

Schroader, Kathy



From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, April 27, 2016 8:20 AM
To: Albrecht, Gary, Alvarez, Jose, Anderson, Colete, Euler, Gordon, Hermen, Matt, Kamp, Jacqueline, Lebowsky, Laurie, Lumbantobing, Sharon, Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy, Wisner, Sonja
Subject: FW: Answers for Comp Plan Work Session Wednesday

Just FYI and for the record Thanks

From: Stevens, Robert
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 8:19 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Madore, David; Euler, Gordon, McCauley, Mark
Subject: Re: Answers for Comp Plan Work Session Wednesday

Thanks, Oliver

No questions, and the direction from Councilor Madore was that staff be prepared to answer his questions in the work sessions. I don't know if any other correspondence is necessary, but use your best judgement.

Bob

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 26, 2016, at 4:48 PM, Orjiako, Oliver <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov> wrote

Hello Bob

Please, see the brief response in red. I will provide email communication between I and Councilor Madore with a subject line "RE: very different views of interpretation" and the RCW 36 70A to the work session tomorrow that supports my response that the county does not qualify for extension. Please, let me know if you have questions.

Best Regards,

Oliver

From: Madore, David
Sent: Tuesday, April 26, 2016 2:16 PM

To: Stevens, Robert; Orjako, Oliver
Subject: Answers for Comp Plan Work Session Wednesday

Bob,

Per our communication during our BOCC hearing today, please pass on these requests to planning so they can prepare answers for tomorrow's work session

Carol Levanen and Susan Rasmussen shared in citizen comment time that the two documents that we as a Board directed to remove from the Comp Plan (the Growing Healthy Report & Aging Readiness Report), have been added back by staff, included in the policies presented to the Planning Commission, and will be included in the Comp Plan that is coming to the BOCC

It is insubordinate for staff to specifically override direct Board actions. Correct me if I am wrong, but those Board directions to staff have not been rescinded. Has staff included them anyway? Please explain. The discussion we had with the Board (incidentally in a work session with the old Board) was about county-wide planning policies that related to the Growing Healthy Report (GHR) and the Aging Readiness Report (ARR) (which, contrary to what Carol and Susan are saying, were adopted by the Board in 2012). The Board provided direction at the work session that there was no interest in including the GHR and ARR in the county-wide planning policies. That direction was adhered to.

Planning staff has adamantly stated to the Board that the deadline cannot under any circumstances be extended. Has any other GMA county ever been granted extra time by a governor? Please explain. The US Census Report released earlier this year confirmed that the growth rate for Clark County has been nearly twice what staff had provided to the Board. The October 20 Commissioner report posted on the Grid for October 20, 2015 appears to be much more accurate than the recommended staff recommended population forecast. https://www.clark.wa.gov/sites/all/files/the-grid/102015R_PopulationForecastCorrection.pdf

Now that the US Census report confirms this, the Comp Plan, as is, is woefully inadequate and significantly outdated before we submit it. I believe that we have the responsibility to do it right. I'd like to know if staff can support this request. Councilor Madore believes that you should base a 20-year plan on a single year's growth rate. In the recession years there was less than 1% growth for several years. Staff presented the OFM ranges in 2014, and the Board, including Councilor Madore, picked the median. The population number was upped in 2015 to reflect growth that happened while the county was in the planning process, again approved by Councilor Madore. Councilor Madore would like to go with the US Census one-year growth number of 2%. For a few years the growth rate may be accelerated, but even the OFM high number for the next 20-years is less than a 1.9% growth rate.

The simplest and quickest way to fix what we can now is to readopt Alternative 4 to at least comply with the GMA directive to provide for the foreseeable growth in the rural area. Knowing this, I appeal to staff to support that correction within the allotted time. There is no such 'GMA directive to provide for the foreseeable growth in the rural area.'

Please ask staff if they are willing to ask the governor for more time (6 to 12 months) is needed to make any corrections. I would appreciate hearing staff explain our options in our work session.

Thank you,

David