Public Hearings - Queen Annels Country - Approval of Golf Course 1990 MJA-51830-85

CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

1	
2	IN THE MATTER OF:
	IN THE MATTER OF:
3	THE APPLICATION OF WASHINGTON : BRICK AND TERRA COTTA COMPANY :
4	FOR APPROVAL OF A GOLF COURSE. :
5	
6	Monday, April 23, 1990
	Pursuant to Notice, the above-entitled hearing
7	was held at the Queen Anne's County Administration
8	Office in Centreville, Maryland, commencing at 7:07
9	p.m., there being present on behalf of the respective
10	parties:
11	COMMITTEE MEMBERS:
12	WILLIAM CORKRAN, CHAIRMAN JOSEPH ELBRICH, JR.
13	KATHRYN LANGNER JOHN GRIFFIN
14	ON BEHALF OF THE CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION:
15	THOMAS A DEMING, ESQUIRE Assistant Attorney General
16	Tawes State Office Building Annapolis, Maryland 21401
17	ON BEHALF OF CITIZENS FOR PRESERVATION:
18	JOHN C. MURPHY, ESQUIRE
19	Suite 206 516 North Charles Street Baltimore, Maryland 21201
20	Bartimore, Maryrana 21201

RECEIVED

21

APR 26 1990





Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

٠	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	

	(
	I
ı	

on	BEHALF	OF	QUEEN	ANNE	DEPARTMENT	OF
		PLI	ANNING	AND	ZONING:	

CHRISTOPHER DRUMMOND, ESQUIRE Blumenthal, Wayson, Downs and Offutt 120 West Water Street Centreville, Maryland 21617

ON BEHALF OF WASHINGTON BRICK:

JOHN H. MURRAY, ESQUIRE 101 Bay Street Easton, Maryland 21601

REPORTED BY: DEBORAH TURNER, NOTARY PUBLIC

HU⁷ -FORTING

- 17

PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Our esteemed attorney has presented me this evening with an opening statement, and I shall read this.

My name is William Corkran, Jr., and I'm a member of the Chesapeake Bay Critical Areas Commission from Talbot County.

Judge John North, Chairman of the Commission has appointed a five-member panel of Commission members to conduct tonight's hearing, and designated me to chair the panel.

The other members are, and sitting here to my right, if I may, with deference to Kay, is Joe Albrecht from Anne Arundel County, and Kay Langner from Cecil County, and John Griffin, who is the Deputy Secretary of the Department of Natural Resources.

The purpose of this hearing is for the panel to review a proposal by Washington Brick and Terra Cotta Company to develop a golf course that would be located in the Resource Conservation Area on a tract that lies adjacent to the Chester River and Queenstown Creek, west



of U. S. Route 50 and 301, and Maryland Route 18. The panel is charged to make a recommendation to the full Commission at it's meeting on May 2, 1990.

This matter comes before the Commission because Section 6007B.1 of the Queen Anne County's Critical Area Ordinance prohibits certain uses in the Resources Conservation Area due to their adverse impact on habitats and water quality.

Among the uses listed under this prohibition is the following, and under Section "G":

"Institutional uses as defined by Queen Anne's County zoning ordinance shall be subject to interpretation by the Critical Area Commission, and a determination of whether or not the use constitutes an industrial or commercial use under the provisions of the Critical Area. Section 4007 of the Queen Anne County zoning ordinance classifies golf courses as an institutional use under the sub heading of 'outdoor recreation'".

The Commission understands these provisions to mean that if a particular institutional use is not



deemed to constitute an industrial or commercial use, it is not, underlined, prohibited in the Resource Conservation Area under Sections 6007B.1 of the Queen Anne County Critical Area Ordinance.

If, on the other hand, the Commission

determines that the proposed golf course does constitute
an industrial or commercial use, then it is not

permitted in the Resource Conservation Area under the

Queen Anne County Critical Area Ordinance.

The relevant portion of the Commission's criteria is 14.15.02.05C(5), which provides in pertinent part:

- "C. In developing their Critical Area programs, local jurisdictions shall use all of the following criteria for Resource Conservations Areas:
- (5) Existing industrial and commercial facilities including those that directly support agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, or residential development not exceeding the density specified in Section C(4), above, shall be allowed in Resource Conservation Areas. Additional land may not be zoned



for industrial or commercial development, except as provided in regulations .06, below."

Regulation .06 refers to the use of a County's growth allocation.

As the Commission's criteria contain no definition of industrial or commercial the issue on which this panel must make a recommendation to the full Commission, is a matter of first impression for the Commission. The panel wishes to hear any information that is relevant to the issue of whether a golf course such as that proposed should be deemed a commercial use or not.

The hearing will be adjudicatory in nature, with participation limited to persons according to party status. Each party will have the right to put on witnesses, present evidence, cross-examine witnesses of other parties, and make closing arguments. The panel's recommendation to the Commission will be based solely on the testimony and evidence received at this hearing.

The hearing will be completed this evening.

In order to accomplish this, parties are requested to



· 1

. 10

make their presentations concise, and keep their crossexamination as brief as possible.

If two or more parties share a common position on this matter they are urged to make presentations and cross-examination through a common spokesperson or counsel.

Rebuttal testimony will be permitted if necessary, but again each party is requested to keep it to the minimum necessary.

The order of the proceeding will be as follows: The introduction by the Chairman; two,

Determination of objections to standing, if any;

preliminary matters, that is procedural or jurisdictional issues; presentation by County officials;

presentation by Washington Brick and Terra Cotta

Company; and six, presentation of relevant information by staff of the Critical Areas Commission; and then presentation by other parties.

Eight, rebuttal testimony if necessary, in same order presentation as above; nine, closing arguments.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

1	The following persons have requested party
2	status by letters received at the offices of the
3	Critical Areas Commission by noon last Friday, April 20,
4	1990:
5	Washington Brick and Terra Cotta Company,
6	Counsel, John H. Murray, Esquire;
7	Department of Planning and Zoning, Queen
. 8	Anne's County, Counsel, Christopher F. Drummond,
9	Esquire;
10	Charles F. Benson;
11	Citizens for the Preservation of Queenstown
12	Creek, Incorporated;
13	McAvoy Cromwell and Byam Stevens, executors of
14	the estate of Clare Stevens, deceased;
15	Lawrence Hoyle, Jr.;
16	Mrs. Thorpe Nesbit;
17	Chauncey and Kathleen Brooks;
18	Mr. and Mrs. Irving Tuttle;
19	Margaret C. Taliaferro;
20	John Lee Carroll;
21	Counsel, John C. Murphy, Esquire.



If there are any objections to the standing of 1 . any person requesting to be a party, we will hear 2 testimony from that person as to how his or her 3 interests may be adversely affected by the Commission's action. 5 Will counsel now please note, in turn, what 6 objections to standing, if any, they wish to raise? 7 MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, John Murray, for 8 Washington Brick and Terra Cotta Company. q I wish to object to the standing of the 10 following: 11 Citizens for the Preservation of Oueenstown 12 Creek. 13 McAvoy Cromwell and Byam Stevens, Executors of 14 the estate of Clare Stevens, deceased; 15 Lawrence Hoyle, Jr.; 16 Mrs. Thorpe Nesbit; 17 Chauncey and Kathleen Brooks; 18 Mr. and Mrs. Irving Tuttle; 19 Margaret C. Taliaferro; 20



John Lee Carroll,

21

3

4

5

6

7

8 9

.10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

on the grounds that those persons and entities do not have any injury in fact, and they're not protected by the zone of interest covered by the issues before the Commission tonight.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, it would be appropriate at this time for Mr. Murphy to offer testimony as to each person against whom standing is objected so that we can hear what their interest is and make a determination whether they should be afforded standing or not.

MR. MURPHY: Good evening, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Good evening.

MR. MURPHY: Members of the Commission, my name is John C. Murphy. I'm the attorney for these individuals whose standing has been questioned.

Just as a preliminary matter I would like to make the observation that in regard to standing it seems to me we are seeking to determine whether a golf course is a permitted RCA use in Queen Anne's County. I



understand that's what this introduction stated, and I have some objections that I'd like to reserve at this time, as to this proceeding, which I'll get into at the time of making procedural objections.

But I would just like to make the preliminary observation that if you're talking about whether golf courses are a permitted use in the RCA in Queen Anne's County, it seems to me that anybody who is a citizen of Queen Anne's County would have an interest in this.

However, I will not rest on that statement, instead I will call Mr. John Lee Carroll to the witness stand.

Where do you want Mr. Carroll to sit? Is it all right for him to sit here?

Can you hear him?

THE REPORTER: I would prefer that he sit over here near the mike.

Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Do you wish Mr. Carroll to be sworn? Does Counsel waive swearing of the witnesses or do you want them sworn?



MR. MURRAY: I prefer them to be sworn. Ì Whereupon, 2 JOHN LEE CARROLL, 3 a witness, called for examination by counsel for the 4 Citizens for Preservation, was duly sworn, and was 5 examined and testified as follows: 6 EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE CITIZENS FOR 7 **PRESERVATION** 8 BY MR. MURPHY: 9 Mr. Carroll, would you, for the record, state 10 your full name and address? 11 John Lee Carroll, Blakeford Farm, P.O. Box 12 199, Queenstown, Maryland 21658. 13 Q And how long have you lived in Queenstown? 14 Since 1970. Α .15 What is your education, Mr. Carroll? Q. 16 I have a MS degree in geology. Α 17 What is your occupation? Q · 18 I'm a geologist. Α 19 How long have you practiced that occupation? Q 20 Since 1960. 21 Α



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

- Q Where do you practice that occupation?
- A In New York, primarily.
- Q Now do you believe that the proposed golf course proposed by the Washington Brick and Terra Cotta Company will have an adverse effect upon you?
 - A Yes, I do.
 - Q Would you explain to the Commission why?
- A Okay, I live at Blakeford, which is a farm just across the mouth of Queen Anne's Queenstown Creek, from Mr. Birney's property, which is known as My Lord's Gift.

And it's called Blakeford because there was once a ford there called Blake's Ford, which was an important trade route in colonial times. And it would still be a ford, or even a land bridge, if the Corps of Engineers didn't periodically dredge a narrow channel through the ford for the benefit of the watermen and the recreational boats.

I have a nautical chart here, which shows the relationship --

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Counsel, do you want to



have that marked as an exhibit? 1 MR. MURPHY: Let's put this up here on --CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: I don't think they can see 3 it from there. 4 Let's pull it around. MR. MURPHY: 5 MR. MURRAY: Mr. Murphy, can we get that 6 marked before we put it up on the board? 7 (Whereupon, the document was marked for 8 identification Exhibit Number 1.) 9 BY MR. MURPHY: 10 Would you mind if the witness approaches and 11 points out? 12 Α See, this is not a small feature. We're 13 talking about this area right in here, okay. And it is 14 this feature -- this dredging length, by the way, is 15 just under a mile. 16 Wait a minute now, this peninsula is your 17 property here? 18 This is Blakeford Point, yes. Α 19 So you own this property here? 20 Α Yeah.



21

Q And right across the entrance to Queenstown
Creek is the My Lord's Gift property, which is the
Washington Brick and Terra Cotta --

MR. DEMMING: Excuse me, Counsel, so that the record will be clear, when you refer to this peninsula, et cetera, could you make a mark on the chart at a label of "A" or "B" or something, so that the transcript will reflect what the exhibit shows?

MR. MURPHY: Sure.

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q You want to mark your property "A", Mr. Carroll, Blakeford.

- A All right, sir.
- Q And then would you mark the Birney property "B"?
 - A All right.
- Q What would be the approximate distance there, do you know?
 - A Just under 500 yards.

MR. MURPHY: I would offer this in evidence, Exhibit 1.



MR. MURRAY: Has it been accepted?

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes, we accept that.

(Whereupon, Exhibit 1 was received into evidence.)

Thank you.

MR. MURPHY:

THE WITNESS: It's this configuration plus the configuration of the two globes of Queenstown Creek that make Queenstown Creek very different from a lot of other creeks on the Bay. It is not the "V" shaped canyon running down into another "V" shaped canyon, it's more like a tidal lagoon, which empties out over a bar. And this creates a problem because Queenstown Creek has really no flushing capability, and pollutants that go in there are likely to remain until the next storm, combined with the spring tide takes them out.

This lack of flushing capability has been the source of serious concern, and there have been a great many studies on it, including one going on right now in the Department of Health.

The other feature of this area is that it is underlain by a semi-consolidated sand layer, which



contains the water table. This sand layer is in contact with the creek so that anything that is put on land adjacent to the creek finds it way eventually into the creek, unless it's rapidly degradable material.

Now you're going to hear some expert testimony about what the golf course will do to the creek, but just let me say a couple of things.

Construction of the golf course could produce -- that construction and grading alone could produce a sedimentation problem in this creek, which it might never recover come from for ten years or more.

Studies of the Patuxent River have shown this.

The pesticides and herbicides, which will be some six times greater than what is currently going on on that property, these materials plus nutrients will enter into the ground water, and go from there into the creek, which is already suffering from too many nutrients.

For the five families living on Blakeford, our whole lives are tied up with the wildlife habitat, both aquatic and terrestrial. Fish, soft crabs, water fowl,



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

10 -

boating, wind surfing, these are all -- these are our lives, and they're what the land values on the Eastern shore are based on.

Golf courses are notoriously hard on geese, and geese are a big element in the economic values of waterfront farms. We operate off of a very shallow well, and a utrafine (phonetic) creek could cause problems for drinking water.

Do I have to say any more about that?

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q Well, --

A I have another reason, which is that this is at present an entirely residential community. I don't know how many of you -- how many of you have been to Queenstown? Anybody here?

Well, those of you who have been there know that it has almost no commercial activity, and it has no commercial activity on the waterfront. It's only 160 acres in size, less than a quarter the size of the My Lord's Gift farm. And there's nothing going on there on the waterfront, except the watermen coming and going.



You cannot buy gas at the dock, and the town wants it that way, and the town keeps it that way. And the rest of the creek is surrounded by farms and residences and there's no commercial activity there either.

Now a golf course is a major commercial activity, practically doubling the daily population of this rural area, and it's not just introducing commercial uses, it's overwhelming it with commerciality.

The residential values, which have been built up in the community, are going to fall, and the question will be, will commercial values take their place. What will those commercial values amount to. Will they be realizable. That's -- you know, when the character of the community is being changed in such a drastic way, I, and the other people that are represented here, have to do some very hard thinking.

I think we have standing.

Q Mr. Carroll, could you tell me what is the organization called, Citizens for the Preservation of



Oueenstown Creek?

A Well, the -- as I explained about this water quality problem has been bothering people for a long time, and the Citizens for the Preservation of Queenstown Creek was started to see if we couldn't solve those problems.

Q So it's interested in water quality of the creek?

A Mainly in the water quality of the creek, and the commerciality of the creek. We don't think that the creek can stand any really -- really any commerciality at all.

Q What effect would the golf course have on the organization of Citizens for the Preservation of Queenstown Creek?

A Frustrate the purpose of the whole organization. It would allow commerciality on the creek, and also reduce the water quality and it would certainly not be in line with what we're trying to achieve.

Q Let me ask you about these individual



1	citizens,	and if you could locate their property for us
2	A	Sure.
3	Q	Margaret Taliaferro happens to be in the
4	audience.	If there's no objection I would just as soon
5	have Mr. C	arroll say where she is.
6		Where is Margaret Taliaferro?
7	A	She lives in Queenstown.
8	Q	In Queenstown on the water?
9	A	Yes.
10	Q	And Chauncey and Kathleen Brooks, do they liv
11	in Queenst	own also?
12	A	Yes, they do.
13	Q	And they live on the water?
14	A	Yes.
15	Q	And you have talked to them about this case?
16	A	Yes.
17	Q	Have they told you how they would be affected
18	by the gol	f course?
19	A	Yes.
20	Q	Which would be essentially the same thing
21	your effec	t





Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

1		BY MR. MURPHY:
2	Q	Now would you locate the Stevens' property for
3	us?	
4	A	Yes, that's on the east side of the creek,
5	there.	
6	Q	That is on the creek also?
7	A .	Yes.
8	Q	And would you locate the Hoyle property?
9	A	The Hoyle property is just north of Mrs.
10	Miles. I	t's this property here.
11	Q	It's on the Chester?
12	A	It's on the Chester River.
13	· Q	And would you locate the Nesbit property?
14	A	The Nesbit property is just southeast of the
15	My Lord's	Gift farm, between the Nesbit property and the
16	Caputo pr	operty and the My Lord's Gift is the
17	Caputo pr	operty.
18	Q	I see. I think that's everybody.
19		MR. GRIFFIN: Where's Taliaferro?
20	·	THE WITNESS: She's in the town, just here.
21		BY MR. MURPHY:



- Q Where is Brooks, also?
- A Brooks -- I would say there.

MR. ELBRICH: Since those are not marked on the map, you might want to do a label designation for who is who, please.

THE WITNESS: These are the two property owners who are --

MR. ELBRICH: In the town.

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q And would it be your testimony that Mrs.

Nesbit and the Stevens estate and the Hoyle interests are affected the same as you are by the proposed golf course?

A Yes, indeed. Hoyle a little less directly, because he's one step removed from the creek, but the commerciality of the area affects Hoyle very severely. In other words, if Carroll or Stevens were to thrown in the towel and turn their property over to Marriott Corporation, Hoyle would be --

800 950-DEPO

- Q And Hoyle --
- A -- in a very bad situation.



1	Q Is Hoyle's property an active farm and
2	A An active farm, yes.
3	Q farming?
.4	A Yes.
5	Q And pretty much all the properties around the
6	town are in farm use?
7	A All actively farmed.
8	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: May I ask a question? What
9	is the difference in designation in green and plain?
10	THE WITNESS: The green, I think, indicates
11	forested areas.
12	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: I see. So that isn't farm'
13	THE WITNESS: Well, it's farmed here. There's
14	a field there is a see this isn't quite
15	correct. She owns a field in here. But it's all part
16	of the same farm.
17	BY MR. MURPHY:
18	Q Originally this was the Miles estate, wasn't
19	it, that you own now?
20	A Yes.
21	MR. MURPHY: May I offer this in evidence?



1	THE WITNESS: Mrs. Miles, by the way, is one
2	of our group.
3	MR. MURPHY: She belongs to the Citizens for
4	Preservation of Queenstown Creek?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, she does.
6	MR. MURPHY: As well as the Caputos who live
7	here?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes, and she asked to be a
9	member of the individuals who were a part of the
10	MR. MURPHY: I think that request came in
1	after I'd sent the names in.
2	I've offered that in evidence.
13	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Any objection?
4	MR. DEMMING: None.
5	(Whereupon, Exhibit Number 2 was received
6	into evidence.)
7	MR. MURPHY: Your witness.
8	EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR WASHINGTON BRICK
9	BY MR. MURRAY:
20	Q Mr. Carroll, would you please locate the
,	logation of your house on Exhibit Number 12



1	A Right here.
2	Q How is that being designated?
3	A However you want. I can make it darker if you
4	like.
5	Q Okay, you testified earlier that you were a
6	resident of Queenstown; that's not correct is it?
7	A I'm not a legal resident, no. For tax
8	purposes do you mean?
9	Q For any purpose?
10	A Well, I don't vote there.
1	Q Does your house lie within the municipal
2	boundaries of Queenstown?
13	A No.
4	Q You also testified that there was no
15	commercial activity in Queenstown Creek. Is it not the
6	case that there are some commercial watermen?
7	A Didn't I say other than watermen?
18	Q I did not hear you say that.
9	A Yeah, I did I meant to say that. Other
20	than watermen coming and going there was no commercial
1	activity. There are about 40 to 50 watermen who keep



1	their boats in the harbor, not all of who live in
2	Queenstown.
3	Q Are there no other commercial activities at
4	all that are visible within Queenstown Creek?
5	A Not that I know of.
6	Q No dredging rigs?
7	A Well, the dredging rig is not does not
8	dredge in Queenstown, except I think the last dredging
9	was a few years ago, and the only dredging before
10	that was in 1955. So mainly those rigs are away from
11	there.
12	Q But they are tied up there from time to time
13	or anchored in the creek?
14	A Yes, they are. It's a problem we're
15	addressing.
16	Q Now is it not also the case that Queenstown
17	municipal sewer facility discharges into the creek at
18	the head of the creek?
19	A That is correct.
20	MR. MURRAY: No other questions of this
21	witness.



	EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE CITIZENS FOR
2	PRESERVATION
3	BY MR. MURPHY:
l	Q Mr. Carroll, I may have misled you. I asked
5	you how long you had lived in Queenstown, and you never
6	meant to mislead the Commission by saying that you lived
7	within the corporate boundaries, did you?
8	A No, no. Oh, I think that is clear from
9	Q Your post office address is Queenstown?
0	A Right, yeah.
1	Q And you have a residence in New York City
2	where you carry on your business, geology?
3	A That's right, you did ask me that. Isn't that
4	what I said.
5	Q You have a residence there, and you've also
6	had this residence in Queenstown since 1960, is it?
7	A 1968 we first moved here, renting a house, and
8	in '70 we bought.
9	Q And you were actually born and raised in
0	Howard County, were you not?
ı	A Howard County, yes.



MR. MURPHY: That's all I have.

Mr. Chairman, that would be our case on standing. I could argue if you wish.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you.

MR. DEMMING: I think we should hear a brief argument from Mr. Murphy, and then a brief response from Mr. Murray.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: All right.

MR. MURPHY: Well, I really don't want to belabor this point, because I think that this is a legal principle, whether a person has a plausible or legitimate concern that they will be affected by the action which is under discussion.

And the question is potential injury in fact, and I think Mr. Carroll, for himself, has amply demonstrated that he fears the effects of a polluted Queenstown Creek for the reasons he stated with respect to the soil types and the use of pesticides and the run off from the grading, et cetera.

He also testified about the commercialization of the area, and his fears that that will interfere with



l

his residential character of his property, and the enjoyment and property value associated with it.

I think this is abundance of testimony with regard to standing.

A case with respect to Citizens for the

Preservation of Queenstown Creek, is a little different.

That is an organization, and there are some cases in

Maryland law that talk about a typical homeowner's

association, if you have a organization of homeowners

they might not have standing, because they don't

have any interest that's different from their interest

as homeowners. There are some cases that stand for

that.

However, again, the question is injury in fact, and we have in our United States, we have organizations that are interested in making money, making a profit, and that's part of the American system. Nobody would dispute the standing of the applicants here, because they have an interest in a profit making business, associated with this property.

This organization does not have an interest in



making a profit. It's interest is somewhat different.

It's interest is in the preservation of Queenstown

Creek, and the commercialization, resisting the

commercialization of the creek.

I would just proffer -- I should have asked Mr. Carroll this, it's a non-profit corporation. It's identified that way in the pleadings, it's incorporated. And organizations under the law have standing, whether they are profit making or non profit, or whatever. It's again an injury in fact, and there is a multitude of Supreme Court cases that have recognized this. The principle has been recognized in Maryland cases, although I'm not aware as a matter of fact of any case authorizing standing to a environmental organization.

However, there's no case that says they don't. It hasn't arisen under Maryland law. It's arisen thousands of times under federal law, and the test is basically the same. The Sierra Club versus Morton case in the Supreme Court is the leading case.

With respect to the other individuals, Mrs.



Taliaferro, the Brooks, who live in the town, Mr.

Carroll testified that the effect on them would be the same as it would be on him. The pollution of the water interfering with their enjoyment of the waterfront property.

I mean, it's hard to seriously argue that your property enjoyment and values would not be affected by the pollution of the body of water on which you own property. They seem to have a legitimate standing interest. They also have an interest in preventing the commercialization of the creek, and of the area.

It's certainly a fundamental principle that commercial activities can harm residential amenities and uses.

I think 99 percent of the cases in Maryland law on zoning are residential owners seeking to prevent some type of commercial use. This is bread and butter standing.

The interests of the farm owners who are also waterfront people, who own land on Queenstown Creek, Mr. Carroll again testified that their interest was



basically the same as his. Their interest is in having property on a non-polluted body of water, versus having property on a body of water that is polluted. It seems to me there's a clear effect on a person's enjoyment and value of his property.

Mr. Carroll very candidly testified that the Hoyle property was not fronting on Queenstown Creek, it obviously isn't, but it would be affected by the commercialization of the area. He said that Hoyle is a farmer, and has a residence on the property, and that it would be affected again by the commercialization.

So, in summary I would submit that with respect to every individual identified as a party that they have ample standing in this case.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you.

Mr. Murray?

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Murphy and I agree on what principles are, we disagree on how they should be applied.

The law of standing in Maryland simply is that



.9

the individuals seeking standing must evidence some special, individual harm, something that sets them apart from the public at large.

That, however, has to be more than simply a fear, or some speculative concern about what some event may mean to them.

It has to be something reasonable objective.

And moreover, even if that assertion is made, it has to be within the zoning interests intended to be protected by the law being applied, or sought to be applied.

Mr. Murphy says that all of the landowners in the area are similarly affected, which proves the point that there is no unique, special, interest to these people. They are situated just like all the rest of us, who are citizens of Maryland, or citizens of Queen Anne's County. We have an interest in our general environment. That does not give us, as individuals, the right to get involved in these kinds of decision making processes.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you.



1 MR. DEMMING: Mr. Chairman, I would suggest 2 that it might be appropriate to take no more than a five 3 or ten minute break so that I could confer with members of the panel on the legal arguments that have been made, 4 and then we can rule on the standing question and get on 5 with this. 6 CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: All right, well how about 7 just five minutes. 8 MR. DEMMING: Okay, there's a conference room 9 right back where that door is back there. We can go 10 back there. 11 (Whereupon, there was a brief recess.) 12 CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Before I announce our 13 decision, I trust that everyone has put his name to the 14 sign-up sheet. If not, I will leave it up here, if you 15 would please do that. 16 17 The panel has decided that the following have 18 standing: 19 The estate of Clare Stevens; 20. Mrs. Nesbit; 21 Chauncey and Kathleen Brooks;



1	Margaret Taliaferro;
2	John Carroll.
3	We have a question because we could not find
4	it on the map there, where Mr. and Mrs. Irving Tuttle
5	may live.
6	MR. CARROLL: Queenstown.
7	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Is their property on the
8	creek?
9	MR. CARROLL: Well, within 200 yards.
10	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: But it's not on the creek?
11	MR. CARROLL: No.
12	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you.
13	We deny standing to the Citizens for the
14	Preservation of Queenstown Creek, Incorporated;
15	Lawrence Hoyle, Jr.;
16	Mr. and Mrs. Irving Tuttle.
17	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Okay, now Mr. Counselor?
1 8	MR. DEMMING: First of all, we have to go to
19	the second item on the agenda, which was any preliminary
20	matters that the parties wanted to raise.
21	MR. MURPHY: I have no objection to Mr.



Wheeler going on if he wants to.

MR. DEMMING: Take him out of order, Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes, yes, fine.

MR. DRUMMOND: Mr. Chairman, my name is
Christopher Drummond. I represent Queen Anne's County
Department of Planning and Zoning, and we would like to
offer some testimony from Commissioner Wheeler Baker.
Mr. Baker, or Commissioner Baker, needs to be at a
meeting in Wye Mills at 8:30, and with the kind consent
of Mr. Murphy and Murray, they have consented to
changing the schedule to let Commissioner Baker make
some remarks so he can get on his way.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Fine, thank you.

MR. DRUMMOND: Thank you.

MR. MURPHY: Could I just reserve my objections until the time I make them at the procedural time on the agenda, rather than waive any objections by letting Mr. Baker go? I reserve my objections.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Commissioner?

MR. DRUMMOND: I guess we want you sworn.



1	MR. MURPHY: I w	aive it.	
2	MR. MURRAY: I d	on't care, waive it.	
3	EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR	QUEEN ANNE'S COUNTY PLANNING	
4	AND	ZONING	
5	BY MR. DRUMMOND:		
6	Q Would you state	your full name?	
7	A Wheeler R. Baker	•	
8	Q And Mr. Baker, y	ou are one of the three county	
9	commissioners for Queen An	ne's County; is that correct?	
0	A That's correct.		
1	Q You're currently	on the Commission, and your	
2	tenure expires		
13	A It expires Novem	ber of this year, 1990.	
4	Q If not re-electe	d.	
15	A Right.		
16	Q Now Commissioner	Baker, I understand that you	
17	have reviewed the prelimin	have reviewed the preliminary plans, or at least the	
18	s concept of the Queenstown	Harbor golf course; is that	
9	correct?		
20	A That's correct.		
	. O Now I understand	that you wanted to address	



the members of the panel with respect to the golf course generally.

MR. MURPHY: I would object, but I don't mean to be difficult, but the hearing notice says that this hearing is limited to a determination of whether this golf course constitutes a commercial use or not. It seems to me any questions have to be directed as to whether this use constitutes a commercial use or not.

MR. DEMMING: Well, does anybody else want to speak on the objection before --

MR. DRUMMOND: Well, I think as an opening question it's certainly preforatory in nature. I'll get to the specifics.

MR. MURRAY: I have no objection to the question. I think it's proper.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: The objection is overruled.

BY MR. DRUMMOND:

Q Go ahead, Commissioner Baker.

A Well, I just wanted to state that -- was it two or three weeks ago, the County Commissioners sent the Critical Areas Board a letter stating our position,



that we were in favor of Mr. Birney's project to put a golf course in RCA. We felt it would be in the best interests of the County for many reasons.

I can't sit before you and tell you that there might not be a few bad side effects, but I think generally it's going to be very positive for the County.

I heard Mr. Carroll speaking of run off to the creek, well, the way I figure it, and I'm not an engineer, so don't get me wrong, but that water means a lot to the operation of a golf course. They need it for irrigation. I would think that they would want to hold that, and -- I can't say for sure, but I'm sure that Queenstown sewage system, which is dumping into the Queenstown Creek now, if they could get their heads together, would probably, hopefully, take the effluent from that system, disperse it on the golf course. It's a wonderful way of getting rid of sewage effluent. We do it at our golf course down in Prospect, and it's very successful.

I don't see anything but pluses on that side.

And when you look at the character of the land around



there now it's farms, and it's been that way forever, and that has run off. We have a lot of nutrients running in from that, and I would see a lot less running off this golf course than off a farm. And I think that would be a plus.

The open space is a big issue for Queen Anne's County also. Now, I've looked at this ever since I was a boy, a developer could have come in and chopped that up into lots years ago, or even now, a lot of it is out of the RCA, a lot of it's out of the critical area.

They could go ahead if they could get perc tests or work out a deal with Queenstown for sewage, and develop that. I would much rather see that in open space and golf course greens. To me that's something that the whole county could use. It would be a benefit for the whole county.

And I see many more pluses on the ledger than I do minuses.

MR. DRUMMOND: Have you seen this?

MR. MURPHY: No.

MR. DRUMMOND: I would offer this, Mr.



Chairman, which is a copy of the letter which I think 1 the Critical Areas Commission received from the County 2 Commissioners. 3 I suppose that would be --4 CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Exhibit 3. 5 MR. DRUMMOND: How are we numbering this? 6 Have we got a different numbering system for the various 7 parties, or --8 CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Let's call it County 9 Exhibit --10 THE REPORTER: Consecutively. If it's okay, 11 we'll do it consecutively. 12 (Whereupon, the document was marked for 13 identification Exhibit Number 3.) 14 MR. MURRAY: May I state an objection? 15 CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes. 16 MR. MURPHY: Perhaps I could just have a 17 continuing objection. 18 The letter does not deal with whether this use 19 is a commercial use or not. 20 CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: We understand that. 21



1

2

MR. MURPHY: May I have a continuing objection?

THE WITNESS: Well, it does in a way, sir, because we understand the nature of what's going to be going on there. We know it's going to be partially commercial, these people are here to make money. We understand that, and we've weighed all that out, that's the reason we're sitting here tonight.

BY MR. DRUMMOND:

- Q Commissioner Baker, were you involved in the comprehensive re-zoning and re-draft -- adoption of a new zoning ordinance in Queen Anne's County?
 - A Yes, I was.
- Q And do you recall discussions or consideration --

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Could we just note for the record that the exhibit was admitted?

(Whereupon, Exhibit Number 3 was received into evidence.)

BY MR. DRUMMOND:

Q Do you recall discussions and the



2

consideration of uses defined as commercial versus uses defined as institutional?

- A Yes, I do.
- Q Could you describe for the panel what you, as a member of the County Commissioners, considered as indicative of an institutional use, as compared to a use indicative of commercial, or commercial in nature?
- A Well, I'll take commercial first. I would think like a seafood packing house, or lumber mill, full blown hotel, versus an institution. An institution would be like a school, golf course.
- Q And you recognize that there are some institutional uses that have a commercial aspect to them?
 - A Yes.
- Q As I assume that the Commissioners recognized that agricultural uses have a commercial aspect to them?
 - A That's true.
- Q And do I understand that there was a conscious decision among the Commissioners to include among institutional uses a golf course, which may also have a



1	commercial aspect to it?
2	A That's correct.
3	MR. DRUMMOND: Nothing further.
4	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you.
5	MR. DRUMMOND: Unless there's any other
6	questions?
7	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Any cross-examination?
8	MR. MURPHY: Mr. Murray can go ahead.
9	EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR WASHINGTON BRICK
. 0	BY MR. MURRAY:
1	Q Commissioner, I know you're in a hurry, so I
2	only have a couple of quick questions.
13	Generally speaking, is it safe to say that b
4	virtue of your position, if for no other reason, you'r
15	interested in the welfare of Queen Anne's County?
16	A That's safe to say.
17	Q Have you considered this golf course project
18	in that context?
19	A Yes, I have.
20	Q Have you reached a conclusion?
21	A Well, I stated earlier we thought it was in



2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	ì
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

the best interests of the County.

Q You think it is as well in the best interests of the area around Queenstown?

A Yes, I do.

MR. MURRAY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Mr. Murphy?

EXAMINATION BY COUNSEL FOR THE CITIZENS FOR

PRESERVATION

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q Mr. Baker, are the Commissioners charged with approving this golf course?

A Well, I don't know -- I kind of get lost on the procedure here, because Critical Areas has to approve it, then it comes back -- no, the Planning Commission would approve it first, then it would go to Critical Areas, then come back to the Planning Commission.

- Q So it's not the Commissioners responsibility to approve or disapprove this golf course, is it?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q So you haven't had any public hearing, you





the one for 20?

2

MR. DRUMMOND: No, I don't think it's

3

relevant.

4

objection.

5

question?

6

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes.

8

THE WITNESS: You want me to answer the

MR. MURPHY: Can he answer the --

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: We will not allow the

9

BY MR. MURPHY:

10

Yes.

11 12 Q

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Initially our concept was, we know that in the critical area, and I'm sure the planner and the people that were more attuned to it can probably do a better job than me on this, but the people that are in the critical area have a lot of problems with erosion, and I felt very strongly that we needed more -- to allow more density in the critical area because erosion control was so expensive. You're talking upwards, in some places, of \$350 to \$400 a running foot, and the average homeowner, landowner, can't afford to do that.



felt that if we allowed a greater density in those areas then they could take and it would be part of their performance package to put shoreline protection on their properties. That was one of the main reasons for that.

And the way it turned out, we're allowed to do that, but we have to tap into our growth allocation to do that. And if a project came up that we thought fell into that, we still feel strongly on it.

- Q Do I remember correctly that you wanted like one in five?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q I don't mean to ask you questions that you might not have personal knowledge about, but do you have personal knowledge about how the Critical Area ordinance happen to come about with saying that institutional uses would be subject to interpretation by the Critical Area Commission? Were you involved in that?
- A Yes. We were on the outside. We knew what was going on. We didn't work on a daily basis, sir.
- Q Well, if you don't know, that would be perfectly fine, but I just wondered, the ordinance says



1	that institutional uses as defined by the Queen Anne's	
2	County zoning ordinance shall be subject to	
3	interpretation to determine whether they constitute	
4	industrial or commercial use. And I assume from that	
5	provision that some of the institutional uses must be	
6	commercial in nature; is that a correct assumption?	
7	A Well, what we're talking about is a big	
8	commercial.	
9	Q The golf course?	
10	A Yes, sir. That's the reason these people want	
11	to hear what we want to do.	
12	Q So you do recognize that it is a commercial	
ì3	use?	
14	A I said that earlier.	
15	MR. MURPHY: That's all I have.	
16	Thank you.	
17	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Any other questions?	
18	MR. DRUMMOND: No, sir.	
19	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Mr. Commissioner, thank	
20	you, very much.	
21	THE WITNESS: Thank you	



MR. DEMMING: Does either counsel have any preliminary matter of a procedural or jurisdictional nature that they want to state at this time, before we proceed?

MR. MURPHY: I do.

MR. DEMMING: Proceed.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you. I have a memorandum, which I would like to give the members of the Commission, that sets out my arguments.

Now I had the privilege of being an assistant attorney general back in the 19th century, and I know we have a very distinguished assistant attorney general here, and you rely upon his advice, and I'm not in any way seeking to question his very, very competent legal abilities.

But I just want to make a few points that in a sense are legal, and in a sense go to the functioning of the Critical Area Commission.

And I really think there's some fundamental points, and some of you people on the Commission, some of you come from different parts of the State, and have



6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

been involved, I know some of you from the Critical Area from the beginning. Others are State representatives and similarly were involved in the Critical Area program, and so you're very, very knowledgeable about this program, and I won't condescend to you or speak down to you.

But I just want to make some points. And as I understood the program, and I had the -- I participated to an extent in providing legal advice to Cecil County in its attempt to satisfy the requirements of the As I understand the Critical Area program the General Assembly said the Critical Area Commission establishes the criteria. You do that through Then the local governments had the option regulations. that they could develop their own Critical Area programs, and ordinances, and submit them for approval to the State Commission. And I think all the local governments actually did that. If they didn't do it, then the State would do it for them, but I think, if I'm not incorrect, I think everybody actually did it themselves.



8

q

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Areas Commission was to establish the criteria, and that's these detailed regulations, and the second responsibility of the Commission was to approve, or disapprove, a local program. This was a very important responsibility of the Commission.

And so the big responsibility of the Critical

But like a lot of things in Maryland the Critical Area program was a system of shared responsibilities, and the law, it seems to me, clearly provides that implementation of the program is the responsibility of the local governments.

Now I don't mean to insult you, but I would just say that you don't have the power to say whether you approve a particular project or not. You don't have it. And we're here tonight to try to decide this, as I read this Notice, whether we're going to approve this golf course project.

I just make the simple point that you don't have the power. That that responsibility is given to the local governments.

I would point out page two of my memorandum,



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 ORTING 800 950-DEPO

and I quote the law there. It says, "The local government has the responsibility to implement the program, subject to State criteria and oversight."

Page three, again I quote the law, "Local jurisdictions to implement. It is the intent of this sub-title that each local jurisdiction shall have primary responsibility for developing and implementing a program." And you people published these regulations in which you defined project approval. It's on page three, "Project approval means the approval of development by the appropriate local approval authority."

Now there's an exception to that. There's no statement in the law that doesn't have an exception, and there is an exception that when it's a State project, then this Commission, as I understand it, has the approval authority, but when it's not a State project, purely private project, such as we have here, you don't have the authority, with all respect to you.

I think really the thing that proves this beyond a shadow of a doubt is the extensive provisions on page four, dealing with project approval and the role



of the Commission. And I've copied -- I've just photocopied the provisions of the law here. The local governments have to approve or disapprove projects consistent with the critical area of law, and criteria in their own local program, and the Commission, you, have the authority to intervene in the proceeding, to appear before the local government as an interested party, and you can appeal that decision, and you have all the standing of an interested party, but you're a party that's basically the same legal capacity as the people have standing here tonight. You have the standing to participate; you don't have the approval or disapproval authority.

I just think that's clear under the law and regulation.

I guess you could look at it a different way, and you could say, well, we're not really approving or disapproving a particular project, we're deciding whether golf courses are RCA uses. And I would say that that's a policy matter. If golf courses are to be RCA uses, and you want to make a policy about that, I've



14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

heard that this body has had a study group that were looking at golf courses, and trying to decide whether they should be classified as RCA or whatever, that's fine. I have no problem with that. Except that an adversary hearing is not the place to decide that.

That's a policy matter. I quoted for you on page five, the Maryland law dealing with regulations, and your enabling law says you have to follow this. A regulation means a statement that has general application and future effect. And if you want to make golf courses permissible in the critical area, that's something that could be done. I just suggest you have to do it by amending your criteria.

I think this is the only Critical Area ordinance that I know that contains this provision that says the Commission has to decide whether a particular use is a commercial use or not. And in a sense you can say, well, why not. You know, the County adopted this ordinance, and they give us this authority, why not exercise it.

Clearly they adopted it, gave you this



authority to decide it, why not exercise this authority?

Well, I think the answer to that is, is that with all respect to Queen Anne's County, the Critical Area Commission does not derive its authority from Queen Anne's County. Derive it from the General Assembly. So you can't be governed by what a local government says you can do. You have to be governed solely by what the State law says you can do, and what you yourselves said you could do in your own regulations.

It's a fundamental principle that a unit of government has to follow its own regulations. There is no provision in your own regulations for project approval by this Commission.

And I've been around the State long enough, too long, to know that this balance of power between the units of local government and the State government is what makes the world go around in the State of Maryland. It's a very, very fundamental thing. And when the General Assembly passes a law saying the State has this authority, the local governments have



this authority, that's it. They could have done it any number of different ways, but they didn't. This is the way they did it. And I remember that this was a matter of great discussion when it came up, when it was argued, this was a fiercely debated thing. And it was said not to be a State takeover, because the local governments retained the authority to approve or disapprove.

And even though here you have a particular case, the same situation could arise in any number of cases. You could get a proposal for a golf course -- suppose you got a proposal for a golf course in Anne Arundel County, or in Baltimore County, and you could say, no, we disapprove it. It does not meet our criteria, it's not an RCA use, or it's an LDA use, we say no. Or it's a commercial use, or it's not a commercial use, we say no; or we say yes, I don't care. It's the same issue.

And you don't have the authority. You don't have the power.

I just think we ought to stop this here, and



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO face this situation.

And again, my respect for Mr. Demming, I'm not being insincere, I've known him for a long time, he's provided years of service to the Natural Resources

Department, but it's not strictly a legal issue. You have a great deal of discretion, you as a Commission, in carrying out your responsibilities. And the question is, do you want to exercise an approval or disapproval authority in the face of clear statements from intent, direct statements by the General Assembly, that this is to be a local responsibility.

And regardless of how you feel about the technical legal issue, I think that you as a Commission ought to face this, and say no, we don't.

That's all I have.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: All right, thank you.

MR. DRUMMOND: Mr. Chairman, I suppose in that Queen Anne's County Critical Area ordinance is the subject, I suppose, the central legal debate in this matter, that we should have a few remarks. And in that



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

I, of course, represent the Department of Planning and Zoning, and I should let the members of the panel know that had a significant hand in drafting the provision, that is now called into question by Mr. Murphy.

I agree with Mr. Murphy that the critical area legislation and the regulations that were promulgated as a result of the legislation, envisioned a system of shared responsibility, and indeed Queen Anne's County, apparently uniquely, has involved the Commission in that system of shared responsibility in a interesting way.

And that has to do with helping us to determine whether uses which we call institutional, and not industrial or commercial, fit or do not fit within what the Commission envisions as industrial or commercial uses. So we think that that is entirely appropriate and consistent with this system of shared responsibility.

I think the County would be the first to say that there is some uncertainty, and perhaps ambiguity, in the language of the Critical Area regulations, with respect to commercial or industrial uses, slash, zoning,



in the RCA. We were very cognizant of that uncertainty, and to resolve that uncertainty attempting to create a program that was as faithful to the intent and purposes of the legislation and regulations, we asked the Commission to become involved.

As I read the regulations the local jurisdictions are asked to create a program that is consistent with the guidelines and the intentions and the purposes of the legislation, and the regulations. It does not say therein that that program must be wholly self contained.

What it says is the local jurisdiction shall adopt a program that is consistent with these guidelines. We don't care so much, says the General Assembly, how you do it so long as it's consistent, and so long as the Critical Area Commission approves it.

Well, certainly the Queen Anne's County
Critical Area ordinance generally, and specifically in
the section that's being challenged by Mr. Murphy, is
consistent with the legislation and the guidelines of
the regulations, and has been approved by the Critical



Area Commission.

So Queen Anne's County hasn't foisted any obligation, or hasn't directed the Critical Area Commission to take upon itself powers that it might no otherwise have had.

I would agree, if that were the case, Queen Anne's County can hardly tell the Critical Area Commission what to do.

However, Queen Anne's County, faced with what we perceive to be something of an uncertainty in the regulations, proposed in the program a cooperative effort with respect to this issue. And when the program was approved, the Critical Area Commission essentially said, yeah, we agree. We will do what you have asked us to do, we will become involved in this decision making process, that is, whether institutional uses, as defined by us, are industrial, commercial uses as defined by you.

There's nothing in the legislation or the regulations that prohibits that sort of, as Mr. Murphy called it, system of shared responsibility.



19

20

21

Now, it's unfortunate that we have to have an adversarial proceeding to wrestle with this issue. as the regulations are presently drafted, and as we understand the intent and purpose of the Critical Area legislation and regulations, we don't perceive that there was any choice. And, Mr. Murphy can waive provisions of project approval in his trial memorandum, but there is nothing in either, though I've only briefly looked through his trial memorandum, that points directly to something that prohibits this. Yes, it's unique. Yes, it may be creative. Yes, it may, unfortunately, bring you all here to Queen Anne's County in the middle of the week, or the beginning of the week, late at night. But it's not prohibited and it certainly makes sense, given the uncertainty that we perceived in Thank you. the regulations.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you. Mr. Murray?

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, members of the

Panel. I'm going to address the points made by Mr.

Murphy in his memorandum in the same order, beginning on page one through page two. There are seven.



Item one is, "Does the Critical Area

Commission have the authority under its enabling law and regulations to determine whether an individual project meets the standards of its criteria?"

Let me cite for you some excerpts from your enabling law. The Declaration of Public Policy for the Critical Area Program is "(a) To foster more sensitive development activity so as to minimize damage to water quality and natural habitats. Its purpose is to establish resource -- a resource protection program by fostering," et cetera.

Section 8-18.06 says that the Commission has all the powers necessary for carrying out the purpose of the subtitle, including adopting a variety of regulations.

Section 8-18.08(a) says, "Local jurisdictions have primary responsibility for developing," but not sole responsibility. Presumably the Legislature wasn't ignorant of the distinction between those two adjectives.

The goals, again, of the Commission are to



minimize adverse impacts on water quality, conserve fish, wildlife, and plant habitat, and establish policies for development which accommodate growth. It's true that those provisions of the legislation don't say "Commission, go out and establish regulations" like the one at issue here tonight. But there is certainly nothing in that broad language that says you can't do it that way.

Mr. Murphy's argument essentially amount to arguments that go to whether or not the regulation that we are here about should have been adopted. They go to the wisdom of the legislation. They go to the local Queen Anne's program and your approval of it, all of which happened a long time ago. And we're not here today to debate whether that program should have been designed the way it was, or whether it should have been approved the way it was designed. That's history.

We're here tonight to implement and act on that program the way it's written.

And these regulations are perfectly consistent with the broad mandate that the General Assembly gave to



the Commission.

Does the Commission have the authority to establish a policy that golf courses are a permissible resource conservation use? For the very same reasons, I answer "Yes."

Number three. "Should the Commission exercise the approval and disapproval power which the General Assembly intended to be performed by local governments?"

That question, the way it is phrased, is like a lot of the polls you see. It answers itself the way it is intended to be answered. But if the question were properly and neutrally phrased, once again, the answer would be "Yes." The Critical Area Commission has the authority, if this is the way it wants to do it, and this is the way Queen Anne's County wants to do it, and you approved their program. Yes, you do have the authority.

Number four. "Is a golf course conducted for profit necessarily a commercial use?" That is an issue before you tonight. I think that it is an issue which goes to a variety of arguments, facts. What does



. .

commercial zoning mean? What is the distinction, if any, between commercial zoning and a commercial use? A commercial zone, for example, is intensively commercial. The whole gamut of uses are predominantly commercial in nature. You'll hear more testimony about that.

Whereas a commercial use is any of a number of uses, which may not be essentially what we would characterize as commercial.

What is the distinction for purposes of the Critical Area Program between a golf course that may be public and a golf course that may be private? Is it the profit motive? Is it whose bank account the proceeds from running the golf course goes to?

I, for one, could not imagine how it would make any difference in your determination of whether or not a golf course is appropriate or not in a critical area, whether or not it is for profit or not for profit.

But those are the kinds of issues that we are going to be arguing about tonight. Because the way this legislation is drafted, we have to address the issue of whether the golf course is, or is not essentially a

800 950-DEPO



commercial use.

"Is a golf course a nature dominated use or a resource utilization use?" Those are issues before the panel tonight. And the evidence I think will indicate that it's essentially a nature dominated use when you have a course designed the way this one is.

"Does a golf course meet the standards for a resource conservation use?" That has a lot to do with these very, very general regulations that the Commission adopted. They don't say, no where in them that I can find, "A golf course is not allowable in the RCA," or "A golf course is allowable." It talks in much more general terms.

It talks about interests in the environment, about water quality, about habitat protection, about vegetation, and buffering, and so on. We're going to talk about all of those kinds of criteria in connection with this golf course.

Finally, number seven. "Is there the possibility of environmental damage from the proposed golf course in Queenstown?" Is there the possibility?



I think you all know the answer to that question. There is the possibility of environmental damage when you go home tonight, if you have an accident and your oil pan drips oil into the road and that gets into the water. But, is that a reason for you not to drive your car?

We're not here about speculation and remote possibilities. We're talking about a carefully designed golf course which we think the evidence will show complies and over complies with all the applicable laws that are intended to protect the water quality, the habitat, and the environment generally. Not just the Critical Area Program requirements, but local zoning, federal law, wetlands law. You name it. This program didn't just spring up here out of somebody's head. It has undergone rigorous and lengthy refinement to comply with those things.

We think you will conclude, after you hear the evidence, that the net effect of this project on this land is a very positive result for the things that you are interested in, water quality and habitat protection.



15.

So, the answer to item seven is maybe technically, in a theoretical sense, yes. Is there a probability of environmental damage? No. The probability in the evidence is just to the contrary. The golf course is good for the land and good for the water.

In sum, we think the issues before you are very clear. Mr. Deming and Mr. Corkran have stated them in their opening remarks, and this certainly is within the Commission's authority. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you. For the record, we would like to note that Mr. Murphy's objections have been noted, but we will proceed with the question before us.

Our illustrious attorney wants to know if anybody wants to take a break? Tom, let's proceed. The hour is getting later and later. I think Tom hasn't had anything to eat, have you?

MR. DEMING: Yes, I have.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: If I hear no one is raving mad about to take a break, let's proceed if you will,



1	with a presentation by Washington Brick and Terra Cotta					
2	Company.					
3	MR. MURRAY: Let's begin with Joe Stevens,					
4	please.					
5	Whereupon,					
6	JOE STEVENS,					
7	a witness, called for examination by counsel the					
8	Applicant, was examined and testified as follows:					
9	DIRECT EXAMINATION					
10	BY MR. MURRAY:					
1	Q Mr. Stevens, please identify yourself?					
2	A My name is Joe Stevens. I'm the Planning					
13	Director of the Queen Anne's County Department of					
4	Planning and Zoning.					
15	Q Mr. Stevens, how long have you been in the					
16	planning and zoning field?					
17	A Approximately six years. Five and a half.					
18	Six years.					
19	Q Is that the extent of your employment					
20	experience, or were you employed before that?					
) j	A That's the extent of my employment experience.					



Q Have you had any education or training outside of your employment experience in the field?

A Yes. I received a Master's in Geography

Concentration and Land Use Planning in 1985. Prior to

that I had a Bachelor's Degree in English and a minor in

geography.

Q Have you had occasion to be involved in land use planning and zoning issues, outside of Queen Anne's County?

A Yes, I have had occasion to be involved in many State programs. I'm also a member of the Maryland Association of County Planning Officials. I'm president of that -- I am also on the Board of Directors for the Maryland Chapter of the American Planning Association, and other different ancillary activities that have spun off from those.

Q Have you had occasion in the past to qualify as an expert in a court of law on the subject of zoning?

A Yes, I have.

Q Mr. Stevens, are you familiar with the golf course project which is the subject of this hearing?



.20

A Yes, I am familiar with it.

Q In what connection have you gained that familiarity?

A From meetings with the Birneys, who are the applicants for the golf course. I have -- my staff has reviewed the golf course in the preliminary stages.

Also looked at it in terms of sketch, concept designs, have helped the Birneys work the project through the systems of the Corps of Engineers, and have indicated to them what we believe they have to comply with in terms of both zoning and Critical Area requirements in order to gain approval from the County authorities.

Q Is it your department's responsibility to approve this project?

A It is our responsibility to grant -- to give review to this project and see that it complies with the applicable zoning requirements, critical area requirements, and we also act in Planning and Zoning as the lead agency for things such as storm water management, although we don't review that; wetlands, with Corps of Engineers; and a number of different state



21

. 1

and federal guidelines to make sure that those approvals are obtained before we take it to the Planning Commission for the actual approval.

Our authority is really more of a review and coordination, not an approval authority in this case.

- Q But you look for those approvals to come in before you give your final approval?
 - A Yes. Yes, we do.
 - Q What is the status of the project today?
- A The status of the project, as far as I'm aware, and I have not been the lead person who has done the review, but I did check with my staff today, is that it has -- it has submitted and resubmitted many times on many different issues.

They have worked through their numbers, their calculations, in terms of woodland protection, both required by the County and the Zoning.

They have met with the Corps of Engineers on many, many occasions to indicate where the wetlands were and what wetlands issues there were.

And they are approaching nearness for going to



the Planning Commission. I can't tell you exactly what minor details are left, but it was indicated to me by my staff, was that the primary issue left is the critical areas determination in regards to commercial institutional use.

- Q And as to that issue, you will rely on the Commission?
 - A Yes.
- Q What is the zone in which this particular property lies?
 - A Countryside.

MR. MURPHY: Objection. May I just have a continuing objection to this?

Clearly, we are going to get into this project, the merits of this project, and I object to that because this Commission does not have any authority to do that, first of all. And secondly, because the notice clearly says that the purpose of the hearing is to determine whether its a commercial use or not.

May I have a continuing objection, so I won't have to make objections every time to these questions?



CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: I override the objection.

BY MR. MURRAY:

- Q Mr. Stevens, I'm not sure that anyone heard the answer to my last question, which was, "What zone is this property in?"
 - A Countryside.
- Q Would you briefly describe the types of uses permitted in the countryside zone?

A In the countryside zone, permitted uses are generally low density residential housing. In the critical area, it's one house per 20 acres. And you can also build with cluster provisions and setbacks, and revegetation standards along the water.

Outside the critical area, the density is one house per five acres, with a mandatory clustering provision, requiring 85 percent open space.

In addition to that, there are different -outside the critical area, different institutional uses,
such as schools, libraries, hospitals, golf courses. A



number of different uses which are considered institutional under the ordinance.

There is also some uses such as gravel extraction, minor dredge disposal operations, and things of that nature.

Q You said, or I thought I heard you say, that certain uses, such as a golf course, while permitted in the countryside zone, are not permitted in the critical area. The zoning ordinance doesn't make that distinction?

A No. No. Only in regards to the question here.

Q So, speaking solely to the zoning ordinance, a golf course then is a permitted use?

A Yes.

Q Is it part of a general category of permitted uses called recreation?

A Yes.

Q And in your ordinance are there distinctions made with regard to golf courses as to whether they are "commercial" or non-commercial?



. A	It's cons	sidered i	nstitutional	recreation	
	•				
outdoor	recreation	subtitle	· .		

- Q So, whether it is a profit or non-profit golf course, it's permitted in the countryside setting?
 - A Yes.
- Q Do you have commercial zones in your zoning ordinance?
 - A Yes, we do.
 - Q What are they called?
- A Urban commercial. Suburban commercial.

 Village center zoning district. We also have suburban industrial zoning district, where a number of commercial uses are allowed.
- Q Would it be within the contemplation of the ordinance to treat a golf course as that kind of commercial use?
 - A No, it wouldn't.
- Q Do you make a distinction, or does your profession make a distinction between a commercial use and a commercial zone?
 - A Well, in general, speaking from a Planning and



Zoning standpoint, if the County were to only allow golf courses in those areas zoned commercial, zoned commercial, urban commercial, suburban commercial, they would have to allow an extensive amount of large acreage for commercial zoning in areas that are relatively rural throughout the county.

Traditionally, and I've seen a number of zoning ordinances that allow golf courses as a sub-category of agricultural use. You see that very often in some of the older zoning ordinances.

In addition to that, there are a number of uses which are commercial in nature that are allowed in our agricultural districts, and in our countryside districts, such as shooting preserves, hunting operations, goose hunting operations, agriculture. We allow agricultural support industry, which is considered a sub-category unto its own in our agricultural district and in our countryside district.

So, in general, the distinction is made for those uses which are -- which do tend to use up much more land, are less intensive in nature, and the



distinction isn't made solely from a profit or nonprofit aspect.

Q You're familiar with the Critical Area local
-- your local Critical Area Program, are you not?

A Yes.

Q And with respect to the Commission's role -the Critical Areas Commission's role in evaluating
whether a particular institutional use is commercial or
industrial, is -- do you have an opinion as to whether
this particular golf course is or is not commercial or
industrial in connection with that ordinance?

when the issue came up before the Commission, the Critical Area Commission, about a year ago, when we were going through our final adoption of our ordinance. The issue was that the Critical Areas Law calls for a criteria, it calls for no new commercial industrial zoning in the RCA. And the issue was whether or not a number of different uses, which were allowed under other zoning districts in our county, would be considered commercial in nature, in terms of the critical areas.



What was hashed out between the Commission and the County staff, and what was worked on and came up with a working relationship on, was that the Commission would look at these uses, because clearly sometimes a church, depending on the intensity of it, the amount of impervious area, how much clearing had to be done, the impact to the environment, or a golf course, or a number of other uses, which were allowed in the resource conservation area, or allowed under our zoning in the resource conservation area, would not have a negative impact, would not be -- would not work against the intent of the criteria.

And then there are those other instances when clearly a church that seats several thousand people, and has a couple of -- three, or four, or five acres of parking, and so on and so forth, does not meet the intent of what the criteria were. And that was a dilemma for both the County and the Critical Area Commission. We didn't want to leave out the opportunity for those uses in those rural areas and we, at the same time, we did not -- and the Critical Area Commission --



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

did not want to open the door for all those uses at varying intensities.

And so, the issue really became, what would be allowed in terms of those institutional uses. And what it was worked out to be was that the Critical Area Commission would review it, not to determine, per se, whether it's defined as commercial, or defined as non-commercial, but really whether its intensity had negative impacts and were against the intent of the RCA. And that was my understanding of the program as we went through that.

MR. MURRAY: Thank you. That's all I have.

EXAMINATION BY THE CHAIRMAN

BY CHAIRMAN CORKRAN:

Q Mr. Stevens, I gather that there is a definition for commercial that planners use in drafting zoning ordinances that may be different from the definition of commercial that we might read in the Wall Street Journal or that we might generally understand in the general business context. Is that correct?

A To a certain extent, yes.



Q Can you explain the distinction and why -- I gather that the word "commercial" in the zoning context may be a somewhat more narrow or restrictive than sort of the general definition of commercial?

A In short, the commercial in the zoning aspect really looks at the intensity of the use. Traffic generation, amount of building, amount of disturbance. And you generally try and put those uses into the commercial category from a zoning standpoint that have those impacts and have them in a significant manner.

Whether or not something is for profit or not is not looked at. I mean, we allow farm stands all over the county and they are clearly commercial uses.

Regardless of what zoning district they are in, a farmer can put up a stand and keep it open six months and in some instances, even year round.

So, it has very little to do with the profit motive.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: I have nothing else. Thank you.

CROSS-EXAMINATION



3

4

5

7 .

G

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q Mr. Stevens, what you're saying is is that as you understand it the provision was intended to say that the Critical Area Commission would look at the use and see whether it was too intense or not?

A What I'm saying is is that my understanding was that the Critical Area Commission would be looking at the use to see if it was more in nature of a commercial use of a commercial zoning, high-intensity use, or more in the nature of a use that was intended for the RCA -- Resource Conservation Area.

Q But that really depends on the intensity of the use. Is that what you're saying? Whether it is commercial or not depends on how intense it is?

A I'm saying that that was my understanding of a major factor in determining whether or not something would fall into one category or another, as per the Critical Area Commission's distinctions.

Q But that was the criteria, how intense the use was?

A In regards to the Commission's determination



or 1 Yes. Q 2 -- the Zoning determination? Α 3 The Commission's determination. Q 4 That was my understanding. Yes. Α 5 How intense it was going to be? Q 6 The intensity, the amount of disturbance, the Α 7 design. 8 It really didn't make any difference whether 9 it was commercial or not? 10 To a certain extent -- as long as it was under 11 the institutional classification, yes. That was my 12 understanding. 13 I mean, you have a whole listing of uses here. 14 Libraries --15 (Nods head affirmatively.) Α 16 museums --17 Yes. Α 18 -- public schools, private schools, indoor Q 19 swimming pools, racquetball courts. And you're saying 20 that the purpose of this ordinance is to decide whether 21



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

√ 301 647-8300
G 800 950-DEPO

they are intensive uses or not?

A I'm saying the purpose of that is to determine whether or not they would be considered resource conservation uses or not.

- Q Not really whether they are commercial or not?
- A That's correct.
- Q Nobody expects a library to be commercial? Is that what you're saying?
 - A Racquetball courts could be commercial.
- Q But that's irrelevant, is what you're saying, is whether it's commercial or not?

MR. MURRAY: He didn't say that. Objection. He's mis-characterizing what the witness said.

THE WITNESS: (No response.)

BY MR. MURPHY:

- Q Well, I mean, does it make any difference whether a library is commercial or not?
 - A Not in my -- no. I don't think so.
 - Q So, it's irrelevant, isn't it?
 - A To a certain extent, yes.
 - Q The Planning Commission approves site plans.



1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
') 1	

Te	that	correct?)
18	Luat	COTTECT	,

- A Yes.
- Q And have they met on this project yet?
- A No, they haven't.
- Q So, they haven't approved it or disapproved it?
 - A No, they haven't.
- Q Now, it's your position that this golf course is an RCA use. Is that what you're saying?
- A From the reviews we've done at this point, I think that it does fall more in the nature of an RCA use, yes. But that's not my determination to make. I can only read the criteria as you do.
 - Q But your position is that it is an RCA use?
- A If I was in the position to make that determination, that would be my vote, among 25, if I was on the Commission. Yes.
- Q Assuming the golf course use is approved, then it's classified as RCA land. Is that correct?
 - A That golf course -- the land itself?
 - Q Yes.



- A The land is classified as RCA right now.
- Q Right. But assuming the Commission says that the golf course is approved, then the use would be classified, in your view, as RCA. Is that correct?
- A My understanding would be that even if we had another golf course come in, that it would still go through the Commission's review process.
- Q I'm not talking about another golf course.

 I'm talking about this golf course.
- A It would be permitted the way it was submitted to the Commission, yes.
 - Q And it would be permitted as an RCA use?
 - A Yes.
- Q So that, it would have the same really status as say farmland, forest land, and the other RCA uses?
 - A (Nods head affirmatively.)
- Q And they could come in and develop houses at the one per 20 standard, if they wished?
- A I think that based on the uses that they are deriving under the zoning right now, and the amount of -- the amount of area they need in order to develop



under the zoning, that it has cut off any alternative for subdividing that into one house per 20 acre density.

- Q Why is that?
- A Because of the way the golf course is laid out. There is no area to cut those wads off, that I'm aware of. You know, I don't know that for a fact that he --
- Q But I mean, as a matter of regulations, it would be an RCA use, and he would be entitled to the one per 20. Is that not correct?
 - A I don't think so. No.
 - Q Why not?
- A Because, as I said, I think the land area required for the golf course would not allow him to get those units. And he's using that land area for the golf course.
- Q You mean that the land area would be subtracted from the -- would be subtracted from the land that's eligible for the one per 20?
- A For the density under the critical areas intensity?



0	Yes	
_	169	•

- A In the critical area or outside --
- Q In the critical area.

A In the critical area? To be honest with you, I'd have to go back and check that to see if we would deduct that or whether or not he would be able to get some lots, assuming that the design of the golf course would allow some lots.

We have a clustering provision under our zoning ordinance. Some of that land for the golf course can be utilized as open space for the development.

- Q But, I mean if it is classified as an RCA --
- A You couldn't get the 20 acre lots. I think that would be physically impossible.
- Q But, we could -- he'd have approximately 400 acres in the -- it's approximately 400 acres in the critical area to be classified as RCA, to be able to get basically houses, assuming he could fit them there. He would be able to get houses at one per 20, wouldn't he?
- A Assuming he could fit them, yes. I think that's a physical impossibility, though.



Q But, from your standpoint in the regulations, that's what he could do?

A Yes, I think so, without going back and looking at them.

MR. MURPHY: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: All right. Thank you. Any questions? Do you have any questions?

PANEL MEMBERS: (No response.)

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Deming, I think Mr. Stevens' role here is finished tonight, and I hope that he can be excused.

MR. DRUMMOND: And I would follow that up

by asking -- I think my role is finished as well, that I

could be excused because my wife is home with our one

month old child and I'm sure she's had enough at this

point, so it is time for me to take over. So, if I may

be excused as well.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: You may be excused. Yes.

MR. DRUMMOND: And I have no closing argument.

I wouldn't have a closing argument, anyway. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you.



1

MR. MURRAY: Incidentally, a point of clarification. On the outline of the procedure, it provides that there will come a time when there will be some testimony by somebody on behalf of the Commission's staff. Is that going to happen?

MR. DEMING: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: And can you identify the individual who will testify?

MR. DEMING: Mr. Rensarry. He's sitting right over here.

MR. MURRAY: Our next witness is Mr. Lex Birney.

Mr. Deming, I think I spoke with you at an earlier time about the idea of pre-marking a bunch of exhibits. Do you want to do that -- do you want me to do that at this time? This and the set of plans --

MR. DEMING: I think I can say for the Chairman that we'd like you to do whatever will speed this thing along.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: You may say that, yes.

(Whereupon, there was a brief recess.)



20

21

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: May I have your attention, please? We are back in session.

MR. MURRAY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope it does turn out that that in fact speeds things along. I guess we're not ready.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Please proceed.

Whereupon,

ARTHUR ALEXIS BIRNEY, JR.

a witness, called for examination by counsel for the Applicant, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MURRAY:

- . Q Please state your full name?
 - A Arthur Alexis Birney, Jr.
 - Q And where do you live?
 - A I live in Annapolis, Maryland.
- Q What is your connection with this golf course project?
- A I am one of the managing partners of Washington Brick and Terra Cotta Company.
 - Q Which is a Virginia limited partnership?



A That's correct.

Q What is your role in connection with this particular project?

A Well, there are three managing partners of our company. There's my father, and my brother, and myself. And as the ones responsible to a board, we are -- with the responsibility of ownership of My Lord's Gift Farm. And had decided -- well, should I go into a brief history, I guess?

Q Yes. Why don't you tell them a little bit about the history of the project?

MR. MURPHY: May I object, and I don't want to make an issue out of this, but again, it's -- we are supposed to be here on whether this is a commercial use. I'd like to state my objection to any questions that do not deal with whether this project is a commercial use and would the Chairman simply acknowledge that I have that continuing objection with respect to this witness?

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: We recognize that, Mr.

Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.



THE WITNESS: Approximately 20 years ago we purchased My Lord's Gift Farm, our company did, and have actively farmed it in agricultural for the last 20 years.

About six years ago, my Dad came up with the idea of developing a 60 room hotel and a golf course, and I guess at that time, a marina facility, based on the farm. And I'd like to bring up a picture I have, if I could, an aerial photograph, so we all know what we are talking about here. This is the farm as it exists today and, in fact, as it has existed for quite awhile.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Will this be an exhibit?

MR. MURRAY: No.

THE WITNESS: I'll just hold it up.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Originally -- about six years ago and I'll run through this very quickly, we had decided that we would like to develop the site right around here to have a small hotel and golf course.

We entered into negotiations with the town of Queenstown and we had hoped to go through an annexation



process to have approximately 400 acres of the farm, which totals about roughly 735 acres annexed into the town, and at that time the Commission set -- then the County set aside 40 acres of LDA land to be used for growth allocation in order that we could use it for the hotel site.

At that time, the golf course was a fairly nominal interest. As we negotiated with the town over a long term, 39 hearings in six years, at their request we moved the site of the hotel a number of times, initially beginning here and over to here, and ultimately up to here. The town in located right around here.

As late as January of 1989, we still expected that -- we had worked very hard to comply with the town's wishes in relocating the facility and had been led to believe that with a few exceptions, or with a few changes, they would enthusiastically support our project. And there is a letter, dated January 16th, 1989, and signed by the three commissioners of Queenstown that says they enthusiastically support the proposed restaurant/hotel and golf complex for My Lord's



_

Gift Farm site.

We feel that it would have a beneficial influence on the redevelopment of the town, as envisioned by the Planning and Zoning Commission, and additionally, a hotel/golf facility would allow the town significant growth, while avoiding the problems of residential development.

MR. MURPHY: Can that be introduced, that letter?

THE WITNESS: It has been.

MR. MURRAY: It can. No. It's been marked, but it hasn't been introduced. We would like to introduce it.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: We note that -- thank you.

THE WITNESS: As a result, one of the caveats, the main thing that they wanted to have changed was they would like to have us not build a marina or any commercial water dependent facility in conjunction with the hotel and we said that we would, in fact, abide by their wish. And we dropped any proposal of doing that and were left with the hotel and a golf course.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

We had, over the years, negotiated with the town and felt that the -- as Mr. Carroll stated, it's a very poor flushing creek. And I've been actively -- I've lived on the farm and I've played there as a boy, and watched it be farmed, and it has, in fact, deteriorated. I would suggest that most of the deterioration was due to the fact that Queenstown dumps approximately 80,000 gallons of sewage a day -- treated sewage a day into the headwaters of the creek.

We had suggested to the town and felt, in talking to Wren over the past year as well, that it would be beneficial if we could take their effluent and irrigate the golf course with it, along the lines of Prospect Bay, and Hog Neck, and Easton. And many state of the art golf courses are in fact doing that.

Unfortunately, it seems that -- well,
negotiations -- suffice it to say, they broke down. It
became evident to us that we would not be able to
develop the hotel along the lines that we had hoped, or
any lines at all, because of some sort of opposition
that we had never been able -- had never -- really had



•

never evidenced itself. It was always a moving target.

So, we decided that in fact it was time to move on. We had spent a lot of our time and a lot of money attempting to satisfy their needs and this was going to be impossible. So, as a result, a mile and a half down the road, we purchased a property, five and a half acres, on Winchester Creek and have currently received and paid for sewage allocation from the County to build a hotel down there.

As a result, we dropped our plans for any requirement for LDA for the hotel site and decided that we would like to proceed with plans for a golf course, because it seemed to us that this would be a really good use for the site, especially in light of the fact that there were going to be no more aspirations, as far as any commercial development of the waterfront at that time, nor would there be any hotel facilities.

My job became one of determining what criteria existed from the County level, from the Corps level, from the Critical Areas level, in order that we design and develop a course that would be consistent with all



•

.

the criteria, and there are a heck of a lot of them.

And I undertook it personally to insure the fact that we would meet or exceed any requirements that we could find. And in fact, in the development of the golf course -- I lost my train of thought. In the development of the golf course, our difficulty really has been finding out exactly what we're supposed to do. And many of the agencies that we have had to deal with were hard pressed to determine exactly how things were supposed to be interpreted.

In any case, in any situation, where we were confronted with an indeterminant indication of what we were supposed to do, our policy was to take the least -- the most stringent and adhere to that, so there would be no question as to what we should do.

We have never, to my knowledge, pushed any environmental issue, whatsoever, and have endeavored in all circumstances, as I said, to meet or exceed any criteria that we could find. And the hardest part about a 405 acre site, with all the different things on it, is determining what things there are to find and then



•

getting somebody to tell what you are supposed to do.

The threshold question, really, in terms of the Critical Areas Commission became one of, was a golf course going to be a permitted use in our situation for this golf course in the RCA. And we felt that in Queen Anne's County, with the ordinance the way that it is, that this should be answered in order for us to move forward.

As a result, we requested, in conjunction at this time with the town of Queenstown, that the Commission -- and I talked to Wren and Dr. Taylor a number of times about this -- give us some preliminary indication as to whether a golf course could be a permitted use in the RCA.

At the request of the town and ourselves, we proceeded to move forward and had some preliminary consultations with the staff on the staff level of the Commission.

At the same time we approached the Chesapeake Bay Foundation, knowing that they had a very strong and vested interest in the future of the Bay, as we do, as



people that are expecting to maintain our land and certainly not as somebody that would like to see it slide into the Bay or be abused in any way. We talked to the Chesapeake Bay Foundation --

MR. MURPHY: Objection. This is clearly hearsay. He's gone into talking with the Commission's staff, Dr. Taylor. Now apparently he's going to relate conversations with the Chesapeake Bay Commission. I mean, I know administrative bodies are liberal, but this is blatant hearsay. The Chesapeake Bay Commission, as far as I know, is not here. Are they here to testify on this? If they are, let them come forward. I really object to this strenuously.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Well, I'll sustain that objection.

MR. MURRAY: May I be heard?

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes.

MR. MURRAY: Not only do I disagree with Mr. Murphy again, it's for the exact same reasons as before. I agree with him in principle, but not in the application.



You will find in the regulations pertaining to the nature of this hearing that hearsay is not a basis for keeping out testimony. The question is whether or not the evidence is probative. Probative means, does it go to the issue? Does it help the decision maker decide the issues before him?

What Mr. Birney is trying to do is establish the context in which this particular golf course was designed. And why are we doing that? Because it goes to the heart of the question that Mr. Murphy himself insists is the only question you should consider. Is this essentially a commercial use that doesn't belong in the RCA?

Mr. Birney wants you to know that the Chesapeake Bay Foundation has something to say about that. And I think it's probative. And we would ask you to permit that evidence to come in.

(Whereupon, there was a discussion off the record.)

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: I'm advised by counsel that we'll proceed. We note the objection. And so, please



2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

proceed.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Birney, would you identify that exhibit?

A This is a letter written to Mr. Bob Price, then Acting Chairman of the Maryland Critical Area Commission, outlining what the Chesapeake Bay Foundation thought were important things in order that a golf course be developed consistently with the RCA.

MR. MURRAY: That is Exhibit Number Five, I believe.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Mr. Murphy, do you object to this letter coming in?

MR. MURPHY: Pure hearsay. Blatant.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: We note your objection, but I'm going to overrule it.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

MR. DEMING: However, I might caution, just to avoid further objections, that if you're going to talk about what that letter says, let's refer to the letter, rather than characterizing it.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Proceed.



MR. MURRAY: Mr. Birney may need the letter back.

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibit No. 5 was received in evidence.)

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q I believe that we offered the letter before you indicated the point of it for purposes of this hearing. What was it that the Chesapeake Bay Foundation wrote? What's the essential point of what --

MR. MURPHY: Objection. The letter speaks for itself. Anybody can read the letter.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: I sustain that. We can read the letter.

MR. MURRAY: Don't answer the question. Just give the exhibit.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q So, would you continue with the description of the history of the project and your efforts to evaluate the propriety of a golf course and the design of a particular golf course at this location?



A Okay. Based on certain criteria, we decided to move ahead with the plan to, at least in concept, come up with our golf course design.

Additionally, a letter was sent to -- okay. Subsequent to that, the Commission did meet and did offer an opinion from a concept point of view.

MR. MURPHY: Objection. This is the Commission's opinion?

THE WITNESS: This is the --

MR. MURRAY: Critical Areas Commission.

THE WITNESS: -- Critical Areas staff opinion.

MR. MURPHY: Objection, Mr. Chairman. The law is quite clear that this is an adversary quasi-judicial proceeding. There is to be no evidence received, except as part of the record. People are to have no contact with the Commission staff, except through the process that we have here.

Now, they are attempting to introduce, apparently, some approval that was given to this project before by a staff member of the Commission.

THE WITNESS: I didn't --



1

MR. MURPHY: Or a communication by the staff member of the Commission. This is the body that's supposed to be deciding that. I object.

(Whereupon, there was a discussion off the record.)

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: We're going to note the objection.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Please proceed.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Birney, what does Exhibit Number Four -- what is it?

A It's a letter from the Project Evaluation

Division commenting on the appropriateness of a golf

course in the RCA.

Q Would you please hand it -- okay. All right.

And if you would, rapidly move us on up into --

MR. MURPHY: Do I have -- has that been offered for -- in evidence?

MR. MURRAY: Yes. You objected to it and your objection was overruled. I think by now that's done.



however.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: We noted the objection,

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: And the basis for noting the objection here is that that letter was done prior to this hearing and we find nothing wrong with that letter coming in as a part of the record.

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibit No. 4 was received in evidence.)

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Birney, would you continue on, but rapidly get up to the current date in the history of the project?

A Okay. That brings us up to the current date. We have designed a golf course that we feel is -- meets or exceeds any of the criteria that we could find anywhere, and I'd like to bring that up if I could. There are some criteria that we felt were exceptionally important in the design and in the development of the course.

MR. MURPHY: Excuse me. Again, is this an



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

exhibit or are you going to use it as a --

MR. MURRAY: The latter.

THE WITNESS: We felt that it was important that the site be served by -- have an existing infrastructure that would support it, and we found that to be true of Route 50 and 301, which is adjacent to the property and allows instant access and egress from the property.

Additionally, we felt that it was important that there not be an over abundance of clearing involved when it came to wooded areas. And as you can see, there is a pretty striking similarity between the golf course design and the actual farm itself. We have concentrated on maintaining the golf course itself to the already cleared portions of the farm.

Certainly in the critical area, that's almost 100 percent true. And I don't profess to be an engineer. We have numbers for you. But I can give you some general indications of what we've tried to do.

Additionally, as I'm sure you're aware, in Queen Anne's County there is a 300 foot buffer and



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

rather than try and work around that, or have relief from that, we submitted to that and we are enthusiastic in maintaining and creating a wildlife habitat in that buffer through extensive 'aforestation.'

What the buffer means is that we've given up over 134 acres of the whole 735 acre site to the buffer, which nobody can go in or use for any purpose whatsoever, except for the wildlife habitat.

We have done -- we will be doing about 29 and a half acres of 'aforestation' within that buffer. And what you see here in the buffer is exactly the same as what we have here, except in the case of the golf course, we'll be adding 30 acres of woodlands to that buffer.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Birney, would you point out the extent of the buffer? That is, the distance away from the water or the shore?

A Okay. It's 300 feet back from the tidal waters and that -- there is a dotted line here that runs around --



Q Okay.

A Well, this is non-tidal, so that dotted line continues on this area and then again -- well, actually it comes out to here and then comes around like that.

So, as you can see from this sketch, there is nothing in there. There's nothing to change from here.

Additionally, I'd like to point out to the Commission that in terms of 'aforestation,' this plat shows -- this design shows what's on here, but that's not what we are going to put there. As I said, we're going to add substantial 'aforestation' and -- the areas that you see marked with these diagonal lines, we will be adding forested areas to.

In essence, the entire 300 foot buffer will be in woodlands, all the way around to here, all the way across here. We'll be adding these areas here. This is already in woodlands. This will be 300 feet deep in woodlands again, and all the way around to here.

Q Mr. Birney, let me give you a moment to catch your breath.

A Okay.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

Q For the record, this is one of the documents attached to or made a part of Exhibit Number Eight and specifically it is sheet number two.

Now, Mr. Birney, if you would. Using the legend, so these people who have never seen this before will have a chance to digest what you're saying, tell them what it is that this plat depicts in the way of existing woodland?

A Okay. Existing woodland would be indicated by these sort of light blue areas with the fuzzy lines around that, and that's on the entire site.

- Q Okay. And what's the cross hatched area?
- A This? This cross hatched area?
- O No. The --

A This is -- are non-tidal wetlands. And in the coastal and in the critical area we will be maintaining and not disturbing in any way, shape, or form, the 25 foot buffer surrounding all non-tidal wetlands area.

- Q Okay. Now, what is the angle with dot areas?
- A The angles with dots are the 'aforested' areas where we will be planting trees.



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

Q	So,	that's	the	approximate	30	acres	of
aforestati	on?						

- A That's correct.
- Q Some of that -- or all of that -- you correct me now -- is within the 300 foot buffer?
 - A That's correct.
- Q Now, as long as we're using this drawing, which discloses a number of facts, would you outline for the members of the Panel, the critical area line itself?
- A The critical area line is this heavy blue line that goes around the perimeter of the farm here.
 - Q So the area in here is not critical area?
 - A That's correct.
- Q Now, what plans, if any, are there to deal with the existing structures any differently than they are today?
- A Well, there are some existing farm structures, houses, where we have some tenants. Those will be taken down and will go away.

There are two houses on the site; this one and this one. They are nice houses and they will stay just



the same as they always have been.

There is an existing barn here where we store farm equipment and the like. That will stay. That's a beautiful 150 foot barn. And then we will be building one 3,000 foot structure --

- O Three thousand square foot?
- A Three thousand square foot structure in the parking lot, out of the critical area, where we will do -- we will establish taking of greens fees and that sort of thing. But, that's out of the critical area.
 - Q Any new roadways involved in the golf course?
- A We anticipate nothing beyond cart paths.

 There will be no roadways or no infrastructure of that nature whatsoever on the site.
- Q You talked a little while ago about the former interest in developing an inn or hotel on the site. Is that part of this project?
- A Absolutely not. And that's why we got the site a mile and a half down the road, which is IDA.
- Q And is there any residential development as part of this project?



A Absolutely not. I think it's clear from looking at the design that we certainly don't anticipate any residential development. I certainly wouldn't plan a golf course like that if I did.

MR. GRIFFIN: It's not unusual, though, for golf courses to have residential development?

THE WITNESS: No, it's not. But we don't feel that in this situation, certainly in the critical area or anywhere else on the site, that it's appropriate and it's not our interest. We have never developed residential homes and we don't have any interest in it.

MR. GRIFFIN: Is this -- right here, is this where 50 and 301 split?

THE WITNESS: Yes. This is 50 and this is 301.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: This is an existing road?

THE WITNESS: That's the existing farm road.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: That would go up to -
THE WITNESS: Right. It's, as it's shown.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: -- pro shop, or whatever?

THE WITNESS: Yes.



MR. GRIFFIN: Where are your parking lots? Where do you plan to --

THE WITNESS: This is it right here. In the upland area, out of the critical area.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q You indicated, I think, briefly that there would be extensive plantings in rough. Where generally would that be?

A Well, I could go back over to this one. As you can see, the land is presently used for agriculture. There is essentially no best management practices that are used, although we would be developing them for the future, as mandated by the Commission.

We have extensive areas of open earth. We have currently a 25 foot buffer that is maintained, as it is in agriculture, around the perimeter of the farm. All of this will go back to some sort of turfed area. And on a golf course of this nature, we anticipate 36 percent of the course will be tees, fairways, and greens, and 64 percent of the farm will go back to turfed in rough.



_

Q What are the areas in light blue on the plat that you're looking at?

A These are -- okay. In keeping with the storm water management and the storm water run-off water quality issues that we feel are fundamentally important to doing it successfully, we've contoured the whole site, with the exception of the 300 foot buffer, because we can't go in there, to drain all storm water into irrigation ponds that we will irrigate -- so that we can irrigate the golf course from them, significantly reducing any storm water run-off from the farm, which currently has no storm water management plan at all, as is the case in most farming areas presently.

So, we would go from a zero storm water management policy to a totally controlled and state of the art storm water management policy or design, I should say.

We feel that that is a significant contribution to the water quality. And in addition to that, as I said, we have offered to take the effluent from Queenstown Creek and put it into our ponds and it



_

is still part of the design to enable us to do that, if the town should see that they would like to do that in the future.

So, I think from a water quality standpoint, it's a superior design and our engineers know better than I how all of that works.

Q Describe briefly, if you would, how the clubhouse operation would work and what kind of functions would occur there?

A We feel that with a golf course of this nature, a very nominal clubhouse is necessary. We don't anticipate -- we're not going to have anything but cold sandwiches and maybe a hot dog stand, men's and ladies' bathrooms, and an area -- maybe a small retail area, where you can buy golf balls when you hit them into all the ponds that we're going to put out there. That's the extent of it. And, we don't anticipate doing anything other than that.

We have worked very hard to adhere to, and as I said, exceed all the standards that we could find.

The alternative to this is a residential



development, and if necessary I suppose that could happen. We're told by our engineers that we could get about 81 lots on there; 19 in the critical area and 62 in the upland area; and the possibility of a community marina associated with those, a not for profit marina, located down here along Little Queenstown Creek.

We'd prefer not to do that. It is currently an acceptable and obtainable use under existing critical area law and existing zoning.

The human activity generated by something like that would be substantial and we feel that a site of this size that's returned to wildlife every evening, is seasonal in nature, and designed around the existing environmental features, is a far superior use to that.

This golf course is also unique in the fact that it is so spread out. Golf courses are sometimes packed into very tight areas, and this is a -- it's a loose golf course and allows approximately 15 acres per eight people. Generally you'd have about eight people on a hole at maximum play. And that would -- following that, you would have about two acres per person, or



eight people on 15 acres at maximum play. And to me that's a pretty low intensity human use, especially when the fact that everybody goes away when the sun goes down. So --

Q Mr. Birney, is there any activity related to the golf course that you intend to promote related to the creek itself?

A Absolutely not. Nor do we anticipate any.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: How many acres are devoted to the golf course per se?

THE WITNESS: Well, the whole site, which essentially runs in this portion here, is approximately 405 acres.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Four hundred and five.
BY MR. MURRAY:

- Q A correction. I think earlier you indicated that there were some golf courses that did use effluent for irrigation purposes. I think that you mistakenly indicated that Hog Neck was one of those courses.
 - A I may have mistakenly indicated that.

 MR. MURPHY: Are you objecting? I mean, are



1	you correc	cting the record?
2.		MR. MURRAY: I'm asking the question and he
3	answered.	Is that an objection?
4		MR. MURPHY: It was a leading question. I'm
5	sorry.	
6		MR. MURRAY: It was a clarification.
7		MR. MURPHY: It was a clarification by the
8	attorney,	rather than by the witness.
9		MR. MURRAY: No other questions from here, Mr
0	Chairman.	
1		CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Okay. Mr. Murphy?
12		CROSS-EXAMINATION
13	·	BY MR. MURPHY:
4	. Q	Mr. Birney, you don't dispute that this is a
15	commercia	l operation?
16	A	Well, my understanding of the zoning in Queen
17	Anne's Co	unty is that it's institutional.
18	Q	Well, but it's a profit making venture,
19	correct?	•
20	A	Do you mean the exchange of moneys?
21	Q	You're in it to make a profit, aren't you?



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis



1	
2	٠
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

0	Yes

A You'd have to ask our engineers. I'm not familiar with that number.

- Q You do recognize that Queenstown Creek is presently suffering pollution problems?
 - A It would seem to me that it has some problems.
- Q Are you going to be followed by experts describing the plans of the project?
 - A I certainly don't profess to be an engineer.
- Q I'm just asking you. Are you going to be followed? There are going to be experts coming after you, who are going to --

MR. MURRAY: Yes. I'll answer that "yes."

MR. MURPHY: Can I have that letter of the Chesapeake Bay Foundation?

BY MR. MURPHY:

- Q Now, when the Chesapeake Bay Foundation wrote its letter, it put some qualifications on its recommendation, did it not?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Didn't it say that, "In our view, the



designation of new golf courses should hinge on consideration of the following factors, while developing the course would require a significant change in land features"?

MR. MURRAY: I guess I will object and make the same objection that Mr. Murphy did; that is, either the letter speaks for itself or it doesn't.

MR. MURPHY: I don't care about that.

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q Are you making any significant changes in land features on this property?

- A In terms of moving piles of earth, no.
- Q How much of the property is being graded?
- A I'm not familiar with those numbers.
- Q It's over 50 percent of the critical area, isn't it?

A In terms of grading, again, I'm not an expert on grading.

Q Well, you're somewhat of an expert on golf courses, I guess, and every golf course I've been to, the tee is set up, and there are bunkers that are set on



the sides, and the green is set up, and there is an awful lot of earth-moving that goes on in connection with a golf course, isn't there?

- A Yes.
- Q This is not going to take place here?
- A We are fortunate in having a very flat site with about a 20-foot fall, which we can utilize to build the golf course on so we are not interfering or moving a significant -- in terms of golf course construction, a significant amount of earth because the site, as it exists, is conducive to a golf course.
- Q The second stipulation of the Chesapeake Bay
 Foundation was whether the proposed golf course would be
 located --

MR. MURRAY: Objection. The same objection.

MR. MURPHY: I'm just reading it. I want to ask him about it. I've got to refresh his memory on it.

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q -- would be located adjacent to areas that are already developed and have infrastructure to accommodate its use.



Now, you're going to go in next to Queenstown, and they have infrastructure to accommodate the use, don't they?

- A We are adjacent to Queenstown, yes, but I'm not sure what -- yes.
- Q But, yet, you're not going to make use of that infrastructure, are you?
 - A I'm not following you.
- Q Wasn't, before, you were going to utilize -you were going to operate this golf course in
 conjunction with the Queenstown sewage treatment system?
 - A We would have liked to have done that, yes.
- Q Well, are you adjacent to an area that is already developed and has infrastructure to accommodate your use?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Are you making use of that infrastructure?
- A In terms of services that it could provide us,
 I suppose so, yes.
 - Q What are they?
 - A A golf shop in Chesapeake Pottery, a drugstore







2.1

ROBERT RAUCH,

a witness, called for examination by counsel for the Applicant, was examined and testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MURRAY:

- Q Mr. Rauch, please tell the Commission who you are.
 - A My name is Robert Rauch.
 - Q What do you do?

A I'm the president of a civil engineering and surveying firm located in Easton, Maryland, Rauch, Wallace & Lane, Inc., and I am the senior project manager for our firm on this project.

VOICE: How do you spell your last name?

VOICE: R-A-U-C-H.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

BY MR. MURRAY:

- Q Mr. Rauch, how long have you been an engineer?
- A Seventeen years.
- Q Briefly describe your work history.
- A I worked approximately five years for the



Maryland Department of Natural Resources as a hydrologist working in flood plain management as a project manager and design engineer.

Following that, I worked for approximately six years as the director of public works for Talbot County, located in Easton, Maryland.

Following that, I've had approximately six years of private practice working as a civil engineer, primarily working on private and public projects.

- Q Have you ever been or are you presently involved in any other golf course projects?
 - A Yes, I am.
 - O Please describe them.
- A We have three projects that are currently in the design stage. Our participation in all of those projects are to provide design support -- engineering design support to the golf course architect to the project.

We have completed -- well, about 90 percent complete on the design of a golf course project located in Easton, Maryland, which is also located in Maryland's



critical areas. It's a full 18-hole golf course and does have a residential component to it.

We are currently working with the state of
Maryland and a private developer out of Houston on a
state of Maryland golf course located in Rocky Gap State
Park in Cumberland.

We have three projects that are in the very early stages of planning. They are at early planning stages, to the point that I'm really not at liberty to discuss them in great detail, other than they are -- one is in the state of Delaware, and two of them are located on Maryland's Eastern Shore.

- Q When did you become involved in this particular project?
- A I've been involved in it for approximately two years.
- Q What has been your responsibility during that time?
- A We've provided engineering support to the owners/developers on the project relating, initially, to some of the work that was described by Mr. Birney with



the town of Queenstown for wastewater treatment and disposal, discussion of extension of utilities to the project, site planning, septic system analysis, and preliminary site designs.

- Q Does that work involve utilizing or working with people from other areas of responsibility?
 - A Yes, it does.
 - Q For example?
- A The entire process of working and managing the design and engineering responsibilities of a golf course involve a variety of disciplines that have developed specific expertises; some dealing with wetlands issues, tidal and nontidal, and septic system design and approval.

With the septic system, those individuals who have some specific expertise are sanitarians. We have stormwater management experts. We have planning experts. We have water quality experts.

So it's a variety of expertises that have to be brought together to develop a project of this sort.

Q There is an architect involved in this



2

3

4

5

6

8

- 9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

project?

There is a golf course architect, yes. Α

Who is? Q

Lindsey Irving, Lindsey Irving & Associates.

Utilizing the exhibits on the table in front of the panel, would you describe for the panel the essential characteristics of this project from your prospective?

Our "marching orders," as they might be, from the developer was to establish a development "envelope," if you like, of the areas that we could work with on the property, which created the least possible controversy; avoid, if at all possible, conflicts with local ordinances, state regulations, federal regulations.

In doing so, we've identified various buffering restrictions, nontidal wetlands restrictions, steep slopes, wooded areas, other sensitive areas -habitat, for example.

We have identified, sequentially, those areas that we can, in fact, work within -- the county actually mandates many of the restrictions that are, in fact,



.

1.7

directed specifically for the protection and enhancement of the environment.

The 300-foot buffer became our first limitation of where we could and couldn't work. As was previously discussed, our only involvement with the buffer was to identify it, stay out of it, and, in fact, enhance it with the required wooded-type afforestation.

We had to identify nesting bird habitat, which was done. Somebody else will testify specifically on what that was and to what extent it was done, but those areas were identified and specific buffers created around them.

We identified nontidal wetlands. This was done through a variety -- a fairly extensive series of site investigations, confirmations by representatives of the Corps of Engineers. In fact, the exhibit that is presented includes a signed copy of the nontidal wetlands designation, as verified by a Corps of Engineers representative.

The nontidal wetlands areas are further dealt with through the use of buffers -- 25-foot buffers --



which are mandated through the county's ordinance, not a specific requirement of the Corps of Engineers.

The critical areas limits were established because there are things we can do in there -- or can't do in there that we can do in the upland or noncritical area.

We had to assess tidal and nontidal areas. We did, in fact, have one pond at this end of the property, which was identified on the state wetlands map entitled "Wetlands."

We, through our experts, had verified that they, in fact, were not tidal wetlands. Some initial drafts of the plan included -- we did not attempt to change the critical areas boundary at any time, which if, in fact, was nontidal, we could have gone through that step.

We left the critical areas boundary as it was.

We did initially have a 25-foot buffer around it. The county had asked for some further verification from the state which, when the long and short of it was it would have required a map amendment, it was determined that we



would simply leave it as a tidal basin when, in fact, we believe it's not, and have maintained the 300-foot boundary.

That became our development envelope. We worked directly with the golf course architect in assisting him in identifying areas that he could work within, and made specific requests relative to the construction of the ponds that are shown on this exhibit, which are noted in blue.

These ponds, while they're typically thought of in a golf course as an aesthetic amenity, they serve a variety of very real benefits to the project.

From our perspective, the primary benefit was to collect stormwater. Grading of the project is such that all stormwater -- I should say, the majority of the stormwater from the graded areas will drain to the proposed ponds.

The areas within the 300-foot buffer will remain undisturbed and, in fact, further covered with turf -- the rough grass plantings.

There will be no grading involved in those.



So what areas are draining to the tidewater and those buffers will continue to, but those areas will be enhanced with further stabilization, which were previously filled agricultural areas.

The balance of the areas are brought to these ponds. We designed these ponds in such a way that there would be no direct discharge to tidewater -- and I emphasize "no direct discharge" with regards to the storage capacity that has been put into those ponds. That storage capacity is based on the static pool levels and how much area within the pond we can accumulate stormwater.

It's our intention on this project from both a stormwater quantity and quality standpoint to retain up to a 100-year storm run-off event for the entire site, which we are able to do, and that's supported in the documents that have been enclosed as an exhibit.

I investigated the ponds from a water quality standpoint and are able to retain the first full inch of run-off on the total project, which is a standard addressed in water quality efforts to enhance the site.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

Additional advantages of the ponds and requirements of the ponds are for irrigation, as well. As was previously stated, it's definitely to our advantage to retain as much water as possible for the purposes of irrigation.

The ponds serve a final role in our management, and that's from the sediment and erosion control standpoint. With the entire site outside of the buffers being graded towards the ponds, those ponds will serve as our sediment basins during construction. All stormwater and potential run-off -- sediment-bearing run-off will be directed and retained within those ponds.

It's a fairly common practice when you can incorporate ponds into your site planning where you actually will overcut those ponds by a slight amount to allow it to fill with sediment so you don't have any further maintenance of it after the work is complete.

There will be no sediment discharged to tidal waters during construction. That's not just our desire; that's very clearly a local, state, and federal



- 11

requirement that we have to provide an adequate sediment and erosion control plan to prevent any sediment from discharging from the site. Ponds do this exceptionally well.

Like I say, there is no grading within the buffers themselves, and that's far in excess of what type of protection is available on the site now.

Q Mr. Rauch, let's talk a bit, if we could, about the habitat implications from this design.

A The 300-foot buffer -- and I would like to boast that that was something that we really wanted to have. It works fine in our site plan; the county has included that in their requirements for the very purpose of enhancing habitat around the perimeters of the project.

These 300-foot buffers are, in fact, included in our site plan and further enhanced with the afforestation. It's just not necessarily required to all be in that area.

Q What is the amount of afforestation, and what does "afforestation" mean?



A We have a responsibility to provide 50 percent

-- and I may defer, if I stumble a little on this, to

somebody who is a little better versed on the

afforestation aspects -- but we have a responsibility to

provide 50 percent of the buffered area, which is about

134 acres, I believe, in wooded area.

We currently have 30-some acres that's already wooded within the buffer. We have to provide a total of 67. So we're adding the additional 29. My addition, by rounding, may not be exact, and that is also included in the exhibits that we have, but, approximately, that's what we're providing.

Q Is that the areas with the dividing lines and the dots that Mr. Birney explained earlier?

A Yes, it is. In addition to the buffers, the ponds themselves provide a very real enhancement to habitat. The duck, goose populations aren't shy about using those types of ponds. They seem to be very popular. There will be fish provided in the ponds.

Grading of the ponds will actually be designed in such a way to enhance the use of those ponds by



5

certain wildlife.

Q What will be the general impact on water quality as a result of the design of the project?

A The water quality issue has been probably the leading factor in the design of this project. It's not our intention to propose a project that would have anything but a positive benefit on the site.

In addition to it being the developer's priority, it's ours from the design perspective, as well. It's not simply the intention to jam whatever you can on a piece of ground. There are too many rules, regulations that establish enough guidelines, that it's virtually impossible to create a negative effect if you follow all of the rules and regulations.

It's our belief on this project that there will actually be an enhancement of water quality on Little Queenstown Creek and the Chester River. I don't pretend to be the expert in this regards.

However, in my capacity to collect expert information -- we do it either through staff members, or we do it through outside experts, or we do it through



source material -- we have included as part of our package a report prepared by a graduate student of Penn State under the direct supervision of a Dr. Wasky.

This is in the experts and people concerned with golf course development at this time. This has been a document that has been looked for for quite some time. It has been in the making for approximately five years.

Again, not pretending to be the expert that prepared this, I feel comfortable in evaluating the conclusions that they have drawn in the report. Much has been said before, and I'll let the document speak for itself in some regards.

Basically, what the study involved was the establishment of turf grass plots, studying them over a five-year period under actual rainfall events and simulated rainfall events through irrigation trying to identify the impacts or movement of nutrients, herbicides, and pesticides.

The conclusions of the report are very positive with regards to properly constructed and



properly -- golf courses. 1 MR. MURPHY: Objection. Have these been 2 marked for identification? 3 MR. MURRAY: Yes. 4 CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes, they have. 5 MR. MURPHY: Are you furnishing copies to 6 anyone? 7 MR. MURRAY: To the Commission. 8 Not to counsel? MR. MURPHY: 9 MR. MURRAY: No. 10 Have they been offered into MR. MURPHY: 11 evidence yet? 12 MR. MURRAY: The blue has. I don't think the 13 books have. 14 MR. MURPHY: The blue map? 15 CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes, it has. 16 MR. MURRAY: All of these documents, I 17 believe, are part of the approval process and were 18 previously submitted to the Critical Areas Commission. 19 Mr. Deming asked me to provide a separate set tonight, 20 which I have done. 21



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

MR. MURPHY: Well, I went down to the Commission last Thursday, and I didn't see that University of Pennsylvania study.

THE WITNESS: It's part of the appendix to our "Best Management Plan," which this is the document.

MR. MURPHY: May I see that? I'll just say: I didn't see this. I looked through all of the material that the Critical Areas Commission has. I was not given this.

It's almost impossible to cross-examine.

That's a big, thick document.

MR. MURRAY: If I may respond. It's my understanding -- and I suspect that we cannot verify this because Mr. Stephens has left -- that Mr. Murphy has been invited to come down to Queen Anne's County and view these documents and those plans for long, many weeks now.

I don't know what happened at the Critical
Areas Commission. I don't know what the Critical Areas
Commission has or doesn't have, but I do know they have
been public record for a long time.



MR. MURPHY: Well, this isn't a Queen Anne's County hearing: it's a Critical Areas Commission hearing. I went down and asked to see the whole record. The only appendix I saw was the stormwater calculations, which I did not copy. I copied everything else.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Well, let's get them into evidence. Let's offer them.

MR. MURRAY: Well, let's do that as a group, then. We then offer Exhibit No. 9, 16, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, and 23, all of which are, as I believe Mr. Rauch has testified, part of the submittals for this project.

They constitute the supporting documentation and appendices, and I want him to be able to refer to them and explain them in terms of his overall explanation of the engineering on this site.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: You've seen none of this, Mr. Murphy?

MR. MURPHY: Have I, what?

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Have you seen none of

those?



MR. MURPHY: I don't know. Can I look at 1 them? 2 Is Lindsey Irving going to be here? 3 MR. MURRAY: He is here. 4 MR. MURPHY: They're going to testify. 5 MR. MURRAY: He is. 6 MR. MURPHY: Mr. Lindsey Irving? 7 Mr. Lindsey Irving, yes. MR. MURRAY: 8 the materials that Mr. Rauch --9 MR. MURRAY: "Rauch." 10 MR. MURPHY: -- "Rauch," I'm sorry -- has 11 prepared, I certainly have no objection to, and that's 12 Exhibits 17, 18, 19, 23, 22, 21, and 20. 13 Assuming Mr. Irving is going to be here, I 14 don't object to Exhibit 15. 15 Exhibit 14 is a newspaper article. I object 16 to that. 17 Exhibit 13 appears to be an article. Exhibits 18 There has been no 13, 12, 11, and 10 are articles. 19 testimony with respect to these at all. They could be 20 articles on, you know, anything. They happen to be 21



seemingly relevant to the subject, but I think if we had some testimony as to how they related to this project or that, I would withdraw my objection, but I object to these articles in the absence of any, or just offering them without -- certainly, the authors of these articles aren't here, and there is no indication of how they relate to this project.

Exhibit 9 is this appendix to the stormwater study. I do not object to that.

Exhibit 16, I have the same objection to it, that there is no testimony on how it relates to this project, at least that I've heard.

MR. MURRAY: I proffer that's not testimony.

Mr. Rauch will testify how these documents relate to his engineering work.

He talked in generic terms a few minutes ago about the fact that he didn't do all of this himself. He relied on employees and outsiders, and he brought it all together, and it's all represented in those drawings and these documents. Some of it is his work; some of it, he reviewed; some of it, some employees did; and



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

some of it is work of outsiders, which he relies on to do his job everyday.

He'll be prepared and is prepared to explain how it fits into part of the puzzle. It's not unrelated or irrelevant. If it were, we wouldn't have brought it.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Do I understand, Mr.

Murphy, you're objecting to some of these; the articles,
in particular?

MR. MURPHY: There has been no testimony about how they relate to this project.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Well, let's give him an opportunity to testify.

MR. MURPHY: Fine. Fine.

MR. MURRAY: Let me see if we can expedite this process.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q In connection with your water quality analyses regarding the golf course, did you take into account any or all of the information contained in that package of documents? If you did, with respect to any of it, identify the exhibit and tell us what you learned from



2

3

4

5

6

•

8

•

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

or relied on in it.

A Yes, I used all of this information in the preparation of our documents.

- Q And they are exhibits, what?
- A Exhibits 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and 16.
- What, generally, do those documents deal with?
- A To assess the water quality impacts of the golf course on this environment, we had to collect data and reference information and resource information, which addressed the circumstances. Alternatively, we could go to extremely elaborate exercises -- site evaluations -- that is not within any scope that we could possibly deal with.

This information is the result of a literature search, discussions with what we determined to be experts, and was a collection of information that we thought fairly represented what could be expected in the development of this project.

Specifically, the Penn State study was really the backbone of our assumptions and contentions that we would, in fact, have a water quality benefit from our



proposed project.

The additional information provided was for review and information purposes for the reviewing agencies because there is very little information that's actually available on this subject.

The newspaper article: this is an article from a technical journal, <u>Golf Course Management Journal</u>, which discusses specifically nitrates in ground water and golf course management.

This letter to Mr. Ken Alkier (phonetic) of Golf Turf from Rutgers University, again, addresses the effects and positive benefits of the use of turf grass and the environment in connection with golf courses.

This was provided to me by Mr. Alkier, who I'm working with on another project.

The Golf Course Superintendent Association of America has published these series of papers, which are specifically "Golf Course Impact on Water Quality,"

"Golf Course Erosion Control," "Wildlife Management on Golf Courses," "Golf Course Pesticide Use," "Golf Courses as Community Assets," "Golf Course Resource



Reclamation and Recycling," "Golf Course Water

Utilization," and "Integrated Pest Management in the

Golf Course."

Finally, we attached excerpts from EPA's "Integrated Pest Management for Turf Grass and Ornamentals."

All of this information was provided to support the conclusions that we drew that there would be a positive impact from the golf course, and we believe that these documents support that information, and they should, in fact, support speak for themselves.

MR. DEMING: May I ask a question?

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes.

VOIR DIRE

BY MR. DEMING:

Q Mr. Rauch, were these documents referenced in a text or in a bibliography of the other reports that are under your name?

A Yes, they were.

MR. DEMING: All right. Thank you.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (CONT.)



/

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Rauch, are these the kind of documents that you rely on in the normal course of your business?

A Yes, they are, especially in circumstances where there is relatively new areas of investigation.

As you can see, some of the information is provided by people in the industry of golf courses. This is not a new question. It's not a new issue. In fact, these are the people that are doing the studies and doing the research to help support other design professionals in addressing these questions.

Q All right. Let's go back to the water quality issue on this site. Based upon your own investigations and research, what do you consider to be the water quality impacts of this design?

A Again, we believe that the water quality impacts will be positive, as compared to what its current use is and as compared to what its potential use is as residential development.

All of these reports support our conclusion that there will not be any transport of nutrients



′

through proper management and proper establishment of the turf grass.

In our position, we emphasize the term

"proper." It's presented and proposed to the county as

part of our site plan approval. We don't intend to have

this golf course constructed and then left up to some

random type of management.

The integrated pest management system is a program that was developed by EPA and documented in one of their publications. Basically, the contention is, is that it's a replacement type program.

You're dealing with people that are licensed: superintendents licensed to handle approved chemicals. Our irrigation system, for example, is a sensing type system, which will only replace water as is determined as being necessary.

The systems of fertilization will be based on replacement purposes only. There is emphasis in the integrated pest management system to have experts working -- licensed experts that are capable of making the determination of when best to apply this. You don't



_

apply them before expected heavy rains; you don't apply them immediately after. There is, procedurally, an environmentally sensitive way of applying these products.

The pesticide, there are suspicions of pesticide movement. Pesticides, based on the information that we've collected and reports and our understanding, are basically attached to the sediment. You would expect to see them in surface run-off. You would typically expect to see that more in the use of pesticides in an agricultural environment because we don't have the extensive uses of ponds. We don't have the extensive buffering. In fact, under the Penn State report, they were unable to record significant levels of run-off even by simulating extreme events.

So the potential of surface water run-off in a properly designed and established and maintained turf grass environment is not to be expected.

So, based on that information, the fact that we have, in fact, designed the site to direct all runoff to our ponds, we feel very comfortable in



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

professionally concluding that we will have a positive impact on the proposed design.

Q You had mentioned, I think, the "Best Management Plan." What does that mean, and does it have any relationship to the water quality issue?

A The "Best Management Plan" is an allencompassing program to design, construct, and maintain
the proposed project in a fashion that is the best for
the environment.

It's actually a three-step process starting with the siting of the project. I discussed the creation of the envelopes that we allowed the golf course architect to work within.

In this siting envelope, we eliminated potential impacts that were considered to be environmentally insensitive.

So that was our first step in our "Best Management Plan." Our second step in our "Best Management Plan" was incorporating design components into our project. The specific one that has been discussed extensively are the use of the ponds.



The use of the more extensive buffering in the area where we found evidence that it was, in fact, nontidal but we conceded that we didn't want to create that as a controversial issue, that was a design decision that was considered to be to the benefit of the environment and the benefit of the project.

Finally, the last component is the management of the course itself. Once we have established a properly-developed turf for this golf course, our proposal site plan and the site plan presentation to the county includes the obligation to incorporate an integrated pest management system, provide them with licensed superintendents, and give them regular reporting and monitoring throughout the life of the project to confirm and to verify that we are, in fact, adhering to the integrated pest management.

You can't have a project of this sort without all of those components, and we don't intend to stick this up there and then forget it. It's got to be ongoing. So you're not just talking about the physical construction of the project. It's a total concept, and



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO the concept is geared toward and has been protection of

MR. MURRAY: Let's do a little bit of I believe that we had an objection.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes, we did.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Murphy, does that objection still stand as to these documents?

MR. MURPHY: That's the studies?

MR. MURRAY: The collection of the golf course

The studies? MR. MURPHY:

Yes.

No.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Are you still objecting?

No.

Then we accept them. CHAIRMAN CORKRAN:

These are items 10, 11, 12, 13, as the ones you had objected to, and 16. That's what I have here, but you've withdrawn that objection.

MR. MURPHY: Well, based on the testimony.



1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
1.1	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

Q You've talked about the "Best Management Plan." Is it incorporated into Exhibit 18?

A Yes, it is.

MR. MURRAY: We would like to offer this in.

MR: MURPHY: The "Best Management Plan"?

MR. MURRAY: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: I thought had identified that previously as no objection.

MR. MURRAY: You did.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Yes, you did.

MR. MURRAY: I don't think we ever got them in, and I'm going through --

MR. MURPHY: No objections.

MR. MURRAY: Do you have objections to any of these other documents?

MR. MURPHY: No.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Rauch, would you fairly expeditiously identify each of these documents, how they relate to each other, and what they have to do with this project?

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Do you want to do this one,



too?

MR. DEMING: That's what you just did.

MR. MURRAY: I think we just did the "Best Management Plan."

THE WITNESS: The "Best Management Plan" is the summary of the information that is supplied in the attachments.

This letter from Lindsey Irving & Associates was one of the attachments, which similarly supports our conclusion of a positive --

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Would you, when you do that each time, tell them what exhibit number you're referring to?

A Exhibit 15, that is a discussion of the various applications that will be used in the management of the course. Mr. Irving will discuss that in more detail.

Exhibit 9 is the appendix to our stormwater management report, and this includes all of the computations that were developed to support the contention and conclusion that we, in fact, are



13.

decreasing the run-off to the tidal waters and enhancing the water quality.

Exhibit 17 is the environmental assessment, which was prepared by a member of our staff, and it addresses pretty much the -- it follows the specific critical areas criteria and country criteria for developing the environmental assessment, and identification of existing and proposed conditions.

Finally, the summary stormwater management report and attachments. That's exhibit -- well, Exhibit 19 is the summary report.

Exhibits 20, 21, 22, and 23 are all plat exhibits to the stormwater management report. They specifically describe predevelopment and postdevelopment conditions, identification of drainage areas, and flow information that's used in the preparation of the report.

MR. MURRAY: Again, a minor housekeeping matter. I'm not absolutely certain that the seven-page exhibit with all of the drawings was actually admitted. As I understand it, there is no objection.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis 301 647-8300

800 950-DEPO

20

21

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: That's correct.

MR. MURRAY: I would like to have that admitted.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: No. 8.

(Whereupon, Applicant's Exhibits Nos. 8 through 23 were received in evidence.)

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Rauch, you were talking a little bit ago about fertilizer and pesticides in turf grass.

What happens to those kinds of chemicals in this kind of golf course environment?

A Based on the information that we've been able to collect and our assessment of that information, the materials are either consumed and retained within the grasses themselves and within the root structures, and there is, in fact, no migration or leaching of these materials when properly applied and properly managed.

- Q Do you contemplate such procedures being in place and effective on this particular site?
 - A Yes, we do.
 - Q With respect, then, to water quality, what is



your opinion as to the net result of the design of this project on water quality?

A The net result, as, in fact, comparing it to relatively unmanaged agricultural use or to a potential of residential use, will be positive. We think there is actually no question about the positive impacts relative to its current agricultural use.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Mr. Murray, I call your attention to the clock. You had asked that precise question once before.

MR. MURRAY: I did not so knowingly, but if I did, I apologize.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Well, I know it, yes, and I would suggest that we move on as quickly as we possibly can, please.

MR. MURRAY: I only have one new subject, and I think I can complete it in one or two questions.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Rauch, the conclusion you just drew with respect to water quality, does that take into account wastewater treatment on site; and if so, how?



A With regards to wastewater treatment, all of the wastewater will be generated from the pro shop site where there will be rest rooms.

The estimated flows that are generated from the project have been developed and reviewed with the local health department. The exact number, I don't have it at my disposal, but it's less than 5,000 gallons per day.

They are being managed on a sewage reserve area of approximately 100,000 square feet. We have done extensive analysis of the site to determine that there are no adverse ground water conditions, that the soils are suitable for this.

This is not a new program, like some of the things we're dealing with. It's a very old, established program. The health department has very close and very specific requirements that we have to meet.

So our belief is that we have, in fact, proposed and designed a wastewater system that is environmentally beneficial or acceptable.

MR. MURRAY: Thank you. No more questions.



CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you. Cross?

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MURPHY:

- Q Are you familiar with the present condition of Queenstown Creek?
 - A I am, generally.
- Q Would you agree with a description of it as being "overenriched with nitrogen and exhibits lethally low dissolved oxygen levels"?
- A I don't have any information that I've personally generated or reviewed. I've heard that discussion, however.
- Q I read through your environmental assessment, and I didn't see any discussion in there of the existing condition of Queenstown Creek. Did I miss it somewhere?
- A I didn't personally prepare the environmental assessment, but in following through the entire documentation -- best management practice, it's our contention that the proposed enhancements of the project



are what is relevant and that the existing condition of the creek is not our immediate responsibility, other than --

- Q Do you consider that to be irrelevant?
- A To the extent that our proposed project is viewed as being an enhancement, I would consider it to be an interesting fact that would support our project.
- Q Are you familiar with the fact that it's designated as an anadromous fish spawning area in the Queen Anne's County critical area program?
- A I'm not an expert in that field, but I believe

 I'm aware of that -- have been told that.
- Q Again, I didn't see any discussion of that in your environmental assessment.
- A I would honestly have to defer to individuals that have prepared that report.
- MR. MURPHY: Are they going to testify, the individuals who prepared this?

MR. MURRAY: One.

THE WITNESS: One of the individuals that prepared it.



1

BY MR. MURPHY:

- Q Is it a member of your organization?
- A No, he is not.
- Q This environmental assessment was prepared by your organization.

MR. MURRAY: If, as you say, you've read it, you will see that it incorporates findings of other people, including the person who will testify as to the specifics.

BY MR. MURPHY:

- Q The ponds, there are three ponds on the site now, and you're constructing six new ponds; is that correct?
- A I think it's nine, but I would count to verify it. It's nine new ponds.
- Q You're going to have 12 ponds all together, then?
- A There are nine newly-constructed ponds. Well, I could point them out for you.

This is a nontidal basin in here.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Rauch, make sure that the



3

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

1-1

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18

19

20

21

members of the panel can see what you're doing.

THE WITNESS: I'm sorry. This is an existing nontidal basin on the site. There is an existing nontidal basin up in this area, which isn't clear on this, but I can show you in this area.

Then this area is the one that I was discussing that is actually shown on the state wetlands map as a tidal basin, but we believe it is, in fact, nontidal.

BY MR. MURPHY:

- Q These ponds, you say, are going to be used for sediment control, as well as stormwater control?
 - A That's right.
 - Q Sediment control during construction?
 - A That's right.
 - Q Are the ponds going to be lined?
 - A No.
- Q The soils on the property, they're generally sandy soils, are they not?
- A No, there is actually a wide variety. We have a soils report that is included in our exhibits that I



could refer to.

Q I understand that, but do you contend they're not generally sandy?

A No, I wouldn't generally call them "sandy soils" at all.

Q How close is the water table to the surface, do you know?

A It varies. In the area of our sewage reserve area, it's approximately four feet. In the area of some of the nontidal wetland areas that we're not developing in, it's within six inches. It varies throughout the project.

Q The maximum between four feet and inches?

A The areas that are not included in our development because of nontidal restrictions, it's as high as six inches.

Typically -- well, we know in the areas that we're developing, which are not nontidal, it's at least 18 inches under the extreme conditions, and those are typically winter seasonally-high water tables when we don't have the golfing activities and the various



nutrient applications and things like that.

During the summer, our water tables are quite a bit lower.

- Q The maximum, though, I mean, it would vary between a range of four feet and inches?
 - A Given the explanation that I gave, yes.
- Q Do you know what a "protective use" is under the critical area regulations?
- A Only that I was listening earlier. I wasn't personally aware of it before tonight's proceedings.
- Q Do you know that agricultural land is classified as a "protective use"?
- A Only that you said it was tonight. I'm not aware of it.
- Q Have you studied how much agricultural land is being lost in this project?
- A I haven't personally. We have somebody here that could give you specific numbers on that, who is scheduled to testify.

I know that we are removing some areas from agricultural and putting it into turf grass, and I say



the agricultural use is a variety of plantings, but we are changing it from a commercial crop to a turf grass. I don't know what you grow: corn, soybeans, whatever.

- Q You're removing a vast majority of it, aren't you?
- A Again, I would defer to somebody giving you specific numbers, but there is approximately 200 acres, plus or minus, that are coming out of agricultural production.
- Q It's your contention that the fertilizers will not leach down to the ground water?
 - A That's correct.
 - Q Why is that, that it will not happen?
- A Through the use of integrated pest management, which is a totally-encompassing program of a replacement process of nutrients, pesticides, irrigation water, the results of the information from the Penn State study and the results of other articles that we have reviewed.
- Q Well, I mean, integrated pest management doesn't have anything to do with fertilizer, does it?



- A Yes, it does.
- Q Isn't it pesticides?
- A No, it's a total program of pesticides, herbicides, and fertilizers, and irrigation water.
- Q Pest management doesn't address the control of pests?
- A It does, and all of those issues are directly related to pest management. If you overwater, you create an environment for pests that are very detrimental. So all of those functions are part of pest management and all part of our "Best Management Plan."
 - Q Fertilizer is part of pest management?
- A Part of what is "an integrated pest management plan." That's very well described in EPA's documents.
- Q In the environmental report on page eight, you say, "The proposed private septic system is a potential point source of water pollution. However, the use of the sewage reserve area, as shown on the plat, which has been approved by the Queen Anne's County Health Department, should minimize this potential impact."

Have you made any analysis as to what this



3

2

4

5

7

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

1.7

18 19

20

21

impact is?

A We work within the constraints and confines of what the health department has determined over years of study. They have determined that this is a suitable site for wastewater disposal.

Q But, yet, on two separate times, you said that there was going to be a positive --

A That's right.

Q -- water quality effect and here you said --

A The overall effect to the site will be positive.

Q I want to ask you about this point source of water pollution from the private septic system. Has that been analyzed as to what that is going to be?

A Yes, by the health department, and they have determined that we have an acceptable site for wastewater disposal.

Q But it has been determining that for the last 50 years and the Bay is polluted.

A They've gotten very good at it now. The restrictions are very different than they were 50 years



_

ago exactly as a result of what you're talking about.

Q You don't have any personal knowledge as to whether there is going to be pollution from this septic system?

A Based on our knowledge of the design of septic systems, percolation rates, types of soils, extensive investigations we've had, there is no indication from the information we have and our knowledge that there will be any pollution from that septic system.

Septic systems, in general, as it says in the report, are potential sites, but properly designed and properly constructed, they're not.

That's what we propose here. We don't intend to do something that is not properly designed or properly constructed.

Q Then you say that "Some nonpoint sources of water pollution may occur from the proposed development in the form of phosphorous from fertilizer and detergents, nitrogen from fertilizer in the atmosphere, suspended solids and sediments from the soil," et cetera.



A It's not a world of absolutes. We have the potential of those points being directed now toward our ponds, and that's how we propose to address that problem by directing that run-off to the ponds.

We also have provided substantial documentation to indicate that those potential impacts are negligible.

So, relative to what is happening today on the agricultural site, I'll reiterate our position is that there will be an enhancement. There is clearly a greater chance of nutrient run-off and deposition to the tidewaters under the agricultural use than what we provide. There is a 300-foot undisturbed buffer around the entire area.

Q How about the pesticides? Does the agricultural use put down the same amount of pesticide?

A The pesticides, in a turf grass environment, do not leak, as supported by the documents. They have to move under surface run-off. Turf grass is recommended and identified as perhaps the best way of stabilizing a site.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

1	Q If the soils are sandy, can they move?	
2	A No, no, they're retained in the soil particles	
3	and will have to move	
4	Q They can't leach down to the ground water?	
5	A According to the reports that we have, no,	
6	they don't.	
	Q You don't have any personal knowledge of that?	
7	A I utilized the experts that I have presented.	
8	Q Which are these reports?	
9	A Absolutely.	
10	Q You're an experienced development engineer,	
11	are you not?	
12	A I believe so.	
13 14	Q You could design a housing development that	
15	would have positive impact, couldn't you?	
16	A Potentially.	
17	Q It could have a more positive impact than	
18	agricultural use, could it not?	
19	${ t A}$ If I designed the site, for the purposes of an	
20	example, with a house sitting in the middle. I mean,	
21	that's a housing development. If we develop a site to	



21.

what its potential allows, our position is that it would be a greater -- a more of a negative impact than what we've proposed.

- Q One per 20 would be?
- A The proposed site will allow up to 81, I believe, units.
 - O In the critical area?

A To the extent that we were directed to develop this site, I don't make the decisions on what to develop. If I'm advised and directed to design a site plan for 81 units on that proposed project, then I'll do it in the most environmentally-sensitive way I can and totally consistent with the rules and regulations of the county and the state's critical area program.

Q Are you saying that this is a better development in the critical area, as far as water quality goes, than it would be under the "one per 20" standard?

A No, I'm saying to you that if we are directed to design a residential subdivision for the maximum potential of that site -- I don't make the decision on



what it is, so I have to talk from that perspective -is that if we met all of the criteria of the county's
critical areas program, this is an improvement to that.

Q I'm asking you: if you design a "one per 20" development solely in the critical area, would it be better water quality or inferior water quality to that that you've got there?

A I would actually have to asses that because I don't know. I have looked at it from the maximum development of the site, and our belief is that it very much is -- this is an improvement.

Q In your environmental study, did you do any studies with respect to the effect on Canadian geese?

A No specific study, no.

MR. MURPHY: That's all I have.

MR. GRIFFIN: I just have two questions for you.

EXAMINATION BY THE COMMISSION

BY MR. GRIFFIN:

Q You spoke quite a lot on this notion of management -- best management practices and quality



construction, emphasizing the need for proper utilization rates, et cetera, et cetera, for pest management, herbicides, et cetera. You referred, I think, to licensed operators and managers.

Does that mean, to your knowledge, that some level of government licenses people in this trade, now, who manage golf courses?

A It's my understanding that it is, and I actually could even defer that question to -- Lindsey, I suspect, has some information on that. If you don't, I'm sorry for deferring it to you.

- Q You think he might be able to answer that?
- A Yes, I think he is going to testify.
- Q You seem to put a fair amount of emphasis on that notion.
- A That's my understanding that there is a level of qualification and a licensing level for using specific types of products.
- Q The other question I had was on the sewage disposal. Did I understand that it was a question of capacity with Queenstown's plant? I assume it's the



municipal plant and not the county plant.

A To my understanding -- and as I say, I've been involved in it for several years, and it's going through a multitude of ups and downs, changes and interpretations. I think, really, the problem at this point is strictly political.

The quantity of wastewater that will be generated from the town is extremely small relative to the irrigation requirements. So there would be no trouble at all in handling the wastewater from a town the size of Queenstown on the project.

MR. GRIFFIN: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: I have a question.

BY CHAIRMAN CORKRAN:

- Q Is the sewage disposal area within the critical area, or outside of it?
- A It is outside of the buffer, but within the critical area.
 - Q Within the critical area.
- A Let me show you specifically where. It's right here, and it was located after some fairly





Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

1 -

Easton, Maryland, Cove Creek Country Club in Romancoke.

You might have heard of those courses. Birdwood Golf

Course for the University of Virginia in

Charlottesville, to name a few in this area.

- Q How long have you been in the business of designing golf courses?
 - A I've been in the business for 22 years.
- Q In connection with designing a golf course, what factors do you take into account environmentally?
- A Environmentally, I try to preserve as much of the natural environment that I can and not create situations that would be detrimental to the environment, to the best of my knowledge and capabilities.

But, generally, when I design a golf course, I try to utilize the entire tract, to take advantage of the best and most natural portion of that tract for the golf course, to provide a pleasant golfing experience for the golfer and a challenging one and one that's aesthetically attractive.

Q Do you rely on persons, such as Mr. Rauch, for the engineering aspects of the golf course development?



	A	Yes,	, a	loť	of	that	c, espe	cially	y in	the
env	ironme	ntal	end	of	it,	on	people	with	his	capabilities
and.	resou	rces.					•			

- Q Do you have any direct experience or knowledge about the impacts of golf courses, generally, on water quality or habitat?
- A My information stems from magazine articles and reports that I've read, which have been published and submitted here in evidence by Mr. Rauch; the Penn State study, in particular.
- Q In designing this particular -- strike that.

 Did you design the Queenstown Harbor Golf Links Course,
 which is in front of you?
 - A Yes, I did.
- Q Is it depicted, generally, in the blue drawings sitting in front of the panel?
 - A Yes, it is.
- Q Did you attempt to treat the site in an environmentally sensitive way, as you designed it?
- A Yes. We attempted to avoid all of the environmental areas that would be considered classified



"sensitive," and we stayed out of these areas as much as possible to avoid any confrontation with environmentally-sensitive areas.

Q Did you rely on Mr. Rauch and other persons working through and under him to identify those areas and recommend solutions?

A Yes, I did.

Q Are there any golf courses that you have designed, which are as environmentally sensitive as this particular course?

A I would say Cove Creek was. Cove Creek is down near Romancoke in southern Kent Island, and it fronts on one of the bays down there. I forget the name of it. Round Bay, or I'm not sure of the name of it -- as well as it borders wetlands, and we avoided wetlands in that situation, also, and even created some of our wetlands to help work with the golf course features, water quality, and what have you, as well as the aesthetics of the environment, but I would say that's probably the closest one.

Q How involved are you in the management of golf



2

3

courses after the construction of them?

A Well, I don't get involved with the management. Once we design the golf course, it's up to the owner to provide the managing aspect of the golf course.

Q Well, this is your opportunity to tell that little bit that you know about management.

MR. MURPHY: Objection.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Rauch indicated that you were going to comment on something that has to do with the management of golf courses.

MR. MURPHY: Objection. The witness said he didn't get involved in management.

MR. MURRAY: He didn't say, however, he didn't know anything about it.

MR. MURPHY: It's a leading question.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: We'll note the objection, but go ahead and answer the question.

THE WITNESS: Regarding management, I think he was referring to licensing. I think there is a state



licensing procedure for various chemical applications.

I don't know exactly which chemicals come under that classification.

I know most golf course operators hire trained superintendents that come out of universities and who are trained in turf management and the application rates of the various fertilizers, insecticides, and herbicides so that their knowledge of this application will be to the best interest of the golf course and the environment.

I know they don't want to just come out and blatantly dump chemicals on the ground and ruin our environment, just like I don't want to see that either. Nobody wants to see that.

MR. MURRAY: That's all of the questions I have.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you. Mr. Murphy.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q Do you have any opinion as to whether this golf course is a commercial use or not?



A No, I don't.

Q It's going to be for profit, isn't it?

A If that's what the owner said it's going to be, then that's what it's going to be.

MR. MURRAY: For the record -- and maybe to save some effort on behalf of my client -- we will stipulate that this is an intended profit-making enterprise.

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q Do you have any knowledge in the critical area regulations, Mr. Irving?

A A limited amount.

Q Did anybody indicate to you that any attempt should be made to preserve agricultural land?

A No, I don't recall that being mentioned.

Q You don't get involved with management, so you don't know whether the pesticides and the fertilizers will leach down into the ground water or not, do you?

A To the best of my knowledge, if properly applied and worked through an integrated pest management program, you won't have that effect. It's only maybe



If the water



not

1	A If it's right at the surface, sure.
2	Q You don't know anything about the water
3	quality of Queen's Town Creek?
4	A No, I don't.
5	MR. MURRAY: That's all I have.
6	THE WITNESS: Thank you, Mr. Corkran.
	CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Thank you, Lindsey.
7	MR. DEMING: Is this the last one? He's not
8	the last one?
9.	MR. MURRAY: Mr. Deming, I believe I'm
10	going to check my list, but I think I've got one more.
11	Whereupon,
12	MILTON MCCARTHY,
13	a witness, called for examination by counsel for the
14	Applicant, was examined and testified as follows:
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. MURRAY:
17	Q Your name, please?
18	A Milton McCarthy.
19	Q And what do you do?
20	
21	A I'm an environmental consultant.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

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

Q	How	long	have	you	been	an	environmental
consultant	- 2					•	

- A I've been self-employed since April 24, 1984.
- Q And prior to that?
- A Prior to that, I was a staff biologist with Ecological Services Office of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in Annapolis, Maryland.
- Q And for what period of time did you hold that position?
 - A Approximately six years.
 - Q Prior to that, what did you do?
- A I was a student at University of Maryland with a degree -- with a bachelor of science degree in fish and wildlife management.
- Q In connection with being an environmental consultant, did you have occasion to review development plans?
 - A Yes, I did, on a regular basis.
- Q And have you had occasion to review the Queen's Town Harbor Golf Links development plan?
 - A Yes, I have.



⁵

When did you do that?

have were originally brought into the project back in, I believe it was, April of 1988 to give a natural resource evaluation of the project and how this project would be impacted by primarily the critical area legislation. So what we did was, is we went out in the field as well as do historical literature review and searches for the various groups of species of critters and plant communities that would be subject to critical area protection and would be found on the property.

- Q Is that something that you had done before?
- A It was something that we did as a normal course of business, you know, in evaluating a project located within the Chesapeake Bay critical area.
- Q Tell us, if you would, what you did in terms of evaluating the environmentally sensitive aspects of the site.
- A Okay. The first thing we did was we checked for endangered species as listed by both U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Maryland National Heritage Program. We found that there were eagle nests that were



south of Route 50 that would not really be impacted by the project. We did some historical literature and aerial photo review of submerged vegetable plant or submerged aquatic vegetation distribution, both in the Chester River and Queen Town's Creek. With all the information that we had developed through literature review, or a lot of it anyway, we went out in the field and ground-truthed the area and identified the various plant communities, and we did some bird survey work to identify various species of birds that were using the site at the point in time which we had done our field work.

Q Perhaps, it would be easiest if you went to the appropriate drawing in the blue papers and indicated to the panel what you found and how it's shown on those drawings.

- A Okay.
- Q I'm not sure which one is yours. Is this the one you want to --
 - A This is the one we want to use.
 - Q Okay.



A What we did is within the critical area we identified all the natural plant communities, which included tidal wetlands, non-tidal wetlands, and upland forest that forms some of the perimeter and is scattered throughout various areas within the Chesapeake Bay critical area.

With that, we did some additional work in terms of identifying groups of species in the field that we could observe that were sensitive in nature and subject to protection in the critical area criteria. That basically included two groups of species: number one, forest interior dwelling birds that you would find in the riparian forests along the shoreline and adjacent to tidal and non-tidal wetlands, and we found several -- or two heron rookeries, one here and one over here by Little Queen's Town Creek.

With that, we basically documented the field notes, everything that we had found. We continued our investigation. What we did is we went ahead and delineated all of the non-tidal and tidal wetland areas that were in the Chesapeake Bay critical area, which is



reflected on the plan shown on the inside of this little checkered line. It reflects the wetlands that were delineated in the field.

Q What, if anything, does the plan contemplate with respect to the two nesting sites?

Natural Resources -- Glen Therus's office over in Wye Mills is requiring us to have established buffers around those areas with time-of-year restrictions when no construction or grading operations can occur, and that time-of-year restriction is from March 15 to, I believe, June 15 of a year.

Q Does that apply to both of these sites or just this one?

A Both, both sites.

Q Is this an active site or just an historical site which didn't show any active use?

A Well, this -- there was a site that was inactive that was picked up over here. When we ground-truthed this area, we found that area not to have any established colonial nesting birds. It was historically



7.

located, but field investigation revealed that there were no colonial nesting birds using this area. Last year, it was my understanding that this area was inactive. My feeling is that this year that that area is still active.

- Q And does the project design take into account the sensitivity that it is supposed to have for those sites?
 - A Yes, it does.
- Q Does the project impact on the wetlands in any harmful way?
 - A No, it does not.
- Q What is the impact from an environmental point of view of these newly created ponds?
- A Well, the newly created ponds basically are going to offer a lot of habitat diversity to the site. Right now, basically you've got four major types of plant communities on the property. You've got various degrees of upland forest. You've got some colestrum (sic) forest in wetland areas. You've got some tidal wetland areas, and you've got a lot of agricultural

800 950-DEPO



field.

The ponds are certainly going to create a certain amount of diversity, which should be used to some degree by waterfowl and pasturing birds. So I think just from having the ponds you're going to create a little bit of diversity to the property.

Q Would you speak for a moment about the afforestation and its impact on habitat.

A Well, the afforestation cannot only be a plus -- I mean, any time you pick up a net gain in terrestial habitat or terrestial forested habitat, I mean, obviously, those are going to be a net gain in forested area, almost 30 acres; and, granted, that will not be mature forest, it will be planted; but, over a period of time, you know, you'll establish that -- as that area matures and grows, I mean, you know, you're going to end up with basically contiguous forested areas all along the shoreline. It's going to increase in the carrying capacity of the site for wildlife. You're just adding that much more spatial diversity.

Q Have you looked at the specific types of



plants that are to be planted to accomplish the afforestation?

- A Yes, I have.
- Q And what do you think of those?
- A Well, the afforestation plan basically calls for mixed hardwood with a little bit of pine mix, and it's all stuff that's locally indigenous to the Maryland coastal plain, and it should work out fine.
- Q Are you familiar with the concept of leaving a 300-foot buffer in what, I believe, Mr. Rauch would call or characterized as rough. What are the water quality and habitat characteristics of that?
- A Well, from a water quality standpoint, I think even though there's been no testimony presented here, the Council of Governments in Washington has -- for stormwater purposes has done some studies that indicate that, by increasing the forested buffer or increasing a buffer area from an overwater area landward, the more that you increase that, the chances of pollutants being discharged through the buffer and getting into water decrease as that buffer increases. So there's,



apparently, a direct correlation between the width of your buffer and a given pollutant entering the system via that buffer area.

- Q To tie that package up neatly, then a 300-foot buffer of grasses is better from a water quality point of view than a farm tilling closer?
 - A Oh, no question, no question.
- Q The phrase or the term -- I think I've pronounced it -- "anadromous fish" --
 - A Yes.
- Q -- was mentioned. Are there any concerns on this site about such fish?
- A There are anadromous fish spawning areas located in the headwaters of Little Queen's Town Creek. It's fairly well documented by the Maryland Tidewater Administration. Historically, I think you have white perch, probably some alewife usage up in there. Right now, I think the usage is pretty much restricted to yellow perch.
- Q Is there anything about this project design that troubles you with respect to the fish?



A No.

Q Are you familiar with the conditions generally of Queen's Town Creek and the Chester River in the vicinity of the project?

A Generally.

Q Is there anything about the project that leads you to believe that either or both would be adversely affected as a result of this project?

A No, there is not.

Q As developments go, how would you characterize this from an environmental sensitivity point of view?

A From an environmental sensitivity point of view, I think the project is fairly well designed. I mean, they're going and putting in an additional 30 acres of forest, which doesn't currently exist, although that's being placed within a 300-foot buffer around tidal waters. You're taking an existing farm, farmed area, which you have a high degree of soil disturbance on a regular basis; and, basically, that's going to be converted into a stabilized area. So you're not going to have wind-blown sediments being generated from the



property that are going to blow into the creek during, you know, periods of high wind that are fairly common around here in the spring when the farmers till.

- Q You heard Mr. Rauch's testimony about the use of the ponds as a means of storing most of the site's surface runoff; is that correct?
 - A Correct.
- Q Do you have an opinion as to whether or not that design is workable?
 - A The design from what standpoint?
- Q From the standpoint of collecting surface water runoff to the extent that there is any, as opposed to letting it go out whatever drainage ways may presently exist naturally?
- A Oh, it certainly would be a benefit. I mean, any time you can treat stormwater and have the sediments or pollutants that are generated from whatever retained or detained prior to them being released in the tidal water, it has to be a benefit.
- Q The site has both tidal wetlands and non-tidal wetlands?



	١
2	
3.	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	1

_			
Α	That	18	correct

Q As far as you know, are all the appropriate and necessary protective considerations included in the design?

A Yes, they are.

MR. MURRAY: No further questions.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Mr. Murphy.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MURPHY:

Q Mr. McCarthy, you're familiar, of course, with the critical area regulations?

A Yes, sir.

Q And is it your contention that a golf course is a nature-dominated environment?

A Seasonally, I think that's an accurate statement.

Q I note the regulations define "nature-dominated environment." It says, "That is, wetlands, forest, or abandoned fields."

A Well, there's no abandoned fields on the property. There's wetlands and there's forest on the



property. There's certainly no abandoned fields.

- Q Do the fairways, greens and tees constitute a nature-dominated environment?
 - A No. I think they're too manicured for that.
- Q It's not a resource utilization activity either, is it? That's agricultural, forestry, fisheries or aquaculture.
 - A No, it's not.
- Q Is it your contention that this is a resource conservation use?
 - A I have no opinion on that.
- Q Do you have an opinion as to whether it's an agricultural -- excuse me, a commercial use?
 - A I don't think there's any question about it.
- Q Did you give any study to the question of whether the nitrates would leach from the fertilizers to the ground water?
 - A No, sir, I did not.
 - Q You did not?
 - A No, I did not.
 - Q Did you give any study to whether the



pesticides would leach from the turf to the ground water?

- A No, sir, I did not.
- Q Did you give any study as to whether the nitrates from the sewage treatment plant would leach to the ground water?
 - A No, I did not.
- Q And yet you offered this opinion that the Queen's Town Creek would not be adversely affected at all?
- A I was saying the habitat of Queen's Town Creek would not be affected by the development of this property.
- Q Well, if the nitrates from the sewage leached into the ground water, wouldn't the habitat be affected?
 - A Not necessarily.
- Q It certainly couldn't be a positive thing for the habitat, could it?
- A If it's in the ground water, where in the ground water? You have to be more specific. If it's in the ground water within the soil, it's tied up.
 - Q If it goes to the ground water, isn't there a



1	good char	ace it could go into the creek?
2 .	A	Not necessarily, no.
3	Q	But possibly?
4	A	Possibly, sure.
5	Q	And the Queen's Town Creek, do you know
6	whether i	t's already a stressed environment?
7	A	It's my understanding from just listening to
8	what I've	e heard tonight that it's fairly stressed.
9	Q	That condition would not be good to receive
0	further s	tress, would it?
1	A	No question, I agree.
2	· Q	Are you familiar with the wildlife in the
3	area?	
4	A	Yes, I am.
5	Q	Is the Chester River do you find wildlife
6	in the Ch	ester River?
7	A	Aquatic or terrestrial or avian?
8	Q	Avian.
9	A	Yes, all over the place.
20	Q	It's actually one of the strongest grounds,
21	isn't it,	for Canadian geese?





Do you have any reason why it wasn't addressed in the environmental impact statement?

- A No, I don't. I don't know why.
- Q Have you made a study of the soils on this site?
- A Only in terms of where wetlands are located, in terms of looking at the kind of soil for the presence or absence of wetland plant communities.
- Q Did you make any determination as to whether the soils were sandy or not?
 - A No, I did not.

MR. MURPHY: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: All right. Thank you,

Mr. Murphy. Thank you.

Mr. Murray --

MR. MURRAY: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: -- may I suggest that we treat new material. We're beginning to repeat a lot of information; and, in the interest of the hour, I would suggest that both you and Mr. McCarthy or -- that both of you, let's stick to new material and not keep





tonight. In what connection, if any, have you become familiar with this golf course project?

A In working with the Queen Anne's County

Economic Development Commission, looking at economic

development projects for the county, and working with

the County Council on Tourism, planning to improve and

enhance tourism in the county, and in my capacity as

executive director of the Chamber of Commerce.

Q In all those capacities, are you interested in the economic welfare of Queen Anne's County?

A Yes. That's our primary interest in the Chamber of Commerce, and we look forward to this project as enhancing that, as we have severe problems with loss of employment in the watering industry, in particular, and loss of economic benefit. We have severe problems in loss of employment and loss of economic benefit in the agricultural industry, and we're looking to the future for tourism as being one means of replacing both those jobs and those funds from the county.

This project would bring a number of people to the county -- I've heard various estimates -- who would



spend the day, play golf, stay at hotels, eat at restaurants, spend money in stores. That's economic development.

Q Do you have an opinion as to whether or not this particular project is appropriately placed at the site?

MR. MURPHY: Objection. It's not the concern of this commission as to whether the resource conservation zoning promotes economic development.

Nothing could be more contrary to the very purpose of resource conservation zoning.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: We sustain your objection.

MR. MURRAY: No further questions.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Mr. Murphy.

MR. MURPHY: I have nothing.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: All right. Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Mr. Crowley, Bill Crowley.

Whereupon,

WILLIAM M. CROWLEY,

a witness, called for examination by counsel for the Applicant, was examined and testified as follows:



1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 1.1 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Crowley, you are our designated clean-up hitter.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: May I? Would he state his name, please.

MR. MURRAY: Yes, sir. I'm going to get him to do that.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Oh, excuse me.

BY MR. MURRAY:

- Q Your name, please?
- A William M. Crowley.
- Q And where do you work?
- A Rauch, Walls and Lane, Centreville, Maryland.
- Q What do you do there?
- A I'm half branch manager. We operate in a dual capacity.
- Q In addition to managing the branch, what do you do?
- A I interpret Queen Anne's County zoning ordinance, discuss the projects with Queen Anne's County



Planning and Zoning, Queen Anne's County Environmental Health Department, Queen Anne's County Department of Public Works and so forth, oversee projects, pull up inventory maps, find out what type of natural resources may exist on the site, then talk it over with Robert Rauch and have him get us the appropriate people to go out and locate those.

- Q Essentially then, do you spend most of your time involved in the application and the use of the county zoning ordinance?
 - A Yes, I do.
- Q And other related ordinances such as the local Critical Area Program?
 - A Yes, I do.
 - Q Are you an engineer?
 - A No, I'm not.
 - Q Are you a certified land planner?
 - A No, I'm not.
 - Q Are you an architect?
 - A No, I'm not.
 - Q But you have expertise in the county zoning



2

3

4

5

6 7

8

9.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ordinance?

A And I'm a registered property line surveyor in the State of Maryland.

Q Now, in connection with those responsibilities, do you have any familiarity with the Queen's Town Harbor Golf Links project?

A Yes, I do.

Q And were most of the drawings contained in the seven-page exhibit done under your supervision?

A Yes, they were.

Q In light of Mr. Corkran's request, I'm going to attempt to ask some leading questions, which I don't think will be objectionable.

MR. MURPHY: I never object.

BY MR. MURRAY:

Q Mr. Crowley, on the blue drawings, there are numerous schedules. Do those schedules depict -- strike that. What do those schedules depict?

A What we did on this plan was took and worked with the Queen Anne's County comprehensive zoning ordinance, determined the total amount of area on the



farm, had all the natural resources located and the appropriate buffers provided, then ran our calculations based on the amount of developable land on the site, also figuring in the required 300-foot buffer that Queen Anne's County has, the amount of existing forested area within that 300-foot buffer, the fact that Queen Anne's County requires 50 percent of that to be forested. So we had approximately 29 acres to be forested on it. Also computing up the total number acreages of existing woodland, non-tidal woodland and so forth on the site.

Q So would it be safe to say, in summary, that you were hands-on involved in the performance-oriented calculations for the project?

- A Yes.
- Q Are all of those calculations depicted on the drawings in the attached schedules?
 - A Yes, they are.
 - Q Are there any adjustments going on today?
 - A No. I believe they're finalized.
- Q Have there been some adjustments going on fairly recently?



A Yes, there have. We've been -- as everyone has stated before, we felt that the pond at the northwesternmost corner of the farm was non-tidal. We sent out a couple people to look at it and had that verified and only provided a 25-foot buffer around that. Couple weeks ago, it was decided we'll go with the 300-foot buffer on that and assume from a critical areas standpoint that it is tidal; and that, in turn, changed a great deal of calculations. It changed the 300-foot buffer total area which then, in turn, changed the amount of farm field in the buffer and out of the buffer, the total woods in the buffer, out of the buffer, and the amount that needed to be afforested.

- Q Okay. But the current plan, at least as far as you know, is depicted on these drawings?
 - A Yes, it is.
 - Q What does the term "commercial zoning" mean?
- A I would say that it means an area that is zoned for specific commercial uses, such as retail stores, gasoline stations, factory outlets and so forth.
 - Q Does Queen Anne's County have such zones?



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

	A	Yes,	they	have	a c	ouple	zone	s wh	ere	uses	are
spec	ifical	lly no	oted i	in the	re,	subur	ban	comm	erci	al,	urban
comm	ercial	l, lit	tle v	,illag	e c	enter,	so	fort	h.		

- Q Is the countryside zone a commercial zone?
- A No.

MR. MURRAY: Thank you. No further questions.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Mr. Murphy.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. MURPHY:

- Q Did you hear the testimony of Mr. Stevens when he talked about what the intent was with the critical area ordinance?
 - A Yes, sir.
 - Q When he talked about institutional uses?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q And he said that, as I recall, whether or not it constituted a commercial use depended upon the intensity of the use?
 - A That's what he said.
 - Q Is that your understanding also?
 - A What I use as constitutes an institutional use



in Queen Anne's County is the comprehensive zoning ordinance; and, as soon as someone comes in to me and asks me, "Is this specific use allowed in Queen Anne's County?" I refer specifically to this book; and, under this book, the golf course is an institutional use. I don't fool with intensely developed or anything. I go specifically by that and use their opinion.

Q Well, do you have an opinion as to whether this golf course is a commercial use or not?

A My opinion of the golf course in that area is that it's an institutional use, according to the Queen Anne's County comprehensive zoning ordinance, which is what I have to work by and which is what I have to have plans approved by.

Q But, you know, the critical area ordinance says that some of these institutional uses may be commercial uses?

- A They don't say that the golf course is.
- Q Do you know if any are commercial uses?
- A No, I don't.
- Q In your view, would they all be institution?



19

20

21

A I would say any time, you know -- it depends upon what a person is classifying a commercial use as. As we look at a commercial use, according to this ordinance, it's specific things, like it says in there gas stations, retail food stores, retail businesses. Then it falls into an institutional use which is the golf courses. It's also got a -- I mean, agricultural uses could be considered a commercial use in this area. Commercial goose hunting could be a commercial use. That's why I leave it up to these people and Queen Anne's County Department of Planning and Zoning to determine that. It's not my job.

Q You're going to take it from them as to what the answer is; is that what you're saying?

- A My answer I derive from what they tell me.
- Q I see. Now, you prepared these plans and the schedule of --
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q And let me draw your attention to the amount of agricultural land on the site.
 - A Yes, sir.



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18 19		
20		
₩ ∪		

Q Could you look at that for a minute.

A I believe it's about 256 acres. Is that right? 256.85 acres.

Q All right. That's total area of farm field on-site; right?

A On-site.

Q 256.85?

A Yes, sir.

Q And, in the critical area, it's --

A I'd have to look through here. 198.40 acres.

Q All right. Total area of farm field, 198.40.

A In the coastal area.

Q "Coastal" means critical area; right?

A Yes, sir.

Q Okay. And how much of that farm field, the 190 acres, how much is being lost?

A On our figures, we're developing 232 acres of disturbed land; but, in the farm field, we have 30.1 acres remaining, which would say that we're developing of the farm field in the coastal zone 167 acres.

Q So 167 acres is being converted from



agricultural use to --

- A Turf grass.
- Q -- golf course use?
- A Yes, sir, which is allowed under Queen Anne's County comprehensive zoning ordinance.
- Q And how much of the site is being -- did you hear the discussion about the development envelope?
 - A Yes, sir.
- Q And you're familiar with that, having prepared these plans. How many acres are in the development envelope; do you know?

A No, sir. What I did exactly was took the limits of disturbance. We didn't go around every piece of woodland and farm field that we weren't disturbing. We just took an overall out-bounds encompassing the golf course area and came up with a figure for that. Now, what we're saying in that is that that encompasses all the area within the golf course, and we came up with the total area which is shown on that plan.

Q I'm sorry, that's what I was asking you. I didn't -- is the development envelope the same as the



amount of land that's being graded?

A No, sir. What we came up with for -- if I'm following you -- for a development envelope is that we located all the natural resources and those buffer areas. We showed them on the plan. Anything that wasn't a natural resource or a buffer area could be developed.

Q I'm just asking you. If you don't know, that's perfectly fine, but --

A Well, that's what you asked me, what the development area or envelope area was, and I just told you.

Q Okay. I'm just asking you. Do you know how many acres are in that development envelope?

A Yeah. I could take out all the natural resources and come up with the total amount of area.

Q But you haven't done that computation?

A It's probably somewheres on that sheet, but I can't lay my hand on it right now.

Q Okay. But, in the coastal area on this sheet, which again "coastal" means the critical area -- right?



1	A	Yes, sir.
2	Q	The total area is 394.67 acres; correct?
3	A	Yes, sir.
4	Q	And you're disturbing I had it here, but I
5	lost it	- 220-something? Where is it?
6	A	Two thirty-two.
7	Q	Two thirty-two?
8	A	Yes, sir.
9	Q	I'm sorry.
10	A	That's area within the golf course confines.
11	Q	Well, I see a total area of coastal zone
12	disturbed	here, 222 acres.
13	A	Two thirty-two it should read.
14	Q	It should be 232?
15	A	I think that's what it says.
16	Q	Mine says 222. I had this earlier. Yours may
17	be later.	
18	A	Yes, 232.
19	Q	Two thirty-two.
20		MR. DEMING: Are the papers that you two are
21	referring	to in evidence?
	4	



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

21

MR. MURRAY: I just made a photocopy off of the original.

MR. DEMING: From this blueprint?

MR. MURPHY: Yeah, it is. It's -- I believe it's a legend on one of those blueprints, isn't it?

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: It should be right here.

MS. LANGNER: It's 232. It's 232.

MR. MURPHY: Two thirty-two? Because on my sheet it's 222.

THE WITNESS: This has been changed since -what you were looking at, I believe, was prior to the
300-foot buffer being established around that non-tidal
pond.

MR. MURPHY: That's all I have.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: All right. Thank you.

MR. MURRAY: Nothing, sir.

CHAIRMAN CORKRAN: Can we go off the record.

Off the record for just a second.

(Whereupon, there was a discussion off the record.)

(Whereupon, at 12:15 a.m., the above-



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



entitled hearing was recessed.)

(Exhibits not attached.)

1		CONTENTS	
2	WITNESS	EXAMINATION BY	PAGE
3	JOHN LEE CARROLL	DIRECT - MR. MURPHY CROSS - MR. MURRAY REDIRECT - MR. MURPHY	12 26 29
5	WHEELER R. BAKER	DIRECT - MR. DRUMMOND DIRECT - MR. MURRAY CROSS - MR. MURPHY	39 46 47
7	JOE STEVENS	DIRECT - MR. MURRAY CHAIRMAN CORKMAN CROSS - MR. MURPHY	72 83 84
8	ARTHUR A. BIRNEY	DIRECT - MR. MURRAY CROSS - MR. MURPHY	94 122
9 10 11	ROBERT RAUCH	DIRECT - MR. MURRAY VOIR DIRE - MR. DEMING DIRECT (continued) - MR. MURRAY CROSS - MR. MURPHY MR. GRIFFIN	130 152 152 165 178
12	LINDSEY IRVING	DIRECT - MR. MURRAY CROSS - MR. MURPHY	181 186
13	MILTON MCCARTHY	DIRECT - MR. MURRAY CROSS - MR. MURPHY	189 201
	MORRIS JONES	DIRECT - MR. MURRAY	207
15 16	WILLIAM CROWLEY	DIRECT - MR. MURRAY CROSS - MR. MURPHY	210 215
17 18			
		·	



20

21

Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO

16

17

18

19

20

21

EXHIBITS

2	APPLICANT'S	DESCRIPTION	MARKED	RECEIVED
3	No. 1	Nautical Chart	14	16
	No. 2	Map	22	26
4	No. 3	Letter from County Commissioner	43	44
5	No. 4	Letter from Project		109
	No. 5	Letter from Chesapeake Ba Foundation	ay	106.
6	No. 6	(Not identified)		
_	No. 7	(Not identified)		
7.	No. 8	(Not identified)		162
	No. 9	Appendix to stormwater		162
		Management Report		
8	No. 10	Article		162
	No. 11	Article		162
9	No. 12	Article		162
	No. 13	Article		162
,,	No. 14	Newspaper Article		162
10		(Not identified)		162
	No. 16	(Not identified)		162
11	No. 17	Environmental Assessment		162
	No. 18	"Best Management Plan"		162
12	No. 19	(Not identified)		162
	No. 20	Plat exhibit to stormwat	er	162
13	1	Management Report		
.	No. 21	Same as No. 20		162
14	No. 22	Same as No. 20		162
14	No. 23	Same as No. 20		162
,,	. 110. 23	Dame as no. 20		102
15				
:		·		

HUNT REPORTING

Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 647-8300 800 950-DEPO