Following comments were submitted online

Parcel No  205384-000

Subject  5 or 10 acres forest

Comments:

RE: Some parts of ALTERNATIVE 4. The most recent updated forestlands map (4c), moving some 40 acre parcels to possible 10 acre minimum is certainly a good step toward fairness and logic. Five acre minimum is preferable in our case.

My family's parcel #205384- was unfairly overlaid with 40 acre minimum by GMA. Because most lands surrounding "Grampa's 100 yr old homestead" on 3 sides had long before been subdivided into 4 or 5 acre rural building lots, our family's remainder of 49 acres was NOT CONGRUENT with the surrounding neighborhood even 20 years ago.

Unfairness. Consequently at our mother's death it could not be divided as her will stipulated among us 3 sisters.

- PRESERVING NATURAL RESOURCES. The SEIS spoke of both forestlands and beautiful timbered VIEWS as valuable natural resources. Even if our 49.5 acres were divided into EIGHT - 6 acre lots and eventually a house built on each (NOT our specific plan) our broad hillside full of oxygen-breathing Douglas fir above Hockinson would still provide habitat for wildlife, and afford a lovely green viewscape for residents and travelers below.

- EASE of STEWARDSHIP. If our lot could be classified as 5 acre minimum, we could each manage our acreage more smoothly for sustainable lumber production. In another generation if a great-grandchild wished to build on 1 acre & keep 5 acres in timber, there would be no damage to the wildlife population, or the hillside views.

Thank you again for the hard work of the staff and elected officials, to give taxpayers additional time to comment. We are glad of the most recent suggested changes.

Submitted by: Donna Andrews

Email: donnaandrews0411@gmail.com

Address

Tukwila, WA