

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

* 7 2 5 7 5 3 *

CP 16# 0476

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2014 8:05 AM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: Wait_Comments Comp Plan Alts & EIS
Attachments: Comments on Clark County Comp Plan EIS Alternatives.docx

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Oliver:

Comments from Jude.

Gordy

From: Wait, Judith Ann [<mailto:judith.wait@email.wsu.edu>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 4:51 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Cc: Euler, Gordon
Subject: comments for the record re Comp Plan Alts & EIS

Comments attached.

Thanks for accepting them into the public record,
and for addressing them soon.
signed,
Jude Wait

Recommendations, comments, and issues for Clark County, Washington, to address in the Environmental Impact Statement for/and the 2016 Comprehensive Plan Update.

Please develop a true *Alternative* to the proposed “Alternatives” you have proposed. Otherwise, Alternative 1 is the only choice. If you plan on combining 2 and 3, why don’t you present that upfront? Are you trying to work around the intent and/or letter of Washington State’s Growth Management Act (GMA) or State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)? One is not an alternative to the other. The only comparable Alternatives are 1 and 2, or 1 and 3.

Per the comments submitted by Futurewise, we agree. We also agree with the comments submitted by several members of the Friends of Clark County. Together, they would make a good start at a viable Alternative. The two documents developed by the Clark County Food System Council are also herein incorporated, as previous comments (to the SEIS Scoping) stated, as they include recommendations for conserving food production agriculture.

Furthermore, you should develop an Alternative that includes a full range of options for preserving rural and urban agricultural (and permaculture and native vegetation areas), urban and rural forest and prairie, wetlands and “shorelines,” fish and wildlife habitat (including pollinator and other beneficial insect habitat), surface and ground water quality and quantity, parks and recreation, and other such “natural resource” values.

This Alternative could be called the Sustainable Future Alternative, and it should include Principles of Smart Growth to address the other issues, some of which are touched upon in your Proposed “Alternative” 2 and 3, such as transportation and regional travel, parks and recreation (add: for the region including integrating/collaborating with the Cities in Clark County).

See also the two sets of comments submitted on Sept 1, 2014, on the (Supplemental) EIS from Jude Wait (reincorporated herein by reference, so not repeated). The proposed Sustainable Future Alternative could address the issues raised (there and herein). As well, additional Elements of the Comprehensive Plan, such as the heretofore recommended Agriculture Element should be included. ...and would be both comprehensive and integrated into Water and Environment Elements. To evaluate the Sustainable Futures Alternative, and compare Alternatives, use a vision for a resilient future, a future we will be proud to promote for our grandchildren’s grandchildren—also commonly referred to as a *sustainable* future—as evaluation criteria.

Get some help with the recommendations herein, such as about Smart Growth and Sustainable Development, from MRSC <http://www.mrsc.org/subjects/planning/smartgrowth.aspx> and the American Planning Association (whose Washington chapter had a conference in Spokane in October, 2014—see the *Legacy and Prophecy* brochure for resource contacts). There are resources galore from which Clark County could choose to use. Join the ICLEI’s Local Governments for Sustainability USA and use their toolkit <<http://www.iclei.org/news/press-room/press-releases/iclei-launches-sustainability-planning-toolkit-to-accelerate-movement-of-sustainable-cities-and-counties>>.

In the meantime, until a true Alternative is co-developed (with true community participation), one that ensures sustainable growth management, the Environmental review of proposed aspects of Alternatives could allow phasing, pursuant to the provision of the SEPA Rules [WAC 197-11-060(5)]. For example, “Phasing allows environmental review to focus on issues that are ready for decision, while deferring decisions that require additional information to the future” (See also Snohomish County’s Environmental Policy Code (Chapter 30.61 SCC); referred to in the Comprehensive Plan 2015 Update Dreaft EIS Volume 1 Snohomish County).

As such, No proposed alterations to the parcel sizes, current zoning, or other designations pertaining to Rural parcels, Forest parcels, Reserve, Holding, or Agriculture, are acceptable at this time.

Arguments already made by Futurewise, Friends of Clark County, Agricultural Preservation Committee, Future of Farming, American Farmland Trust, and Clark County Food System Council documents (herein included by reference) indicate the need for more information and a solid plan for implementation of a full range of tools, strategies, and programs—Agricultural preservation tools etc—as well as the Washington State Food System Roundtable principles and goals. Until Clark County can develop an Alternative that ensures future sustainability principles and laws are presented and evaluated, including those necessary to mitigate adverse impacts, Clark County should stick to the real “map cleanup” efforts such as making the color scheme legible.

For example, in the proposed Alternative 2, a downsizing of parcel size, permitting subdivision (and all its consequences) would be imposed, whether on the people who said they wanted to keep the current parcel size designation, as well as the people who would like a smaller lot size category. Yet there are other solutions, which would be much better in the long run, for all the people—those who own parcels, those who returned the survey (aka Census but not even close to a scientifically valid survey nor census that should be conducted to inform policy), and all residents of Clark County, now and into the future.

Welcome to the future Alternative: Young people want to farm. People want to eat locally produced wholesome food. Citizens want good governance and good health. We know we need the birds and bees to cultivate healthy habitats. The honorable activity of farming, and growing food that feeds people, is not a mere “hobby.” Food farming is vital for our present lives, for the future for our great-great-grandchildren, and for resilient communities. Evaluate the Sustainable Future Alternative for Clark County.

Respectfully submitted,

Jude Wait,

Co-editor/researcher/author of the *Sustainable World Sourcebook* (2010);

Clark County resident