



# Public Comment

# SEPA Alternatives

April 14, 2015  
(7:30 a.m.)

# 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

*What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?*

All Statements sorted chronologically

As of April 14, 2015, 7:34 AM



*As with any public comment process, participation in Engage Clark County is voluntary. The statements in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.*

# 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

*What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?*

As of April 14, 2015, 7:34 AM, this forum had:

Attendees: 382

All Statements: 88

Hours of Public Comment: 4.4

This topic started on April 7, 2015, 5:27 PM.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Na. - not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 11:53 PM

I submit for the record my objection to the inclusion of Alternative 4 for consideration and analysis in the SEPA Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement on the grounds that

- It conflicts with the intent of the Growth Management Act by knowingly creating conditions that support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands; that set the stage for infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection; and that risk the depletion of ground and surface water supplies.
- It creates real financial risk to taxpayers in terms of wasted planning staff time; likely increases in property taxes to all property owners to cover infrastructure development, required environmental mitigations, and increases in property tax valuations; and costs to defend against likely lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA rules and regulations.
- It was developed contrary to customary and normal planning and public participation processes which violates the spirit, and possibly the fact, of the appearance of fairness doctrine as it is applied in Washington state.

Specifically in regards to the potential violation of the appearance of fairness doctrine: I understand that Councilor Madore may not be in technical violation of the appearance of fairness doctrine, but his actions are contrary to everything county government states they are doing to be more transparent. It is my understanding the Councilor Madore has had a major role in drafting and revising Alternative 4 in response to requests from Clark County Citizens United (CCCU) a single, special interest group claiming to speak for rural landowners seeking redress from what they feel to have been a taking of their property rights by the GMA. It is also my understanding that Councilor Madore directed Peter Silliman, who is not a member of the Community Planning Department, nor a planner at all, to help these few individuals craft a plan to completely restructure rural and resource land zoning. I also understand that Councilor Madore, without consulting planning staff, circumvented the normal and customary practice for developing comprehensive plan information by having GIS staff work directly with him on Alternative 4. This action appears to have been a deliberate exclusion of the county's professional planning staff and a direct contravention of the procedure used to vet the other Alternatives, all of which is, in effect, a willful circumventing of the public process used to vet Alternatives 1-3

I recently reviewed 123 pages of emails, released through an FOIA request for all emails between the dates of 10/01/2014 and 2/18/2015 of David Madore, Tom Mielke, Jeanne Stewart, Oliver Orjiako and Peter Silliman with the keywords: Carol Levanen; Susan Rasmussen; Growth Management Act; Rural Alternative; Alternative #4; and Clark County Citizens United.

By my count there are approximately 60 emails in this FOIA request that document the breadth and depth of input CCCU has had in the drafting of Alternative 4, to the exclusion of all other members of the public. There were no emails to or from any other groups or individuals, much less the planning staff, despite the expansive nature of the keywords "Growth Management Act; Rural Alternative; and Alternative #4." In addition to the extent of email input from CCCU into the drafting of Alternative 4, in what was a most unusual circumstance, there was an individual who identified as being an officer of CCCU actually seated at the table with county councilors and representatives of the cities during the board work session on March 11, 2015. I am told that this too, is neither usual nor customary procedure.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

These reasons are the basis of my concern that the development of Alternative 4 appears to violate both the Public Participation element of the GMA and the County's own public participation resolution. In my opinion, choosing to include Alternative 4 in the EIS analysis is a failure of the council's fiduciary responsibility to taxpayers and a failure of the council's ethical duty to serve a diverse public with fairness and impartiality. I therefore request that Alternative not be considered as an alternative for analysis in the SEPA process.

Finally, given Councilor Madore's often stated concerns about integrity and transparency, and his statements that other Boards and political bodies not hide behind attorney-client privilege, I am also requesting that the council waive all exceptions to the production of documents under the public records act, including the waiver of its attorney-client privilege, and release to the public into this record all documents pertaining to advice they have received from counsel and all of the legal counsel public records to planning staff. I make this request so that we, the public, have full and transparent information regarding the county councilors' understanding of what laws, rules and regulations they may be choosing to ignore in going forward with including Alternative 4 in the EIS review. As a demonstration of his commitment to transparency I ask Councilor Madore to lead the council in waiving all privileges and to produce all documents between legal and planning staff and the councilors, and between legal and the county manager regarding this Comprehensive Plan update.

---

Judy ZEIDER inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 11:03 PM

I am a resident of what is left of rural Clark County. I generally support Alternative #1 and definitely oppose Alternative #4. Alternative #4 would allow unplanned sprawl where public services are already stretched to their limit. Staff estimates that Alternative #4 would add approximately 7,931 new lots to the rural areas bringing the total to potentially 17,321 new lots, some as small as 1 acre. My family is on a well and septic system. The addition of almost 8000 more wells and septic systems in rural Clark County would endanger groundwater. In addition, rural roads are crumbling, law enforcement and fire/EMS resources are stretched thin, and portable classrooms are installed around even newer schools in the Battle Ground School District. Thank you for considering my input.

1 Supporter

---

michael Benson inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 11:03 PM

Alternative 4 flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that:

- \_Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,000 new rural lots
- \_Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection
- Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:

- \_ Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners
- \_ Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don't divide and develop their land, taxes will

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Name

pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases  
\_ Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations

Alternative 1 is the best choice:

\_ Already plans for 7000 new lots according to population assumptions adopted by the county  
\_ Stays out of legal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected

I urge Councilors to not include Alternative 4 in the SEPA analysis

1 Supporter

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 13, 2015, 11:01 PM

I am a resident of what is left of rural Clark County. I generally support Alternative #1 and definitely oppose Alternative #4. Alternative #4 would allow unplanned sprawl where public services are already stretched to the limit. Staff estimates that Alternative #4 would add approximately 7,931 new lots to the rural areas bringing the total to potentially 17,321 new lots, some as small as 1 acre. My family is on a well and septic system. The addition of almost 8000 more wells and septic systems in rural Clark County would endanger groundwater. In addition, rural roads are crumbling, law enforcement and fire/EMS resources are stretched thin, and portable classrooms are installed around recently built schools in the Battle Ground School District. Judy Zeider

---

3i Benson inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 10:18 PM

The development of Alternative 4 violates the county's own resolution (2014-06-17), which adopted a population figure of 562,000 people with 90% of the increases to occur within the current UGAs and 10% to non-urban.

These assumptions are woven in to the planning of all Alternatives: 1, 2 & 3 but not Alternative 4. Alternative 4, with the potential for 17,000 new rural parcels (almost 8000 more than under two of the three alternatives), which would have the impact of increasing the total population at a minimum of 21,280 in the county forecast, all of which to occur in the rural area.

In order to keep the 90/10 split, the County would have to select a population increase for the entire county of 191,000. Such an increase in the rural area is not only unsustainable but it is in violation County's resolutions and disregards GMA standards for planning.

By abiding by the principals of Smart Growth, 90% of population should occur within the urban growth boundary. Open space preservation supports smart growth goals by bolstering local economies, preserving critical environmental areas, improving community quality of life, and guiding new growth into existing communities.

Alternative 4 deviates from the resolutions that this board adopted in January and June. I therefore request that Alternative not be considered as an alternative for analysis in the SEPA process.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

1 Supporter

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (unverified)

April 13, 2015, 10:04 PM

I support Alternative 1, and waiting until additional commissioners are on the board to decide.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 10:01 PM

In the interests of protecting our community and preserving our resources I support Alternative 1. Alternative 4 is a travesty and a blatant subversion of the process and was conceived in a vacuum.

2 Supporters

---

Karen Kumpula inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 9:40 PM

As a property owner who would be affected by Alt 4 I am strongly against it. The infrastructure in my area, small farm roads, wells and water supply would not support the change of AG-20 to R-5. We have active farming in my community that would be severely impacted by Alt.4.

This plan was created by a county councilor with no community planning experience.

Alt 4 will raise taxes for rezoned properties. The County can only freeze their portion of our taxes. They don't control school levies, ports, state funding. Please do not vote for alt. 4!

2 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 9:39 PM

I support alternative 1 because it was developed when Clark County was growing at its fastest. Though the recession hit and the growth did not happen as expected, alternative 1 maintains room for future growth.

I oppose Alternative 4 for many reasons. It is not related to the the planning goals set forth in RCW 36.70a.020(1), (2), (8), (9), (10), (11), and (12). I feel there was not adequate public representation in the planning process, which violates violates 020(11).

As rural landowner, I feel that Alt 4 does not represent the desires of the rural landowner base. If Alt 4 is approved, it will change the character of Clark County from its current rural state to a less desirable (but more profitable for a select few individuals) suburban county.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

2 Supporters

---

John Fitzsimmons inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 9:30 PM

I am in favor of alternatives 1-3. Thank You.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 9:27 PM

As alternate 2 and 3 are not in the best interests of ALL clark county citizens, and alternate 4 was thrown together by an incompetent that has absolutely no planning experience what so ever with no public input process and therefore is not a legal option, I support alternative one only.

On top.of that, shame on the other councilors for not getting control of the rouge and even letting alt 4 even get as far as it has....we county residents shall not forget the lack of governance during election time!!!

1 Supporter

---

Alice Linker inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 9:13 PM

Resource land, especially agriculture and forests, will be vital to a healthy future for Clark County. I support Alt. 1.

---

2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 13, 2015, 8:58 PM

I support Alternative 1, which preserves the large tracts of productive farmland and minimizes the subdivision on these parcels. Farmland is invaluable to our community and will serve us well as young, innovative citizens get into small acreage farming and support our local economy. We should focus on higher density developments on sites that have been abandoned or can be redeveloped and not gobble up additional natural open spaces, both farm and forest. These types of landcover are important to the quality of life and the high level of livability in our region. I strongly oppose Alternative 4, which has not been vetted and is some awful idea of Californication of SW Washington. The exact reason people leave California. We must work harder to combine our desire to provide for growth and balance the protection of prime farmland as such. People need to eat and the effects of climate change and drought in California only reinforces the importance of spreading out agricultural infrastructure. Our climate and lifestyles as well as values provide a perfect place for farmers to thrive, and the County should be helping not hurting these efforts.

---

Don Joling inside Clark County (unverified)

April 13, 2015, 8:14 PM

Do ling-



---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

I disagree with Alt 4 for many of the same reasons stated by others in the forum: One commissioner, untrained in urban growth and land management coming up with a last minute plan- behind closed doors at the behest of one small special interest group that has already lost in court.

No plan for how or who will pay for the infrastructure that will be required to support a potential 20,000 new residents, especially given Alt 4 is not zoned to provide that many jobs.

Water: As recently as the mid- 1990's, there was a moratorium on building in and around Battleground due to the lack of water. There's currently a historic drought in California, and many of those residents will relocate to Washington in search of more relaxed water laws. It's my opinion that our commissioner doesn't realize that water in Clark County isn't infinite.

Opening the county to yet another taxpayer funded defense of leadership only following the rules it sees fit to abide by, has to stop. Now.

Thank you.

---

Sue J Cannard inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 7:13 PM

I support alternative one, the position of Friends of Clark County

4 Supporters

---

Craig Lane inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 6:16 PM

As a resident of North County I do not support Alternative 4. I want alternatives considered that went through the normal, deliberative process rather than something thrown in at the last minute.

2 Supporters

---

David McDonald inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 5:33 PM

[https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/1330tc7alw8g.4y7/BOCC-Ltr-FOCC\\_Comments.pdf](https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/1330tc7alw8g.4y7/BOCC-Ltr-FOCC_Comments.pdf)

### 1 Attachment

[https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/1330tc7alw8g.4y7/BOCC-Ltr-FOCC\\_Comments.pdf](https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/1330tc7alw8g.4y7/BOCC-Ltr-FOCC_Comments.pdf) (2.3 MB)

1 Supporter

---

Tim Trohimovich outside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 4:32 PM

Dear County Councilors:

Futurewise is very concerned about Alternative 4. As was explained in our November 13, 2014 letter enclosed, increasing densities in the county's agricultural, forest, and rural areas will not protect the county's agricultural and forest industries or rural character. The county also lacks the available water to support the rural density

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

increases and re-designations and rezones. Further, there is no need to increase the urban growth areas at this time. The county's planned 20 year population growth can be accommodated in the existing urban growth areas. This will save money for the county's taxpayers and ratepayers. Moving forward with Alternative 4 commits the county to years of litigation and ultimately having to reverse course like the last comprehensive plan update. Save the taxpayers money, adopt Alternative 1.  
Thank you for considering our comments.  
Tim Trohimovich, AICP  
Director of Planning & Law Futurewise  
tim@futurewise.org

### 1 Attachment

[https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/13300laatmyo.3j3/Futurewise\\_Comments\\_on\\_Comp\\_Plan\\_Alternatives\\_Nov\\_13\\_2014.pdf](https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/13300laatmyo.3j3/Futurewise_Comments_on_Comp_Plan_Alternatives_Nov_13_2014.pdf) (223 KB)

---

John Karpinski inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 3:49 PM

Dear Clark County Counselors:

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on behalf of CCNRC and myself on Clark County's proposed 2015 Growth Management Act update.

Sadly, I must inform the County that their planning efforts, and particularly Alternative 4, clearly and unequivocally violate Washington's Growth Management Act. Only the "No change" Alternative #1 complies with the Act.

Alternative 4 violates GMA requirements for public participation

Washington's Growth Management Act requires "early, open, and continuous" public participation in the preparation of growth management plans.

Here, Alternative four was irregularly done outside of the normal public review process, and without benefit of County planning or legal staff input. See Columbian article of 4/13/15, incorporated by reference.

Also, Alt 4 was apparently designed to accommodate a disgruntled special interest group that repeatedly lost its GMA appeals;

See the following decisions in 95-2-0067c - Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al .

3/20/1995 Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al, Final Decision and Order  
12/6/1995 Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al, Order on Reconsideration  
10/1/1996 Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al, Compliance Order and Order of Invalidity

See also the following Opinions of the Growth Board AFTER the Poyfair remand

2/5/1998 Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al, Compliance Order and Order of Invalidity

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

4/30/1998 Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al, Order on Reconsideration  
5/11/1999 Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al, Compliance Order

### II. LEGAL STANDARD TO EXPAND UGA'S NOT FOLLOWED :

The County did not follow the rules for expanding UGA boundaries, whether by sequencing, use of urban reserve, or avoiding protecting resource lands. This is error.

#### A. COUNTY DIDN'T FOLLOW THE STANDARDS FOR NEW URBAN GROWTH LOCATION OF RCW 36.70A.110(3).

The following legal requirements was not used in the County's Alternatives 2,3 and 4:

(3) Urban growth should be located first in areas already characterized by urban growth that have adequate existing public facility and service capacities to serve such development, second in areas already characterized by urban growth that will be served adequately by a combination of both existing public facilities and services and any additional needed public facilities and services that are provided by either public or private sources, and third in the remaining portions of the urban growth areas.

#### B. NO AVOIDANCE/PROTECTION OF AGRICULTURAL LANDS.

Clark County made no attempt to avoid existing Ag lands, allowing for the conversion of literally 1000's of acres of resource land into incomparable zones that do not protect the resource lands.

This continues the County's illegal efforts to develop resource land that has repeatedly found by the Growth Board, Clark Co Superior Court, and Washington's Court of appeals to violate the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.

See 95-2-0067c - Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al ,  
see also 07-2-0027 Karpinski, et al v. Clark County, et al, Final Decision and Order

### III County Growth plan violates GMA's requirements for rural planning in RCW 36.70A.070 (5)

Clark County's Growth plan violates the following rural protection provisions of RCW 36.70A.070 (5):

#### A RCW 36.70A.070 (5) (b):

(b) Rural development. The rural element shall .....accommodate appropriate rural densities and uses that are not characterized by urban growth and that are consistent with rural character.

#### B RCW 36.70A.070 (5) (c)

(c) Measures governing rural development. The rural element shall include measures that apply to rural development and protect the rural character of the area, as established by the county, by:

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

- (i) Maintaining or otherwise controlling rural development;
- (ii) Assuring visual compatibility of rural development with the surrounding rural area;
- (iii) Reducing the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development in the rural area;
- (iv) Protecting critical areas, as provided in RCW 36.70A.060, and surface water and groundwater resources; and
- (v) Protecting against conflicts with the use of agricultural, forest, and mineral resource lands designated under RCW 36.70A.170.

IV Growth management plan over allocates industrial land, leading to additional residential development and sprawl.

The Growth Plan over-allocates job land needs and allows conversion of "jobs" lands into housing by the County's watering down of the "no net loss" of industrial lands. This has previously been found by the NWGMHB to be in violation of the GMA in 95-2-0067c - See Achen, et al v. Clark County, et al .

### V Conclusion

Each of the County Councilor's duties and oath of office requires you to follow all laws of the State of Washington; not just the laws you agree with. Please immediately fix these egregious violations of Washington's Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.

Sincerely yours,

John S. Karpinski

---

Jennifer Barnes inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 3:43 PM

I am 100% AGAINST ALT 4 for many of the same reasons others have mentioned. Most importantly, this alternative completely ignores the fact that such changes require major and expensive infrastructure that is not in place. This is "a plan with no planning" or preparation and a terrible idea for Clark County.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 3:32 PM

We are longtime North County residents and are concerned about the need for an expedited decision on this issue – one that will affect many of us for decades to come. We ask the board and others involved in this process to defer this decision until the board has additional members to guide this process. Growth is not a bad thing but such growth will require infrastructure improvements to our roads, schools, fire and other safety

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

systems. The people who desire accelerated growth are also those who would ask for waived impact and building fees, and refute the need to raise the funds (taxes) to meet these needs. The cost of this growth has to be carefully evaluated. And we don't see that these costs have been estimated or that there is consensus, particularly on the impacts of option 4. (It is very difficult to interpret option 4, as the color schematics aren't similar to the other plans.) We repeat, please defer this decision until the expanded (voter-requested) board is populated.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 3:28 PM

There are so many things wrong about Alt4. First of all, zoning revisions require due diligence in preplanning for all the infrastructure needed to serve the growth and needs of any new proposed development. Schools, roads, local community needs and marketability just to name a few. Let's look at the areas affected by downsizing lot size and the impact it would have on each community. Schools. We are already at full capacity in most high schools. The roads, try driving on Hwy 503 and Main st. in Battle Ground. It's beyond capacity now. Simply put, we all know the cart has to come before the horse. Plan ahead for growth. It is what the planning board is here to do. It is what they are trained to do. Who benefits from Alt4? Certainly not the majority of us. As a Realtor here working with rural land sales I do not see any big demand for rural acre lots. The biggest issue I have is how can a person with no experience in zoning and planning just bring a proposition to the table? No to Alt4.

---

A.G. Flynn inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 2:07 PM

Land use and growth alternatives as presented on this website are difficult to compare coherently. GIS or cartographic systems were not used properly to allow for across-the-alternative comparisons. Legends, colors and overlays should match on each proposal. Sadly this basic instrument was not used to citizens' advantage. Shortcomings in basic presentation aside, it is clear that Clark County should WAIT to implement any plan proposals or alternatives until a full council is seated and sworn in 2016.

Any attempt to foreclose on this important process before all five members are seated could open the county to lawsuits, frivolous and otherwise, by landowners on every side of this debate. At this date there is no need to decide the future of land use in Clark County. The State of Washington will allow deliberation in 2016, so no "straw man" arguments about timing need be advanced.

IF comments are regarded by existing council electees the first easy move is REJECTION of Alternative 4. Opening rural lands to sprawl and foolish infrastructure development will cause basic quality-of-life in our county to suffer. Several other agencies with high stakes have not been consulted on this poorly crafted proposal. WSDOT, school districts and fire suppression organizations need to comment before it could even be considered viable. Summary: REJECT Alternative 4.

IF the current panel of county representatives feels they must choose from the existing alternatives before they are joined by a full and complete council they would be wise to select Alternative 1 or Alternative 2. Either of these proposals allow Clark County to continue metered growth and actively seek compatible industry while maintaining good relationships with all municipalities, school districts and area service providers. Summary: Accept Alternative 1 or Alternative 2.

OVERALL - Clark County should wait to decide this issue until a full council is available to vote in 2016.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Alternative 4 should be rejected as incomplete and flawed.

Alternative 1 is acceptable.

Alternative 2 is acceptable.

---

Elizabeth Campbell inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 2:53 PM

I support Alternative 2. It allows for ample, appropriate growth and business development in Clark County. I particularly oppose Alternative 4 which is contrary to the intent of the Growth Management Act. It would result in sprawl and an increased demand for services in our rural areas.

1 Supporter

---

Rachel Woodward Clark (unverified)

April 13, 2015, 2:27 PM

I support option 1 or 2, I strongly oppose option 4. Option 4 is strongly against agriculture. After moving here from an area where farmers and farmland are cherished, I am surprised to see such option 4. Farming, livestock and open space should be supported and we should not be looking at extending the urban growth boundary and giving up so much undeveloped land to development of business parks and housing subdivisions. Homeowners are already feeling pushed off of their own properties by developers due to increasing taxes. Open space should be preserved for the public to enjoy.

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 13, 2015, 1:37 PM

Alternative 1 is my vote and is best for our community.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 1:22 PM

The County Councilors should adopt Alternative 1. The current plan provides plenty of land for growth, keeps large acreage for farm and forest uses, avoids the costs of providing services to many small parcels located all over the county, and ensures we will have large enough parcels to provide for economic development/local jobs.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 11:42 AM

What makes Clark county a great place to live is the amount of farm land and open space; this (north Clark county) is a place where people want to come to get away from urban sprawl, breathe fresh air and experience the country. The extremely valuable resource and commodity which is Clark county is being and will be lost forever with each parcel of land developed for high density housing and unnecessary commercial use. Clark county would be better served by growing up instead of out, focusing on developing tourism, thinking about the effect of these growth alternatives on future generations, and remembering that these growth alternatives go

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

against the Growth Management Act, and knowingly creates conditions that:

Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,321 rural lots

Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection

Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:

Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners

Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don't divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase

More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases

Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations

1 Supporter

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 10:06 AM

It is my opinion, and shared with a growing number of concerned citizens, that this "Alternative 4", currently being considered, is the creation of an inexperienced policy analyst (a member of the Councilors' staff), at the direction of a County Councilor; and it came to be only as a result of Councilors' relationship with Clark County Citizens United, a special interest group. It needs to be noted that CCCU alleges representation of "6,000" (sometimes 8,000) rural landowners in Clark County, although absolutely no documentation exists for this number to be verified.

CCCU does not represent all rural landowners but is receiving special treatment. This was unethically, and perhaps illegally, reinforced by that fact that CCCU was the only special interest group invited to the work session held on March 11, 2015, where CCCU was supposed to be representing rural land-owners. This action itself flies in the face of a goal of the Growth Management Act, "Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts" (Goal #11).

Other community groups, such as the Clark/Cowlitz Farm Bureau, Friends of Clark County, Friends of East Fork, Clark County Food System Council or any number of rural neighborhood associations - of which none were invited to the table at a particular, well-attended and very public work session (March 11) - have not received the attention or the ear of the majority of the current County Councilors, and, in fact, conversations have been denied ..... conversations, for example, regarding TDR's. TDR's have been suggested and encouraged by no fewer than three community groups for the last 20 years. Absolutely no consideration has been given to this program.

This is but one issue surrounding the development of Alternative 4 as an update to the Comprehensive Growth Plan. There are numerous violations that would be created by the acceptance of this alternative: suburban sprawl, critical depletion of ground and surface water available in rural areas, loss of productive ag land, potential infrastructure failures, increase in property taxes - and more.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

It is obvious that all continuing efforts to pursue Alternative 4 is an investment of taxpayer money on something that should never come to be, and, at worst, will result in sizeable lawsuits. This is an irresponsible or even unethical use of tax money.

2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 13, 2015, 9:53 AM

I support alternative 1. Sue Cannard

---

George Espinosa inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 9:42 AM

After attending most of the "Open Houses", submitting at least two petitions and making numerous appeals to the BOCC since 2007, we have yet to see that all the public input and personal appeals has influenced the direction of this plan. When one studies the current boundaries of the City of Vancouver, and the area now in Urban Holding, you discover the area of Urban Hold is more than twice the size of the City. Then consider that none of the projected growth and job creation estimates have even come close to reality, one can only conclude this whole exercise is nothing more than an expansion of Government control by absorbing our Private Property Rights at the total expense of the property owners. I am not a Lawyer but have read many cases regarding property rights and believe that Property Rights are included in Constitutional right to Due Process, which has so obviously been denied in this case to the point it is my opinion it amounts to a "Taking" which demands we be compensated for being denied our intended lawful use of our properties.

Respectfully:

George L. Espinosa

2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 13, 2015, 8:25 AM

In our view all four proposed maps are unsuitable. We believe the large parcels surrounded by small lots should be respectfully changed to mirror their neighbors. We own 80 acres located at 16104 NE 259th Street. The tax parcels are as follows: 986003678; 986027184; 226268000; 986027183. Our neighbors have 5 acre zoning to the north and to the west. South and adjacent of us, the zoning is ONE and two acre lots. Many houses surround us. We are located one mile north of Battle Ground main street. We have PUD water and a reservoir and pump station on our property. Fire Dist. #3 is less than a mile away. We have County road frontage. We plan to continue growing trees, but would like the option to create smaller farms in the future. We believe 5 acre mini farms are ideally suited for Clark County. We believe all ag-land should be zoned 5 acres, and all forest land should be zoned 10 acres. We also do not understand why some ag land on Alternative 4 is proposed for 5 acre zoning while our land on the edge of B.G. is proposed for 10 acre zoning. This new zoning will impact our personal financial retirement lives for many years to come. We thank you for all your hard work. But we believe in being realistic about an urban county being fair to the large landowners. Large land owners need to be treated with fairness and have their land zoned in a way that is reflective of their neighbors.

Respectfully, Dave and Valerie Larwick

---

Jeffrey Posey inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 7:18 AM



---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

I support alternative 1. Although, there should be more wilderness area and agriculture land. We are using every square inch of Clark County and it is wasteful.

2 Supporters

---

Brian Grier inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 7:15 AM

I think #4 is a bad idea. It would allow more development outside the current growth boundaries. This would create havoc with infrastructure. I prefer #1

3 Supporters

---

Vicki Kraft inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 12:34 AM

I recommend adoption of Amendment # 4 for the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. It addresses the real disparities Clark County rural landowners have been facing for the last 20 years. It provides for rural zoning which is more representative of the actual lot sizes. Previously zoning had been determined inaccurately based on aerial photos which make it extremely difficult at best to really know how many acres make up a lot or area. In addition, there were many rural lands with faulty soil data and designations. These designations should have been based on the 1972 NRCS soil manual but weren't. Thankfully under this new amendment actual land size is being recognized and accounted for with new corresponding acreage zoning. This will prevent the landlock nature of downzoning which put a gridlock on most rural landowners in 1994 when the current zoning structure was implemented. Under this new amendment, rural farmers and citizens will once again have the freedom and flexibility to sell off a small portion of their property or leave 1-2 acres to their children if they choose. My hat is off to the County Councilors for making extra measures to make sure the rural citizens are heard - including the public open houses and this online forum. This newest amendment best reflects the voice and needs of local rural landowners. I'm hopeful we'll see Amendment # 4 included for our rural community in the updated Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

---

JAN VERRINDER inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 10:05 PM

Forget 4: sprawl, increased public services demand without a payment plan, traffic congestion, ruins the rural feel. I favor #1 or 2, and would prefer we file for extension until the 5 councilors under the Charter are seated.

3 Supporters

---

Russ Williams inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 9:01 PM

I would prefer Option 1 or Option 2, as they support more gradual development and protect more of our environment. Also, they support a more modest increase on demand for expanded infrastructure. Option 3 is not as conservative, while Option 4, only recently presented, seems to have been developed with limited input, and minimal opportunities for widespread public evaluation and input.

---

Greg Bender inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 8:58 PM

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

My wife and I moved as far north into Clark County as we could afford to get away from sprawl. We are in favor of growth management that does not open the flood gates to mass development. Clark County has some of the most productive agricultural land in the state, and nothing is being done to conserve any of it.

We are 100% against alternative 4 for numerous reasons. Alternative 4 flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that:

Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,321 new rural lots.

Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection.

Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies.

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:

Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners.

Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don't divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase.

More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases.

Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations.

3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 8:11 PM

I am opposed to alternative 4 because it encourages endless development and growth which rapidly begets further development and more growth. This cycle is unsustainable, like a pyramid scheme which kicks the cost down the road to the next generation. Clark County must invest in quality of life practices such as preserving arable food producing and climate controlling larger parcels from becoming another strip mall.

1 Supporter

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 12, 2015, 5:24 PM

For sensible growth, the facts support Alternative # 1. It already allows over nine thousand new rural parcels.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

A sensible growth plan supports Alternative # 1. It already has room for over nine thousand new rural parcels. Clark County will function the best when the greatest amount of growth occurs within the cities. Having to provide services and infrastructure beyond city limits is far more costly and impractical than developing land within the boundaries of our fine, well run Cities in the County. Creating over seventeen thousand new lots as would be permitted under alternative #4 would be an expensive disaster for the County, raise taxes on all the neighbors of the upzoned properties, and keep the cities where those services are already provided growing on a far more orderly basis. Paul Christensen

---

Rory Bowman inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 3:48 PM

I was born and raised in Clark County, a fifth-generation Washingtonian. As such, I have watched the process and effects of suburban development in Clark County for almost all of my fifty years, and this gives me some perspective on how development can unfold and the many different impacts it can have: positive and negative, expected and unexpected.

Of the four alternatives on offer I support either Alternative 1 (no substantive change) or Alternatives 2 or 3.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

(which are small, mostly city-requested changes). I absolutely oppose Alternative 4.

Previous growth-management planning was completed before the 2008 economic downturn and predictions of greater economic and population pressures made then have not yet been fulfilled. In the absence of even those levels of growth, no major change is warranted at this time, and so Alternative 1 is most appropriate. We planned for growth that did not happen, much as a parent might buy clothes for a growing child. Just as it would make no sense for such a parent to buy more even larger clothes, it makes no sense for us to discard Alternative 1, which Clark County hasn't yet grown into.

Alternative 3 is more aggressive than present population numbers or available funds for infrastructure warrant, and will be a fine starting point as an aggressive-growth option during the next planning cycle, but is arguably too aggressive and expensive at this time, negatively impacting agriculture. With one set of too-large clothes, what reasonable parent would buy more?

Alternative 4 seems less like a serious professional proposal than a real-estate development wish list of the kind that was common in the late 1980's and 1990's, as incoming money sought to overbuild in the areas opened by I-205 with hope of fast returns on a southern-California development model. It does not show signs of serious input from trained development staff, and there is every indication that it was put forward by David Madore and non-planning staff Peter Silliman and Don Benton, in violation of the newly-adopted county charter and standard land-use planning protocols and procedures. Completing the parents' new clothes analogy, Alternative 4 is a whole stack of too-big britches.

Alternative 1 is more than adequate for this planning cycle and the oddly aggressive Alternative 4 should already be taken off the table. Given the current political situation in Clark County with the newly adopted council system, it would be even better if these discussions could be delayed until all five county councilors have been seated and had time to "get up to speed" on lawful and ethical planning methods. If such a delay is not possible, the conservative course is to hold position and not commit county resources to any major change.

Alternative 1 is much to be preferred of the three serious alternatives on offer.

- Rory Bowman, Post Office Box 202, Vancouver

### 3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 3:32 PM

The timing of, and the process/resources used to bring alternative 4 to the comprehensive plan update for Clark County is, in my opinion, of concern:

late in the process, well after cut-off for new options.

Rushed to the discussion.

Presented by one councilor, with some assistance from a non-planner staff, and input from a limited number of citizen activists.

Non-collaborative with local jurisdictions (schools, cities, transportation planners, water and power providers)

Not collaborative with county planning staff who are trained, and obligated to follow laws and best-practices in

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

following public involvement.

### Consequence of Alternative 4

Encourages suburban sprawl.

Diminishes the size and productivity of agricultural lands.

Impacts forested areas (with related water quality risks due to septic tanks and de-forestation)

Adds no road capacity, while increasing quantity of residents in rural areas.

Related environmental failures probable: water supply, water quality, air quality.

Pressure on rural schools (building capacity and transportation)

Straining public services like law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency medical response.

Most importantly:

Limits future necessary expansion of city urban growth boundaries when the county areas are too small and highly-parcelized for job-lands, and built with rural housing. This will kill the city & county jobs producing ability in the next 20 years, further forcing our kids/grand-kids to leave to find a job/career elsewhere.

And, the risks, if it is adopted, to the county budget for legal defense.

I support alternative 2, cleans up some left-over issues, yet does not increase sprawl, keeps citizen costs low (taxes remain low).

5 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 2:53 PM

I am in support of options 1 and 2 but would prefer this decision was postponed until the full 5 councilors are seated in January 2016. I am against option 4 as it makes the most changes with out any required review of the individual properties. There are many non-similar changes made that would be better handled on a case-by-case basis taking local factors into consideration.

1 Supporter

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 2:39 PM

I am in favor of delaying adoption of the GMA plan until the Council has 5 members and can have a full discussion without the pressure of a last minute addition to the alternatives addressed. Alternative 4 is too broad and creates future uncertainty. It is hard to compare its impact on future development in the County given that the maps for the various alternatives do not follow the same format. However, overall, it just takes too many scattered properties out of the rural, agricultural and forestry zones creating a random pattern of development that will make it a) hard for genuine farmers to carry on normal business, and b) making it almost impossible to respond to new residents requests for services that will be inevitable over time. Alternative 1 provides adequate growth opportunities with some minor adjustments. For example, I believe staff said option 3 offered a more open timeline for appeals and I would possibly in favor of this for those who were residents of non-conforming lots prior to the adoption of the last Growth Management Plan. Or, I would possibly support a

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Plan for these 'grandfathered' rural landowners - - but not for those who purchased after the last plan's adoption. Alternative 4 is not acceptable as it is.

2 Supporters

---

Bill Baumann inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 1:51 PM

I support alternative 2. I strongly oppose alternative 4. It was created in a back room by a special interest group and one councilor and does not take into account the interests of the entire county.

3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (unverified)

April 12, 2015, 11:14 AM

I oppose Alt 4. It will further unbalance the ratio of developable land to farm land and threatens the future of Clark County's local food supply. David Madore continues to push his personal agenda which flies in the face of State law and policy and ignores the needs of our citizenry except for those of his big business buddies. NO ON ALT 4. Patty Ingraham

---

Warren Neth inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 10:51 AM

Some of Clark County Councilors, Clark County is a rapidly urbanizing county and part of an ever-expanding metropolitan area. Our natural resources, rural character, great schools and neighborly community are a few of the reasons, which make Clark County a highly desirable community to live in. Your stewardship of the Comprehensive Plan process is crucial to preserving that livability.

Slow Food Southwest Washington does not believe that ALT 4 should be considered in this round of GMA updates. The proposal opens developments into Clark County's rural areas without consideration of:

1. The smaller parcel sizes that ALT4 proposes will put increased market pressure on our remaining agricultural land, out pricing larger lots for 'commercially viable farms', as described in the 2007 "Analysis of the Agricultural Economic Trends and Conditions in Clark County, Washington" by Globalwise.
2. How will these new, smaller parcel size designations be used in the future? Developing these smaller parcel sizes, without creating zones where they will be used in the long-term, will open the smaller parcel sizes to be used during Annual Review process anywhere in the rural area. I do not believe the discretionary procedure of clustering similarly sized lots will provide adequate direction for future clustering of similar sized lots that you have proposed.
3. ALT4 directs development toward Rural areas, which does not honor the considerable investment made to direct development toward Cities, Rural Centers, and Urban Reserves that Clark County has already made.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Slow Food Southwest Washington questions:

Rural Character -

How will the 1 acre parcelization of Clark County's forest and fields effect traffic and other lifestyle benefits of Clark County's rural character?

Property taxes - Has their been an assessment of how rural landowners taxes will raise as the new smaller zoned lots, as well as the houses and infrastructure they require as they develop?

Capitol Improvements - How does the BOCCC plan to pay for the new roads, utilities, sewer, fire districts, sheriff's presence and other Capitol Improvements as we open up 15,000 new parcels across our rural areas?

Water- Clark County's rural residents are dependent on wells that draw from already stressed aquifers. Who will be monitoring the effect of new wells drilled and manage our water resources?

Process-

1. After the community had already given input during the first two years on ALT1, ALT2, ALT3, Council member Madore proposed ALT4, with minimal analysis and outreach to effected stakeholders.

2. At the March 11th, BOCCC Work Session Council member Madore continually insisted "No new parcels will be created". At the following Open House, Community Planning stated an estimated 15,000 new parcels would be created between ALT3 and 4.

3. The 2013 survey of AG20 and FR40 landowners called the Rural Census was not a scientific poll, vote in actual census. The questions left ambiguity and were loaded. Removing AG20 and FR40 based on this survey is not good stewardship of the Comprehensive Planning process nor Clark County's agriculture or forest resource lands.

Slow Food Southwest Washington requests:

1. Consider zoning options that would provide flexibility to family's who might want to share their land, not a blanket zoning policy that opens Clark County's rural areas to subdivision.

2. Focus residential development to Cities, Rural Centers, and Urban Reserves.

3. Protect Clark County's last large acreage parcels of class 1 growing soils. Develop Agricultural Production District's, Transfer of Development Rights and Purchase of Development Rights as described in numerous reports developed by citizen led committees, such as Clark County Agriculture Preservation Strategies Report, Clark County Food System Council's "Conserving agricultural food production in Clark County", Slow Food Southwest Washington's "Grow Clark County" recommendations.

4. Consider the Grow Clark County recommendation to develop policy that conserves farmland and strengthen the farm economy. More info here: [www.slowfoodswwa.com/growclarkcounty](http://www.slowfoodswwa.com/growclarkcounty)

I look forward to talking further about these issues.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Thank you,  
Warren Neth  
Executive Director  
Slow Food Southwest Washington  
360-771-1296  
warren@slowfoodswwa.com  
www.slowfoodswwa.com

3 Supporters

---

Olson inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 8:19 AM

Alternative Four is flawed in many ways but among the most egregious is the unacceptable level of capitol costs such unplanned population increases will cost County taxpayers due to the 'leapfrog' nature of such development.

A second problem with Alternative 4 is the lack of professional guidance and citizen input that such projects demand. The last minute-hurried nature of the proposal left little or no time for meaningful public involvement or process.

I urge the Councilors to reject Alt-4 based on future costs and the lack of public transparency and input from Clark Co citizens outside the developer and 'stand to profit' supporters of the proposal.

2 Supporters

---

Bob Brewer inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 7:28 AM

How can it be considered planning when properties within 100 yards of an elementary school remain zoned 5 acres or larger?

Communities thrive in close proximity to their schools and public facilities. Forcing families away destroys their community.

Sequestration of school adjacent properties sacrifices the safety of our littlest school children and is the death sentence to family centered communities.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 7:14 AM

WHERE WILL WE GET OUR FOOD, WE NEED MORE FARMS NOT HOUSES, THE PRICE OF LAND IS SO HIGH THAT YOU CANT AFFORD TO FARM UNLESS SOMEONE IS WORKING. WITH NEW HOUSING COMES MORE WATER USAGE WHERE WILL FARMS GET THEIR WATER/DO ANY OF YOU SUPPORT YOUR LOCAL FARMER GO OUT TO A FEW FARMS AND YOU WILL SEE THEY FARM BECAUSE THEY LOVE IT NOT TO GET RICH.

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 11, 2015, 5:52 PM



---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

I support Alternative 1.

---

Kathryn Ketcham inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 4:43 PM

I would like to comment in favor of Alternative 2 which I understand is Alternative 1 with some additions to Urban Growth Areas requested by some of the cities and a few corrections. This is a conservative choice which is responsive to some urgent needs.

I would also like to note that it is difficult to compare Options 1-3 with Option 4 on the available maps because the categories and color scheme are different.

That said, I oppose Alternative 4 for these reasons: 1) From the maps it looks like Alternative 4 increases residential lots without regard to maintaining Resource Lands including Forest and Agricultural land and, possibly, without regard of wetlands, riparian lands and wildlife habitat. 2) The addition of so many residential lots (I have heard figures ranging from 6,000-8000) with the associated non-permeable surfaces of rooftops, driveways, and access roads is a storm water management issue. 3) In addition, I am concerned about the cost of infrastructure for these diffuse residences and how it will be paid. No detailed plan for paying for the infrastructure has been presented.

Sincerely,  
Kathryn Ketcham  
123 W. 30th St  
Vancouver, WA 98660  
360-693-5373

2 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 2:22 PM

Alt 4 is bad because it negatively affects environmental impacts on air/water quality/wildlife protection. It also creates risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies. Finally Alt 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of: Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners.

The Best choice is Alt 1 still allows for the growth of 9,390 new rural parcels. Alt 1 keeps Clark County out of legal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected. It minimizes pressure on rural schools and public services. Changes are not needed because growth assumptions of 2007 were never realized.

3 Supporters

---

Betty Montgomery inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 1:23 PM

I am alarmed by the process underway. I respectfully request that no action be taken on selecting or deleting

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

and of the alternatives until after the full, five-member council is seated in January 2016. I believe that the state will support the county's request for a postponement due to our newly enacted Home Rule Charter."

3 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 11, 2015, 1:09 PM

We need to extend deadline for public comment.

We need farmlands in Clark County! The key is to manage growth but not at the cost of losing precious small farms.

Donna Roberge

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 12:21 PM

I support Alternative 1. The current Comprehensive Growth Management Plan was adopted in 2007 with overly optimistic population assumptions that were never realized. Alternative 1 still has room for population growth while protecting forests, agricultural land and ground water supplies. infrastructure and emergency services are designed to accommodate Alternative 1.

I oppose Alternative 4. It violates the State Growth Management Act by encouraging suburban sprawl and diminishing agriculture and forest lands. Alternative 4 would create an additional 17,321 new rural lots scattered throughout over east and north Clark County. These additional lots will cause increased taxes for all county residents to provide infrastructure, including roads, schools, police, fire and other emergency services. Additional scattered development could affect watersheds and aquifers by creating more hardscape that encourages runoff rather than percolation into the groundwater. The changes in zoning will increase property taxes for those who do not subdivide. Current rural landowners who complain of the inability to reap economic benefits by subdividing their land ignore the fact that they have benefited economically for years from lower property tax rates for agricultural and forestry zoning. Wildlife habitat will decrease as more forest lands are cleared and farmlands are converted to subdivisions. All county taxpayers will be burdened with the costs of defending the county against lawsuits for violation of state law, when those funds in the county budget to be better used to serve current needs.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 12:19 PM

I support Alternative 1, the no change alternative as the growth assumptions of 2007 were never realized. Alt 1 still allows for the growth of 9,390 new rural parcels. Alt 1 keeps Clark County out of legal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected.

Alternative 4 is a bad plan. It flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that:

Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,321 new

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

rural lots

Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection

Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:

Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners

Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don't divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase

More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases

Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations

1 Supporter

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 11:11 AM

The Comp plan over estimated growth from 2007. Alternative 1 is the only one that makes sense. Why would the County want to increase urban sprawl and ruin the rural lifestyle, not to mention the added taxes and costs that would be required if Alternative 4 were adopted. Keep Clark County horse friendly with urban/rural buffers which can blend high density urban areas with low density rural areas and protect agri/forest areas. Protect our watershed and our soil.

2 Supporters

---

William Maiden inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 11:15 AM

Alternative 4 takes the county in absolutely the wrong direction. It would increase sprawl and put pressure on public services with no way to pay for them. It is a bad idea. By the way... It seems like this was a surprise to the county planning department. How could that happen?

---

Chuck Green inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 10:53 AM

As a candidate for Clark County Council District 2, here is why I am opposed to Comprehensive Plan Alternative 4. I offer the following comments for the record, and a proposed solution.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

-Clark Green  
field

Beside the fact it was developed by one County Councilor, who will also be voting on it as a preferred land use alternative, and one special interest group, it has a number of flaws.

Take a look at the maps, which I am attaching to my post here. What do you get?

- Parcelization of rural Clark County into 1-5 acre parcels. It will add 8,000 new lots (see page 26, [http://clark.wa.gov/thegrid/documents/2015\\_0414\\_BOCC\\_H\\_SEPA\\_ALT\\_STAFF\\_REPORT\\_and\\_ATTACHMENTS.pdf](http://clark.wa.gov/thegrid/documents/2015_0414_BOCC_H_SEPA_ALT_STAFF_REPORT_and_ATTACHMENTS.pdf)).
- No protection for small farms or other agricultural uses, including wineries.
- 8,000 large houses on these new lots, translating to 20,000 more people in the rural area.
- With 25-30 percent of Clark County workers commuting to Portland, this potentially adds 12,000 more vehicles a day crossing our already-overcrowded I-5 and I-205 bridges.

What do you also get?

- **NO NEW JOBS.** Other than a few service workers cleaning or doing landscaping at these new rural mansions, this alternative creates no new jobs.
- **NO RELIEF TO I-5 CONGESTION.** Those opposed to previous efforts to add capacity to I-5 across the Columbia River wanted Clark County to add jobs to reduce I-5 Bridge congestion. Alternative 4 does not alleviate I-5 Bridge congestion; it increases it.
- **NO PROTECTION OF SMALL FARMS** and other agricultural uses. If you want to see what you get when you have 1-5 acre rural lots, check out the Rolling Hills area south of Ridgefield.
- **STRANGLING OF SMALL CITIES.** Creating a ring of large, expensive houses around our small cities prevents future growth. Which means no new small city neighborhoods and no new jobs.
- **INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION ON RURAL ROADS AND THROUGH SMALL CITIES.** With no rural services, retail areas, or job centers, 20,000 rural residents will travel southward into Vancouver and across the I-5/I-205 bridges, adding substantial traffic to substandard roads.
- **NO ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION.** There is no way C-TRAN can afford to serve these outlying areas, nor are there sidewalks or paths for rural residents to use or to access C-TRAN.
- **IMPACT ON GROUNDWATER.** Rural lots will be served by wells and septic tanks, not water and sewer lines.

MY VALUE-BASED COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROPOSAL

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

- Extend the current Comprehensive Plan one year (Alternative 1) as the "interim Comprehensive Plan." Extending the current plan one year allows two new councilors to have a say. It allows for the county to meet the state-imposed June 2016 deadline, staving off state sanctions.
- Undertake a broad, value-based community discussion on what should go into the Comprehensive Plan.
- Agree on values and performance measures with which to develop and evaluate the Plan.
- Include a comprehensive variety of community groups, such as Clark County Citizens United, Friends of Clark County, land conservation as well as the building and development community, and others, to provide input and discuss trade-offs of various options.
- Bring in a group such as WSU-Vancouver's Initiative for Public Deliberation to facilitate a series of forums to capture community input.
- Allow County Planning staff to fairly and equitably develop and evaluate a plan for community review, before acted on by the FIVE County Councilors.

### 1 Attachment

[https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/132tu3zpgaeo.427/Alt4\\_Uses.jpg](https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/132tu3zpgaeo.427/Alt4_Uses.jpg) (87.6 KB)

### 2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 11, 2015, 10:00 AM

I support Alternative 4. Most people living in the rural area are there because they wanted to live in the country. This alternative would be the best plan. Most landowners would not build houses on every parcel of land they own.

---

Garrett Hoyt inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 9:40 AM

The Growth Management Act allowed Clark County to designate areas that were important resources areas for the county. In 1994 our elected leaders, citizen groups and came together and made decisions on what resources needed to preserved for our county. Alternative 4 is supported by a special interest group that disagreed with the GMA in 1994 and are trying to overthrow the will of the people that was decided 20 years ago. If Alternative 4 were adopted, it would be challenged in court and would likely lose (like happened last time). All of this is done at the taxpayers expense for the benefit of a special interest group. This option needs to be abandoned before sending it to the environmental process.

In the previous Comprehensive Plan, the county planned for growth because the county was growing quickly at the time. Then came the recession and growth slowed dramatically. Alternative 1 is the so-called 'do nothing' alternative, but in reality this alternative is saying that we've already planned for growth that didn't end up happening and that plan is still a good one. I fully support Alternative 1.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

2 Commenters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 8:48 AM

I strongly support alternative 4.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 12:38 AM

My property/home is on one of the parcels proposed to be re-zoned by Alternative 4.

Alternative 4 would allow development that would negatively impact the rural nature of our area and add further stress and add traffic to an already failing road (Sunset Falls Road), not to mention the impacts to the East Fork Lewis River. When I found out that a large chunk of land along the East Fork (thankfully currently owned by the Columbia Land Trust) was being considered for a housing development a few years ago, I was absolutely shocked. Who thought THAT was a good idea?? As a former land use planner, I understand the need to have consistency - but I do not agree with setting the land use and zoning to current use. That presumes that what we have been doing and what we are currently doing is the right thing. It should be set to the intended future use that is most appropriate for the area. It is ridiculous to increase density in an area that is surrounded by Weyerhaeuser, the East Fork Lewis River and the Gifford Pinchot National Forest (respectively) on 3 of its sides. My husband jokes that he would love to drive down our driveway and see a taco cart at the bottom of the hill so we don't have to drive a half hour for a meal out, but he is kidding. That would be horrible and totally wreck the natural landscape that provides habitat for so many important flora and fauna. It is unfortunately the nature of American government to be short-sighted and focused on re-elections, but we need to do better for our children.

I didn't ask for my property to be re-zoned to a more dense use as part of Alternative 4 and if it is approved, I'm tempted to fight to keep my current FR-80!

If Alternative 4 really is considered, I'd love to know how the County intends to fund to maintain the roadways out here in the sticks as well as fix exponentially more power outages than they already do because more houses are being built out here.

3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 4:27 PM

I am supportive of Alternative 4.

---

Rita Dietrich inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 3:57 PM

I strongly support Alternate 4 as it gives the rural landowner more flexibility in planning for the future and allows non-agricultural parcels of land to be in compliance with the zoning.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

1 Supporter

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 10, 2015, 2:28 PM

Mr. Malinowski, your memory is not exactly right--the courts actually concurred with the GMA, with one minor exception. The decision can be found in the link

below:[http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Legacy/western/decisions/1995/95-67\\_comp\\_ord.htm](http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Legacy/western/decisions/1995/95-67_comp_ord.htm)

---

Debbie Nelson inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 12:19 PM

I strongly request that no action be taken on adopting or narrowing any of the alternatives until after the full, five-member council is seated in January 2016. I believe that the state will support the county's request for a postponement due to our newly enacted Home Rule Charter.

4 Supporters

---

Tom Gibson inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 10:42 AM

Clark County's view that endless growth and urban sprawl is sustainable or good for the community is very curious because the only supporting evidence that this is so comes from third party interests who would profit from such delusional thinking. Apparently Clark County believes that there are no criteria or examples that would result in a determination that development of land should be moderated, that there are no larger principles in play regarding the environment or community that could result in moderating growth into our rural areas. Further it appears that rapidly depleting natural and human resources is seen as a goal to solving financial concerns and that those financial concerns are of paramount importance while no value is given to other uses of land other than building, retail and industry.

Tax policy has been to value land actively being farmed and providing the sole or main living source for at least one person in a household as residential if housing has been allowed in neighboring areas. Tax burdens have been placed on people's profession if they are a farmer that don't exist in any form for anyone else.

Currently Clark County imports almost a billion dollars a year in food while it produces less than 5% of food consumed in the county even though hundreds of land parcels exist in Clark County, which is a prime year round growing area with adequate water and labor, which are appropriate for this use. Since studies have shown that for every dollar spent buying food from a local grower create about \$2.50 in the local economy it is unreasonable to say that the only productive use of so much of this land is for the tax revenues gained from mostly housing development. Housing development provides a short term profit for a local builder but almost as many liabilities as it does revenue and most of the expense of the housing is spent on goods, materials and often labor that come from out of state so that economic gain is an illusion of growth that creates as many or more problems than it solves. Cities in Clark County have only been able to keep up with the demands to keep roads paved, sewage treated, trash hauled, and children educated from the fees and taxes of even more development which means in essence that the only way to get out of the mess we created is to create an even bigger one and to keep doing so in a continuous loop as if there will never be any end to how much we can keep growing and developing.

The current land use alternatives, especially Alternative 4, provide more of the same tired old thinking th

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Continuous growth of the housing market is a good sign that the county is doing well, in spite of the many obvious flaws in that logic. Making decisions by cherry picking which facts to promote to make an argument to keep on developing is just working backward to justify doing what you already planned to do without ever once considering a complicated plethora of facts about the health, vitality and functionality of this county. County Councilors have worked tirelessly to defeat transportation issues that link the community and region together yet they demand that we not only continue but work to accelerate development, even in sensitive rural areas that will be permanently damaged by such activity.

Communities in the county are increasingly at risk for being cut off from the most essential services by random acts of building sans any real community development and apparently the plan is to make people even more dependent on the government and other similarly sized enterprises that have the cash to steer government's thinking in this direction. County Councilors instead of getting the support they need to verify the validity of their ideas have chosen to avoid asking for this help and get advice from other sources that they prefer to work with, even without acknowledging that they and our government are apparently working in some kind of secret cabal whose goals and purposes can only be guessed at. Gold and wealth is worthless without agriculture.

Agriculture is the basis of all wealth. The real question is whether you want to keep your sovereignty or yield it to other people and countries. The focus of agriculture in this country has been growing commodity crops for chemical companies, middle men and distributors that make the majority of the profit in huge monoculture operations that tend to rely on high levels of mechanization and investment. Agriculture has started to shift away from this disastrous production model to growing food by and for people.

Clark County's refusal to consider promoting agriculture and local food production or see it as having any value is both short sighted and potentially dangerous. In my opinion every community should set goals for what percentage of food eaten is from the local community and work to increase that amount as one of the most creative jobs programs they could participate in. Given the continuing drought in California, Eastern Oregon and western Washington, which some predict could last generations as it has in the past, and our own water problems why are we as a nation giving our food sovereignty and be dependent on imports from other countries for the long term?

Clark County has been a leader in agriculture in some ways as evidenced by our very popular farmer's markets but much more work needs to be done to develop a comprehensive plan to take care of the health of the people and the county. The current land use alternatives don't speak to this at all and primarily serve as a guideline to help developers but do little to address how this development is going to impact everyone in Clark County.

### 4 Supporters

---

Susan Rasmussen inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 10:01 AM

Alternative 4 is needed. It is the only plan recognizing the obligation to address the long-standing issues of rural landowners.

- Alt.4 is the only plan employing an inclusive policy with the rural communities.
- The shift in policy is commendable. This recognizes the rural landowners as being significant stakeholders and gives merit to the issues in designing their futures
- Alt.4 is a step towards diversifying our rural economy and become less dependent on natural resources.
- Alt. 4 recognizes small-scale agriculture, family-owned woodlots, rural lifestyles.
- Counties across the state have moved towards friendlier rural growth provisions.
- Alt. 1 is exact status quo, Alt.2 nearly is



---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

- The rural lands have been neglected over 20 yrs.

Alt.1 would freeze these lands for 40 yrs.

- Alt. 4 would align rural zoning to correspond with the patterns of historical development.

- Alt.4 is a step forward in correctly defining Clark County's Rural Character per GMA policy.

2 Supporters

---

Jim Malinowski inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 10:20 PM

It is clear that many of the contributors to this forum have not read the GMA. The county violated the clear mandates of the GMA in their 1995 massive down zoning. CCCU won its lawsuit against the county for this reason. Judge Poyfair's decision stated that "the result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA." (See the Columbian article of April 6, 1997). The county has been acting in defiance of that court order ever since. We deserve better of our county government. Alternative 4 is a move in the direction of obeying the clear terms of the GMA and reducing the current high percentage of non-conforming lots in the rural areas of the county.

Jim Malinowski  
Amboy

2 Supporters

---

Jerry Winters inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 10:00 PM

I support Alt. 4. Ag. 20 needs to break down even more, 5s, and 1s. This would allow small home framing and build community. After a plan is adopted will there still be holding ie. Lt. Industrial overlay. Vancouver needs to increase the UGB it may not be the county's job, but the city missed the boat!! It's Clark County's plan, why let Vancouver control the outcome!!

2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 9, 2015, 9:15 PM

We support Alternative 4. It is the only appropriate choice as this is a county wide plan, not just a plan for the cities. The old plan before 1994 was working fine. We should just go back to that one. Small parcels that are less than 10 acres in the rural and resource lands is what this county and the people need and want. Then they can afford to buy, farm, forest and live on the land.

---

Dennis Karnopp inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 9:09 PM

Clark County and Washington in general where a trashy state compared to Oregon and it's land use zoning. We moved into Washington in 1979 and where appalled by the lack of zoning, it looked like trailer trash. I am firmly in favor of keeping the existing land use laws and zoning restrictions to keep Clark and Washington not

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

...ing trailer trash again. I know that people want to use their property for whatever they want but, sometimes its to the detriment to the community as a whole, and will lower growth and property values. Now we have Oregonians moving into Washington because of the tax structure and Clark County is slowly getting cleaned up, this transformation of wealth will definitely stop if the existing zoning and land use laws are relaxed.

2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 9, 2015, 7:24 PM

I support alternative #4 and suggest we make it rural 5 acre minimum. As a property owner and not just a group that has no financial investment in real property.

---

Terry Conner inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 6:30 PM

The citizens of Clark County did NOT ask for this.

Alt 4 is yet another half-cooked, special interest move, credited to the same rogue Councilour who continues to defy long standing protocol and logic. Alt 4 began as a direct violation of the HRC, having been directed by Madore to have his non-qualified protégé, Silliman whip up some maps, while he (Madore) tried his single hand at Planning. No experience, no intelligence, no vetting.

The brass tacks of Alt 4 are simply and tragically BAD for rural farmers, suburban landowners, and the Clark County community that depends on and supports local farming.

Just a few of the bad results would be water shortage, taxes to support development of the 8000 lots, detachment of rural well being, violating the GMA curfew, future legal costs, further morale decline to citizenry, further animous towards the BOCC from Clark County residents.

4 Supporters

---

Tim Gaughan inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 5:43 PM

I am opposed to Alternative 4. This Alternative was composed, proposed and maps attempted to be modified midway through the open house process by a lone county councilor who has no apparent expertise or professional credentials to draft a land use plan to be considered under the GMA. Madore has ignored the planning process, advice of planning professionals and apparent dismay by legal staff. Alternative 4 appears to move against the grain of the primary intent of the GMA by promoting urban sprawl and future costs to all taxpayers in ClarkCounty. This alternative has the potential of litigation and sanctions by the State.

3 Supporters

---

Suzanne Kendall inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 4:46 PM

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

I oppose Alternative 4 for the following reasons:

1. Phase 2 of the Growth Management Plan Update Process is scheduled to last 24 months. The time was initially spent getting Public Input on the three staff-proposed alternatives that concluded with the August and October 2014 hearings. The remainder of Phase 2 was to be spent analyzing the three established alternatives.

Instead, over 12 months into Phase 2 and after the August and October 2014 Public Hearings, one of the three County Councilors introduced a 4th alternative without meaningful consultation with the citizens or County planners. No public hearings have been held on Alternative 4. Instead, the County Councilor held "open houses" with the opportunity for hundreds of citizens (at each open house) to crowd around a room full of maps and make an attempt to get the attention of County staff (6-8) or County Councilors (3) to ask questions and have a meaningful conversation.

If the Clark County Council demands that the tardy Alternative proposed by one individual representative remain and be fully analyzed for its intended and unintended consequences, the Growth Management Act DEADLINE OF JANUARY 2016 MUST BE EXTENDED BY AT LEAST FOUR MONTHS.

2. I am very concerned about the costs to Clark County taxpayers if the Council decides to allow an unannounced Alternative 4 proposal 18 months into our 36 month process. If this Alternative is allowed to stand the County must, and will, be taken to court. If history is any indication, the County will be in costly litigation for up to, including Supreme Court litigation, 7+ years.

3. It is my understanding that Alternative 4 creates at least 8000 more parcels and that the current minimum 20 acre agricultural parcels will be reduced to as low as 5 and 10 acres. I value our local, productive farm lands and believe strongly that our working farms must be protected.

In this age of changing climate and reduced water supplies, we should treasure what good water we have left in Clark County. I have experience in managing farm land of approximately 1500 acres and know how difficult it is to farm on a 5 acre postage stamp-size plot with good farm practices which require crop rotation.

4. Adding over 8000 parcels with Alternative 4 will also make it difficult to supply water to all the new development. Wells are already drying up and Clark County Public Health must review all new private wells for adequate water availability to meet GMA regulations prior to the issuance of building permits.

5. It will also be very difficult to maintain the QUALITY of the water we have. With the addition of thousands of new lots and a steadily increasing population in our former agricultural areas, we will have to pave over ground and greatly increase runoff, contamination and pollution.

6. The costs to the taxpayers for the dramatic increase in the need for public services will be immense. The mass development of our county from 9300 to 17000+ parcels will benefit outside developers to the detriment of all citizens. I believe that a decision of this magnitude must be considered by the full 5-member Council required by our County charter.

14 Supporters

---

John Ley inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 3:59 PM

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

I am grateful there is an Alt. 4.

The facts as presented at the public hearings: "6 of every 10 parcels in the Rural category do not conform to our current zoning map. Seven of every 10 parcels in the AG category do not conform to our current zoning map. Eight of every 10 parcels in the FR category do not conform to our current zoning map."

Are the land owners wrong? Or is the map & previous zoning wrong?

Clearly, the previous map (20 year old) was wrong, and is penalizing current land owners.

We clearly need to respect property ownership rights. We need a zoning map that at a minimum, reflects current reality. It is irresponsible to have 60-80% of rural land owners 'not in compliance' with current zoning law.

My understanding is that Alt 4 does that. Thank you!

3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 10:18 AM

We need the combination of ALT 3 AND 4. Let's expand the UGB and create more local Jobs within the cities. The plan was poorly organized back 20 years ago, like a shotgun approach; we can do SO much better for this county and our communities! Not saying to make everything 1 acre lots but if there's a 40 acre parcel with 5's or 10's around it, maybe we need to have some adjustment. It's not like it used to be, farming, forest, etc. Plus how many people can afford 40 acres instead of a 10? We need a better plan and to have some consistency in zoning/UGB. If a person living on 40 acres wants to split their land into 10's for their children to start their own families/memories as they did growing up at that location, what's so wrong with that? And if not, that's their choice but it should be an option, and their right. By doing this it's going to keep local families here, add local work, and create more tax dollars for the help of the community!

4 Supporters

---

Michele Wollert inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 10:04 AM

I am a Clark County resident of Vancouver. Although I am not a rural landowner or farmer, I contribute more than my fair share of county taxes on several properties in the city. I support local agriculture by being a committed consumer of local produce, pasture-raised eggs, and meat. I am a loyal customer who supports Clark County businesses, restaurants and farmer's markets that sell local farm products and I have purchased CSA farm shares. I am including this personal information as a preface to my comments because I have heard two councilors diminish the testimony of residents who do not own large amounts of rural land or who live in urban areas. All Clark County voices count when considering changes to the Growth Management Act and I hope you will consider mine.

I am opposed to Alternative 4 of the GMA for the following reasons:

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Alternative 4 was developed without the input of Clark County community planning experts. It was written by one councilor, who has no experience in planning, with the limited and biased feedback of one honored grandfather and a group of landowner advocates. It excludes important other stakeholder and expert information, which places Clark County at increased legal risk.

Alternative 4 threatens our water quality. Evidence-based research shows that urban sprawl pollutes water by removing native vegetation, increasing impervious surfaces, erosion, and pollution from cars and trucks on roads since more residents will need to drive.

Alternative 4 threatens our drinking water supplies. This option will create more rural lots than can be served by ground water supplies. Rural development is already contributing to wells going dry and Alternative 4 will exacerbate the problem.

Alternative 4 threatens our working farms and fertile land by paving over a precious, threatened resource. Once that is done, the loss of farmland cannot be regained.

Alternative 4 will cost taxpayers and ratepayers more money than they are spending now. Many peer-reviewed studies show that compact development saves taxpayers money in property taxes and community services.

Alternative 4 increases litigation risks and the costs of appeals to Clark County and its taxpayers. During the last GMA update, Clark County spent seven years in appeals, all the way to the Washington State Supreme Court. In the end, Clark County was mandated to take 1,500 acres of farmland out of the urban growth areas and re-designate it as Agriculture 20. These appeals are costly in terms of time and taxpayer money.

The argument that all landowners should be able to develop their property as they wish, ignores the importance of carefully-crafted land use and zoning laws that benefit the greater good. Without a thoughtfully-developed, evidence-based plan for the control of future growth, quality of life and environmental protections are lost for current and future generations. Chaotic, self-interested development harms everyone. We purchase our property with the full knowledge and understanding that it can only be developed within certain legal restrictions. We can sell it, as I did with two CC zoned lots not conducive to residential housing, when its zoning and land use designation does not meet our future needs.

Alternative 4 should be abandoned as it is not a viable option for Clark County's environmental and livability future.

16 Supporters

---

Loren Sickles inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 12:02 AM

I am in opposition to alternative 4 primarily on the basis of how this alternative was brought forward. The primary proponent has openly stated that no-one with knowledge of growth management, land-use or environmental laws was involved in the development of Alt 4. The formation of alternative 4 was done behind closed doors and without prior knowledge of the whole council or county staff. Alternative 4 should be, at the least, put on hold until the two new council members are installed, or scrapped altogether.

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Given the time constraints of State law the prudent path forward is to continue discussions focused on alternatives 1-3 as they are the only ones which have been thoroughly vetted by knowledgeable people.

13 Supporters

---

Esther Schrader inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 11:05 PM

Anything is better than Alternative 4.

3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 9:59 PM

While I really do not think Alt 1 is even viable anymore and Alt 2 is really bad in my opinion especially for my area I think Alt 3 has potential as does Alt 4. If we could work Alt 3 for the urban growth boundary areas and Alt 4 for the rural and Forestry and Ag plots I would see a seriously happy balance for all the landowners.

3 Supporters

---

Angela Pond inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 9:58 PM

Alternative 3 gets my vote as the best option. Allow our smaller communities to develop and marginally expand their boundaries. Alternative 4 is a thinly veiled attempt to develop the north county with thousands more homes. That sounds good...but wait..the homeowners will be working in Portland and there is no way to get there now without sitting in traffic for an hour or more each way. No plans in our lifetime to change this. Keep the north county rural, beautiful and producing goods on family farms.

10 Supporters

---

Linda Tubbs inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 9:50 PM

Sadly, it appears feedback such as mine and others (including planners) is meaningless. I do not wish to live in Los Angeles. I would like to continue to be able to purchase local farm products. The entire process behind alternative 4 smacks of inside baseball. If there is sanity, it will not be adopted. Mr Malinowski--the court actually upheld the GMA--see the decision attached:

[http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Legacy/western/decisions/1995/95-67\\_comp\\_ord.htm](http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Legacy/western/decisions/1995/95-67_comp_ord.htm)

3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 9:20 PM

I believe Alt 4 violates the Growth Management Act. It is also an insult to the qualified and talented staff who have worked on putting together robust and viable alternatives. It risks lawsuits and more wasted money by this council. I live in north county and do not want to be surrounded by McMansions. I believe in the viability of

---

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Clark County's agricultural community.

11 Supporters

---

Marvin Case inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 4:03 PM

I have examined maps of the four suggested land use alternatives. I have talked briefly with two county staff members. I think Alternative 4 is the most honest and realistic of those offered. In my area (although the plan does not benefit me) the plan coincides with existing parcel sizes. It is logical, drawing lines between larger and smaller forest zones along coinciding or conforming parcels. Alternative 4 preserves rural character while recognizing existing conditions. Selfishly, I would like my parcels to be located in smaller zones. But failing that, Alternative 4 is an intellectually honest portrayal of growth objectives in the county.

Marvin Case

7 Supporters

---