

## Rachel Pitzel

---

**From:** Brenda Martinez  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 10, 2011 8:23 AM  
**To:** Rachel Pitzel  
**Subject:** FW: Response Deadline on Villages/Lawson Hills Written Comments

**Importance:** High

Rach,

Please post on the website first thing this morning. Thanks!

---

**From:** Phil Olbrechts [<mailto:olbrechtslaw@gmail.com>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 09, 2011 11:09 PM  
**To:** Brenda Martinez  
**Cc:** 'Nancy Rogers'; Steve Pilcher  
**Subject:** Response Deadline on Villages/Lawson Hills Written Comments  
**Importance:** High

Brenda,

Please post the following email ASAP:

It appears that the written testimony exceeds 1,700 pages. This number excludes the prehearing motions and the development agreements and their exhibits. Under the current briefing schedule the Applicant will have to respond to these documents in one week's time. The Applicant is tasked with responding to the majority of these 1700+ pages in that one week period. I will probably be seeking additional time beyond the required ten days to issue my decision. In order to do so, for liability reasons, I will need the authorization of the Applicant. I propose that the response period be extended for an additional week, the reply period be extended to a total of four business days and that I have fifteen business days from the deadline of the reply documents to issue my decision. For all hearing participants, please email any objections to this proposal to Steve Pilcher, cc'd above, by 10:00 am on Thursday, 8/11/11. I will need the express authorization of the Applicant to proceed with this proposal.