From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Tuesday, May 17, 2016 9:43 AM
To: susan rasmussen
Subject: TESTIMONY 5/17/16

Primarily, the point of the GMA is to manage growth - not to prevent or put a cap on rural growth as stated by Judge Poyfai. He is correct. The GMA's purpose is not to prohibit people from using their properties and advance their properties for maintenance of natural habitats or providing idealized vistas. This is what is stated in regards to the Energy and Natural Resources Chapter, Final SEIS:

Scenic resources, such as views of the snow-capped mountains, have generally not been recognized as a critical or sensitive resource in need of protection to the same extent as other natural resources... The first step in mitigation of the potential impacts of development on these resources would be to inventory the views from major public routes, etc. Policies and programs could then be developed to protect these scenic resources from alterations. Provisions for clustering would minimize the need for additional infrastructure, leave the largest amount of open space and scenic views intact.

Imposing extreme environmental or habitat rules, and now scenic considerations that would make rural lands unavailable or too expensive for the average citizen is not reasonable. Environmentally sound practices are addressed in detail throughout county code. It is not GMA's goal to stop citizens from enjoying rural lifestyles. That is their choice. The GMA requires to recognize and define rural character. That is primarily a description of how rural citizens view their neighborhoods. Housing affordability in rural and resource lands is a very appropriate concern. Please keep that in mind as you consider how to meet the GMA's 14 planning goals. Rural housing affordability fails to be addressed in the final SEIS.

5-acre parcels are predominantly what is on the ground, and composing the county rural character. 5-acre parcels are reasonable, appropriate, and GMA compliant. What does not conform to the unique rural character are the overwhelming non-conforming lots in AG, FR, and rural zones.

The county's unique rural character is well-documented in historical USDA Census of Ag, and forestry reports. Clark County has always had small to very small farms that are primarily 5 acres. The 12 reports listed in the documents for the Comp. plan fail to include any USDA Census of Ag. County profile reports.

There are excessive demands placed on the rural property owners. It is evident their exclusion from the county's planning process was intentional. Taken in combination, this ideology disadvantages rural land owners at every opportunity, and directly undermines basic American principals that all citizens are entitled to equal representation and rightfully are entitled a voice in designing the futures of their properties.

Susan Rasmussen for Clark County Citizens United, Inc
FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD OF THE 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE
FYI and for the record  Thanks

-----Original Message-----
From  Tilton, Rebecca
Sent  Wednesday, May 18, 2016 2 39 PM
To  Orjiako, Oliver, Schroader, Kathy
Subject  Comp Plan Testimony (5/17/16 BOC hearing)

Hello,

Please see the attached comments, which were submitted at the board's hearing yesterday (during public comment)

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