Public Hearings - Calvert County - Critical Area Amendments 1990 MSA_S1830-73

BEFORE THE CALVERT COUNTY PROGRAM AMENDMENTS PANEL

IN THE MATTER OF:

CRITICAL AREA PANEL :
PUBLIC HEARING ON :
CRITICAL AREA AMENDMENTS :
89-1, 89-2, 89-3, 89-4, 90-5. :

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

1

2

3

4

Monday, July 30, 1990

Pursuant to Notice, the above-entitled hearing was held before SAM BOWLING, CHAIRMAN of the Calvert, at the County Amendment Panel, Commissioners Hearing Room, Prince Frederick Courthouse, Prince Frederick, Maryland 20678, commencing at 7:05 p.m., there being present: PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

SAM BOWLING, CHAIRMAN LOUISE LAWRENCE BOB SCHOEPLEIN MICHAEL WHITSON

ALSO PRESENT:

DR. DAVID BROWNLEE, Environmental Planner, Calvert County

SUSAN LAWRENCE BARR, Secretary

BETSY RUSSELL, Halle Enterprises

JACK UPTON, Chesapeake Lighthouse Developers

REPORTED BY: DOTTIE GARRISON, NOTARY PUBLIC

RECEIVED

AUG 17 1990

HUNT REPORTING

CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 766-HUNT (4868) 800 950-DEPO

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Ladies and gentlemen, I would like to bring this meeting to order, and I would like to begin by introducing the panel. On my right is Louise Lawrence from the Department of Agriculture. On my left, Mike Whitson from St. Mary's County. I am Sam Bowling from Charles County. On the far left is Susan Lawrence, who is our staff person, and our court recorder is Dottie Garrison. Dave Brownlee from Calvert County will make the presentation tonight.

The purpose of our meeting is to hear your comments on the proposed amendments to the Calvert County Critical Areas Law. And we are required by law, under 18.809, I believe it is, to hold a hearing with at least three panel members present.

Normally, a decision on this matter would be made within 45 days, I think it is. So, if it's not made this month, it will be made at the next commission meeting following this one, because our next meeting is the day after tomorrow, and that would not provide adequate time for any additional public comment. We



′

generally allow two weeks for additional public comment, written comment, if you chose to submit some.

Dave, would you like to go ahead?

MR. BROWNLEE: I would let everybody know there is an agenda up here on the seat; and the first case, Critical Areas Amendment 89-1, there's a staff report on the second chair here, if you'd like.

And all of these have gone to the Calvert

County Planning Commission and Board of County

Commissioners and have been approved by them previously.

Okay, I'll go on into the first one, which deals with Halle Marina, Breezy Point, and what we'd like to do here is establish a buffer exemption area. When the county set up its program, it designated certain areas having particular characteristics as buffer exemption areas.

Okay, there's cites such as lack of natural buffers, presence of bulkheading on the property, lack of submerged aquatic vegetation in the area, to what extent the property was used for marine related activities, and so with that they designated -- the



county designated certain areas. And it seems Halle
Marina was not appointed at that time, though it meets
those criteria. It's been a marina since the 1930s. It
expanded with its boat basin in the '40s and '50s, and
is presently being revitalized as, you know, intense
marine use. It's designated marine commercial, and so
we support the designation of this area as a buffer
exemptioned area.

Any comments from the public on that?

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Anybody have anything they want to say about it?

MS. RUSSELL: We're all with Halle. Halle Enterprises.

MR. BROWNLEE: This is a map of Halle Marina. This is the Chesapeake Bay. This is Plum Point Creek going back with a boat basin here. And there's a boat -- buffer exemption area -- is this area here, going around the marina, not the outside portion which hasn't been disturbed.

MR. WHITSON: It's all bulkheaded, Dave?

MR. BROWNLEE: This basin is all bulkheaded.



.8

This is a dredged spoil area in here. Much of this area has been spoiled in the past through dredge spoils. The Army Corps of Engineers and the State have abandoned that area as wetlands to allow grading to go in there and filling in this area as a decimated area in the past.

This is a marsh area back here, which is being preserved and maintained, and we may even do some enhancement on that as they further develop the property -- ask for some enhancement.

This is all bulkheaded through here, and here they're putting in a new jetty. There's an existing jetty on this side. It doesn't come out as long as the other. They're putting in a stone abutment to come out to match the other side here. So, right now, it fills up with sand coming in from the south. So they do have permits to do that, and I guess they'll begin that fairly soon.

MS. RUSSELL: We've been requested by the Department of Natural Resources to provide a harbor area for their Department of Natural Resources police boats,



so we're speeding up our program, somewhat, and from the Governor's Office of Economic and Community Development they would like us to proceed on making some improvements because there's been a lull in the housing industry locally.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Please identify yourself for the court reporter.

MS. RUSSELL: I'm Betsy Russell with Halle Enterprises.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Thank you.

Mike, any questions?

MR. WHITSON: None.

MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. We'll do Critical Areas

Amendment 89-2. And there's a staff report on.

MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. We'll do Critical Areas Amendment 89-2. And there's a staff report on, actually, 89-2 and 3, right here. I have a full staff report. It says only 2 at the top, but it is 2 and 3. 89-2 and 89-3.

In 89-2, we're simply trying to bring the County Critical Areas map into a line with the State Title Wetlands map, which has the line of the critical areas on it. It was brought to our attention by a



person developing property along the line, and so we began processing this change early on.

We are in the process of changing all of our maps. Let me briefly explain to the panel members.

When we began mapping the critical areas, before we had State wetlands maps available to us, we set our critical areas lines 1,000 foot from tidal water, and then later on received the State wetlands maps. And for some reason, the changes weren't all made, or I don't know if any were made, but we do have a lot of discrepancies between where there is the State line and our line.

Our regulations require that we use the State line. Our ordinance says we will be using that, so tonight we'll be looking at changing the line on the full first district. And a few isolated cases, like this one that were brought to our attention early, we'll be doing separately. And then the second and third districts, we have completed the maps. We haven't taken them to our public hearing yet. You'll be seeing those in the future.

But, in this case, the red line is the new



critical area line. This is the new wetland line -well, actually not new. It's the State wetland line is
here. State critical areas line here, where our
published maps are here for the wetlands, and here for
the critical areas.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: You're actually reducing the size of the critical area.

MR. BROWNLEE: In this particular spot. We have it going both ways, as you'll see when we look at the first district. And this person here, developing this property, brought it to our attention. As, you know, they're developing that property they were getting a -- this is an R-1 area, and they are developing this section now and hope to expand this way.

MS. BARR: What is the name of that project? Sam's probably seen it.

MR. BROWNLEE: It's the Lighthouse --

MR. UPTON: Chesapeake Lighthouse.

MR. BROWNLEE: Chesapeake Lighthouse. So, in this case, we're simply going to amend the line to reflect the State wetlands map.



1	That's my presentation.				
2	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Any comments?				
3	MR. UPTON: The only comment that we made at				
4	this presentation				
5	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Please identify yourself.				
6	MR. UPTON: Yes, sir. Jack Upton on behalf of				
7	Chesapeake Lighthouse Developers and Forestry				
. 8	Development. We had pointed this matter out to the				
9	county some time ago, and then, subsequent to the				
10	initiation and the development, again, approached the				
11	planning office. Quite obviously, we're here in full				
12	support of the recommendation.				
13	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Louise? Mike?				
14	MR. WHITSON: No.				
15	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Bob hasn't been here long				
16	enough.				
17	Dave, was there any public comment on this one				
18	way or the other?				
19	MR. BROWNLEE: No, sir.				
20	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: No comments?				
21	MR. BROWNLEE: Making it easy				



1	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: We'll go on to the next			
2	one.			
3	(Whereupon, there was a discussion off			
4	the record.)			
5	MR. BROWNLEE: Critical Area No. '89-3 is the			
6	Ship's Point Research Park. This is down in Lusby.			
7	Again, it's a case of an error in mapping we'd like to			
8	correct. In this case it's not the line, but the			
9	designation, and the fact that it was listed as a buffe			
0	exempt area but was not mapped as a buffer exempt area.			
1	So, it's just correcting an error.			
2	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: It was listed but not			
13	mapped.			
4	MR. BROWNLEE: Right, it was listed under our			
15	list of buffer exempt areas, but not put on our official			
6	maps. This is Ship's Point Research Park here. Mill			
17	Creek and Solomon's is here, to give you an idea of			
18	where it is.			
9	MR. WHITSON: Pretty intensely developed area			
20	to start with.			



MR. BROWNLEE:

21

Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

This is the parcel, and part of

13.

.

it was mapped as LDA. Part of it is mapped as LDA by mistake. It should all be IDA -- this one whole parcel. In the mapping it got shifted such that some of these parcels were IDA, and part of this was LDA. This is all here -- they want this to be IDA as well. And these parcels here that look like they're falling in the IDA should be LDA. Mainly, what we're changing is this parcel IDA, and everything else is LDA, and adding the buffer exempt along this site.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: With the rapidity with which we made some of those changes when we did the original mapping -- and I was part of the Calvert County panel -- and I can understand how these things happen, because some of it changed, just bing-bing-bing, just like that.

MR. BROWNLEE: And the scale on the critical area of our map is such that it's difficult to pinpoint those parcels.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Because we had two complete different philosophies about mapping at that time. The commission had one spelled out in law, and Calvert



County had a different one. And we needed to reconcile, so that's how some of these came about, I'm sure. Any questions?

MR. WHITSON: No.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: It's an industrial park now and has been there for sometime.

MR. BROWNLEE: Research park.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Research park.

MR. BROWNLEE: I don't know if there's a lot of activity. It was the port for the Liquid Natural Gas Plant, and then they had, I think, several minor activities in there. I'm not fully up to what exactly is going in there. We do have ships coming in at times. I don't know all the activities there, but it is a research and industrial facility.

Critical Areas Amendment 89-4: Revisions of the definition of the forest and developed woodlands.

The definition that we like to use for a forest is, you know, "a biological community dominated by trees and other woody plants covering a land area of one acre."

It use to be one acre. We'd like to change that to a



.

thousand square feet or more. This also includes forests that have been cut, but not cleared. And add: "Areas commercially harvested of forest cover in the critical area will be considered forested for development purposes."

The main reason for these changes is the fact that we have a lot of existing subdivisions that have not been developed. Most of the lots are less than an acre. People come in and develop them; they actually do not come under the definition of a forest because they're less than an acre; therefore, they can clear up to 85 percent of the lot, keeping the 15 percent of any lot must be forested. So they could clear up to 85 percent of the forest. We could lose forests, or areas of forests, that way. So we wanted to, you know, change the regulations such that we would at least have replacement and have some limits on what could be replaced.

I did hand out a little further justification for the proposed changes to the critical area just tonight, and a little chart of impact of change. We



chose to set a size to the definition of a forest because, if you don't, trying to implement the definition of a community becomes difficult. You know, a single person could be a community with all the bacteria, et cetera, within it. So one tree might be a community. Someone else might argue, "Well, you need, you know, foxes, and raccoons, everything running around. The whole thing is community and it really has to be 20 acres."

So, to set a size, we thought was important. We chose a thousand square feet. It's roughly the size of an average house, and it would create a noticeable opening in the forest canopy. That's why we chose the thousand square feet.

We also propose to protect those small lots -I should look on the chart. Say you had a quarter acre
lot -- on the left. And if they were limited to
clearing 30 percent, they could only clear, you know,
3,267 feet. We thought that might be difficult to
actually get a house, driveway, et cetera, in an area
that small. Well, we thought it was appropriate that



5,000 square feet may be sufficient to build your house, driveway, et cetera, and if that might be a reasonable limit, then, everybody who wanted to build a house on their lot should be granted that area of clearing.

Now we are asking for replacement of all clearing. Okay, if it's greater than a thousand square feet, we want replacement. If it's up to 5,000 square feet or under 20 percent, we want it on a one-for-one basis. Beyond that, we'll apply the one and a half times as the law states.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: On a small lot it might not be practical for them to replace that thousand square feet.

MR. BROWNLEE: On a small lot?

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: On a small lot.

MR. BROWNLEE: Right.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: What does he do then?

MR. BROWNLEE: He pays fees in lieu.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Fees in lieu, okay.

MR. BROWNLEE: For replacement elsewhere in the critical areas. All right, we wouldn't -- under



that 5,000 square feet, we wouldn't require replacement on site unless there was a particular area that was appropriate. If he did have an area on his lot, that would be our first choice, especially in the buffer.

We'd ask him to plant that first. And, then, if he, you know, didn't have room elsewhere, then we'd take fees in lieu. But that is first choice is first to look on site. Can he place anything there? Many of these lots are fully wooded to begin with, and there's actually no place for them to replant at all.

MS. BARR: Isn't there a breaking point for your fees in lieu? Like up to a certain amount it's so much?

MR. BROWNLEE: Okay. If it's the standard 20 percent, or on this case under 5,000 square feet, it's two cents a square foot. And that's based on replanting seedlings, and that's using the recommendations of the forester. So, with any reasonable clearing, we would ask for a replacement with seedlings. In addition, any replanting of the 15 percent, where you have nothing and you want to plant 15 percent, well, that's for seedlings



and bonded up to two cents.

Now, if they want to go beyond 20 percent, or if they need for some reason to clear an area in the buffer, say, for access, then we're asking for the larger trees to be planted somewhere else, and that's the 40 cents a square foot. We would use that at that point. And it's a little complicated if you go between your 20 and 30 percent. For the first 20 percent you get it at two cents a square foot. Of course, the total area is 1-1/2 times now, and anything between the two, we charge 40 cents a square foot.

MR. WHITSON: Sure, right.

MR. BROWNLEE: It's a little complicated. But it gives them the benefit of the 20 percent at the lower price.

MR. WHITSON: You're going to be explaining that one a lot.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: I'm sure you are.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: You're examining the situation on a lot-by-lot basis? You've got the square feet here.



MR. BROWNLEE: Right.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: And so on a quarter acre lot you would permit up to 5,000 square feet?

MR. BROWNLEE: Right, because the -- yes, right. For a half acre lot?

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: For whatever it was.

MR. BROWNLEE: We're at a quarter. For a quarter, the limit of 30 percent would be 3,267. So that would be less than the 5,000, so, with our change, we would allow them to go up to 5,000.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: That's what I meant.

MR. BROWNLEE: Right. But for the half acre lot, you actually could go to 6,534.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: There is a frustration here between trying to save the trees as they are and, obviously, permitting a reasonable home site. Does the property holder have 5,000 square feet to play with, so to speak, to build a two-story house and use an extra thousand square feet elsewhere for site lines or something like that? Is that possible?

MR. BROWNLEE: Yes. Yes, that 5,000 square



feet is his to use as he wishes. That's a maximum amount; and if he needs more than that, then he has a hardship. Of course, he could go for a variance. But the law would allow him to go up to 5,000 square feet in any way that, you know, he could manage it. We have a limit of four stories in the county. That would limit him there.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: No, I was thinking of plat line.

MR. WHITSON: Outside of a variance, does the county plan on having any other kind of mitigation, other than going to the Board of Appeals or whatever the equivalent is here?

MR. BROWNLEE: We don't. I understand some counties, if you go beyond the 30 percent, you pay three times or something. That wasn't in our law.

MR. WHITSON: Well, actually, I mean less than that. Is there any administrative mitigation that can be done in lieu of --

MR. BROWNLEE: No. We would try it. You know, we would like to set something up like that. We



routine, that happen all the time, we expect them to happen.

We got back from the Critical Areas Commission

handle some of those administratively: the ones that are

have so many Board of Appeals cases. We wanted to

that it wasn't within the law to do that without changing the law. So, yes, we would like to handle a lot more administratively, if we could. But, at this point, you know, we can't. It means a lot of the cases go to the Board of Appeals.

MR. WHITSON: Is the greatest effect of this going to be sort of the older, grandfathered subs like the Redchester -- Long Beach, White Sands Beach. Is that the older?

MR. BROWNLEE: Definitely.

MR. WHITSON: Yes, the small lots.

MR. BROWNLEE: That's our limit to lot size, and, of course, there's quarter acre lots of R-1 in the critical areas. Okay, when someone subdivides a larger parcel, then when he subdivides, we'll be applying all the criteria for the larger lot. And they would be



placed on a plat. So, actually, these exemptions and so forth will only apply to existing lots.

What we ask for is square footage of clearing, square footage of impervious surface in advance, or evenly distributed among the lots, so that the person buying the lot knows in advance that they are limited to clearing 20 percent of their lot, because the guy used, you know, so much for the road. So, in the new subdivisions, that'll all be handled at subdivision level and spelled out in terms of clearing and impervious surface.

But we do have a large number of existing lots that we think we're losing forest because if someone clears 5,000 square feet, the cost to them is \$100 at two cents a square foot. So it's not a large cost to any one property owner, but we do get replacement, and right now we're not.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: You have restrictions on clearing in the buffer, don't you?

MR. BROWNLEE: We do have restrictions. We're real weak, right now, on our penalties. The three times



for illegal clearing doesn't show up in the buffer section. So, I think we're very weak, and we made recommendations that, you know, that be changed. And we do have some -- I have another set of amendments coming, including buffer management plan, which spells out, adds fees and so forth, for that. This would help some, and if they clear more than a thousand square feet in the buffer, then we can hit them with three times because that would be a forest and be illegal now. So this gets us a little closer.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Little more leverage.

MR. BROWNLEE: We've had someone -- that's another reason for this is that penalties -- we've had someone go out and clear eight-tenths of an acre in the critical areas, and we can't do anything. It's not a forest. You know, it's maintained 15 percent, but that's it. You know, he can go scot-free, and first we're trying to hit him with all these fees, and he can go back and say, "Well, it's not a forest."

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Under your old definition it wasn't.



MR. BROWNLEE: Right.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: I'm catching up here. In a subdivision situation, does each and every lot have to meet these requirements, or does the entirety of, say, a five-lot subdivision have to meet these requirements?

MR. BROWNLEE: See, when you subdivide, you're usually more than five acres. So, you're a large number. So the 5,000 exemption doesn't really hold. You have to meet all the criteria. Limit to 20 to 30 percent clearing. 15 percent impervious surface if you're LDA or RCA. So, they don't actually get into here except for existing lots because we'd address that at subdivision level.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Now, when they're mitigating, elsewhere in the critical area, Calvert County has sufficient land --

MR. BROWNLEE: Well, actually we haven't even planted our first tree yet. But we setting up a committee, hopefully, this -- in August -- to have the trees planted this fall. And we're setting up the committee to make recommendations to the commissioners



on what policies, how we prioritize and choose sites.

And then the same committee, hopefully, or a similar committee, would continue meeting twice a year, once before the growing season for the fall planting and once before the spring planting, and choose sites.

So those policies and so forth are not established now. We hope to do that next month and get it going, so we get some planting this fall.

MR. SCHOEPLEIN: Do you have a tree planting program, other than exclusive of the Critical --

MR. BROWNLEE: There's the Green Shores. I know that our county doesn't, no, but that the Forest, Park, and Wildlife does, through Green Shores, et cetera. I don't know how much area we'll have will show up. You know, we'll set a priority, and we'll allow private land as well, as long as it's not required to plant because of development. You wouldn't plant them there -- as well.

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Any more questions? We have no audience to tell -- to submit. So, I guess, Dave, probably we have to leave the record open for a



couple of weeks anyway. So we would not be able to 1 present these at the next commission meeting, which is 2 the day after tomorrow. 3 MS. BARR: Oh, we can't? 4 CHAIRMAN BOWLING: No. 5 MS. BARR: Because you have to leave it open 6 for two weeks? 7 CHAIRMAN BOWLING: We have to leave it open. 8 It'll have to be the meeting following. 9 MR. BROWNLEE: That's fine. And we have one 10 other amendment. 11 CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Oh, I'm sorry. 12 that was it. 13 MR. BROWNLEE: There a critical area in the 14 90-1. 15 CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Okay. 16 MR. BROWNLEE: And this is to change the 17 critical area line in the first district from our 18 present map to the critical area line on the State 19 wetlands maps. We have Tax Map numbers 25, 28, 30 20 through 40, 42 through 45, and 47. So parts of these



- 21

1	maps might be a little bit in the second district. We				
2	want to change those as well, since they're on the tax				
3	map. But mostly it's in the first district.				
4	There's nobody here to ask if they want to see				
5	a particular map.				
6	MR. WHITSON: Would you like to see a map?				
7	MR. SCHOEPLEIN: I would like to see what				
8	you're doing. That's great.				
9	MR. BROWNLEE: Okay, so the red line is the				
10	new line. The black is the old. And you see it often				
11	jumps back and forth on either side.				
12	MR. WHITSON: You've carefully checked this				
13	map over for accuracy, right?				
14	MS. BARR: Oh, right. With a fine-toothed				
15	comb.				
16	MR. BOWLING: Compared it to the areas, right?				
17	MS. BARR: Oh, yes.				
18	(Whereupon, there was a discussion off				
19	the record.)				
20	MR. BROWNLEE: We did send them up for review				
21	they were adopted. You know, we have had some problems				



1	with circlear areas line, the transfer zone coming in,				
2	ours being further out				
3	MS. BARR: Is that transfer zone included in				
4	what district is that in?				
5	MR. BROWNLEE: Second district. We have those				
6	done now. We just have to take them to public hearing.				
7	MS. BARR: Good.				
8	MR. BROWNLEE: So, in that case we had a				
9	transfer zone. The county's policy so far has been that				
10	they have adopted these maps, gone through public				
11	hearing, critical areas has approved them that these				
12	are the official maps and we have to go through a				
13	change to go to the State wetland line.				
14	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Even though we're required				
15	to observe the State wetland line by law.				
16	MR. BROWNLEE: That's right.				
17	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: So that binds anyway.				
18	MS. BARR: Well, this is the county's				
19	position.				
20	MR. BROWNLEE: That's the county position,				
21	okay. I know my position; that's the county position,				



1	okay. In this case it looks like it's mostly closer in,			
2	so it would be less critical areas.			
3	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: That's right. Seems you			
4	might have to look at your growth allocation computation			
5	to see if maybe we need to take a little away.			
6	MR. BROWNLEE: Maybe they'd give us some; we			
7	don't know yet.			
8	(Laughter.)			
9	MS. BARR: Get my plenimeter out and start			
10	a			
11	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: It probably won't change			
12	anything.			
13	MR. BROWNLEE: They can figure it out on the			
14	computer, though, and they will be redoing that.			
15	MS. BARR: That's what caused all the problems			
16	in the first place.			
17	MR. BROWNLEE: The computer? I think you have			
18	the idea.			
19	CHAIRMAN BOWLING: Well, this is really			
20	something the commission asked you to do, isn't it?			
21	MS. BARR: Yes, I have old letters, I think,			



21

probably recorded before Dave was with the county, just saying that there were problems with the maps. From way back. Unfortunately they have surfaced.

MR. BROWNLEE: I came in right as this was being adopted in November of '88. We adopted it in December. I don't know a lot of the history. I'm learning.

MS. BARR: Good. Me, too.

MR. BROWNLEE: And that was the final amendment.

MR. BOWLING: That's the final amendment. Any questions?

PANEL MEMBERS: (No response.)

CHAIRMAN BOWLING: With that, I'm going to declare this meeting at an end. I've already been through the spiel about, you know, two weeks to submit written comments to the commission. So, we will probably take this up, not at the next commission meeting, but at the following commission meeting.

(Whereupon, at 7:40 p.m., the aboveentitled hearing was adjourned.)



CONTENTS

2	SPEAKERS		PAGE
3	MR. BROWNLEE		
	89-1		3
4	89-2		6
5	89-3		. 10
6	89-4	·	12
7	90-1		25
	,	•	

EXHIBITS

(None)





August 21, 1990

301 766-HUNT (4868) 800 950-DEPO (3376)

Critical Area Commission 275 West Street Suite 320 Annapolis, MD 21401 ATTN: Peggy

Dear Peggy:

Enclosed please find the Certificate of Notary sheet for the hearing of July 30, 1990, in the matter of Critical Area Panel Public Hearing on Critical Area Amendments 89-1, 89-2, 89-3, 89-4, 90-5. Please attach it to the original transcript.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

Cynemas Brutsen

CYNTHIA G. KNUTSEN

Secretary

CGK

RECEIVED

AUG 23 1990

DNR CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

Certified Verbatim Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY

I, DOTTIE GARRISON, the officer before whom the hearing was held, do hereby certify that the testimony was taken by me by magnetic tape and thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under my direction; that said testimony is a true record of the testimony given; that I am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any of the parties to the action in which this testimony is taken; and, further, that I am not a relative or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested in the outcome of the action.

Dottie Garrison

Notary Public in and for

the State of Maryland

My Commission Expires:

april 14, 1994



AUG 23 1990

CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

