

EDITORIAL: Letter to the Editor of *The Valley Review*
(posted on the ittakesgrit.org's discussion forum Oct. 4, 2003)

Note: We have placed a copy on our front page of Mr. Dick's editorial to Editor Brady Boucher, and also provided future links to it on our Editorial page and on John Dick's election page. We have edited it only for spelling and punctuation, although we have provided clarifying explanations of some of Mr. Dick's statements, based on personal knowledge.

Following the previous issue of the Review, after it seemed clear -- even to the most woefully uninformed in Sultan -- that this paper was tagging along in its predecessor's footsteps, we were going to write a critique on our own website about this paper's increasingly (and transparent) biased nature but thought we'd wait for one more issue to be published. There were two reasons for that: (1) Contrary to first-hand knowledge of the injurious purpose of the "news" that has previously been published by Kenton Coy, Derek (Boucher) Boyd and Brady Boucher -- and, yes, even Dusty Boucher too, I'm sorry to say -- in its various shape-shifting forms, I felt it necessary to give the paper more time by which to prove itself as a "legitimate" newspaper (there is, after all, a need for such a vehicle here); and (2) With each succeeding issue, it will increasingly damn itself for what it is: "Nothing But The Voice For More of What Sultan's Has Already Had Too Much Of," which is, of course, a bad boy, me-first, if-it's-free-I'll-take-three-monopoly, that will go out of business as soon as its goal is accomplished: To get C. H. Rowe, Derek Boyd and Jim Flower elected to council.

CANDIDATE JOHN DICK'S LETTER TO THE EDITOR:

"Posted by John Dick on 14:52:53 10/4/2003 from 67.75.208.207:

This is a letter to Baby B@%&*er. I am posting it here [on our website] because I do not know if he has the guts to print it in his paper. Lies must be stopped, and rumors cannot spread. Sometimes the truth hurts, but lies cost you.

Dear editor,

Your last few papers have been very interesting. The few news stories you produce are quite colorful. I must, however, respond to your political statements in your non-political paper from October 3, 2003. I never said Sultan had backdoor dealings within their politics. Nor did I say "Dirty Politics". Those are your words, not mine, and I do not need to be quoted on something I did not say. I was disappointed by the Sportsman's Club not using the donation I so generously gave to them for the good causes they support. True. I was not angry. You see I do not get mad until someone lies. If you have proof they sold it I would like to see it because it would be foolish for someone to buy something and not use it. It was a gift certificate for meat and I have yet to see it come back to my store.

As for being a supporter of Proposition 1, you're right. Was it to take the voters rights away? You lied. You see, once again Mr. Boucher you failed as a reporter because you did not do your homework. NO ONE CAN TAKE YOUR RIGHT TO VOTE AWAY. Except oneself. Prop. 1 was a chance for a new direction for this city. A chance to get Sultan out of the headlines of trash and into the spotlight for the future. It failed at the polls, by very little, you're correct. But it made a difference in a small way in the accountability of our elected officials.

The development you mentioned that I fought against -- and will continue to fight against with all my neighbors -- is a 20-unit condo sandwiched between several houses right next to our High School. Once again, you failed as a reporter. The property as it sits now is only 1.9 acres. To build a 20-unit condo you need 2.0 acres of land. That is why there are currently three law suits filed to take land from three of my neighbors to get the "legal" building lot size. Now that is news, seeing how law suits and the judicial system are two things you do not seem to like. [It is owned by the same people](#) who are building affordable housing duplexes all over town, including the one four to five feet from a

house on Alder. It is not pretty and the owner of the existing home can't even use the bathroom without being "peeped" in on by the builders. I agree with Mr. Boyd: Property rights are important! But I would include myself and other homeowners as property owners also.

I do not own any property other than what my house sits on. It is a neighborhood. I have a right, property rights, to keep it just that. A peaceful, safe place to raise my family. I did not buy a house in an industrial area and I will not allow my home or any other property owner's home to be destroyed by greed.

As for the children. How many do you have? I have five. They are all Dicks and they are not ashamed of their name. In fact, I come from a family of Dicks and we can all laugh and joke. Something it seems you cannot do. If your mind wants to make my family name something other than what it is, then BOUCHER YOU XXX and the next time a member of your family wants to call an area of this city "rape trail," think of the kids then.

Mr. Hill is his own man. He made a choice. He had time to think. He changed his mind. Life went on. You are right. I wrote it, but he signed it. Mr. Hill also said to me he never endorsed Mr. Flower either. But your paper reported he did. WHY? By the way, [who wrote his statement in](#) the voter's pamphlet and the one read at the chamber's forum? Please answer, even though I already know. It would be the right thing to do, to let everyone know the "truth". Hey, wasn't the "truth" the name of the group that was against Prop. 1? Did you support the "truth"? If you did, then you should print it, or at least get the facts.

Here's a scoop for you, and it is a fact and the truth and you may quote me on this: "I will represent all of the people in Sultan, including you, as a city council member whether they vote or not." And if they do vote, I hope they live in town because I don't want a coin toss. I will not let lies and greed go unchallenged and I will stand up and fight for every neighborhood in this city if their quality of life is on the line.

John Dick"

G.R.I.T. NOTES:

(1) The lawsuit to gain land to build the 20-unit condo was filed by Ray and Kay George, Sultan real estate agents/developers. (See our Land Use Page for details).

(2) I have spoken with two knowledgeable sources recently who said that Councilman Dusty Boucher wrote Richard Hill's statements published in all public venues.

Further....even though Mr. Dick did not mention it, perhaps Mr. B. Boucher would explain why:

1. He's been deifying Mayor Rowe in several recent articles, with barely a mention of Candidate Tolson;
2. printed perfectly detestable photos of Tolson and Dick, side-by-side with flattering photos of Rowe and Flower;
3. has yet to print the responses by Candidates Dick, Opsal and Tolson to the *Valley Review's* candidate questionnaire;
4. printed purported word-for-word "interviews" with his brother, Candidate Derek (Boucher) Boyd and Mayor C. H. Rowe, the veracity of both highly questionable, at least; and
5. purposefully made his brother Derek Boyd look good in a so-called "interview," while Boyd's opponent Scott Opsal was denigrated by urging him to be "very brief" in his responses. (We interviewed Mr. Opsal this morning, October 5, 2003. We'll be using a *real* recorder and taking the time to do a *real* word-for-word transcription. Moreover, we'll be happy to provide a voice copy of that interview to "prove" its authenticity, something Editor Boucher refused to do.)

**PREVIOUS COMMUNICATIONS OF INTEREST SENT TO
VALLEY REVIEW EDITOR BOUCHER**

Sent to Editor Brady Boucher, 4:38 a.m., August 15, 2003 - SUBJECT: Dick/Flower race:

"Dear Brady,

I (finally) picked up the latest paper and was disappointed at the manner in which you covered the Dick/Flower/Hill race. I happen to know for a fact that John was out of town. Additionally, I spoke to him earlier this week and he told me you only left a single message on his answering machine.

I can appreciate that deadlines cause unavoidable problems, and have fallen "victim" to them myself. However, your avoidance of running info on John will give you an excellent opportunity to make a public apology for your incomplete reporting and run a story on the results of your face-to-face interview with him. If you do not, you will have pretty well plopped yourself and your paper forever into the "bird cage liner" category, along with your predecessor. Believe it or not, I for one would like to see a reputable local paper that truly covers all issues -- especially those I never seem to have time for -- succeed. And, despite Derek's perceived, almost-militant stupidity, and this most-recent kind of "reporting," I believe your paper is a firm step above Kenton's and would like to see you make a go of it.

I urge you to do the right thing, Brady, and do an objective story of John. Despite any political differences, he now deserves that, based on the way you portrayed him in your most recent issue.
Loretta"

Sent to Editor Brady Boucher, Sept. 26, 2003, 7: 36 a.m.

Brady never responded to the below email. However, I did have two detailed conversations with Candidate Jim Flower on this subject later that same day. I also had a conversation (in three different segments) with Richard Hill late that afternoon. Our position was that we would remove his endorsement of Mr. Dick that appeared on our website as soon as the *Valley Review* printed a retraction of their false article quoting Hill's endorsement of Jim Flower. Mr. Hill told me during our conversation that he made no such endorsement of Mr. Flower, and that Brady had written both the quote and the article.

"Dear Brady,

I am requesting to either meet with you, or ask that you call me (360-793-6683) to discuss Richard Hill's rather eloquent endorsement of Jim Flower that was printed in your most recent issue. This endorsement was printed as a direct word-for-word quote from Mr. Hill, as follows: *'Jim Flower is clearly the stronger choice for Sultan in the race for Position #5. He has the common-sense approach our community needs right now. I like his platform and find myself agreeing with a great deal of what he says. I am urging my supporters in the Primary Election to now support Jim Flower in the upcoming November election. He's clearly the best choice.'*

I am perplexed, since, as you know if you have read my front page this morning, Mr. Hill has asked me to remove his written endorsement of Mr. Dick as council candidate for Position 5 from my website.

I received the following transcription on our answering machine last evening from Mr. Hill:

'Hi. Miss, Miss Loretta Storm, this is Richard Hill. I was just calling to let you know I understand you put the piece about John Dick in your system. I'd, I'd apprecia--I'd appreciate this very much if you can pull that from, pull it from the system, because I've basically talked to both candidates and I am stating right now that I am going to be staying neutral with this, that I'm not going to endorse nobody here. I just want to stay out of it, you know. So I really would appreciate if you could pull that, pull that away from your system. Pull it out, I mean, I mean, cause, you know, I don't want to be showing, playing favorites with anybody. So if you could do that for me, I'd appreciate it. I'm at home, so you want to talk, want to talk to me, I'll be home, 799-xxxx. [phone number withheld]. Bye.' [recorded machine voice saying: 'Thursday, 7:39 PM. End of Messages.' (in reality, the time of the message was really 8:39 PM, due to an incorrect time setting on our machine.)]

I am understandably reluctant to either remove or retain Mr. Hill's endorsement of Mr. Dick until I can speak with those directly involved and get to the bottom of this whirlwind turn-around.

In addition to yourself, I am also going to attempt to speak with Mr. Hill today (his message came in last night after we had retired) in the hope of scheduling some face time with him.

I believe the people of Sultan deserve to know the true story of what has happened here. I look forward to speaking with you.

Loretta Storm
360-793-6683"