

Schroader, Kathy



From Tilton, Rebecca
Sent Thursday, September 10, 2015 8 39 AM
To Madore, David, Stewart, Jeanne, Mielke, Tom, Silliman, Peter, Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy
Subject Comments RE Comp Plan Update (9/8/15 BOCC Hearing)
Attachments Sydney Reisbeck_090815 pdf

The attached written testimony was received from Sydney Reisbick during the public comment portion of the 9/08/15 BOCC hearing

Thank you,
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Council
Board of County Councilors
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE 360-397-2232, ext 4305 | E-MAIL Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov

9/8 Rec'd by BOCC
CCUd = Orjako
Schroeder

Board of County Councilors
Community Planning Staff
1300 Franklin St
Vancouver WA 98660
For Comprehensive Plan Record

Sydney Reisbick (personal hat)
PO Box 339
Ridgefield, WA 98642
9/8/15

For the 9/8/15 BOCC Hearing, citizen comment period
Input on the Comprehensive Plan process re the Goals of the Growth
Management Act (GMW) related to the proposed Alternatives for the
Comprehensive Plan

Alternative 1 is my preferred Alternative for many reasons I will only cover
one today, as it relates to one Goal of the Growth Management Act

Goal (8) Natural Resource Industries

Maintain and enhance natural resource-based industries, including
productive timber, agriculture and fisheries industries Encourage the
conservation of productive forestlands (read soils) and productive
agricultural lands (read soils), and discourage incompatible uses For Clark
County, this also includes mineral lands, such as gravel mines

I will start with mineral lands, because that makes a good example of the
problems that occur when "discouragement of incompatible uses" has failed
There was opposition to the houses on Livingston Mountain, right on the
borders of the mining resource, but the developers and property rights
people won There is now an unfortunate conflict between houses and gravel
mining, both mining operations and gravel trucks Frustration and misery
abound There are reasons for protecting resource lands from encroachment
by incompatible uses (This does not mean that I agree with law-breaking
mining operations and law-breaking trucks)

The same is true of forestry There is noise and there are trucks A rural
buffer between the active timberlands and houses is important to "quality of
life" for both forests and houses Houses scattered in forest also increase
danger of forest fire, which does not protect the forestland If a wildfire
should occur because of a house resident, the forester is not protected from
an increase in fire insurance rates and the ratepayer for fire fighting is not
protected Houses do not enhance the forestlands

The same is true of agriculture, which makes noise early in the morning, puts smells in different directions, depending on the wind, and takes large machines over the roads. Surrounding the farm with houses sets up untenable tension and the farmer stays farming only while he can put up with the complaining. The "right to farm" helps, but the best solution is to give the farm a mostly undeveloped rural land buffer.

Alternative 1 leaves the minimally developed rural buffers on the resource lands. Alternative 4 does not.

That is how one goal of the GMA is affected by two of the Alternatives.

Thank you for allowing my input.

Sydney Reibick