

Schroader, Kathy



From: Wisner, Sonja
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 2:46 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Planning Commission Testimony
Attachments: Planning Commission testimony doc

Fyi and for the record

From: Wisner, Sonja
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 2:43 PM
To: Bill Wright; Eileen Quiring; John Blom-Hasson; Karl Johnson; Richard Bender; Ron Barca-Boeing; Ron Barca-MSN; Steve Morasch (stevern@landerholm.com)
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver; Euler, Gordon
Subject: FW: Planning Commission Testimony

From: Dianne Kocer [<mailto:diannekxm@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, November 18, 2015 2:19 PM
To: Wisner, Sonja
Subject: Planning Commission Testimony

Dear Sonja,

I am including the testimony as an attachment, but in case you are unable to open it I am also including it in the body of this email. Please let me know, by return email, that you received and forwarded this. Thank you very much!

Planning Commission

Clark County, WA

RE: Growth Management Act

Dear Commissioners,

I have a great deal of concern about the direction the "planning" process is taking place in this updating of the GMA for Clark County. My concerns fall into two general areas:

1) We have a Planning Commission and a Planning Department, made up of planning professionals They, and you, did the assigned job of analyzing the existing plan based upon the requirements of the GMA process. The County Council's job is to evaluate the recommendations given to them from this process, listen to the input from the public, whom you all represent, and then make a choice of which plan seems most in line with the public's needs, knowing that each choice satisfies the requirements of the Act, is defensible in court, and meets the needs of the county while protecting, as it was designed to do, the rural character which is part of Washington in general and Clark County in particular.

That process has been upended by a councilor who thinks he knows more than you and the professional planning staff. He has stepped out of the job that he was elected to do and replaced the professional analysis with his own. One would think he would understand his own job description, but it appears that is not the case.

Given the above, the public has no idea where his assumptions come from, why he doubts the output from you and the planning staff, and why he believes he has a right to ignore his job description and take over a task best handled by professionals, who presumably DO know what they are doing and can be held accountable if they don't.

Therefore, there is no doubt in my mind that the alternative proposed by a non-professional in the field should be rejected soundly.

2) The GMA has a primary purpose of preventing urban sprawl and therefore preserving the rural character to enhance agricultural opportunities, wildlife habitat protection, open spaces, orderly development, minimizing expense of infrastructure, etc.

Alternative 4/5 does not comply with that purpose. The elimination of Ag-20 would lead to a hodge podge development of 4-20+ homes in small enclaves throughout the county. These in turn disrupt habitat for wildlife, create disputes with neighbors who are farming or other wise living a rural life on their 20+ acres. It interferes with the need to keep large tracts intact for future LAMIRDs, as needed. It significantly adds to infrastructure expense for roads and transportation expense for school districts.

It is important that any plan strongly consider the possibility that we in Clark County need to be more food sufficient. If there is a major disruption in supply for whatever reason, we could find ourselves without accessible vegetables, eggs, fruit, etc

I urge you to recommend a professionally conceived plan that will not land the taxpayers of Clark County in court paying to defend an ill-conceived, unprofessionally generated plan.

Thank you very much.

Dianne Kocer

Brush Prairie, WA

360-891-1466

Planning Commission
Clark County, WA

RE: Growth Management Act

Dear Commissioners,

I have a great deal of concern about the direction the "planning" process is taking place in this updating of the GMA for Clark County. My concerns fall into two general areas

1) We have a Planning Commission and a Planning Department, made up of planning professionals. They, and you, did the assigned job of analyzing the existing plan based upon the requirements of the GMA process. The County Council's job is to evaluate the recommendations given to them from this process, listen to the input from the public, whom you all represent, and then make a choice of which plan seems most in line with the public's needs, knowing that each choice satisfies the requirements of the Act, is defensible in court, and meets the needs of the county while protecting, as it was designed to do, the rural character which is part of Washington in general and Clark County in particular.

That process has been upended by a councilor who thinks he knows more than you and the professional planning staff. He has stepped out of the job that he was elected to do and replaced the professional analysis with his own. One would think he would understand his own job description, but it appears that is not the case.

Given the above, the public has no idea where his assumptions come from, why he doubts the output from you and the planning staff, and why he believes he has a right to ignore his job description and take over a task best handled by professionals, who presumably DO know what they are doing and can be held accountable if they don't.

Therefore, there is no doubt in my mind that the alternative proposed by a non-professional in the field should be rejected soundly

2) The GMA has a primary purpose of preventing urban sprawl and therefore preserving the rural character to enhance agricultural opportunities, wildlife habitat protection, open spaces, orderly development, minimizing expense of infrastructure, etc.

Alternative 4/5 does not comply with that purpose. The elimination of Ag-20 would lead to a hodge podge development of 4-20+ homes in small enclaves throughout the county. These in turn disrupt habitat for wildlife, create disputes with neighbors who are farming or otherwise living a rural life on their 20+ acres. It interferes with the need to keep large tracts intact for future LAMIRDS, as needed. It significantly adds to infrastructure expense for roads and transportation expense for school districts.

It is important that any plan strongly consider the possibility that we in Clark County need to be more food sufficient. If there is a major disruption in supply for whatever reason, we could find ourselves without accessible vegetables, eggs, fruit, etc

I urge you to recommend a professionally conceived plan that will not land the taxpayers of Clark County in court paying to defend an ill-conceived, unprofessionally generated plan.

Thank you very much.

Dianne Kocer
Brush Prairie, WA
360-891-1466