

6/14/16 Rec'd From Carol Levanen - RLT  
CC'd - Bacc, Orjisko, Schroeder ✓

Clark County Board of Councilors  
P O Box 5000, Vancouver, Washington 98666

June 14, 2016 - For the Public Record

Dear Councilors,

The current online map for Alternative 4 is dramatically different than what the public saw at Open Houses. Now, the 2016 Comprehensive Plan, shows a second Alternative 4, by staff. It looks like the county is planning a "bait and switch" of Alt 4. Hopefully, that is not the case. As you proceed with the proposed 2016 Comprehensive Plan, Clark County Citizens United, Inc. would like you to answer these questions:

1. Has the public had ample opportunity to review all aspects of this plan in order to have a thorough understanding of apparent massive changes and how these changes will impact their lives?  
In the joint work session of April 7, 2016, two planning staff members are quoted twice that there are no changes to the Plan, and the information was just rearranged. This does not appear to be true.
2. Has there been any meaningful public participation process to allow the public to have a complete understanding of how twelve "Reports", listed in the 2016 update, such as the Aging Readiness and Growing Healthier Reports, etc, impact the 2016 Comprehensive Plan and their lives?
3. Has these twelve reports had a meaningful review and analysis in the draft SEIS and final SEIS?  
Three of the reports have a major impact throughout this Plan, yet, there is no indication that they were fully discussed under SEPA or that two of them were adopted.
4. How and when was the deference granted to staff, in 2008 through 2012, that allows them to effect and influence policy creation to such a degree, as to change the whole complexion of the 2016 Comp Plan?  
Examples are the Growing Healthier and Aging Readiness Reports.
5. Why aren't the massive changes and directional shift of the Plan, reflected in the Draft SEIS and Final SEIS? This undermines and does not comport to the public participation process required by the GMA.
6. Why is the GMA Planning Goal # 6, Protections for Private Property Rights, disregarded and overridden by environmental protection and optional community designs?  
The GMA Planning Goals are not being granted equal recognition. The Public Record references private property rights, frequently.
7. Where is the documented reason for the high percentage of 85% set aside and perpetuity covenant requirement for the Cluster Development Ordinance as it relates to the optional element in the GMA?
8. Has the county complied with every aspect of the Superior Court Orders written by Judge Edwin Poyfair, according to the deference afforded the courts, under the GMA?
9. What's the legitimate government objective for not changing the 2016 Comprehensive Plan to reflect the adopted Preferred Alternative, Alt. 4 version, adopted on November 24, 2015, which was later repealed?
10. Why does the rural and resource land have to stay status quo, in limbo for another 20 years, thereby reducing or eliminating economic prosperity for that segment of society?

These are serious legal questions that councilors need to answer, before adopting the 2016 Comp. Plan.

Sincerely, 

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



034321