

Schroader, Kathy



From Orjiako, Oliver
Sent Thursday, September 10, 2015 3:33 PM
To Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose
Cc Schroader, Kathy
Subject FW: Writers failed to realize importance of keeping ag & forestry viable

Follow Up Flag Follow up
Flag Status Flagged

FYI, and Kathy for the record Please, include in the packet for this evening We need to start another set of comments for the PC and BOCC as the comment period runs until September 17 Thank you

Oliver

From Carol Levanen [<mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com>]
Sent Thursday, September 10, 2015 3:29 PM
To Stewart, Jeanne, Mielke, Tom, Madore, David, Orjiako, Oliver
Subject Fw: Writers failed to realize importance of keeping ag & forestry viable

----- Forwarded Message -----

From susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>
To susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>, Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
Sent Thursday, September 10, 2015 1:54 PM
Subject Writers failed to realize importance of keeping ag & forestry viable

The mistruths, and absent data in the draft SEIS are tools used to facilitate the downfall of alternative 4. These tools actually advance CCCU's values by exposing misconduct to the public eye and facilitating dialogue on issues of considerable public interest. "Who is really navigating public policy on land use issues?"

There are rules that apply when writing an EIS. If these rules aren't respected by the writers and consultants tasked with the job of writing an unbiased dseis for proper analysis, how are the councilors supposed to make important informed decisions? How are competing interests in this case the private property rights of rural citizens, supposed to intervene and get our voices heard? CCCU is now tasked with going through the draft with a fine-tooth comb.

What are the motivations of the writers of the draft? By taking it upon themselves to provide their analysis, one would think that Alternative 4 proponents are vigilantes, invading marauders that only want to carve up the county, crowd the highways, deplete water resources all for self-serving purposes.

Purpose of the authors is a big factor for consideration, and interpretation. Motivation becomes really important in part of the decision of the County Councilors. The county's various comprehensive plans are lawfully supposed to serve the entire breadth of all county communities by facilitating positive changes. That has never happened for the rural communities. Needed changes in how the county comprehensive plans are developed need to happen. The draft clearly illustrates the poor conduct of the writers, the process used, and a faulty report. Unfortunately, this isn't uncommon for Clark County.

When engaged in an activity of the entire public's interest, private interests of the writers and consultants need to be set aside. The public's right to honest data outweighs purely private interests.

What the writers failed to realize is that farmers and foresters are operating businesses that are in the public's interest to keep viable. Many counties recognize this, in particular Chelan County. Chelan recognizes the needs of the resource-based industries, the importance of options for private property, and the importance of property rights.

1. Getting a complete list of the additional lots that should be in Alternative
1. A description of a compromise that will satisfy the Cities' concerns about a peripheral buffer around the cities that want one
2. Should corrections/additions to the SEIS and a call for more analysis be submitted in writing?