

**Schroader, Kathy**

---



**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 07, 2015 4:34 PM  
**To:** 'Lynn Carman'  
**Cc:** Schroader, Kathy  
**Subject:** RE: Latest Email on the growth plan??

Hello Lynn:

Thanks for submitting your comment. I don't believe that the road improvements along NE 199<sup>th</sup> Street is done for him. Mr. Lagler submitted the application and it is the county obligation to process it. The provisions of RCW 36.70A.367 sunsets December of 2016. The timeline/due date for the county comp plan update is on or before June 30, 2016. We could have combined to two processes but choose not to do so. The hearing on the RILB will be first heard by the PC and then the Board and the public will have the opportunity to testify and provide input.

The hearing on October 20, 2015 on the comp plan is for the BOCC to consider the recommendations of the Planning Commissions regarding the plan update. The Board may adopt, reject, or modify the PC recommendation. Please, you can copy me on your comments. Thank you.

Best,

Oliver

**From:** Lynn Carman [<mailto:lynn.carman@comcast.net>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 07, 2015 4:22 PM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** RE: Latest Email on the growth plan??

Thanks Oliver. I have submitted my comments. So all the roadway being done out north is for him? Wow, when can I get my roadwork done? My small circle built in the 1970s has had only one surrey seal coat and some tar in the cracks. I have never seen things done this poorly in the past, everything was done in a timely manner and not willy nilly. Please tell me again this isn't a done deal.

Sincerely,  
Lynn

**From:** Orjiako, Oliver [<mailto:Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 7, 2015 1:45 PM  
**To:** 'Lynn Carman'; Alvarez, Jose; Euler, Gordon; Schroader, Kathy  
**Cc:** [kaitlin.gillespie@columbian.com](mailto:kaitlin.gillespie@columbian.com)  
**Subject:** RE: Latest Email on the growth plan??

Hello Lynn:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your email and inquiry. No, the RILB is not a push for alternative 4 and it is not a done deal. The RILB project was initiated by an application by Mr. Dennis Lagler for the county to designate rural industrial land bank as required by GMA under RCW 36.70A.367. The section of the RCW dealing with RILB has its own timeline and requirements and the county is following that. Please, feel free to call me or Gordy Euler if you have additional questions. Thank you.

Best,

Oliver

**From:** Lynn Carman [<mailto:lynn.carman@comcast.net>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, October 07, 2015 12:40 PM

**To:** Orjiako, Oliver

**Cc:** [kaitlin.gillespie@columbian.com](mailto:kaitlin.gillespie@columbian.com)

**Subject:** Latest Email on the growth plan??

Oliver:

I'm confused here and in hopes that you can help. The RILB hearing is after this 20<sup>th</sup> hearing if my memory serves me from this am other email on it?

Or should I call this a Clark County Done Deal?? There is the appearance #4 it moving forward.

Sincerely,

Lynn Carman

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