

Leslie Clark

Subject: Challenge the planning regimen

From: [susan rasmussen](#)
Sent: Thursday, April 7, 2016 6:47 PM
To: marc.boldt@clark.wa.gov
Subject: FW: Challenge the planning regimen



Hi Marc,

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)

3061

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.

Thanks for your time and all your efforts. By the way, that was the right thing to do for the Laglers.
Susan

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

From: Boldt, Marc
Sent: Thursday, April 7, 2016 12:22 PM
To: susan rasmussen
Subject: Re: Challenge the planning regimen

To get this right .after telling us how bad we are you want us to go back to alt 4?

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 7, 2016, at 11:44 AM, susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com> wrote:

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.