

Anderson, Colete

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 1:39 PM
To: Anderson, Colete
Subject: FW: My public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

FYI



CP16#0659

From: Dylan Normington [<mailto:dylannormington@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 11:46 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: My public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Mr. Orjiako,

This is my public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

Alternative 4 was prepared by a County Councilor without substantive input from Clark County staff. This Alternative should not be approved to move forward for the following reasons:

- 1) The presentation to the public on this Alternative was inconsistent and was not readily available to all residents of Clark County. There were two "open houses" held on this Alternative. Neither open house was held in the city of Vancouver, the largest incorporated area in Clark County. This made it a burden to residents in the Southern and Western portions of the County. In addition, there was different information presented at each open house and it is my understanding that Alternative 4 was modified between the Open Houses. Therefore, the public involvement process was not done correctly on this Alternative and therefore the Alternative cannot move forward because the presentation of the Alternative to the public violated processes and procedures mandated by Washington state law.
- 2) Councilor David Madore developed and promoted Alternative 4 prior to presenting the Alternative to the public for comment. This is a violation of the state's processes and procedures for implementing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.
- 3) Alternative 4 does not address the County's need for future commercial and industrial uses in the rural areas of Clark County.
- 4) Alternative 4 does not comply with state law. The County will incur costly legal bills if this Alternative is approved. I recommend that County Councilors do not approve Alternative 4 to move forward.
- 5) Councilor David Madore has violated the ex-parte requirements of preparing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. He has frequently consulted with and has taken recommendations from Clark County Citizens United, an entity that represents the interests of some, but not all, rural landowners. He has stated that Alternative 4 is a good alternative for the Growth Management Plan. He has not consulted with other groups that would oppose Alternative 4 (e.g. Friends of Clark County) and he has not conducted a poll, sample or vote of all residents of Clark County regarding this Alternative. In my opinion, state law has been violated by Councilor Madore.

Please accept my comments.

Thank you very much.

Dylan Normington
103 NW 108th St
Vancouver, WA 98685

Anderson, Colete

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 1:36 PM
To: Anderson, Colete
Subject: FW: Comprehensive Growth Planning

fyi

From: Bill Baumann [<mailto:baumann@pacifier.com>]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 8:05 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Comprehensive Growth Planning

Greetings:

I'm writing you because I think you will include my comments in the official record and may have the most impact on the discussion.

I am very concerned about Councilor Madore's last minute efforts to bow to the special interest group of which Susan Rasmussen is a member. I believe that if Alternative 4 is adopted, it will create huge infrastructure problems and costs so that individuals seeking to develop small lots have utilities as well as transportation opportunities. Alternative 4 is phenomenally short-sighted and obviously created by someone who knows nothing about planning. Plus, it will raise taxes of everyone in the county so that rural landowners can be served.

Please do everything you can to persuade the councilors to reject this option. Councilor Madore says he listens to cogent arguments. If we are to take him at his word (which he's proven we should not) then explain to him that his Alternative 4 will increase costs and reduce the opportunities for jobs in rural Clark County. Most employers seeking to relocate here need larger plots of land on which to build. Alternative 4 will remove those, consigning Clark county to be a bedroom community to Portland forever more.

Thanks for your time.
Best Regards,

Bill Baumann,
Box 817, Ridgefield WA 98642

And thanks for the good job you are doing under conditions of such extreme difficulty.

Anderson, Colete

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, April 14, 2015 9:33 AM
To: Euler, Gordon; Anderson, Colete; O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: FW: Additional Public Comment

More from Dylan for the record if you don't have it.

From: Dylan Normington [<mailto:dylannormington@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Monday, April 13, 2015 5:08 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Additional Public Comment

Dr. Orjiako,

I have an additional comment regarding Alternative 4.

RCW 36.70A.011 states "The legislature finds that this chapter is intended to recognize the importance of rural lands and rural character to Washington's economy, its people, and its environment, while respecting regional differences. Rural lands and rural-based economies enhance the economic desirability of the state, help to preserve traditional economic activities, and contribute to the state's overall quality of life.

The legislature finds that to retain and enhance the job base in rural areas, rural counties must have flexibility to create opportunities for business development. Further, the legislature finds that rural counties must have the flexibility to retain existing businesses and allow them to expand. The legislature recognizes that not all business developments in rural counties require an urban level of services; and that many businesses in rural areas fit within the definition of rural character identified by the local planning unit.

Finally, the legislature finds that in defining its rural element under RCW 36.70A.070(5), a county should foster land use patterns and develop a local vision of rural character that will: Help preserve rural-based economies and traditional rural lifestyles; encourage the economic prosperity of rural residents; foster opportunities for small-scale, rural-based employment and self-employment; permit the operation of rural-based agricultural, commercial, recreational, and tourist businesses that are consistent with existing and planned land use patterns; be compatible with the use of the land by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat; foster the private stewardship of the land and preservation of open space; and enhance the rural sense of community and quality of life."

Alternative 4 would allow for residential lots that are too small for a "traditional rural lifestyle". Rural means rural, not suburban. By allowing these small lot sizes, Clark county's rural areas will lose their "traditional rural lifestyle". In addition, these small lot sizes will make it more challenging for farmers to purchase additional land in rural Clark County. For agricultural purposes, it is much easier for purchase land in larger blocks (i.e. only 1 seller for 20 acres instead of 4 sellers for 5 acres each). This will violate the legislature's finding that land use patterns should "permit the operation of rural-based agricultural....businesses".

Also, 5-acre lot sizes will make the rural areas of our county less compatible by wildlife and for fish and wildlife habitat. Smaller lot sizes will increase density and vehicular traffic in these areas, which will increase the number of incidents of wildlife-automobile crashes. Therefore, Alternative four will make the rural areas of our county less compatible for wildlife.

Thanks for accepting my testimony.

Best Regards,

Dylan Normington

503 NW 108th St
Vancouver, WA 98685

