

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

7 1 7 9 8 7 *
CP16#0392

From: LaRocque, Linnea on behalf of Barnes, Ed
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 1:14 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Tilton, Rebecca; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: Missed opportunities, discussions (For the Record)

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 30, 2014 10:00 AM
To: Silliman, Peter; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; cnldental@yahoo.com; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary McIsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Missed opportunities, discussions (For the Record)

Dear Commissioners,

Last night, the planners presented another open house. This was well attended. However, there were no opportunities made available to the public to have open discussions, questions answered, and concerns voiced. It is my understanding that these open houses provide the appropriate forums in which the citizens may openly collaborate. These presentations are falling way short of their goals.

It was very evident at your last work session with Oliver that nobody is at the table to represent the interests and futures of the rural communities and their citizens. According to the Rural Development Council, this methodology is obsolete. The rural communities and their citizens need representation for their interests and future designs. This community requires equal standing among the local jurisdictions. This ensures that the rural communities get their fair share of good family-wage jobs. These jobs help to create the solid foundation that supports a diverse, and robust rural economy. In turn, a hearty rural economy sustains the all important rural character (per GMA). According to the Dept. of Commerce, (Terry Lawhead), the responsibility of representation for rural interests falls to the County by default.

The rural communities and their citizens are continually ignored. This is not only immoral, it is unlawful. Last night, Gordy Euler told me the three alternative plans came directly from the Commissioners. Gordy said, "Talk to them if you don't like the plans." I am appealing to the Commissioners to assume the controls of this plan...you are the bosses. Navigate towards a future with hearty growth in mind... for jobs, housing, rural lifestyles, hobby farms, very small to small farms, and small family-forestry farms.

All of this is supported in written details in the Situation Assessment, Berk Report, 2012. This report clearly shows the changing face of agriculture in Clark County and how it has evolved over the past 20 years. Farming in Clark County is no longer agriculture in the traditional sense of large farms. Present and future trends need to be acknowledged and the proper changes to the comprehensive plan need to reflect this.

Oliver has said, "We don't promise change. We promise analysis!" Oliver stated two weeks ago before the Planning Commission; "We want to clean up the maps." Let's see a demonstration of this analysis put into action. Let's see a cleaning up of the maps for the resource and rural lands where a mere 17% of the parcels conform to their actual zoning. The Clark County 1994 Comp. Plan was obsolete before it was signed into law. Judge Poyfair's Superior Court Order is compelling; "The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA." This was written April, 1997!

Our three Clark County Commissioners are the bosses in charge here. Demand better work from our county planners. Demand that they recognize the studies in the reports. Demand proper analysis, and design appropriate alternatives accordingly. During discussions with the Wa. State Dept. of Commerce, they have said; "Clark County planners aren't planning. They're practicing lethargy, or a self-serving agenda."

We need two more alternatives that properly reflect present and future trends, the uniqueness of our county, the desires of the rural citizens, and growth for all communities. This will support a robust regional economy for all.

My best to all of you,

Susan Rasmussen

Sent from Windows Ma

To: Silliman Peter, david.madore@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov, cnldental@yahoo.com, susan.rasmussen, [Leah Higgins](mailto:Leah.Higgins), [Rick TDunning](mailto:Rick.TDunning), [Rita Dietrich](mailto:Rita.Dietrich), [Jerry Olson](mailto:Jerry.Olson), [Fred Pickering](mailto:Fred.Pickering), [Jim Malinowski](mailto:Jim.Malinowski), [Frank White](mailto:Frank.White), [Benjamin Moss](mailto:Benjamin.Moss), [Lonnies Moss](mailto:Lonnies.Moss), [Melinda Zamora](mailto:Melinda.Zamora), [Nick Redinger](mailto:Nick.Redinger), [Curt Massie](mailto:Curt.Massie), [Marcus Becker](mailto:Marcus.Becker), [Zachary McIsaac](mailto:Zachary.McIsaac), [Clark County Citizens United Inc.](mailto:Clark.County.Citizens.United.Inc)

Dear Commissioners,

CCCU would like to clarify the record regarding previous zoning maps that planner, Oliver Orijaka presented to the Board of Commissioners at the recent work session on October 22, 2014. He showed the commissioners the resource zoning maps that he said had been in place prior to 1994. He was stressing to the commissioners how much resource land there was. But, he failed to mention that the maps had been in constant flux and what the parcel sizes were in those zones at that time. They were 2.5, 5, 10, and 20 acre zones, not the 5, 10, 20, 40 and 80 acres that are currently in place. CCCU has a very large two inch binder of various land use maps of Clark County dating from 1987 to 2014. One particular Clark County, Washington 1993 map, of a township of the Rock Creek, Fargher Lake, View, Cedar Creek areas, shows the existing parcelization in those areas at the time, along with the names of the owners of the parcels. It's very telling. These were lands that had been divided long before the GMA. There are many historical family names on that map, in addition to Long View Fibre Company, School Land, State Forest Board, Washington State Game Department, and others. This map shows the people and the rural parcelization that helps define and is part of the rural character in that area of Clark County. It shows the pattern of small parcelization of 2.5 and 5 acres throughout the area. Another old map (with no date) called *Clark County Broad Land Use and Traffic Circulation*, shows the broad expanse of state, federal, and large private timber lands in eastern Clark County. A *Draft 20 year Plan Map (Rural and Natural Resource Lands)* map shows the massive areas of the old Agri-Forest 40 acre zoning, which was ruled as illegal in the court. The notebook has numerous Agri-Forest maps of different areas showing the parcelization that was in place at the time. There is a Portland metro agriculture map that includes Clark County. This book also has aerial photos of the Agri-Forest lands that have white tape strips surrounding parcels of rural land. There is a map called *Prime Farmland - Clark County Washington, General Highway maps - Thematic detail compiled by state staff. US Department of Agriculture Soil Conservation Service M7-0-24076*. It is very different than the 1994 GMA SEIS map of Prime and Unique Agriculture Soil, the Forest Soil map, and the existing Comprehensive Plan map of 1994 and today. CCCU's notebook also contains a *Growth Management - Issue 9 - June 1994 Perspectives map of Alternative A, B and C*. Alternative A has Ag Tier 1 - 20 acres, Ag Tier 2 - 10 acres, Forest Tier 1 - 40 acres, Forest Tier 2 - 20 acres, Rural Farm - 10 acres, Rural Estate - 5 acres and Rural Residential 2.5 acres. There are maps of the old Resource Line that divided the rural lands. There are also 1996 *Orthophotography - Clark County, Washington* aerial maps.

If a picture tells a thousands words, these maps certainly do. It was erroneous for Clark County to ignore the parcelization of the rural areas and over designate resource lands in 1994, even though they had maps and other documents to determine the area differently. For this Board of Commissioners to continue to accept that faulty data is also erroneous. The court in 1997 has said, "*The Board's (WVGMB) interpretation was erroneous, and the County's decision to follow the Board's lead was unfortunate. The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA. Clark County must come into compliance with this court decision and it's plain meaning. The rural development (parcelization) in the rural lands must be recognized in a meaningful way by the county and in the 2016 Comprehensive Plan.*"

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, inc.
PO Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604