condition we're talking about is the transfer

1 station, correct?

2 A. Yes, as defined in that textbook
3 terminology.

4 Q. And that's the textbook you rely on,
5 right?

6 A. Sure.

7 Q. That's the textbook you have sitting there
8 next to you, correct?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. The 13th Edition?

11 A. No. The document that you're referring to
12 is the real estate damages text material as produced
13 by the Appraisal Institute.

14 Q. All right. Based on the statement I just
15 read from your report, where in your report do we
16 find your baseline value or a comparison of data
17 where a similar situation slash condition is known
18 to exist?

19 A. You do not. As it states in my report, I
20 utilize --

21 Q. You answered the question, sir. Thank
22 you.

23 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Let's take a
24 5-minute break. We will start at about 2:02 or

90

1 something like that.

2 (A short recess was taken.)

3 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: We will
4 reconvene the hearing.

5 Mr. Blazer, you can proceed.

6 BY MR. BLAZER:

7 Q. Thank you, sir.

8 All right. Mr. Kleszynski, let's go
9 to that case where you worked for my firm a couple
10 years ago.

11 You have up there what we marked as
12 TCH Exhibit 45, which is a report that you did in
13 2011, our client matter was the Tinaglia Family
14 Limited Partnership, correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And you recall that case involved property
17 in Glencoe?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. And that's the property that belonged to
20 our client, the Partnership, correct?

21 A. That is correct.

22 Q. And it had been contaminated by a dry
23 cleaners next door to it. Do you recall that?

24 A. I do.

1 Q. And the detrimental condition in that case
2 was that contamination, correct?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Just like here, the detrimental condition
5 is the transfer station, correct?

6 A. Well, I think we have a fundamental
7 disagreement, but other than the things that we
8 discussed, I just want to make sure that the record
9 is clear from my perspective in the event we meet
10 again on that issue. I want to be perfectly clear
11 that the terminology detrimental condition is the
12 textbook terminology and has a different meaning as
13 it relates to the Tinaglia Family Limited
14 Partnership.

15 Q. Could you turn to the table of contents in
16 TCH Exhibit 45?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. Now, you see one the things you did
19 here -- we will get into parts of this report, but
20 one of the things you did here was a property
21 history?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. And where is that in your report in this
24 case?

1 A. It is not.

2 Q. You also did a highest and best use
3 analysis?

4 A. That is correct.

5 Q. Again, in the case for me?

6 A. Yes.

7 Q. And where is that in your report in this
8 case?

9 A. It is not in the report in this case.

10 Q. Let's keep going.

11 A. Wait a second. Let me check one place
12 though.

13 Q. For highest and best use?

14 A. I want to be positive.

15 Q. Absolutely, I want you to be positive.

16 A. Okay. No, it is not addressed.

17 Q. Next thing on the table of contents in
18 Exhibit 45, estimate of marketing time, where is
19 that in your report in this case?

20 A. It is not.

21 Q. Estimate of exposure time, where is that
22 in your report in this case?

23 A. It is not and would not be included.

24 Q. Zoning, where is that in your report in

1 this case?

2 A. It is not.

3 Q. Real estate tax and assessment, where is
4 that in your report in this case?

5 A. It is not in this report, nor would it be.

6 Q. Definition of market value, where is that
7 in this case?

8 A. It is not in this report nor would it be.

9 Q. All right. Let's go to the next page of
10 the table of contents. Estimate of value by the
11 direct sales comparison approach, where is that in
12 this case?

13 A. It would not be -- it is not and would not
14 be.

15 Q. Can you look at Exhibit 46, that rather
16 hefty stack of documents, TCH 46?

17 A. I am sorry. I was looking at the bottom
18 where it says 73.

19 Q. I printed it double-sided just so it's not
20 quite so --

21 A. Sure.

22 Q. Could you describe what Exhibit 46 is?

23 A. Exhibit 46 would be the backup research
24 that was utilized in the appraisal of the Tinaglia

1 property with two specific dates of value that would
2 be in the body of my file.

3 MR. BLAZER: If we could just take a
4 moment, Mr. Hearing Officer.

5 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr.
6 Kleszynski, this is a back up for TCH Exhibit 45,
7 correct?

8 THE WITNESS: Yes.

9 MR. BLAZER: May I proceed?

10 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Yes.

11 BY MR. BLAZER:

12 Q. Am I correct, Mr. Kleszynski, that what
13 you were doing with Exhibits 45 and 46 was
14 determining the value of the property that was the
15 subject of your report and then determining the
16 impact on that value resulting from the detrimental
17 condition, correct?

18 A. Yes and no.

19 Q. Explain what you mean by yes and no.

20 MR. SECHEN: I have an objection as to
21 relevance, materiality.

22 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: I think it is
23 a preliminary question at this point, so I will let
24 it stand.

1 THE WITNESS: In this particular case,
2 based on your associate's interpretation of the law
3 and the definition of debt of damages, my assignment
4 was to evaluate the Tinaglia property as of two
5 specific dates in time, one being the date, the
6 earlier date the February 6, 2008, being a date at
7 which point we knew that the property or we believed
8 that the property was unimpacted by the spill from
9 the adjacent cleaners.

10 The April 11 date being the date at
11 which we knew that the spill had existed and we had,
12 I believe at that point in time, the reports
13 associated with the cost of remediation and other
14 aspects. And when -- and so that's the yes part.

15 The no part is, is that based on my
16 discussions with your office at that time, we
17 identified that the calculation of damages, because
18 it's a legal issue and not an appraisal issue, would
19 be defined as the differences between those two
20 value and conclusions.

21 Q. And you certainly expressed no
22 disagreement with that concept, did you?

23 A. No.

24 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Hold on for

96

1 one second. Okay.

2 BY MR. BLAZER:

3 Q. And so what you did in your report,
4 Exhibit 45, based in part on the data that's in
5 Exhibit 46, is issue an opinion regarding the impact
6 in terms of dollar value from that detrimental
7 condition, correct?

8 A. Yes. Given that definition of damages and
9 the scope of the work that was defined by your
10 office.

11 Q. Right.

12 And in terms of the independent
13 opinion that you come to in this case, none of that
14 is in your report, correct?

15 A. Yes, that would be correct.

16 Q. But you also did a second report for my
17 firm in that case, right?

18 A. I am not sure.

19 Q. Exhibit 47.

20 A. Oh, I am sorry. Yes.

21 Q. For the record, TCH Exhibit 47?

22 A. Got it.

23 Q. And like you did here with Poletti's
24 report, you reviewed someone else's report in

1 Exhibit 47, right?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And that is actually entitled, a rebuttal
4 analysis and appraisal review, correct?

5 A. It is.

6 Q. Was that a Standard 3 review?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. And the report you were rebutting was
9 written by Integra Realty, right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. The company that wrote three of the four
12 reports that Poletti relied on, correct?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Could you turn to Exhibit 47, page 2,
15 second paragraph under the heading, scope of the
16 rebuttal opinion and appraisal review?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. And in your report --

19 MR. SECHEN: Page 15.

20 MR. BLAZER: Page 2, second paragraph,
21 under scope of a rebuttal opinion.

22 BY MR. BLAZER:

23 Q. Are you there?

24 A. Yes.

1 Q. And you said here, please note that Ms.
2 McGarr, and Ms. McGarr was the person whose report
3 that you were rebutting in Integra Realty, correct?

4 A. Yes.

5 Q. Please note that Ms. McGarr states that
6 items used in her review are retained in her file.
7 Absent an opportunity to review the file material, I
8 reserve the right to amend this rebuttal opinion and
9 review after additional material is provided. Did I
10 read that correctly?

11 A. You did.

12 Q. And that was because without that material
13 contained in her file you couldn't be sure what she
14 relied on, right?

15 A. Based on -- that would be true based on
16 the questions that I was asked, the evaluation
17 questions that I was asked and the scope of work.

18 Q. And the scope was a Standard 3 review,
19 right?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. And without that information contained in
22 her file, you couldn't determine whether there was,
23 in fact, information that was contrary to the
24 opinions she generated, correct?

1 A. Well I really couldn't verify anything --

2 Q. Right.

3 A. -- in the material that was presented.

4 So, for example, in that particular case, I didn't

5 have the opportunity to review the actual sales

6 documents as I did in the Poletti incident. This is

7 a different valuation question, different assignment

8 and different scope of work.

9 Q. We're still talking about a Standard 3
10 review, right?

11 A. Yes, globally we are.

12 Q. All right. And then in the context of
13 your Standard 3 review, you did a point by point
14 analysis and response to what to me appears to be
15 every comment in Ms. McGarr's report, correct?

16 A. Yes.

17 Q. And would it be fair to state that it was
18 important to you to analyze every point and
19 determine whether or not her statements were
20 accurate?

21 A. It was important for me to do exactly what
22 it says in Standard 3, which was to point out areas
23 of disagreement and give the basis for those
24 disagreements.

1 Q. Do you still have your report hanging
2 around there somewhere?

3 A. My report for the?

4 Q. For this case?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. If you could go to page 6, second
7 paragraph.

8 A. Okay.

9 Q. The part that starts, while completing
10 this assignment, do you see that section?

11 A. I do.

12 Q. You say in that paragraph that you
13 considered the supply and comparable data presented
14 in the Poletti and Lannert reports, correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. And supplemental data retained in your
17 file, correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. What supplemental data and information?

20 A. That's retained in my file?

21 Q. Yes?

22 A. It's all of the information that I
23 referred to at the beginning of this testimony as it
24 related to the documents that I looked up on the

101

1 Multiple Listing Service for the addresses and PIN
2 numbers and the Poletti report as well as their --
3 as well as their, for lack of a better term, the
4 information that comes off public record sources.

5 Q. And none of that information is attached
6 to your report in this case, correct?

7 A. Yes, that's why it says it's retained in
8 the file.

9 Q. Just like Ms. McGarr said, right?

10 A. Yes.

11 Q. We will get back to McGarr in a minute.

12 I believe you testified you also
13 reviewed Mr. Lannert's report; is that correct, in
14 this case?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Okay. Obviously Lannert didn't do
17 anything for the Tinaglia case, we're talking about
18 this case, right?

19 A. Yes.

20 Q. All right. Do you agree with Mr. Lannert
21 that the existing zoning and the permitted uses with
22 within a 1-mile study radius of the subject site
23 indicates that the existing uses have been
24 established for many years and continued growth as

1 anticipated as planned?

2 A. I would say that I generally agree with
3 that statement, yes.

4 Q. And do you know what the predominant use
5 is within 1 mile of the site?

6 A. My recollection, the answer is yes, I saw
7 a lot of open space, I saw residential and I saw
8 industrial and commercial.

9 Q. All right. Do you recall from Lannert's
10 report that it's 55 percent open space?

11 A. I would have to look. I have no reason to
12 argue with that issue.

13 Q. I want to make sure we're certain here,
14 Mr. Kleszynski. I haven't marked this,
15 Mr. Kleszynski, because it's in the Application.

16 MR. BLAZER: I hope that's okay with you,
17 Mr. Hearing Officer.

18 BY MR. BLAZER:

19 Q. This is the text of Mr. Lannert's report
20 out of the siting application?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. If you could turn to page 3.1-6 of the
23 table entitled Land Use Ratios.

24 A. Yes.

1 Q. All right. And you see there that he
2 identifies open space as 55 percent?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. All right. And what's the second-most
5 predominant use within the 1-mile study area?

6 A. Residential.

7 Q. 37 percent?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. Do you agree with Mr. Lannert that
10 residential uses have been successfully integrated
11 within the study area?

12 MR. SECHEN: Objection, scope.

13 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
14 overruled.

15 THE WITNESS: Yes.

16 BY MR. BLAZER:

17 Q. Do you agree that open space and
18 residential land uses account for 92 percent of the
19 area within a 1-mile radius of the proposed site?

20 A. Based on this arithmetic and calculation,
21 yes, I do.

22 Q. And you have no reason to dispute it, do
23 you?

24 A. None.

1 Q. Do you agree that the area within 1 mile
2 of the site has been defined by open space and
3 residential uses that have been established over the
4 past years?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. Do you agree that the Village of Round
7 lake Park is a multi-faceted commercial and
8 residential community?

9 A. Yes.

10 Q. Do you recall this from the Poletti
11 report, right?

12 A. That's my recollection. I would have to
13 go back and look at it specifically, but that would
14 also be -- I am familiar with Round Lake Park, and
15 that description would be reasonable.

16 Q. Right. So I assume would you agree with
17 Mr. Poletti that this is not an area that is defined
18 by industrial uses, correct?

19 A. Again, I would have to go back and look at
20 his report, but yes.

21 Q. Well, since Mr. Lannert said exactly the
22 opposite, why didn't you mention your disagreement
23 with him in your report?

24 A. I don't have a recollection of recalling

1 that as a disagreement point when I reviewed the
2 Lannert report. The areas that I concentrated on in
3 the Lannert report were what I identified as being
4 pretty much the, what I call the land planning
5 issue, what I believe the land planning issues as it
6 related to the positioning of the property on the
7 site.

8 Q. You have Mr. Lannert's report there?

9 A. I do.

10 Q. Could you turn to page 3.1-12?

11 A. Sure.

12 Q. Section 8, second bullet?

13 A. Okay.

14 Q. He said here, the character of the
15 immediate area surrounding the site has been defined
16 by industrial uses that have been established over
17 the past year. Did I read that correctly?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Why didn't you in your report mention that
20 you agree with Poletti and disagree with Lannert?

21 A. Because as it relates to that particular
22 paragraph, the area surrounding the subject site is,
23 in fact, identified as being predominately
24 industrial. When you drive up and down Porter

1 Drive, the applications that are up and down Porter
2 Drive are clearly industrial. And when you go to
3 the east, the applications, for example, with the, I
4 will call it a scrap yard or recycling yard, are
5 residential in character, and that's how I
6 interpreted that section of the report.

7 Q. Mr. Lannert's study area was 1 mile,
8 right?

9 A. I agree that he defined it as 1 mile both
10 in the testimony and as part of his report. But my
11 interpretation of the immediate environs of the
12 subject property is that it's industrial in
13 character.

14 Q. Did you talk to Lannert about your
15 interpretation of what he said?

16 A. I did not.

17 Q. Did you talk Poletti about his
18 disagreement with what Lannert said?

19 A. I spoke to neither one of those gentlemen
20 prior to.

21 MR. SECHEN: Object, I think it
22 mischaracterizes the reports.

23 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Well, I am
24 going to withstand the objection as asked and

1 answered because he has said he never spoke to
2 Poletti at all, so it really doesn't get us
3 anywhere.

4 MR. BLAZER: Understood.

5 BY MR. BLAZER:

6 Q. You had an assignment to accomplish in
7 this case, correct, Mr. Kleszynski?

8 A. Tell me what you mean by "accomplish."
9 That implies to me that I set out with a specific
10 goal.

11 Q. You were given an assignment in this case,
12 correct?

13 A. Yes, I was asked a valuation question --

14 Q. The "yes" is all I needed.

15 And that assignment was communicated
16 to you by Mr. Sechen on behalf of the Village,
17 correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Let's go back to TCH Exhibit 47, your
20 rebuttal report that you did for my firm two years
21 ago.

22 Do you recall that Ms. McGarr at
23 Integra had criticized your initial report, TCH 45?

24 A. Yeah, there was a lot of criticism going

108

1 around.

2 Q. There was a lot of criticisms going around
3 absolutely, and she had criticized your conclusion
4 regarding how the real estate market operates, do
5 you remember that?

6 A. I do.

7 Q. All right. And in response to that
8 criticism in your rebuttal report, you said that the
9 description of market operation offered in the
10 Integra report appears to be understated in this
11 matter, and that the reader and user of your report
12 should consider how the market actually operates, do
13 you remember that?

14 A. I would have to read it, but.

15 Q. If could you turn to page 8 of Exhibit 47,
16 the third paragraph?

17 A. Okay.

18 Q. The paragraph that starts, with respect to
19 this specific item.

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. All right. If you could read that to
22 yourself.

23 A. Okay.

24 Q. Okay. Was I accurate in my description of
109

1 your criticism of Ms. McGarr?

2 A. You were.

3 Q. Okay. And you point out that in that case
4 the ability to sell the property had not just been
5 negatively impacted by the detrimental condition, it
6 had been completely derailed, right?

7 MR. PORTER: I am going to object. We
8 have gone a long time now talking about properties
9 that have absolutely nothing to do with the Groot
10 Transfer Station, we have gotten so far beyond
11 relevancy, it's ridiculous. I object to relevancy.

12 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
13 overruled.

14 BY MR. BLAZER:

15 Q. Do you need me to read that question back?

16 A. No.

17 Yes, it was my conclusion that the in
18 the instance where there was an agreed upon price
19 that upon determination of the environmental --
20 identifying an existing environmental condition that
21 would have remediation costs were -- derailed that
22 sale.

23 Q. And that environmental condition was the
24 detrimental condition whose impact you were retained

110

1 to assess, correct?

2 A. Yes. The spill with an identifiable
3 location, and for lack of a better term, from a
4 remediation cost.

5 Q. All right. And then in your rebuttal
6 report, TCH 47, page 9, you finally said for
7 purposes of clarification, the APC analysis -- and
8 APC is you, right?

9 A. Associated Property Counsels, yes.

10 Q. For purposes of clarification, the APC
11 analysis opines on the value of the subject property
12 before and after consideration of the environmental
13 condition of the real estate as of two points in
14 time?

15 A. Yes. Oh, I am sorry.

16 Q. That's okay. I'm accurate so far?

17 A. Yes.

18 Q. The analysis applied is compliant with the
19 USPAP guidelines, appraisal practice and appraisal
20 theory, correct?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Now let's go back to the report you did in
23 this case.

24 Where is the discussion in your

111

1 report how a market operates?

2 A. There is none, nor would there be based on
3 the questions asked and scope of work.

4 Q. Am I correct, sir, that you performed no
5 independent analysis in this case of the values of
6 properties in the area before and after the
7 imposition of the detrimental condition, that being
8 a transfer station, correct?

9 A. Yes, that would be correct. I did not
10 evaluate any properties in the -- in this -- I did
11 not formulate an opinion of value about any property
12 in this instance based on the scope of work.

13 Q. You could have done a comparative
14 analysis, right?

15 A. That's two different questions.
16 Comparative analysis is not an evaluation. What I
17 did in your instance was that we were focused on
18 a --

19 Q. Let me try and ask you the question again
20 so we're clear. Let me rephrase the question for
21 you.

22 You could have done a target and
23 control analysis of your own, right?

24 A. Sure.

1 Q. Did anybody tell you not to?

2 A. The answer to that question is yes and no.
3 When we're outlining the scope of work, the question
4 that I asked was whether or not it was needed for me
5 to do my own target and control area analysis. That
6 was not included in my scope of work based on
7 discussions relative to the amount of data that was
8 in the Poletti report, as well as the locations of
9 the -- and the physical characteristics of the case
10 study, the case study province.

11 Q. And who told you not to do your own target
12 and control analysis?

13 A. That was my discussions in setting up the
14 scope of work with Attorney Sechen.

15 Q. You could have gone to some other transfer
16 stations and done your own analysis but for
17 Mr. Sechen telling you it was not in your scope of
18 work?

19 A. Well --

20 Q. Is that right, sir, yes or no?

21 A. Yes and no. And it's yes and no because
22 of the fact that after having read the Poletti
23 reports, in my discussions in setting up the scope
24 of work with Mr. Sechen, we agreed, we mutually

113

1 agreed that there was sufficient data that it was
2 unnecessary to go in that direction.

3 Q. So Mr. Sechen agreed that you did not need
4 to do your own independent target and control
5 analysis of other transfer station areas, correct?

6 A. He agreed with my conclusion that I didn't
7 think we needed it either, yes.

8 Q. Let's go back again now to your rebuttal
9 report TCH 47. This is on page 10, fourth
10 paragraph.

11 A. The one that begins the Integra report?

12 Q. Yes.

13 A. Okay.

14 Q. Here you criticize Ms. McGarr's use of
15 what she described as comparable properties, do you
16 recall that?

17 A. I do.

18 Q. And you described what she identified as
19 comparables and the property you were reviewing as a
20 giant leap that is misleading, although the subject
21 has many positive features, the property does not
22 compete with top of the market real estate in the
23 City of Chicago, nor can it be confused with real
24 estate that competes for renters or buyers of

1 nationally recognized properties. Did I read that
2 correctly?

3 A. You did.

4 Q. And then you said page 10 of the report,
5 fifth paragraph. I will wait until you are there.

6 A. I am there.

7 Q. Although the national analysis is
8 interesting, the Integra report does not consider or
9 put their analysis into the perspective of the
10 location in which the subject property exists. Did
11 I read that correctly?

12 A. You did.

13 Q. And you described her comparison to other
14 real estate markets as misleading, correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Now, Poletti's report uses other transfer
17 stations in other markets as the basis for his
18 opinion on impact of property values, correct?

19 A. He certainly does.

20 Q. Let's take an example from his report, the
21 Bluff City Transfer Station, that's one of them,
22 right?

23 A. Sure.

24 Q. That's one of the ones you looked at?

1 A. Absolutely.

2 Q. You actually went out there, right?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. It's in Elgin, right?

5 A. Certainly.

6 Q. You know, it's immediately next door to
7 the Village of Bartlett, right?

8 A. I do.

9 Q. And in reviewing that part of Poletti's
10 report, did you determine what kind of development
11 existed in the vicinity of the transfer station
12 before it was built?

13 A. Yes.

14 Q. Let's say within 1 mile of where the
15 transfer station is?

16 A. Yes, I was very familiar with its location
17 because it's adjacent to the Villa Olivia golf
18 course to the east and had done work on Villa Olivia
19 relative to some of the residential units that were
20 being developed there.

21 Q. Have you ever done any work for the
22 Village of Bartlett? You can look at your resume,
23 if you need to?

24 A. I don't think we have been hired by the

1 Village of Bartlett or the attorneys that represent
2 them.

3 Q. Do you know what an estate residential
4 zoning area is?

5 A. Generically the answer is yes, but it
6 depends obviously on the municipality.

7 Q. Are you aware that the Village of Bartlett
8 has multiple zoning classifications called estate
9 residential?

10 A. Sure.

11 Q. And you're aware -- are you aware that one
12 of those includes 40,000 square foot residential
13 lots?

14 A. I would have to go back and look at that,
15 but that doesn't surprise me.

16 Q. And how many of those types of residential
17 units are within 1 mile of this proposed transfer
18 station?

19 A. When you say this, are we talking about
20 within 1 mile of the --

21 Q. Of Groot, of the proposed Groot station?

22 A. How many estate --

23 Q. Residential units are there within 1 mile
24 of the proposed Groot transfer station?

1 A. I don't have a clue.

2 Q. Let's go back to your rebuttal report TCH
3 47, page 10, we're still on page 10, fifth
4 paragraph.

5 You talked about the fact that Ms.
6 McGarr from Integra used examples of paired sales in
7 support of her opinion, correct?

8 A. Yes.

9 Q. And then you said the Integra report does
10 not reference the fact that each of the locations
11 sited is superior to the subject with respect to
12 population base, retail strength, visibility and
13 accessibility, did I read that correctly?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. All right. Where in your report do we
16 find your comparison of the population base in Round
17 Lake Park to Glenview, Elgin, Bartlett and Elburn?

18 A. You don't, nor --

19 Q. Where in your report do we find your
20 comparison of the retail strength in Round Lake Park
21 compared to Glenview, Elgin, Bartlett and Elburn.

22 A. You don't nor --

23 MR. SECHEN: Objection to him cutting off
24 the witness.

1 MR. BLAZER: His answer was you don't.

2 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: But he did
3 say "nor" then he got cut off. We have let all of
4 the experts complete their answers.

5 Mr. Kleszynski, did you have
6 something more to say?

7 THE WITNESS: No. That's fine. Thank
8 you.

9 BY MR. BLAZER:

10 Q. And where in your report do we find your
11 comparison of the visibility in Round Lake Park to
12 Glenview, Elgin, Bartlett and Elburn?

13 A. You don't, nor would you.

14 Q. And finally, where in your report do we
15 find your comparison of the accessibility in Round
16 Lake Park as compared to Glenview, Elgin, Bartlett
17 and Elburn?

18 A. You don't, nor would you.

19 Q. And one reason we wouldn't is because that
20 wasn't part of your assignment, right?

21 A. It was not part of the scope of work nor
22 was it, in my opinion, a relevant question given the
23 work that Claudia had done in this instance.

24 Q. And if you could turn to -- you're still

119

1 on page 10, the last sentence of TCH 47, you
2 concluded that the use of one sale to extract this
3 market adjustment with support from three properties
4 in significantly different locations causes the
5 conclusion to lack credibility, did I read that
6 correctly?

7 A. You did.

8 Q. But in this case you didn't question
9 Poletti's credibility, right?

10 A. Well, first of all, I am not talking about
11 Poletti's credibility, I am talking about the
12 credibility of the conclusions that Poletti had
13 formulated based on the work that he did. And it's
14 my opinion that to compare this statement based on
15 the scope of work that was part of this assignment,
16 is absolutely ridiculous because they're totally
17 different assignments with totally different
18 valuation questions that require totally different
19 analysis. So that's my answer.

20 MR. BLAZER: Could I ask that the question
21 be read back, Mr. Hearing Officer.

22 (Record was read back.)

23 THE WITNESS: The answer to that question
24 is I did not question Mr. Poletti's credibility, nor

120

1 did I question the credibility of his conclusions
2 based on the work that I did and the review of the
3 document that was provided to me in this matter.

4 BY MR. BLAZER:

5 Q. Because that wasn't part of your
6 assignment, right?

7 A. No, actually, it was part of my assignment
8 under Standard 3; that if I had any questions
9 associated with the credibility of Poletti's
10 conclusions, that it was incumbent upon me to cite
11 those conclusions and then tell you what the impact
12 would be. Unlike what occurred in the MaRous
13 report, which didn't offer any of that.

14 The issue as far as this is concerned
15 is that had -- under Standard 3, had I, in fact, had
16 any reasonable doubt about the conclusions that were
17 presented by Poletti, I would have at that point
18 identified those things and actually done the
19 analysis to identify the impact of what those
20 differences would be.

21 Q. Like you did for my firm two years ago
22 when you were reviewing --

23 A. Because it was irrelevant in the instance
24 of your firm --

121

1 Q. Excuse me.

2 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr.
3 Kleszynski, let him finish the question, you're going
4 to get the chance to answer?

5 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

6 BY MR. BLAZER:

7 Q. Like you did for my firm two years ago
8 when you were reviewing the Integra report in the
9 context of a Standard 3 review? Yes, sir, correct?

10 A. Yes, that is correct, absolutely --

11 MR. BLAZER: I have no further questions.

12 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: You may
13 finish your answer, Mr. Kleszynski.

14 THE WITNESS: You're absolutely correct
15 because it was not relevant in the assignment that I
16 did for your firm.

17 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr. Smith is
18 not here.

19 I have a couple of follow-up
20 questions that I had.

21 THE WITNESS: Is it okay if I come over
22 that way to make sure I hear you.

23 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: I am going to
24 speak in the mike.

122

1 EXAMINATION

2 BY HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS:

3 Q. We talked to the other three appraisers
4 and asked whether they would utilize similar
5 methodologies as Poletti, I think that was the
6 essence of what you said, maybe I didn't say it
7 exactly?

8 A. Your statement is correct.

9 Q. Did anyone suggest doing a before or after
10 analysis on any of the transfer stations that
11 existed? Do you understand my question?

12 A. You have to clarify for me what you mean
13 by a before and after analysis.

14 Q. One of the things I wondered as I sat
15 throughout this entire hearing is that no one has
16 prepared an analysis of what has happened to
17 property values from before versus what occurred to
18 them after. Now that we have had 30 years of
19 transfer stations occurring in Illinois, no one has
20 provided a, here's what they were, property values
21 were the day before the transfer station went in,
22 and the year before, and here's where they were two
23 years later. Did anyone ever suggest doing
24 something like that, some historical approach?

123

1 guess is my question?

2 A. It would depend I think, I guess the
3 answer is, is the answer is somewhat academic is the
4 easiest way to start and say that, given the fact
5 that on a daily basis we have more data, not only
6 about the operation of facilities like this, but the
7 steps that are taken in order to protect property
8 values, that from an academic perspective exercise,
9 which is how these studies always start out and how
10 these methodologies always start out in our
11 profession, that the idea would be, is that now over
12 this period of time, maybe one of the things that we
13 should start doing in our classrooms is to teach
14 this as the possibility of another methodology to
15 test the impact.

16 Q. I get the feeling, and I am not trying to
17 put words in your mouth, that you're not comfortable
18 as a quote status issue; is that a fair statement?

19 A. I am not. To be honest with you, we use
20 Excel and the Duke University's methodology for
21 using Excel in multiple regression analysis, and it
22 doesn't have as many variables that I can utilize
23 with as the preprogram softwares do.

24 Q. And when you say multiple regression, what

125

1 do you mean?

2 A. Well, to me, multiple regression is, it's
3 only done in comparison to linear regression.
4 Linear regression only isolates one, you know, two
5 pieces of data and compares them. Multiple
6 regression analysis basically identifies a multitude
7 of variables that can be applied and then runs its
8 statistical analysis in order to get various degrees
9 of certainty and standard deviations and
10 co-efficient. And quite frankly, that's where I
11 slip off the sled in my understanding of how they
12 work because I have not -- I have just never modeled
13 it in the programs that we use in my office.

14 Q. And I am familiar with double regression,
15 and this is single regression, however, multiple
16 coefficients or multiple variables; is that a fair
17 statement?

18 A. That would be correct.

19 Q. And I assume if I ask you about King's
20 psychological (phonetic) nomenclature, you have no
21 idea what I am talking about?

22 A. I am going to tell you I have no clue nor
23 would I purport to have the background to answer
24 that question. That's why I went to the Ph.D.s and

126

1 that's --

2 Q. That's my next question. The Texas A and
3 M professor, you mentioned -- what was his name?

4 A. His name is, his name is Thomas Jackson.

5 Q. Okay. And is he a statistician or
6 appraiser or both?

7 A. He's an MAI designated appraiser as well
8 as a, I believe he teaches in the finance
9 department.

10 Q. Okay.

11 A. And I want to be clear about what I did
12 with this. My questions to him were, because it's
13 important that you know this, my questions to him
14 were designed to increase my understanding of what
15 were appropriate methodologies to be applied. I
16 mean, I didn't ask him to do any work, I didn't ask
17 him to do, you know, it was me doing what's required
18 in our profession which is when you have a, for lack
19 of a better term, when you're uncertain of things,
20 what's incumbent upon us is to seek out that
21 knowledge from knowledgeable parties.

22 Q. Referring to your, the two reports, one is
23 Round Lake Park Exhibit 2 and 1 is TCH Exhibit 51,
24 are there any difference in those two reports other

127

1 than the September date on page 11?

2 A. My suspicion is, is that the September 5th
3 date is the big part of it and, quite frankly,
4 there's probably some commas and periods and things
5 like that, that were corrected by my assistant when
6 it went through the final proofing.

7 Q. But you don't believe there was anything
8 substantive change?

9 A. In my opinion, there's no substantive
10 variation between those reports.

11 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: I have
12 nothing further.

13 Mr. Sechen.

14 MR. SECHEN: I will try to be brief.

15 REDIRECT EXAMINATION

16 BY MR. SECHEN:

17 Q. You just mentioned, Mr. Kleszynski, that
18 you spoke to the Ph.D.s regarding whether the
19 appropriate methodologies were used by Mr. Poletti?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. Were they?

22 A. Yes.

23 MR. BLAZER: We can't hear you. Sorry.

24 MR. SECHEN: Thank you.

128

1 BY MR. SECHEN:

2 Q. You were repeatedly asked questions about
3 why things are in one report and why they are not in
4 this report, is there a short answer for that?

5 A. Yes.

6 Q. What is a short answer?

7 A. There are two completely different
8 assignments and two completely -- and two completely
9 different valuation questions.

10 Q. At one point you were describing land use
11 to the east of the subject site?

12 A. Yes.

13 Q. Is that land use residential, is it
14 industrial?

15 A. Well, there's vacant land directly to the
16 east of the subject site, and then further east of
17 the subject site, is the -- well, it's been referred
18 to as the scrap yard, in modern -- in today's world
19 we call it a recycling yard.

20 Q. So if you would have referred to that use
21 as being residential, that would be incorrect?

22 A. Absolutely.

23 Q. Let me just cut to the chase here and
24 limit a bunch of what I got written down here?

129

1 MR. BLAZER: No objection.

2 BY MR. SECHEN:

3 Q. Mr. Clark here asked you questions about
4 differences in value because one piece of property
5 is in one school district and one piece of property
6 is in another school district?

7 A. Yes.

8 Q. Now, throughout these hearings you have
9 also heard questions regarding difference in
10 property caused by other factors regarding, for
11 example, whether they have sanitary sewer, whether
12 they're in a flood plain, as opposed to what other
13 property may have; is that correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 MR. BLAZER: Object to the form of the
16 question and also leading.

17 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
18 overruled.

19 BY MR. SECHEN:

20 Q. Now, Professor Poletti utilized the
21 multiple regression analysis; is that correct?

22 A. Yes.

23 Q. Can you tell us what utilizing the
24 multiple regression analysis does with respect to

1 such differences in property?

2 A. What it does is it basically purifies the
3 data. And by purifying the data, it just -- it's
4 just pure math. It is the input of the data and
5 it's the running of the multiple regression analysis
6 to determine whether or not, without any judgment,
7 so to speak, about the data that you input, whether
8 or not there is a statistical variation of
9 significance. That's the difference.

10 Q. Does that in short mean it obviates the
11 need to discuss any difference because the math
12 takes care of it?

13 A. It takes a lot of that stuff into
14 consideration, I guess, is the easiest way to say
15 it.

16 Q. And it does so without subjectivity?

17 MR. BLAZER: Objection, leading.

18 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
19 overruled.

20 THE WITNESS: The answer is yes, it's
21 pure, it's just pure arithmetic.

22 MR. SECHEN: I have nothing further.

23 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Okay.

24 Mr. Porter?

1 MR. PORTER: Thank you.

2 MR. BLAZER: Mr. Hearing Officer,
3 Mr. Porter had no questions on cross.

4 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: He has the
5 opportunity like we have had throughout this hearing
6 to clarify the questions that people had before him
7 that may raise other issues.

8 MR. BLAZER: Thank you.

9 CROSS EXAMINATION

10 BY MR. PORTER:

11 Q. Mr. Kleszynski, am I pronouncing that
12 correctly?

13 A. You're doing just fine.

14 Q. I am Rick Porter, the attorney for Groot.

15 You were asked about the hours of
16 operations at a proposed Groot facility and whether
17 Mr. Poletti was aware the facility could, on
18 occasion, operate 24 hours, do you recall that
19 questioning?

20 A. I do.

21 MR. BLAZER: Object to the form of the
22 question, mischaracterizes both the question that
23 was asked and the answer was given.

24 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection

132

1 overruled.

2 BY MR. PORTER:

3 Q. You reviewed the Poletti testimony; is
4 that correct?

5 A. I was here for the Poletti testimony.

6 Q. Isn't it true that he testified that the
7 proposed Groot facility would typically operate from
8 4:00 a.m. to 8:00 p.m. normally with potential to
9 operate 24 hours?

10 A. I recollect that, yes.

11 Q. So Mr. Poletti drafted his report, which
12 you have endorsed, he knew the operating hours of
13 the proposed facility, right?

14 MR. BLAZER: Object to characterization
15 and also calls for speculation.

16 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
17 sustained.

18 MR. GROSSMARK: Objection.

19 BY MR. PORTER:

20 Q. It's your understanding when Mr. Poletti
21 drafted his report, he was aware of the proposed
22 operating hours of the facility?

23 MR. BLAZER: Calls for speculation --

24 MR. GROSSMARK: And assumes facts not in

1 evidence.

2 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Could you
3 rephrase the question.

4 BY MR. PORTER:

5 Q. Isn't it true when you drafted your
6 report, you understood that Mr. Poletti knew what
7 the hours were that the facility was proposed to
8 operate?

9 MR. BLAZER: Same objection.

10 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
11 overruled.

12 THE WITNESS: It is true that my
13 recollection of the Poletti report relative to the
14 issue of the hours of operation were only clarified
15 when I heard the testimony that he said he was aware
16 that it could operate for 24 hours, that he had a
17 certain time frame that I don't recall specifically
18 what the time frame was, but that there was the
19 possibility that it could be 24 hours, and that it
20 was at that point that was clarified in my mind
21 regarding his report.

22 BY MR. PORTER:

23 Q. All right. It was clarified in your mind
24 that he was aware of the hours that he drafted his

1 report, correct?

2 MR. GROSSMARK: Objection, hearsay.

3 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
4 overruled.

5 THE WITNESS: I have to answer that
6 question yes.

7 BY MR. PORTER:

8 Q. Now, Mr. Blazer made a big deal out of the
9 fact --

10 MR. BLAZER: Object to the form of the
11 question.

12 BY MR. PORTER:

13 Q. -- you did not do your target and control
14 analysis, isn't that correct?

15 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
16 sustained.

17 MR. PORTER: The characterization
18 is accurate, I will rephrase.

19 MR. BLAZER: I ask that be stricken and he
20 be directed to control his mouth.

21 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Please
22 proceed both of you.

23 BY MR. PORTER:

24 Q. Do you recall Mr. Blazer asking you

135

1 several questions about the fact that you do not do
2 your own target and control analysis?

3 A. Yes.

4 Q. Isn't it true Mr. MaRous, Mr. Blazer's own
5 witness did not do his own target and control
6 analysis?

7 MR. BLAZER: Objection,
8 mischaracterization. Mr. MaRous did not issue an
9 independent opinion like Mr. Kleszynski did.

10 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
11 overruled.

12 THE WITNESS: It is true that the MaRous
13 report did not include any references to that issue.

14 BY MR. PORTER:

15 Q. Mr. Blazer pointed out that the Elgin
16 Transfer Station, which Mr. Poletti had considered,
17 was near large estate properties, do you recall that
18 line of questioning?

19 A. Yes -- no, he actually said it was near
20 areas that were zoned for large estate properties
21 but never really identified any specific large
22 estate areas that would be near that property.

23 Q. Doesn't the fact that the Elgin Transfer
24 Station which had no impact on property values, did

136

1 not impact those large estates, just support
2 Mr. Poletti's ultimate conclusions in this case
3 which involves --

4 MR. BLAZER: Objection.

5 MR. PORTER: Can I finished my question
6 first, counsel.

7 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: In this
8 respect I will say I thought you were finish a
9 couple of times myself, Mr. Porter. If you want to
10 restate the question, you can get it on the record
11 and we will go from there. How is that?

12 MR. PORTER: Touche.

13 BY MR. PORTER:

14 Q. Isn't it -- well, strike that.

15 Doesn't the fact that the Elgin
16 Transfer Station did not have any impact on large
17 estate properties only support Mr. Poletti's
18 ultimate opinions here that involves industrial open
19 space and more moderate residential sites within a
20 mile?

21 A. It would --

22 MR. BLAZER: Objection, foundation,
23 assumes facts not in evidence.

24 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: What's the

1 foundation objection?

2 MR. BLAZER: He didn't testify that he
3 knows one way or the other whether it impacted large
4 estate properties or not. Poletti doesn't indicate
5 whether or not he considered the large estate
6 properties near the Elgin Bluff City Transfer
7 Station. So unless this witness can testify that he
8 did consider them and determine that they were or
9 were not affected by the transfer station, there is
10 no foundation, and it assumes facts not in evidence.

11 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr. Porter, I
12 ask that you limit the question not to large estate,
13 but to his actual findings that he testified which
14 to.

15 BY MR. PORTER:

16 Q. Again, do you recall that Mr. Blazer asked
17 you about the Elgin Transfer Station and whether or
18 not in its location it's large estate property,
19 correct?

20 A. Yes. And my answer is the same, that
21 they're located near some properties that are zoned,
22 whether or not they're approved, I have no clue.

23 Q. And in Mr. Poletti's report, that Elgin
24 Transfer Station was one of the transfer stations he

138

1 reviewed and noted that there had been no impact on
2 property values around that transfer station; is
3 that right?

4 MR. BLAZER: Objection, that report isn't
5 in evidence and there's no indication whether or not
6 that report considered the estate properties near
7 the Bluff City Transfer Station.

8 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Objection
9 overruled.

10 THE WITNESS: I am uncomfortable with
11 answering the question only because of the fact that
12 I would have to go back and look at the data that
13 was used in the Poletti report to determine what and
14 relook at the target and control areas. So it would
15 have to be more specific. And based on the question
16 you asked, I can't answer it.

17 BY MR. PORTER:

18 Q. All right. There was some questioning by
19 the hearing officer concerning regression analysis,
20 do you recall that?

21 A. Yes.

22 Q. Isn't it true that the use of target and
23 control areas and regression analysis is one of the
24 six recognized methodologies under that appraisal

139

1 damages publication he was referring to earlier for
2 determining the impacts on property values from a
3 potentially detrimental condition?

4 A. It is.

5 MR. PORTER: Nothing further.

6 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr. Clark.

7 MR. SECHEN: If I may interrupt one
8 second, it may benefit the record and perhaps the
9 Village Board if one of us were to clarify which
10 transfer station -- the Elgin transfer station is
11 referred to by another name.

12 THE WITNESS: Bluff City.

13 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: For the
14 record we call Elgin Transfer Station Bluff City.

15 Please proceed, Mr. Clark.

16 RE CROSS EXAMINATION

17 BY MR. CLARK:

18 Q. Multiple regression analysis only analysis
19 data that you supply, correct?

20 A. Yes.

21 Q. So if you don't supply certain data, a
22 multiple regression analysis doesn't address that
23 data, does it?

24 A. It only deals with the data that you use.

140

1 THE WITNESS: Thank you.

2 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr.

3 Grossmark?

4 MR. GROSSMARK: No further questions.

5 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr. Blazer.

6 RECROSS EXAMINATION

7 BY MR. BLAZER:

8 Q. Mr. Kleszynski, I am going to read you a
9 portion of testimony from Mr. Moose?

10 A. From Mr. MaRous or?

11 Q. Moose.

12 Question: In response to some of Mr.
13 Grossmark's questions regarding again overnight
14 operations, 24/7 operations, you were mainly, it
15 sounded like, focusing on exigent circumstances,
16 snow storms, things like that, correct? Answer:
17 Yes, and as well as to service commercial clients.

18 Question: Right. But servicing
19 commercial clients are not emergency situations,
20 right? Answer: But I also testified that 24 hours
21 is necessary to service certain commercial clients.

22 Now, with the understanding of what
23 the applicant refers to with respect to 24/7
24 operations, do you know if Mr. Poletti was here when

141

1 Mr. Moose said that?

2 MR. SECHEN: Objection, scope, relevance,
3 materiality. What difference does it make --

4 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: One at a
5 time.

6 Mr. Sechen, proceed.

7 MR. SECHEN: It makes no difference if
8 Mr. Poletti was there when Mr. Moose testified. I
9 mean, sooner or later this proceeding has to end and
10 that's why there are scope objections or relevance
11 and materiality, we're so far afield that it is
12 amazing.

13 MR. PORTER: Join in the objection. It's
14 irrelevant whether or not he was here.

15 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr. Blazer?

16 MR. BLAZER: The witness was asked a
17 series of questions about his understanding of what
18 Mr. Poletti knew or didn't know about 24/7
19 operation. I objected to most of them, some you
20 sustained, some you didn't.

21 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: I think
22 almost all of them he said he had no idea. Why are
23 we going through this?

24 MR. BLAZER: Because he said, his opinion,
142

1 his independent opinion of his review of Poletti's
2 report was premised in part on this issue of 24/7
3 operations.

4 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: And you got
5 that out of him completely. And I don't know where
6 we're going with this.

7 MR. BLAZER: I will move on, Mr. Hearing
8 Officer.

9 BY MR. BLAZER:

10 Q. You said in response to Mr. Sechen's
11 question, Mr. Kleszynski, that your report in this
12 case and your report for my firm for the Tinaglia
13 family were two completely different assignments,
14 correct?

15 A. Yes.

16 Q. Your review of Poletti's report was a
17 Standard 3 review, correct?

18 A. Yes.

19 Q. Your review of Integra's report was a
20 Standard 3 review, correct?

21 A. Yes, and more.

22 Q. Next question, the MaRous report, unlike
23 your report, does not presume to include an
24 independent opinion about impact on property value,

1 correct?

2 A. Yes.

3 Q. And as far as estate properties near the
4 Bluff City transfer stations, and you mentioned that
5 there was estate residential zoning in that area,
6 correct, you are aware of that?

7 A. I am aware that there is a state
8 residential zoning.

9 Q. Okay. You have no idea if those estate
10 residentially zoned properties in fact have
11 40,000 square foot properties on them, correct?

12 A. You mean 40,000 square foot sites that
13 they --

14 Q. Sites, correct.

15 A. I have no clue as I stand here today.

16 Q. You have no idea whether Integra -- excuse
17 me, whether Mr. Poletti took that into account in
18 his review of Bluff City, correct?

19 A. That's why I said I would have to go back
20 and look at the data that he used.

21 MR. BLAZER: That's all I have.

22 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr. Sechen?

23 MR. SECHEN: Nothing further.

24 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Mr. Sechen,

144

1 do you --

2 MR. SECHEN: I move the admission of the
3 two exhibits.

4 MR. BLAZER: They're already in.

5 MR. SECHEN: They're already in?

6 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Yes, they
7 are.

8 MR. SECHEN: At this point we have nothing
9 further.

10 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Any request
11 for admission further TCH exhibits we went through.

12 MR. BLAZER: There is, Mr. Hearing
13 Officer.

14 We will start with 45.

15 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Any objection
16 to the admission of TCH Exhibit 45.

17 MR. PORTER: I object, it's irrelevant,
18 untimely.

19 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: TCH
20 Exhibit 45 will be admitted over objection.

21 MR. SECHEN: Let the record reflect my
22 objection.

23 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Thank you.
24 The record will so reflect.

1 MR. BLAZER: I am sorry. Now I am
2 stepping on you.

3 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: TCH
4 Exhibit 46, same objections?

5 MR. PORTER: Same objection.

6 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Same ruling.
7 TCH Exhibit 47, same objection?

8 MR. PORTER: Yes.

9 MR. SECHEN: Same objections.

10 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: Same ruling.

11 MR. BLAZER: And TCH Exhibit 51, which is
12 the version of Mr. Kleszynski report we got on
13 Sunday.

14 MR. PORTER: What is 51?

15 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: It is the
16 Sunday report we received from Mr. Kleszynski, from
17 Mr. Sechen.

18 MR. SECHEN: No objection.

19 MR. BLAZER: Do you need another one?

20 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: I already
21 marked it. So we're good.

22 Mr. Porter you're not -- let me ask,
23 does anybody have any further evidence they wish to
24 submit?

1 MR. GROSSMARK: Yes.

2 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: What is that?

3 MR. GROSSMARK: I would like to offer the
4 times of operation for the three transfer stations
5 that were discussed during this witness' testimony.
6 I think Mr. Blazer asked if he recalled if these
7 were the times of operation, he said it sounded
8 right. I would request that judicial notice be
9 taken that those are the times of operation for
10 those three transfer stations.

11 MR. BLAZER: What I can actually do,
12 Mr. Hearing Officer, to make it easier.

13 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: You know
14 what, let's take a break. We will come back and
15 deal with this in ten minutes and then we will
16 finish this issue.

17 I think Mr. Porter has no further
18 testimony; is that correct

19 MR. PORTER: That is correct.

20 HEARING OFFICER LUETKEHANS: So we will
21 deal with this issue in ten minutes as well. And
22 then we will go directly into closings, unless
23 someone else has an issue to address at that time.
24 We will switch court reporters.


147

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Thank you.

1 STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS.
2 COUNTY OF L A K E)
3

4 Jennifer A. Lang, C.S.R., being first
5 duly sworn says that she is a court reporter doing
6 business in the State of Illinois; and that she
7 reported in shorthand the proceedings of said
8 hearing, and that the foregoing is a true and
9 correct transcript of her shorthand notes so taken
10 as aforesaid, and contains the proceedings given at
11 said hearing.

12
13 

14 Certified Shorthand Reporter



15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

A	116:17	93:3 98:4	2:1 3:1	approval	142:16 147:6
ability	adjustment	100:14 111:7	appeared	1:7 5:3 83:13	asking
110:4	24:12 120:3	111:11,18	30:17 48:24	83:20	43:19 45:20
able	adjustments	112:5,14,16	49:12	approved	135:24
19:4,5,6,10	23:22	112:23 113:5	appears	138:22	aspects
20:13 24:8	administrative	113:12,16	14:20 100:14	approximately	50:7 96:14
47:16	59:11	114:5 115:7	109:10	9:17 11:20	assess
aboveentitled	admission	115:9 120:19	applicant	54:21	111:1
1:11	36:1 145:2,11	121:19	5:24 141:23	april	assessment
absent	145:16	123:10,13,16	application	96:10	94:3
99:7	admissions	125:21 126:6	1:6 5:2 15:2,3	area	assessors
absolutely	9:22	126:8 130:21	15:13 46:10	9:8,22 10:9	53:4,6,10
44:8 64:12,18	admit	130:24 131:5	61:4 62:23	11:6,19,21	assignment
93:15 109:3	54:9	135:14 136:2	75:22 76:6	16:2,5 17:4	12:6,9,10,14
110:9 116:1	admitted	136:6 139:19	103:15,20	17:5,14	17:18,20
120:16	36:6 145:20	139:23	applications	19:13 24:16	13:18 14:22
122:10,14	advantages	140:18,18,22	16:12 17:10	25:9,24 26:2	14:24 31:15
129:22	29:13	analyst	79:21 107:1	26:18,19	41:5 54:17
abstract	advocate	19:23 39:21	107:3	32:21 41:19	60:15,18,19
23:20	64:10	88:22	applied	41:20 44:14	62:19 64:2
academic	aerial	23:9 25:10	22:8 23:9	44:17,21	64:15 65:4
125:3,8	16:21	26:10 29:23	25:13,15	45:9,10	65:11,20
accept	affield	31:16 40:5	26:15 27:8	67:10 79:2,6	66:20 67:7
64:15 68:20	142:11	48:1	27:19 31:16	80:8,13,14	69:3 76:8,15
acceptable	aforesaid	149:10	40:7 47:14	81:11 82:1	77:1 96:3
48:2	149:10	afternoon	48:1,3 74:24	89:13 104:5	100:7 101:10
access	5:23 37:17	5:23 37:17	76:22 89:7	104:11,19	108:6,11,15
21:19	53:21,22	accessibility	111:18	105:1,17	119:20
accessibility	agency	118:13 119:15	124:17 126:7	106:15,22	120:15 121:6
118:13 119:15	3:12 5:10	accomplish	127:15	107:7 112:6	121:7 122:15
108:6,8	ago	108:6,8	applies	113:5 117:4	assignments
account	54:20 91:10	104:18 144:17	40:5	124:12 144:5	120:17 129:8
104:18 144:17	108:21	accuracy	26:11	areas	143:13
21:4	121:21 122:7	21:4	applying	13:23 17:22	assistant
accurate	agree	14:18 100:20	23:22 25:9	18:19 20:7	57:10 59:12
109:24	64:21 65:2	111:16	appraisal	24:19,20,21	61:8 128:5
135:18	72:8 89:5,10	accurately	8:2,9,22 9:1	27:22,23	associated
8:10 20:11,18	102:20 103:2	23:1 42:2,4	9:5,7,18,19	28:5,5 30:19	8:1 9:9 11:18
act	104:9,17	12:11 15:17	9:20 10:7,18	30:20 31:5,6	33:9 38:11
65:12	105:1,6,16	67:3 69:19,23	10:21,23	42:19 43:11	96:13 111:9
acting	106:20 107:9	28:11	11:2,5,6,8	43:12,22	121:9
67:3 69:19,23	agreed	activities	11:10,19	44:7,9,10,12	associates
28:11	110:18 113:24	28:11	12:17 13:8	45:2,2,12,13	12:13 96:2
actual	114:1,3,6	60:21 61:15	14:1 15:23	78:8 100:22	assume
60:21 61:15	agreement	100:5 124:1	21:12,15,17	106:2 114:5	6:22 42:3
138:13	13:3	138:13	21:18 22:6	136:20,22	48:23 66:18
add	alleged	139:16	23:17 24:13	139:14,23	105:16
67:15	88:3,14	allowing	34:7,19,24	arent	126:19
addendum	8:20	30:1,20	48:2 64:6,7	45:1	assumed
77:19	allow	allows	64:24 70:4	argue	48:22 50:9,14
addition	8:20	88:22	90:13 94:24	103:12	assumes
21:14 70:14	amazing	amazing	96:18 98:4	arithmetic	133:24 137:23
additional	142:12	142:12	98:16 111:19	23:3 104:20	138:10
31:7 48:20	amend	amend	111:19 124:3	131:21	assumption
50:22 99:9	99:8	99:8	139:24	arms	74:13
additionally	amount	amount	appraiser	38:21 39:6	assumptions
9:17,23 17:9	13:16 29:9,19	13:16 29:9,19	7:24 11:11	artfully	76:22
20:22 21:21	40:22 48:17	40:22 48:17	12:11 13:17	71:4 73:3	attached
22:4,21	113:7	113:7	14:3 19:23	articles	6:18 7:1 102:5
address	analyses	analyses	22:12 23:18	21:16,23	attempt
14:5 74:19	22:3 29:14	22:3 29:14	28:18 47:16	arts	45:13
140:22	analysis	analysis	64:10,14,22	8:17	attending
147:23	22:21,24 23:7	22:21,24 23:7	65:3,7,9,13	asked	46:8
addressed	23:13,17	23:13,17	69:2 70:1,5	21:22 35:5,5	attorney
84:2,8 93:16	24:14,16,18	24:14,16,18	127:6,7	41:6 42:23	13:21 113:14
124:10	26:16 27:9	26:16 27:9	appraisers	43:3,21	132:14
addresses	27:11 28:3,8	27:11 28:3,8	21:1,6 22:5	61:23 62:4	attorneys
38:10,15 102:1	28:8 29:11	28:8 29:11	25:14 29:7	66:8,10,12	117:1
adhered	29:12,22	29:12,22	123:3	66:19 67:5,5	authoring
34:6	30:17 31:3	30:17 31:3	approach	67:13 68:2	72:19
adjacent	40:3,23 41:9	40:3,23 41:9	23:23 94:11	71:1 72:3,12	authority
44:7 96:9	43:5 46:17	43:5 46:17	123:24	72:17 74:18	1:4 5:5 42:15
	46:18 47:1	46:18 47:1	appropriate	74:19 84:10	available
	50:7 80:8,13	50:7 80:8,13	23:21 29:10,22	85:5 99:16	18:12 25:11
	80:15 81:11	80:15 81:11	31:17 43:13	99:17 107:24	26:7 29:19
	81:14,17,21	81:14,17,21	48:1 49:13	108:13 112:3	29:20 49:11
	82:1 88:21	82:1 88:21	127:15	113:4 123:4	average
			128:19	129:2 130:3	22:23 25:12
			appear	132:15,23	26:16,18
			82:19	138:16	28:9 31:8
			appearances	139:16	awarded

8:20,21 9:6 10:8 aware 46:6,23 64:9 64:12,14,22 87:8 117:7 117:11,11 132:17 133:21 134:15,24 144:6,7	24:17 25:7 27:10,24 30:1,7,7 31:12,14 43:20 126:6 131:2 basing 20:15,16 basis 44:1 77:16 81:2 100:23 115:17 125:5	big 68:21 128:3 135:8 bill 69:17 bills 69:13,16 bit 30:5 35:23 54:23 blazer 3:6,7 4:7,12 5:13,13 36:4 53:18,20 55:13,18,20 55:24 56:5 62:8,14 68:9 68:12 81:9 85:2,6 86:23 91:5,6 95:3 95:9,11 97:2 98:20,22 103:16,18 104:16 108:4 108:5 110:14 119:1,9 120:20 121:4 122:6,11 128:23 130:1 130:15 131:17 132:2 132:8,21 133:14,23 134:9 135:8 135:10,19,24 136:7,15 137:4,22 138:2,16 139:4 141:5 141:7 142:15 142:16,24 143:7,9 144:21 145:4 145:12 146:1 146:11,19 147:6,11	brainstorming 124:8 break 30:13 90:24 147:14 brief 128:14 briefly 6:9 8:13 10:4 12:8 broad 89:21 building 18:16 30:9 buildings 24:4 27:19 51:21 built 116:12 bullet 106:12 bunch 129:24 business 9:11 149:6 buyers 24:22 114:24	101:4 102:6 102:14,17,18 108:7,11 110:3 111:23 112:5 113:9 113:10 120:8 137:2 143:12 cases 48:12 cataloging 16:4 categorization 29:8 categorizat... 30:15 40:4 categorize 27:16 caught 57:12 cause 1:11 64:10 caused 88:18 130:10 causes 120:4 ceretti 5:18 cerretti 3:15 certain 40:1,2 41:8 50:6,7,9,14 51:8 52:16 52:21 103:13 124:9,17 134:17 140:21 141:21 certainly 72:2 96:21 115:19 116:5 certainty 32:9 126:9 certified 149:14 chain 58:16 chance 122:4 change 40:18 128:8 changed 57:4,6,12 character 29:10 57:10 106:14 107:5 107:13 characteris... 27:14,15 113:9 characteriz... 35:1 133:14 135:17 chart 77:19 chase 129:23 check 13:17 31:6 78:3,6 93:11 checked 41:24 48:24 77:21,24 checking 31:3 chicago 8:16 114:23 chief 7:24 circulated 18:11,14 circulation	19:12,13 circumstances 42:14 43:9 82:21 141:15 cite 121:10 cited 27:23 city 18:5 19:6 84:17 85:21 114:23 115:21 138:6 139:7 140:12 140:14 144:4 144:18 claim 70:2 clarification 111:7,10 clarified 134:14,20,23 clarify 123:12 132:6 140:9 clark 3:11 4:5,11 5:9,9 36:13 36:14,16 49:15 82:24 130:3 140:6 140:15,17 clarks 83:24 classes 9:16,17 10:21 classificat... 117:8 classrooms 125:13 claudia 119:23 cleaners 91:23 96:9 clear 6:21 53:1 92:9 92:10 112:20 124:18 127:11 clearly 80:5 107:2 clerk 60:24 client 69:8,10,10 70:15 71:1 72:3,12 73:15 74:4,7 74:15,20,22 75:2,4,16 76:2 87:10 91:13,20 clientele 11:23 clients 141:17,19,21 close 37:7 closed 19:8 closings 147:22 clue 118:1 126:22 138:22 144:15 code 64:6,9,13,19 coefficient 126:10 coefficients		
B							
b 4:15 bachelor 8:17 bachelors 38:3 back 13:21 16:8 19:21 20:8 25:19 31:4 39:2,15 51:22 53:12 54:2 59:23 60:3,23 63:17 77:19 79:11,11 80:6 82:4 85:16 86:18 86:20,21 95:6 102:11 105:13,19 108:19 110:15 111:22 114:8 117:14 118:2 120:21,22 139:12 144:19 147:14 background 8:11,15 32:11 126:23 backup 94:23 backwards 78:2 backyard 89:18 bartlett 116:7,22 117:1 117:7 118:17 118:21 119:12,16 base 118:12,16 based 29:18 32:10 35:3 38:21 48:7,18,19 49:1 52:15 58:22 69:6 70:23 90:14 96:2,15 97:4 99:15,15 104:20 112:2 112:12 113:6 120:13,14 121:2 139:15 baseline 88:19 90:16 basement 27:21,22 basically 9:5,15 10:17 11:16 12:16 13:20 15:6 18:9 19:16 23:10 24:8	bathroom 27:22 bathrooms 27:21 30:12 bay 84:17 becoming 10:19 bedrooms 27:20 30:11 began 8:19 60:22 61:16 beginning 62:18 101:23 begins 114:11 behalf 2:8,12,17 3:4 3:8,12 5:9 5:19,24 63:23 66:23 67:3 68:6,23 69:1,7,19,23 76:10 83:19 108:16 believe 9:16 18:3 32:18 35:3 52:7 56:18 58:4,5 76:19 79:18 80:22 82:13 83:23 84:4,10,13 96:12 102:12 106:5 127:8 128:7 believed 96:7 belonged 91:19 belvidere 16:8 17:6,11 79:14 benefit 7:18 140:8 benign 88:16 best 18:12 23:23 37:11,11 38:5 50:3 58:12,14 59:15 93:2 93:13 124:21 bet 42:14 better 14:8 15:9 17:10 19:17 27:13 30:14 33:22 39:4 42:9 43:8 46:15 53:3 61:4 102:3 111:3 124:6 124:8 127:19 beyond 67:7 110:10	blazers 136:4 block 44:14,16 bluff 18:5 19:6 84:16 85:21 115:21 138:6 139:7 140:12 140:14 144:4 144:18 board 1:1 2:12 5:3 5:16 80:18 80:20 140:9 bob 5:17 body 16:3 18:2 20:3 27:24 33:23 34:6,22 35:12,17 41:24 46:13 57:24 71:5 95:2 bottom 94:17 bought 76:11,18 boundaries 51:11 boundary 51:8 bounded 44:16	blazer 3:6,7 4:7,12 5:13,13 36:4 53:18,20 55:13,18,20 55:24 56:5 62:8,14 68:9 68:12 81:9 85:2,6 86:23 91:5,6 95:3 95:9,11 97:2 98:20,22 103:16,18 104:16 108:4 108:5 110:14 119:1,9 120:20 121:4 122:6,11 128:23 130:1 130:15 131:17 132:2 132:8,21 133:14,23 134:9 135:8 135:10,19,24 136:7,15 137:4,22 138:2,16 139:4 141:5 141:7 142:15 142:16,24 143:7,9 144:21 145:4 145:12 146:1 146:11,19 147:6,11 blazers 136:4 block 44:14,16 bluff 18:5 19:6 84:16 85:21 115:21 138:6 139:7 140:12 140:14 144:4 144:18 board 1:1 2:12 5:3 5:16 80:18 80:20 140:9 bob 5:17 body 16:3 18:2 20:3 27:24 33:23 34:6,22 35:12,17 41:24 46:13 57:24 71:5 95:2 bottom 94:17 bought 76:11,18 boundaries 51:11 boundary 51:8 bounded 44:16	brainstorming 124:8 break 30:13 90:24 147:14 brief 128:14 briefly 6:9 8:13 10:4 12:8 broad 89:21 building 18:16 30:9 buildings 24:4 27:19 51:21 built 116:12 bullet 106:12 bunch 129:24 business 9:11 149:6 buyers 24:22 114:24	C c 2:15,16 57:15 149:4 calculated 26:17 calculation 96:17 104:20 calculations 23:6 call 5:1 7:5 16:4 23:7 28:20 45:12 63:6 106:4 107:4 129:19 140:14 called 7:13 11:4 13:6 23:10 24:24 117:8 calls 133:15,23 canned 75:7 cant 128:23 139:16 capacity 12:11 65:12 85:9 car 24:7 care 57:15 69:11 131:12 career 73:7 carried 35:8 carry 35:7 case 17:19 19:19 26:24 29:16 44:6 52:9 78:8 85:10 89:3,23 91:9 91:16 92:1 92:24 93:5,8 93:9,19,22 94:1,4,7,12 96:1 97:13 97:17 100:4	101:4 102:6 102:14,17,18 108:7,11 110:3 111:23 112:5 113:9 113:10 120:8 137:2 143:12 cases 48:12 cataloging 16:4 categorization 29:8 categorizat... 30:15 40:4 categorize 27:16 caught 57:12 cause 1:11 64:10 caused 88:18 130:10 causes 120:4 ceretti 5:18 cerretti 3:15 certain 40:1,2 41:8 50:6,7,9,14 51:8 52:16 52:21 103:13 124:9,17 134:17 140:21 141:21 certainly 72:2 96:21 115:19 116:5 certainty 32:9 126:9 certified 149:14 chain 58:16 chance 122:4 change 40:18 128:8 changed 57:4,6,12 character 29:10 57:10 106:14 107:5 107:13 characteris... 27:14,15 113:9 characteriz... 35:1 133:14 135:17 chart 77:19 chase 129:23 check 13:17 31:6 78:3,6 93:11 checked 41:24 48:24 77:21,24 checking 31:3 chicago 8:16 114:23 chief 7:24 circulated 18:11,14 circulation	19:12,13 circumstances 42:14 43:9 82:21 141:15 cite 121:10 cited 27:23 city 18:5 19:6 84:17 85:21 114:23 115:21 138:6 139:7 140:12 140:14 144:4 144:18 claim 70:2 clarification 111:7,10 clarified 134:14,20,23 clarify 123:12 132:6 140:9 clark 3:11 4:5,11 5:9,9 36:13 36:14,16 49:15 82:24 130:3 140:6 140:15,17 clarks 83:24 classes 9:16,17 10:21 classificat... 117:8 classrooms 125:13 claudia 119:23 cleaners 91:23 96:9 clear 6:21 53:1 92:9 92:10 112:20 124:18 127:11 clearly 80:5 107:2 clerk 60:24 client 69:8,10,10 70:15 71:1 72:3,12 73:15 74:4,7 74:15,20,22 75:2,4,16 76:2 87:10 91:13,20 clientele 11:23 clients 141:17,19,21 close 37:7 closed 19:8 closings 147:22 clue 118:1 126:22 138:22 144:15 code 64:6,9,13,19 coefficient 126:10 coefficients

126:16	completely	consider	45:2,10,13	135:14	criticize
collect	12:21 110:6	30:6 40:2	80:8,13,14	138:19	114:14
26:13	129:7,8,8	41:10 46:11	81:11,24	140:19	criticized
collection	143:5,13	46:13 67:11	112:23 113:5	141:16	108:23 109:3
37:2	completing	71:16,17	113:12 114:4	143:14,17,20	critique
come	16:18 67:14	86:1,5	124:11	144:1,6,11	65:21
13:21 21:4	101:9	109:12 115:8	135:13,20	144:14,18	cross
41:2 48:14	completion	138:8	136:2,5	147:18,19	4:5,6,7,10
81:21 82:1	34:8 62:23	consideration	139:14,23	149:9	35:24 36:15
97:13 122:21	compliance	111:12 131:14	conversation	corrected	49:19 53:19
147:14	64:3	considered	60:6	56:18 128:5	132:3,9
comes	compliant	75:12 101:13	conversations	correctly	crude
88:10 102:4	111:18	136:16 138:5	60:12 61:10	20:1 23:6	44:2
comfortable	components	139:6	62:1,11,15	28:22 47:24	crunched
68:2 125:17	23:21	considering	62:22 63:1	65:15 70:6	42:7 48:14
coming	comprehensive	40:1	82:1 87:6	70:21 73:20	culbertson
16:8 41:19	9:24	consisted	convinced	74:5 89:1	2:6
86:2	concentrated	15:6,7	67:16	99:10 106:17	currently
commas	106:2	consistent	cook	115:2,11	10:13 11:1
128:4	concept	18:9 40:13	52:5	118:13 120:6	customarily
comment	96:22 124:10	87:10	copies	132:12	22:16
6:2,3 68:8,9	concerned	consists	22:2 55:15	cost	cut
100:15	23:4 61:11	11:23	copy	23:22 96:13	119:3 129:23
comments	121:14	constructed	14:16,18	111:4	cutting
59:23 60:1,3	concerning	124:13	cord	costs	118:23
60:11 63:1,7	12:5 139:19	construction	56:6	110:21	
63:17	conclude	30:21 48:9	correct	couldnt	D
commercial	30:20,24	78:16	15:19 36:24	62:8 99:13,22	d
103:8 105:7	concluded	consulting	37:19 38:4	100:1	4:1 28:17
141:17,19,21	1:13 22:19	8:2 11:20 34:1	40:9,17	counsel	126:24
committees	31:8 82:8	34:9,21 35:5	41:15,16,21	137:6	128:18
28:19	120:2	contact	42:3,8 44:11	counselors	daily
commonly	conclusion	28:24	46:4 47:19	8:1 11:18	125:5
13:12 23:19	23:2 32:1 41:2	contacted	48:15,22	counsels	dale
communicate	46:1 48:14	21:10,21 22:4	49:2,5,8	111:9	4:3 7:5,12,20
65:4,8	67:17 82:14	22:11	50:19 51:12	count	69:1
communicated	82:19 86:2	contained	51:14 52:17	78:12	damages
14:7 108:15	109:3 110:17	74:3,14 99:13	52:22 54:18	counted	25:6,6 88:18
communication	114:6 120:5	99:21	54:19 55:1	27:20	90:12 96:3
34:20	conclusions	contains	56:15,21	counties	96:17 97:8
community	20:20 23:2	149:10	57:15,19,23	52:8	140:1
105:8	34:15 35:11	contaminated	61:20,22	county	dangerous
companies	35:17 58:19	91:22	63:3 64:3,7	3:13 5:10 52:5	42:11
83:12,13,19	60:6 63:8,9	contamination	64:8,11,17	52:12 149:2	data
86:10	64:16 75:1,3	92:2	64:18 65:1,5	couple	19:20 20:2
company	96:20 120:12	contd	65:9,18,19	27:23 64:20	22:22 23:18
98:11	121:1,10,11	3:1	66:5,6,16,17	78:13 80:5	24:20 26:13
comparable	121:16 137:2	content	66:21,22	81:7 91:9	28:1,8 29:9
101:13 114:15	concurring	62:2,16 63:2	67:2 69:14	122:19 137:9	29:19 30:1,7
comparables	46:1	contents	70:11 72:7	course	30:7,15 31:3
114:19	concur	87:9 92:15	72:14 73:12	9:10 10:23	31:3,7 38:11
comparative	32:17	93:17 94:10	74:8,11,21	11:3 33:14	38:13 39:17
112:13,16	condition	context	76:15 77:4	46:8 116:18	39:20 40:1,2
compare	25:1,2 27:2	12:14,20 31:14	77:15 78:4,5	courses	40:4,4,7,22
120:14	74:14 88:3	41:4 68:4,13	78:18,19,22	8:20 10:24,24	41:3,8,18,21
compared	88:12,15,18	68:22 74:10	79:3,17 82:6	court	41:22,23
118:21 119:16	88:21,23	87:7 88:2,14	82:11 83:14	7:18 147:24	46:19 47:14
compares	89:3,7,7,11	89:5 100:12	83:17,21	149:5	48:13,18,19
13:11,12 126:5	89:22,24	122:9	84:3,9 85:17	cover	48:21 50:21
comparison	90:17 92:1,4	continued	86:3 87:4	57:13	51:17,19,20
26:20 88:20	92:11 95:17	8:22 102:24	88:5,9 89:4	credibility	52:1,12,17
90:16 94:11	97:7 110:5	continuing	89:9,11 90:1	21:3 120:5,9	52:22 53:4
115:13	110:20,23,24	8:23	90:8 91:14	120:11,12,24	70:16 72:12
118:16,20	111:13 112:7	contract	91:20,21	121:1,9	72:20 73:10
119:11,15	140:3	60:23	92:2,5 93:4	credible	74:23 75:16
126:3	conditions	contrary	95:7,12,17	12:16,23 13:2	75:20 77:2,5
compete	11:1 21:13	99:23	97:7,14,15	20:23 28:16	77:7,20,21
114:22	88:4,9	contributes	98:4,12 99:3	31:21 34:21	88:20,22
competes	conduct	24:2	99:24 100:15	40:24 49:13	90:16 97:4
114:24	66:10,12,13,15	contributory	101:14,17	65:14 69:5	101:13,16,19
competitive	conducted	23:19,20 24:9	102:6,13	creek	113:7 114:1
52:9	59:7 65:17	control	105:18 108:7	3:8 5:14 79:13	124:11 125:5
complete	80:9 81:15	1:3 5:5 17:22	108:12,17	criterion	126:5 131:3
8:23 9:14	conference	18:19 20:7	111:1,20	9:14 15:2,16	131:3,4,7
14:24 31:18	61:6	23:11 24:16	112:4,8,9	15:18 22:9	139:12
88:16 119:4	confirm	24:19,20	114:5 115:14	60:5 76:9	140:19,21,23
completed	76:17	26:1,19 28:5	115:18 118:7	criticism	140:24
19:18 22:24	confused	30:19 31:6	122:9,10,14	108:24 109:8	144:20
32:4,21 34:1	114:23	41:19 42:18	123:8 126:18	110:1	dataset
41:5 63:5	connection	43:11,22,23	130:13,21	criticisms	38:20,22
64:2 80:10	76:15	44:10,17	133:4 135:1	33:11,15 109:2	date

10:22 55:1,2 55:5,6,9 56:12,13 57:18,22 58:22 61:11 68:17 96:5,6 96:6,10,10 128:1,3	127:7 designation 9:3,4,6,13,15 10:2,3,5,6,8 designations 8:21 designed 127:14 determination 20:23 21:5 22:23 26:2,5 26:15 30:2 42:17 110:19 determinations 47:20 determine 12:13,15,19,24 19:22 20:10 20:13 21:10 22:7,9 24:21 25:20,22 27:9 28:15 28:20 29:1 31:21 42:1 43:7 45:8 47:19 48:8 49:4,7,8 65:13 69:3 70:18 73:16 77:21 84:5 99:22 100:19 116:10 131:6 138:8 139:13 determined 12:22 27:6 44:4 47:23 76:5,7 determining 47:18 95:14,15 140:2 detrimental 11:1 21:13 24:24 25:2 88:3,4,8,12 88:15,18 89:3,5,6,11 89:22,23 92:1,4,11 95:16 97:6 110:5,24 112:7 140:3 develop 35:9 developed 27:12 28:2 48:10 116:20 development 32:3,21 34:20 60:7 116:10 deviations 126:9 didnt 28:22 35:21 39:1 40:9 41:22 42:21 47:20 49:4 54:9 61:1,3 61:7 66:15 77:6,14 78:3 78:3 80:12 80:14 81:16 82:17 84:13 84:15 86:1,5 88:6 100:4 102:16 105:22 106:19 114:6 120:8 121:13 123:6 127:16 127:16 138:2 142:18,20	difference 13:15 23:16 27:1 39:17 39:19 47:13 127:24 130:9 8:21 142:3,7 differences 26:21 96:19 121:20 130:4 131:1 different 23:14 26:4 45:17 53:4,6 62:10,12 92:12 100:7 100:7,8 112:15 120:4 120:17,17,18 129:7,9 143:13 differently 71:20 digital 16:12 direct 4:4 6:6 7:15 42:21,23 79:1 94:11 directed 74:12 135:20 direction 80:5 114:2 directly 129:15 147:22 disagree 35:1 77:16 106:20 disagreement 13:3 35:10 72:2 92:7 96:22 100:23 105:22 106:1 107:18 disagreements 100:24 discard 92:1,4,11 discarded 38:8,12,16,24 39:7,13 41:3 discuss 131:11 discussed 22:11 70:9 85:10 92:8 147:5 discussion 60:4 87:12,18 88:11 111:24 discussions 60:15 81:21 96:16 113:7 113:13,23 124:2 dispute 104:22 distance 43:6,15 distorted 44:5 district 45:24 130:5,6 districts 45:16,18,21 divide 11:17 doctor 37:19 83:3,5 doctorate 37:21 83:2	document 6:21 8:6 15:24 22:1 35:4 46:15 53:13 55:8 56:22 57:8 67:6 72:18 90:11 121:3 documented 16:9,11 documents 15:5,6,8 22:1 71:18 85:16 94:16 100:6 101:24 doesnt 21:4 25:2 45:5 56:3 85:2 108:2 117:15 125:22 136:23 137:15 138:4 140:22 doing 24:13,18 25:7 57:9 63:18 67:16 68:2 70:2,5 71:14 95:13 123:9 123:23 124:13 125:13 127:17 132:13 149:5 dollar 97:6 dont 13:5 35:2 36:9 38:14 39:12 39:18 41:3 42:23 46:2 49:15 51:1 55:15 59:17 62:7 65:24 67:12 73:2 78:12 105:24 116:24 118:1 118:18,22 119:1,13,18 128:7 134:17 140:21 143:5 door 91:23 116:6 doors 37:6,7,8,12 84:6,17,19 84:19 double 126:14 doublesided 94:19 doubt 85:17 121:16 dr 23:5,10 26:7 26:11 28:24 29:20 30:20 31:11,14,15 32:17 43:14 44:22 50:7 82:20 83:1 draft 59:22 61:19 63:5,7 drafted 133:11,21 134:5,24 drafting 73:22 drafts 87:7	drill 25:17 drilling 19:17 drive 16:6 106:24 107:1,2 driving 17:2 44:3 drove 18:11 79:5,12 79:15 dry 91:22 due 35:16 duke 125:20 duly 7:13 149:5 <hr/> E <hr/> e 4:1,15 149:2 earlier 56:23 96:6 140:1 earth 16:24 43:6 44:3 easier 147:12 easiest 20:24 34:12 42:12 50:22 59:18 125:4 131:14 east 17:9 107:3 116:18 129:11,16,16 edition 21:15 90:10 education 8:14,23,23 educational 8:15 124:15 effect 22:10 31:22 32:13,20 70:19 72:5,6 effective 54:24 55:2,5,6 55:9 56:12 56:13 57:21 egress 19:11 egressing 18:16 either 23:22 28:1 35:22 53:14 57:7 114:7 elburn 18:4 19:7 84:16 85:18 118:17,21 119:12,17 elected 26:11 38:20 54:13,13 71:7 72:20 82:20 elgin 116:4 118:17 118:21 119:12,16 136:15,23 137:15 138:6 138:17,23 140:10,14	eliminated 40:16 elses 97:24 emailed 56:8 emergency 141:19 employment 7:23 endorsed 133:12 entering 37:3 entire 62:18 76:5 123:15 124:5 entitled 71:6 98:3 103:23 environmental 15:17 110:19 110:20,23 111:12 environs 107:11 error 57:2,3,6 68:18 essence 123:6 essentially 26:17 established 102:24 105:3 106:16 establishment 17:15 estate 8:2,19 9:8,9 10:10 11:10 11:11,19 21:15 22:14 23:17 24:3 27:14,15 30:13,22 47:16 48:11 90:12 94:3 109:4 111:13 114:22,24 115:14 117:3 117:8,22 136:17,20,22 137:17 138:4 138:5,12,18 139:6 144:3 144:5,9 estates 137:1 estimate 93:18,21 94:10 ethics 11:7 64:7,10 64:13,19 70:3 evaluate 96:4 112:10 evaluation 99:16 112:16 evd 4:17 event 92:9 events 58:17 everybody 56:3 evidence 134:1 137:23 138:10 139:5 146:23 evolved
--	---	---	---	--	---

124:6,7	10:16,17 32:11	15:20 41:17	8:2 42:14	four	51:22 53:12
exact	expertise	45:7 100:17	54:10,13,17	82:5,8 98:11	79:8,16,24
55:22	8:11 9:8 10:9	125:18	69:12 91:9	fourth	80:2 82:4
exactly	experts	126:16	97:17 108:20	74:1 114:9	87:22 91:8
6:24 7:3 41:11	119:4	faith	121:21,24	frame	94:9 101:6
53:13 100:21	explain	82:22	122:7,16	134:17,18	105:13,19
105:21 123:7	20:24 23:16	familiar	143:12	frankly	107:2 108:19
examination	30:4 50:23	85:15,23	firms	56:23 126:10	111:22 114:2
4:4,5,6,7,8,9	51:1 52:18	105:14	11:23,24 54:6	128:3	114:8 117:14
4:10,11,12	95:19	116:16	first	fraudulent	118:2 137:11
6:13 7:15	explained	126:14	6:9 7:13 15:1	65:9	139:12
9:24 35:24	23:24	familiarity	20:1,1 26:14	friday	144:19
36:15 49:19	exposure	28:22	37:18 43:1	84:23 85:12	147:22
53:19 79:1	93:21	familiarize	43:21,21	front	goal
123:1 128:15	express	15:9 17:13	59:22 62:10	6:15,16	6:15,16
132:9 140:16	72:9	45:14 79:20	63:10 120:10	function	40:3 41:14
141:6	expressed	familiarized	137:6 149:4	34:4	going
examined	72:2 74:11	79:2	five	fundamental	22:20 24:1,10
7:14	96:21	family	9:21 60:15	27:13 92:6	25:16 37:15
example	extended	91:13 92:13	62:5	further	39:15 40:11
13:19 18:12	25:18	143:13	flood	27:16 44:10,20	41:12 54:12
23:24 25:12	extent	far	45:8,10,11	45:2 49:15	56:1,7 57:8
25:19 27:18	74:23	23:4 24:18	130:12	73:14,15	59:5 64:20
29:5 30:5	extract	61:11 79:8	focused	122:11	80:6 81:6
71:6 100:4	23:19 120:2	110:10	112:17	128:12	82:21 93:10
107:3 115:20	extraordinary	111:16	focusing	129:16	107:24
130:11	76:21	121:14	141:15	131:22 140:5	108:24 109:2
examples	extremely	142:11 144:3	followed	141:4 144:23	110:7 122:3
26:6 118:6	42:11	features	18:13	145:9,11	122:23
excel		114:21	follows	146:23	124:11
125:20,21	F	february	7:14	147:17	126:22 141:8
exception	f	96:6	followup		142:23 143:6
69:22	2:10	feeling	122:19	G	golf
exclusion	face	125:16	foot	garage	116:17
40:6 41:10	33:21	feet	22:24 25:13	24:2,5,6,7,9	good
exclusively	facilities	79:16,23 80:1	26:16,18	garner	5:23 36:17,18
87:3	19:10 52:9	felt	28:10 117:12	2:2	53:21,21,22
excuse	84:20 125:6	39:7 43:11	144:11,12	gathering	146:21
6:16 72:5	facility	fema	foreclosure	24:20 25:8	google
122:1 144:16	1:3 5:5 19:8,8	45:12	38:19 39:9	generally	16:24 43:6
exercise	30:21 37:3,3	field	40:14	103:2	44:3
125:8	37:6 46:4,6	8:18 11:10	foreclosures	generate	gotten
exhausted	46:24 48:9	fifth	39:1,14 41:15	72:4	110:10
85:1	70:10 78:16	115:5 118:3	foregoing	generated	governs
exhibit	82:9 84:2,7	file	149:8	66:3 99:24	34:20
6:23 54:1,2	132:16,17	56:22 60:20,21	forest	generic	graduate
91:12 92:16	133:7,13,22	60:22 61:1,3	38:3	89:6	8:16
93:18 94:15	134:7	61:7,8,9,12	forget	generically	graduating
94:22,23	fact	61:16,18	44:15	45:21 117:5	8:18
95:6 97:4,5	12:15 13:1	95:2 99:6,7	form	gentlemen	great
97:19,21	17:15 20:11	99:13,22	130:15 132:21	5:7 107:19	10:20,20
98:1,14	20:17 23:5	101:17,20	135:10	geography	groot
108:19	28:14 29:14	102:8	formally	38:1	1:7 2:8 5:2,24
109:15	29:24 30:18	final	61:3	giant	15:4,13
127:23,23	31:20 32:21	59:6,7 128:6	former	114:20	30:21 70:18
145:16,20	34:10 35:2,4	finalization	22:6	give	73:18 76:11
146:4,7,11	39:24 40:14	58:17	formerly	100:23	76:17 110:9
exhibits	42:20 44:6,9	finalized	60:21	given	117:21,21,24
6:14 36:1,6	44:20 45:1	57:5	formulate	31:15 43:12	132:14,16
95:13 145:3	47:24 48:10	finally	13:2,3 14:4,4	69:2 97:8	133:7
145:11	48:24 66:15	65:7 85:21	32:1,5,12	108:11	grossmark
exigent	71:1 77:22	111:6 119:14	47:16 49:13	119:22 125:4	3:3 4:6 5:11
141:15	82:10 83:2	finance	67:13 70:1	132:23	5:11 49:18
exist	84:6 99:23	127:8	70:17 71:6	149:10	49:20 53:16
88:21 90:18	106:23	find	72:13 88:22	glencoe	84:10 133:18
124:5	113:22 118:5	24:1,4 28:6	112:11	91:17	133:24 135:2
existed	118:10	47:11,15	formulated	glenn	141:3,4
17:8,14 26:5	121:15 124:1	90:16 118:16	13:1 31:10,10	2:16 5:19	147:1,3
96:11 116:11	124:17 125:4	118:19	31:20 43:9	57:15	grossmarks
123:11	135:9 136:1	119:10,15	63:9 68:1	glenview	141:13
existing	136:23	findings	69:5 71:13	18:3,4,13 19:5	group
102:21,23	137:15	20:20 138:13	120:13	36:20 44:6	2:15
110:20	139:11	fine	formulating	44:13 84:16	growth
exists	144:10	7:2 53:24 81:8	72:9	84:23 85:12	102:24
115:10	factors	119:7 132:13	found	118:17,21	guess
expand	47:18,21	finish	23:5 26:24	119:12,16	10:19 11:16
65:20 66:20	130:10	122:3,13 137:8	28:7 29:6,8	globally	19:21 34:12
67:7	facts	147:16	29:21	100:11 124:4	37:15 39:4
expanded	133:24 137:23	finished	foundation	go	42:11 46:12
17:4	138:10	137:5	11:2,6 137:22	21:7 25:19	49:6 50:22
experience	fair	firm	138:1,10	37:5 39:2	

51:13 54:1 55:12 59:18 62:20 71:3 125:1,2 131:14 guideline 43:15 guidelines 11:5,7 43:20 111:19	hearings 130:8 hearsay 135:2 hefty 94:16 heights 47:8,10 heres 55:12 65:3 123:20,22 hes 127:7 higher 14:8 42:15 highest 93:2,13 hinshaw 2:6 hired 61:5 70:1 116:24 historical 123:24 history 92:21 hold 52:8 96:24 home 79:13,14 homes 3:9 5:14 45:22 51:20 honest 125:19 honestly 61:6 hope 103:16 hopefully 56:6 hour 1:12 36:22 hours 46:19,20,24 49:21 50:1,9 50:14 84:1,7 84:11,14,17 84:18,22 85:8,14,19 85:22 132:15 132:18 133:9 133:12,22 134:7,14,16 134:19,24 141:20 housing 44:15,16 hundred 11:17 78:14 hurt 54:9	17:22 18:19 20:9 22:21 24:17 27:13 27:17 30:13 31:12 33:6 34:3 35:12 39:6,9 41:8 42:18 46:21 59:5 63:6 77:20 82:5 88:17 89:14 96:17 106:3 106:23 114:18 121:18 124:14 136:21 identifies 34:5 51:24 89:12 104:2 126:6 identify 5:21 13:23 77:10 80:12 88:23 121:19 identifying 17:3 25:5 38:15 110:20 iepa 85:9,9 illinois 3:13 5:10 10:13 86:9 86:13 87:1 87:17,20 123:19 149:1 149:6 im 6:20,24 37:15 69:6 111:16 imaging 55:11 immediate 106:15 107:11 immediately 116:6 impact 30:22 32:2,2 40:7 45:19 45:21,24 46:2 47:1,12 48:10 60:8,9 67:9 70:10 73:19 78:17 82:10 86:14 88:15,16,23 89:8,14,19 95:16 97:5 110:24 115:18 121:11,19 125:15 136:24 137:1 137:16 139:1 143:24 impacted 110:5 138:3 impacts 140:2 implies 108:9 imply 69:23 74:16 important 42:24 47:19,21 100:18,21 127:13 imposition 89:12 112:7 inappropriate 48:16	inartful 72:19,19 73:22 incident 100:6 include 54:10 63:11 65:20 66:20 67:8 136:13 143:23 included 15:5 17:20 21:12 38:20 41:9 49:22 62:21 75:10 75:22 93:23 113:6 includes 64:15 117:12 including 10:24 16:7 88:16 inclusion 40:6 income 23:23 inconsistent 34:2 58:1 incorrect 129:21 increase 127:14 incredulous 47:11,15 incumbent 121:10 127:20 independence 70:4 independent 42:16 63:12 67:9,19 70:17 71:1 71:13 72:4 72:14 78:20 80:6,13,15 81:12 86:2,7 97:12 112:5 114:4 136:9 143:1,24 independently 42:7 49:4,7 76:17 77:14 78:3 80:8,10 81:15 index 20:9 indiana 10:14 indicate 138:4 indicated 56:10 57:21 64:1 70:13 83:23 84:13 indicates 57:13,18 102:23 indication 139:5 individual 9:7 individuals 10:8 industrial 103:8 105:18 106:16,24 107:2,12 129:14 137:18 industries 1:7 2:8 5:2 15:4 70:18	73:18 industry 124:6 influenced 17:15 information 20:15 52:13,16 52:22 53:6 53:11 70:17 72:13,16,23 73:16,17 74:3,14 76:3 99:21,23 101:19,22 102:4,5 ingress 19:10 ingressing 18:15 initial 20:14 66:4 108:23 input 26:12 30:1 131:4,7 inputting 46:18 inspected 16:1 17:21 43:10 77:2 inspecting 17:4 inspection 17:5 79:9 instance 12:10 20:4 23:10 24:15 26:8,11,23 28:15 29:1 29:21 34:4 47:23 50:24 53:8 66:14 69:24,24 70:7 110:18 112:12,17 119:23 121:23 instances 25:14 institute 8:22 9:1,6,7 9:19,20 10:18,21,23 11:8 21:12 21:17,18 22:6 48:2 64:7 90:13 124:3 instructed 61:7 instructing 11:6 instructor 11:3 instructors 22:5,6 124:3 integra 21:21 82:13 83:10,17 98:9 99:3 108:23 109:10 114:11 115:8 118:6,9 122:8 144:16 integras 143:19 integrated 104:10 intended 74:16	intent 65:4 interaction 62:20 interactions 24:22 interest 64:11 interesting 115:8 internally 71:24 interpretation 96:2 107:11,15 interpreted 107:6 interrupt 13:6 140:7 intersection 17:11 introduce 5:7 involve 12:1 involved 91:16 124:16 involves 137:3,18 irrelevant 121:23 142:14 145:17 isnt 45:3,6 56:7 71:2,9 133:6 134:5 135:14 136:4 137:14 139:4,22 isolate 24:7 isolates 126:4 issue 11:1 14:6 28:12 64:11 69:6 92:10 96:18,18 97:5 103:12 106:5 121:14 124:2,4,9 125:18 134:14 136:8 136:13 143:2 147:16,21,23 issues 33:9 106:5 124:9 132:7 item 109:19 items 57:11 99:6
					J
					j 4:3 jacket 61:12 jackson 127:4 jean 3:17 5:18 jeep 3:6 jennifer 1:23 149:4 job 12:24 42:9 70:6 join 142:13 judged 41:4 82:22

judgment 131:6	lack 14:7 15:9	114:20	120:4	85:13, 13, 18	matters 6:6
judicial 147:8	17:10 19:17	learned 46:8	long 11:9 28:17	85:19, 22, 22	mccann 82:12, 15, 16
june 60:22, 22	27:13 30:14	leaving 6:24 37:3	56:7 110:8	127:3 133:8	83:11
jurisdictions 10:11	33:22 35:16	legal 96:18	look 8:5 12:18 38:7	magna 2:10	mccue 3:17 5:18
	42:14 43:7	length 38:21 39:6	38:9, 11, 13	mai 8:21 9:2, 4	mcgarr 99:2, 2, 5 102:9
	46:15 53:3	letter 55:3 57:13, 18	39:2 43:1, 1	10:1, 3 22:4	102:11
	61:4 102:3	level 33:18	44:22 45:4, 7	127:7	108:22 110:1
	111:3 120:5	liability 88:17	45:15, 17	main 17:6, 12 79:10	118:6
	124:6, 8	library 21:16	51:22 52:3	making 24:12 57:9	mcgarrs 100:15 114:14
	127:18	license 1:24	53:12 55:4	management 38:3	mean 13:5 20:12
K	lacking 35:18	licensed 8:24 10:12, 13	72:17 77:9	map 44:22	52:18 58:14
k 149:2	take 1:2, 8 2:13, 17	light 89:17	77:11 85:16	maps 45:12	58:16 60:2
karlovics 2:11 5:15, 15	3:4, 13, 16, 18	limit 129:24 138:12	94:15 103:11	mark 55:13	75:5 95:19
keep 37:18 83:1, 3, 4	4:18, 19 5:4	limitation 124:10	105:13, 19	marked 6:14 8:3 14:13	108:8 123:12
93:10	5:10, 12, 17	limited 8:1 39:22, 23	116:22	15:2 91:11	126:1 127:16
kind 21:22 22:2	5:20 6:14, 22	50:17, 20	117:14	103:14	131:10 142:9
86:16 116:10	15:4 17:16	51:11 87:3	139:12	146:21	144:12
kings 126:19	30:21 31:21	91:14 92:13	144:20	market 23:22 24:23	41:6 60:20
kleszynski 4:3 6:7, 13 7:6	32:4, 6, 12	limiting 74:13	looked 42:4 45:11	25:22 32:2	measurable 88:24
7:12, 20, 21	36:5 57:14	line 81:5 136:18	47:22 51:17	94:6 109:4, 9	measured 43:5 46:22
7:22 8:9	66:23 67:4	linear 126:3, 4	52:3, 5 72:21	109:12 112:1	88:19
12:4 14:10	68:7, 24 69:9	list 54:5	78:8 79:6	114:22 120:3	measurement 45:3
15:20 32:22	69:11, 14, 17	listed 3:19 20:5, 6	87:4 101:24	marketing 8:16, 18	measurements 44:2
56:8 68:14	69:20 70:18	listing 31:4 38:17	115:24	markets 115:14, 17	meet 34:13 35:16, 22
69:1 73:15	73:18 74:8	40:12 49:12	looking 38:17 55:8	marks 36:2	39:8, 8 92:9
87:23 91:8	75:12 80:18	51:24 72:21	68:5 94:17	marous 32:23 33:1, 5	meets 34:23
95:6, 12	80:20 87:11	77:9, 12	loss 88:16	33:12, 20, 21	member 9:5
103:14, 15	105:7, 14	102:1	lot 103:7 108:24	33:24 34:13	members 21:18 80:17, 19
108:7 119:5	118:17, 20	listings 77:18	109:2 131:13	34:22 65:21	memorized 84:15
122:3, 13	119:11, 16	litigated 12:2	lots 117:13	65:22 66:5, 8	memory 49:24
128:17	127:23	litigation 11:21	toyola 8:16, 18	66:16, 21	mention 105:22 106:19
132:11 136:9	land 15:23 103:23	little 30:5 35:23	luetkehans 2:2, 3 4:8 5:21	67:6 121:12	mentioned 10:11 33:15
141:8 143:11	104:18 106:4	54:23	6:1, 11, 20	136:4, 8, 12	34:16 84:20
146:12, 16	106:5 129:10	live 47:3, 5, 8	7:2, 7, 10	141:10	127:3 128:17
knew 46:10 54:14	129:13, 15	llc 2:2 3:6	36:5, 9, 13	143:22	144:4
96:7, 11	landfill 85:9	llp 3:2	49:17 53:18	marouss 33:8, 16, 17	merit 82:22
133:12 134:6	lang 1:23 149:4	local 1:6	55:16, 19, 21	124:19	met 22:11 69:4
142:18	language 39:16 60:5	located 17:6, 10 20:5, 6	56:2 62:6, 9	masters 38:1	83:6
know 7:3 15:18	72:24 73:2	31:6, 22	68:10 81:2, 6	material 21:13, 14 25:5	methodologies 22:8 74:24
37:21 40:3, 8	73:12 75:7, 8	32:13, 19	85:4 86:19	90:12 99:7, 9	123:5 125:10
41:3 42:10	75:10	44:1, 19 45:9	90:23 91:3	99:12 100:3	127:15
46:20 50:12	tannert 15:6 33:11, 16	70:19 79:12	95:5, 10, 22	materiality 95:21 142:3, 11	128:19
51:4, 16, 18	35:6, 10 50:9	79:21 138:21	96:24 104:13	materials 21:11	139:24
52:3 53:9	50:13 51:6	location 24:11 43:12, 23	107:23	math 131:4, 11	methodology 29:4 124:16
54:11 55:24	51:11 75:22	44:18 111:3	110:12 119:2	mathematical 21:4 23:6	125:14, 20
59:17 78:12	76:8 101:14	labeled 113:8 118:10	122:2, 12, 17	mathematically 23:1	michael 3:7 5:13
81:4 84:13	102:16, 20	labeled 113:8 118:10	122:23 123:2	matter 12:4, 16 14:17	michigan 10:14
84:16, 18	104:9 105:21	labeled 113:8 118:10	128:11	15:1, 11	mike 122:24
85:9 103:4	106:2, 3, 20	labeled 113:8 118:10	130:17	19:18 28:14	mile 47:3, 5 103:5
116:6 117:3	107:14, 18	labeled 113:8 118:10	131:18, 23	33:2 42:20	105:1 107:7
126:4 127:13	tannerts 50:5, 8, 18	labeled 113:8 118:10	132:4, 24	56:9 62:21	107:9 116:14
127:17	102:13 103:9	labeled 113:8 118:10	133:16 134:2	65:12 91:13	
141:24	103:19 106:8	labeled 113:8 118:10	134:10 135:3	109:11 121:3	
142:18 143:5	107:7	labeled 113:8 118:10	135:15, 21		
147:13	lapsed 34:15	labeled 113:8 118:10	136:10 137:7		
knowledge 50:3 52:15	large 11:22 136:17	labeled 113:8 118:10	137:24		
58:12, 15	136:20, 21	labeled 113:8 118:10	138:11 139:8		
59:16 124:22	137:1, 16	labeled 113:8 118:10	140:6, 13		
127:21	138:3, 5, 12	labeled 113:8 118:10	141:2, 5		
knowledgeable 127:21	138:18	labeled 113:8 118:10	142:4, 15, 21		
known 65:8 88:21	tarry 3:11 5:9	labeled 113:8 118:10	143:4 144:22		
90:17	taw 2:10, 15 11:23	labeled 113:8 118:10	144:24 145:6		
knows 138:3	11:24 54:6	labeled 113:8 118:10	145:10, 15, 19		
	69:12 96:2	labeled 113:8 118:10	145:23 146:3		
	leading 130:16 131:17	labeled 113:8 118:10	146:6, 10, 15		
	leap 113:8 118:10	labeled 113:8 118:10	146:20 147:2		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	147:13, 20		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	148:13, 20		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	149:11 150:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	150:11 151:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	151:11 152:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	152:11 153:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	153:11 154:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	154:11 155:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	155:11 156:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	156:11 157:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	157:11 158:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	158:11 159:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	159:11 160:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	160:11 161:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	161:11 162:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	162:11 163:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	163:11 164:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	164:11 165:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	165:11 166:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	166:11 167:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	167:11 168:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	168:11 169:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	169:11 170:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	170:11 171:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	171:11 172:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	172:11 173:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	173:11 174:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	174:11 175:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	175:11 176:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	176:11 177:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	177:11 178:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	178:11 179:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	179:11 180:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	180:11 181:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	181:11 182:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	182:11 183:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	183:11 184:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	184:11 185:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	185:11 186:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	186:11 187:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	187:11 188:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	188:11 189:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	189:11 190:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	190:11 191:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	191:11 192:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	192:11 193:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	193:11 194:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	194:11 195:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	195:11 196:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	196:11 197:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	197:11 198:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	198:11 199:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	199:11 200:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	200:11 201:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	201:11 202:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	202:11 203:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	203:11 204:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	204:11 205:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	205:11 206:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	206:11 207:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	207:11 208:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	208:11 209:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	209:11 210:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	210:11 211:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	211:11 212:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	212:11 213:1		
		labeled 113:8 118:10	213:11 214:1		
		<			

117:17,20,23 137:20	130:21,24 131:5 140:18 140:22	79:10	occurring 123:19	ones 38:12 40:15 42:4 44:18 44:20 48:24 78:3 115:24	50:18 51:7,7 51:10,14 64:16 70:9 99:24 137:18
miles 80:5	multitude 126:6	northern 44:19	october 1:12	ongoing 10:19	opportunity 71:18 99:7 100:5 132:5
mind 134:20,23	multitudes 25:8	note 49:21 99:1,5	offer 35:11 66:13 121:13 147:3	online 21:17,18,19	opposed 130:12
minimization 60:5 72:5	municipality 117:6	noted 68:1 139:1	offered 67:14 109:9	onsite 36:23 37:13	opposite 105:22
minimize 22:9 31:22 32:13 60:9 70:19 82:10	mutual 87:10	notes 149:9	offers 10:23	open 37:6,7,9,10,12 61:1,3,7,8 84:7,17,19 103:7,10 104:2,17 105:2 137:18	options 22:12
minimizing 72:5	mutually 113:24	notice 147:8	office 59:1,12 96:16 97:10 126:13	opened 60:20,21 61:9 61:18	order 5:6 13:17 14:3 14:24 17:13 21:10 22:8 23:18,20 24:21 28:3 28:19 29:1 40:24 69:3 125:7 126:8
minute 102:11	N	number 6:16 9:16 15:16 20:4 24:10 27:20 27:21 39:20	officer 2:4 4:8 5:1,21 6:1,11,20 7:2,7,10 36:5,9,13 49:17 53:18 55:14,16,19 55:21 56:2 56:10 62:6,9 68:10 81:2,6 85:4 86:19 90:23 91:3 95:4,5,10,22 96:24 103:17 104:13 107:23 110:12 119:2 120:21 122:2 122:12,17,23 123:2 128:11 130:17 131:18,23 132:2,4,24 133:16 134:2 134:10 135:3 135:15,21 136:10 137:7 137:24 138:11 139:8 139:19 140:6 140:13 141:2 141:5 142:4 142:15,21 143:4,8 144:22,24 145:6,10,13 145:15,19,23 146:3,6,10 146:15,20 147:2,12,13 147:20	operating 84:22 85:8 133:12,22	outlined 113:3
minutes 147:15,21	n 4:1	numbers 20:9 42:6 78:9 102:2	object 107:21 110:7 110:11 130:15 132:21 133:14 135:10 145:17	operate 46:7,24 50:1 132:18 133:7 133:9 134:8 134:16	outline 14:2
mirrored 35:20	name 7:17,18,20 127:3,4,4 140:11	O	objected 142:19	operates 109:4,12 112:1	outlining 134:11
mischaracter... 136:8	names 17:24	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	objected 142:19	operation 46:3,20,20 49:21 50:10 50:15 84:1 84:11 109:9 125:6 134:14 142:19 147:4 147:7,9	overall 24:2 39:18 62:11 88:1,2 88:14
mischaracter... 33:22 34:9,11	nationally 115:7	objections 142:10 146:4,9	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	operations 132:16 141:14 141:14,24 143:3	overnight 141:13
mischaracter... 107:22 132:22	national 115:7	observations 48:19	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	operating 84:22 85:8 133:12,22	overruled 104:14 110:13 130:18 131:19 133:1 134:11 135:4 136:11 139:9
mislead 65:5	nationally 115:1	observation 18:8 49:9	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	operation 46:3,20,20 49:21 50:10 50:15 84:1 84:11 109:9 125:6 134:14 142:19 147:4 147:7,9	owner 88:17
misleading 65:9 114:20 115:14	near 17:11 24:18 27:2,3 57:7 136:17,19,22	observational 26:12,12 28:8	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	operations 132:16 141:14 141:14,24 143:3	P
misrepresent 64:23	nearby 73:19	offices 2:10	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	opined 51:18	p 1:12,13 2:15 85:13,19,22 133:8
misrepresents 43:17	nearest 47:9	oftentimes 45:23	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	opines 111:11	page 4:2,16 31:13 54:5 55:4,9 68:18 70:14 73:24 75:15 76:20 87:22 87:23 94:9 98:14,19,20 101:6 103:22 106:10 109:15 111:6 114:9 115:4 118:3,3 120:1 128:1
misrepresents 43:17	necessary 13:2 141:21	oh 97:20 111:15	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	opinion 12:16,23 13:2 20:16,17,23 25:3 28:16 28:20 30:16 32:12,16,17 32:19 34:11 34:13 35:15 35:20,21 40:18,22 41:1,13 43:9 47:17 49:14 63:12 65:14 67:9,14,14 67:19,19 68:2 69:6 70:1,5,12,17 71:1,7,13 72:4,10,14 78:15,20 80:7 81:12 88:22 97:5 97:13 98:16 98:21 99:8 112:11 115:18 118:7 119:22 120:14 128:9 136:9 142:24 143:1,24	pages 6:21
misrepresents 43:17	need 46:13 83:24 84:6 110:15 114:3 116:23 131:11 146:19	okay 13:10 43:20 46:6 53:2 67:21,22 72:16 75:15 80:24 81:4 93:16 97:1 101:8 102:16 103:16 106:13 109:17,23,24 110:3 111:16 114:13 122:21 127:5 127:10 131:23 144:9	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	paired 23:12,14 118:6	paper 124:15
misrepresents 43:17	needed 108:14 113:4 114:7	olivia 116:17,18	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	palos 47:8,9	paragraph 70:14 72:11,24 73:10,14 74:1,1 75:15 76:20 87:23 88:10 98:15 98:20 101:7
misrepresents 43:17	needs 74:4,10,12,15 74:20,22 75:2,3,12,13 87:10	omission 54:16	objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18	papers 124:15	
misrepresents 43:17	negatively 110:5		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		
misrepresents 43:17	neither 107:19		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		
misrepresents 43:17	never 63:16 75:11 76:2 80:19 81:3 82:12 82:15,16 87:12,13,16 87:18 108:1 126:12 136:21		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		
misrepresents 43:17	new 89:17		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		
misrepresents 43:17	newman 59:11		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		
misrepresents 43:17	nomenclature 9:4 10:6 25:4 126:20		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		
misrepresents 43:17	noon 85:13		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		
misrepresents 43:17	normal 9:10		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		
misrepresents 43:17	normally 42:13 133:8		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		
misrepresents 43:17	north 16:7 44:17		objection 36:4 61:24 72:9 81:1,7 84:24 95:20 104:12,13 107:24 110:12 118:23 130:1 130:17 131:17,18 132:24 133:16,18 134:9,10 135:2,3,15 136:7,10 137:4,22 138:1 139:4 139:8 142:2 142:13 145:15,20,22 146:5,7,18		

101:12	86:9 132:6	140:15	137:2,17	prepared	9:18
106:22	perceived	plugged	138:23 143:1	32:23 123:16	produced
109:16,18	88:24 89:13	27:24	143:16	preparing	14:17 22:3
114:10 115:5	percent	point	pollution	14:23	57:8 90:12
118:4	11:17,20	12:3 19:9 27:7	1:3 5:5	preprogram	profession
park	103:10 104:2	36:8 68:21	population	125:23	24:17 29:7
1:2 2:13,17	104:7,18	78:24 95:23	41:23 118:12	preprogrammed	32:10 33:18
3:16,18 4:18	perfectly	96:7,12	118:16	28:2	125:11
4:19 5:4,17	92:10	100:13,13,18	porter	present	127:18
5:20 6:14,23	performed	100:22 106:1	2:7 4:10 5:22	5:17 6:10 20:3	professional
15:4 36:6	112:4	110:3 121:17	5:23,23 16:5	33:1	8:7,10 11:4,7
57:14 60:24	period	129:10	36:10,12	presentation	13:7 14:1
63:23 66:24	25:18 38:18	134:20 145:8	106:24 107:1	16:20 44:23	31:18,19
67:4 68:7,24	49:10 62:17	pointed	110:7 131:24	presented	34:7,19,24
69:9,11,14	62:18 124:14	82:24 136:15	132:1,3,10	15:3 16:3,18	47:15 54:5
69:17,20	125:12	points	132:14 133:2	19:24 20:11	64:6 69:2,5
74:8 75:13	periods	25:21 111:13	133:19 134:4	20:15,17,18	70:3,4
79:13,14	128:4	poletti	134:22 135:7	21:2,7 26:24	professionals
80:18,20	permanent	12:12,24 15:7	135:12,17,23	31:9 33:13	21:6
87:11 105:7	20:9	17:20,23	136:14 137:5	35:17 40:22	professor
105:14	permitted	18:3,20	137:9,12,13	41:24 42:2,5	23:8 27:5,8
118:17,20	102:21	19:18 20:4	138:11,15	46:16 48:20	28:6,13
119:11,16	person	20:14 21:24	139:17 140:5	61:5 77:3,7	127:3 130:20
127:23	63:22 66:19	22:22 23:5,8	142:13	77:13,18	program
part	69:4 99:2	23:10 24:14	145:17 146:5	78:10 100:3	28:23,23
43:4 54:15	personally	25:13 26:7,9	146:8,14,22	101:13	programs
64:12,19	31:24	26:10,11	147:17,19	121:17	126:13
67:11,12	perspective	27:6,8 28:6	portion	president	progression
75:1,3 88:6	31:18 39:21	28:13,17,24	11:22 14:5	7:24	29:11,14
96:14,15	41:7 92:9	29:20 30:20	44:19,21	presume	project
97:4 101:9	115:9 125:8	31:11,15	72:18 141:9	15:19 28:1	25:4 59:2 86:8
107:10 116:9	peter	32:17 33:12	portions	67:3 69:15	87:1
119:20,21	2:11 5:15	33:17 34:5	28:17 77:7	86:14 143:23	projects
120:15 121:5	ph	35:7,10	posed	presumed	86:13 87:17
121:7 128:3	28:17 126:24	37:18 38:8	15:11	40:15 70:5	pronouncing
143:2	128:18	38:14 40:13	position	presumption	132:11
particular	phillip	40:23 41:7	60:9	40:17 69:17	proofing
9:23 12:10	2:3	42:5,7,18	positioning	pretty	128:6
19:4,9 20:4	philosophy	43:14 44:14	106:6	18:9 45:3	proofreading
23:4 24:11	37:23,24 83:2	46:2,15	positive	60:10 106:4	57:9,11 59:6,8
24:15 25:3,4	phonetic	47:22 48:18	86:18 93:14,15	previously	properly
25:20 26:7	126:20	48:22 50:4,7	114:21	3:19	42:19
26:23 28:15	photocopy	50:17,20	possibility	price	properties
29:1,20	8:7	51:7,12,16	125:14 134:19	22:23 25:12	22:10 25:1
33:10 38:10	photograph	51:23 53:9	possible	26:16,18	31:23 32:3
47:23 48:9	16:21	63:13 65:13	55:11	28:9,9 30:8	38:7,24
50:23 51:2	photographs	67:8 70:15	possibly	30:8 45:22	41:18 45:9
69:24 96:1	16:2,14,17,19	70:16 72:13	58:5 89:14	45:24 110:18	49:5,8,9
100:4 106:21	photography	73:6,10,17	post	prices	73:19 89:8
124:23	16:13	75:23 76:22	89:17	24:22 45:19	110:8 112:6
parties	physical	77:8,13,18	potential	pricing	112:10
56:9 127:21	27:15 113:9	78:10,11,21	12:2 89:8,23	25:21 26:3,21	114:15 115:1
partnership	physically	82:4,17,20	124:15 133:8	27:2 31:8	120:3 136:17
91:14,20 92:14	30:12 38:10	83:1,1 84:12	potentially	prings	136:20
parts	43:5	86:7 87:4	140:3	23:11	137:17 138:4
92:19	pick	98:12 100:6	practice	primary	138:6,21
party	18:6	101:14 102:2	11:5,13,16	18:18 38:22	139:6 144:3
64:11	picked	105:10,17	13:8 14:2	52:1	144:10,11
pass	42:19	106:20	34:8,19 35:1	printed	property
9:23	piece	107:17 108:2	64:6 65:1	94:19	8:1 11:18 16:1
pattern	24:3 130:4,5	113:8,22	69:5 70:4	prior	16:2,5 17:2
18:13	pieces	120:12	111:19	56:19 58:16,17	17:3,7 18:11
patterns	39:20 126:5	121:17 123:5	predetermined	59:5 107:20	19:12 23:11
26:3,22 27:2	pin	128:19	64:16	probably	25:20 32:14
pay	78:9 102:1	130:20	predominant	36:21,21 60:15	32:18,20
45:22	place	132:17 133:3	39:4 103:4	62:21 128:4	42:17 46:3
paying	24:23 93:11	133:5,11,20	104:5	problem	60:7 67:20
69:13,15	placed	134:6,13	predominantly	21:2,7,8,8	70:11,20
pdf	60:8	136:16 138:4	29:23	51:3 55:12	72:6 76:11
22:2 56:24	plain	139:13	predominately	proceed	76:18 78:17
pearse	45:8,10 130:12	141:24 142:8	17:13 33:8	6:4 7:11 91:5	79:22 82:10
48:3	planned	142:18	35:2,16	95:9 135:22	91:16,19
peer	103:1	144:17	39:23 106:23	140:15 142:6	92:20 95:1
13:13,14,15,19	planning	polettis	preliminary	proceeded	95:14 96:4,7
14:9 28:14	15:23 106:4,5	41:18 44:22	6:6 95:23	18:17 79:10,14	96:8 106:6
33:7	plant	48:13 49:23	premature	proceeding	107:12 110:4
pencil	89:16	82:5 84:3,8	35:24	14:22 83:7	111:9,11
54:12	please	86:3 97:23	premised	142:9	112:11
people	7:8,19 76:20	115:16 116:9	143:2	proceedings	114:19,21
9:21 11:24	99:1,5	120:9,11,24	prepare	1:10 149:7,10	115:10,18
45:22 59:7	135:21	121:9 124:19	14:11	produce	123:17,20

125:7 130:4 130:5, 10, 13 131:1 136:22 136:24 138:18 139:2 140:2 143:24	108:13 110:15 112:19, 20 113:2, 3 119:22 120:8 120:20, 23, 24 121:1 122:3 123:11 125:1 126:24 127:2 130:16 132:22, 22 134:3 135:6 135:11 137:5 137:10 138:12 139:11, 15 141:12, 18 143:11, 22	reading 54:11 real 8:1, 19 9:8, 9 10:10 11:9 11:11, 19 21:15 22:14 23:17 24:3 27:14, 15 30:13, 22 47:16 48:11 88:24 90:12 94:3 109:4 111:13 114:22, 23 115:14 really 6:17 29:24 68:20 89:14 100:1 108:2 136:21 reality 21:21 83:10 98:9 99:3 reason 38:8 85:16 103:11 104:22 119:19 124:23 reasonable 32:9 48:7, 8 105:15 121:16 reasonably 30:15 40:24 43:8, 22 44:4 reasons 13:3 35:9 39:13 41:10 81:7 rebuttal 98:3, 16, 21 99:8 108:20 109:8 111:5 114:8 118:2 rebutting 98:8 99:3 recall 59:21 85:3 91:16, 23 103:9 105:10 108:22 114:16 132:18 134:17 135:24 136:17 138:16 139:20 recalled 147:6 recalling 105:24 receipt 65:22 receive 9:13 10:1 12:5 59:23 63:7 received 10:3 56:4 60:2 60:23 62:22 63:1, 16 146:16 receiving 33:10 recess 91:2 rechecked 31:8 recognized	115:1 139:24 recollect 39:13 133:10 recollection 37:12, 22 38:5 38:14, 17 39:3, 4, 5, 10 41:11, 14 44:13 51:23 53:14 78:7 83:15 84:22 85:1, 8 103:6 105:12, 24 134:13 reconvene 91:4 record 6:9 20:8, 13 27:21 30:10 49:1, 11 52:1 52:4 53:4 56:3 72:22 77:9, 11 86:21 92:8 97:21 102:4 120:22 137:10 140:8 140:14 145:21, 24 recorded 30:8 recorder 52:6 records 20:10 21:19 52:2 53:7, 11 75:17 76:14 recross 4:11, 12 140:16 141:6 recycling 107:4 129:19 redirect 4:9 128:15 refer 25:2 reference 72:11 73:9 118:10 referenced 21:24 references 74:23 136:13 referred 13:12 18:1, 2 23:12 24:15 101:23 129:17, 20 140:11 referring 7:3 15:12 37:19 51:19 83:1, 3, 4 88:8 90:11 127:22 140:1 refers 141:23 reflect 6:10 8:11 57:1 145:21, 24 reflected 74:20, 22 refresh 84:21 refreshes 85:7 regarding 12:4 20:21 33:16 51:17 62:2, 16 63:2 63:17 67:9	67:19, 20 72:4 84:11 97:5 109:4 128:18 130:9 130:10 134:21 141:13 regression 27:9, 10 29:22 30:16 81:14 81:16, 20 125:21, 24 126:2, 3, 4, 6 126:14, 15 130:21, 24 131:5 139:19 139:23 140:18, 22 related 13:16 32:6 63:8 101:24 106:6 relates 34:8 92:13 106:21 relative 60:4, 6 113:7 116:19 124:2 134:13 relevance 95:21 142:2, 10 relevancy 110:11, 11 relevant 119:22 122:15 reliable 75:17 76:6, 9 relied 22:1 50:5, 8 98:12 99:14 relook 139:14 rely 90:4 remained 37:10 remediation 96:13 110:21 111:4 remember 62:8 65:24 82:6 109:5 109:13 rendered 12:15 65:13 rendering 89:16 renters 114:24 repeatedly 129:2 rephrase 68:10 112:20 134:3 135:18 report 9:18 13:23 14:11, 16, 19 14:23 15:7, 8 16:3, 15, 18 16:22 17:21 17:23 18:3 18:20 19:24 20:3, 4 22:22 25:13 27:24 28:17 31:13 32:23 33:5, 7 33:8, 10, 11 33:12, 12, 16 33:17, 18, 21 33:23 34:1, 5 34:6, 9, 13, 21	34:22, 23 35:6, 7, 10, 11 35:12, 15, 17 35:21 38:15 39:3, 11, 24 40:13, 41:24 42:5 46:11 46:14, 14 49:23 50:5, 8 50:14, 16, 17 50:18, 21 51:6, 7, 10, 23 54:24 55:4, 5 55:6, 10 56:8 56:11, 12, 13 56:14, 16, 19 57:5, 24 58:2 58:17, 22 59:14, 22 60:4 61:20 62:3 16, 23 63:2, 5, 7, 10 63:13 64:2 65:8, 21, 22 66:4, 5, 8, 16 66:21 67:8 68:4, 13, 18 68:22 70:13 70:15, 16, 24 71:5, 9, 10, 21 71:23 72:13 73:1, 10, 17 73:24 74:4 74:11, 15, 21 74:23 75:11 75:23 76:23 77:13, 19, 23 80:7, 24 82:4 82:5, 12, 15 82:16, 21 83:11 84:3, 8 86:3, 7 87:8 87:9, 22 90:15, 15, 19 91:12 92:19 92:23 93:7, 9 93:19, 22, 24 94:4, 5, 8 95:15 97:3 97:14, 16, 24 97:24 98:8 98:18 99:2 100:15 101:1 101:3 102:2 102:6, 13 103:10, 19 105:11, 20, 23 106:2, 3, 8, 19 107:6, 10 108:20, 23 109:8, 10, 11 111:6, 22 112:1 113:8 114:9, 11 115:4, 8, 16 115:20 116:10 118:2 118:9, 15, 19 119:10, 14 121:13 122:8 124:19 129:3 129:4 133:11 133:21 134:6 134:13, 21 135:1 136:13 138:23 139:4 139:6, 13 143:2, 11, 12 143:16, 19, 22 143:23
proposed 46:4, 7, 24 50:10 104:19 117:17, 21, 24 132:16 133:7 133:13, 21 134:7 protect 125:7 protection 15:17 provide 75:20 provided 16:24 75:16, 21 75:24 76:2 99:9 121:3 123:20 providing 64:23 province 113:10 psychological 126:20 public 6:2, 3 20:8, 13 27:21 30:10 49:1, 11 51:24 52:2, 4 72:22 75:17 76:14 77:9 77:11 102:4 publication 140:1 published 21:11 pulled 20:10 pure 30:7, 7 131:4 131:21, 21 purifies 131:2 purifying 131:3 purport 126:23 purposes 111:7, 10 put 54:12 115:9 125:17	questioning 81:5 88:5 132:19 136:18 139:18 questions 9:9 36:11, 12 53:17 83:24 86:20 99:16 99:17 112:3 112:15 120:18 121:8 122:11, 20 127:12, 13 129:2, 9 130:3, 9 132:3, 6 136:1 141:4 141:13 142:17 quite 56:23 61:6 94:20 126:10 128:3 quote 125:18	reading 54:11 real 8:1, 19 9:8, 9 10:10 11:9 11:11, 19 21:15 22:14 23:17 24:3 27:14, 15 30:13, 22 47:16 48:11 88:24 90:12 94:3 109:4 111:13 114:22, 23 115:14 really 6:17 29:24 68:20 89:14 100:1 108:2 136:21 reality 21:21 83:10 98:9 99:3 reason 38:8 85:16 103:11 104:22 119:19 124:23 reasonable 32:9 48:7, 8 105:15 121:16 reasonably 30:15 40:24 43:8, 22 44:4 reasons 13:3 35:9 39:13 41:10 81:7 rebuttal 98:3, 16, 21 99:8 108:20 109:8 111:5 114:8 118:2 rebutting 98:8 99:3 recall 59:21 85:3 91:16, 23 103:9 105:10 108:22 114:16 132:18 134:17 135:24 136:17 138:16 139:20 recalled 147:6 recalling 105:24 receipt 65:22 receive 9:13 10:1 12:5 59:23 63:7 received 10:3 56:4 60:2 60:23 62:22 63:1, 16 146:16 receiving 33:10 recess 91:2 rechecked 31:8 recognized	67:19, 20 72:4 84:11 97:5 109:4 128:18 130:9 130:10 134:21 141:13 regression 27:9, 10 29:22 30:16 81:14 81:16, 20 125:21, 24 126:2, 3, 4, 6 126:14, 15 130:21, 24 131:5 139:19 139:23 140:18, 22 related 13:16 32:6 63:8 101:24 106:6 relates 34:8 92:13 106:21 relative 60:4, 6 113:7 116:19 124:2 134:13 relevance 95:21 142:2, 10 relevancy 110:11, 11 relevant 119:22 122:15 reliable 75:17 76:6, 9 relied 22:1 50:5, 8 98:12 99:14 relook 139:14 rely 90:4 remained 37:10 remediation 96:13 110:21 111:4 remember 62:8 65:24 82:6 109:5 109:13 rendered 12:15 65:13 rendering 89:16 renters 114:24 repeatedly 129:2 rephrase 68:10 112:20 134:3 135:18 report 9:18 13:23 14:11, 16, 19 14:23 15:7, 8 16:3, 15, 18 16:22 17:21 17:23 18:3 18:20 19:24 20:3, 4 22:22 25:13 27:24 28:17 31:13 32:23 33:5, 7 33:8, 10, 11 33:12, 12, 16 33:17, 18, 21 33:23 34:1, 5 34:6, 9, 13, 21	34:22, 23 35:6, 7, 10, 11 35:12, 15, 17 35:21 38:15 39:3, 11, 24 40:13, 41:24 42:5 46:11 46:14, 14 49:23 50:5, 8 50:14, 16, 17 50:18, 21 51:6, 7, 10, 23 54:24 55:4, 5 55:6, 10 56:8 56:11, 12, 13 56:14, 16, 19 57:5, 24 58:2 58:17, 22 59:14, 22 60:4 61:20 62:3 16, 23 63:2, 5, 7, 10 63:13 64:2 65:8, 21, 22 66:4, 5, 8, 16 66:21 67:8 68:4, 13, 18 68:22 70:13 70:15, 16, 24 71:5, 9, 10, 21 71:23 72:13 73:1, 10, 17 73:24 74:4 74:11, 15, 21 74:23 75:11 75:23 76:23 77:13, 19, 23 80:7, 24 82:4 82:5, 12, 15 82:16, 21 83:11 84:3, 8 86:3, 7 87:8 87:9, 22 90:15, 15, 19 91:12 92:19 92:23 93:7, 9 93:19, 22, 24 94:4, 5, 8 95:15 97:3 97:14, 16, 24 97:24 98:8 98:18 99:2 100:15 101:1 101:3 102:2 102:6, 13 103:10, 19 105:11, 20, 23 106:2, 3, 8, 19 107:6, 10 108:20, 23 109:8, 10, 11 111:6, 22 112:1 113:8 114:9, 11 115:4, 8, 16 115:20 116:10 118:2 118:9, 15, 19 119:10, 14 121:13 122:8 124:19 129:3 129:4 133:11 133:21 134:6 134:13, 21 135:1 136:13 138:23 139:4 139:6, 13 143:2, 11, 12 143:16, 19, 22 143:23 146:12, 16	
qualified 11:2 13:9 15:10 22:13, 14 24:24 35:5 41:6 43:4, 21 45:23 46:12 49:6 51:2, 3 51:3, 15 52:20 59:4 62:10, 10, 12 62:13 63:15 67:5 68:11 71:19 74:18 84:11 85:5 86:17 90:21 95:23 100:7	qualification 6:17 8:8, 10 54:3 qualified 11:2 13:9 15:10 22:13, 14 24:24 35:5 41:6 43:4, 21 45:23 46:12 49:6 51:2, 3 51:3, 15 52:20 59:4 62:10, 10, 12 62:13 63:15 67:5 68:11 71:19 74:18 84:11 85:5 86:17 90:21 95:23 100:7	reading 54:11 real 8:1, 19 9:8, 9 10:10 11:9 11:11, 19 21:15 22:14 23:17 24:3 27:14, 15 30:13, 22 47:16 48:11 88:24 90:12 94:3 109:4 111:13 114:22, 23 115:14 really 6:17 29:24 68:20 89:14 100:1 108:2 136:21 reality 21:21 83:10 98:9 99:3 reason 38:8 85:16 103:11 104:22 119:19 124:23 reasonable 32:9 48:7, 8 105:15 121:16 reasonably 30:15 40:24 43:8, 22 44:4 reasons 13:3 35:9 39:13 41:10 81:7 rebuttal 98:3, 16, 21 99:8 108:20 109:8 111:5 114:8 118:2 rebutting 98:8 99:3 recall 59:21 85:3 91:16, 23 103:9 105:10 108:22 114:16 132:18 134:17 135:24 136:17 138:16 139:20 recalled 147:6 recalling 105:24 receipt 65:22 receive 9:13 10:1 12:5 59:23 63:7 received 10:3 56:4 60:2 60:23 62:22 63:1, 16 146:16 receiving 33:10 recess 91:2 rechecked 31:8 recognized	67:19, 20 72:4 84:11 97:5 109:4 128:18 130:9 130:10 134:21 141:13 regression 27:9, 10 29:22 30:16 81:14 81:16, 20 125:21, 24 126:2, 3, 4, 6 126:14, 15 130:21, 24 131:5 139:19 139:23 140:18, 22 related 13:16 32:6 63:8 101:24 106:6 relates 34:8 92:13 106:21 relative 60:4, 6 113:7 116:19 124:2 134:13 relevance 95:21 142:2, 10 relevancy 110:11, 11 relevant 119:22 122:15 reliable 75:17 76:6, 9 relied 22:1 50:5, 8 98:12 99:14 relook 139:14 rely 90:4 remained 37:10 remediation 96:13 110:21 111:4 remember 62:8 65:24 82:6 109:5 109:13 rendered 12:15 65:13 rendering 89:16 renters 114:24 repeatedly 129:2 rephrase 68:10 112:20 134:3 135:18 report 9:18 13:23 14:11, 16, 19 14:23 15:7, 8 16:3, 15, 18 16:22 17:21 17:23 18:3 18:20 19:24 20:3, 4 22:22 25:13 27:24 28:17 31:13 32:23 33:5, 7 33:8, 10, 11 33:12, 12, 16 33:17, 18, 21 33:23 34:1, 5 34:6, 9, 13, 21	34:22, 23 35:6, 7, 10, 11 35:12, 15, 17 35:21 38:15 39:3, 11, 24 40:13, 41:24 42:5 46:11 46:14, 14 49:23 50:5, 8 50:14, 16, 17 50:18, 21 51:6, 7, 10, 23 54:24 55:4, 5 55:6, 10 56:8 56:11, 12, 13 56:14, 16, 19 57:5, 24 58:2 58:17, 22 59:14, 22 60:4 61:20 62:3 16, 23 63:2, 5, 7, 10 63:13 64:2 65:8, 21, 22 66:4, 5, 8, 16 66:21 67:8 68:4, 13, 18 68:22 70:13 70:15, 16, 24 71:5, 9, 10, 21 71:23 72:13 73:1, 10, 17 73:24 74:4 74:11, 15, 21 74:23 75:11 75:23 76:23 77:13, 19, 23 80:7, 24 82:4 82:5, 12, 15 82:16, 21 83:11 84:3, 8 86:3, 7 87:8 87:9, 22 90:15, 15, 19 91:12 92:19 92:23 93:7, 9 93:19, 22, 24 94:4, 5, 8 95:15 97:3 97:14, 16, 24 97:24 98:8 98:18 99:2 100:15 101:1 101:3 102:2 102:6, 13 103:10, 19 105:11, 20, 23 106:2, 3, 8, 19 107:6, 10 108:20, 23 109:8, 10, 11 111:6, 22 112:1 113:8 114:9, 11 115:4, 8, 16 115:20 116:10 118:2 118:9, 15, 19 119:10, 14 121:13 122:8 124:19 129:3 129:4 133:11 133:21 134:6 134:13, 21 135:1 136:13 138:23 139:4 139:6, 13 143:2, 11, 12 143:16, 19, 22 143:23 146:12, 16	
qualified 11:2 13:9 15:10 22:13, 14 24:24 35:5 41:6 43:4, 21 45:23 46:12 49:6 51:2, 3 51:3, 15 52:20 59:4 62:10, 10, 12 62:13 63:15 67:5 68:11 71:19 74:18 84:11 85:5 86:17 90:21 95:23 100:7	qualified 11:2 13:9 15:10 22:13, 14 24:24 35:5 41:6 43:4, 21 45:23 46:12 49:6 51:2, 3 51:3, 15 52:20 59:4 62:10, 10, 12 62:13 63:15 67:5 68:11 71:19 74:18 84:11 85:5 86:17 90:21 95:23 100:7	reading 54:11 real 8:1, 19 9:8, 9 10:10 11:9 11:11, 19 21:15 22:14 23:17 24:3 27:14, 15 30:13, 22 47:16 48:11 88:24 90:12 94:3 109:4 111:13 114:22, 23 115:14 really 6:17 29:24 68:20 89:14 100:1 108:2 136:21 reality 21:21 83:10 98:9 99:3 reason 38:8 85:16 103:11 104:22 119:19 124:23 reasonable 32:9 48:7, 8 105:15 121:16 reasonably 30:15 40:24 43:8, 22 44:4 reasons 13:3 35:9 39:13 41:10 81:7 rebuttal 98:3, 16, 21 99:8 108:20 109:8 111:5 114:8 118:2 rebutting 98:8 99:3 recall 59:21 85:3 91:16, 23 103:9 105:10 108:22 114:16 132:18 134:17 135:24 136:17 138:16 139:20 recalled 147:6 recalling 105:24 receipt 65:22 receive 9:13 10:1 12:5 59:23 63:7 received 10:3 56:4 60:2 60:23 62:22 63:1, 16 146:16 receiving 33:10 recess 91:2 rechecked 31:8 recognized	67:19, 20 72:4 84:11 97:5 109:4 128:18 130:9 130:10 134:21 141:13 regression 27:9, 10 29:22 30:16 81:14 81:16, 20 125:21, 24 126:2, 3, 4, 6 126:14, 15 130:21, 24		

reported 1:23 27:20 149:7	31:19 resulted 12:22,22 41:12 41:12	71:23 77:5 85:14, 19 86:5 88:13 89:20 90:5 90:14 91:8 94:9 97:11 97:17 98:1,9 99:8,14,19 100:2,10,12 102:9,18,20 103:9 104:1 104:4 105:11 105:16 107:8 109:7,21 110:6 111:5 111:8 112:14 112:23 113:20 115:22 116:2 116:4,7 118:15 119:20 120:9 121:6 133:13 134:23 139:3 139:18 141:18,20 147:8	4:15 126:24 128:18 149:4 safe 32:1 66:18 safety 71:12 73:4 sale 25:12,22 39:10 39:14 77:11 77:12 110:22 120:2 sales 20:5,6,11 23:4 23:18 24:4 24:21 25:9 25:16,17 26:13,14 27:11 30:8 38:19,19 39:1 40:14 40:14 41:15 77:8,18 94:11 100:5 118:6 sample 20:12 sampled 78:8 sampling 9:20 16:16 49:2,3,13 sanitary 130:11 sat 61:6 123:14 satisfy 29:3 saturday 85:13,18,22 saw 16:10 37:8 67:19 103:6 103:7,7 saying 23:24 43:18 69:19 says 33:24 34:23 53:13 55:5,9 56:22 57:23 71:10 74:14 94:18 100:22 102:7 149:5 scenario 25:8 scheme 39:19 schirott 2:2 school 45:16,17,20,21 45:23 130:5 130:6 scope 34:10,11 46:17 46:18 50:17 51:8 69:20 74:17 76:8 97:9 98:15 98:21 99:17 99:18 100:8 104:12 112:3 112:12 113:3 113:6,14,17 113:23 119:21 120:15 142:2 142:10 scopes 51:11 scrap	107:4 129:18 search 72:22 sechen 2:15,16 4:4,9 5:19,19 6:8 6:12,21,24 7:4,5,16 35:23 36:7 43:3 56:4,9 56:24 57:15 57:22 58:3,4 58:18 59:2 59:14,22 60:3,13,16 61:10,19 62:2,4,16,21 63:2,8,11,17 66:21 67:18 68:8 69:13 69:16 71:22 71:24 75:21 80:21,23 81:1,3,10,18 81:22 82:2 84:24 87:6 87:15 88:4 95:20 98:19 104:12 107:21 108:16 113:14,17,24 114:3 118:23 128:13,14,16 128:24 129:1 130:2,19 131:22 140:7 142:2,6,7 144:22,23,24 145:2,5,8,21 146:9,17,18 sechens 69:11 143:10 second 6:12 28:20 76:20 93:11 97:1,16 98:15,20 101:6 106:12 140:8 secondmost 104:4 section 15:1,5,12,15 15:16,24 76:9,21 101:10 106:12 107:6 see 17:9 18:15,21 18:23 19:2 22:24 31:6 45:15 46:2 56:3 73:9 75:17 76:23 84:21 85:7 92:18 101:10 104:1 seek 127:20 seeking 83:12,13,20 select 25:16 selected 16:19 27:3,4 41:23 49:5,7 49:10 selection 40:4 selections	43:13 sell 110:4 sellers 24:22 seminars 10:24 senior 10:7 sense 32:18 52:12 sent 57:14,17 58:3 58:4,18 59:21 69:18 sentence 120:1 separate 63:12 78:21 september 55:1,3,7,10 56:14,19,22 57:5,7,19,23 58:22 60:20 61:2 63:6 65:23 68:14 68:15,16,20 128:1,2 series 142:17 serve 28:19 service 19:13 30:10 31:5 38:18 40:12 49:12 51:24 72:21 77:10,12 102:1 141:17 141:21 services 64:24 89:6 servicing 141:18 servicing 9:22 set 52:16,21 108:9 setting 24:19 113:13 113:23 sewer 130:11 shines 89:17 shipped 28:16 short 38:19 39:1,10 39:14 40:14 41:15 91:2 129:4,6 131:10 shorthand 149:7,9,14 shouldnt 124:24,24 show 8:3 14:13 55:21 56:7 56:11 58:19 showed 38:18 showing 85:1 shows 56:13 side 79:12 significance 131:9
result 40:8,24 resultant	53:17 54:22 60:1 71:2,22	s 2:7,11 3:7			

significant 13:14 26:21 27:1	125:23 solid 3:12 5:10 41:10 67:17	80:19 107:19 108:1 124:4 128:18	station 1:8 17:16 18:4 18:5,5 19:5 19:6,7 30:22 31:21 32:4,7 32:13 36:20 43:6 44:13 47:4,6,9 70:19 73:18 86:13 87:1 87:17,20 89:4 90:1 92:5 110:10 112:8 114:5 115:21 116:11,15 117:18,21,24 123:21 124:12 136:16,24 137:16 138:7 138:9,17,24 139:2,7 140:10,10,14	study 17:20 24:1 28:21 52:10 102:22 104:5 104:11 107:7 113:10,10 stuff 131:13 subdivisions 17:8 subject 16:1,2,5,5 17:2,3,4,7 17:14 18:1 35:24 43:8 43:23 70:10 76:11,18 78:16 79:17 79:22 81:20 81:24 95:15 102:22 106:22 107:12 111:11 114:20 115:10 118:11 129:11,16,17 subjectively 47:19 subjectivity 131:16 submission 56:19 submit 21:23 22:2 146:24 subsequent 8:17 10:18 21:20 substantive 128:8,9 successfully 104:10 suffers 72:19 sufficient 40:23 114:1 suggest 35:13 123:9,23 summary 31:13 sunday 56:4,10,15,20 57:18 85:13 85:19,22 146:13,16 superior 118:11 supplemental 101:16,19 supply 9:20 101:13 140:19,21 support 11:21 24:12 81:11 118:7 120:3 137:1 137:17 supportable 23:3 supported 28:10 sure 18:22 19:1 20:22 45:11 46:9,19 47:8 51:5 53:1 58:24 59:24 61:24 69:10 81:23 82:3	90:6 92:8 94:21 97:18 99:13 103:13 106:11 112:24 115:23 117:10 122:22 surprise 45:5 117:15 surrounding 22:10 25:1 31:23 32:3 32:14,20 48:11 60:9 67:10,20 70:11,20 72:6 78:17 79:21,22 89:8 106:15 106:22 survey 23:11 susan 59:11 suspect 44:18 suspicion 58:21 128:2 sustain 81:7 sustained 133:17 135:16 142:20 swear 7:7 switch 147:24 sworn 7:9,14 149:5
simple 30:15 45:3 simply 24:16 single 42:24 43:15,17 77:11,12 126:15 singlefamily 43:24 sir 7:17,23 8:14 9:2 11:13 14:15 16:14 16:22 17:1 17:17,24 19:14 20:19 49:21 90:21 91:7 112:4 113:20 122:9 site 16:10,11 18:3 18:10,13,14 18:15 37:9 50:10 79:2,6 79:8,9,10,17 102:22 103:5 104:19 105:2 106:7,15,22 129:11,16,17 sited 118:11 sites 17:20,21 18:1 18:24 19:3,3 51:17 137:19 144:12,14 siting 1:4,6 5:2,5 15:3 25:3 27:3 83:13 103:20 sittings 22:3 sitting 1:3 5:4 90:7 situation 88:20 90:17 situations 12:1 141:19 six 139:24 size 27:19 30:9 slash 88:20 90:17 sled 126:11 slightly 62:10,12 slip 126:11 smith 6:10 122:17 snow 141:16 software 28:1,2,23 30:1 softwares	solving 21:8 22:13,13 somebody 69:15 somebodys 89:18 someones 13:20 somewhat 47:11 125:3 sooner 58:23 142:9 sorry 48:6 61:14 88:2 94:17 97:20 111:15 128:23 146:1 sort 42:16 67:15 sound 85:14,19,23 sounded 141:15 147:7 sounds 70:23 85:15 sources 49:10 52:1,11 53:10,15 102:4 south 17:7 79:11,14 southern 16:6 44:21 space 103:7,10 104:2 104:17 105:2 137:19 speak 23:3 67:15 69:1 122:24 131:7 speaking 61:21 68:6,23 specialization 11:14 specialized 21:16 specific 23:20 38:15 39:16 44:14 44:16 74:4 74:15 75:13 76:7 95:1 96:5 108:9 109:19 136:21 139:15 specifically 40:1,12 66:7 67:13 71:13 77:8 82:18 84:18 105:13 134:17 speculation 133:15,23 spell 7:17 spend 10:19 11:18 36:19 spends 11:19 spent 10:20 spill 96:8,11 111:2 spoke	spoken 63:22 spot 41:24 77:21,24 78:3,6 square 22:24 25:13 26:16,18 28:9 117:12 144:11,12 sr 3:15 sra 8:21 10:5,6 ss 149:1 stack 94:16 stand 39:12 62:13 95:24 144:15 standard 13:6,15,24,24 14:5,8 19:22 20:23 22:16 33:7,18 34:6 34:13,14,14 34:16,18,19 34:23,23 35:7,8,9,14 35:16,22 65:18 66:10 66:12,13,16 98:6 99:18 100:9,13,22 121:8,15 122:9 126:9 143:17,20 standards 11:4 13:7 14:1 34:7,18,24 64:5,13 69:4 70:3 71:6 standpoint 20:18 stands 10:6 start 6:2,6 36:10 60:17 90:24 125:4,9,10 125:13 145:14 started 60:19 79:9 starting 16:6 starts 101:9 109:18 state 7:17 100:17 144:7 149:1 149:6 stated 71:5 statement 6:17 8:7,9 54:2 66:22 72:3 78:5 90:14 103:3 120:14 123:8 125:18 126:17 statements 10:20 states 8:24 10:12 90:19 99:5	statistical 28:3 29:11 30:3,18 126:8 131:8 statistically 28:4,10 statistician 127:5 statistics 42:11 status 125:18 stephen 3:3 stepping 146:2 steps 14:2 22:20 31:17 125:7 steve 5:11 stock 72:24 73:2 75:7 storms 141:16 street 17:6,12 79:10 79:12 streets 44:15 strength 118:12,20 stricken 135:19 strike 45:6 52:15 68:8 75:5 137:14 striking 36:2 studies 19:20 25:15 26:24 48:3 78:8 82:5 125:9	substantive 128:8,9 successfully 104:10 suffers 72:19 sufficient 40:23 114:1 suggest 35:13 123:9,23 summary 31:13 sunday 56:4,10,15,20 57:18 85:13 85:19,22 146:13,16 superior 118:11 supplemental 101:16,19 supply 9:20 101:13 140:19,21 support 11:21 24:12 81:11 118:7 120:3 137:1 137:17 supportable 23:3 supported 28:10 sure 18:22 19:1 20:22 45:11 46:9,19 47:8 51:5 53:1 58:24 59:24 61:24 69:10 81:23 82:3	target 17:22 18:19 20:7 23:11 24:16,19 25:16,17,24
T					
t 3:3 4:15 table 92:15 93:17 94:10 103:23 take 8:4,19 9:16 12:18 14:3 16:22,22 28:12 69:22 90:23 95:3 115:20 147:14 taken 16:17 48:13 91:2 125:7 147:9 149:9 takes 131:12,13 talk 54:22 82:20 83:9 107:14 107:17 talked 88:3 118:5 123:3 talking 38:9 69:6 77:5 82:9 86:14 89:24 100:9 102:17 110:8 117:19 120:10,11 126:21 target 17:22 18:19 20:7 23:11 24:16,19 25:16,17,24					

26:18 28:5	46:16 53:3	111:16	74:17	110:10 112:8	117:16
30:19 31:5	61:4 89:6,11	112:15	timber	113:15 114:5	typically
41:20 42:18	102:3 111:3	115:21,24	3:8 5:13 79:13	115:16,21	29:6,6 88:19
43:10,22,23	124:7,8	119:7 120:19	time	116:11,15	133:7
44:9,12,14	127:19	126:10,24	9:23 10:20,20	117:17,24	typo
44:21 45:1,9	terminology	127:1,2	11:18,20	123:10,19,21	71:15,16
45:12 80:7	69:22 72:20	131:9 142:10	12:3 19:9	124:5,12	typographical
80:12,14	89:12 90:3	144:19,21	25:18 36:19	136:16,23	56:17 57:2,3,6
81:11,24	92:11,12	theory	37:8,14	137:16 138:6	68:18
112:22 113:5	terminus	111:20	38:18 49:10	138:9,17,24	
113:11 114:4	16:6,8	thereon	60:14 62:17	138:24 139:2	
124:11	terms	36:3	62:18,22	139:7 140:10	
135:13 136:2	8:22 10:24	theres	71:24 73:11	140:10,14	
136:5 139:14	22:12 39:19	29:24 30:3	93:18,21	144:4 147:4	
139:22	40:11 43:24	84:24 128:4	96:5,12,16	147:10	
taught	46:17 97:6	128:9 129:15	110:8 111:14	transmit	
10:22	97:12	139:5	124:14	59:13	
tax	test	theyre	125:12	transmittal	
94:3	39:8 48:12	68:16 120:16	134:17,18	55:3	
tch	125:15	130:12	142:5 147:23	transmitted	
4:20,21,22,23	tested	138:21,22	times	56:23,24 61:19	
55:19,20	43:13 48:18	145:4,5	25:21 71:22	63:11 66:1,8	
58:9 91:12	testified	thing	72:1 137:9	68:17	
92:16 94:16	7:14 33:1	6:9,12 20:1,2	117:4,7,9	transpired	
95:6 97:21	50:13 65:11	26:1,14	timing	66:7	
108:19,23	102:12 133:6	40:10 43:1	33:9	tressler	
111:6 114:9	138:13	57:13 75:24	tinaglia	3:2	
118:2 120:1	141:20 142:8	93:17	91:13 92:13	truck	
127:23	testify	things	94:24 96:4	19:6 84:17,19	
145:11,16,19	42:21 138:2,7	6:8 11:14,15	102:17	84:19	
146:3,7,11	testimony	14:21 29:6,9	143:12	true	
teach	33:14 34:2	30:12 45:8	today	14:18 48:22,23	
125:13	35:3,18,20	50:6 57:10	5:17 12:5	49:1 52:8	
teaches	50:16 65:14	92:7,18,20	39:12 56:16	61:12 65:6	
127:8	68:6,23 84:4	121:18	62:19 68:6	65:10 99:15	
teaching	101:23	123:14 124:7	68:23 144:15	133:6 134:5	
10:15,17,21	107:10 133:3	124:15	today's	134:12 136:4	
technically	133:5 134:15	125:12	129:18	136:12	
61:21	141:9 147:5	127:19 128:4	told	139:22 149:8	
technique	147:18	129:3 141:16	81:3 83:2,4	truly	
23:9 25:15	testing	think	87:13 113:11	8:10 67:13	
27:9,11	44:1 124:17	13:22 14:7	tool	trustee	
29:23 40:5,7	texas	27:22 29:16	26:10	3:16,18 5:17	
techniques	28:18 127:2	31:24 33:20	tools	5:18	
25:10,11 31:16	text	33:21 36:21	26:6	trustees	
47:14 48:1	21:11,13,14	42:9,23 55:2	top	2:12 3:19	
tell	25:5 89:12	55:24 56:17	114:22	try	
7:22 8:13 9:2	90:12 103:19	62:7 63:4	total	24:7 70:8	
9:12 10:4,12	textbook	64:20 65:16	36:21 78:11	112:19	
10:15 11:13	90:2,4,7 92:12	66:6,18	totally	128:14	
13:11 14:14	tflp	67:12 70:9	120:16,17,18	trying	
14:21 15:21	55:14,18,19	73:2,3 78:24	touche	28:15 88:6	
16:9 17:1,17	thank	80:4,4 92:6	137:12	125:16	
17:24 18:6,7	6:1 36:7,12	95:22 107:21	track	turn	
19:14 20:19	49:16 53:16	114:7 116:24	18:13	73:24 92:15	
22:18 29:13	53:24 90:21	123:5 125:2	traffic	98:14 103:22	
33:4 34:17	91:7 119:7	142:21 147:6	18:15 19:7	106:10	
67:18,24	122:5 128:24	147:17	trailers	109:15	
76:10 80:17	132:1,8	third	18:23	119:24	
80:21,22	141:1 145:23	87:22 109:16	transaction	two	
81:18 87:8	148:1	thomas	38:22 39:6,10	6:8,14 15:5	
108:8 113:1	thats	127:4	transactions	19:9 24:6	
121:11	7:2 13:6,16,18	thought	39:7 42:1	44:7 52:11	
126:22	21:17 24:14	34:2 124:13	77:22	53:10,14	
130:23	25:13 29:19	137:8	transcript	54:20 58:4,5	
telling	30:8,14	thousand	1:10 149:9	86:20 87:7	
87:15 113:17	37:16 38:5	79:16,23 80:1	transfer	95:1 96:4,19	
tells	39:10,22	three	1:8 17:16 18:4	108:20	
39:24	52:24 56:17	17:19 21:23,24	18:4,5,23	111:13	
ten	57:24 61:21	22:4 26:24	19:19 30:22	112:15	
9:16,17 62:21	63:9 64:5	48:11 49:22	31:21 32:4,7	121:21 122:7	
147:15,21	68:17 70:6	51:17 53:10	32:12 36:20	123:22 124:3	
tender	71:4,8,15	53:14 60:15	43:12 47:4,5	124:14 126:4	
36:7	75:24 78:1	62:5 82:13	47:9 49:22	127:22,24	
term	78:20 81:8	83:9,10,16	52:6 53:5,7	129:7,8,8	
14:8 15:10	83:15 85:17	83:20 84:12	53:11 70:18	143:13 145:3	
17:11 19:17	89:21 90:4,7	98:11 120:3	73:18 82:6	twocar	
25:2,17	91:19 96:14	123:3 147:4	83:20 84:12	24:1,5,6,9	
27:13 30:14	97:4 101:20	147:10	86:13 87:1	type	
33:22 38:16	102:7 103:16	tied	87:17,20	23:7 24:4	
42:14 43:8	105:12 107:5	21:1 40:12	89:4,24 92:5	types	

uspap 11:5 64:3,19 65:18 111:19	100:1 version 56:24 57:22 63:10 68:5 68:14,15,16 146:12	28:12 34:12 39:4 42:12 50:22 57:7 59:18 66:19 70:8 122:22 125:4 131:14 138:3	119:21,23 120:13,15 121:2 126:12 127:16	85:22 133:8 133:8	14:14 15:16 36:2,6 37:16 37:17 54:2 58:7 87:22 87:23 90:24 98:14,20 127:23
utilize 90:20 123:4 125:22	63:10 68:5 68:14,15,16 146:12	59:18 66:19 70:8 122:22 125:4 131:14 138:3	worked 54:6 91:9	000 24:10,10 117:12 144:11,12	20 25:19 84:7,17
utilized 31:4 32:10 50:21 74:24 77:21 94:24 130:20	versions 58:2 59:13	weak 13:23	working 8:18 16:6 59:2 60:14,19 86:10	02 90:24	2008 96:6
utilizing 26:9 130:23	versus 123:17	weakness 13:23	world 129:18	0301 1:7	2010 76:12,18
<hr/> V <hr/>	vicinity 116:11	website 52:7	worth 9:21	084003293 1:24	2011 91:13
vacant 129:15	view 26:13 57:1	week 47:1 50:2	wouldnt 42:24 71:16 119:19 124:24	<hr/> 1 <hr/>	2013 1:12 55:7,10
valuation 9:9 10:10 15:10 22:13 64:24 74:18 89:6 100:7 108:13 120:18 124:9 124:9 129:9	villa 116:17,18	weight 82:22	wrote 70:24 98:11	1 4:18 6:14,15 6:23 8:4 31:13 36:1,6 54:1 103:5 105:1 107:7 107:9 116:14 117:17,20,23 127:23	21st 60:22
valuations 9:10	village 1:1,2 2:13,17 3:4,16,18 5:3,4,12,16 5:16,20 7:5 36:1 57:14 59:3 60:23 63:23 66:23 67:4 68:7,24 69:8,11,14 69:16,20 74:7 75:12 75:20,21 76:10 80:18 80:20 87:11 105:6 108:16 116:7,22 117:1,7 140:9	went 17:9 18:10 20:8 31:4 36:23 77:17 80:4,4 116:2 123:21 126:24 128:6 145:11	<hr/> X <hr/>	10 1:13 25:19 37:16,16 55:3,10 56:19,22 57:5,7,19 68:15,16,19 68:20 114:9 115:4 118:3 118:3 120:1	24 6:22 46:7,24 50:1 132:18 133:9 134:16 134:19 141:14,20,23 142:18 143:2
value 23:19,20,23 24:2,9 31:22 32:2,2,14 46:3 60:8,10 67:9,20 70:11,20 72:6 78:17 88:19 89:8 89:15,20 90:16 94:6 94:10 95:1 95:14,16 96:20 97:6 111:11 112:11 130:4 143:24	villages 74:10,12	west 17:7 79:12,15	x 4:1,15	<hr/> Y <hr/>	25 78:9
valuations 9:10	virtually 10:22	whats 63:6 86:7 104:4 127:17 127:20 137:24	yard 107:4,4 129:18 129:19	year 10:1 106:17 123:22	2nd 1:11
value 23:19,20,23 24:2,9 31:22 32:2,2,14 46:3 60:8,10 67:9,20 70:11,20 72:6 78:17 88:19 89:8 89:15,20 90:16 94:6 94:10 95:1 95:14,16 96:20 97:6 111:11 112:11 130:4 143:24	visibility 118:12 119:11	whichever 68:5	yeah 28:18 59:11 67:23 78:1 108:24	year 10:1 106:17 123:22	3 1:13 13:6,15 13:24,24 15:2,5,12,16 15:18 19:22 20:24 22:9 22:16 33:8 33:18 34:14 35:8,8,14 60:5 65:18 66:10,12,13 66:16 76:9 98:6 99:18 100:9,13,22 103:22 106:10 121:8 121:15 122:9 143:17,20
values 22:10 32:20 82:10 112:5 115:18 123:17,20 125:8 136:24 139:2 140:2	visit 16:11 37:13 38:10	whos 28:18 59:11	yeah 28:18 59:11 67:23 78:1 108:24	year 10:1 106:17 123:22	11 55:4,9 68:18 70:14 75:15 96:10 128:1
variable 46:21	visitation 52:6	wish 146:23	year 10:1 106:17 123:22	years 9:21 10:22 25:20 54:20 91:10 102:24 105:4 108:20 121:21 122:7 123:18,23	112 106:10
variables 24:7 27:17,23 29:5,8,17,17 46:16 125:22 126:7,16	visited 16:1 17:19	withstand 107:24	yesterday 33:13 34:3	year 10:1 106:17 123:22	12 1:12 76:20
variances 26:5	visits 16:10	witness 4:2 7:8,9,13 36:8 86:22 95:8 96:1 104:15 118:24 119:7 120:23 122:5 122:14,21 131:20 134:12 135:5 136:5,12 138:7 139:10 140:12 141:1 142:16 147:5	youre 7:3 12:5 15:12 24:18,20 25:7,8 45:20 46:1,23 64:9 64:14,22 68:5 88:8 90:11 117:11 119:24 122:3 122:14 125:17 127:19 132:13 146:22	123 4:8	128 4:9
variation 28:4 30:3,19 39:23 128:10 131:8	visual 26:19	wondered 123:14	youre 7:3 12:5 15:12 24:18,20 25:7,8 45:20 46:1,23 64:9 64:14,22 68:5 88:8 90:11 117:11 119:24 122:3 122:14 125:17 127:19 132:13 146:22	128 4:9	12th 65:23
various 25:21,21 42:1 126:8	volunteering 70:24	words 12:23 21:3 125:17	zoned 136:20 138:21 144:10	132 4:10	13th 21:15 90:10
vehicle 37:7	<hr/> W <hr/>	work 9:21 11:3 12:12,13,19 12:19 13:1,4 13:16,17,20 19:16,18 31:11,18 34:4,10,11 47:22,24 48:17,20 50:22 54:7 60:17,21 61:16 66:2 67:15,16 69:4,6 71:14 74:17 78:2 97:9 99:17 100:8 112:3 112:12 113:3 113:6,14,18 113:24 116:18,21	zoning 93:24 102:21 117:4,8 144:5,8	132 4:10	13th 21:15 90:10
vehicles 18:21 37:2,5	wait 93:11 115:5	wondered 123:14	<hr/> Z <hr/>	132 4:10	14 73:24
verbal 60:10 63:20	walked 79:5	wondered 123:14	zoned 136:20 138:21 144:10	141 4:12	145 4:20
verification 77:17	wanted 29:3 79:20	wondered 123:14	zoning 93:24 102:21 117:4,8 144:5,8	145 4:20	146 4:21,22,23
verified 41:20	wasnt 40:17 46:16 68:9 82:18 119:20 121:5	wondered 123:14	<hr/> 0 <hr/>	146 4:21,22,23	15 25:19 75:15 98:19
verify 27:6 41:22 72:22 77:2,6 77:14 78:4	waste 3:12 5:10 83:12,19 86:10	wondered 123:14	00 1:12 37:16,16 37:16,17 85:12,13,13 85:18,19,22	15 25:19 75:15 98:19	4 24:10 34:6,14 34:16,18,24 85:22 133:8

4:22 97:19 97:21 98:1 98:14 108:19 109:15 111:6 114:9 118:3 120:1 146:7					
49 4:6					
<hr/> 5 <hr/>					
5 55:1,7 56:14 57:23 68:14					
51 4:23 55:14,18 58:9 127:23 146:11,14					
53 4:7					
55 103:10 104:2					
5minute 90:24					
5th 58:22 63:6 128:2					
<hr/> 6 <hr/>					
6 4:4 24:10 85:12,13,18 85:19 96:6 101:6					
<hr/> 7 <hr/>					
7 46:7,24 50:1 141:14,23 142:18 143:2					
70 11:20					
73 94:18					
<hr/> 8 <hr/>					
8 85:22 106:12 109:15 133:8					
83 17:12					
<hr/> 9 <hr/>					
9 60:20 61:2 85:13 111:6					
92 104:18					