

REC'D 6/14/16 FROM SUSAN RASMUSSEN - RL
CC'd - BOCC; ORJAKO; Schroeder



From: susan rasmussen
Sent: Tuesday, June 14, 2016 9:29 AM
To: susan rasmussen; cndental@yahoo.com
Subject: Testimony 6.14.16

for the public record of the 2016 comp. plan

CCCU won the ruling on rural land use densities by lawfully advancing our case through the judicial system. The Poyfair decision ruled the County's application of a formula for the rural area that capped rural growth was erroneous. This formula compelled the county to downzone substantial portions of the rural areas. Compliance to this order should have had a transformative effect on the comp plan and should have required the staff's cooperation with the CCCU as a stakeholder. That requires a tremendous shift of attitudes.

I understand why staff continually uses an exclusionary public process policy. The members of the Food Systems Council, providers of the policy recommendations written in the Growing Healthier report, and members of the Agriculture Preservation Strategies Committee are prime indicators of using elite groups. If you eliminate the rural land owners or for that matter, anyone that doesn't embrace the policy agenda, this allows staff to drive the agenda towards a devised outcome. This attitude elevates the care taken in extreme measures and costs to create new policies that preserve the agenda. This attitude improperly displaces the public participation process to the back of the bus. What should provide the horse power that drives policies, is really nothing more than theatrics used to support a pre-determined outcome. This undermines the GMA's intent of the public participation process.

That action is unworkable, not morally sound, and not GMA compliant. This process is unworkable because it doesn't recognize diverse views of stakeholders that are affected by the policies per GMA law, doesn't use a collaborative process, and reciprocity. You can't have a unified county with policy driven like that. . .it's not going to work. You are going to get lines being drawn, people sitting on opposing sides of the room like brides and grooms. This generates divisiveness that results in lengthy court battles.

It is amoral because it embraces a public participation process that practices discrimination. You can't eliminate the views of citizens that don't agree with policies that continually cap rural growth. The integrity of the character of the public participation process is foundational to everything. The staff are trying to paper over a moral void and avoid compliance to court orders with policy. . .it's not the right thing to do.

It is not lawful because it is not according to GMA laws and the intention built into the open and continuous public participation process. State law says to intentionally reach out and incorporate communities into the participation process that are impacted by the regulations and court actions per RCW 36.70A.140. This ensures a lawful, inclusionary participation process.

CCCU's court actions should have granted us status as prime stakeholders for the 2004, 2007, and this update. We won the ruling against capping rural growth by advancing our issues through the judicial system. To this day, the GMA says nothing about stopping or limiting growth, or enhancing growth. The point is how local jurisdictions accommodate growth and use the planning goals to reflect local policies. Compliance to the Poyfair Decisions should have had a transformative effect on the comp plan

and should have required the staff to cooperate with the rural land owners. That requires an intentional shift towards inclusiveness. . for everyone, including the Board of Councilors.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Rasmussen for CCCU
Sent from Mail for Windows 10