Schroader, Kathy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 1 50 PM
To: 'susan rasmussen'
Cc: Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose, Schroader, Kathy
Subject: RE: Who is responsible for ensuring oversight?

Hi Susan.

Please, note that land use and transportation are among the mandatory elements of the counties fully planning under the GMA. Thanks

Oliver

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 8:46 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Carol Levanen; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete
Cc: Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; McCauley, Mark; DONALD MCISAAC; Jim Malinowski; Jerry Olson; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Rick Dunning; Fred Pickering; lorettajsteele@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Who is responsible for ensuring oversight?

Good morning Oliver,

I've reread the particular section of the RCW, and it is not a mandatory element of the GMA.

What is inconsistent with the GMA is not lending recognition to the policies set down by the elected officials This diminishes and stifles the ability to advance local discretion, which is clearly recognized in the GMA and upheld in the Courts time and again

There is no oversight to ensure that the policies set forth by the County Councilors, is indeed upheld and implemented by the planning staff, county attorneys, and the planning commission

Who is responsible for ensuring the oversight and the integrity of the process?

Thank you,
Susan Rasmussen for CCCU,Inc

Sent from Windows Mail

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 8:36 AM
To: susan rasmussen, Carol Levanen, Euler, Gordon, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete
Cc: jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, david.madore@clark.wa.gov, mark mccauley@clark.wa.gov, DONALD MCISAAC

Good morning Susan

Thank you for your email and concerns expressed We are following directives from the Board of County Councilors I will review the work sessions you mentioned. I will stress that it is staff responsibility to make sure that the councilors are made aware of the requirements of GMA Our role include making sure that our update include recent amendments to the GMA.

I provided the sections below to Carol following a brief discussion with her on September 17, 2015 at the PC deliberation. I am including it here in my reply to you It is important to note that deference to local governments does not mean developing a growth management plan that is inconsistent with the Growth Management Act

At the PC deliberation meeting we briefly talk about some language in the RCW 36.70A (GMA) and other new related changes. As you read RCW 36 70A.070 (1), you will find the following.
". . Wherever possible, the land use element should consider utilizing urban planning approaches that promote physical activity".

Section RCW 36.70A 070 (6)(a)(vii) says "Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles"

Feel free to review ESSB 5186 and 2SHB 1565 If you have questions, please let me know

Best Regards,

Oliver

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 7:03 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Carol Levanen
Cc: Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; McCauley, Mark; DONALD MCISAAC
Subject: Re: Ignoring directives from the Councilors

Dear Oliver and Carol,

We are at odds over interpretation of the GMA here. Without doubt, the GMA is distinctly clear that local discretion should be advanced, and the policies set down by the policy makers, (the elected officials) need to be recognized, honored and implemented In this case, staff has been disregarding what the policy makers have clearly stated

Please be so kind as to recall the work session with the Clark County Board of Councilors and the planning staff held mid July Oliver, you weren't in attendance but you still should access the recording of the minutes to listen to the tone of this particular work session Gordy Euler presented the two reports. One was the Growing Healthier Report, and the other was the report on aging. His obvious intent was to include them in the 2016 comprehensive plan update.

However, the Board of County Councilors had a different opinion on these reports and unanimously agreed for them to be excluded from this comprehensive plan update.

Despite the clear directives from the policy makers, the Clark County Board of Councilors, the reports remain listed on the Community Development site as "Resource Documents" for the 2016 update Most disturbing is the fact that planning staff have disregarded the directives of the Councilors. This is the prime issue of concern.

Thank you for your attention,
Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from Windows Mail

From: Carol Levanen
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2015 8:55 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver

Hello Oliver, Thanks for the info .. What I was concerned about was the healthy food language that is proposed for the Comprehensive Plan I don't believe it is a mandate of the GMA and I don't believe it should be used as a means to lock up rural and resource lands into large lot zoning I did find a WAC that I think we did discuss, but it simply says may consider, and there is no directive to that passage We are very alarmed that the Health Department has been incorporated into the comp plan in such a way as to attempt to accomplish an environmental and no growth agenda This is not planning, it is social engineering Please try not to do that in the 2016 update of the Plan Thanks!

Best Regards, Carol Levanen, Ex Secretary, CCCU, Inc

From: "Orjiako, Oliver" <Oliver Orjiako@clark wa gov>
To: "Carol Levanen (cnldental@yahoo com) (cnldental@yahoo com)" <cnldental@yahoo com>
Cc: "Euler, Gordon" <Gordon Euler@clark wa gov>, "Alvarez, Jose" <Jose Alvarez@clark wa gov>, "Schroader, Kathy" <Kathy Schroader@clark wa gov>
Sent: Monday, September 21, 2015 4 18 PM
Subject: RCW 36 70A 070

Hello Carol:

At the PC deliberation meeting we briefly talk about some language in the RCW 36.70A (GMA) and other new related changes. As you read RCW 36.70A.070 (1), you will find the following:
" .. Wherever possible, the land use element should consider utilizing urban planning approaches that promote physical activity".

Section RCW 36 70A.070 (6)(a)(vii) says "Pedestrian and bicycle component to include collaborative efforts to identify and designate planned improvements for pedestrian and bicycle facilities and corridors that address and encourage enhanced community access and promote healthy lifestyles"

Feel free to review ESSB 5186 and 2SHB 1565 If you have questions, please let me know

Best Regards,

Oliver

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