

**Schroader, Kathy**



**From** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent** Friday, September 11, 2015 11 51 AM  
**To** Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose  
**Cc** Schroader, Kathy  
**Subject** FW Farmgate data

FYI and for the record Thanks

---

**From** susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]  
**Sent** Friday, September 11, 2015 9 42 AM  
**To** Madore, David, Stewart, Jeanne, Mielke, Tom, Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject** Re Farmgate data

CCCU recently attended the land use forum presented by the Clark County Food Systems Council Mr Tom Trohimovich, the attorney representing Futurewise, was one of the speakers He said that the agricultural industry contributed \$52 million dollars to the local economy, and there are 1,929 farms However, he failed to elaborate and recognize a trend The historical perspective tells a different story

According to the latest USDA Census of Agriculture (2012), Clark County does have 1,929 farms and the main agricultural operations include milk, fryers, and berries The farmgate value is the total value of crops and livestock produced in the county

The farmgate value of agriculture in Clark County is \$51.8 million from the 2012 Census, but in the 2002 Census of Agriculture it was \$54.4 million this figure describes the trend Dips also occurred in associated area counties Cowlitz was \$29 million in 2012, and \$30.5 million in 2002 Skamania was \$6 million in 2012, but \$11.5 million in 2002

By comparison, Yakima County had \$843.8 million in 2002, but increased to \$1.65 billion in 2012

In the associated food processing sector of food, Clark County's 2013 state Dept of Revenue reported gross sales of \$357 million

Please be so kind as to include this in the comments for the draft SEIS  
Thank you,  
Susan Rasmussen for CCCU, Inc  
Sent from Windows Mail

---

**From** [susan rasmussen](mailto:susan_rasmussen)  
**Sent** Friday, September 11, 2015 9 42 AM  
**To** [susan rasmussen](mailto:susan_rasmussen)

Sent from Windows Mail

---

**From** [susan rasmussen](#)

**Sent** Friday, September 11, 2015 9 27 AM

**To** [david.madore@clark.wa.gov](mailto:david.madore@clark.wa.gov), [tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov](mailto:tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov), [jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov](mailto:jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov)

Sent from Windows Mail

Testimony of September 10, 2015

Kindly include in the comments for the draft SEIS

The mistruths and absent data in the draft SEIS are tools, used by the writers, to facilitate the downfall of alternative 4. These tools actually advance CCCU's values by exposing misconduct to the public eye and facilitating dialogue on issues of considerable public interest. "Who is really navigating public policy on land use issues?"

There are rules that apply when writing an EIS. If these rules aren't respected by the writers and consultants tasked with the job of writing an unbiased draft for proper analysis, how are the Councilors supposed to make important informed decisions? How are competing interests in this case the private property rights of rural citizens, supposed to get our voices heard? CCCU is now tasked with going through the draft with a fine-tooth comb.

What are the motivations of the writers of the draft? By taking it upon themselves to provide their analysis, one would think that Alternative 4 proponents are vigilantes that only want to carve up the county, crowd the highways, deplete water resources all for self-serving purposes. On the other hand, you have the cities all wanting to lay claim to the future designs of our large lot properties that they have locked up and secured for their future use. Where do private property rights enter into the equation?

Purpose of the authors is a big factor for consideration, and interpretation. Motivation becomes really important in the decision-making process of the County Councilors. The county's various comprehensive plans are lawfully supposed to serve the entire breadth of all the diverse communities. That has never happened for the rural communities. For nearly two years, CCCU has literally been here week after week demanding attention to insure inclusion. The draft clearly illustrates the poor conduct of the writers, an exclusive process collaborating with the cities, and the environmental communities. The end result is a draft riddled with gaps and faults. Unfortunately, the writers have employed this practice before. CCCU's court decision speaks directly to the faulty process.

When engaged in an activity of the entire public's interest, private interests of the writers and consultants need to be set aside. The public's right to honest data outweighs purely private interests.

What the writers failed to realize is that farmers and foresters are operating businesses that are in the public's interest to keep viable. Many counties recognize this. In particular, Chelan County. Chelan recognizes the needs of the agricultural industries, the importance of options for private property, rural culture, and the importance of property rights. Their ordinances enable the county to maintain an economically viable agricultural industry.

Clark County Citizens United respectfully requests that the Clark County Board of Councilors take control of this comprehensive plan

Thank you for your consideration,  
Susan Rasmussen for CCCU, Inc

1