

From: [Kathleen Otto](#)
To: [Rebecca Messinger](#)
Subject: FW: The CCCU Study, as viewed by C & S
Date: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:36:36 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: Monday, March 4, 2024 11:25 AM
To: Gary Medvigi <Gary.Medvigi@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>
Subject: Fw: The CCCU Study, as viewed by C & S

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

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

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

From: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
To: "david.madore@clark.wa.gov" <david.madore@clark.wa.gov>; "tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov" <tom.mielke@clark.wa.gov>; "ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov" <ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov>; "cnldental@yahoo.com" <cnldental@yahoo.com>; "sprazz@tds.net" <sprazz@tds.net>; "leahnwhomes@gmail.com" <leahnwhomes@gmail.com>; "ralan1953@gmail.com" <ralan1953@gmail.com>; "billrita@pacifier.com" <billrita@pacifier.com>; "wcolsons@tds.net" <wcolsons@tds.net>; "fredp@yacolt.com" <fredp@yacolt.com>; "j.malinowski@ieee.org" <j.malinowski@ieee.org>; "firfarmer@yahoo.com" <firfarmer@yahoo.com>; "benjaminmoss@johnlscott.com" <benjaminmoss@johnlscott.com>; "lon@moss-wriston.com" <lon@moss-wriston.com>

wriston.com>; "mzamora1001@gmail.com" <mzamora1001@gmail.com>; "nickredinger@hotmail.com" <nickredinger@hotmail.com>; "cmassie331@gmail.com" <cmassie331@gmail.com>; "marcusb35@msn.com" <marcusb35@msn.com>; "ccuinc@yahoo.com" <ccuinc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 at 07:58:46 PM PDT
Subject: Fw: The CCCU Study, as viewed by C & S

Thanks Susan, I will forward this on to be placed into public record.

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

From: "sprazz@tds.net" <sprazz@tds.net>
To: Carol Levanen <cnldental@yahoo.com>
Cc: sprazz@tds.net
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 4:39 PM
Subject: The CCCU Study, as viewed by C & S

Ok. Let's use the facts and figures from the Berk Study and apply them to correctly reflect what the GMA states.

Presenting: THE CCCU STUDY (a comprehensive analysis reflecting what is truly happening on the lands in Clark County),
Rough Draft 1:

Population Projections and Split:

The Exhibit 1 of the Berk Study clearly shows that much of the population growth spanning over the last decade occurred out in the unincorporated areas of Clark County. The unincorporated areas grew at a rate of 2.7%. The urban growth rate in the cities was 1.2%. Over twice as many citizens prefer to live in the unincorporated areas of our County. This is compelling evidence that clearly demonstrates the desires, needs, and local trends of our citizens. The current proposed population split of 90/10 is not an accurate reflection of what has truly transpired in the County. A more accurate population projection split would be 75/25, or 80/20. This issue is important as it is a guidance tool in helping reveal an accurate picture of what is transpiring in Clark County and how we can best accommodate and plan for this trend.

Coordinated Growth and Guidance: Tools:

The GMA intentions are to combat uncoordinated growth. Over the past several years, the Washington Dept. of Transportation has actively invested millions of our tax dollars in massive improvements and upgrades along NE 219th, Highway 503, and the new Salmon Creek Interchange. The aggressive construction of infrastructure projects financed by vast amounts of public dollars are well planned. The State of Washington clearly demonstrates recognition and support of the growth that has transpired in the rural areas of Clark County, and has planned their infrastructure projects accordingly. This should be a proper guidance tool for Clark County.

The GMA recognizes regional differences. The Legislators acknowledged this and made allowances for much local discretion and decision making.

The Primary Flaw With the Existing Comp. Plan:

The primary flaw with the existing comp. plan is that it has never truly acknowledged the existing development and parcelization that was already in place when the original plan was written. GMA demands that the zoning be consistent with the "existing patterns of land use." To consistently match the zoning to properly reflect the parcelization and population settlement should be one of the prime goals. The County maps are profoundly dominated by parcels much smaller in size than the zoning dictates. This demonstrates inconsistency and demands change.

Rural Lands Element, Lifestyles:

We have had conversations with the County Commissioners and planners about the need to acknowledge diverse lifestyles in the comp. plan; particularly rural lifestyles. Presently, the rural lands are being underserved by the comp. plan. by putting severe restrictions on those lands. However, the population settlement patterns clearly show that unincorporated Clark County is where people prefer to live and possibly work. An opportunity is presented here. Clark County needs to accurately reflect this shift in population. The rural lands element should be written to encompass a diversity of lifestyles, uses, residential densities, and businesses that bring employment opportunities. The Exhibits included in the Berk Study, May 2012, clearly show the population trend shift in favor of rural lands. This is another important guidance tool. This shift in the population trend can and should be rightfully acknowledged in the rural lands element of Clark County's plan. This population shift shown in the settlement patterns can be accomplished and still maintain the integrity of the "rural character." Perhaps the "rural character" is what has driven the migration of the population shift over the past decade away from the high-density housing of the cities. Clark County needs to rightfully accommodate the citizens seeking a "rural lifestyle." Berk Study, Exhibit 1 proves this, once again.

Growth in Very Small and Small Farms:

The majority of the growth in the rural lands came as a result of growth in very small and small agricultural endeavors. The Berk Study, 2.2 Employment Trends states:

"Those employed in farming and agriculture (proprietors, full-time, and part-time) grew at a rate of 2.2% from 2000 to 2009. The majority of this growth came from increases in farm proprietors, which grew at 2.4%. All other farm employment grew at 2.1%. The rate of growth in this industry outpaces the County as a whole, which grew at a rate of 1.7%. The jobs tied to the forest industry grew at a rate of 2% during this period. However, jobs in logging only account for approximately 600 jobs in the County, and these jobs are down 3% since 2000."

3.0 Summary of Key Findings:

"Key Finding #1: Agriculture in Clark County in 2011 is in the midst of a decade's long transition from large scale commodity farming into more intensive, value-added, urban-oriented farming."

"There has been a substantial growth in the number of very small farms and moderate growth of small farms. This is also reflected by farm size, with farms less than 50 acres making up almost 85% of total farms in Clark County in 2007, up from 79% in 1997"

Undoubtedly, the massive migration of large commercial dairy farms out of Clark County has had an influence on the decline in commodities figures over the past decade for Clark County. However, farming activities are still on going as the Exhibits indicate. Yes, Clark County's picture of agriculture is evolving into much smaller farms. This marked change to small and very small farms is a definite trend, and a trend that has been driven in part by high land prices, restrictive environmental regulations, high cost of machinery and fuel, and an apparent desire for more of the citizens to live a more rural lifestyle. Our County is still experiencing the profound impacts of the last recession. The decline of large, commercial farms, and the resulting decline of farm commodities has had a detrimental impact on the local economy already struggling from the recession and the highest unemployment rate in the state. However, the obvious trend of very small to small farming operations provides one of the few bright spots in a return to a robust local economy. Exhibit 4, Berk Study: Clark County Farm Employment: shows the increased farm and proprietor employment from 2001 to 2009. Accommodations need to be made to the Clark County Comp plan to allow these very small, and small scale farming activities. If the Legislators had intended for farms and forest lands to be 10, 20, 40, or 80 acres, they would have written the language.

Berk Study, Exhibit 5: Clark County Farms by Type:

"The growth in the number of farms is mostly in very small farms with a slight increase in small farms, though some of the increase may be attributed to increased efforts of the USDA to count all small farms in the census."

" Commercial farms are declining:
- While the number of commercial farms has decreased between 1997 and 2007, mid-sized and commercial farms' share of total commodity output stayed constant at 85%
- Commodity values are declining.
- Commercial farms are the most productive farm type, with 38 farms producing \$39.4 million. Put another way, 2% of Clark County farms account for 75% of total commodity outputs. Subsequently, the loss of commercial farms corresponds to a loss in commodity totals."

Berk Study, Exhibit 13 Farm Typology:

"Most farms in Clark County are family farms (e.g.owned by families, individuals, or family-held farm corporations). In 2007, only three farms were owned by non-family held corporations.

After residential/lifestyle farms, the most common type of farms includes retirement farms as well as limited-resource farms.

Growth in farm operators is dominated by older cohorts, 70% of new farmers were older than 55 years old."

Berk Study, 10.2 Trends in Forestry: Summary of Key Trends

"Similar to agriculture, timber production has seen a long pattern of decline due to changing federal land management policies, changing regulatory standards, market trends and the loss of forest land."

It is highly noteworthy that the Washington State Current Use Taxation program regarding timber lands requires a minimum of five acres to be planted in trees. This is one of the criteria that satisfies the state's current use taxation program. According to the County maps, the majority of the lands designated Forest Tier 1 and Tier 2 (40 and 80 acres), are not consistent with the zoning. The Forestry parcels are characterized by much smaller lots than the county designated 40 and 80 acres. The maps are clearly dominated by forestry parcels much smaller in size than the zoning designates.

Overall, the composition, parcelization of the landscape, and nature of employment has changed, and will continue to change throughout Clark County. It is our sincere desire to see the changes in the Comp Plan reflect what the County needs in order to accomplish important outcomes: provide a boost for a thriving regional economy, and help cultivate and nurture a very livable community for the present citizens and for future generations.

----- Original Message -----

From: [Carol Levanen](#)

To: [Euler, Gordon](#) ; [Carol Levanen](#) ; [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](#) ; [Clark County Citizens United Inc.](#) ; [David Madore](#) ; ed.barnes@clark.wa.gov ; [Tom Mielke](#)

Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 10:22 AM

Subject: Re: Committees (This information for public record)

Thanks Gordy,

I think one can say that all of those working at the CASE Center, WSU, food bank and the county would be government folks working along with planners. Mr. Morgan logged his land and has been active with the county ever since. Mr. Zimmerman and Mr. Beaudoin are full time farmers, but Mr. Beaudoin is having a hard time now. There is one horse person, five persons who are involved with land trusts,(also county involved) a handful of persons who provide products to farmers markets and the rest are farmers market people. You seem to believe that because one provides a limited amount of farmers market items, that you are now a farm of long term commercial significance and a full time farmer. Farmers market items can easily be provided by hobby farmers with small back yard gardens on small lots. Food banks and farmers markets are wonderful, but they are a small portion of the equation when you are complying with the GMA mandates for resource lands. I guess you believe such people on committees, who are determining the lives of thousands of rural lands owners is appropriate, but I disagree. That is not what the GMA intended when it mandates the counties to preserve resource lands that have long term commercial significance.

Have a Great Day!

Best Regards, Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary, CCCU, Inc.

From: "Euler, Gordon" <Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov>

To: 'Carol Levanen' <cnldental@yahoo.com>

Cc: "Orjiako, Oliver" <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>; "Alvarez, Jose" <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; "Cook, Christine" <Christine.Cook@clark.wa.gov>

Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 8:12 AM

Subject: RE: Committees (This information for public record)

Carol:

I'm not sure what information you have about the APAC. I counted 18 members on the list I sent you, three of which worked for government agencies. The other 15 represented all manner of working farmers, folks involved with farmers markets, and folks involved with land trusts.

I'm not sure what 'other lists of names' you are looking for, but I have attached a list of Rural Lands Task Force members. At the Board's request, three of the members of the task force came from the APAC.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

From: Carol Levanen [<mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2014 2:10 AM

To: Euler, Gordon; Carol Levanen; 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; Clark County Citizens United Inc.; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Euler, Gordon

Subject: Re: Committees (This information for public record)

Dear Gordy,

I had a glitz with your attachment, but I did get the information for the APAC group. But, who were the people on the other groups that were mentioned? We noted that on the list you provided, there were very few agriculture people in attendance. Most of them were county or other type of officials. It would seem that all of the people on such a committee would be from the agriculture community. Regardless, although CCCU, Inc. can agree with many of the comments in the report, we cannot agree on the recommendations. Please forward me the other lists of names.

Thanks!

Best Regards,

Carol Levanen, Ex. Secretary, CCCU, Inc.

From: "Euler, Gordon" <Gordon.Euler@clark.wa.gov>

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

Cc: "Orjiako, Oliver" <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; "Madore, David" <David.Madore@clark.wa.gov>; "Alvarez, Jose" <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; "Cook, Christine" <Christine.Cook@clark.wa.gov>

Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 3:33 PM

Subject: FW: Committees (This information for public record)

Carol:

The Agricultural Preservation Advisory Committee (APAC) was a group of folks (list attached) chosen by the Board of County Commissioners and guided by Commissioner Stuart to do what the name suggests: to figure out ways to maintain and enhance the agriculture industry in the county. Pat Lee served as staff to the group. As you have seen, the APAC came up with two dozen or so recommendations, many of which were land use-related.

When the Board convened the Rural Lands Task Force, one of their charges was to review the APAC report to see which of the recommendations could be implemented. Two examples: Beef up the county's right-to farm/log ordinance and develop a transfer of development rights (TDR) program. The RLTF recommendation to amend the county's right-to-farm/log ordinance (CCC Chapter 9.26) was looked at, but as proposed would have conflicted with state law. A pilot TDR program was proposed but the idea was rejected by the Board.

Let me know if you want additional information.

Gordy

From: Orjiako, Oliver

Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 11:24 AM

To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose

Cc: Cook, Christine

Subject: FW: Committees (This information for public record)

Hello Gordy:

Please, do you have answers to any of Carol's questions? Thank you.

Oliver

From: Madore, David
Sent: Monday, June 16, 2014 11:19 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Subject: FW: Committees (This information for public record)

FYi

From: Carol Levanen [<mailto:cnldental@yahoo.com>]
Sent: Friday, June 13, 2014 3:29 PM
To: Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed; Carol Levanen; 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; Clark County Citizens United Inc.
Subject: Committees (This information for public record)

Dear Commissioners,

CCCU, Inc. has just accessed a 47 page document supposedly produced by a group of people on the Agriculture Preservation Strategies Committee, that convened in 2008 to 2009. We are not familiar with this group, nor is the public. The **Appendices** note in **A. Agriculture Preservation Committee, B. Public Comments and Survey Summary, C. Clark County Equestrian Survey and G. Recommendations of the Office of Farmland Preservation Task Force**. Besides the 47 page document, there is mentioned a **Future Farming Study**, as well. CCCU, Inc. has been actively participating in Clark County GMA land use plan issues for many years, but is not familiar with of any of these groups or activities. We believe there has been no meaningful public outreach to allow those most affected by these proposals to comment of the information. The Appendices notes the list of the members of the Agriculture Preservation Committee, but does not include that information in the report, or at least it is not available on line for review.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. asks the commissioners who these groups and members are? Who appointed them? Who created the reports for them? Where did they get their information? Why were these documents produced in the first place? What connection do these reports have to county staff? Are any of the persons on these groups employees of the county? Where is the scientific research information to support these reports? There is very little, if any noted in the report. As CCCU, Inc. researches further, it is likely that more questions will arise, that will need to be answered by the county, before any meaningful changes can be made to the Comprehensive Land Use Plan.

Sincerely,

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

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.