

Merrill, Hannah

From: zSMP
Subject: RE: SMA/SMP Update - Terminology Denies Beneficial Use March 2013 - Public Comment

From: Karl Spees [REDACTED]
Sent: Thursday, March 21, 2013 8:16 AM
To: zSMPC; Steve Gray; Karl Spees
Subject: SMA/SMP Update - Terminology Denies Beneficial Use March 2013 - Public Comment

Please enter this as a public comment to Clallam County SMA/SMP Update.
kes

SMA/SMP Update - Terminology Denies Beneficial Use March 2013

The contrived language and concepts “Feeder Bluffs” and “(littoral) Drift Cells” deny full beneficial use of shoreline private property.

Established engineering tables give the maximum stable slope for different soil types. Sand (stable slope) would have a more gradual slope than clay. (Many of our bluffs are compacted glacial till.) The configuration of the bluff is critical in the rate of decay, sloughing off. With a grading permit and adequate width of a lot, one could sculpt the corner overburden of a bluff and create a much more stable building location. (The Port Angeles, WA landfill is experiencing this situation.) If the property owner could stabilize the base of the bluff from erosion of water/wave action the property shoreline could be made virtually stable indefinitely.

The idea that the bluff sloughing material is necessary to maintain the profile of the shoreline is fallacious, false science, non-science. ‘Drift Cells’ are overly simplistic models that do not hold up under modest scientific scrutiny. The recent formation of sandbars off the mouth of the Elwha River give testimony to the disproof of this flawed theory/concept. The artificial constructs of ‘Feeder Bluffs’ and ‘Drift Cells’ unnecessarily tie the hands and deny the private property owner from the options of full beneficial use. The artificial constructs ensure that the property cannot be developed maximally or when developed is the structures are subject to the whims/uncertainty of natural erosion. In effect you can build on a bluff but the State will handicap you from protecting it from the ravages of erosion and mother nature. (It is like deny a man or woman the right of owning a firearm for protection from thugs, bandits, or rapists. It makes sense only if you understand the perverse objectives of an all controlling powerful central government.(UN Agenda 21).

The terms/false constructs of “Drift Cells” and “Feeder Bluffs” should be remove. “Drift Cells” and “Feeder Bluffs” by design surreptitiously impair full beneficial use of private property and diminish individual rights. The damage done now will need to be undone later. (The other options is to let governance grow contrary to our State Constitution.)

The SMA/SMP Update is ‘bulldozing’ our individual private property rights. The SMA/SMP Update as imposed from the DoE should not be adopted.

Karl Spees - Student of Natural History and local geomorphology