

March 24, 2022

Citizens' Agricultural Advisory Committee

Study Session

Packet Addition #2

Date: March 24, 2022

To: Peninsula Township AG Ordinance Study Committee

From: Lew Seibold 3195 Cherry Hill Rd., Traverse City, MI; Peninsula Township

Re: **Proposed Ordinance AG Advisory Study Group - March 24 Meeting**

1. Objection:

In light of the untimely letter from Mr Grant Parsons (another committee member) and the “preemption” of a portion of the meeting by the township attorney regarding the WOMP Lawsuit, I respectfully would like to raise an objection to these two attempts to weaken the presentation/discussion with Mr Hoag. The members of the AG community had anticipated this time, not to prove or disprove any points but to understand the aspects of Michigan’s Right to Farm Legislation **and its application**. To preempt both the time, because of the Winery Lawsuit, and to weaken the content of Mr. Hoag’s presentation is neither a “good faith” gesture nor a good use of our focus on general farming and horticultural aspects of the ordinance. Why are we being sidetracked by the winery issue, again? Maybe all discussion of the AG ordinance should be tabled until it culminates.

2. Specifically to Mr Grant’s letter:

- a. Mr. Parsons begins his letter with a statement that his personal perspective is “as a land use advocate for Peninsula Township”.
- b. Is Mr. Parsons qualified, alone, to judge the merits or demerits of Mr. Hoag’s presentation or discussion regarding land use?
- c. It seems condescending to assume that Grant is capable of knowing preemptively what Mr. Hoag is going to present. This is unfair to Mr. Hoag at this point in time.
- d. I have no problem and would welcome Mr. Parsons critiquing the presentation all he wants, after the fact.
- e. Grant suggests that the “truth” about MI RTF lies in the middle???
- f. Mr. Parsons suggests that we (farmers) are going to seek answers about application.
- g. OF COURSE WE ARE!!!
- h. Farming in all its forms is an application based vocation. Does he think it is theoretical, and/or things grow because of legal rhetoric and ordinances?
- i. Everyone deals with the application of the ordinance at some point.
- j. If Mr. Hoag is an advocate, is that any different than Mr. Parsons being an advocate for his version of “land use” as he stated in the prologue of the letter?
- k. How far will the legal counsels push the township citizenry toward irrelevance in the actual practice of open and healthy citizen debate and participation?