

**Schroader, Kathy**



**From:** Tilton, Rebecca  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 29, 2015 10:48 AM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy  
**Subject:** Oct. 20 Comp Plan Comments  
**Attachments:** Alexander\_Valerie\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Allen\_Milada\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Boynton\_Stephen and Lissa\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Edwards\_Ron\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Levanen\_Carol\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Levanen\_Carol\_10-27-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Marshall\_Sue\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Rasmussen\_Susan\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Reisbick\_Margaret\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Starke\_Gretchen\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf; Tweet\_Margaret\_10-20-15 Comp Plan Comments.pdf

Hello,

Here are your copies of written testimony submitted during the Oct. 20 Comp Plan hearing. There's also one from Carol Levanen that was submitted on Oct. 27 during general public comment.

Also, I've mailed a packet of information to Cindy Holley (sign-in sheets, written testimony, maps, etc.).

Thanks and have a great day. :)

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Council  
Board of County Councilors  
1300 Franklin Street  
PO Box 5000  
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000  
PHONE: 360-397-2232, ext. 4305 | E-MAIL: [Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov)

From- Susan Rasmussen

mario.villanueva@wa.usda.gov  
to susan rasmussen

Thu, Oct 15 3:55 PM

RE: Clark County Rural communities

*My concern to Mr. Villanueva: C.C. has never had a policy of inclusiveness with the rural communities*

Susan,

This appears to be a weighty problem but not insurmountable. A couple of thoughts here – organizing the rural constituency in Clark County to somehow speak with a unified voice about the items that you note are of concern, is the first item that comes to mind. Is there a community leading entity that could help you do that? Also, having elected officials attend this – that is local, state and federal folks, that could benefit from the “daylighting” of rural concerns here and elevate that to their level of policy thinking might be helpful. Holding a rural forum of sorts to do this, could help galvanize some political will and influence around issues of concern could prove helpful. I am willing to attend an event like that and speak about the key work that our agency, USDA Rural Development is doing in these areas. In particular our comments could focus on the importance of helping making our rural areas sustainable. If a unified rural Clark County voice could be garnered in this manner to weigh in on the county’s Comprehensive Growth Plan process, it might get at tending to some of your stated concerns.

This all said, I (USDA Rural Development) have to be able to respond to help with this, but can’t be the convener. WSU Cooperative Extension might be a great partner to talk to about helping you work on this. Here is a link to their website. <http://cahnrs.wsu.edu/extension/>. Let me know how I can help, and best wishes on your efforts to preserve the rural way of life in Clark County.

Mario Villanueva  
Washington State Director  
Rural Development | U.S. Department of Agriculture  
1835 Black Lake Boulevard SW, Suite B | Olympia, WA 98512  
Phone: 360-704-7715 | Fax: 855-843-6124  
Email: mario.villanueva@wa.usda.gov  
[www.rurdev.usda.gov](http://www.rurdev.usda.gov)

*Committed to the future of rural communities  
Estamos dedicados al futuro de las comunidades rurales*

Stay Connected with USDA:



**From:** susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]  
**Sent:** Thursday, October 15, 2015 1:37 PM  
**To:** Villanueva, Mario - RD, Olympia, WA  
**Subject:** Clark County Rural communities

Dear Mr. Villanueva,

March 16, 1994

VIA FAX 699-2011

Peggy Scolnick  
Clark County Planning  
P.O. Box 9810  
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

Re: CCNRC Green Alternative Details

Dear Peggy:

Thank you for your inquiry regarding details of CCNRC's Green Alternative, and the County's apparent consideration of including this alternative as a full and complete alternative in the Growth Management DEIS. As you know, CCNRC's Green Alternative has four elements: 1) reduced Urban Growth Boundaries; 2) enhanced Ag and Forest Land protections; 3) increased Critical Land protection; 4) vigorous rural development limitations. Here is a brief outline of the elements that we consider key to any Green Alternative:

**I. URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES**

- A. Shrink all Urban Growth Boundaries from approved Interim Boundaries.
- B. Shrink Vancouver UGB based on map I presented at recent meeting with County staff, except exclude all of Felida west of McCann Road.
- C. Shrink Washougal UGB by area inside Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area.
- D. I would be more than happy to take a few minutes and sit down with you and other staff, to go into more detail on each of these UGBs. Please call and schedule a time if you are interested.

**II. INCREASED AG/FOREST PROTECTIONS.**

- A. Increase lands designated for Agriculture by removing parcelization criteria; paramount factor should be soil type.
- B. Lands currently useable as both Ag/Forest but currently fall into neither category should be categorized as Ag/Forest with appropriate minimum acreages.
- C. Minimum acreages described in Internal Draft 3-11-94 Alternative C are acceptable for SEPA purposes for Ag and Forest minimum lot sizes.

**III. RURAL DEVELOPMENT SCENARIOS.**

- A. Minimum lot sizes suggested in 3-11-94 Internal Draft acceptable, but should be re-labeled to: 10 acres: Rural; 15 acres: Rural Conservancy.
- B. Clear and specific policies limiting development on currently valid but soon to be substandard lots must be include Potential solutions include: 1) a lottery for building permits that will ensure that no more than approximately 1/20th of the rural residential growth

**EXHIBIT A**

eggy Scolnick  
Re: CCNRC Green Alternative Details  
March 16, 1994  
Page 2

projection is implemented per year; 2) required amalgamation of rural lots; and 3) an aggressive program of transferrable development rights, excise tax increase to buy development rights, etc. to obviate any major takings concerns.

C. Substantially reduced or eliminated "rural activity centers".

**IV. INCREASED CRITICAL AREA PROTECTIONS.**

A. Broad extension of strong wetland regulations including, but not limited to, rural areas and Category 5 wetlands.

B. A broad program of sensitive wildlife habitat protection beyond the Washington Department of Wildlife PHS program as to be recommended by the scientist Citizens Wildlife Habitat Committee.

C. Substantial new development limitations in Critical aquifer recharge areas, floodplains, steep slopes, etc.

I hope this outline provides you sufficient detail as to be able to include, analyze and model a Green Alternative in the Draft EIS. If you have any questions regarding any of these issues, or wish more details (for example, like on Urban Growth Boundaries), I will gladly meet with you to discuss these issues. Please be advised that I will be on vacation from April 1 through April 14. Also please be advised that CCNRC is willing to accept combining the Rural Clark County Preservation Association Rural Alternative with CCNRC's Green Alternative. Although there are minor differences between CCNRC and the rural group's plan (CCNRC opposes family compounds, requests larger lot sizes for Forest zones), the Internal Draft of 3-11-94, combined with the comments herein, should help to accurately present a comprehensive course of action that is both consistent with CCNRC and the Rural Clark County Preservation Association's interests, and is the best course of action for the community.

Thank you again for your continued consideration of including a Green Alternative as a full and complete alternative in the Growth Management Plan EIS.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Karpinski

JSK/dmk

cc: Jim Seeley  
Craig Greenleaf  
Ed Gallagher  
Onofre Contreras  
CCNRC Chair  
RCCPA

ecolnick.ga