


Schroader, Kathy



From: NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 3:21 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Alternate 1

Comments:

Stop pandering to special interests and start considering the real impact of alternative 4 on county infrastructure and services.

Alternative 1 is consistent with the GMA, including its goals and principles (Chapter 36.70A RCW), according to the latest Growth Management Hearings Board and the latest court decisions.

Alternative 1 is adequate for the 20-year projected growth estimate.

The DSEIS supports choosing Alternative 1 as the preferred option as it states that Alternative 1 will have the least impact on all the elements it considered: earth resources; water resources; fish and wildlife resources; energy and natural resources; land and shoreline use (which includes housing); transportation; and public facilities and utilities.

Alternative 1 is the most friendly to Clark County taxpayers and ratepayers, rural and non-rural, because ratepayers of all wealth levels subsidize the cost growth. Growth does not support itself.

Planned growth, as currently exists is frugal and saves large areas needed for future farms, forests, greenspaces and commercial/industrial and multi-unit housing developments.

Submitted by:
Randall Pearl

Email: rpearl@comcast.net

Address: