

Rachel Pitzel

From: Steve Pilcher
Sent: Tuesday, July 19, 2011 4:38 PM
To: WebMaster
Subject: FW: Objection for the Hearing Examiner

Please post in conjunction with last ruling from the Examiner.

From: Cindy Proctor [<mailto:proct@msn.com>]
Sent: Sunday, July 17, 2011 3:57 PM
To: Steve Pilcher; Brenda Martinez; Stacey Borland
Subject: Objection for the Hearing Examiner

Steve please forward to Mr. Olbrechts.- Cindy Proctor

Mr. Examiner,

I would like to raise an *objection* to the inclusion of any new language to the Villages and/or Lawson Development Agreement as presented by Mr. Pilcher on Saturday July 16 2011, specifically regarding the Covington Water Agreement and from a blanket objection standpoint to any and all revised language the City and/or Applicant may propose.

The Applicant and City are certainly in a position to pull their Development Agreements until they have completed them and re-submit for a new public hearing; however adding new language after the close of Public Oral testimony does not serve the public interest. This issue goes to the heart of the public comments regarding one of the fundamental flaws of the Development Agreements; that they are incomplete.

Cindy Proctor