

Deposition of: **Talbot County Council Meeting**

December 13, 2021

In the Matter of:

Talbot County Council Meeting

Veritext Legal Solutions

800-734-5292 | calendar-dmv@veritext.com |

	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Page 1
1	COUNTY COUNCIL OF TALBOT COUNTY, MARYLAND
2	
3	
4	Continuation of Public Hearing
5	on Resolution 308 by Daniel Watson
6	
7	December 13, 2021; 5:00 p.m.
8	
9	
10	Council Chambers, Easton, Maryland
11	
12	
13	COUNCIL MEMBERS:
14	Chuck F. Callahan
15	Pete Lesher
16	Frank Divilio
17	Corey W. Pack
18	Laura E. Price
19	
20	Reported by
21	Diane Houlihan

	<u> </u>		,
	Page 2		Page 4
1	TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS	1	at this point, it was 350 two months ago, to
2		2	join in and express support for Petition 21-01.
3	MR. CALLAHAN: Let's get ready to get	3	And I'm really speaking for them also.
4	started. But first let's all stand and say the	4	That number is over 1.4 percent of the
5	Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.	5	adult population of Talbot County. And the
6	(Pledge of Allegiance.)	6	generally accepted ratio of people who write in
7	MR. CALLAHAN: Okay. Well, I appreciate	7	on an issue, compared to those who are engaged
8	it, everybody being here.	8	that just don't take that step is about ten to
9	So we're going to go ahead and let you,	9	one.
10	Dan, go ahead and get started and the	10	So you're looking at something in the
11	continuation of your meeting and everything.	11	order of magnitude of 15 percent of the people
12	If you want to go ahead, and the floor is	12	in Talbot County who are already focused on
13	yours.	13	this issue before tonight's disclosures. I'm
14	MR. WATSON: Thank you very much.	14	sure there will be more.
15	MR. CALLAHAN: Yup.	15	Resolution 281 that you adopted on
16	MR. WATSON: Good evening, Council	16	August 11, 2020, nine months after it was
17	Members. My name is Dan Watson. I live at	17	introduced, was the county's one and only
18	8404 Akeley Manor Lane.	18	opportunity to influence the biggest project
19	Thank you very much for inviting me here	19	ever to happen in Talbot County. In adopting
20	tonight to complete the presentation in	20	Resolution 281, you may hear me refer to it as
21	connection with Petition 21-01 that was filed	21	R281, you gave an unconditional green light to
	Page 3		Page 5
1	back on May the 7th, more than seven months	1	Lakeside, the 2,500 home subdivision and half a
2	ago.	2	million square feet of retail space on the
3	This presentation began two months ago on	3	opposite side of Route 50 from the historical
4	October 12th, but it will be concluded tonight.	4	little Town of Trappe.
5	Unlike the October meeting, Mr. Thomas and	5	The petition filed on the May the 7th, two
6	staff and I were able to meet in advance and	6	months before any ship sailed or horse left the
7	communicate about ground rules. And that	7	barn, was to urge you to rescind that action so
8	should make the evening go much more smoothly,	8	that before the county had time for so that
9	and I hope not to use the full amount of time	9	the county had time to answer important
10	that was allotted.	10	questions before construction of Lakeside got
11	Not only to speed things up, but also to	11	underway. The idea is that after we all
12	help make clear the points I'll be conveying	12	learned what was really going on, the project
13	tonight, I delivered to each of you almost two	13	could come back and be considered anew by the
14	weeks ago a 15-page preview of this	14	community.
15	presentation, together with about 50 documents	15	I'm here tonight, the reason I'm here
16	that substantiate the claims I'm making	16	tonight is to present you with new information
17	tonight.	17	that you, the Planning Commission, the public
18	While I alone am responsible for my	18	did not have during consideration of Resolution
19	remarks tonight, I also want to remind everyone	19	281, or in August 2020 when you adopted it.
20	that Ms. Moran's roster shows that you all have	20	Based on this new information, I believe
21	received e-mails from over 412 other citizens	21	you will agree that the only proper course is

	Page 6		Page 8
1	rescission of Resolution 281. Not to kill	1	falsehoods and misrepresentations corrupted a
2	Lakeside, but so that the applicant can bring	2	proper consideration of Resolution 281.
3	it back again in a proper context, untainted by	3	Followed by evidence, indeed I think proof of
4	falsehoods and misrepresentations.	4	backing up my points. And finally, just a few
5	A point that needs making right up front	5	concluding remarks.
6	is this: The County?s authorization for	6	On December 1st, a couple of weeks ago, I
7	Lakeside to proceed is a land use decision.	7	delivered to MDE and others, including the
8	It's a land use decision if ever there was one.	8	Attorneys General's Office and EPA and
9	Probably the most important land use decision	9	yourselves, a 15-page letter replete with
10	ever made in Talbot County.	10	footnotes and some 55 exhibits in that document
11	It is now somehow an esoteric technical	11	to express as clearly as I am able the points I
12	matter having to do with wastewater science.	12	will be making here tonight.
13	That is why these basic decisions about	13	Some other documents obtained through PIA
14	Lakeside, including rescission, is your	14	requests since December 1st further
15	responsibility and not the Maryland Department	15	substantiate these claims.
16	of Environment's, or MDE's.	16	Exhibit 2 of the letter to MDE is
17	Under Maryland law, land use decisions are	17	especially important, as it defines what I mean
18	the purview of county government. There is no	18	by that obviously harsh word, falsehood, which
19	question that you, comprised of the County	19	I will use a lot here tonight.
20	Council, have the authority to rescind 281,	20	I'm not a reckless man, and I know I am
21	particularly based on new information that	21	making very serious allegations that the review
	Page 7		Page 9
1	affects public health of your constituents, as	1	and the approval process of Lakeside
2	discussed on October 12th, or new information I		
	discussed on educating and mention in	2	culminating in approval of Resolution 281 last
3	will present tonight showing how the applicant	3	culminating in approval of Resolution 281 last August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is
3	will present tonight showing how the applicant	3	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is
3 4	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process	3 4	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue.
3 4 5	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation.	3 4 5	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said
3 4 5 6	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind	3 4 5 6	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point
3 4 5 6 7	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of	3 4 5 6 7	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm
3 4 5 6 7 8	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th	3 4 5 6 7 8	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is clearly your responsibility as well. You are	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I wrote.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is clearly your responsibility as well. You are our Board of Health.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I wrote. These terms, falsehood, false, untrue, are
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is clearly your responsibility as well. You are our Board of Health. Under your rules, I am here to state my	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I wrote. These terms, falsehood, false, untrue, are used throughout these materials. Sometimes
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is clearly your responsibility as well. You are our Board of Health. Under your rules, I am here to state my case. So I would like to ask that you hold any	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I wrote. These terms, falsehood, false, untrue, are used throughout these materials. Sometimes awkwardly. To me, there is very compelling
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is clearly your responsibility as well. You are our Board of Health. Under your rules, I am here to state my case. So I would like to ask that you hold any questions until I finish laying out the whole	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I wrote. These terms, falsehood, false, untrue, are used throughout these materials. Sometimes awkwardly. To me, there is very compelling evidence that strongly suggests a statement or
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is clearly your responsibility as well. You are our Board of Health. Under your rules, I am here to state my case. So I would like to ask that you hold any questions until I finish laying out the whole story. That will be both the fastest and	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I wrote. These terms, falsehood, false, untrue, are used throughout these materials. Sometimes awkwardly. To me, there is very compelling evidence that strongly suggests a statement or purported fact is not true. And I set forth my
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is clearly your responsibility as well. You are our Board of Health. Under your rules, I am here to state my case. So I would like to ask that you hold any questions until I finish laying out the whole story. That will be both the fastest and clearest route. And I'm happy to take	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I wrote. These terms, falsehood, false, untrue, are used throughout these materials. Sometimes awkwardly. To me, there is very compelling evidence that strongly suggests a statement or purported fact is not true. And I set forth my evidence for that claim.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is clearly your responsibility as well. You are our Board of Health. Under your rules, I am here to state my case. So I would like to ask that you hold any questions until I finish laying out the whole story. That will be both the fastest and clearest route. And I'm happy to take questions and have a general discussion at the	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I wrote. These terms, falsehood, false, untrue, are used throughout these materials. Sometimes awkwardly. To me, there is very compelling evidence that strongly suggests a statement or purported fact is not true. And I set forth my evidence for that claim. But other as yet undiscovered evidence
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	will present tonight showing how the applicant corrupted the county's land use review process with falsehood and misrepresentation. Not only is your right to rescind unconstrained, but in the context of information you heard on October the 12th bearing on the threat to public health, it is clearly your responsibility as well. You are our Board of Health. Under your rules, I am here to state my case. So I would like to ask that you hold any questions until I finish laying out the whole story. That will be both the fastest and clearest route. And I'm happy to take questions and have a general discussion at the end if you like.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	August was corrupted by falsehoods. That is facts were presented as true that were untrue. I would like to read of bit of what I said in that letter to MDE on this important point and ask anyone who is concerned about what I'm saying, this word falsehood and so forth, to read all of Exhibit 2. This is part of what I wrote. These terms, falsehood, false, untrue, are used throughout these materials. Sometimes awkwardly. To me, there is very compelling evidence that strongly suggests a statement or purported fact is not true. And I set forth my evidence for that claim. But other as yet undiscovered evidence might have a bearing on the actual truth or

			,
1	Page 10 appropriate.	1	Page 12 rescinded. Each one standing alone would be
2	Falsehoods can be simple, genuine,	2	reason enough to rescind 281.
3	innocent mistakes. It happens all the time.	3	The first item is a big deal. And it was
4	It's still a falsehood.	4	the only one that I was able to present on
5	Falsehood can arise from a listener	5	October the 12th. Severe pollution in La
6		6	•
	drawing a logical but wrong inference from facts said by a speaker because other facts are		Trappe Creek caused by problems and
7 8	not known to that listener. The falsehood can	7	deficiencies with the existing Trappe
		8	wastewater treatment plant. You all remember
9	arise from simple omission of a material fact.	9	the photos.
10	There's a reason that an oath is a promise to	10	Incredibly enough, Resolution 281 that you
11	tell the whole truth.	11	adopted permits Lakeside to connect 120 homes
12	Falsehoods arise from confusion, and	12	and possibly many more to that system. Not
13	falsehoods can be purposeful lies, bold or	13	only polluting our waters, but contributing
14	subtle. Falsehoods can be created or	14	more to an existing public health hazard, as
15	perpetuated over time simply because of	15	you heard.
16	people's faulty memories or part of a story is	16	This first issue is not first because I
17	remembered but part of it's forgotten and so	17	think it is the most important and most
18	on.	18	outrageous, but only because it was the most
19	Because Dan Watson has no way to	19	obvious. It is the one that everybody in
20	differentiate or know or prove the reasons	20	Talbot County knows about and are rightly
21	behind any falsehood, and as I have no	21	outraged about. It's the one that's easiest to
	Page 11		Page 13
1	intention to state or imply the motive, the	1	understand and the outrage is captured in
2	purposefulness, the innocence, or the reason	2	photographs.
3	that any falsehood arose, the terminology	3	The issue of falsehoods and
4	falsehood will just have to do.	4	misrepresentations I'm presenting here tonight
5	So to the point. Why must Resolution 281	5	I think is a more serious form of pollution,
6	be rescinded? Resolution 281 must be reversed	6	but there are no photographs.
7	and rescinded because its approval was based on	7	Everyone should know this, too. Among the
8	false pretenses and misrepresentations. I'm	8	people who heard the information presented
9	going to lay that all out for you. That's why	9	about the existing plant and La Trappe Creek on
10	I'm here tonight, and it's troubling.	10	October 12th were our Planning Commissioners.
11	But first, it's necessary to back up a	11	They, too, heard Matt Pluta, the Choptank
12	moment.	12	Riverkeeper, as he delivered independent lab
13	And Ms. Moran, if you could put up the	13	reports showing that every day that plant puts
14	first slide, please.	14	out effluent at 13 times, not double or triple,
15	SECRETARY: Other than this one? The next	15	but 13 times the nitrogen concentration as a
16	one?	16	modern plant. And Maryland Department of
17	MR. WATSON: Yes. This one. Thanks.	17	Environment somehow says that's fine because
18	The first here you will recognize the	18	remarkably in 2019 they gave Trappe a discharge
19	slide that I put up on October 12th. It's the	19	permit that has no nitrogen limits in it at
20	same one. And it lists five independent	20	all.
21	reasons that why Resolution 281 must be	21	Worse, Shore River's lab reports, you'll

		Uuii	Cir Meeting December 13, 2021
	Page 14		Page 16
1	remember, showed that E coli and fecal coliform	1	Ms. Price's effort to face up to this
2	in the little stream just below the Trappe	2	particular problem by drafting a resolution
3	plant, where sludge hasn't been removed in over	3	that is intended to be a compromise and I
4	20 years, is more than ten times greater than	4	understand may be introduced tomorrow night.
5	the State of Maryland's safe limit.	5	But if I understand correctly that it still
6	Tom Hughes, who you know, just got written	6	permits Lakeside to connect, trying only to
7	confirmation from MDE this week that it has not	7	limit the duration of the harm, I don't think
8	monitored conditions in La Trappe Creek for at	8	it's adequate and does not address at all the
9	least five years, which is their requirement.	9	legal consequences of the Planning Commission's
10	And we think probably not since 1998. And	10	decisions.
11	where is the Department of Natural Resources in	11	So all of that had to do with the first
12	all this, by the way, DNR?	12	reason to rescind 281. And standing alone, it
13	You, Council members, and the Planning	13	requires its rescission.
14	Commissioners also heard Dr. Smullen detail a	14	Looking back at the slide, the second
15	litany of severe problems with the Trappe	15	item, which I am not going to get into, deals
16	plant. Not just with the treatment plant	16	with the plans for the new wastewater treatment
17	itself, but with terrible inflow and	17	plant proposed for Lakeside on the east side of
18	infiltration problems in its collection system	18	Route 50.
19	that occur even with normal rainfall, not just	19	As you know, six weeks ago on
20	extreme rainfall. Yet Resolution 281 permits	20	October 28th, about 200 citizens of Talbot
21	Lakeside to connect to that system.	21	County were at the Community Center, as were
	Page 15		Page 17
1	As the Council knows but I do not believe	1	some of you, offering comments and criticisms
2	has yet reported to the Maryland Department of	2	of various aspects of that plant, with not a
3	Environment, on November the 3rd, after hearing	3	single speaker endorsing it.
4	the testimony of Mr. Pluta and Dr. Smullen and	4	Dr. Smullen and Mr. Pluta and others
5	others, the Planning Commission reconsidered	5	knowledgeable technically spoke on technical
6	its earlier vote and formally determined that	6	issues.
7	connecting Lakeside to the existing Trappe	7	Until the results of that MDE review
8	sewer system, as Resolution 281 permits, cannot	8	process are known, the county cannot judge
9	be allowed. It is, in fact, inconsistent,	9	whether or not the system contemplated supports
10	inconsistent with the Talbot County	10	or erodes our Comprehensive Plan, and that is
11	Comprehensive Plan until such time as the	11	not a concern of MDE's. MDE is not looking at
12	Trappe plant meets enhanced nutrient removal	12	that system with respect to our Comprehensive
13	standards, ENR standards.	13	Plan. The Planning Commission does that.
14	So let me say that again. The Planning	14	Could we put up the next slide? Okay.
15	Commission has found that a central element of	15	The third item that was listed on that
16	Resolution 281 is inconsistent with the Comp	16	slide is a fundamental legal problem with
17	Plan. Consequently, as a legal proposition, I	17	Resolution 281 that I'm also not going to get
18	believe you are compelled to rescind 281 or MDE	18	into depth here tonight. That legal problem,
19	itself must reverse its earlier approval of	19	which went somehow unnoticed, deals with the
20	Resolution 281. It's a public health matter.	20	fact that Resolution 281 made dramatic changes
21	I want to acknowledge and salute	21	to the properties around Trappe, around Trappe
	<u> </u>		11 / 11

	•		
	Page 18	1	Page 20
$\frac{1}{2}$	that were not called out in the title of 281 or	1	And the next slide, please.
2	the text of 281, that are not owned by the	2	So this brings us to the fourth and fifth
3	developer, that are not part of Lakeside, and	3	items. The fourth and the fifth items together
4	were never discussed or reviewed by the	4	from the October slide, as you remember, are
5	Planning Commission, by the public or by you,	5	what I came here to talk about tonight.
6	the County Council. But the changes were made,	6	They're the most difficult to see and the most
7	reclassified, mapped in our county's legal	7	difficult to understand, but they are the most
8	document.	8	serious in both a legal and moral sense because
9	I'm not going to review this slide, but I	9	this issue goes directly to the integrity of
10	put it up here just to illustrate the breadth	10	Talbot County's land review processes. And our
11	and variety of properties around Trappe that	11	reaction to that, those violations of our
12	are impacted by this problem. This isn't just	12	integrity, will show us who we really are as a
13	a little one little lot (inaudible).	13	county.
14	Each one of these circles, this is two	14	Because of the fact that consideration of
15	different maps in Trappe. On the left is the	15	Resolution 281 from the outset was corrupted by
16	sewer service map, and on the right is	16	falsehood and misrepresentation, you didn't
17	long-range planned sewer service map. Both of	17	know that falsehoods and representations
18	which are relevant, both of which had many	18	that you didn't know in August of 2020, I'm
19	errors. Each one of these is a parcel of land	19	sure you will actually see them clearly at the
20	or a group of parcels of land that were	20	end of the night.
21	reclassified and remapped by Resolution 281	21	Before we get into that, I want to talk
	Page 19		Page 21
1	with no one's knowledge, no one's review, and	1	about, put some perspective on the Lakeside
2	it affects property interests.	2	project. Look at it at 100,000-foot level.
3	This was not some minor administrative	3	First, to get an idea of what well, to
4	glitch or matter of fixing some typos or an	4	get an idea of what's really going on.
5	incorrect property line. The issue involves	5	Resolution 281 is not just your average
6	the property rights of all those property	6	comprehensive water and sewer plan amendment
7	owners in the Trappe area, helping some of them	7	like any other. Comprehensive sewer plan
8	and hurting most. Most noticeably, it seems to	8	amendments can plan has been amended 55
9	have benefited the developer of Lakeside by	9	times in Talbot County. Seems to come up every
10	downgrading the development potential for other	10	week. This is not just your average, run of
11	properties that were set to complete with	11	the mill comprehensive water and sewer plan
12	Lakeside if they were developed. In	12	amendment.
13	particular, these properties here on the west	13	What is proposed is precedented in rural
14	side of Route 50.	14	Talbot County. Lakeside is a billion dollar
15	This is a serious legal matter, and	15	real estate deal in a corn field on the
16	Resolution 281 must be rescinded until it's	16	opposite side of the peninsula's busiest
17	straightened out and fixed properly. I'm sure	17	highway from a financially strapped little
18	there are many lawyers listening and watching	18	town, population about 1,000.
19	this who recognize the seriousness of this flaw	19	Now, I'm a former real estate professional
20	in 281. Many of us laymen wouldn't necessarily	20	and developed a little property myself. I'm a
21	grasp it.	21	capitalist. There is nothing wrong with a
	~ .		

		Journ	December 13, 2021
	Page 22		Page 24
1	project that makes money, even a project that	1	month. I mean big, like \$120, \$130 a month for
2	makes lots and lots of money. We should all be	2	a little house owned by an elderly couple. It
3	so lucky.	3	appears they've had scant help over the years
4	But that is if it's done on the up and up.	4	from State and county government, all things
5	Whether it's golf or cards or marriage or real	5	considered, to deal with these problems, which
6	estate development, cheating poisons	6	these problems stem from costs connected with
7	everything.	7	the Trappe sewage system.
8	So a billion dollars is a lot of money.	8	I, for one, am pretty sympathetic to their
9	2,500 homes at say \$400,000 a pop is a billion	9	plight, about which I knew very little. And I
10	dollars. Plus there's a half a million square	10	wrote about that in the Spy a couple of weeks
11	feet of commercial space to take care of any	11	ago.
12	rounding errors. So let's say a billion. At a	12	So the other co-applicant with the town is
13	ten percent margin, that would be \$100 million	13	the developer, Rocks Engineering, out of
14	in profit. And the real estate brokerage fees	14	northern Virginia, Vienna, Virginia. And
15	would be in the tens of millions. So if any	15	they're doing business in Lakeside as Trappe
16	project in this county or any other county was	16	East Holdings Business Trust. And I'll refer
17	to be pursued with tenacity, this is the one.	17	to the developer as Rocks.
18	As with the MDE sewage permits you'll be	18	We know the ownership of that project
19	hearing about, Resolution 281 was sponsored by	19	because the developer's attorney in August went
20	two parties working together jointly. And that	20	to the trouble of releasing an official
21	itself is a unique arrangement, which MDE has	21	statement published in the Talbot Spy under the
	Page 23		Page 25
1	acknowledged. The two parties are the Town of	1	headline Rocks family owns and controls
2	Trappe and the developer, Rocks.	2	Lakeside development project.
3	The little historic Town of Trappe, for	3	Rocks' attorney did not mention Rauch
4	those who don't know, consists of about 340	4	Engineering, who in the past has been
5	households, which is the size of a subdivision	5	identified in the press in Talbot County as the
6	in most places. In the last town election, 93	6	developer of Lakeside and who have, in fact,
7	voters came out. So 47 people are a majority	7	done engineering work for the project for two
8	of the decision-makers in the democratic Town	8	decades.
9	of Trappe.	9	Rocks has successfully developed, as we
10	The biggest vote ever taken in Trappe was	10	know, other property in Talbot County with the
11	the referendum on Lakeside in 2003, where the	11	help of Rauch Engineering, including the Easton
12	developer offered the town a number of	12	Club, which wraps around the now abandoned golf
13	inducements. If 77 people had voted nay rather	13	course.
14	than aye, Lakeside wouldn't be on the agenda	14	Rocks has generally remained far behind
15	today, but it is.	15	the scenes, if that name is new to some people.
16	Trappe has never been accused of being a	16	Rocks and the Town of Trappe have
17	high income, wealthy community. Rather, it	17	additional and very different relationship in
1 /			
18	seems made up of hard working, full-time	18	addition to being co-applicants. In fact,
	seems made up of hard working, full-time residents, many elderly. For reasons buried in	18 19	addition to being co-applicants. In fact, they're partners in obtaining the MDE permits
18			

The government body in which development coccurs is the regulator, the overseer, the dispector of what goes on. And that's the case in Lakeside. Trappe has all the same powers. Mr. Pack, you talked about Trappe as a recognized municipal body with the same sovereignty as others. And that's exactly right. Annupolis. Except in this case, due to the diveloper, any developer who would have a solverloper, any developer who would have a institution whose money backs the developer and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and that things are done properly by the book. When the Raush Company built Columbia 50 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for cample. But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. So that normal guardrail is missing. The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level list that thiff and it way is the weather-beaten sign forever. If allot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot county knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way list in a corn field, a financially squeezed little The government body in which scase, due town in the hands of an experienced developer old vargue recoilections from the past, what could go wrong? So now lefs talk about what Resolution 2 81 is in dwhat it did. It's the topic at hand. Rocks and the town requested the county to adopt Resolution 281 to get the county to adopt Resolution 281 the sale and the town requested the county to adopt Resolution 281 to get the county to adopt Resolution 281 to get the county that Lakeside would have a so called S-1, or that Lakeside be use		-		
cocurs is the regulator, the overseer, the imspector of what goes on. And that's the case in Inspector of what goes on. And that's the case in Inspector of what goes on. And that's the case in Inspector of what goes on. And that's the case in Inspector of what goes on. And that's the case in Inspector of what goes on. And that's cased the integration of the case of the county of the sovereignty as others. And that's exactly register of the county sovereignty as others. And that's exactly right. Trappe has all the same powers as the City of Annapolis. Except in this case, due to the imbalance of power and the reality of the situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and its 93 voters inevitably in the thrall of this developer, any developer who would have a project this size? Usually in these deals, my life experience, there's another important party, the mortgagee of bank or insurance company, an institution whose money backs the developer and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees Tage 27 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and that things are done properly by the book. When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for example. But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. So that normal guardrail is missing. The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot Lakeside has been roady to go before the great receive the Trappe East every difference in the cast of the exhibits here? Mr. WATSON: Tim going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. It's on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. No wastewater capacity in the existing on page 1 It minute. It is in there.				Page 28
inspector of what goes on. And that's the case in Lakeside. Trappe as all the same powers. Mr. Pack, you talked about Trappe as a creognized municipal body with the same of recognized municipal body with the same of readers of that Lakeside to the same of the county to adopt Resolution 281 to get the county to adopt Resolution 281 to get the county to that Lakeside to get the county to that Lakeside county to the desisting that status the applicant spread on the Lakeside of the think they of the substitution whose money backs the developer and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees Page 27 I all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and that things are done properly by the book. When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 Years ago, it was		, ,	1	town in the hands of an experienced developer,
in Lakeside. Trappe has all the same powers. Mr. Pack, you talked about Trappe as a recognized municipal body with the same recognized would have a constitution. Set us and what it did. It's the topical to adopt Resolution 281 to adopt R	2	occurs is the regulator, the overseer, the	2	old vague recollections from the past, what
Mr. Pack, you talked about Trappe as a recognized municipal body with the same sovereignty as others. And that's exactly right. Trappe has all the same powers as the City of of Rockville or Hagerstown or the City of attackeside would have a so-called S-1, or immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is mibalance of power and the reality of the situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and it is 93 voters inevitably in the thrall of this developer, any developer who would have a project this size? Usually in these deals, my life experience, there's another important party, the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an institution whose money backs the developer and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees The chief purpose of Resolution 281, the main objective was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicant slipped in another thing, too. You see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council in December of 2019, when it first amount, relassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to example. Page 27 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and that things are done properly by the book. When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 When the Rauck Company built Columbia 50 The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level in this: Lakeside has been on the radar of perspective of Lakeside of thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. But the takeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. But the exhibit hat is in a minute. It is in there. Exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. Exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. Exhibit that is in a mi	3	inspector of what goes on. And that's the case	3	could go wrong?
recognized municipal body with the same sovereignty as others. And that's exactly right. Trappe has all the same powers as the City of Rockville or Hagerstown or the City of Annapolis. Except in this case, due to the imbalance of power and the reality of the situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and it is 93 voters inevitably in the thrall of this developer, any developer who would have a project this size? Usually in these deals, my life experience, there's another important party, the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an institution whose money backs the developer and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of project this size? Resolution 281 the language in Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. Rock s and the town requested the county to adopt Resolution 281 to get the county intended a comprehensive's water and sewer plan amended so that Lakeside would have a so-called S-1, or immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is not legally entitled to get any permits from MDE for sewage facility. It's that simple. The chief purpose of Resolution 281, the main objective was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicant slipped in another thing, too. You see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council in December of 2019, when it first the Council in December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the language in Exhibit F explicitly said Lakeside ato the original Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater reapacity of the existing old plant, no wastewater reapacity of MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do you have that as one of your you have all the exhibits here? MR. WATSON: Yes. That is M	4	in Lakeside. Trappe has all the same powers.	4	So now let's talk about what Resolution
right. Trappe has all the same powers as the City of Rockville or Hagerstown or the City of In Annapolis. Except in this case, due to the immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is minuted in the little Town of Trappe and it is the situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and it was investing the mort project this immediate priority, sewer service in immediate priority, sewer service classification, because without it, Lakeside is minuted in the state side in minuted in the sex is minuted to the state side property at all. But while pursuing that status, the applicant slipped in annother thing, too. You see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council in December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to example. When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 y	5	Mr. Pack, you talked about Trappe as a	5	281 is and what it did. It's the topic at
right. Trappe has all the same powers as the City of Rockville or Hagerstown or the City of the Council In December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to example. Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council In December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to example. Resolution	6		6	hand. Rocks and the town requested the county
Trappe has all the same powers as the City of Annapolis. Except in this case, due to the imbalance of power and the reality of the imbalance of power and the reality of the imbalance of power and the reality of the is 39 voters inevitably in the thrall of this developer, any developer who would have a project this size? 16 But while pursuing that status, the applicant slipped in another thing, too. You see, when Resolution 281, the main objective was to get designated 8-1. 18 But while pursuing that status, the applicant slipped in another thing, too. You see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council in December of 2019, when it first ame up, reclassification was its only purpose. 18 Page 27 and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees 19 All the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and that things are done properly by the book. 20 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for seample. 21 But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 22 So that normal guardrail is missing. 33 The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 18 All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 21 County kinow after the and to the page 20 per page 20 per page 20 per page 21 per page 22 per page 22 per page 24 per page 25 per page 26 per page 27 per page 28 per page 29 per pag	7	sovereignty as others. And that's exactly	7	to adopt Resolution 281 to get the county
10 of Rockville or Hagerstown or the City of 11 Annapolis. Except in this case, due to the 12 imbalance of power and the reality of the 13 situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and 14 its 93 voters inevitably in the thrall of this 15 developer, any developer who would have a 16 project this size? 17 Usually in these deals, my life 18 experience, there's another important party, 19 the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 20 institution whose money backs the developer 21 and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees 17 that things are done properly by the book. 18 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 19 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 10 example. 11 Resolution 281, the language in Exhibit F to 11 read no wastewater capacity of the existing 12 experience, there's another important party, 13 that things are done properly by the book. 14 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 15 example. 16 But while pursuing that status, the 17 applicant slipped in another thing, too. You 18 see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to 19 the Council in December of 2019, when it first 20 came up, reclassification was its only purpose. 21 And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to 22 explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to 23 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. 24 The sentence in the original Exhibit F 25 read no wastewater capacity of the existing 26 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 27 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 28 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 29 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 20 And at that time, the language in Exhibit F 20 read no wastewater capacity of the existing 21 Resolution 281, the language in Exhibit F 22 explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to 23 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. 24 The sentence in the original Exhibit F 25 read no wastewater repartive wastewater repartive of the existing objective wastewater repartive and the existing Trappe wastewater repartive of the existing th	8	right.	8	comprehensive's water and sewer plan amended so
11 Annapolis. Except in this case, due to the imbalance of power and the reality of the situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and 13 situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and 14 tis 93 voters inevitably in the thrall of this 15 developer, any developer who would have a 16 project this size? 16 project this size? 17 Usually in these deals, my life 18 experience, there's another important party, 19 the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the mortgage or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgage or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgage or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgage or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgage or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Mortgage or bank or insurance company, an 19 the Council in December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to 20 explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to 10 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that 11 The sentence in the original Exhibit F read no wastewater plant, that is the existing of plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Of plant, no wastewater treatment plant will be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer district. That's Lakeside. No	9	Trappe has all the same powers as the City	9	that Lakeside would have a so-called S-1, or
imbalance of power and the reality of the situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and lits 93 voters inevitably in the thrall of this developer, any developer who would have a project this size? 15 Usually in these deals, my life 18 experience, there's another important party, and the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 20 institution whose money backs the developer and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees 16 Page 27 and the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and 22 that things are done properly by the book. 3 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 4 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 25 example. 18 But in this case, surprisingly, there is 27 no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 28 So that normal guardrail is missing. 19 The last point I want to make about the 29 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 10 perspective of Lakeside, or thinks they do, 12 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 20 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 10 not legally entitled to get any permits from MDE for sewage facility. It's that simple. 14 The chief purpose of Resolution 281, the main objective was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicative was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicative was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicative was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicative was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicative was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicative was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicant slipped in another thing, too. You see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council in December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the langu	10	of Rockville or Hagerstown or the City of	10	immediate priority, sewer service
13 situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and 14 its 93 voters inevitably in the thrall of this 15 developer, any developer who would have a 16 project this size? 17 Usually in these deals, my life 18 experience, there's another important party, 19 the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 20 institution whose money backs the developer 21 and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees 21 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and 22 that things are done properly by the book. 33 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 4 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 5 example. 64 But in this case, surprisingly, there is 65 ro mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 75 So that normal guardrail is missing. 76 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 77 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 78 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 78 Is the simple. 79 The last point I want to make about the 70 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 71 Sale side had been ready to go before the great 72 recession hit and it was just put on hold 73 indefinitely. 74 The chief purpose of Resolution 281, the main objective was to get designated S-1. 85 But while pursuing that status, the 85 applicant slipped in another thing, too. You 85 see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to 95 the Council in December of 2019, when it first 96 came up, reclassification was its only purpose. 97 And at that time, the language in Exhibit F 98 explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to 99 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. 90 The existing old plant, no wastewater rapacity of the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant 90 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 18 sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 19 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 19 you have that as one of your you have all 19 the exhibits here? 10 MDE for experience, there is applicant slipped in another thing, too. You 19 the Council in December of 2019, when it first 19 came up, reclassification was its only purpose.	11	Annapolis. Except in this case, due to the	11	classification, because without it, Lakeside is
14 its 93 voters inevitably in the thrall of this 15 developer, any developer who would have a 16 project this size? 17 Usually in these deals, my life 18 experience, there's another important party, 19 the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 20 institution whose money backs the developer 21 and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees 18 Page 27 29 that things are dotted and Ts are crossed and 20 that things are done properly by the book. 20 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 3 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 4 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 5 example. 6 But in this case, surprisingly, there is 7 no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 8 So that normal guardrail is missing. 9 The last point I want to make about the 10 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 15 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 21 The chief purpose of Resolution 281, the main objective was to get designated S-1. But while pursuing that status, the applicant slipped in another thing, too. You see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council in December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the language in Exhibit F 20 explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. The sentence in the original Exhibit F 21 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing 22 that particular time, the language in Exhibit F 23 explicitly said Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 24 existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the 25 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 26 the existing Tr	12	imbalance of power and the reality of the	12	not legally entitled to get any permits from
developer, any developer who would have a project this size? Usually in these deals, my life experience, there's another important party, the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an institution whose money backs the developer and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees Page 27 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and that things are done properly by the book. When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for example. But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. So that normal guardrail is missing. The last point I want to make about the perspective af Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside hab been on the radar of County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold institution whose money back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. The sentence in the original Exhibit F or example. But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way the recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way are creased in the ack when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. The sentence in the original Exhibit F or example. But in this case, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council in December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. The sentence in the original Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant will be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer district. That's Lakeside. No MS. PRICE:	13	situation, is not the little Town of Trappe and	13	MDE for sewage facility. It's that simple.
16 project this size? 17 Usually in these deals, my life 18 experience, there's another important party, 19 the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 20 institution whose money backs the developer 21 and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees 22 and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees 23 dand at that time, the language in Exhibit F to 24 that things are done properly by the book. 25 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 26 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 27 example. 28 But in this case, surprisingly, there is 29 The last point I want to make about the 29 The last point I want to make about the 20 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 21 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 22 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 23 Earlie the newspaper articles and hoopla way 24 Face of the sexisting frape pears that as one of your you have all the exiting has been on the radar of 25 Earlie that things are dotted and Ts are crossed and that time, the language in Exhibit F to 26 Earlie that things are done properly by the book. 3 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 the existing Trape plant. Think about that. 4 The sentence in the original Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing Trappe district wastewater treatment plant will be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 26 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do you have that as one of your you have all the exhibits here? 27 MR. WATSON: Yes. That is 28 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. 28 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. 29 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. 30 Mr. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. 31 Mr. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It	14	its 93 voters inevitably in the thrall of this	14	The chief purpose of Resolution 281, the main
17 Usually in these deals, my life 18 experience, there's another important party, 19 the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an 20 institution whose money backs the developer 21 and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees 22 and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees 23 And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to 24 that things are done properly by the book. 25 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 26 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 27 example. 28 So that normal guardrail is missing. 29 The last point I want to make about the 20 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 21 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 26 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 27 Trees and the time, too. You 28 see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council in December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. 29 And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to 20 Explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. 30 The sentence in the original Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe wastewater reapacity of the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant will be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer district. That's Lakeside. No	15	developer, any developer who would have a	15	objective was to get designated S-1.
the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an institution whose money backs the developer and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees Page 27 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and that things are done properly by the book. When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for sexample. But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. So that normal guardrail is missing. The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside and the visiting old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant will be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer district. That's Lakeside. No MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do you have that as one of your you have all the exhibits here? MR. WATSON: Yes. That is MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. Resolution 281 was first submitted to the Council in December of 2019, when it first came up, reclassification was its only purpose. And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. The sentence in the original Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. The sentence in the original Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing Trappe district. That's Lakeside. No MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: Yes. That is MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: I'm goin	16	project this size?	16	But while pursuing that status, the
the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an institution whose money backs the developer and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees Page 27 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and that things are done properly by the book. When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for example. But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. So that normal guardrail is missing. The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. The last point I was just put on hold indefinitely. The last point I was just put on hold indefinitely. The last point I was just put on hold indefinitely. The last point I was just put on hold indefinitely. The last point I was just put on hold indefinitely. The last point I want to make about the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant will be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer district. That's Lakeside. No MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do you have that as one of your you have all the exhibits here? MR. WATSON: Yes. That is MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. It's on page let me remember. It would be on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. No wastewater capacity in the existing	17	Usually in these deals, my life	17	applicant slipped in another thing, too. You
20 institution whose money backs the developer 21 and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees Page 27 1 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and 2 that things are done properly by the book. 3 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 4 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 5 example. 6 But in this case, surprisingly, there is 7 no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 8 So that normal guardrail is missing. 9 The last point I want to make about the 10 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 14 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 came up, reclassification was its only purpose. 21 And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to Page 29 Resolution 281, the language in Exhibit F to Page 29 1 Resolution 281, the language in Exhibit F to 2 explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to 3 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. 4 The sentence in the original Exhibit F 5 read no wastewater capacity of the existing 6 Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the 7 existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of 8 the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of 8 the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant 9 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 10 sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 11 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 12 you have that as one of your you have all 13 the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of 14 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 15 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 16 MR. WATSON: Yes. That is 17 MS. PRICE: which one? 18 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what 19 on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. 19 No wastewater capacity in the existing	18	experience, there's another important party,	18	see, when Resolution 281 was first submitted to
and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees Page 27 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and that things are done properly by the book. When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for texample. But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. So that normal guardrail is missing. The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. So with that background, billion dollars 2	19	the mortgagee or bank or insurance company, an	19	the Council in December of 2019, when it first
Page 27 1 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and 2 that things are done properly by the book. 3 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 4 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 5 example. 6 But in this case, surprisingly, there is 7 no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 8 So that normal guardrail is missing. 9 The last point I want to make about the 10 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 14 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 20 Resolution 281, the language in Exhibit F 2 explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to 3 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. 4 The sentence in the original Exhibit F 2 read no wastewater capacity of the existing 4 Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the 2 existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of 3 the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant 4 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 5 sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 11 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 12 you have that as one of your you have all 13 the exhibits here? 14 MR. WATSON: Yes. That is 15 MS. PRICE: which one? 16 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 No wastewater capacity in the existing	20	institution whose money backs the developer	20	came up, reclassification was its only purpose.
1 all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and 2 that things are done properly by the book. 3 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 4 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 5 example. 6 But in this case, surprisingly, there is 7 no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 8 So that normal guardrail is missing. 9 The last point I want to make about the 10 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 14 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 10 When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 20 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. 21 The sentence in the original Exhibit F 2 explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to 3 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. 4 The sentence in the original Exhibit F 5 read no wastewater capacity of the existing 6 Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the 6 existing Trappe district wastewater rapacity of 8 the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant 9 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 10 sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 11 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 12 you have that as one of your you have all 13 the exhibit shere? 14 MR. WATSON: Yes. That is 15 MS. PRICE: which one? 16 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what 17 exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. 18 It's on page let me remember. It would be 19 on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. 20 No wastewater capacity in the existing	21	and, therefore, has a lot of influence and sees	21	And at that time, the language in Exhibit F to
that things are done properly by the book. When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. The sentence in the original Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. So that normal guardrail is missing. The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. So with that background, billion dollars explicitly said Lakeside could not connect to the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. The sentence in the original Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater treatment plant will be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer district. That's Lakeside. No MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do you have that as one of your you have all the exhibits here? MR. WATSON: Yes. That is MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. It's on page let me remember. It would be on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. No wastewater capacity in the existing		Page 27		Page 29
When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for example. But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. So that normal guardrail is missing. The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. So with that background, billion dollars 3 the existing Trappe plant. Think about that. The sentence in the original Exhibit F read no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe district wastewater plant, and the existing Trappe wastewater reapacity of the existing Trappe wastewater reapacity of the existing Trappe wastewater reapacity of the existi	1	all the Is are dotted and Ts are crossed and	1	
4 years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for 5 example. 5 read no wastewater capacity of the existing 6 But in this case, surprisingly, there is 7 no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 8 So that normal guardrail is missing. 9 The last point I want to make about the 10 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 14 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 20 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 21 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 22 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 25 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 26 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 27 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 28 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 39 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 40 The sentence in the original Exhibit F 5 read no wastewater capacity of the existing 5 Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the 6 Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the 7 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 8 the existing Trappe wastewater rapacity of 8 the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant 9 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 10 sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 11 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 12 you have that as one of your you have all 13 the exhibits here? 14 MR. WATSON: Yes. That is 15 MS. PRICE: which one? 16 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 it's on page let me remember. It would be 19 on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. 20 No wastewater capacity of the existing	2	that things are done properly by the book.	2	
5 read no wastewater capacity of the existing 6 But in this case, surprisingly, there is 7 no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 8 So that normal guardrail is missing. 9 The last point I want to make about the 10 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 14 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 20 Tappe district wastewater capacity of the existing 20 Tappe district wastewater plant, that is the 20 Existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of 21 Existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of 21 existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of 22 existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of 23 Existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 24 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 25 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 26 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 28 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 28 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 29 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 29 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 20 wistewater capacity of 20 Existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 wastewater capacity of 21 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 21 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 21 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 22 existing Old plant, no wastewater capacity of 23 the existing Trappe wastewater capacity of 24 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 24 will be	3	When the Rauch Company built Columbia 50	3	the existing Trappe plant. Think about that.
But in this case, surprisingly, there is no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. So that normal guardrail is missing. The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level tis this: Lakeside has been on the radar of County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great Ruth So with that background, billion dollars Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the existing old plant, no wastewater treatment plant will be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer district. That's Lakeside. No MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do you have that as one of your you have all the exhibits here? MR. WATSON: Yes. That is MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. It is on page let me remember. It would be on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. No wastewater capacity in the existing	4	years ago, it was (inaudible) neutral, for	4	The sentence in the original Exhibit F
7 no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all. 8 So that normal guardrail is missing. 9 The last point I want to make about the 10 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 14 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 20 existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant will be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 10 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do you have that as one of your you have all the exhibits here? 12 MR. WATSON: Yes. That is MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what 17 Exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 No wastewater capacity in the existing	5	example.	5	read no wastewater capacity of the existing
8 So that normal guardrail is missing. 9 The last point I want to make about the 10 perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level 11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 14 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 20 The last point I want to make about the 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe wastewater treatment plant 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East 20 will be allocated to serve the Trappe East	6	But in this case, surprisingly, there is	6	Trappe district wastewater plant, that is the
The last point I want to make about the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level loss sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of loss which is the perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level loss sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 12 It is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of loss which is the perspective of Lakeside has been on the radar of loss sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 12 It is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of loss sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 13 It loss price loss whe was even district. That's Lakeside. No 14 It loss price loss whe was even district. That's Lakeside. No 15 It loss price loss whe was even district. That's Lakeside. No 16 It loss price loss whe was even district. That's Lakeside. No 17 It loss price loss were district. That's Lakeside. No 18 It loss price loss were district. That's Lakeside. No 19 It loss price loss price loss were district. That's Lakeside. No 10 It loss price loss	7	no mortgage on the Lakeside property at all.	7	existing old plant, no wastewater capacity of
perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 11 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 14 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 10 sewer district. That's Lakeside. No 11 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 12 you have that as one of your you have all 13 the exhibits here? 14 MR. WATSON: Yes. That is 15 MS. PRICE: which one? 16 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what 17 exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. 18 It's on page let me remember. It would be 19 indefinitely. 19 on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 20 No wastewater capacity in the existing	8	So that normal guardrail is missing.	8	the existing Trappe wastewater treatment plant
11 is this: Lakeside has been on the radar of 12 Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot 13 County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, 14 recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way 15 back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. 16 All of that left a very strong impression that 17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 10 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 10 you have that as one of your you have all 11 MS. PRICE: Do you have real quick. Do 12 you have that as one of your you have all 13 the exhibits here? 14 MR. WATSON: Yes. That is 15 MS. PRICE: which one? 16 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what 17 exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. 18 It's on page let me remember. It would be 19 on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. 20 No wastewater capacity in the existing	9	The last point I want to make about the	9	will be allocated to serve the Trappe East
Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. Talbot County since 2003. Everybody in Talbot the pound in the exhibits here? MR. WATSON: Yes. That is MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. It would be on page let me remember. It would be on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. No wastewater capacity in the existing	10	perspective of Lakeside at 100,000-foot level	10	
County knows about Lakeside, or thinks they do, recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. It is a minute. It is in there. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold indefinitely. So with that background, billion dollars recession in the existing in the exhibits here? MR. WATSON: Yes. That is MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. It would be on page let me remember. It would be on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. No wastewater capacity in the existing				
recalls the newspaper articles and hoopla way back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold recession			12	
back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever. All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold lit's on page let me remember. It would be indefinitely. So with that background, billion dollars MS. PRICE: which one? MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. It would be on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. No wastewater capacity in the existing			13	the exhibits here?
All of that left a very strong impression that Lakeside had been ready to go before the great recession hit and it was just put on hold lindefinitely. So with that background, billion dollars 16 MR. WATSON: I'm going to mention what exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. lindefinitely. lindefinite			14	
17 Lakeside had been ready to go before the great 18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 19 So with that background, billion dollars 10 exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there. 11 It's on page let me remember. It would be on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. 20 No wastewater capacity in the existing	15	back when, saw the weather-beaten sign forever.	15	MS. PRICE: which one?
18 recession hit and it was just put on hold 19 indefinitely. 19 on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 20 No wastewater capacity in the existing	16		16	
19 indefinitely. 20 So with that background, billion dollars 19 on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan. 20 No wastewater capacity in the existing	17	Lakeside had been ready to go before the great	17	exhibit that is in a minute. It is in there.
20 So with that background, billion dollars 20 No wastewater capacity in the existing	18	recession hit and it was just put on hold	18	It's on page let me remember. It would be
	19	•	19	on page 47 I think of the Comp Plan.
21 in a corn field, a financially squeezed little 21 Trappe district wastewater treatment plant will	20	So with that background, billion dollars	20	No wastewater capacity in the existing
	21	in a corn field, a financially squeezed little	21	Trappe district wastewater treatment plant will

	Tuioot County C		<u> </u>
	Page 30		Page 32
1	be allocated to serve the Trappe East sewer	1	month, and adding its sewage to the sewage
2	district. That was in December.	2	flowing into La Trappe Creek by Valentine's
3	Two months later when Rocks agreed to the	3	Day. It's all regulated only by the Town of
4	so-called concession to split Lakeside into two	4	Trappe you see.
5	phases, the amendment of Resolution 281 also	5	MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Watson, when you're
6	slipped in a new Exhibit F that reversed the	6	saying November, are you saying this past
7	idea I just expressed, reversed it 180 degrees	7	November?
8	and permitted Rocks to connect Lakeside's first	8	MR. WATSON: Five weeks ago.
9	120 homes, and it could be more, to the	9	MR. CALLAHAN: Okay. I just want to make
10	deficient plant.	10	sure.
11	Now, I use the word slipped in. We know	11	MR. WATSON: So all of this is what I'm
12	it has connotations. I use the word slipped in	12	calling the other thing besides the
13	because the transcripts of Council meetings and	13	classification of S-1.
14	Planning Commission meetings, the transcripts	14	MS. PRICE: I'd still like to see where
15	show that no one on the Council, no Council	15	Exhibit F is and you haven't gotten there yet.
16	member or Planning Commission member ever once	16	I'd just like to see it here.
17	spoke of that remarkable 180-degree reversal.	17	MR. WATSON: I'm sorry?
18	And I believe no one realized that there had	18	MS. PRICE: The original Exhibit F, I just
19	ever been a change. I think everybody thought	19	wish you could tell me which one of your 60
20	the amendment that they were looking at had	20	exhibits it is, please.
21	always been there since December. It had not	21	SECRETARY: I think it's 7B.
	Page 31		Page 33
1	been.	1	MR. WATSON: My hearing
2	Because and only because of the successful	2	MR. DIVILIO: It's 7B. It's labeled 43
3	and largely unnoticed substitution, I think	3	and 47 in Granicus. And it includes that map
4	completely unnoticed substitution of Exhibit F,	4	that he was referencing that we didn't discuss.
5	Rocks can and is building Lakeside right now,	5	MS. PRICE: Thank you.
6	even though it will be months until the MDE	6	MR. WATSON: You know, I need to clarify
7	even acts on the permit for the new plant.	7	something. What I put into and this could
8	Had F not been substituted unnoticed,	8	be very misleading. It's important I stop.
9	Rocks could not connect Lakeside to the	9	What I put into the packet, because I
	Rocks could not connect Eureside to the		what I put into the packet, occause I
10	existing plant and I believe would not have	10	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred
10 11			
	existing plant and I believe would not have	10	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred
11	existing plant and I believe would not have been moving forward today.	10 11	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred to it, I will be referring to it here tonight,
11 12	existing plant and I believe would not have been moving forward today. Adding insult to injury, even though the	10 11 12	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred to it, I will be referring to it here tonight, are the pages from the comprehensive water and
11 12 13	existing plant and I believe would not have been moving forward today. Adding insult to injury, even though the Planning Commission on November 3rd formally	10 11 12 13	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred to it, I will be referring to it here tonight, are the pages from the comprehensive water and sewer plan that may be the very pages from
11 12 13 14	existing plant and I believe would not have been moving forward today. Adding insult to injury, even though the Planning Commission on November 3rd formally determined that connecting Lakeside to the old	10 11 12 13 14 15	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred to it, I will be referring to it here tonight, are the pages from the comprehensive water and sewer plan that may be the very pages from exhibit, from the amended exhibit, the amended
11 12 13 14 15	existing plant and I believe would not have been moving forward today. Adding insult to injury, even though the Planning Commission on November 3rd formally determined that connecting Lakeside to the old plant is inconsistent with the county	10 11 12 13 14 15	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred to it, I will be referring to it here tonight, are the pages from the comprehensive water and sewer plan that may be the very pages from exhibit, from the amended exhibit, the amended Exhibit F. That is the comprehensive water and
11 12 13 14 15 16	existing plant and I believe would not have been moving forward today. Adding insult to injury, even though the Planning Commission on November 3rd formally determined that connecting Lakeside to the old plant is inconsistent with the county Comprehensive Plan, Rocks went anyway and laid	10 11 12 13 14 15	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred to it, I will be referring to it here tonight, are the pages from the comprehensive water and sewer plan that may be the very pages from exhibit, from the amended exhibit, the amended Exhibit F. That is the comprehensive water and sewer plan that was actually enacted.
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	existing plant and I believe would not have been moving forward today. Adding insult to injury, even though the Planning Commission on November 3rd formally determined that connecting Lakeside to the old plant is inconsistent with the county Comprehensive Plan, Rocks went anyway and laid the pipe, made the connection after	10 11 12 13 14 15 116	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred to it, I will be referring to it here tonight, are the pages from the comprehensive water and sewer plan that may be the very pages from exhibit, from the amended exhibit, the amended Exhibit F. That is the comprehensive water and sewer plan that was actually enacted. I assure you I have, and Ms. Moran has on
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	existing plant and I believe would not have been moving forward today. Adding insult to injury, even though the Planning Commission on November 3rd formally determined that connecting Lakeside to the old plant is inconsistent with the county Comprehensive Plan, Rocks went anyway and laid the pipe, made the connection after November 3rd.	10 11 12 13 14 15 116 17 18	referred to it in my letter to MDE and referred to it, I will be referring to it here tonight, are the pages from the comprehensive water and sewer plan that may be the very pages from exhibit, from the amended exhibit, the amended Exhibit F. That is the comprehensive water and sewer plan that was actually enacted. I assure you I have, and Ms. Moran has on your server, and I'm sure, frankly, you have on

think to have that item in your package because it idin't occur to me that it wasn't there. It is it didn't occur to me that it wasn't there. It is MS. PRICE: It would be nice to compare the two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: Pardon me? MR. WATSON: Pardon me? MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. MS. price: It would be nice to compare the two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. MS. price: It would be nice to compare the two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. MS. price: It would be nice to compare the two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. The two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. The two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. The two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. The two. Thank you. So that whole issue is the other thing in the document I sent you. So that whole issue is the other thing in the two will see, the citizens of Talbot County, and the Planning Commission too, were denied honest, untainted framework for decision-making. So now let me describe what I'm talking about, those falsehoods. The first falsehood was that in 2002, which means that the land is expected to be increased in the two did get in the two five years. The talking about, those falsehoods. The first falsehood was that in 2002, which means that the land is expected to be increased in developed in three to five years. The property as sewer service priority classification of S-2, which means that the land is expected to be increased in developed in three to five years. The property had officially said that by severybody else. For the Talbot County Council to legally r				
think to have that item in your package because it idin't occur to me that it wasn't there. I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I		Page 34		Page 36
it didn't occur to me that it wasn't there. I I		• •		
4 In the seven areas that are almost always discussed in detail by the commission. It's all in play. 7 MR. WATSON: Pardon me? 8 MS. PRICE: It would be nice to compare the two. Thank you. 9 the two. Thank you. 10 MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. 11 indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. 12 The sentence I read to you is the sentence I resolution. I mean the classification S-1. 13 that you will find in the document I sent you. 14 So that whole issue is the other thing because the main circus tent is obtaining the resolution. I mean the classification S-1. 16 resolution. I mean the classification S-1. 17 Because without that, without obtaining I classification as S-1, the subdivision of I alkeside could not get underway. It's the sine qua non, as they say. 18 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got I is S-1 classification, but it did so only 3 based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I will show you. 19 Talbot County gave the Lakeside property a sewer service priority classification of S-2, which means that the land is expected to be Page: 4 developed in three to five years. 11 In presenting Resolution 281, Talbot County and to the I main play and the Planning Commission to so now let me describe what I main play and the Planning Commission as you'll see here when I developed in three to five years. 12 In presenting Resolution 281, not only were the implications obvious that county a sever service priority classification as I will show you. 11 The senting Commission must have formally to legally reclassify a property, the county I planning Commission must have formally the determined that the reclassification is 11 or read from the transcripts. Almost two decades ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades		• • •		
the two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: Pardon me? MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. The sentence I read to you is the sentence to compare that you will find in the document I sent you. So that whole issue is the other thing because the main circus tent is obtaining the resolution. I mean the classification S-1. Because without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of the Council under tendence as the sentence of the Council under the subdivision of the				•
6 the two. Thank you. 7 MR. WATSON: Pardon me? 8 MS. PRICE: It would be nice to compare 9 the two. Thank you. 10 MR. WATSON: That's the entire point 11 indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. 12 The sentence I read to you is the sentence 13 that you will find in the document I sent you. 14 So that whole issue is the other thing 15 because the main circus tent is obtaining the 16 resolution. I mean the classification S-1. 17 Because without that, without obtaining 18 classification as S-1, the subdivision of 19 Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine 20 qua non, as they say. 21 While Rocks and the town did get 2 its S-1 classification, but it did so only 3 based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I will show you. 5 To see why these falschoodss matter, one 6 must know these key points, which everyone on 6 the Council understands but not necessarily 8 everybody else. For the Talbot County Council 9 Planning Commission must have formally 10 Planning Commission must have formally 11 determined that the reclassification is 2 consistent with the county's Comprehensive 16 Plan. The Planning Commission must take into 17 And second item is before the Planning 20 where the public can address the Planning 20 where				·
MR. WATSON: Pardon me? MS. PRICE: It would be nice to compare the two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. The sentence I read to you is the sentence that you will find in the document I sent you. MR. Watson: The sentence I read to you is the sentence that you will find in the document I sent you. MR. Watson: The sentence I read to you is the sentence that you will find in the document I sent you. MR. Watson: The sentence I read to you is the sentence that you will find in the document I sent you. MR. Watson: The sentence I read to you is the sentence that you will find in the document I sent you. MR. Watson: The sentence I read to you is the sentence that you will sent to the Planning to Commissioners, to the public, and to you on the Council under the guise of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of Talbot County, and the Planning Commission too, were denied because without that, without obtaining the resolution. I mean the classification S-1. In the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of leaves without that, without obtaining the decision-making. So now let me describe what I'm talking about, those falsehoods. The first falsehood was that in 2002, Talbot County gave the Lakeside property a sewer service prior		•		
MS. PRICE: It would be nice to compare the two. Thank you. MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. The sentence I read to you is the sentence that you will find in the document I sent you. So that whole issue is the other thing because the main circus tent is obtaining the resolution. I mean the classification S-1. Because without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine while Rocks and the town did get MS. PRICE: It would be nice to compare graphs and the Planning Commission too, were denied to because the main circus tent is obtaining the resolution. I mean the classification S-1. The first falschood was that in 2002, Talbot County gave the Lakeside property a sewer service priority classification of S-2, which means that the land is expected to be Page 33 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got it is S-1 classification, but it did so only shased on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I will show you. To see why these falsehoods matter, one must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily everybody else. For the Talbot County Council obleance planning Commission, as you'll see, her ditize the guise of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of false p		·		<u>.</u> •
9 the two. Thank you. 10 MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. 11 The sentence I read to you is the sentence 13 that you will find in the document I sent you. 13 that whole issue is the other thing 15 because the main circus tent is obtaining the 16 resolution. I mean the classification S-1. 17 Because without that, without obtaining 18 classification as S-1, the subdivision of 19 Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine 20 qua non, as they say. 21 While Rocks and the town did get 21 While Rocks and the town did get 22 which means that the land is expected to be 22 which means that the land is expected to be 24 will show you. 22 to lassification, but it did so only 3 based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as 1 will show you. 3 to see why these falsehoods matter, one 6 must know these key points, which everyone on 7 the Council understands but not necessarily 8 everybody else. For the Talbot County Council 29 to legally reclassify a property, the county 10 Planning Commission must have formally 11 determined that the reclassification is 21 consistent with the county's Comprehensive 13 Plan. The Planning Commission must take into 14 account seven discreet issues as defined by law that really comprise the whole Comprehensive 16 Plan. And it's serious business. 17 Planning Commission must hold a public hearing 20 where the public can address the Planning 20 where the public can address the Planning 20 where the public can address the Planning 20 where the public and to you on the Council under the guise of false pretenses. As you will see, the citizens of Talbot County. 12 and the Planning Commission too, were denied honest, untainted framework for decision-making. So now let me describe what 15 honest, untainted framework for decision-making. So now let me describe what 16 honest, untainted framework for decision-making. So now let me describe what 17 I'm talking about, those falsehoods. 18 The first falsehood was that in 2002, 18 developed in three to five versus				·
MR. WATSON: That's the entire point indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. The sentence I read to you is the sentence that you will find in the document I sent you. So that whole issue is the other thing to because the main circus tent is obtaining the resolution. I mean the classification S-1. If because without that, without obtaining the classification as S-1, the subdivision of lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine quan non, as they say. While Rocks and the town did get Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got will seed on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I will show you. To see why these falsehoods matter, one must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily everybody else. For the Talbot County Council of Legally reclassify a property, the county lot learning learning late consistent with the county's Comprehensive late account seven discreet issues as defined by law that really comprise the whole Comprehensive late and a late a pace of this subdivision, lot at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision, late a scale and at a pace of this subdivision, late a scale and at a pace of this subdivision, late as a scale and at a pace of this subdivision, late as a scale and at a pace of this subdivision, late as a scale and at a pace of this subdivision, late as a scale and at a pace of this subdivision, late as a scale and at a pace of this subdivision, late as a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,		•		·
11 indeed. And I apologize for that oversight. 12 The sentence I read to you is the sentence 13 that you will find in the document I sent you. 14 So that whole issue is the other thing 15 because the main circus tent is obtaining the 16 resolution. I mean the classification S-1. 17 Because without that, without obtaining 18 classification as S-I, the subdivision of 19 Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine 20 qua non, as they say. 21 While Rocks and the town did get 22 tits S-1 classification, but it did so only 23 based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I 4 will show you. 25 To see why these falsehoods matter, one 26 must know these key points, which everyone on 27 the Council understands but not necessarily 28 everybody else. For the Talbot County Council 29 to legally reclassify a property, the county 20 planning Commission must have formally 21 determined that the reclassification is 21 Plan. The Planning Commission must take into 28 account seven discreet issues as defined by law 29 that really comprise the whole Comprehensive 20 Planning Commission must have that determination, 20 where the public can address the Planning 20 can a dat a pace of this subdivision,	9	•	9	•
The sentence I read to you is the sentence I that you will find in the document I sent you. The son that you will find in the document I sent you. So that whole issue is the other thing I so that what I so that I so t	10		10	•
that you will find in the document I sent you. So that whole issue is the other thing because the main circus tent is obtaining the resolution. I mean the classification S-1. Because without that, without obtaining Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine qua non, as they say. While Rocks and the town did get Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got will show you. Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got will show you. To see why these falsehoods matter, one must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily to legally reclassify a property, the county Planning Commission must have formally determined that the reclassification is plan. The Planning Commission must take into Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning and the Planning Commission too, were denied honest, untainted framework for decision-making. So now let me describe what honest, untainted framework for decision-making. So now let me describe what honest, untainted framework for decision-making. So now let me describe what realking about, those falsehoods. The first falsehood as that in 2002, That falbot County assert falsehoods. The first falsehood was that in 2002, That false count, those falsehoods. The first falsehood was that in 2002, That false county assert exist falsehoods. The first falsehood was that in 2002, That falsehood was that in 2002, The first falsehoods was that in 2002, That falsehood was that in 2002, That falsehoods and in 2002, That falsehood was that in 2002, That falsehood was that in 2002, That falsehoods and in 2002, That falsehoods an	11	indeed. And I apologize for that oversight.	11	Commissioners, to the public, and to you on the
14 So that whole issue is the other thing 15 because the main circus tent is obtaining the 16 resolution. I mean the classification S-1. 17 Because without that, without obtaining 18 classification as S-1, the subdivision of 19 Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine 20 qua non, as they say. 21 While Rocks and the town did get 22 tist S-1 classification, but it did so only 23 based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I 24 will show you. 25 To see why these falsehoods matter, one 26 must know these key points, which everyone on 27 the Council understands but not necessarily 28 everybody else. For the Talbot County Council 29 to legally reclassify a property, the county 20 to legally reclassify a property, the county 21 determined that the reclassification is 22 consistent with the county's Comprehensive 23 Plan. The Planning Commission must have formally 24 that really comprise the whole Comprehensive 25 that really comprise the whole Comprehensive 26 the And second item is before the Planning 27 where the public can address the Planning 28 where the public can address the Planning 29 where the public can address the Planning 20 and the Planning Commission too, untended thonest, untainted framework for 21 decision-making. So now let me describe what 21 I'm talking about, those falsehoods. 16 The talking about, those falsehoods. 17 Talbot County gave the Lakeside property a sewer service priority classification to him the decision-making. 20 The first falsehoods. 21 Talbot County at the lake tine property and the property and the property had officially said that by 22 dot or so, Rocks should be entitled to develope the property had never been cl	12	The sentence I read to you is the sentence	12	Council under the guise of false pretenses. As
because the main circus tent is obtaining the resolution. I mean the classification S-1. Because without that, without obtaining lacture of the Council understands but not necessarily everybody else. For the Talbot County Council Delaming Commission must have formally that the really comprise the whole Comprehensive lacture of the County sever the understands but not necessarily hand officially said that the really comprise the whole Comprehensive lacture in the County sever the public can address the Planning Commission must take the planning Commission must have formed the county is one of the county never said the property and the task and the certain property and the county gave the Lakeside property and sewer service priority classification of S-2, which means that the land is expected to be page: Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got its S-1 classification, but it did so only a sewer service priority classification of S-2, which means that the land is expected to be page: Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got its S-1 classification, but it did so only a sewer service priority classification of S-2, which means that the land is expected to be page: Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got its S-1 classification, but it did so only a sewer service priority classification of S-2, which means that the land is expected to be developed in three to five years. In presenting Resolution 281, not only were the implications obvious, but Rocks' attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when a severyone on the Council understands but not necessarily ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop the planning Commission must take into it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should	13	that you will find in the document I sent you.	13	you will see, the citizens of Talbot County,
16 resolution. I mean the classification S-1. 17 Because without that, without obtaining 18 classification as S-1, the subdivision of 19 Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine 20 qua non, as they say. 21 While Rocks and the town did get 20 this S-1 classification, but it did so only 3 based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I 4 will show you. 5 To see why these falsehoods matter, one 6 must know these key points, which everyone on 7 the Council understands but not necessarily 9 to legally reclassify a property, the county 10 Planning Commission must have formally 11 determined that the reclassification is 12 consistent with the county's Comprehensive 13 Plan. The Planning Commission must take into 14 account seven discreet issues as defined by law 15 And second item is before the Planning 16 decision-making. So now let me describe what 17 I'm talking about, those falsehoods. 18 The first falsehood was that in 2002, 18 Talbot County gave the Lakeside property a 20 sewer service priority classification of S-2, 21 which means that the land is expected to be 20 developed in three to five years. 21 In presenting Resolution 281, not only 22 were the implications obvious, but Rocks' 23 attorney said it directly to you and to the 24 attorney said it directly to you and to the 25 Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I 26 read from the transcripts. Almost two decades 27 ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades 28 ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades 29 ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop 21 Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet 22 swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but 23 it was not true. 24 The property had never been classification at all. 25 In presenting Resolution 281, not only 26 at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	14	So that whole issue is the other thing	14	and the Planning Commission too, were denied an
Because without that, without obtaining 17 I'm talking about, those falsehoods. 18 The first falsehood was that in 2002, 19 Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine 20 qua non, as they say. 21 While Rocks and the town did get Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got 1 tits S-1 classification, but it did so only 3 based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I 4 will show you. 5 To see why these falsehoods matter, one 6 must know these key points, which everyone on 7 the Council understands but not necessarily 9 to legally reclassify a property, the county 10 Planning Commission must have formally 11 determined that the reclassification is 12 consistent with the county's Comprehensive 13 Plan. The Planning Commission must take into 14 account seven discreet issues as defined by law 15 And second item is before the Planning 16 Commission can make that determination, 17 Planning Commission must hold a public hearing 20 Talbot County gave the Lakeside property a 20 sewer service priority classification of S-2, which means that the land is expected to be Page: 4 developed in three to five years. 1 developed in three to five years. 1 In presenting Resolution 281, not only were the implications obvious, but Rocks' attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when be read from the transcripts. Almost two decades ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop 10 Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet 11 of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell 12 swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but 13 it was not true. 14 The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	15	because the main circus tent is obtaining the	15	honest, untainted framework for
Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine qua non, as they say. While Rocks and the town did get Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got its S-1 classification, but it did so only based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I will show you. To see why these falsehoods matter, one must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily everybody else. For the Talbot County Council planning Commission must have formally consistent with the county's Comprehensive Han. The Planning Commission must take into account seven discreet issues as defined by law that really comprise the whole Comprehensive Page 35 In presenting Resolution 281, not only were the implications obvious, but Rocks' attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I go, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	16	resolution. I mean the classification S-1.	16	decision-making. So now let me describe what
Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine qua non, as they say. 20 sewer service priority classification of S-2, while Rocks and the town did get Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got its S-1 classification, but it did so only based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I will show you. To see why these falsehoods matter, one must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily everybody else. For the Talbot County Council planning Commission must have formally classification is consistent with the county's Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission must take into Plan. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Page 35 which means that the land is expected to be everyloged in three to five years. In presenting Resolution 281, not only were the implications obvious, but Rocks' attorney said it directly to you and to the planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the read from the transcripts. Almost two decades ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	17	Because without that, without obtaining	17	I'm talking about, those falsehoods.
qua non, as they say. 20 sewer service priority classification of S-2, 21 While Rocks and the town did get Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got its S-1 classification, but it did so only based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I will show you. To see why these falsehoods matter, one must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily everybody else. For the Talbot County Council planning Commission must have formally consistent with the county's Comprehensive plan. The Planning Commission must take into that really comprise the whole Comprehensive for Planning Commission must have fore the Planning formits as it wanted to all in one fell that really comprise the whole Comprehensive formits as it was not true. 20 sewer service priority classification of S-2, which means that the land is expected to be developed in three to five years. In presenting Resolution 281, not only were the implications obvious, but Rocks' attorney said it directly to you and to the planning Commission, as you'll see here when I ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not where the public can address the Planning at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	18	classification as S-1, the subdivision of	18	The first falsehood was that in 2002,
Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got its S-1 classification, but it did so only based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I will show you. To see why these falsehoods matter, one must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily long to legally reclassify a property, the county Planning Commission must have formally consistent with the county's Comprehensive Han. The Planning Commission must take into And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, And second item is before the Planning Commission must hold a public hearing Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted to be Page 35 developed in three to five years. I hrepsonting Resolution 281, not only were the implications obvious, but Rocks' attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission must two decades ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be d	19	Lakeside could not get underway. It's the sine	19	Talbot County gave the Lakeside property a
Page 35 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got its S-1 classification, but it did so only based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I will show you. To see why these falsehoods matter, one must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily levelyody else. For the Talbot County Council levelyody else. For the Talbot County Panning Commission must have formally levelyody else. For the Talbot County and officially said that by levelyody else. For the Talbot County and to the levelyody else. For the Talbot County never levely else here when I leve	20	qua non, as they say.	20	sewer service priority classification of S-2,
1 Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got 2 its S-1 classification, but it did so only 3 based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I 4 will show you. 5 To see why these falsehoods matter, one 6 must know these key points, which everyone on 7 the Council understands but not necessarily 8 everybody else. For the Talbot County Council 9 to legally reclassify a property, the county 10 Planning Commission must have formally 11 determined that the reclassification is 12 consistent with the county's Comprehensive 13 Plan. The Planning Commission must take into 14 account seven discreet issues as defined by law 15 that really comprise the whole Comprehensive 16 Plan. And it's serious business. 17 And second item is before the Planning 18 Commission can make that determination, 19 Planning Commission must hold a public hearing 20 were the implications obvious, but Rocks' 2 In presenting Resolution 281, not only 3 were the implications obvious, but Rocks' 4 attorney said it directly to you and to the 9 Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I read from the transcripts. Almost two decades ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. 14 The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. 15 Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	21	While Rocks and the town did get	21	which means that the land is expected to be
2 its S-1 classification, but it did so only 3 based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I 4 will show you. 5 To see why these falsehoods matter, one 6 must know these key points, which everyone on 7 the Council understands but not necessarily 8 everybody else. For the Talbot County Council 9 to legally reclassify a property, the county 10 Planning Commission must have formally 11 determined that the reclassification is 12 consistent with the county's Comprehensive 13 Plan. The Planning Commission must take into 14 account seven discreet issues as defined by law 15 that really comprise the whole Comprehensive 16 Plan. And it's serious business. 17 And second item is before the Planning 18 Commission can make that determination, 19 Planning Commission must hold a public hearing 20 where the implications 281, not only were the implications obvious, but Rocks' attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission able notes. 10 Planning Commission almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. 14 The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. 17 Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,		Page 35		Page 37
based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I were the implications obvious, but Rocks' attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I planning Commission ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the implications obvious, but Rocks' attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I attorney said it directly to you and to the Planning Commission almost two decades ago, this was the assertion, a	1	Resolution 281 adopted, of course, and it got	1	developed in three to five years.
4 will show you. 5 To see why these falsehoods matter, one 6 must know these key points, which everyone on 7 the Council understands but not necessarily 8 everybody else. For the Talbot County Council 9 to legally reclassify a property, the county 10 Planning Commission must have formally 11 determined that the reclassification is 12 consistent with the county's Comprehensive 13 Plan. The Planning Commission must take into 14 account seven discreet issues as defined by law 15 that really comprise the whole Comprehensive 16 Plan. And it's serious business. 17 And second item is before the Planning 18 Commission can make that determination, 19 Planning Commission must hold a public hearing 20 where the public can address the Planning 20 at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	2	its S-1 classification, but it did so only	2	In presenting Resolution 281, not only
To see why these falsehoods matter, one must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily everybody else. For the Talbot County Council Planning Commission must thave formally letermined that the reclassification is Plan. The Planning Commission must take into Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning Planning Commission, as you'll see here when it read from the transcripts. Almost two decades ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	3	based on falsehood and misrepresentation, as I	3	were the implications obvious, but Rocks'
must know these key points, which everyone on the Council understands but not necessarily everybody else. For the Talbot County Council planning Commission must have formally determined that the reclassification is plan. The Planning Commission must take into account seven discreet issues as defined by law that really comprise the whole Comprehensive plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning read from the transcripts. Almost two decades ago, this was the assertion, allows ago, this was not true. 11 of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell 12 swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. 13 it was not true. 14 The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never b	4	will show you.	4	attorney said it directly to you and to the
the Council understands but not necessarily everybody else. For the Talbot County Council to legally reclassify a property, the county Planning Commission must have formally consistent with the county's Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission must take into that really comprise the whole Comprehensive Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning reverybody else. For the Talbot County Council ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	5	To see why these falsehoods matter, one	5	Planning Commission, as you'll see here when I
everybody else. For the Talbot County Council by to legally reclassify a property, the county Planning Commission must have formally determined that the reclassification is longitude that the reclassification is Plan. The Planning Commission must take into longitude that really comprise the whole Comprehensive Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning ago, Talbot County had officially said that by 2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	6	must know these key points, which everyone on	6	read from the transcripts. Almost two decades
to legally reclassify a property, the county Planning Commission must have formally Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet consistent with the county's Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission must take into account seven discreet issues as defined by law that really comprise the whole Comprehensive Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	7	the Council understands but not necessarily	7	ago, this was the assertion, almost two decades
Planning Commission must have formally 10 Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet 11 determined that the reclassification is 11 of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell 12 consistent with the county's Comprehensive 13 Plan. The Planning Commission must take into 14 account seven discreet issues as defined by law 15 that really comprise the whole Comprehensive 16 Plan. And it's serious business. 17 And second item is before the Planning 18 Commission can make that determination, 19 Planning Commission must hold a public hearing 20 where the public can address the Planning 10 Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet 11 of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell 12 swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but 13 it was not true. 14 The property had never been classified S-2 15 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never 16 been given any priority classification at all. 17 Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification 18 implied, Talbot County never said the property 19 should be developed at all, and certainly not 20 at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	8	everybody else. For the Talbot County Council	8	ago, Talbot County had officially said that by
determined that the reclassification is consistent with the county's Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission must take into account seven discreet issues as defined by law that really comprise the whole Comprehensive Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	9	to legally reclassify a property, the county	9	2007 or so, Rocks should be entitled to develop
consistent with the county's Comprehensive Plan. The Planning Commission must take into account seven discreet issues as defined by law that really comprise the whole Comprehensive Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning consistent with the county's Comprehensive swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	10	Planning Commission must have formally	10	Lakeside, all 2,501 homes with a million feet
Plan. The Planning Commission must take into account seven discreet issues as defined by law that really comprise the whole Comprehensive Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning it was not true. The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	11	determined that the reclassification is	11	of retail just as it wanted to all in one fell
account seven discreet issues as defined by law that really comprise the whole Comprehensive Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning The property had never been classified S-2 in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	12	consistent with the county's Comprehensive	12	swoop. That's what we were led to believe, but
that really comprise the whole Comprehensive Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	13	Plan. The Planning Commission must take into	13	it was not true.
Plan. And it's serious business. And second item is before the Planning Commission can make that determination, Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning 16 been given any priority classification at all. Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	14	account seven discreet issues as defined by law	14	The property had never been classified S-2
And second item is before the Planning 17 Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification 18 Commission can make that determination, 19 Planning Commission must hold a public hearing 20 where the public can address the Planning 20 at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	15	that really comprise the whole Comprehensive	15	in 2002 or at any time. In fact, it had never
Commission can make that determination, 18 implied, Talbot County never said the property should be developed at all, and certainly not 20 where the public can address the Planning 20 at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	16	Plan. And it's serious business.	16	been given any priority classification at all.
Planning Commission must hold a public hearing where the public can address the Planning 20 at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	17	And second item is before the Planning	17	Exactly contrary to what S-2 classification
20 where the public can address the Planning 20 at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,	18	Commission can make that determination,	18	implied, Talbot County never said the property
	19	Planning Commission must hold a public hearing	19	should be developed at all, and certainly not
	20	where the public can address the Planning	20	at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,
21 Commission. And the public's comments are 21 notwithstanding that Trappe and Rocks were all	21	Commission. And the public's comments are	21	notwithstanding that Trappe and Rocks were all
	20	where the public can address the Planning	20	should be developed at all, and certainly not at a scale and at a pace of this subdivision,

	•		
	Page 38		Page 40
1	for it.	1	falsehood was emphasized again and again in the
2	Evidence of this, indeed proof, will be	2	2020 review process, that Lakeside was S-2 and
3	presented shortly.	3	had always been programmed for development in
4	But this S-2 falsehood, and I call it the	4	three to five years. And it shows how
5	S-2 falsehood, that almost 20 years ago Talbot	5	Resolution 281 was framed and corrupted in that
6	County had formally agreed that Lakeside should	6	process.
7	be developed in three to five years was front	7	Everybody should recall that the complete
8	and center in 2020 to the Council, to the	8	transcripts of all of these meetings, the
9	Planning Commission, and to the public.	9	section pertaining to, everything pertaining to
10	When Resolution 281 was introduced the	10	Lakeside are in the packet that I sent you. So
11	very first time, Mr. Pack, of course, asked	11	this is not if you anybody wants to
12	Ms. Moran to read the title of the resolution.	12	double check or see the context, it's all there
13	And the falsehood was right there instantly.	13	for you.
14	The title to Resolution 281 includes these	14	Let's begin. Mr. Showalter, on the first
15	words: To reclassify and remap the Lakeside	15	night, he represents Rocks Development.
16	property from S-2, areas where sanitary	16	Mr. Showalter on the first night that
17	improvements are programmed for progress within	17	Resolution 281 was discussed substantively, led
18	three to five years, to S-1. And those words	18	off with the S-2 falsehood. And it framed the
19	are included in the text also.	19	whole review from that night
20	What could be more clear? If Lakeside was	20	MS. PRICE: Dan, which meeting? Just give
21	classified for development in three to five	21	us the date of the meeting that you're reading
	Page 39		Page 41
1	years, and it's been around essentially since	1	from.
2	the turn of the millennium, then, my God,	2	MR. WATSON: This was the May 20th
3	obviously it's time to get this thing going.	3	meeting, May 20, 2020.
4	That falsehood that the property was	4	And all these quotes can be matched up,
5	classified for the development in three to five	5	not instantly. I didn't organize it that way,
6	years was not new. In fact, that was a big	6	but they can be matched up. And I'm around to
7	part of the problem. That untruth had been	7	do that for you if there's any confusion.
8	around for years and years, at least since	8	So Mr. Showalter left off, led off with
9	2004. And it had been repeated and repeated so	9	the S-2 falsehood, and it framed the whole
10	many times in so many contexts by so many	10	review from that moment until August 11th when
11	people that understandably the people not in	11	it was adopted. This is what he said to you.
12	the know were easily duped, including you on	12	The current county comprehensive water and
13	the Council and the Planning Commissioners and	13	sewer plan most recently adopted with respect
14	all of the public.	14	to this project in 2002 includes the entirety
15	But the fact that the falsehood is old,	15	of this project as S-2, W-2 area.
16	it's been around forever and has been repeated	16	References to W-2 is the water service.
17	for years, does not make it somehow true. Of	17	I'm going to skip over W-2. Usually it's the
18	course not.	18	same thing. It's always S-2, W-2.
19	I now want to read you quotes from the	19	The current county comprehensive water and
20	transcripts of Council meetings and Planning	20	sewer plan most recently adopted with respect
21	Commission meetings that show how this	21	to this project in 2002 includes the entirety
41			

	Page 42		Page 44
1	of this project as S-2, which indicates that	1	of time, since roughly about 2008 to today, was
2	water and sewer infrastructure was anticipated	2	I guess the time that it took that the current
3	to be extended to serve this development within	3	classification of the county in the county
4	three to five years of adoption of that plan.	4	that was S-2, which is future planning within
5	So in 2005 to 2007 time frame, we're now	5	three to five years, they felt like it's past
6	almost 16 years beyond that, and the first pipe	6	12 years and now it's classified S-1.
7	has not been put into the ground.	7	Mr. Clarke was reporting to you as a fact
8	Later that was the very first beginning	8	that MDE not only knew the property had been
9	of the first substantive discussion. Later,	9	S-2 for 18 years, which it was not, but for
10	Mr. Showalter explained the so-called	10	their own part MDE determined that the passage
11	concession Rocks was willing to offer.	11	of time had already somehow transformed
12	Ms. Price, I was mistaken. That was the,	12	Lakeside to S-1 status, a transubstantiation
13	announcement of the concession, that was the	13	idea of some sort. The same idea was repeated
14	February 11th, first meeting in front of the	14	more than once to you and to the Planning
15	Council, not the Planning Commission. These	15	Commissioners, too.
16	are from the Council meetings.	16	You will hear evidence that the falsehoods
17	Later, Mr. Showalter explained a so-called	17	that the property was S-2 was accepted and
18	concession Rocks was willing to offer just to	18	believed by all commissioners and Council
19	get things moving. He'd split Lakeside into	19	persons, and the report that MDE was indeed
20	two phases so the county would only have to	20	interpreting Lakeside already to be classified
21	designate the northern portion as S-1. Rocks	21	S-1 and eligible for immediate development was
	Page 43		Page 45
1	would agree to leave the southern part as S-2.	1	also accepted. How could it be otherwise since
2	But of course, that was false because none of	2	MDE issued the permits, and yet the County
3	Lakeside had ever been S-2. That southern	3	Council members knew the county had never
4	portion, in fact, was unprogrammed. But this	4	classified Lakeside as S-1, even if it had been
5	is what Mr. Showalter said.	5	S-2.
6	There's an amendment that would move a	6	At least Mr. Lesher was skeptical of MDE's
7	portion, essentially the northern half of the	7	right to do that, what Mr. Clarke said, as his
8	project, from S-2 and would retain S-2	8	comment to Mr. Clarke was this: Mr. Lesher:
9	designation of the southern half. From the	9	That's kind of navy to me. Is there any
	congruence of the southern man, 110m me	_	That's kind of new to me. Is there any
10	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent	10	provision in the law where this change of
10 11			
	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent	10	provision in the law where this change of
11	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent with your current plan because we're more than	10 11	provision in the law where this change of status for this change of status without
11 12	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent with your current plan because we're more than 15 years beyond the time frame when	10 11 12	provision in the law where this change of status for this change of status without legislative action?
11 12 13	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent with your current plan because we're more than 15 years beyond the time frame when infrastructure was proposed to be connected.	10 11 12 13	provision in the law where this change of status for this change of status without legislative action? And Mr. Lesher was the only one on the
11 12 13 14	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent with your current plan because we're more than 15 years beyond the time frame when infrastructure was proposed to be connected. Remember that reference to MDE as that plays	10 11 12 13 14	provision in the law where this change of status for this change of status without legislative action? And Mr. Lesher was the only one on the Council to vote against Resolution 281.
11 12 13 14 15	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent with your current plan because we're more than 15 years beyond the time frame when infrastructure was proposed to be connected. Remember that reference to MDE as that plays directly into the second falsehood and shows	10 11 12 13 14 15	provision in the law where this change of status for this change of status without legislative action? And Mr. Lesher was the only one on the Council to vote against Resolution 281. Emphasizing the solidly of the falsehood,
11 12 13 14 15 16	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent with your current plan because we're more than 15 years beyond the time frame when infrastructure was proposed to be connected. Remember that reference to MDE as that plays directly into the second falsehood and shows how deeply these things were intertwined.	10 11 12 13 14 15 16	provision in the law where this change of status for this change of status without legislative action? And Mr. Lesher was the only one on the Council to vote against Resolution 281. Emphasizing the solidly of the falsehood, Mr. Clarke explained Rocks' concession, as it
11 12 13 14 15 16 17	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent with your current plan because we're more than 15 years beyond the time frame when infrastructure was proposed to be connected. Remember that reference to MDE as that plays directly into the second falsehood and shows how deeply these things were intertwined. In the next quote, the county engineer did	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	provision in the law where this change of status for this change of status without legislative action? And Mr. Lesher was the only one on the Council to vote against Resolution 281. Emphasizing the solidly of the falsehood, Mr. Clarke explained Rocks' concession, as it was perceived, meant that the southern half of
11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	MDE's perspective, the project is consistent with your current plan because we're more than 15 years beyond the time frame when infrastructure was proposed to be connected. Remember that reference to MDE as that plays directly into the second falsehood and shows how deeply these things were intertwined. In the next quote, the county engineer did not create but just reinforced the falsehood	10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	provision in the law where this change of status for this change of status without legislative action? And Mr. Lesher was the only one on the Council to vote against Resolution 281. Emphasizing the solidly of the falsehood, Mr. Clarke explained Rocks' concession, as it was perceived, meant that the southern half of Lakeside would remain S-2, when, in fact, it

4 Now listen to this one. This is from the 5 July 21, 2020, public hearing in this room 6 before you. This is Mr. Showalter explaining 7 to you and to the staff and to the public why 8 Resolution 281 should be adopted. These were 9 his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with 10 respect to its maps, designated the entirety of 11 this project as S-2, which meant that it was 12 indeed to be served by public water and sewer 13 within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 14 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 21 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 8 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 to sought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 17 In this developer was the split zoning to a first part of the developed out, the 18 And then once it is developed out, the once it is developed out, the one read that gain. I'm 29 sorry. 1 I think that the agreement that came 20 discussions with the Town of Trapp 21 with the developer was to do the split it to allow the first part of that developer out, the other part can be more to allow the first part of that developer out, the other part can be more to allow the first part of that developer out, the other part can be more to allow the first part of the lot. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the be 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was a	at came Trappe and allow the			Page 46	
2 development in three to five years for water 3 service. 4 Now listen to this one. This is from the 5 July 21, 2020, public hearing in this room 6 before you. This is Mr. Showalter explaining 7 to you and to the staff and to the public why 8 Resolution 281 should be adopted. These were 9 his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with 10 respect to its maps, designated the entirety of 11 this project as S-2, which meant that it was 12 indeed to be served by public water and sewer 13 within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 14 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 22 determined to be consistent with the County's 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 8 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 13 adoption of Resolution 281. 14 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 17 meeting. It was not a public hearing. 18 not controlled. And repliced simply okay, 19 Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter, 10 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 10 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 11 meeting. It was not a public hearing. 12 not one vote, Mr. Pack had 13 novertheless, the developer's lawyer, 14 nor developer was the split and the developer was the split and that the developer to the dot. 15 Mr. Pack also acknowledged th	at came Trappe and allow the				
3 service. 4 Now listen to this one. This is from the 5 July 21, 2020, public hearing in this room 6 before you. This is Mr. Showalter explaining 7 to you and to the staff and to the public why 8 Resolution 281 should be adopted. These were 9 his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with 10 respect to its maps, designated the entirety of 11 this project as S-2, which meant that it was 12 indeed to be served by public water and sewer 13 within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 14 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 21 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. Thaf's the transubstantiation again. 8 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 13 adoption of Resolution 281. 14 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 16 Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter 17 Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter 18 Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, st. 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 22 determined to be consistent with the County's 23 determined to be consistent with the County's 24 determined to be consistent with the County's 25 determined to be consistent with the County's 26 determined to be consistent with the County's 27 determined to be consistent with the Town of	Trappe and allow the				
4 Now listen to this one. This is from the 5 July 21, 2020, public hearing in this room 6 before you. This is Mr. Showalter explaining 7 to you and to the staff and to the public why 8 Resolution 281 should be adopted. These were 9 his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with 10 respect to its maps, designated the entirety of 11 this project as S-2, which meant that it was 12 indeed to be served by public water and sewer 13 within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 14 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 21 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 8 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 afour to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 13 adoption of Resolution 281. 14 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready	allow the	_	2	•	
5 July 21, 2020, public hearing in this room 6 before you. This is Mr. Showalter explaining 7 to you and to the staff and to the public why 8 Resolution 281 should be adopted. These were 9 his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with 10 respect to its maps, designated the entirety of 11 this project as S-2, which meant that it was 12 indeed to be served by public water and sewer 13 within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 14 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 21 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falschood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 And then once it is developed out, the 7 part can be moved into S-2, the S-2 sid of 8 lot. Mr I need to read that again. I'm 9 sorry. I think that the agreement that came of discussions with the Town of Trapp with the developer was to do the split: 10 allow the first part of that developen 11 to allow the first part of that developen 12 to allow the first part of that developen 13 to allow the first part of that developen 14 to allow the first part of that developen 15 to allow the first part of that developen 16 developed out, the other part can be m 17 to the S-2 side of the lot. 18 Mr. Pack seemed to have bought th 19 that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 ago. 22 Mr. Pack also acknowledged the be 23 long-standing falschood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 24 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 25 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 26 of time to have automatically turned it into 27 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 28 At the		out of discussions with the Town of Trapp	3	service.	3
6 before you. This is Mr. Showalter explaining 7 to you and to the staff and to the public why 8 Resolution 281 should be adopted. These were 9 his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with 10 respect to its maps, designated the entirety of 11 this project as S-2, which meant that it was 12 indeed to be served by public water and sewer 13 within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 14 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's Page 47 1 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 8 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 15 his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with 16 form MDE's interprets the passage 16 of time to have automatically turned it into 17 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 18 At the County Council meeting on 19 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 13 adoption of Resolution 281. 14 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready	. C 1	the developer was the split zoning to allow	4	Now listen to this one. This is from the	4
7 to you and to the staff and to the public why 8 Resolution 281 should be adopted. These were 9 his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with 10 respect to its maps, designated the entirety of 11 this project as S-2, which meant that it was 12 indeed to be served by public water and sewer 13 within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 14 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 21 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 8 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 developed out, the other part can be m 15 to the S-2 side of the lot. 16 Mr. Pack seemed to have bought th 17 that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. 18 claimed MDE said. And seemingly co- 29 by the fact that MDE had issued permit 20 by the fact that MDE had issued permit 21 ago. 22 Mr. Pack also acknowledged the be 23 Rocks faux concession. But perhaps the just indicated confusion because Mr. Lothers promptly correct him that the provate of time to have automatically turned it into 29 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 20 afour to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 21 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 22 classification status. That is prior to the 23 adoption of Resolution 281. 24 Af first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 25 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 26 lothers part can be more to the late to allow the first part of t	s S-1.	first part of the development to stay as S-1	5	July 21, 2020, public hearing in this room	5
Resolution 281 should be adopted. These were his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with 10 respect to its maps, designated the entirety of 11 this project as S-2, which meant that it was 12 indeed to be served by public water and sewer 13 within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 14 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 21 maps. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 3 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 13 adoption of Resolution 281. 4 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 16 mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter and sewer 12 with that the agreement that came of discussions with the Town of Trapp with the two libration of discussions with the Town of discussions with the Town of discussions with the Town of discussions with t	other	And then once it is developed out, the other	6	before you. This is Mr. Showalter explaining	6
his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with respect to its maps, designated the entirety of this project as S-2, which meant that it was indeed to be served by public water and sewer within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 15 years beyond that is where we are today. Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And from MDE's perspective, consistency with the county comprehensive water and sewer plans looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond the time frame that was programmed by the county to be served for infrastructure. It's determined to be consistent with the County's Page 47 plans. So now, not only does he represent the long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he sagain reports that MDE interprets the passage of time to have automatically turned it into At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer long already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready Mr I need to read that again. I'm sorry. I think that the agreement that came of discussions with the Town of Trapp with the developer was to do the split it to allow the first part of that developm stay on the S-1 side. And then once it' developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought th that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. claimed MDE said. And seemingly colored that Lakeside was ago. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the be Rocks faux concession. But perhaps to just indicated confusion because Mr. I was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, whis itself, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, st corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalte	de of the	part can be moved into S-2, the S-2 side o	7	to you and to the staff and to the public why	7
this project as S-2, which meant that it was indeed to be served by public water and sewer within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 16 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 21 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 4 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 was not already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 16 Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter.		lot.	8	Resolution 281 should be adopted. These were	8
this project as S-2, which meant that it was indeed to be served by public water and sewer within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 16 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 17 to allow the first part of that developer was to do the split to allow the first part of that developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 22 by the fact that MDE had issued permit 23 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 24 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 25 of time to have automatically turned it into 27 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 28 At the County Council meeting on 29 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 21 adoption of Resolution 281. 29 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 21 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 21 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 21 first mith at the prior to the 21 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 21 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 21 first mith at the prior to the 21 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 21 first mith at the prior to the 22 first manner of the discussion of Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 21 first manner of that developer was to do the split: to allow the first part of that developer was to do the split: to allow the first part of that developer was to do the split: to allow the first part of that developer was to to the S-2 side of the lot. 3 five to the S-2 side of the lot. 3 five to the S-2 side of the lot. 3 five to the S-2 side of the lot. 3 five to the S-2 side of the lot. 3 five to the S-2 side of the lot. 4 five the S-2 side of the lot. 4 five th	m	Mr I need to read that again. I'm	9	his words: The plan adopted in 2002 with	9
indeed to be served by public water and sewer within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 15 years beyond that is where we are today. Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And from MDE's perspective, consistency with the county comprehensive water and sewer plans looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond the time frame that was programmed by the county to be served for infrastructure. It's determined to be consistent with the County's Page 47 plans. So now, not only does he represent the classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he deagain reports that MDE interprets the passage of time to have automatically turned it into At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready of discussions with the Town of Trapp with the developer was to do the split: to allow the first part of that developm with the developer was to do the split: to allow the first part of that developm with the developer was to do the split: to allow the first part of that developm stay on the S-1 side. And then once it' developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought th that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. classified MDE said. And seemingly or by the fact that MDE had issued permit to the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought th that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. claimed MDE said. And seemingly or by the fact that MDE had issued permit to the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the be Rocks faux concession. But perhaps to just indicated confusion because Mr. L was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, whin itself, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, st corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11t		sorry.	10	respect to its maps, designated the entirety of	10
within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 16 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 17 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 18 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 19 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 10 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 11 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 12 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 13 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 14 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 15 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 16 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 17 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 18 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 19 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 20 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 21 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 22 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 23 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 24 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the developer was to do the split it to allow the first part of that developer 24 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 25 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 26 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 27 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the 28 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the developed out, the other part can be mode to the S-2 side of the lot. 28 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. 29 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the County's and the Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. 20 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the County's and the Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. 20 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the County's and the Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. 20 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the County's and the Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. 21 Infrastructure hasn't been consistency with the County's and the Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. 22 Infrastructure hasn't	ne out	I think that the agreement that came ou	11	this project as S-2, which meant that it was	11
14 15 years beyond that is where we are today. 15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 21 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 8 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 13 along that is where we are today. 14 to allow the first part of that development is stay on the S-1 side. And then once it' developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 18 Mr. Pack seemed to have bought th to the S-2 side of the lot. 19 developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 10 developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 10 developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 10 developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 10 developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 10 developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 11 developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 11 developed out, the other S-2 side of the lot. 11 developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 12 developed out, the other S-2 side of the lot. 13 developed out, the other S-2 side of the lot. 14 developed out, the other S-2 side of the lot. 15 developed out, the other S-2 side of the lot. 16 developed out, the other S-2 side of the lot. 18 developed out, the observed by the fact tha	pe and also	of discussions with the Town of Trappe an	12	indeed to be served by public water and sewer	12
15 Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And 16 from MDE's perspective, consistency with the 17 county comprehensive water and sewer plans 18 looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond 19 the time frame that was programmed by the 20 county to be served for infrastructure. It's 21 determined to be consistent with the County's 22 determined to be consistent with the County's 23 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 24 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 25 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 26 of time to have automatically turned it into 27 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 28 At the County Council meeting on 29 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 13 adoption of Resolution 281. 14 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 15 stay on the S-1 side. And then once it' developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 16 developed out, the other part can be m to the S-2 side of the lot. 17 to the S-2 side of the lot. 18 Mr. Pack seemed to have bought th that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE said. And seemingly co claimed MDE said. And seemingly co laimed MDE said. And seemingly colaimed MDE said. And seemingly c	zoning	with the developer was to do the split zoni	13	within the period of 2005 to 2008. Twelve to	13
from MDE's perspective, consistency with the county comprehensive water and sewer plans looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond the time frame that was programmed by the county to be served for infrastructure. It's determined to be consistent with the County's Page 47 plans. So now, not only does he represent the long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he sagain reports that MDE interprets the passage of time to have automatically turned it into S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond to to the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought th to the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the tot the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the tot the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the tot the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the tot the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the tot the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the tot the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the tot the S-2 side of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the tot the tata Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE had that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. And seemingly of the fact that MDE had that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE had that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE had that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE had that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE had that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE had that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE had that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE had that Lakeside was alrea	nent to	to allow the first part of that development	14	15 years beyond that is where we are today.	14
to the S-2 side of the lot. Is looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond the time frame that was programmed by the county to be served for infrastructure. It's determined to be consistent with the County's Page 47 plans. So now, not only does he represent the classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he determined to have automatically turned it into S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by that Lakeside of the lot. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE said. And seemingly concluded the best of the fact that MDE had issued permit ago. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the best of time to have automatically turned it into so there promptly correct him that the properties of time to have automatically turned it into At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by classification status. That is prior to the determined to be consistent with the County's that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Calaimed MDE said. And seemingly concluded was already S-1, as Mr. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the best other fact that MDE had issued permined. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the best of the bout said. And seemingly concluded was advanced claimed MDE had issued permined. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the best of the bout said. And seemingly concluded was acknowledged the best of the bout said. And seemingly collidary ago. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the best of the bout said. And seemingly collidary ago. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the best of the bout said. And seemingly collidary ago. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the best of the lot. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the best of the lot.	t's	stay on the S-1 side. And then once it's	15	Infrastructure hasn't been constructed. And	15
looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond the time frame that was programmed by the county to be served for infrastructure. It's determined to be consistent with the County's long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he sagain reports that MDE interprets the passage of time to have automatically turned it into S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by of adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond label that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. delamined to have bought th that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. delamined MDE said. And seemingly co localized by the fact that MDE said. And seemingly co by the fact that MDE had issued permit by the fact that MDE had issued permit hat Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. delamined MDE said. And seemingly co localized by the fact that MDE had issued permit by the fact that MDE had issued permit hat Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. delamined MDE said. And seemingly co localized by the fact that MDE had issued permit hat Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. delamined MDE said. And seemingly co localized by the fact that MDE had issued permit hat Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. delamined MDE said. And seemingly co localized by the fact that MDE had is undereday and said. And seemingly oble that Lakeside was not, and said. And seemingly oble that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the be Rocks faux concession. But perhaps to by the fact that MDE had is undereday ago. Mr. Pack also acknowledged the be was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, which itself, of course, is a falsehood because was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, which itself, of course, is a falsehood because was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, which itself, of course, is a falsehood because was not S-	noved over	developed out, the other part can be move	16	from MDE's perspective, consistency with the	16
the time frame that was programmed by the county to be served for infrastructure. It's determined to be consistent with the County's Page 47 plans. So now, not only does he represent the classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he classified S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter.		to the S-2 side of the lot.	17	county comprehensive water and sewer plans	17
county to be served for infrastructure. It's determined to be consistent with the County's Page 47 plans. So now, not only does he represent the classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he determined to have automatically turned it into At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was Rocks faux concession. But perhaps the just indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside of time to have automatically turned it into was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, which itself, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, st. corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. hearing MDE said. And seemingly or by the fact that MDE had late adoption of nestored instantly with a discussion of the late adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had late adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had late adoption of Resolution 281. At already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready late of the fact that MDE had late and make a late and make and make a late and make a late and make a late and	he idea	Mr. Pack seemed to have bought the id	18	looks at times. And so we're 12 years beyond	18
determined to be consistent with the County's Page 47 plans. So now, not only does he represent the long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was long-standing falsehood that Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the piust indicated confusion because Mr. Lakeside to be sampled in the	Showalter	that Lakeside was already S-1, as Mr. Sho	19	the time frame that was programmed by the	19
Page 47 1 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 8 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 13 adoption of Resolution 281. 14 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 1 ago. 2 Mr. Pack also acknowledged the be 3 Rocks faux concession. But perhaps the just indicated confusion because Mr. L 6 was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, which is tiself, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. 10 Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, st. corrected. And replied simply okay, 11 So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. 12 In ago. 13 Rocks faux concession. But perhaps the just indicated confusion because Mr. L 14 Just indicated confusion because Mr. L 15 others promptly correct him that the propertion interprets the passage of times to promptly correct him that the propertion interprets the passage of times in just indicated confusion because Mr. L 16 Just Indicated confusion because Mr. L 16 Just Indicated confusion because Mr. L 18 Just Indicated confusion because Mr. L 19 Just indicated confusion because Mr. L 10 Just Indicated confusion because Mr. L 11 Just Indicated confusion because Mr. L 12 Just Indicated confusion because Mr. L 13 Just Indicated confusion because Mr. L 14 Just Indicated confusion because Mr. L 15 Just Indicated Confusion Betause Mr. L 16 Just Indicated Confus	orroborated	claimed MDE said. And seemingly corrol	20	county to be served for infrastructure. It's	20
1 plans. 2 So now, not only does he represent the 3 long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was 4 classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he 5 again reports that MDE interprets the passage 6 of time to have automatically turned it into 7 S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. 8 At the County Council meeting on 9 August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by 10 a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly 11 with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer 12 classification status. That is prior to the 13 adop. 1 ago. 2 Mr. Pack also acknowledged the be 3 Rocks faux concession. But perhaps the just indicated confusion because Mr. Let others promptly correct him that the prior to the standard purported interprets the passage of time to have automatically turned it into 6 was not S-1 per MDE's purported interprets the passage of time to have automatically turned it into 7 but S-2. That happened instantly, which is itself, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. 10 Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, structure corrected. And replied simply okay, 11 So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. 12 It was not a public hearing. 13 nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, 14 Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter.	nits long	by the fact that MDE had issued permits lo	21	determined to be consistent with the County's	21
So now, not only does he represent the long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was long-standing falsehood that Lakeside to be S-1 and ready long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was long-standing falsehood that Lakeside to be S-1 and ready long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was long-standing falsehood that Lakeside to be served. long-standing falsehood because was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter long-standing falsehood because was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter long-standing falsehood because was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter long-standing falsehood because was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter long-standing falsehood because was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter long-standing falsehood because was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter long-standing falsehood because was not S-	Page 4			Page 47	
long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he gagin reports that MDE interprets the passage of time to have automatically turned it into S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by of time to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready A classification that MDE interprets the passage others promptly correct him that the prior to the just indicated confusion because Mr. L was not S-1 per MDE's purported interprets the passage others promptly correct him that the prior to S-2. That happened instantly, which is self, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, structure corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter		ago.	1	plans.	1
d classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he again reports that MDE interprets the passage of time to have automatically turned it into S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by of a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready again reports that MDE interprets the passage others promptly correct him that the prion othes was not S-1 per MDE's purported interpreted interpr	enefits of	Mr. Pack also acknowledged the benef	2	So now, not only does he represent the	2
again reports that MDE interprets the passage of time to have automatically turned it into S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready others promptly correct him that the prior was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, which is used in the series of the was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, which is tell, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, structure corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear Bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready others promptly correct him that the prior was not S-1 per MDE's purported inter but S-2. That happened instantly, which is tell, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, structure corrected. And replied simply okay, So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter	the remark	Rocks faux concession. But perhaps the r	3	long-standing falsehood that Lakeside was	3
of time to have automatically turned it into S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready and only Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter.	Lesher and	just indicated confusion because Mr. Lesh	4	classified S-2 in 2002 when it was not, he	4
S-1. That's the transubstantiation again. At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had but S-2. That happened instantly, which itself, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, structure corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. but S-2. That happened instantly, which itself, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, structure corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter.	oroperty	others promptly correct him that the prope	5	again reports that MDE interprets the passage	5
At the County Council meeting on August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready at itself, of course, is a falsehood because wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, st. corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter	erpretation	was not S-1 per MDE's purported interpre	6	of time to have automatically turned it into	6
August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready wasn't S-2. Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, structure corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear adoption of Resolution 281. So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter	ich	but S-2. That happened instantly, which	7	S-1. That's the transubstantiation again.	7
a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 10 Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, statistically corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter	se it	itself, of course, is a falsehood because it	8	At the County Council meeting on	8
with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 11 corrected. And replied simply okay, Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter		wasn't S-2.	9	August 11th when you adopted Resolution 281 by	9
classification status. That is prior to the adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready Mr. Showalter, do you want to be hear So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter	tanding	Mr. Pack seemed okay with that, stand	10	a four to one vote, Mr. Pack led off directly	10
adoption of Resolution 281. At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready So let's continue with August 11th meeting. It was not a public hearing. nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter		corrected. And replied simply okay,	11	with a discussion of Lakeside's existing sewer	11
14 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 17 meeting. It was not a public hearing. 18 nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, 19 Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter	ırd.	Mr. Showalter, do you want to be heard.	12	classification status. That is prior to the	12
14 At first, I for one thought Mr. Pack had 15 bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 16 already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 17 meeting. It was not a public hearing. 18 nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, 19 Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter		•	13	•	13
bought Mr. Showalter's claim that MDE had 15 nevertheless, the developer's lawyer, already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 16 Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter		meeting. It was not a public hearing. But	14	-	14
already declared Lakeside to be S-1 and ready 16 Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter				· ·	
	er, was	Mr. Showalter, and only Mr. Showalter, w			
11/ 101 millieurate development whether of not the 11/ invited up to speak. And these were n		invited up to speak. And these were his ve	17	for immediate development whether or not the	17
		first words. Just very briefly, I just want t			
		reiterate that what is proposed before you			
	•	today, what you're being asked to adopt as			
	te your plar	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	21	means the development can take place anywhere	21

	Tuloot County (
	Page 50		Page 52
1	which already reflects this project. Which	1	All the quotes I've read to you up to now
2	already reflects this project. There it is.	2	incidentally were just from the transcripts of
3	A few minutes later, you adopted	3	the three Council meetings.
4	Resolution 281 by a four to one vote,	4	The Planning Commission met four times to
5	relinquishing Talbot County's one and only	5	discuss Lakeside and Resolution 281. And those
6	opportunity to influence Lakeside in any	6	transcripts are full of similar and often more
7	fashion whatsoever. You gave Rocks and the	7	blatant repetitions of these things as if they
8	town the S-1 classification essential to	8	were fact when they were not. It shaped the
9	receiving final MDE permits to get underway.	9	Planning Commission's view of Lakeside, as is
10	Going forward, Rocks has only the Town of	10	also reflected in the transcripts.
11	Trappe and its 93 voters to contend with in	11	Given the time constraints, I'm not going
12	making the most out of its 865 acres, a billion	12	to recount I'm going to recount only a
13	dollar deal if ever I saw one.	13	couple of illustrative items.
14	There's a post script of these County	14	Predictably, Mr. Showalter's first words
15	Council transcripts that hints at just how	15	when asked to present at the commission's first
16	persuasive Mr. Showalter can be. This quote is	16	review of amended 281. And that was,
17	from not last year, but May 11th of this year,	17	Ms. Price, was the May 20, 2020, meeting.
18	and suggests that perhaps he permanently	18	Mr. Showalter's first words were these: The
19	convinced you, Mr. Pack, that his story was	19	current county comprehensive water and sewer
20	true. And that even without Resolution 281	20	plan designates the entirety of this property
21	being adopted, Lakeside had already been	21	for water and sewer service beginning 2005 to
	Page 51		Page 53
1	classified as S-1 by MDE and would be developed	1 1	2008.
2	anyway forthwith and that splitting the south	2	Later in that session, he said MDE, as
3	end into a different phase as S-2 had been a	3	Mr. Clarke indicated, has consistently through
4	concession.	4	the years, determined that this area from their
5	On May 11th of this year when my petition,	5	perspective is considered S-1. It's available
6	what we're talking about now, was first	6	for immediate infrastructure and construction.
7	introduced and the county refused to let me	7	Showing Mr. Showalter's persuasiveness to
8	speak, you were on the phone and said the	8	the benefit, as to the benefits of Rocks'
9	following, preemptively objecting to hearing me	9	concession to split Lakeside into two phases,
10	out. Removing 281 and opening up the entire	10	Commissioner Paul Spies said this: When this
11	parcel to S-1 development zoning is something	11	first came up to me, it was first proposed for
12	that I dread. I don't think that is	12	the whole entire project to go S-1. And I
13	advantageous to us.	13	think if they pushed hard enough or really
14	In other words, if Resolution 281 went	14	wanted to do that and got fed up with the
15	away, it would revert back the entire thing to	15	system, they would have the legal groundwork to
16	being S-1.	16	move the entire property to S-1. I think some
17	Referring to Resolution 281, you said 281	17	of the staff that they have given us some of
18	split it so that one-half will be developed S-1	18	the stuff they have given us since they first
19	and the back half as S-2, to go back to a	19	came in front of us has been compromises. So
20	full-blown I think 250 acres at S-1 is	20	they're getting something, we're getting
			something.
21	something I would not want to do.	21	something.

Literally moments before the commission's final vote on June the 10th, Mr. Spies captured the import of the S-2 falsehood perfectly when he said: We're voting on a time frame that in my mind has already been passed. So there you have it. That's what call the first falsehood. There was a second. The second falsehood that completely permeated and corrupted an honest consideration of Resolution 281 was that heack in the early 2000s, Lakeside had obtained valid legal sewer permits from MDE. And that thought — everyone's mind that they had thought — everyone's mind that they had thought — everyone's who had thought to even been approved by Talbot County way back then. And that's because you can't get MDE permits unless the county, not the town or the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning project by a formal finding of the Planning Tommission that it is consistent with the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County lake Appland in 200 permits fact, with the Secretary Grambles are serious charges I'm making. We all know that. About MDE issuing the permits in in 2005 and two construction or the soft interaction of Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Devoted it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in a 2005 and		Tailoot County (,
the import of the S-2 falsehood perfectly when he said: We're voting on a time frame that in my mind has already been passed. So there you have it. That's what I call the first falsehood. There was a second. The second falsehood that completely permeated and corrupted an honest consideration of Resolution 281 was that back in the early 2000s, Lakeside had obtained thought — everyone who had thought to even the project by a formal finding of the Planning course, and that it is consistent with the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning Commission that it is consistent with the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must alrady have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits in 2005. In Implication to the comp Plan. In fact, quilte the opposite. The falbot County Council members. So if Lakeside had permits back in the acounty not be two more than the planning course. But I'm sure we will. Obviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their permits from MDE, they did not go on to respect to the false had permit to a largely have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back in the all, had never found it consistent with the comp Plan. In fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the projected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediately rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland flap prerequisite to issue permits.		•		·
the import of the S-2 falsehood perfectly when he said: We're voting on a time frame that in my mind has already been passed. So there you have it. That's what I call the first falsehood. There was a second. The second falsehood that completely permeated and corrupted an honest consideration of Resolution 281 was that back in the early 2000s, Lakeside had obtained valid legal sewer permits from MDE. And that thought reverone's mind that they had thought reverone's mind that they had thought reverone who had thought to even the peer approved by Talbot County way back then. And that's because you can't get MDE permits unless the county, not the town or the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning Commission that it is consistent with the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 from start to finish and corrupted the whole process. Here is a (inaudible). These are serious charges Tm making. We all know that. About MDE issuing the permits illegally. And I'm sure you know that two weeks ago I sent all this information to Secretary Grumbles asking for a formal investigation and I also sent it to the Automey General's Office and to the EPA in Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of course. But I'm sure we will. Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of so that they had that by had they had they had long ago obtained their permits from MDE, they did not go on to Page 57 comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit investigation		•		
he said: We're voting on a time frame that in my mind has already been passed. So there you have it. That's what I call There was a second. The second falsehood that completely permeated and corrupted an honest consideration of Resolution 281 Irom start to finish and corrupted the whole process. Here is a (inaudible). These are serious charges I'm making. We all know that. About MDE issuing the permits lidegal sewer permits from MDE. And that a confirmed in everyone's mind that they had thought — everyone who had thought to even question it, that Lakeside must already have been approved by Talbot County way back then. And that's because you can't get MDE permits unless the county, not the town or the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning 20 project by a formal finding of the Planning 21 Commission that it is consistent with the 21 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the 21 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that all, had never found it consistent with the 21 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that all, had never found it consistent with the 21 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that all, had never found it consistent with the 21 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recied the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, 705 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?		• •		
5 my mind has already been passed. 5 So there you have it. That's what I call the first falsehood. 7 into consideration of Resolution 281 from start to finish and corrupted the whole process. 10 Here is a (inaudible). 10 Here is a (inaudible). 11 Here is a (inaudible). 12 Windows were permits from MDE. And that 12 into consideration of Resolution 281 was that 13 back in the early 2000s, Lakeside had obtained 14 thought — everyone who had thought to even 15 question it, that Lakeside must already have 16 been approved by Talbot County way back then. 16 Here is a consistent with the 18 Windows weeks ago I sat all this information to weeks ago I sat all this information to weeks ago I sat all this information to weeks ago I sent all this information to descript of all this information to descri	3	1	3	•
the first falsehood. There was a second. The second falsehood that completely permeated and corrupted an honest consideration of Resolution 281 from start to finish and corrupted the whole process. Here is a (inaudible). These are serious charges I'm making. We all know that. About MDE issuing the permits into consideration of Resolution 281 was that to finish and corrupted the whole process. Here is a (inaudible). These are serious charges I'm making. We all know that. About MDE issuing the permits illegally. And I'm sure you know that two weeks ago I sent all this information to weeks ago I sent all this information to secretary Grumbles asking for a formal investigation and I also sent it to the Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of course. But I'm sure we will. Add that's because you can't get MDE permits unless the county, not the town or the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning 20 said that they had long ago obtained their permits from MDE, they did not go on to Page 57 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 5 some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue 4 service and the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. So right after Ms. Moran read into the received the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, 105 has now since expired. So is		he said: We're voting on a time frame that in	4	public, not by the Planning Commission, and not
the first falschood. There was a second. The second falschood that completely permeated and corrupted an honest consideration of Resolution 281 was that because you can't get MDE permits unless the county, not the town or the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning 21 Commission that it is consistent with the 22 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here is a (inaudible). These are serious charges I'm making. We all know that. About MDE issuing the permits lite of finish and corrupted the whole process. Here is a (inaudible). These are serious charges I'm making. We all know that. About MDE issuing the permits lite of finish and corrupted the whole process. Here is a (inaudible). These are serious charges I'm making. We all know that. About MDE issuing the permits lite sall, know that. About MDE issuing the permits lite provide investigation and I also sent it to the Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of course. But I'm sure we will. Obviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their permits from MDE, they did not go on to Page 57 comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 29-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue 19 minutes and proved a 20 min	5	my mind has already been passed.	5	by you, Council members.
that completely permeated and corrupted an honest consideration of Resolution 281 was that back in the early 2000s, Lakeside had obtained thought — everyone who had thought to even thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had thought to even the form thought— everyone who had to the	6	So there you have it. That's what I call	6	Nevertheless, that falsehood was woven
that completely permeated and corrupted an honest consideration of Resolution 281 was that back in the early 2000s, Lakeside had obtained valid legal sewer permits from MDE. And that tooffirmed in everyone's mind that they had 13 weeks ago I sent all this information to week ago I sent all this information to weeks ago I sent all this information to the tought everyone who had thought to even 14 Secretary Grumbles asking for a formal investigation and I also sent it to the Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of course. But I'm sure we will. 19 Obviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their permits from MDE, they did not go on to 19 Page 57 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 15 already have looked at it and approved it once 16 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 17 some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue 18 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 11 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 14 The Talbot County Council had emphatically 17 rejected it and it refused back then to 15 permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, 705 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 permit?	7	the first falsehood.	7	into consideration of Resolution 281 from start
honest consideration of Resolution 281 was that back in the early 2000s, Lakeside had obtained valid legal sewer permits from MDE. And that confirmed in everyone's mind that they had thought — everyone who had thought to even question it, that Lakeside must already have been approved by Talbot County way back then. And that's because you can't get MDE permits unless the county, not the town or the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning Commission that it is consistent with the Source Plan. That's Maryland Code already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Plan that consistent with the Complan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Plan Perequisite to issue permits.	8	There was a second. The second falsehood	8	to finish and corrupted the whole process.
all know that. About MDE issuing the permits illegally. And I'm sure you know that two weeks ago I sent all this information to secretary Grumbles asking for a formal investigation and I also sent it to the Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of course. But I'm sure we will. Obviously when Rocks or the Town or Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their permits from MDE, they did not go on to Page 57 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 120 and that it false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 120 and they county never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the The Talbot County council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal prerequisite to issue permits.	9	that completely permeated and corrupted an	9	Here is a (inaudible).
12 valid legal sewer permits from MDE. And that 13 confirmed in everyone's mind that they had 14 thought — everyone who had thought to even 15 question it, that Lakeside must already have 16 been approved by Talbot County way back then. 17 And that's because you can't get MDE permits 18 unless the county, not the town or the 19 developer, but the county has approved a 20 project by a formal finding of the Planning 21 Commission that it is consistent with the 21 Page 55 21 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2 9-511. 3 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 4 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. 8 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 illegally. And I'm sure you know that two weeks ago I sent all this information to Secretary Grumbles asking for a formal investigation and I also sent it to the Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of course. But I'm sure we will. Obviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their 21 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 22 explicitly announce that these permits were legal and valid. Who would do that? But of course, that essential but unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that was the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as	10	honest consideration of Resolution 281 was that	10	These are serious charges I'm making. We
13 confirmed in everyone's mind that they had 14 thought everyone who had thought to even 15 question it, that Lakeside must already have 16 been approved by Talbot County way back then. 17 And that's because you can't get MDE permits 18 unless the county, not the town or the 19 developer, but the county has approved a 20 project by a formal finding of the Planning 21 Commission that it is consistent with the 22 9-511. 23 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 24 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 25 already have looked at it and approved it once 26 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 27 some kind. And that is false. 28 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 29 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 14 The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 investigation and I also sent it to the 16 Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in 17 Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of course. But I'm sure we will. 18 Obviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their permits from MDE, they did not go on to 20 priest by a formal finding of the Planning 21 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2	11	back in the early 2000s, Lakeside had obtained	11	all know that. About MDE issuing the permits
thought everyone who had thought to even question it, that Lakeside must already have been approved by Talbot County way back then. And that's because you can't get MDE permits unless the county, not the town or the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning 20 project by a formal finding of the Planning 21 Commission that it is consistent with the Page 55 1 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2 9-511. 2 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 4 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 12 recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as an extension of the old application, the old 19 permit?	12	valid legal sewer permits from MDE. And that	12	illegally. And I'm sure you know that two
15 question it, that Lakeside must already have 16 been approved by Talbot County way back then. 17 And that's because you can't get MDE permits 18 unless the county, not the town or the 19 developer, but the county has approved a 19 project by a formal finding of the Planning 20 project by a formal finding of the Planning 21 Commission that it is consistent with the 22 p-511. 23 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 24 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 25 already have looked at it and approved it once 26 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 27 some kind. And that is false. 28 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 29 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 14 The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 innestigation and I also sent it to the 16 Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in 17 Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in 18 Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in 18 Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in 19 Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of 10 course. But I'm sure we will. 10 Obviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their 12 explicitly announce that these permits were 14 egal and valid. Who would do that? But of 13 course, that essential idea was unstated and 14 inherent. And it was that essential but 15 unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that 16 was the falsehood, which is why you'll never 17 see in the transcript an explicit false claim 18 that the permits were legal and valid. 19 So right after Ms. Moran read into the 10 record the title of Resolution 281 at the first 11 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that 12 recited the falsehood about having	13	confirmed in everyone's mind that they had	13	weeks ago I sent all this information to
heen approved by Talbot County way back then. And that's because you can't get MDE permits unless the county, not the town or the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning Commission that it is consistent with the Page 55 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of course. But I'm sure we will. Dobviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their permits from MDE, they did not go on to Page 57 explicitly announce that these permits were legal and valid. Who would do that? But of course, that essential idea was unstated and inherent. And it was that essential but unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that was the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	14	thought everyone who had thought to even	14	Secretary Grumbles asking for a formal
And that's because you can't get MDE permits unless the county, not the town or the developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning Commission that it is consistent with the Page 55 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at lall, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal prerequisite to issue permits. Philadelphia. Tve heard from no one yet, of course. But I'm sure we will. Obviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their permits from MDE, they did not go on to explicitly announce that these permits were legal and valid. Who would do that? But of course, that essential idea was unstated and inherent. And it was that essential but unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that was the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	15	question it, that Lakeside must already have	15	investigation and I also sent it to the
18 unless the county, not the town or the 19 developer, but the county has approved a 20 project by a formal finding of the Planning 21 Commission that it is consistent with the 22 page 55 1 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2 9-511. 3 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 4 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. 8 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 course. But I'm sure we will. 14 Obviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe said that they had long ago obtained their 20 permits from MDE, they did not go on to Page 57 1 explicitly announce that these permits were legal and valid. Who would do that? But of course, that essential idea was unstated and inherent. And it was that essential but unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that was the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	16	been approved by Talbot County way back then.	16	Attorney General's Office and to the EPA in
developer, but the county has approved a project by a formal finding of the Planning 20 said that they had long ago obtained their 21 permits from MDE, they did not go on to Page 55 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the 4 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 11 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 12 recited the falsehood about having long ago bained their 21 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 21 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 22 said that they had long ago obtained their 21 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 22 said that they had long ago obtained their 22 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 22 said that they had long ago obtained their 21 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 24 said that they had long ago obtained their 22 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 24 said that they had long ago obtained their 21 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits from MDE, they did not go on to 25 permits were explicitly announce that these permits were legal and valid. Who would do that? But of supplies from MDE, they did not go ourse, that essential but inherent. And it was that they permits were legal and valid, that they had long a course, that essential	17	And that's because you can't get MDE permits	17	Philadelphia. I've heard from no one yet, of
20 project by a formal finding of the Planning 21 Commission that it is consistent with the 22 permits from MDE, they did not go on to Page 57 1 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2 9-511. 3 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 4 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. 8 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 12 Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 13 Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 14 The Talbot County Council had emphatically 15 rejected it and it refused back then to 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 prerequisite to issue permits. Page 57 Page 57 1 explicitly announce that these permits mexplicitly announce that these permits mexplicitly announce that these permits were legal and valid. Who would do that? But of course, that essential lidea was unstated and inherent. And it was that essential but unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that was the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. 9 So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first 11 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that 12 recited the falsehood about having long ago 13 been programmed S-2 for development in three to 14 five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The 15 permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old 19 permit?	18	unless the county, not the town or the	18	course. But I'm sure we will.
Page 55 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, The Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal permits from MDE, they did not go on to Page 57 explicitly announce that these permits were legal and valid. Who would do that? But of course, that essential idea was unstated and inherent. And it was that essential but unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that was the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old prerequisite to issue permits.	19	developer, but the county has approved a	19	Obviously when Rocks or the Town of Trappe
Page 55 Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 9-511. So if Lakeside had permits back in the 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. 8 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 14 The Talbot County Council had emphatically 15 rejected it and it refused back then to 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 permit? Page 57 1 explicitly announce that these permits were 2 legal and valid. Who would do that? But of 2 course, that essential idea was unstated and inherent. And it was that essential but unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that was the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. 9 So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old prerequisite to issue permits.	20	project by a formal finding of the Planning	20	said that they had long ago obtained their
Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code 2 9-511. 3 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 4 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. 8 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 14 The Talbot County Council had emphatically 15 rejected it and it refused back then to 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 Pan. That's Maryland Code 2 legal and valid. Who would do that? But of 3 course, that essential idea was unstated and 4 inherent. And it was that essential but 4 unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that 4 was the falsehood, which is why you'll never 5 see in the transcript an explicit false claim 6 that the permits were legal and valid. 9 So right after Ms. Moran read into the 10 record the title of Resolution 281 at the first 11 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that 12 recited the falsehood about having long ago 13 been programmed S-2 for development in three to 14 five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The 15 permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 16 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this 17 as a new application or are they treating this 18 as an extension of the old application, the old 19 permit?	21	Commission that it is consistent with the	21	permits from MDE, they did not go on to
2 9-511. 3 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 4 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. 8 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 14 The Talbot County Council had emphatically 15 rejected it and it refused back then to 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 permit? 2 legal and valid. Who would do that? But of 3 course, that essential idea was unstated and 4 inherent. And it was that essential but 5 unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that 6 was the falsehood, which is why you'll never 7 see in the transcript an explicit false claim 8 that the permits were legal and valid. 9 So right after Ms. Moran read into the 10 record the title of Resolution 281 at the first 11 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that 12 recited the falsehood about having long ago 13 been programmed S-2 for development in three to 14 five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The 15 permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 16 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this 17 as a new application or are they treating this 18 as an extension of the old application, the old 19 permit?		Page 55		Page 57
3 So if Lakeside had permits back in the 4 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. 8 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 14 The Talbot County Council had emphatically 15 rejected it and it refused back then to 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 prerequisite to issue permits. 3 course, that essential idea was unstated and inherent. And it was that essential but 4 inherent. And it was that essential but 5 course, that essential idea was unstated and inherent. And it was that essential idea was unstated and inherent. And it was that essential but 6 unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that 6 was the falsehood, which is why you'll never 7 see in the transcript an explicit false claim 8 that the permits were legal and valid. 9 So right after Ms. Moran read into the 10 record the title of Resolution 281 at the first 11 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that 12 recited the falsehood about having long ago 13 been programmed S-2 for development in three to 14 five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The 15 permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 16 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this 17 as a new application or are they treating this 18 as an extension of the old application, the old 19 permit?	1	Comprehensive Plan. That's Maryland Code	1	explicitly announce that these permits were
4 2000s, and they did, then we as a county must 5 already have looked at it and approved it once 6 before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of 7 some kind. And that is false. 8 Here are the facts. MDE did issue 9 Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit 10 in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. 11 But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at 12 all, had never found it consistent with the 13 Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. 14 The Talbot County Council had emphatically 15 rejected it and it refused back then to 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 prerequisite to issue permits. 4 inherent. And it was that essential but 16 unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that 16 was the falsehood, which is why you'll never 17 see in the transcript an explicit false claim 18 that the permits were legal and valid. 9 So right after Ms. Moran read into the 10 record the title of Resolution 281 at the first 11 meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that 12 recited the falsehood about having long ago 13 been programmed S-2 for development in three to 14 five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The 15 permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 16 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this 18 as a new application or are they treating this 18 as an extension of the old application, the old 19 permit?	2	9-511.	2	legal and valid. Who would do that? But of
already have looked at it and approved it once before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Prerequisite to issue permits. but unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that was the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	3	So if Lakeside had permits back in the	3	course, that essential idea was unstated and
before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal prefered. was the falsehood, which is why you'll never see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	4	2000s, and they did, then we as a county must	4	inherent. And it was that essential but
some kind. And that is false. Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically The Talbot County Council had emphatically see in the transcript an explicit false claim that the permits were legal and valid. So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland micror the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	5	already have looked at it and approved it once	5	unstated idea, that it's legal and valid, that
Here are the facts. MDE did issue Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal prerequisite to issue permits.	6	before. Resolution 281 is just a cleanup of	6	was the falsehood, which is why you'll never
Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal prerequisite to issue permits. 9 So right after Ms. Moran read into the record the title of Resolution 281 at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	7	some kind. And that is false.	7	see in the transcript an explicit false claim
in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006. But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal prerequisite to issue permits. In fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at the first meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that rejected the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	8	Here are the facts. MDE did issue	8	that the permits were legal and valid.
But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at all, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal prerequisite to issue permits. In meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	9	Lakeside permits back then, a discharge permit	9	So right after Ms. Moran read into the
all, had never found it consistent with the Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal recited the falsehood about having long ago been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old prerequisite to issue permits.	10	in 2005 and two construction permits in 2006.	10	record the title of Resolution 281 at the first
Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite. The Talbot County Council had emphatically rejected it and it refused back then to designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal refused back the opposite. So been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old prerequisite to issue permits. Has been programmed S-2 for development in three to five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	11	But in fact, Talbot County never reviewed it at	11	meeting on December 17, 2019, the title that
The Talbot County Council had emphatically 14 five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The 15 rejected it and it refused back then to 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 prerequisite to issue permits. 14 five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The 15 permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 16 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this 17 as a new application or are they treating this 18 as an extension of the old application, the old 19 permit?	12	all, had never found it consistent with the	12	recited the falsehood about having long ago
rejected it and it refused back then to 15 permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 16 designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, 17 which section 9-511 of the Maryland 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 prerequisite to issue permits. 15 permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05 16 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this 17 as a new application or are they treating this 18 as an extension of the old application, the old 19 permit?	13	Comp Plan. In fact, quite the opposite.	13	been programmed S-2 for development in three to
designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority, which section 9-511 of the Maryland Environmental Article says is a legal prerequisite to issue permits. 16 has now since expired. So is MDE treating this as a new application or are they treating this as an extension of the old application, the old permit?	14	The Talbot County Council had emphatically	14	five years, Mr. Pack, you said this: The
which section 9-511 of the Maryland 17 as a new application or are they treating this 18 Environmental Article says is a legal 19 prerequisite to issue permits. 10 as a new application or are they treating this 11 as a new application or are they treating this 12 as a new application or are they treating this 13 as an extension of the old application, the old 14 permit?	15	rejected it and it refused back then to	15	permit that was issued by MDE back in 2004, '05
18 Environmental Article says is a legal 18 as an extension of the old application, the old 19 prerequisite to issue permits. 19 permit?	16	designate Lakeside S-1, immediate priority,	16	has now since expired. So is MDE treating this
19 prerequisite to issue permits. 19 permit?	17	which section 9-511 of the Maryland	17	as a new application or are they treating this
	18	Environmental Article says is a legal	18	as an extension of the old application, the old
20 Accordingly, the MDE permits Lakeside did, 20 So yes. Everyone paying the least	19	prerequisite to issue permits.	19	permit?
	20	Accordingly, the MDE permits Lakeside did,	20	So yes. Everyone paying the least
21 in fact, obtain had been issued illegally and 21 attention to Lakeside, the staff, the public,	21	in fact, obtain had been issued illegally and	21	attention to Lakeside, the staff, the public,

the Planning Commission, and you Council members were well aware that MDE had already awarded permits to Lakeside way back when. And that somewhat offhanded reminder, not intentional, not a big deal, but just a reference right up front in the first meeting, demonstrates my point, that everybody knew about the permits. No one had any idea or reason to suspect they were illegal. But they were. Really it seemed that there was really lowere. Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge permit. And so everyone was just looking at the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be raturally a pro forma review, and the fact that how they pulled that off. The record shows that except for Page 59 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have been May 20, 2020, Mr. Showalter was pret betoen May 20, 2020, Mr. Showalter was pret but about it. MDE considers it S-1. MDE county rejects this amendment, the project vocunty rejects this amendment, the		<u> </u>		
members were well aware that MDE had already awaredd permits to Lakeside way back when. And that somewhat offhanded reminder, not that was been that were discussed at some length, that is all the review it got. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was murinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have been approved by the county long ago. Which it hadhart. So what permits? It began with the shady to how the Resolution 281 was more shady on the that first Planning Commission, that would have been — I did Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant may be not a county reposition of the county of the county long ago. Which it Shadart. Given that Resolution 281. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was murinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have been approved by the county long ago. Which it Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand question at the first Planning Commissioner Spies asked Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant was really yor of doing the county a favor her beginner for the project view by the county				Page 60
awarded permits to Lakeside way back when. And that somewhat offhanded reminder, not intentional, not a big deal, but just a intentional, not a big deal, but just a reference right up front in the first meeting. demonstrates my point, that everybody knew reason to suspect they were illegal. But they reason to suspect they were illegal. But they go forward. When (inaudible) brought his presentatic to the commissioners, I think that same day, to the commissioners, I think that same day. Mr. Showalter emphasized what everyone a knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281. Is wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone land that off. The record shows that except for Page 59 wastewater issues that were discussed at some length, that is all the review it got. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was been approved by the county long ago. Which it had MDE permits, which again must have been approved by the county long ago. Which it had more than the review it got. Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand question at the first session — MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the lad ada again so we can follow along. At the first Planning Commission, that would have been — I did this is Planning Commission, that would have been — I did this is Planning Commission, that would have been — I did this is Planning Commission, that would have been — I did this is Planning Commission that this process here today is not				
4 this is Planning Commission, that would ha 5 intentional, not a big deal, but just a 6 reference right up front in the first meeting, 7 demonstrates my point, that everybody knew 8 about the permits. No one had any idea or 9 reason to suspect they were illegal. But they 10 were. 11 Really it seemed that there was really 12 nothing much to consider about Resolution 281. 13 Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 19 naturally assumed were discussed at some 2 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 5 menomy on how the Resolution agao. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits, which again must have 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits, which again must have 9 meshow you how the Resolution agan with 10 question at the first session — 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: That would have been — I did 14 MR. WATSON: That would have been — I did 15 mreferace right with the 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been — I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have				
5 intentional, not a big deal, but just a 6 reference right up front in the first meeting, 7 demonstrates my point, that everybody knew 8 about the permits. No one had any idea or 9 reason to suspect they were illegal. But they 10 were. 11 Really it seemed that there was really 12 nothing much to consider about Resolution 281. 13 Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 20 how they pulled that off. 21 The record shows that except for 21 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 22 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 6 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 about the permits of the first session— 10 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 11 dedate again sow ecan follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: That would have been—I did 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been—I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 blunt about it. MDE considers it S.1. MDE issued construction discharge permits for the issued construction discharge permits for the country and first the project with the project was all about getting Lakeside reclassified. 16 the applicant obsuccessfully frame 281 to be 16 This is what he said: MDE has issued to swa all about getting Lakeside reclassified. 17 to construction and discharge permits for this project previously. And MDE believes that amendment is not necessary to the county perceptually as the project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the country a mendment is not necessary. This really made the were recommend approval of Resolution 281. 2 Consider how powerful that point is	3	awarded permits to Lakeside way back when. And	3	
6 reference right up front in the first meeting, 7 demonstrates my point, that everybody knew 8 about the permits. No one had any idea or 9 reason to suspect they were illegal. But they 10 were. 11 Really it seemed that there was really 11 nothing much to consider about Resolution 281. 12 Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 19 how they pulled that off. 21 The record shows that except for 21 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 2 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session - 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 14 ms. WATSON: This would have been -1 did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 blunt about it. MDE construction discharge permits for the country rejects this amendment, the project is don't project it sis amendment, the project is don't prought his Resolution 281. 2 Consider on shots into my notes. So I don't have 19 don't precise fore. 2 So for those reasons I would urge you to 10 project previously. And MDE believes that an amendment is not necessary to the country a project previously. Wow. They believe an amendr proviously wow. They believe an amendr not even necessary. This really made the write in the common knowledge that Lakeside 10 question at the first session - 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant was re	4	that somewhat offhanded reminder, not	4	•
demonstrates my point, that everybody knew 8 about the permits. No one had any idea or 9 reason to suspect they were illegal. But they 10 were. 11 Really it seemed that there was really 12 nothing much to consider about Resolution 281. 13 Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falschoods enabled 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 20 how they pulled that off. 21 The record shows that except for 21 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 2 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 6 had gotten MDE permits; Nich again must have 6 had gotten MDE permits; Nich again must have 6 had gotten MDE permits; Nich dagain must have 6 had gotten MDE permits; Nich again must have 7 heen approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session — 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: That would have been — I did 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been — I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have	5	intentional, not a big deal, but just a	5	been May 20, 2020, Mr. Showalter was pretty
8 about the permits. No one had any idea or 9 reason to suspect they were illegal. But they 10 were. 11 Really it seemed that there was really 12 nothing much to consider about Resolution 281. 13 Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 10 how they pulled that off. 21 The record shows that except for 21 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 22 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session	6	reference right up front in the first meeting,	6	blunt about it. MDE considers it S-1. MDE has
9 reason to suspect they were illegal. But they 10 were. 11 Really it seemed that there was really 12 nothing much to consider about Resolution 281. 13 Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 19 how they pulled that off. 20 how they pulled that off. 21 The record shows that except for 21 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 22 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits? It began with 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session — 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? 14 MS. PRICE: (Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been — I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 country rejects this amendment, the project of go for ward. 19 go forward. 11 When (inaudible) brought his presentation to the commissioners, I think that same day. 11 when (inaudible) brought his presentation to the commissioners, I think that same day. 11 when (inaudible) brought his presentation and day. 11 when (inaudible) brought his presentation and all when everyone a knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281. 15 to the commissioners, I think that same day. 16 This is what he said: MDE has issued construction and discharge permits for this is was all about getting Lakeside reclassified. 16 This is what he said: MDE has issued construction and discharge permits or project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is n	7	demonstrates my point, that everybody knew	7	issued construction discharge permits for this
10 were. 11 Really it seemed that there was really 12 nothing much to consider about Resolution 281. 13 Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 20 how they pulled that off. 21 The record shows that except for 21 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 2 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 11 Ms. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with tave 12 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant to to the commissioners, I think that same day, to the tecommissioner Spies asked what many wonde 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 When (inaudible) brought his presentation to the commissioners, I think that same day, Whr. Pack's passing duestion, the offhand 19 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 15 was all about getting Lakeside to the construction and discharge permits for this project previously. And MDE believes that project previously. And MDE believes that project previously. And MDE believes that a mamendment is not necessary to the county project previously. And MDE believes that a mamendment is not necessary to the county project previously. Wow. They believe an amendr not even necessary. This really made the wreview previously. Wow. They believe an amendr not even necessary. This really made the wreview previously. Wow. They believe an amendr not even necessary. This real	8	about the permits. No one had any idea or	8	project before. So if you do nothing or if the
Really it seemed that there was really nothing much to consider about Resolution 281. Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 15 was all about getting Lakeside reclassified. 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 18 project previously. And MDE believes that 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 20 how they pulled that off. 20 amendment is not necessary to the county p 21 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 21 length, that is all the review it got. 22 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 6 had not even provided by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session	9	reason to suspect they were illegal. But they	9	county rejects this amendment, the project will
12 nothing much to consider about Resolution 281. 13 Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 20 how they pulled that off. 21 The record shows that except for 21 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 2 length, that is all the review it got. 2 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 Mr. Showalter emphasized what everyone a knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281 to knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281 to knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281 to knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281 to knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281 to knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281 to knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281 to be a small about getting Lakeside reclassified. 16 This is what he said: MDE has issued construction and discharge permits for this project previously. And MDE believes that project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county p 20 So for those reasons I would urge you to 21 So for those reasons I would urge you to 22 Consider how powerful that point is. MI has issued construction and discharge permits of the commy has issued 20 construction and discharge permits of the construction and discharge permits of the construction and ischarge permits of the construction and ischarge and previously. Wow. The	10	were.	10	go forward.
13 Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge 14 permit. And so everyone was just looking at 15 wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled 16 the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be 17 virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that 18 it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 19 naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 10 how they pulled that off. 11 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 11 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 12 length, that is all the review it got. 13 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 14 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 15 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 16 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 17 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 18 project previously. And MDE believes that amendment is not necessary to the county project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county project previously. Work the county project previously of Resolution 281. 18 project previously. And MDE believes that amendment is not necessary to the county project previously of Resolution 281. 19 project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county project previously. Work the county of Resolution 281. 20 consider how powerful that point is. MI 21 has issued construction and discharge permits of the county. Work They believe an amendment is not necessary to the county and previously. Wow. They believe an amendment is not necessary. This really made the work previously. Work They believe an amendment is not necessary. This really made the work previously. Work They believe an amendment is not necessary. This really made the work previously. Work They believe an amendment	11	Really it seemed that there was really	11	When (inaudible) brought his presentation
how they pulled that off. The record shows that except for Page 59 wastewater issues that were discussed at some length, that is all the review it got. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside maintand in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have maintand in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have had gotten MDE permits, which again must have marinated in the first session MR. WATSON: That would have been I did Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your opinion that this process here today is not was all about getting Lakeside to was all about getting Lakeside reclassified. This is what he said: MDE has issued to This is what he said: MDE has issued construction and discharge permits project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county p project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county p project previously. And MDE believes that project previously. And MDE believes that project previously. And MDE believes that project previously. And MDE has issued construction and discharge permits project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county a favor the recommend approval of Resolution 281. Consider how powerful that point is. MI has issued construction and discharge permits project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county a favor the recommend approval of Resolution 281. Consider how powerful that point is. MI has issued construction and discharge permits project is essentially S-1 today and that an amendment is not necessary to the county a favor the recommend approval of Resolution 281. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let The recommend approval of Resolution 281. Let's go b	12	nothing much to consider about Resolution 281.	12	to the commissioners, I think that same day,
wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone it had more poulted that off. The record shows that except for Page 59 it wastewater issues that were discussed at some length, that is all the review it got. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was it maintaid in the common knowledge that Lakeside maintaid in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have had gotten MDE permits, which again must have been approved by the county long ago. Which it hadn't. So what permits? It began with MR. Pack's passing question, the offhand question at the first session MR. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. WATSON: That would have been I d	13	Lakeside was renewing its wastewater discharge	13	Mr. Showalter emphasized what everyone already
the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be ritually a pro forma review, and the fact that ritually a pro forma review, and the fact that ritually a pro forma review, and the fact that ritually a pro forma review, and the fact that ritually assumed were legal and valid, explain ritually assumed were legal and valid. The record show pand that an recommend approval of Resolution 281 recommend approval of Resolution 281 recommend approval of Resolution 281 recommend approval of Resolution 2	14	permit. And so everyone was just looking at	14	knew, the key fact. Given that Resolution 281
virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain how they pulled that off. The record shows that except for Page 59 wastewater issues that were discussed at some length, that is all the review it got. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have had gotten MDE permits, which again must have been approved by the county long ago. Which it hadn't. So what permits? It began with wf. Pack's passing question, the offhand question at the first session MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the date again so we can follow along. MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? MR. WATSON: That would have been I did maturally assumed were legal and valid, explain 19 project previously. And MDE believes that namendment is not necessary to the county p amendment is not necessary to the county p recommend approval of Resolution 281. Consider how powerful that point is. MI has issued construction and discharge permits recommend approval of Resolution 281. Consider how powerful that point is. MI has issued construction and discharge permits recommend approval of Resolution 281. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 1	15	wastewater issues. These falsehoods enabled	15	was all about getting Lakeside reclassified.
it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain how they pulled that off. The record shows that except for Page 59 wastewater issues that were discussed at some length, that is all the review it got. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have had gotten MDE permits? It began with hadn't. So what permits? It began with hadn't. So what permits? It began with MR. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the date again so we can follow along. MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. Spies: Well, so it's still your opinion that this process here today is not	16	the applicant to successfully frame 281 to be	16	This is what he said: MDE has issued
naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain how they pulled that off. The record shows that except for Page 59 wastewater issues that were discussed at some length, that is all the review it got. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was had gotten MDE permits, which again must have had gotten MDE permits? It began with hadn't. So what permits? It began with hadn't. So what permits? It began with MR. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the date again so we can follow along. MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? MR. WATSON: That would have been — I did MR. WATSON: That would have been — I did MR. WATSON: That would have been — I did Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your opinion that this process here today is not	17	virtually a pro forma review, and the fact that	17	construction and discharge permits for this
how they pulled that off. The record shows that except for Page 59 wastewater issues that were discussed at some length, that is all the review it got. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have been approved by the county long ago. Which it hadn't. So what permits? It began with hadn't. So what permits? It began with Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand question at the first session MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the date again so we can follow along. MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. WATSON: That would have page 59 The amendment is not necessary to the county p So for those reasons I would urge you to recommend approval of Resolution 281. Consider how powerful that point is. MI has issued construction and discharge permit on the even necessary. This really made the w review pretty much pro forma; didn't it? Later, voicing the same puzzlement man had at the time and some have to this day, probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm meeting. Commissioner Spies asked Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant was really sort of doing the county a favor here by going through this Resolution 281 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonders. MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. WATSON: Those is did not have the county a point on that this process here today is not	18	it had MDE permits earlier, which everyone	18	project previously. And MDE believes that this
The record shows that except for Page 59 wastewater issues that were discussed at some length, that is all the review it got. Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have been approved by the county long ago. Which it hadn't. So what permits? It began with Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand question at the first session MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the MR. WATSON: T'm sorry? MR. WATSON: That would have been – I did MR. WATSON: That would have been – I did MR. WATSON: That would have been – I did MR. WATSON: That would have been – I did MR. Spies: Well, so it's still your opinion that this process here today is not	19	naturally assumed were legal and valid, explain	19	project is essentially S-1 today and that an
Page 59 1 wastewater issues that were discussed at some 2 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? 14 MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 recommend approval of Resolution 281. 2 Consider how powerful that point is. MI 3 has issued construction and discharge permit on the powerful that point is. MI 3 has issued construction and discharge permit on the previously. Wow. They believe an amendr on the ven necessary. This really made the wore review pretty much pro forma; didn't it? 7 Later, voicing the same puzzlement man had at the time and some have to this day, probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 10 Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 11 meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 12 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant was really sort of doing the county a favor here by going through this Resolution 281 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder the process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder opinion that this process here today is not opinion that this process.	20	how they pulled that off.	20	amendment is not necessary to the county plan.
1 recommend approval of Resolution 281. 2 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: T'm sorry? 14 MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 1 recommend approval of Resolution 281. 2 Consider how powerful that point is. MI 3 has issued construction and discharge permit is. MI 4 previously. Wow. They believe an amendr is not even necessary. This really made the wince review pretty much pro forma; didn't it? 4 Later, voicing the same puzzlement man is had at the time and some have to this day, probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 6 preview pretty much pro forma; didn't it? 7 Later, voicing the same puzzlement man is had at the time and some have to this day, probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 8 had at the time and some have to this day, probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 9 probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 10 Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm in meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 11 meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 12 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant was really sort of doing the county a favor in here by going through this Resolution 281 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder in the first seemed, the applicant of the process in the process here today is not in the first seemed in the proviously. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder in the first seemed in the common had at the time and some have to this day, probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked in the proviously. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder in the first seemed in the common ha	21	The record shows that except for	21	So for those reasons I would urge you to
2 length, that is all the review it got. 3 Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let 4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? 14 MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 2 Consider how powerful that point is. MI 3 has issued construction and discharge permit 4 previously. Wow. They believe an amendr 5 not even necessary. This really made the w 6 review pretty much pro forma; didn't it? 7 Later, voicing the same puzzlement man 8 had at the time and some have to this day, 9 probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 10 Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm 11 meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 12 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant 13 was really sort of doing the county a favor 14 here by going through this Resolution 281 15 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonde 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 2 Consider how powerful that point is. MI 3 has issued construction and discharge permit is a has issued construction and discharge permit is previously. Wow. They believe an amendr or to even necessary. This really made the w previously. Wow. They believe an amendr or to even necessary. This really made the w previously. Longton is method. 2		Page 59		Page 61
Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let me show you how the Resolution 281 was marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have been approved by the county long ago. Which it hadn't. So what permits? It began with mestion at the first session MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the date again so we can follow along. MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. Shows to construction and discharge permit and has issued construction and discharge permit and the previously. Wow. They believe an amendr not even necessary. This really made the w review pretty much pro forma; didn't it? Later, voicing the same puzzlement man had at the time and some have to this day, probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm meeting. Commissioner Spies asked Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant was really sort of doing the county a favor here by going through this Resolution 281 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. Spies: Well, so it's still your opinion that this process here today is not	1	wastewater issues that were discussed at some	1	recommend approval of Resolution 281.
4 me show you how the Resolution 281 was 5 marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? 14 MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 4 previously. Wow. They believe an amendr 5 not even necessary. This really made the w 6 review pretty much pro forma; didn't it? 7 Later, voicing the same puzzlement man 8 had at the time and some have to this day, 9 probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 10 Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm 11 meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 12 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant 13 was really sort of doing the county a favor 14 here by going through this Resolution 281 15 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 previously. Wow. They believe an amendr 5 not even necessary. This really made the w 7 Later, voicing the same puzzlement man 8 had at the time and some have to this day, 9 probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 10 Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm 11 meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 12 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant 13 was really sort of doing the county a favor 14 here by going through this Resolution 281 15 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 opinion that this process here today is not	2	length, that is all the review it got.	2	Consider how powerful that point is. MDE
marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside had gotten MDE permits, which again must have been approved by the county long ago. Which it hadn't. So what permits? It began with hadn't. So what permits? It began with had at the time and some have to this day, mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant mr. Spies asked what many wonder mr. Spies asked what many wonder mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your	3	Let's go back to the transcript. Now, let	3	has issued construction and discharge permits
6 had gotten MDE permits, which again must have 7 been approved by the county long ago. Which it 8 hadn't. So what permits? It began with 9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? 14 MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 6 review pretty much pro forma; didn't it? 7 Later, voicing the same puzzlement man 8 had at the time and some have to this day, 9 probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 10 Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm 11 meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 12 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant here by going through this Resolution 281 13 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder 14 Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your 15 opinion that this process here today is not	4	me show you how the Resolution 281 was	4	previously. Wow. They believe an amendment is
been approved by the county long ago. Which it hadn't. So what permits? It began with hadn't. So what permits? It began with had at the time and some have to this day, probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asket must be probably tonight, commissioner Spies asket	5	marinated in the common knowledge that Lakeside	5	not even necessary. This really made the whole
hadn't. So what permits? It began with Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand question at the first session MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the date again so we can follow along. MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. Spies: Well, so it's still your opinion that this process here today is not	6	had gotten MDE permits, which again must have	6	review pretty much pro forma; didn't it?
9 Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand 10 question at the first session 11 MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? 14 MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 9 probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked 10 Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Comm 11 meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 12 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant 13 was really sort of doing the county a favor 14 here by going through this Resolution 281 15 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder 16 Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your 17 opinion that this process here today is not	7	been approved by the county long ago. Which it	7	Later, voicing the same puzzlement many
question at the first session MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the date again so we can follow along. MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading from? MR. WATSON: That would have been I did MR. WATSON: That would have been I did meeting. Commissioner Spies asked MR. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant was really sort of doing the county a favor here by going through this Resolution 281 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder MR. WATSON: That would have been I did mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your opinion that this process here today is not	8	hadn't. So what permits? It began with	8	had at the time and some have to this day,
MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the 11 meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 12 date again so we can follow along. 13 MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? 14 MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 meeting. Commissioner Spies asked 19 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant was really sort of doing the county a favor 10 here by going through this Resolution 281 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder man	9	Mr. Pack's passing question, the offhand	9	probably tonight, Commissioner Spies asked
date again so we can follow along. 12 Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant was really sort of doing the county a favor here by going through this Resolution 281 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonds MR. WATSON: That would have been I did Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 17 opinion that this process here today is not	10	question at the first session	10	Mr. Showalter. This is the Planning Commission
13 MR. WATSON: I'm sorry? 14 MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 was really sort of doing the county a favor 19 here by going through this Resolution 281 10 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder 11 Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your 12 opinion that this process here today is not	11	MS. PRICE: (Inaudible) start with the	11	meeting. Commissioner Spies asked
14 MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading 15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 here by going through this Resolution 281 19 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder 10 Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your 11 opinion that this process here today is not	12	date again so we can follow along.	12	Mr. Showalter if, as it seemed, the applicant
15 from? 16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 18 process. Mr. Spies asked what many wonder 19 Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your 19 opinion that this process here today is not	13	MR. WATSON: I'm sorry?	13	was really sort of doing the county a favor
16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 16 Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 17 opinion that this process here today is not	14	MS. PRICE: Which one are you reading	14	here by going through this Resolution 281
16 MR. WATSON: That would have been I did 16 Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your 17 screen shots into my notes. So I don't have 17 opinion that this process here today is not	15	from?	15	process. Mr. Spies asked what many wondered.
	16	MR. WATSON: That would have been I did	16	Mr. Spies: Well, so it's still your
	17	screen shots into my notes. So I don't have	17	
	18		18	
19 this would have been December. 19 you're going through because it's the proper	19	this would have been December.	19	you're going through because it's the proper
20 MR. PACK: Seventeenth. 20 channels for the county.	20	MR. PACK: Seventeenth.	20	channels for the county.
21 MR. WATSON: That was December 19, 2019, 21 Mr. Showalter: That's correct.	21		21	Mr. Showalter: That's correct.

The record shows that Mr. Spies, other commissioners, and the County Council members all believed that. Other transcript stuff I don't have here. There are other examples as well where the applicant's attorney made pretty clear to the commission that while it was good to clean all this up with these classification technicalities by adopting Resolution 281, the project was coming anyway. And what was the proof? The proof was that MDE had already issued construction permits in 2006. And it worked. It corrupted the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin for three to five years rather than right away. It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been the commissioners sall believed that. Other transcript stuff I technical issues for the new sewer system? The so what is that Talbot County citizens, who love this unique place and honestly do cherish our rural character and quality of life and want the county that's described in our Comp Plan, and the Planning Commission too, who are serious about these issues, the citizens and the Planning Commission were denied the right to see that Lakeside got the proper review that was needed then and is still needed now in December 2021. Look at the issues that were not discussed, not even mentioned in Talbot County's review of Resolution 281, while people were focused on whether a sludge pond should have two feet or three feet of freeboard. Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the people in Trappe, but everybody wherever they				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2 commissioners, and the County Council members 3 all believed that. Other transcript stuff I 4 don't have here. 3				Page 64
all believed that. Other transcript stuff I don't have here. There are other examples as well where the applicant's attorney made pretty clear to the commission that while it was good to clean all this up with these classification technicalities by adopting Resolution 281, the project was coming anyway. And what was the proof? The proof was that MDE had already issued construction permits in 2006. And it worked. It corrupted the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin for three to five years rather than right away. I seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been issued. And that was true. But almost no one knew that from the outset they were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 281. So the final thing I'll talk about before I ask for a short break is sort of the so what question. So what if the applicant used falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that I Talbot County had already reviewed and approved that ago, proving the first point since permits couldn't have been issued without the County's approval? As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd the Planning Commission and everyone else that do to again. A citizens, who love this unique laca dwont the county that hone does rive the hone of cascribed in our Comp Plan, and the Planning commission too, who are serious about these issues, the citizens and the Planning Commission too, who are serious about these issues, the citizens and the Planning Commission too, who are serious about these issues, the citizens and the Planning Commission too, who are serious about these issues, the citizens and the Planning Commission too, who are serious about these issues, the citizens and the Planning Commission too, who are serious about these issues, the citizens and the Planning Commission too, who are denied the right to see		•		·
There are other examples as well where the applicant's attorney made pretty clear to the applicant's attorney made pretty clear to the applicant's attorney made pretty clear to the this point these classification are serious about these described in our Comp Plan, and the Planning Commission that while it was good to clean all this up with these classification are technicalities by adopting Resolution 281, the project was coming anyway. In And what was the proof? The proof was that MDE had already issued construction permits in 2006. And it worked. It corrupted the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin for three to five years rather than right away. It is seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been had. Page 63 So bottom line, MDE permits had been issued. And that was true. But almost no one knew that from the outset they were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 281. So the final thing I'll talk about before I ask for a short break is sort of the so what question. So what if the applicant used 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits 20 the Planning Commission and everyone, else that 20 the Planning Commission to the Planning Commission were denied the Planning Commission were denied the Planning Commission were denied the Planning Commission to the Planning Commission were denied the Planning Commission to the Sissues, the citizens and the Planning Commission to the Commission were denied the Planning Commission to the Commission were denied the Planning Commission to the Planning Commission to the Commission to were denied the Planning Commission to the Commission to were denied the Planning Commission to the Planning Commission to the Planning Commission to the Planning Commission to the Compte Commission to the Plannin	2	commissioners, and the County Council members	2	The so what is that Talbot County
There are other examples as well where the applicant's attorney made pretty clear to the commission that while it was good to clean all this up with these classification get technicalities by adopting Resolution 281, the project was coming anyway. 10	3	all believed that. Other transcript stuff I	3	citizens, who love this unique place and
described in our Comp Plan, and the Planning commission that while it was good to clean all this up with these classification this up with these classification technicalities by adopting Resolution 281, the project was coming anyway. 11 And what was the proof? The proof was that MDE had already issued construction the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin southern part would not be eligible to begin had. 12 Is seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been had. 13 So bottom line, MDE permits had been and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 281. 14 So the final thing I'll talk about before and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution for Trappe. 15 So the final thing I'll talk about before and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution for Trappe. 16 Issued. And that was true. But almost no one also were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution for Trappe. 16 Issued. And that was true and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution for Trappe. 17 So the final thing I'll talk about before and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution for Trappe. 18 Issued. And that was true. But almost no one also have two feet or three feet of freeboard. 19 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution for Trappe. 19 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of Trappe. 20 Trappe. 21 Lakeside on the voil that way the property tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County,	4	don't have here.	4	•
this up with these classification technicalities by adopting Resolution 281, the project was coming anyway. that MDE had already issued construction permits in 2006. And it worked. It corrupted the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin for three to five years rather than right away. It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been had. Page 63 So bottom line, MDE permits had been issued. And that was true. But almost no one knew that from the outset they were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 281. So the final thing I'll talk about before I ask for a short break is sort of the so what question. So what if the applicant used falsechoods and misrepresentations to imply that I Talbot County had already reviewed and approved I ago, proving the first point since permits couldn't have been issued without the County's ago, proving the first point since permits couldn't have been issued without the County's ago, proving the first point since permits couldn't have been issued without the County's ado it again. Commission tove, who are serious about these issues, the citizens and the Planning Commission were demied the right to see that Lakeside to the proper review that was needed then and is still needed now in December 2021. Lacks at the issues that were not discussed, not even mentioned in Talbot County's review of Resolution 281, while people where focused on whether a sludge pond should have two feet or three feet of freeboard. Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all as to how much money Lakeside in pour to the schools? Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Not a tax rate	5	There are other examples as well where the	5	quality of life and want the county that's
this up with these classification technicalities by adopting Resolution 281, the project was coming anyway. And what was the proof? The proof was that MDE had already issued construction permits in 2006. And it worked. It corrupted the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin to split Lakeside to five very south shades to split Lakeside to five very south shades to how much money Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the people	6	applicant's attorney made pretty clear to the	6	described in our Comp Plan, and the Planning
technicalities by adopting Resolution 281, the project was coming anyway. And what was the proof? The proof was that MDE had already issued construction 12 that MDE had already issued construction 14 the whole process. It's why some commissioners 15 and some on the Council felt they had achieved 16 something when the developer reluctantly agreed 17 to split Lakeside into two phases so the 18 southern part would not be eligible to begin 19 for three to five years rather than right away. 19 It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been 20 It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been 21 had. Page 63 I So bottom line, MDE permits had been 18 knew that from the outset they were improper 24 and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It 28 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 281. So the final thing I'll talk about before 19 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 takeside long ago, that MDE had issued 20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 12 takeside got the proper review that at Lakeside got the proper review that at was needed then and is still needed now in December 2021. Look at the issues, that were not discussed have twen mentioned in Talbot County's review of Resolution 281, while people were focused on whether a sludge pond should have two feet or three feet of freeboard. Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all 20 then a to work more patched in Talbot. Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all 20 then a big on the two feet or three feet of freeboard. Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all 20 then and because of the corrupt framing 21 to work more patched in Talbot. Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a lax rate cap, everyone, not	7	commission that while it was good to clean all	7	Commission too, who are serious about these
10 project was coming anyway. 11 And what was the proof? The proof was 12 that MDE had already issued construction 13 permits in 2006. And it worked. It corrupted 14 the whole process. It's why some commissioners 15 and some on the Council felt they had achieved 16 something when the developer reluctantly agreed 17 to split Lakeside into two phases so the 18 southern part would not be eligible to begin 19 for three to five years rather than right away. 20 It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been 21 had. Page 63 1 So bottom line, MDE permits had been 21 issued. And that was true. But almost no one 3 knew that from the outset they were improper 4 and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It 5 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 6 281. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved: 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? Namber one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all 19 as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the 20 live. Who is going to pay for the schools? 2 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is 2 going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county 2 road improvements, all the additional services? 3 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of 3 Trappe. 4 And you know, don't you, that we have a 2 property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. The Co	8	this up with these classification	8	issues, the citizens and the Planning
that MDE had already issued construction permits in 2006. And it worked. It corrupted the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin for three to five years rather than right away. It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been had. Page 63 So bottom line, MDE permits had been sisued. And that was true. But almost no one skew that from the outset they were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution So the final thing I'll talk about before I ask for a short break is sort of the so what question. So what if the applicant used Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued It ago, proving the first point since permits do it again. And what was true nor that was true is the nand is still needed now in December 2021. Look at the issues that were nor discussed, not even mentioned in Talbot County's review of Resolution 281, while people were focused on whether a sludge pond should have two feet or three feet of freeboard. Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the people in Trappe, but everybody wherever they Page 63 I live. Who is going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county road improvements, all the additional services? Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of Trappe. And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to being Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk bout it. Number rove feet or three fe	9	technicalities by adopting Resolution 281, the	9	Commission were denied the right to see that
that MDE had already issued construction permits in 2006. And it worked. It corrupted the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin for three to five years rather than right away. It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been had. Page 63 So bottom line, MDE permits had been sisued. And that was true. But almost no one knew that from the outset they were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution East. So the final thing I'll talk about before I ask for a short break is sort of the so what question. So what if the applicant used Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued to falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that Talbot County had already reviewed and approved Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued ago, proving the first point since permits oculdn't have been issued without the County's do it again. Look at the issues that were not discussed, not even mentioned in Talbot County's review of Resolution 281, while people were focused on whether a sludge pond should have two feet or three feet of freeboard. Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the people in Trappe, but everybody wherever they live. Who is going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county road improvements, all the additional services? Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Not And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. Wher	10	project was coming anyway.	10	Lakeside got the proper review that was needed
the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin for three to five years rather than right away. If seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been had. Page 63 So bottom line, MDE permits had been issued. And that was true. But almost no one knew that from the outset they were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 281. So the final thing I'll talk about before I alsk for a short break is sort of the so what presumably valid permits for the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits to couldn't have been issued without the County's approval? As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd the Planning Commission and everyone else that and some on the Council felt they had achieved the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved to something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the to split have been in this would read to so the very relieve feet of freeboard. Number to expect of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all have two feet or three feet of freeboard. Number two, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all and to two for the so the ware focused on whether a sludge pond should have two feet or three feet of freeboard. Number twe fect or three feet	11	And what was the proof? The proof was	11	then and is still needed now in December 2021.
the whole process. It's why some commissioners and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin for three to five years rather than right away. It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been had. Page 63 So bottom line, MDE permits had been sknew that from the outset they were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 281. So the final thing I'll talk about before 1 ask for a short break is sort of the so what 1 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 1 ago, proving the first point since permits 1 ask or a Smr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd do it again. You had invalid. Pretty powers were deveryone else that 1 So what if Resolution 281, while people were focused on whether a sludge pond should have two feet or three feet of freeboard. Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the people in Trappe, but everybody wherever they 20 every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the people in Trappe, but everybody wherever they 21 live. Who is going to pay for the schools? Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county road improvements, all the additional services? Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of Trappe. And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it.	12	that MDE had already issued construction	12	Look at the issues that were not
and some on the Council felt they had achieved something when the developer reluctantly agreed to split Lakeside into two phases so the southern part would not be eligible to begin for three to five years rather than right away. It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been had. Page 63 So bottom line, MDE permits had been sissued. And that was true. But almost no one ad invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 281. So the final thing I'll talk about before lask for a short break is sort of the so what presumably valid permits for the sewer long ago, that MDE had issued ago, proving the first point since permits and oil the Planning Commission and everyone else that leading ago that MDE had issued the Planning Commission and everyone else that leading ago the MDE had issued the Planning Commission and everyone else that leading ago, that MDE had issued the Planning Commission and everyone else that leading ago, that MDE had issued the Planning Commission and everyone else that leading ago, the MDE had issued the Planning Commission and everyone else that leading the first point since permits to some the view feet or three feet of freeboard. Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the people in Trappe, but everybody wherever they live. Who is going to pay for the schools? Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county road improvements, all the additional services? Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of Trappe. And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it.	13	permits in 2006. And it worked. It corrupted	13	discussed, not even mentioned in Talbot
16 something when the developer reluctantly agreed 17 to split Lakeside into two phases so the 18 southern part would not be eligible to begin 19 for three to five years rather than right away. 20 It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been 21 had. Page 63 1 So bottom line, MDE permits had been 22 issued. And that was true. But almost no one 3 knew that from the outset they were improper 4 and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It 5 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 6 281. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 9 question. So what if the applicant used 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 18 have two feet or three fect of freeboard. 17 Number one, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, there was no discussion at all 18 as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the people in Trappe, but everybody wherever they 10 live. Who is going to pay for the schools? 11 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county road improvements, all the additional services? 14 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of 15 Trappe. 16 Trappe. 17 And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. 18 Not at ax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 19 Nobody talked about it. 19 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 10 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 11 nobody talked about it. 11 Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 12 nobody talk	14	the whole process. It's why some commissioners	14	County's review of Resolution 281, while people
17 to split Lakeside into two phases so the 18 southern part would not be eligible to begin 19 for three to five years rather than right away. 20 It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been 21 had. Page 63 1 So bottom line, MDE permits had been 22 issued. And that was true. But almost no one 3 knew that from the outset they were improper 4 and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It 5 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 6 281. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 9 question. So what if the applicant used 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 18 of this matter, there was no discussion at all 19 of this matter, there was no discussion at all 19 as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost 20 every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the 21 page 65 22 live. Who is going to pay for the schools? 23 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is 24 going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county 25 road improvements, all the additional services? 26 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of 27 Trappe. 28 And you know, don't you, that we have a 28 property tax revenue cap here in this county. 29 Not at ax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 20 cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how 26 much money a billion dollars of new assessable 27 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 28 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 29 Nobody talked about it. 30 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 31 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 32 nobody talked about it. 31 The Council didn't 32 talk about it. 33 talk town the reverbody wherever they 34 live. Who is going to pay for the schools? 35 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Tr	15	and some on the Council felt they had achieved	15	were focused on whether a sludge pond should
18 southern part would not be eligible to begin 19 for three to five years rather than right away. 20 It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been 21 had. Page 63 1 So bottom line, MDE permits had been 22 issued. And that was true. But almost no one 3 knew that from the outset they were improper 4 and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It 5 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 6 281. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 9 question. So what if the applicant used 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 18 of this matter, there was no discussion at all 19 as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the people in Trappe, but everybody wherever they 20 Page 65 21 Live. Who is going to pay for the schools? 22 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is 33 going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county road improvements, all the additional services? 34 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of Trappe. 35 Trappe. 36 Trappe. 36 Trappe. 37 And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. 38 And you know, don't you at a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to be a fiscal mess. 38 Nobody talked about it. 39 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. 40 It is doi to again. 41 Number two, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, no one at the public hearing	16	something when the developer reluctantly agreed	16	have two feet or three feet of freeboard.
for three to five years rather than right away. It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been issued they were improper It who is going to pay for the schools? Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is going to pay for the schools? Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of It seemed like a big wit everybody wherever they And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked ab	17	to split Lakeside into two phases so the	17	Number one, because of the corrupt framing
20 It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been had. 21 Page 63 1 So bottom line, MDE permits had been issued. And that was true. But almost no one 3 knew that from the outset they were improper 4 and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It 5 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 6 281. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 9 question. So what if the applicant used 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 12 tax base is going to be a fiscal mess. 14 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 15 Vot Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is 3 going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county 4 road improvements, all the additional services? Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of 6 Trappe. 1 So the final thing I'll talk about before 7 And you know, don't you, that we have a 8 property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 10 cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how 11 much money a billion dollars of new assessable 12 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 13 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. 15 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 16 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 17 nobody talked about it. The Council didn't 18 do it again. 18 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 19 of this matter, no one at the public hearing 19 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 19 of this matter, no one at the public hearing 10 of this matter, no one at the public hearing 10 of this matter, no one at the public hearing 10 of this matter, no one at the public hearing 10 of this matter, no one at the public hearing 10 of this matter, no one at the public hearing 10 of this matter, no one at the public hearing 10 of this matter, no one at the public hearing 10 of this matter, no one at the publi	18	southern part would not be eligible to begin	18	of this matter, there was no discussion at all
Page 63 So bottom line, MDE permits had been issued. And that was true. But almost no one knew that from the outset they were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution So the final thing I'll talk about before I ask for a short break is sort of the so what question. So what if the applicant used I falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that I Talbot County had already reviewed and approved Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued I ago, proving the first point since permits couldn't have been issued without the County's approval? As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd of the Planning Commission and everyone else that I visue. Who is going to pay for the schools? Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county road improvements, all the additional services? Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of Trappe. And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it. Number two, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, no one at the public hearing	19	for three to five years rather than right away.	19	as to how much money Lakeside is going to cost
Page 63 1 So bottom line, MDE permits had been 2 issued. And that was true. But almost no one 3 knew that from the outset they were improper 4 and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It 5 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 6 281. 6 Trappe. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 9 question. So what if the applicant used 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, else that 18 do it again. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 2 live. Who is going to pay for the schools? 2 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is 3 going to pay for the schools? 2 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is 3 going to pay for the schools? 3 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is 4 road improvements, all the additional services? 5 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of 6 Trappe. 7 And you know, don't you, that we have a 8 property tax revenue cap here in this county. 9 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 10 cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable 12 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 13 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 14 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 15 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 16 nobody talked about it. The Council didn't 18 talk about it. 18 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 19 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	20	It seemed like a big win, but I think we'd been	20	every Talbot County taxpayer. Not just the
1 Iive. Who is going to pay for the schools? 2 issued. And that was true. But almost no one 3 knew that from the outset they were improper 4 and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It 5 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 6 281. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 9 question. So what if the applicant used 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 18 Iive. Who is going to pay for the schools? 19 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is 3 going to pay for the sew EMT staff, the county 10 road improvements, all the additional services? 10 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of 11 Trappe. 12 And you know, don't you, that we have a 13 property tax revenue cap here in this county. 14 Poor tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 16 cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable 17 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 18 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 19 Nobody talked about it. 10 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 11 talk about it. 12 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 13 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	21	had.	21	people in Trappe, but everybody wherever they
2 issued. And that was true. But almost no one 3 knew that from the outset they were improper 4 and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It 5 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 6 281. 6 Trappe. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 9 question. So what if the applicant used 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 18 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. 2 Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. 3 going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county road improvements, all the additional services? 4 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of 5 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of 6 Trappe. 7 And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. 9 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 10 cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 14 Nobody talked about it. 15 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it. 16 Number two, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, no one at the public hearing		Page 63		Page 65
knew that from the outset they were improper and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution corrupt good improvements, all the additional services? Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of Trappe. And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. Number two, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, no one at the public hearing	1	So bottom line, MDE permits had been	1	live. Who is going to pay for the schools?
and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution of Trappe. Corput tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap bere in this county. much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it. Number two, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, no one at the public hearing	2	issued. And that was true. But almost no one	2	Not Mr. Rocks, not the Town of Trappe. Who is
5 corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution 6 281. 6 Trappe. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 9 question. So what if the applicant used 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 18 Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of 17 Trappe. 7 And you know, don't you, that we have a 18 property tax revenue cap here in this county. 19 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 10 cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how 11 much money a billion dollars of new assessable 12 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 13 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 14 Nobody talked about it. 15 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 16 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 17 nobody talked about it. The Council didn't 18 do it again. 18 talk about it. 19 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 19 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	3	knew that from the outset they were improper	3	going to pay for the new EMT staff, the county
6 281. 6 Trappe. 7 So the final thing I'll talk about before 7 And you know, don't you, that we have a 8 I ask for a short break is sort of the so what 8 property tax revenue cap here in this county. 9 question. So what if the applicant used 9 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 10 cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 11 much money a billion dollars of new assessable 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 12 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 13 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 14 Nobody talked about it. 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 15 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 16 approval? 16 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 18 talk about it. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 20 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	4	and invalid. Pretty powerful stuff. It	4	road improvements, all the additional services?
So the final thing I'll talk about before I ask for a short break is sort of the so what question. So what if the applicant used falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that Talbot County had already reviewed and approved Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued presumably valid permits for the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits couldn't have been issued without the County's approval? And you know, don't you, that we have a property tax revenue cap here in this county. Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it. So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to the Planning Commission and everyone else that of this matter, no one at the public hearing	5	corrupted completely the issuance of Resolution	5	Not Rocks Engineering and not the Town of
I ask for a short break is sort of the so what question. So what if the applicant used 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 20 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 20 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 20 Nobody talked about it. 3 property tax revenue cap here in this county. 4 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 20 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 20 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 20 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, at a tax revenue cap here in this county. 4 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, at a tax revenue cap here in this county. 4 Tax base is going to a pillion dollars of new assessable 20 the Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 21 cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how 22 much money a billion dollars of new assessable 23 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 24 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 24 Nobody talked about it. 25 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 26 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 27 nobody talked about it. 28 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 29 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	6	281.	6	Trappe.
question. So what if the applicant used 9 Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 10 falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that 11 Talbot County had already reviewed and approved 12 Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 10 cap, but a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate 10 cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 14 Nobody talked about it. 15 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it. 18 talk about it. 19 Number two, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, no one at the public hearing	7	So the final thing I'll talk about before	7	And you know, don't you, that we have a
falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that Talbot County had already reviewed and approved Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued presumably valid permits for the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to approval? As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to the Planning Commission and everyone else that Cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how much money a billion dollars of new assessable tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it. Number two, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, no one at the public hearing	8	I ask for a short break is sort of the so what	8	property tax revenue cap here in this county.
Talbot County had already reviewed and approved Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued presumably valid permits for the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits local difference of the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits local difference of the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits local difference of the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits local difference of the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits local difference of the sewer long ago, proving to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. Nobody talked about it. Robert Talbot County, not a nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. Nobody talked about it. Nobody talked about it. Nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it. Nobody talked about it.	9	question. So what if the applicant used	9	Not a tax rate cap, everyone, not a tax rate
Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued 12 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 13 presumably valid permits for the sewer long 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 10 tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a 11 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 12 Nobody talked about it. 13 Nobody talked about it. 14 Nobody talked about it. The Council didn't 18 talk about it. 19 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 20 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	10	falsehoods and misrepresentations to imply that	10	cap, but a tax revenue cap. So do you know how
presumably valid permits for the sewer long ago, proving the first point since permits 14 ago, proving the first point since permits 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 21 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 22 Nobody talked about it. 23 nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess. 24 Nobody talked about it. 25 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 26 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 27 nobody talked about it. 28 talk about it. 29 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 20 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	11	Talbot County had already reviewed and approved	11	much money a billion dollars of new assessable
ago, proving the first point since permits 14 Nobody talked about it. 15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 16 Cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 14 Nobody talked about it. 15 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 16 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 17 nobody talked about it. The Council didn't 18 talk about it. 19 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 20 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	12	Lakeside long ago, that MDE had issued	12	tax base is going to bring Talbot County, not a
15 couldn't have been issued without the County's 16 approval? 16 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 17 As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 18 do it again. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 21 Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to 22 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and 23 nobody talked about it. The Council didn't 24 talk about it. 25 Number two, because of the corrupt framing 26 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	13	presumably valid permits for the sewer long	13	nickel. It's going to be a fiscal mess.
approval? As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd do it again. So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to the Planning Commission and everyone else that 16 cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and nobody talked about it. The Council didn't talk about it. Number two, because of the corrupt framing of this matter, no one at the public hearing	14	ago, proving the first point since permits	14	Nobody talked about it.
As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd 17 nobody talked about it. The Council didn't 18 do it again. 18 talk about it. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 20 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	15	couldn't have been issued without the County's	15	Wherever they live, Lakeside is going to
do it again. 18 talk about it. 19 So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to 20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 20 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	16	approval?	16	cost every Talbot County taxpayer a bundle, and
So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to the Planning Commission and everyone else that the Planning Commission else t	17	As Mr. Showalter assured everyone, they'd	17	nobody talked about it. The Council didn't
20 the Planning Commission and everyone else that 20 of this matter, no one at the public hearing	18	do it again.	18	talk about it.
	19	So what if Resolution 281 was portrayed to	19	Number two, because of the corrupt framing
21 it was just pro forma, relating only to 21 talked about any of the other following things	20	the Planning Commission and everyone else that	20	of this matter, no one at the public hearing
	21	it was just pro formal relating only to	21	talked about any of the other following things

			<u> </u>
	Page 66		Page 68
1	either, all of which are fundamental to the	1	The risk of creating a new retail hub,
2	Comp Plan. And this is in regard, remember, to	2	which, with the town controlling the rezoning
3	the biggest, most impactful, most disruptive	3	and enthralled to the big developer, could
4	project ever proposed in Talbot County. We	4	easily happen.
5	didn't talk about it.	5	The basic common sense question whether a
6	Lakeside's impact on our rural character,	6	single developer is permitted to sextuple the
7	which is fundamental to the Comp Plan vision.	7	size of a small town without any conditions,
8	Lakeside's impact on the quality of life in	8	does the one-time authorization from the county
9	Talbot County, also fundamental to the Comp	9	and the loss then of any control forever after?
10	Plan. The traffic, not just the enormous	10	Whether it's wise to let any developer,
11	impact of traffic in general, but the State's	11	Rocks Engineering being just an example, of
12	utter foolishness in particular of authorizing	12	such a huge dominant project to operate ever
13	a town of 7,000 essentially to straddle the	13	after with only the regulation of one small
14	County's and the Delmarva Peninsula's main	14	little town that inevitably will dominate it,
15	highway when the State is planning to spend	15	including, for example, powers of zoning, over
16	billions to move traffic faster across the Bay	16	rezoning and land use.
17	Bridge to speed down to Trappe.	17	And nobody ever talked about the
18	MR. DIVILIO: Excuse me. Can you read	18	alternative of encouraging Trappe to grow on
19	that statement again? You said nobody spoke?	19	the west side of Route 50, where in the 2002
20	MR. WATSON: Yes. I will read it.	20	comprehensive water and sewer long-range plan,
21	I said that the general intro is these are	21	there were a lot of properties also designated
	Page 67		Page 69
1	things not discussed in the public hearing or	1	S-2, sizeable parcels that would accommodate
2	what have you.	2	growth (inaudible) and scale. And in fact, had
3	Traffic, not just the enormous impact in	3	been intended there were a couple of parcels
4	general, but the State's utter foolishness in	4	that were intended, three large tracts, to go
5	particular of authorizing a town of 7,000	5	ahead of Lakeside designated as S-1 for
6	essentially to straddle the county's and	6	immediate priority. Those were among the
7	Delmarva's main highway when the State is	7	properties you saw up there on the circles that
8	planning to spend billions to move traffic	8	had been downgraded by the applicant's mapping
9	faster across the Bay Bridge. Never discussed	9	errors unnoticed by anyone.
10	by the Planning Commission or by you on the	10	The applicant's falsehoods and corrupt
11	Council on the record.	11	framing of Resolution 281, and this is the
12	MR. DIVILIO: Thank you.	12	point, the applicant's falsehoods and
13	MR. WATSON: How about the multi-million		corrupt this is the so what. These
14	dollar clover leaf overpass that will have to	14	falsehoods corrupted the framing of Resolution
15	be built in Trappe. Did you know that there	15	281 and assured that all discussion focused
16	are three spots already drawn up on the Town of	16	only on technical wastewater issues. And even
17	Trappe's Comprehensive Plan for the clover	17	there, the county was misled, if you recall
18	leaf? No one talked about it.	18	Dr. Smullen's report and the photos of La
19	School capacity and the expense to build a	19	Trappe Creek.
20	school. Nobody, on the record anyway, breathed	20	The applicant's falsehoods concerning the
21	a word about that.	21	S-2 sewer classification and MDE's bogus
	a word about man		5 2 50 wor classification and MDE's bogus

	Tuisot County C		
	Page 70		Page 72
1	permits undermine entirely the integrity of our	1	falsehood about the Lakeside sewer service
2	land review process. If, in the face of this	2	priority classification. We were told that
3	new information, you, the County Council, let	3	prior to adopting Resolution 281, Lakeside was
4	stand Resolution 281 and refuse to rescind it	4	classified S-2 and had been in that status for
5	without prejudice, you will be driving a stake	5	18 years.
6	through any pretense of integrity of our land	6	The title of Resolution 281 and the text
7	review process.	7	both falsely state it.
8	And this is why I and more than 412 other	8	Talbot County established its
9	citizens are calling on you to rescind 281	9	comprehensive water and sewer plan when the
10	tomorrow night.	10	County Council adopted Resolution 281 (sic.) on
11	And if you permit it, I'd like to take a	11	October 6, 2002. Technically that action was a
12	very short break, after which I will present	12	report of the review and an earlier Comp Plan
13	the proof, put on the table the proof. And	13	enacted in 2002. It was adopted six months
14	we'll see how quickly we can wrap this up.	14	before the properties east of Route 50 were
15	MR. PACK: Madam Chairperson, can I get a	15	optioned, had been optioned by Rocks and other
16	time check, a time frame?	16	properties were annexed into the Town of
17	MR. WATSON: I don't see what time it is.	17	Trappe.
18	MR. CALLAHAN: It's 6:15 and we're giving	18	Incredibly, it seems that only 18 hard
19	you to seven o'clock.	19	copies of that 2002 comprehensive water and
20	MR. WATSON: Let me not take a break,	20	sewer plan were made. And only five were
21	then, please.	21	distributed to county officials. Although it
	Page 71		Page 73
1	MR. CALLAHAN: Okay. Yup.	1	has now been amended 55 times, to this day the
2	MS. PRICE: Would five minutes help?	2	Talbot County comprehensive water and sewer
3	Everyone want to take a five-minute break? Is	3	plan document is not even accessible on the
4	that okay?	4	web. It was put up on the web on
5	MR. WATSON: I'm sorry?	5	September 11th because I was asking a lot of
6	MR. CALLAHAN: You can take a five.	6	questions. But at 453 megabytes, really no one
7	MR. WATSON: No. If it's going to cut	7	can download it.
8	into the time, I can keep going.	8	The inaccessibility of the full
9	MR. CALLAHAN: Okay.	9	comprehensive water and sewer plan document may
10	MR. WATSON: So now to the evidence	10	have contributed to the problems with Lakeside,
11	proving what I say is true.	11	as it inhibited anyone from looking at the
12	First I'd like to remind everyone that the	12	controlling document in its entirety.
13	material assembled, the arguments I've	13	So we need to look at the 2002
14	expressed are set out in detail in that letter	14	comprehensive water and sewer plan document to
15	and all that information can be made available.	15	understand the sewer priority classification
16	And if after this session, as the proof, any	16	applied to Lakeside 18 years ago, which was the
17	individual Council member or two members wanted	17	baseline for consideration of Resolution 281.
18	to go over something, I'm happy to do that, I'm	18	This is actually much simpler than it seems.
19	available.	19	Anyone can follow it.
20	As to the proof, I would first like to	20	First, only certain parcels of land have
1			

1 in Talbot County is not classified. It's 2 called unprogrammed, which says there are no 3 plans in place to connect to sewer. 4 But the county government is willing to 5 authorize sewer for any property. The county 6 shows that parcel by parcel on maps included in 7 its comprehensive water and sewer plan. And if 8 any individual property owner wants sewer, it 9 must come to the county to get the property 10 formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, 11 that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe 12 did when it presented 281, even though they 1 and can be developed. MDE knows that. B 2 maybe someone got confused about it 20 ye 3 ago. Who knows? 4 So to know about Lakeside's status, we 5 must simply look at the maps and the Talbo 6 County comprehensive water and sewer chapter two, pages 43 to 47. 9 Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 10 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer plan I think that were ever printed. And as 11 think that were ever printed. And as	ars
2 called unprogrammed, which says there are no 3 plans in place to connect to sewer. 4 But the county government is willing to 5 authorize sewer for any property. The county 6 shows that parcel by parcel on maps included in 7 its comprehensive water and sewer plan. And if 8 any individual property owner wants sewer, it 9 must come to the county to get the property 10 formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, 11 that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe 12 maybe someone got confused about it 20 ye ago. Who knows? 4 So to know about Lakeside's status, we must simply look at the maps and the Talbo 6 County comprehensive water and sewer chapter two, pages 43 to 47. 9 Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 10 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe 11 plan I think that were ever printed. And as 12 did when it presented 281, even though they 13 go. Who knows? 4 So to know about Lakeside's status, we must simply look at the maps and the Talbo 6 County comprehensive water and sewer chapter two, pages 43 to 47. 9 Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 10 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer plan I think that were ever printed. And as 11 plan I think that were ever printed. And as	ars
plans in place to connect to sewer. But the county government is willing to authorize sewer for any property. The county shows that parcel by parcel on maps included in tits comprehensive water and sewer plan. And if any individual property owner wants sewer, it must come to the county to get the property formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe did when it presented 281, even though they ago. Who knows? So to know about Lakeside's status, we must simply look at the maps and the Talbo County comprehensive water and sewer characteristic pertaining to Trappe, which are found in chapter two, pages 43 to 47. Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer plan I think that were ever printed. And as	
But the county government is willing to authorize sewer for any property. The county shows that parcel by parcel on maps included in its comprehensive water and sewer plan. And if any individual property owner wants sewer, it must come to the county to get the property formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe did when it presented 281, even though they So to know about Lakeside's status, we must simply look at the maps and the Talbo County comprehensive water and sewer cha pertaining to Trappe, which are found in chapter two, pages 43 to 47. Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer plan I think that were ever printed. And as	
authorize sewer for any property. The county shows that parcel by parcel on maps included in its comprehensive water and sewer plan. And if any individual property owner wants sewer, it must simply look at the maps and the Talbo County comprehensive water and sewer cha pertaining to Trappe, which are found in chapter two, pages 43 to 47. Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe did when it presented 281, even though they shows that parcel by parcel on maps included in county comprehensive water and sewer cha pertaining to Trappe, which are found in chapter two, pages 43 to 47. Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer plan I think that were ever printed. And as you can see in these plans, the maps are blo	
shows that parcel by parcel on maps included in its comprehensive water and sewer plan. And if any individual property owner wants sewer, it must come to the county to get the property formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe to the plan I think that were ever printed. And as did when it presented 281, even though they to county comprehensive water and sewer charges are countries. Country comprehensive water and sewer charges are countries to Trappe, which are found in chapter two, pages 43 to 47. Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges are charges. The country comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges are charges. The country comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges are charges. The country comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges are charges. The country comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges are charges. The country comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges are charges. The country comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges are charges. The country comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges are charges. The country comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges are charges. The comprehensive water and sewer charges are charges. The comprehensive water and sewer charges are cha	
its comprehensive water and sewer plan. And if any individual property owner wants sewer, it must come to the county to get the property formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe did when it presented 281, even though they did when it presented 281, even though they represented 281, even though they represented 281, even though they pertaining to Trappe, which are found in chapter two, pages 43 to 47. Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer plan I think that were ever printed. And as	oter
any individual property owner wants sewer, it 9 must come to the county to get the property 10 formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, 11 that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe 12 did when it presented 281, even though they 13 chapter two, pages 43 to 47. 4 Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer plan I think that were ever printed. And as 12 you can see in these plans, the maps are blo	
9 must come to the county to get the property 10 formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, 11 that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe 12 did when it presented 281, even though they 13 Fortunately, I have here one of the 18 14 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer plan I think that were ever printed. And as 15 you can see in these plans, the maps are blo	
formally reclassified and remapped. Indeed, that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe did when it presented 281, even though they 10 copies of the comprehensive water and sewer plans. It is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe 11 plan I think that were ever printed. And as 12 you can see in these plans, the maps are blo	
that is just what Rocks and the Town of Trappe land I think that were ever printed. And as did when it presented 281, even though they land you can see in these plans, the maps are blo	
did when it presented 281, even though they 22 you can see in these plans, the maps are blo	r
	vn
told Mr. Spies that they really didn't have to. 13 up, much bigger, easier to read.	
Now, in Talbot County there are three 14 The documents, incidentally, the documents	nts
sewer service priority classifications called 15 I saw in MDE files from 2004 from PIA	
16 S-1, S-2, and S-3. If you're not mapped in one 16 agreements had copies of these maps photoe	opied
of those categories, it means the county is 17 in black and white. Absolutely unreadable.	
simply not planning to extend sewer to your 18 Can we put up the next slide, please? All	
19 particular property. 19 right. Let's keep going. Next. Okay. The	
20 If, as, and when the county plans to do 20 next one. Okay. Here we are. Sorry. Okay	•
21 so, it will remap and reclassify your property 21 So this slide is in your packet at 7B.	
Page 75	ıge 77
1 and show it on the sewer service area map. 1 The Trappe section of the county comprehe	sive
2 In Talbot County, property can be 2 water and sewer plan starts with some very	
3 connected to sewer if it is classified S-1, 3 brief narrative of the existing sewer service	
4 which means immediate priority. If you're not 4 system as it existed at that time. The key	
5 S-1, no hook up. 5 item I will call your attention to is this	
6 When a property is classified S-2, means 6 figure 23, which is up on the screen.	
7 that at the time the classification is made, 7 As you see, its label describes exactly	
8 the county expects, expects that that property 8 what it is. Town of Trappe, label is over he	e
9 will be moved up to S-1 in three to five years 9 right there, can't read it here, the Town of	
and presumably then developed and hooked up to 10 Trappe sewer service area. The dark gray a	e
	:
11 sewer. 11 areas as the legend clearly shows that are th	
11 sewer. 11 areas as the legend clearly shows that are th 12 I emphasize expects because Maryland law 12 properties that as October of 2002 were	
12 I emphasize expects because Maryland law 12 properties that as October of 2002 were	up
I emphasize expects because Maryland law and the language of the comprehensive water and law classified S-1, this dark gray, immediate	up
I emphasize expects because Maryland law and the language of the comprehensive water and sewer plan itself is very clear. The fact that 12 properties that as October of 2002 were classified S-1, this dark gray, immediate priority. Meaning they were already hooked	up
I emphasize expects because Maryland law and the language of the comprehensive water and sewer plan itself is very clear. The fact that the property is expected or programmed to be the property is expected or programmed to be to properties that as October of 2002 were classified S-1, this dark gray, immediate priority. Meaning they were already hooked to the property is expected or programmed to be to or they were entitled to be hooked up.	up
I emphasize expects because Maryland law and the language of the comprehensive water and sewer plan itself is very clear. The fact that the property is expected or programmed to be moved up to S-1 at a certain time is not self 12 properties that as October of 2002 were classified S-1, this dark gray, immediate priority. Meaning they were already hooked or they were entitled to be hooked up. In bright orange are the areas that the	up
I emphasize expects because Maryland law and the language of the comprehensive water and sewer plan itself is very clear. The fact that the property is expected or programmed to be moved up to S-1 at a certain time is not self operative. I properties that as October of 2002 were classified S-1, this dark gray, immediate priority. Meaning they were already hooked or they were entitled to be hooked up. In bright orange are the areas that the legend says are S-2. It's hard to see on this	up
I emphasize expects because Maryland law and the language of the comprehensive water and sewer plan itself is very clear. The fact that the property is expected or programmed to be moved up to S-1 at a certain time is not self operative. In bright orange are the areas that the legend says are S-2. It's hard to see on this slide, but that's orange. And yeah, that one	up

	Page 78		Page 80
1	county expected that in three to five years	1	classified S-2 did not originate in 2019, but
2	those parcels might be moved up to S-1 and so	2	started back around 2004 when Rocks and the
3	on. And if so, then they could be connected	3	Town of Trappe began pursuing permits from MDE.
4	and developed.	4	It probably contributed to the permit falsehood
5	In brown, and there's only a little of it	5	also.
6	in the very top and the very bottom right, are	6	So how did this claim originate that
7	the few parcels classified in the legend S-3.	7	Lakeside was S-2? Here is another map you will
8	Meaning that in October 2002, the county	8	find.
9	expected those properties to be moved up	9	Next slide, I'm sorry, Ms. Moran.
10	towards development and eligibility in six to	10	So how did this claim originate that it
11	ten years. And that's it. That is the status	11	was S-2? Here is the other map, you've seen it
12	of the Trappe sewer service area in October of	12	before, of Trappe. And this is a map, figure
13	2002.	13	24, called the long-range planning sewer
14	With one exception, having nothing to do	14	service map. And it's just what it says, a
15	with Lakeside at all, Talbot County made no	15	long-range plan.
16	change to the sewer service area	16	Now, some really simple but (inaudible)
17	classifications or maps from that date until	17	analogies will illustrate the point. Let's
18	adoption of Resolution 281 in August 2020.	18	just say you're asked to describe yourself and
19	Now, if you look at figure 23, look in	19	you say I'm a single man but I have a
20	your copy of this figure 23, at the land on the	20	long-range plan to get married.
21	east side of Route 50, the land comprising	21	Or you're asked to describe your residency
	Page 79		Page 81
1	Lakeside, as we all see, that this land right	1	and say I live in Talbot County and I have a
2	here, all that. As we all see, that land is	2	long-range plan to move to California.
3	white. Not gray, not orange, not brown, but	3	Or you describe your profession. And you
4	white. That means that when the comprehensive	4	say I'm an auto mechanism, but I have a
5	water and sewer plan was adopted, Lakeside,	5	long-range plan to become a brain surgeon.
6	like most of the land in Talbot County, was	6	In each case, the first part describes
7	given no sewer service classification by Talbot	7	your current condition, followed by something
8	County. It was what everyone called	8	that describes your expectation for the future
9	unprogrammed. It's a corn field. It had	9	at the time that you answered the question.
10	always been unprogrammed. It was unprogrammed	10	Expectation or not, you're not married
11	when it was adopted in 2002, as this map shows,	11	until you find a partner, get a license, and
12	and it was unprogrammed on August the 10th,	12	say I do. You're not a resident of California
13	2020.	13	until you backpack your stuff and move. And
14	D 4 1 4 1 1 4 4 4 1	14	you won't be permitted to operate until you go
	But when the applicant presented	1	
15	Resolution 281 to the Council in December 17,	15	to med school and a lot more.
15 16			to med school and a lot more. And in expressing an expectation, you did
	Resolution 281 to the Council in December 17,	15	
16	Resolution 281 to the Council in December 17, 2019, and throughout 2020, as it was being	15 16	And in expressing an expectation, you did
16 17	Resolution 281 to the Council in December 17, 2019, and throughout 2020, as it was being evaluated by everyone, it was misrepresented to	15 16 17	And in expressing an expectation, you did not commit yourself to it. In each case, a
16 17 18	Resolution 281 to the Council in December 17, 2019, and throughout 2020, as it was being evaluated by everyone, it was misrepresented to long ago been reclassified S-2, programmed for	15 16 17 18	And in expressing an expectation, you did not commit yourself to it. In each case, a specific action is needed to move from one

	Page 82		Page 84
1	classification is if the Talbot County Council	1	was read at every meeting and you heard it
2	adopts a resolution amending the comprehensive	2	repeated again in the transcripts. It was
3	water and sewer plan, which can only be done if	3	untrue.
4	the Planning Commission has found that the	4	There are many other ways to corroborate
5	proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive	5	that figure 23 is the right one. An obvious
6	Plan, which can only be done after	6	example is the one other time some properties
7	commissioners hear comments at a public hearing	7	in Trappe, properties totally unrelated to
8	and considers the full gamut of elements of the	8	Lakeside, were reclassified. These were the
9	Comprehensive Plan, not just one.	9	little strip of residences in the southeast
10	So the only remaining question is whether	10	section of old Trappe. This little piece right
11	the sewer service classification for Lakeside	11	down there.
12	property was ever changed subsequent to its	12	If you look at the slide, on figure 24 the
13	adoption in October 2002. The answer is it did	13	lots are shown in gray as S-1, eligible for
14	not.	14	connection. Figure 24 says S-1, they're
15	The law is very clear and well-practiced.	15	eligible for connection.
16	To obtain any priority classification at all to	16	But in March of 2018, the Town of Trappe
17	move up from one to the next, the County	17	presented a request to the county, Resolution
18	Council and only the County Council must	18	259, to reclassify them S-1 from category S-3.
19	expressly authorize that step by amending the	19	Obviously, if figure 24 was the relevant
20	plan. The classification cannot be changed by	20	document, that would have been unnecessary.
21	action of a municipality or by interpretation	21	But if you look at figures 23, they are
	Page 83		Page 85
1	by MDE, interpretation by MDE or any other	1	classified S-3 and do need to be reclassified.
2	matter. And the passage of time does not do	2	And that's what happened.
3	it. That is even if Lakeside had been	3	Finally, I want to report that among other
4	classified S-2 for development in three to five	4	knowledgeable people who have recently reviewed
5	years, which it was not, the passage of five	5	this proposition I'm making, Mike Pullen, the
6	years would not have transformed Lakeside to	6	former attorney for 20 years, which included
7	S-1 status.	7	the period from 2002 comprehensive water and
8	Once, in 2004, the town tried to get the	8	sewer plan was adopted, agrees that this is the
9	Council to reclassify Lakeside from its	9	correct analysis, what I'm saying here. And
10	unprogrammed status to S-1. And the Council,	10	you have a copy of Mr. Pullen's e-mail
11	Talbot County Council, turned them down flat.	11	confirming that in your package at Exhibit 7C.
12	That story I'll relate shortly as a part of the	12	So now let's move to the issuance of the
13	timeline on the falsehood number two.	13	invalid permits in 2006. In 2005 and six, MDE
14	So in presenting R281, the applicant, with	14	issued a discharge permit and two construction
15	their experienced lawyers and engineers who are	15	permits to Lakeside for this billion dollar
16	expert in land use matters, consistently	16	deal.
17	ignored figure 23, the true sewer service map,	17	The permits were invalid because, number
18	and instead misrepresented that figure 24	18	one, MDE cannot issue construction permits to
19	described the sewer service priority	19	extend sewer facilities to property whose sewer
20	classification of the Lakeside property. That	20	service priority classification is not
21	falsehood was repeated each time the resolution	21	immediate priority. Meaning S-1 in Talbot
	. P		

referendum. Rocks had not even laid out the substantial inducements he was offering to the Town of Trappe's voters, and the annexation wasn't approved and completed until May of that year, about six months after the Planning Commission met. But Rocks and the town got started with their plans and in December of 2003 submitted an application to Dr. Tien at MDE's water and science division seeking a discharge permit for sesentially the same new spray irrigation plant we see today. The documents are in your package I obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a for this, and this is a quote, "Mr. Rauch's enclosures do not include all of the relevant pages of the county comprehensive water and sewer plan. In particular, charter two, page 45, and figure 23." He went on to fully explain the same falsehood that I've described here. And he pointed out that none of the property was classified S-1 and he called for an investigation. This was in December of 200. Here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a for chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to for 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to for 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say prepared to publish a tentative approval once the appropriate water and sewer plan classifications are in place. That means once
2 substantial inducements he was offering to the 3 Town of Trappe's voters, and the annexation 4 wasn't approved and completed until May of that 5 year, about six months after the Planning 6 Commission met. 7 But Rocks and the town got started with 8 their plans and in December of 2003 submitted 9 an application to Dr. Tien at MDE's water and 10 science division seeking a discharge permit for 11 essentially the same new spray irrigation plant 12 we see today. 13 The documents are in your package I 14 obtained via a PIA request shows some of the 15 internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded 16 with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a 17 chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive 18 water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 this, and this is a quote, "Mr. Rauch's 2 enclosures do not include all of the relevant 3 this, and this is a quote, "Mr. Rauch's 4 enclosures do not include all of the relevant 5 pages of the county comprehensive water and 6 sewer plan. In particular, charter two, page 45, and figure 23." He went on to fully explain the same 6 pointed out that none of the property was 6 classified S-1 and he called for an 12 investigation. This was in December of 200-13 Here is an interesting episode. In July 14 of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some 15 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say 16 MDE had reviewed the application and was 17 prepared to publish a tentative approval once 18 water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to
Town of Trappe's voters, and the annexation wasn't approved and completed until May of that year, about six months after the Planning Commission met. But Rocks and the town got started with an application to Dr. Tien at MDE's water and science division seeking a discharge permit for essentially the same new spray irrigation plant we see today. The documents are in your package I obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a for this, and this is a quote, "Mr. Rauch's enclosures do not include all of the relevant pages of the county comprehensive water and sewer plan. In particular, charter two, page 45, and figure 23." He went on to fully explain the same pointed out that none of the property was classified S-1 and he called for an investigation. This was in December of 2004 Here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say MDE had reviewed the application and was prepared to publish a tentative approval once the appropriate water and sewer plan
wasn't approved and completed until May of that year, about six months after the Planning Commission met. But Rocks and the town got started with an application to Dr. Tien at MDE's water and science division seeking a discharge permit for essentially the same new spray irrigation plant we see today. The documents are in your package I obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a fractional or approval and completed until May of that pages of the county comprehensive water and sewer plan. In particular, charter two, page 45, and figure 23." He went on to fully explain the same falsehood that I've described here. And he pointed out that none of the property was classified S-1 and he called for an investigation. This was in December of 200- Here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say MDE had reviewed the application and was prepared to publish a tentative approval once the appropriate water and sewer plan
year, about six months after the Planning Commission met. But Rocks and the town got started with their plans and in December of 2003 submitted an application to Dr. Tien at MDE's water and science division seeking a discharge permit for essentially the same new spray irrigation plant we see today. The documents are in your package I obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to pages of the county comprehensive water and sewer plan. In particular, charter two, page 45, and figure 23." He went on to fully explain the same falsehood that I've described here. And he pointed out that none of the property was classified S-1 and he called for an investigation. This was in December of 2004 Here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan
6 Commission met. 7 But Rocks and the town got started with 8 their plans and in December of 2003 submitted 9 an application to Dr. Tien at MDE's water and 10 science division seeking a discharge permit for 11 essentially the same new spray irrigation plant 12 we see today. 13 The documents are in your package I 14 obtained via a PIA request shows some of the 15 internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded 16 with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a 17 chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive 18 sewer plan. In particular, charter two, page 45, and figure 23." 8 He went on to fully explain the same 9 falsehood that I've described here. And he 10 pointed out that none of the property was 11 classified S-1 and he called for an 12 investigation. This was in December of 2004 13 Here is an interesting episode. In July 14 of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some 15 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say 16 MDE had reviewed the application and was 17 prepared to publish a tentative approval once 18 the appropriate water and sewer plan
But Rocks and the town got started with their plans and in December of 2003 submitted an application to Dr. Tien at MDE's water and science division seeking a discharge permit for sessentially the same new spray irrigation plant we see today. The documents are in your package I obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a representation of 2003 submitted He went on to fully explain the same pointed out that none of the property was classified S-1 and he called for an investigation. This was in December of 2004 Here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say make a propriate water and sewer plan MDE had reviewed the application and was prepared to publish a tentative approval once the appropriate water and sewer plan
their plans and in December of 2003 submitted an application to Dr. Tien at MDE's water and science division seeking a discharge permit for essentially the same new spray irrigation plant we see today. The documents are in your package I obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to He went on to fully explain the same falsehood that I've described here. And he pointed out that none of the property was classified S-1 and he called for an investigation. This was in December of 2004 here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan
an application to Dr. Tien at MDE's water and science division seeking a discharge permit for essentially the same new spray irrigation plant we see today. The documents are in your package I obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to falsehood that I've described here. And he pointed out that none of the property was classified S-1 and he called for an investigation. This was in December of 2004. Here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan.
science division seeking a discharge permit for essentially the same new spray irrigation plant we see today. The documents are in your package I 13 Here is an interesting episode. In July obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 10 pointed out that none of the property was classified S-1 and he called for an investigation. This was in December of 2004. Here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 the appropriate water and sewer plan
essentially the same new spray irrigation plant we see today. The documents are in your package I obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 11 classified S-1 and he called for an investigation. This was in December of 2004 there is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan the appropriate water and sewer plan
we see today. The documents are in your package I begin{align*} 12 investigation. This was in December of 2004. The documents are in your package I begin{align*} 13 Here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to linearly. This was in December of 2004 and interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say that the application and was prepared to publish a tentative approval once the appropriate water and sewer plan investigation. This was in December of 2004 and investigation.
The documents are in your package I Here is an interesting episode. In July obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to Here is an interesting episode. In July of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say MDE had reviewed the application and was prepared to publish a tentative approval once the appropriate water and sewer plan
obtained via a PIA request shows some of the internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 14 of 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the ADE had reviewed the application and was prepared to publish a tentative approval once the appropriate water and sewer plan to 15 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the ADE had reviewed the application and was prepared to publish a tentative approval once the appropriate water and sewer plan to 2004, the secretary of MDE, not some 15 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 16 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 17 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say the appropriate water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 functionary and 18 functionary and 18 functionary and 18 functionary and 1
internal exchanges with MDE, which concluded with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to label{eq:concluded} 15 functionary, wrote the Town of Trappe to say 16 MDE had reviewed the application and was prepared to publish a tentative approval once 18 the appropriate water and sewer plan
with a Mr. Anderson pointing out an item on a chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 16 MDE had reviewed the application and was prepared to publish a tentative approval once the appropriate water and sewer plan to 18 the appropriate water and sewer plan to 18 the appropriate water and sewer plan to 19 miles appropriate water and 19 miles appropriate water appropriate water appropriate water appropriate water appropriate water appropriate water appropria
17 chart on page 2-43 of the 2002 comprehensive 17 prepared to publish a tentative approval once 18 water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 the appropriate water and sewer plan
water and sewer plan as sufficient reason to 18 the appropriate water and sewer plan
process the discharge application, checking a 19 classifications are in place. That means once
box on a form that said the application was 20 the property was classified S-1. So in the
21 consistent with the county comprehensive water 21 summer of 2004, MDE knew that the Lakesi
Page 91 Pa
1 and sewer plan. And he did that after Mr. Tien 1 property was not S-1 and needed to be
2 asked him "was that enough." 2 reclassified.
3 While the chart entry, indeed, referred 3 In response, on August the 12th, the
4 cryptically to a large plant, it stands alone 4 assistant town attorney wrote Secretary
5 with nothing more. And there's no explanation 5 Philbrick a three-page letter to convince MD
6 as to its location, its properties to be 6 that section 9-511 does not exist. Saying it
7 served, the phasing, the relationship to 7 does not appear that any State law, regulation
8 existing facilities, or anything else. That 8 or guideline currently requires an amendmen
9 was it. And of course, it had nothing to do 9 the Talbot County comprehensive water and
9 was it. And of course, it had nothing to do 10 with sewer service priority classifications of 10 plan for the processing of this ground water
with sewer service priority classifications of 10 plan for the processing of this ground water
with sewer service priority classifications of 10 plan for the processing of this ground water any parcel of land. 11 discharge permit application.
with sewer service priority classifications of 10 plan for the processing of this ground water any parcel of land. 11 discharge permit application. 12 Within weeks, as word got out that 12 And also, on the following page,
with sewer service priority classifications of any parcel of land. 11 discharge permit application. 12 Within weeks, as word got out that 12 And also, on the following page, 13 Mr. Hoon, an attorney in Chestertown acting on 13 conflated, seemed to be conflating S-2 in the
with sewer service priority classifications of any parcel of land. Within weeks, as word got out that Mr. Hoon, an attorney in Chestertown acting on behalf of some Talbot citizens, wrote a letter land plan for the processing of this ground water discharge permit application. And also, on the following page, conflated, seemed to be conflating S-2 in the Maryland classification system, which is
with sewer service priority classifications of any parcel of land. Within weeks, as word got out that behalf of some Talbot citizens, wrote a letter to MDE with numerous exhibits, all of which are long plan for the processing of this ground water discharge permit application. And also, on the following page, conflated, seemed to be conflating S-2 in the Maryland classification system, which is immediate priority, with S-2 in the Talbot
with sewer service priority classifications of any parcel of land. Within weeks, as word got out that behalf of some Talbot citizens, wrote a letter to MDE with numerous exhibits, all of which are in your packet, blowing the whistle. He said In plan for the processing of this ground water discharge permit application. And also, on the following page, conflated, seemed to be conflating S-2 in the Maryland classification system, which is immediate priority, with S-2 in the Talbot County system, which is not. So that could be conflated to the conflation of this ground water discharge permit application. It discharge permit application. Maryland classification system, which is immediate priority, with S-2 in the Talbot County system, which is not. So that could be
with sewer service priority classifications of any parcel of land. Within weeks, as word got out that behalf of some Talbot citizens, wrote a letter to MDE with numerous exhibits, all of which are in your packet, blowing the whistle. He said we believe that certain incomplete information plan for the processing of this ground water discharge permit application. And also, on the following page, conflated, seemed to be conflating S-2 in the Maryland classification system, which is immediate priority, with S-2 in the Talbot County system, which is not. So that could be the source of part of the falsehood. Who
with sewer service priority classifications of any parcel of land. Within weeks, as word got out that behalf of some Talbot citizens, wrote a letter to MDE with numerous exhibits, all of which are in your packet, blowing the whistle. He said we believe that certain incomplete information plan for the processing of this ground water discharge permit application. And also, on the following page, conflated, seemed to be conflating S-2 in the Maryland classification system, which is immediate priority, with S-2 in the Talbot County system, which is not. So that could be source of part of the falsehood. Who provided to MDE has caused MDE to make an last whose simple to make an

	-		
	Page 94	,	Page 96
1	property as S-1, immediate priority for	1	sued the county essentially to try to force the
2	development of sewer lines. It was a	2	county to reconsider the matter. And it went
3	non-starter.	3	to the Maryland Court of Appeals. The
4	Several public hearings were scheduled,	4	Council's rejection of Lakeside stood.
5	this is in 2004, were scheduled. And the town	5	Now, I have no proof about the next
6	pitched the County Council hard. But the	6	statement, but I have to say I believe there is
7	Council, their picture is on the wall right out	7	no possibility that the people at MDE who were
8	here, Tom Duncan, Phil Foster, Hope Harrington,	8	dealing with Lakeside were unaware of this.
9	Hillary Spence, and Peter Carroll, the Council	9	Certainly, the County Council's adamant
10	were having none of it. They were so certain,	10	rejection of Resolution 123. And yet five
11	as most of us are today, that authorizing a	11	months later, it issued a discharge permit.
12	single subdivision of 2,500 homes and half a	12	In 2006, MDE issued two construction
13	million feet of commercial space across Route	13	permits, which certainly were not related to
14	50 from the tiny Town of Trappe with traffic	14	that little chart on page 43 at all. None of
15	problems, school issues, and so on was out of	15	this was proper.
16	the question and in no way compatible with our	16	Documents at Exhibits 15 and 16 in your
17	Comprehensive Plan. The fact that 15 years has	17	packet hint at what was going on as to other
18	passed doesn't change that.	18	documents I recently obtained from PIA
19	MS. PRICE: Mr. Watson, real quick. Has	19	requests.
20	there been, until this Council did something in	20	Now, some MDE internal e-mails from 2004
21	2020, between 2004, which you just spoke of,	21	era were uncovered by journalists at the Center
	Page 95		Page 97
1	and then, was there ever a time when the	1	for Public Integrity and were quoted in an
2	developer came and asked us to amend the	2	astonishing article they published in 2009 that
3	comprehensive water and sewer plan for this	3	everyone should read. It's Exhibit 3 in your
4	approval?	4	packet.
5	MR. WATSON: No, ma'am.	5	An example of what was reported in that
6	MS. PRICE: Thank you.	6	article. "In May of 2005, a Maryland
7	MR. WATSON: Several public hearings	7	Department of Planning official wrote an e-mail
8	were here is the point. The County Council	8	to an MDE official expressing concerns about
9	was so sure, they weren't having any part of	9	the town's effort to bypass the county's
10	it. They did not even send the Town's	10	process for approving changes, referred to as
11	amendment request for reclassification to the	11	amendments, to its comprehensive water and
12	Planning Commission for its recommendation. It	12	sewer plan". "How can you and we act on an
13	was clearly their power alone. The Council	13	amendment that has not been locally adopted?
14	rejected the request by a five to nothing vote.	14	What's up with that?"
15	And they had the county attorney, Mr. Pullen,	15	All these are but hints of what went on
16	prepare an unusual 21-page findings of fact	16	and demonstrate why an investigation is needed
17	documenting some of its objectives.	17	because 15 years later, those permits, those
18	The rejection was big news in Trappe and	18	false MDE permits, were used to build the story
19	Talbot County. And one of the Star Democrat	19	that corrupted Talbot County's land use
20	articles announcing it, it's in your packet, in	20	approval process so R281 could launch Lakeside.
21	2005, Ms. Price, to your question, the town	21	Only after they had the illegally-issued
	2003, 1416. I 1100, to your question, the town		omy area diey nad die megany-issued

	Tailoot County C	-	
	Page 98		Page 100
1	permits in hand did Rocks Engineering close on	1	process for comprehensive water and sewer
2	the purchase of the Trappe properties.	2	planning in Talbot County has been rendered
3	Another item in your packet is	3	meaningless. That statement is as true today
4	documentation regarding the scandal that became	4	as it was 12 years ago.
5	public in the spring of 2009 when it was	5	Meanwhile, Talbot County also heard about
6	discovered that the Town of Trappe had applied	6	construction permits. And it, too, joined in
7	to MDE to obtain \$21 million from Obama's	7	asking for an investigation. That is the
8	American Reinvestment and Recovery Act, that's	8	County Council asked for an investigation.
9	the AARA, to pay for the wastewater treatment	9	That's in your packet at 15.
10	plant that Rocks was supposed to build at	10	What happened next is really remarkable
11	Rocks' expense. The town claimed the project	11	and I think an important element in what
12	had all the needed permits and was shovel	12	anybody would call a scandal. So an
13	ready.	13	investigation from MDE has been asked for. Six
14	What is truly shocking to me is that MDE	14	months went by with no action from MDE.
15	formally placed this proposal at the top of the	15	Suddenly on February the 3rd, 2010, out of the
16	State's list, number one, and was clearly set	16	blue the Town of Trappe sends a letter to MDE
17	to grant taxpayer funds to the project to build	17	and also the county announcing that they have
18	the Lakeside plant that Rocks was supposed to	18	abandoned any intention of building any new
19	pay for, and Rocks would have received	19	wastewater treatment plant on the east side of
20	\$1.8 million in cash for the spray irrigation	20	Route 50. And accordingly, they were
21	field.	21	surrendering their two construction permits,
	Page 99		Page 101
1	When the story broke, the town, who is	1	the ones that had been issued in 2006.
2	imminently wrapped up in all this, immediately	2	Instead of a new plant, and get this, they
3	backed down. As far as I know, there was never	3	would send all of their sewage from Lakeside to
4	any investigation into this outrageous	4	the existing Trappe plant. I'm not making this
5	arrangement that almost happened and there were	5	up. The two letters are Exhibits 17A and 17B.
6	only a couple of articles about it.	6	So on February 16th, this is cause and
7	Also in 2009, Talbot Preservation	7	effect, on February 16th at Secretary Wilson's
8	Alliance, Tom Alspach, learned of the issuance	8	request, an MDE official wrote Mr. Alspach,
9	of the invalid construction permits and had to	9	this is Exhibit 18, reporting that they had
10	send in a Public Information Act request to MDE	10	begun an investigation but now that the town
11	to get some background. All of this is in your	11	has abandoned its plans and surrendered the
12	packet at 15. Mr. Alspach investigated,	12	permits that "that made it unnecessary for MDE
13	recognized the improprieties of the issuance of	13	to take any action". Conveniently, the
14	the permits, and took action.	14	investigation was aborted, and no one at MDE
15	On behalf of TPA, he wrote MDE Secretary	15	had to explain anything and no one Talbot
16	Wilson, reporting on the irregularities and	16	County learned anything more about what had
17	asking for a formal investigation saying this:	17	happened with the Lakeside permits.
18	As a result of Trappe's procurement of	18	It appears those permits, which we now
19		19 know were improper, were never mentioned	
1 /	construction permits for a sewer project that	19	know were improper, were never mentioned in
20	construction permits for a sewer project that is not consistent with the Talbot County	19 20	Talbot County until the opening minutes of the
			• •

	-		
	Page 102		Page 104
1	later. We read that. At that point, as you	1	them the check for \$1.8 million to take title
2	saw in the transcripts, the permits had become	2	to the spray field.
3	the lens through which we all evaluated the	3	MS. PRICE: Can I ask a simple question?
4	most important, disruptive, incompatible	4	And if we ask a couple of questions, certainly
5	development project ever proposed in Talbot	5	I would think we would give him a couple of
6	County.	6	extra minutes.
7	MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Watson, I just want to	7	MR. CALLAHAN: Yeah.
8	make sure, time check. You've got	8	MS. PRICE: I do have a question. If MDE
9	MR. WATSON: I've got ten members. I	9	did, in fact, issue the permit without County
10	assume there's going to be a hard stop for me.	10	Council approval, shouldn't they be the ones
11	MR. CALLAHAN: Well, you know, just if	11	that need to go back?
12	there's something important, which it all is, I	12	And again, different administration,
13	just want to let you know.	13	different secretaries, different employees and
14	MR. WATSON: There are important things	14	all of that. So it's not necessarily a
15	here. And it's unfortunate.	15	reflection on who is there now.
16	MR. CALLAHAN: I understand.	16	But if they issued these permits without
17	MR. WATSON: Thank you for your that	17	the comprehensive water and sewer plan approval
18	was appropriate and I appreciate it.	18	coming from us, shouldn't they be the ones who
19	MR. CALLAHAN: No problem.	19	rescind this whole permit?
20	MR. WATSON: I will send to all the	20	MR. WATSON: Those permits, Ms. Price, no
21	Council members highlighting things that I did	21	longer have any relevance, except the fact that
	Page 103		Page 105
1	not mention here because a lot of it's	1	they existed in the past
2	interesting, you'd like to know.	2	MS. PRICE: Correct. But they're still
3	MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Watson, one question	3	building now.
4	I want to make sure I heard it right.	4	MR. WATSON: If Resolution 281, nothing is
5	The Town of Trappe wanted \$21 million for	5	done, Rocks will get a multiple permits.
6	the developer. Is that what you said?	6	Will get a new discharge permit. Actually not
7	MR. WATSON: The application was made by	7	new. They're talking about it as a renewal
8	the Town of Trappe.	8	MS. PRICE: Correct.
9	MR. CALLAHAN: Right.	9	MR. WATSON: Let me finish. And then
10	MR. WATSON: Not the Town of Trappe was	10	MS. PRICE: But that's my question
11	going to give the money. First of all, what I	11	exactly. That's my question exactly.
12	know about this is what I read in the papers.	12	It can't be a renewal. If the permit was
13	MR. CALLAHAN: Right. I'm just	13	issued improperly, let's give it that, if it
14	MR. WATSON: But not that they were going	14	was improperly issued, then you can't renew
15	to give the money to Rocks Engineering. But	15	something improperly issued.
16	that they, the Town of Trappe, would be	16	So shouldn't this truly be, this
17	building the plant using that money.	17	information, I'm not saying that we're not
18	That would relieve Mr. Rocks. Two people	18	listening and all of that, but ultimately, this
19	don't have to build it. Mr. Rocks would be	19	is MDE who needs to fix this mess.
20	relieved of that obligation.	20	MR. WATSON: Ms. Price, with due respect,
21	Apparently, the Town of Trappe would hand	21	first of all, I agree with you entirely, which

	J			
1	Page 106		Page 108	
1	is why on December 1st I sent to Secretary	1 citizens are busy and just don't follow the		
2	Grumbles, Mr. Curry, and a bunch of other	2 details anyway. All they know is Lakeside and		
3	people at MDE and the Attorney General's Office	3	the old sign.	
4	and EPA all this information with a request for	4	But what about the professionals? Well,	
5	a formal investigation and a revocation of	5	how many so that's the question. How many	
6	their approval of 281.	6	Planning Commissioners have come and gone over	
7	They don't write and of course, the	7	20 years? I think we've had five Planning	
8	permits are, if they're illegal, they're	8	Commissioners since Lakeside started. Kehoe,	
9	illegal. And were illegal admonition, from the	9	someone whose name I've forgotten, Sandy	
10	beginning.	10	Coyman, Ms. Verdery, and now Mr. Salinas.	
11	So that, of course, is correct.	11	As to the attorney, Mr. Pullen left five	
12	MS. PRICE: Could we have a copy of those	12	years ago. And Mr. Kupersmith left just after	
13	letters that you wrote when you're done?	13	passage of Resolution 281, interestingly to go	
14	MR. WATSON: It was sent to you on	14	to work for Mr. Showalter's firm. And	
15	December the 1st.	15	Mr. Thomas wasn't around when any of this	
16	MS. PRICE: Okay. Thank you.	16	history was happening.	
17	MR. WATSON: Ms. Moran delivered it on	17	And what about the County Council? We've	
18	December 1st. She confirmed to me that she	18	had four elections, four turnovers since	
19	sent it to each of you individually as well as	19	Lakeside was conceived. No Council member here	
20	putting it in the packet.	20	knows the roots of this story and this	
21	MS. PRICE: Okay. Thank you.	21 experience.		
	Page 107		Page 109	
1	MR. WATSON: Let me say, however, that	1	I am confident that the great majority,	
2	while it is true that the illegal permits were	2	not all, but the great majority of what I've	
3	an MDE issue, Ms. Price, Resolution 281 is not	3	said to you here tonight is new.	
4	an MDE permit.	4	So compounding things, the legal research	
5	Resolution 281 and the improper amendment	5	of land use review processes can be pretty	
6	of the comprehensive water and sewer plan is a	6	technical and subtle, hard to follow. Almost	
7	Talbot County land use matter, and the	7	every one of us, from County Councilman to	
8	responsibility for that lies with the County	8	Planning Commissioners to layman like me, only	
9	Council and cannot be that responsibility is	9	learn these things through word of mouth over a	
10	a heavy burden that is on your desk.	10	long period of time. Understandably, everyone	
11	Back on the clock I guess? Okay.	11	relies on what others, who are more experienced	
12	MR. CALLAHAN: Yup.	12	and knowledgeable, tell us. Like lawyers and	
13	MR. WATSON: All right. So here is a key	13	engineers have our trust.	
14	question. How could this have happened? Okay.	14	There is not one lawyer on the Council,	
15	First, I am sure many are thinking, some	15	there's not one lawyer on the County Council or	
16	in this room, that Watson has lost it. None of	16	the Planning Commission. You know that. The	
17	this can be true because how could something	17	only person I know in the county operation here	
18	this bizarre ever have happened. It sounds	18	who, other than the county attorney, who	
19	preposterous on its face, I know.	19	happens to be a lawyer is Bill Anderson, so	
20	But think about it. Lakeside's been	20	heads the Public Works Advisory Board.	
21	around here for 20 years. Most regular	21 So as a consequence of all this, virtually		
21	:			

			<u> </u>
	Page 110		Page 112
1	everything that any of us know about the	1	No. The answer has got to be no.
2	history of Lakeside and the long saga of its	2	Anyone who knew those things and stood by
3	approval process is what Rocks' agents told us.	3	silently as Resolution 281 was presented and
4	Time and again, it was they who were called up,	4	considered and adopted would have been
5	invited up to explain everything. It's in the	5	complicit in all this and as culpable as the
6	transcripts. And there was never a word of	6	applicant. And I don't believe it ever
7	pushback. It's all right there in the	7	happened.
8	transcripts.	8	So is not the worst of it that supporters
9	So that brings us to who did know the	9	were also among those who were victimized? So
10	whole long story when Resolution 281 was	10	let's face it, we've all been had.
11	presented at every discussion, knew it had	11	I have a section here that because of the
12	never been S-2 and knew the permits were	12	passage of time I'm not going to speak to but
13	tainted. It was the applicant, in particular	13	is very important, having to do with the
14	Rocks Engineering and Rocks' professional	14	Council's power to act. And this is what
15	consultants who were there all along who were	15	Ms. Price made a remark at the recent meeting.
16	active participants every step of the way over	16	Oh, my gosh, we have two opinions, what are we
17	20 years.	17	to do. That needs to be resolved, and not just
18	And we all know, as discussed at the	18	for you on the Council.
19	outset, falsehoods can arise in a million ways,	19	But Mr. Thomas, who is not here tonight,
20	including simple mistakes, confusion, incorrect	20	expressed an opinion without any citations or
21	inferences.	21	certifications or legal reasons, just a
	Page 111		Page 113
1	I have no idea how it happened. This is	1	conclusionary opinion. And he expressed it not
2	really important, but I can't go beyond what I	2	only to you all at the County Council in
3	can say here. But once those falsehoods are in	3	executive session in private, it was expressed
4	existence, they can be perpetuated on and on	4	to the entire body politic, to the Planning
5	forever.	5	Commission, to the Public Works Advisory Board,
6	It's my own opinion that the biggest	6	to me, to every person who watched or is
7	insult is not that Rocks and the town,	7	interested in this.
8	knowingly or otherwise, misled the opponents of	8	And that's appropriate, because the county
9	Lakeside, but the applicant misled its	9	attorney's obligations are not to the County
10	supporters as well, those on the Council and	10	Council, does not work for the County Council.
11	anyone else of that view.	11	He's the county attorney for Talbot County,
12	For surely, this information that I'm	12	Maryland. Analogous to the attorney general of
13	laying out here is all new to you, as it is new	13	the United States is not the president's
14	to the Planning Commissioners and to everyone	14	attorney. For that reason, he has a duty and
15	else.	15	responsibility to all of us and
16	Did you know that Lakeside was never S-2?	16	MR. DIVILIO: Who is that? I'm sorry.
17	Did you know that they switched out figure 24	17	MR. WATSON: The county attorney.
18	for figure 23 in framing it up? Did you know	18	MR. DIVILIO: County attorney has a duty
19	the chicanery involved in the MDE permits, that	19	and responsibility to work for all of the
20	they were invalid and how the applicant had	20	citizens of the county? Is that what you're
21	gotten the investigation back in 2010 dropped?	21	MR. WATSON: He works for Talbot County,

	Page 114		Page 116
1	Maryland.	1	the new plant, Rocks has been building just as
2	The last time that came up is when I was	2	fast as they can since the morning of
3	told that I had sued the wrong party because I	3	July 15th. It's amazing.
4	had sued the Talbot County Council in my	4	Apparently, following the old song that
5	petition and it took a month to reapply so that	5	it's easier to beg forgiveness than get
6	I sued Talbot County, Maryland, and had to go	6	permission, and well, that works sometimes.
7	back.	7	But when you make that decision to beg
8	And those responsibilities, Mr. Divilio,	8	forgiveness rather than ask permission, you're
9	which I'm sure the attorney here would	9	taking risks and you know it.
10	acknowledge, those responsibilities go beyond	10	So because of the 180-degree turn slipped
11	reporting to and having duties only to the	11	in in the amended Exhibit F, Rocks can now
12	County Council. They extend beyond that.	12	connect Lakeside to the existing plant right
13	And because that legal opinion was voiced	13	now no matter what happens to the permits for
14	publicly to all of us, and appropriately so, we	14	the new spray irrigation plant. That is if the
15	are as entitled as you are to know the full	15	County Council, MDE ignore the Planning
16	opinion. So if there were to the extent,	16	Commission's decision on November 3rd, which
17	and I certainly hope that you have asked the	17	they shouldn't.
18	County Council in the context of the Gallagher	18	Rocks has already laid the pipe to
19	opinion and, with or without it, to provide a	19	connect. So I guess they're banking on nobody
20	full legal opinion in writing with citations	20	stopping them.
21	and legal reasoning, laid out there, because	21	Now, Ms. Price, I know you're working on
	Page 115		Page 117
1	you would be derelict if you didn't do that.	1	legislation to somehow mitigate the problems
2	To the extent that has been done and should	2	with the La Trappe Creek and the existing
3	have been done, we are entitled to understand	3	plant. And you're drawn to the idea of
4	that also.	4	compromise, which is usually a right idea.
5	And we are not your adversaries. The		
6		5	But given the history of falsehood you've
I	Talbot County Council ought not be perceiving	5 6	
7	Talbot County Council ought not be perceiving citizens as the opposing party. We're your		But given the history of falsehood you've
7 8		6	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise
	citizens as the opposing party. We're your	6 7	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling
8	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We	6 7 8	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should
8 9	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand	6 7 8 9	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling
8 9 10 11 12	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand it, but I believe we're entitlement to that information. And I hereby make the request, I hereby make the request.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should compromise and ask for a few dollar bills back. What I don't understand is why people
8 9 10 11 12 13	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand it, but I believe we're entitlement to that information. And I hereby make the request, I hereby make the request. Let's see, so if you could just give me	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should compromise and ask for a few dollar bills back. What I don't understand is why people assume that construction at Lakeside can't be
8 9 10 11 12 13 14	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand it, but I believe we're entitlement to that information. And I hereby make the request, I hereby make the request. Let's see, so if you could just give me about three minutes, I think I'm done.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should compromise and ask for a few dollar bills back. What I don't understand is why people assume that construction at Lakeside can't be stopped. If that's the right thing to do, and
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand it, but I believe we're entitlement to that information. And I hereby make the request, I hereby make the request. Let's see, so if you could just give me about three minutes, I think I'm done. MR. CALLAHAN: Yup.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should compromise and ask for a few dollar bills back. What I don't understand is why people assume that construction at Lakeside can't be stopped. If that's the right thing to do, and it is, and for good reasons, if not these,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand it, but I believe we're entitlement to that information. And I hereby make the request, I hereby make the request. Let's see, so if you could just give me about three minutes, I think I'm done. MR. CALLAHAN: Yup. MR. WATSON: And this is the question of	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should compromise and ask for a few dollar bills back. What I don't understand is why people assume that construction at Lakeside can't be stopped. If that's the right thing to do, and it is, and for good reasons, if not these, what, it can be stopped. It's not complicated.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand it, but I believe we're entitlement to that information. And I hereby make the request, I hereby make the request. Let's see, so if you could just give me about three minutes, I think I'm done. MR. CALLAHAN: Yup. MR. WATSON: And this is the question of but the horse has left the barn. So this is	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should compromise and ask for a few dollar bills back. What I don't understand is why people assume that construction at Lakeside can't be stopped. If that's the right thing to do, and it is, and for good reasons, if not these, what, it can be stopped. It's not complicated. The land isn't going to go anywhere.
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand it, but I believe we're entitlement to that information. And I hereby make the request, I hereby make the request. Let's see, so if you could just give me about three minutes, I think I'm done. MR. CALLAHAN: Yup. MR. WATSON: And this is the question of but the horse has left the barn. So this is the third point that everybody knows about but	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should compromise and ask for a few dollar bills back. What I don't understand is why people assume that construction at Lakeside can't be stopped. If that's the right thing to do, and it is, and for good reasons, if not these, what, it can be stopped. It's not complicated. The land isn't going to go anywhere. Work stops. Maryland law says that
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand it, but I believe we're entitlement to that information. And I hereby make the request, I hereby make the request. Let's see, so if you could just give me about three minutes, I think I'm done. MR. CALLAHAN: Yup. MR. WATSON: And this is the question of but the horse has left the barn. So this is the third point that everybody knows about but we tap dance around.	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should compromise and ask for a few dollar bills back. What I don't understand is why people assume that construction at Lakeside can't be stopped. If that's the right thing to do, and it is, and for good reasons, if not these, what, it can be stopped. It's not complicated. The land isn't going to go anywhere. Work stops. Maryland law says that vesting rights, that is Rocks can say well,
8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	citizens as the opposing party. We're your constituents. We're all in this together. We are not only is it fair that we understand it, but I believe we're entitlement to that information. And I hereby make the request, I hereby make the request. Let's see, so if you could just give me about three minutes, I think I'm done. MR. CALLAHAN: Yup. MR. WATSON: And this is the question of but the horse has left the barn. So this is the third point that everybody knows about but	6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	But given the history of falsehood you've heard tonight and the fact that the compromise is sort of between the Rocks family and 15,000 families who live here in Talbot, I feel that particular proposal would be more like telling someone who was pick-pocketed that he should compromise and ask for a few dollar bills back. What I don't understand is why people assume that construction at Lakeside can't be stopped. If that's the right thing to do, and it is, and for good reasons, if not these, what, it can be stopped. It's not complicated. The land isn't going to go anywhere. Work stops. Maryland law says that

	Page 118		Page 120
1	says that vesting requires that a party	1	implications to Talbot County, the developers,
2	proceeding in reliance on something must have	2	the people who live here, to this staff, to the
3	done so in good faith, in good faith.	3	kids, if the kids understood this. And maybe
4	Tonight's revelations should address that	4	there are some young adults who pay attention.
5	point, along with Exhibit 24 in your package.	5	What's the implication? If you're a big
6	So good faith and clean hands is another	6	player, you don't have to play by the rules.
7	principle.	7	You know, a lady and her husband down in
8	And as far as will there be litigation,	8	Cordova or something come to the Planning
9	the lawyers will get busy, no question about	9	Department. Did they have to pay attention to
10	it. Talbot County has legal insurance. It's	10	encroachments and building right? You know, is
11	exactly why we have legal insurance, is	11	the staff's heart really in it when what the
12	something unexpected comes up. And it might be	12	hell, if it's a billion dollar project and you
13	expensive, but we are a part of a legal	13	just go with it. Oh, I got an idea. Just go
14	insurance group and it is covered.	14	ahead and do it and then nobody will do
15	So in the fullness of time, things would	15	anything.
16	get straightened out. And that project,	16	We got trees on the side of the river that
17	Lakeside won't die, but that project altered in	17	we're not supposed to cut down. What the hell,
18	scale or altered in pace or conditioned in some	18	cut them down. We'll see. Nobody is going to
19	fashion will get resurrected and it will exist	19	say anything. After all, look at Rocks
20	in Talbot County but in a better form.	20	Engineering. They shouldn't have been able to
21	And with all this attention to their	21	get along with it, but they can.
	Page 119		Page 121
1	plight and the problems that have happened, it	1	It just I mean I couldn't write it up
2	sure is my hope that the 340 families down	2	because your head explodes. It is my I'll
3	there in Trappe who have been struggling with	3	pass these things, all we reviewed tonight.
4	this in the dark for so long will also get some	4	I'm talking about this integrity issue,
5	attention.	5	the falsehoods. It's fundamental. It's why
6	And here is the question, what is the cost	6	there is no question about this.
7	to Talbot County of not acting, of not	7	Remember the other three things? The
8	rescinding 281, knowing what you know now?	8	existing Trappe plant is crazy. The mapping
9	None of which you knew in August of 2020.	9	problem is a legal problem that it just needs
10	What's the cost of not acting, of taking no	10	to be revoked and set aside.
11	action to rescind, saying to Rocks and the Town	11	And Ms. Price, you can't defer to MDE.
12	of Trappe well, you got away with that one, the	12	Resolution 281, matters having to do with land
13	shipped sailed, the horse is already out of the	13	use are the responsibility of Talbot County.
14	barn, which it wasn't in May. That's just one	14	They are the responsibility of Talbot County.
15	of those things.	15	And I'm sure you regret it often, but you five
16	The costs are incalculable. It's a cost	16	individuals, bless you for your time and your
17	of Talbot County's integrity, and we can't	17	work, but you carry a hell of a burden. And
18	offord it	one of your burdens is to decide what you're	
1	afford it.	10	
19	The blue part on my draft here is where I	19	going to do about this.

	Turou county (, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Page 122		Page 124
1	saying which reason. It could be because of	1	MR. WATSON: Mr. Divilio, someone sent me
2	the maps. But to rescind it. The work will	2	the e-mail that you sent them expressing the
3	stop. It will take a little while. We will	3	view that I'm the least credible man in Talbot
4	all reconvene when the dust has settled. And	4	County.
5	we as a community, as a community, the Planning	5	And I can only tell you that I do my best
6	Commission front and center, will reassess that	6	to get my facts straight.
7	project properly, not through the lens of these	7	And should I have made a mistake, and it
8	falsehoods, but taking into account all the	8	is quite possible, not certain, but quite
9	issues that are part and parcel of evaluating a	9	possible, first thing I would do is take a good
10	project.	10	look at it and acknowledge and agree that
11	And with that, I want to, I'm dead serious	11	that's a mistake. Gee, I thought X and I was
12	here, I want to thank you for your time and	12	wrong, it was Y. Happens all the time.
13	especially thank you for your attention.	13	MR. DIVILIO: Thank you.
14	Thanks.	14	MR. WATSON: Ask my wife.
15	MR. CALLAHAN: Thank you, Mr. Watson.	15	MR. PACK: Yeah. I would like to say
16	Appreciate it.	16	something very briefly.
17	MR. DIVILIO: I have one question.	17	First of all, Mr. Watson, thank you. I
18	MR. CALLAHAN: Sure. Go ahead, Council.	18	mean the amount of time and effort that you put
19	MR. DIVILIO: You're hitting on honor and	19	into gathering all this information and all the
20	integrity and claiming it.	20	documents must have been somewhat exhaustive on
21	If there are falsehoods that you led the	21	your part. So I just want to first thank you
	Page 123		Page 125
1	community to believe by accident, how would you	1	for the time and effort that you put into it.
2	correct those? And have you ever in the past	2	I know, I feel that your heart is in the
3	corrected a Spy article if you put out	3	right place. Let me say that. And you're
4	information that wasn't correct?	4	right. No man is infallible. We all make
5	MR. WATSON: Well, first of all, let's	5	mistakes.
6	start with this. Were I to	6	You know I was around in 2006, 2005, and I
7	MR. DIVILIO: It's simple. Just would you	7	do remember the public outpour over those
8	print a retraction? And if you brought	8	permits being issued. I remember talking with
9	something up tonight that was incorrect that	9	persons like Mr. Alspach and Mr. Bowman and the
10	you later found out, how would you like that to	10	late Mike Sullivan about those permits. So I
11	be corrected?	11	do remember the discussion amongst the members
12	MR. WATSON: Well, you'll pause while I	12	of the community about how MDE issued those
13	take a minute how best to answer this.	13	permits without them being incorporated into
14	First of all, should it be brought to my	14	the county comprehensive water and sewer plan.
15	attention that I have made an error, and who	15	So I was around and I do remember that.
16	among us is perfect, I promise you that	16	Regarding the action on November 3rd of
17	something I said here tonight is wrong.	17	the Planning Commission, I will certainly talk
18	How can any man, Mr. Divilio, sit here for	18	to our legal staff whether or not that has any
19	two hours with this much	19	bearing. As you do know, during your research,
20	MR. DIVILIO: By checking and verifying	20	and I'll speak with Patrick when he gets back
I	your information before you do it publicly.	21	in or speak with Chip, 281 has already been

1	Page 126		Page 128	
1	incorporated into the comprehensive water and	1	very interesting points. Thank you.	
2	sewer plan.	2	MR. WATSON: Well, thank you for that	
3	Our county attorney, your county attorney	3	acknowledgment. The	
4	has said publicly there is no way to unring	4	MR. LESHER: I'm sorry. I need to excuse	
5	that bell. It's already done.	5	myself.	
6	MR. WATSON: Yes.	6	MR. CALLAHAN: Yup.	
7	MR. PACK: So I don't know what	7	MR. PACK: Yeah. I just wanted to make	
8	November 3rd even did in my thoughts. I've	8	those statements. Thank you, Mr	
9	been scratching my head trying to figure out	9	MS. PRICE: I think we're all just kind of	
10	what they did in taking that vote, because 281	10	giving wrap up here, Mr. Watson. And I'll just	
11	is already incorporated into the comprehensive	11	say that I agree with Mr. Pack, the amendment	
12	water and sewer plan.	12	to the comp water and sewer plan is the	
13	The only thing this body could do, from	13	vehicle. I don't think rescission of the	
14	what I understand, again, and I'll go back and	14	resolution is. We've said that for six months.	
15	talk to my county staff, is to amend the	15	So maybe tomorrow's resolution to amend	
16	comprehensive water and sewer plan itself,	16	the comp water and sewer plan is correct.	
17	itself. Because it's already been adopted by	17	Maybe it needs to be a different resolution to	
18	MDE, which you know.	18	amend the comp water and sewer plan. But	
19	So I'm not asking for a question. I'm	19	that's what needs to be done.	
20	just making a general statement as far as what	20	So whether I start the ball rolling	
21	transpired this evening. So I'll look into all	21	tomorrow with the one that we have and at l	
	Page 127		Page 129	
1	of that and find out what, if anything,	1	hear that out publicly and get feedback on	
2	November 3rd did or did not do.	2	that, whether we also introduce another one	
3	If Council were to have the mind to amend	3	based on the information that you provided	
4	the comprehensive water and sewer plan, we	4	tonight.	
5	would have to sit down with Mr. Clarke and	5	I thank you very much. There's a lot of	
6	county staff and figure out a way to do that.	6	other information and documented things that we	
7	You do raise some very interesting points.	7	were not aware of that I don't think anybody	
8	And some of the things that, again, I remember	8	probably in this room was aware of. And	
9	ten-plus years ago these same things being	9	certainly, we need to take that under	
10	raised. So you do bring back to memory a lot	10	consideration.	
11	of that discussion back in '06, 05 that I	11	Might not stop the process of what's	
12	remember hearing amongst various members of the	12	getting introduced tomorrow. But that doesn't	
13	community regarding some of the things	13	mean that something else can't be introduced in	
14	happening down in Trappe.	14	another couple of weeks. Just keep kind of all	
15	As you know, resolutions can be changed.	15	the balls in the air.	
16	They can be amended, as you do know. And	16	MR. WATSON: Can I say just one short	
17	you're right. There was a change in how the	17	thing? Very a moment.	
18	effluent was going to be handled by the Town of	18	It is true, as I said to Mr. Thomas	
10				
19	Trappe. So that was done.	19	before, that an amendment to the comprehensive	
	Trappe. So that was done. And but you do raise some interesting	19 20	before, that an amendment to the comprehensive water and sewer plan appears that it would have	

	Taibot County C	Lounch Weeting December 13, 2021
	Page 130	Page 132
1	could.	1 STATE OF MARYLAND 2 I, Diane Houlihan, a Notary Public in and
2	But here is the central issue that I would	for the State of Maryland, County of Baltimore City, 3 do hereby certify that the within named, Talbot
3	urge you to talk to your lawyer about. An	County Council Audio, personally appeared before me
4	amendment now is a new thing that happens when	4 at the time and place herein set according to law, was interrogated by counsel.
5	that's passed. And if you remember, I	5
6	discussed or mentioned vesting.	I further certify that the examination was 6 recorded stenographically by me and then transcribed
7	Rocks Engineering had already started. I	from my stenographic notes to the within printed
8	believe the argument that that party would have	7 matter by means of computer-assisted transcription in a true and accurate manner.
9	vis-a-vis an amendment, okay, is the argument	8
10	would be it doesn't pertain to me because it's	I further certify that the stipulations 9 contained herein were entered into by counsel in my
11	too late, it didn't come up.	presence.
12	Whereas, rescission dates back to May the	I further certify that I am not of counsel
13	7th. And the issues of vesting are although	11 to any of the parties, not an employee of counsel, nor related to any of the parties, nor in any way
14	different, having to do I'm not even a	12 interested in the outcome of this action.
15	lawyer. But I would urge you to explore that	AS WITNESS my hand Notorial Seal this 20th day of November, 2021 of Factor MD
16	carefully with the attorney.	14
17	MR. PACK: Thank you very much.	15 Vione Meuliha
18	MR. WATSON: Thank you.	Diane Houlihan
19	MR. CALLAHAN: Thank you.	17 Notary Public 18
20	MS. PRICE: Plus you made a very good	19 20 My commission expires September 16, 2025
21	point about good faith.	21
	Page 131	
1	MR. CALLAHAN: Yup. Motion to adjourn.	
2	MR. PACK: Thank you.	
3	MR. CALLAHAN: Madam Secretary.	
4	MR. DIVILIO: Motion to adjourn.	
5	MR. CALLAHAN: Motion to adjourn.	
6	(Meeting concluded at: 7:18 p.m.)	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		

[**05 - 281**] Page 1

0	13th 115:20	85:6 107:21 108:7	2025 132:20
05 57:15 127:11	15 3:14 4:11 8:9	110:17	20th 41:2 132:13
06 127:11	43:12 46:14 94:17	200 16:20	21 46:5 95:16 98:7
	96:16 97:17 99:12	2000s 54:11 55:4	103:5
1	100:9	2002 36:18 37:15	21-01 2:21 4:2
1 28:9,15 32:13	15,000 117:7	41:14,21 46:9	23 77:6 78:19,20
34:16,18 35:2	15th 116:3	47:4 68:19 72:11	83:17 84:5,21
38:18 42:21 44:6	16 42:6 96:16	72:13,19 73:13	92:7 111:18
44:12,21 45:4	132:20	77:12,21 78:8,13	24 80:13 83:18
47:7,16,20 48:5	16th 101:6,7	79:11 82:13 85:7	84:12,14,19
48:15,19 49:6	17 57:11 79:15	90:17	111:17 118:5
50:8 51:1,11,16	17a 101:5	2003 23:11 27:12	250 51:20
51:18,20 53:5,12	17b 101:5	89:13 90:8	259 84:18
53:16 55:16 60:6	18 44:9 72:5,18	2004 39:9 57:15	281 4:15,20 5:19
60:19 69:5 74:16	73:16 76:9 101:9	76:15 80:2 83:8	6:1,20 8:2 9:2
75:3,5,9,16,20	180 30:7,17	92:12,14,21 93:20	11:5,6,21 12:2,10
77:13 78:2 83:7	116:10	94:5,21 96:20	14:20 15:8,16,18
83:10 84:13,14,18	19 59:21	2005 42:5 46:13	15:20 16:12 17:17
85:21 86:1,2,4	1998 14:10	52:21 55:10 85:13	17:20 18:1,2,21
87:1 92:11,20	1st 8:6,14 106:1	95:21 97:6 125:6	19:16,20 20:15
93:1 94:1	106:15,18	2006 55:10 62:13	21:5 22:19 28:5,7
1,000 21:18	2	85:13 96:12 101:1	28:14,18 29:1
1.4 4:4	2 8:16 9:9 36:20	125:6	30:5 33:20 35:1
1.8 98:20 104:1	37:14,17 38:4,5	2007 37:9 42:5	36:8,10 37:2
100 22:13	38:16 40:2,18	88:9	38:10,14 40:5,17
100,000 21:2	41:9,15,15,16,17	2008 44:1 46:13	45:14 46:8 47:9
27:10	41:18,18 42:1	53:1	47:13 50:4,20
10th 54:2 79:12	43:1,3,8,8 44:4,9	2009 97:2 98:5	51:10,14,17,17
11 4:16	44:17 45:5,18	99:7	52:5,16 54:10
11th 41:10 42:14	46:11 47:4 48:7,7	2010 100:15	55:6 56:7 57:10
47:9 49:13 50:17	48:17 49:7,9 51:3	111:21	58:12,16 59:4
51:5 73:5	51:19 54:3 57:13	2018 84:16	60:14 61:1,14
12 44:6 46:18	69:1,21 72:4	2019 13:18 28:19	62:9 63:6,19
100:4	74:16 75:6,21	57:11 59:21 79:16	64:14 69:11,15
120 12:11 24:1	77:17,20 79:18	80:1	70:4,9 72:3,6,10
30:9	80:1,7,11 83:4	2020 4:16 5:19	73:17 74:12 78:18
123 96:10	86:1,5 93:13,15	20:18 38:8 40:2	79:15 86:6 89:18
12th 3:4 7:2,8	110:12 111:16	41:3 46:5 52:17	101:21 105:4
11:19 12:5 13:10	2,500 5:1 22:9	60:5 78:18 79:13	106:6 107:3,5
93:3 13 1.7 12:14 15	94:12	79:16 87:8,9,10	108:13 110:10
13 1:7 13:14,15	2,501 37:10	89:17 94:21 119:9	112:3 119:8
130 24:1	2-43 90:17	2021 1:7 64:11	121:12,21 125:21
1362 132:15	20 14:4 38:5 41:3	88:5 132:13	126:10 129:21
	52:17 60:5 76:2		

[28th - amazing]

28th 16:20	8404 2:18	action 5:7 45:12	adversaries 115:5
3	865 50:12	72:11 81:18 82:21	advisory 109:20
	9	99:14 100:14	113:5
3 74:16 78:7 84:18	-	101:13 119:11	afford 119:18
85:1 89:13 97:3	9-507 86:18	125:16 132:12	agency 86:15
308 1:5	9-511 55:2,17 93:6	active 110:16	agenda 23:14
340 23:4 119:2	925 88:13	acts 31:7	agents 110:3
350 4:1	93 23:6 26:14	actual 9:18	ago 3:2,3,14 4:1
3rd 15:3 31:13,18 100:15 116:16	50:11	adamant 96:9	8:6 16:19 24:11
125:16 126:8	a	adding 31:12 32:1	27:4 32:8 37:7,8
123.16 126.8	aara 98:9	addition 25:18	38:5 49:1 56:13
	abandoned 25:12	87:3	56:20 57:12 59:7
4	100:18 101:11	additional 25:17	63:12,14 73:16
400,000 22:9	able 3:6 8:11 12:4	65:4	76:3 79:18 100:4
412 3:21 70:8	87:14,19 120:20	address 16:8	108:12 127:9
43 33:2 76:8 96:14	aborted 101:14	35:20 118:4	agree 5:21 43:1
45 92:7	absolutely 9:20	adequate 16:8	105:21 124:10
453 73:6	76:17	adjourn 131:1,4,5	128:11
47 23:7 29:19 33:3	accepted 4:6	administration	agreed 30:3 38:6
76:8	44:17 45:1	104:12	62:16
5	accessible 73:3	administrative	agreement 48:2
50 3:15 5:3 16:18	accident 123:1	19:3	48:11
19:14 27:3 48:2	accommodate	admonition 106:9	agreements 76:16
68:19 72:14 78:21	69:1	adopt 28:7 49:20	88:7
94:14 100:20	account 35:14	86:13	agrees 85:8
55 8:10 21:8 73:1	122:8	adopted 4:15 5:19	ahead 2:9,10,12
5:00 1:7	accurate 132:7	12:11 35:1 41:11	69:5 120:14
6	accused 23:16	41:13,20 46:8,9	122:18
6 72:11	achieved 62:15	47:9 50:3,21	air 129:15
60 32:19	acknowledge	72:10,13 79:5,11	akeley 2:18
6:15 70:18	15:21 114:10 124:10	85:8 86:7 87:8	allegations 8:21
7	acknowledged	89:18 97:13 112:4	allegiance 2:5,6
	23:1 49:2	126:17	alliance 99:8
7,000 66:13 67:5	23.1 49.2	adopting 4:19	allocated 29:9
	acknowladament		20.1
77 23:13	acknowledgment	62:9 72:3	30:1
7:18 131:6	128:3	adoption 42:4	allotted 3:10
7:18 131:6 7b 32:21 33:2	128:3 acreage 47:20	adoption 42:4 47:13 78:18 82:13	allotted 3:10 allow 48:4,14
7:18 131:6 7b 32:21 33:2 76:21	128:3 acreage 47:20 acres 50:12 51:20	adoption 42:4 47:13 78:18 82:13 adopts 82:2	allotted 3:10 allow 48:4,14 allowed 15:9
7:18 131:6 7b 32:21 33:2 76:21 7c 85:11	128:3 acreage 47:20 acres 50:12 51:20 88:6,13	adoption 42:4 47:13 78:18 82:13 adopts 82:2 adult 4:5	allotted 3:10 allow 48:4,14 allowed 15:9 alspach 99:8,12
7:18 131:6 7b 32:21 33:2 76:21 7c 85:11 7th 3:1 5:5 130:13	128:3 acreage 47:20 acres 50:12 51:20 88:6,13 act 97:12 98:8	adoption 42:4 47:13 78:18 82:13 adopts 82:2 adult 4:5 adults 120:4	allotted 3:10 allow 48:4,14 allowed 15:9 alspach 99:8,12 101:8 125:9
7:18 131:6 7b 32:21 33:2 76:21 7c 85:11	128:3 acreage 47:20 acres 50:12 51:20 88:6,13 act 97:12 98:8 99:10 112:14	adoption 42:4 47:13 78:18 82:13 adopts 82:2 adult 4:5 adults 120:4 advance 3:6	allotted 3:10 allow 48:4,14 allowed 15:9 alspach 99:8,12 101:8 125:9 altered 118:17,18
7:18 131:6 7b 32:21 33:2 76:21 7c 85:11 7th 3:1 5:5 130:13	128:3 acreage 47:20 acres 50:12 51:20 88:6,13 act 97:12 98:8 99:10 112:14 acted 47:18	adoption 42:4 47:13 78:18 82:13 adopts 82:2 adult 4:5 adults 120:4 advance 3:6 advantageous	allotted 3:10 allow 48:4,14 allowed 15:9 alspach 99:8,12 101:8 125:9 altered 118:17,18 alternative 68:18
7:18 131:6 7b 32:21 33:2 76:21 7c 85:11 7th 3:1 5:5 130:13	128:3 acreage 47:20 acres 50:12 51:20 88:6,13 act 97:12 98:8 99:10 112:14	adoption 42:4 47:13 78:18 82:13 adopts 82:2 adult 4:5 adults 120:4 advance 3:6	allotted 3:10 allow 48:4,14 allowed 15:9 alspach 99:8,12 101:8 125:9 altered 118:17,18

amend 86:10 95:2	anyway 31:16	78:12,16 88:21	106:3 108:11
126:15 127:3	51:2 62:10 67:20	91:20	109:18 113:11,12
128:15,18	108:2	areas 36:4 38:16	113:14,17,18
amended 21:8	apologize 34:11	77:11,16	114:9 126:3,3
28:8 33:14,14	apparently 103:21	argument 7:21	130:16
52:16 73:1 116:11	116:4	130:8,9	attorney's 113:9
127:16	appeals 96:3	arguments 71:13	attorneys 8:8
amending 82:2,19	appear 93:7	arose 11:3	audio 132:3
amendment 21:6	appeared 132:3	arrangement	august 4:16 5:19
21:12 30:5,20	appears 24:3	22:21 99:5	9:3 20:18 24:19
43:6 49:21,21	101:18 129:20	article 55:18 89:6	41:10 47:9 49:13
60:9,20 61:4	applicant 6:27:3	97:2,6 123:3	78:18 79:12 93:3
86:14,16 87:2,3	24:12 28:17 36:10	articles 27:14	119:9
93:8 95:11 97:13	58:16 61:12 63:9	95:20 99:6	authorities 87:18
107:5 128:11	79:14 83:14	aside 75:18 121:10	authority 6:20
129:19 130:4,9	110:13 111:9,20	asked 38:11 49:20	86:10
amendment's 36:2	112:6	52:15 61:9,11,15	authorization 6:6
amendments 21:8	applicant's 62:6	80:18,21 91:2	68:8
97:11	69:8,10,12,20	95:2 100:8,13	authorize 74:5
american 98:8	applicants 25:18	114:17	82:19
amount 3:9	application 57:17	asking 56:14 73:5	authorizing 66:12
124:18	57:18 90:9,19,20	99:17 100:7	67:5 94:11
analogies 80:17	92:16 93:11 103:7	126:19	auto 81:4
analogous 113:12	applied 73:16 98:6	aspects 17:2	automatically
analysis 85:9	appreciate 2:7	assembled 71:13	47:6
anderson 90:16	102:18 122:16	assertion 37:7	available 53:5
109:19	appropriate 10:1	assessable 65:11	71:15,19
anew 5:13	92:18 102:18	assistant 93:4	average 21:5,10
annapolis 26:11	113:8	assisted 132:7	awarded 58:3
annex 88:13	appropriately	assume 102:10	aware 58:2 129:7
annexation 88:16	114:14	117:13	129:8
88:19 89:20 90:3	approval 9:1,2	assumed 58:19	awkwardly 9:13
annexed 72:16	11:7 15:19 61:1	assure 33:17	aye 23:14
announce 57:1	63:16 86:21 92:17	assured 63:17	b
announcement	95:4 97:20 104:10	69:15	back 3:1 5:13 6:3
42:13	104:17 106:6	astonishing 97:2	11:11 16:14 27:15
announcing 95:20	110:3	attention 57:21	51:15,19,19 54:11
100:17	approvals 25:20	77:5 118:21 119:5	54:16 55:3,9,15
answer 5:9 82:13	approved 54:16	120:4,9 122:13	57:15 58:3 59:3
112:1 123:13	54:19 55:5 59:7	123:15	80:2 104:11
answered 81:9	63:11 90:4	attorney 24:19	107:11 111:21
anticipated 42:2	approving 97:10	25:3 37:4 56:16	114:7 117:11
anybody 40:11	area 19:7 41:15	62:6 85:6 89:8	125:20 126:14
100:12 129:7	53:4 75:1 77:10	91:13 93:4 95:15	127:10,11 130:12

backed 99:3	benefits 49:2 53:8	brain 81:5	callahan 1:14 2:3
background 27:20	best 123:13 124:5	breadth 18:10	2:7,15 32:5,9
99:11	better 118:20	36:1	70:18 71:1,6,9
backing 8:4	beyond 42:6 43:12	break 63:8 70:12	102:7,11,16,19
backpack 81:13	46:14,18 111:2	70:20 71:3	103:3,9,13 104:7
backs 26:20	114:10,12	breathed 67:20	107:12 115:15
ball 128:20	big 12:3 24:1 39:6	bridge 66:17 67:9	122:15,18 128:6
balls 129:15	58:5 62:20 68:3	brief 77:3	130:19 131:1,3,5
baltimore 132:2	95:18 120:5	briefly 49:18	called 18:1 28:9
bank 26:19	bigger 76:13	124:16	30:4 42:10,17
banking 116:19	biggest 4:18 23:10	bright 77:16	74:2,15 79:8
barber 48:1	66:3 111:6	bring 6:2 65:12	80:13 92:11 110:4
barn 5:7 115:17	bill 109:19	127:10	calling 32:12 70:9
119:14	billion 21:14 22:8	brings 20:2 110:9	cap 65:8,9,10,10
base 65:12	22:9,12 27:20	broke 99:1	capacity 29:5,7,20
based 5:20 6:21	50:12 65:11 85:15	brokerage 22:14	67:19
11:7 35:3 88:12	120:12	brought 60:11	capitalist 21:21
129:3	billions 66:16 67:8	123:8,14	captured 13:1
baseline 73:17	bills 23:21 117:11	brown 78:5 79:3	54:2
basic 6:13 68:5	bit 9:5	build 67:19 97:18	cards 22:5
71:21	bizarre 107:18	98:10,17 103:19	care 22:11
bay 66:16 67:9	black 76:17	building 31:5,21	carefully 130:16
bearing 7:9 9:18	blatant 52:7	100:18 103:17	carroll 94:9
125:19	bless 121:16	105:3 116:1	carry 121:17
beaten 27:15	blowing 91:16	120:10	case 7:13 26:3,11
beg 116:5,7	blown 51:20 76:12	built 27:3 67:15	27:6 36:7 81:6,17
began 3:3 59:8	blue 100:16	bunch 106:2	cash 98:20
80:3 88:5	119:19	bundle 65:16	categories 74:17
beginning 42:8	blunt 60:6	burden 107:10	75:20,21
52:21 106:10	board 7:11 109:20	121:17	category 84:18
begun 101:10	113:5	burdens 121:18	cause 101:6
behalf 91:14 99:15	body 26:1,6 86:13	buried 23:19	caused 12:6 91:18
believe 5:20 15:1	86:19 113:4	33:19	center 16:21 38:8
15:18 30:18 31:10	126:13	busiest 21:16	96:21 122:6
37:12 61:4 91:17	bogus 69:21	business 24:15,16	central 7:21 15:15
96:6 112:6 115:10	bold 10:13	35:16	130:2
123:1 130:8	book 27:2	busy 108:1 118:9	certain 73:20
believed 44:18	bottom 63:1 78:6	buy 88:8	75:16 91:17 94:10
62:3	88:1	bypass 97:9	124:8
believes 60:18	bought 47:15	c	certainly 37:19
bell 126:5	48:18	california 81:2,12	96:9,13 104:4
benefit 53:8	bowman 125:9	call 38:4 54:6 77:5	114:17 125:17
benefited 19:9	box 90:20	100:12	129:9
		100.12	

certifications	city 26:9,10 132:2	clover 67:14,17	82:7 108:6,8
112:21	claim 9:16 47:15	club 25:12	109:8 111:14
certify 86:16	57:7 79:21 80:6	cluster 89:1	commit 81:17
132:3,5,8,10	80:10	code 55:1 86:9,12	common 59:5 68:5
chairperson 70:15	claimed 48:20	86:18	communicate 3:7
chambers 1:10	77:20 98:11	coli 14:1	community 5:14
change 30:19	claiming 122:20	coliform 14:1	16:21 23:17 36:2
45:10,11 78:16	claims 3:16 8:15	collection 14:18	122:5,5 123:1
81:21 94:18	clarifications	columbia 27:3	125:12 127:13
127:17	81:20	come 5:13 21:9	comp 15:16 29:19
changed 82:12,20	clarify 33:6	74:9 108:6 120:8	55:13 64:6 66:2,7
127:15	clarke 44:7 45:7,8	130:11	66:9 72:12 86:17
changes 17:20	45:16 53:3 127:5	comes 118:12	87:2 88:19 128:12
18:6 97:10	classification	coming 62:10	128:16,18
channels 61:20	28:11 32:13 34:16	104:18	company 26:19
chapter 76:6,8	34:18 35:2 36:20	comment 45:8	27:3 31:20
character 64:4	37:16,17 44:3	comments 17:1	compare 34:5,8
66:6	47:12 50:8 62:8	35:21 82:7	compared 4:7
characterization	69:21 72:2 73:15	commercial 22:11	compatible 94:16
9:20	73:21 75:7 79:7	94:13	compelled 15:18
charges 56:10	82:1,11,16,20	commission 5:17	compelling 9:13
chart 90:17 91:3	83:20 85:20 93:14	15:5,15 17:13	complete 2:20
96:14	classifications	18:5 30:14,16	19:11 40:7
charter 92:6	74:15 78:17 91:10	31:13 35:10,13,18	completed 90:4
cheating 22:6	92:19	35:19,21 36:5,14	completely 31:4
check 40:12 70:16	classified 37:14	37:5 38:9 39:21	54:9 63:5
102:8 104:1	38:21 39:5 44:6	42:15 52:4 54:21	complicated
checking 90:19	44:20 45:4,19	56:4 58:1 60:3,4	117:16
123:20	47:4 51:1 72:4	61:10 62:7 63:20	complicit 112:5
cherish 64:4	74:1 75:3,6 77:13	64:7,9 67:10 82:4	compounding
chestertown 91:13	77:21 78:7 80:1	86:12 87:7 88:18	109:4
chicanery 111:19	83:4 85:1 86:4,5	89:12,14,19 90:6	comprehensive
chief 28:14	87:1 92:11,20	95:12 109:16	15:11 17:10,12
chip 125:21	clean 62:7 118:6	113:5 122:6	21:6,7,11 31:16
choptank 13:11 chuck 1:14	cleanup 55:6 clear 3:12 38:20	125:17 132:20	33:12,15 35:12,15
	62:6 75:14 82:15	commission's 16:9	36:3 41:12,19 46:17 52:19 55:1
circles 18:14 69:7 circus 34:15	clearest 7:16	52:9,15 54:1 89:5 89:7 116:16	67:17 68:20 72:9
citations 112:20		commissioner	
114:20	clearly 7:10 8:11 20:19 77:11 95:13	53:10 61:9,11	72:19 73:2,9,14 74:7 75:13 76:6
citizens 3:21 16:20	98:16	commissioners	76:10 77:1 79:4
36:13 64:3,8 70:9	clock 107:11	13:10 14:14 36:11	82:2,5,9 85:7 87:4
91:14 108:1	close 98:1	39:13 44:15,18	87:6 90:17,21
113:20 115:7	CIUSC 70.1	60:12 62:2,14	92:1,5 93:9 94:17
113.20 113.7		00.12 02.2,14	72.1,3 73.7 74.17

95:3 97:11 99:21	confirming 85:11	constituents 7:1	correct 49:5 61:21
100:1 104:17	conflated 93:13	115:8	85:9 105:2,8
107:6 125:14	conflating 93:13	constraints 52:11	106:11 123:2,4
126:1,11,16 127:4	confused 76:2	constructed 46:15	128:16
129:19	confusion 10:12	construction 5:10	corrected 49:11
comprehensive's	41:7 49:4 110:20	53:6 55:10 60:7	123:3,11
28:8	connect 12:11	60:17 61:3 62:12	correctly 16:5
comprise 35:15	14:21 16:6 29:2	85:14,18 96:12	corroborate 84:4
comprised 6:19	30:8 31:9 74:3	99:9,19 100:6,21	corroborated
comprising 78:21	116:12,19	117:13	48:20
compromise 16:3	connected 24:6	consultants	corrupt 64:17
117:4,6,11	43:13 75:3 78:3	110:15	65:19 69:10,13
compromises	connecting 15:7	contained 132:9	corrupted 7:48:1
53:19	31:14	contemplated	9:3 20:15 36:9
computer 132:7	connection 2:21	17:9	40:5 54:9 56:8
computers 33:19	31:17 84:14,15	contend 50:11	62:13 63:5 69:14
conceivable	connotations	context 6:3 7:7	97:19
121:20	30:12	40:12 114:18	cost 64:19 65:16
conceived 108:19	consequence	contexts 39:10	119:6,10,16
concentration	109:21	continuation 1:4	costs 24:6 119:16
13:15	consequences	2:11	council 1:1,10,13
concern 17:11	16:9	continue 49:13	2:16 6:20 14:13
concerned 9:7	consequently	contrary 37:17	15:1 18:6 28:19
89:16	15:17	contributed 73:10	30:13,15,15 35:7
concerning 69:20	consider 58:12	80:4	35:8 36:12 38:8
concerns 97:8	61:2	contributing	39:13,20 42:15,16
concession 30:4	consideration	12:13	44:18 45:3,14
42:11,13,18 45:16	5:18 8:2 20:14	control 68:9	47:8,18 50:15
49:3 51:4 53:9	54:10 56:7 73:17	controlling 68:2	52:3 55:14 56:5
concluded 3:4	89:5 129:10	73:12	58:1 62:2,15
90:15 131:6	considered 5:13	controls 25:1	65:17 67:11 70:3
concluding 8:5	24:5 53:5 112:4	conveniently	71:17 72:10 79:15
conclusionary	considers 60:6	101:13	82:1,18,18 83:9
113:1	82:8	conveying 3:12	83:10,11 86:20
conclusive 9:20	consistency 46:16	convince 93:5	87:9 94:6,7,9,20
condition 81:7	consistent 35:12	convinced 50:19	95:8,13 100:8
conditioned	43:10 46:21 54:21	copies 72:19 76:10	102:21 104:10
118:18	55:12 82:5 86:17	76:16	107:9 108:17,19
conditions 14:8	87:6 88:18,19	copy 78:20 85:10	109:14,15 111:10
68:7	90:21 99:20	106:12	112:18 113:2,10
confident 109:1	consistently 53:3	cordova 120:8	113:10 114:4,12
confirmation 14:7	83:16	corey 1:17	114:18 115:6
confirmed 54:13	consists 23:4	corn 21:15 27:21	116:15 122:18
106:18		79:9	127:3 132:3

[council's - detail]

council's 96:4,9 112:14	108:17 109:7,15 109:17,18 113:2,8	culpable 112:5 current 41:12,19	declared 47:16 deeply 43:16
councilman 109:7	113:9,10,11,11,17	43:11 44:2 52:19	defer 121:11
counsel 132:4,9,10	113:18,20,21	81:7	deficiencies 12:7
132:11	114:4,6,12,18	currently 47:20	deficient 30:10
counties 86:10	115:6 116:15	93:8	defined 35:14
county 1:1,1 4:5	118:10,20 119:7	curry 106:2	defines 8:17
4:12,19 5:8,9 6:6	120:1 121:13,14	cut 71:7 120:17,18	degree 30:17
6:10,18,19 12:20	124:4 125:14	d	116:10
15:10 16:21 17:8	126:3,3,15 127:6		degrees 30:7
18:6 20:13 21:9	132:2,3	dan 2:10,17 10:19 40:20	delivered 3:13 8:7
21:14 22:16,16	county's 4:17 7:4	dance 115:19	13:12 106:17
24:4 25:5,10,20	18:7 20:10 35:12	daniel 1:5	delmarva 66:14
27:12,13 28:6,7	36:8 46:21 50:5	dark 77:10,13	delmarva's 67:7
31:15 35:8,9	63:15 64:14 66:14	119:4	democrat 89:6,8
36:13,19 37:8,18	67:6 88:19 97:9	date 40:21 59:12	95:19
38:6 41:12,19	97:19 119:17	78:17	democratic 23:8
42:20 43:17 44:3	couple 8:6 24:2,10	dates 130:12	demonstrate
44:3 45:2,3 46:17	52:13 69:3 99:6	day 13:13 32:3	87:15 97:16
46:20 47:8 50:14	104:4,5 129:14	60:12 61:8 73:1	demonstrates 58:7
51:7 52:19 54:16	course 5:21 9:19	132:13	denied 36:14 64:9
54:18,19 55:4,11	25:13 35:1 38:11	dead 122:11	department 6:15
55:14 56:3 59:7	39:18 43:2 49:8	deal 12:3 21:15	13:16 14:11 15:2
60:9,20 61:13,20	56:18 57:3 91:9	24:5 50:13 58:5	97:7 120:9
62:2 63:11 64:2,5	106:7,11	85:16	depth 17:18
64:20 65:3,8,12	court 96:3	dealing 96:8	derelict 115:1
65:16 66:4,9 68:8	cover 36:1	deals 16:15 17:19	describe 36:16
69:17 70:3 72:8	covered 36:3	26:17	80:18,21 81:3
72:10,21 73:2	118:14	decade 101:21	described 64:6
74:1,4,5,9,14,17	coyman 108:10	decades 25:8 37:6	83:19 92:9
74:20 75:2,8 76:6	crazy 121:8	37:7	describes 77:7
77:1 78:1,8,15	create 43:18	december 1:7 8:6	81:6,8
79:6,8 81:1 82:1	created 10:14	8:14 28:19 30:2	describing 88:11
82:17,18 83:11	creating 68:1	30:21 57:11 59:19	designate 42:21
84:17 86:1,2,4,13	credible 124:3	59:21 64:11 79:15	55:16
86:14,15,15,17,19	credit 127:21	90:8 92:12 106:1	designated 28:15
86:19 87:6 88:17	creek 12:6 13:9	106:15,18 115:20	46:10 68:21 69:5
90:21 91:21 92:5	14:8 32:2 69:19	decide 121:18	88:21
93:9,16,21 94:6	117:2	decision 6:7,8,9	designates 52:20
95:8,15,19 96:1,2	criticisms 17:1	23:8 36:16 89:7	designation 43:9
96:9 99:20 100:2	crossed 27:1	116:7,16	desk 107:10
100:5,8,17 101:16	cryptically 91:4	decisions 6:13,17	detail 14:14 36:5
101:20 102:6	culminating 9:2	16:10	71:14 88:1
104:9 107:7,8			

[details - endorsing]

details 108:2	discharge 13:18	96:16,18 124:20	easiest 12:21
determination	55:9 58:13 60:7	doing 24:15 61:13	easily 39:12 68:4
35:18 91:19	60:17 61:3 85:14	119:21	east 16:17 24:16
determined 15:6	90:10,19 93:11	dollar 21:14 50:13	29:9 30:1 72:14
31:14 35:11 44:10	96:11 105:6	67:14 85:15	78:21 91:19,20
46:21 53:4	disclosures 4:13	117:11 120:12	100:19
develop 37:9	discovered 98:6	dollars 22:8,10	easton 1:10 25:11
developed 19:12	discreet 35:14	27:20 65:11	132:13
21:20 25:9 37:1	discuss 33:4 52:5	dominant 68:12	effect 101:7
37:19 38:7 48:6	discussed 7:2 18:4	dominate 68:14	129:21
48:16 51:1,18	36:5 40:17 59:1	dotted 27:1	effluent 13:14
75:10 76:1 78:4	64:13 67:1,9	double 13:14	127:18
developer 18:3	89:17 110:18	40:12	effort 16:1 97:9
19:9 23:2,12	130:6	downgraded 69:8	124:18 125:1
24:13,17 25:6	discussion 7:17	downgrading	either 48:1 66:1
26:15,15,20 28:1	42:9 47:11 64:18	19:10	elderly 23:19 24:2
48:4,13 54:19	69:15 110:11	download 73:7	election 23:6
62:16 68:3,6,10	125:11 127:11	dr 14:14 15:4 17:4	elections 108:18
95:2 103:6	discussions 48:3	69:18 90:9	element 15:15
developer's 24:19	48:12 88:12	draft 119:19	100:11
49:15	disruptive 66:3	drafting 16:2	elements 82:8
developers 120:1	102:4	dramatic 17:20	eligibility 78:10
development	distributed 72:21	drawing 10:6	eligible 44:21
19:10 22:6 25:2	district 29:6,10,21 30:2	drawn 67:16	62:18 84:13,15
26:1 38:21 39:5	divilio 1:16 33:2	117:3 dread 51:12	emphasize 75:12
40:3,15 42:3 44:21 46:2 47:17	66:18 67:12	driving 70:5	emphasized 40:1 60:13
47:21 48:5,14	113:16,18 114:8	dropped 111:21	emphasizing
51:11 57:13 78:10	122:17,19 123:7	due 26:11 105:20	45:15
79:19 83:4 86:5	123:18,20 124:1	duncan 94:8	emphatically
89:2,9,11 94:2	124:13 131:4	duped 39:12	55:14
102:5	division 90:10	duration 16:7	employee 132:11
diane 1:21 132:2	dnr 14:12	dust 122:4	employees 104:13
132:16	document 8:10	duties 114:11	emt 65:3
die 118:17	18:8 34:13 73:3,9	duty 113:14,18	enabled 58:15
different 18:15	73:12,14 84:20	e	enacted 33:16
25:17 51:3 104:12	documentation	e 1:18 3:21 14:1	72:13
104:13,13 128:17	98:4	85:10 96:20 97:7	enclosures 92:4
130:14	documented 129:6	124:2	encouraging
differentiate	documenting	earlier 15:6,19	68:18
10:20	95:17	58:18 72:12 87:2	encroachments
difficult 20:6,7	documents 3:15	55.15 / 2.12 5/.2	120:10
1		early 54:11	
directly 20:9 37:4 43:15 47:10	8:13 76:14,14 87:14 88:2 90:13	early 54:11 easier 76:13 116:5	endorsing 17:3

[engaged - faith]

engaged 4:7	errors 18:19 22:12	exhibit 8:16 9:9	explodes 121:2
engineer 43:17	69:9	28:21 29:1,4,17	explore 130:15
92:2	esoteric 6:11	30:6 31:4 32:15	express 4:2 8:11
engineering 24:13	especially 8:17	32:18 33:14,14,15	expressed 30:7
25:4,7,11 65:5	122:13	33:20 85:11 97:3	71:14 112:20
68:11 88:8 98:1	essential 50:8 57:3	101:9 116:11	113:1,3
103:15 110:14	57:4	118:5	expressing 81:16
120:20 130:7	essentially 39:1	exhibits 8:10	97:8 124:2
engineers 83:15	43:7 60:19 66:13	29:13 32:20 91:15	expressly 82:19
109:13	67:6 90:11 96:1	96:16 101:5	extend 74:18
enhanced 15:12	established 72:8	exist 93:6 118:19	85:19 114:12
enormous 23:21	estate 21:15,19	existed 77:4 89:3	extended 42:3
66:10 67:3	22:6,14	105:1	extension 57:18
enr 15:13	evaluated 79:17	existence 111:4	extent 114:16
entered 132:9	102:3	existing 12:7,14	115:2
enthralled 68:3	evaluating 122:9	13:9 15:7 29:3,5,7	extra 104:6
entire 34:10 36:1	evening 2:16 3:8	29:8,20 31:10	extreme 14:20
47:20 51:10,15	126:21	47:11 77:3 91:8	f
53:12,16 99:21	event 93:19	101:4 116:12	
113:4	everybody 2:8	117:2 121:8	f 1:14 28:21 29:1,4
entirely 70:1	12:19 27:12 30:19	expectation 81:8	30:6 31:4,8 32:15 32:18 33:15
105:21	35:8 40:7 58:7	81:10,16	116:11
entirety 41:14,21	64:21 115:18	expected 36:21	face 16:1 70:2
46:10 52:20 73:12	everyone's 54:13	75:15 78:1,9	107:19 112:10
entitled 28:12	evidence 8:3 9:14	expects 75:8,8,12	facilities 85:19
37:9 77:15 114:15	9:16,17 38:2	expense 67:19	91:8
115:3	44:16 71:10	98:11	facility 28:13
entitlement	exact 45:19	expensive 118:13	91:20
115:10	exactly 26:7 37:17	experience 26:18	fact 9:15,19 10:9
entry 91:3	77:7 87:12,13,13	108:21	15:9 17:20 20:14
environment	105:11,11 118:11	experienced 28:1	25:6,18 37:15
13:17 15:3	examination	83:15 109:11	39:6,15 43:4 44:7
environment's	132:5	expert 83:16	45:18 48:21 52:8
6:16	example 27:5	expired 57:16	55:11,13,21 56:1
environmental	68:11,15 84:6	expires 132:20	58:17 60:14 69:2
55:18	97:5	explain 58:19 92:8	75:14 89:20 94:17
epa 8:8 56:16	examples 62:5	101:15 110:5	95:16 104:9,21
106:4	exception 78:14	explained 42:10	117:6
episode 92:13	exchanges 90:15	42:17 45:16	facts 9:4 10:7,7
era 96:21	excuse 66:18	explaining 46:6	55:8 124:6
erodes 17:10	128:4	explanation 91:5	fair 115:9
erroneous 91:19	executive 113:3	explicit 57:7	faith 118:3,3,6
error 123:15	exhaustive 124:20	explicitly 29:2 57:1	130:21
		J1.1	

[false - full] Page 10

false 9:11 11:8	feedback 129:1	53:11,11,18 54:7	forgotten 10:17
36:12 43:2 55:7	feel 117:8 125:2	57:10 58:6 59:10	108:9
57:7 79:21 86:7	fees 22:14	60:3 63:14 71:12	form 13:5 90:20
97:18	feet 5:2 22:11	71:20,21 73:20	118:20
falsehood 7:5 8:18	37:10 64:16,16	81:6 103:11	forma 58:17 61:6
9:8,11 10:4,5,8,21	94:13	105:21 107:15	63:21
11:3,4 20:16 35:3	fell 37:11	123:5,14 124:9,17	formal 54:20
36:18 38:4,5,13	felt 44:5 62:15	124:21	56:14 99:17 106:5
39:4,15 40:1,18	field 21:15 27:21	fiscal 65:13	formally 15:6
41:9 43:15,18	79:9 98:21 104:2	five 11:20 14:9	31:13 35:10 38:6
45:15 47:3 49:8	fifth 20:2,3	32:8 37:1 38:7,18	74:10 98:15
54:3,7,8 56:6 57:6	figure 77:6 78:19	38:21 39:5 40:4	former 21:19 85:6
57:12 72:1 80:4	78:20 80:12 83:17	42:4 44:5 46:1,2	forth 9:8,15
83:13,21 92:9	83:18 84:5,12,14	57:14 62:19 71:2	forthwith 51:2
93:17 117:5	84:19 92:7 111:17	71:3,6 72:20 75:9	fortunately 76:9
falsehoods 6:48:1	111:18 126:9	78:1 79:19 83:4,5	forward 31:11
9:3 10:2,12,13,14	127:6	86:6 95:14 96:10	50:10 60:10
13:3 20:17 35:5	figures 84:21	108:7,11 121:15	foster 94:8
36:17 44:16 58:15	filed 2:21 5:5	fix 105:19	found 15:15 55:12
63:10 69:10,12,14	files 76:15	fixed 19:17	76:7 82:4 87:5
69:20 110:19	final 50:9 54:2	fixing 19:4	88:18 123:10
111:3 121:5 122:8	63:7	flag 2:5	four 7:19 47:10
122:21	finally 8:4 85:3	flat 83:11	50:4 52:4 108:18
falsely 72:7	93:20	flaw 19:19	108:18
falseness 9:19	financially 21:17	floor 2:12	fourth 20:2,3
families 117:8	23:20 27:21	flowing 32:2	frame 42:5 43:12
119:2	find 34:13 80:8	focused 4:12	46:19 54:4 58:16
family 25:1 117:7	81:11 127:1	64:15 69:15	70:16
far 25:14 99:3	finding 54:20	follow 59:12 73:19	framed 40:5,18
118:8 126:20	86:11	108:1 109:6	41:9
farmland 88:7,13	findings 95:16	followed 8:3 81:7	framework 36:15
fashion 50:7	fine 13:17	following 51:9	framing 64:17
118:19	finish 7:14 56:8	65:21 93:12,19	65:19 69:11,14
fast 116:2	105:9	116:4	111:18
faster 66:16 67:9	firm 108:14	foolishness 66:12	frank 1:16
fastest 7:15	first 2:4 7:20	67:4	frankly 33:18
faulty 10:16	11:11,14,18 12:3	foot 21:2 27:10	freeboard 64:16
faux 49:3	12:16,16 16:11	footnotes 8:10	front 6:5 38:7
favor 61:13	21:3 28:18,19	force 96:1	42:14 53:19 58:6
february 42:14	30:8 31:21 36:18	forever 27:15	122:6
100:15 101:6,7 fecal 14:1	38:11 40:14,16 42:6,8,9,14 47:14	39:16 68:9 111:5	full 3:9 23:18 51:20 52:6 73:8
fed 53:14	' ' '	forgiveness 116:5 116:8	
16u 33.14	48:5,14 49:18 51:6 52:14,15,18	110.0	82:8 114:15,20
	31.0 32.14,13,10		

[fullness - honestly]

fullness 118:15	117:17 120:13,13	growth 69:2 88:21	heard 7:8 12:15
fully 92:8	122:18 126:14	grumbles 56:14	13:8,11 14:14
functionary 92:15	god 39:2	87:16 106:2	49:12 56:17 84:1
fundamental	god 39.2 goes 20:9 26:3		100:5 103:4 117:6
	•	guardrail 27:8	hearing 1:4 15:3
17:16 66:1,7,9 121:5	going 2:9 5:12 11:9 16:15 17:17	guess 44:2 107:11 116:19	22:19 33:1 35:19
funds 98:17	18:9 21:4 29:16		46:5 49:14 51:9
further 8:14 132:5	39:3 41:17 50:10	guideline 93:8	65:20 67:1 82:7
		guise 36:12	127:12
132:8,10 future 44:4 45:21	52:11,12 61:14,19 64:19 65:1,3,12	h	hearings 94:4 95:7
81:8	65:13,15 71:7,8	hagerstown 26:10	heart 120:11
	76:19 96:17	half 5:1 22:10	125:2
g	102:10 103:11,14	43:7,9 45:17	heavy 107:10
gallagher 114:18	112:12 117:17	51:18,19 94:12	held 89:13
gamut 82:8	120:18 121:19	hand 28:6 98:1	hell 120:12,17
gathering 124:19	120.18 121.19	103:21 132:13	121:17
gee 124:11	golf 22:5 25:12	handled 127:18	help 3:12 24:3
general 7:17 66:11	good 2:16 62:7	hands 28:1 118:6	25:11 71:2
66:21 67:4 113:12	117:15 118:3,3,6	happen 4:19 68:4	helping 19:7
126:20	124:9 130:20,21	happened 49:7	high 23:17
general's 8:8	gosh 112:16	85:2 87:12 99:5	highlighting
56:16 106:3	gotten 32:15 59:6	100:10 101:17	102:21
generally 4:6	88:10 111:21	107:14,18 111:1	highway 21:17
25:14	governing 86:13	112:7 119:1	66:15 67:7
genuine 10:2	86:19	happening 108:16	hillary 94:9
getting 53:20,20	government 6:18	127:14	hint 96:17
60:15 129:12	24:4 26:1 74:4	happens 10:3	hints 50:15 97:15
give 40:20 103:11	granicus 33:3	109:19 116:13	historic 23:3
103:15 104:5	grant 98:17	124:12 130:4	historical 5:3
105:13 115:13	grasp 19:21	happy 7:16 71:18	history 23:20
127:21	gray 77:10,13	hard 23:18 53:13	108:16 110:2
given 37:16 52:11	79:3 84:13	72:18 77:17 94:6	117:5
53:17,18 60:14	great 27:17 109:1	102:10 109:6	hit 27:18
79:7 117:5	109:2	harm 16:7	hitting 122:19
gives 86:9	greater 14:4	harrington 94:8	hold 7:13 27:18
giving 70:18	green 4:21	harsh 8:18	35:19
128:10	ground 3:7 42:7	hazard 12:14	holdings 24:16
glitch 19:4	93:10	head 121:2 126:9	home 5:1
go 2:9,10,12 3:8	groundwork	headline 25:1	homes 12:11 22:9
27:17 28:3 51:19	53:15	heads 109:20	30:9 37:10 94:12
53:12 56:21 59:3	group 18:20	health 7:1,9,11	honest 36:15
60:10 69:4 71:18	118:14	12:14 15:20 hear 4:20 44:16	54:10
81:14 89:21	grow 68:18	hear 4:20 44:16	honestly 64:4
104:11 108:13		82:7 129:1	
111:2 114:6,10			

[honor - intro]

94:1

honor 122:19	immediately	income 23:17	infrastructure
hook 75:5	75:21 99:2	incompatible	42:2 43:13 46:15
hooked 75:10	imminently 99:2	102:4	46:20 53:6 89:2
77:14,15	impact 36:2 66:6,8	incomplete 91:17	inherent 57:4
hoon 91:13 92:2	66:11 67:3	inconsistent 15:9	inhibited 73:11
hoopla 27:14	impacted 18:12	15:10,16 31:15	initiate 87:16
hope 3:9 94:8	impactful 66:3	incorporated	injury 31:12
114:17 119:2	implication 120:5	125:13 126:1,11	innocence 11:2
horse 5:6 115:17	implications 37:3	incorrect 19:5	innocent 10:3
119:13	119:21 120:1	110:20 123:9	inspector 26:3
houlihan 1:21	implied 37:18	incredibly 12:10	instantly 38:13
132:2,16	imply 11:1 63:10	72:18	41:5 49:7
hours 123:19	import 54:3	indefinitely 27:19	institution 26:20
house 24:2 31:21	important 5:9 6:9	independent	insult 31:12 111:7
households 23:5	8:17 9:6 12:17	11:20 13:12	insurance 26:19
hub 68:1	26:18 33:8 100:11	indicated 49:4	118:10,11,14
huge 68:12	102:4,12,14 111:2	53:3	integrity 20:9,12
hughes 14:6	112:13	indicates 42:1	70:1,6 97:1
hurry 31:19	impression 27:16	individual 71:17	119:17 121:4
hurting 19:8	improper 63:3	74:8	122:20
husband 120:7	101:19 107:5	individually	intended 16:3
i	improperly	106:19	36:1 69:3,4
-	105:13,14,15	individuals	intention 11:1
idea 5:11 21:3,4	improprieties	121:16	100:18
30:7 44:13,13	99:13	inducements	intentional 58:5
48:18 57:3,5 58:8	improvements	23:13 90:2	interested 89:10
89:1 111:1 117:3	38:17 65:4	inevitably 26:14	113:7 132:12
117:4 120:13	inaccessibility	68:14	interesting 92:13
identified 25:5	73:8	infallible 125:4	103:2 127:7,20
ignore 116:15	inaudible 18:13	inference 10:6	128:1
ignored 83:17	27:4 56:9 59:11	inferences 110:21	interestingly
illegal 58:9 88:11	60:11 69:2 80:16	infiltration 14:18	108:13
106:8,9,9 107:2	incalculable	inflow 14:17	interests 19:2
illegally 55:21	119:16	influence 4:18	internal 90:15
56:12 97:21	incidentally 52:2	26:21 50:6	96:20
illustrate 18:10	76:14	information 5:16	interpretation
80:17	include 92:4	5:20 6:21 7:2,8	49:6 82:21 83:1
illustrative 52:13	included 38:19	13:8 56:13 70:3	interpreting 44:20
imbalance 26:12	74:6 85:6 91:21	71:15 91:17 99:10	interprets 47:5
immediate 28:10	includes 33:3	105:17 106:4	interrogated
44:21 47:17 53:6	38:14 41:14,21	111:12 115:11	132:4
55:16 69:6 75:4	including 6:14 8:7		intertwined 43:16
77:13 85:21 93:15	25 11 20 12 60 15		

129:3,6

intro 66:21

25:11 39:12 68:15

110:20

[introduce - law]

Page 13

introduces 120.2	122:9 130:13	111.17 10 114.15	52.0 54.11 15
introduce 129:2		111:17,18 114:15	53:9 54:11,15
introduced 4:17	issuing 56:11	116:9,21 119:8	55:3,9,16,20
16:4 38:10 51:7	item 12:3 16:15	120:7,10 125:2,6	57:21 58:3,13
129:12,13	17:15 34:2 35:17	125:19 126:7,18	59:5 60:15 62:17
introduction 60:1	77:5 90:16 98:3	127:15,16	63:12 64:10,19
101:21	items 20:3,3 52:13	knowing 119:8	65:15 69:5 72:1,3
invalid 56:1 63:4	j	knowingly 111:8	73:10,16 77:20
85:13,17 99:9	january 89:13	knowledge 19:1	78:15 79:1,5,21
111:20	join 4:2	59:5	80:7 82:11 83:3,6
investigated 99:12	•	knowledgeable	83:9,20 84:8
investigation 9:21	joined 100:6	17:5 85:4 109:12	85:15 86:3 87:1,5
56:15 87:17 92:12	jointly 22:20	known 10:8 17:8	88:5 89:4,15 92:2
97:16 99:4,17	journalists 96:21	56:2	92:21 96:4,8
100:7,8,13 101:10	judge 17:8 117:21	knows 12:20 15:1	97:20 98:18 101:3
101:14 106:5	july 46:5 88:5	27:13 76:1,3 86:2	101:17 108:2,8,19
111:21	92:13 116:3	93:18 108:20	110:2 111:9,16
investigator 87:20	june 54:2	115:18	116:12 117:13
invited 49:17	k	kupersmith	118:17
110:5	keep 71:8 76:19	108:12	lakeside's 30:8
	129:14		47:11 66:6,8 76:4
inviting 2:19 involved 111:19	kehoe 108:8	l	107:20
	key 35:6 60:14	la 12:5 13:9 14:8	
involves 19:5	77:4 107:13	32:2 69:18 117:2	land 6:7,8,9,17 7:4
irregularities		lab 13:12,21	18:19,20 20:10
99:16	kids 120:3,3	label 77:7,8	36:8,21 68:16
irrigation 90:11	kill 6:1	labeled 33:2	70:2,6 73:20,21
98:20 116:14	kind 45:9 55:7	lady 120:7	78:20,21 79:1,2,6
issuance 63:5	128:9 129:14	laid 31:16 90:1	83:16 88:9,14
85:12 99:8,13	knew 24:9 44:8	114:21 116:18	89:15,16 91:11
issue 4:7,13 12:16	45:3 58:7 60:14	lakeside 5:1,10	97:19 107:7 109:5
13:3 19:5 20:9	63:3 92:21 110:11	6:2,7,14 9:1 12:11	117:17 121:12
34:14 55:8,19	110:12 112:2	14:21 15:7 16:6	lane 2:18
85:18 88:10 104:9	119:9	16:17 18:3 19:9	language 28:21
107:3 121:4 130:2	know 8:20 10:20	19:12 21:1,14	29:1 75:13
issued 45:2 48:21	13:7 14:6 16:19	23:11,14 24:15	large 69:4 91:4
55:21 57:15 60:7	20:17,18 23:4	25:2,6 26:4 27:7	largely 31:3
60:16 61:3 62:12	24:18 25:10 30:11	27:10,11,13,17	late 117:20 125:10
63:2,12,15 85:14	33:6 35:6 39:12	28:9,11 29:2,10	130:11
87:10 96:11,12	56:11,12 65:7,10	30:4 31:5,9,14	launch 97:20
97:21 101:1	67:15 76:4 87:12	34:19 36:19 37:10	laura 1:18
104:16 105:13,14	99:3 101:19	38:6,15,20 40:2	law 6:17 35:14
105:15 125:8,12	102:11,13 103:2	40:10 42:19 43:3	45:10 75:12 82:15
issues 17:6 35:14	103:12 107:19	44:12,20 45:4,18	93:7 117:18,21
58:15 59:1 64:1,8	108:2 109:16,17	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	132:4
64:12 69:16 94:15	110:1,9,18 111:16	47:3,16 48:19 50:6,21 52:5,9	

[lawyer - mde] Page 14

lawyer 49:15	letters 101:5	look 21:2 64:12	80:11,12,14 83:17
109:14,15,19	106:13	73:13 76:5 78:19	mapped 18:7
130:3,15	level 21:2 27:10	78:19 84:12,21	74:16
lawyers 19:18	license 81:11	120:19 124:10	mapping 69:8
83:15 109:12	lies 10:13 107:8	126:21	121:8
118:9	life 26:17 64:5	looked 55:5	maps 18:15 46:10
lay 11:9	66:8	looking 4:10 16:14	74:6 76:5,12,16
laying 7:14 111:13	light 4:21 87:15	17:11 30:20 58:14	78:17 122:2
layman 109:8	limit 14:5 16:7	73:11	march 84:16
laymen 19:20	limits 13:19	looks 46:18	margin 22:13
leaf 67:14,18	line 19:5 45:21	loss 68:9	marinated 59:5
learn 109:9	63:1	lost 107:16	marriage 22:5
learned 5:12 99:8	lines 94:2	lot 8:19 18:13 22:8	married 80:20
101:16	list 98:16	26:21 48:1,8,17	81:10
leave 43:1	listed 17:15	68:21 73:5 81:15	maryland 1:1,10
led 37:12 40:17	listen 46:4	88:2 103:1 127:10	6:15,17 13:16
41:8 47:10 122:21	listener 10:5,8	129:5	15:2 55:1,17
left 5:6 18:15	listening 19:18	lots 22:2,2 84:13	75:12 86:9 93:14
27:16 41:8 108:11	75:18 105:18	love 64:3	96:3 97:6 113:12
108:12 115:17	lists 11:20	lucky 22:3	114:1,6 117:18,21
legal 15:17 16:9	litany 14:15	m	132:1,2
17:16,18 18:7	literally 54:1	ma'am 95:5	maryland's 14:5
19:15 20:8 53:15	litigation 118:8	madam 70:15	matched 41:4,6
54:12 55:18 57:2	little 5:4 14:2	131:3	material 10:9
57:5,8 58:19	18:13,13 21:17,20	magnitude 4:11	71:13
81:21 109:4	23:3 24:2,9 26:13	mail 85:10 97:7	materials 9:12
112:21 114:13,20	27:21 68:14 78:5	124:2	matt 13:11
114:21 118:10,11	84:9,10 88:1	121.2	(10 15 00
110 10 101 0	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	mails 3.21.96.20	matter 6:12 15:20
118:13 121:9	96:14 122:3	mails 3:21 96:20 main 28:14 34:15	19:4,15 35:5
125:18	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15	main 28:14 34:15	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20 117:1	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6 long 18:17 47:3	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8 making 3:16 6:5	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12 md 132:13
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20 117:1 legislative 45:12	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6 long 18:17 47:3 48:21 56:20 57:12	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12 md 132:13 mde 8:7,16 9:6
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20 117:1 legislative 45:12 length 59:2	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6 long 18:17 47:3 48:21 56:20 57:12 59:7 63:12,13	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8 making 3:16 6:5 8:12,21 36:16	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12 md 132:13 mde 8:7,16 9:6 14:7 15:18 17:7
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20 117:1 legislative 45:12 length 59:2 lens 102:3 122:7	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6 long 18:17 47:3 48:21 56:20 57:12 59:7 63:12,13 68:20 79:18 80:13	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8 making 3:16 6:5 8:12,21 36:16 50:12 56:10 85:5	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12 md 132:13 mde 8:7,16 9:6 14:7 15:18 17:7 17:11 22:18,21
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20 117:1 legislative 45:12 length 59:2 lens 102:3 122:7 lesher 1:15 45:6,8	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6 long 18:17 47:3 48:21 56:20 57:12 59:7 63:12,13 68:20 79:18 80:13 80:15,20 81:2,5	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8 making 3:16 6:5 8:12,21 36:16 50:12 56:10 85:5 101:4 126:20	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12 md 132:13 mde 8:7,16 9:6 14:7 15:18 17:7 17:11 22:18,21 25:19 28:13 31:6
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20 117:1 legislative 45:12 length 59:2 lens 102:3 122:7 lesher 1:15 45:6,8 45:13 49:4 128:4	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6 long 18:17 47:3 48:21 56:20 57:12 59:7 63:12,13 68:20 79:18 80:13 80:15,20 81:2,5 88:21 109:10	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8 making 3:16 6:5 8:12,21 36:16 50:12 56:10 85:5 101:4 126:20 man 8:20 80:19	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12 md 132:13 mde 8:7,16 9:6 14:7 15:18 17:7 17:11 22:18,21 25:19 28:13 31:6 33:10 43:14,19
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20 117:1 legislative 45:12 length 59:2 lens 102:3 122:7 lesher 1:15 45:6,8 45:13 49:4 128:4 letter 8:9,16 9:6	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6 long 18:17 47:3 48:21 56:20 57:12 59:7 63:12,13 68:20 79:18 80:13 80:15,20 81:2,5 88:21 109:10 110:2,10 115:21	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8 making 3:16 6:5 8:12,21 36:16 50:12 56:10 85:5 101:4 126:20 man 8:20 80:19 123:18 124:3	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12 md 132:13 mde 8:7,16 9:6 14:7 15:18 17:7 17:11 22:18,21 25:19 28:13 31:6 33:10 43:14,19 44:8,10,19 45:2
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20 117:1 legislative 45:12 length 59:2 lens 102:3 122:7 lesher 1:15 45:6,8 45:13 49:4 128:4 letter 8:9,16 9:6 33:10 71:14 91:14	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6 long 18:17 47:3 48:21 56:20 57:12 59:7 63:12,13 68:20 79:18 80:13 80:15,20 81:2,5 88:21 109:10 110:2,10 115:21 119:4	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8 making 3:16 6:5 8:12,21 36:16 50:12 56:10 85:5 101:4 126:20 man 8:20 80:19 123:18 124:3 125:4	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12 md 132:13 mde 8:7,16 9:6 14:7 15:18 17:7 17:11 22:18,21 25:19 28:13 31:6 33:10 43:14,19 44:8,10,19 45:2 47:5,15 48:20,21
125:18 legally 28:12 35:9 legend 77:11,17 78:7 legislation 79:20 117:1 legislative 45:12 length 59:2 lens 102:3 122:7 lesher 1:15 45:6,8 45:13 49:4 128:4 letter 8:9,16 9:6	96:14 122:3 live 2:17 65:1,15 81:1 117:8 120:2 locally 97:13 location 91:6 logical 10:6 long 18:17 47:3 48:21 56:20 57:12 59:7 63:12,13 68:20 79:18 80:13 80:15,20 81:2,5 88:21 109:10 110:2,10 115:21	main 28:14 34:15 66:14 67:7 majority 23:7 109:1,2 makers 23:8 making 3:16 6:5 8:12,21 36:16 50:12 56:10 85:5 101:4 126:20 man 8:20 80:19 123:18 124:3 125:4 manner 132:7	19:4,15 35:5 64:18 65:20 83:2 96:2 107:7 116:13 132:7 matters 36:3 83:16 121:12 md 132:13 mde 8:7,16 9:6 14:7 15:18 17:7 17:11 22:18,21 25:19 28:13 31:6 33:10 43:14,19 44:8,10,19 45:2

moving 31:11

[mde - new]

56:11,21 57:15,16
58:2,18 59:6 60:6
60:6,16,18 61:2
62:12 63:1,12
76:1,15 80:3 83:1
83:1 85:13,18
86:2,20 87:10,17
88:10 90:15 91:15
91:18,18 92:14,16
92:21 93:5 96:7
96:12,20 97:8,18
98:7,14 99:10,15
100:13,14,16
101:8,12,14 104:8
105:19 106:3
107:3,4 111:19
116:15 121:11
125:12 126:18
mde's 6:16 17:11
43:10,20,21 45:6
46:16 49:6 69:21
75:19 90:9
mean 8:17 24:1
34:16 121:1
124:18 129:13
meaning 77:14,21
78:8 85:21
meaningless 100:3
means 36:21
47:21 74:17 75:4
75:6 79:4 92:19
132:7
meant 45:17 46:11
mechanism 81:4
med 81:15
meet 3:6
meeting 2:11 3:5
33:21 40:20,21
41:3 42:14 47:8
49:14 52:17 57:11
58:6 61:11 84:1
89:12,14,20
112:15 131:6

meetings 30:13,14
39:20,21 40:8
42:16 52:3
meets 15:12
megabytes 73:6
member 30:16,16
71:17 108:19
members 1:13
2:17 14:13 45:3
56:5 58:2 62:2
71:17 102:9,21
125:11 127:12
memories 10:16
memories 10.10 memory 127:10
mention 25:3
29:16 103:1
mentioned 64:13 101:19 130:6
mess 65:13 105:19
met 52:4 89:19
90:6
mike 85:5 125:10
mill 21:11
millennium 39:2
million 5:2 22:10
22:13 37:10 67:13
94:13 98:7,20
103:5 104:1
110:19
millions 22:15
mind 54:5,13
127:3
minor 19:3
minute 29:17
59:18 71:3 123:13
minutes 50:3 71:2
101:20 104:6
115:14
misleading 33:8
misled 69:17
111:8,9
misrepresentation
7:5 20:16 35:3
7.5 20.10 55.5

misrepresentatio
6:4 8:1 11:8 13:4
63:10
misrepresented
79:17 83:18
missing 27:8
mistake 124:7,11
mistaken 42:12
mistakes 10:3
110:20 125:5
mitigate 117:1
modern 13:16
moment 11:12
41:10 129:17
moments 54:1
money 22:1,2,8
26:20 64:19 65:11
103:11,15,17
monitored 14:8
month 23:21 24:1
24:1 32:1 88:6
93:19 114:5
months 3:1,3 4:1
4:16 5:6 30:3 31:6
72:13 90:5 96:11
100:14 128:14
moral 20:8
moran 11:13
33:17 38:12 57:9
79:19 80:9 106:17
moran's 3:20
morning 116:2
mortgage 27:7
mortgagee 26:19
motion 131:1,4,5
motive 11:1
mouth 109:9
move 43:6 53:16
66:16 67:8 81:2
81:13,18 82:17
85:12
moved 48:7,16
75:9,16 78:2,9
· '

moving 31:11 42:19
multi 67:13
multiple 105:5
municipal 26:6
municipality
82:21
n
name 2:17 25:15
108:9
named 132:3
narrative 77:3 natural 14:11
naturally 58:19
nay 23:13
near 89:2
necessarily 19:20
35:7 104:14
necessary 11:11
60:20 61:5,18
need 33:6 48:9
73:13 85:1 87:16
104:11 128:4
129:9
needed 64:10,11
81:18 87:21 93:1
97:16 98:12
needs 6:5 105:19
112:17 121:9
128:17,19
neutral 27:4
never 18:4 23:16
37:14,15,18 45:3
45:19 55:11,12
57:6 67:9 86:4,5 87:1,8,9 99:3
101:19 110:6,12
111:16
nevertheless
49:15 56:6
new 5:16,20 6:21
7:2 16:16 25:15
30:6 31:7 39:6
45:9 57:17 64:1

[new - part]

65:3,11 68:1 70:3

Q0.1 Q0.11 100.19			
89:1 90:11 100:18			
101:2 105:6,7			
109:3 111:13,13			
116:1,14 130:4			
news 95:18			
newspaper 27:14			
nice 34:5,8			
nickel 65:13			
night 16:4 20:20			
40:15,16,19 70:10			
nine 4:16			
nitrogen 13:15,19			
non 34:20 94:3			
normal 14:19 27:8			
northern 24:14			
42:21 43:7			
notary 132:2,17			
noted 92:2			
notes 59:17 132:6			
noticeably 19:8			
notorial 132:13			
notwithstanding			
37:21			
november 15:3			
31:13,18 32:6,7			
116:16 125:16			
126:8 127:2			
132:13			
number 4:4 23:12			
64:17 65:19 83:13			
85:17 86:9 98:16			
numerous 91:15			
nutrient 15:12			
0			
o'clock 70:19			
oath 10:10			
obama's 98:7			
objecting 51:9			
objective 28:15			
objectives 95:17			
obligation 103:20			
obligations 113:9			

obtain 55:21
82:16 98:7
obtained 8:13
54:11 56:20 90:14
96:18
obtaining 25:19 34:15,17 89:11
obvious 12:19
37:3 84:5
obviously 8:18
39:3 56:19 84:19
occur 14:19 34:3
occurs 26:2
october 3:4,5 7:2
7:8 11:19 12:5
13:10 16:20 20:4
72:11 77:12,21
78:8,12 82:13
offer 42:11,18
offered 23:12
offering 17:1 90:2
offhand 59:9
offhanded 58:4
office 8:8 56:16
106:3
official 24:20 97:7
97:8 101:8
officially 37:8
officials 72:21
oh 112:16 120:13
okay 2:7 17:14
32:9 49:10,11
71:1,4,9 76:19,20
76:20 106:16,21
107:11,14 130:9
old 28:2 29:7
31:14 39:15 57:18
57:18 84:10 108:3
116:4
omission 10:9
once 30:16 44:14
48:6,15 55:5 83:8 92:17,19 111:3

oversight 34:11
owned 18:2 24:2
owner 74:8
owners 19:7
ownership 24:18
owns 25:1
р
p.m. 1:7 131:6
pace 37:20 118:18
pack 1:17 26:5
38:11 47:10,14,19
48:18 49:2,10
50:19 57:14 59:20
70:15 124:15
126:7 128:7,11
130:17 131:2
pack's 59:9
package 34:2
85:11 90:13 118:5
packet 33:9 40:10
76:21 91:16 95:20
96:17 97:4 98:3
99:12 100:9
106:20
page 3:14 8:9
29:18,19 90:17
92:6 93:5,12
95:16 96:14
pages 33:12,13
76:8 92:5
papers 103:12
parcel 18:19 51:11
74:6,6 91:11
122:9
parcels 18:20 69:1
69:3 73:20 78:2,7
88:15
pardon 34:7
part 9:9 10:16,17
18:3 39:7 43:1
44:10 48:5,7,14
10.10.50.57,17

48:16 62:18 81:6

83:12 89:4 93:17

95:9 118:13

[part - planning]

119:19 122:9	perfectly 54:3	persons 44:19	plan 15:11,17
119.19 122.9	period 46:13 85:7	125:9	17:10,13 21:6,7,8
participants	109:10	perspective 7:20	21:11 28:8 29:19
110:16	permanently	21:1 27:10 43:10	31:16 33:13,16
particular 16:2	50:18	46:16 53:5	35:13,16 36:3
19:13 66:12 67:5	permeated 54:9	persuasive 50:16	41:13,20 42:4
74:19 92:6 110:13	permission 116:6	persuasiveness	43:11 46:9 49:21
117:9	116:8	53:7	52:20 55:1,13
particularly 6:21	permit 13:19 31:7	pertain 130:10	60:20 64:6 66:2,7
parties 22:20 23:1	55:9 57:15,19	pertain 130.10 pertaining 40:9,9	66:10 67:17 68:20
132:11,11	58:14 70:11 80:4	76:7 87:4	72:9,12,20 73:3,9
partner 81:11	85:14 90:10 93:11	pete 1:15	73:14 74:7 75:14
partners 25:19	96:11 104:9,19	peter 94:9	76:11 77:2 79:5
parts 7:20	105:6,12 107:4	petition 2:21 4:2	80:15,20 81:2,5
party 26:18 114:3	permits 12:11	5:5 51:5 93:21	82:3,6,9,20 85:8
115:7 118:1 130:8	14:20 15:8 16:6	114:5	86:14,15,16,17
pass 121:3	22:18 25:19 28:12	phase 51:3	87:2,4,7 88:20
passage 43:21	45:2 48:21 50:9	phases 30:5 42:20	90:18 91:1 92:1,6
44:10 47:5 83:2,5	54:12,17 55:3,9	53:9 62:17	92:18 93:10 94:17
108:13 112:12	55:10,19,20 56:11	phasing 91:7	95:3 97:12 99:21
passed 54:5 94:18	56:21 57:1,8 58:3	phil 94:8	104:17 107:6
130:5	58:8,18 59:6,8	philadelphia	125:14 126:2,12
passing 59:9	60:7,17 61:3	56:17	126:16 127:4
patrick 125:20	62:13 63:1,13,14	philbrick 93:5	128:12,16,18
paul 53:10	70:1 80:3 85:13	phone 51:8	129:20
pause 123:12	85:15,17,18 87:11	photocopied	planned 18:17
pay 65:1,3 98:9,19	88:11 96:13 97:17	76:16	planning 5:17
120:4,9	97:18 98:1,12	photographs 13:2	13:10 14:13 15:5
paying 57:20	99:9,14,19 100:6	13:6	15:14 16:9 17:13
peninsula's 21:16	100:21 101:12,17	photos 12:9 69:18	18:5 30:14,16
66:14	101:18 102:2	pia 8:13 76:15	31:13 35:10,13,17
people 4:6,11 13:8	104:16,20 105:5	90:14 96:18	35:19,20 36:10,14
23:7,13 25:15	106:8 107:2	pick 117:10	37:5 38:9 39:13
39:11,11 64:14,21	110:12 111:19	picture 94:7	39:20 42:15 44:4
85:4 96:7 103:18	115:21 116:13	piece 84:10 87:20	44:14 46:1 52:4,9
106:3 117:12	125:8,10,13	pipe 31:17 42:6	54:20 56:4 58:1
120:2	permitted 30:8	116:18	60:3,4 61:10
people's 10:16	68:6 81:14	pitched 94:6	63:20 64:6,8
perceived 45:17	perpetuated 10:15	place 47:21 64:3	66:15 67:8,10
perceiving 115:6	111:4	74:3 92:19 125:3	74:18 80:13 82:4
percent 4:4,11	person 109:17	132:4	86:12,15 87:7
22:13	113:6	placed 98:15	88:17 89:5,7,12
perfect 123:16	personally 132:3	places 23:6	89:14,19 90:5
			95:12 97:7 100:2
	1		

100.67.100.0.16			120.0
108:6,7 109:8,16	polluting 12:13	preservation 99:7	129:8
111:14 113:4	pollution 12:5	president's 113:13	problem 16:2
116:15 120:8	13:5	press 25:5	17:16,18 18:12
122:5 125:17	pond 64:15	presumably 63:13	39:7 102:19 121:9
plans 16:16 46:17	pop 22:9	75:10	121:9
47:1 74:3,20	population 4:5	pretense 70:6	problems 12:6
76:12 86:11 90:8	21:18	pretenses 11:8	14:15,18 24:5,6
101:11	portion 42:21 43:4	36:12 86:7	73:10 94:15 117:1
plant 12:8 13:9,13	43:7	pretty 24:8 60:5	119:1
13:16 14:3,16,16	portrayed 63:19	61:6 62:6 63:4	proceed 6:7
15:12 16:17 17:2	position 43:20,21	109:5	proceeding 118:2
29:3,6,7,8,21	possibility 96:7	preview 3:14	proceedings 2:1
30:10 31:7,10,15	possible 124:8,9	previously 60:18	process 7:4 9:1
90:11 91:4 98:10	possibly 12:12	61:4	17:8 36:9 40:2,6
98:18 100:19	post 50:14	price 1:18 29:11	56:8 61:15,17
101:2,4 103:17	potential 19:10	29:15 32:14,18	62:14 70:2,7
116:1,12,14 117:3	power 26:12 95:13	33:5 34:5,8 40:20	90:19 97:10,20
121:8	112:14	42:12 52:17 59:11	100:1 110:3
play 36:6 120:6	powerful 61:2	59:14 71:2 94:19	129:11
player 120:6	63:4	95:6,21 104:3,8	processes 20:10
plays 43:14	powers 26:4,9	104:20 105:2,8,10	109:5
please 11:14 20:1	68:15	105:20 106:12,16	processing 93:10
32:20 70:21 76:18	practiced 82:15	106:21 107:3	procurement
pledge 2:5,6	precedented	112:15 116:21	99:18
plight 24:9 119:1	21:13	121:11 128:9	profession 81:3
plus 22:10 88:15	predictably 52:14	130:20	professional 9:21
127:9 130:20	preemptively 51:9	price's 16:1	21:19 110:14
pluta 13:11 15:4	prejudice 70:5	principle 118:7	professionals
17:4	prepare 95:16	print 123:8	108:4
pocketed 117:10	prepared 92:17	printed 76:11	profit 22:14
point 4:1 6:5 9:6	preposterous	132:6	programmed
11:5 27:9 34:10	107:19	prior 47:12 72:3	38:17 40:3 46:19
58:7 61:2 63:14	prerequisite 55:19	priority 28:10	57:13 75:15 79:18
69:12 80:17 95:8	presence 132:9	36:20 37:16 55:16	progress 38:17
102:1 115:18	present 5:16 7:3	69:6 72:2 73:15	project 4:18 5:12
118:5 130:21	12:4 52:15 70:12	73:21 74:15 75:4	21:2 22:1,1,16
pointed 92:10	presentation 2:20	75:21 77:14 82:16	24:18 25:2,7
pointing 90:16	3:3,15 7:21 60:11	83:19 85:20,21	26:16 41:14,15,21
points 3:12 8:4,11	presented 9:4 13:8	91:10 93:15 94:1	42:1 43:8,10
35:6 127:7,21	36:10 38:3 74:12	private 113:3	46:11 50:1,2
128:1	79:14 84:17 89:10	pro 58:17 61:6	53:12 54:20 60:8
poisons 22:6	110:11 112:3	63:21	60:9,18,19 62:10
politic 113:4	presenting 13:4	probably 6:9	66:4 68:12 87:5
	37:2 83:14 88:3	14:10 61:9 80:4	89:4 98:11,17

[project - reckless]

99:19 102:5	provided 91:18	70:13 73:4 76:18	rauch 25:3,11
118:16,17 120:12	129:3	123:3 124:18	27:3
122:7,10	provides 86:18	125:1	rauch's 92:3
promise 10:10	proving 63:14	puts 13:13	reaction 20:11
123:16	71:11	putting 106:20	read 9:5,9 29:5
promptly 49:5	provision 45:10	puzzlement 61:7	34:12 37:6 38:12
proof 8:3 38:2	public 1:4 5:17	q	39:19 48:9 52:1
62:11,11 70:13,13	7:1,9 12:14 15:20		57:9 66:18,20
71:16,20 96:5	18:5 35:19,20	qua 34:20	76:13 77:9 84:1
proper 5:21 6:3	36:11 38:9 39:14	quality 64:5 66:8	97:3 102:1 103:12
8:2 61:19 64:10	46:5,7,12 49:14	question 6:19	reading 40:21
96:15	56:4 57:21 65:20	54:15 59:9,10	59:14
properly 19:17	67:1 82:7 94:4	63:9 68:5 81:9	ready 2:3 27:17
27:2 91:21 122:7	95:7 97:1 98:5	82:10 94:16 95:21	47:16 98:13
properties 17:21	99:10 109:20	103:3 104:3,8	real 21:15,19 22:5
18:11 19:11,13	113:5 125:7 132:2	105:10,11 107:14 108:5 115:16	22:14 29:11 94:19
68:21 69:7 72:14	132:17		reality 26:12
72:16 77:12 78:9	public's 35:21	118:9 119:6 121:6	realized 30:18
84:6,7 91:6 98:2	publicly 114:14	122:17 126:19	really 4:3 5:12
property 19:2,5,6	123:21 126:4	questions 5:10	20:12 21:4 35:15
19:6 21:20 25:10	129:1	7:14,17 73:6 104:4	53:13 58:11,11
27:7 35:9 36:19	publish 92:17	- '	61:5,13 73:6
37:14,18 38:16	published 24:21	quick 29:11 94:19 quickly 70:14	74:13 80:16 87:21
39:4 44:8,17 49:5	97:2	quite 55:13 124:8	100:10 111:2
52:20 53:16 65:8	pulled 58:20	124:8	120:11
74:5,8,9,19,21	pullen 85:5 95:15	quote 43:17 50:16	reapply 114:5
75:2,6,8,15 82:12	108:11	92:3	reason 5:15 10:10
83:20 85:19 89:20	pullen's 85:10	quoted 97:1	11:2 12:2 16:12
92:10,20 93:1	purchase 98:2	quotes 39:19 41:4	58:9 90:18 113:14
94:1	purported 9:15	52:1	122:1
proposal 82:5	49:6		reasoning 114:21
86:20 88:16 98:15	purpose 28:14,20	r	reasons 10:20
117:9	purposeful 10:13	r281 4:21 83:14	11:21 23:19 60:21
proposals 89:9,11	purposefulness	97:20	112:21 117:15
proposed 16:17	11:2	radar 27:11	reassess 122:6
21:13 43:13 49:19	pursued 22:17	rainfall 14:19,20	recall 40:7 69:17
53:11 66:4 88:13	pursuing 28:16	raise 127:7,20	recalls 27:14
102:5	80:3	raised 127:10	received 3:21
proposition 15:17	purview 6:18	range 18:17 68:20	98:19
85:5	pushback 110:7	80:13,15,20 81:2	receiving 50:9
prove 10:20 56:2	pushed 53:13	81:5	recession 27:18
proved 87:2	put 11:13,19	rate 65:9,9	recited 57:12
provide 34:1	17:14 18:10 21:1	ratio 4:6	reckless 8:20
114:19	27:18 33:7,9 42:7		

reclassification	regard 66:2	remarkable 30:17	99:10 101:8 106:4
28:20 35:11 95:11	regarding 98:4	100:10	115:11,12
reclassified 18:7	125:16 127:13	remarkably 13:18	requested 28:6
18:21 60:15 74:10	regret 121:15	remarks 3:19 7:19	requests 8:14
79:18 84:8 85:1	regular 107:21	8:5	96:19
93:2	regulate 25:21	remember 12:8	requirement 14:9
reclassify 35:9	regulated 32:3	14:1 20:4 29:18	requires 16:13
38:15 74:21 83:9	regulation 68:13	43:14 59:18 66:2	93:8 118:1
84:18 93:21	93:7	121:7 125:7,8,11	rescind 5:7 6:20
recognize 11:18	regulator 26:2	125:15 127:8,12	7:6 12:2 15:18
19:19	reinforced 43:18	130:5	16:12 70:4,9
recognized 26:6	reinvestment 98:8	remembered	104:19 119:11
99:13	reiterate 49:19	10:17	121:21 122:2
recollections 28:2	rejected 55:15	remind 3:19 71:12	rescinded 11:6,7
recommend 61:1	95:14	reminder 58:4	12:1 19:16
recommendation	rejection 95:18	removal 15:12	rescinding 119:8
95:12	96:4,10	removed 14:3	rescission 6:1,14
reconsider 96:2	rejects 60:9	removing 51:10	16:13 128:13
reconsidered 15:5	relate 83:12	rendered 100:2	129:21 130:12
reconvene 122:4	related 96:13	renew 105:14	research 109:4
record 57:10	132:11	renewal 105:7,12	125:19
58:21 62:1 67:11	relating 63:21	renewing 58:13	residences 84:9
67:20	relationship 25:17	repeated 39:9,9	residency 80:21
recorded 132:6	91:7	39:16 44:13 83:21	resident 81:12
recount 52:12,12	releasing 24:20	84:2	residents 23:19,20
recovery 98:8	relevance 104:21	repetitions 52:7	resolution 1:5
red 45:20	relevant 18:18	replete 8:9	4:15,20 5:18 6:1
refer 4:20 24:16	84:19 92:4	replied 49:11	8:2 9:2 11:5,6,21
reference 43:14	reliance 118:2	report 44:19	12:10 14:20 15:8
58:6	relies 109:11	69:18 72:12 85:3	15:16,20 16:2
references 41:16	relieve 103:18	reported 1:20	17:17,20 18:21
referencing 33:4	relieved 103:20	15:2 43:19,20	19:16 20:15 21:5
referendum 23:11	relinquishing 50:5	97:5	22:19 28:4,7,14
90:1	reluctantly 62:16	reporting 44:7	28:18 29:1 30:5
referred 33:10,10	remain 45:18,21	89:6 99:16 101:9	33:20 34:16 35:1
91:3 97:10	remained 25:14	114:11	36:8 37:2 38:10
referring 33:11	remaining 82:10	reports 13:13,21	38:12,14 40:5,17
51:17 92:1	remap 38:15	47:5	45:14 46:8 47:9
reflected 52:10	74:21	represent 47:2	47:13 50:4,20
reflection 104:15	remapped 18:21	representations	51:14,17 52:5
reflects 50:1,2	74:10	20:17	54:10 55:6 56:7
refuse 70:4	remark 49:3	represents 40:15	57:10 58:12 59:4
refused 51:7 55:15	112:15	request 84:17	60:14 61:1,14
		90:14 95:11,14	62:9 63:5,19

[resolution - secretary]

64:14 69:11,14	58:17 59:2 61:6	117:7,19 119:11	110:12 111:16
70:4 72:3,6,10	64:10,14 70:2,7	120:19 130:7	safe 14:5
73:17 78:18 79:15	72:12 109:5	rockville 26:10	saga 88:5 110:2
82:2 83:21 84:17	reviewed 18:4	rolling 128:20	sailed 5:6 119:13
86:6 89:18 96:10	55:11 63:11 85:4	room 46:5 107:16	salinas 108:10
101:21 105:4	88:17 92:16 121:3	129:8	salute 15:21
107:3,5 108:13	revision 86:14	roots 108:20	sandy 108:9
110:10 112:3	revocation 106:5	roster 3:20	sanitary 38:16
121:12,21 128:14	revoked 121:10	roughly 44:1	saw 27:15 50:13
128:15,17	rezoning 68:2,16	rounding 22:12	69:7 76:15 86:3
resolutions 127:15	right 6:5 7:6 18:16	route 5:3 7:16	102:2
resolved 112:17	26:8 31:5 38:13	16:18 19:14 68:19	saying 9:8 32:6,6
resources 14:11	45:7 57:9 58:6	72:14 78:21 94:13	85:9 93:6 99:17
87:21	62:19 64:9 76:19	100:20	105:17 119:11
respect 17:12	77:9 78:6 79:1	rules 3:7 7:12	122:1
41:13,20 46:10	84:5,10 94:7	120:6	says 13:17 55:18
105:20	103:4,9,13 107:13	run 21:10	74:2 77:17 80:14
response 93:3	110:7 116:12	rural 21:13 64:4	84:14 86:12
responsibilities	117:4,14 120:10	66:6	117:18 118:1
114:8,10	125:3,4 127:17	S	scale 37:20 69:2
responsibility	rightly 12:20	s 6:6 28:9,15 32:13	118:18
6:15 7:10 107:8,9	rights 19:6 117:19	34:16,18 35:2	scandal 98:4
113:15,19 121:13	risk 68:1	36:20 37:14,17	100:12
121:14	risks 116:9	38:4,5,16,18 40:2	scant 24:3
responsible 3:18	river 120:16	40:18 41:9,15,18	scenes 25:15
result 99:18	river's 13:21	42:1,21 43:1,3,8,8	scheduled 89:21
results 17:7	riverkeeper 13:12	44:4,6,9,12,17,21	94:4,5
resurrected	road 48:1 65:4	45:4,5,18 46:11	school 67:19,20
118:19	rocks 23:2 24:13	47:4,7,16,20 48:5	81:15 94:15
retail 5:2 37:11	24:17 25:1,3,9,14	48:7,7,15,17,19	schools 65:1
68:1	25:16 28:6 30:3,8	49:6,7,9 50:8 51:1	science 6:12 90:10
retain 43:8	31:5,9,16,19	51:3,11,16,18,19	scratching 126:9
retraction 123:8	34:21 37:3,9,21	51:20 53:5,12,16	screen 59:17 77:6
revelations 118:4	40:15 42:11,18,21	54:3 55:16 57:13	script 50:14
revenue 65:8,10	45:16 49:3 50:7	60:6,19 69:1,5,21	seal 132:13
reversal 30:17	50:10 53:8 56:19	72:4 74:16,16,16	second 16:14
reverse 15:19	65:2,5 68:11	75:3,5,6,9,16,20	35:17 43:15 54:8
reversed 11:6 30:6	72:15 74:11 80:2	75:21 77:13,17,20	54:8
30:7	88:6,8,9,12,14	78:2,7 79:18 80:1	secretaries 104:13
revert 51:15	90:1,7 92:2 93:21	80:7,11 83:4,7,10	secretary 11:15
review 7:4 8:21	98:1,10,11,18,19	84:13,14,18,18	32:21 56:14 87:16
17:7 18:9 19:1	103:15,18,19	85:1,21 86:1,2,4,5	92:14 93:4 99:15
20:10 36:9 40:2	105:5 110:3,14,14	87:1 92:11,20	101:7 106:1 131:3
40:19 41:10 52:16	111:7 116:1,11,18	93:1,13,15 94:1	

Veritext Legal Solutions 202-803-8830 -- 410-494-8300

[section - song]

section 40:9 55:17	82:11 83:17,19	129:20	signature 132:15
77:1 84:10 93:6	85:20 91:10	sewerage 86:11	silently 112:3
112:11	services 65:4	sextuple 68:6	similar 52:6
see 20:6,19 28:18	session 53:2 59:10	shaped 52:8	simple 10:2,9
32:4,14,16 35:5	60:1,1,3 71:16	shed 87:15	28:13 80:16 88:16
36:7,13 37:5	113:3	shine 71:21	104:3 110:20
40:12 57:7 64:9	set 9:15 19:11	ship 5:6	123:7
70:14,17 76:12	71:14 98:16	shipped 119:13	simpler 73:18
77:7,17 79:1,2	121:10 132:4	shocking 98:14	simply 10:15
88:4 90:12 115:13	settle 88:8	shore 13:21	49:11 74:18 76:5
120:18	settled 122:4	short 60:2 63:8	sine 34:19
seeking 90:10	seven 3:1 35:14	70:12 129:16	single 17:3 68:6
seemingly 48:20	36:4 70:19	shortly 38:3 56:2	80:19 94:12
seen 80:11	seventeenth 59:20	83:12	sit 123:18 127:5
sees 26:21	severe 12:5 14:15	shots 59:17	sits 47:20
self 75:16	sewage 22:18 24:7	shovel 98:12	situation 26:13
selling 31:20	28:13 32:1,1	show 20:12 30:15	89:15
send 95:10 99:10	101:3	35:4 39:21 59:4	six 16:19 72:13
101:3 102:20	sewer 15:8 18:16	75:1	75:19 78:10 85:13
sends 100:16	18:17 21:6,7,11	showalter 40:14	90:5 100:13
sense 20:8 68:5	23:21 28:8,10	40:16 41:8 42:10	128:14
sent 34:13 40:10	29:10 30:1 33:13	42:17 43:5 46:6	size 23:5 26:16
56:13,15 87:9	33:16 36:20 41:13	48:19 49:12,16,16	68:7
106:1,14,19 124:1	41:20 42:2 46:12	50:16 60:5,13	sizeable 69:1
124:2	46:17 47:11 52:19	61:10,12,21 63:17	skeptical 45:6
sentence 29:4	52:21 54:12 63:13	showalter's 47:15	skip 41:17
34:12,12	64:1 68:20 69:21	52:14,18 53:7	slide 11:14,19
september 73:5	72:1,9,20 73:2,9	108:14	16:14 17:14,16
93:20 132:20	73:14,15 74:3,5,7	showed 14:1	18:9 20:1,4 76:18
serious 8:21 13:5	74:8,15,18 75:1,3	showing 7:3 13:13	76:21 77:18 80:9
19:15 20:8 35:16	75:11,14 76:6,10	53:7	84:12
56:10 64:7 122:11	77:2,3,10 78:12	shown 84:13	slipped 28:17 30:6
seriousness 19:19	78:16 79:5,7	shows 3:20 40:4	30:11,12 116:10
serve 29:9 30:1	80:13 81:20 82:3	43:15 58:21 62:1	sludge 14:3 64:15
42:3	82:11 83:17,19	74:6 77:11 79:11	small 68:7,13
served 46:12,20	85:8,19,19 87:4,7	90:14	smoothly 3:8
91:7	90:18 91:1,10	sic 72:10 89:16	smullen 14:14
server 33:18	92:1,6,18 93:9	side 5:3 16:17	15:4 17:4
service 18:16,17	94:2 95:3 97:12	19:14 21:16 48:1	smullen's 69:18
28:10 36:20 41:16	99:19,21 100:1	48:2,7,15,17	solidly 45:15
46:3 52:21 72:1	104:17 107:6	68:19 78:21	somewhat 58:4
74:15 75:1 77:3	125:14 126:2,12	100:19 120:16	124:20
77:10 78:12,16	126:16 127:4	sign 27:15 108:3	song 116:4
79:7 80:14 81:20	128:12,16,18		

[soon - system]

soon 33:21 88:12	squeezed 27:21	step 4:8 82:19	subtle 10:14 109:6
sorry 32:17 34:1	staff 3:6 46:7	110:16	successful 31:2
48:10 59:13 71:5	53:17 57:21 65:3	stipulations 132:8	successfully 25:9
76:20 80:9 113:16	120:2 125:18	stood 96:4 112:2	58:16 88:10
128:4	126:15 127:6	stop 33:8 102:10	suddenly 100:15
sort 44:13 61:13	staff's 120:11	122:3 129:11	sued 96:1 114:3,4
63:8 117:7	stake 70:5	stopped 117:14,16	114:6
sounds 107:18	stand 2:4 70:4	119:20	suffer 23:20
source 93:17	standards 15:13	stopping 116:20	sufficient 90:18
south 45:20 51:2	15:13	stops 117:18	suggests 9:14
southeast 84:9	standing 12:1	story 7:15 10:16	50:18
southern 43:1,3,9	16:12 47:3 49:10	50:19 83:12 87:19	sullivan 125:10
45:17 62:18	stands 31:20 91:4	97:18 99:1 108:20	summer 92:21
sovereignty 26:7	star 89:6,8 95:19	110:10	support 4:2
space 5:2 22:11	start 56:7 59:11	straddle 66:13	supporters 111:10
94:13	123:6 128:20	67:6	112:8
speak 49:17 51:8	started 2:4,10	straight 124:6	supports 17:9
112:12 125:20,21	80:2 90:7 108:8	straightened	supposed 25:21
speaker 10:7 17:3	130:7	19:17 118:16	98:10,18 120:17
speaking 4:3	starter 94:3	strapped 21:17	sure 4:14 19:17
specific 81:18	starts 77:2	stream 14:2	20:19 32:10 33:18
specifically 89:17	state 7:12 11:1	strip 84:9	56:12,18 95:9
speed 3:11 66:17	14:5 24:4 66:15	strong 27:16	102:8 103:4
spence 94:9	67:7 72:7 75:19	strongly 9:14	107:15 114:9
spend 66:15 67:8	86:1 93:7 132:1,2	structured 7:19	119:2 121:15
spies 53:10 54:2	state's 66:11 67:4	struggling 119:3	122:18
61:9,11,15,16	98:16	stuff 53:18 62:3	surely 111:12
62:1 74:13	statement 9:14	63:4 81:13	surgeon 81:5
split 30:4 42:19	24:21 66:19 96:6	subdivision 5:1	surprisingly 27:6
48:4,13 51:18	100:3 126:20	23:5 34:18 37:20	surrendered
53:9 62:17	statements 128:8	94:12	101:11
splitting 51:2	states 113:13	submits 86:20	surrendering
spoke 17:5 30:17	statewide 75:19	submitted 28:18	100:21
66:19 94:21	status 28:16 44:12	90:8	suspect 58:9
sponsored 22:19	45:11,11 46:1	subsequent 82:12	switched 111:17
spotlight 71:21	47:12 72:4 76:4	substantial 90:2	swoop 37:12
spots 67:16	78:11 81:19 83:7	substantiate 3:16	sympathetic 24:8
spray 90:11 98:20	83:10	8:15	system 12:12
104:2 116:14	stay 48:5,15	substantive 42:9	14:18,21 15:8
spring 98:5	stem 24:6	substantively	17:9,12 24:7
spy 24:10,21 123:3	stenographic 132:6	40:17	53:15 64:1 75:19
		substituted 31:8 substitution 31:3	77:4 93:14,16
square 5:2 22:10	stenographically 132:6	31:4	
	134.0	J1. 4	

[table - tonight's]

t	talking 36:17 51:6	things 3:11 24:4	44:1,2,11 46:19
table 70:13	105:7 121:4 125:8	27:2 42:19 43:16	47:6 52:11 54:4
tainted 110:13	tap 115:19	52:7 65:21 67:1	61:8 68:8 70:16
take 4:8 7:16	tax 65:8,9,9,10,12	102:14,21 109:4,9	70:16,17 71:8
22:11 35:13 47:21	taxpayer 64:20	112:2 118:15	75:7,16 77:4
70:11,20 71:3,6	65:16 98:17	119:15 121:3,7	79:20 81:9 83:2
101:13 104:1	technical 6:11	127:8,9,13 129:6	83:21 84:6 95:1
122:3 123:13	17:5 64:1 69:16	think 8:3 12:17	102:8 109:10
124:9 129:9	109:6	13:5 14:10 16:7	110:4 112:12
taken 23:10	technicalities 62:9	29:3,19 30:19	114:2 118:15
talbot 1:1 4:5,12	technically 17:5	31:3 32:21 34:2	121:16 122:12
4:19 6:10 12:20	72:11	48:2,11 51:12,20	124:12,18 125:1
15:10 16:20 20:10	tell 10:11 32:19	53:13,16 60:12	132:4
21:9,14 24:21	109:12 124:5	62:20 76:11 77:19	timeline 83:13
25:5,10,20 27:12	telling 117:9	100:11 104:5	times 13:14,15
27:12 35:8 36:8	ten 4:8 14:4 22:13	107:20 108:7	14:4 21:9 39:10
36:13,19 37:8,18	78:11 102:9 127:9	115:14 121:20	46:18 52:4 73:1
38:5 50:5 54:16	tenacity 22:17	128:9,13 129:7	tiny 94:14
55:11,14 56:3	tens 22:15	thinking 107:15	title 18:1 38:12,14
63:11 64:2,13,20	tent 34:15	thinks 27:13	57:10,11 72:6
65:12,16 66:4,9	tentative 92:17	third 17:15 115:18	104:1
72:8 73:2 74:1,14	terminology 11:3	thomas 3:5 108:15	today 23:15 31:11
75:2 76:5 78:15	terms 9:11	112:19 129:18	44:1 46:14 49:20
79:6,7 81:1 82:1	terrible 14:17	thompson 89:8	60:19 61:17 90:12
83:11 85:21 86:1	testimony 15:4	thought 30:19	94:11 100:3
86:4 88:17 91:14	text 18:2 38:19	47:14 54:14,14	115:20
91:21 93:9,15	72:6	124:11	told 72:2 74:13
95:19 97:19 99:7	thank 2:14,19	thoughts 126:8	89:8 110:3 114:3
99:20 100:2,5	33:5 34:6,9 67:12	thrall 26:14	tom 14:6 94:8 99:8
101:15,20 102:5	95:6 102:17	threat 7:9	tomorrow 16:4
107:7 113:11,21	106:16,21 122:12	three 37:1 38:7,18	31:21 70:10
114:4,6 115:6	122:13,15 124:13	38:21 39:5 40:4	128:21 129:12
117:8 118:10,20	124:17,21 128:1,2	42:4 44:5 46:1,2	tomorrow's
119:7,17 120:1	128:8 129:5	52:3 57:13 62:19	128:15
121:13,14 124:3	130:17,18,19	64:16 67:16 69:4	tonight 2:20 3:4
132:3	131:2	74:14 75:9,20	3:13,17,19 5:15
talbot's 75:20	thanks 11:17	78:1 79:19 83:4	5:16 7:3 8:12,19
talk 20:5,21 28:4	122:14	86:6 93:5 115:14	11:10 13:4 17:18
63:7 65:18 66:5	thing 28:17 31:20	121:7	20:5 33:11 61:9
125:17 126:15	32:12 34:14 39:3	tien 90:9 91:1	109:3 112:19
130:3	41:18 51:15 63:7	time 3:9 5:8,9 10:3	117:6 121:3 123:9
talked 26:5 65:14	117:14 121:20	10:15 15:11 23:18	123:17 129:4
65:17,21 67:18	124:9 126:13	28:21 37:15 38:11	tonight's 4:13
68:17	129:17 130:4	39:3 42:5 43:12	118:4

[top - vesting]

top 78:6 98:15	trappe 5:4 12:6,7	trying 16:6 126:9	unique 22:21 64:3
topic 28:5	13:9,18 14:2,8,15	ts 27:1	united 113:13
totally 84:7	15:7,12 17:21,21	turn 39:2 116:10	unnecessary
town 5:4 21:18	18:11,15 19:7	turned 47:6 83:11	84:20 101:12
23:1,3,6,8,12	23:2,3,9,10,16,20	turnovers 108:18	unnoticed 17:19
24:12 25:16 26:13	24:7,15 25:16	twelve 46:13	31:3,4,8 69:9
28:1,6 32:3 34:21	26:4,5,9,13 29:3,6	two 3:3,13 4:1 5:5	unprogrammed
48:3,12 50:8,10	29:8,9,21 30:1	18:14 22:20 23:1	43:4 74:2 79:9,10
54:18 56:19 65:2	32:2,4 37:21 48:3	25:7 30:3,4 34:6,9	79:10,12 83:10
65:5 66:13 67:5	48:12 50:11 56:19	37:6,7 42:20 53:9	86:8
67:16 68:2,7,14	64:21 65:2,6	55:10 56:12 62:17	unreadable 76:17
72:16 74:11 77:8	66:17 67:15 68:18	64:16 65:19 71:17	unrelated 84:7
77:9 80:3 83:8	69:19 72:17 74:11	76:8 83:13 85:14	unring 126:4
84:16 88:9,13,20	76:7 77:1,8,10	86:9 92:6 96:12	unstated 57:3,5
90:3,7 92:15 93:4	78:12 80:3,12	100:21 101:5	untainted 6:3
93:20 94:5,14	84:7,10,16 88:14	103:18 112:16	36:15
95:21 98:6,11	88:20 91:19,20	123:19	untrue 9:4,11 84:3
99:1 100:16	92:15 94:14 95:18	typos 19:4	untruth 39:7
101:10 103:5,8,10	98:2,6 100:16	u	unusual 95:16
103:16,21 111:7	101:4 103:5,8,10	ultimately 43:21	update 49:21
119:11 127:18	103:16,21 117:2	105:18	urge 5:7 60:21
town's 89:7 95:10	119:3,12 121:8	unaware 96:8	130:3,15
97:9	127:14,19	unconditional	use 3:9 6:7,8,9,17
towns 86:10 89:2	trappe's 67:17	4:21	7:4 8:19 30:11,12
tpa 99:15	90:3 99:18	unconstrained 7:7	36:8 68:16 83:16
tracts 69:4	treating 57:16,17	uncover 87:15	97:19 107:7 109:5
traffic 66:10,11,16	treatment 12:8	uncovered 96:21	121:13
67:3,8 94:14	14:16 16:16 29:8	undermine 70:1	usually 26:17
transcribed 132:6	29:21 98:9 100:19	understand 13:1	41:17 117:4
transcript 2:1	trees 120:16	16:4,5 20:7 73:15	utter 66:12 67:4
57:7 59:3 62:3	tried 83:8	102:16 115:3,9	V
transcription	triple 13:14	117:12 126:14	vague 28:2
132:7	trouble 24:20	understandably	valentine's 32:2
transcripts 30:13 30:14 37:6 39:20	troubling 11:10 true 9:4,15 37:13	39:11 109:10	valid 54:12 57:2,5
	39:17 50:20 63:2	understands 35:7	57:8 58:19 63:13
40:8 50:15 52:2,6 52:10 84:2 102:2	71:11 83:17 100:3	understood 120:3	variety 18:11
110:6,8	107:2,17 129:18	underway 5:11	various 17:2
transformed	132:7	34:19 50:9	127:12
44:11 83:6	truly 98:14 105:16	undiscovered 9:17	vehicle 128:13
transpired 126:21	trust 24:16 109:13	unexpected	verdery 108:10
transpired 120.21	truth 9:18 10:11	118:12	verifying 123:20
44:12 47:7	try 96:1	unfortunate	vested 117:20
TT.12 T1.1	u y 70.1	102:15	vesting 117:19
			118:1 130:6,13

[victimized - yup]

vienna 24:14	42:2 46:2,12,17	_ •	wrap 70:14
	+2.2 40.2,12,17	weather 27:15	128:10
view 52:9 111:11	52:19,21 68:20	web 73:4,4	wrapped 99:2
124:3	72:9,19 73:2,9,14	week 14:7 21:10	wraps 25:12
violations 20:11	74:7 75:13 76:6	weeks 3:14 8:6	write 4:6 106:7
virginia 24:14,14	76:10 77:2 79:5	16:19 24:10 32:8	121:1
virtually 58:17	82:3 85:7 86:10	56:13 91:12	writing 114:20
109:21	87:4,6 90:9,18,21	129:14	written 14:6
vis 130:9,9	92:1,5,18 93:9,10	went 17:19 24:19	wrong 10:6 21:21
vision 66:7 86:16	95:3 97:11 99:21	31:16 51:14 92:8	28:3 114:3 123:17
voiced 114:13	100:1 104:17	96:2 97:15 100:14	124:12
voicing 61:7	107:6 125:14	west 19:13 68:19	wrote 9:10 24:10
vote 15:6 23:10	126:1,12,16 127:4	whatsoever 50:7	91:14 92:15 93:4
45:14 47:10 50:4	128:12,16,18	whistle 91:16	97:7 99:15 101:8
54:2 95:14 126:10	129:20	white 76:17 79:3,4	106:13
voted 23:13 wa	aters 12:13	wife 124:14	X
voters 23:7 26:14 wa	atson 1:5 2:14	willing 42:11,18	x 124:11
50:11 90:3	2:16,17 10:19	74:4	
voting 54:4	11:17 29:14,16	wilson 99:16	y
w	32:5,8,11,17 33:1	wilson's 101:7	y 124:12
	33:6 34:7,10 41:2	win 62:20	yeah 77:18 104:7
41:17,18	59:13,16,21 66:20	wise 68:10	124:15 128:7
wait 59:18	67:13 70:17,20	wish 32:19	year 50:17,17 51:5
walt 99:10 wall 94:7	71:5,7,10 94:19	witness 132:13	90:5
want 2:12 3:19	95:5,7 102:7,9,14	wondered 61:15	years 14:4,9 24:3
15:21 20:21 27:9	102:17,20 103:3,7	word 8:18 9:8	27:4 37:1 38:5,7
32:9 39:19 49:12	103:10,14 104:20	30:11,12 67:21	38:18 39:1,6,8,8
49.18 51.21 64.5	105:4,9,20 106:14	91:12 109:9 110:6	39:17 40:4 42:4,6
71:3 85:3 88:3,4	106:17 107:1,13	words 38:15,18	43:12 44:5,6,9
102:7,13 103:4	107:16 113:17,21	45:20 46:9 49:18	46:1,2,14,18 53:4
122:11,12 124:21	115:16 122:15	51:14 52:14,18	57:14 62:19 72:5
wanted 37:11	123:5,12 124:1,14	work 25:7 108:14	73:16 75:9 76:2
53:14 71:17 103:5	124:17 126:6	113:10,19 117:18	78:1,11 79:19
119:20 128:7	128:2,10 129:16	121:17 122:2	83:5,6 85:6 86:6
wants 40:11 74:8	130:18	worked 62:13	94:17 97:17 100:4
wastewater 6:12 Wastewater	ay 10:19 14:12	working 22:20	107:21 108:7,12
12:8 16:16 29:5 6	27:14 31:20 41:5	23:18 116:21	110:17 127:9
29:7,8,20,21	54:16 58:3 81:21	works 109:20	young 120:4
58:13.15.59:1	94:16 110:16	113:5,21 116:6	yup 2:15 71:1
69:16 98:9 100:19	115:21 126:4	worse 13:21	107:12 115:15
watched 113:6	127:6 132:11	worst 112:8	128:6 131:1
watching 19:18 Wa	ays 84:4 110:19	woven 56:6	
water 21:6.11 W6	e've 108:7,17	wow 61:4	
23:21 28:8 33:12	112:10 128:14		

[zoning - zoning]

Z	
zoning 48:4,13	
51:11 68:15	
31.11 00.13	

Veritext Legal Solutions 202-803-8830 -- 410-494-8300