

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 9:47 AM
To: Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Hermen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Lumbantobing, Sharon; Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy; Wisner, Sonja
Subject: FW: Remaining comments from May 10 testimony
Attachments: May 10 final comments to BOCC.docx

FYI and for the record. Thanks.

From: Heidi Owens [<mailto:heidi.owens@comcast.net>]
Sent: Saturday, May 14, 2016 10:51 AM
To: Tilton, Rebecca; Orjiako, Oliver; Boldt, Marc
Subject: Remaining comments from May 10 testimony

Hello Rebecca, Councilor Boldt, and Dr. Orjiako,

Attached are my completed comments from my May 10 testimony that I would like submitted to the record and included in the 2016 Comp Plan record, as well as the binder for the Planning Commission and the Councilors.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Regards,
Heidi Owens

To Honorable Chairman Mark Boldt, Councilors Jeannie Stewart, Julie Olson, David Madore, Tom Mielke
From Heidi Owens
CC Oliver Orjiako, Director of Community Planning
Date May 13, 2016
Subject Completed Comments from May 10th Public Testimony for the Record

From 1982 to 1992, Clark County paved over 52,000 acres of farm land ¹ Since 1992, the county has lost another 30,000 acres ¹ For a county that was rooted in agriculture in the mid, 20th century is this what residents want, a continued loss in county ag lands the provide sources of locally grown, fresh foods?

Based on what I am seeing in this community the answer is no! Restaurants, such as Lepellah, Willems on Main, Roots, and others rely on local foods, a steady stream of customers frequent at least five neighborhood famers markets in Clark County, consumers want quality, local food, grocers know of this demand and are looking to farms for locally grown, natural foods, more farms in Clark County are offering CSAs This is a permanent/mainstream trend Local food systems strengthen rural economies As the legislative body of Clark County, this council can and should recognize the growing trend for local foods and support policies that leverage Agriculture and the food system in Clark County

When I look at the preferred alternative for the 2016 Comprehensive Plan and see the upzoning of AG-20 to AG-10, I wonder **where is the county's Agricultural Plan, Vision, Policy or anything that helps guide the decisions regarding the planning for the county resource lands?** Even with the draft cluster provision, instead of a straight split, I must ask how that supports Agriculture I call this council's attention to WAC 365-196-815 "Conservation of natural resource lands" which states in Section (1)(b)(i) that "development regulations must prevent conversion to a use that removes land from resource production " Yes, Section (3)(b)(ii) gives cluster zoning as an innovative zoning technique for resource lands, however, WAC 365-196-815 (3)(a) states "when adopting development regulations to assure the conservation agricultural lands, counties should consider use of innovative zoning techniques " So, again, I must ask this council where is the vision for AG?

I wish to further point out that WAC 365-196-815(3)(a) specifies that innovative zoning techniques "should be designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy Any nonagricultural uses allowed should be limited to lands with poor soils or lands otherwise not suitable for agricultural purposes " The current draft cluster provision is more focused on providing housing than protecting AG It allows for building sites to be greater than 1 acre if needed for septic reasons It does not require clusters to be on public water or limited to lands with poor soils/not suitable for agricultural purposes

The current preferred alternative option to allow clustering on AG-land is erroring on the side of providing a housing option on AG land AG has been 20 acres in Clark County since the 1979 Comprehensive Plan ² When one looks at the 1979 Clark County Comp Plan map, it has a very different look than today's planning map Much more land is zoned Agriculture at 20 acres and large tracks are zoned Rural Farm at 10-20 acres When I compared the 1979 map with the preferred alternative map, showing current use, I can see that much of the currently zone AG land aligns with the zoned Ag land from 1979 A smaller portion aligns with the Rural Farm I see only a few tracks that are outside these areas in Rural Estate (5-10 acres) or Rural Residential (2.5-5 acres) What is interesting is that a review showed that the majority of those parcels are in current use My point is that the position that Rural property owners universally lost their property rights by the 1994 Comprehensive Plan are not matching a review of the facts Any legal parcel owned in 1980 is still legal today, there were no property rights taken away by the introduction of GMA or the Clark County 1994 plan These owners still have full use of the property, and zoning regulations are legitimate actions of government

authority (Village of Euclid v Ambler Realty Co, 1926) In fact, many of the rural resource Agriculture property owners have similar zoning to what they had in 1980

- 1 "Agriculture plays vital, changing role in Clark County," The Columbian, Feb 25, 2012
- 2 1979 Clark County Comprehensive Plan Map