

Schroader, Kathy



From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>
Sent: Tuesday, May 24, 2016 4:48 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: FW: Testimony 5/24

For the public record of the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update

We've had comprehensive planning under GMA over 22 years now in Clark County. It is time to take an impartial, academic review of all aspects. Do a self-audit and analysis, "Has the plan been working as it was intended? Does it meet the demands without overregulating the rural communities?" Does all the methodology work? Does it meet the needs of housing for future generations?

The Thorpe report revealed a valuable lesson. The methodology for the buildable lands report needs analysis and updating. The policy makers need accurate information to ensure you have adequate and usable land that will provide available housing and jobs for all diverse segments of society. It also revealed how easy the data is subject to manipulation.

CCCU is continually working for responsible legislation and fighting against rules and regulations that are unreasonable, that increase the price of housing and jobs, and make it more difficult to live a lifestyle of one's choosing.

Without question, the public participation process for this plan leaves much to be desired. At the very beginning, the citizens were limited to 3 optional plans. Currently, the preferred alternative provides a false choice at best for the rural landowners. This plan carries a lot of baggage, just look at the inclusion of the 12 reports. Over-regulation is a primary concern. In the end, there will be no relief provided for the rural landowners, because there will be no net change for them. The regulations will be so extravagant that it would be economically prohibitive to create any land divisions.

Because the exclusionary practices have been in place throughout, the rural landowners have been denied a full and fair democratic process. Our particular views contrast with those of the planning staff. At every opportunity, rural landowner issues are discredited, our issues fail to garner your attention, let alone equal footing among competing interests. This shouldn't be the normal course of a plan that can lay claims to integrity, inclusionary process, relies on truthful data, supports all GMA planning goals equally and values integrity above all else.

As I see the world, the duties of county staff are not to provide public officials with the "specific answers" on any given issue, or to arrive at a predetermined outcome. But, rather to provide sufficient and truthful information to foster informed decisions by the policy makers.

Back in April, 1997, Judge Poyfair stated, "The Board had an end in sight and disregarded the GMA's mandate in applying an unauthorized formula."

I ask you to delve in and ask the difficult but necessary questions. Does the county's comprehensive plan fully comply with all intentions and directives of the Poyfair Remand? Does the plan still "put a ceiling on rural growth?"

The public participation plan is working as it was intentionally designed to work—to exclude the rural landowners and advance the cap on rural growth. Judge Poyfair ruled this is not GMA compliant.

If you are the least bit hesitant and question the integrity of the process and the plan, this document is not worthy of your signatures.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rasmussen for CCCU

Sent from Mail for Windows 10