



Natalie Ranker <nattim7072@gmail.com>

Additional Testimony - Natalie Ranker
414 Simpson
North Bend 97459

BOC meeting on the 7th

Tonia Moro <tonia@toniamoro.com>

Wed, Aug 7, 2019 at 8:56 AM

To: Natalie Ranker <nattim7072@gmail.com>, Larry and Sylvia Mangan

<manganlarryandsylvia@gmail.com>

Cc: Jody McCaffree <jodymccaffree@gmail.com>

This is how I envision an argument. You should start with talking about their bias and then go to stamps bias (see below) - Start with money taken ... and then add that:

despite the money you have taken, it has become clear that all of you are biased; you bend over backward to aid the applicant and are willing to put the county's residents at risk. You continually amend the code for the benefit of this project. If there is a hurdle for the applicant, you fix it by changing the rules or hold off on changing the rules. Here are some of the numerous examples:

- 1) CCZLDO §4.11.125 (Special Development Considerations) and CCZLDO §§5.11.100 - 5.11.300(Geologic Assessments) adopted pursuant to Ordinance Ord. 17-04-004PL dated May 2, 2017, effective July 31, 2017. These provisions require site plan review for structures and a geologic assessment for any use in Geologic Hazard Special areas, and they set forth policies to minimize risks to life and property associated with new development in areas deemed hazardous due to risks of flooding,

Exhibit: 9

Date: 8/7/19

landslides, tsunamis, earthquakes, erosion and wildfires.

Yet you specifically exempted the applicant from these health and safety requirements so they can hold on to permits that were issued almost a decade ago.

Moreover you have specifically not applied these criteria to the CBEMP zones again, so that the applicant can hold on to those permits and not have to deal with hazards related as they may relate to the terminal

2) CCZLDO §5.0.175 was also amended effective January 2015 part of AM-14-11 and Ordinance No. 14-09-012PL. Rec. 30, 33, 35. This provision allows an applicant to seek such pipeline permits without a landowner's signature only when it has a right to condemnation

3) More recently, you attempted to gut the substantive requirements of the permit extension criteria and shoved the amendment through without any review by the citizens advisory

committee and without providing notice of the full extent of your amendments to DLCD.

4) you have failed to amend the CBEMP for 45 years, again to the benefit of the applicant.

While you may try to avoid this bias claim by relying on the fact that a hearings officer has resolved the issues, but that won't work either.

Mr. Stamp is biased also. He is not an impartial decision maker

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Natalie Ranker".

From: Natalie Ranker [mailto:nattim7072@gmail.com]

Sent: Tuesday, August 06, 2019 6:55 AM

[Quoted text hidden]

[Quoted text hidden]