

Schroeder, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2015 1:49 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete
Cc: Schroeder, Kathy
Subject: FW: Inclusive Policy Shift Requires Efforts of Staff and Planning Commissioners

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Just FYI and for the record. Thanks.

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 17, 2015 11:27 AM
To: Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Orjiako, Oliver; Carol Levanen; Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Re: Inclusive Policy Shift Requires Efforts of Staff and Planning Commissioners

For the Public Record, Draft SEIS, Board of County Councilors, and the Planning Commission

Now is the time to begin linking all the data together for analysis of the 2016 Clark County comprehensive plan update. As you deliberate this evening, please be aware of the inclusive shift in policy by the Board of Clark County Councilors.

The County's rural communities have been locked up in status quo far to long. To make matters worse, an artificially created rural character was forced on these communities. Their lands were locked up and future generations were denied their cultural heritage and the ability to live on the land. This is the "forced generational migration," that Fred Pickering presented in public testimony on Sept. 10, 2015. This is not what the GMA intended.

Please recall lead planner, Gordy Euler's opening remarks at this work session when he referred to their collaboration with the cities, "Work with our partners, the cities." This attitude of exclusivity demands attention and profound changes need to occur.

The GMA gives importance to the public participation element. The Dept. of Commerce has written:
"The term "public participation" implies that those affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process, and an opportunity to influence the decision."

When the 1994 was being written, Clark County sent a request to John Karpinski for his recommendations. Mr. Karpinski responded with the "Green Alternative Plan." This plan is the foundation for the county's present plan. This letter is in the public record for this comprehensive plan update. It demonstrates the plan was written with an elite, and exclusive collaborative process with the cities and the environmental communities. The present plan employed a very flawed public process and shows grave indifference to the rural citizens. The result is an imbalanced plan. This is a demonstration of dominance of one culture over another. This practice is ongoing today as demonstrated in Mr. Euler's opening remarks on Sept. 10. This practice is wrong and not what GMA intended.

Without question, the present plan has disproportionately burdened the rural landowners; socially, culturally, and economically. The rural communities have never been considered, "partners in.

collaboration.” Disregarding the desires and needs of the rural communities has resulted in many degrading impacts. Particularly disturbing is the fragmentation of families that Mr. Pickering referenced in his testimony. This is the inhumanity of the present plan that has gone unrecognized for 20 years.

Thankfully, a more inclusive policy shift occurred in January 2015 with the addition of Alternative 4. This inclusive policy was directed by the policy makers, the Clark County Board of County Councilors. However, CCCU isn't seeing this shift carried forth by the planning staff, and the Planning Commission. This inclusive policy is going to require a tremendous change in attitudes by the staff, as well as the commissioners.

The GMA was passed in 1990. Private property rights were listed as one of the thirteen planning elements. All of the planning elements (now 14), carry equal weight. Despite being written in the GMA, Clark County's plan gives no recognition of private property rights. Despite the citizens voicing their concerns in the early stages of development for the Community Framework Plan and Policies, private property rights haven't ever been considered important enough to recognize in any of the county's plans and subsequent updates. It is not coincidental that the voices of the rural landowners have also gone unrecognized. This is not compliant with GMA.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. strongly urges the County Councilors and the Planning Commission conduct a compliance analysis of Alternative 4 to the GMA. While not perfected, Alternative 4 is the plan that most supports private property rights, and is the only plan out of the four presented, that employed an inclusive public process with the rural communities.

Thank you,
Susan Rasmussen for Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

From: Carol Levanen

Sent: Wednesday, September 16, 2015 5:41 PM

To: david.madore@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov, Orijako, Oliver

September 16, 2015
the DSEIS review

For the Public Record and

Clark County Planning Commission
Clark County Board of Commissioners
P.O. Box 5000
Vancouver, Washington 98666

Dear Commissioners and Councilors,

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. asks the Planning Commission and Board of Commissioners to choose Alternative 4 as the preferred alternative in the DSEIS of the 2016 Comprehensive Land use Plan.

The Record fully supports such a decision. CCCU, Inc. has done continuous research for approximately two years and submitted our findings into the record on a continuous basis. The research is both pertinent and factual and supports the mandates of the Growth Management Act. Based on that information, there is both public and legal support for Alternative 4.

Keep in mind that one of the underlying forces to the creation of Alternative 4 is the court orders of Superior Court Judge, Edwin J. Poyfair April 4, 1997, Conclusion of Law and Order, and the Court of Appeals Division II, March 12, 1999, Published Opinion. Many of the Orders from the Poyfair decision were ignored by Clark County. In particular, item 3. The Board is not above the law; item 4. failure to solicit meaningful public input; item 6. Comprehensive Plan EIS violates the State Environmental Policy Act and item 7. the county used an unauthorized formula to the review of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan's land use densities and the interpretation was erroneous. The Board's requirement for a vacant buildable lands analysis for the rural area was erroneous. The result was a plan that gave little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA. Clark County must now be compelled to comply with these orders. The Court of Appeals Opinion, confirmed that the GMA does not require counties to use OFM's projections as a cap on non-urban growth. The Board exceeded its authority.

It is primarily for these reasons, that Clark County Citizens United, Inc. has again come forward to assure the county complies with the courts. We urge the Councilors and Commissioners to understand and accept that the rural and resource lands cannot remain static for over twenty years and the law must be obeyed. The landowners must have relief from the massive down zoning that occurred in 1994, using unauthorized formulas and erroneous decisions. Such actions are not allowed under the Growth Management Act.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604