

Brenda Martinez

From: Bob Edelman [<mailto:BobEdelman@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, October 26, 2011 11:37 AM
To: Brenda Martinez
Cc: Steve Pilcher
Subject: RE: Objections

The audio cannot be downloaded nor can the audio from October 24. I am not able to respond by 5:00 with a proper objection in the time available and without the audio record to review – I have medical appointments this afternoon and am unavailable after 1:00 pm.

In general, I object to Mr. Young being invited to reiterate and expand on his declaration. I replied to his declaration in Exhibit 256 on August 19. None of that information was considered in Council discussions with Mr. Young. His testimony was in the form of expert testimony complete with a long dissertation on his qualifications. There is no justification for allowing his additional testimony, particularly without allowing cross-examination.

There are two key issues which Mr. Young reiterated and emphasized. Both of these were addressed in my reply. The MPD conditions call for an outline of the “exact” terms and process for performing the fiscal analysis. Mr. Young claims that this is not practical and asserts that outlining methods to arrive at exact terms and processes meets the requirement. In effect he is challenging the MPD condition. The second issue which he also reiterated is that he presumes that part of the process requires his expert participation and review. There is nothing in the Development Agreements that requires such expert support during the process.

Bob Edelman

EXHIBIT

0-8