

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 11:39 AM
To: Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Hermen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Lumbantobing, Sharon; Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy; Wisner, Sonja
Cc: McCauley, Mark
Subject: FW: Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update

Just FYI and for the record. Thanks.

From: Nwankwo, Ike (COM) [mailto:ike.nwankwo@commerce.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2016 7:06 PM
To: susan rasmussen
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: RE: Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update

Hi Susan,
Thanks for your interest and involvement in the Clark County GMA process.
I have addressed your questions (in red) below.
Please let me know if you need more clarification.

Thanks
Ike

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:spazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 8:59 AM
To: Nwankwo, Ike (COM)
Subject: RE: Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update

Hello Ike,

I hope that you and your family are doing well.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. has some real concerns over the legality of sending the county Plan up to you for review prior to being approved or adopted by the elected County Councilors. Is this a new protocol?

No, this is not a new protocol. The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires all jurisdictions planning under the GMA to submit their draft plans at least 60 days prior to adoption to the Dept. of Commerce for review. [see RCW 36.70A.106(1)]

The Plan has many new elements and has not gone out for public review in any open house. Yet, the Plan is three times larger than the existing comprehensive Plan and contains many new elements that have not been reviewed by the public, nor analyzed by the Councilors or the Planning Commission. I don't see where any open houses are on a schedule. There are no opportunities for open discussions, questions and answers here. There has been no final EIS presented to the public, and the documents sent to you have had little to none public review.

Last Wednesday, April 27th, was the first time the plan was given to the Council. It appears that the elected officials were given the documents the same time they was submitted to the State. We are still waiting to review the final SEIS.

Ike, we would appreciate your input here as soon as possible.

GMA requires jurisdictions planning under the Act to establish a public participation program (see RCW 36.70A.140) identifying procedures for early and continuous public process for GMA plans and regulations, and I believe the county has done a good job of that. They have held public hearings and open houses some of which I attended. I understand that a series of public hearings are planned during the months of May and June that would include the proposed plan elements and the final EIS. If you are not aware of the scheduled hearings, please contact the Clark County Community Planning Office for information.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns,

Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Nwankwo, Ike \(COM\)](#)
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:06 PM
To: [susan rasmussen](#)
Subject: RE: Hello Ike

Hi Susan,
Hope all is well with you.

I have answered some of the questions you asked (see below). Some of them are not clear enough
Thanks for the opportunity.
Ike

From: susan rasmussen [<mailto:sprazz@outlook.com>]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 6:36 PM
To: Nwankwo, Ike (COM)
Subject: Hello Ike

Hello Ike,
I hope you and your family are doing well. My question mostly concerns the ofm projections. I hope it's not a legal question.

How much flexibility do the county Councilors have to do their own policy interpretation of exact values in the planning assumptions?

Cannot answer this question because it is not clear enough.

If they want to increase OFM's projections by say 10%, or some sort of reasonable deviation, would that be ok?
OFM has assigned population numbers to Clark County. If the County wants to change, increase or deviate from the numbers, they should contact OFM to resolve any issues. You can reach Yi Zhao at OFM by phone at 360-902-0592 or by email at yi.zhao@ofm.wa.gov

Is it permissible to alter the projections as updated information is made available?
Same as above – contact OFM for answer.

Would it have to make the rounds back to the planning commission for their recommendation?

Changes in the OFM numbers might trigger another round of public process depending on the extent of change but will defer to your local codes, statutes and guidelines and your Prosecuting Attorney and SEPA Responsible Official regarding the adequacy of the public process if that becomes the case.

Thank you for your help,
Susan Rasmussen

Sent from Windows Mail

From: ike.nwankwo@commerce.wa.gov
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 5:40 PM
To: susan.rasmussen

Hi Susan,
Thanks for contacting me with your question on planning assumptions and flexibility. I think you are asking about OFM population projection numbers for the county, could you be a little more specific with your question so I can better answer it. Of course you know that if it borders on legal advice, I will defer to the county prosecuting attorney.

Thanks
Ike

From: susan rasmussen [<mailto:sprazz@outlook.com>]
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2015 3:01 PM
To: Nwankwo, Ike (COM)
Subject: question for you

Hello Ike,

I have another question to pester you.

How much flexibility do the county Councilors have to be able to do their own policy interpretation of exact values in the planning assumptions? i.e. adjusting the ofm figures.

Thank you, appreciate any advice here,
Susan

Sent from Windows Mail