

Schroader, Kathy



From: Gretchen Starke <gstarke@pacifier.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 25, 2016 5:02 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: comments on the growth plan
Attachments: growth plan update, written comments, final eis, may 2016 doc

VANCOUVER AUDUBON SOCIETY

P O Box 1966 Vancouver, WA 98668-1966
www.vancouveraudubon.org



Comments on the Clark County Update of the Growth Management Plan ***ATTN: Oliver Orjako***

As an organization that focuses on birds, appreciates birds, and advocates for birds, Vancouver Audubon's comments will be from the viewpoint of birds. Of the alternatives presented, we support Alternative 1.

For any alternative except Alternative 1, the need for new roads will impact wildlife. Each new road has the potential to fragment habitat. Habitat that is fragmented is less useful to many species, especially those species humans find desirable such as warblers. On the other hand, species that humans find less desirable, such as starlings, do well in fragmented habitat. Therefore, for wildlife, Alternative 1 is the better one.

Of course, the actual placement of buildings in habitat will displace wildlife. The disturbance of wildlife from new development extends beyond its footprint. From vehicles coming and going from the development to children running around, many species will be forced out to be replaced by more tolerant species -- such as crows. Allowing more development as provided for in all alternatives outside the urban growth boundaries will reduce the populations of more desirable species of wildlife. Therefore, for wildlife, Alternative 1 is the better one.

Certain species of wildlife, such as ducks, beavers, and otters are dependent on surface water, especially water that produces food such as fish or water plants. In general, all species of wildlife need water for drinking. There is a connection between surface water and ground water. If something goes wrong with ground water in quantity or quality, it could show up in surface water. Development means impervious surfaces such as roofs, sidewalks, roads (especially roads), and parking lots. Impervious surfaces prevent rain water from replenishing ground water, thereby contributing to potential reduction of water in ponds and streams. Alternative 1 provides for development within existing urban growth boundaries, rather than allowing extensive development beyond them. Therefore, for wildlife, Alternative 1 is the better one.

Sincerely,

Gretchen Starke
Conservation Chair,
Vancouver Audubon Society