

Schroader, Kathy



From Orjiako, Oliver
Sent Monday, September 14, 2015 10 13 AM
To Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose
Cc Schroader, Kathy
Subject FW Sunday reporting on Sept 10 hearing - For the public record and the SEIS review

Follow Up Flag Follow up
Flag Status Flagged

FYI, and for the index I have more for the record Thanks

From Carol Levanen [mailto:cnidental@yahoo.com]
Sent Sunday, September 13, 2015 10 15 AM
To Madore, David, Mielke, Tom, Stewart, Jeanne, Orjiako, Oliver, McCauley, Mark
Subject Fw Sunday reporting on Sept 10 hearing - For the public record and the SEIS review

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

From Carol Levanen <cnidental@yahoo.com>
To Kaitlin Gillespie <kaitlin.gillespie@columbian.com>
Sent Sunday, September 13, 2015 10 08 AM
Subject Sunday reporting on Sept 10 hearing - For the public record

Hello Kaitlin

Thanks for the fairly accurate account of the confrontation I received from Clark County Attorney Christine Cook. The part you were inaccurate on was the statement that Councilor Madore set "rules" that prevent the public from speaking. In open public hearings such as these, no rules can be set that prevent the public from speaking regardless of how many times they have spoken at other hearings. In addition, this was the only opportunity for the public to discuss the alternatives before the Planning Commission and the Councilors at the same time before verbal testimony was closed. Although Councilor Madore didn't explain it very well, those of us at the Sept 3 hearing took it to mean that those who said something at one hearing didn't have to come to the other to give the same information. This seems fair especially for site specific requests which we believe he was thinking of. But in your desire to degrade Councilor Madore, you took it out of context. It would not have been legal for Councilor Madore to prevent public testimony at these hearings and he did not set "rules" to do so. But your article clearly shows the Columbian bias against Councilor Madore and the open public process when it comes to the overall agenda of the Democrat party. Both of these hearings demonstrated support for Alternative 4 which CCCU expected to happen.

I have attached the verbatim conversation of Councilor Madore which clearly says one has the opportunity to speak twice. I would have thought you would have reviewed that video, before writing this article or perhaps you did.

Best Regards Carol Levanen Ex Secretary CCCU Inc P O Box 2188 Battle Ground Wash 98604

Open Public Forum - Public testimony For the Public Record
People

- Carol Levanen
-
- Sep 11 at 1 03 AM

To

- Jeanne Stewart
- Tom Mielke
- David Madore
- Oliver Orjiako

Dear Councilors,

For the record I would like to voice concern over Attorney Christine Cook trying to stop me from giving testimony at the Joint Clark County Planning Commission/Clark County Councilor hearing scheduled on September 10, 2015. As I approached the microphone and began to speak she interrupted me to say that I gave testimony last week and I was allowed only one chance to give testimony claiming Councilor Madore set that rule at the last hearing. I said I was representing an organization (which represents approximately 6,000 members and supporters) and she countered it was Clark County Citizens United and I spoke last week or similar comments. I told her the information I was giving was different than last week but she continued to counter. To make matters worse Councilor Stewart sided with Ms. Cook and said it wasn't fair that I should speak again when there were others who might have wanted to speak, but didn't think they could. I then said legally she could not stop me from speaking. I proceeded with testimony but by then some of my 3 minutes of time had been used and I was unable to give my whole testimony verbally. This exchange from county staff and councilor was degrading and embarrassing to me. It made me look as if I was trying to be treated differently than other citizens which certainly wasn't the case. This all happened in a public forum with an audience. I understood from the last hearing of September 3, 2015 that there were two opportunities to speak to that forum. Since I do not generally attend the Planning Commission hearings I wanted to take advantage of having two opportunities to state different positions and comments within the combined 6 minutes of allowed testimony.

I went back to listen to exactly what was said on September 3, 2015 by Councilor Madore, as I understood it differently than Ms. Cook. The following is verbatim quotations:

'The purpose of this evening is to make sure that we receive testimony from you. It's our turn to hear from you. There are two opportunities for citizens to make sure you have been heard. This is one of two meetings. September 3. If you testify here you have an opportunity to speak for three minutes.' "There will be another opportunity September 10 at the same time, same location here at 6:00 P.M. as well. If you testify tonight, the idea is that you have been heard. It's not an election. What we're doing is making sure that each issue, each point, each insight that you can offer us will be heard. There are two opportunities for verbal testimony."

Clearly Councilor Madore did not limit testimony to only one night. Certainly the Councilors would want to hear all of the testimony presented by the public regarding the Draft SEIS in as many forums as possible to get the whole picture. I understood the purpose for the joint meeting was so that people didn't have to repeat their testimony twice to commissioners and councilors and have to attend two meetings, as well. Regardless, it was not appropriate for Ms. Cook to attempt to censure my testimony in an open public forum. This speaks to the open public process requirements of the Growth Management Act as it regards public input and outreach. As a county attorney representing the councilors Ms. Cook should have known better. Perhaps a public apology is in order.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188