| Q. Incentive zoning? A. Incentive zoning? A. Incentive zoning would not attain the - or approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Of course, I don't believe that incentive zoning would not attain the - or approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Of course, I don't believe that the City believes that it would generate the same number of affordable units. C. D. the proposal's objectives - all right. So you don't have an independent belief that that alternative is not reasonable. Varie simply challenging the City's statement that they don't think incentive zoning would - The proposal's objectives - all right. So you don't have an independent belief that that alternative is not reasonable. Varies imply challenging the City's statement that they don't think incentive zoning would - The proposal's objectives - all right. So you don't have an independent belief that that alternative is not reasonable. Varies imply challenging the City's statement that they don't think incentive zoning would - The proposal's objectives of the proposal's objectives of the proposal's objectives of the proposal's objectives of the proposal's objectives. I man, the City has told you? A. The control objectives in the proposal's objectives of the proposal? MR. WEBER. Visit of the case on you own analysis of the case objectives. I was not be all the proposal's objective of the proposal's objective of the proposal's objective of the proposal's objective of the proposal's objective | | Page 65 | | Page 67 |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 2 A Incentive zoning. 3 Q. Now, why do you believe that incentive zoning would not attain the - or approximate the objectives of the proposal? 5 A. Of course, I don't believe that the City believes that it would generate the same number of afforciable units. 7 Q. Do the proposal's objectives – all right. So you don't have an independent belief that that atternative is not reasonable. You're simply challenging the City's statement that they don't think incentive zoning would – 11 MR. WEBER: I'm going to object to this line of questioning. This is going well belyond the scope of the direct testimony. Now Mr. Bricklin is postulating now asking the witness about those. I mean – 12 Question of the proposal is that they don't think in the been discussed in a saking the witness about those. I mean – 13 A mR. BRICKLIN: Maybe I misunderstood. I thought he earlier testimony of – including incentive zoning were not reasonable alternatives. 14 A mR. WEBER: No, I don't think anyone mentioned incentive zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that – 22 I mean, that the Appelliant's contentions that alternatives that was taking about. 23 I mad find not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word incentive zoning. "You're now going down a different road. 24 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was taking about. 25 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was shat – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was taking about. 26 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was shat – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he make that as an original direct testimony, and at this point. So if a sustained. 26 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point. So if a sustained. 26 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds an | 1 | | 1 | MR. BRICKLIN: He didn't have to mention it. I asked him |
| a tain the — or approximate the objectives of the proposal? A Cl course, I don't believe that the City believes that it would generate the same number of affordable units. A Cl course, I don't believe that the City believes that it would generate the same number of affordable units. C Do the proposal's objectives — all right. So you don't have an independent belief that that afternative is not reasonable. You're simply challeniging the City's statement that they don't think incentive zoning would — 10 | | NAT 1987 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 200 20 | | |
| attain the – or approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Of course, I don't believe that the City believes that if would generate the same number of affordable units. D. De the proposal's objectives – all right. So you don't have an independent belief that that atternative is not reasonable. You're simply challenging the City's statement to that they don't think in enteritive zoning would – MR. WEBER: I'm going to object to this line of direct testimony. Now Mr. Bricklin is postulating new aliation, the statement was not income that the direct testimony. Now Mr. Bricklin is postulating new aliation, the statement was not income the control of the case. MR. BRICKLIN: Mapple insunderstood. I thought he restified that the alternatives that haven't been discussed in easily et testimost elementary of – including income that the control of the case. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: Mapple insunderstood. I thought he restified that the alternatives that haven't been discussed in easily et testimony of – including income that the case of the control of the case. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: How shad he testificate to was that – I mean, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives that don't involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word "nocentive zoning." You've now going down a different road. Page 68 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was taking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, fro objecting to the line of questioning. HEARNE EXAMINEE: the responded to a question about the objectives of the proposal? A power than the area oniginal deflect testimony. And at this point. So if a sustained. Q (By Mr. Bricklin) is believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives that you desired the objectives of the Proposal? A power than the control of the case. Page 80 Q bost the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the prop | 3 | Market again to the Section of the S | 3 | No. 020 Wind Start 5 3 300 Minut 12 Wind Starts 10 100 Minut 12 |
| vould generate the same number of affordable units. 7 | 4 | | 4 | |
| would generate the same number of affordable units: Do the proposal's objectives – all right. So you don't have an independent belief that that alternative is not reasonable. Vou're simply challenging the City's statement that they don't think incentive zoning would – MR. WEBER: I'm going to object to this line of questioning. This is going well beyond the scope of the direct testimony. Now Mr. Brickish is postulating new alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and alternatives that haven't been discussed in earlier testimony of – including incentive zoning were not reasonable afternatives that have been discussed in earlier testimony of – including incentive zoning were not reasonable afternatives would not meet those objectives? MR. WEBER: No. I don't think what he testified to was that – want and the development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word "incentive zoning," You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he washe hat as an original direct testimony. And at this point. So it's sustained. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to pour question, rm objection in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. MR. WEBER: Well, in response of a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. Quest Mr. Bricklin So let the go back them — let me revind, go back to when (inaudible). MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. | 5 | Characteristics and account of the control of the c | 5 | Virtual Changes Pall Control C |
| 2. O. De the proposal's objectives — all right. So you don't have an independent belief that that alternative is not reasonable. You're simply challenging the City's statement that they don't think incentive zoning would — that they don't think incentive zoning would — that they don't think incentive zoning would — questioning. This is going well beyond the scope of the questioning. This is going well beyond the scope of the alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and asking the witness about hose. I mean — the testified that the alternatives tool. I thought he testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in earlier testimony. For including incentive zoning were not reasonable alternatives. I mean, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives are including incentive zoning were not reasonable alternatives. I mean, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives are including incentive zoning were not reasonable alternatives. The proposal didn't need to be considered. He never used the word didn't need to be considered. He never used the word alternative zoning. "You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said — his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that — he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was taking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. MR. WEBER: the collectives of the proposal. A read the device was in Interpreted the objectives. A lineary to would not a the thought process you went through in reaching that conclusion? A lineary to would not make that statement to wou that they would not a the thought process you went through in reaching that conclusion? A lineary did not involve increases in development capacity conclusions. A lineary did not involve increases in development capacity and the proposal of the proposal of the proposal of t | 6 | 0.00 C 0. | 6 | Expensive Secretary Secret |
| have an independent belief that that alternative is not reasonable. You're simply challenging the City's statement that they don't think incentive zoning would — MR. WEBER: I'm going to object to this line of that they don't think incentive zoning would — MR. WEBER: No going well beyond the scope of the direct testimory. Now Mr. Brickill is postulating new alternatives that have been discussed in asking the witness about those. I mean — MR. BRICKLIN: Maybe I misunderstood. I thought he aeriler testimory of — including incentive zoning were not reasonable alternatives. The control of that the alternatives that have been discussed in earlier testimory of — including incentive zoning were not reasonable alternatives. The control of | 7 | | 7 | |
| that they don't think incentive zoning would – MR. WEBER: I'm going to object to this line of a direct testimory. Now Mr. Bricklin is postulating new additionally the scope of the direct testimory. Now Mr. Bricklin is postulating new additionally the scope of the asking the witness about those. I mean — MR. BRICKLIN: Maybe I misunderstood. I thought he saking the witness about those. I mean — MR. BRICKLIN: Maybe I misunderstood. I thought he saftier testimony of — including incentive zoning were not reasonable afternatives. MR. WEBER: No, I don't think anyone mentioned incentive zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that — 22 I mean, that the Appealants' contentions that alternatives 23 that did not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word 24 didn't need to be considered. He never used the word 25 "incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 66 AMR. BRICKLIN: He said — his testimony about 90 seconds 29 ago was that — he agreed that incentive zoning was what he 30 was talking about. Page 66 AMR. BRICKLIN: He said — his testimony about 90 seconds 29 ago was that — he agreed that incentive zoning was what he 30 point — and because he asid it in response to your question, I'm 20 diple in the about 1 miscentive zoning but he didn't — that didn't reach back and 30 miscentive zoning but he didn't — that didn't reach back and 30 point — and because he asid it in response to a previous 9 point— and because he asid it in response to a previous 9 point— and because he asid it in response to a previous 9 point— and because he asid it in response to a previous 9 point— and because he proposal? Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then — let me rewind, 30 point— and because he its point. So its sustained, 10 point and 10 poi | 8 | | 8 | Q. Right. And my question is: Is your testimony to that |
| MR. WEBER: I'm going to object to this line of questioning. This is going well beyond the scope of the discussioning. This is going well beyond the scope of the alternatives testimony. Now Mr. Brickinis postulating new alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in the testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in reasonable alternatives. MR. RRICKLIN: Maybe I misunderstood. I thought he reasonable alternatives that have been discussed in reasonable alternatives. MR. WEBER: Not, I don't think anyone mentioned incentive zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that — Large in the didn't need to be considered. He never used the word incentive zoning, if you're now going down a different road. Page 65 MR. BRICKLIN: He said — his testimony about 90 seconds go was that — he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARNIG EXAMINER: He responded to a question about make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point. So it's ustained, and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point is a said in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained, go back to when (inaudible). What are — what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A Excluding — just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. MR. WEBER: Neth (in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection of the proposal of the proposal? A Excluding — just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. MR. WEBER: I'men with objection. MR. WEBER: All many and intere | 9 | reasonable. You're simply challenging the City's statement | 9 | effect based on your own analysis or is it based on what the |
| questioning. This is going well beyond the scope of the direct testimony. Now Mr. Bricklin is postulating new alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and asking the witness about those. I mean - was asking the witness about those. I mean - testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in the value of the consider. The proper is that did not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word "incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 65 Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said — his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that — he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was altaing about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARNIG EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't — that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point. Soil's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then — let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are — what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objective have proposed. A many of the half and the collections of the Proposal? A. Excluding — just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: renew my objection. MR. WEBER: renew my | 10 | that they don't think incentive zoning would | 10 | City has told you? |
| questioning. This is going well beyond the scope of the direct testimony. Now Mr. Bricklin is postulating new alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and asking the witness about those. I mean - was asking the witness about those. I mean - testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in the value of the consider. The proper is that did not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word "incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 65 Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said — his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that — he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was altaing about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARNIG EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't — that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point. Soil's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then — let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are — what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objective have proposed. A many of the half and the collections of the Proposal? A. Excluding — just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: renew my objection. MR. WEBER: renew my | 11 | MR. WEBER: I'm going to object to this line of | 11 | A. I read the objectives and I interpreted the objectives. |
| alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and asking the witness about those. I mean — testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in earlier testimony of — including incentive zoning were not reached that the alternatives. MR. WEBER: No, I don't think anyone mentioned incentive zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that—22 I mean, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives that did not involve increases in development capacity and didn't need to be considered. He never used the word a didn't need to be considered. He never used the word a gao was that—he agreed that incentive zoning," You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said—his testimony about 90 seconds was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, rm be objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about increase and recipinal direct testimony. And at this point—and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross desart necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So its sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then—let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are—what's an example of alternatives that you provide the proposal? A box of you have the EIS in front of you there? A conspiration of MHA and for the proposal? A limit. Let's go to the—the thin thild bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A man of the proposal? A man of the proposal of nouseholds; do housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see ther? A man of the proposal? A man of the proposal of the proposal? A man of the proposal? A man of the proposal of the proposal? A condition of the proposal? A condition of which—you kneed the proposal? A condition of which—you kneed the proposal? A condition of the proposal? A condition of the proposal? A condition of the proposal? A conditi | 12 | | 12 | Q. Right. No, I know you read the objectives. But in terms of |
| asking the witness about those. I mean — MR. BRICKLIN: Maybe I misunderstood. I thought he acriler testimenty of — including incentive zoning were not reasonable alternatives. MR. WEBER: No, I don't think anyone mentioned incentive zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that — 12 I mean, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives that did not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word "incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, Pro objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't – that didn't reach back and point — and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin)'s Del true go back then — let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. is more — MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: There's an objection. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: There's an objection. MR. WEBER: There's an objection. | 13 | direct testimony. Now Mr. Bricklin is postulating new | 13 | ruling saying these other alternatives are not reasonable |
| MR. BRICKLIN: Maybe I misunderstood. I thought he testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in erasonable alternatives that have been discussed in erasonable alternatives. MR. WEBER: No, I don't think wan be testified to was that - large in think was the testified to was that - large in that did not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testified to was that - large incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Vell, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question and see that as an original direct testimony. And at this point – and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin's) so te me go back then – let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are – what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A in some – MR. WEBER: Relarce may be objection. MR. WEBER: Relarce may be idection. MR. WEBER: Relarce may be alternatives would not meet the the upcombination of the proposal? A Description of the proposal? MR. Description of the proposal? A Description of the proposal. MR. WEBER: Relarce may be objection. MR. WEBER: Relarce may be identified to wash that — through in reaching that baleer through it set through it pack do the objectives? D. Ou be seen the condition. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning as a means of doing that' MR. WEBER: Again, you'r | 14 | alternatives that haven't been mentioned by anyone and | 14 | because they would not have achieved these objectives, is |
| testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in earlier testimony of – including incentive zoning were not personable alternatives. MR. WEBER: No, I don't think anyone mentioned incentive zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that – tanen, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives that did not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word "incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, Pm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't – that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Brickkin) So let me go back them – let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are – what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. No. Weber: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Velli prepasal renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Velli prepasal renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Tenew my objection. MR. WEBER: Tenew my objection. MR. WEBER: Tenew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 15 | asking the witness about those. I mean | 15 | that based on your own analysis of those alternatives or is |
| accomplish alternatives. Reg 66 Reg 87 MR. BEBER. Yell, in response to your question, fm objecting to the line of questioning. The Atlant analysis did you and to generate altie number of units? MR. WEBER. So can you tell me the thought process you went through in reaching that conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion. A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my conclusion? A No what analysis did you | 16 | MR. BRICKLIN: Maybe I misunderstood. I thought he | 16 | your conclusion based on the City's statement to you that |
| reasonable alternatives. MR. WEBER: No, I don't think anyone mentioned incentive zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that — 12 | 17 | testified that the alternatives that have been discussed in | 17 | they would not that those alternatives would not meet |
| MR. WEBER: No, I don't think anyone mentioned incentive zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that — 21 Inean, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives that did not involve increases in development capacity 23 that did not involve increases in development capacity 24 didn't need to be considered. He never used the word 25 "incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. 26 baked into the cake. 27 MR. BRICKLIN: He said — his testimony about 90 seconds 29 ago was that — he agreed that incentive zoning was what he 29 was taking about. 30 was taking about. 31 involve incentive zoning was what he 30 was taking about. 32 MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm 34 objecting to the line of questioning. 35 MR. WEBER: Well in response to a previous 39 point — and because he said it in response to a previous 39 point — and because he said it in response to a previous 30 question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from 31 raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. 36 What are — what's an example of alternatives that you 30 believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate 30 the objectives of the proposal? 31 MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. 42 MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. 43 MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. 44 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 10 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 10 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 11 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 12 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 13 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 14 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 15 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 15 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 16 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 17 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 17 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 18 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. 19 M | 18 | earlier testimony of including incentive zoning were not | 18 | those objectives? |
| zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that I mean, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives that did not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word didn't need to be considered. He never used the word fincentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARINOS EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't - that didn't reach back and point - and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross deesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then - let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). Wat are - what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A linosme - Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A linosme - MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 19 | reasonable alternatives. | 19 | A. No, they did not make that statement to me. That's my |
| Iman, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives that did not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he wast alking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting but he didn't – that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point – and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then – let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible), go back to when (inaudible), a means of doing that? A Excluding – just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 20 | MR. WEBER: No, I don't think anyone mentioned incentive | 20 | conclusion. |
| that did not involve increases in development capacity didn't need to be considered. He never used the word "incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 66 Rage 68 Rage | 21 | zoning in direct. I think what he testified to was that | 21 | Q. All right. So can you tell me the thought process you went |
| didn't need to be considered. He never used the word "incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said – his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that – he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't – that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point – and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then – let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you — A low, First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 — or 3216, you know, all of which — you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning and integral element of the City's prior planning direction for Mi-IA and for the proposal. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then — let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are — what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A Yes. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A Um-hum. A line me Can be divided the self-in a literatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A yep. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A line me Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A Um-hum. A line me Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A Um-hum. Charling ExAm | 22 | I mean, that the Appellants' contentions that alternatives | 22 | through in reaching that conclusion? |
| Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said — his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that — he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't — that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point— and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you — A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 — or 3216, you have, if any one without — you know, I read the bejectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then — let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are — what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding — just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. I nsome — D. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. I nsome — D. A Weber: I renew my objection. A. I nsome — D. A MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. D. A Correct. | 23 | that did not involve increases in development capacity | 23 | A. I looked at the objective and I said they could not |
| Page 66 MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you - A Cway. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 - or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the City Council's resolution 2316 - or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the City Council's resolution 2316 - or 3216, you for all tread the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 - or 3216, you whort elide the City Council's resolution 2316 - or 3216, you where the City Council's resolution 2316 - or 3216, you whort elide the City Spring life the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposa | 24 | didn't need to be considered. He never used the word | 24 | accomplish that objective without upzoning. Upzoning is |
| MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. A Conect. Wh. What are what's an example of alternative zoning as a means of doing that? A In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 25 | "incentive zoning." You're now going down a different road. | 25 | baked into the cake. |
| MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. A Conect. Wh. What are what's an example of alternative zoning as a means of doing that? A In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | | | | |
| ago was that — he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't — that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point — and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then — let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What analysis did you — A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 — or 3216, you know, all of which — you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MrHA and for the proposal. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then — let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What analysis did you — A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 — or 3216, you know, all of which — you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MrHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. D. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first — well, let's go to the — the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. A. Um-hum. A. Im-hum. A. Um-hum. A. Um-hum. A. Im-hum. A. Im-hu | | Page 66 | | Page 68 |
| involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. A. Doso the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 1 | portential international states of the color | 1 | Next William on 1977 to 1980 to 19 |
| MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't — that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point — and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then — let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are — what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding — just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. A. Excluding — just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. A. In some — MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds | 1 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives |
| objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 2 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he | 2 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't |
| HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Do so the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. HEARING EXAMINER: There's an objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 2 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. | 2 3 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? |
| incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposal that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 2 3 4 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm | 2 3 4 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you |
| make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point — and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then — let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are — what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding — just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some — MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 2 3 4 5 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. | 2 3 4 5 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. |
| point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 2 3 4 5 6 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about | 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you |
| question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I direction for MHA and for the proposal. 10 direction for MHA and for the proposal. 11 Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. 12 A. Yep. 13 Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? 4. Um-hum. 15 Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? 4. Um-hum. 17 Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? 20 A. Um-hum. 21 Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I |
| raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make |
| Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning |
| go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I A. Yes. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. |
| What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I A. Yes. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. C. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. C. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? Do you see there section 1.2, Object | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? |
| the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I A. Um-hum. Description of the proposal? A. Um-hum. A. Um-hum. A. Um-hum. A. Um-hum. C. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. Description of the proposal? Description of the proposal of the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. |
| the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding – just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I A. Um-hum. 17 Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. 20 A. Um-hum. 21 Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? |
| A Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. 18 refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? 20 a means of doing that? 21 A. In some 22 MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. 23 HEARING EXAMINER: There's an objection. 24 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I 27 Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? 20 A. Um-hum. 21 Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? 28 A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. |
| without upzones. 18 refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, 19 right? 20 a means of doing that? 21 A. In some 22 MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. 23 HEARING EXAMINER: There's an objection. 24 MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I 25 refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, 19 right? 20 A. Um-hum. 21 Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? 24 A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? |
| a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. HEARING EXAMINER: There's an objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I A. Um-hum. 21 Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. |
| A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. HEARING EXAMINER: There's an objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet |
| A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. HEARING EXAMINER: There's an objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I A. In some Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, |
| HEARING EXAMINER: There's an objection. 23 you see that? MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I 24 A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? |
| MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I 24 A. Correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of |
| 25 mean, he didn't just mention it. It's 25 Q. Now, are you is it your testimony were you focussing | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. HEARING EXAMINER: There's an objection. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | MR. BRICKLIN: He said his testimony about 90 seconds ago was that he agreed that incentive zoning was what he was talking about. MR. WEBER: Well, in response to your question, I'm objecting to the line of questioning. HEARING EXAMINER: He responded to a question about incentive zoning but he didn't that didn't reach back and make that as an original direct testimony. And at this point and because he said it in response to a previous question in cross doesn't necessarily prohibit the City from raising the objection at this point. So it's sustained. Q. (By Mr. Bricklin) So let me go back then let me rewind, go back to when (inaudible). What are what's an example of alternatives that you believe the appellants have proposed that do not approximate the objectives of the proposal? A. Excluding just requiring provision of affordable housing without upzones. Q. Does the city code currently provide for incentive zoning as a means of doing that? A. In some MR. WEBER: I renew my objection. HEARING EXAMINER: There's an objection. MR. WEBER: Again, you're asking for incentive zoning. I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. What analysis did you do to assess whether the alternatives that were discussed by the other witnesses that don't involve upzoning would not generate a like number of units? What analysis did you A. Okay. First of all, I read the summary of the HALA report. I read the City Council's resolution 2316 or 3216, you know, all of which you know, I read the objectives, I read the description of the proposal, all of which make upzoning an integral element of the City's prior planning direction for MHA and for the proposal. Q. So do you have the EIS in front of you there? A. Yep. Q. Can you turn to page 1.3, please? A. Yes. Q. Do you see there section 1.2, Objectives of the Proposal? A. Um-hum. Q. The first well, let's go to the the third bullet refers to the 6,200 units of income-restricted housing, right? A. Um-hum. Q. And the first bullet refers to an increase in production of housing more generally across broad ranges of households; do you see that? A. Correct. |