From: George and Charlotte Peterson [mailto:peterkanga46@hotmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2016 1:13 PM
To: Cnty Board of County Councilors General Delivery; Boldt, Marc; Stewart, Jeanne; Olson, Julie (Councilor); Madore, David; Mielke, Tom
Subject: Write Your Councilor

Sender Information
Name: George and Charlotte Peterson
Phone Number: (360) 687-2995
Email Address: peterkanga46@hotmail.com
Address:
22111 NE 182nd Ave
Battle Ground, Washington

Subject: The comprehensive plan
Message:
We are opposed to the proposed policies contained in the rural and natural resource element and the Transportation element. Please do not deny us landowners the use of our land that we have been paying taxes on for years. We wish to own and maintain within our property.
NEWS RELEASE

May 4, 2016

Contact: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning
(360) 397-2280 ext. 4112; oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov

State to begin review of proposed county growth plan materials

Vancouver, WA – Documents covering proposed changes to the local growth management plan have been submitted to the Washington Department of Commerce for the state review required to update the plan.

Two binders of material on the county’s “preferred alternative” were transmitted last week. Topics include proposed changes to zoning, urban growth areas and county code. The package also includes:

• Updates to planning policies;
• Draft capital facilities plan;
• Draft county capital facilities financial plan;
• Long-range road plan (arterial atlas);
• Final supplemental environmental impact statement;
• Commerce check list;
• Proposed impact fees (parks, schools and transportation); and
• Public comments.

Meanwhile, public hearings are scheduled this month for the Planning Commission and Board of County Councilors, followed by deliberations in June. All sessions will be at the Public Service Center, Sixth Floor, 1300 Franklin St., as follows:

• May 19, 6:30 p.m.: Joint public hearing on entire plan update, including environmental impact statement
• May 24, 6:30 p.m.: Joint public hearing on entire plan update, including environmental impact statement
• June 2, 6:30 p.m.: Planning Commission deliberations
• June 21, 10 a.m.: Board of County Councilors deliberations

Related materials are online at www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/plan-adoption. Public comments may be submitted online using Engage Clark County at www.clark.wa.gov/engage-clark-county.

###

You can also link to the full news release on Clark County’s website: https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/state-begin-review-proposed-county-growth-plan-materials

Sent to:
Rick Zoller <doczoller@aol.com>; Bill Zimmerman <bi-zifarms@juno.com>; Judy Zimmerly <dennisz@millerrzimmerly.com>; Kathy Zimmer <kathyzimmer@msn.com>; Kathleen Zimmer <kathleenzimmer28@yahoo.com>; David Zilavy <davidzilavy@gmail.com>; Judy Zeider <jmzeider@aol.com>; Robert Zastoupil <cjzast@yahoo.com>; John Zagunis <zagunis@pacificer.com>; Karl Ylonen <ktmkarl@tds.net>; Cyrus Yamin <cyrus_yamin@yahoo.com>; Phil Wuest <pwuest@dsw-law.com>; Matt Wubben <Matt@legacy6inc.com>; Jared Wubben <jared@legacy6inc.com>; Steve Wrightson <steve@fire3.org>; Tom Wooldridge <twwooldridge@ci.lacentern.wa.us>; Michele Woodward <michele@highward.com>; Ted & Victoria Woods <tjwoods11437@hotmail.com>; Susan Wood <swood5star@hotmail.com>; Les Wood <swood54@yahoo.com>; Karen Wood <kwood@pacificer.com>; Dave Wood <dwood@newlandcommunities.com>; Brian Wolfe <bwolfe@bhlaw.com>; Theresa Wolf <Theresa98682@hotmail.com>; Patricia Lee Witter <klkw@comcast.net>; Steve Wisnieski <RCTF@tds.net>; Denice Wisnieski <dede.wisnieski@gmail.com>; John Wish <wish87@comcast.net>; Wiser, Sonja <Sonja.Wiser@clark.wa.gov>; Bruce Wiseman <treewisemans@msn.com>; Jerry Winters <deerfeeder@juno.com>; Jim Winkler <JHW@Winklercompanies.com>; Mary Ellen Winborn <dcdplan@co.clallam.wa.us>; Wilson, Susan <Susan.Wilson@clark.wa.gov>; Jim Wilson <wilsonarchserv@comcast.net>; James Wilson <travelthewilsonway@comcast.net>; Frank Wilson <wilsonf4387@yahoo.com>; Gary & Barb Wills <garybarbwills@aol.com>; Virgil Williams <virgwill@gmail.com>; Robert Williams <selectiveangler@tds.net>; Kammee Williams <dkwill1111@aol.com>; John Williams <john.williams@cityofbg.org>; Holly Williams <hollyjander@juno.com>; Anita Will <whipplecreekproject@gmail.com>; DenMark Wichar <deedub@webtv.net>; Sharon Whittle <swwhittle@aol.com>; Paul White <paul.white@kiwilt.com>; Lealane White <lealanewhite@gmail.com>; Frank White <firfarmer@yahoo.com>; Doris White <dorisisbobw@aol.com>; David White <dcwhite@integration.com>; Cliff Wegandt <cliffwegandt@hilton.com>; Scott Weston <westonsan@yahoo.com>; Dave Weston <davewv@aks-eng.com>; Darren Wertz <darren.wertz@ci.ridgefield.wa.us>; Cindy Werner <cwerner@usgs.gov>; Terry Wellner <twellner@aim.com>; Charlene Welch <chelwelch@comcast.net>; Westrand, Shann <Shann.Westrand@rtc.wa.gov>; Angela Maria Weinmuller <angelamariatweinmuller@gmail.com>; Rick Wel <rweil@tds.net>; Damon Webster <dwebster@macaysposito.com>; Webers <webers@pacificer.com>; Gregory Weber <confluencewinery@aol.com>; Steven T. Webb <steinwebb@vansd.org>; Kyle Watson <zootfish@aol.com>; Molly Warnke <blondie4104@yahoo.com>; John Warnke <warnkejm@msn.com>; Wayne Wanke <wwanke@comcast.net>; Rosalind Wang <dwaung99@yahoo.com>; Len Waiko <lenwalko@hotmail.com>; Dale Waite <daleelee@waite.com>; Jude Wait <judith.wait@wsu.edu>; Wendy Wahl <wendyw@ahoduction.com>; David Wahl <wahlda@comcast.net>; Michael Wade <mcwadepca@gmail.com>; Stacey Waddell <stacey.waddell@gmail.com>; Jan Vis <haglass@aol.com>; Dean Vilander <maridean@hotmail.com>; Bart Viers <bviers@unitedroad.com>; Jennifer Vick <jvick1414@gmail.com>; Laurie Veitenheimer <laurie12@q.com>; Daryl Veitenheimer <veitenheimer@msn.com>; Tom VanLaken <tvlberries270@aol.com>; Ron VanLaeken <ronvanlaeken@comcast.net>; Eugene VanKoll <vankoll@aol.com>; Ken Vance <Ken@therefllector.com>; Allison VanArnam <avanarnam@comcast.net>; Valenter, Lynn
Please remove me from this list, the opinions of rural people don’t seem to count for too much down town and the new majority over there doesn’t seem to care so please once again, not more emails.

Thank you

On 5/4/2016 12:55 PM, Schroader, Kathy wrote:

NEWS RELEASE

May 4, 2016

Contact: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning
(360) 397-2280 ext. 4112; oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov

State to begin review of proposed county growth plan materials

Vancouver, WA – Documents covering proposed changes to the local growth management plan have been submitted to the Washington Department of Commerce for the state review required to update the plan.

Two binders of material on the county’s “preferred alternative” were transmitted last week. Topics include proposed changes to zoning, urban growth areas and county code. The package also includes:

- Updates to planning policies;
- Draft capital facilities plan;
- Draft county capital facilities financial plan;
- Long-range road plan (arterial atlas);
- Final supplemental environmental impact statement;
- Commerce check list;
- Proposed impact fees (parks, schools and transportation); and
- Public comments.

Meanwhile, public hearings are scheduled this month for the Planning Commission and Board of County Councilors, followed by deliberations in June. All sessions will be at the Public Service Center, Sixth Floor, 1300 Franklin St., as follows:
• May 19, 6:30 p.m.: Joint public hearing on entire plan update, including environmental impact statement
• May 24, 6:30 p.m.: Joint public hearing on entire plan update, including environmental impact statement
• June 2, 6:30 p.m.: Planning Commission deliberations
• June 21, 10 a.m.: Board of County Councilors deliberations


###

You can also link to the full news release on Clark County’s website: [https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/state-begin-review-proposed-county-growth-plan-materials](https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/state-begin-review-proposed-county-growth-plan-materials)

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

--

Eric Cordova
Vulcan Performance/Performance Supply Co.
30718 NW 10th Ct
Ridgefield, WA 98642

Ph 360-263-6044
Fax 360-783-6442
20-year Comp Plan continues to worsen – rural citizens are literally crying;
See for yourself in this 3 minute video clip:
http://www.cvtv.org/vid_link/18089?start=2610&stop=2850

Last year, the citizen representatives directed Clark County Planning Staff not to embed anything into the Comp Plan that is not required by law.
The result is the fattest and most packed plan in the history of our county that literally weighs 10.2 pounds and fills two 3.5" binders.
It pushes an intrusive social engineering agenda including high capacity transit and "demand management" that seeks to restrict citizen driving rather than improving road capacity.
The plan increases the cost of each home by many thousands of dollars in higher impact fees for schools, parks, and rural traffic that were already high and further drive up the cost of unaffordable homes in our community.
A sampling of fee increases just for one category that the trio of County Councilors are poised to impose include for single family homes:
an increase of $1,269 for Battle Ground
an increase of $2,547 for Ridgefield
an increase of $1,357 for Vancouver
an increase of, $2,983 for Washougal
and for multi-family homes:
an increase of $2,767 for Camas school district
an increase of $4,963 for Evergreen school district
an increase of $4,734 for Ridgefield for school district
The trio is poised to raise traffic impact fees for the largest area of the county, rural district 2, from $52 to $264 per trip, a 500% increase. Each new rural home would be charged 10 times that because each one is calculated to create 10 traffic trips per day.
This plan is a disaster for Clark County. It will continue to restrict the private property rights of rural citizens, worsen our housing crisis by restricting the supply of useful land, force families off their land because they wouldn't have the freedom to build homes on their own land.
One citizen representative expresses his objection in this video clip:
http://www.cvtv.org/vid_link/18128?start=5901&stop=7895
Some rural citizens are literally crying for the losses inflicted by this disastrous plan that fails to meet the most basic requirement of the Growth Management Act, to provide enough useful land to meet our basic needs for the next 20 years.
Board of County Councilors (05-03-16) > Clark/Vancouver Television

This is the official website of Clark/Vancouver Television (CVTV), serving the City of Vancouver and Clark County, Washington. It features both live and on demand...

Like Comment Share

Carney Layne, Ken Willmon and 34 others
Chronological

28 shares

Kj Hinton The 3 Stooges don't care.
Like · Reply · 4 · 12 hrs

Margaret Tweet Affordable housing starts requires available land. In both urban and rural areas.
Like · Reply · 4 · 12 hrs

Eric Cordova I feel for the man and his family and he doesn't owe apology for anything he said IMHO.
Like · Reply · 8 · 11 hrs

Anne Miller It's a travesty. Heartbreaking what is happening to these citizens...again.
Like · Reply · 6 · 11 hrs

Debra Fisher This has been the plan since the 1970's, to deny rural landowners their rights to their property. It has been the planners dream to concentrate populations within urban growth boundaries.
Like · Reply · 7 · 11 hrs

David Clark Google wildlands movement project
Like · Reply · 3 hrs

Write a reply...

Susan Powell Hirtzel This is so sad, really heartbreaking for these land owners, and so wrong.
Like · Reply · 1 · 9 hrs
minority students, what was the solution? to put equal money into those schools? no. to purchase equal and current materials for teachers and students? no. their solution was to take children and create a burden for them and create a burden on their parents by bussing them and distributing them throughout the white schools. and eventually they closed most of the schools in the minority neighborhoods. i know this because my daughter and i protested outside the courthouse begging them not to bus. but they did. i know this because lived in a minority neighborhood. in ideology, i see clark county going down the same damn road! and it's not the proverbial yellow brick road either! i just keep telling myself—GOD sees all and GOD will some day judge all. oh universe...please protect david madore. he's our only hope obiwan kenobi!

like · reply · 9 hrs

peter van nortwick it's called the growth management act for a reason and every where they have been implemented cost of housing skyrockets. then we hear about not enough affordable housing. if you want housing to be affordable it needs to be reasonable cost to build and sufficient areas to build at all levels in the housing market. high costs force home sizes up to help spread the cost out over the home. stan green is a good guy and i know he greatly values his family being close to him.

like · reply · 4 · 9 hrs · edited

timothy pavel the county is run by liberals and are sticking to the people that live on property.

like · reply · 2 · 8 hrs

david wayne glenn jr. forgive me for not being wise to all that is going on but that man's plea really moved me. but what can i do as a citizen? i have been following all these posts and i cant help but think i am not unlike most people that do not fully grasp what's going on. if each apartment is getting a comp fee of $5000 does that mean rent rates for already expensive apartments will increase? i have my father in law who is low income moving to vancouver and i am already stressed that his $1900 a month in social security is not really sufficient to afford rent and cost of living. i own a home in vancouver near salmon creek- what does the $1500 increase to single family homes in vancouver mean? are my annual taxes going to double? .... how do i learn more so i can understand what is happening? can anyone post links to articles or something that might break this down and explain things a little better? all i seem to understand from this is that the counselors are about to make policy on something extremely huge that is going to impact this town for years and nobody is even on the same page on whether this is a good plan to impose or not—yet it sounds like they're all going to just vote it in to meet some deadline. david madore- i cant say i know enough to even feel your arguments or questions are right or not but as you did for another cause i fought for last year you want the citizens to be heard and involved and for that i respect you.

like · reply · 1 · 7 hrs · edited

david knight i still cannot get this to play. is there a youtube version or something?

like · reply · 1 hr

steven cox the trio cannot be voted out quick enough.

like · reply · 2 · 1 hr

will h. matson for the amount of people riding rural transit a minivan is all areas like yacolt need.

like · reply · 55 mins

ken willimon keep up the great reporting david! we appreciate the updates and information we won't get from anyone else! further, you're driving the liberal buffoons at the oregonian nuts! i love it!

like · reply · 54 mins

margie coursey i don't know if i should select the mad or sad button.

like · reply · 42 mins

butch grumbly the three stooges strike again.

like · reply · 22 mins

david madore the grieving citizen begging for the marc boldt, jeanne stewart, and julie olson that stripped rural citizens of their private property rights is reminding that trio of their campaign promises to protect those rights.
Julie Olson campaigned for those rights when running but killed Alternative 4 as soon as elected. Click to enlarge this snapshot of Julie Olson's campaign website showing her promise to citizens: http://julieolsonforclark.com/Julie_Olson/Issues.html

See that last line? "Protecting private property rights"

Honesty in politics is the basis for trust.

Proven responsible financial stewardship of tax payer dollars
Provide predictable, responsible and efficient delivery of regional services.
Provide effective and balanced land use planning to encourage economic development and job creation while protecting private property rights.

Like · Reply · 1 min · Edited

Steven Cox Pity we lack the ability to hold recall elections.

Like · Reply · 2 mins
Hearings set as growth plan gets state review

By The Columbian
Published: May 5, 2016, 6:05 AM

Clark County — Clark County has submitted documents covering proposed changes to the local growth management plan to the state Department of Commerce for the state review required to update the plan.

Two binders of material on the county's preferred alternative were transmitted last week. The topics include proposed changes to zoning, urban growth areas and county code. The package also includes updates to planning policies; the draft capital facilities plan; the draft county capital facilities financial plan; the long-range road plan; the final supplemental environmental impact statement; the commerce check list; proposed impact fees and public comments.

Public hearings are scheduled this month for the Planning Commission and Board of County Councilors, followed by deliberations in June. All sessions will be at the Public Service Center, Sixth Floor, 1300 Franklin St. Here are the dates:

• 6:30 p.m. May 19 and May 24: Joint public hearing on entire plan update, including environmental impact statement.

• 6:30 p.m. June 2: Planning Commission deliberations.

• 10 a.m. June 21: Board of County Councilors deliberations.

Schroader, Kathy

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 4:14 PM
To: Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Hermen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lumbantobing, Sharon; Lebowsky, Laurie; Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy; Wiser, Sonja
Subject: FW: Clusters

All:

A message from Commissioner Morris.

Gordy

From: Elisasue@aol.com [mailto:Elisasue@aol.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 2:50 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Re: Clusters

Hi Gordy - Thanks for getting back to me so quickly and answering my questions. Obviously, I need to go back and read the cluster language. :-)

I think it's good that you're honoring the Rural Task Force. They worked for a very long time. And I believe I would have agreed with the Council on the clustering proposal. Depending on the lot configuration and road frontage, you could have wound up with some really strange shaped parcels. And it still wouldn't reduce the number of new children in schools, the number of new cars on the roads, the number of new wells or the number of new septic tanks.

But it was a good effort!

And to all of the planning staff - remember there are hundreds and hundreds of us out here who support you totally! We're just all sorry this horrible episode with Council Madore is unfolding.

Keep up the good work - you've got lots of friends!

Betty Sue

In a message dated 5/4/2016 5:20:25 P.M. Pacific Daylight Time, Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov writes:

Commissioner:

Great to hear from you.
Using the cluster provision in the Rural area requires that platting and zoning be met. For 20 acres in an R-5 zone, this means four five-acre lots, or else using one of the two clustering options (with or without a buildable remainder lot). There is no provision for an extra lot, and uses on the remainder lot are restricted.

The proposal for clustering on Ag and Forest lands is similar, except that the proposal requires clustering for land divisions on the proposed AG-10 and FR-20 parcels. The Board indicated today they want another option to requiring clustering, so we’ll put something together and get it posted.

I believe we are at risk by going to the smaller parcel sizes on resource lands, but we are being true to one recommendation of the Rural Lands Task Force. We proposed the cluster requirement as mitigation—to show we are (mostly) serious about protecting resource lands. I believe we are at greater risk if we simply allow Ag and Forest parcels to divide, even with a specified building envelope. But, that is the direction of the Board, and we’ll see what happens.

Thanks for asking!

Gordy

From: Elisue@aol.com  [mailto:Elisue@aol.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2016 4:57 PM
To: Euler, Gordon
Subject: Clusters

Hi Gordy -

I've been reading the proposed cluster ordinance. Is my memory correct that when you cluster in a rural 5 you get an extra dwelling? So if someone has 15 acres they can cluster the development and build 4 homes. Then the remainder lot has restricted uses?

Thanks - Betty Sue

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
May 4 at 6:40pm

20-year Comp Plan continues to worsen – rural citizens are literally crying:
See for yourself in this 3 minute video clip:
http://www.cvtv.org/vid_link/18089?start=2610&stop=2850

Last year, the citizen representatives directed Clark County Planning Staff not to embed anything into the Comp Plan that is not required by law.
The result is the fattest and most packed plan in the history of our county that literally weighs 10.2 pounds and fills two 3.5" binders.
It pushes an intrusive social engineering agenda including high capacity transit and "demand management" that seeks to restrict citizen driving rather than improving road capacity.
The plan increases the cost of each home by many thousands of dollars in higher impact fees for schools, parks, and rural traffic that were already high and further drive up the cost of unaffordable homes in our community.

A sampling of fee increases just for one category that the trio of County Councilors are poised to impose include for single family homes:

- an increase of $1,269 for Battle Ground
- an increase of $2,547 for Ridgefield
- an increase of $1,357 for Vancouver
- an increase of, $2,917 for Washougal

and for multi-family homes:

- an increase of $2,767 for Camas school district
- an increase of $4,963 for Evergreen school district
- an increase of $4,734 for Ridgefield for school district
- an increase of, $3,111 for Washougal for school district

The trio is poised to raise traffic impact fees for the largest area of the county, rural district 2, from $52 to $264 per trip, a 500% increase. Each new rural home would be charged 10 times that because each one is calculated to create 10 traffic trips per day.

This plan is a disaster for Clark County. It will continue to restrict the private property rights of rural citizens, worsen our housing crisis by restricting the supply of useful land, force families off their land because they wouldn't have the freedom to build homes on their own land.

One citizen representative expresses his objection in this video clip:
http://www.cvtv.org/vid_link/18128?start=5901&stop=7895

Some rural citizens are literally crying for the losses inflicted by this disastrous plan that fails to meet the most basic requirement of the Growth Management Act, to provide enough useful land to meet our basic needs for the next 20 years.
Board of County Councilors (05-03-16) >
Clark/Vancouver Television

This is the official website of Clark/Vancouver Television (CVTV), serving the City of Vancouver and Clark County, Washington. It features both live and on demand...

Like  Comment  Share

Sue Parry, Ray Orr and 52 others

49 shares

Kj Hinton The 3 Stooges don't care.
Like · Reply · 5 · May 4 at 6:59pm

Margaret Tweet Affordable housing requires available land, in both urban and rural areas.
Like · Reply · 4 · 21 hrs · Edited

Eric Comment I feel for the man and his family and he doesn't owe apology for anything he said iMHO.
Like · Reply · 10 · May 4 at 7:26pm

Anna Miller It's a travesty. Heartbreaking what is happening to these citizens...again.
Like · Reply · 9 · May 4 at 7:34pm

Debra Fisher This has been the plan since the 1970's, to deny rural landowners their rights to their property. It has been the planners dream to concentrate populations within urban growth boundaries.
Like · Reply · 9 · May 4 at 8:08pm

David Clark Google wildlands movement project
Like · Reply · 1 · Yesterday at 3:57am

Write a reply...

Susan Powell Hinojosa This is so sad, really heartbreaking for these land owners, and so wrong.
Like · Reply · 2 · May 4 at 10:04pm
minority students. what was the solution? to put equal money into those schools? no. to purchase equal and current materials for teachers and students? no. their solution was to take children and create a burden for them and create a burden on their parents by bussing them and distributing them throughout the white schools. and eventually they closed most of the schools in the minority neighborhoods. i know this because my daughter and i protested outside the courthouse begging them not to bus, but they did. i know this because lived in a minority neighborhood. in ideology, i see clark county going down the same damn road! and it's not the proverbial yellow brick road either! i just keep telling myself---GOD sees all and GOD will some day judge all. Oh Universe...please protect David Madore. He's our only hope Obiwa Kenobi! 

Like · Reply · May 4 at 10:06pm

Peter V. Nortwick It's called the Growth Management Act for a reason and everywhere they have been implemented cost of housing skyrocket. Then we hear about not enough affordable housing. If you want housing to be affordable it needs to be reasonable cost to build and sufficient areas to build at all levels in the housing market. High costs force home sizes up to help spread the cost out over the home. Stan Green is a good guy and i know he greatly values his family being close to him.

Like · Reply · 7 · May 4 at 10:16pm · Edited

Timothy Pavei The county is run by liberals and are sticking to the people that live on property.

Like · Reply · 7 · May 4 at 10:57pm

David Wayne Glenn Jr. Forgive me for notbeing wise to all that is going on but that mans plea really moved me. But what can i do as a citizen? I have been following all these posts and I cant help but think I am not unlike most people that do not fully grasp what's going on. If each apartment is getting a comp fee of $5000 does that mean rent rates for already expensive apartments will increase? I have my father in law who is low income moving to Vancouver and I am already stressed that his $1900 a month in social security is not really sufficient to afford rent and cost of living. I own a home in Vancouver near Salmon Creek- what does the $1500 increase to single family homes in Vancouver mean? Are my annual taxes going to double? .... How do i learn more so I can understand what is happening? Can anyone post links to articles or something that might break this down and explain things a little better? All I seem to understand from this is that the counselors are about to make policy on something extremely huge that is going to impact this town for years and nobody is even on the same page on whether this is a good plan to impose or not- yet it sounds like they're all going to just vote it in to meet some deadline. David Madore- I cant say I know enough to even feel your arguments or questions are right or not but as you did for another cause I fought for last year you want the citizens to be heard and involved and for that I respect you.

Like · Reply · 3 · May 4 at 11:43pm · Edited

David Knight I still cannot get this to play. Is there a youtube version or something?

Like · Reply · Yesterday at 5:35am

Steven Cox The trio can't be voted out quick enough.

Like · Reply · 2 · Yesterday at 5:50am

Will H. Matson For the amount of people riding rural transit a minivan is all areas like Yacolt need.

Like · Reply · 2 · Yesterday at 6:27am

Ken Willmon Keep up the great reporting David! We appreciate the updates and information we won't get from anyone else! Further, you're driving the liberal buffoons at the Oregonian nuts! I love it!

Like · Reply · 1 · Yesterday at 6:28am

Margie Coursey I dont know if I should select the mad or sad button.

Like · Reply · 1 · Yesterday at 6:40am

Ken Willmon select both and add outraged!

Like · Reply · 1 · 22 hrs

Margie Coursey Exactly what I was thinking. Disgusted too.

Like · Reply · 22 hrs

Write a reply...
Butch Grumbly: The three stooges strike again.
Like · Reply · 2 · Yesterday at 7:00am

David Madore: The grieving citizen begging for the Marc Boldt, Jeanne Stewart, and Julie Olson that stripped rural citizens of their private property rights is reminding that trio of their campaign promises to protect those rights.

Julie Olson campaigned for those rights when running but killed Alternative 4 as soon as elected. Click to enlarge this snapshot of Julie Olson’s campaign website showing her promise to citizens: http://julieolsonforclark.com/Julie_Olson/issues.html

See that last line? “Protecting private property rights”

Honesty in politics is the basis for trust.

KJ Hinjon: Our locally alleged Republicans have failed us repeatedly on this.

I have yet to see where Olson has, in any way, voted differently than her democrat opponent, Chuck Green, would have had he been elected.

She is the textbook example of a "RINO."

Like · Reply · 5 · 23 hrs

David Gregory: Sadly, most folks thought promises meant something....

Like · Reply · 4 · 23 hrs

Write a reply...

Steven Cox: Pity we lack the ability to hold recall elections.

Like · Reply · 1 · 23 hrs

Chad Taylor: Perhaps you should publish their home addresses so “We the people” could create problems that follow them home, like they do for us.

Like · Reply · 23 hrs

David Madore: Chad Taylor, the most appropriate way to hold candidates accountable is in the public setting, not at their home.

Like · Reply · 5 · 23 hrs

Chad Taylor: I understand what is appropriate however what is appropriate no longer seems to work. I understand you won’t publish such things. I simply want to convey the level of frustration.

Like · Reply · 1 · 23 hrs

Steven Cox: We must love them and allow them peace and protected their privacy, even when they would not do the same for us.

Like · Reply · 3 · 23 hrs

[...]

031834
Wiff H. Mateson: Yes, publishing private addresses is what "ibls do. Better if we start attending their meetings.
Like · Reply · 12 hrs · Edited

Dennis Anderson: I'll bet your were given 24 hours to read it and vote on it.
Like · Reply · 23 hrs

Barbara Kaller: So wrong of this trio!!!
Like · Reply · 18 hrs

Robert Gildart: Just like D.C. Corruption on the local level.
Like · Reply · 18 hrs

Carol Levanan: Councilor Madore, CCCU, Inc. is there at every hearing and researches every statement made by all. We have combed through the new Plan, page by page, and wholehearted support what you are saying. This new plan is three times the size of the existing Plan and is highly regulatory and restrictive. Information we submit in the record is verified by researched data that is accurate and credible. Nothing we submit is simply our opinion. You have been the champion of the rural people and all of the citizens of Clark County and have clearly shown the dedication to that task. The problem is, you know too much about what has happened in this Plan and county staff doesn't want the public to be told this information. It appears they are trying to censure you by removing your freedom of speech via rude comments, lawsuits and false Columbian articles. But we who have researched the data, know what the truth really is, and we have large notebooks of information to back it up. The Comprehensive Plan must be accurate and true, and you are working very hard to assure the people that will happen. We commend your hard work and dedication, and wish you well!
Like · Reply · 2 · 7 hrs
Schroader, Kathy

From: Schroader, Kathy
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2016 1:20 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Wednesday, May 11 is last day to post a comment on Engage Clark County

**Wednesday, May 11 is last day to post a comment on Engage Clark County**

Don’t miss your chance to use Engage Clark County to comment about proposed updates to the county’s Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

The topics are:
1. Proposed Clustering Requirements for Resource Lands (AG-10 and FR-20)
2. Capital Facilities Plan – Transportation
3. Arterial Atlas Amendments
4. Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS)
5. Title 40 – Unified Development Code
6. Community Design Element
7. Environmental Element
8. Historical, Archaeological and Cultural Preservation Element
9. Housing Element
10. Rural and Natural Resource Element
11. Transportation Element

Comprehensive plan questions on Engage Clark County will be available through **Wednesday, May 11**. Engage Clark County comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and Board of County Councilors in advance of two joint hearings on the proposed update scheduled for May 19 and May 24.

The May 11 deadline applies only to Engage Clark County. All comments for the joint Planning Commission and board hearing can be submitted by email, the online comment form or mail until 5 p.m. on May 24. Residents also can provide oral testimony at the May 19 and May 24 hearings. Although comments can be submitted right up to the last hearing date, it is helpful for decision makers to receive comments as early as possible.

Following the joint Planning Commission and board hearings on May 19 and May 24, the Planning Commission is scheduled to deliberate and develop a recommendation to the board on June 2. They will consider all submitted materials, including written and oral testimony. After the Planning Commission has made its recommendation to the board, another comment period will begin. The board has scheduled a June 21 public hearing to take testimony on the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

If you have questions about any part of the proposal or process, please email staff at comp.plan@clark.wa.gov.

Visit our Get Involved page for more information about submitting comments.

To leave a comment on Engage Clark County, go to www.clark.wa.gov/engage-clark-county.

Thank you!

Sent to:
David Zilavy <davidzilavy@gmail.com>; Jennifer Vick <jvick1414@gmail.com>; Geneva Taylor <taylorgeneva4@gmail.com>; Jace Rock <jarcerock@cbseal.com>; Eric Reygers <ereygers@gmail.com>; koni Odell <chowchowhound@gmail.com>; Greg Noeck <lighthouse1967@gmail.com>; McCall, Marilee <Marilee.McCall@clark.wa.gov>; Ronald Lee <ron@archbbl.com>; W.P.Guruge Lasantha <wpgbblasantha@hotmail.com>; Amal Kraw <hopefully100@yahoo.com>; Kamp, Jacqueline <Jacqueline.Kamp@clark.wa.gov>; Richard Johnson <randk_johnson@comcast.net>; Linda Holtorf <holtorf@comcast.net>; Victoria Haugen <victoriahaugen@yahoo.com>; Michael Harrison <michaelharrison@comcast.net>; Furno, Peggy <Peggy.Furno@cityofvancouver.us>; Robert A. Freed <robarbara@earthlink.net>; Sharon Ferguson <sharon10quilts@yahoo.com>; Sue Emerick <suebee143@gmail.com>; Darlene Edwards <ventrinony@hotmail.com>; Chuck Dougherty <chuck@formstudio.co>; Nancy Dong <ndong1@gmail.com>; Laisa Cobb <klutz1@comcast.net>; Jim Cobb <klutz_1@comcast.net>; James Cobb <klutz1@comcast.net>; Clemans, Scott <Scott.Clemans@clark.wa.gov>; Tanya Cardoza <smileyuv@gmail.com>; Dan Bolton <dan.bolton@bbfuller.com>; Wayne Bell <wwbellaustin@yahoo.com>; Robert Baldwin <robport140@aol.com>; Barb Baldus <bjandron@comcast.net>; Juliana Bagherpour <julianaevae@comcast.net>; David Zilavy <davidzilavy@gmail.com>; mvenolaue <mvenolaue@hotmail.com>; Jennifer Vick <jvick1414@gmail.com>; Ian Verrinder <janow85@gmail.com>; Margaret Varkados <mvvarkados@hotmail.com>; Steve Valenta <stevewithvalenta@gmail.com>; Michael Thompson <thompsonmi@centurylink.net>; Sherrie Thomas <sherrie.thomas@kp.org>; Geneva Taylor <taylorgeneva4@gmail.com>; Benjamin Surmi <almoncreekOFC@koelschsenior.com>; Todd Shank <mtshank@gmail.com>; Elizabeth Scott <escott@crede.org>; Elizabeth Scott <escott@crede.org>; Jay Schindler <jschin@pacific.com>; Juanita Rogers <juanita.rogers@abam.com>; Jace Rock <jarcerock@cbseal.com>; Rob Palena <palena@mackayposito.com>; Dan Packard <dann.packard@gmail.com>; Greg Noeck <lighthouse1967@gmail.com>; John Nison <johnnymn@gmail.com>; Sarah Newsum <sarahn@btaoregon.org>; Bethany Neal <bethany.neal@molinaihealthcare.com>; Kristie Minkoff <kaminkoff@gmail.com>; Ed & Bev Menteer <fsa7sdm@comcast.net>; Sharleen & Dave Meadows <shardavemeadows@gmail.com>; McConaughy, Patricia <Patricia.McConaughy@clark.wa.gov>; McCall, Marilee <Marilee.McCall@clark.wa.gov>; Jimmy Liu <jtlui1@yahoo.com>; Jimmie Liu <jtlui1@yahoo.com>; Wade Leckie <wade@badmonkeybikes.com>; Lebowsky, Laurie <Laurie.Lebowsky@clark.wa.gov>; W.P.Guruge Lasantha <wpgbblasantha@hotmail.com>; Scott Kueny <kueny@holthomes.com>; Steven Koch <steven.koch@gmail.com>; Chris Kesting <chris_kesting@hp.com>; Ellen Ives <eives@comcast.net>; Linda Holtorf <holtorf@comcast.net>; Karl Hinze <karl.hinze@parks.wa.gov>; Victoria Haugen <victoriahaugen@yahoo.com>; Kathleen Hartson <baboushka9@yahoo.com>; Michael Harrison <michaelharrison@comcast.net>; Jennifer Halleck <jennifer.halleck@vansd.org>; Joe Greulich <jgreulich10985@aol.com>; Linda Godson <lgodson@pdx.edu>; Eric Giacchino <eric@bikeclarkcounty.org>; Jessica Ghiglieri <tinytranslation@gmail.com>; Heather Garrett <heathershammock@yahoo.com>; Furno, Peggy <Peggy.Furno@cityofvancouver.us>; Charles (Chuck) Frayer <frayerc@comcast.net>; Kristi Finney <finnek@comcast.net>; Sharon Ferguson <sharon10quilts@yahoo.com>; Sue Emerick <suebee143@gmail.com>; Darlene Edwards <ventrinony@hotmail.com>; Anna Dearman <adearman@mcknze.com>; Amanda Cotton <cottonamanda15@yahoo.com>; John Correa <john.correa3@gmail.com>; Clemans, Scott <Scott.Clemans@clark.wa.gov>; Phil Brown <philippbrown1948@gmail.com>; Heather Blosser <blosserh@gmail.com>; Tim Bauer <bauert@aks-eng.com>; Scott Batson <scott.batson@portlandoregon.gov>; Robert Baldwin <brobert140@aol.com>; Juliana Bagherpour <julianaevae@comcast.net>; David Zilavy <davidzilavy@gmail.com>; Jennifer Vick <jvick1414@gmail.com>; Geneva Taylor <taylorgeneva4@gmail.com>; Elizabeth Scott <escott@crede.org>; Elizabeth Scott <escott@crede.org>; Jay Schindler <jschin@pacific.com>; Jace Rock <jarcerock@cbseal.com>; John Nison <johnnymn@gmail.com>; Sarah Newsum <sarahn@btaoregon.org>; Bethany Neal <bethany.neal@molinaihealthcare.com>; Kristie Minkoff <kaminkoff@gmail.com>; Ed & Bev Menteer <fsa7sdm@comcast.net>; Sharleen & Dave Meadows <shardavemeadows@gmail.com>; Trish McConaughy <pmconau@hotmail.com>; McCall, Marilee <Marilee.McCall@clark.wa.gov>; Jimmy Liu <jtlui1@yahoo.com>; Jimmy Liu <jtlui1@yahoo.com>; Lebowsky, Laurie <Laurie.Lebowsky@clark.wa.gov>; W.P.Guruge Lasantha <wpgbblasantha@hotmail.com>; Scott Kueny <kueny@holthomes.com>; Dennis Johnson <kardenj@comcast.net>; Linda Holtorf <holtorf@comcast.net>; Victoria Haugen <victoriahaugen@yahoo.com>; Kathleen Hartson <baboushka9@yahoo.com>; Michael Harrison <michaelharrison@comcast.net>; Joe Greulich <jgreulich10985@aol.com>
NW Children's Outreach <wackymo@comcast.net>; Chris <cemaitland@aol.com>; Judie Zelazny <jodie.zelazny@chhh.org>; Anthony Yarby <yarbyan@gmail.com>; John Wilson <kandjawilson1@comcast.net>; Linda & John Williams <mudman191@gmail.com>; John Williams <john@wheelchairdestinations.com>; Carol Welch <cwelch53@hotmail.com>; M Weimer <weimer38@gmail.com>; Tom Waltz <waltztr@dhs.wa.gov>; Jennifer Vick <jvick1414@gmail.com>; Catherine Van Son <cansionc@uw.edu>; S Tuttle <tutumoon@comcast.net>; Kathy Trippy <ktrippy@comcast.net>; Torres, Michael <Michael.Torres@clark.wa.gov>; Michael Thompson <thompsonmi@centurylink.net>; Geneva Taylor <taylorgeneva4@gmail.com>; Suzanne Sutton <ssuttonnb@hotmail.com>; Emily Stoutsenberger <estoutsenberger@gmail.com>; Snodgrass, Bryan <Bryan.Snodgrass@cityofvancouver.us>; Snell, Marty <Marty.Snell@clark.wa.gov>; Melissa Smoot <swelderabuseprevention@gmail.com>; Marilyn Slaby <Marilyn@marlynslaby.com>; Andy Silver <asilver@councilforthehomeless.org>; Peggy Shea han <peggy.sheehan@cityofvancouver.org>; Schroader, Kathy <Kathy.Schroader@clark.wa.gov>; Sara Scheetz <sarascheetz@atyourplaceseniorcare.com>; sally schaffer <schaffermom@yahoo.com>; Jake Rock <jackerock@cbseal.com>; Amanda Robrach <arrrcliffy@gmail.com>; Lori Rhodig <lori@accessah.com>; Jim Quintana <jimq@c-tran.net>; Jessica Prater <jessica.prater@brookdale.com>; Kris Potter <familygardening@gmail.com>; Aideet Pineda <aideet.pineda@molinahealthcare.com>; Kathi Pickett <kathipickett@gmail.com>; Sharon Pesut <sharon@swwpic.org>; Ian Parham <ian.parham@molinahealthcare.com>; Shelia Osheroff <tehillard_singer@hitmail.com>; Susan O’Shea <skoshers@gmail.com>; Mary Beth O’Donnell <modonnell2023@comcast.net>; Greg Noelck <lighthouse1967@gmail.com>; Bethany Neal <bethany.neal@molinahealthcare.com>; Tracy Nagy <Tracynagyre@gmail.com>; Kristie Minkoff <kaminkoff@gmail.com>; Joanna Michaud <jmichaud115@gmail.com>; Suzann Meyer <suzzannmeyer@gmail.com>; Ed & Bev Menteer <fisa7dm@comcast.net>; Martine Meland <McMeland@gmail.com>; Sharleen & Dave Meadows <shardevemeadows@gmail.com>; Amy McCullough <amy.mp@nwjustice.org>; McCall, Marilee <Marilee.McCall@clark.wa.gov>; Marilee McCall <mccll@m.cci.landwood.ca.us>; Cathleen & Rodney Mazour <rmazour@comcast.net>; Pat Mayes <patriciajmayes@gmail.com>; Robert Maul <rmaul@cityofcamas.us>; Susan Marssdorf <marssdorf@comcast.net>; Lumbantobing, Sharon <Sharon.Lumbantobing@clark.wa.gov>; Helen Ludugson <legalhele.comnet>; Kathy Lobryne <klobryne@yahoo.com>; Jimmy Liu <jlj1u1@yahoo.com>; Jimmy Liu <jlj1u1@yahoo.com>; Marsha Lewis <healthguidepost@gmail.com>; Lebowsky, Laurie <laurie.lebowsky@clark.wa.gov>; W.P. Gurse Lasantha <wpgblasantha@hotmail.com>; Colleen Kuhn <colleenk@hsca- wa.org>; Amal Kraw <hopefully100@yahoo.com>; Mitch Kneipp <mkneipp@ci.washougal.us>; Dave Kelly <KellyDW@dhs.wa.gov>; Kamp, Jacqueline <Jacqueline.Kamp@clark.wa.gov>; Charity Judd <charjudd@aol.com>; Juanita Joy <jmjoyeddron@gmail.com>; Olga Sharrion Jones <osharrion@msn.com>; Mindy Johnston <mjjohnstone@lcsw.org>; JoAnn Johnston <ceo@ccrealtors.com>; Roy Johnson <rjohnson@vhausa.com>; Greg Johnson <news@seniormessenger.org>; Bob & Debra Johnson <dfjohnson53@live.com>; Tom Iberle <Tom@frendsfotheacarpenter.org>; Dwayne C Hongel <dwaynehongel@yahoo.com>; Linda Holtorf <lholtorf@comcast.net>; Matt Herring <mherring@innovativeservicesnw.org>; Victoria Haugen <victoriahaugen@yahoo.com>; Patty Hastings <patty.hastings@columbian.com>; Kathleen Hartson <babouska@yahoo.com>; Michael Harrison <michaelharrison@comcast.net>; Tom & Linda Harriman <tom.harriman@msn.com>; Doug Hamilton <dwhamilton1@comcast.net>; Jim & Diave Graybill <jegdmg@msn.com>; Lee Gray <lgray@mediationClarkCounty.com>; Walt Gordon <waltg@c-tran.org>; Linda Godson <lgodson@pdx.edu>; Gilbert, Holley <Holley.Gilbert@clark.wa.gov>; Gaston, Vanessa <Vanessa.Gaston@clark.wa.gov>; Jeremy Garcia <jeremy.garcia@211info.org>; Furno, Peggy <Peggy.Furno@cityofvancouver.us>; Nicole Fleming <calallily@gmail.com>; Sharon Ferguson <sharon10quits@yahoo.com>; Euler, Gordon <Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov>; Linda Estes <estes@comcast.net>; Mark Eshelman <meshelman@pcmloan.com>; Sue Emerick <suebee143@gmail.com>; Ellinger, Susan <Susan.Ellinger@clark.wa.gov>; Helen Elder <helenelder1@gmail.com>; Ann Donnelly <adonnelly7@comcast.net>; Nancy Dong <ndong1@gmail.com>; Connie Dods <cddods5254@msn.com>; kathy Dietrich <prairiekathy@gmail.com>; Susan Denavit <sdenavit@hotmail.com>; David, Lynda <lynda.david@rtc.wa.gov>; Ron Daggett <daggett_ron@yahoo.com>; Kathy D <kalollar@yahoo.com>; Margie Coursey <margiec@comcast.net>; Amanda Cotton <cottonamanda15@yahoo.com>; Clemons, Scott <Scott.Clemons@clark.wa.gov>; Andy Clay <Andy.clay@svdp.us>; Chris Christensen <cjcniec5674@gmail.com>; Paula Cappelletto <pnmcapelletto@gmail.com>; Pete Capell <pccapell@cityofcamas.us>; C Mary Campbell <cmarcy1008@gmail.com>; Mary Brown <sraindownbrown9@gmail.com>; Carol Lee Braithwait <yesproperties@hotmail.com>; Phil Bourquin <pbourquin@cityofcamas.us>; Lisa Bordner <lisabordner@gmail.com>; Cory Bolkans, Ph.D.
Curleigh Carothers <jcarothers@ci.camas.wa.us>; Lynn Carman <ClarkCountyNeighbors@hotmail.com>; Lynn Carman <lynn.carman@comcast.net>; Ken Carlson <kkcarlson50@comcast.net>; Delores Carlson <dedecarlson65@yahoo.com>; Carmac Carlson <carencubbyhole@netscape.net>; Carlson, Brian <Brian.Carlson@cityofvancouver.us>; Tanya Cardoza <smileyuv@gmail.com>; Pete Capell <pcapell@ci.camas.wa.us>; John Cantrell <john.cantrell@hp.com>; Rick Campfield <five4him@comcast.net>; John Calnan <ajcalnan@yahoo.com>; Ted Caldwell <tedcaldwell@cox.net>; Lora Caine <lcaine@comcast.net>; Linda Busch-Pfeifle <treelead58@comcast.net>; Ginger Burr <gburr2000@yahoo.com>; Ken Burgstahler <burgstk@wsdot.wa.gov>; Heather Burgess <hburgess@philippburgesslaw.com>; Kelley Burg <kellburg@gmail.com>; Judy Bumbler-Enjuik <sunnysidenava@yahoo.com>; Vicki Brunberg <brunbert@sbglobal.net>; Christie BrownSilva <siftonneighborhood@gmail.com>; Christie BrownSilva <heritageneighborhood@gmail.com>; Suzanne Browning <ssbrowning7@msn.com>; Rick Browne <rickbrownme.com>; Roxanne Brown <roxieb5@juno.com>; Melinda Brooks <melindabrooks2001@yahoo.com>; Katy Brooks <kbrooks@portvanusa.com>; Bob Brockmann <bbrockm295@aol.com>; Kathy Brock <kathybrock@comcast.net>; Mary Brewer <Tyrone1957@msn.com>; Allan Brettman <abrettman@oregonian.com>; LeAnne M. Bremer <leanne.bremer@millernash.com>; Breitmayer, Becky <Becky.Breitmayer@clark.wa.gov>; Shastine Bredlie <shastine@comcast.net>; Gayle Brauner <braunergr@tds.net>; Ed Brannfors <edbrannfors@tds.net>; Steve Brandt <stevebrandt@juno.com>; Carol Lee Bratthwait <yesproperties@hotmail.com>; Patty Boyden <pbroyden@comcast.net>; Rory Bowman <rory.parker@pobox.com>; Nick Bowling <carolnich@aol.com>; Rick Bower <dirtczar@aol.com>; Phil Bourquin <pbourquin@cityofcamas.us>; Mike Bomar <mbomar@cred.org>; Boldt, Marc <Marc.Boldt@clark.wa.gov>; John Blom <johnblom@hasson.com>; Karena Block <wkiseblock@yahoo.com>; Tracy Blehm <btcblehm@comcast.net>; Elizabeth Blankenship <lizzyleash@yahoo.com>; Amy Blankenship <amy9031058@gmail.com>; Nancy Blair <blair5797@comcast.net>; Lisa Blaine <lisab@lowercolumbiaCAP.org>; John Bishop <bishopg@earthlink.net>; Rick Bieby <bieby563@msn.com>; Joerg Bieeck <JAB@carbonates.com>; Bryon Bestul <bjestul@juno.com>; Wayne Bergerow <berghal@comcast.net>; Joanne Berg <jaberg@bergent.com>; Don Benz <meridon@comcast.net>; Sandra Bennett <sandra@comcast.net>; Al Benkendorf <admin@benkassoc.com>; Richard Bender <bender50@comcast.net>; Greg Bender <gwbender@gmail.com>; Shane Bemis <jatakco@comcast.net>; Ron Bellis <bonbellis@aol.com>; Jack Bellikka <jack.baywest@gmail.com>; Roy J. Belloff <jbelloff@comcast.net>; Eric E. Beck <jbecker@clarkpud.com>; Chelsea Beck <chelseabeck@mac.com>; Karen Beall <karen_beall@comcast.net>; Allie R. Beal <jackywmi@msn.com>; Mary Baur <mary.schwarz.baur@outlook.com>; Chris Baumann <chrissb@planningsolutionsinc.com>; John Baugher <jbaugher@msn.com>; Tim Bauer <bauert@aks-eng.com>; Linda Bauer <lbauer@crwwd.com>; Steve Barton <Abrams501@comcast.net>; Jeff Barsness <barsnej@wsdot.wa.gov>; Sandra Barnes <sandy@june@aol.com>; Ronald H. Barca <ronnets@msn.com>; Norman Banks <nbanks@comcast.net>; Doug Ballou <dougballou@comcast.net>; George Ball <gballjl@yahoo.com>; Wonder Baldwin <wbaldwin@portridgefield.org>; Robert Baldwin <brobert140@aol.com>; Larry Baldwin <lakelarrylodge@yahoo.com>; Fred & Marrian Bakker <fmibakker@teds.net>; Brandi Baker <info@cwchamber.com>; Juliana Baghpour <juliana.ev@gmail.com>; Adam Babuka <babukaa@gmail.com>; Samuel Atkinson <SATKINS93@aol.com>; Janet Aspaas <janetaspaas@comcast.net>; Linda Ashley <ashleysltd@hotmail.com>; Susan E. Arnold <info@portvanusa.com>; Joe Arndt <newsdesk@kgw.com>; Donna Andrews <donnaandrews0411@gmail.com>; Lori Anderson-Benson <clarkcountyhomes@yahoo.com>; Steven Anderson <stevena48@earthlink.net>; Larry Anderson <lonefox@centurytel.net>; Greg Anderson <gdanderson@cityofcamas.us>; Denise Anderson <deniseajls@hotmail.com>; Anderson, Colete <Colete.Anderson@clark.wa.gov>; Carl Anderson <carlpatanderson@juno.com>; Angela Anders <knowbd@comcast.net>; Jennifer Amsler <jenniferamsler@cseal.com>; Alvarez, Jose <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; Darcy Altizer <darcy@swca.org>; Milada Allen <timberline713@gmail.com>; Marnie Allen <marnie.allen@esd112.org>; Val Alexander <cyotyerdige@teds.net>; Linda Alexander <lindaalexander96@gmail.com>; Gretchen Alexander <galexander@cuyoterdige.com>; Albrecht, Gary <Gary.Albrecht@clark.wa.gov>; Stepanie Agard <concretedesign@comcast.net>; Brendan Addis <brendanaddis@comcast.net>; Michael Achen <achendev@nwlink.com>; Stephan Abramson <abramson@lifesicpartners.net>; Dara <shay dacres@teds.net>; Port of Vancouver <info@portvanusa.com>; KPDX Fox 49 <foxdesk@kpdx.com>
I cannot find anything in this plan about rezoning Ag. 20 which we are. With the traffic and homes built across the street from our field we have found out that this is not suitable for our cows or horses. The current road is a direct connection to Camas, Freeways and Vancouver and is very dangerous for us, our animals and the drivers themselves. We feel with the growing population the should be rezoned cluster or housing. We bought this 4 years ago thinking it would be a perfect country life. I think it would benefit you and us to look at this road and see how rezoning the properties on both sides of this road will be a step that will have to be taken in the near future for the safety of all concerned. With the growing traffic just in the last year this is going to be of top priority in the next 2 years. If you have documents on Ag. 20 please tell me, all I see is F20 and Ag 10.

Thank you for your time.

Janiffer Van Koll
18606 ne 182 ave.
Brush Prairie, Wa 98606
360 904-5245
Hello comp planners, I am trying to understand one part of the updates but as I am not fluent in legalese, I am hoping that a human might be able to elucidate what I am trying to understand.

So, my family has a ~50 acre lot in Hockinson. They are wanting to divide it, the updates say the minimum lot size can be reduced to 20 acres in their zoning, FR-40.

What I am wondering is- could we legally break off a twenty acre piece and divide it into a cluster-lot development? Or am I missing something from my reading of the code?

Thanks!

-Noah
The process for this comprehensive plan update has demonstrated flaws and a biased approach from the beginning.

Because the citizens were only offered 3 alternative plans to choose, (one plan being status quo), they were denied a range of alternative plans, let alone a broad range of options that would enable diverse views and choices to be recognized.

The rural property owners were denied recognition and inclusive opportunities to participate in the developmental process for the three alternative plans. This exclusionary practice is counter to GMA law, especially considering rural landowners are heavily burdened by county land use zoning and regulations. Given the fact their lands have been frozen over 20 years; this is a real issue of contention. Clark County Citizens United has provided many testimonies on the faults of using exclusionary practices.

Many months prior to the introduction of the 3 plans, Clark County Citizens United presented before the Planning Staff at several work sessions. CCCU has provided hundreds of testimonies at public hearings over the past 3 years on behalf of thousands of rural landowners. That was intentional to ensure the recognition of the needs of the landowners would be acknowledged in this update. Much to our disappointment, the issues provided in those hundreds of testimonies, are ignored in the Comprehensive Plan. It is as if Clark County Citizens United never presented at a public hearing over 3 years.

Many changes have occurred over the past 25 years regarding the trends and conditions of agriculture in Clark County. The changes in this industry, along with their requirements, aren't acknowledged in this update. They are well documented in the USDA Census of Agriculture, Clark County Profiles extending back to 1950-2012. The changes in the industry are also documented in the Clark County Globalwise Report. These documents fail to be mentioned in the two volumes of the Comprehensive Plan. The Globalwise Report, and the USDA Census of Agriculture Clark County summaries have been quoted numerous times in various testimonies by CCCU.

The Rural and Resource lands still suffer from massive downzoning as a result of the 1994 Plan. Some land owners went from Rural 1 acre lots, to Forest-80 zoning. The economic and cultural impacts, stemming from reductions in functions and loss of economic values of thousands of acres of private properties, have never been studied and failed to be recognized. There has never been a county attempt at mitigation for those losses despite the suffering imposed on many rural families. CCCU has provided testimony on this issue. The Comprehensive Plan fails to mention this issue.
The Resource Lands were designated without benefit of proper GMA protocols. Resource lands were designated via aerial photographs and staff interpretations (according to the Metadata). The soils, pertaining to the Resource zones, have never benefited from a review of their capabilities and productivity classifications according to GMA law. The 1972 NRCS Soils Manual should have provided the necessary means to apply the analysis to deem the soils worthy of conservation into a Resource zone. The NRCS Soils data had already been applied to prior County comprehensive growth maps. The maps, showing properly designated prime soils, were available to use for the resource designations in the 1994 Plan. The County failed to use the historic soils maps and chose, instead, to rely on a method that is non-compliant to GMA lawful standards. This information is verifiable and has been included in many CCCU’s public testimonies.

There have been changes in the Dept. of Revenue’s Current Use Taxation Program for Forestry since the county’s 2007 update. The update to this program currently allows a minimum 5 acres of trees and a forest management plan to qualify for the benefits of this updated program. The intentions of the Legislature is important to recognize. The Legislature recognizes the importance forestry families provide to the state’s economy, and supports the viability of the many small, privately owned family woodlots. This is especially important for Clark County since 75% of the county forests are privately owned small woodlots. The statewide average is 50%. The volumes of the Comprehensive Plan fail to acknowledge the updated current use state taxation law. CCCU has provided numerous testimonies concerning this subject that is of great concern to the many Clark County Forestry families.

The GMA has much language on the importance of recognizing, “unique rural character.” GMA grants much deference to local jurisdictions in defining their unique rural qualities. The massive downzoning, from the 1994 Plan, fails to recognize and accurately define rural character. Each subsequent update has also failed at attempts to define rural character. The Globalwise Report mentions this failure. As a result, only 17% of the AG-20 zoned parcels conform to their zone size, and 7% of FR-40 parcels conform to their zone size. The predominance of non-conforming lots in their zones, fails to conform to the county’s rural character. This is not GMA compliant. This is the primary issue in Judge Edwin Poyfair’s Superior Court Orders written April, 1997, and supported by the Court of Appeals, Division II decision.

The Superior Court Orders further define the 1994 Plan as “erroneous,” and using an “unauthorized formula.” Judge Poyfair elaborates and says, “The result is a Plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA,” NO. 96-2-00080-2, FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER. This was confirmed in a recent interview with the Judge. The membership of Clark County Citizens United, Inc. has been warning the County to be brought into full and complete compliance to the Superior Court Orders. It is the duty of this County Board of Councilors to uphold the laws, and fully comply with all aspects and implied intentions as written in the Court Orders, and the GMA laws. Clark County Citizens United has provided numerous testimonies on the county's non-compliance to our Superior Court Orders. The contents of the county update fail to mention CCCU’s court actions, the Superior Court Orders, and the county’s responsibility to comply with the Superior Court Orders.

Respectfully submitted for the Public Record of the Comprehensive Plan Update,
Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
Please include these comments in the official public record for the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE; CITIZEN PARTICIPATION and COORDINATION

The term “public participation” implies that those who are affected by a decision have a right to be involved in the decision-making process, and an opportunity to influence the decision.

It is a requirement written in GMA law that, “early and continuous public participation,” be employed throughout the process of the local comprehensive plan and the supporting regulations. County government has a duty to, “establish and broadly disseminate procedures and assure that a broad variety of citizens can learn about, become engaged in and influence decisions about local actions.”

The Goals of Public Participation:
- Enhances the quality of planning by incorporating a wide variety of information and perspectives
- Allows communities to make decisions based on shared values and engages citizens in the ownership of local land use challenges and solutions
- Educates and empowers citizens
- Supports swift and efficient project implementation
- Ensures that good plans remain intact over time
- Fosters a sense of community, and trust in government.

Quoted directly from the Department of Commerce

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. has intentionally provided hundreds of testimonies, contained in the public record over 3 years, concerning issues about our unresolved compliance to our court actions, the advancement of an “unauthorized formula”, property rights denied equal standing among the other 13 GMA planning goals, improperly zoned resource lands, inflated numbers for the rural vacant buildable lands analysis, unrealistic urban/rural ratios that defy reality, the predominance of non-conforming lots that fail to define the county’s rural character, failing to acknowledge the shifts in agricultural trends, failing to acknowledge updates in the state current use taxation program for 5 acres of trees, failing to offer a broad range of alternative plans, and using a process that is consistently exclusionary for landowners and rural communities.

Most disturbing, is the County’s failure to acknowledge any of CCCU’s hundreds of important testimonies regarding issues concerning the economies and culture of rural property owners and rural communities in the proposed comprehensive plan.

There are four possible reasons for ignoring CCCU’s testimonies:

1. Clark County Citizens United never provided public testimony, never had conversations with the Planning Staff, and never spoke with the Councilors to influence policy directives to elevate rural issues.
2. Issues surrounding rural landowners and rural communities are deemed irrelevant by staff and Councilors. Therefore, rural landowner concerns are not worthy of consideration in the writing of the Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

3. Clark County rural landowners are not tax-paying citizens and therefore not worthy of the benefits associated with elected representation by the Board of Councilors, and not worthy of upholding the Democratic process.

4. The staff are inappropriately influencing public policy decisions and undermining the work of the lawfully elected County Councilors. This action greatly impairs the public process.

The question is; “Why is CCCU’s large body of testimony ignored in the Comprehensive Plan?” The Board of County Councilors are the elected officials. It is their duty to follow the laws. **If there is anything that disadvantages the rural property owners and their issues, the entire BOCC should be concerned.**

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

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Written in the Comprehensive Plan Update, is Chapter 11: Community Design Element. It states; Through the Perspectives Program which began in October 1991 to develop the Community Framework Plan, citizens in Clark County expressed their opinion about the design of their community. Overriding themes from the comments were:
- Preserve open space and natural areas;
- Encourage land development that preserves a sense of place and a feeling of community;
- Encourage development of a transit system;
- Develop a better diversity of employment opportunities and housing;
- Avoid sprawling development; and
- Design criteria are important to the acceptance of higher densities.

It is simply wrong to label these Design elements (from 1991) as being indicative of overriding themes from county citizens. They are themes strongly presented in the Karpinski response to county staff in a request to Mr. Karpinski on his preferred elements.

 CCCU recommends revisions here for consideration.

1. That the Clark County Vision be revised to include a well-reasoned and balanced discussion of the relationship of our constitutionally protected property rights and the other 13 GMA goals.
2. Each Councilor develop his or her process for assessing the equity of all 14 GMA goals.
3. Each Councilor perform an informal audit or assessment to determine if Clark County’s Comprehensive Plan, the policies, and land-use regulations are actually working as they were intended to work. Are they improving the overall health, safety, and addressing quality of life issues equally for all county citizens? If there are deficiencies being exposed, how can they be addressed?
4. If one segment of Clark County society is being overburdened by regulations, how can this be best remedied?
5. Are all citizens and their concerns being recognized equally before this Board?

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
Avoiding Unconstitutional Takings of Private Property | Washington State

Download the 2015 Attorney General's Office Advisory Memorandum:

http://www.atg.wa.gov/avoiding-unconstitutional-takings-private-property

Sent from Mail for Windows

To be included in the public record for the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Plan update

Thank you,
Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
FORM SUBMISSION from http://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/comp-plan-comments

First Name: Rj
Last Name: Newell
Email Address: blueskiesvj@comcast.net
Phone Number: (360) 891-6910
Street Address: 16906 s.e. 30th st.
City: vancouver
State: Washington
Zip Code: 98683
Message Subject: vanc. planning input
Parcel Number:
Comments: My concern is to hold the reins on accelerated growth a bit, preserve what open space we have left, and our forested areas in the city boundary. What I fear is that the rush to get 'big', is moving at a faster pace that many of us want, or that we can afford. We have been discovered. True. I realize that means more tax money for our gov.to spend, which sometimes feels like a salivating insatiable monster. Protect what we have while we still have it, and control the housing sprawl. A little consideration for those of us that can't keep up with the continuous property tax increases. Cool it a little, We'd like to stay here.
Regards, Rj
ALL POLITICS IS LOCAL

Councilors look to testify to Planning Commission

Posted on May 6, 2016 by Kaitlin Gillespie

Frequent readers of this blog and The Columbian – and really just anyone even a little tuned in to county politics – are well aware of where each of the Clark County councilors stand on the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update.

But Councilors David Madore and Tom Mielke, Republicans, seem bent on making sure the Planning Commission knows exactly what their opinions are.

Mielke asked at Wednesday’s board time meeting if the councilors will have the chance to testify at the Planning Commission’s June 2 deliberations, where they’ll make a final recommendation to the county council on what to adopt as its final growth plan.

“No,” came the answer from Chair Marc Boldt, no party preference. “That does away with the independence of the planning commission.”

Madore piped up.

“Do the county councilors have an opportunity to interface with the planning commission in their processes or is that a conflict?” Madore asked the Clark County Prosecutor’s Office representative, who declined to answer.

Remember, the county’s attorneys aren’t advising the board on land-use matters in the wake of Madore’s ongoing accusations that they’ve lied about the growth plan. She deferred to the Home Rule Charter for more details.

Councilor Jeanne Stewart, a Republican, joined Boldt in disagreeing.

“It almost seems inappropriate for us to go and tell the planning commission individually what we want,” Stewart said. “I think it would be confusing because when we come back to make final decisions, will a consensus have already been garnered?”

Madore, however, pressed on, saying “freedom of speech” gives councilors the right to “participate in any county affairs.”

“That First Amendment right, I think, belongs to all of us,” Madore said. “We ought to be able to testify to the degree as any other citizen to the planning commission.”

There wasn’t an official answer on this issue. I see what Madore and Mielke are saying, but it’s problematic. What happens if a third councilor shows and wishes to testify at this meeting? Doesn’t that constitute debate under the Open Public Meetings Act?

Madore and Mielke’s request also seems unusual given that, unlike their constituents, the final decision on the growth plan rests with the Clark County council. That’s kind of the whole deal with representative government. They have the ability to reject or revise the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

And having sat through my fair share of four-hour hearings in recent months, I’m fully expecting we’ll hear plenty of testimony from all five councilors on the matter.
Kaitlin Gillespie
I'm the Clark County government reporter at The Columbian. Get in touch at kaitlin.gillespie@columbian.com or 360-735-4517.

Comments

1 Comment

Add a comment...

David Clark
Kaitlin---"What happens if a third councilor shows and wishes to testify at this meeting? Doesn't that constitute debate under the Open Public Meetings Act?"
ME--- It is a public meeting and publically noticed.

Kaitlin---"They have the ability to reject or revise the Planning Commission's recommendation."
ME --- Isn't that like the president telling congress what he would or would not sign?

Reply · 1 · May 6, 2016 11:51pm

Facebook Comments Plugin
One online comment form for growth plan closes May 11

By The Columbian
Published: May 8, 2016, 5:51 AM

Time is running out to submit comments to Engage Clark County about proposed updates to the county's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update.

Engage Clark County, a new online way to submit comments, will close on May 11. People can comment on a number of issues related to the county’s 20-year growth plan through that platform, found at http://clark.wa.gov/engage-clark-county (http://clark.wa.gov/engage-clark-county).

The county will continue to take comments on the growth plan by email, by mail or online at http://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/comp-plan-comments (http://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/comp-plan-comments) until 5 p.m. on May 24.

People can also provide oral testimony at two joint hearings of the Planning Commission and Clark County council at 6:30 p.m. on May 19 and 24.
Argh. That is hugely close and I may not have my printer back by then. I need to print out documents because hard to read on line. Grrr.

Sydney

On May 6, 2016, at 1:14 PM, Schroader, Kathy <Kathy.Schroader@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Wednesday, May 11 is last day to post a comment on Engage Clark County

Don’t miss your chance to use Engage Clark County to comment about proposed updates to the county’s Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

The topics are:

1. Proposed Clustering Requirements for Resource Lands (AG-10 and FR-20)
2. Capital Facilities Plan – Transportation
3. Arterial Atlas Amendments
4. Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS)
5. Title 40 – Unified Development Code
6. Community Design Element
7. Environmental Element
8. Historical, Archaeological and Cultural Preservation Element
9. Housing Element
10. Rural and Natural Resource Element
11. Transportation Element

Comprehensive plan questions on Engage Clark County will be available through Wednesday, May 11. Engage Clark County comments will be provided to the Planning Commission and Board of County Councilors in advance of two joint hearings on the proposed update scheduled for May 19 and May 24.

The May 11 deadline applies only to Engage Clark County. All comments for the joint Planning Commission and board hearing can be submitted by email, the online comment form or mail until 5 p.m. on May 24. Residents also can provide oral testimony at the May 19 and May 24 hearings. Although comments can be submitted right up to the last hearing date, it is helpful for decision makers to receive comments as early as possible.
Following the joint Planning Commission and board hearings on May 19 and May 24, the Planning Commission is scheduled to deliberate and develop a recommendation to the board on June 2. They will consider all submitted materials, including written and oral testimony. After the Planning Commission has made its recommendation to the board, another comment period will begin. The board has scheduled a June 21 public hearing to take testimony on the Planning Commission’s recommendation.

If you have questions about any part of the proposal or process, please email staff at comp.plan@clark.wa.gov.

Visit our Get Involved page for more information about submitting comments.

To leave a comment on Engage Clark County, go to www.clark.wa.gov/engage-clark-county.

Thank you!

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
The Reflector
AFFIDAVIT OF PUBLICATION

STATE OF WASHINGTON
COUNTY OF CLARK

Karen Sangalli, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says that she is editor of THE REFLECTOR, a weekly newspaper. That said newspaper is a legal newspaper by order of the Superior Court of Clark County and is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of publication herein referred to, published in the English language, continually as a weekly newspaper in Battle Ground, Clark County, Washington, and is now and during all of said time was printed in an office maintained at the aforesaid place of publication of said newspaper. That the annexed is a true copy of Legal Ad# 90543

Not. of Joint Hrg.-2016 Comp. Plan Update

as it was published in regular issues (and not in supplement form) of said newspaper on

05/04/2016

and that such newspaper was regularly distributed to its subscribers and area residents during all of said period.

Karen Sangalli
Subscribed and sworn to before me

05/04/16

Notary public in and for the State of Washington
at Battle Ground, Washington

031874
STATE OF WASHINGTON  
COUNTY OF CLARK

Karen Sangalli, being first duly sworn on oath, deposes and says that she is editor of THE REFLECTOR, a weekly newspaper. That said newspaper is a legal newspaper by order of the Superior Court of Clark County and is now and has been for more than six months prior to the date of publication herinafter referred to, published in the English language, continually as a weekly newspaper in Battle Ground, Clark County, Washington, and is now and during all of said time was printed in an office maintained at the aforesaid place of publication of said newspaper. That the annexed is a true copy of Legal Ad # 90533


as it was published in regular issues (and not in supplement form) of said newspaper on

05/04/2016

and that such newspaper was regularly distributed to its subscribers and area residents during all of said period.

Karen Sangalli

Subscribed and sworn to before me

05/04/16

Notary public in and for the State of Washington Residing at Battle Ground, Washington

Staff Contact: Oliver Orijako (360) 397-2380, x4292, oliver.oriako@clark.wa.gov or Corydataline (360) 397-2260. Copies are also available at Clark County Community Planning, 1300 Franklin Street, 3rd Floor, Vancouver, Washington.

Anyone wishing to give testimony in regard to this matter should appear at the time and place stated above. Written testimony can be provided to the Board of Clark County Commissioners by mailing to the Clark County Commissioners at Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov or mail to the Clark County BCC, c/o Rebecca Tilton, PO Box 9810, Vancouver, WA 98666-9810. Written testimony should be received at least two (2) days prior to the hearing date for review.

Approved As To Form Only: Anthony F. Goltz
Prosecuting Attorney

By: Christine Cooks
CHRISTINE COOK
Sr. Deputy Prosecuting Attorney

May 4
Affidavit of Publication
STATE OF WASHINGTON

County of Clark

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
CLARK CITY COMMUNITY PLANNING-L
PO BOX 9810
VANCOUVER WA 98666-9810

REFERENCE: 70914 FSEIS AVAILABILITY
3373750 Clark County Compreh

I, the undersigned say,

That I am over the age of eighteen and not
interested in the above entitled matter; that I am
now, and at all time embraced in the publication
herein mentioned, was, the principal clerk of the
printer of The Columbian, a daily newspaper
printed, published and circulated in the said
county and adjudged a newspaper of general
circulation by the Superior Court of the County of
Clark, State of Washington, under Proceeding No.
802006715; that the advertisement, of which the
annexed is a true printed copy, was published in
the above-named newspaper on the following dates,
to wit:

PUBLISHED ON: 04/27

TOTAL COST: 179.52
FILED ON: 04/27/16

I Certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury
that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature

031876
Affidavit of Publication
STATE OF WASHINGTON
County of Clark

ACCOUNTS PAYABLE
CLARK CTY COMMUNITY PLANNING-L
PO BOX 9010
VANCOUVER WA 98666-9010

REFERENCE: 70914  JT HEARING BOC PC
3374101  NOTICE OF JOINT PUBL

I, the undersigned say,

That I am over the age of eighteen and not
interested in the above entitled matter; that I am
now, and at all time embraced in the publication
herein mentioned, was, the principal clerk of the
printer of The Columbian, a daily newspaper
printed, published and circulated in the said
county and adjudged a newspaper of general
circulation by the Superior Court of the County of
Clark, State of Washington, under Proceeding No.
802006715; that the advertisement, of which the
annexed is a true printed copy, was published in
the above-named newspaper on the following dates,
to wit:

PUBLISHED ON: 05/04

TOTAL COST: 130.90
FILED ON: 05/04/16

I Certify (or declare) under penalty of perjury
that the foregoing is true and correct.

Signature  

031877
Schroader, Kathy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 9:08 AM
To: Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Hermen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Lumbantobing, Sharon; Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy; Wiser, Sonja
Subject: FW: Error on slide yesterday
Attachments: Comp Plan slides.pptx; Comp Plan May 11 slide.pptx

FYI and for the record. Thanks.

From: Tilton, Rebecca
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 9:05 AM
To: Boldt, Marc; Stewart, Jeanne; Olson, Julie (Councilor); Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Error on slide yesterday

Hello,

Please see the below message from Heidi Owens pertaining to the handout she submitted at the May 10 public comment portion of the council meeting.

I’ve added her corrected handout to the record.

Thanks,
Rebecca

From: Heidi Owens [mailto:heidi.owens@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 8:59 AM
To: Tilton, Rebecca
Subject: Error on slide yesterday

Hi Rebecca,

There was an error on the handout I submitted yesterday.

Attached are 2 files, the first is a copy of yesterday’s handout noting that it had an error and was resubmitted to the record.
The second is the corrected slide. Is there anything else I should do to correct the record?

I will have written comments and another slide for the record on Friday.

Thank you so much!

Heidi Owens
**Resolution 2015-04-05**

**Planning Assumptions**
- Planned Population Growth: 129,546
- Assumed Annual Growth Rate: 1.12%
- Urban/Rural Pop. Growth Split: 90/10
- No. of Needed Rural Parcels: 12,955

**Board Principles and Values**
- Rural Lands:
  - Minimize the conversion of productive farmland — those lands which have long-term commercial agricultural viability. It is being used today for commercial agriculture?

**Revised: Resolution 2016-03-01**

**12,859 RURAL GROWTH RATE**
- A 2.66 persons/household = 4,835 PROJECTED PARCEL NEED

What is the number of new parcel Homesteads available under the preferred alternative?

**8024 new parcels**

**RESULT?**
- 3181 more parcels than needed.
- 985 more parcels than existing conditions, effectively 5,670 acres of Agriculture Land.

**QUESTION?**
If current 2007 Comprehensive Plan is in compliance with GMA, how does this board justify an additional 985 rural parcels when the potential rural parcel currently exceeds the needs for projected growth?

How will you justify this?
What will it cost taxpayers to defend this?
Resolution 2015-04-05
Planning Assumptions
Planned Population Growth: 129,546
Assumed Annual Growth Rate: 1.12%
Urban/Rural Pop. Growth Split: 90/10
Projected Rural Population Growth: 12,955 persons

Board Principles and Values
Rural Lands:
Minimize the conversion of productive farmland – those lands which have long-term commercial agricultural viability. Is it being used today for commercial agriculture?

Revised: Resolution 2016-03-01
Planned Population Growth: 128,586
Assumed Annual Growth Rate: 1.26%
Urban/Rural Pop. Growth Split: 90/10
Projected Rural Population Growth: 12,859 persons

12,859 Rural population growth at 2.66 persons/household = 4,835 PROJECTED PARCEL NEED (to accommodate projected growth)

What is the number of new parcel Homesites available under the preferred alternative? 8024 new parcels

RESULT? 3189 more parcels than needed.
985 more parcels than existing conditions, effecting 5670 acres of Agriculture Land.

QUESTION? If current 2007 Comprehensive Plan is in compliance with GMA, how does this board justify an additional 985 rural parcels when the potential rural parcels currently exceeds the needs for projected growth?

How will you justify this?
What will it cost taxpayers to defend this?
FYI and for the record. Thanks.

From: Bridget McLeman [mailto:bridget.mcleman@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 7:48 PM
To: McCaulley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: Comment on Growth Management Plan

I have submitted the attached document on the engage Clark County web based comment forum. I am uncertain as to which category it fits so I thought I would duplicate the entry by emailing a copy to you. I did not add my name to it - though I’m quite happy to do so if you think it matters. It is a general comment on the principle of 'appearance of fairness' and the undue influence of specific parties in the process rendering an unbiased decision impossible. If there is a better place to submit it - please let me know.

I attach this for the public record.

Thank you.

Bridget McLeman
"Appearance of fairness"

It is not clear where where it is appropriate to place my comments on the public record on the development of Clark County’s Growth Management plan. It seems clear on the review of the record, the public testimony, and the content of Clark County Public Record Requests for emails etc. through the lengthy GMA process that one Councilor has not taken an objective stance in listening and addressing the information presented to Council. Instead, there is a pattern of undue influence of one particular group and the ignoring of all other citizen opinion, data, and comment.

While the doctrine of “Appearance of Fairness” (http://mrsc.org/Home/Explore-Topics/Legal/General-Government/The-Appearance-of-Fairness-Doctrine.aspx) establishes rules for avoidance of bias in decisions connected to land management issues, it does not, typically, relate to Council member’s process of policy adoption connected to the Growth Management Plan. However, in the case of the development of various alternatives in the case of Clark County’s comprehensive plan, certain council members have strayed from policy into policy implementation by both developing an alternative and identifying the ways in which a new GMP would be implemented.

Without going into the practical and technical steps one Councilor took in developing the plan, what follows are some specific examples of the bias, the evidence of one lobby group driving the process, and one councilor advocating his particular view of policy implementation.

Mr. Madore has also moved beyond the status of policy maker as is clear to multiple references to working on data himself, developing algorithms for use by GIS staff, and giving specific implementation criteria with directions to Community Planning staff not to comment, change or introduce any other material. This aspect of Mr. Madore’s intervention is documented elsewhere but is accessible in a number of Public Records Requests at https://www.clark.wa.gov/councilors/public-records-request

The other aspect of Mr. Madore’s violation of the ‘appearance of fairness’ criteria relates to the closeness of his working relationship with one group representing one element of rural citizens to the exclusion of listening to any other perspectives. He has eliminated any perception that he could objectively listen to citizen comment and to choose among policy alternatives and implementation practices. He has clearly established too close a connection with the officers of the Clark County Citizens United lobby group to be objective. The two spokespersons have a total right to testify, as they have, weekly on their particular position however both have worked many hours and days in the Councilor’s office to the extent that they made themselves at home using staff facilities such as refrigerator, lunch room etc.

What follows are random examples of the influence of CCCU over the development of Alternate 4 for the next Growth Management Plan, its components and its process.
1. Planning Process: Significant influence of legal adviser for Clark County Citizens United (CCCU) in direct contact with Councilor Madore in 'giving instructions' to Planning staff.

Note: Mr. Madore met public record requirements by forwarding certain emails from his private email address to his county email address. (No attempt made to verify all emails forwarded).

Exchange of e-mails David Madore collaboration with Donald McIsaac, lawyer for CCCU, driving the development of the process for adoption of Alternative 4, an alternative presented by Mr. Madore but clearly developed in collaboration with Mr. Silliman and Mr. McIsaac.

From: DONALD MCISAAC [mailto:donaldmcisaac@msn.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 01, 2015 9:11 AM
To: Orijiako, Oliver
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Silliman, Peter; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David
Subject: Alternative 4 Process and Schedule

Oliver,
Thank you for the prompt response.
If Thursday, February 5 from 10-11 is still open on your calendar please pencil me in to meet at that time.
Thank you also for provided the written description detail on Alternative 2; this gives an idea of the detail threshold needed for Alternative 4 descriptions. Regarding the descriptions of the rural components of Alternative 2, there are references to changing the millennium lot size in "some" R areas; elsewhere there are references to A, F, and R changes "as appropriate". Is there anything in writing, as opposed to a map display, on how the "some" or "as appropriate" are described?
I committed to sending you my thoughts on further process and schedule beyond the current pause in the process to consider an alternative 4 for rural areas. Please see attached for further discussion when we meet.
Please advise on the acceptability of the Thursday meeting time,
Don

From: Oliver.Orijiako@clark.wa.gov
To: donaldmcisaac@msn.com
CC: Mark.Mccauley@clark.wa.gov; Peter.Silliman@clark.wa.gov; Tom.Mielke@clark.wa.gov; Jeanne.Stewart@clark.wa.gov; David.Madore@clark.wa.gov; Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov
Subject: RE: Alternative 4 Process and Schedule
Date: Tue, 3 Feb 2015 01:03:07 +0000

Hello Don:
Staff proposal is reduce the minimum parcel size from Rural- 20 to R-10 to maintain buffering of resource land as required by GMA. We have identified areas that the proposal will apply and it is better to see that on a map. It appears that it will be a two-step process. We do not have a written document on the proposal. It is just that. The idea is that if as proposed, the current AG-20 will become AG-10. A minimum parcel size of 10 acres. It will not require a Rural -20 to buffer AG-10.
Yes, I will put you down at 10:00 a.m. on Thursday. At some point we need to engage the public on the development of Alternative 4. Please, let me know if you have questions. Thank you.
Best Regards.
From: DONALD MCISAAC [mailto:donaldmcisaac@msn.com]
Sent: Tuesday, February 03, 2015 8:07 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Silliman, Peter; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David; Euler, Gordon
Subject: RE: Alternative 4 Process and Schedule

Oliver,

Thanks for the response. I presume a written description of how the particular parcels were selected for Alternative 2, and how others were not, can be forthcoming at some point—perhaps in the draft SEIS if not prior.

I agree with you on the need to engage the public at some point on the development of Alternative 4. In the Process and Schedule document sent in the earlier email, it would start with a briefing of the Councilors at a work session next Wednesday, February 11. While that would not be a decision-making meeting of the BOCC, it is a public meeting where the public would get first exposure to Alternative 4 ideas. After receiving guidance from the Councilors as to what should be put out for public comment on a draft Alternative 4, the proposed schedule calls for release of the draft Alternative 4 ideas by February 17 followed by a public hearing or town hall meeting on February 26.

I look forward to talking with you Thursday at 10 about the process and schedule. Please let me know if you have different thoughts on formal engagement of the public.

I meet with Peter on Thursday mid-day, where we hope to agree on Alternative 4 features and elements that could be analyzed in the SEIS, as per the January 21 work session direction.

If there are advance arrangements that need to be done to set the February 11 work session meeting agenda, please make room for to allow this.

Thanks,

Don

From: Orjiako, Oliver
To: "DONALD MCISAAC"
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Silliman, Peter; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David; Euler, Gordon; Cook, Christine; O"Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: RE: Alternative 4 Process and Schedule
Date: Tuesday, February 03, 2015 10:38:19 AM

Good morning Don:

Thanks for your email. We have a schedule and a public participation process which we have been following. Staff will adjust our schedule and timeline for completion of the 2016 plan update as soon as there is a decision/direction from the BOCC on a proposed 4th Alternative. There is a pause in the process per the BOCC directive at the January 21, 2015 work session until a new alternative 4 is developed.

I am reviewing your proposed schedule and process expectation and will share my thoughts when we meet on Thursday. We have a good working relationship with the Board's Office and BOCC on scheduling work session related to the plan update. I am not aware of a February 11 work session. I am seeking PA's council on the level of public involvement in the development of alternative 4 since it is outside of the SEIS Scoping process to date. I need more information regarding your question on how a particular parcel were selected for Alternative 2 and not others. We will discuss this further on Thursday and also clarify your
assertion that the public had not seen the staff recommended range of alternatives nor the content of alternative 2 prior to October 22. If you have questions, please call me.
Best Regards,
Oliver

2. **Undue Influence:** Clark County Citizens’ United involvement in policy development, directing development, influencing outcomes.

   Example: Multiple emails (sample below) from Susan Rasmussen and Carol Levanen – primary leaders of Clark County Citizen’s United to council member Madore requesting inclusion of information in the Comprehensive Plan:

   From: susan rasmussen
   To: Madore, David
   Subject: Reader
   Date: Tuesday, September 01, 2015 2:32:35 PM
   Please be so kind as to include this as a resource document for the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update
   Sent from Windows Mail

   Example: Multiple emails insisting on removal of Healthy communities report and resource references on first, the CC Public Health web site and then, in the Comprehensive Plan and attachments.

   From: Carol Levanen [cnidential@yahoo.com]
   To: David Madore [David.Madore@usdigital.com]
   Subject: Growing Healthy Report - Comm. Planning - Health Department - continued agenda
   Sent: 1 Sep 2015 21:08:44 +0000

   The videos are gone, but the report is still there.

   2016 Comprehensive Growth management Plan update - Community Planning - Clark County, Washington
   <
   [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YGHT4F3gcY&feature=youtu.be](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YGHT4F3gcY&feature=youtu.be)

   From: Carol Levanen
   To: McCauley, Mark; Orijako, Oliver
   Subject: Fw: Documents - Comprehensive Growth Management PlanCommunity Planning
   Date: Thursday, September 03, 2015 11:53:13 AM
----- Forwarded Message -----  
From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>  
To: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>; "jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov"  
<jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov>; "david.madore@clark.wa.gov" <david.madore@clark.wa.gov>;  
"tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov" <tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov>; Jim Malinowski  
<j.malinowski@ieee.org>  
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2015 11:08 AM  
Subject: Documents - Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Community Planning  

Dear Councilors,  

Listed as one of the Elements of the Comprehensive Plan is the "Growing Healthier  
Report." This report is also one of three, along with the "Aging Readiness" report,  
that is listed as resources for the comprehensive plan. I recall that the Board did not  
authorize this; but the reports are there.  

Sincerely, Susan Rasmussen  

http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/comp_plan/docs.html  
Sent from Windows Mail

From: Carol Levanen  
To: Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Orjiako, Oliver; McCauley, Mark  
Subject: Fw: Clark County Food Systems Council - A special interest political group - For the Record  
Date: Thursday, September 03, 2015 11:57:02 AM

----- Forwarded Message -----  
From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>  
To: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2015 10:54 AM  
Subject: Reader  
Strategies for change, Food Systems Council  
Sent from Windows Mail

From: Carol Levanen  
To: Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David; tpm.mielke@clark.wa.gov; cnldental@yahoo.com  
Subject: Fw: 2012 Clark County Food Systems Council on clark.wa.gov website  
Date: Thursday, September 03, 2015 11:02:37 PM  
What did it cost the public to produce this glitzy advertisement for this political environmental group?  
Did staff compose it? Who authorized it?

From: Madore, David  
To: Carol Levanen  
Subject: Fwd: Food Systems Council - Clark County - For the Public Record  
Date: Friday, September 04, 2015 7:16:57 AM  
Carol,  
The removal of the file that you mention in you other latest email, may have been removed in  
response to this email yesterday.
Begin forwarded message:

From: "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>
Date: September 3, 2015 at 4:25:01 PM PDT
To: "Melnick, Alan" <Alan.Melnick@clark.wa.gov>, "Madore, David"
       <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: FW: Food Systems Council - Clark County - For the Public Record
Dr. Alan Melnick,
There is yet one more case where Clark County public resources are being used to
advocate for a one-sided political agenda. The Clark County Food System Council,
formed using public grant funds in 2007, has morphed into an organization that
has linked up with entities that have litigated against Clark County, such a
Futurewise [http://futurewise.org/], while excluding organizations that hold a
different view such as Clark County Citizens United (CCCU).
The latest example is the Land use Forum, held at the Vancouver Library on
August 31, 2015 that advocated against Alternative 4. An audio recording of that
meeting is here:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ZeYiwbl77fU&feature=youtu.be
The primary purpose of their current activity is to advocate against alternatives 2
and 4. An example of their advocacy starts at the 44:00 marker of the video. The
invited presenters, partners, and speakers universally oppose our proposed comp
plan update alternatives.
Because this organization is sponsored by Clark County Public Health, our staff
has also been joined in the advocacy and spends funds on travel and lodging to
advocate at events in other areas. Here is an example:
https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YEGHT4F3gcY&feature=youtu.be
Many of the projects and influence of this organization and others are healthy
and good.
We certainly welcome the community and various organizations to advocate for
political agendas. However, these political advocacy activities must not use
taxpayer funds, nor use Clark County Public health resources.
Please let me know what we need to do to disconnect this organization from
Clark County Public Health.
Thank you,
David Madore

From: Melnick, Alan
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark
Subject: RE: Food Systems Council - Clark County - For the Public Record
Date: Friday, September 04, 2015 2:02:42 PM
Dear Councilor Madore,
Clark County Public Health did not participate in the Land Use Forum on August 31. As we
discussed a couple of days ago, we provide information for the Food System Council and
other community groups regarding research evidence about the association between environmental factors, natural and manmade, and public health. We do so, because, as you note, many of the FSC projects, as well as projects other community organizations engage in, are healthy and good.

The video has been removed from YouTube.

Best regards,
Alan
Alan Melnick, MD, MPH, CPH | Public Health Director/Health Officer
Clark County Public Health
1601 E. Fourth Plain Blvd., Bldg. 17, 3rd Floor
P.O. Box 9825, Vancouver, WA 98666-8825
(360) 397-8412

From: Madore, David
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 2:25 PM
To: Melnick, Alan
Subject: old website docs
Dr. Alan Melnick,
There is another cluster of documents remaining our Public health website that continue to advocate against growing local healthy food and rural property owners. It pushes hyper density in inner cities and wars against rural lifestyles with false assumptions.

Here's an excerpt from page 13 of the "Health Element Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Growing Healthier" document:

"People in rural areas have unequal access to healthy foods. Emerging research in the US has revealed a disparity in food price and quality by geography. Populations living in rural areas often must travel longer distances to access full-service grocery stores. Controlling for population density, one study found that rural areas have fewer food retailers of any kind compared to urban areas. A US Department of Agriculture report also found higher food prices in rural areas which typically have smaller food retail establishments."


It appears that virtually all of the documents and links on this page push the same agenda. Some citizens refer to such activism as social engineering and Agenda 21. http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/community/growing_healthy/documents.html

As the BOCC has communicated in our Comp Plan Update work sessions, such documents do not belong in the comp plan.

Thank you for helping us to clean up our county website.

David

From: Madore, David
To: Melnick, Alan
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Horne, Chris
Subject: Re: old website docs
Date: Sunday, September 20, 2015 9:12:43 AM
Dr Alan Melnick,
Thank you for the very informative response. I fully embrace the necessity to follow a public process to amend or repeal any policy that was formally adopted previously.
As our board shared in our last comp plan work session, our intent is to only include the GMA required documents in our comp plan. I will add this to a list of extracurricular documents that we can consider removing.
As always, your help is outstanding and very much appreciated.
David Madore

On Sep 18, 2015, at 11:09 AM, Melnick, Alan <Alan.Melnick@clark.wa.gov> wrote:
Dear Councilor Madore,

In 2012, the Board of County Commissioners voted 3-0 to adopt the Growing Healthier Report and directed that it be folded into the County Comprehensive Plan. The Public Health Advisory Council championed the development of the Growing Healthier Report, which included a thorough scientific literature review and comprehensive community engagement, including public meetings, public presentations and extensive efforts to get community feedback. I believe there was broad community support, including, but not limited to, support from hospital and health system partners and local healthcare providers. The Planning Commission voted 6-0 to recommend that the Board of Commissioner adopt the Growing Healthier Report.

I understand and appreciate your concerns that the report pushes an agenda that supports high density while disparaging rural living. My understanding of the report is that it relies on the best available science to provide a flexible tool that the Board can use in prioritizing strategies based on consideration of potential health impacts. I consulted with the Prosecuting Attorney’s Office and understand that the Growing Healthier Report is an adopted document in the Comprehensive Plan until the Board modifies the Comprehensive Plan to remove it. As such, I have reservations about removing the Growing Healthier Report from our website. Since we are reviewing our on-line content in a comprehensive manner, I’m hopeful that rather than taking a piecemeal approach to removing information and documents from our website that we can work with the County Prosecuting Attorney’s Office in a comprehensive review of what needs to remain and what can be removed from our site.

Best regards,
Alan
Alan Melnick, MD, MPH | Public Health Director/Health Officer
Clark County Public Health
1601 E. Fourth Plain Blvd., Bldg. 17, 3rd Floor
P.O. Box 9825, Vancouver, WA 98666-8825
(360) 397-8412
Web | Facebook | Twitter
Public Health – Always working for a safer and healthier community

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: Mon, September 21, 2015 4:18 PM
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: Orjiako, Oliver
To: "susan rasmussen"; Carol Levanen; Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete
Cc: Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; McCauley, Mark; DONALD MCISAAC
Subject: RE: Ignoring directives from the Councilors
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 8:36:23 AM

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
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; lorettaajsteele@gmail.com
Subject: Re: Who is responsible for ensuring oversight?
Date: Tuesday, September 22, 2015 9:11:40 AM
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
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

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: 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
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

From: Madore, David
Sent: Friday, September 25, 2015 12:52 PM
To: 'susan rasmussen'; Orjiako, Oliver; Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark
Subject: RE: very different views of interpretation

Oliver,
If I remember correctly, our last Comp Plan Work Session covered the topic of extracurricular documents and nonessential policies and information being included in the Comp Plan. The consensus of the BOCC was to avoid all ingredients that are not essential in the Comp Plan. Instead, our direction is to only include what is necessary.
We can make more timely updates and improvements to policies if they are outside of the Comp Plan.
This Comp Plan update is our opportunity to remove extras from the Comp Plan. I believe that is the direction already communicated. If this matter needs a formal vote of the BOCC to clearly establish that direction, please let us know. Otherwise, I will assume that staff is fully onboard and working toward that end.
Please let me know if the path forward needs better clarification.
Thank you,

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 1:03 PM
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark; Cook, Christine
Subject: FW: very different views of interpretation

Hello Councilor:
In response to your email dated September 25, 2015, Staff does not see the comp plan as an opportunity to remove extras as you stated. The comp plan update is an opportunity to review and include recent changes to the state statute, recent changes to the plan text and any pending policy direction from the past Board and the present Councilors. What is necessary I believe is the need for further public discussion and deliberation on several levels. I have no idea what ‘extracurricular documents and non-essential policies’ are being referred to here. First of all, everything that is in the comp plan now is county policy. The comp plan is compilation of work adopted by previous Boards, which means it is hardly non-essential. The comp plan is missing some key provisions of county policy also adopted, albeit more recently, by previous Boards.
The GMA requires eight elements, listed in RCW 36.70A.070:
5) A rural element. Comp Plan Chapter 3; also includes natural resources.
6) A transportation element. Comp Plan Chapter 5
7) An economic development element (Comp Plan Chapter 9), and
8) A parks and recreation element (cue the recently adopted/acknowledged/talked about Parks plan). Comp Plan Chapter 7.

The Environmental Element (Comp Plan Chapter 4) covers the required critical areas ordinances and stormwater program. The Shoreline Master Program policies (also required) are in Comp Plan Chapter 13.

What do we do with the Historic, Archaeological and Cultural Resource element (Comp Plan Chapter 8)? Do we tell the schools that they are not important (Comp Plan Chapter 10)? The GMA Land Use element includes a statement that says 'wherever possible, the land use element should consider utilizing planning approaches to promote physical activity'. Should we not integrate the Growing Healthier Report prepared jointly by Public Health and Community Planning and the Aging Readiness Report which has its own Board-appointed commission into the comp plan, both of which were adopted by previous boards? The county has a sustainability policy which we intend to include. Do we leave that out because it's county policy but somehow not worthy of being in the comp plan?

Perhaps we need a formal hearing for the Councilors to identify what those elements in the existing plan and previous Board directives should be removed or not included. Thank you.

Best,
Oliver

Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 1:40 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Madore, David
Subject: RE: very different views of interpretation

Oliver,

The policies published here may have been those of previous boards. But I believe that they are not in agreement with the current board.


They include such social engineering agendas as forcing citizens out of their cars into high capacity transit, purposely increasing traffic congestion, adding tolls to our freeways, trumping sound local best practices with an agenda to stop global warming, fragmenting the families of rural citizens, and more unhealthy practices that stagnate and oppress the citizens of our community. We will follow and appropriate process to eliminate these unhealthy choices from our adopted policies and from the Comp Plan. These are policy decision that we as a Board are responsible to determine. Please support our endeavor as a Board to make these corrections.

I welcome your feedback.

Thank you,

David

From: Orjiako, Oliver
To: Madore, David
Cc: McCauley, Mark
Subject: RE: very different views of interpretation
Date: Tuesday, September 29, 2015 2:44:37 PM
Hello Councilor:
As I stated in my previous email reply, when staff presents the plan text with policies to the Councilors in a formal hearing the Councilors will identify what those elements in the existing plan and previous Board directives should be removed or not included. Thank you.

Note: Multiple emails go to David Madore's US Digital email. David Madore meets the public records requirements by emailing county business emails to his county email. There is no way to check whether all correspondence has been forwarded.

David Madore
Begin forwarded message:
From: DONALD MCISAAC <donalmdmcisaac@msn.com>
Date: November 23, 2015 at 7:15:54 AM PST
To: David Madore <david.madore@usdigital.com>
Subject: Process
David-
The State review process is a bit different than what I spoke of earlier: there may not be a mandatory State review process prior to the final adoption, but rather a 60 day notification of the Department of Commerce that final adoption is imminent, with the possibility of a State Hearings Board review only if someone appeals. See below. No changes on my perspective of the draft to final SEIS process.
See screenshot of Oliver’s "Remaining Process" slide as it was presented Sept 3 and 10. On Nov 9, he changed the final EIS from December 15 to Feb 16.
See also the short State published primer on the update process, including sections 3 and 4: "legislative action" (action by elected County officials) and submittal to the State.
Notice also in this primer that after the 60 day notice is given to Commerce that a final adoption is imminent, a 60 day window for "any person or organization" to appeal begins (bottom of page 13). It would be after an appeal that the State Board reviews the County action, not before, as any appeal goes to them before court, according to this document.
I will try to call this morning.

In the end, I still see the process on Tuesday to be
1. Properly adopt a Preferred Alternative that is a mix of the Alternatives, with Alternative 1 only being the remaining parts of status quo not changed by revised A-4, A-3, and any relevant parts of A-2.
2. Instruct the staff to complete a final FEIS using the proper policy choices for planning assumptions and the best available information.
3. Instruct the staff to modify and update the CMP document in accordance with the Preferred Alternative and any relevant policy decision since the last document update.
Example: Citizen forums – differential response

Complaint from CCCU

From: Carol Levanen
To: Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; Rita Dietrich; Madore, David; Orjiako, Oliver; Silliman, Peter
Subject: Supporters of CCCU tax dollars being used against them by the county - For the Public Record
Date: Thursday, July 09, 2015 12:36:51 PM

Dear Councilors,
Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is adamantly opposed to our tax dollars being used to promote the head of a neighborhood association's political agenda against us. We are keenly aware of the costs involved in mass mailings and believe it is not the county's position to take sides and allow this sort of thing to occur. Alternative 4 is the only document that will set things right for all rural landowners. To see this newsletter being used to oppose this option and misrepresent the intent and purpose of this alternative, using county tax dollars, is clearly biased.
The county taxes have no business funding such activity and CCCU, Inc. considers it an outrage for doing so.
We urge the Councilors to stop this policy as soon as possible, before it does any more damage. if this person wants to spread her political agenda to the neighborhood, she needs to do it on her own dime.
Sincerely,
Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

Response from David Madore

From: Madore, David
To: Carol Levanen
Subject: Re: Supporters of CCCU tax dollars being used against them by the county - For the Public Record
Date: Thursday, July 09, 2015 1:25:05 PM

Carol,
Thank you for bringing this to our attention. I had not realized that using public funds to publish such content amounts to inappropriately fund advocacy.
Freedom of speech is best exercised when the advocates fund their own.
Thanks
David Madore
Contrast: Clark County Citizens United Community Forum – February 12, 2016

David Madore
January 27

Shenanigans happen. The competition has been fierce:
“Trust the staff. They are the experts.” - Trust, but verify.
“That fact checking process has been an eye opening experience that revealed that the numbers reported by planning staff were, in fact, agenda driven. GIS staff has been a fabulous help and a reliable source of uncompromised truth. That truth revealed planning assumptions used by the planning staff, significantly changed the tallies reported to the councilors to achieve a political agenda.”
I urge you to read the Op-ed in this week’s Reflector:
http://www.thereflctor.com/.../page_3e7a8335-88f1-5c5b-a496-...

Citizens have one last opportunity to turn the tide or forever hold their peace. Will you make a difference?

Alternative
4 Town Hall Meeting

WHO: Sponsored by Clark County Citizens United

WHERE: Hockinson High School (in the Commons), 16819 NE 159th St, Brush Prairie

WHEN: Fri., Feb. 12, 7-9 p.m.
David Madore
February 15:
Thanks to videographer Jim Karlock, the video of Friday’s Town Hall meeting is now available online. Dr. Don McIsaac’s presentation is queued up here: https://vimeo.com/155251268#t=831s...

I hope to clip individual sections and post them soon for easy navigation. Knowledge is power, both for citizens and citizen representatives. Thanks again to the rural citizens, Clark County Citizens United, and the other 15 organizations that sponsored this event. It was intended to be an opportunity for citizens to engage with their county councilors. Even though Jeanne Stewart, Julie Olson, nor Marc Boldt showed up, citizens can still help their county councilors to better understand on Tuesday morning at 10 am on the 6th floor at 1300 Franklin. Bring quarters for the parking garage on the north side of the Public Service Center.

David Madore
February 13:
Town Hall Meeting packed the house at Hockinson High School:

This snapshot was only able to capture a portion of the room filled with rural citizens with hands raised in support of our adopted Comp Plan Preferred Alternative.

Of the 200 or so citizens, 4 hands were then raised to repeal the plan in favor or Alternative 1, the status quo plan that’s been in place since 1994. Tom Mielke and I were there to listen and answer questions. Julie Olson, who said she would be there, did not show up. Neither did Marc Boldt or Jeanne Stewart. 15 other organizations took part in the Town Hall meeting hosted by Clark County Citizens United. Dr. Don McIsaac presented an excellent report and knocked it out of the ballpark with such clarity and professionalism. Thanks to Jim Karlock, who videotaped the meeting, we should be able to post that presentation shortly. Jim Katzinski of Pacific Legal Foundation (PLF), was a panelist along with other professionals to answer questions and provide support for the citizens. PLF has successfully defended citizens’ private property rights across the nation winning multiple cases before the US Supreme Court. They are standing by to defend our rural citizens if necessary. The most important meeting for citizens to appeal to their citizen representatives will be Tuesday at 10am on the 6th floor of the Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin, Vancouver. Bring quarters for the parking garage on the north side.

If the county council votes to repeal the Preferred Alternative and readopt the old 1994 Alternative-1 Plan, the citizens are ready to defend their rights in court. I hope that the county will instead, choose to be on the citizens’ side to defend their private property rights and the plan that fully complies with the GMA.
David Madore shared Clark County Republican Party’s event.
February 15

Last call. It’s now or never.
Since Jeanne Stewart, Julie Olson, and Marc Boldt did not attend the Town Hall meeting created for them, you can still be sure they hear your plea Tuesday before making the most important county decision in decades.

The Public Hearing following this meeting was posted as an Event on Facebook:
Interested

Protect Your Property Rights - Alternative 4 Hearing
Tue 10 AM · Public Service Center, sixth-floor hearing room, 1300 Franklin St., Vancouver (map)
17 people interested · 14 people going

Protect your private property rights! The Clark County Council's next apparent target for repeal is their scheduled "reconsideration" of Alternative 4. This is the same issue where so many concerned citizens came to a townhall meeting last Friday to ask questions and express their views -- and yet all three of the most recently elected councilors failed to attend and listen to them.

You can make SURE they listen by attending the upcoming council meeting on this Tuesday, Feb 16 at 10:00 am.

RSVP to this event page, then please SHARE this event on your timeline, and be sure to click the link to "Invite Your Friends". See you there!

Following Board vote in February 2016 FB Post:
David Madore
Like This Page  February 23  Edited

Why can't we just get along to fight as a team against the citizens?

Four words: It's not about you.

When we get hired under false pretenses to do the job of representing the citizens that trusted us with their vote to be their voice and their advocate, we are not the victim. We are the offender.

When we make promises to protect and defend citizens' private property rights and then do everything in our power to take them away, we are not the victim. We are the offender.
http://www.marcboldt.com/what-i-believe.php#navbar

When we campaign for limited government, lower taxes, less regulations, for more freedom and unity, and then do the opposite after taking office, we are not the victim. We are the offender.

When we run on a platform to represent ALL the citizen and then rescind the citizen passed ballot measures including the one passed by a record breaking landslide vote (our voter approved Light Rail policy), we are not the victim. We are the offender. http://gis.clark.wa.gov/Election/2013/

When we fail to even show up at the citizen organized Town Hall meeting put on for us to better understand, and then we vote to kill Alternative 4 and every available rural citizen option, we are not the victim.
We are the offender.
When we are called on the carpet to answer for our actions that hurt others, we are not the victim. We are the offender.

When we wonder why others don’t join with us to war against the citizens we are sworn to defend, we are not the victim. Rather, we make our friends and our neighbors who trusted us, the victims of our actions.

Today was another sad disastrous day for Clark County citizens. But do not settle for the injustice. Do not accept being a victim.

I encourage each citizen to defend your human rights stripped away today. The county fought against the citizens in 1994 and citizens won on every count. But the citizens trusted the county to make the corrections identified by the judge. The county ran out the clock instead.

We will win again if we work together. And this time, we will require the court order to be obeyed. I encourage you to support and work with:
Clark County Citizens United
PO Box 2188
Battle ground, WA 98604
cccuinc@yahoo.com
360-667-0516
Robert Dean
April 5 at 3:03am -

Many of my close friends are members of Clark County Citizens United. Every one of them is an advocate for citizens rights, including private property rights - just like David Madore.

Anna Miller
April 4 at 6:38pm -

I came across this Facebook message that was posted by the large rural lands/private property rights organization, Clark County Citizens United. It is a statement in support of the re-election of David Madore for Clark County Council, District 3. This is the David Madore I know. I am proud to call him friend and grateful for his love and commitment to our community. Please read their statement below:

“Clark County Citizens United, Inc. fully supports your willingness to be a candidate for Position 3 and to serve the public for another 4 years. You have been, without a doubt, the finest commissioner/councilor Clark County has ever had. In addition, you have always conducted yourself in an honest, kind and professional manner while showing the public that you really do care about them and their welfare and want to help them whenever you can. You’re a person who stays up late at night to help the people, and even sometimes works on their behalf until morning, getting no sleep at all. You ask for nothing in return from the people and yet you give your all on their behalf. That is true commitment! Thanks for all you have done and all you do on behalf of Clark County and it’s people!”

Clark County Citizens United
So sad to see this wonderfully qualified woman lose her position: So many volunteers step up to serve our community simply because they care and they can use their skills and abilities to make our community a better place. The vast majority serve on citizen boards without any pay.

A token per diem of $75 per day is provided to members who meet for multiple hours on one 3-member board called the Board of Equalization. These citizens help individual taxpayers who believe their property valuation is too high.

That board researches the County Assessor’s documents, the citizen’s justifications, and market info, and then decide on that taxpayer’s valuation that determines their property tax.

Board members ideally would have ample experience as assessors, realtors, and faithful citizen leadership so they are well qualified to make informed knowledgeable decisions helpful and fair to citizens.

These Board members, and several alternates who fill in as needed, are appointed to three year terms by the County Councilors who should base their decisions on qualifications, not on partisan differences.

Yet, today, the trio of Marc Boldt, Jeanne Stewart, and Julie Olson, voted to remove one of the best qualified candidates in our history who is already serving as an excellent existing alternate Board member. They chose to go advertise again for someone else more acceptable.

Her background includes working as an assessor in our own assessor’s office in prior years, holding a current real estate license in Oregon and Washington and currently working as a broker, being a highly respected Oregon Representative and Senator with a great track record faithfully representing citizens in prior years, a business owner, an active community volunteer in multiple capacities, college honors, was recommended by staff and colleagues, and much more.

But there’s one problem for the trio. She’s a conservative Republican and a county council candidate who voted for Alternative 4, the rural citizen private property rights plan on the Planning Commission.

They claim she has a conflict of interest. Not so. If any person sitting on any board has a conflict of interest, they simply recuse themselves from that decision. http://www.realtor.org/.../$/f.../r_coe-pledge-of-performance.pdf

Her name is Eileen Quiring. It is an injustice for the trio to discriminate against this proven friend of citizens.

The same pattern is unfolding in this election as the last. Our deputy county manager is contributing $500 to staff surrogates the same way that he contributed to Julie Olson to elect staff representatives in the place of citizen representatives.
Margaret Tweet Clark County citizens still have the opportunity to consider the qualifications of Eileen Quiring for County Council.
Like · Reply · 4 · 10 hrs
Jim Maine Madore didn't explain that it's a conflict of interest. She's a realtor.
Like · Reply · 9 hrs
Margaret Tweet From the post above about Eileen Quiring for County Council her professional status is mentioned. "holding a current real estate license in Oregon and Washington and currently working as a broker," That does not appear to have prevented her from serving thus far. Her experience could bring missing perspective to the county council.
Like · Reply · 9 hrs
Write a reply...
Anna Miller Right Margaret!
http://www.electeileenq.org/
Like · Reply · 1 · 10 hrs
Anna Miller And
https://www.facebook.com/Eileen-Quiring-for-County.../
Like · Reply · 1 · 10 hrs
Don Railback I can assure all those who hate the corrupt trio on the county council that next week will not be pleasant for them.
Like · Reply · 1 · 9 hrs
Philip Johnson Oh my goodness there is a smell of politics in the air down at the county building, I would assume this is not the first time that, that smell has permeated the building. I also assume that the previous two years you were the chair, that nothing reeked of politics ever. Nope, no sir the last two years was like attending an Eagle Scout convention, helping little old ladies cross the street, saying the oath, etc. Ms. Quiring is a big girl, I am sure she took the news with grace, and continued her quest to be a county councilor. As for the deputy county manager giving his money to whomever he wishes, how is that any business of yours? You probably have noticed that Mr. and Mrs. Mielke have given $500.00 to Ms. Quiring, in what way is that right? How can one participate in picking their own replacement? Oh yeah, that's right it's none of my business what the Mielke's do with their money, good for them for participating. Sir, you play the political game quite cunningly, your feigning dismay that others are playing that same game is an insult to any citizen in the county that is paying attention.
Like · Reply · 9 hrs
David Madore Philip Johnson, decency and integrity are not a partisan virtues. They are human decency basics. Rather than excusing such corrupt behavior, we ought to stand against bullying and defend those that are unfairly harmed.
Like · Reply · 2 · 6 hrs · Edited
without incident for sometime now. Why now? What has changed? Nothing, except she entered the race to run against the person they want to serve with.

Like · Reply · 4 · 7 hrs · Edited

Steven Wallace Thanks, this explains a lot.

Like · Reply · 1 · 9 hrs

David Knight We aren’t giving Jeanie Stewart a pass here are we? Boldt was no surprise, and Julie hadn’t really been vetted. But Jeanie was a disaster. She makes some noise about David Evans and jumps on the conservative rehab train? She is a closet enabler.

Like · Reply ·
Just FYI. Thanks.

From: Lynn Carman [mailto:lynn.carman@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 10:54 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: McCauley, Mark
Subject: RE: NEWS RELEASE: State to begin review of proposed county growth plan materials

Thank you Oliver for your supplying the RCW on his as I was having problems locating it. But again it's confusing that you would submit this 60 days prior to the hearing and adoption unless it was a done deal and yes I know you get the directions from the Councilors on how GMA plays out. If the general public were to know you have already submitted the plan to the State, wouldn't they feel that it's a waste of time to add their comments? Then there is the issue of the rezoning of the agr and forest land and going back to the use of cluster developments in these areas? When did the public notice go out on this as I see they added this May the 4th. Will you require all these rural developments to put in sewer lines or will they have septic? Then there is the issue if these have septic, who will enforce this as it's not being enforced now and you just added a fee instead of making those whom don't comply with the laws do so?

Also the fact that a citizen has until 5 PM the day prior to the hearing, which I understand is now joint with the CC Planning Commission and the CC Councilors. So why is it that folks are being told that they have to use the Engage Clark County and must have their comments in today by 5PM? This reeks of having to use a third party involvement instead of directly supplying your comments to the direct parties of record? I keep asking what is going on down there?

My comments will be in by the 18th and 5 PM as I'm still doing research.

Thank you for your reply and the RCW that I couldn't find.

Sincerely,
Lynn Carman
Good morning Lynn:

As I stated on my previous email, submittal to State Department of Commerce is not a new protocol. The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires all jurisdictions planning under the GMA to submit their draft plans at least 60 days prior to adoption to the Dept. of Commerce for review. (see RCW 36. 70A.106 (1))

Following the final action of the County Council, staff will forward any revisions or amendments of the draft to Dept. of Commerce of the adopted land use plan and development regulations. According to the County Charter, it is the County Manager who presents the land use comprehensive plan to the Councilors following the recommendations of the Planning Commission through the public hearings process. I hope this is helpful. Thank you.

Best,
Oliver

From: Lynn Carman [mailto:lynn.carman@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2016 6:25 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: McCauley, Mark
Subject: RE: NEWS RELEASE: State to begin review of proposed county growth plan materials

Hello Oliver:

So it is a ‘Clark County Done Deal?’ Submitting information without approval doesn’t make sense at all, why waste the state’s GMA folks time? Or why waste the citizens’ time if it’s already sent? The barn door has been flung wide open now with is being proposed in the rural area, the county has failing roads and now you are adding more without taking a serious look at GMA and controlling growth. So whom is going to pay for the added use of roadways that aren’t up to standards when it comes to adding more traffic? I know it takes three deaths before anything is done. How sad.

Sincerely,
Lynn Carman

From: Orjiako, Oliver [mailto:Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 4, 2016 4:47 PM
To: Lynn Carman
Cc: McCauley, Mark
Subject: RE: NEWS RELEASE: State to begin review of proposed county growth plan materials

Hello Lynn:

This is our normal practice to begin the required the 60-day Commerce review. Start will provide the state the final outcome following public hearing and final action of the Council. Thanks.

Best,

Oliver

From: Lynn Carman [mailto:lynn.carman@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2016 3:53 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: McCauley, Mark
Subject: FW: NEWS RELEASE: State to begin review of proposed county growth plan materials
May 4, 2016

Contact: Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning
(360) 397-2280 ext. 4112; oliver.orjiako@clark.wa.gov

State to begin review of proposed county growth plan materials

Vancouver, WA — Documents covering proposed changes to the local growth management plan have been submitted to the Washington Department of Commerce for the state review required to update the plan.

Two binders of material on the county’s “preferred alternative” were transmitted last week. Topics include proposed changes to zoning, urban growth areas and county code. The package also includes:

- Updates to planning policies;
- Draft capital facilities plan;
- Draft county capital facilities financial plan;
- Long-range road plan (arterial atlas);
- Final supplemental environmental impact statement;
- Commerce check list;
- Proposed impact fees (parks, schools and transportation); and
- Public comments.

Meanwhile, public hearings are scheduled this month for the Planning Commission and Board of County Councilors, followed by deliberations in June. All sessions will be at the Public Service Center, Sixth Floor, 1300 Franklin St., as follows:

- **May 19, 6:30 p.m.**: Joint public hearing on entire plan update, including environmental impact statement
- **May 24, 6:30 p.m.**: Joint public hearing on entire plan update, including environmental impact statement
- **June 2, 6:30 p.m.**: Planning Commission deliberations
- **June 21, 10 a.m.**: Board of County Councilors deliberations
Related materials are online at www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/plan-adoption. Public comments may be submitted online using Engage Clark County at www.clark.wa.gov/engage-clark-county.

###

You can also link to the full news release on Clark County's website: https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/state-begin-review-proposed-county-growth-plan-materials

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

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

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
FYI and for the record. Thanks.

----- Forwaded Message -----  
From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com> 
To: "cndental@yahoo.com" <cndental@yahoo.com>  
Sent: Wednesday, May 11, 2016 1:48 PM  
Subject: 

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD OF THE 2016 CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board had a definitive view of what comprehensive growth planning should look like. The Board ordered Clark County to apply their specific formula to the county’s first comprehensive growth plan under GMA law. The Board’s formula strove to curtail all Clark County rural growth.

Clark County applied the Board’s formulaic approach as the foundational basis of the plan. In doing so, the county incorporated drastic, prescriptive measures to stop rural growth. The county eliminated all rural centers, and created a new agri-forest zone. Ultimately, the county relied on massive downzoning to stop all rural growth. The downzoning resulted in overwhelming non-conforming parcels to their zone size throughout all rural and resource zones. Most importantly, the plan failed to remotely resemble the unique rural character of the county.

The plan created much controversy and rural landowners came forward in droves to contest it. To this day, the 1994 Clark County Comprehensive Plan remains one of the most contested comprehensive plans in GMA planning history. Over 64 private appeals were filed with the Hearings Board. Clark County Citizens United, Inc. was one such appeal.

CCCU’s appeal resulted in prevailing court actions in the Superior Court and the Court of Appeals. Both Courts have ruled the formula is “unauthorized” according to GMA law. This is an overarching decision that addresses the very foundation the plan was built on. Since the foundation
of the county’s comprehensive plan is deemed “unauthorized,” all elements of the plan that are
associated with it should also be considered “unauthorized.”
Therefore, all elements of the county comprehensive plan that used the formula as the
foundation, should also be considered “unauthorized.”

Sincerely,

Susan Rasmussen, Pres.
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604
FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD OF THE 2016 CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

The Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board had a definitive view of what comprehensive growth planning should look like. The Board’s formula was specific. It was clearly intended to stop all rural growth. This formula remains as the foundation of the county plan today.

Clark County applied the Board’s formulaic approach and used it as the foundation for all county comprehensive plan land use and zoning regulations. Because of this basic decision, it was necessary for the county to incorporate drastic, prescriptive measures to stop rural growth and force it into urban areas. This was counter to what was happening at the time. The county eliminated all rural centers, and created a new agri-forest zone. Ultimately, the county relied on aggressive rural downzoning to forcibly stop rural growth. The downzoning resulted in overwhelming numbers of non-conforming, substandard parcels to their zone size throughout all rural and resource zones.

Most importantly, the actions the county undertook failed to resemble the county’s unique rural character and failed to consider long-standing rural cultural practices. The plan was highly controversial. Rural citizens came forward in droves to contest the plan. To this day, the 1994 Clark County Comprehensive Plan remains as the most contested growth plan in GMA history. Over 64 appeals were filed against the plan with the Hearings Board. Clark County Citizens United, Inc. was one of the appellants.

CCCU’s appeal resulted in prevailing court actions in the Superior Court, and the Court of Appeals. The Courts have ruled the formula, that provides the basis for the county’s 1994 comprehensive plan, is an “unauthorized formula” according to GMA law. Judge Poyfair’s ruling is overarching and addresses the very foundation of the county’s plan. By inference, all elements of the plan instituted as a consequence of using the “unauthorized formula” should be addressed as they all suffer from impacts of the formula. The elements, tainted by using an “unauthorized formula,” are the planning assumptions, policies, all land use and county zoning regulations.

CCCU is primarily concerned the county has failed to take the necessary corrective measures to accomplish full and complete compliance to the Superior Court Orders. The unlawful formula, along with the impacted elements, remains as the foundation of the county’s plan today.

The comprehensive plan updates are the appropriate times to make the corrections. Instead, the county has cleverly devised ways and means to ensure the unlawful formula is advanced at every update. Population projections are set low, numbers for all vacant buildable lands are always healthy. Resource lands are designated via aerial photography and staff interpretations...not according to GMA law. The urban/rural ratios have failed to accurately reflect real percentages. All 14 GMA planning goals aren’t granted equity. Entire chapters are devoted to the environment, and community design. Property rights are allowed 2 sentences in the entire 2 volumes of work. Overwhelming numbers of non-conforming parcels remain since corrections to the down zonings (referenced in Poyfair’s Conclusions of Law) and land use regulations have failed. Urban holding and reserve overlays linger over 20 years. Updates to the State’s Economic Use Taxation Program for 5 acres of trees fails to be recognized. Current trends in agriculture (USDA Census of Agriculture, 2017) fail recognition. The citizens were denied a broad range of alternative plans from which to choose. Exclusionary practices are repeatedly employed to eliminate the rural land owners in the important decisioning the futures of their properties.
When all actions are viewed in combination, one can clearly see an advocacy campaign that intentionally sets a goal to
disadvantage rural concerns at every opportunity throughout the planning process. This campaign is ostensibly directed
at the county Councilors and for the most part, is very effective. This has gone undetected for years. This campaign only
reinforces the flawed formula and short-changes the public process.

Questions should be asked and challenges need to be brought forth.

1. Has Clark County fully complied with all aspects and intentions of the Judge Poyfair’s Superior Court Orders?
2. Has there been a well-reasoned, balanced discussion of the relationship of our constitutionally protected
   property rights, and the other 13 GMA planning goals?
3. Has there been any assessment to determine if Clark County’s Comprehensive Plan, policies, and land use
   regulations are actually working as they are intended to work?
4. Is the comprehensive plan improving the overall quality of life issues for all citizens?
5. Is one segment of Clark County society singled out, and overburdened as a consequence of land use regulations
   and zoning?

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD OF THE 2016 CLARK COUNTY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Judge Poyfair reflected on the intentions written in his Superior Court Orders, April 1997. In a recent interview with CCCU, he stated the entire plan should have been thrown out and rewritten since the foundation was illegal. In the Judge’s words, “They put the cart before the horse.” The desired outcome was first developed, then elements were contrived to support the outcome. He concluded in the Superior Court Orders, “The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA.”

The Judge’s decision was landmark and was he was commended by his peers for arriving at an overarching decision. The legalities and ethics of perpetuating any elements of the comprehensive plan whose origins are directly linked to the unauthorized formula need to be scrutinized. This question needs to be asked;

- Despite various elected county commissioners coming and going over the years, the same planning regimen remains in place.

- The “flawed formula,” along with the consequential impacts linked to that formula remain. Why isn’t this challenged?

There is compelling evidence the unlawful formula remains strongly imbedded in county land use regulations and zoning. One can easily recognize the resulting downzoning in the preponderance of non-conforming lots in their zones. Approximately 17% AG-20, and 7% FR-40 parcels conform to their zone sizes. Most UH and UR properties (burdened by overlays over 29 years), also suffer from non-compliance. This is a problem because non-conforming parcels fail to conform to Clark County’s unique rural character. Since the formula has been perpetually advanced over the years, Alternative Plans 1, 2, 3, and even 4 are all tainted by the unlawful formula to some degree.

Alternative plan 4 differs in that the formula relies upon recognizing a predominant parcel size unique to the zone. That defers to the historic patterns of rural lot development, and also acknowledges previous county growth plans. Those historic growth plans (prior to 1994) are held in high regard. The formula using the predominant lot size, has been successfully applied by Pierce County and supported by the Puget Sound Regional Council. It is regarded in the 2016 Thorpe Analysis.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
Sent from Mail for Windows 10
The Board had an end in sight (restricting growth in rural areas), but failed to develop the factors from the record and the GMA necessary to support its decision. The Board erroneously interpreted and applied the GMA when it failed to require the agri-forest resource lands meet the statutorily mandated definitional criteria for resource lands. Furthermore, there is no substantial evidence in the record to support the designations of agri-forest lands as resource lands under the GMA.

This formulaic view of the GMA requirements is fatally flawed. There is no requirement in the GMA and the OFM projections be used in any manner other than as a measure to ensure urban growth areas are adequately sized and infrastructure in those growth areas is provided for. This Board decision, however, compelled the County to downzone substantial portions of the rural areas in order to meet the Board’s apparent requirements.

The only requirement for rural areas in the GMA is that growth in rural areas not be urban in character. While the GMA contains no restrictions on rural growth, it does require a variety of residential densities. By trying to comply with the Board’s errant decision, the County violated a GMA planning goal.

Notwithstanding the designation of urban growth areas, a county may allow non-urban or “rural” growth outside those areas. “Non-urban” or “rural” growth encompasses a variety of uses and residential densities, including clustered residential development, provided such uses and densities are “not characterized by urban growth,” and are consistent with rural character.

It is evident the rural land use density regulations were driven in part by earlier Growth Management Hearing Board decisions requiring urban population plus rural population to equal Office of Financial Management population forecasts. (Citation omitted.) This formulaic view of the GMA is fatally flawed. There is no requirement in the GMA that the OFM projections be used in any manner other than as a measure to ensure urban growth areas are adequately sized and infrastructure in those growth areas is provided.
For. The Board's requirement to, in essence, require a vacant buildable lands analysis for the rural area was erroneous. This Board decision, however, compelled the County To downzone substantial portions of the rural areas in order to meet the Board's apparent Requirements.

Court of Appeals, Page 6:

Nothing in the GMA provides that a county must use OFM's population projections for any Other purpose. More particularly, nothing in the GMA provides that a county must use OFM's Population projections as a cap or ceiling when planning for non-urban growth. Construed According to its plain meaning, then, the GMA does not require counties to use OFM's Population projections as a cap or ceiling on non-urban growth.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.O

ReSent from Mail for Windows 10
For the Public Record of the Clark County 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update

Yes, Alt. 4 Plan helps to correct the “unauthorized formula.” The soils are still incorrect. Alt. 4 Plan is the closest of all the plans to being GMA compliant and supportive of all 14 GMA planning goals. It is also the only plan based on a predominant lot size formula. This formula has been proven in the courts to be GMA compliant. (Pierce County)

Marc, you have a chance to get this right, to get into compliance with CCCU’s Superior Court Orders, and to do the fair thing. According to GMA, it doesn’t matter who authors the plan. Klickitat County hired an outside source to write their successful plan. They liked her work so much, the County hired her full time.

We first approached the County planners to write a rural plan months before they revealed the 3 plans. We were rebuffed. In fact, MS. Cook said, “I will not defend an ag. 5!” However, that is the predominant size of lots throughout all ag and forestry zones.

Please look at the intent of the most recent change to the State Dept. of Revenue, Forestry current use taxation program that recognizes a minimum 5 acres of trees. That is important to the F-40 zoned folks because 75% of the forested area is privately owned in Clark County. The average statewide is 50%. Only 7% of the F-40 lots conform to their zone size. For the most part, the 5 acre parcels are already on the ground. That drove the F-10 zone in Alt. 4. You won’t find the recent changes in the current use forestry taxation program in the county plan, or the documents. It is included in my testimonies several times.

If you examine the 2012 USDA Census of Agriculture, Clark County profile, you will see the well-established trend towards smaller, intensely managed farms. As you probably know, Clark County’s farmgate value was $51.8 M. 2012; $54.4 M. 2002. Cowlitz was $29 M., and $30.5 M. Skamania was $6 M., and $11.5 M. 2002. There is an overall downward trend in farmgate values in Western Wa.

By comparison, Yakima County had $843.8 M. in 2002 and increased to a whopping $1.65 B. by 2012.

There are 1929 Clark County farms. The average cash farm income is $1,243. 92% had sales below $24,999. 72% had sales below $5,000. The preponderance of small farms in the county is not new information. This is referenced in the USDA 1954 Ag. Census report. What is important to recognize in the USDA reports, the small size ag. operations are historically documented and unique to the county. The parcel size for farms is secondary. (Pierce County)

What Clark County does have are many horse enthusiasts (first in the state per capita), a very robust 4-H Program, and very avid gardeners. The WSU Master Gardeners program always has a waiting list.

You won’t find this in the comprehensive plan documents. You will find it in my testimonies, and you can take my facts and figures to the bank. This background work makes the foundation of Alt. 4.

Marc, we want the County to be successful with a balanced and fair plan. The zoning in Alt. 4 is the rural people’s plan, and they expect those corrections to be made this time around. We are willing to work with you here to get this right.
Subject: Rural property owners don't expect special treatment during the process of the County's 20 year update of the comprehensive growth plan. However, we rightfully expect fairness and a voice in designing the future plans of our properties.

County planning is supposed to carry out their tasks in an even-handed, non-biased manner. By state law, the planners need to include stakeholders that are impacted by land-use regulations. For decades now, the Dept. of Community Development has gone out of their way to wreck havoc on rural property rights, and exclude rural landowners from the process. Primarily, this is the reason behind much imbalance and strife in the County's growth Plan.

Those who want to advance one goal only, environmental protection at the cost of rural property rights and a robust rural economy, have advanced their agenda. Despite lawfully elected County Boards coming and going, this attitude has prevailed. As a result, the County's Plan devotes an entire chapter to the environment. You will be hard pressed to find any language on affordable housing, recognition of regional differences, promoting economic opportunities for all citizens, property rights, and an inclusive planning process. These are listed among the 14 GMA planning goals and require equal treatment under state law.

Clark County Citizens United intentionally focused on the needs and desires of rural communities early in the process for this growth plan update. The dominant sentiment of rural landowners, expressing a desire for property rights, has been present before the Board of County Councilors every week over 2 years. The Public Hearing Feb. 16 was packed with overwhelming support for the rural alternative 4 Plan. Clark County Citizens United has established an extensive body of testimony, along with reports and factual data contained within the public record of this update supporting the need for rural comprehensive land-use changes, supporting policies, and full compliance to our Superior Court Orders. It would have been easier to ignore a buzzing hornet.

Yet, these sentiments and pleas for relief were ignored by Councilors Olson, Stewart, and Boldt. 4 of the 5 Councilors were elected to represent more than their constituents in town. Why did the three Councilors find it impossible to support basic property rights of the rural citizens? Councilor Olson brazenly claimed to support rural property rights during her successful bid for County Council, District 2. Councilors Boldt and Olson were in office less than two months and voted against important land-use decisions impacting rural lands over the next 20 years. The entire Board must pay attention to all 14 GMA planning goals and find balance, fairness, and provide relief for rural property owners.

At minimum, this update should have been considered as a major undertaking as well as an important opportunity to redesign the entire County's Comprehensive Growth Plan using a lawful formula that doesn't put a cap on rural growth. Important questions need to be asked by every Councilor addressing why the "unauthorized formula" remains as the foundation of the plan today. Do Councilors Stewart, Olson, and Boldt fail to realize their preferred alternative plan is derived from the same "unauthorized formula?" That terminology is directly from CCCU's Superior Court Orders.

The planners have successfully sold their misguided concepts that conform to their old planning regimen. It has become a way to ensure that the regimen continually is biased against rural property owners, and the unlawful formula is advanced another 20 years. This is an abuse of the rural citizens. All County Councilors should recognize the overwhelming need to challenge the County's planning regimen.

CCCU has never presented testimony before the Board to direct the urban neighborhoods what is best for their future plans.
Susan Rasmussen
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
Subject: For the public record of the 2016 comp. plan update

Written in the Comprehensive Plan Update, is Chapter 11; Community Design Element. It states; Through the Perspectives Program which began in October 1991 to develop the Community Framework Plan, citizens in Clark County expressed their opinion about the design of their community. Overriding themes from the comments were:

- Preserve open space and natural areas;
- Encourage land development that preserves a sense of place and a feeling of community;
- Encourage development of a transit system;
- Develop a better diversity of employment opportunities and housing;
- Avoid sprawling development; and
- Design criteria are important to the acceptance of higher densities

It is simply wrong to label these Design elements (from 1991) as being indicative of overriding themes from county citizens. They are themes strongly presented in the Karpinski response to county staff in a request to Mr. Karpinski on his preferred elements.

CCCU recommends revisions here for consideration.
1. The overall Clark County Vision be revised to include a reasoned discussion of the relationship of our constitutionally protected property rights in relation to the other 13 GMA goals.
2. Each Councilor develop his or her process for personally assessing the equity of all 14 GMA goals in this plan update
3. The BOCC preform an independent audit to determine if the County’s updated Plan, the Policies, land-use regulations, and all processes employed for such will function to improve the overall general health, welfare, safety, economic, cultural, and social vitality...improvements addressing quality of life issues enjoyed by all county citizens; with equity.
4. If short-comings are noted, recommend needed changes to policies to arrive at balance, equity, and inclusion. If one segment of Clark County society is being overburdened by regulations, how can this be best remedied?
5. The advancement of policies for the "greater good" (the environmental chapter) should not outweigh the need to protect private property rights
6. At least, provide an honest attempt to balance all 14 goals and not let any particular goal disproportionately outweigh the other goals.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
FORM SUBMISSION from http://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/comp-plan-comments

First Name: Gretchen
Last Name: Starke
Email Address: gstarke@pacific.com
Phone Number: (360) 892-8627
Street Address: 308 NE 124th Ave
City: Vancouver
State: Washington
Zip Code: 98684
Message Subject: comment on the comp plan update
Parcel Number:
Comments: I was disturbed when I heard Councilor Madore disparage public transportation at the last hearing I attended. Provided public transportation and multimodal transportation is very important and must be included in the planning process. In addition, all documents must be included, either by reference or otherwise, including the report on aging.
May 9, 2016

Mr. Oliver Orjiako  
Clark County Community Planning Director  
PO Box 5000  
Vancouver, WA  98666

Re:  Final Ecology Approval of the Clark County Shoreline Master Program - Limited Amendment

Dear Mr. Orjiako:

The Department of Ecology (Ecology) is pleased to announce final approval of the Clark County (County) Shoreline Master Program (SMP) limited amendment. Congratulations to you, your staff, and the community for completing this limited amendment. Ecology finds the County’s amendment is consistent with the policy and procedural requirements of the Shoreline Management Act (RCW 90.58) and its implementing rules.

Ecology, therefore, approves the County’s limited SMP amendment as submitted. The enclosed Attachment A, Findings and Conclusions document, provides more information about our decision. This is Ecology’s final action and there will be no further modifications to the proposal.

The SMP is effective 14 days from the date of this letter. This 14-day period was established by the state legislature in 2011 and is intended to provide lead time for the County to prepare to implement the new SMP amendment.

Ecology is required to publish a newspaper notice that the County’s SMP amendment has received final approval. The publication of this notice, in the form of a legal ad, will begin a 60-day appeal period. We will provide a copy of the legal ad to the County for its records.

Finally, please integrate the changes referenced in this correspondence into the County’s SMP. When this is complete, please forward one clean hard copy and one digital copy of the complete approved SMP to Ecology.
Mr. Oliver Orjiako  
May 9, 2016  
Page 2

If you have any questions, please contact our regional planner, Kim Van Zwalenburg, at Kim.Vanzwalenburg@ecy.wa.gov or (360) 407-6520.

Sincerely,

Maia D. Bellon  
Director

Enclosure

By Certified Mail [7012 1010 0003 3028 4369]

cc: Gary Albrecht, Clark County  
    Paula Ehlers, Ecology  
    Tim Gates, Ecology
ATTACHMENT A: FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS
FOR PROPOSED LIMITED AMENDMENT TO THE CLARK COUNTY
SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM

SMP Submittal accepted February 23, 2016, Ordinances No. 2014-12-10 and 2015-12-12
Prepared by Kim Van Zwalenburg on April 29, 2016

Brief Description of Proposed Amendment: Clark County has submitted a limited amendment of their Shoreline Master Program (SMP) to Ecology for approval to add Carty Lake to the list of shoreline waterbodies, incorporate recent critical area amendments into the SMP including the 2014 wetlands rating system, revise language addressing existing residential structures, revise language addressing maintenance and repair, and to correct numerous scriveners' errors.

FINDINGS OF FACT

Need for amendment. The proposed amendments are needed to address the inadvertent omission of Carty Lake from the list of shoreline waterbodies and to update the critical area regulations within shoreline jurisdiction consistent with the county’s most recent updates. To improve clarity, the county has also revised language they have found problematic related to residential structures as well as maintenance and repair.

SMP provisions to be changed by the amendments as proposed: The following sections of the existing Clark County SMP, codified in Chapter 40.460 of the Clark County Code, are proposed for change (underline for new language; strikeout for deleted language):

Section 40.460.170 Relationship to other plans and regulations - The amendment adds the following provision to clarify the relationship of the SMP and the critical area ordinance:

E. The Clark County Critical Area Ordinances (CAO) are adopted into the master program by reference, except that those provisions inconsistent with the Shoreline Management Act and implementing Washington Administrative Code chapters shall not apply in shoreline jurisdiction. The applicable CAO is the version listed in CCC 40.460.530. Any amendments to the CAO shall be incorporated through an amendment to the master program that is approved by the Department of Ecology pursuant to WAC 173-26-191(2)(b).

Section 40.460.210 Applicability, Section C - add Carty Lake to the list of lakes

Section 40.460.230 Exemptions from a Shoreline Substantial Development Permit - Revisions to B.2 include a citation to the section on nonconforming uses and development and make clear replacement of a demolished home is not normal maintenance and repair. The revisions to B.16 and C.1 improve consistency with RCW 77.55.181 (4) which does not allow local government to require permits or charge fees for fish habitat enhancement projects that are consistent with provisions of that chapter.

B. List of Exemptions
   2. Subject to the provisions of CCC 40.460.250, normal maintenance or repair of existing legally-established structures or developments, including those that have been damaged by accident, fire, or elements. Replacement of a structure or development may be authorized as repair where such replacement is the common method of repair for the type of structure or development and the features of the repaired replacement...
structure or development, including but not limited to its size, shape, configuration, location, and external appearance, must be is comparable to the original structure or development, including but not limited to its size, shape, configuration, location, and external appearance and the repair must replacement does not cause substantial adverse effects to shoreline resources or environment. The replacement of demolished existing single-family residences and their appurtenances is not considered normal maintenance and repair.

16. a. A public or private project that is designed to improve fish or wildlife habitat or fish passage when all of the following apply:

1. a. The project has been approved by DFW;

2. b. The project has received hydraulic project approval (HPA) by WDFW pursuant to Chapter 77.55 RCW; and

3. c. Clark County has determined that the project is substantially consistent with the local Shoreline Master Program. Clark County shall make such determination in a timely manner and provide it by letter to the applicant.

b. Fish habitat enhancement projects that conform to the provisions of RCW 77.55.181 are determined to be consistent with local shoreline master programs and do not require a statement of exemption.

C. Statements of Exemption.

1. Any person claiming exemption from the substantial development permit requirements shall make an application to the Shoreline Administrator for such an exemption in the manner prescribed by the Shoreline Administrator, except that no written statement of exemption is required either for a project designed to improve fish or wildlife habitat or fish passage pursuant to WAC 173-27-040(2)(p)(iii)(A), or for emergency development pursuant to WAC 173-27-040(2)(d).

Section 40.460.250 Nonconforming uses and development - Revisions to B.5 and C.2 increase the damage threshold from 60% to 75%.

Section 40.460.520 Archaeological, cultural and historic resources - Language is revised in regulation A to reference to the state’s (rather than Clark County) predictive model for archaeological artifacts and data. A minor edit is made in regulation B.

A. When a shoreline use or development is in an area known or likely to contain archaeological artifacts and data based on the state’s or Clark County’s predictive model, the applicant shall provide for a site inspection and evaluation by a professional archaeologist prior to issuance of any shoreline permit or approval. Work may not begin until the inspection and evaluation have been completed and the county has issued its permit or approval.

B. If any item of possible archaeological interest (including human skeletal remains) is discovered on site, all work shall immediately stop, and the county, State Department of...
Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), and affected Native American tribe(s) shall be notified of the discovery. A stop-work order will be issued. The shoreline permit will be temporarily suspended. All applicable state and federal permits shall be secured obtained as a condition of resumption of development activities. Development activities may resume only upon the applicant’s receipt of county approval.

Section 40.460.530 Critical areas protection - The first change clarifies how amendments to the county’s CAO are incorporated into the SMP. The addition of ordinance references are corrections to scriveners’ errors with the exception of references to Ordinance 2014-12-05. The county’s Ordinance 2014-12-05 adopted changes to the critical area ordinance for areas outside shoreline jurisdiction. These changes were updates consistent with the 2014 wetlands rating system (Chapter 40.450 Wetlands); deletion of the “Priority Habitats and Species Map” and a revision to Table 40.440.010-1 Exempt and Reviewed Activities related to residential development. These changes are now being incorporated into the SMP through this amendment.

B. Applicable Critical Areas.

For purposes of this Program, the following critical areas will be protected under this Program. An amendment to these regulations will apply in shoreline jurisdiction only if it is adopted as an SMP limited amendment or update.

1. Critical aquifer recharge areas, defined in Chapter 40.410 as adopted by Ordinance 2005-04-15, dated April 26, 2005; Ordinance 2009-03-02;

2. Flood hazard areas, defined in Chapter 40.420 as adopted by Ordinance 2012-07-15, dated July 24, 2012;

3. Geologic hazard areas, defined in Chapter 40.430 as adopted by Ordinance 2005-04-15, dated April 26, 2005; Ordinance 2006-09-13; Ordinance 2009-01-01; Ordinance 2012-02-03; and Ordinance 2012-07-16;

4. Habitat conservation areas, defined in Chapter 40.440 as adopted by Ordinance 2006-08-03, dated August 1, 2006; Ordinance 2012-07-16; and Ordinance 2014-12-05; and

5. Wetlands, defined in Chapter 40.450 as adopted by Ordinance 2006-05-27, dated May 26, 2006; Ordinance 2012-07-03; Ordinance 2012-07-16; and Ordinance 2014-12-05.

C. Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas.

1. General Provisions. Chapter 40.410, Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, Ordinance 2005-04-15, dated April 26, 2005; and Ordinance 2009-03-02, is hereby adopted in whole as part of this Program.

F. Habitat conservation areas - The first change deletes the provision referencing a county map “Priority Habitats and Species Map” (F.1.b shown below) and re-numbers the provisions which follow. Additional changes update all references to the county’s stormwater code from Chapter 40.385 to 40.386 (sections not shown here) and correct habitat function points consistent with the 2014 wetland ratings system update.
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b. The above habitat areas are mapped on a countywide basis in the adopted “Priority Habitat and Species Map.” Maps are on file with Clark County Environmental Services, except that maps of individual locations of sensitive, threatened, or endangered wildlife species are maintained separately to protect sensitive species.

Section 40.450.560 Site planning and development - Provision A.2 is revised to correct the stormwater code reference and add language on low impact development.

2. Impervious surfaces shall be minimized to the extent feasible as specified in Chapter 40.385 40.386. Low impact development techniques shall be utilized where feasible to minimize increases to stormwater runoff.

Section 40.460.590 Water quality and quantity - Stormwater code references are corrected.

Section 40.460.630 Use-specific development regulations – Stormwater code references are corrected in F. Industrial uses 2.g (2), J. Recreational uses 11 (b) and N. Utility uses 6. Provision K. Residential is revised to include provisions on existing residential structures.

13. Existing residential structures.

a. Legally established existing residential structures and appurtenances located landward of the OHWM and outside the floodway that do not meet the standards of this Program are considered to be conforming, except that an application to replace an existing residential structure must meet all setback, height, and other construction requirements of the Program and the Act. A one - (1) time expansion is allowed, as follows:

1a. The expansion is no more than twenty-five percent (25%) of the habitable floor area of the existing residence;

2b. The expansion does not exceed the allowed height limit;

3c. The expansion is no further waterward of than the existing structure; and

4d. The applicant demonstrates through a letter of exemption that the expansion will result in no net loss of shoreline ecological functions.

b. If a structure or development is damaged by fire, flood, explosion, or other natural disaster and the damage is less than seventy five thirty percent (7560%) of the replacement cost of the structure or development, it may be restored or reconstructed to those configurations existing at the time of such damage, provided:

1. The reconstructed or restored structure will not cause additional adverse effects to adjacent properties or to the shoreline environment;
2. The rebuilt structure or portion of structure shall not expand the original footprint or height of the damaged structure;
3. No degree of relocation shall occur, except to increase conformity or to increase ecological function, in which case the structure shall be located in the least environmentally damaging location possible;
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4. The submittal of applications for permits necessary to restore the development is initiated within twelve (12) months of the damage. The Shoreline Administrator may waive this requirement in situations with extenuating circumstances;

5. The reconstruction is commenced within one (1) year of the issuance of permit;

6. The Shoreline Administrator may allow a one (1) year extension provided consistent and substantial progress is being made; and

7. Any residential structures, including multifamily structures, may be reconstructed up to the size, placement and density that existed prior to the damage, so long as other provisions of this Program are met.

c. If a structure or development is either demolished, or damaged by fire, flood, explosion, or other natural disaster and the damage is more than seventy-five percent (75%) of the replacement cost of the structure or development, then any replacement structure has to meet the requirements of the Program and the Act.

14. New appurtenances shall meet the setback requirements of this Program.

Section 40.460.800 Definitions – Revisions are made to “normal maintenance” and “normal repair” largely addressing demolished single-family homes.

“Normal maintenance” means those usual acts to prevent a decline, lapse, or cessation from a lawfully established condition (WAC 173-27-040(2)(b)), except for maintenance that would cause substantial adverse effects to shoreline resources or environment; and, provided, that the replacement of demolished existing single-family residences and their appurtenances is not considered normal maintenance; and further provided that maintenance of nonconforming structures and developments is subject to the provisions of CCC 40.420.010 and 40.460.250. See also “normal repair.”

“Normal repair” means to restore a development to a state comparable to its original condition, including but not limited to its size, shape, configuration, location and external appearance, within a reasonable period after decay or partial destruction, except where for repair that would cause substantial adverse effects to shoreline resources or environment; and, provided, that the replacement of a demolished existing single-family residence and its appurtenances is not considered normal repair; and further provided, that repair or replacement of nonconforming uses is subject to CCC 40.420.010 and 40.460.250. Replacement of a structure or development may be authorized as repair where such replacement is the common method of repair for the type of structure or development and the replacement structure or development is comparable to the original structure or development including but not limited to its size, shape, configuration, location and external appearance and the replacement does not cause substantial adverse effects to shoreline resources or environment (WAC 173-27-040(2)(b)). See also “normal maintenance.”

Amendment History, Review Process:
Ordinance No. 2014-12-10: The record shows the proposed Carty Lake amendment originated from a local planning process that began in 2014. This element was originally part of the county’s 2014 Limited Amendment. Concerns raised by the Port of Ridgefield resulted in the Board of County Commissioners removing the addition of Carty Lake from the 2014 Limited Amendment during final

1 In 2015, Clark County changed their form of government and the 3-member Board of County Commissioners is now a 5-member Board of County Councilors.
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consideration. Issues were resolved during a multi-agency meeting held in Ridgefield in September 2014.

The record shows that a public open house was held on June 24, 2014, and a public hearing before the Planning Commission was held on August 7, 2014. Notice of the hearing was published July 23, 2014. The record also shows the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) held hearings August 19 and November 18, 2014.

Ordinance No. 2015-12-12: The record shows this proposed amendment originated from a local planning process that began in late 2014. Proposed changes include incorporating updates to critical area regulations including the 2014 wetland ratings system, revisions to language related to nonconforming residential structures, and maintenance and repair along with corrections to scriveners’ errors. The record shows the Planning Commission held a public hearing on August 20, 2015. Notice of the hearing was published August 5, 2015 in The Columbian. The record indicates the BOCC held hearings on October 13 and 27th and December 15, 2015.

With passage of Ordinance #2014-12-10, on December 16, 2014 and Ordinance 2015-12-12 on December 15, 2015, the BOCC authorized county staff to forward the proposed amendments to Ecology for approval.

The proposed SMP amendments were received by Ecology for state review and verified as complete on February 23, 2016. Notice of the state comment period was distributed to state and local interested parties identified by the county on March 22, 2016, in compliance with the requirements of WAC 173-26-120 (2) and as follows: the state comment period began on April 6, 2016 and continued through April 21, 2016 for a total of 15 days. Ecology staff determined the proposed amendment is relatively straightforward and non-controversial and a shorter comment period is justified.

Notice of the comment period, including a description of the proposed amendments and the authority under which the action is proposed along with the manner in which interested persons may obtain copies and present their views was provided on Ecology’s website: http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/sea/shorelines/smp/mycomments/ClarkCountyLimitedAmendment.html and as part of the written notice mailed to over 100 interested parties. Ecology received no comments.

Consistency with Chapter 90.58 RCW: The proposed amendments have been reviewed for consistency with the policy of RCW 90.58.020 and the approval criteria of RCW 90.58.090(3), (4) and (5). The county has also provided evidence of its compliance with SMA procedural requirements for amending their SMP contained in RCW 90.58.090(1) and (2).

Consistency with “applicable guidelines” (Chapter 173-26 WAC, Part III): The proposed amendments have been reviewed for compliance with the requirements of the applicable Shoreline Master Program Guidelines (WAC 173-26-171 through 251 and 173-26-020 definitions). This

---

2 The county adopted changes to their critical area regulations under the Growth Management Act in Ordinance No. 2014-12-05. These changes are now being incorporated into the SMP.

3 Per RCW 90.58.090 (2)(a), the comment period shall be at least 30 days unless the department determines the level of
included review of a SMP Submittal Checklist, which was completed by the county and submitted to Ecology for review along with other amendment materials.

**Consistency with Limited Amendment Criteria:** The proposed amendments have also been reviewed for compliance with WAC 173-26-201(1)(c) of the SMP Guidelines.

- The amendments are necessary to improve consistency with the Act’s goals, policies and implementing rules applicable to shorelines of the state within the local government (WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(i)(D) and to correct errors and omissions (WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(i)(E)).
- Clark County is not currently conducting a comprehensive shoreline master program (WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(ii)).
- The proposed amendments will not foster uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state’s shorelines (WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(iii)).
- The amendments are consistent with all applicable policies and standards of the Act (WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(iv)).
- All procedural rule requirements for public notice and consultation have been satisfied (WAC 173-26-201(1)(v)).
- The master program guidelines analytical requirements and substantive standards have been satisfied, as applicable to the amendments.
- The amendments will not result in a net loss of shoreline ecological functions (WAC 173-26-201(1)(c)(vi)).

**Consistency with SEPA requirements:** The county submitted evidence of SEPA compliance for both ordinances:

Ordinance 2014-12-10: The County provided a SEPA checklist and issued a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) for the proposed SMP amendments on June 20, 2014. Notice of the SEPA determination was published in both The Reflector and The Columbian on July 2, 2014. Ecology did not comment on the DNS.

Ordinance 2015-12-12: The County provided a SEPA checklist and issued a DNS on August 12, 2015 which was published August 12, 2015.

**Other studies or analyses supporting the limited amendments:** Ecology also reviewed the following additional documents prepared by the County in support of the SMP amendments:

**Ordinance 2014-12-10:**
- _SEPA Determination of Non-Significance, July 17, 2014_
- _Clark County Planning Commission minutes, August 7, 2014_
- _Planning Commission Recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners, August 19, 2014_
- _Clark County Board of Commissioners Minutes, August 19, 2014_
- _Errata – Exhibit A addition to the Inventory & Characterization of Section 5.8A regarding Cutty Lake_

**Ordinance 2015-12-12:**
- _SEPA Determination of Non-Significance, August 4, 2015_
- _Clark County Planning Commission Public Hearing minutes, August 20, 2015_
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- Planning Commission Recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners, September 29, 2015
- Board of County Councilors Minutes, October 13, 2015 and October 27, 2015

Summary of issues raised during the county’s public review process:

The issues raised during the county's public review process focused on the proposed addition of Carty Lake to the list of shoreline waterbodies in the County’s SMP. Early in the process, Ecology requested the County correct the omission of Carty Lake from the list of waterbodies. The County agreed to add this as a third element in the proposed limited amendment. The Port of Ridgefield raised objections to this listing. Port property is located entirely within the City of Ridgefield and subject to the city of Ridgefield SMP. Despite attempts to clarify this before the County Commissioners during the hearing, the Commission chose to remove the listing of Carty Lake from this limited amendment proposal to allow time for the parties to discuss their concerns.4

Summary of issues identified by Ecology as relevant to its decision: None

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

After review by Ecology of the complete record submitted, Ecology concludes that the county’s proposed SMP amendments are consistent with the policy and standards of RCW 90.58.020 and RCW 90.58.090 and the applicable SMP guidelines (WAC 173-26-171 through 251 and .020 definitions).

Ecology concludes that the proposed amendments are consistent with the criteria for approving limited amendments in WAC 173-26-201(1)(c).

Ecology concludes that the county has complied with the requirements of RCW 90.58.100 regarding the SMP amendment process and contents.

Ecology concludes that the county has complied with the requirements of RCW 90.58.130 and WAC 173-26-090 regarding public and agency involvement in the SMP update and amendment process.

Ecology concludes that the county has complied with the purpose and intent of the local amendment process requirements contained in WAC 173-26-100, including conducting open houses and public hearings, notice, consultation with parties of interest and solicitation of comments from tribes, government agencies and Ecology.

Ecology concludes that the county has complied with requirements of Chapter 43.21C RCW, the State Environmental Policy Act.

---

4 Subsequent to this decision, a meeting was held in September with representatives from the Port of Ridgefield, Clark County, City of Ridgefield, Ecology, Ridgefield National Wildlife Refuge and interested citizens. Agreement was reached
Attachment A: Findings and Conclusions
Clark County 2015 Limited Amendment, Ordinances #2014-12-10 and 2015-12-12
4/29/2016

Ecology concludes that the county's limited amendment submittal to Ecology was complete pursuant to the requirements of WAC 173-26-110 and WAC 173-26-201(3)(a) and (h) requiring a SMP Submittal Checklist.

Ecology concludes that it has complied with the procedural requirements for state review and approval of shoreline master program amendments as set forth in RCW 90.58.090 and WAC 173-26-120.

DEcision AND EFFECTIVE DATE

Based on the preceding, Ecology has determined the proposed limited amendment is consistent with Shoreline Management Act policy, the applicable guidelines and implementing rules. Ecology approval of the proposed limited amendment will be effective 14 days from the date of this approval.
Schroader, Kathy

From: Wiser, Sonja
Sent: Thursday, May 12, 2016 1:15 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Albrecht, Gary
Cc: Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Lebowsky, Laurie; Hermon, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Alvarez, Jose; Lumbantobing, Sharon; Schroader, Kathy
Subject: Final Ecology Approval of CC Shoreline Master Program.pdf
Attachments: Final Ecology Approval of CC Shoreline Master Program.pdf

FYI and for the record
FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD OF THE CLARK COUNTY 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Dear Councilors,

Clustering is a tool that allows people to use land they otherwise may not be able to develop. In addition, it enables land owners to minimize roads that serve the subdivision, and allows an opportunity to site buildings according to the topography. Clustering can be a good tool and should be encouraged, not penalized by excessive regulations for every land division in the proposed AG-10 and FR-20 zones.

Please take a close look at the wording of the only land parcelization method proposed in the AG-10, and FR-20 zoning districts.

_The provisions of this subsection shall apply to all land divisions in the AG-10, FR-20 zoning districts._

The provisions for clustering are found in the chapter for Energy and Natural Resources; 5.3 Mitigation in the Final SEIS. Mitigation implies remedy for a loss of functions and values. As proposed, this ordinance is highly restrictive, and impacts private property rights. This is a good example that demonstrates an imbalance of the GMA planning goals.

Table 40.210.010-4 Lot Requirements – FR-20 and AG-10 Cluster indicates the Remainder Lot will be 85% or greater of the parent parcel. This is an extremely high remainder size requirement. The Clark County Agricultural Preservation Strategies Report frequently references cluster developments as a tool. There is no documentation of a high percentage remainder parcel. There is no documentation of this ordinance being used for AG and FR land divisions.

If use of the large remainder lot is further limited by requiring preservation _in perpetuity_, some form of an offset of impacts (to the land owner) would be needed. Otherwise, cutting the remainder parcel size to 70% minimum would be needed. Mitigation should be considered a two-way street. The county must mitigate the landowner for the loss of functions and values if the 85% remainder parcel is to remain as such in perpetuity. Use of perpetuity is not further supported by the GMA’s balanced planning goals, but relies on a WAC adopted by the Dept. of Commerce in 2010. This rule is written as a suggestion and uses “should” in lieu of “shall.”

_(b)(ii) The open space portion (the reserve area) . . .should be held by an easement . . .for open space or Resource (farming or forestry) use. This (portion) should be held in perpetuity without an expiration date._ WAC 365-196-425 (5)

This ordinance provides a good opportunity that demonstrates the imbalance of the GMA Planning Goals. Please ask, where did the idea come from to support the high percentage? What is the norm? How does this proposal support rural housing affordability? If the landowner will only get one parcel, would it be economically viable? If remainder parcels are going to be required to remain undeveloped in perpetuity, what recompense is the county going to offer landowners?

To require land owners to only make land divisions via this ordinance (as written) clearly advances the environmental goals over the protections of private property rights. Many times, _property rights are recognized and assured by minimizing land use regulations_ so people can use their property as they wish, unless county codes say differently.
Please refrain from using the term “mitigation measure,” “scenic views in tact,” “would be more efficient for providing energy and other natural resources.” Public welfare, health and safety already address the public interests.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10
Schroader, Kathy

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Monday, May 16, 2016 9:47 AM
To: Albrecht, Gary; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; Hermen, Matt; Kamp, Jacqueline; Lebowsky, Laurie; Lumbantobing, Sharon; Orjiako, Oliver; Schroader, Kathy; Wiser, Sonja
Subject: FW: Remaining comments from May 10 testimony
Attachments: May 10 final comments to BOCC.docx

FYI and for the record. Thanks.

From: Heidi Owens [mailto:heidi.owens@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, May 14, 2016 10:51 AM
To: Tilton, Rebecca; Orjiako, Oliver; Boldt, Marc
Subject: Remaining comments from May 10 testimony

Hello Rebecca, Councilor Boldt, and Dr. Orjiako,

Attached are my completed comments from my May 10 testimony that I would like submitted to the record and included in the 2016 Comp Plan record, as well as the binder for the Planning Commission and the Councilors.

Thank you for your assistance in this matter.

Regards,
Heidi Owens
To: Honorable Chairman Mark Boldt, Councilors Jeannie Stewart, Julie Olson, David Madore, Tom Mielke  
From: Heidi Owens  
CC: Oliver Orjiako, Director of Community Planning  
Date: May 13, 2016  
Subject: Completed Comments from May 10th Public Testimony for the Record

From 1982 to 1992, Clark County paved over 52,000 acres of farm land. Since 1992, the county has lost another 30,000 acres. For a county that was rooted in agriculture in the mid, 20th century is this what residents want, a continued loss in county ag lands the provide sources of locally grown, fresh foods?

Based on what I am seeing in this community the answer is no! Restaurants, such as Lepella, Willems on Main, Roots, and others rely on local foods; a steady stream of customers frequent at least five neighborhood famers markets in Clark County; consumers want quality, local food; grocers know of this demand and are looking to farms for locally grown, natural foods; more farms in Clark County are offering CSAs. This is a permanent/mainstream trend. Local food systems strengthen rural economies. As the legislative body of Clark County, this council can and should recognize the growing trend for local foods and support policies that leverage Agriculture and the food system in Clark County.

When I look at the preferred alternative for the 2016 Comprehensive Plan and see the upzoning of AG-20 to AG-10, I wonder where is the county’s Agricultural Plan, Vision, Policy or anything that helps guide the decisions regarding the planning for the county resource lands? Even with the draft cluster provision, instead of a straight split, I must ask how that supports Agriculture. I call this council’s attention to WAC 365-196-815 “Conservation of natural resource lands” which states in Section (1)(b)(i) that “development regulations must prevent conversion to a use that removes land from resource production.” Yes, Section (3)(b)(ii) gives cluster zoning as an innovative zoning technique for resource lands; however, WAC 365-196-815 (3)(a) states “when adopting development regulations to assure the conservation agricultural lands, counties should consider use of innovative zoning techniques.” So, again, I must ask this council where is the vision for AG?

I wish to further point out that WAC 365-196-815(3)(a) specifies that innovative zoning techniques “should be designed to conserve agricultural lands and encourage the agricultural economy. Any nonagricultural uses allowed should be limited to lands with poor soils or lands otherwise not suitable for agricultural purposes.” The current draft cluster provision is more focused on providing housing than protecting AG. It allows for building sites to be greater than 1 acre if needed for septic reasons. It does not require clusters to be on public water or limited to lands with poor soils/not suitable for agricultural purposes.

The current preferred alternative option to allow clustering on AG-land is erring on the side of providing a housing option on AG land. AG has been 20 acres in Clark County since the 1979 Comprehensive Plan. When one looks at the 1979 Clark County Comp Plan map, it has a very different look than today’s planning map. Much more land is zoned Agriculture at 20 acres and large tracks are zoned Rural Farm at 10-20 acres. When I compared the 1979 map with the preferred alternative map, showing current use, I can see that much of the currently zone AG land aligns with the zoned Ag land from 1979. A smaller portion aligns with the Rural Farm. I see only a few tracks that are outside these areas in Rural Estate (5-10 acres) or Rural Residential (2.5-5 acres). What is interesting is that a review showed that the majority of those parcels are in current use. My point is that the position that Rural property owners universally lost their property rights by the 1994 Comprehensive Plan are not matching a review of the facts. Any legal parcel owned in 1980 is still legal today, there were no property rights taken away by the introduction of GMA or the Clark County 1994 plan. These owners still have full use of the property, and zoning regulations are legitimate actions of government
authority (Village of Euclid v. Ambler Realty Co, 1926). In fact, many of the rural resource Agriculture property owners have similar zoning to what they had in 1980.

2. 1979 Clark County Comprehensive Plan Map.
Clark County Board of Councilors  
P.O. Box 5000  
Vancouver, Washington 98666  

May 10, 2016  

For the Public Record and Comp Plan update

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. has reviewed the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Public Record Index and minutes of the February 16, 2016 Clark County Councillor hearing. CCCU requests that all of the testimony contained in those minutes be carefully indexed into the Record to help correct a flawed Index submitted with the 2016 Comprehensive Plan, to Washington State Department of Commerce. Compared to the hearing minutes, that Index demonstrates numerous omissions of public testimony for that date.

The February 16, 2016 Councillor hearing is important because it was noticed as a hearing to reconsider the Preferred Alternative and consider public comment. At this hearing, numerous attendees came to give testimony and were denied the chance to speak because the meeting went so long. They were given no future opportunity to provide verbal public comment, before the adopted November 24, 2015 Preferred Alternative was repealed and a new Alternative was quickly created and adopted on February 23, 2016.

At this hearing, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney, Christine Cook, tells Councilor Olson the remand of 36,000 acres of Agri-forest lands, re-designated all lots as five acre parcels. A review of the Agri-forest Task Force Information and Planning Commission report, demonstrates that statement is false and none of the land went through an EIS. Of the approximately 350 parcels contained in Agri-forest, only 15 of the parcels were given 5 acre status, and the rest of the parcels were designated 20 acres and 10 acres, respectively.

At this hearing, Community Planning Director, Oliver Orjako falsely states a Rural Vacant Buildable Lands Model was never used for the rural areas. Staff claimed a RVBLM was not used for rural because of two 1997 rulings from Judge Poyfair. Research demonstrates a recent Alternative 2 map legend showing descriptions for the designations are based on a Rural Vacant Buildable Lands Model. In addition, Judge Poyfair (Judge Ladley) had only one ruling, regarding erroneous use of a VBLM in the rural area. The second was from directives of the Court of Appeals Division II.

At this hearing, the majority of public testimony Alternative 4 supported the November 24, 2015 Preferred Alternative. But, the Index demonstrates few of these testimony items are recorded. A review of the Index sent to the state, demonstrates many omissions and February 16, 2016 is missing a great deal of public testimony. The county must make corrections to the flawed Index by reviewing the minutes of the February 16, 2016 hearing and forwarding it to the state for review. A closer look at the Index demonstrates the county must make a great many corrections before certification of the Public Record Index can be made.

Sincerely  

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

Please see the attached testimony received from Heidi Owens, Carol Levanen and Susan Rasmussen during the public comment portion of the board's May 10 hearing.

Thanks!
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Council
Board of County Councilors
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE: 360-397-2232, ext. 4305 | E-MAIL: Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov
12 April 10, 2016: For the public record of the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update.

The Hearings Board drove the flawed formula Clark County used in the 1994 Plan. Both the Superior Court and the Court of Appeals have ruled the formula is unauthorized according to GMA law. The county has failed to correct the massive downzoning that was consequential to applying the unlawful formula. As a result, the flawed formula has been advanced time and again into subsequent county plans. Because the county has failed to take the necessary corrective measures to accomplish full and complete compliance to the Superior Court Orders, the unlawful formula remains as the foundation of the county plan today.

The comp. plan updates are the appropriate times to make corrections. Instead of getting the task done, the county cleverly devises ways and means to ensure the unlawful formula advances in every update. Population projections are set low, numbers for all vacant buildable lands are always healthy. Resource lands are designated via aerial photos and staff interpretations. That is against GMA law. All 14 GMA planning goals are not granted equity. Entire chapters are devoted to the environment, and community design. Property Rights are allowed 2 sentences in the entire 2 volumes of the plan. Overwhelming numbers of nonconforming lots remain since corrections to the downzoning (referenced in Poyfair’s Conclusions Of Law) and land use regulations have failed. Urban holding and reserve overlays linger over 20 years on many private properties. Updates in the State’s Current Use Taxation Program for Forestry that now recognizes a minimum 5 acres of trees isn’t recognized. The current county trends in agriculture as reported in the USDA Census of Agriculture failed to be recognized. The citizens were denied a broad range of alternative plans from which to choose, and exclusionary practices are repeatedly used that eliminates the rural land-owners from participating in the important business of designing the futures of their properties.

When viewed in combination, it is clear there is a full-blown advocacy campaign that intentionally sets a goal to disadvantage rural concerns at every opportunity. This campaign is ostensibly lobbied to the County Councilors and is very effective. This campaign has gone unnoticed or tolerated until 2015 when one Councilor decidedly challenged the county’s planning regimen and began unraveling the flaws.

Questions need to be asked:

1. Despite having various elected Boards come and go over the years, why do we still have the same plan that maintains the flawed formula? Why hasn’t it ever been challenged before this update?

2. The zoning that is proposed is directly linked to the unlawful formula. Does every Councilor bless this formula?

3. Has Clark County full complied with all aspects and intentions of the Superior Court Orders?

4. Why haven’t the economic and cultural impacts to the rural communities been recognized?

5. Are all 14 GMA Planning Goals equally represented in the comprehensive Plan?
6. Does the Plan offer all county citizens opportunities to advance their lifestyles, and provide for economic and cultural well being?

One can easily recognize the resulting down zoning in the preponderance of non-conforming lots in their zones. Approximately, 17% AG-20 parcels, and 7% FR-40 parcels conform to their zone sizes. Most UH and UR overlay properties also suffer from non-compliance. This is compelling evidence the unlawful formula strongly remains rooted in county land-use regulations and zoning. Since the formula has been perpetually maintained, Alternative Plans 1,2,3, and to a lesser degree 4, are all tainted by the formula.

Alternative 4 differs in that the formula relies upon recognizing a predominant parcel size unique to the zone. That defers to the historic patterns of rural lot development, and acknowledges previous county growth plans. That formula was successfully applied by Pierce County and supported by the Puget Sound Regional Council. It is also regarded in the 2016 Thorpe Analysis.

Judge Poyfair reflected on his Intentions from his court orders in a recent Interview with CCCU. He stated the entire plan should have been thrown out and rewritten since the foundation was illegal. In the Judge's words, "They put the cart before the horse." The desired outcome was first developed, then elements were contrived to support to the outcome. He concluded, the plan gives no regard for historic rural character, patterns of lot development, nor prior county growth plans. The Judge's decision was landmark and considered to be overarching because it addresses the foundational basis of the entire plan. The Judge was commended by his peers for this decision.

The legalities and ethics of perpetuating any elements of the comprehensive plan whose origins may be directly linked to the unauthorized formula need to be scrutinized. Susan Rasmussen for Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
Hello,

Please see the attached testimony received from Heidi Owens, Carol Levanen and Susan Rasmussen during the public comment portion of the board’s May 10 hearing.

Thanks!
Rebecca

Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Council
Board of County Councilors
1300 Franklin Street
PO Box 5000
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000
PHONE: 360-397-2232, ext. 4305 | E-MAIL: Rebecca.Tilton@clark.wa.gov
For the record

From: Lebowsky, Laurie  
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2016 4:13 PM  
To: Wiser, Sonja  
Cc: Bjerke, Bill; Orjiako, Oliver; Hsiao, Rosie  
Subject: FW: DEAB Response Memo to Park Impact Fee

Hi Sonja,

Could you forward the attached letter from the DEAB regarding the proposed update to the Parks Impact Fees to the Planning Commission members.

Laurie

From: Hsiao, Rosie  
Sent: Wednesday, May 04, 2016 11:09 AM  
To: Lebowsky, Laurie; Wiser, Sonja; LaRocque, Linnea  
Subject: DEAB Response Memo to Park Impact Fee

Hello, ladies:

Attached is the memo from DEAB regarding to Park Impact Fee. Please let me know if you need me to make copies for PC and BOCC work session.

Thank you.

Rosie Hsiao  
Clark County Public Works  
Development Engineering  
Phone: 397-6118 ext. 4559  
rosie.hsiao@clark.wa.gov

http://www.clark.wa.gov/publicworks/engineering/index.html

To schedule an appointment to submit project applications or additional information, please call 397-6118 ext 5104. Appointments will be confirmed by 3:00 same business day. Any appointment requests after 3:00pm will be confirmed the following business day.
DEAB Response to the Clark County Parks Advisory Board
For
May 4, 2016 Work Session

The Development and Engineering Advisory Board (DEAB) applauds the Parks Advisory Board (PAB) for addressing the concerns of both the DEAB and the Building Industry of America (BIA) in their recent presentations to both boards regarding proposed Park Impact Fee (PIF) increases. Please find below the DEAB’s formal response to the Park Impact Fee Technical Document, dated April 16, 2016, and Park Impact Fee Rate Recommendations, dated April 20, 2016.

DEAB has concerns over the significant increase in PIFs across Park Impact Fee Districts 5-10 (those districts located within Clark County jurisdiction) of approximately 162% for single-family residences and 177% for multi-family residences over the current PIF rates. Of particular concern are the assumptions used to calculate the PIFs, predominantly with regard to the Parks Division’s proposed per acre cost of acquisition. While the PAB did revisit these costs following their presentation to the DEAB at our April 14, 2016 meeting, DEAB continues to feel that the per acre acquisition cost the PAB lists in their Land Value Changes Since 2002 chart as found on page 7 of the PIF Technical Document, dated April 16, 2016, particularly in Park Districts 6 and 9, do not reflect current per acre land prices of undeveloped land. This 135% increase in per acre land value does not appear commensurate with what developers are observing in the open marketplace from 2002 to 2016. Developers are experiencing current per acre land values (without improvements) between $130,000 and $170,000.

It appears that the PAB will be implementing the PIF increase in a 3-year phased process. DEAB feels that a more modest increase should be utilized over a longer period of time to further reduce the immediate impacts to housing affordability by allowing a slower integration of costs over a longer period of time.

DEAB encourages the Clark County Parks Division to look at other solutions/options for park acquisition and development, possibly in concert with a much slower phased approach and a more moderate PIF increase corresponding more closely with current land values.

Regarding the Park Impact Fee Technical Document, dated April 16, 2016, it is DEAB’s request that the PAB remove any reference to land values and acquisition rates in Park Districts 1-4, as those values and rates are not germane to the PAB’s purview of looking at Park Districts within Clark County jurisdiction.

Prepared by DEAB
May 3, 2016
Hi Kathy,

Here's what Heidi Owens submitted this morning re: comp plan.

Rebecca
### COMPREHENSIVE PLAN RECORD

#### Resolution 2015-04-05

**Planning Assumptions**
- Planned Population Growth: 129,546
- Assumed Annual Growth Rate: 1.12%
- Urban/Rural Pop. Growth Split: 90/10
- No. of Needed Rural Parcels: 12,955

#### Board Principles and Values
- **Rural Lands:**
  - Minimize the conversion of productive farmland — those lands which have long-term commercial agricultural viability. Is it being used today for commercial agriculture?

#### Revised: Resolution 2016-03-01

- Planned Population Growth: 128,586
- Assumed Annual Growth Rate: 1.26%
- Urban/Rural Pop. Growth Split: 90/10
- No. of Needed Rural Parcels: 12,859

---

12,859 RURAL GROWTH RATE
A 2.66 persons/household = 4,835 PROJECTED PARCEL NEED

---

**What is the number of new parcel Homesites available under the preferred alternative?**

8024 new parcels

---

**RESULT?**

3189 more parcels than needed.
985 more parcels than existing conditions, effecting 5670 acres of Agriculture Land.

---

**QUESTION?** If current 2007 Comprehensive Plan is in compliance with GMA, how does this board justify an additional 985 rural parcels when the potential rural parcels currently exceeds the needs for projected growth?

How will you justify this?
What will it cost taxpayers to defend this?
Just FYI and for the record. Thanks.

From: Nwankwo, Ike (COM) [mailto:ike.nwankwo@commerce.wa.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 06, 2016 7:06 PM
To: susan rasmussen
Cc: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: RE: Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update

Hi Susan,
Thanks for your interest and involvement in the Clark County GMA process.
I have addressed your questions (in red) below.
Please let me know if you need more clarification.

Thanks
Ike

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 05, 2016 8:59 AM
To: Nwankwo, Ike (COM)
Subject: RE: Clark County Comprehensive Plan Update

Hello Ike,

I hope that you and your family are doing well.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. has some real concerns over the legality of sending the county Plan up to you for review prior to being approved or adopted by the elected County Councilors. Is this a new protocol?

No, this is not a new protocol. The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires all jurisdictions planning under the GMA to submit their draft plans at least 60 days prior to adoption to the Dept. of Commerce for review. [see RCW 36.70A.106(1)]

The Plan has many new elements and has not gone out for public review in any open house. Yet, the Plan is three times larger than the existing comprehensive Plan and contains many new elements that have not been reviewed by the public, nor analyzed by the Councilors or the Planning Commission. I don’t see where any open houses are on a schedule. There are no opportunities for open discussions, questions and answers here. There has been no final EIS presented to the public, and the documents sent to you have had little to none public review.

Last Wednesday, April 27th, was the first time the plan was given to the Council. It appears that the elected officials were given the documents the same time they were submitted to the State. We are still waiting to review the final SEIs.
Ike, we would appreciate your input here as soon as possible.

GMA requires jurisdictions planning under the Act to establish a public participation program (see RCW 36.70A.140) identifying procedures for early and continuous public process for GMA plans and regulations, and I believe the county has done a good job of that. They have held public hearings and open houses some of which I attended. I understand that a series of public hearings are planned during the months of May and June that would include the proposed plan elements and the final EIS. If you are not aware of the scheduled hearings, please contact the Clark County Community Planning Office for information.

Thank you for your attention to our concerns,

Susan Rasmussen for
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: Nwankwo, Ike (COM)
Sent: Tuesday, October 27, 2015 6:06 PM
To: susan rasmussen
Subject: RE: Hello Ike

Hi Susan,
Hope all is well with you.

I have answered some of the questions you asked (see below). Some of them are not clear enough
Thanks for the opportunity.
Ike

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 6:36 PM
To: Nwankwo, Ike (COM)
Subject: Hello Ike

Hello Ike,
I hope you and your family are doing well. My question mostly concerns the ofm projections. I hope it’s not a legal question.

How much flexibility do the county Councilors have to do their own policy interpretation of exact values in the planning assumptions?
Cannot answer this question because it is not clear enough.

If they want to increase OFM’s projections by say 10%, or some sort of reasonable deviation, would that be ok?
OFM has assigned population numbers to Clark County. If the County wants to change, increase or deviate from the numbers, they should contact OFM to resolve any issues. You can reach Yi Zhao at OFM by phone at 360-902-0592 or by email at yi.zhao@ofm.wa.gov

Is it permissible to alter the projections as updated information is made available?
Same as above – contact OFM for answer.

Would it have to make the rounds back to the planning commission for their recommendation?
Changes in the OFM numbers might trigger another round of public process depending on the extent of change but will defer to your local codes, statutes and guidelines and your Prosecuting Attorney and SEPA Responsible Official regarding the adequacy of the public process if that becomes the case.

Thank you for your help,
Susan Rasmussen

Sent from Windows Mail

From: ike nwankwo@commerce.wa.gov
Sent: Monday, October 26, 2015 5:40 PM
To: susan rasmussen

Hi Susan,
Thanks for contacting me with your question on planning assumptions and flexibility.
I think you are asking about OFM population projection numbers for the county, could you be a little more specific with your question so I can better answer it. Of course you know that if it borders on legal advice, I will defer to the county prosecuting attorney.

Thanks
Ike

From: susan rasmussen [mailto:sprazz@outlook.com]
Sent: Friday, October 23, 2015 3:01 PM
To: Nwankwo, Ike (COM)
Subject: question for you

Hello Ike,

I have another question to pester you.

How much flexibility do the county Councilors have to be able to do their own policy interpretation of exact values in the planning assumptions? i.e. adjusting the ofm figures.

Thank you, appreciate any advice here,
Susan

Sent from Windows Mail
Ken:

The proposal is for AG-20 and FR-40 lands only. If you're in UH-40 (urban holding 40) you are in an urban area, and there is no proposed change to properties covered by UH except for a few properties in the Fisher's Landing area.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

-----Original Message-----
From: Schroader, Kathy
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 11:45 AM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Subject: FW: Revised draft, land division ordinance for resource lands

FYI

Kathy Schroader, Office Assistant II
Community Planning Department
360-397-2280, X 4958
kathy.schroader@clark.wa.gov

-----Original Message-----
From: Ken Navidi [mailto:kennavidi@frontier.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 10:35 AM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: RE: Revised draft, land division ordinance for resource lands

Kathy,

Does this include UH40? I have property zoned UH-40 and I don't even see it as a designation on www.clark.wa.gov

Will the minimum lot size be affected on my property as well? Can I have a planner call me?

Ken Navidi
(360) 600-9836
Subject: Revised draft, land division ordinance for resource lands

As part of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update, the county is proposing to change the minimum parcel sizes for properties zoned AG-20 and FR-40 to 10 acres (AG-10) and 20 acres (FR-20), respectively. At the May 4, 2016 Board Work Session, county staff proposed code language requiring that any land divisions in the new AG-10 and FR-20 zones be accomplished using a cluster provision. The Board at the work session asked staff to develop code language that allows for regular land divisions with the option for clustering. Both proposals can be found here: https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/title-40-development-code-revisions.

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

Does this include UH40? I have property zoned UH-40 and I don't even see it as a designation on www.clark.wa.gov.

Will the minimum lot size be affected on my property as well? Can I have a planner call me?

Ken Navidi
(360) 600-9836

-----Original Message-----
From: Schroader, Kathy [mailto:Kathy.Schroader@clark.wa.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 10:01 AM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: Revised draft, land division ordinance for resource lands

As part of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update, the county is proposing to change the minimum parcel sizes for properties zoned AG-20 and FR-40 to 10 acres (AG-10) and 20 acres (FR-20), respectively. At the May 4, 2016 Board Work Session, county staff proposed code language requiring that any land divisions in the new AG-10 and FR-20 zones be accomplished using a cluster provision. The Board at the work session asked staff to develop code language that allows for regular land divisions with the option for clustering. Both proposals can be found here: https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/title-40-development-code-revisions.

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

From: Schroader, Kathy
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 10:03 AM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: Revised draft, land division ordinance for resource lands

As part of the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update, the county is proposing to change the minimum parcel sizes for properties zoned AG-20 and FR-40 to 10 acres (AG-10) and 20 acres (FR-20), respectively. At the May 4, 2016 Board Work Session, county staff proposed code language requiring that any land divisions in the new AG-10 and FR-20 zones be accomplished using a cluster provision. The Board at the work session asked staff to develop code language that allows for regular land divisions with the option for clustering. Both proposals can be found here: https://www.clark.wa.gov/community-planning/title-40-development-code-revisions.

Sent to:
Bicycle Alliance of WA <info@bicyclealliance.org>; KPDX Fox 49 <foxdesk@kpdx.com>; Mill Creek Senior Estates <millcreek@kpsns.net>; Pacific Specialty and Rehab <pacific@extendicare.com>; Port of Vancouver <info@portvanusa.com>; No Name Given <coiver@od.sco.edu>; No Name Given <shadyhollower@yahoo.com>; No Name Given <tharrissoccer@yahoo.com>; No Name Given <tom8595@q.com>; No Name Given <lowlye@aol.com>; No Name Given <charsoppe@comcast.net>; No Name Given <kungfugirl24@hotmail.com>; No Name Given <davidqw@aol.com>; No Name Given <jaferner@msn.com>; No Name Given <gkdarley@gmail.com>; No Name Given <firpo3237@msn.com>; No Name Given <2rondo@comcast.net>; No Name Given <suschiener@yahoo.com>; Webers <webers@pacificer.com>; A.J. Zelada <ajz@zelada.com>; Aaron Chidester <aaronc@unite4life.com>; Adam Babuka <babukaa@yahoo.com>; Adam Klucka <Akluka@BHHSNW.com>; Adrienne DeDonna <adedona@jlainvolve.com>; Adrienne Stout <adrienne.stout@wssw.wa.gov>; Aideet Pineda <aideet.pineda@molinahospitalhealthcare.com>; Akustare Clara <aclary@maulfoster.com>; Al Benkendorf <admin@benkassoco.com>; Al Korpela <butch.korpela@gmail.com>; Al Luiz <aluiz@ci.lacenter.wa.us>; Al Matson <matsonhome1983@hotmail.com>; Al Swindell <swindella@ci.woodland.wa.us>; Alan Delatorre <aland@pdx.edu>; Alan Malone <al Malone@gmail.com>; Melnick, Alan <Alan.Melnick@clark.wa.gov>; Alan Pordes <aspordes@comcast.net>; Alan Schumacher <mtvfarm62@yahoo.com>; Alan & Melba Halgren <melbahalgren@aol.com>; Alex W. Mattilla <alexm@integrity.com>; Ali Caley <alicaley@comcast.net>; Safayi, Ali <Ali.Safayi@clark.wa.gov>; Alina McElvenny <macben@q.com>; Topper, Alishia <Alishia.Topper@cityofvancouver.us>; Allan Brettman <abrettman@oregonian.com>; Allan Evridge <allan.evridge@gmail.com>; Allan Mattson <amatsinn@aol.com>; Allen Strat <allen.stray@tetrapak.com>; Allen & Michele Owen <micheleowen@live.com>; Allie R. Beal <jacywimmer@msn.com>; Allison Toso <kiwiache@gmail.com>; Allison VanAmb <avanam@comcast.net>; Aloma Cole <aloma@wa.net.com>; Amal Kraw <hopefully100@yahoo.com>; Amanda Cotton <cottonamanda15@yahoo.com>; Amanda Smeller <smellera@ci.woodland.wa.us>; Amelia Leung <chinesecraft@hotmail.com>; Amy Blankenship <amy@9031058@gmail.com>; Amy Corbett <amyc@metfamily.org>; Amy McCullough <amym@nwjustice.org>; Amy Reynolds <deputydir@sharevancouver.org>; Amy Sidran <amy@sidran.com>; Anand Tawker <anandtawker@yahoo.com>; Andrea Bruno <abruno@diabetes.org>; Andrea Cameron <andrea@cameron@gmail.com>; Andrew Desrochers <desrochers.inc@gmail.com>; Andrew Munio <andrewm@prairielectric.com>; Andrey Ivanov <andrey.ivanov6784@gmail.com>; Andy Clay <andy.clay@svdp.us>; Andy Johnston <andy@ajinc.net>; Meade, Andy <andy.meade@cityofvancouver.us>; Andy Nuttbrock <nuttbrocka@hdjdg.com>; Andy Silver <silver@councilforthehomeless.org>; Angela Andersen <knowbd@comcast.net>; Angela Arnett <ashleyarnett@hotmail.com>; Brosius, Angela <Angela.Brosius@cityofvancouver.us>; Angela Southwick <a.southwick@yahoo.com>; Angela Maria Weinmuller <angelamaria@weinmuller@gmail.com>; Anita Krivitzky <tanteanita@gmail.com>; Anita Will <whipplecreekproject@gmail.com>; Ann Donnelly <adonnelly7@comcast.net>; Ann Foster <annfoster5093@gmail.com>; Ann Morrow <anniedmor@comcast.net>; Ann Shaw <annshaw@riverviewbank.com>; Anna Dearman <adearman@mknze.com>; Pendergrass, Anna <Anna.Pendergrass@clark.wa.gov>; Johnston, Anne
Greta Sutton <garbo0198@gmail.com>; Gretchen Alexander <galexander@clarkpud.com>; Gretchen Renggli <gretchen.renggli@cancer.org>; Gretchen Starke <gstarke@pacifier.com>; Heath, Hailey <hailey.heath@cityofvancouver.us>; Hal Newhouse <newhouse@pacifier.com>; Han Tran <tr98han@gmail.com>; Hank Couch <hankd42@q.com>; Harley Rhodes <NWrhodetrip@yahoo.com>; Heather Birdwell-Currey <hcurrey@ci.lacenter.wa.us>; Heather Blosser <blosserh@gmail.com>; Heather Burgess <hburgess@philippsburgesslaw.com>; Heather Garrett <heathershammock@yahoo.com>; Heather Melton <heather_melton@yahoo.com>; Heather Norton <heather.norton.law@gmail.com>; Heidi O'Connor <heidi@thekidscookingcorner.com>; Heidi Rosenberg <heleen.charneski@camas.wednet.edu>; Helen Elder <heleenelder1@gmail.com>; Helen Ludugson <legal@comcast.net>; Henry Diaz <hdiaz@mackaysposito.com>; Henry Lasch <ford.f250@comcast.net>; Herb Kennon <hjkennon@msn.com>; Herb Pfleger <pfleger@comcast.net>; Hil Vandermeer <hilvandermeer2@msn.com>; Hilary Franz <hilary@futurewise.org>; Hilary Torres <hilary_torres@comcast.net>; Hilda Naranjo <hilda@hildanaranano.com>; Gilbert, Holley <Holley.Gilbert@clark.wa.gov>; Holly Williams <hollyjander@juno.com>; Holly K. Chamberlain <mitchamb@pacifier.com>; Hope Bonell <covenantmakers@hotmail.com>; Hope Reffett <hopereffett@comcast.net>; Howard Frumkin <frumkin@uw.edu>; Howard & Edith EK <howieek@gmail.com>; Hunter Decker <hwebdecker@gmail.com>; Ian Parham <ian.parham@molinahealthcare.com>; Ike Nwankwo <ike.nwankwo@commerce.wa.gov>; Ilia Stanek <iilastanek@hotmail.com>; Inge Netzer <inge.netzer@gmx.net>; Ingrid Dankmeyer <ingdank@msn.com>; J. Avery <javerry@lhs.org>; J. Douglas Gless <hgsa@teleport.com>; Jace Rock <jacerock@cbsseal.com>; Jack Bellikka <jack.baywest@burkman.com>; Burkman, Jack <Jack.Burkman@cityofvancouver.us>; Jack Kaeding <jkaeding@comcast.net>; Jack Melton <jacksondee9915@yahoo.com>; Jackie Schroader <jackson15@comcast.net>; Jacky W. Miller <jackywmiller@msn.com>; Janice Inaco <sweatjw15@yahoo.com>; James Cobb <klutz@comcast.net>; James Davidson <jmdavidson@hevanet.com>; James Fenn <jamesfenn@comcast.net>; James Harpe <james.harpe@q.com>; James Howsley <jamie.howsley@jordanramis.com>; James Howsley <jamie.howsley@jordanramis.com>; James Kisse <james.kisse@doh.wa.gov>; James Stanley <bryon_72003@yahoo.com>; James Wilson <travelthewilsonway@comcast.net>; James L Sellers <jsellerslawoffice.com>; Jamie Clark <jclark@sqaengineering.com>; Jamie Dotson <jamied@iqcu.com>; Jan Harder <jan.harder@gmail.com>; Jan Malone <mwwjan@comcast.net>; Jan Verrinder <janowav85@gmail.com>; Jan Vis <haglass@aol.com>; Jan Whitehead <jan.whitehead@ymail.com>; Jan Wickert <jwickert@vhausa.com>; Jane VanMeter <janemadeline@hotmail.com>; Janet Aspaas <janetaspaas@comcast.net>; Luhn, Janet <janet.luhn@clark.wa.gov>; Janet Parker <18psalms2@comcast.net>; Janet Shotwell <levileah@yahoo.com>; Janette Cegka <maddjan54@hotmail.com>; Janine Hook <janine@hookedonclarkcounty.com>; Jared Wubben <jared@legacy6inc.com>; Jason Carnell <jcarnell@thephoenixcasino.com>; Jay Cerveny <cervenj@tds.net>; Jay Schindler <jschin@pacifier.com>; Jean Drevdahl <1koala.com>; Jean Kent <jeaken@pacifier.com>; Jeanette Pease <peaseyan@hotmail.com>; Jeanette Scibelli <lcca@lcca.net>; Jeanette Steinhauser <mylouee@aol.com>; Jeanne Caswell <jmcswell11@aol.com>; Jeanne Holliday <jholliday@vhausa.com>; Jeanne Holliday <jholliday@vhausa.com>; Jeanne Kojis <ynormal@pacifier.com>; Jeanne Phipps <jeannep@hsc-wa.org>; Stewart, Jeanne <Jeanne.Stewart@clark.wa.gov>; Jeff Barsness <barsnej@wsdot.wa.gov>; Jeff Booren <booren@gmail.com>; Jeff Carothers <mayorcarothers@centurytel.net>; Jeff Hamm <jeffh@ct-tran.org>; Jeff Hodges <hodgesjeffrey@msn.com>; Jeff Mack <jeff.mack@gmail.com>; Jeff Miller <jeffm777@live.com>; Jeff Nicholas <kuhio1@comcast.net>; Jeff Sarvis <jsarvis@ci.lacenter.wa.us>; Jeff Sarvis <jsarvis@ci.lacenter.wa.us>; Swanson, Jeff <Jeff.Swanson@clark.wa.gov>; Jeff Tompkins <jeff.tompkins@accent-inc.com>; Jeff D. Strong <northcounty@tds.net>; Jenni Frayer <jlonglegs@comcast.net>; Jennifer Amsler <jenniferamsler@cbseal.com>; Campos, Jennifer <Jennifer.Campos@cityofvancouver.us>; Jennifer Capper <jupiterflight@live.com>; Jennifer Chariarse <jennifer.chariarse@abam.com>; Jennifer Halleck <jennifer.halleck@vansd.org>; Jennifer McDaniel <jmcdaniel@ci.washougal.wa.us>; Jennifer Underwood <swood77@comcast.net>; Jennifer Vick <jvick1414@gmail.com>; Jens Jorgensen <jens@jorgensentimber.com>; Jeremy Garcia <jeremy.garcia@211info.org>; Jerrenne Murray <newmedtc@hotmail.com>; Jerry Hatcher <info@empowerup.org>; Jerry Holbrook <jerry@holbrookinc.net>; Jerry Kauffman <manager@lewissandclarkplaza.com>; Jerry Kolke <JerryKolke@aol.com>.
Schroader, Kathy

From: Hermen, Matt
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 9:33 AM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: FW: Padden Parkway

You can put this in the Comp Plan record.

From: Julie Dallavo [mailto:jdallavo@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, May 10, 2016 9:30 AM
To: Hermen, Matt
Subject: Re: Padden Parkway

Thank you so much for this information. I work at Home Depot and find myself using 76th to Andresen to avoid Padden as much as I can! Progress and more population...where are we going to put everyone? ☐ Julie

On Tue, May 10, 2016 at 8:47 AM, Hermen, Matt <Matt.Hermen@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Ms. Dallavo,

The County has several proposed road project affecting Padden Parkway and streets in your neighborhood. They include:

1. Intersection improvement at Padden Parkway and Andresen

2. Improve 94th Ave from Padden Parkway to 99th St to a 2 lane arterial with center turn lane

3. Improve 152nd Ave from Padden Parkway to 99th St. to accommodate more vehicles

4. Improve Ward Rd. from 88th St. to Davis Rd to accommodate more vehicles

These road projects are aimed at improving the traffic flow on the collector streets that connect to Padden Parkway, which would have benefits to traffic on Padden. Project #2 is currently being constructed, while project #1, #3 & #4 are conceptual and do not have funding secured. The Capital Facilities Plan is a conceptual plan that lists projects necessary to accommodate the planned growth. As funding becomes available the individual projects are prioritized become more detailed in their design.

Thank you,

Matt Hermen, AICP
Planner III
Clark County
Department of Community Planning
360.397.2280 x4343

From: Schroader, Kathy
Sent: Monday, May 09, 2016 8:46 AM
To: Hermen, Matt
Subject: FW: Padden Parkway

FYI

Kathy Schroader, Office Assistant II
Community Planning Department
360-397-2280, X 4958
kathy.schroader@clark.wa.gov

From: Julie Dallavo [mailto:jdallavo@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, May 08, 2016 8:57 AM
To: Cnty Community Planning
Subject: Padden Parkway

My house backs up to the Parkway at 147th. I'm wondering what the plan is for the parkway improvements. Is it simply providing easier right turn access to major intersections or more? How extensive is the plan?

Thank you, Julie Dallavo

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