

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DEPARTMENT OF PERMITTING SERVICES
MONTGOMERY COUNTY

----- X
:
IgCC PUBLIC WORK SESSION :
:
----- X

A meeting in the above-entitled matter was held on
Wednesday, July 2, 2014, commencing at 2:04 p.m., in the
County Office Building, 100 Maryland Avenue, 1st Floor
Auditorium, Rockville, Maryland 20850, before:

MARK NAUMAN



ORIGINAL

INDEX

<u>STATEMENT OF:</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Mark Nauman	3
Daniel Coffey	7
Molly Hauck	14
Shaun Pharr	19
Virginia Sheard	21

P R O C E E D I N G S

1
2 MR. NAUMAN: I want to thank everyone for coming.
3 This is our fifth of six worksessions. This is our draft
4 worksessions, so to speak. This was to invite people to
5 give us input and comment on the IgCC. We're hoping to have
6 a finalized version ready to present to -- in legislative
7 form -- to present to council October 1st of this year. So,
8 as we go through the Summer, we're going to be having one,
9 maybe two more far more intense sessions which will be a
10 give and take as opposed to just give, which has been this
11 first round.

12 My name is Mark Nauman, I'm with the Montgomery
13 County Department of Permitting Services. And, I think most
14 everybody here knows me. All of these sessions and all of
15 the sessions that we will be having in the future are being
16 transcribed for accuracy. It takes about a week for us to
17 get the transcripts up on our website but, about this time
18 next week you should be able to read the transcripts. So
19 far, all of the comments that we've received over the last
20 year, give or take, we have posted up on our website. We
21 will continue to update that as time goes on, and we
22 progress through the Summer. So, check up on that.

23 I'm also going to be posting some additional
24 information, we're beginning a Twitter account for the
25 Department, and we have an e-subscription where, if you go

1 to our website, you'll be able to sign up for e-
2 subscriptions and you'll receive automatic e-mail updates as
3 it pertains to this and other issues with Permitting
4 Services.

5 In terms of housekeeping, because these are being
6 transcribed, we ask that anybody that wishes to speak, and
7 everyone can speak, we have three people scheduled to speak
8 today, but anyone that wishes to speak, I ask that you come
9 up here, give your name and feel free to speak freely.
10 These microphones really don't reach very far, so I ask that
11 you don't stand up and try to speak into them from back
12 there.

13 In terms of some additional information, and this
14 is going back to Chapter 7 which was supposed to have been
15 covered last week -- which deals with water, water reuse,
16 water administration -- just a little update to that, WSSC
17 is fully committed to the adoption of Chapter 7 and they're
18 fully willing to consider water reuse inside the building.
19 There are some concerns with that dealing with water quality
20 for flushing, for cleaning purposes. Any time wastewater,
21 whether it's reclaimed water or rainwater that's being store
22 and reused, any time it contacts their supply or waste
23 stream, they want to make sure that there is a level of
24 water treatment and safety for the occupants of the
25 building.

1 Two that end, I have begun a conversation with the
2 EPA to try to establish a protocol, a water safety protocol.
3 I hope to be able to have this completed this Summer and
4 made available by the time we roll out this code. But there
5 is a possibility that might not happen with this iteration
6 of the code, and it may not -- the water reuse indoor,
7 inside of the building -- may not take place until the next
8 code cycle.

9 I mentioned the Twitter account and e-mail
10 subscriptions, I'm going to be putting up some information.
11 One is Governor O'Malley and Maryland Department of the
12 Environment has an initiative called Zero Waste Maryland,
13 which is to, the goal is to virtually reduce waste and
14 maximize water usage in the State of Maryland by 2040. And
15 we're looking at goals of 90 percent, anywhere from 54 to 90
16 percent diversion from landfills, reuse, recycle, and this
17 also applies to stormwater, and water capture on site. So,
18 that would be gray water coming from HVAC systems, from
19 sinks, hand washing, things like that, laundries.

20 So, like I said, we're trying to establish a
21 protocol that WSSC will be comfortable with, and if we're
22 able to do that, we'll be moving forward. A group called
23 the Chesapeake Water Environmental Association has responded
24 to the draft document of Zero Waste Maryland, and they have
25 made some recommendations. I am going to be posting a link

1 to both of these documents. In addition, on July the 22nd,
2 there is a webinar. The webinar is water reuse in the
3 Chesapeake Bay Region, and it's a case study of three
4 projects that are moving forward with very innovative waste
5 water and water reuse programs. I would urge everybody to
6 sign up for this. It's a free webinar. I believe it's an
7 hour and a half long. But, I will be posting a link up on
8 this as well. Actually, Reggie will be posting a link.
9 I'll be giving him the information to get up on the website
10 So, watch out for our Twitter account. Hopefully, that will
11 be up in another week or so. And, if you are not on e-
12 subscription, go ahead and sign up. And, in lieu of that,
13 just check up on our website.

14 Going back to the fact that we're posting all
15 comments online, last week I asked that for these next two
16 sessions today, and our last session, session number six for
17 next week, I ask that people try to take the time to review
18 the comments that we have posted, and to take this time now
19 to comment on those comments. I'd ask that you avoid
20 commenting on your own comments, but comment on others.
21 Traditionally, as most of you know, these sessions have not
22 lasted very long, and I don't anticipate this one either,
23 but it's a short break from heat outside.

24 We have three people scheduled to speak today, but
25 we're not going to limit it to just these three individuals.

1 But I'll go ahead and invite people to speak in the order
2 that they have signed up, and the first one is Stephen Kirk
3 with DGS. And I don't think Stephen's here. No, okay. Dan
4 Coffey. Dan Coffey is with AIA PV, and USGBC.

5 MR. COFFEY: My name is Dan Coffey, representing
6 Potomac Valley AIA, as well as USGBC Montgomery County
7 Branch for the National Capital. We've worked on a fair
8 amount of comments back last, this time last year, and sort
9 of, a lot of our comments today are just sort of a quick
10 recap of those. And then I've got a few general things at
11 the end that I'd like to sort of propose out.

12 Anyway, the AIA Potomac Valley, we all know that
13 this endeavor through last Summer and then culminated with
14 some reports that we did on July 30th, and then did a
15 subsequent one on February 4th of this year which went
16 through the ASHRAE 189 comments as well. And, those
17 comments, when I went onto the website for the County, I was
18 having difficulty finding the link back to those documents.
19 I could see some of the other comments. Is all that in one
20 location on the website or is there?

21 MR. NAUMAN: Well, we have it -- Reggie, you're
22 best to answer this. Is it still in two locations on the
23 website?

24 MR. JETTER: The AIA --

25 MR. COFFEY: Right.

1 MR. JETTER: One location.

2 MR. COFFEY: We're just trying to see where that
3 information was because we had a fair amount of it, and we
4 just didn't want to have to resubmit duplicate information.

5 MR. NAUMAN: Certainly.

6 MR. COFFEY: That was one of your requests from
7 earlier.

8 MR. NAUMAN: Right. Ralph Bennett commented on it
9 last week that some of the IgCC comments were missing, so we
10 went back and made sure that they got posted. So I do
11 believe that all of it is up now.

12 MR. COFFEY: Okay, great. But anyway, the
13 American Institute of Architects and especially the Potomac
14 Valley Chapter, are all committed to green building in
15 Montgomery County as many of the members of participated in
16 green rating systems for the buildings that they've either
17 designed or worked on here in the County, and are committed
18 to the adoption of the codes which assist in reducing carbon
19 admissions, which I think is really the overarching goal
20 that we're trying to really focus on, with really the main
21 principles really is the sustainability, the environment,
22 economic impact as well as equity, is really sort of those
23 overarching principles of sustainability.

24 The brief summary of Chapters 8 and 9, and I won't
25 go through all of the lengthy comments that we had, that

1 we've got posted but, I'll just sort of highlight a couple
2 of the ones. That we suggested in some cases an appropriate
3 existing ASHRAE requirement may be substituted for some of
4 the new requirements. That we did not support the
5 requirements for separated rooms for printers, copiers,
6 janitorial rooms, given the advancement in the chemical
7 technologies and equipment that's being produced now that
8 we're not having near the environmental issues that we have
9 previously in some of the other technologies. So, we'd like
10 to have that re-looked at. That I think those things have
11 gotten a lot better.

12 The next item here is that we suggest the
13 omission, the requirements for a separate combustion air for
14 wood and biomass combustion, since this is a requirement
15 that already exists in the adopted codes currently, either
16 that or coordinate between those codes. Propose the
17 deletion of the requirements for eliminating certain
18 composite wood products since EPA will be regulating such
19 product soon, and compliant materials are now less available
20 and more expensive. So again, material, we need some
21 flexibility with this particular item as well as some
22 others. Materials are constantly evolving in trying to help
23 keep those things in check.

24 And then we suggest many of the acoustical
25 requirements be moved to Appendix A. The industry standards

1 vary, but in general, IgCC is more lenient than some of
2 those standards, and really in some of these buildings,
3 especially, you get into assembly use buildings and those
4 things, those acoustic requirements have a lot of very
5 special uniqueness' to them. Then we agree with DPS's
6 suggestion of moving the daylighting requirements.
7 Definitely, we agree. They are a lot of complexities and
8 trying to go through those and regulate those are going to
9 be a little difficult. So we agree until we can get some of
10 those things standardized. But daylighting is something
11 that would be helpful in the future. But, I think right now
12 until we can settle that one down.

13 I think those are my main comments on Chapter 8.
14 Again, the full comments that we've got are really the
15 comments that we had from back in last July. On Chapter 9,
16 this chapter really has a broad range of specialized
17 inspections and verifications for building systems going far
18 beyond existing protocols. One of the concerns here is that
19 if we roll out the commissioning spec as its currently in
20 there without editing it, we're concerned about, we've got a
21 huge learning curve for the industry. We've got a huge
22 shortage of qualified commissioning specialists to help us
23 do that, as well as establishing really good industry
24 standards. And, I think that's going to take probably a
25 year or two to at least get a good baseline settled down

1 with that. We're seeing a lot of variations on the
2 projects, and we just see that a big hurdle in front of us
3 that we need to work on. So we'd like to see that sort of
4 maybe in the first version of this pushed to more of an
5 elective concept, or something a little less stringent.

6 Table 903 lists the components, a recommended
7 inspection program which greatly exceeds the current norms.
8 This will require either more inspections than currently
9 required, or it also involves significant added expense and
10 effort for the authority having jurisdiction, Department of
11 Permitting Services, to administer. This may also open the
12 possibility of doing some third party inspections. So
13 again, some procedural things here need to be thought
14 through because that is a fairly lengthy process, and
15 because those inspections are scattered throughout the
16 project, not just at the end of completion. They're during
17 the whole construction sequence. That it is a pretty
18 significant administrative piece to administer on the
19 projects.

20 We're seeing some of the more significant projects
21 being built, and some of the institutional clients embarking
22 on those efforts with some success. So we think it is
23 something good. We just need to come up with a better plan
24 to administer it. So those are really my comments on
25 Chapter 9. Some of the other comments that we had, real

1 quick. The one that you touched on about posting the
2 comments. Is all that going to get posted in one central
3 spot, or will they be separated? The AIA comments right now
4 are in a separate location, or is everything getting
5 compiled into one --

6 MR. NAUMAN: We have everything in one location.

7 MR. JETTER: It's on one webpage.

8 MR. COFFEY: One webpage, but is it two links
9 within the page or is it all compiled into comments.

10 MR. NAUMAN: There are links to the individual
11 groups or the individual stakeholders that have made their
12 comments.

13 MR. COFFEY: Okay.

14 MR. NAUMAN: If you'd like to comment on how that
15 is done, please feel free to do so.

16 MR. COFFEY: Yeah, it's just gotten a little
17 confusing as we've -- we've gotten a lot of people asking us
18 for information along the way and sort of way they go to
19 find out the current comments and things. There's a number
20 of other jurisdictions sort of watching what we're doing
21 right now. One is the USGBC Maryland in the Baltimore area,
22 is going, they're a little step behind us right now, but
23 they are embarking on some pretty significant endeavors
24 along these lines as well. And the District is constantly
25 reevaluating their process and trying to, again, improve it

1 to make it more beneficial. So, they're just trying to sort
2 of see what we're thinking versus what they're
3 contemplating. And again, some dialogue sharing and
4 information sharing back and forth has been helpful because
5 they're seeing things that we don't and vice versa, which is
6 good.

7 In the interim also, well LEED be still left in as
8 an alternate compliance path? I got a little bit of mixed
9 information, at least in the sort term, and let that be an
10 owner decision as to whether they do LEED. Because in a lot
11 of cases, the LEED standard will be in excess of IgCC.
12 Because the IgCC was really a minimum code standard, whereas
13 the LEED is more of a strategy to strive for future
14 improvements.

15 MR. NAUMAN: Our intent is to, this would supplant
16 the current green building regulation, which would take LEED
17 of the table. You could still do it on a voluntary basis
18 but, in terms of the ability to not only review with
19 thoroughness without any ambiguities, we would also have
20 full enforcement capabilities, which also applies to the
21 ability to do on site inspections where, currently with the
22 LEED certification program we do not have that option. So
23 our intent is to move forward without LEED.

24 MR. COFFEY: There won't be a transition phase,
25 it'll be after this date LEED's off the table?

1 MR. NAUMAN: Correct.

2 MR. COFFEY: Okay. I think really those are my
3 major comments. Otherwise, the rest of the comments that we
4 had from previous we're still finding to be relevant.

5 MR. NAUMAN: Very good. All right, Dan, thank
6 you.

7 MR. COFFEY: Thank you.

8 MR. NAUMAN: Molly Hauck. Good afternoon.

9 MS. HAUCK: Good afternoon.

10 MR. NAUMAN: Here's one of my cards.

11 MS. HAUCK: Thank you. My name is Molly Hauck,
12 and I've lived in Kensington since 1982. I represent the
13 Committee to Save Kensington, a group of Kensington
14 residents that worked on reducing the level of density
15 allowed by the Kensington Sector Plan before it was passed
16 in March 2012. We remain concerned about the impacts of
17 high density on infrastructure such as roads and schools, as
18 well as the environment. This concern is heightened in non-
19 transit oriented areas such as Kensington. For example,
20 Kensington's Master Plan allows for three high density mixed
21 use buildings located where there are low density buildings
22 today, in the sites of Hardware City, Savannah, and
23 Metropolitan Avenue near the train tracks.

24 The plan also permits higher density office
25 buildings and more development in residential areas. I'm

1 testifying today in support of a mandatory building code to
2 replace the voluntary LEED program. One motivation for me
3 to speak today on behalf of the Committee to Save Kensington
4 is that we have been told that the carbon footprint of
5 Kensington will triple as a result of the new development
6 and new residents allowed by the Master Plan. And these
7 impacts are being allowed countywide. Kensington is only
8 one of the many sector plans that the Planning Board has
9 proposed and the County Council has passed, or is working
10 on. We know that we can do better in regulating how, not
11 just how much, the county grows in the critical near term as
12 the effects of climate change begin to cause so much in both
13 financial and environmental costs.

14 Chris Graham, a member of the Committee to Save
15 Kensington, spoke at a previous meeting outlining the
16 environmental impacts of development and how best to
17 mitigate the potential damage to the planet. We have the
18 ability to plan growth and the technology to allow both
19 development and the environmental to coexist and even thrive
20 together. We appreciate and agree with you, Mark Nauman,
21 that, your concern about climate change, and are glad that
22 you express that in the meetings, when you opened the
23 meeting on May 21st.

24 We hope that your work will help implement the
25 climate action plan passed by the County Council. We

1 advocate for the introduction of a mandatory building code
2 such as the IgCC rather than the voluntary LEED program. We
3 appreciate the many meetings scheduled to discuss the
4 details of implementing the IgCC in Montgomery County, and
5 including every stakeholder in the process. We support
6 holding some sessions during the evening so more residents
7 can participate. We encourage you to publicize these
8 meetings widely, and every way possible so more citizens can
9 find out about them and participate in them. We only found
10 out about them because of our ongoing interests, and only
11 one of our group heard about them.

12 Transparency is critical to the success of this
13 process. We regard the permitting department as one that
14 can regulate the otherwise unrestrained development allowed
15 by the master plans proposed by the Planning Board and
16 adopted by the County Council. Our goal is to draw
17 attention to how this building code will affect citizens and
18 environmentalist who have to live with the development and
19 its impacts. We encourage you to implement the strictest
20 building code possible that will require developers to
21 severely limit the carbon footprint of the buildings, and
22 add the most effective environmental amenities possible. We
23 support using the highest standards for water quality and
24 stormwater manage, tree canopy, and site design.

25 Whenever the IgCC is better than the current

1 Montgomery County Code, we encourage you to use it. I also
2 want to mention Virginia Sheard who is part of the Committee
3 to Save Kensington, who's back here. She's a real expert on
4 development in the county. We can and must do better for
5 future generations who will inherit our county. The time is
6 now. Thank you for your work.

7 MR. NAUMAN: Thank you, Ms. Hauck. May I ask you,
8 did you provide this electronically to us?

9 MS. HAUCK: I didn't. Not yet.

10 MR. NAUMAN: Okay, may I have a copy of that?

11 MS. HAUCK: Yeah.

12 MR. NAUMAN: Or if you can e-mail me a copy.

13 MS. HAUCK: I can e-mail it to you.

14 MR. NAUMAN: Okay, that would be great. Okay, we
15 have nobody else scheduled to speak, but we can make this a
16 free-for-all. Anybody that would like to comment, that
17 would be great. Mr. Coffey?

18 MR. COFFEY: Dan Coffey. The early comment that
19 you had made about the process from this point, so we're
20 going through the worksessions right now collecting comments
21 from various groups, and then in the Fall, the October
22 presentation you're going to be doing to County Council.
23 So, what I'm trying to figure out is when will be seeing a
24 draft of the proposed IgCC information? What I've seen so
25 far has been fairly brief on it, so it doesn't look like a

1 lot of changes are being made, or at least not a lot that's
2 been published yet. I guess, will there be a second
3 workgroup where we can do that review and have that
4 dialogue?

5 MR. NAUMAN: Yes, there will be. Possibly two
6 more. The intent, as I stated previously for this, was to
7 engage our stakeholders to look over the document, provide
8 input, give us the ability to digest it, and so I'm still
9 getting comments from other stakeholders which are rather
10 critical to this process. And, I'm hoping that by the end
11 of this month that will all be finalized. As I stated, I've
12 begun conversation with EPA to try to finalize Chapter 7,
13 our approach with Chapter 7. But, moving forward as those
14 are coming in, we're compiling all of this information. I'm
15 going through and doing a summary of it. And then we will
16 be doing our internal meetings, and we will make another
17 draft proposal, hopefully cleaned up along the lines of what
18 the comments and input that we have realized so far.

19 And, we're anticipating the next format to be more
20 of, you know, a dialogue, as opposed to just sitting and
21 listening. But, as I said, keep an eye on our website and
22 look in your mailbox and see what comes up. We'll let you
23 know when these do become available. We're on a very short
24 time schedule here though. October is going to be here
25 before we know it, and so, we may be limited to just one

1 more session that would be actual public comment on what we
2 consider to be our next to final draft. But that depends on
3 how well we make out this Summer.

4 MR. COFFEY: Okay.

5 MR. NAUMAN: Thank you. Yes?

6 MR. PHARR: I just have some follow-up to that.
7 When the department has -- this is also just a procedure
8 process question. Shaun Pharr with the Apartment and Office
9 Building Association. When the department is finally
10 settled on its formal draft, it's still then got to go
11 through the formal notice and comment rulemaking process, is
12 that correct?

13 MR. NAUMAN: That's correct, yes. And, we're
14 hoping to have that done by October 1st.

15 MR. PHARR: Okay. To have published by October
16 1st?

17 MR. NAUMAN: That's correct, yes. So we'll have
18 it available in a legislative form by then, and for final
19 comment. And then presentation to the legislative body to
20 move it forward.

21 MR. PHARR: Okay. But, is there, there's still
22 one more official public comment period, right? That'd be
23 30 days?

24 MR. NAUMAN: Correct. There will be at least one
25 more, yes.

1 MR. PHARR: From when you publish in the County
2 Register? Is that when, what's the triggering event?

3 MR. NAUMAN: That's correct. Yes.

4 MR. PHARR: You'll publish in the Register, 30
5 days, speak now or forever hold your piece, basically.

6 MR. NAUMAN: That's correct.

7 MR. PHARR: And is it the typical thing, if you
8 get comments and then decide even after all of this very
9 productive and admirable advanced effort to get everybody's
10 concerns about, if you decide based on comments that you, on
11 those formal comments, that you still need to make some
12 substantive revisions, do you, I'm just thinking about the
13 typical APA process. Do you have to republish as proposed
14 again?

15 MR. NAUMAN: Well, that could be done through
16 executive regulations and changes through executive
17 regulation. Nothing would be absolutely written in stone
18 unless it actually becomes part of Montgomery County
19 regulation. But, this is always going to be available for
20 amendment. This is a trial run for all of us. So, as we
21 move forward, if we find that there are things that are
22 really untenable for either side, we will be making changes.
23 So this is, it's a free form endeavor.

24 MR. PHARR: Got you. Okay, and you've got to have
25 council action, right?

1 MR. NAUMAN: Correct.

2 MR. PHARR: So you'll publish in the register,
3 comments period will run, assuming you don't make
4 significant changes at that point, as far as the executive
5 is concerned, they're final. The council's got to take
6 affirmative action to approve.

7 MR. NAUMAN: That's correct.

8 MR. PHARR: And then they will become effective
9 thereafter.

10 MR. NAUMAN: That's correct. And we're hoping for
11 an effective date of the first of next year.

12 MR. PHARR: Okay, thank you.

13 MR. NAUMAN: Okay, thank you. Anyone else? Yes?
14 Come own down, please. Thank you.

15 MS. SHEARD: My name is Virginia Sheard, S-H-E-A-
16 R-D. I live in Kensington View near Wheaton Plaza, and I'm
17 speaking as an individual because our land use and zoning
18 committee of our local association didn't know where to
19 start in analyzing or commenting on this whole thing. My
20 biggest concern is a piecemeal approach. That I don't see,
21 that what I've read is, you know, you have this big book
22 that you have to buy, and we did manage to get enough
23 donations to buy one for our community use, I think. That
24 the problem is that by going through chapter by chapter
25 you're editing specific content but you're not looking at

1 the big picture. And you're saying that this is a trial
2 run. We did that with the CR zone and we have to come back
3 and start amending it as soon as it was done. Likely the
4 zoning code rewrite, the same thing.

5 A lot of public hearings and then there are a lot
6 of things wrong with it when it's just ready to be
7 implemented. And the implementation phase of this is what
8 has been lacking. You need an analysis of all the agencies,
9 the departments, the staff, the inspectors on site, and all
10 of the interactions that anyone in the current code by
11 language, or by action, intersects with any parts of this
12 code, you need to know what they are. You need to know the
13 implications of applying whatever editorial changes, or
14 whatever administrative changes you make either by executive
15 regulation or elsewhere. You need to know exactly who's
16 going to be affected by this and how it's going to be
17 implemented.

18 And, that's not yet part of this process. And I
19 think it's lacking. And before you go to a draft that's
20 going to go to the council and here the same comment when
21 they have the public hearing there, I think it would behoove
22 you to come prepared to identify every single part of our
23 codes, our regulations, our policies, that intersect with
24 any of the content of the IgCC, and be prepared to identify
25 it, explain it, say why you are adopting it or not adopting,

1 or you're changing or whatever, before it gets to the
2 council. Because too many times in the last year at least,
3 and before that, things get to the council, it's a draft,
4 either from the 8787 Georgia, or from the Executive's
5 office, and immediately the council has questions. So I
6 hope that you will come prepared with the answers to the
7 questions before it gets to the council. Thank you.

8 MR. NAUMAN: Thank you. Anyone else? No? Okay.
9 Once again, I would like to recommend that you take a look
10 at all of the comments that we have posted online. Next
11 week will be our last proposed session. We do have in
12 waiting a seventh session if it becomes necessary. It's
13 really starting to look like it won't be necessary, at least
14 for this go round. But, please take a look at all of the
15 comments. It's a lot of material, and I realize that. And,
16 if you have any additional input on what has already been
17 proposed by the various stakeholders, and that is most of
18 the county agencies, that is the architects, Potomac Valley
19 AIA, MCPS, General Services, Park and Planning, WSSC. We
20 have a lot of input there.

21 And, this is all still up for consideration. We
22 have been working on this for over two years, and we are
23 engaging all of the stakeholders as much as is possible.
24 And, we are giving consideration to the administrative
25 aspect of this, and our reasons for moving forward will be

1 well articulated to both the public and to the council. So,
2 just to put your mind at ease.

3 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: When is the session next
4 week? You said the last session was next week, which is
5 July 9th. Did you mean July 16th?

6 MR. NAUMAN: I'm sorry, July the 16th. I've done
7 this for the last three times. So I'm very sorry. Thanks.
8 Okay. Anyone else? I want to thank everybody for coming.
9 Like I said, keep an eye out for tweets and e-mails, and our
10 website. And, we'll see everyone in two weeks.

11 (Whereupon, at 2:39 p.m., the meeting was
12 adjourned.)

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

√ Digitally signed by Keena Lukacinsky

ELECTRONIC CERTIFICATE

DEPOSITION SERVICES, INC., hereby certifies that the foregoing pages represent an accurate transcript of the electronic sound recording of the proceedings before the Montgomery County Department of Permitting Services, in the matter of:

IgCC PUBLIC WORK SESSION



Keena Lukacinsky

July 7, 2014