

Mr. Hazen, tear up these findings.

Northern Star would have you believe up is down, left is right and big is small. The activity of developing, constructing and operating a liquefied natural gas facility is by every measure large in scale and thus incompatible with siting at Bradwood.

What you as commissioners are being asked to sign your names to is embarrassing in its unabashed linguistic contortions and its breathtaking audacity. Are you really going to put your names to analysis that speculates wildly about the meaning of LUBA's decision saying "It is likely LUBA relied on" this or "it is likely LUBA relied on" that. Was it written by mind readers because it sure wasn't written by text readers?

For example, the draft asserts LUBA said it is okay to define small to medium as anything occupying less than 100-acres. LUBA said no such thing. What LUBA In fact wrote was,

The Goal 9 language does suggest that the needs of "small" industrial users can be met by breaking up large industrial sites greater than one hundred acres in size, although that does not necessarily suggest that all industrial development less than 100 acres in size is "small" or "moderate" in scale.

By way of analogy LUBA is saying, just because small buildings fit on small lots; you can't claim all buildings that fit on small lots are small buildings. If that were true the Empire State Building would be called small.

Just because minor surgery only leaves a small scar, you can't conclude that all surgery that leaves a small scar is minor. By this logic brain surgery would be minor surgery.

But size is not the real issue. The Northeast Community Plan does not say "Development at Bradwood shall be of a small or moderate size." It says "Development activities at Bradwood shall be of small or moderate scale."

LUBA points out, "The 'small to moderate' scale limitation presumably has some meaning independent of the building size limitation."

LUBA clearly asks you to provide what meaning small to moderate has beyond size.

And small to moderate what? Small to medium pizza? Small to moderate earthquakes? No, small to moderate **development activity**.

And yet these findings rather than answer LUBA's obvious question, try to sweep this under the rug, stubbornly sticking to the 100-acre size standard and claiming that development activity is a settled issue.

Why? Because to go down the path of speaking in plain English leads directly to the common sense conclusion that you apparently don't want to hear; namely Bradwood's scale of development activity is too darn big.

If you approve these shoddy findings history will say, "They did it for the money."

If you deny these findings history will say, "They were heroes to their people."

It's not too late. Be heroes to the people. Be our heroes. Tear up these findings.