

Glenda Wiles

From: Jeff Burrows
Sent: Monday, October 1, 2018 11:51 AM
To: Ravalli County Commissioners Office
Subject: FW: OFFER TO RESOLVE the Hughes creek gate issue peacefully.

Attempt to reach out to Mr Mikolaichik for Hughes Creek planning if appeal is unsuccessful. Landowners do not seem interested.

Jeff

From: suzanne <suzanner1@live.com>
Sent: Monday, October 1, 2018 10:40 AM
To: Jeff Burrows <jburrows@rc.mt.gov>
Subject: Re: OFFER TO RESOLVE the Hughes creek gate issue peacefully.

Hello Jeff,

I call em like I see em. So don't be offended that because you have ruled in the favor of the George Soros money receiving special interest groups that you are free from such comments being made against you. Supporting the very causes endorsed by the NWO and George Soros makes you a culprit. You can still do the right thing, and if you do I will make a public apology.

The facts remain that your decision to force a county roadway ignored all facts presented, and based your opinion of establishing such county road on your presumptions, of which were argued against, but ignored. Your testimony of the placement of the 1900 Alta post office is unethical and also not proven by evidence. This is a conflict of interests and also an invalidation of your quasi court decision. Additionally the admission by Mr Hoffman at the last hearing is quite damning, don't you think? Bias undoubtedly. Without a resolution, you will pay for your crimes.

I have offered you a way to do the right thing, so to save yourself and the landowners the hardships and stresses that are certain if a peaceful solution is not reached. Your position of opening this road to public access is your goal, and our goal is to prevent such action from happening. How can we be expected to work with the county to do anything when the county is continually working against the landowners and not willing to cooperate?

I also find it striking that you now ask for us to invite you through our lands so to prepare for the invasion that you are planning. Yea, all PR as it seems. We will NEVER invite county officials, nor forest service nor special interest groups to come into our lands.

It will be interesting when our suite and investigation into this matter hits you just before the election.

Your refusal to work with us landowners in an honest way means that we will continue to pursue our prosecution of yourself and other county officials.

From: Jeff Burrows <jburrows@rc.mt.gov>
Sent: Monday, October 1, 2018 10:20 AM
To: 'suzanne'
Subject: RE: OFFER TO RESOLVE the Hughes creek gate issue peacefully.

Michael,

I think the commission has shown good faith throughout this process and the last meeting was another example where we delayed the gate removal to allow the landowners to continue to pursue the legal appeal.

The decision that Hughes Creek is a county road, beyond the current gate has been made. We made that decision based on the facts presented in a public meeting. That decision is currently in litigation, as you well know. That decision cannot be revisited.

It was discussed in the meeting that the landowners may be able to file another petition.

I find it hard to believe you are seeking a peaceful solution when you utilize every opportunity to accuse the commission of a dark, secret agenda. This is blatantly false and a lie.

The direction from the commission after the last meeting was to reach out to the landowners and see if we can resolve issues that may arise if the legal appeal is not successful in the Supreme Court.

As you know, there is another meeting scheduled to discuss this issue on January 15th 2019. It was anticipated the appeal would be ruled on by that time.

The question posed to the landowners was: Do you want to meet with the commission and/or forest service to develop a plan in the event your appeal is not successful to the Supreme Court? This plan would help alleviate conflicts between the public and the landowners, again, if the appeal is unsuccessful.

Winter is closing in, and the opportunity for a meeting beyond the gate is quickly closing. Please let me know if the landowners are interested in meeting and who they would allow beyond the gate.

Jeff

From: Suzanne <suzanner1@live.com>
Sent: Friday, September 28, 2018 11:03 PM
To: Jeff Burrows <jburrows@rc.mt.gov>
Subject: Re: OFFER TO RESOLVE the Hughes creek gate issue peacefully.

Hello Jeff,

I have read in the papers that you are stating that you are acting in good faith. Is this true?
If so, I have an offer for you.
Prove your good faith.

Hear an appeal to the commissioners decision concerning the nature of the roadway (public or private).

- If it is proven that the county has a road through my land, I will open the gate.
- If it is shown by the evidence that the 1900 county roadway did not go beyond my gate, then I ask you to do the right thing and give us landowners the peace we deserve and reverse your decision. Let the actual facts show where the county road ends.

This is the easy way to settle this peacefully.

I do not want a political/legal war, but am readying to fight the county in the courts if necessary.

Facts to consider:

1. The county commissioners have done wrong by not having true evidence to back your decision, but used presumption concerning the placement of the 1900 Alta post office, as well as the presumption of the route of the 1900 approved county roadway, then presumed the county road to go through our private lands. We have been challenging you on these things all along but have been continually ignored.
2. You should know well that to try to establish a position without real evidence is misconduct and is illegal, punishable by fines, and possible jail time.
3. Commissioner Hoffman clearly stated that the county held a position in opposition of the landowners as early as in the first hearing. Is that evidence of a lack of good faith by the county, and a conflict of interest? We may soon find out!
4. Your use of the law to try to say that you have no choice to open this roadway is also in error, because without your own decision to deem our land a county roadway, clearly in opposition to facts, the law does not apply. What you are actually saying is that the law applies, because you say that it does. That is not good faith nor honest in any way. Do you not see that?
5. The county's short 10 day notice to us landowners, before the first hearing was inadequate for the landowners to ready a defense.
6. The county's prevention of the landowners, to access county records leading up to and after the second hearing shows a good reason to rehear the evidence of which the landowners were prevented from gathering at that time. To refuse an appeal is evidence of a lack of good faith.
7. A judge in 1993 made judgement that the county did not have evidence to show that there was a county road through our lands. The commissioners have ignored this ruling completely.
8. The county cherrypicked evidence, many times incomplete and out of context, so to prove their position. This is a violation of ethics and demonstrates a clear attempt to defraud. In the 9/18 hearing, just a week ago, the county attorney stated that one piece of evidence to demonstrate the county easement across my land is the 1982 commissioner decision, but he failed to recognize that this decision was overruled by a judge in 1993, and made void. Another attempt to defraud? Our attempts to argue against this have been ignored.
9. Statements by commissioners to demean the landowners by stating that we do not want to work with the county is a fraud. We have been peacefully trying to work this out, but there is no middle ground in this issue, either the gate remains or it is out. So by stating that we landowners are not willing to cooperate or work with the county is not valid, because the county has not been willing to work with evidence, truth nor the landowners, not in any way.

There is much more that I could add to this list.

We do have all of the evidence to show clearly that every claim that I have made here is true, factual and based on evidence.

Do you really want to go down the rabbit hole and see how deep you have dug yourself in, or do you want peaceful solution to this matter, once and for all? Your choice. We landowners are readying either way.

By the way, I am forwarding this email to every news/ source that I can contact, so to show our good faith, publicly.

Do you have the same good faith?

L. M. Mikolaichik