



**Leslie Clark**

---

**Subject:** FW:

**From:** [susan rasmussen](mailto:susan.rasmussen)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 24, 2016 11:20 AM  
**To:** [comp.plan@clark.wa.gov](mailto:comp.plan@clark.wa.gov); [jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov](mailto:jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov); [julie.olson2@clark.wa.gov](mailto:julie.olson2@clark.wa.gov); [tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov](mailto:tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov); [david.madore@clark.wa.gov](mailto:david.madore@clark.wa.gov); Boldt, Marc  
**Subject:** FW:

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

**From:** [susan rasmussen](mailto:susan.rasmussen)  
**Sent:** Thursday, May 19, 2016 6:05 PM  
**To:** [susan rasmussen](mailto:susan.rasmussen)  
**Subject:**

First off, CCCU's clients are our membership: our children, grandchildren, great grandchildren, members of our large extended families, church communities, friends, rural landowners, farming, and forestry families. Most of whom want their land use rules to be more reasonable and respectful of private property rights. Nobody pays us to participate in this critical, and often frustrating project.

The sentiment I'm hearing from our membership is that, "*it's time to do this right.*" Property rights have been under fire here. . .and the degradations continue. We have to push back to gain protections in Clark County, so rural landowner's may enjoy the ability to use their properties within reason. CCCU supports local planning solutions that provide a balance of all GMA planning goals, and provide the best benefits for all concerns.

Kindly note that the point of GMA is to manage growth - -not to prevent, or to "*put a cap on rural growth,*" to quote Judge Poyfair. It is not GMA's goal to halt rural lifestyles. The Dept. of Commerce's guidelines say to define rural character in conjunction with the rural residents themselves. Who can better define rural features than the citizens who actually live and work in the area. The Dept. supports diversity and rural lifestyles. First and foremost, rural character describes how people view their neighborhood. It makes sense to allow them deference in defining unique rural character. Their considerations should be valued above other considerations here in designing the futures of their properties. CCCU doesn't drive into town week after week to tell the urban citizens how to design the futures of their neighborhoods. That isn't respectful. I sincerely hope everyone here tonight pays attention to that issue.

The county has failed to include the rural landowners as stakeholders. It is GMA law, any group of citizens that are impacted by the county land use and zoning regulations are required to be active participants throughout the planning process. Rural land owner issues suffer as a consequence. One result of practicing exclusivity is clearly demonstrated in how the citizens weren't offered a range of alternative plans; let alone a broad range of options that lent recognition to a rural perspective. This is not GMA compliant.

3076

Ten months prior to the 3 plans presented, CCCU had already established an extensive body of testimony in the public record. CCCU intentionally participated early in the county's public process and made hearty contributions into the public record. The resource lands had been ignored over 22 years, and mounting issues were demanding attention. CCCU's mission was to ensure rural issues would be recognized at this update.

The planning staff presented only 3 alternative plans to the citizens. Surprisingly, none of the plans acknowledged and incorporated any of CCCU's issues contained within the public record. Instead of alternative plans that lent a rural landowner perspective; the planning staff gave us apathy. The rural landowners were left to fend for ourselves if we wanted a rural alternative 4 plan. This is concrete evidence the planning staff disregarded the intentions of the public participation process. The process was nothing more than a superficial exercise. . . fluff. What's more, the desired outcome had already been written years ago.

The plan was intentionally managed in such a way as to directly lead to a previously written forgone conclusion. The Board was fed a restrictive diet of information that would lead them to this predetermined outcome. This action severely impairs the abilities of the BOCC to conduct the important business of making well-reasoned and balanced decisions. This action further undermines the public participation process.

The list of 12 reports in the plan (Growing Healthier, Aging Readiness Reports, etc.) demonstrates this. The U.S.D.A. Census of Agriculture 1950-2012 Clark County Profiles should have been included to establish industry trends towards smaller, intensely managed farms on 5-acre parcels. The Globalwise Reports supports that trend. There are no reports from the Clark County Executive Horse Council that clearly demonstrate thriving equine and 4-H communities. There is nothing regarding the updates to the Dept. of Revenue Current Use Taxation Program, Forestry, that now recognizes a minimum 5-acres of trees. This is important for Clark County because the FR-40 zone is dominated by small 5-acre woodlots. It is important to recognize the intent of the update in the current use program. It was specifically amended to encourage and support the many small woodlots that contribute to the State's forests.

This public process, and all the associated foundational documents comprise this campaign and the staff are the lobbyists. That is not their duty. Reports were intentionally excluded from the process that indicate support for change in the resource lands is overdue. The USDA Census of Agriculture county profiles 1950-2012, and the Globalwise Report all indicate trends towards smaller, intensely managed farms. Instead of those reports, you are given the Growing Healthier Report that reads like a scare tactic and the county will quickly succumb to a fresh food shortage. Reports are excluded from the Clark County Executive horse council, the 4-H communities, master gardeners, etc. All these indicate a robust rural lifestyle that is thriving. Reports are absent to indicate degradations to rural lifestyles, culture, society, economies and property rights. There is nothing in the plan that addresses the updates in the state current use taxation program for forestry that now recognizes a minimum 5 acres of trees. There is nothing about how the overwhelming non-conforming lots fail to conform to the county's unique rural character. This looks very much like a campaign.

When viewed in combination, the evidence overwhelmingly indicates rural landowners were disadvantaged at every opportunity. The public participation plan for this update was a sham, but it worked as it was intended to work. . . to exclude the rural landowners from the process, and to maintain the cap on rural growth. This advances the "unauthorized formula" and is not GMA compliant.

GMA supports people using their properties within the laws. They are not merely for habitat, or maintaining a monumental country museum so urban citizens can enjoy the vistas. Reasoned environmental practices benefit all, but they are clearly spelled out in ordinances, and storm water regulations.

We have not reached the point where the benefits to the landowners are on equal footing with the community. The needs of the community continue to outweigh the takings and damages to individual landowners. I sincerely hope the Planning Commission and the Board pays attention to that issue and stands up for the rural property owners. The 1994 comp plan did not do enough to protect rural landowners...it still doesn't. The plan has gone far from the objectives of the GMA, to preserve a functioning, vibrant, and diverse rural community, supported by a robust rural economy. This plan has been draining the life blood, and shutting down rural growth and diversity. . .the opposite of the GMA objective.

We are concerned about property restrictions that are going to impact our abilities to use our properties, like the extremely high, 85% cluster remainder lot size, the covenants, and restrictive building envelopes.

Without question, part of the problem of county plans is how they continually ignore the property rights goal and over-emphasizes open space and the environmental goal. We ask that you not allow concern for the environment to supersede concern for property rights. The GMA forbids that. It says that all 14 goals must be given equal protection. Nothing in GMA suggests that "concerns for the greater good," as in environmental issues, should override property rights. It's time to find a balance. For example, the remainder lot of a cluster will be required to be forever set aside. That's based on a rule from the Dept. of Commerce. The rule says "should," not "shall." It's time to pay attention to all GMA goals for reasonable, clear, and effective rules. The cluster ordinance has gone far from the objectives of the GMA to

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10