

From: [Kathleen Otto](#)
To: [Rebecca Messinger](#)
Subject: FW: 1% Rural Growth shows that Clark County has put a "cap" on rural growth, illegal according to the courts
Date: Thursday, February 22, 2024 8:32:47 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)



Kathleen Otto
County Manager

564.397.2458



From: Clark County Citizens United, Inc. <cccuinc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 22, 2024 1:39 AM
To: Gary Medvigy <Gary.Medvigy@clark.wa.gov>; Karen Bowerman <Karen.Bowerman@clark.wa.gov>; Michelle Belkot <Michelle.Belkot@clark.wa.gov>; Glen Yung <Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov>; Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>; Kathleen Otto <Kathleen.Otto@clark.wa.gov>; Carol Levanen <cccuinc@yahoo.com>; sprazz@outlook.com
Subject: Fw: 1% Rural Growth shows that Clark County has put a "cap" on rural growth, illegal according to the courts

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD AND THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Submitted by:

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. P.O. Box 2188 Battle Ground, Washington 98604
E-Mail cccuinc@yahoo.com

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

From: Clark County Citizens United, Inc. <cccuinc@yahoo.com>
To: Carol Levanen <cccuinc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Monday, October 23, 2023 at 08:49:56 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: 1% Rural Growth

<https://doh.wa.gov/sites/default/files/legacy/Documents/Pubs/346090.pdf>

A 1% rural growth is not right under this Comprehensive Plan. There has not been one good reason supporting this extreme growth reduction. Knowledge of the 10% rural growth policy failure is not new. It has lived for years in historical Clark County Buildable Land Reports and documents. Evidence exists in testimony submitted into the Public Record by Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

County documents demonstrate the 1% rural growth is a direct result of the 1994 massive downzoning of rural and resource lands. An unauthorized formula is being used to "cap" rural growth. This is illegal under the Growth Management Act and court rulings under:

Superior Court Law and Order Case No. 96-2-00080-2:

Superior Court Reconsideration - Case No. 96-200080-2

Superior Court Judgement - 96-2-05498-8

Court of Appeals Div.II Published Opinion Case No. 22164-1-II

Washington State Dept. of Health, Office of Community Health Systems **Series on Urban/Rural Disparities**, Fact Sheet February 2017, Percent change of population distribution for Wa. State and its Counties by percent population rural ;

Clark: 17.5% 2000 Rural Pop. 13.8% 2010 Rural Pop

*Clark County had a **-21.4% rural** population shift 2000-2010.*

- **2000 Plan Monitoring Report, Price of Housing, Pg. 40:**

. There was very little opportunity for home ownership in a more rural setting for households achieving the median income. By 1998, only Amboy offered existing housing and Yacolt offered new housing in the rural setting with an average sales price that could be purchased by the median income household. Rural housing opportunities are generally well beyond the median income household's ability to purchase.

- **52,380:** 1995 Rural population per 2002 BLR
- **61,816:** 2000 Rural population per 2000 Monitoring Report
- **58,566:** 2010 Rural population, U.S. Census Urban & Rural

Note: The adopted 2012 population allocation was **79,689** (2002 BLR, Pg. 4) With 2 years left on the planning horizon, the rural allocation is failing the growth projection by **21,123 people**.

- **62,205**: 2015 Rural population, 2015 Comp Plan. Pg.82
 - **66,181**: 2015 Rural population, 2021 BLR, Pg. 12
 - **66,975**: 2020 Rural population, 2021 BLR, Pg. 12
 - **65,048**: 2020 Rural population, U.S. Census Urban & Rural
-
- **345,238**: 2000 Clark County Census, OFM
-
- **425,363**: 2010 Clark County Census, OFM
-
- **499,200**: 2020 Clark County Census OFM
-
- **2000-2020 the countywide population increased 153,962 people. The rural population increased 3,232. This is not commensurate to the 10% rural allocation.**

The population numbers show a trend that is self evident. Rural families do what all families do best. They grow and nurture the next generation of citizens. Those citizens were promised, a minimum of 10% rural growth in efforts to accommodate affordable housing for the next generation of rural children. While children were growing, the County was busy with plans diverting rural buildable land to the county's Legacy Lands Program, Parks and critical areas. There is no analysis how the county's programs have impaired rural housing opportunities, no social and economic studies in an EIS and no mitigation planned for the consequences suffered by this loss of land for rural housing. The county's irresponsible lack of attention is altering the social fabric that is the foundation of the county's unique rural character. The 1% growth is not indicated in any Clark County Comprehensive Planning Assumptions.

- If staff are out of touch with legitimate policy management and has issues

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows