

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 1:48 PM
To: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: GMA



CP16# 0701

From: Lynn Carman [<mailto:lynn.carman@comcast.net>]
Sent: Wednesday, March 25, 2015 12:05 PM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; kaitlin.gillespie@columbian.com; Ken Vance
Subject: GMA

Lynn Carman
11104 NW 33 Avenue
Felida, WA 98685
3/25/2015

Clark County Councilor
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA 98666

Honorable Clark County Councilors:

RE: Growth Management Act 2016

I am requesting that my comments are included in any current or developed Administrative Record assigned or established for this said Proposal. I am also requesting to be a party of record and informed of the ruling be made for this proposed change.

I am just shaking my head at how this process is being done, not abiding by the process and procedures that have been in place for the past 20 years. The micromanaging that has been done and not allowing the process and procedures that can be found on Clark County's website to be followed. Alternative #4 should be handled through the rezoning process not the way it's being proposed here with the Alternative #4. These rural landowners should be going to the Clark County Planning Commissioners for their zone changed. Building on rural lands doesn't comply with the true meaning of what GMA was proposed. Nor does it comply with the RCWs handed down by the state nor does it meet the concurrency issues.

Alt. #3, if the boundaries were not submitted by the first deadline then these should be tossed out. Then there is the issue if these expanded boundaries do not help expand the job market on a whole they too should be tossed out. These expansions should be for industrial or commercial use not for houses.

Alt. #2 If this is truly for jobs and not houses then it should be allowed but again we still have lands that have yet to be developed that are sitting empty. All those lots across from Cosco are still empty and not built upon, so why add more

out in the rural setting until these lands are developed to the fullest?

Alt. #1 Do nothing!! Well that is also a joke. The density that was deemed upon us all is now showing how concurrency is not being met, roadways are failing due to the density in some areas that shouldn't have been deemed with the density that we currently are seeing. Level E is not acceptable to get area residents out of an area that is deemed dangerous. Not abiding by what was filed with the courts is a total waste of time and money. Development needs to be stopped and a serious look at the density of all of Clark County. Fix the roadways or do not allow development to happen. If density is to happen then you need to fix the roadways to the standards that will handle the traffic that you have allowed to happen. Doing nothing is what got us in the problems that we currently see today.

All Alt. have or will fail the citizens/taxpayers of Clark County. You have just wasted staff's time and our money in not taking GMA seriously. Your micro managing and by passing the procedures and process is just mind boggling. If you don't know the procedures or why the process is in place do nothing and ask staff. Or take some time and read our own county website to learn why things are done. Building it and they will come is not planning.

Sincerely,
Lynn Carman