		1
1		
2		
3	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES	
4	HOUSE STATE GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE	
5		
6	RYAN OFFICE BUILDING	
	ROOM 205	
7	HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA	
8		
9	WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2008	
10	9:00 A.M.	
11		
12		
13		
14		
15	BEFORE:	
16	HONORABLE BABETTE JOSEPHS, CHAIRMAN HONORABLE MATTHEW E. BAKER	
17	HONORABLE KERRY A. BENNINGHOFF HONORABLE MIKE CARROLL	
	HONORABLE PAUL I. CLYMER	
18	HONORABLE MARK B. COHEN HONORABLE TOM C. CREIGHTON	
19	HONORABLE FLORINDO J. FABRIZIO HONORABLE ROBERT FREEMAN	
20	HONORABLE JARET GIBBONS	
21		
22		
23	DDENDA G HAMTIEON DEDODETIG	_
24	BRENDA S. HAMILTON REPORTING P.O. BOX 165	
25	ELM, PENNSYLVANIA 17521 717.627.1368 FAX 717.627.0319	

1	(CONT'D)			
2	HONORABLE CARL W. MANTZ			
3	HONORABLE JIM MARSHALL HONORABLE MICHAEL H. O'BRIEN			
4	HONORABLE CHERELLE L. PARKER HONORABLE THOMAS J. QUIGLEY			
5	HONORABLE SEAN M. RAMALEY HONORABLE KATHY RAPP			
6	HONORABLE MIKE VEREB HONORABLE GREG VITALI			
7	HONORABLE ROSITA C. YOUNGBLOOD			
8				
9				
10	ALSO PRESENT:			
11	SECRETARY STEVE CRAWFORD, SECRETARY OF			
12	LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS RODNEY L. OLIVER, MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR			
13	SUSAN S. BOYLE, MINORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR			
14				
15				
16	BRENDA S. HAMILTON, RPR REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC			
17				
18				
19				
20				
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				

			3
1	INDEX		
2	NAME	PAGE	
3			
4	DEPUTY SECRETARY CATHLEEN C. MYERS		
5	SECRETARY JAMES P. CREEDON	25	
6			
7			
8			
9			
10			
11			
12			
13			
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: I'm going to start 3 the hearing while we're moving furniture a 4 5 little bit because the stenographer said she was ready and that's my signal. 6 7 I want to welcome the witnesses; but 8 before I do that, if we start over here on my 9 left and the members say their names, their counties, introduce themselves, I'd appreciate 10 11 that. 12 REPRESENTATIVE RAMALEY: Good 13 morning. Sean Ramaley, Beaver and Allegheny 14 Counties. 15 REPRESENTATIVE FABRIZIO: Flo 16 Fabrizio, Erie County. REPRESENTATIVE MARSHALL: Jim 17 18 Marshall, Beaver County. 19 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Mike 20 O'Brien, Philadelphia. 21 REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Paul Clymer, 22 Bucks County. 23 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Babette Josephs, 24 Philadelphia County.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Matt Baker,

25

```
1
      Tioga and Western Bradford Counties.
               Minority chair's legal counsel, Rod
2
3
      Quarry.
               REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS: Jaret
4
5
      Gibbons, Lawrence County.
               REPRESENTATIVE CARROLL:
                                        Mike
6
      Carroll, Luzerne and Monroe County.
7
8
               REPRESENTATIVE RAPP: Kathy Rapp,
9
     Warren, McKean and Forest Counties.
10
               REPRESENTATIVE MANTZ: Carl Mantz,
11
     Lehigh and Berks Counties.
12
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Rodney Oliver, the
     Executive Director of the Committee. And I
13
14
     want to say that these four members are not
15
     here, not because they're not interested, but
16
     because they have conflicting committee
17
     meetings, Representative Gingrich,
18
     Representative Kula, Representative Kortz, and
19
     Representative Curry.
20
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER:
21
     Representative Watson.
22
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Sir,
23
     Mr. Creighton, you want to say you're here?
24
               REPRESENTATIVE CREIGHTON:
25
     Creighton from Lancaster County.
```

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Tom Creighton from Lancaster, in case he could not be heard.

Thank you for joining us. Welcome, Secretary and Ms. Myers.

We all have the testimony of the Secretary. I don't see any reason to ask him to read it, repeat it again. And we've heard it, I believe, before, pretty much as you are presenting it now.

I would like to ask Ms. Myers to give her testimony and as much as you can to speak to us, not to read to us, and then after you are concluded, if both of you will stay at the witness table, we will ask questions.

Please proceed when you're ready.

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Thank you,
Chairman Josephs, Chairman Baker as well, and
members of the committee.

I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you some of the matters relating to our administration of the constitutional, statutory, regulatory provisions relating to the submerged lands of the Commonwealth.

At a hearing on September 11th, 2007 Secretary Creedon testified and explained how the Commonwealth looks at the bulkhead line in particular.

We share our understanding of how that is done, and I am here today because we were asked to provide some additional explanation of how the Commonwealth determines the boundary of the submerged lands of the Commonwealth which would -- which would identify our jurisdiction in administering those laws.

As you probably know, submerged lands beneath the ordinary low water mark navigable rivers within Pennsylvania are owned by the Commonwealth.

The state may authorize the private use of submerged lands and even give riparian owners significant indications of ownership and leases of -- and ownership of structures placed on those riparian submerged lands.

Under Pennsylvania law, riparian owners along navigable rivers may have ownership of the bottom only as high as the low water mark.

And the case law is clear on that point, and we've provided citations to you in

my written remarks.

Rivers change their course. They can move. The Commonwealth's obligation and rights to administer the submerged lands of the Commonwealth move with the river, or may move with the river. So that when we have an open Delaware River, we believe our obligations under the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act are to protect the shoreline and administer the law where the shoreline has found itself to be.

So basically changes in local water line resulting from natural accretion or erosion can add to or diminish riparian owner's and the Commonwealth's title.

However, changes in low water mark caused by artificial filling will not modify that boundary unless the legislation should act to declare it to be so.

Where there's artificial fill on Commonwealth submerged lands, we retain ownership and the riparian owner may own the structures on top of that -- submerged lands.

In places like Philadelphia, where there has been a long-term and extensive

development, The natural water line has been significantly altered and may be extremely difficult to locate or find, even with much research and historical reconstruction.

In such circumstances, the

Pennsylvania courts have supported the use of
an artificial low water line for purposes of
boundary determinations.

The -- I'd like to get into a little bit of the development of that law relating to the bulkhead line. During the development of the Philadelphia ports, the shape of the waterfront has been extensively modified along the shoreline, both by adding and removing fill from the area along the shore and along the harbor.

In 19 -- in 1864 the General Assembly responded to these modifications by authoring a survey and establishing a low water line.

There have been many other -- several other occasions where the legislature has acted to establish a boundary line, including the federal bulkhead line which was established after Congress empowered the Army to create harbor lines.

After the federal legislation was

passed, the Pennsylvania General Assembly gave
a general grant to cities of the first class,
meaning Philadelphia, of course, to revise and
establish the arbitrary low water line or
bulkhead line on the Delaware River in
conformity with those established by the
Secretary of War or as they may from time to

time be established by him.

So it's clear that this was intended to be a proxy for or a line to quiet title on where the Commonwealth lands end where there has been extensive filling over time and the legislature can then act to say we're going to quiet title, on this side of the bulkhead line is public land, on the other side is private land.

Since that time the General Assembly,

DGS and DEP have all generally utilized the

bulkhead line as the boundary of Commonwealth

submerged lands in legislative transfers,

leases, and submerged lands licenses relating

to the Delaware River in Philadelphia where

the submerged lands of the Commonwealth have

been filled and the federal bulkhead lines

traverses those filled lands.

Now, occasionally a different question is presented, and I believe it has arisen in some of the developments that are going forward along the Philadelphia shoreline at this time.

And the question has been presented as to how we apply the bulkhead line when the boundary -- as a boundary when the bulkhead line actually traverses open water.

That is, the surveyed line that
establishes the bulkhead line that's on the
map now crosses right over a visible part of
the Delaware River, which we all know is a
navigable river and there's commerce occurring
on that river. How do we deal with that?

Okay. What our -- what our position is and what we think is a clear and a simple application of our obligation to protect the river and the shoreline is that where the river is, and the shoreline is ascertainable, we continue to treat the submerged lands as ending at the water's edge, at the low water mark.

So we do take jurisdiction when the

river is there, visible, and there's a shoreline we can easily ascertain regardless of the location of the bulkhead line.

We use the bulkhead line when we're on upland and we think that's the purpose of the legislative determination that there should be a clear line on filled land where the shoreline is not visible, the navigable waterway is not there now, there is nothing for us to protect with our Dam Safety and Encroachments Act requirements, so we respect the legislatively created bulkhead line as the line we should use separating the Commonwealth's title from private title.

To summarize, the DEP and DGS utilize the bulkhead line in administering our constitutional, statutory and administrative obligations for the majority of submerged lands transfers on the Delaware River waterfront in Philadelphia.

However, where those -- in those circumstances, which have been few, where the bulkhead line traverses open water, the ordinary low water mark is utilized as the appropriate boundary.

```
1
               And I'd be willing to answer
2
      questions about that.
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you. Very
3
      interesting. Let me say that we've been
4
5
      joined by Representative Freeman. And that I
      should have said before Mr. Chairman Baker has
6
7
      a pressing meeting at about 10:00.
               So he is going to have to leave us,
8
9
     but he will get a good report from his
     excellent staff.
10
11
               And we've been joined by his staff,
12
     Ms. Susan Boyle.
13
               Questions? Representative O'Brien.
14
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Thank you,
15
     Madam Chair.
               Intriguing. Absolutely intriguing.
16
17
     And I do want to thank you for making your
18
      comments, Philadelphia specifically, because
19
      as the Philadelphia legislator, I do love
20
      Philadelphia and as being a waterfront
21
      legislator, I do love the Delaware River.
22
               But, joyfully, I'm a member of the
23
      Pennsylvania General Assembly and not
24
      Philadelphia City Council.
25
               As you may be aware, of the 203
```

legislative districts, 177 have navigable waterways. 177 are impacted by the question of riparian rights.

So now the question becomes a larger policy question. So let's turn our attention there. Because certainly a lot of the waterways throughout this Commonwealth are not affected by pier heads and bulkheads.

So let's begin with a question that I put to the Secretary on September 11th in Philadelphia when he gave testimony before

Gaming Oversight where we tried to establish a definition of a riparian lease.

The Secretary at that time informed me that he wasn't an attorney and wasn't able to speak to that. I presented to the Secretary that Blacks Law Dictionary defined riparian lease as that area between the high and low water mark. The high, the low water mark.

Now, the Secretary and I went back and forth on that. Representative Keller and the Secretary went back and forth on that. It seems like we were unable to come to a conclusion on that.

1 Now, I got to say the Commonwealth --2 the Commonwealth has really, through practical usage, has kind of left that question hanging 3 out there. 4 5 Took us a little bit of time and a little bit of research, but we were able to 6 7 come up with a submerged land survey that your department submitted back in 2000 where the 8 9 question is asked on what basis does the Commonwealth derive riparian leases. 10 11 answered high and low water marks. 12 So once we get out of Philadelphia County, we walk down the street here to the 13 14 Susquehanna. We walk down here to the 15 Susquehanna. 16 Mr. Secretary, how do you put 17 together a riparian lease? 18 SECRETARY CREEDON: Can I ask for a 19 little clarification? I'm sorry. I'm not 20 that -- what do you wish -- what do you want 21 me to address in that question?

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: What do you use, high or low water mark?

SECRETARY CREEDON: If it goes
back -- and that's the reason I asked DEP to

22

23

24

25

be here today -- I believe we have provided you with what we have used as the traditional use of the measurement. 3

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: simple question. What do you use on the Susquehanna?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: We use the low water mark. We own the -- but there are two different riparian issues you're referring to.

One is the issue of public trust, which is their riparian easement which the public enjoys, even on private land, and there's case law in many states which grants the public right of access between the high and low water marks everywhere.

We're talking about a different principle of water law, which is the delivery of the title of the beds of navigable rivers to the sovereign states when they joined the United States and that title resides in the Commonwealth by virtue of the existence of the Delaware River or Susquehanna River or the Little J River.

We -- we just vindicated the public's

rights in the Little J River determining that it was a navigable river in Huntingdon County and the Huntingdon County Court agreed with us.

And in all those cases we're talking about who owns the bottom of the river.

Because if the Commonwealth owns the bottom of the river, they must exercise care to assure that public rights in use of that river, including the ability to use the bottom for ordinary commerce, fishing, boating, and recreation, are not intruded upon.

In the case of Little J River, it's a good example. A -- an excellent fishing club was established on the river, took good management of the river, both sides of the river, got leases, managed the river well.

But they shut it off from the public and they put cables across and said no one else could use that stretch of the Little J River. Made it a private fishing club.

We and The Fish Commission had complaints about that from people who felt that was a public trust, that was public land under the bed of the river because it was

1 navigable, and the court ended up agreeing
2 with us.

And so we're talking about that riparian land. It's not really a good use. We didn't come up with riparian, the term riparian. It was adopted by others. Because you are correct. Riparian usually refers to just that strip.

But when people are trying to build along the river, they say we need rights to that riparian strip. And when the Commonwealth owns the bed all the way up to low water mark, that's where people want to put piers and docks and promenades and so we end up giving rights to sit on the bed of the river, to occupy lands of the Commonwealth, and that's why when we have to do that, DGS then writes a lease to -- essentially like a lease of any other Commonwealth land, except this is special because it's on the bottom of the river.

I don't know if that helps,
but that's --

24 REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Well,
25 let's -- let's explore for a moment some --

```
1
      some things that you put out here.
2
               If I could walk across the river, if
      I could leave my house and I could walk across
3
     the river, when do I cross into New Jersey?
4
5
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: There is a
      line, and it's not right down the middle, I
6
7
     don't believe, on the Delaware, but there is a
8
      line.
9
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: There is a
     demarcation along there.
10
11
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS:
                                        There is a
     demarcation, that's correct.
12
13
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: All right.
14
      So the river bed, that land, if we sucked out
     all the water, there's a line that goes down
15
16
     the river.
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS:
17
                                        That's
18
      correct.
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: That's the
19
20
     boundary between Pennsylvania and New Jersey.
21
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Yes, sir.
22
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Now, we take
23
     water and put it on top of that. So we look
     to the United States Constitution. The United
24
25
     States Constitution says, well, that water
```

```
1
     under the Uniform Commerce Clause, that water
2
     is now a navigable waterway so we got to use
     that for commerce. Right?
3
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Correct.
4
5
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: But the
     Commonwealth still owns that land, that river
6
7
     bed. Right?
8
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Correct.
9
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Right to
     that border?
10
11
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS:
                                        Uh-huh.
12
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: So now we
13
     come out and we say, well, we got to make sure
14
     that commerce can continue. Right?
15
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Uh-huh.
16
              REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN:
                                        We get ships
17
     up and down the river. Commerce can
18
     continue. What was that? McCulloch versus
     Maryland. Something. 1803? I don't know.
19
20
     I'm a butcher. I don't know about those
21
     things.
22
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Uh-huh.
23
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: So -- now to
     get this done, the Fed comes in and says we're
24
25
     going to establish a pierhead, a bulkhead, and
```

we're going to impose navigational servitude.

Now, you can build inside this pierhead/bulkhead. You can do stuff inside of this pierhead/bulkhead, but you can't do anything outside of this because we got to retain commerce.

Right? Do you agree with me so far?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Uh-huh.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: So far we're

together.

All right. What does this have to do with protecting and preserving commerce under the Uniform Commerce Clause? What does this have to do with the Commonwealth's ownership? What does this have to do with valuation and what does this have to do with stewardship of the people's resources?

I'm not getting this
pierhead/bulkhead versus high, low water
mark.

Now, before I let you answer, just one more thing and then I will be quiet, but in perpetuity, in perpetuity, the riparian rights along the Delaware River were valueless. You either own the water or its

mud. Valueless.

Until the administration said, let's step back, let's evaluate and valuate. Let's put a value on this, which the administration did. Five dollars a square foot.

And I still got to come back, if high water/low water is more square footage than pierhead/bulkhead, isn't it our mandate as stewards of the public trust to charge on the larger area?

I'll be quiet.

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: I'm not sure exactly the question that you'd like me to answer. So if you could --

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN:

Pierhead/bulkhead is federal. Doesn't affect us. We own the bottom of the river to the -- to the middle of it, to the boundary of it.

Pierhead/bulkhead is an arbitrary -- the arbitrary navigational servitude under the Uniform Commerce Clause.

Pierhead/bulkhead -- low water/high
water mark is the standard definition of
riparian right. This is what we should use as
a definition for evaluation and establishing

square footage that we times by five to get a value. Why aren't we?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: What I have -- you have raised many different interesting issues of water law which we have to bring together and come together when we administer our Dam Safety and Encroachments Act.

I am advising you how we interpret
the law as applied to our particular role,
which is just under the Dam Safety and
Encroachments Act, if someone is on -wants to occupy submerged lands of the
Commonwealth, how do we administer that law
and how do we understand our obligations to
extend?

And the way we understand it and the way we have treated it is that if there's open water and you can see the river and you can see the shoreline, there's no question and we apply the principles, the common principle you understand, which is up to the low water mark is owned by the Commonwealth and is Commonwealth titled lands.

There may be other rights in the public based on other laws but I don't

administer that. I'm dealing with a property's -- property ownership title in the Commonwealth and that's the bed of the river and it ends at the low water mark.

There are, certainly, other rights, but that's what I'm dealing with and that's all I'm dealing with with the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act. Who can get the right to occupy, essentially lease our land, Commonwealth land, and give it to DEP because there's always the shoreline water, water resource habitat problems involved with that.

We don't get all of them. We only get those cases where it's up to 25 acres, and only where there's a water dependent use can we issue a license.

When we have vast land and we are faced with land that has been filled, we and the courts have directed and upheld the use of the bulkhead line as a line quieting title and describing where the public land, the submerged lands of the Commonwealth, even though they're filled, should be considered to end.

And we have used that as, admittedly,

```
1
      an arbitrary line as all lines to quiet
2
     boundary title are. We have used that
      routinely to describe on upland where we think
3
      the Commonwealth boundary is.
4
5
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Madam Chair?
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Yes.
6
7
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: I have a
8
      number -- I have a number -- I have a number
9
     of questions, but in the interest of time and
      the interest of -- of fairness to my
10
11
     colleagues, I'd like to -- I'd like to yield
12
     at this time.
               But I would request the Chair
13
14
      recognize me at a later time.
15
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Certainly. I
16
     believe Mr. Clymer -- before you start,
17
     however, I'd like to say we've been joined by
18
     a number of representatives, Benninghoff,
     Vereb, Quigley, and Youngblood, Parker, and
19
20
     Secretary Crawford.
21
               Please go ahead.
22
               REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Thank you,
     Madam Chair.
23
24
               And good morning for our special
25
      guests.
```

1 DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: 2 morning, sir. REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: For the 3 members, I think it would be helpful if 4 someone could describe the land that 5 SugarHouse is attempting to purchase, describe 6 the land as it relates to the definitions that 7 8 we heard this morning and the number of 9 acres. 10 Could someone just give us an 11 overview there? 12 SECRETARY CREEDON: Yeah. What we 13 can do is we can give you some general 14 information on SugarHouse -- what we believe 15 SugarHouse is looking for. 16 We have it as 7.38 acres or 321,500 17 square feet of area required. And, again, 18 that area required is by the definition which 19 Deputy Secretary Myers defined this morning. 20 REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: So then -- so 21 then SugarHouse is attempting to buy 7.3 22 acres, is that correct, of riparian land? 23 SECRETARY CREEDON: They're not 24 attempting to buy anything. They're 25 attempting -- first of all, they -- there's no 1 legislation that's been introduced on
2 SugarHouse.

There's been no approach actually formally to the department, I believe, at least the DGS, with SugarHouse's proposal.

We're basing this on information that we've received either through informal meetings or through submissions that they've had in order that we can keep track of what might be required.

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: We do have pending applications before us for SugarHouse.

We have a NPDES permit which was conditionally issued, and we have a Chapter 105 permit under the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act pending.

So I believe those numbers were based upon whatever they submitted to our regional office describing those permit requests.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: My next question is the -- according to the historical maps that we have, where was the water edge in the 1800s? Do you know where that might have been? The -- according to your definition of

1 the riparian --2 DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: No. No. We're looking at the land today. 3 REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: All right. 4 5 Well, I think that's important. But I'll step back for a moment. 6 7 My next question is this. Based on 8 what we have heard, how is it that the city 9 government could find an antiquated law dated in 1907 and from that law they have drawn the 10 11 rights to allow the Commerce Commission to 12 provide the authority for SugarHouse to move 1.3 forward? 14 Where in that law, which I have had 15 the opportunity to read, as did staff, that 16 said that the -- that this land could be sold 17 without the authority of the Pennsylvania 18 General Assembly? 19 How -- how did that come about? 20 Where is that authority when I have looked at 21 other -- other authority from the constitution 22 to the administrative code of 1929? 23 Explain that to me, if you would please, and to the other members here. 24

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: I don't have

an explanation. I haven't studied that and the Commonwealth takes no position on -- on the authority of the city.

We know what our authority is. We have authority under the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act and with the legislature, and we know what the authority of the legislature is, and we've worked with the legislature on these land trans -- these land transactions involving Commonwealth lands for many years.

We have -- we have submitted an amicus brief in that litigation that is ongoing to answer that very question and we simply preserved our -- you know, made clear what we thought the extent of our authority to engage in submerged licenses was and took no position on whether or not the city has some authority to do the same

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: You're both aware of the fact that the General Assembly in the past has provided state land, riparian lands, for the purpose of development along the Delaware River?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Absolutely.

1 REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: And when that 2 took place, it was done through legislation. DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Correct. 3 REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: We looked at 4 5 things that are very similar to the situation that we now have today with SugarHouse. 6 7 So my question is, back then we went 8 through the legislative process to secure that 9 land for the economic development along the river, and yet in this case we're being denied 10 11 that, where the door is being shut. 12 Do you have any observations on that issue? 13 14 DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: No, sir. 15 REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Well, I know 16 that there are other members that want to --17 that have thoughts here, and I can continue. Are you also aware then that the 18 General Assembly continues to look at 19 20 legislation that deals with riparian rights? 21 DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Absolutely. 22 We've worked very well with this Committee. 23 We think that -- to be clear, 24 remember, I said the Department of 25 Environmental Protection only deals with,

submerged lands in relatively small situations. If it's -- or if it's not one of those water-dependent uses.

If it's not for a marina or park, you
know, a dock or a public utility, we don't
have authority. If it's for a condominium or
residential development, we don't have any
authority.

So what we do is work with the legislature and -- and assist on analysis and determination of things like public access rights and what -- what are the uses of that shoreline and what -- and what is the habitat implication and what kind of permit are we going to be issuing.

So that's our experience as well.

Either we have submerged land -- since 1978

either we have issued submerged lands

licenses -- 1978 is when the Dam Safety and

Encroachment Act was adopted.

It's been since that time it's been either we've issued licenses or the General Assembly took a specific action on the transaction.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: I'll conclude

```
1
     with this last thought, and that is according
2
      to the historical maps that we have looked at,
      and we had a hearing down in Philadelphia
3
     where we had an opportunity to view those
4
5
     maps, really where the water edge was in those
     maps, that land is designated as Commonwealth
6
7
      land and that's the land that we're looking at
8
     even today.
9
               I'm just -- I'm just, I guess,
      exasperated that it looks like we -- we, the
10
     General Assembly, is not being given its due
11
12
     diligence in is who to purchase that land and
     our authority to allow that to occur.
13
               So thank you, Madam -- Madam
14
15
      Chairlady, and we'll continue the dialogue
16
      later.
17
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Thank you. I just
18
     want to say we've been joined by
19
     Representative Cohen.
20
               Mr. Chairman Baker has a question.
21
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER:
                                      Thank you,
22
     Madam Chair.
23
               And again thank you very much for
24
      attending and giving us your valuable time
```

25

this morning.

1 Madam Secretary, you had mentioned 2 that you administer the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act and you had certain 3 obligations relative thereto and then you 4 5 mentioned applications pending, permits pending, SugarHouse and its 7.3 acres. 6 7 Is that -- is that the normal due 8 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

diligence and protocol of -- of applicants to apply for these things before they own or enter into any kind of agreement?

You'd mentioned they don't own this land yet and yet you're entertaining applications and permits. Is that -- is that the normal course of -- that transpires?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: requirement for the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act goes beyond submerged lands of the Commonwealth.

Any -- any obstruction or encroachment, and even things in the floodplain, in the floodway come under that act.

So there are many occasions when you would have a Chapter 105 permit requirement and come to us because you're doing things on land you already do own, whether or not
there's been a determination that they'll also
have to get rights to land they don't own in
order to finish or complete the project.

So whether it's typical or not, certainly there are occasions where we will be looking at the permit consequences of a proposal with an applicant.

And this is not something that's been acted on, so we frequently work that out and advise them that we think there are problems with what they're planning to do and that they're going to have difficulty getting a permit because of some of the regulations that don't fit with what they're planning to do.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: So does DEP, in fact, issue permits to applicants that don't actually own the land or have entered into any kind of contract or lease?

I mean is that -- is that part of the due diligence? Is that part of the --

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: We would except to have indications before a permit was issued, of ownership or easements or rights, legal rights to -- to the activities on the

land that they propose to do that relate to our permit obligation, yes.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: I'm just trying to get my head around.

SECRETARY CREEDON: Mr. Chairman,
maybe if I could just kind of help. You've
got to keep in mind, and the first thing about
any of these projects, is none of them is
typical. Every one of them has some little
different twist to it.

So it's difficult to give you a typical project. But what -- what generally I've seen happen is most of these requests they're asking for, they own a piece of property and they are required -- they need some additional -- rights beyond what they have the title to from us. So they have -- if you can think of it almost as two pieces of property, the one they wish to build on, and perhaps they want to extend the marina, they want to extend some walkways, maybe they want to build over, so they have a base piece of ground and a secondary piece of ground which they need to come to the legislature, the DGS.

In the case of SugarHouse they would go to the city for the permit. So a lot of times DEP will conduct permit reviews on the piece that they -- they don't need our involvement on as well, and on other properties as well.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: I just find it extraordinary that -- that permits and applications could be granted to an applicant that doesn't have any legal right to the land yet.

So I'm just trying to understand this concept of -- it's almost an advisory kind of thing, but yet, if you do enter a permit, that's a legal grant of -- of -- of permission to do certain things.

So I don't know if it's a contingency, do you then require -- before you actually deliver the permit or give the permit to the applicant, do you require that they obtain the DEP --

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Yes.

Ordinarily these things would occur

concurrently, because no one would ever get a

development done if they had to have

1 everything sequentially and everyone would ask for everyone else's permits and documents and 2 we'd never get anywhere. 3 So usually they go forward 4 5 concurrently. But I am advised that there have been some occasions where for one reason 6 7 or another we would issue the permit but it 8 would then be conditioned upon obtaining all 9 necessary easements, leases, or acquisitions. 10 REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Thank you. 11 appreciate that. That answers my question on 12 that. 13 And it was mentioned earlier that 14 informal meetings have transpired with 15 SugarHouse. 16 When did those meetings occur and are 17 you -- are you at liberty to discuss what took 18 place or transpired during those meetings? 19 SECRETARY CREEDON: I -- I did not 20 attend the meetings. Our real estate 21 office -- they're held with our real estate 22 office. I'm told they were -- December? 23 DIRECTOR JOANNE PHILLIPS: September.

DIRECTOR PHILLIPS: Or summer.

24

SECRETARY CREEDON: September?

```
1
               SECRETARY CREEDON: Summer. Over the
2
      summer. Sometime this summer.
                                      July, August.
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: The basis --
3
     or what transpired in those meetings, is that
4
5
     proprietary or is that something you think you
     could share with this committee?
6
7
               SECRETARY CREEDON: Joanne Phillips
      is our director of real estate. She attended
8
9
     the meeting.
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS. Ms. Phillips, I
10
11
     think if you come up and I would invite the
     other deputy secretary, Madam, if you require
12
13
     a technical person, to ask her to come up
14
     also --
15
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: That's okay.
     We're fine.
16
17
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: -- so things can
18
     move more smoothly.
19
               Ms. Phillips.
20
               DIRECTOR PHILLIPS: Sure. Good
21
     morning. Joanne Phillips. I'm the director
22
     of the Bureau of Real Estate. There were --
23
     we --
24
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: You may have to
25
     get closer to your mike.
```

1 DIRECTOR PHILLIPS: Sure. 2 CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: I'm sorry. DIRECTOR PHILLIPS: That's all 3 4 right. Thank you. 5 We took in some documentation regarding the site, survey, plan, information 6 7 that would allow us to begin an analysis of 8 what might be needed in the event there was 9 legislation, in the event we were asked to call on it. It was really a intake of some 10 documentation which we've done for other 11 12 riverfront developers that are undertaking to begin the process. 13 14 So it was really an intake of some 15 information. That was really the extent 16 of our -- of our meeting. I think there was 17 one meeting where it was even exchanged by 18 mail. 19 So the other thing is we -- is we did 20 participate in some meetings just to 21 understand what was going on with the river 22 and met with some city agencies where, I 23

believe, SugarHouse may have been -- in the summer, sort of an introductory, this is what 24 25 we've been awarded and this is what the

```
1
     project looks like.
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Informational
2
     type of things?
3
               DIRECTOR PHILLIPS: Really
4
5
      informational.
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER:
6
                                      Sharing
7
     between each other like we are now basically?
8
               DIRECTOR PHILLIPS: Correct.
9
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Okay. Thank
10
     you.
11
               SECRETARY CREEDON: Sir, we have
12
     an -- we have an ongoing list actually, an
     inventory we keep. I think there's -- by my
13
14
     quick count, there's about eight to ten on
15
     this list.
              And some we'll never hear from
16
17
             They may have come in and said we're
     again.
18
     thinking of buying pier such and such. What's
19
     going on? We read a lot in the paper. What's
20
     happening? We try to share as much as we
21
     can.
22
               I know I certainly, when I've had the
23
     opportunity to meet people, I say you must
24
     meet with your legislator because the key to
25
     this is going to be their approval or, quite
```

frankly, their disapproval of moving this forward.

We try to get as much information because generally what has happened is they go to their legislator and a bill comes out, and we'd like to be at least prepared and be able to come back and say based on what we know here's -- here's how this policy will work, here's what's applicable.

I know the one -- I can think of two that I've sat in have been very general.

Not -- one -- one bulkhead, I think,

nongaming. One -- I'm sorry. Very early on,

two, three years ago I thought Foxwood gave a quick presentation before they were even granted a license.

But, again, it was just what's going on, that type of dialogue and discussion.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Okay. One last question, if I may, because I do apologize. I have this pressing meeting at ten o'clock.

Secretary Creedon, in your testimony that was read ahead of time, you mention the SugarHouse property along the Delaware River.

I'll focus on that parcel since it's already been mentioned.

There seems to be somewhat of a conflict regarding testimony about that parcel in that you support the effort of the SugarHouse to obtain the so-called riparian permit from the city of Philadelphia rather than the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

And that is enunciated, it's articulated in here, in your testimony on the last page, and yet it's been clearly the intent and the will of the General Assembly, especially for the resolution that was passed recently unanimously, that it -- that -- that was -- what was done by Philadelphia council was not correct and it -- these matters should be approved by the Commonwealth and the legislative bodies' responsible for that.

Do you still hold to that opinion or do you still think Philadelphia city council has that right?

SECRETARY CREEDON: Let me -- let me try to clarify and put a little bit more meat on the bones of the testimony.

When SugarHouse and -- indicated they

were going to proceed with the city permit, I think the administration at that point -- I know the administration expressed its -- we were okay with that.

And the reason we were was that if it was a way to get the process moving in Philadelphia, to -- in order to have gaming occur, which we're supportive of, we felt this was a -- a course of action, if appropriate, that could be followed.

Unfortunately, because of the litigation, chief counsel or general counsel has advised that I not discuss my view on whether the city has the ability to do that and ultimately I think the Supreme Court will make that decision, although to make it even more interesting, the new mayor has pulled that permit. So it's -- the soap opera continues.

REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Are you -- are you participating in that -- in that ongoing litigation?

SECRETARY CREEDON: No. We elected not to -- to file any -- any briefs in support or in opposition to either side of that.

```
1
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: And could you
2
      tell us who's representing the Commonwealth's
      interests in the land?
3
               SECRETARY CREEDON: At --
4
5
      representing the Commonwealth's interest in
      the land?
6
7
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Yeah.
      there a state entity, department, legal
8
9
      counsel representing the state's interests in
10
      this land?
11
               SECRETARY CREEDON: Where the --
12
      the -- I guess in this case we have -- the
13
     administration is not a party to the
14
      litigation.
15
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Well --
16
               SECRETARY CREEDON: Although --
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: We're not a
17
18
     party. The Department of Environmental
19
     Protection submitted an amicus brief
20
      clarifying the issue of what the role of the
21
     Commonwealth was, the Commonwealth executive
22
      agencies, in administering the submerged lands
23
      licenses under the Dam Safety and
24
     Encroachments Act.
25
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: In the amicus
```

brief can you share with us whether you supported Philadelphia city council?

as I said before, we took no position as to anybody else's rights. We simply agreed that the General Assembly and the Commonwealth, through the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act, specifically, the legislature gave the Governor and the Commonwealth through the Department of Environmental Protection the right as defined in -- and the obligation as defined in the Dam Safety and Encroachments Act to issue submerged lands licenses on submerged lands in the Commonwealth in those specified areas that the statute lays out for our administration.

And we clarified that because the -the original briefs were overly broad. The
original briefs cited questions of the act
without --

CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Which act?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: The Dam

Safety and Encroachments Act which say one has
to go to the legislature or DEP, and it left

out the "or DEP".

```
1
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: So the amicus
     brief was filed --
2
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Very
3
      limited.
4
5
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: -- on behalf
      of the narrowness of DEP?
6
7
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Correct.
8
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Do you, any of
9
      you collectively, know if anyone is
      representing the broader essence of the
10
11
     people, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania on
12
     this issue? The people of Pennsylvania?
1.3
               SECRETARY CREEDON: As I've
14
      indicated, the department elected, based on
     what had been filed and what would be
15
16
     determined, to not enter into the litigation.
17
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: So I guess the
18
      answer is there's -- you're not aware of
19
      anyone.
20
               SECRETARY CREEDON: The lit -- I'm
21
      trusting the Supreme Court and the
22
      litigants to make a determination and
23
      represent the people.
24
               REPRESENTATIVE BAKER: Okay. Thank
25
      you very much.
```

```
1
               Thank you, Madam Chair.
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: I know that
2
     there's a second round. I'd like to give
3
     people a first opportunity.
4
5
               Mr. O'Brien.
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Thank you,
6
7
     Madam Chair.
8
               Ms. Myers, it would be something
9
     really unusual if I asked you about water
10
     management. That --
11
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: That would
     be something within my jurisdiction.
12
13
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Yes. So --
14
     and I really wanted to stay away from
15
     SugarHouse. Notice I tried to keep it to a
16
     statewide policy discussion.
               But it's like potato chips. We start
17
18
     to eat them and just can't resist them. I got
     to go there. So here we are.
19
20
               So SugarHouse currently has a 105
21
     permit?
22
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: No.
                                             They
     have an application.
23
24
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Application
25
     pending?
```

```
1
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS:
                                        Αn
2
     application, yes, sir.
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: 105
3
     application pending. That's correct? Right?
4
5
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS:
                                        Uh-huh.
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: When was
6
     that filed?
7
8
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: I don't have
9
     that information. But I can get it for you.
10
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: You'll --
11
     you'll provide that?
12
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: I certainly
     will.
13
14
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Thank you.
15
               Now, under the Dam Safety and
16
     Encroachment Act, which we've been dancing
17
     around on riparian issues, can DEP grant a 105
18
     permit if the General Assembly has not
     authorized the conveyance of that specific
19
20
     parcel?
21
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Yes.
22
     long as the permit was conditioned upon proper
23
     ownership of any area that was to be built on,
24
     yes.
25
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: So if
```

there's a cloud over the title, can you issue the permit?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: So long as we made it conditioned upon -- we would not be authorized to clear title or to determine who has title. We don't engage in property law adjudication.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: So we got a situation going here that the Commonwealth owns part of it, the riparian lands.

Currently SugarHouse has not closed on their option. So you've got LHTW, Limited, who owns vast land, and you've got clouds all over the place. Kind of like what we got out there today.

Who are you issuing a permit to?

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: The

applicant -- no, we only deal with an

applicant. We look at the application, we

look at what they're requesting, we look at

whether they meet all the requirements, and
then we make a decision.

So whoever is the applicant is is who we would consider issuing a permit to, obviously.

In the situation where there's uncertain title to material areas within the permit, we would either -- as I said before, either put a condition saying this permit only authorizes these activities, if you've obtained those rights, or we would simply not issue it until that was clear.

And we would have the discretion to do it either way, I believe.

REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: So -- so if

I come in and I apply for a permit to put a

well on Representative Clymer's property,

you'll give me a provisional permit to do

that?

It's yes or no.

DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Well, it's not that simple as being a yes or no. If there was no reason to believe you didn't own the property -- I mean do we search for property interests on every single permit for every single dock in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania? Absolutely not.

If a question was raised to us about ownership, we would probably -- we would put a condition in the permit.

```
1
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Okay.
                                                I'm
2
      raising it to you.
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Okay.
3
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: SugarHouse
4
5
      does not own the property located at 10001
     North Delaware Avenue, Philadelphia, PA.
6
7
     property is owned by LHTW, Limited. And I'd
8
      request, I'd request that DEP withhold any
9
     permits to anyone but the proper owner who has
10
      the deed and clear title.
11
               Is that a reasonable request?
12
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Certainly.
     We always take public -- public comments --
13
14
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN:
                                        Thank you
15
     very much.
16
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: -- and
17
      comments from the legislature.
18
               REPRESENTATIVE O'BRIEN: Madam Chair,
      I have nothing further.
19
20
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Clymer has a
21
      question, but I do want to say that the
22
      Finance Committee is going to have a meeting
     here at 10:00.
23
24
               So I'm going to at some point soon
25
      recess this hearing, not adjourn it, recess it
```

```
1
      and we will come back as soon as we can do
2
      that conveniently to follow this very
      interesting line of questioning.
3
               Mr. Clymer, if you -- if you have
4
5
      something you can wrap up quickly before the
      recess.
6
               REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Oh, I'm
7
      sorry. I'm sorry, Madam Chair. I didn't
8
9
      realize.
               For Secretary Creedon, let me follow
10
11
     up on the questions and answers asked by
     Chairman Baker.
12
               You explained that there's no
13
14
     executive agency, no part of this
15
      administration which has seen fit to become
16
      involved in the ongoing SugarHouse litigation
      to protect the interests of all of the
17
     Commonwealth's citizens in this land.
18
19
               Why is it that not -- why is that not
20
     the responsibility of the Department of
21
     General Services since you are the
22
      caretaker --
23
               SECRETARY CREEDON:
                                    Sure.
24
               REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: -- of the
25
      state land?
```

1	SECRETARY CREEDON: Representative
2	Clymer, I think I explained my position to you
3	in my letter of January 17th where I indicated
4	that based on my you know, our review, the
5	department's review of the case and the the
6	questions being asked of the court, that we
7	really did not see that we would add any
8	benefit benefit to that litigation and just
9	adding another party to it really didn't make
10	sense to us. That was our decision.
11	REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Well, I may
12	disagree with that, but I appreciate your
13	SECRETARY CREEDON: Wouldn't be the
14	first time we disagreed on some things.
15	REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: One quick
16	question is that the land at Spring Garden and
17	Broad Street, the state-owned land was sold
18	for \$25 million. Is that correct?
19	DIRECTOR PHILLIPS: That's under
20	agreement.
21	SECRETARY CREEDON: That's under
22	agreement of sale.
23	REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Under
24	agreement of sale?
25	SECRETARY CREEDON: Yes.

1 REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Based on the 2 value of \$25 million for that parcel of land, how does that relate to the lease that is 3 being provided, that you have agreed to, for 4 5 the -- for the 7.3 acres of the SugarHouse land? Is that five per square foot based --6 7 is that the relative figure based on what the 8 agreed to price is for the Broad Street --9 SECRETARY CREEDON: There is --10 REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: -- and Spring 11 Garden --12 SECRETARY CREEDON: There is no 13 agreed price for any property -- for the 14 SugarHouse property. We recommended to the 15 legislature a policy, where a number, through 16 the very healthy legislative debate process, 17 actually two bills that were passed yesterday 18 and are waiting signature by the Governor, that number was increased. 19 20 Did I think it needed to be 21 No, I didn't. But it was. increased? 22 that's how we work out here and that's great. 23 We're going to get a little bit more money. 24 To value -- to use Broad and Spring

Garden Street as any indicator of value of a

25

property that's underwater on a wharf on the Delaware River, it doesn't match up.

And keep in mind that the appraised value, even if we put our five dollars a square foot, the appraised value that we consistently receive and the General Assembly consistently approved, was always a dollar.

So we thought we were making big strides by going to five dollars. But you can -- it would be completely unfair to argue that the property's worth more now.

If you want to take the position, we had -- we had a proposal process for Broad and Spring Garden where people had to bid on the property, if you will. Submit proposals. I have no reason to believe that someone would bid \$25 million for land along the Delaware.

I -- maybe you could surprise me.

REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: Secretary

Creedon, we're talking about an industry

that's going to make millions of dollars in a

very short time and that's why that -- those

riparian lands are worth a lot of money,

because of the value that's going to come into

that industry.

```
1
               SECRETARY CREEDON: I -- I --
               REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: My word, that
 2
      is very valuable land --
 3
               SECRETARY CREEDON: I understand.
 4
 5
               REPRESENTATIVE CLYMER: And there is
      an answer between the two. I know we have to
 6
7
      qo so I'll --
               CHAIRMAN JOSEPHS: Mr. Clymer, I'm
 8
 9
      sorry.
10
               The hearing is recessed. We will --
11
     we will notify everybody when it is resumed.
12
      Thank you very much. Thank you, Deputy
13
      Secretary. Thank you, Secretary.
14
               SECRETARY CREEDON: Happy to be
15
      here.
16
               DEPUTY SECRETARY MYERS: Thank you,
     Madam Chairman.
17
18
               (The proceedings were recessed at
19
      10:01 a.m.)
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same.

Brenda S. Hamilton, RPR Reporter - Notary Public