


O'Donnell, Mary Beth



From: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
Sent: Tuesday, June 17, 2014 6:45 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Re: Committees (This information for public record)

From: "Euler, Gordon" <Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov>
To: "cnldental@yahoo.com" <cnldental@yahoo.com>
Cc: "Orjiako, Oliver" <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>; "Alvarez, Jose" <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; "Cook, Christine" <Christine.Cook@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 3:33 PM
Subject: FW: Committees (This information for public record)
Dear Gordy, (For the record)

Thanks for the information. The concern here is the possibility of bias on these committees. As I read all or their reports, I see the same recommendations and the same language from all of them. It appears that all of the reports were written by the same group or person. There is also mention of documents from a 1997 Seattle study, that was being referenced. Is the language in the county documents taken from the Seattle study? The concern is also not against agriculture landowners being protected, but rather that the rest of the rural landowners are also protected. The Agriculture District idea and the rural reserve idea are not acceptable to the rural people and are very bad ideas.

Another concern is the lack of a meaningful public process for all of this activity that you are mentioning. What you are saying to me is that a hand full of hand picked persons are controlling the rural lands with their supposed recommendations. That is not acceptable. The public should have been informed over these ideas and recommendations and given an honest opportunity to provide their comments and concerns to be considered. Clark County has a court mandate which the county must comply with. It states there must be a meaningful public participation process for the record, when considering policy for the GMA.Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Best Regards,

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

Carol:

The Agricultural Preservation Advisory Committee (APAC) was a group of folks (list attached) chosen by the Board of County Commissioners and guided by Commissioner Stuart to do what the name suggests: to figure out ways to maintain and enhance the agriculture industry in the county. Pat Lee served as staff to the group. As you have seen, the APAC came up with two dozen or so recommendations, many of which were land use-related.

When the Board convened the Rural Lands Task Force, one of their charges was to review the APAC report to see which of the recommendations could be implemented. Two examples: Beef up the county's right-to farm/log ordinance and develop a transfer of development rights (TDR) program. The RLTF recommendation to amend the county's right-to-farm/log ordinance (CCC Chapter 9.26) was looked at, but as proposed would have conflicted with state law. A pilot TDR program was proposed but the idea was rejected by the Board.

Let me know if you want additional information.

Gordy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 11:24 AM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Cc: Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: Committees (This information for public record)

Hello Gordy:

Please, do you have answers to any of Carol's questions? Thank you.

Oliver

From: Madore, David
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 11:19 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: Committees (This information for public record)

FYI

From: Carol Levanen [<mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2014 3:29 PM
To: Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Committees (This information for public record)

Dear Commissioners,

CCCU, Inc. has just accessed a 47 page document supposedly produced by a group of people on the Agriculture Preservation Strategies Committee, that convened in 2008 to 2009. We are not familiar with this group, nor is the public. The **Appendices** note in **A. Agriculture Preservation Committee, B. Public Comments and Survey Summary, C. Clark County Equestrian Survey and G. Recommendations of the Office of Farmland Preservation Task Force**. Besides the 47 page document, there is mentioned a **Future Farming Study**, as well. CCCU, Inc. has been actively participating in Clark County GMA land use plan issues for many years, but is not familiar with of any of these groups or activities. We believe there has been no meaningful public outreach to allow those most affected by these proposals to comment of the information. The Appendices notes the list of the members of the Agriculture Preservation Committee, but does not include that information in the report, or at least it is not available on line for review.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. asks the commissioners who these groups and members are? Who appointed them? Who created the reports for them? Where did they get their

information? Why were these documents produced in the first place? What connection do these reports have to county staff? Are any of the persons on these groups employees of the county? Where is the scientific research information to support these reports? There is very little, if any noted in the report. As CCCU, Inc. researches further, it is likely that more questions will arise, that will need to be answered by the county, before any meaningful changes can be made to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Sincerely,

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

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.