Schroader, Kathy

From: Orjako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 4:26 PM
To: ‘Carol Levanen’, Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Olson, Julie (Assessment); Boldt, Marc; Madore, David
Cc: Euler, Gordon, Schroader, Kathy
Subject: RE Public Records Request to RW Thorpe & Associates, Inc regarding the Thorpe Report and the Clark County Comprehensive Plan

Hello Carol:

Again, thanks for your email. The public record request involves a private entity and a public agency therefore requires our PA’s office to be notified. It is appropriate for planning staff to step aside and have the PA’S office handle the request.

In response to your other issues. None of the issues you raised relates to the public record request.

Yes, I admitted that we do not have a good record on pre 1994 clusters as well as post 1994 in Agriculture and Forest Districts. I also indicated to you that Community Planning and GIS staff are working (reviewing our county permit records including but not limited to old micro-film files) to determine the number of parcels in old clusters combined with new ones so an estimate can be made on potential over counts. There is a good record from 1999 because that is when the county provided for clustering in Rural 5, 10, and 20.

Whatever the number is it will make no difference because the DSEIS analyzed potential environmental impacts. What you should be arguing is going forward the county need to flag and maintain in our GIS and Community Development permit system approved cluster shot plats and subdivisions to inform the comp plan update process in the future. You know very well that the Planning Commission and Councilors do not rubber stamp planning staff reports. We never claim to have all the answers or know it all.

On your public record request, I believe that the PA’s office will treat your request as they will treat all others. I thank you for your continued interest in Clark County planning process. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thanks.

Best,

Oliver

From: Carol Levanen [mailto:cnlidental@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, February 01, 2016 3:42 PM
To: Orjako, Oliver; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Olson, Julie (Assessment); Boldt, Marc; Madore, David
Subject: Re: Public Records Request to RW Thorpe & Associates, Inc. regarding the Thorpe Report and the Clark County Comprehensive Plan

For the Public Record and the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update

Dear Oliver,

Thanks for the reply. CCCU looks forward to receiving the requested information that confirms that Thorpe & Associates did indeed get any and all information relating to the corrected assumptions, to enable their firm to make an accurate and fair assessment of the alternatives. The question needs to be asked, why Thorpe did not apply the same assumptions to all of the alternatives for comparison? Why was only all 4 singled out? In addition, either Thorpe or county staff should have also shown the work and data used for the DSEIS assumptions, so a comparison could be made with the new assumptions. Clark County Councilors should not be “rubber stamping” policy just because the planning staff says it is so. They too, need to do due diligence to determine whether the information.
that staff is giving and recommending to them is data driven, accurate and appropriate in the application for which it is to be used. Remember, county staff are supposed to be the fact finders and are advisory only. During a Planning Commission hearing on November 19, 2015, you admitted that county staff does not have data or enough data or data is lacking, when you discussed remainder cluster lots, therefore, you counted them in lands to be developed. Thorpe validated that doing so does not comply with RCW or CCC. CCCU believes that if staff does not have accurate and complete data, that can actually be verified, to compose a Comprehensive Plan, how can that plan be legitimate? CCCU believes that this has been happening since the 1994 Plan, particularly in the rural and resource lands. The Commissioners and the Hearing Board have been “rubber stamping” the Comprehensive Plans for the rural and resource areas, without verifying the data is true and accurate. That is a fatal flaw.

Clark County is the only county in the state that does not consider particular assumptions in their planning process or have a mechanism in their Comp Plan that addresses inconsistencies. There is something wrong with these county policies and they need to be fixed. When the GMA says to preserve open space and critical lands, it behooves the county to incorporate these directives, as other counties have done, within the assumptions and the buildable lands analysis. National wetlands, stream and buffers, steep slopes, etc. should indeed be removed from the planning scheme for housing. The public deserves to have all of the information affecting their lives, out in the open, in the public light, so that they too can understand why particular policy is being made by the county. Remember, tax dollars are being used for the Comprehensive Plan process, and the money needs to be accounted for, particularly taxes that are being collected from the rural and resource landowners.

CCCU is also curious as to why a public request would be going to the prosecuting attorneys office? Is that where all public records requests go routinely? CCCU was not aware that such was the case, as in the example of such requests to the Sheriff’s office. It would seem to be quite a burden of paperwork for the prosecuting attorney office, and CCCU wonders if these requests are being treated differently, just because they apply to the Thorpe report. Regardless, the information is indeed public and since county attorney, Christine Cook stopped CCCU from getting answers from Thorpe at the time of the presentation, it is appropriate that we request that information now.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

From: "Oriako, Oliver" <Oliver.Oriako@clark.wa.gov>
To: 'Carol Levanen' <cnldental@yahoo.com>, "Cook, Christine" <Christine.Cook@clark.wa.gov>, "Euler, Gordon" <Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: "Richardson, Bill" <Bill.Richardson@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, February 1, 2016 8:20 AM
Subject: RE Public Records Request to RW Thorpe & Associates, Inc regarding the Thorpe Report and the Clark County Comprehensive Plan

Good morning Carol

Your public record request is similar to Councillor Madore’s public record request to R W Thorpe which our PA’s office is handing. I have copied Mr. Bill Richardson your request. Thanks.

Oliver

From: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2016 1:00 PM
To: Cook, Christine, Oriako, Oliver, Euler, Gordon
Subject: Fw Public Records Request to RW Thorpe & Associates, Inc regarding the Thorpe Report and the Clark County Comprehensive Plan

From: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
To: Clark County Citizens United Inc <cccunc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2016 11:11 AM
Subject: Public Records Request to RW Thorpe & Associates, Inc regarding the Thorpe Report and the Clark County Comprehensive Plan
This is a Public Records Request for all information to date, regarding the Thorpe Report and Analysis to the Clark County Comprehensive Plan. The requested information must be sent via electronic file with the original format that is un-disassembled.

Dear Ms. Cook, Mr. Orjako and Mr. Euler,

According to state law and the contract between Clark County and Thorpe, Thorpe is subject to the Public Records Act and required to deem all documents and communications pertaining to the Clark County Comp Plan work as public records that must be provided upon request.

This is a Public Records request for all records between November 24, 2015 and January 29, 2016 and any other related documents.

Please provide records in the original electronic form, including the actual email records in their original native format including all attachments sent or received. The records must be intact and not converted, disassembled, translated, reorganized, or changed to a format. The records are to be preserved and provided in their original native electronic format and delivered electronically. Any records that only exist in non-electronic form are requested to be provided in Adobe Acrobat format as text readable electronic files. This request is for all communications and documents created, sent, or received by Thorpe pertaining to the Report, including:

1. All emails, recorded phone messages, logs, notes, drafts, and documents within the above specified dates.

2. All records regarding the Clark County Comp Plan, stored on Thorpe computers or elsewhere such as the Cloud, remote offices, home computers, cell phones (personal and business), thumb drives, portable hard drives, or other locations or mediums.

3. All related documents and communications between Consultants engaged by Thorpe, Clark County attorneys, Clark County staff, and all other jurisdictions contacted for this Report.

4. All communications and documents relating to the topics of scope, contract, planning assumptions, FSEIS addendum, Clark County instructions and discussions regarding column A assumptions.

5. All communications and documents relating to instructions limiting communications with Clark County Council Members or excluding Column A assumptions from being considered or analyzed.

6. A copy of the master document, Exhibit A - Planning Assumption Choices, Rev. 1.09" that defines planning assumptions as columns A and B.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc thanks you for your attention to this matter and looks forward to your timely response to this Public Records Request.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.