Public Hearings - Somerset County 1990 MSH_S1830-87

BEFORE THE CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

1

3

4

5

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

2

PUBLIC HEARING
CHESAPEAKE BAY CRITICAL : FILE NO. SO A-2 (bssey G.A.)
AREA COMMISSION :

SO 1-3 (Program amarles)

Monday, July 9, 1990

Pursuant to Notice, the above-entitled hearing was held before RUSSELL W. BLAKE, ACTING CHAIRMAN, at the Municipal Building, Princess Anne, Maryland 21853, commencing at 7:15 p.m., there being present on behalf of the respective parties:

ON BEHALF OF THE COMMISSION:

G. STEELE PHILLIPS RUSSEL W. BLAKE WILLIAM J. BOSTIAN

ALSO PRESENT:

TOM VENTRE RON ADKINS CLAUDIA JONES

REPORTED BY: CHRIS HOFER

JUL 25 1997



Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

301 766-HUNT (4868) 800 950-DEPO

PROCEEDINGS

MR. VENTRE: Two weeks ago this past Friday as required by the Critical Area Law for public notice.

There are two items on our agenda tonight. First is to consider a request of the Somerset County Commissioners to approve a local award of growth allocation to the Vessey property for a portion of that property to be subdivided, known as Megan's Lots, in southeastern Somerset County on the Pocomoke River.

The second item on the agenda is the final consideration of this panel of the amendments that have been negotiated over the course of the past year or so with Somerset County to bring the Somerset County program into closer compliance with the critical area requirements.

If you're familiar with that, the last formal meeting that this panel, as a matter of fact, held was in this very room.

VOICE: That was a long time ago.

MR. VENTRE: Late last summer or early autumn with Judge North -- Chairman North -- present as I was



and all of the members of the panel at the time were the two -- resolved, finally, the issue that was still sticking, namely the growth allocation. At that time, it is was resolved to the satisfaction of the panel.

I'll get back more into that detail when that subdivision item comes up.

Russ, I understand you're the acting chairman tonight.

MR. BLAKE: By default. Now I should say that I'm not sure I'm going to be attend Wednesday now, in Easton. I was planning to until something came up Friday, and now I don't know if I'm going to be able to leave town in time to get there to make it worthwhile or not.

MR. VENTRE: Okay. Well, if anyone who is here -- Bill is a regular member of the panel, and perhaps --

VOICE: Shep Krech is out of town, as you may know, for the whole month of July, and Bob Price could not be --

VOICE: I'd be happy to cover for you.



VOICE: Okay.

MR. VENTRE: The panel is --

VOICE: No, I'm planning on it.

VOICE: I am too, but I just can't promise you right now that I can.

MR. VENTRE: The panel is one short in any case because with Ron Karasic one -- but we will take notes tonight, and we will be able to relay anything directly or through Bill and Steele to the commissioners at their regular monthly meeting this coming Wednesday.

The reporter has already begun. I will start on behalf of the staff with regard to the Vessey property. You have information. I brought extras if you would like copies of those. Steele, why don't I just give that to you.

MR. BOSTIAN: What's the scale of the map up there? I can't see. It's small.

MR. VENTRE: Oh, I'm sorry. This scale is one inch to 60 feet. The Vessey farm, also known as Vessey Orchards, is in the very southeastern part of the county right here at this bend in the Pocomoke River,



approximately five miles or so below Pocomoke City.

· 7

It's a lovely spot as is that whole area of the county. This is just the area immediately around --well, the growth allocation itself. This entire area surrounding here is the Vessey farm and orchards, peaches, tomatoes, other kinds of crops. Lovely spot. All upland.

The particular site here is all upland here except for right along, or what is likely, most likely, the buffer slope. Heavily forested, undisturbed, including some very handsome, mature specimens of cypress trees just very --

MS. JONES: I got some pictures.

MR. VENTRE: Very nice to look at. Claudia took pictures the day we were in the field on June 13th. So, it's all there if you would like to look at them.

MS. JONES: This is the site looking in this direction.

MR. PHILLIPS: When you ran your hand over there, the slope, you were kind of deep in the lot. You didn't --



20

21

1

MR. VENTRE: Yes, I was just --

MS. JONES: And that's looking across the was at the --

MR. PHILLIPS: You went deeper than they actually are?

MR. VENTRE: Yes.

MR. PHILLIPS: Okay.

MS. JONES: It looks like a nice place to -- and this is part of the site too.

It's all like this. It's all MR. VENTRE: According to information on the USGS quad sheet upland. that covers the area, which is the Kingston quad for Somerset County, this area is at an elevation of 15 feet above sea level. It's very high, very dry, very nice. We are talking about a cultivated field here. been worked over the years. I believe there was something planted in it the day we were there, or at least in part of the field there was something planted. The only natural thing on the site was right along the riverbed down here as well as a row of trees and shrubs on this western side of the property.



The request is for 20,000 square feet of growth allocation. Now, as you recall in the original program that was made operational by act of law -- by operation of law, rather -- for Somerset County, that is how their growth allocation procedure worked. That it was not necessary in Somerset County to deduct the entire acreage of the parcel, but only a disturbed area that had a certain size. Now, Ron can elaborate on this in his remarks.

That is what we are considering. This growth

allocation is being considered under the current terms of the Somerset program. Okay. This will change later on this evening on another matter, but the operative program tonight is the original program submitted by Somerset, and that's what applies here. So, the request is for 20,000 square feet.

MR. BLAKE: Maybe we ought to take these in the opposite order. Who set the agenda?

(Laughter.)

MR. VENTRE: Again, to familiarize, this is a very active farm. There is a house right here where one



of the Vessey children, who is approximately our age, or my age -- I don't know about you guys -- approximately my age -- is here. There are houses downstream farther here that you can see. In fact, one of them shows up in one of the photographs. And then farther down to the southwest is the village of Rehobeth, which is classified as LDA by Somerset County. I would say approximately a mile and a half, maybe two miles away farther down the road on this map, downstream.

The staff raises no issues at all with this site. It is upland. There are no wetlands on the site. There are no HPAs on the site, although directly across the Pocomoke, which this point is at least 200 feet, maybe 300 feet wide, is a designated Natural Heritage Area designated by the Heritage program of the Maryland Forest, Park, and Wildlife Service. It is the Hickory Point Cypress Swamp.

As a matter of fact, a small piece of the Vessey farm, but not here in question, not close to this, is within that designated HPA, and here on your maps I have it outlined in yellow. That is the HPA,



and you see where that red "X" is up there is where the property is that we're considering tonight.

This is its relation to the HPA, across the river from it and only to that extent adjacent. There are no habitat issues per se on the site in question. The buffer is intact. It's undisturbed, full of trees and shrubs, including those mature cypress trees. And the upland portion is flat. There are no wetlands. It has been a farm for many years. We have no concerns from the staff from a technical point of view on the Vessey request.

MR. BLAKE: Any comments from the audience?

MR. BOSTIAN: I move that we approve the -- we don't approve of that. I'm sorry.

MR. BLAKE: We would recommend, wouldn't we, to the --

MR. VENTRE: At this point, the panel is only taking comments from the general public from the interested parties. Ron, for the record, I'd like to --

MR. ADKINS: Yes. Are you taking comments now from the general public?



MR. VENTRE: Well, there are these school buses circling around outside as we came in.

MR. PHILLIPS: Ron, we thought you'd have a packed house here.

MR. ADKINS: Did you really?

MR. BLAKE: I thought we'd have dinner.

MR. ADKINS: Well, gentlemen, I guess I would like to offer for the record, I believe that Mr. Ventre did a wonderful job in describing the scene of the proposed growth allocation and the setting around it.

Just a couple of other minor things. I guess it would be southwest of this site, down river from where the proposal is, there was an interim subdivision prior to December -- excuse me -- prior to December 1st, 1985, platted and filed, creating six lots.

The county mapped that RCA in its mapping because the development itself was not there as of that time frame, and there was an inter-family transfer occur, I believe, and prior to the program or right after the program approval that it created an additional two lots. And I just wanted to point that out, and that



2 3 4

.5

while there are not LDAs adjacent to the property, it is developed and has a density adjacent to it that may be LDA water. And I think you'd probably confirm that in that there's houses all along the Pocomoke adjacent to the site.

I think that Mr. Ventre also provided you in your packet the finding of fact that the county commissioners made on the audit proposal for growth allocation. I won't go into any particular detail about that, but I think it addresses all of the issues that Somerset County's growth allocation as well as the criteria would have us address in considering any growth allocation proposal.

We've had only one other growth allocation proposal from this county. So, there is nothing but plenty of growth allocation available. As you know, we divided it up so that we would give it out one-twentieth of the growth allocation in any given year except the first year. The first year you were allowed to give out one-fifth. I believe that's correct, isn't --

VOICE: That's right.



MR. ADKINS: This year, I don't recall the exact acreage, but there was some 60-some acres of growth allocation available to be given out. This is the only -- well, we have one other pending application, but it has not got very far. It's the only application we have on the table at this point in time. Growth allocation, as you say, is one lot above the density that would be allowed in a resource conservation area.

He only has a small percentage of his farm in the critical area. This particular section of his farm is sectioned off from the rest of the farm by a county road, and it, in itself, is just a very small field as I indicated right now.

In regard to the proposal, it has received preliminary plat approval from the county, and it has received health department approval from the Somerset County Health Department. I think the farm and the fact would indicate when the preliminary plat was approved — the health department approval came in a letter dated February 12th, 1990, from an acting environmental health director.



With that, we believe it has gone through the appropriate procedures to be approved, and we believe that it, in itself, represents one of our better opportunities to have development in some of our best soils that we offer in our county, some of the highest elevations that we offer up off of one of the prettiest rivers that we have in the state.

It is unlike most development that we have in the county in that we would not be allowed to have densities at one unit per acre in most areas because of the soil types and the higher ground level. This particular proposal would allow one unit per acre, whereas most that you would feel in the future you would have one unit per two acres. That's really the theme and theory behind the growth allocation debiting system that we have now in our program and what we've agreed to change in county amendment.

So, I guess I would just be here to answer any questions you may have of the site. It's a very benign proposal. It's not one of major proportions as the last one. I guess it goes from one end of the scale to the



other, and I'd be glad to answer any questions you all may have.

MR. BOSTIAN: Why didn't he just split it in half and go all the way to the road?

MR. ADKINS: I don't know why he didn't. At this point in time, he would have to create a right of way here, whereas he has a county road now. We asked him to consider that, and we hope that he does still, at some point, consider it because it, in itself, would create much less disturbance and make much more sense.

But at this point in time, that's the approved preliminary plat from Mr. Vessey. And maybe just noting the elevation, maybe it should have been named Megan's Hill because that's about as high as we get here in the county. We don't get much higher elevation --

VOICE: That was awful high.

MR. ADKINS: -- than about 15 feet. Actually, I think, well, maybe 28 feet is the highest, somewhere in that vicinity.

MR. VENTRE: It shows clearly on the contour. The 15-foot contour is at the top of this rising and



clear back, and I think way beyond the road and it just goes on and on and on. It's a 15-foot elevation.

MR. ADKINS: The site -- one other last thing
I would add is that it's my understanding from the owner
this particular thing is -- he has a phased approach for
using his farm. He intends to subdivide this parcel
here. And the remainder of the farm, it is my
understanding, he wants to establish a AG preservation
district. The method to the madness is that you buy off
development rights when you buy the easement value.

On a farm, and if you don't have development nearby, then you don't show development pressure; and, therefore, the rates are much lower. And it, in itself, he would be creating his own development pressure by subdividing the parcel adjacent to what he would be putting in the easement. That's the overall plan of the farm as I understand it.

MR. PHILLIPS: Do you think that's going to work?

MR. ADKINS: Well, I don't think it would hurt. He may not get top dollar, but he may do better



than if it wasn't divided and developed, but that's his --

MR. BOSTIAN: I suspect it will have to be transferred for it to really have an effect.

MR. ADKINS: I suspect it will be too, but I think it could be transferred. I don't believe he'd have difficulty selling it. It would depend upon the price.

MR. BOSTIAN: He doesn't want to.

MR. ADKINS: Yes. Yes, right.

MR. BOSTIAN: You can't have it both ways.

MR. ADKINS: Yes, that's true.

MR. VENTRE: Ron, Claudia and I did have a question about the buffer, and it's more a clarification. We didn't have any transits or any kind of measuring instruments. We didn't know how far back — if the 100-foot demarcation captures the entire slope, in other words, as proposed to the top of the slope and beyond it or what. We couldn't even determine where that 100-foot line falls.

MR. ADKINS: We went out and tried to follow



the slope standards because we thought possibly the buffer might need to be extended.

MR. VENTRE: I understand. We have the same question.

MR. ADKINS: And we didn't carry a transit either. But, in investigating it, and we checked with our soil conservation service as well, it didn't -- short of where the drop itself is, the slope didn't exceed the 10 percent. It didn't slope -- now, but it didn't exceed the slope requirements for extending the buffer to the extent of --

MR. BOSTIAN: The slopes that I'm familiar with in that area are very gentle to until you get right down and then --

MR. VENTRE: Yes, this is more like this. It was heavily overgrown. You couldn't really tell. You could see the --

MR. BOSTIAN: They're very close to the river.

MR. ADKINS: It was a very gradual slope until you got to the side of the river, the riverbank, and then it probably was a drop of 15 feet. Very



dramatic.

MR. VENTRE: And then thinking of, as we said, the upland area was cultivated, and it was planted. And seeing just where the tractors -- and that there was an edge of grasses and weeds and stuff like that from the top of the slope back into the field itself. So, if -- what I'm saying is, if the slope is entirely within the buffer, then it is protected and there is certainly no issue, and probably would not have to be extended according to the regulations.

MR. ADKINS: We didn't believe it did. We thought that the full extent of most of the slope was the riverbank itself. It was a very, very gradual change in contour.

MR. VENTRE: So, we have no problem with that.

MR. PHILLIPS: Where do you start your measure of your 100-foot buffer in a situation like this?

MR. ADKINS: Well, we'll probably be concerned in a situation like that. You measure it from the top.

MR. PHILLIPS: The top?

MR. ADKINS: Yes, I don't think it serves as



2	MR. PHILLIPS: From the top of the riverbank?
3	MR. ADKINS: Yes, to go down to actually
4	the
5	VOICE: Mean high water line.
6	MR. ADKINS: mean high water line. So,
7	we'll measure it from the top of the embankments.
8	MS. JONES: So, when they come in, if they
9	should come in for a building permit, then, that would
10	be actually for the
11	MR. ADKINS: Yes, we've sort of established
12	that now after a few people not having their buffer just
13	right, of going out and measuring the buffer for each
14	permit and also each area's request.
15	MR. PHILLIPS: Ron, how much you say he's
16	subdividing this all, but he's going to put the rest of
17	the farm in AG district.
18	MR. ADKINS: That's his master plan, yes.
19	MR. PHILLIPS: How much is left?
20	MR. ADKINS: Of his farm?
21	MR. PHILLIPS: Of the farm?

much purpose --



MR. ADKINS: Well, he has two or three tracts there. I suspect together they may add up to over 500 acres or more. This particular tract has over 200, but only a small portion --

MR. PHILLIPS: This portion of tract was 200 acres?

MR. ADKINS: Yes, but only a portion of it --- 200. I believe it is. Only a portion of it, maybe
some 35 or so acres of it, was in the critical area. It
was under 40 acres is the problem. The critical area
line, since this is upland and tidal waters, is actually
a thousand feet and doesn't come a thousand feet plus
wetland. And it only comes into the parcel in here
somewhere, and the parcel itself extends for several
more acres and towards the highway, which is up here.

I don't have the exact figures memorized, but it was less than 40 acres in the critical area of this parcel. He had two other parcels as well, one of which is wetter, and I think the state has an interest in buying.

MR. VENTRE: This one whole piece of this



farm, it's entirely undisturbed forest.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. ADKINS: Yes, and I think the state has an interest in buying it.

MR. VENTRE: That is the portion that is within -- I'll call your attention to the Somerset County map there around to your left. You see down in that -- to the lower left there in that square. That's it. Go down stream a little bit more. Right there is were the property you questioned is on the Somerset side.

MR. ADKINS: But this is Worcester.

MR. VENTRE: That's correct. That's the

Worcester side. Now, put your finger there where there
is that little -- go back up, right there. That is also

Mr. Vessey's property. And that, at least from the
latest information we saw, is still, including being in
the field, is still heavily wooded, undisturbed.

MR. BLAKE: That was in that --

MR. VENTRE: That is with the --

MR. BLAKE: -- the yellow.

MR. VENTRE: -- the NHA, the Natural Heritage



Area.

MR. BLAKE: 'Cause that's where the river kind of comes back in.

MR. ADKINS: In reviewing the plat, locally, we checked with the Heritage people for comment, and, basically, their comment was just don't disturb the buffer --

MR. VENTRE: Did they just give that orally or verbally?

MR. ADKINS: No, we have a letter from them.

MR. VENTRE: Oh, you do, okay.

MR. ADKINS: We have a letter from them.

Jonathan McKnight. I believe that's the fellow's name,
or Wayne Towel -- Wayne Timble.

MR. VENTRE: Wayne Timble. Okay.

MR. ADKINS: May 5th, 1989.

MR. VENTRE: 'Cause that was referred to. I'm glad you mentioned that one because that was referred to in both the commissioner's minutes and the planning commission's minutes. That there had been the comment received from -- unfortunately, it wasn't in the





Court Reporting and Litigation Support Serving Baltimore, Washington and Annapolis

MR. ADKINS: Well, I'm going to leave unless

you feel the need for me to stay?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. VENTRE: Why don't you stay --

MR. ADKINS: I'll be glad to.

MR. VENTRE: -- just to answer questions, although I'm sure your panel -- it has been a while, but the panel is familiar with the issue. Treading out to the next item on the agenda tonight.

MR. ADKINS: Do you want to record this?

MR. VENTRE: What?

MR. VENTRE:

MR. ADKINS: Do you want to record this?

As you know, the Somerset County

program has had a very long history, and perhaps somewhat troubled at times, with the commission. We have reached our resolution. I do regret that it has taken as long as it's taken, and I will take the responsibility for that. We did go through the seven principal items at the staff level that the commission

had directed us to negotiate when the commission gave

tentative approval to the remaining sections of the

Over time, mostly in 1989, I worked with Ron



Somerset program back in 1988.

and his staff here at Princess Anne to make sure that those points were taken care of and resolved. I am satisfied that they were. I did not detail them here tonight for you in this very, very short memorandum.

They had to do, as I indicate in this memorandum, of the seven areas. They were everything ranging from just language changes, stylistic changes -- some word choices here where "recommendations" should have been "requirements," and things of that nature -- all the way to more substantive issues, and the foremost among those was the method of deducting for growth allocation.

Again, as you recall, we finally brought that to resolution last year here in a meeting in this room with Chairman North present as well. And the decision at that time was, in effect, letting Somerset County change its growth allocation deduction method in a way that met what it strongly believed to be its purpose, or its needs, I should say, because of the development situation here in Somerset County, the need for very large lots only, typically things of that nature, and



taking a cue also from what other jurisdictions had done in already approved programs.

Based on those principal factors, Ron worked out, to our satisfaction, a format for calculating the deduction. What it does, the principal feature of that, is it eliminates this reference that we just dealt with to a 20,000 square foot minimum, and it goes to a one acre minimum. And Ron, if you want to take over now, please go right ahead.

MR. ADKINS: What it does is it allows for when we have on-site septic and wells, single-family subdivision -- as I indicated earlier, it's typically two-acre lot sizes. And the fear in our county was that that really was, if we counted raw acreage when we had that setting, it was really taking our growth allocation and cutting it in half because we would get literally very few homes compared to a jurisdiction that could have higher densities because of -- water and sewer.

So, we left that -- that was our particular issue that we had. We wanted to protect that right to count less than the raw acreage. For all other types of



development -- commercial, industrial, multi-family, single family, water and sewer subdivisions -- we allowed that to de determined on a case-by-case basis in consultation with the commission and staff.

In regard to the debiting of less than the raw acreage for the on-site septic and well, what was negotiated was basically a one-acre debit instead of 20,000 square feet for each single-family dwelling and a deep covenant of limiting the development on the path to our own -- 20,000 square feet. So, we were actually still going to keep the development minimal within that two-acre tract, but double the amount of debiting from that which was disturbed, 20,000 square feet. I think that probably captures the overall growth allocation changes.

MR. BOSTIAN: Did you have to advertise all that?

MR. ADKINS: Yes, we've had a hearing on --

MR. VENTRE: It was advertised, and the county commissioners have heard it. In fact, their hearing was in April.



MR. ADKINS: Yes, we submitted --1 Any controversy then? MR. BLAKE: No, none at all. MR. ADKINS: 3 So, the changes --MR. VENTRE: 4 MR. BOSTIAN: How long is your growth 5 allocation going to last you? 6 MR. ADKINS: Well, I haven't rethought how 7 many acres that means, but it could last for some time. 8 The problem there is, though, where do we put it. 9 all the wetland, I'm tired of wetland. 10 MR. BOSTIAN: Who's going to use it? 11 MR. ADKINS: Where do we put it? That's yet 12 It depends really on what the court is to be seen. 13 going to allow. 14 MR. PHILLIPS: You said you've limited to 60 15 acres a year? 16 MR. ADKINS: Right now we have, yes. And that 17 thought was still to stay the same for the time being. 18 MR. PHILLIPS: Well, what do you do when a 19 subdivision comes in that is over? Or you have two of 20 21 them come in?



MR. ADKINS: Well, we only may be able to award a section of it to growth allocation, or they may have to wait until another year, or we may have to rethink our policy. The policy was one that we didn't want to give it all away suddenly, and then have a good development occur five years down the road, and we have no way of -- 10 or whatever, and have any way of maximizing it.

It's the county's strong belief that the commission's intention is not to give you five percent every so often, but to give you five percent. And that's what we have to deal with. So, we want it to last us for a while. So, that's why we have the 60 acres, which was one-twentieth of the -- and that was based on the debiting of the 20,000 square feet of this development. This would have meant quite a few homes, and, of course, we didn't change the cap of 60 acres, but we would be changing the debit to one acre.

So, instead of 120 potential homes per year, due to allocation, it would only be 60 if we had the -- individual lots --



- 1	
2	mention, another key factor in that was that the
3	remaining area would be covenanted, or there would be
4	some restriction in keeping with the commission's polic
5	which it adopted in February of 1988, when the issue wa
6	raised initially on the policy level.
7	So, we are satisfied. The chairman is
8	satisfied. This panel has been satisfied. This is now
9	the redrafted Somerset program in this document, and
0	there it is. Any other questions?
1	MR. BLAKE: What are we supposed to do with
2	that tonight?
13	MR. BOSTIAN: Hear public comment on it.
4	MR. VENTRE: That's it. There being no
5	further comments?
6	MR. BLAKE: No other comment. The hearing is
7	closed.
18	MR. VENTRE: Thank you very much.
19	(Whereupon, at 7:45 p.m., the above-
20	entitled hearing was adjourned.)

And there is the, as Ron did

MR. VENTRE:



21

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY

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

CHRIS HOFER



JUL 27 1990

DNR CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION





July 26, 1990

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

Ms. Peggy Mickler Critical Area Commission 275 West Street Suie 320 Annapolis, MD 21401

RE: Public Hearing Chesapeake Bay Critical Area Commission dated July 9, 1990, File No: SO A-2

Dear Ms. Mickler:

Enclosed please find the Certificate of Notary sheet for the above-referenced hearing. Please attach it to the original transcript.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

HUNT REPORTING COMPANY

CYNTHIA G. KNUTSEN

Secretary

CGK enc

RECEIVED

306 27 1990

DNR CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

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

CERTIFICATE OF NOTARY

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

CHRIS HOFER



JUL 27 1990

DNR CRITICAL AREA COMMISSION

