

From: [Oliver Orjiako](#)
To: [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
Subject: FW: 2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Update
Date: Thursday, December 5, 2024 8:12:24 AM
Attachments: [CPC-Public_Respons_05DEC2024.pdf](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)
[image006.png](#)

Hi Jeff,

FYI and for the record. Thanks.



OLIVER ORJIAKO
Director
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.2280



From: jnanney56@gmail.com <jnanney56@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, December 5, 2024 5:11 AM
To: Gary Medvigy <Gary.Medvigy@clark.wa.gov>; Glen Yung <Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov>; Michelle Belkot <Michelle.Belkot@clark.wa.gov>; Karen Bowerman <Karen.Bowerman@clark.wa.gov>; Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Kathleen Otto <Kathleen.Otto@clark.wa.gov>; Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; Rebecca Messinger <Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: 2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Update

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.

Dear Council Members,

I am writing on behalf of the Chelatchie Prairie Coalition regarding the proposed agenda item for December 6, 2024, titled "2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Update."

First and foremost, we urge the council to defer all decisions regarding the DEIS alternatives to be studied until the new council takes office in January. The recent election results clearly

indicate that the residents and voters seek a change in direction that aligns with their needs and priorities. The current council members, including the Chair, who will soon be retiring, do not represent the views of the community. While the Chair emphasized the importance of maintaining the integrity of this process, rushing through these alternatives less than a month before the new council's inauguration—especially during an already crowded agenda requiring a special setting—raises concerns about lame-duck politics. It appears that outgoing councilors are attempting to impose their perspectives despite the electoral outcomes. While we acknowledge the tight timeline, it is important to note that many delays have stemmed from previous actions by the council and the cities' failure to submit their plans in a timely manner. Should this council choose to proceed with these alternatives, we respectfully submit our comments as follows:

1. Approve the DEIS Alternatives recommended by the Planning Commission with the following exceptions:

- Deny any recommendation from the Planning Commission to reopen the VBLM process by considering the 10/30 Market Factor.

- Deny any expansion of Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) proposed by any city that would convert agricultural lands or rural lands intended to buffer agricultural areas. Cities have already created urban-style growth within their limits, often encroaching on agricultural lands. All rural lands between city limits and agricultural zones should remain protected to prevent further pressure on agricultural lands. Additionally, any conversion of these lands would be inconsistent with *King County v. Friends of Sammamish Valley* and WAC 365-190-040 and 050. Any site-specific requests outside proposed Urban Growth Boundaries should also be rejected.

- Deny Camas' proposal to include Forest Lands for reasons similar to those for denying agricultural land inclusion.

2. All Site-Specific Requests (SPR) related to Surface Mining Overlays (SMOs) represent an attempt by an out-of-state mineral rights corporation to acquire land. Decisions regarding SMOs should be deferred to the new council, which can conduct a comprehensive county-wide study similar to those conducted between 2011 and 2014. It is important to remember that this previous comprehensive study took three years and involved numerous work sessions and public hearings focused on designating appropriate lands as Mineral Lands. Proceeding with these SPRs now would violate the Growth Management Act (GMA) and undermine public involvement, particularly impacting residents near proposed SMOs where rezoning to heavy industrial use would conflict with existing zoning and land uses.

3. The county is currently out of compliance with the Growth Management Act, resulting in significant losses in grants and loans. Approving site-specific reviews or allowing conversions of agricultural, rural, or forest lands will worsen this non-compliance and lead to costly

litigation.

Thank you for your attention to these important matters.

Best regards,

John E. Nanney

CHELATCHIE PRAIRIE COALITION (CPC)

A Chelatchie Prairie Landowners LLC

President - Board of Directors

Founding Member

<https://www.facebook.com/Chelatchie/>

360-524-4014



December 5th, 2024

Subject: 2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Update

TO:

Chair/Dist 4: Gary Medvigy, Gary.Medvigy@clark.wa.gov

District 1: Glen Yung, Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov

District 2: Michelle Belkot, Michelle.Belkot@clark.wa.gov

District 3: Karen Bowerman, Karen.Bowerman@clark.wa.gov

District 5: Sue Marshall, Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov

CC:

County Manager: Kathleen Otto Kathleen.Otto@clark.wa.gov

Director Community Planning: Oliver Orjiako Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov

Panner III, Jose Alvarez, Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov

County Clerk: Rebecca Messenger Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov

Dear Council Members,

I am writing on behalf of the Chelatchie Prairie Coalition regarding the proposed agenda item for December 6, 2024, titled "2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Update."

First and foremost, we urge the council to defer all decisions regarding the DEIS alternatives to be studied until the new council takes office in January. The recent election results clearly indicate that the residents and voters seek a change in direction that aligns with their needs and priorities. The current council members, including the Chair, who will soon be retiring, do not represent the views of the community. While the Chair emphasized the importance of maintaining the integrity of this process, rushing through these alternatives less than a month before the new council's inauguration—especially during an already crowded agenda requiring a special setting—raises concerns about lame-duck politics. It appears that outgoing councilors are attempting to impose their perspectives despite the electoral outcomes. While we acknowledge the tight timeline, it is important to note that many delays have stemmed from previous actions by the council and the cities' failure to submit their plans in a timely manner. Should this council choose to proceed with these alternatives, we respectfully submit our comments as follows:

1. Approve the DEIS Alternatives recommended by the Planning Commission with the following exceptions:

- Deny any recommendation from the Planning Commission to reopen the VBLM process by considering the 10/30 Market Factor.

- Deny any expansion of Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) proposed by any city that would convert agricultural lands or rural lands intended to buffer agricultural areas. Cities have already created urban-style growth within their limits, often encroaching on agricultural lands. All rural lands

between city limits and agricultural zones should remain protected to prevent further pressure on agricultural lands. Additionally, any conversion of these lands would be inconsistent with King County v. Friends of Sammamish Valley and WAC 365-190-040 and 050. Any site-specific requests outside proposed Urban Growth Boundaries should also be rejected.

- Deny Camas' proposal to include Forest Lands for reasons similar to those for denying agricultural land inclusion.

2. All Site-Specific Requests (SPR) related to Surface Mining Overlays (SMOs) represent an attempt by an out-of-state mineral rights corporation to acquire land. Decisions regarding SMOs should be deferred to the new council, which can conduct a comprehensive county-wide study similar to those conducted between 2011 and 2014. It is important to remember that this previous comprehensive study took three years and involved numerous work sessions and public hearings focused on designating appropriate lands as Mineral Lands. Proceeding with these SPRs now would violate the Growth Management Act (GMA) and undermine public involvement, particularly impacting residents near proposed SMOs where rezoning to heavy industrial use would conflict with existing zoning and land uses.

3. The county is currently out of compliance with the Growth Management Act, resulting in significant losses in grants and loans. Approving site-specific reviews or allowing conversions of agricultural, rural, or forest lands will worsen this non-compliance and lead to costly litigation.

Thank you for your attention to these important matters.

Best regards,



John E. Nanney

CHELATCHIE PRAIRIE COALITION (CPC)



A Chelatchie Prairie Landowners LLC

Board of Directors

Founding Member

<https://www.facebook.com/Chelatchie/>

360-524-4014