

COMMENTS FROM ED SWAKON FOR DEC 22 WATERSHED MEETING: PUBLIC COMMENT

Thank you for the opportunity to address you this morning. I would like to address three items with you. 1. The comments of your chairman to the County Commission's INLUC committee; 2. Comments on section 3.4 and my recommendation that you not adopt this section today, and; 3. The announced changes to the public comment process

First as your chairman indicated he made a presentation to the County INLUC committee in which he stated that if you as a committee adopted section 3.4 that the Commissioner and staff had the science from the watershed and could use this in the County's evaluation of the 9 pending CDMP applications coming back to the Commission in April of 2006. I believe this statement was misleading because you have not yet evaluated the social implications of any of the test scenarios. It is conceivable that you as a group will find many of the associated landuse changes unacceptable to completely "hold the line". Yet your preliminary evaluation of the test parameters clearly favored the no movement of the UBD test scenario. It is inappropriate to use only the evaluation of the test scenarios against your evaluation parameters with a full understanding of the complimentary landuse regulation changes required.

Second, I want to thank Bill Losner for submitting to the consultants many of the comment and concerns I had distributed to all of you by email. I believe that many of the consultant's responses provided to you this morning misunderstood the comments and therefore I still disagree with many of their responses. I do not believe you as a group have the information you need to adopt this section. I don't doubt that BMP are being used, but what I don't know is when and what affect that they are presumed to have. If you go thru a convoluted process of requesting that additional language be added at a later date, I remind you of the fiasco associated with the adoption of Section 3.1 which I believe has still not be distributed with all of the final wording.

You should not rely on blind faith that the technical review committee is OK with this section. Where are the minutes of there meeting? What were there concerns? I remind you that this is the most important section of the entire report. The evaluation of Water Quality is what started this whole process. You have got to get the water right! Don't adopt this section without getting the missing information.

Finally, I do not believe you have significantly changed at all your documentation of the public comments. You Mr. Chairman incorrectly stated that speakers had previously been identified in the proceedings. That has not been the case. The requirement that public comment must be submitted electronically in order to be included in the proceedings is not any different that before. Now my comments will get listed in the public comment section instead of the observer comments. You should be able to capture all public input even if not submitted electronically.

I believe your 3 minute timer is not working properly.