

From: [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
To: [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#); bellaj1018@gmail.com
Cc: [Bart Catching](#); [Jose Alvarez](#); [Oliver Oriako](#)
Subject: RE: Comprehensive Plan Update Comments
Date: Wednesday, November 6, 2024 1:53:38 PM

Good day, Jessica,

Thank you for your comments concerning the Surface Mine Overlay application process, as relates to the Land Use Alternatives to be studied in the DEIS.

I have forwarded your concerns to staff and will enter your comments into the Comprehensive Plan Index of Record. These will also be brought to the attention of the Planning Commission ahead of the Hearing tomorrow, Nov. 7.

Regards,

Jeff Delapena

From: Clark County <webteam@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, November 6, 2024 1:27 PM
To: Cnty 2025 Comp Plan <comp.plan@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Comprehensive Plan Update Comments

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



Submitted on Wed, 11/06/2024 - 1:27 PM

First Name

Jessica

Last Name

Becker

Email Address

bellaj1018@gmail.com

Address

Yacolt, Washington. 98675

Message Subject

Do not include SMO site specific requests in any 2025 update alternatives

Parcel Number

247859000, 247858000, 247860000, and 247849000

Comments

Hello,

There have been at least 26 public comments against a 2025 update site specific application to add a surface mining overlay on Deer Drive. I have not seen any comments in favor of this. The county commissioned a mineral lands task force for the last comprehensive update. During that process, SMOs were added. It is my understanding that there are still SMO properties that have not even had a permit application for mining. If the county truly is in need of minerals and aggregate for building, shouldn't those lands be first for mining? In addition, a precedent was set 10 years ago when the task force was developed. No mining overlays should be added through the 2025 update without extensive research, public engagement, and clear evidence that those minerals are needed.

Specific to the SMO site specific application on Deer Drive, the previous minerals task force deemed that a SMO on land that affected the East Fork Lewis River should be removed due to environmental impacts. That also sets a precedent. In addition to the grave environmental impacts of a mine just above Sunset Falls Road, there are also negative implications on the quality of life of adjacent homeowners, The two lane rural road cannot accommodate gravel trucks. Opening up mining on Deer Drive, adjacent to Weyerhauser land, encourages divestiture of timber land in favor of mining. This would continue to wreak havoc on the area as all of that Weyerhauser land above Sunset Falls Road drains directly into a river that has had millions of dollar spent for its improvement.

The community would like to understand how the council intends to handle these SMO applications outside of the alternative maps being presented to the Planning Commission on 11/7/24. So far, all we have heard is that we aren't talking about this right now and that staff doesn't have the ability to process all them. The fact is, however, that these SMO requests are out there - and they are being made by mineral rights owners and not necessarily property owners.

I request that the Planning Commission take a stand against these SMO site specific requests and remove them from consideration during the 2025 Comp Plan Update. They need to be handled in a way consistent with the way things were handled before - separately, with a task force, with environmental analysis, and with community input.

Thank you,

Jessica Becker

