

From: Ed Bowen [mailto:smp@co.clallam.wa.us]
Sent: Thursday, April 02, 2015 2:57 PM
To: zSMP
Subject: Shoreline Master Program

To: SMP@co.clallam.wa.us (Shoreline Master Program)

This message was sent via the Clallam Website Email Form 04-02-2015.

Name: Ed Bowen

Email: smp@co.clallam.wa.us

Subject: Shoreline Master Program

Comments: Dear Clallam County Commissioners,

I say this because the public comment process online is now limited to voicing our citizen's ideas to the Board of Clallam County Commissioners; not necessarily focused on a fault of the process but just to be clear why this is addressed to you at this time. The current phase of the process for the Shoreline Master Program Update plan (SMP) is with the Planning Commission and they are your advisors; so it would seem fitting that you can make request for them to look into matters of interest.

At the April 1st Planning Commission meeting staff spent a large proportion of time identifying a possible option for the commission to include in its deliberation of the issues: To have at an upcoming meeting presentation and discussion by the North Olympic Peninsula Resource Conservation & Development Council on what I believe I heard said at the commission is the forthcoming "what-if" product:
Projected Climate Change and Impacts for the North Olympic Peninsula.

It appears that without motion the commission agreed to this presentation. My point to you today is the commission did not appear to include other presentation options in their agreement; this is one particular aspect to be presented in what now stands to be their process of coming to a decision on the SMP they will or will not submit to you for consideration. I believe that singularity approach is flawed, if not alone on the basis of fair and balanced.

So I would suggest to you to provide guidance to your advisory commission that if presentations are going to be a part of their process that you would like to hear a multitude of particular aspects.

What does that look like and what might be reasonable for the commission to consider? I would begin with consideration for the three following groups if they elected to participate:

Pacific Legal Foundation

(thinking along the lines of addressing the litigation potential from landowners if the SMP is flawed in those regulated respects)

Citizens Alliance of Property Rights

(thinking along the lines of where government's reach in to people's lives and freedoms has become a possible de-motivating factor in how those people are the very stewards of the land)

Jefferson County approved Shoreline Master Program Update Plan—possibly presented by the Olympic Stewardship Foundation

(thinking along the lines of a neighboring county with an approved updated plan and the problems with the plan that citizens have run in to)

Again, these groups may not be willing to present, but I provide them as a suggested list to consider inviting into this newly apparent component of the commission's deliberation process.

On the matter of "What-If", give thought to the idea "What If" there actually isn't a period in the sentence after "Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness" in the Declaration of Independence...and the possibility the declaration actually declares that the government derives its just power from the consent of the governed is an Unalienable Right endowed by one's creator? This is a supremacy clause for intent within both our US and State Constitutions. For the purpose in this SMP matter whether the period is there or not there is context as to whether government understands this right when it considers how and when it regulates the people; the person. The Governed is not just one view point either.