

Summary of Public Comments and Staff Response

“Comment acknowledged” means the staff has read the comment and does not suggest any changes to the proposal based on the comment.

“We agree” means the staff has read the comment, agrees with it, and has recommended changes to the proposal based on the comment.

“We disagree” means the staff has read the comment, disagrees with it, and does not suggest any changes to the proposal based on the comment.

No.	Name and Location	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
1	King County Fire Chiefs, King County	Support the proposal to ban land clearing burning	Comment acknowledged
2	Ron Munro, Woodinville	The cost of hauling debris from a heavily wooded lot is unreasonable. (1 acre rural property). The emissions from the truck to haul the debris cause more air pollution than the burning.	Comment acknowledged. See Appendix C for a comparison of emissions from hauling versus burning.
3	David, Snohomish County	The emissions do not endanger air quality. The cost of hauling debris from a heavily wooded lot is unreasonable.	Comment acknowledged
4	Dennis and Dalene Somerville, Arlington	Need to burn to dispose of storm debris on their 20 acre farm.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
5	Greg and Larry Magone, Auburn	Need to continue to burn as a forest management technique.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
6	Michael Southern, Vaughn	Limit the burn ban to high density areas.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
7	Erin Short, Vaughn	The cost of hauling debris from a heavily wooded lot is unreasonable (20 acre rural	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal

		property).	on residential burning.
8	Connie Renz, Gig Harbor	Not clear where the disposal sites are. Who will enforce this? Support the land clearing ban, but not the residential ban.	Comment acknowledged. The Impact Analysis identified the disposal sites. The ban will be enforced by the agency.
9	Joe Rein, Gig Harbor	Debris that is disregarded could be a fire danger. Concerned that the ban might result in illegal dumping.	Comment acknowledged
10	William Nicholson	Residential burning should be allowed on ½ acre lots or bigger. Allow low density areas to burn more frequently	Comment acknowledged
11	Kip Clinton, Lakebay	It is impractical to dispose of large piles of brush without burning.	Comment acknowledged
12	Ross Bischoff	Burning is a natural process and the CO2 is necessary for plant life.	Comment acknowledged
13	Anonymous	It is not cost effective to impose the ban. There are too many exceptions, so the ban won't be effective.	Comment acknowledged
14	Phyllis Whitford Graham	This will encourage people to remove the trees on their property. The trees help clean the air. People on a fixed income cannot afford to buy a chipper.	Comment acknowledged
15	Alan Roland Graham	Enforce the laws we have on the books.	Comment acknowledged
16	Mike Rasmussen Roy	What works on small parcels will not work on large parcels. Concerned that people will cease maintaining their property if they cannot burn.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
17	Kathy Rasmussen, Roy	Get a handle on garbage burning. Have a once every quarter cleanup.	Comment acknowledged.

18	Michael McGehee Eatonville	Pierce County is zoned rural and the smoke goes in to the mountains. People may choose to leave the debris on the ground where it will become a fire hazard. Large (20 acre) timbered parcels will become a financial liability if people cannot burn. We will use fossil fuels to transport and chip vegetation.	Comment acknowledged.
19	Dennis Daugherty, Graham	Own 20 acres and am against the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
20	Richard Cornelius, Graham	Has a 5 acre parcel and alternatives to burning are not economically feasible.	Comment acknowledged.
21	E.C. Young Gig Harbor	Concerned that there will be illegal dumping because of the high cost of alternatives.	Comment acknowledged.
22	Eileen Young, Gig Harbor	Maintaining acreage requires burning because of the cost of alternatives.	Comment acknowledged
23	Wilfred Stephenson, Roy	Opposed to the burn ban.	Comment acknowledged
24	Deborah and Mike Schultz, Woodinville	Support the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
25	Frank Shirley, Vaughn	Teach people how to burn properly rather than ban burning.	Comment acknowledged
26	John Anderson, Graham	Kapowsin is zoned R-10. The lots are large and can handle the burning.	Comment acknowledged
27	Sheila Sinn, Arlington	Curb side recycling is not available in most rural areas. Snohomish County Solid Waste does not offer a viable alternative to burning. There is none available. On site chipping is extremely expensive and not	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.

		reasonably economical.	
28	Mike Reid, Duvall	Cuttings from fruit trees need to be burned to destroy disease.	Comment acknowledged
29	Maxine Keesling, Woodinville	Curb side recycling is not a reasonable alternative for large amounts of debris from our 24 acres of rural land. Smoke from burning is not harmful if within the federal health standards.	We agree with the comment on curbside recycling and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning. We disagree with the comment that wood smoke is not a health hazard. See the information contained in Appendix A.
30	Pierce County Fire District 16, Lakebay	This proposal will result in lost revenue to the District. There will be an increase in alarm activity due to complaints. This will become a public relations problem for the District because most residents of the Key Peninsula oppose the ban.	Comment acknowledged.
31	Dennis Someville, Arlington	Needs to burn once in the Spring and once in the Fall to get rid of storm debris.	Comment acknowledged.
32	Rolfe Skrinde, Seattle	The greenhouse gas emissions from hauling the debris are greater than for burning.	We disagree with the comment. The comparison of emissions from burning versus hauling is in Appendix C.
33	Eric Russell, Marysville	The emissions from burning are overstated. The half hour travel distances from homes to disposal sites are too far.	We disagree with the comment and stand by the emissions estimates contained in the Impact Analysis.
34	Victor Moreno Snohomish	President of a 116 lot homeowner association with 5 acre lots. Have received many calls from members of the association opposed to the proposal.	Comment acknowledged.

35	Tim Knibbe. Arlington	Has 16 acres and needs to be able to burn fallen trees. Cannot afford the alternatives.	Comment acknowledged.
36	Rich Greenshields Marysville	As a rural landowner, needs to burn downed materials to prevent a fire hazard.	Comment acknowledged
37	Richard and Jean Davis, Arlington	Opposed to the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
38	Kevin Creameans, Arlington	Need to burn blackberries and blow down.	Comment acknowledged
39	Warren Aspden, Arlington	Opposed to the proposal. The Impact Analysis contains a bunch of unproven assertions.	Comment acknowledged
40	Larry Wright, Orting	Own 16 acres. Needs to burn weeds to prevent spread of seeds.	Comment acknowledged. Weed burning would not be restricted by the proposal.
41	A. Loren Kraetz, Arlington	Allow a window for burning or grandfather property owned for 30 years or more. Burning does not contribute to global warming. The trucks will contribute to global warming.	Comment acknowledged
42	Rolfe Skrinde, Seattle	The greenhouse gas emissions from hauling the debris are greater than for burning	We disagree with the comment. The comparison of emissions from burning versus hauling is in Appendix C.
43	Salome Chambers, Snohomish	Limit the ban to dense areas. Live in an area of 5 acre home sites. Little smoke is generated if you burn correctly. Concerned about illegal dumping.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
44	John Tweet, Eatonville	Cost to haul off debris is excessive for landowners with 20 acres. Cost is more than \$5,000 per acre.	We disagree with the comment. Our estimate of costs for burning versus hauling is contained in Appendix C.
45	M. Neumann	Address the big brush piles burned by	Comment acknowledged

		developers, not the cleanup by rural landowners.	
46	Vern Hollo	Have a small tree farm and need to burn to keep it cleaned up.	Comment acknowledged. Commercial tree farms are not affected by this proposal.
47	Rolfe Skrinde, Seattle	The greenhouse gas emissions from hauling the debris are greater than for burning	We disagree with the comment. The comparison of emissions from burning versus hauling is in Appendix C.
48	Fred Dockendorf	Need to burn to dispose of storm debris and cannot afford disposal cost.	Comment acknowledged.
49	Vince Burton, Arlington	Burning is crucial to maintaining rural property. There is a large amount of storm debris each winter that cannot be reasonably handled other ways.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
50	Ron Munro, Woodinville	The costs of the alternatives are much more expensive than burning. The alternate methods all involve putting more vehicles on rural roads. It will shift the air pollution from burning to the trucks. It will result in illegal dumping or burning.	Comment acknowledged. The comparison of emissions is found in Appendix C.
51	Myrna Lopas and Lee Van Dusen, Eatonville	The cost and the physical effort to remove vegetation is too expensive. If vegetation is left in place it becomes a home for rodents and a fire hazard.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
52	Ed Adrian, Lake Stevens	Lives on 7 acres and needs to burn to dispose of storm debris.	Comment acknowledged.
53	Laura Galbato, Carnation	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
54	Sharon Shadbolt,	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged

	Mason County		
55	Jack Brett, North Bend	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
56	Jackie Irwin, Snohomish County	Should treat rural homeowners and developers differently. Try to recycle as much as possible, but have too much material and need to burn 5 times a year. The use of fossil fuels also pollutes the environment too.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
57	Robert Elliot	Burn ban on woody debris is nonsense. Enforce the current laws.	Comment acknowledged
58	Jim Peterson, Granite Falls	Telling someone they can't burn brush, but can have a recreational fire pit is stupid.	Comment acknowledged.
59	Robert Kajca	The alternatives to burning all cost money.	Comment acknowledged.
60	Pete Porzuczek	Occasional burning in rural areas is not a problem.	Comment acknowledged.
61	Bernard and Susan Wright, Issaquah	Live on 3 acres and compost, but curbside is not practical for the quantity of brush we clean up.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
62	Mark Aberle, North Bend	Rent a chipper twice a year, but still need to burn once a year to clean up debris.	Comment acknowledged.
63	Larry Lorack, Carnation	The options are not as plentiful or convenient as the staff imply.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
64	M. Lowe, Winnebago County Illinois	Imposed a similar ban in Winnebago County, Illinois that was later reversed.	Comment acknowledged.
65	Arie van der Hoeven and Yuki Ito, Redmond	Cannot keep the debris around our home "Firewise" without the ability to easily dispose of dry branches and downed trees by burning.	Comment acknowledged.

66	David and Betty Burton	Those in the rural areas with hundreds of trees, there is no reasonable way to dispose of the debris other than burning.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
67	Ted Wolfe, King County	Make these rules apply only to areas with 1 house per acre or smaller.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
68	Anonymous	More mandates to follow without concrete evidence.	Comment acknowledged.
69	Arie van der Hoeven and Yuki Ito, Redmond	Curbside pickup is 500 yard away from our house and there is no way we could dispose of the downed branches from a 5.5 acre property using curbside.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
70	Craig Lynd	Out in the rural areas we don't have curbsides for curbside pickup.	Comment acknowledged.
71	Anonymous, King County	Proposal is over the top.	Comment acknowledged.
72	James Hammond, Cumberland	Focus on illegal dumping.	Comment acknowledged.
73	Ed Hartmann	Supports proposal	Comment acknowledged
74	Don and Lynda Dorgan, May Valley	Try to compost, but cannot dispose of all the debris on large properties (greater than 1 acre).	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
75	Julie Valvano, Redmond	Supports proposal	Comment acknowledged
76	Matt Cowan, Snoqualmie Pass Fire and Rescue	Reasonable alternatives are not practical in Snoqualmie Pass area.	Comment acknowledged.
77	Karyn Davies, Orting	The cost of transporting yard debris would create a hardship for many who don't have access to trucks or trailers..	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
78	Dennis Myers	Live on 5 acres. Would create a hardship.	Comment acknowledged.

79	Terri Benson, Shoreline	It is better to burn than to drive and throw the materials in to a landfill.	We disagree with the comment. The comparison of emissions from burning versus hauling is in Appendix C.
80	Scott Orton	Need to stop pollution from China where all the pollution comes from. The proposal is unaffordable.	Comment acknowledged.
81	Heather Robinson, Granite Falls	Supports proposal	Comment acknowledged
82	Howard Lucus, Arlington	Live in rural Snohomish County. Burn ban makes sense in areas of high population density, not rural areas. Need to burn because of large amount of debris from storms.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
83	Peter Middleton	Have a chipper, but still need to burn to get rid of diseased vegetation. There isn't much burning anyway, so the current system is not broken.	Comment acknowledged.
84	D. King, Graham	Need to burn to dispose of limbs and prevent a fire hazard.	Comment acknowledged.
85	G. Pellici	This is a bad idea. What people do on their property is their own business.	Comment acknowledged.
86	Daniel Brown, Redmond	Live on 5 acres and try to properly manage it. Burning is the only reasonable option.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
87	Greg Magone, Auburn	Writing a forest stewardship plan and want to burn to build a house on a 30 acre parcel.	We contacted Mr. Magone and let him know that if this proposal was adopted he would not be allowed to burn to clear the home site.
88	Vance McLane, Snohomish	Cost of hauling to a composting facility is excessive compared to the cost of burning.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal

			on residential burning.
89	Mike Rasmussen, Roy	Concerned that since the alternatives to burning are excessively expensive, the rural landowners will let their property go.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
90	Dan Wenceslao, Stanwood	Not convinced that there is a scientific rationale for the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
91	Rae Stephenson, Bothell	Supports the proposal	Comment acknowledged
92	Tracy Sisk, Marysville	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
93	Patti McQuillin, Gig Harbor	Wants to be a good steward of the land, but needs to do a certain amount of burning to manage the debris and the invasive plants.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
94	Joann, Spanaway	Go after the big sources like aircraft and diesel.	Comment acknowledged
95	Robert Matney, Edgewood	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
96	Paul Hansen	Proposal is ridiculous and stupid.	Comment acknowledged
97	Sharon Marsland, Vashon	Supports the proposal	Comment acknowledged
98	Hal Buttery, Granite Falls	Supports the proposal	Comment acknowledged
99	Arie van der Hoeven and Yuki Ito, Redmond	Skeptical about the CO2 reductions from the proposal. CO2 from trees and woody debris eventually release through burning or decomposition. Costs need to be shared if homeowners are not allowed to burn.	Comment acknowledged.
100	Dennis and Donna Neuzil, Clyde Hill	Support the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
101	Robert Loiselle,	Do not believe that there are viable	Comment acknowledged.

	Roy	alternatives to burning in rural Pierce County. Regulations will impose severe financial burdens with no net environmental benefit.	
102	Mike McGarry, Gig Harbor	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
103	Anonymous, King County	Live on acreage in rural King County, have 3-4 small fires per year, and use the ashes to enrich the soil.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
104	Gretchen Browne, King County	Live on 5 acres and recycle, but need to burn to clean up storm debris that will not fit in a recycling container.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
105	Dick Hook, Pierce County	Land clearing burn ban will make new homes less affordable.	Comment acknowledged.
106	Kim Barrow	Are backyard fireplaces considered campfires? Is thinning your trees and burning the branches considered “silvicultural”?	We responded to Ms. Barrow that backyard fireplaces are “recreational fires” and are not included in this proposal. We also let her know that burning branches is not “silvicultural” and would be included in the ban.
107	Peter Tang, Snohomish County	Should increase the allowable size of “recreational fires”. Current laws are not enforced.	Comment acknowledged.
108	Pierce County Fire Chiefs Assn, Pierce County	Supports the land clearing ban.	Comment acknowledged
109	Steve Albright, Woodinville	For homeowners with heavily treed property curb side is not practical. Hauling to recycling dump site is only an option if you own the equipment to cut, move, and haul tons of material	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.

110	Kim Foster, Fox Island	Not a practical option for Fox or Anderson Islands. These are rural islands with larger parcels.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
111	Peter Lamanna, King County	Proposal will significantly increase the cost of maintaining rural property.	Comment acknowledged
112	Bob Sargent, Rainier Wood Recycling	Estimated cost of recycling versus burning for a home where ½ acre is cleared.	Comment acknowledged
113	Chuck West, Key Peninsula Fire Dept	Concerned that Pierce County Solid Waste cannot handle the existing load of yard waste.	We sent Chief West the list of recycling facilities in Pierce County that informed the agency that they can handle additional wood waste. We agree with the concern about residential yard waste compost capacity in Pierce County.
114	Margo Gooding, Roy	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
115	Glenn and Sheryl Charvat, Woodinville	Support the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
116	Calvin Palmer, Orting	Disagree that the alternatives are a reasonable option for small wood lot owners.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
117	Chuck West, Key Peninsula Fire Dept	Questioned the capacity of wood waste recyclers to handle additional debris.	We sent Chief West the list of recycling facilities in Pierce County that informed the agency that they can handle additional wood waste. We agree with the concern about residential yard waste compost capacity in Pierce County.
118	June Eva Peoples, Redmond	Generates far more branches and waste from wind storms than yard waste can accommodate.	Comment acknowledged.
119	Bill,	Stop imposing urban rules on rural	Comment acknowledged.

	King County	homeowners.	
120	Maxine Herbert-Hill, Puyallup	More efficient to burn. Consider the carbon balance of burning on site versus hauling it off.	Comment acknowledged. Appendix C contains our estimates of the relative emissions from burning versus trucking.
121	Vicki Jans, Arlington	Only burn a few times and would like to see it continue. Find a better way.	Comment acknowledged
122	Peter Smiley, Everett	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
123	Phil Reimer, Maple Valley	Live in Maple Valley on 6 acres. Need to clean up branches that are a fire hazard. Leave the rule as it is.	Comment acknowledged
124	Ted Barker	People lining on acreage in rural areas should not be subject to the same rules as someone living in the confines of a city lot.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
125	Darrel Stuver, Redmond	Live in an area with many large trees. Recycle as much as possible, but still need to burn a few times to clean up debris.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
126	Sally Neumeyer, King County	Need to give the rural folks a break.	Comment acknowledged
127	Mike Reid	There are too many exceptions to make this practical. Research is flawed about what is a reasonable alternative.	Comment acknowledged
128	Robert Rogland, Carnation	Ban would not make a difference in air quality.	Comment acknowledged
129	Deborah and Mike Shultz, Woodinville	Support the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
130	Michael Gaines	Need to address disposal of weed plants and disposal of small diameter material without the use of chippers that contribute greenhouse gases. Need to have a	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.

		reasonable cost collection system for rural areas.	
131	Gene and Jeannette Bolland	Just because there are alternatives does not mean they are practical. Wood smoke in the normal concentrations Is not a health problem.	We agree with the first comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning. We disagree with the second comment. Please refer to the documents from the Washington State Departments of Health and Ecology regarding the health effects of wood smoke in Appendix A.
132	Pat Collier, Vashon Island	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
133	Jim Seiber, Fall City	Hauling to disposal site will result in burning fossil fuels. Should continue to allow responsible burning.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
134	Sally Abbey and Maxine Tuerk, Snohomish	Growth Management Act requires that the character of rural areas be preserved.	Comment acknowledged
135	Nancy McFarland, Redmond	Need to clean up branches every year. Curbside is not feasible, dragging material to the street is not feasible, and hiring out is expensive.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
136	Mark Watland	Need to dispose of windfall by burning. Gas powered chippers create carbon monoxide.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
137	Paul Quast	Air quality in my area is good. There is no reason to further restrict burning.	Comment acknowledged
138	Robert Pollak, Gig Harbor	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
139	K. Pollak	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
140	Robert Pollak	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged

141	John Tweet	The cost to haul the debris away is an additional \$5,000 per acre.	We disagree with this comment. Our cost estimates are contained in Appendix C.
142	Dora Tam	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
143	Anonymous	Low income people cannot afford to have yard waste picked up.	Comment acknowledged
144	Judy Benton, Ravensdale	Small landowners will be inconvenienced by the ban.	Comment acknowledged
145	Jeanne Hannah	Burn material that is too heavy to load in the pickup. Should be able to burn a couple of times a year.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
146	Lynda McMaken	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
147	Linda Holmly	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
148	Martin Robinett, Everett	The alternatives are not reasonable for land clearing. It can cost 3 to 10 times more to grind than to burn. Not enough companies doing grinding in Snohomish County. It will only increase housing costs at a time when property values are devaluing.	We disagree with this comment. Our cost estimates are contained in Appendix C. We identified 10 companies in Snohomish County that recycle land clearing debris.
149	Elaine Willey	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
150	Ole Una, Palmer	Concerned that if large parcels within the King County forest protection area are not allowed to burn, the debris will pile up and it will become a fire hazard.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
151	Gary Nealis, Redmond	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
152	Linda Rucinski, Snohomish County	For land owners with 5 acre parcels who have retained much of their forest, the alternatives are very costly or time prohibitive.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.

153	Chief Lemon, Maple Valley Fire and Life Safety	Main concern of the commissioners is the “policing” of the residential burn ban.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
154	David Vander Pol, Auburn	Current burn ban has done its job. Rural people will have to expend large amounts of energy to truck their debris.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
155	Dennis Krisman	Recreational burning needs to be restricted as well.	Comment acknowledged
156	Jim Bozich, Gig Harbor	Need to burn the large amount of debris from his 10 acre parcel. The alternatives all use fossil fuels to haul it or grind it.	Comment acknowledged.
157	Dennis and Kathryn Meyers	Have acreage and just maintaining the limbs will cost lots of time and money.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
158	Dawn Aspden	Hauling the debris is worse for the environment than burning.	Comment acknowledged
159	Roy Johnson	Have 22 acres in Snohomish County. Not convinced that the air quality improvements justify the cost of the alternatives.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
160	Dirk van Veen, Duvall	Have a 5 acre parcel and bringing in heavy equipment to remove the debris would do damage to the property.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
161	Sara Van Fleet, Vashon Island	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
162	Sally Abbey and Maxine Tuerk	The owners of properties 5 acres or larger would need dump trucks to remove the vegetation. This is neither reasonable nor economical.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
163	Vern Stieben, Gig Harbor	Make a distinction between developers and individuals burning on their own land. Give	We disagree with this comment. Our cost estimates are contained in

		special consideration for an individual land owner who clears land to build their house.	Appendix C.
164	Rose McKay, Everett	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
165	Geoff & Debbie Fischer, Maple Valley	A burn ban would be ridiculous for those with acreage. The amount of debris we burn would require a large professional chipper or contract it out.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
166	Eric Fisher, Bothell	Please reconsider, it only accounts for 6% of the pollutants. You can't just take this away from people because of "nuisance".	Comment acknowledged.
167	Gary Reiersgard, Lake Stevens	The agency does not understand. Burning and smoke from it rarely affected anyone directly. Use common sense and distinguish between major land clearing and household burning.	Comment acknowledged.
168	Chief Rick Hjelle, Snohomish County Fire District 17	The proposal will increase the burden on local Fire Districts. Air quality is only an issue in rural areas during air stagnations. Better regulate, educate and enforce the burning permit system based on proximity to neighbors.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
169	Ron Adams, Stanwood	Live on 5 acres north of Stanwood. Have a wood chipper and it helps, but still need to burn larger pieces. Cannot reasonably transport to a disposal site.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
170	Karen Burzlaff, Marysville	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
171	Holly Powers, Arlington	Burn tree limbs and debris from storms and am against the proposal.	Comment acknowledged.

172	Susan Rusch, King County	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
173	Don Campbell, Tulalip	Opposed to the proposal.	Comment acknowledged.
174	Bobbe Alf, Stanwood	Live on a 10 acre horse farm and have lots of debris from windstorms. If unable to burn the farm will have lots of brush piles.	Comment acknowledged
175	Jennifer and Todd Smith, Snohomish County	Support the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
176	Steve and Marlene Routt, Arlington	Chipping, hauling, processing the waste is use of another fuel, which may pollute and cost more in the end.	Comment acknowledged
177	Nancy Dean, Stanwood	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
178	Ken & Joanne Morrison, Snohomish	Proposal poses a hardship on the rural population which outweighs the cut in emissions.	Comment acknowledged
179	Gene Wheeler, Arlington	Rural residents cannot afford the expense of cleaning up the huge mess a wind storm creates. It is impractical for rural landowners.	Comment acknowledged
180	Jay Sullivan, Snohomish County	Temporary burn bans are sufficient.	Comment acknowledged
181	Cliff Ruthrauff, Edmonds	The wind storm debris is going to burn one way or another. Better to burn it in a controlled manner than to have it burn like California.	Comment acknowledged
182	Larry Powers, Pasco	The agency is worthless.	Comment acknowledged
183	Daniel Eakin,	The reason given for the ban is that some	Comment acknowledged

	Snohomish County	people with breathing problems don't like it when someone burns outside. The rights of the few should not outweigh the rights of the many.	
184	Michael Andreoni	Supports proposal.	Comment acknowledged
185	Wendy Dowell, Arlington	We have 6.5 acres and the clean up after wind storms require us to burn branches at times. Hauling the debris in a truck is expensive.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
186	Larry Bradford	Giving the developers only 6 months notice is not fair.	We disagree with this comment. We have been in discussion with the development community about this proposal for over 2 years.
187	Jonathan & Sharon Ward, Lake Stevens	Impact on some people's lifestyles far outweighs the minimal positive impact.	Comment acknowledged.
188	Barb Wilson, Snohomish County	Opposes the proposal. Not clear that the motor vehicle emissions from trucking to the disposal site is the lesser of two evils.	Comment acknowledged.
189	Carram Bohag, Monroe	Own 7.3 acres. The proposal would create a considerable financial hardship. Do not own a vehicle that could transport the waste.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
190	Bob Berget	Not consistent with the needs of the population in rural areas. Continue to allow country burning on acreage.	Comment acknowledged.
191	Al Bernardy, Snohomish County	Live on 2.5 acres and need to burn once a year to get rid of branches and blackberry vines. Taking the debris to the dump is time consuming and expensive.	Comment acknowledged.
192	Bill Hebner, Arlington	Owns a mostly wooded 8 acre farm. Try to recycle as much as possible, but not able to	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal

		handle all the material that is produced each year.	on residential burning.
193	Fred Owyen, N. Lakewood	Ban seems to be about pacifying people who moved to the country from urban areas.	Comment acknowledged.
194	Wade Erickson	This is the few trying to control the many.	Comment acknowledged.
195	Kelly Chambers, Snohomish	There will be debris dumped on public lands.	Comment acknowledged.
196	Catherine Carpenter, Silvana	Have 10 acres but no truck to haul the debris to a waste disposal site. Probably a fire risk to let the debris build up.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
197	Todd and Tina Glover, Marysville	Manage burning rather than ban it. Limit the number of permits.	Comment acknowledged.
198	Ivan Atkins	Recycle as much as possible, but cannot compost all the debris from his property. Does not own a truck to haul the debris.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
199	Anonymous	Supports proposal.	Comment acknowledged
200	Lynn Shebilske, Woodinville	Have large amount of debris from 35 trees. Would take innumerable truck runs to haul the debris which would create motor vehicle emissions.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
201	Terry Helman	Supports proposal.	Comment acknowledged
202	Mike Ashmore	Will be forced to log off his property if the burn ban is enacted.	Comment acknowledged
203	Carol & Gary Geissler, Marysville	Have had problems with their neighbors smoke, but banning burning on properties greater than 2 acres is ridiculous.	Comment acknowledged.
204	William Lider, Lynnwood	Supports proposal.	Comment acknowledged
205	Anonymous	Extend the proposal to Kitsap, Mason, Jefferson, and Clallam Counties.	Comment acknowledged

206	Ed Adrian	No to the burn ban.	Comment acknowledged
207	Sandy Rock	Supports proposal.	Comment acknowledged
208	James Simpson, Kent	The cost of debris removal is extremely prohibitive.	Comment acknowledged
209	Anonymous	Supports proposal.	Comment acknowledged
210	Vic Moreno, Snohomish County	No good reason for the ban. Not feasible to take yard waste to a dump site. Likely to result in illegal dumping.	Comment acknowledged.
211	Travis & Cheri Foglesong, Snohomish County	Proposal is uncalled for. Only burn when weather is favorable.	Comment acknowledged.
212	David and Deborah Luxem, Seattle	Supports proposal.	Comment acknowledged
213	Guy LaRue, Marysville	Supports proposal.	Comment acknowledged
214	Rick Spence, 4 Creeks President Emeritus	This would accomplish nothing. Focus on the motor vehicles.	Comment acknowledged.
215	Beverly Hoback, Arlington	Supports proposal.	Comment acknowledged.
216	Paul Lindberg, Ravensdale	Own 6.5 acres and can barely keep up with the debris. Do not own a truck, so brush would just pile up and become a fire hazard.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
217	Jerry Adam, Maple Valley	Would take many trips to dispose of all the debris. It's a pain to load the truck and drive to the recycler.	Comment acknowledged.
218	Aretta Rowe, Arlington	Live on 5 acres and have lots of downed trees each year.	Comment acknowledged.
219	Jack Rensel, Arlington	Use downed limbs for forest habitat, but there is so much that burning is the only feasible disposal option. Not clear that it will improve air quality.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.

220	Kimberly Curry and Nancy Klein, Maple Valley	Have lots of debris from winter storms. Would take multiple trips (burning fuel) to take it to the compost facility.	Comment acknowledged.
221	Tom Burton, Snohomish	Has 5 acres that was logged in the 50's. Would be very expensive to haul the debris or have equipment come in to chip it.	Comment acknowledged.
222	Connie Faast	Have lots of winter debris. Do not want to fill up landfills.	Comment acknowledged.
223	Thomas Maloney, Snohomish County Fire Marshall	a. Concerned about lack of participation by the building community. b. Need to ensure there are no conflicts between the fire code and the state outdoor burning regulation.	a. We met early in the process with the development community and they had no concerns about the land clearing phase out. b. Comment acknowledged.
224	Mary Lour Vikan, Vaughn	Cannot realistically haul a bin to the curb with large lots. The volume of yard waste is too great for curbside.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
225	Walter Walker, Redmond	Have 10 acres and compost, but cannot compost all the debris that accumulates over the winter.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
226	Eileen Lawrence	Abandon plans for the burn ban.	Comment acknowledged
227	L. Kunish	Support the proposal except we should have included Kitsap and the effective date should be sooner.	Comment acknowledged
228	Carole and Jim Hasselbom, Arlington	Have 3.5 acres and 75 to 100 trees that drop debris during the winter. Chip what we can and burn the big material in the wood stove, but there is too much material to handle on site.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
229	Phyllis McGillivray	Own property that is rural and cannot afford to have the wood debris trucked off.	Comment acknowledged.

230	Sheila Brashear	Need to balance the rights of rural citizens with the few people with allergies that are affected by wood smoke.	Comment acknowledged.
231	Charles Smith, Snohomish County	Own 20 acres and it would take 8 to 15 loads a year to the recycler. Should consider the impact that the truck emissions have, chipping too.	Comment acknowledged.
232	Eric Harris, Renton	Leaving fallen branches in place will create a fire hazard. Lots of debris on rural lots from winter storms. Not reasonable from an economic standpoint to take all of it to a compost facility. Curbside is a joke for large lots.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
233	Jim Sullivan, Snohomish	The proposal is stupid.	Comment acknowledged
234	Pete von Reichbauer, King County Council	Had questions about the impact on agricultural property owners and property owners in RA-5 zoned areas.	We sent an email to Councilmember von Reichbauer letting him know that properties in the RA-5 area would be affected by the proposal, but agricultural operations were not.
235	Cynthia & Kirk Schlemlein	Live on 10 acres and try to model proper stewardship of rural land. Use burning to maintain the pasture free of weeds. Loose 2 large trees a year and have numerous large branches and tree tops that fall during the winter. Try to use the larger pieces for wood heat, but the amount of material is too large to reasonably dispose of other than burning.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
236	Jesse Carey	This will just create unnecessary trips for folks in the rural area. It might create a fire	Comment acknowledged.

		danger because people will not clean up their brush.	
237	John Klein, Arlington	This is just a way to give money to big business.	Comment acknowledged.
238	Dewley Larson, Snohomish	Do something about the vehicles. They are a bigger source of air pollution than burning.	Comment acknowledged.
239	Cindy Schlemlein, Snohomish County	Proposal would create undo practical and monetary hardships for an unacceptably large portion of the rural community. Spend the next three years coming up with solutions that better understand all the diverse challenges.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
240	Lynne Stallcop, Pierce County	Live in a rural area and there is no recycling plan for blown down trees. There is currently no other way to get rid of storm debris.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
241	David McCone	Try to compost or chip debris when possible but bur to get rid of invasive species.	Comment acknowledged.
242	James Garrick, Ravensdale	Live on 2.5 acres. Winter storms bring down large amounts of debris. The proposal would require the purchase of a chipper that consumes fossil fuel.	Comment acknowledged.
243	Anonymous, Key Peninsula	Supports the proposal	Comment acknowledged.
244	Lydia Moreno, Machias	Live on 16 acres. Can't compost many plants because they will root. Chippers have their own environmental impact. Can't leave debris in place, because it's a fire hazard. Concerned about an increase in	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.

		illegal dumping. Keep the proposal within a small radius of cities.	
245	Kevin Daoust, King County	Live in the rural area and have large amounts of debris each winter. Don't have the option of buying a truck, loading it and taking it to the disposal site. Storing the debris will create a fire hazard and draw pests.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
246	Gary Carver, Anacortes	Already have many controls on air pollution.	Comment acknowledged.
247	Renee Mead, King County	Not convinced that the proposal will have an impact on air quality.	Comment acknowledged
248	Debra Pruitt	Focus on the high density areas.	Comment acknowledged
249	Gary Stotler, Carnation	Curbside will not pick up the large quantities of debris generated each year. Branches do not compost. Chippers are very expensive. People will likely leave the debris to become a fire hazard.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
250	Rick Sorrels, Key Peninsula	There are only two ways to dispose of yard debris: burning or decomposition. Each emits pollutants. The current alternatives are not reasonable.	Comment acknowledged
251	Anonymous, Snohomish County	While it eliminates air pollution in one area it only increases it in another.	Comment acknowledged
252	Richard Duncan, Snohomish	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
253	Amy Hammingh, Klahanie	Supports the proposal	Comment acknowledged
254	Brenda Furry, Marysville	This will place an undue burden on rural property owners trying to manage their	Comment acknowledged

		debris.	
255	Tanya Ryner, Snohomish County	Property is covered with trees that constantly drop debris. Proposal would result in piles of dead material that will not compost.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
256	Jack Stedman	Supports the proposal.	Comment acknowledged
257	Kelly Bonson, Arlington	Winter storms result in lots of debris and cleaning up is back breaking work. The idea that burning could be replaced with chipping and hauling is not realistic.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
258	Kim Foster, Gig Harbor	The volume of debris created each year is enormous. Hauling is expensive and would result in many additional truck trips.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
259	Barbara Hawkins, Snohomish	Supports the proposal	Comment acknowledged
260	Elmer Mikelson, Stanwood	People need to be able to maintain their rural property as a reasonable cost. If we don't keep them up, there will be a fire hazard.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
261	Helen Fagerlie	Should allow burning 2 weeks in spring and fall.	Comment acknowledged
262	David Schuurman, Snohomish	Proposal is unbalanced. Rural residents should continue to be able to burn.	Comment acknowledged
263	David McGlothem	Proposal targets the little guy. The alternatives are not realistic for rural properties.	We agree with the comment and have recommended changes to the proposal on residential burning.
264	Harry Custer, Arlington	The proposed ban will cause people to dump on public land.	Comment acknowledged