

**From:** Steven R. Jones, Ph.D. <sjones@nwresearch.net>  
**Sent time:** 01/04/2015 03:45:32 PM  
**To:** Gary Pruitt <gary@yrcaa.org>  
**Cc:** Mike Leita <mike.leita@co.yakima.wa.us>; Rand Elliott <Rand.Elliott@co.yakima.wa.us>; Kevin Bouchey <Kevin.Bouchey@co.yakima.wa.us>  
**Subject:** RE: Draft Strategic Plan  
**Attachments:** Draft Strategic Plan wo photos (Jones).docx

---

At your request I have enclosed some changes to the Strategic Plan document that was sent on the 18<sup>th</sup> of December. I have been out of town for most of that time and just completed this review. I see by the mailing I received on Friday that some of the issues I raise have been changed. The new document I received Friday simply reiterates most of the same material I have objections to. Objective 5 on page 15 is right out of the Environmental Justice rule book. It identifies a special class of people that require special treatment above and beyond the general public. Furthermore, these "highly impacted communities" are being designated by unelected agency bureaucrats. Don't get me wrong. We need bureaucrats that are sensitive to the public. Notwithstanding, we do not need to give those same dedicated public servants the right to choose which "highly impacted communities" need more air quality than others or special treatment under existing rules.

As I have commented in the redacted document enclosed, there should be no mention of "Environmental Justice" in this document. When you review the literature on the "Environmental Justice" movement, you find two advocacy groups. The first and most logical is the true environmentalists that believe if you damage the environment that you should have to correct the damage. This advocacy is logical but has been taken to a level that is in some cases punitive and restrictive to progress. The second advocacy group that supports "Environmental Justice" is far more dangerous. This advocacy group believes that the whole of the environment is a "collective" and anyone that used the environment for gain has disproportionately disadvantage someone or something else. This advocacy believes that anyone that has achieved gains should redistribute those gains to everyone or everything that has less or has been damaged. They use the terms "fair", "fairness", or "equity" to describe the reasons for "Environmental Justice". You can see these terms used throughout the agency Strategic Plan document. This advocacy group believes that the advances produced by Western civilization have been to the detriment of the environment and they want to be the group that tells us all how the environment will be portrayed. This second group is socialist at best and communist at the worst. I don't see how you can use the term "Environmental Justice" without being an advocate for one or both of these groups. I am opposed to the use of "Environmental Justice" in any form in this Strategic Plan document.

Thanks for the opportunity to comment on the plan. As it is currently written, I would have to vote no on approval. I think this document needs far more discussion than we have previously been exposed to. I do want to commend the work that you and the YRCAA staff performs for the community. I am very pleased to be a small part of what you do. I know that you must have worked diligently on this plan and I do not want to take away from the majority of it. I will apologize in advance if I offended you by my comments. That was not my intension. I simply do not believe in the "Environmental Justice" movement. At this time you, at least, know my opinion.

Best regards,

*Steven R. Jones, Ph.D.*  
Colossal Orchards, Inc.