

Friends of Clark County
P.O. Box 513
Vancouver, WA 98666
friendsofclarkcounty.org

RECEIVED

JUL 29 2015



July 28, 2015
Mr. Oliver Orjiako
Director, Clark County Community
Planning

Dear Mr Orjiako:

I have seen an email from Councilor Madore to Manager McCauley reporting on the Ridgefield Open House for Alternative 4. By my count, there have been four versions of Alternative 4: the first being the one presented at a work session by Mr. Silliman, the second set forth by Councilor Madore at a subsequent work session, the third for the Ridgefield Open House and then the 4th version that appeared briefly between the Ridgefield and Hockinson Open Houses.

Perhaps the 4th map (or a further revision) was the map used at the BOCC Hearing on Alternative 4 that preceded the Councilor's vote to remand Alternative 4 to the consultants for the SEIS? During that hearing, a map showed rural, FR and AG lands surrounded by undefined small lots. This map was available on the screen as "evidence" for rural landowners to testify that their lands were surrounded by small lots, and thus it would be consistent to divide their land.

I am not sure whether Councilor Madore's email to Mr. McCauley is part of the record for the SEIS. I also am not sure whether the SEIS will be on the 3rd version that was at the open houses or on a 4th (or later) version.

However, I wanted to make sure that the record is clear that I attended both open houses and the hearing. At none of these did I hear substantive discussion regarding rural character, GMA goals and purposes, or de facto/functional de-designation of resource lands. Or of the effects of massive county wide decreases in minimum lot sizes, such as the impact of the 8-11,000 new septic systems and wells that could be allowed if the new lots were created, or the impact on resource areas due to reduction of the buffers that current rural 5-acre zoning provides. There was no presentation on



impacts on habitats, open spaces, storm water or traffic on both rural and adjacent city corridors.

At the open houses and the hearing, I heard some voice enthusiastic support for the Fourth Alternative(s) championed by Councilor Madore. The vast majority of those were focused on fiscal gain for themselves or their heirs. Allowing smaller lots (increased density) in the rural areas would allow current property owners to make money by subdividing their land to sell all or part of it.

Although I am not an attorney, my understanding of the decisions by the Growth Management Hearings Board and the Courts is that financial gain for property owners is not a justification for altering the comprehensive plan's zoning for resource and rural zones to the detriment of other GMA Purposes and Goals, including the careful balance intended by the GMA between the multiple factors that make up rural character.

Please make this a part of the record.

Sydney Reisbick, President
Friends of Clark County
Approved by the Board.