

Merrill, Hannah

From: earnest spees [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, July 16, 2011 11:18 AM
To: Merrill, Hannah; Gray, Steve
Subject: Public Testimony - Wetlands, SMP Map Designation, EPA Tyranny

Hanna Merril

I wish to add my comments to what Pearl has very skillfully laudably surfaced to the public eye. I request that these comments be entered as an independent entry, expounding on a very significant observation

Thank you
Karl Spees

Pearl R.H. makes another square hit on the perversion of the DoE/EPA attempt to strip the Citizens of their private property rights.

The only thing we can definitely say about the character of our wetlands and shorelines after 10 years, is they will be changed. Some greatly some only slightly. The thought that private property owners will be required to spend \$10,000's of dollars to untangle the mess the DoE, EPA, and County bureaucrats are creating with their precautionary (non-) science is truly an outrage against all of the County citizens.

Pearl has shared her research with me about another issue. Any time the idea of DEVELOPMENT is mentioned in the volumes of material generated by the DoE/EPA/ and other on the SMP Update, it is modified with THREAT or RISK. Development is merely a change in appearing or form of a property. One difference in the Constitutional observing citizens (the people paying the bills) and the DoE/EPA/earth worshipers/radical environmentalist/globalists (the inept parasites of socialist utopia) is Citizens believe we are STEWARDS of the land, the others think human rights are superseded by the planetary needs (mythical delusional false religious beliefs) and it is governments job to impose this false religion on the Citizens. We are merely another species of beasts. It is loony. It is insane. It is self destructive. We need to wake up and change our direction.

The NNL and 200' buffers need to be rejected out of hand. We need to quit dumping scarce public funds down this RAT HOLE!

Karl Spees - Public Testimony on the Clallam County SMP

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN

07/14/11 Public Forum Per Consultant Jim Kramer, designated Wet Lands are NOT identified in

the SMP presentation maps.

The purple areas indentified in the SMP public forum Clallam County presentation maps **as risk OR threat of development property areas are MISLEADING.**

If you doubt the **seriousness of wetland's omission** in the SMP maps presented in Public Forums go to the Clallam County map website of designated Wetland Maps and look at page 45 (Dungeness River area) and page 39 (area between Lake Farm Road and N Bagley Creek Road).

As described on Clallam County map website,

Parcels and **wetlands are too small and numerous to label legibly** at this scale, they are

identified with tiny labels. **To view wetland** codes and large parcel numbers, you must zoom to at

least 400%. To view small parcel labels, you must zoom to at least 1200%

Clallam County **wetland maps** are not interactive and in spite of the **damning consequences of wetland designation** to private property owners and developers these wetland maps are posted with Clallam County's **disclaimer of accuracy.**

Map information is from multiple sources, accuracy is limited and layers may not align with each other. This map is

intended to serve only as a guide to the general location and extent of regulated wetlands, streams, geologic hazards, and

wildlife habitat. Determination of actual regulatory location typically requires a field examination by qualified staff.

HOW COULD INACCURATE WETLAND MAPS AFFECT YOU?

EPA blocks Sacketts from building a house - and denies them their day in court

The Sacketts are renting, and they wanted to build a home on their half-acre lot, to raise a family.

Their parcel is in a residential area, with sewer and water hookups, and they got the needed local permits to build. But then EPA swooped in, without notice or hearings, and announced that the property is "wetlands." The Sacketts were ordered to return their land to EPA's liking on pain of ruinous fines.

The Sacketts dispute EPA's claim. They hired a soil expert and a biologist, and got a certification that their parcel is not a wetland.

But EPA - and the Ninth Circuit - say they can't challenge the agency in court!

Instead, they would first have to seek a "permit" costing hundreds of thousands of dollars (more than the value of the land!), and bring a legal case when the permit was denied. Or they could violate EPA's orders and be crushed with penalties of \$32,500-plus per day - and then seek court review.

Either way, the courtroom doors are slammed in their faces - unless they pay massive fees or fines!

So *this* is the crucial issue before the Supreme Court: Can EPA take people's property, simply by declaring it "wetlands," without having to justify their actions? Or do Americans still have the right to defend themselves and their property rights, in court, against government oppression?

"This case is garnering a lot of attention because it's a case that could happen to you," as Damien Schiff says. "The Sacketts are not big developers. They just wanted a family home."

Pearl Rains Hewett

Invited SMP update committee member