

## APPLICANT'S FINAL ARGUMENT

The applicant has submitted a comprehensive application that discusses the proposal with clarity, and addresses the applicable criteria with substantial evidence, often from professional witnesses. Conversely, our primary opponent, Oregon Coast Alliance (ORCA) argues that the applicant's evidence is flawed, while for the most part, refuting the applicant's evidence with conjecture rather than substantiated evidence. While it is the applicant's burden to provide evidence in support of relevant criteria, when challenging evidence from professional witnesses, it is not enough to make assumptions based on speculation. Case in point, ORCA believes it is better suited to assess potential impacts from water usage than to rely on the state agency (ODWR) assigned to make those decisions based on scientific data. Also, while the method for safe application of chemicals is clearly addressed in the application, including drift and runoff, ORCA intentionally ignores the evidence and implies potential injury to farm uses and farmers. These, and other misguided attempts to "muddy the waters" are distasteful at best.

There was other evidence submitted from local citizens, primarily discussing issues associated with water and traffic. Those issues have been thoroughly addressed in the applicant's submittals and will be resolved through processes with the Oregon Department of Water Resources, the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Coos County Road Department. As was stated in the hearing, those factors are not relevant to this golf course decision. If there is not suitable access or a suitable water source, as determined by the appropriate agencies, it is unlikely that a golf course will be constructed.

Based on the substantial evidence provided in the initial application and subsequent rebuttal, the applicant respectfully requests that the Planning Commission approve the proposed golf course with conditions.