



The majority of this board has, as you know, allowed the weakening of environmental protections in the GPU.

This is doubly dangerous and irresponsible in the face of climate change. These reviews are your opportunity to create a positive legacy rather than the negative legacy you are at risk of leaving to the following generation.

As for the specific items scheduled for review today I bow, on the whole, to staff recommendations with a few exceptions.

Those exceptions are:

CO-G1- I disagree with the staff recommendation for the 2014 version. I think the 2012 version is preferable because it includes the words, "...for the enjoyment of residents and visitors...". Quality of life is a concept that should permeate the entirety of the GPU.

CO-P1x- I disagree with staff and say return to the 2012 version. It is important to include the words "...to transfer subdivision rights from high value open space and resource lands to urban development areas". It is not acceptable to leave that out, doing so changes the meaning in a critical manner.

CO-P4- The Ad Hoc Working Group recommendation of the 2012 alternative A is preferable because it contains the words "greenbelt overlay zones".

Sylvia De Rooy
Eureka