

Merrill, Hannah

From: earnest spees [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, November 24, 2011 8:17 PM
To: Karl Spees; Merrill, Hannah; zSMP
Subject: Common Sense Alliance on Land Use - Public Comment

Shoreline Advisory Group - Public Comment

This email's path is interesting at minimum. It's content is extremely pertinent to the work we are doing in Clallam County's SMA/SMP Update. The ESEE (Economic, Social, Environmental, Energy Impacts) evaluation is pertinent to our process as are each of the other points. Please enter this comment under the CAPR participant public comment.
Karl Spees - Member of SAC.

--- On **Thu, 6/10/10**, earnest spees [REDACTED] wrote:

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Norman MacLeod **To:** various [REDACTED]
Sent: Wed, June 9, 2010 12:56:31 PM
Subject: FW: What Others Are Saying to the Council

If they can have a thorough public process that includes *all* potentially impacted stakeholder groupings in Portland, why are we not afforded an equal opportunity in our rural counties, to say nothing of our own urban areas?

While I'm not saying that Portland's outcome is what we would want to see in our rural areas, this points out how much more thorough their process was than any we have seen around here.

Norm MacLeod

From: Common Sense Alliance [mailto:info@commonsensealliance.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 09, 2010 10:57 AM
To:
Subject: What Others Are Saying to the Council



Wednesday, 09 June 2010

Vol. 21

Dear Norman,

As we mentioned yesterday in our Newsletter, it is important to communicate with the Council at this time. We thought you might enjoy reading what an Orcas Island supporter wrote on June 8, 2010:

San Juan County Planning Commission

San Juan County Council

Via e-mail: council@sanjuanco.com

Dear Chairs and Members of the Council and Commission:

I am writing as a professional planner with over 25 years experience in land use and environmental planning in Oregon. Ten of those years I spent working on fish and wildlife habitat regulations to preserve, protect, enhance and restore resources in the very urban Portland Metropolitan area. About five years ago we completed this process, a process with a purpose very similar to the purpose for which you are undertaking an update to your Critical Area Ordinance. While the purposes are similar, the resources we want to protect are similar, and the best available science is similar, what is not similar is the process. We did this for an urban area (even more challenging), and we undertook a very thorough, well funded, roundly represented with all interests proportionally at the table multi year amazing

process with incredibly qualified staff and much public involvement.

We spent ten years actively mapping resources, sending the maps out to all local jurisdictions to insure accuracy, and notifying every affected property owner and asking for their input. Our maps were developed with aerial photography and then ground truthed.

For ten years, we had planners, scientists, all the resource agencies, resource and economic experts, and all interest groups, including environmental, business and property owners, around a large table. We based our program on the best available science. We have threatened fish species in our rivers. We are an urban area, with industrial, commercial, residential and river dependent industrial uses along our rivers. What could be worse, you might ask? All our uses, even our residential uses at high density, have much more impact on our resources than the low density mostly residential San Juan Islands uses will ever have, and still we met the standard.

And we did this without making existing uses non-conforming. We did this with an adequate and qualified array of staff planners and resource professionals to manage the project and process without relying on special interest groups to do our work for us. All sides weighed in continuously. We did it cooperatively, such that the end product was not appealed! Now there is a measure of success.

We did it with the economic impacts carefully vetted against the environmental impacts. We did it without setting unreasonable, insensitive uniform one size fits all buffers. The buffers you are considering will constitute a taking, and that will likely lead to a backlash requiring compensation, and/or a reduction in tax rate for lands such as shoreline, which you tax at the higher rates now, but which you may make worthless with 200-300' setbacks. What is the point of owning waterfront view property if you can't see the water from your house?

I am an out of state property owner who looks forward to the day she can live on her land in the islands. By the time that happens, I will have waited many, many years. My land in San Juan County has been in my family for four generations. We

have waited a long time. From what I see you are considering in the way of setbacks alone, the use and enjoyment of my property will be ruined by regulations before I ever get that chance.

I can't be there to fight property rights battles, much less track your process in any meaningful way from afar. Therefore I am writing this letter to encourage you to be as sensitive to your neighbors, your property owners, your taxpayers, as you are endeavoring to be to your resources. Address only the problems you can identify. Don't buckle to outside pressure and large well funded special interests. Stand up to the State; if you don't have the resources to do a good job of this, then don't do it until they provide those resources for you to do so. Certainly don't do it with special interest groups as volunteers.

I urge you to:

1. Rely on local Best Available Science to justify any change to the existing regulations, which would infringe upon the use of my property and my neighbors property. This science must be peer reviewed.
2. Weigh the economic impacts carefully. In Oregon we use an ESEE analysis, balancing Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy consequences of the alternatives we consider. Not a bad idea, even if your State does not require it. Quantify, qualify and understand the economic impacts to your community before making a decision. The tax impacts of devaluing so much property, especially shoreline, could be devastating to your tax base, during these difficult economic times.
3. One size fits all buffers are not scientifically appropriate, they are thoughtless over kill. Build in flexibility to do what is right on a parcel-by-parcel, resource-by-resource basis, with each resource inventoried and ground truthed. This burden should not be left to the property owners who have done nothing wrong to begin with.

4. Clarify what the problem is you are addressing. What is broken that needs to be fixed? Where have we gone so wrong and what impacts have brought all this about? Aren't the Islands and their inhabitants known for environmental stewardship? Isn't that why you live there, because you value what is so near and dear to all of us, visitors, residents and property owners alike?

5. You should only be doing what is minimally necessary to meet the laws of the State. The less you do, the less harm will be done, as you clearly don't have the financial resources to do it well.

Sincerely,

Mary Gibson

PO Box 1790

Lake Oswego, Or. 97035

Common Sense Alliance

P.O. 1249 Friday Harbor, 98250

info@commonsensealliance.net

www.commonsensealliance.net

To ensure our newsletter always reaches your inbox, please add info@commonsensealliance.net to your address book. If you prefer not to receive news from Common Sense Alliance in the future, you can

[Change your subscription](#)

[Unsubscribe](#)

Powered by Joobi

=

