Statement from Robert Goldberg, Champlin’s attorney

“We are reviewing the RI Supreme Court's ruling in declining to enter a consent order that would have incorporated the elements of a MOU reached in mediation between Champlin’s Marina and RI Coastal Resource Management Council.

“While the court declined to issue the consent order, saying the Supreme Court was not the appropriate place for the requested action, it is important to note the Court did not dispute the legitimacy of the settlement and also validated the use of mediation as a means to settle disputes.

“This case has been languishing in litigation for 17 years, and Champlin’s along with CRMC are committed to finally settling it. The mediated settlement involves significant concessions from Champlin’s that resulted in an expansion plan that is one third of what was originally proposed. It adds no new boats, and puts in place several new environmental protections.

“We remain troubled by the actions and vitriol of the Attorney for the Intervenors. His unhinged, irresponsible, anything goes behavior, clearly the result of a failed poorly thought-out obstructionist legal strategy, runs contrary to the rules of attorney conduct and Professional Standards.

“Finally on the role and power of Intervenors to void or veto settlements — we continue to point out that mere intervention does not vest a party with the right to grant or deny a permit. No governmental authority is ceded or gained by granting intervention. Intervenors are not created by or limited in their mission by the general laws. Their motivations do not have to be disclosed. In fact, where the Intervenor is an association or corporate entity, even its members or owners need not be disclosed. Certainly, Intervenors’ true motivations are beyond reach. This is, of course, in contrast to a governmental entity whose very being and purpose is controlled by statute.”
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