

O'Donnell, Mary Beth



CP16# 0313

From: LaRocque, Linnea on behalf of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Wednesday, October 01, 2014 8:21 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca, O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: For the public record, and comp. plan scoping

for the file

From: sprazz@tds.net [mailto:sprazz@tds.net]
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2014 9:26 PM
To: Barnes, Ed; Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Silliman, Peter; cnldental@yahoo.com
Subject: For the public record, and comp. plan scoping

Out of concern for the struggles of local farmers, Lewis County noted that the GMA is not intended to trap anyone into economic failure, as evidenced by the mandate to conserve only those farmlands with long-term commercial significance. Lewis County took much consideration regarding soil, productivity, growing capacity, and production of lands located near populated areas.

Lewis County weighed the needs of the agricultural industry in designating Agricultural resource lands. The GMA does not prohibit this practice. Lewis County recognized the migration out of the county by many large and small dairy farms that dotted the landscape. Lewis County acknowledged the migration and planned according to present, and future farming needs. Twenty years ago, Clark County was experiencing this same migration of commercial dairy farms. We were down to app 22 dairy farms. Today, Clark County has app. 5. One of the Birk Studies talks about the descending trend of farms in Clark County, and that the trend is towards very small to small farms predominating agriculture. The face of agriculture in our county has changed, but our comprehensive plan has remained frozen.

Lewis County also recognized the necessity to encourage young family members to stay, live and work the family-owned farms. There is an historical, cultural practice of accommodating multi-generations of families living on the farm. Lewis County acknowledges this practice that perpetuates the farm being a sustaining economic unit. "long-term commercially significant." Clark County allows only one dwelling on 20 acres of ag. resource land, 40 or 80 acres resource forest.

In August, 2006, the Supreme Court noted in Lewis County v. Western Wa. Growth Management Hearings Board; "Lewis County may designate resource lands based on the local farm industry's projected land needs. If the State wants to conserve all land that is capable of being farmed without regard to its commercial viability, it may buy the land."

The Supreme Court goes on to say, "Thus, the GMA is implemented exclusively by city and county governments and is to be construed with the flexibility to allow local governments to accommodate local needs."

CCCU has attempted work sessions with Oliver, Chris Cook, and planning staff. Our concerns regarding prime soils, existing parcelization, predominant parcel size and zoning are rebuffed. Yet, we see our concerns and interpretation of the GMA confirmed in court actions.

Sincerely,
Susan Rasmussen for CCCU, Inc