

Leslie Clark

Subject: Real Disconnect...Balance Needed For the Public Recore



From: susan rasmussen

Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2015 11:52 AM

To: Rick Dunning; cnldental@yahoo.com

Cc: jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov; tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov; david.madore@clark.wa.gov; mark.mccauley@clark.wa.gov; Leah Higgins; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary Mclsaac; Clark County Citizens United Inc.

Subject: Re: Real Disconnect...Balance Needed For the Public Recore

Hello Rick,

Without question, there is a very real disconnect between the rural landowners, the planners and the townships. Unfortunately, it is ongoing without a cure in sight. The cities' voices are louder than the rural landowners and their assumptions dominate & prevail.

It is obvious the mayors and county planners have not thought much about property rights. This concept is why folks have been burdened for 20 years with large lot zoning, UH & UR overlays. The overlays have been abusively used as components of a scheme to prevent any growth in the rural areas...a moratorium. To ignore the large lot zoning for 20 years is unheard of in other counties; as is the abuse of the overlays. There is a reason why the rural landowners have been continually *excluded* in any update to the county's growth plan.

Two of our goals is to promote equal treatment of the rural citizens and welcome the concept of respect for property rights by governmental agencies. Far to long, our input and perspective have been undervalued or nonexistent in regional goals and plans. As a result, a healthy respect for property rights has suffered degradation and may not exist on the third floor. Over this past year, Carol & I attempted to collaborate with Oliver, Jose, Gordy & Chris Cook. Our meetings were confrontational, hostile ... absent of any collaborative efforts and substance. There hasn't been a balance of perspectives on the 3rd. floor, nor any demonstration of inclusion.

Respect for property rights is the 6th. goal of the GMA. Carol and I see this right disrespected time & again by unsuspecting landowners who are told that they must deed over easements for habitats, conservation, roads, etc. If the landowners don't comply with the demands imposed by the planners, they employ coercion & hold their permits hostage.

The Councilors made a big stride forward by granting the landowners stakeholder status. This gesture is an attempt to put the rural landowners on equal footing...not mere pawns for the cities to decide our fate. There is still much work ahead to gain respect for private property rights.

Here's to a balanced future,
Susan
Sent from Windows Mail

3066

From: Rick Dunning

Sent: Sunday, April 26, 2015 7:44 AM

To: cnldental@yahoo.com

Cc: jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, david.madore@clark.wa.gov, mark.mccauley@clark.wa.gov, [susan rasmussen](#), [Leah Higgins](#), [Rita Dietrich](#), [Jerry Olson](#), [Fred Pickering](#), [Jim Malinowski](#), [Frank White](#), [Benjamin Moss](#), [Lonnie Moss](#), [Melinda Zamora](#), [Nick Redinger](#), [Curt Massie](#), [Marcus Becker](#), [Zachary McIsaac](#), [Clark County Citizens United Inc.](#)

Susan,

Your last sentence is important. Proper growth management, even before we used the term, allowed individuals who owned land in the path of development to reap financial benefits when development was complete. When the Growth Management Act was introduced, legislature hired past State Representative Joe King to develop a purchase or transfer of development rights (TDR/PDR) to be introduced statewide. That task was above Joe's pay grade and wasn't accomplished. Even today, after years of trying, it takes substantial Hgovernmental involvement to create such a program (see FORTERRA/King County/transfer of development rights).

So cities in our state (and in OUR county) should create TDR/PDR programs to "claim" the land they want frozen for future development with payment (or even a promise to pay) the neighboring landowner. This should be done out of the existing marketplace. They are trying to do this in King County with realtors, developers, builders, landowners, and local government representatives all at the table.

Our Clark county city leaders are ignorant of the history and progress of others trying to resolve this issue. I might be able to get Forterra's executive leadership down here for a presentation about this, if our County Councilors and City Mayors could attend.

Best,
Rick

Sent from my iPad

On Apr 25, 2015, at 6:19 PM, Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com> wrote:

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: susan rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>

To: "cnldental@yahoo.com" <cnldental@yahoo.com>

Sent: Saturday, April 25, 2015 12:53 PM

Subject: Re: Public record for alt. 4 treated differently

Hi Carol,

It appears that the county is not recognizing the importance of the public record as a guidance tool. Kitsap County's *process* of their comprehensive plan was recognized by the Governor for their outstanding public outreach component... "The Year of the Rural."

Six open houses & hundreds of public comments were processed before any alternative plans were written. Without question, Clark County doesn't value the process, and may

not be employing the index as intended. Clark County planning hasn't received any awards.

Remember what Loretta said about the '94 plan? The target of the plan was foremost, the justification was secondary. That is why Judge Poyfair thought the entire plan should have been thrown out and started fresh.

I've been reading the 10 pg. letter from the mayors. They are assuming a lot and disregarding private property rights completely. This is a big issue since it has been an ongoing theme now for 20 years. They don't care about the humanity...the farmers and landowners can eek out a substandard living farming their land until the cities deem it necessary to bring it into their city limits. In the mean time, sentence the landowners to poverty, craft building moratoriums through urban reserve & urban holding overlays to maintain large lots, and further stifle the rural economy so one day the towns can lay claim to the land.

Susan

Sent from Windows Mail

From: cnldental@yahoo.com

Sent: Friday, April 24, 2015 11:03 PM

To: greg.kimsey@clark.wa.gov, jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov, david.madore@clark.wa.gov, tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov, mark.mccauley@clark.wa.gov, [susan rasmussen](#), [Leah Higgins](#), [Rick Dunning](#), [Rita Dietrich](#), [Jerry Olson](#), [Fred Pickering](#), [Jim Malinowski](#), [Frank White](#), [Benjamin Moss](#), [Lonnie Moss](#), [Melinda Zamora](#), [Nick Redinger](#), [Curt Massie](#), [Marcus Becker](#), [Zachary McIsaac](#), cnldental@yahoo.com, [Clark County Citizens United Inc.](#)

Dear Mr. Kimsey,

Thank you for your timely response. The April date was the last posting of testimony for the public record index. No doubt, the public thinks that what is posted, is in fact everything that was submitted, to date. In fact, that can't be further from the truth. CCCU is well aware of the requirement that the record must be complete by the time of the final approval of the Plan. But, don't you think that is too late for councilors to read, understand and consider the submitted testimony at that late date? State law does say that they must consider the public input. What is a record good for, if information for it is 'cherry picked'. The public record is the only recourse the taxpayers of Clark County have to voice their opinion to those who say they want to hear from them. The ballot box is the other. The GMA has much language regarding public input and process. In the 1994 Comp Plan, the index was rewritten twice and was still dramatically incomplete. A thousand pieces of testimony were never entered in the record at that time. The county lost in the court regarding the public process. Is that what the county wants to have happen again? Having an ongoing open and complete public process, record and index tells the public that what they have to say is important and gives integrity to the process. Isn't that what your goal is? Unfortunately, your response tells me that county agents do not consider the situation in the same way, and would argue that the county will get the information in the record when they have to, and not before. A more appropriate method to assure a full and complete record, is that planning staff stays out of the picture, until the testimony information is listed. This process should not take more than a few days to perform, and then staff can review the contents. There should be independent persons handling public testimony, similar to ballot protection. The legal implications for both do matter in the eyes of the courts.

Best Regards,

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

From: "Kimsey, Greg" <Greg.Kimsey@clark.wa.gov>

To: 'Carol Levanen' <cnldental@yahoo.com>; 'Stewart, Jeanne' <Jeanne.Stewart@clark.wa.gov>;

"Mielke, Tom" <Tom.Mielke@clark.wa.gov>; "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>; "McCauley, Mark" <Mark.McCauley@clark.wa.gov>; Susan Rasmussen <sprazz@outlook.com>; Leah Higgins <leahnwhomes@gmail.com>; Rick Dunning <ralan1953@gmail.com>; Rita Dietrich <billrita@pacifier.com>; Jerry Olson <wcrolsons@tds.net>; Fred Pickering <fredp@yacolt.com>; Jim Malinowski <j.malinowski@ieee.org>; Frank White <firfarmer@yahoo.com>; Benjamin Moss <benjaminmoss@johnscott.com>; Lonnie Moss <mossback44@gmail.com>; Melinda Zamora <mzamora1001@gmail.com>; Nick Redinger <nickredinger@hotmail.com>; Curt Massie <cmassie331@gmail.com>; Marcus Becker <marcusb35@msn.com>; Zachary McIsaac <zmcsaac@ashbaughbeal.com>; Clark County Citizens United Inc. <cccuinc@yahoo.com>
Cc: "Orjiako, Oliver" <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; "Cook, Christine" <Christine.Cook@clark.wa.gov>; "McCauley, Mark" <Mark.McCauley@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 24, 2015 2:34 PM
Subject: RE: Request for audit of the public record index of the 2016 Comp. Plan Update - For the Public Record

Hi Carol.

Yes, I recognize that Clark County Citizens United requested that my office conduct an audit of the public records index for Clark County's 2016 comprehensive plan update. However, a request for an audit does not require this office to conduct an audit. While a request for an audit does not require the audit be conducted, I do take audit requests very seriously and carefully consider what action, if any, we should take in response to that request.

When a concern regarding an aspect of Clark County operations is brought to the attention of my office, generally our first action is to contact the Director of the county department where the concern originates from. We discuss the concern with the Director to gather information that will help us to better evaluate the concern and what our response, if any, should be to address the concern.

My understanding is that state law requires the public record of comments and input regarding a county's comprehensive plan update (the "Public Record") must be complete at the time the legislative body approves the comprehensive plan update (the Public Record must be complete at that time, however it may meet the requirement to be complete even though it has not yet been fully indexed).

We have discussed Clark County Citizens United's concern with Community Planning Department Director, Oliver Orjiako, staff in the Prosecuting Attorney's Office and acting county Manager Mark McCauley. As a result of these discussions it is my opinion that the county has the proper procedures and controls in place to ensure compliance with state law regarding the requirement that the Public Record be complete at the time the legislative body approves the comprehensive plan update.

In your email you state "All items prior to April 14, 2015 intended by the public for the record, are mandated by state law to be in the record, before the record's last date, which is April 14, 2015." I am not aware of the law you are referring to, if you would provide me additional information about this I would be happy to respond. If the "items" you are referring to are comments and/or information that you want included in the Public Record my understanding is that they can be submitted any time prior to approval of the comprehensive plan update by the Board of County Councilors and would then be included in the Public Record.

While I believe the county is acting appropriately to ensure that the Public Record will be complete when the Board of County Councilors approve the comprehensive plan update, if you believe items are missing from the Public Record I encourage you to contact Oliver Orjiako.

If you have additional comments, concerns or questions please don't hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Greg

From: Carol Levanen [<mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2015 8:24 PM
To: Kimsey, Greg; Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; McCauley, Mark; Susan Rasmussen; Leah Higgins; Rick Dunning; Rita Dietrich; Jerry Olson; Fred Pickering; Jim Malinowski; Frank White; Benjamin Moss; Lonnie Moss; Melinda Zamora; Nick Redinger; Curt Massie; Marcus Becker; Zachary Mclsaac; Carol Levanen; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Re: Request for audit of the public record index of the 2016 Comp. Plan Update - For the Public Record

Dear Mr. Kimsey,

CCCU has filed a formal email request for an audit of the public record index. It is your responsibility to fulfill that request. CCCU is quite sure that many items are missing or mis-labeled. You have responded that the index will be complete by the end of the GMA update, but that is much too late. All items prior to April 14, 2015 intended by the public for the record, are mandated by state law to be in the record, before the record's last date, which is April 14, 2015. This request is not between planning staff and you, it is between CCCU and the auditors office. Our question to planning staff, is why the testimony is not already in the record? Are these items of public testimony just sitting in no-man's-land? CCCU does expect the Auditors office to independently review and confirm the information and respond to the audit request. CCCU looks forward to resolution of this matter, as soon as possible. Thank you for your time and attention.

Sincerely,

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

From: "Kimsey, Greg" <Greg.Kimsey@clark.wa.gov>
To: 'susan rasmussen' <sprazz@outlook.com>
Cc: "cnldental@yahoo.com" <cnldental@yahoo.com>; "jim.malinowski@icloud.com" <jim.malinowski@icloud.com>; "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>; "Stewart, Jeanne" <Jeanne.Stewart@clark.wa.gov>; "Mielke, Tom" <Tom.Mielke@clark.wa.gov>; "McCauley, Mark" <Mark.McCauley@clark.wa.gov>; "Orjiako, Oliver" <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Thursday, April 23, 2015 3:52 PM
Subject: RE: Request for audit of the public record index of the 2016 Comp. Plan Update

Hi Susan,

We have discussed your concern with Oliver Orjiako, Community Planning Director as well as a member of his staff. While you are correct that certain items are not currently included in the public records index for the 2016 comprehensive plan update, our discussions cause us to believe that the Planning Department is diligently working to include them. We have no reason to believe that all items that should be included in this database will be included and indexed prior to adoption of the plan.

If you believe there are specific documents that should be in the public records index for the 2016 comprehensive plan update but don't appear to have been included I encourage you to contact Oliver Orjiako.

I hope this addresses your concern. If you have additional concerns, comments or questions please don't hesitate to contact me again.

Regards,
Greg

From: Kimsey, Greg
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2015 3:13 PM
To: 'susan rasmussen'
Cc: cnldental@yahoo.com; jim.malinowski@icloud.com; Madore, David; Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom
Subject: RE: Request for audit of the public record index of the 2016 Comp. Plan Update

Hi Susan, this is to acknowledge receipt of your request.

I hope to provide you a response no later than early next week.

Regards,
Greg

From: susan rasmussen [<mailto:sprazz@outlook.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, April 22, 2015 2:19 PM
To: Kimsey, Greg
Cc: cnldental@yahoo.com; jim.malinowski@icloud.com; Madore, David; Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom
Subject: Request for audit of the public record index of the 2016 Comp. Plan Update

Dear Auditor Kimsey,

A recent review of the public records index for the comprehensive plan 2016 update demonstrates there are numerous items missing and or mislabeled. This creates an incomplete index of the public record. Clark County Citizens United, Inc. is requesting a full audit of the index of the public record for the comprehensive plan update. We look forward to your response to this request.

Thank you for your attention,

Susan Rasmussen
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from Windows Mail

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.