

Leslie Clark

Subject: What is the Prime Objective?



From: [susan.rasmussen](mailto:susan.rasmussen@clark.wa.gov)

Sent: Thursday, May 26, 2016 3:52 AM

To: jeanne.stewart@clark.wa.gov; david.madore@clark.wa.gov; julie.olson2@clark.wa.gov; **Boldt, Marc**; tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov

Subject: What is the Prime Objective?

Dear Councilors,

Compliance to the Hearings Board, and compliance to all the Superior Court Orders are two different issues.

Noted in CCCU's testimony contained in the public record of the comprehensive plan, CCCU's case was closed by the Hearings Board with unreconciled "remaining issues." For some unapparent reason, CCCU's case never was returned to Judge Poyfair's Superior Court. Judge Poyfair never understood that and questions that action. As a result, CCCU's case never benefited from his oversight to insure complete compliance. Our sole opportunity for review of compliance relied on a corrupt Hearings Board. Judge Poyfair severely reprimanded that Board for demanding the county use a "formulaic view" that relied on their "erroneous formula." The Judge said the Board overstepped their legal bounds.

Everyone should be concerned about unreconciled issues, and efforts made to properly identify them. It is also apparent, and disturbing, the county failed to do the necessary work required for complete compliance and respectfully honor all Superior Court Orders. Important questions need to be asked, and answered:

1. What are the lingering issues that fail to be reconciled?
2. Why wasn't the necessary work done to accomplish full compliance?
3. How is it that long-standing Superior Court Orders were not honored?
4. How did Superior Court Orders get relegated to no-man's land until the clock ran out?
5. Was this an intentional ploy to avoid compliance to all the Superior Court Orders?
6. Did the Board of County Councilors sanction and direct this unbecoming act?
7. Did staff grant themselves authority for this behavior?

The acting county manager, county staff, and the BOCC shouldn't condone only partial compliance to the Poyfair Decision. Aren't we all after an upstanding, truthful plan that can rightfully lay claim to full compliance to Superior Court Orders, and the GMA? What is the main objective?

1. GMA compliance, but only partial compliance to the Superior Court Orders?
2. Full compliance to all aspects and intentions of the Poyfair Decision and GMA compliance.

To date, the county's actions lead one to believe staff is intentionally avoiding compliance and trying to skim by and accomplish little as possible in the way of attaining full compliance and honor all aspects and intentions of the Poyfair Decision. Something is terribly wrong, and highly unethical if that is the county's prime objective.

3079