Public Hearings - Somerset county 1989 MSA_S1830-70

CRITICAL AREAS COMMISSION HEARING



Somerset Court House Corner of Prince William Street and Somerset Street Upper Floor Princess Anne, Maryland 21853

May 11, 1989, Thursday



FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

COURT REPORTING • DEPOSITIONS D.C. AREA 261-1902 BALT. & ANNAP, 974-0947

```
APPEARANCES:
   COMMISSION:
3
   Robert Price, Chairman
   Ronald A. Karasic
   Russell W. Blake
   Shepard Krech
   Thomas H. Ventre, Staff
   CITIZENS PRESENT:
7
   Dana Simson, Box 16, Frenchtown, MD 21867
8
   John F. Orth, Box 16, Frenchtown, MD 21867
   Randy Stadler, Box 33 Manokin, MD 21836
   John Rafter, Rt. 1, Box 245, Mt. Vernon, MD 21853
   Fred Ford, Rt. 1, Box 301, Marion Station, MD
   Nevette Muir, Upper Fairmount, MD 21867
   Atwood S. Barwick, Upper Fairmount, MD 21867
11
   Karl H. Zickrick, Upper Fairmount, MD 21867
   Bettie H. Zickrick, Upper Fairmount, MD 21867
12
   Howard E. Stone, Box 933, Upper Fairmount, MD 21867
   Virginia A. Stone, Box 233 Hall's Creek Rd. Upper Fairmount
13
   Mike Keene, Rumbly, MD
   Al Goetze, Rt. 5, Box 764, Easton, MD 21601
   Lee Quinn, Rt. 1, Box 142, Princess Anne, MD 21853
Robert L. Ditzel, Rt. 3, Box 145, Princess Anne, MD 21853
Gordon T. Hungerford, Box 25 Rumbley, Westover, MD 21871
15
   Joey Hungerford, Box 25 Rumbley, Westover, MD 21871
16
   James W. Hungerford, Box 204, Fairmount, MD
   Jackson Lee Cook, Upper Fairmount, MD 21867
17
   John J. Jordan, Box 52, Westover, MD
   Bobbi Stadler, no address given
18
19
21
22
```



. 3

ь

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Ladies and gentlemen, I think we can get started. We've got a tape recorder rather than court stenographer. My name is Robert Price and I'm a member of the Critical Areas Commission from Queen Anne's County. To my right is Ron Karasic from Baltimore City and Mr. Russell Blake from Pocomoke to my left and Doctor Shepard Krech --.

I may add that Mr. Ron Adkins is also a member of the Commission from Somerset County -- position. We are a panel of the Critical Areas Commission that has been appointed -- member that could not attend. We have been appointed by the Commission to hold this public hearing on a program amendment for -- been submitted by Somerset County. Now this is a hearing that's required by Section 8-509 of the Natural Resource Article of the Maryland Code. Tom Ventre of the Critical Areas staff, who's seated over...

MR. ADKINS: Excuse me, Mr. Chairman --.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Why don't we continue while he sets up if that's all right. The purpose of tonight's hearing is to hear public comment on the proposed amendment

COURT REPORTING • DEPOSITIONS
D.C. AREA 261-1902
BALT. & ANNAP. 974-0947

submitted by Somerset County. Following tonight's meeting, this panel will report to the full Commission at a meeting that is scheduled for May the 24th, at which time it's anticipated as I understand it, that a vote will be taken on the approval of this program amendment.

In view of our rather short time, any written comments that anyone would wish to submit should be in the Commission's office prior to the May the 24th date. Mr. Ventre can give you the address as to where these comments should be forwarded after the hearing. The format of the meeting will be that Mr. Adkins will review the program amendment as approved by the -- of Somerset County.

And following his presentation, any member of the public that wishes to make a statement will be heard by the panel. We'd like to keep statements to maybe a limit of 5 minutes. And if there are no questions, we'll commence with Mr. Adkins. Does anybody have any questions at this time? Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Does he have -- (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN PRICE: I do not know. He's going to make a presentation and we'll hear it along with you.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right.

Я

CHAIRMAN PRICE: You want to turn it on?

MR. VENTRE: Gentlemen, for the record my name is Ron Adkins. I'm the County's Department of Technical and Community Services Administrator. Essentially that equates to Planning and Zoning Director, that might be what you're more comfortable hearing in term.

I've been asked to present the County's position on the growth allocation request to award 222 acres of growth allocation of Somerset County's, a variable growth allocation in FY 1988, excuse me, calendar year 1988 to a location in Fairmount, specifically noted in a case report that has been previously submitted to the Commission but I'll go over them again.

For the record I'd like to say that the County's position is one that this is a hearing that would consider how the County gave that growth allocation subsequent to or pursuant to the Code of Maryland's Comar 1415.02.06 which directs jurisdiction in how they should locate future growth expansion in a critical area.

We are not here tonight, nor has the county taken a position favorably or negatively on the merits of the

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

specific proposal of Somerset Springs as a development project. I want to make sure the record reflects that we have acted positively in awarding our growth allocation to this specific site and have not had any action, nor have we had any proposal for action in the way of an application, for a development activity in this point in time.

Secondly, I'd like to make sure for the record that the letter submitted by Philip L. Gerald, President of the Somerset County Commissioners dated January 11, 1988, that holds out the County's position and references what I'm about to present. To reiterate for the record, it is in the case file. We would like to make sure that that is reflected.

As you noted earlier, it's sort of a unique position to be put in. When you're a member of the Critical Areas Commission you also serving your employers, which, which is Somerset County. So obviously for this instance I am a Somerset County employee and don't pretend to portray a Commission member.

Now, more to the meat of the issue. Somerset

County within its Chesapeake Bay Critical Area program,

laid out a procedure and methodology for giving the growth

allocation, which we felt we were enhancing the section of Comar I just cited to you. What I would specifically point to you is some of the goals of the program is to concentrate development next to development, not into agricultural lands or sprawling out into resource conservation areas.

In doing so, we acknowledge the intent within our program to have new growth allocation, new development that could occur by the use of growth allocation, to occur next to growth centers of community centers that are designated in our comprehensive plan.

Having said that, I would like to at both the location features that I mentioned earlier, locating it next to LDA's that the criteria require, not within habitat protection areas, at least 300 feet away from tidal wetlands and tidal waters.

This regulation or this requirement was in addition to those and the County considered that when information was being discussed and decisions were being made back in late December on whether the growth allocation should be awarded.

What I'd like basically to say to you is this

specific proposal is located on County Tax Map 39 and involves a number of parcels on 39 as well as a number of parcels on 48. Not all of those require growth allocation. Tax Map 39 involves parcels 154, 118 and 183. On Tax Map 48 involves parcel number 2.

The present zoning at the site is maritime residential commercial, which by its nomenclature would indicate that it's a mixed use type of possibility there. Also, there's a conservation 1 zoning on some of the lower lying wetland and not wet, not tidal wetland areas.

The County followed in its program the public hearing process. This process was not mandated by the Critical Areas criteria. It was never mandated by law. However, the County program which was passing the ordinance felt that it was important to have the public process in giving out growth allocations.

Therefore we, we established the public hearing requirement that would be treated similar to how we treat rezonings in our county. Where the Planning Commission, if given an opportunity to hear comment in a public hearing format and give its recommendation to the County Commissioners who in turn also act based upon that. On

December 27th, I believe it was of last year, County Commissioners and the County Planning Commission did conduct a joint public hearing on the specific issue that is on the table this evening. And pursuant to the testimony they received and to the direction that was given in the program, the Planning Commission did recommend to the County Commissioner to conditionally, to conditionally award growth allocation at this specific site.

And just what I'd like to do rather than dominate time for people to discuss their interests or concerns either pro or con on this specific topic, I would like to read into the record what the conditions were and what some of the factors were that were considered by the Planning Commission before the ensuing embodiment of the County Commissioner's opinion.

The County Planning Commission found 5 items in its findings dated December 30th, 1988. And those 5 items were based upon receiving written testimony and exhibits in public testimony at the hearing on December 27th. Those 5 findings are 1) The opposition presented to the Commission by adjoining property owners and members of the public.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: This is prior to the

Commission's findings?

MR. ADKINS: Prior to the Commission's findings that were embodied by the County Commissioner and accepted by the County Commissioner. So it represents both bodies.

2) The request by the Applicant was for 222 acres, more or less, a growth allocation for the 1988 growth allocation that was available in Somerset County and that it would be assigned to the project known as Somerset Springs.

Three, that the Planning Commission know the impact of the project on the area. Both, I might add, negatively and positively. Four, that the Planning Commission consider the testimony regarding the existing development and characteristics of the area.

And five, that the Zoning Commission took notice of the fact that various impact studies and reports as well as compliance with all local, state and federal regulations must be complied with. For these reasons the request for the designation of growth allocation is hereby recommended to be conditionally granted from the following: Condition #1: That the developer shall replace the existing -- land -- clearing on at least an acre by acre basis. Condition 2: That the developer shall provide special replanting

procedures for removal of greater than 20% of the forested land. These provisions are as follows and are as outlined in the critical area criteria in the Somerset County program. If they remove from 20% of the site in trees, they have to replant on a one to one basis. And 20-30% of the trees, and that ratio of trees, the ratio of replanting is 1:1 1/2. Wherever trees are cleared, you have to plant one and half trees. And greater than 30% obviously points to 3:1.

Condition 3: The developer shall limit and -service of the project site to 15% of the critical area
portion of the parcel. Condition 4: The developer shall
maintain or reduce storm water run off to down stream
properties, water forces, channels or conduits to the rates
and -- that will be resulted from a ten year predevelopment storm --.

Condition #5: The developer shall construct all roads, bridges and utilities outside of any habitat protection area unless no feasible alternative exists.

Condition #6: The developer shall use cluster development techniques when practical to reduce impervious surface areas and to preserve fish, plant and wildlife habitat.

Condition #7: The developer shall incorporate a wildlife corridor system which connects adjacent land.

Condition #8: The developer shall limit densities to 3.99 unit per acre or less. Condition #9: The developer shall comply with the Chesapeake Bay Critical Area criteria, both local and state programs.

Condition #10: That all impact studies, reports and findings regarding the proposed development be timely submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Department of Technical and Community Services for review. Condition #11: That the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Department of Technical and Community Services shall use these items (meaning the reports) within 30 days to determine any negative impact.

Condition #12: That determined there will be a negative impact from any of these studies or reports, the Applicant will have 90 days to rectify the situation, and provide a viable alternative proposal. Condition #13: Should the Applicant fail to comply with any of these conditions, the allocation will be automatically withdrawn and forfeited. Condition #14: Comply, he must comply with the conditions of approval for growth allocation -- the

Somerset County Critical Area Program and zoning ordinance. And finally, the last condition, project must be substantially completed from 3 years of the date of the approval. If not substantially completed as determined by the Planning and Zoning Commission the growth allocation shall be withdrawn.

Those are the conditions on which the Planning Commission recommended and the subsequent action of the County Commissioners embodied. I guess there's two other points I'd just, just like to make to you gentlemen tonight.

And basically that is again that we are not asking approval of the Somerset County Springs development project. The County has not given approval of the Somerset County Springs development project. In fact, the current zoning designations there would require at least 2 or 3 public hearings by the Board of Zoning Appeals to discuss varying issues of land use as well so a subdivision review process for whatever amount of subdivision plats that are proposed by the developer in the future.

Therefore, the County has not received, nor have they given their blessing for the project. They have given

their blessing for growth allocation to be there to support the project should it become a feasible thing to do based upon the studies and ultimate review of the project. The other item that I wanted to reiterate was that the County's program was above and beyond what the criteria required for us to do in treating the growth allocation.

Somerset County saw growth allocation as a finite item. They saw that as a resource that was not renewable. Therefore, we treated it as such in our growth allocation section of our program requiring growth allocation to be limited to a certain percentage each year.

There was a unique opportunity that was available in 1988. Since the County had had a moratorium in effect, in 1988, for most of the year, when the program was written we felt that there would be a lot of pent up interest from the jurisdiction from developers who would have liked to have developed but could not of because we had moratoriums in effect.

Therefore, there was an additional amount of growth allocation available in 1988, for the calendar year, that would not be available in any ensuing year based upon our program. The other item pursuant to our growth

allocation process is that you may hear some testimony in regard to how the growth allocation process required site plans and health department approval prior to hearing growth allocation requests. This specific development activity, as you can well recognize by seeing the county, is not typical of Somerset County, nor is it typical of the Eastern Shore in general.

The typical development that we experience is that of single family residential, relatively large lot development but is predicated on the health department being able to perk the lots to be able to allow septic systems to occur there. Therefore, the program is written in that manner.

In reviewing the request for growth allocation the Department determined that it was inappropriate to require major departmental approvals before you -- whether you should or shouldn't even give any indication of support to a project.

In this instance, this specific project will require approval from the Department of Environment for water appropriations, for discharge permits and for the creation of an additional, addition to or new sewage

treatment plant. There will also be many other permits that are not necessarily related to health department, but the developer will have to insure to the County that he has acquired. The point being that I'd like to raise to you the reason the health department issue was raised was because it seemed like it was a chicken head situation and one that didn't necessarily fit to what the County had envisioned as typical development standards.

Therefore, the county did not require health department approval, in fact, health department approval in its own local sense is not really a major part of the, plays a major part in this role. It's the Department of Environment's approval that is essential for the developer in order to meet the -- issue.

Again, the County is in a position to ask you to look at the locational features that we are required to look at. We believe we have done that, we believe we have located it next to our community center in our plan, next to existing LDA, we believe that the growth allocation itself has been appropriately placed and handled appropriately under our plan. And again, we are not asking, nor are we in a position ourselves to say we have,

1 given a blessing on the project as it stands right now. because there are many questions we want to see answered 3 before we give the final, final seal of approval and permits that are issued. Thanks for that and I'll be glad to answer any of your questions. MR. KRECH: Question, Ron. The final condition 7 that you mentioned... 8 MR. ADKINS: Uh huh. 9 MR. KRECH: The growth allocation shall be 10 withdrawn at the end of the three year period if it's not 11 completed. What happens to that growth allocation that is 12 withdrawn? 13 MR. ADKINS: I guess I didn't do a good job of 14 explaining to you. We do have, we treat growth allocation 15 as a resource, therefore we're managing it. And any given 16 year up to 5% of growth allocation can occur. 17 MR. KRECH: That's tacked on to the following 18 year? 19 MR. ADKINS: So therefore if we had only a 20 portion of that project that would come to be a reality... 21 MR. KRECH: Uh huh.

MR. ADKINS: For growth allocation, we would

1 request an amendment back to this Commission... 2 MR. KRECH: Right. 3 MR. ADKINS: ...and say we are amending the maps 4 not to allow further development at that specific site. 5 MR. KRECH: Uh huh. 6 MR. ADKINS: And redeposit that growth 7 allocation. 8 MR. KRECH: You redeposit it? 9 MR. ADKINS: Back into the system. 10 MR. KRECH: Okay. 11 MR. ADKINS: Yes, sir. Yes? 12 MR. BLAKE: Mr. Chairman. Ron, I take it that if 13 growth allocation is approved for this that there would be 14 a series of other hearings where the public would 15 additionally have input, is that correct? 16 MR. ADKINS: That, that's true. As would the 17 Commission. 18 MR. BLAKE: (Inaudible) 19 MR. ADKINS: As would the Commission in terms of 20 its project review. The Board of Zoning Appeals would be 21 the authority under the current zoning ordinance that would 22 hear the proposal for a marina or a hunt marina type of

concept. There are two concepts as I understand it for the site now. The Board of Appeals would be the entity that would hear any civic center or institutional type of use, any commercial type of use, and any type of multi-family use.

All of those would require individual public hearings and a certain set of standards that would have to be approved in order to allow those uses to be there. The Planning Commission on the other hand, would be the body that would be involved with approving any subdivision activity that would occur there on a single lot basis.

That does not follow a public hearing, but it does follow an open meeting process. So those would be the format, that we would process the application under the current zoning law.

The Commission itself would have knowledge and interaction based upon the project notification regulations of any development activity proposed there and of course it's the law gives the Commission, they have the intervention authority at any time based upon that.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Can you tell me something about Fairmount?

MR. ADKINS: Well, I'm not nearly as qualified to talk to you about Fairmount as some of the people that are here. It's certainly their community and their community they know better than I.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: What I meant, you referred to this project being next to a limited development area.

MR. ADKINS: Uh huh.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Could you show me...?

MR. ADKINS: Yeah, I can. I can show you.

Fairmount...

CHAIRMAN PRICE: And whether they have sewer and water is what...

MR. ADKINS: Fairmount is, is, is a very nice community that really has an historic district core and had water and sewer introduced to it in the late or early, mid '70's I guess it was. This is 361, this is the state highway that carries you to Fairmount.

Fairmount stretches from this point that is commonly known as Upper Hill, all the way through Upper Fairmount, on down to a southwesterly point that is not shown on this map that is Lower Fairmount. All of this community is served by water and sewer and currently the

sewage treatment plant there is not at its total capacity. In fact, one of the issues over the years has been that it's been awfully expensive to, to, for the present property owners to pay the operational costs for an under capacity, under utilized plant.

The Critical Area boundary weaves in and out here. This specific project is not entirely in the Critical Area, in fact, only a portion of it is. But the community is fairly densely populated in older homes throughout served by water and sewer and it's a pleasant community to be in.

It's a community center in our comprehensive plan. It's not a, the full scale level would be a growth center such as Princess Anne, it's a community center in our plan and we encourage development, residential development next to it.

I don't know what else to explain to you other than I can tell you there's a mixture of housing there, both new housing and older turn of the century housing and there is a couple of historic sites that have been put on the historic register. Further down from this location the academy and another farmhouse, I can't remember the proper

name of it. 2 CHAIRMAN PRICE: Is Fairmount incorporated as a 3 town? 4 MR. ADKINS: No sir. If it was then you would be 5 dealing with Fairmount City Council and you wouldn't be dealing with me. 7 CHAIRMAN PRICE: How about the, you mentioned it 8 has a water system? 9 MR. ADKINS: It has a water and sewer system. 10 The sewer system is a vacuum system. The water system is a 11 central supply system. I believe one of the issues that 12 came out of the earlier hearing was the Accofer was 13 inadequate to handle it. We're not 100% sure whether the 14 Accofer is adequate to handle it or not, but I can tell you 15 that it's not the same Accofer that Somerset County or the 16 jail here in Somerset County is accessing. That is the 17 Minoken, and this I believe is accessing the Magothy 18 Accofer, which is about 80 to 100 feet deep in the ground. 19 CHAIRMAN PRICE: There's no potential development 20 land in the area? 21 MR. ADKINS: No, no.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Limited development?

1 MR. ADKINS: Limited development and resource conservation areas. 3 MR. VENTRE: We do have, excuse me your Ron, we 4 do have a Critical Area overlay for that portion of the map if you would like. We can mount it up. 6 CHAIRMAN PRICE: Thank you. Dana Simson? Would 7 you like to... 8 MS. SIMSON: Sure. 9 CHAIRMAN PRICE: The people who speak, do they 10 have to come forward? 11 COURT REPORTER: Just a little bit. 12 CHAIRMAN PRICE: Just a little bit. There's a 13 microphone where, right, right there? 14 MS. SIMSON: I think the problem with the amount 15 of the growth allocation that really bothers me is that it 16 really overwhelms the community. Fairmount is really not 17 very large. I think probably the population might be 450 18 people. 19 We can't really get a straight answer out of the 20 developer about how many units he is indeed going to put in, but 1,000 units was mentioned. We're talking it would

severely overwhelm our community and it's a historical

community, people wave at one another when they go up and down the road and I think that the culture would also be overwhelmed. There's a lot of watermen, there's already a shortage of slips out at the Roman Marina. There's a shortage of, I don't know, sometimes I think there's a shortage of water.

I, I don't know about the, the real stats on the sewer, but it's quite common for all of our water to start rushing and there's something funny with the airlock or something like that and also our electricity will dim and go on and off, so I have some worries myself about how the different utilities will handle this increased population.

My main concern is that I feel that the growth allocation in its implied development is really in opposition to all the, our community stands for. Many of us have come there from other places to try to escape this kind of development and the people who were there are very fond and proud of the community that is still existing, and there's not very many places that are existing, like what's down in our community.

I think that with all developments responsible thinking is in order, and Somerset County is one of the

last large areas that's left culturally and ecologically intact. We see bald eagles and egrets and herons and all kinds of wildfowl, and I really wonder if we continue to push into all these remote, undeveloped areas what's going to be left. You know, we can develop everything.

I'm sure you can turn a buck out of any piece of property in a good number of areas, especially near the water. My question is what's the point? Who's it really going to benefit? I think it's important now that this point in our lives coming, coming to this point in this century when, you know, we've have worries about the greenhouse effect, we have worries about the lumber, we have many, many worries that we need to now look to the future and short term is only short term.

And I don't really see any long term benefits out of this community. It's to benefit rich people who are going to come here from who knows where. There are condo resorts that were built in Salisbury and Cambridge and those were not sold. This does not have water view, and it's going to be much more expensive.

I don't see any benefits from the surrounding community, it's going to run people out of their homes with

high taxes and you know, basic over-development. I think
the only people who are going to benefit are the
developers. I think that's pretty much what I have to say.
I just feel it's very important to look long term and I
don't feel that this is at all beneficial long term. Thank
you.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Thank you. Mr. John Orth.

MR. ORTH: I guess the meaning of this hearing is to talk about the growth allocation. I find it very difficult to separate the growth allocation from the project. I know that we're supposed to be focusing on the, the implications and significance of laying out of the growth allocation for this particular piece of property.

I view the granting of the growth allocation as being just this side of giving the developer, Mr. Dahlman, basically carte blanche to further develop, bring his ideas out. He hasn't, I don't believe he's given us specific ideas, or specific enough ideas on what he has planned there.

So I, I guess I'm just registering my skepticism about the intentions of the developer and his communications about what is going to go on there. So I am

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

skeptical about supporting the growth allocation. I, I don't, I don't support a no growth policy or I don't want to quash a project before it has a chance to come about, but I'm skeptical of that, that we give out the growth allocation without further information. We'll be opening the door for who knows what.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Thank you. Mr. Staller?

MR. STATLER: Statler. I'd like to say that no acreage should be used for -- growth allotment of this project, Somerset Springs. If we knew the facts, we could see that this project is doomed by Mother Nature. But we do not have the facts, because the growth allotment process has been circumvented by officials in their haste to avoid the truth.

We people decided this decade to clean the Chesapeake Bay. Our lawmakers, including the County Commissioners, have made a few laws to help us. Let me point out the process. We are gathered here as part of this process, but before we gathered here, I quote "Applications for growth allocations shall apply to County Commissioners for consideration. An application shall include site plans or subdivison plats as per the

requirements of the Somerset County building ordinance or subdivision regulations." What did we get for site plans? Two pages. That was it. How are we supposed to make a decision when we only have two pages or nothing? We're supposed to be giving out 15% or more, it depends upon how you calculate of all, all 20 years worth of growth allotment in this one project.

Я

According to the subdivision regs., pages 1037 to 1023 of our Critical Areas Plan, Somerset County Critical Areas Plan, there is this much information including the site plan. I'd like to review what is not here. What we do have an area of vicinity map.

What we could not get was the boundary survey plat, one inch equals 100 feet, which is pretty detailed, which includes the typographical map existing in a proposed regrading surface of the land, it is the end of that, location of natural features, flood plain boundaries, 100 year flood plain.

This is going to be a very important one for this project. I'll tell you about it in a minute. Location and extent of all sterile -- septic limitations, wet soil, hydric soil and soils with hydric property was shown in

Somerset County survey. They didn't want to have the soils mapped. But let me tell you what's in the soils map of this project. Soil type OM which is Othello silty loam, by the Somerset County soil survey, classified as 5W-1. O1 being not too wet, going on down, it's very wet.

This means that slowly or very slowly permeable subsoil and it's poorly drained. Because it is almost at sea level, it's subject to occasional flooding by high tides. I live next to this piece of property and I'll vouch for that.

Loblolly pine, the only important forest tree, grows slowly. It is frequently damaged and sometimes killed by salt water. The other soil type on this project, Othello silty clay loam, classified as 6W-2, meaning that this, this is a quote from our bureaucracy, the Department of Agriculture.

"These soils are so wet, so difficult to drain, and so difficult to work that they cannot be easily cultivated. They can be worked only within a very narrow range of moisture content and within this range they are intractable and tough. The subsoil of these soils is so finely textured and so impermeable that drainage is

generally impractical." If I had the site plan from the Technical Director, I mean, if it had been presented, I as the Technical Director would have thrown it out because the soils of all the project are these two main types.

Then we're supposed to have had detailed drawings showing the location, proposed use and height of each building. We got something. Location of all parking and loading areas, we got a little bit of that. Location and type of recreational areas, we got a lot of that.

Location of all existing or proposed site improvement, improvement and storm drains etc., etc., we didn't get any of that. Now the big one, description method and location of water supply and sewage disposal facilities.

And Mr. Adkins has glossed over that saying this project is so big it doesn't need it, it's going outside the bounds of the health department. We have seen nothing related to our water supply. I mean, it could be affecting the town. He said the town sewage system is under capacity, yes it is. By 100 units. This project wants 1,000 units. Hall's Creek is a really just a tidal estuary. It's not a flowing body of water. The town

sewage comes into that, Hall's Creek. There is no more room for 1,000 units of sewage. So where is that sewage going to go is a very important question. Why would we have to sit at a meeting like today when it could have been handled earlier in the preliminary site plan?

We should also have site plans in relation to the Critical Areas of the district. So the Critical Areas overlay district boundaries, the -- areas and forested areas, we didn't see any of that. The landscaping plan, nothing.

Location of -- habitat protection rules, no.

Location of all continuous forested areas adjacent to the site, no. Location of agricultural fields, no. Location of tidal and non-tidal wetlands on the site, here's another big one. The soil as you have heard, are wet, wet,

The forest type is forest with some, a fair percentage of housing forest wetlands. Due to forest, plus the forest types, most likely this whole thing is non-tidal wetlands. Governor Schaeffer has come out in support of saving non-tidal wetlands and here you'll have a project which we are giving up 222 acres that will probably be all non-tidal wetland. Why was that not mapped before we even

had to gather here? Okay, we did get some computations in these two pages. We didn't get the total lot area, we didn't get the floor area for each type of use, we didn't get the -- and ground coverage percentage of the whole project, we did not get anything about the road area, which would be very important.

We didn't get anything about off street parking and loading --. Open space areas, there are going to be lots of open space areas, but no calculations for it. It goes on and on and on of what we did not get.

Along with the site plan the developer should have done a forest management plan, a habitat protection plan, a soil conservation plan, a storm water plan, a sediment erosion control plan, a planting plan, with comments from all the various agencies so that before we even have to give a growth allocation the project is either yeah or nay.

I say that Mother Nature is such that our County Commissioners did not want to see it, wanted to give out the growth allotment and that it should not even be considered. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Mr. John Rafter?

MR. RAFTER: I'm speaking for the concerned

citizens, although I work for the Department of Environment

and I have -- I'm not speaking for --. I can say that for

years I've been riding around the Eastern Shore admiring

the beauty of this place and I've been seeing many villages

with ghost town, ghost town effects. There's lots, lots of

beautiful homes here.

If somebody wants to come and move to the Eastern Shore, fine. I think, think some of the people that love the Eastern Shore the most are outsiders that really appreciate it. There's plenty of old homes with paint, peeling paint and if someone wants to move here, please come and do it, take care of these old houses.

And I've seen, I've seen the Eastern Shore become the playground for the rich. The poor in the county, I don't know where the poor people in this county go after the rich take over here. I've seen sediment choke out streams, swamps, marshes.

I've seen 5th and 6th and 7th generation Eastern
Shore people that can no longer live in the villages. I've
seen marinas become so dense and side by side that you
could walk from boat to boat all day long. And I really do

feel that this is a special place. I was born and bred here. Moved away for a long time, travelled around the world and came back and settled in, in a handyman's special in a little oyster village near here.

And the Eastern Shore is a unique place and to see, see it change so drastically so quickly I think is unwise. You know, I travelled some and I vacationed some in South Carolina, I seen these projects in South Carolina and it's a nightmare. I don't know many people that play golf, I don't want to play golf. You know, I can't afford a condo.

It was more -- of thousands a dollars a month.

And these are part time homes for people. I'd rather see people who are going to live on the Eastern Shore and appreciate its beauty and quality of living here. Live here and help us, help us take care of some of these little places, help us take care of some of these little houses that are going to fall down and be bulldozed if they're not attended to.

The village I live in half of Main Street could be bulldozed tomorrow, you know. It's kind of sad to see it. All up and down the Eastern Shore I ride around and

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

see, one day you're looking up and I saw three eagles yesterday in Dorchester County. I talked to the local people who live there and it's a sad situation. The water went up against a brick wall. But I'm not sure projects like this is what they want as an alternative. I think they'd rather have the Eastern Shore try to bounce back.

I think they'd like to see the bays and rivers have a chance at survival. Projects like this to me is anti-survival. This is anti Eastern Shore, this is anti-common sense for a quiet little area like this. And I've seen the highways of the Eastern Shore become so choked up that, I was in a restaurant one day and this old 90 year old man came in and gave his car keys to his son and said look, I can't drive here anymore, it's too dangerous for me to drive, take my car.

You know, stop lights. How many stop lights are you going to get a year out here on the highway here? They're talking about making it, in the paper they're talking about making a double span over the Chesapeake Bay Bridge tunnel, which means more and more traffic, more and more people coming through here. And I'm not anti-growth, but I'm just, just go slow and take things easy and

remember what the Eastern Shore is all about, remember the heritage of this place. It's a sacred -- hole. We don't, we don't develop places to get rich, we're just passing through this life. Let's leave it in a sense to our, our grandchildren who'll know what the Eastern Shore used to be, and what it is. Let's keep it the same. That's all.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Thank you. Mr. Barwick?

MR. BARWICK: My name is Atwood Barwick. I'm a resident of Fairmount and I have a specific point to make and I'll start off with that. There are a couple points based on Mr. Adkins testimony that I think need clarification.

First of all, I agree with the previous testimony that I don't think you can separate the intended use of the land from the allocation is I think germane. I don't think this, you should give an allocation unless you know what the allocation's for.

What the final purpose is going to be. In that vein it is implied that this allocation was based on the fact that the Fairmount area was designated as growth area on the plan. Well, Upper Fairmount's a village, it's not a commercial town. It's very small. The commercial

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

activities consist of a small commercial -- processing plant and general store. And it's also been designated as a natural, a historic district, submitted as a national registered property. The other two national registered properties on that area are the School Ridge Farm and the Fairmount Academy.

They're located close to the development and School Ridge Farm, which is an early plantation, is adjacent to the development property. In fact, it's adjacent to the area that's to be attempted to develop right along the water there on Back Creek, on Hall's Creek.

So I don't think you can look at this allocation as being an area that's looking for growth and needs the opportunity to expand. I don't think Upper Fairmount is looking for the opportunity to expand. Secondly, the plan that was sent out by the County on the Critical Areas, the reason they designated this -- area was because the water and sewer system.

At that time they indicated that the sewer system had the capacity for an additional 60 dwellings and that the water capacity had zero additional capacity. So based on that you could put in 60 more houses and have sewer

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

facilities and you could put no more houses in -- exists. My main point which upsets me the most is that the state of Maryland has made a great deal of, of noise nationally about the impact of the Shane's Donna Bay and the --Coseco Bay and this Critical Areas plan was intended to be a major growth step toward that and to me to take mischief like this before the Inks Fairview Line in the Somerset Critical Areas plan, and encourage the development of a large tract of this land for the purpose that's intended to benefit nobody in Somerset County.

It's intended to benefit people from not even necessarily from this country. And it's going to be an exclusive resort, that means guarded gates. It's going to be using facilities, golf courses, a small bay, Eastern Shore village and other things in there that are not needed and do not have to be built on Critical Areas land and there's essentially no good reason I can think of for putting these sorts of facilities on wetlands.

There's plenty of other land that could accommodate that. If Mr. Dahlman's original plan to make this strictly a hunting resort were the basis for this, I think you probably wouldn't find a lot of testimony because

people here understand hunting. To use these wetlands for residential development, for golf courses, and for other kinds of resort facilities, I think it's going to send a very bad signal out not only to Marylanders but to the country about how deeply committed we really are to save the bay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Mr. Keene?

MR. KEENE: My name is Mike Keene. I guess I'm appearing here tonight as a concerned citizen in opposition to the allocation as -- hard to separate the project. I have a house in Rumly, which is 3 miles, 3 miles away from this and I had intentions of opening a branch office of -- my family business across the street here and back of McDonald's.

I was supposed to open that business the first of April. But because of the soil content and the non-tidal wetlands that that piece of property is, I have to go in and get a bulldozer in there to start it. We're talking about today it may be the middle of July we can put that 4,000 square foot warehouse in there.

Now I've been down to this piece of property and I've been all around it with the boat, and I can tell you

right now we can cut this thing short, you fellas just get in the car and take a ride down there and look at it. It just doesn't fit any type of development. I've been hunting down here, I've been running charter on the Chesapeake Bay for 30 years.

I started out in Annapolis, South River, Castle Marina, Kent River, Queen Anne, Tilghman, Somerset Marina, Cape Charles, Virginia, and Ocean City, Maryland. My concern is the seafood industry of Somerset County. Blue crab is the only thing they got going. It's a very, very fragile system here.

I was in Tampa, Florida the other day at a restaurant in the Hilton that Maryland soft crabs were on the menu. And I walked back in the kitchen and --. This is a very fragile ecology. The habitat can't stand another beer can, much less an oil spill of something in the nature of the Exxon accident.

I had a whole lot that I wanted to say and it sort of doesn't fit here, except that I've been very involved in the fisheries of the Chesapeake Bay and I've seen it decline and it's horrendous and the only thing we have left is, one of the only things we had is Somerset

County. The big thing Somerset County can't stand is 3,000 people, another 1,000 boats and another 1,000 automobiles. That's the impact that this area may see. There's wetlands there, Tory Brown's been sweating over this duck that's -- and Upper Fairmount adjacent to this property there's a big dike and research project and public hunting area that he's been worried about and pouring money into for a long time.

Them ducks aren't going to come in there if that wetlands section is backed up to a parking lot and convention center. That's just ridiculous. What I haven't told you is that I'm a member of the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Council. I was appointed to that council back of Jim Colter who was Secretary of Natural Resources.

In fact, Jim and Louie Phipps came down here to run the fishing on the charter. Colter got out of the car and he looked around and he said where in the hell are we? And Louie said don't worry about it boss, we -- on a map when we left.

And that's just great, because we still have an area like that that not everybody knows about. We've got the only duck population in the state right around this area here. And we're very carefully managing this, proper

Sign

management of resources. We just can't stand 3,000 people in Upper Fairmount. Basically that's --. The other part of my business is a building business. We sell, we have -- builders and contractors and I've been doing that on the Eastern Shore for 30 years. And I've seen what happened to Ocean Pines.

And I've seen contracts that we wrote to people that had to move away or they went bankrupt because of the big buildings. I've got a warehouse and showroom in Easton right now, on Billby Road, a big building. You probably know where it is. I had the developer call me into a real estate office the other day and inform me what he was going to do with the other 100 acres around me and how I fit into his plans.

I can recall -- . When is this going to stop?

That's one of the things I never mentioned to you that the Mid-Atlantic Fisheries Council has a habitat committee.

It's -- incidentally, that's responsible to the Secretary of Commerce.

This is the Blue Fish management plan that you may have heard about or read about where we're proposing a 10 fish limit on recreational fishermen and a cap on all

commercial fishes. I'll be holding — in Florida and Maine probably in September. Habitat's right out here. For the flounder, we've got flounder planted in the Bay. We've got Blue Fish planted in the Bay. This give our council some interest in what happens right here in this project right here in Somerset County. We're going to stay right on top of this.

This isn't the only project we're looking at.

Long Island's of them, you mentioned South Carolina,
they're all up and down the coast. The fact remains that
no net loss is what we've got to have in habitat fisheries.
There's no Blue Fish in the Bay now. I called Cape Charles
this morning and -- guys who charter those guys.

There's no Blue Fish. There's been two Black

Drum caught and no Blue Fish. Blue Fish are offshore about

15 miles. They're not coming into the Bay. So we've got a problem.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Mr. Howard Stone?

MR. STONE: I don't have a prepared speech like the rest of these boys, but I moved here from Baltimore, I spent 32 years up there and it was a rat race up there. I found a peaceful haven, Fairmount. You laugh, you don't

know Fairmount.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Upper Fairmount.

MR. STONE: Upper Fairmount, Fairmount, Lower Fairmount. Sounds like a big place! You're talking about 500 people. Now let me tell you something about, you people say, the man just said we have a water system, we got a sewer system.

That sounds great. Let me tell you something, I worked on that system part time. That sucker don't work.

And they said they have 80 more houses or 60 more houses to add on, they'd better hook up the other 100. That gives them -- on there yet that the sewage system will not cover.

The water dumps into Hall's Creek. If you all had a set of Waist Waders, you might be able to get across the water that's this deep, that's how much sludge is in there. This water does not flow away. Hall's Creek Road, which is higher than this man's property, I have waded kneed deep in water on a high tide.

I live on Hall's Creek Road, I back up to this gentleman's playground that he wishes to make, I've hunted across it. You can't get across it without a set of Waist Waders. There's a lot of wildlife. It's something that's

very rare. I've hunted Maine to Florida, I've fished all over the east coast and that is why I am here. And it's a very special place. And of all the people who are here tonight, we have three local people from Fairmount here, all the rest of us are come here's as they call us. The people that are here don't realize what they have. The local waterman doesn't realize what all the -- life anyplace else. And that's why we got to think twice before you give the country away. Especially to a foreigner. That's it.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Thank you, Mr. Stone. Mr. Al Goetze?

MR. GOETZE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, members of the Commission. I'm Al Goetze and I'm from Easton,
Maryland. We'd like to say in reference to Somerset County in the 60's and 70's I lived on Great Fox Island for many months, many years as a member of the Fox Island Gun Club and also as a fisherman and I know the marshes of Tangier and Pocomoke Sound.

I've been there many times and I've lived there for an earlier portion in my life. I serve today for Maryland as a Commissioner on the Atlantic State Marine

Fisheries Commission. I also serve with Mike Keene, and I don't want to be repetitious because he said a great deal, I serve on the Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Council. I would like to direct, direct your attention to the matter of not just whether we have fish or crabs, but whether we have industry in Maryland.

The industry I'm referring to of course, that industry that relates to the commercial fishery and a very important part of it, the recreational fishery. It is a big part of the Maryland economical base for what this state is economically.

Today we should all know this, the Chesapeake Bay program directs that we have three basic Bay-wide FMP's, Fishery Management Plans. They are oysters, shad and river herring and blue crab. And I hope all of us realize that two of those -- or two of those plans are addressing species that are in a state of complete collapse.

Oysters are a disaster. How can anyone say otherwise? And shad river herring are almost extinct. So we're looking at blue crabs, and how appropriate for this discussion tonight to suggest that blue crabs could possible be endangered also and this particular area we're

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

discussing is not only for Maryland and Virginia, but for the entire coast of the United States. The fishery, the nursery grounds for the blue crab. This is where they grow up, this is where the food chain takes place, this is where the crabs really come from. Otherwise we couldn't have the harvest we have at Crisfield's, Smith Island, Tangier and -

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

21

I don't want to take up making a lot of speeches, but I just want to reference as things go on, as a Commission member and as a council member, our charge is to conserve and restore the fisheries for the commercial and recreational industry. Critical Area law, and I can't tell you this, has very specific language in it and I have it here and I will submit it a written report.

I won't belabor it by reading it back to you, but I'd like to read some other statements of state and federal as it relates to this issue. The Chesapeake Bay program, final Chesapeake Bay wetland policy statement which is just hot off the press, if you don't have it I certainly advise that you should read it, it says in one paragraph, "The signatories, who are of course all three governors, Thomas from E.P.A., Washington, D.C. and the Commission. The

signatories will use existing programs and develop new program to limit permanent and irreversible, direct and indirect impacts to wetlands. Direct and impact, and direct and indirect impacts to wetland. Only in rare instances will losses of wetland acreage or function be allowed or considered justified."

That seems pretty direct to me. Also on a national scale, the head of E.P.A. asked, this is a report that I also would highly recommend to you, asks that we have the governor of New Jersey conduct a national wetlands policy and very briefly again, they finalized it in two very brief statements.

The interim goal of the policy to achieve no overall net loss of the nation's remaining wetland base and long term goal is to increase the quantity and quality of the nation's wetland resource. And finally, the council which I serve on and National Marine Fishery Service and NOAA are dedicated to the policy, and we are in the process right concurrently, next week we will be voting up I hope, I believe it's going to happen, a policy.

And the policy states again, trying to say it as briefly as possible, the policy shall be supported by three

policy objectives which are: Maintain the current quantity and productive capacity of habitats supporting important commercial and recreational fisheries, including their food bays. This objective will be implemented using a -- principle of no net habitat loss.

What I'd like to close up with is to say this. From what I see of it, and there are many other species by the way, besides the two that I've mentioned, which like oysters, shad and river herring which are on the decline, think of for example striped bass.

But from what serving, this is my 7th year on the Commission, serving with these, with a group that's charged with the responsibility to do this, to conserve and to restore, restoration is an enormous, enormous task that nobody really has come to grips with and said we're doing it.

Contrary to what you may read in the papers, we are not restoring. The striped bass population in the bay is such that the -- remains after 4 years of no fishing at 3.1. Our goal before we can even think of opening up and down the coast for the whole fishery is 8. This year there's very little hope that it's going to be much higher

than 3.1. So I thank you for your consideration.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Mr. Lee Quinn?

MR. QUINN: Mr. Price and members of the Commission, I'm a resident of Somerset County and I don't have a prepared speech, I just have a bad memory when I stand up so I wrote a couple things down that I wanted to focus on because I'm really amazed that as many people are here that have come tonight.

There was a real dearth of information about this hearing and a -- verification that to me is unbelievable. I don't see how without notification and information anyone can come to a hearing and speak intelligently without knowing what's going on until someone sits down and says this is why we're here.

Now I subscribe to the local paper, the Salisbury paper, I listen to the radio, watch the local T.V. programs, the news. And I usually try to get a Baltimore Sun and I saw only one little fine print notice about this meeting tonight.

And that just doesn't seem reasonable to me in terms of the process of what we're involved in. I consider essentially the horrible possibility that the work of the

FREE STATE REPORTING INC.

Commission is considered insignificant. And the results of this meeting are inconsequential. But I don't think that's the way it should be. I think what you're doing should be important and I think the results of these hearings and what happens in this development is going to affect the Bay all the way from Baltimore to Norfolk.

I'm not knowledgeable about the technicalities, I do have some sympathy for the people who are trying to deal with them in the absence of information, is is it possible that you can have some effort either as a Commission or the local government or the local press, the electronic media somehow or other to let people know what's going on. And that's my concern this evening. I am obviously concerned about the Bay and the water. If you could help us on this it would be very much appreciated.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Let me, the list that I have of persons that wish to testify. I think there aren't any more that signified they did, but in view of the, what we've heard, would anybody else like to, yes ma'am?

MS. SANDLER: I'm Bobbi Sandler. I'd like to --. CHAIRMAN PRICE: Beg your pardon?

MS. SANDLER: My name is Bobbi Sandler, I'd like to make a couple of...

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Yes, would you come forward?

MS. SANDLER: Okay. Okay, I have a couple of questions to raise and one is with the growth allocation process itself. The method that Somerset County came up with for computing its growth allocation was on a square foot basis.

This method itself has come under some question from the Critical Areas Commission and it seems to me that this needs to be straightened out first if the process of continuing the growth allocation hasn't been finalized of that growth allocation be given out.

Another concern that I have is for the actual growth allocation meetings of the Somerset Springs development. If we assume for a moment that the square foot method will be approved, gives guidelines for assessing the various development types, from a single family home requiring 20,000 square feet of growth allocation to a townhouse of only 6,000 square feet.

At a public hearing held here in the last days of December, this method was used to to show the total growth

allocation needed for Somerset Springs. The various parcels of the development were described unit by unit showing the total square foot requirements. This method came up with a figure close to the 222 acres that were asked for in growth allocation, so it was made to seem that if this was given to a developer his growth allocation needed to be met.

The trouble is that this is not the case at all.

The development category designated as non-residential is to be computed from square foot needs as "variable depending on the area of disturbance". In the case of Somerset Springs this disturbance is extensive.

It would have to include the ponds projected to be dredged in the non-tidal wetland area and also the surrounding golf course. The roads and pavement connecting all together. At the hearing in December this non-residential development was glossed over and said not to have been computed yet and inappropriately it was given the figure of zero instead of the several hundred acres that it actually would encompass.

Not adding this extensive disturbed area into the final growth allocation needs, gave a false indication of

need to the project. My point is that the 222 acre growth allocation in question would not be adequate for the project to be completed as planned. It is only this first year that 20% of the growth allocation is to be given out. After that it's at the rate of only 5% a year.

The actual need for Somerset Springs as planned can tie up the growth allocations for the county for years. This would be at the expense of anyone else that might want to use it and is both unfair and poor planning. The main problem with a project like this in Somerset County is its sheer size.

Growth allocation in the Critical Area was meant to allow for normal growth of a community, spring out and normal growth pattern. Something like this comes along and focuses the entire growth of the county into one area. I think this would have a detrimental effect on the county as a whole and certainly in this one area that would be so intensely developed.

This area along the Annamessex River had been designated a natural area by the Maryland Outdoor Recreation and Open Space Plan. And this intense development really goes against the County's long range

plans for the area. I also had a few comments that, that I'd like to make and one is that we have a wonderful rural area here and I think we all have a sense that it's going to last forever, and probably the people who saw the flocks of passenger pigeons would be amazed that they're all extinct today.

The change can occur and it can occur very rapidly and once that happens there's no going back.

There's an article in a national newspaper just the other day that talked about the over-development of the South Carolina coastline, that's been referred to here also.

One resident in that area who is 36 years old said that as a boy he's sit at his father's gas station and watch a car go by one every 10-15 minutes. Today that same gas station has 24, 4,600 cars a day crawling past it.

The traffic there is threatening to strangle the entire area. And the article went on to say that everyone's mad dash to live by the water is killing off the fish nursing areas and we've had some people talk that certainly know more than I do about this, but I have a few statistics I'd like to share with you.

The shellfish and larval stage fish can't move

away from disturbances that are caused by development and more than 20% of North Carolina's shellfish waters are now closed because of pollution. And in South Carolina 32% are --. The State Marine Fisheries Division in North Carolina says the commercial seafood catches along its coast have dropped from 432 million pounds in '81 to 191 pounds in 1988. These aren't the directions we want to see Somerset County go in.

I think a development the size and scope of Somerset Springs is just the beginning of the end and I just really urge that this kind of growth allocation -- this project be denied. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Thank you. Did anyone else wish to make any comment? Yes, sir.

MR. FORD: My name is Fred Ford. I live in Marion. I was born and raised in Upper Fairmount. I made up my mind tonight I wasn't going to say anything, but I have to. I share with a gentlemen who got up there and said he didn't know about this meeting and I think that's pretty sad. I didn't either. Somebody called me and told me about it.

A little piece in the paper about this big. I

. 1

also didn't know about the initial meeting until that was broadcast. I resent the fact that that meeting was held 2 days before a decision had to be made by the Commissioners and it was my understanding that there had to be 3 public meetings and I heard the gentleman's explanation of that and I don't buy a nickel's worth of it. But what I'm concerned about is I'm a native of this place.

Most of these people have moved in there and I keep hearing the remarks that we're the only people that are really concerned about this are people who have moved down here from the city. Well, I've lived on the Eastern Shore all my life. I lived on the upper shore, I worked there and I came back down here to retire.

I lived in New York for about 2 years. I saw what development did to a quiet, nice little town in Nasaw County. We had a German butcher shop with wood shavings on the floor. We had a Polish delicatessen. We had a Jewish jewelry store.

Everybody knew everybody else and they, we never locked out house. And one day we went out to a former place to get a bag of potatoes, a place just like Mr.

Dryden, in fact, the house looked just like it and we got

out there and voila, there was -- town. And gentlemen, I can tell you in 6 months the whole complex of that little town changed. The taxes, since I lived there have gone up 400%. There are elderly ladies living there, I have my wife's aunt living up there who's having great difficulty paying her taxes. The Mafia took over the -- bar, it was run by a little Irishman. It's a dope distribution center for eastern New York State. Those are my concerns.

Я

I'm concerned about the water --. I'm not sure we got enough water for this place. I'm concerned about the sewage disposal. I'm concerned about the landfill and I think that's going to be a real problem. I'm concerned about the very way of life that people down in Fairmount live.

The whole, the whole place is going to change and I know it's going to change and I'm concerned about it. I was a Scoutmaster down in Fairmount many years ago. And I can remember seeing small otters sliding down the ditch bank in the same area on the same land that this development is being proposed.

I've seen bald eagles down there. I probably saw the last big flight of canvas back duck that ever took off

during the war. I was down there in a duck blind, we scrounged a few shells and I have never seen the skies darkened by ducks since. Before or since, for that matter. And I'll bet you now the Chesapeake Bay, there may be 1,000 canvas backs. The black duck population still exists but it's greatly down.

There's so many reasons that I oppose this that I didn't prepare a speech and I didn't get up here and make notes about it. But I can tell you this. The way of life in Somerset County is getting ready to change.

In the northeast corridor, and I speak about Richmond and Washington and Philadelphia and New York, this is probably the last, the last county that is rural in many respects. I know that the Big Annamessex River is the last pristine river in the state of Maryland.

I work for a utility. We pulled cables across rivers on the upper shore where there were marinas on both sides of the river and on up the rivers. And I can tell you for a fact the bottoms of those rivers were cesspools and I mean exactly that, cesspools.

We buried cable in 3 feet of human waste. It's still there. Ask the marina fisherman who take the Sassmus

River and the Bohemian River and just ride over the Chesapeake Bridge, Chesapeake Bay Bridge and look at all the boats. At some point in time we're going to have to limit the number of marinas on the Chesapeake Bay and we're going to have to limit the number of boats license. Here's a man who wants to put a development and build two marinas. And the Bay cannot stand that.

We have a lot of nerve to go to the federal government and ask them for millions and millions and millions of dollars to clean up the Chesapeake Bay when our political subdivision down here don't have the guts to do it or to take any part in it. And that is a fact. I really believe that most of the local political subdivisions are trying to find ways to circumvent the Critical Areas law. If I'm mistaken, then I don't read the newspapers very well. Gentleman, I thank you.

CHAIRMAN PRICE: Thank you. Was there anybody else that wished to make a statement? Yes, sir.

MR. ZICKRICK: I'm Karl Zickrick, I live in Upper Fairmount and I want to be on the record as being opposed to the allocation. Also would like to ask Mr. Adkins a question regarding the Condition 13 on -- development --.

1 What are we basing that on? What, what plan are we basing 2 that on? What is significant development for completion? 3 MR. ADKINS: The decision, you want me to answer 4 that? 5 CHAIRMAN PRICE: Just try one question, go ahead. 6 The decision on what is and isn't it MR. ADKINS: 7 is based, the rest of the Planning Commission in Somerset 8 County -- myself and the County Commissioners. In terms of when does it start, approval itself hasn't been given, 10 finalized yet so obviously it hasn't started as of this 11 moment. But it would seem to me they'd get started once 12 that had been formalized. 13 MR. ZICKRICK: Well let me clarify my question. Based on what we saw at the December meeting what Mr. 15 Dahlman had proposed, is that whole development part of 16 this, what would be considered? 17 MR. ADKINS: The whole development is part of the 18 growth allocation action, it's based on the --. 19 MR. ZICKRICK: Thank you. 20 CHAIRMAN PRICE: Does anybody have anything 21 they'd like to tell the panel? Tom, you want to give an

address, or anybody who wishes to make any written comment

1 if you would stop over and see Tom Ventre, he can give you the address of the... 3 MR. VENTRE: Thank you, Mr. Price. I can give it 4 to you and again I'll point out that on top of that 5 ballister over there are small sheets of paper with the 6 Commission's mailing address in Annapolis and its telephone 7 number so you can reach us through either means. 8 CHAIRMAN PRICE: Okav. 9 MR. VENTRE: And as far as that goes, Mr. 10 Chairman, what about the record opens, did you inform the 11 audience, the 2 weeks? 12 CHAIRMAN PRICE: Yes, prior to May 24th. Does 13 any member of the panel wish to make any comments? No? 14 Not being any further comments then we thank you all for 15 your attention and testimony and with that we'll adjourn 16 the meeting. 17 (Whereupon, at 8:42 p.m. the hearing was 18 adjourned.) 19 20

21

CERTIFICATE This is to certify that the foregoing transcript 3 In the matter of: 4 5 CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA HEARING 6 Robert Price, Chairman BEFORE: 7 DATE: May 11, 1989 8 Somerset Court House, Corner of Prince William PLACE: 9 Street and Somerset Street, Upper Floor, Princess Anne, Maryland 21853 10 11 12 represents the full and complete proceedings of the 13 aforementioned matter, as reported as reduced to typewriting. 15 16 17 Kevin Richard Reppenhagen FREE STATE REPORTING, INC. 18 19 20 21