

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

From: Heather Tischbein <htischbein@wa-net.com>
Sent: Monday, March 30, 2015 8:39 AM
To: Stewart, Jeanne
Cc: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan; Euler, Gordon; Swanson, Jeff
Subject: Input on Alternative 4 for the record



CP16#0597

Dear Jeanne Stewart,

It was a pleasure to meet with you last Thursday, March 26. Thank you for your generosity in meeting with us for 90 minutes. I hope the meeting was of value to you in terms of serving your learning about the complexities and history of the land use decisions that have been made since the GMA became state law.

Have you been able to access all the historical documents we called to your attention? If not, please let me know and I'll get on that immediately.

I want to reiterate in writing that I oppose the inclusion of Alternative 4 as an option for consideration in this round of GMA updates. At the Ridgefield open house Wednesday, March 25, I witnessed a CCCU member in conversation with a small group of people seated in the bleachers in which she said that the creation of Alternative 4 was initiated by CCCU with the intention to undo what CCCU feels to be the individual property rights restrictions created by the GMA in the 1990s. The statements made by this woman were verified as being accurate in the one-on-one conversations I had that evening with staff of the county's planning department.

It is my opinion that it is not good public policy to propose, and promote in the case of Councilor Madore, the adoption of land use policies based on the perspective and desires of one group of citizens, especially a group of citizens who publicly advocate their intention to undo, or do an end run around, the GMA in order to serve their own financial and family interests, literally at the expense of all the rest of us.

As we tried to convey in our meeting, there are two categories of objections to Alternative 4. First, the intent and goal of Alternative 4 fly in the face of state law, the GMA, by knowingly creating conditions that 1) support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, and 2) set the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection, and 3) create real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies. Second, Alternative 4 creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of 1) wasted planning staff time, 2) increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners, and 3) costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA rules and regulations and breaches of the separation of executive and legislative authorities stipulated in the charter. In my opinion, pursuing Alternative 4 by including it in the EIS analysis is a failure of the council's fiduciary responsibility to taxpayers and a failure of what I believe to be your moral responsibility as elected officials to make every sincere effort to understand, respect, and represent the diverse interests of all citizens, not just the interests of those who voted for you or whose personal values and belief systems align with your personal values and belief systems. Last time I checked, We were all in this together...with all our differences.

In the interest of trying to be of service to you, I'm sharing below a recent report issued by King County having to do with local foods. I am sending this along by way of showing why I take issue with the assertion by some that "agriculture is dead" in Clark County. This is not true, though there is compelling evidence that some have been trying, with some success, to kill it off through policy and budget decisions. If you read only page 5 of this report, copied in its entirety below, you will get a sense of what is also true in Clark County as a microcosm, or fractal, of what is happening in terms of the re-structuring of our food systems and land ownership and tenure patterns statewide and nationwide.

Agriculture is not yet dead in Clark County and We (as citizens in collaboration with our public servants) have a right and a responsibility to investigate what is actually happening within and to our agriculture and food systems and to liberate together about what We, as diverse citizens, would like to see happen in our county to manifest and protect a shared, co-created vision of quality of life, and to not be subjected to a vision of quality of life dictated by just a few. The process of updating the GMA is an opportunity to breathe renewed life and vitality into the farming and food sector here and I stand for doing just that with rigor and determination, in order that our children and our children's children have a

chance to live in healthy, vibrant, resilient and thriving communities of place in Clark County. As currently envisioned, Alternative 4 would pretty much take that option off the table by building out 20th century suburban sprawl. We're in the 21st century. Please take this bad idea off the table, now, so that We, as a community of diverse people, can effectively deal with our 21st century circumstances.

Most sincerely,

Heather Tischbein
1119 NW 131st Way
Apt. A
Vancouver, WA 98685

<http://your.kingcounty.gov/dnrp/local-food/documents/2015-KC-Local-Food-Report.pdf>

King County's Local Food Initiative

MESSAGE FROM THE EXECUTIVE

Few places do food better than King County. Our culinary scene is world-renowned. We have vibrant urban areas within a tractor ride of farms growing delicious, healthy produce. Our residents can browse at more than 40 bustling farmers markets across the county. Nowhere is healthful living more valued. King County has the largest food market of any county in the Pacific Northwest, with close to \$6 billion annually spent on food and beverage.

But that's where our food story begins to... wilt a bit. Only about two percent of that \$6 billion is going back to King County's farms, whose survival is increasingly at risk due to development pressure, regulatory challenges, and fewer growers getting into farming. Our local food system was not built to withstand global threats such as climate change. What's more, many low-income communities in King County – where residents experience higher rates of obesity and diabetes – suffer from limited access to nutritious foods.

Last year I launched the Local Food Initiative to better connect local farms to consumers, increase access to healthy, affordable foods in underserved areas, support our farmers, and create a farm-to-plate pipeline that is more resilient to the effects of climate change. I asked more than 30 high-level stakeholders in our local food system – our "Kitchen Cabinet" – to take a hard look at these issues. With this report, they have recommended meaningful targets, strategies, and actions for the County and our partners to pursue. In this report you will find my Top 20 priority actions for 2015-17. You will also learn about the Cabinet's process, the current state of our county's food system, and see additional Cabinet recommendations for how it can be enhanced over the long term. I believe that, working together, we can achieve our vision for a stronger food system within a decade.

Everyone can help in this process by working to become better "food citizens." Be aware of what you're consuming, where it is grown or produced, and whether others also have the opportunity to eat healthy, local food. Through wise food purchasing and consumption we can keep our farms productive, our food businesses thriving, and ensure that everyone has access to affordable, healthy food.

Thank you.
Dow Constantine
King County Executive