

O'Donnell, Mary Beth



CP 16# 0560

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 9:11 AM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: For the record: Input from FOCC
Attachments: FOCC to BOCC 3-17-15.doc

Just FYI and for index! Thanks.

From: Sydney Reisbick [<mailto:reisbicks@comcast.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, March 17, 2015 8:53 AM
To: Cnty Board of County Councilors General Delivery
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: For the record: Input from FOCC

Good Morning.

Here is a "for the record" written version of our input during the public comment period the 3/3/15 hearing. With a thank you and a request.

Sydney Reisbick
Friends of Clark County

Friends of Clark County
P.O. Box 513
Vancouver, WA 98666
friendsofclarkcounty.org



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

MARCH 17, 2015

1300 Franklin, 6th Floor, Vancouver, WA 98660
boardcom@clark.wa.gov

Dear Sirs and Madam,

Here, for the record, is my presentation at the BOCC hearing of 3-3-15. Thank you for taking the de-designation goal out of Alternative 4. This is also the basis for our official request to be "at the table" for future discussions of the Growth Management Plan.

THE GMAP Alternative 4 is not just the concern of rural landowners.

Friends of Clark County speaks for smart (efficient, organic) growth in Clark County. We have status to comment on this rural alternative because we speak for home-owning taxpayers who pay thousands of dollars every year to Clark County for services. We advocate for smart, efficient, organic development of our county because sprawl, scattering or spot zoning is more expensive to maintain services. If the 4th alternative is included in the GMP, it will either increase taxes for all homeowners or decrease services. This will happen whether or not there are financial repercussions from being out of compliance or breaking laws or rules of the Growth Management Act (GMA).

Clark County Board of County Councilors propose a new "Rural Alternative" for the County's Growth Management Plan (GMP) effectively proposing to de-designate over 6,500 acres of resource lands of 9.5 acres or less to rural parcels. Rural parcels are eligible for development into houses and home businesses.

How large is 6,500 acres? It is 10 square miles. This is more land than the cities Ridgefield and La Center combined, larger than Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge and equivalent to a swath one mile wide from the Welcome to Washington sign on the I-5 bridge to past the Fairgrounds (Exit 9). Even re-zoning this much land is legally questionable. De-designating it from resource land will get our Plan appealed.

At the January GMP work session, staff was instructed to delay the release of the completed Supplementary Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS). Blocking the release of the SEIS for the first 3 alternatives stopped the Growth Management process until the new alternative can be constructed and analyzed.

Costs to County taxpayers for this expansion of the Growth Management Plan include the costs to create, present, solicit public input for, and analyze the environmental effects of the new alternative. Legal costs will also land in our laps.

All county citizens absorb the cost of increased infrastructure (roads and utilities) when development occurs in our rural areas. Water availability is a major concern already as wells dry up as more development takes place. What happens to water for growing the produce and raising the livestock that feeds our community? It is a concern of anyone who wishes to eat healthy, local, unadulterated food.

The 4th alternative is not just the concern of rural landowners.

Sydney Reisbick, President
Friends of Clark County