



CC- Box C
Orjako
Schroeder

Dec 1 1 59 PM

susan rasmussen

TO SUSAN RASMUSSEN

This is a milestone

At last, after 21 years, the membership of CCCU is very grateful to this Board for recognizing the rural communities, ~~and their voices~~. It is good to know that we aren't being wryly dismissed and treated as second class citizens. For the first time in the history of Clark County planning, this Board has set a new standard recognizing inclusion, diversity, private property rights, and sensitivity to rural concerns. *You have hit a milestone*

Rather than assuming old policies and factors are correct, you have actually taken the time to listen, review, and examine many old complex rural issues. You are ^{are also} dealing with two opposing societal views. ~~urban vs rural~~. Nowhere is this more evident than in the draft seis. This document contains biases that discredits rural concerns at every opportunity. The exaggerated, inflated number of rural lots as buildable. The unrealistic 90/10% urban rural ratio. The predominance of non-conforming lots. The 20 year imposition of urban reserve and urban holding overlays. *Claiming that the large remainder lots that are remnants from cluster developments are buildable because they*

If you put the changes proposed in alt. 4 in a historical perspective alongside the 1994 plan, Alt. 4 changes are modest and pale in comparison. ~~The '94 plan initiated massive downzoning of the rural areas.~~ *will be buildable when they are consumed within city limits* This contested plan created a regulatory shock and awe on rural properties, rural economies, most importantly...stole away rural culture. These facts are lost.

There are claims the flaws in the process used to write alt. 4 will cause it to be rejected by the Hearings Board. In reality, Plans 1, 2 & 3 were composed ~~entirely~~ by staff without benefit of an inclusive process. Alt. 4 is the only plan that has evolved as a direct result from the Board listening to public input, responding, and addressing concerns accordingly. This process, with a surprisingly unusual goal when placed alongside the '94 plan, should be commended.

It has taken much work by this Board. Rural communities have waited 21 years for their review. During this span, rural lands have been evolving. When you ignore anything for that long, like my housework, a lot of work piles up. Rural communities have gained importance and can't be swept under the rug any longer. Thank you, thank you, thank you for hitting the reset button and writing alternative 4. *EJUD*

One wouldn't expect the cities to shrug off any attempts at excluding them from participating in this update of the county's comprehensive plan. However, the rural landowner's attempts at participation have been rebuffed at every turn. This has been on-going for 21 years.

Something has been off about this update, and all previous subsequent updates since 1994. After 21 years of neglect of the rural lands, how can we not be offered a range of alternative plans? How can we not have a voice in the county's plans? How can the draft SEIS be so blatantly biased that clearly discredits any rural concerns? There are some valuable

observations here that pertain to how county plans are written with complete disregard for rural sensitivities.

The problem is, this is how the county has done the business of planning for decades. To include the rural communities, the landowners is problematic...so we are wryly dismissed time and again at every update.

CCCU has patiently waited for resolution to our Superior Court Orders:

“The Board’s decision to uphold the adequacy absent additional environmental analysis regarding designations and changes to the pattern of rural development was clearly erroneous. The county’s rural and resource lands regulations are inconsistent with the Growth Management Act.” April 4, 1997 Judge Poyfair.

Judge Poyfair said the 1994 plan is unlawful. Clearly erroneous is a legal term that is a standard of review. Under this standard, Findings of fact are made on the basis of evidentiary hearings and usually involve credibility determinations. Review under the clearly erroneous standard is significantly deferential, requiring a “definite and firm conviction that a mistake has been committed.”

This isn’t a piecemeal decision, it is broad based. The judge was commended by his colleagues. The conclusion is that the county’s plan was flawed because the method used to write the plan was wrong. The county invented the desired outcome first, then manipulated the factors in such a way to support the desired outcome. The result is a completely senseless plan that altered the course of the county’s unique rural character and stole rural culture.

CCCU has built a strong record that supports a case for reviewing the rural areas and the policies that impact our lands. Frankly speaking, we have had to conquer biases like we were leaning towards criminal behavior.

Schroader, Kathy

From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Friday, December 04, 2015 9:20 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver, Schröder, Kathy
Subject: Comp Plan comments for Dec 1
Attachments: Levanen_Carol_12-01-15 Comp Plan Comments pdf, Rasmussen_Susan_12-01-15 Comp Plan Comments pdf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Attached for your records are copies of comments received from Susan Rasmussen and Carol Levanen, Dec 1, 2015

Thanks, and have a great day

Rebecca

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