

rec  
4/17/08  
W176

Humboldt County Planning Commission  
Humboldt County Courthouse  
Eureka, California 95501

Re: County Health Officer Health Report (April 3, 2008)

Dear Commissioners:

I came by to provide some additional thoughts on the Health Report you received a short while back. I already mentioned how I do not find it logical and common sensical to say urbanites are healthier than rural folks. I have concluded the report is incomplete by ignoring many other health related factors.

I understand more accidents occur closer to home than away from home; so, with more people in an urban setting, aren't there more accidents in an urban setting? If this is true, isn't the number of trips a bigger factor than the mileage per trip? I know rural folks plan their trips better than urbanites who find it easier to hop in the car and drive to just get toothpaste or Tylenol.

Where are the health numbers on crime, child predation, rape, murder, and spread of disease? I am sure the San Francisco and Oakland numbers would be interesting in regards to what happens when people are crammed together.

Don't engines provide less pollution per mile when they run steadily over longer distances versus being started, stopped, and gunned over and over again in an urban setting.

Before policy and regulations are put in place based on the speculated consensus about Global Warming, it might be a good idea to develop a factual consensus about what is really going to happen. A case in point is what happened in the 1970s when a speculated consensus and not a factual consensus was applied by California Department of Forestry, Water Quality, California Department of Forestry, politicians, fishermen, environmentalists, and general public. Policies, regulations, and taxpayer funded projects were put in place forcing and requiring under threat of regulatory violation and citation the removal of debris out of streams. Those who said this did not look like a good idea were pushed aside and ridiculed. Hundreds of miles of streams were damaged and fish habitats were damaged before reason prevailed and a factual consensus was able to overcome what was happening.

Other speculated consensus actions now in play that I believe factual consensus will eventually show has hurt species, humans, rural communities, and this country involve the ongoing spotted owl, wild fish only, and Global Warming policies.

Be careful how you proceed, because it is a shame to learn what you had only after it is gone.

Good luck,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Charles L. Ciancio".

Charles L. Ciancio  
RPF # 317  
P.O. Box 172  
Cuten, CA 95534

Summary of the Book Titled  
**Rest In Peace Rural America**  
(A bunch of truths that show what is going wrong)

- This book provides information that fits into the hot button issues of our time.
- There is a Fourth Branch of unelected governmental folks and a broken regulatory development process that is hurting this country and everyone in it.
- A real life, upfront, and close experience with this problem is provided by what is happening to Rural America.
- As a rich country, it has been easy for us to accommodate incorrect environmental and regulatory thinking, to ignore how the use of natural resources affects us all, and to make use of natural resources an even smaller part of our economy.
- Everything we need and want (food, shelter, frills) starts with the use of natural resources.

The result is:

1. Inappropriate and unjustified lock-up of natural resources.
  2. Inability to maintain in-country manufacturing infrastructure.
  3. Destruction of rural communities dependent on production of natural resource products.
  4. Loss of Middle Class jobs throughout the country.
  5. Destruction of the Middle Class throughout the country.
  6. Increased dependence on imports of all kinds often detrimentally produced in third world countries.
- There is reason to believe future wars will not just be fought over oil.
  - Rural folks are not better than city folks. They are simply a part of what is good in this country, and the country will be less for their loss.
  - No management means less diversity, haphazard fire, damaged property, damaged natural resources, lost habitats, and injured and dead species and humans.
  - Active planned management and disturbance means more diversity, increased productivity, more natural resource and habitat protection, more food, more sex, increased species populations, and prosperity for species and humans.
  - Yes, humans have done bad things; but, a fair, open minded review finds Mother Nature does heal and humans applying technological know-how, based on historical and peer reviewed science, site specific factual truths, logic, and common sense, can give better results than a haphazard Mother Nature.

Note: This information is factually supported by what has been lived and experienced for over forty years. For contradictory information to be considered, it must first have a similar factual basis and not be based on theory.

## **Rest In Peace Rural America**

(Speculated Consensus runs the show and a sad fish story)

### **- Speculated consensus is pushing factual consensus into the back of the bus.**

Politically correct public review processes involving inexperienced people are allowing resource set-aside and regulatory decisions to be made without utilizing proven historical and peer reviewed science, site specific facts, logic, and common sense. Then without adequate oversight, unelected public entities and judicial system are allowed to routinely apply these poor decisions in an unprofessional, improper, and sometimes abusive manner.

- A case in point is what happened in the 1970s when a speculated consensus and not a factual consensus was applied by California Department of Forestry, Water Quality, California Department of Forestry, politicians, fishermen, environmentalists, and general public. Policies, regulations, and taxpayer funded projects were put in place forcing and requiring under threat of regulatory violation and citation the removal of debris out of streams. Those who said this did not look like a good idea were pushed aside and ridiculed. Hundreds of miles of streams were damaged and fish habitats were damaged before reason prevailed and a factual consensus was able to overcome what was happening.

- Other speculated consensus actions now in play that factual consensus is showing have the potential to hurt species, humans, rural communities, and this country involve the ongoing spotted owl, wild fish only, and Global Warming policies.

- **In the beginning of the sad fish story**, land use practices were terrible. Humans ripped and snorted across the land. Fish were abundant.

- Starting in the 1970s, fish populations reached historic lows. Heavy handed, poorly developed and poorly administered regulatory land-use restrictions were applied, and rural folks suffered.

- After thirty plus years, many, many, many fish life cycles, billions of restoration dollars, a bunch of pseudo scientific brain-storming, and application of heavy-handed land-use regulations, fish populations remain at historic lows and in some areas have dropped lower.

- Maybe it is time to stop clubbing the producers of natural resource products over the head with unjustified and not factually supported land-use restrictions, and it is time to look elsewhere?

- Maybe, the Holy Grail of cute and cuddly predators, grab for restoration dollars, and other unaccountable regulatory actions need a better look?

- Maybe clubbing and killing returning hatchery fish in hatchery spillways and shutting down properly run fish hatcheries has not been such a good idea?

- Maybe, proper hatchery activities can be used to help produce more fish versus letting an uncontrollable ocean and haphazard Mother Nature run the show?

- Maybe, just maybe some folks need to get their head out of their rear-end?

- Be careful how you proceed, because it is a shame to learn what you had only after it is gone.

Note: This information is factually supported by what has been lived and experienced for over forty years. For contradictory information to be considered, it must first have a similar factual basis and not be based on theory.

Charles L. Ciancio

California Registered Professional Forester #317

3/7/08