

From: John and Cindy Mackay [REDACTED]
Sent: Saturday, July 07, 2012 7:34 AM
To: Wessel, Ann (ECY)
Subject: Re: WRA 18

Ann,

Questions are usually given answers. Am I to surmise that the statements are true and no answers will be given? My personal experience is that people with the fortitude to speak up when wrong is being done are dealt with harshly.

I have, since I wrote my letter to you, heard that where the plan has been put in place it has had a very negative impact on that area. Just what are you trying to accomplish as you "save the fish"?

John Mackay

From: [Wessel, Ann \(ECY\)](#)
Sent: Friday, July 06, 2012 12:08 PM
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: WRA 18

Thank you for your comment

From: John and Cindy Mackay [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, July 02, 2012 9:58 AM
To: Wessel, Ann (ECY)
Subject: WRA 18

It is of real concern to our family how the Department of Ecology reacted when confronted with opposition to WRA 18 by one of its own. As we understand it, your in-house Economist on March 19th wrote a memorandum to the 'rule making team' that the evaluated draft proposal DID NOT MEET THE LEGAL REQUIREMENT OUTLINED IN RCW 34.05.328 (1) of the Administrative Procedures Act.

Then, two days later this same individual sent written notice to his supervisor informing him that he found that he could not support the proposal as it was unlawful and he could not keep his professional integrity intact by supporting it.

The Department of Ecology responded by removing this person from the team. (Probably worse than that actually!---my supposition).

So how are we to believe that this proposal has merit when your own people who oppose it are handled in this manner?

Is this indeed a solution looking for a problem by an out-of-control agency? If not, when might we expect to see some technical proof of that?

John Mackay
[REDACTED]

