FYI, and for the record. Thanks.

Oliver

From: Heather Tischbein [mailto:htischbein@wa-net.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 3:47 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Euler, Gordon
Subject: DSEIS testimony

Please find attached my testimony for the record in re to the DSEIS under consideration as part of the GMA-Comprehensive Plan update process underway.
Hello Heather:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your email and the attached comment. Staff will include in our record of index and made available to the PC and BOCC. Thank you.

Best,

Oliver

---

From: Heather Tischbein [mailto:htischbein@wa-net.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 3:47 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Euler, Gordon
Subject: DSEIS testimony

Please find attached my testimony for the record in re to the DSEIS under consideration as part of the GMA-
Comprehensive Plan update process underway.
Schroader, Kathy

From: Heather Tischbein <htischbein@wa-net.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 4:16 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Euler, Gordon; Schroader, Kathy
Subject: Re: DSEIS testimony
Attachments: September 15 2015 letter to Planning Commission and BOCC.doc

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Thank you, Oliver. I just caught a typo in what I sent you, so am sending again with the correction in verb tense. Picky, picky, picky. I can’t attend Thursday night hearings as I’m in Portland on Wed.-Thurs. each week, looking after my grandsons, and don’t leave until around 8 PM on Thursdays.

All the best to you as well,

Heather

----- Original Message ----- 
From: Orjiako, Oliver
To: 'Heather Tischbein'
Cc: Euler, Gordon ; Schroader, Kathy
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 4:05 PM
Subject: RE: DSEIS testimony

Hello Heather:

This is to acknowledge receipt of your email and the attached comment. Staff will include in our record of index and made available to the PC and BOCC. Thank you.

Best,

Oliver

From: Heather Tischbein [mailto:htischbein@wa-net.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 3:47 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver
Cc: Euler, Gordon
Subject: DSEIS testimony

Please find attached my testimony for the record in re to the DSEIS under consideration as part of the GMA- Comprehensive Plan update process underway.
This email and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law.
September 15, 2015

Planning Commission
Board of County Councilors
c/o Oliver Orjiako, Director
Clark County Community Planning
1300 Franklin St.
Third Floor
Clark County, WA 98660

Dear Planning Commissioners and County Councilors,

I am writing in support of your adopting proposed Alternative 1 as an interim preferred option to the GMA Comprehensive Plan. I am in accord with others who have already testified in favor of this option. These are my reasons:

1. To allow for the transition to a home rule county to fully complete: Clark County is in a transition year in terms of implementing the voter approved home rule charter. In this exceptional circumstance, it makes sense to me to postpone the deliberations and recommendations of changes to the current Comprehensive Plan until the two new councilors are elected and seated in January 2016.

2. To allow staff to address information gaps: As many who have testified have noted, the DSEIS that is under review is inadequate in its evaluation of the cumulative impacts of Alternative 2 and Alternative 4. Given the scope of potential environmental impacts of the creation of 8,200-12,400 new rural “lots” that these two alternatives allow, it seems that a full EIS would better provide a thorough analysis upon which informed decisions could made. And, as others have testified, there are also economic impacts inherent in each alternative that have not been thoroughly investigated and deliberated. Susan Rasmussen of Clark County Citizens United suggested in her letter to the editor, published in the Columbian on August 3, 2015, “Common sense would dictate that if the planners and elected leaders callously down-zoned thousands of acres, (in the 1990s) surely an economic analysis would be a prime consideration…this is required under the state Growth Management Act. This has not been done in Clark County.” Surely we would not choose to make the same mistake twice and up-zone thousands of acres without first doing a thorough economic analysis. In my opinion, to do so is akin to hoping that somehow two wrongs will magically create a right.

Though some have testified characterizing Alternative 1 as a “no action” alternative, planning commissioner Ron Barca explained quite simply in the joint hearing on September 10, 2015, that “no action” is not an accurate description of Alternative 1. Rather, Alternative 1, and the assumptions and projections upon which it is based, provides plenty of room for growth over the next couple of years. And the environmental impacts and costs to taxpayers and ratepayers are fairly well understood.
I also want to call attention to two themes that I have heard frequently in recent testimony by citizens: 1) a hearkening back to a past and to remembrances of future possibilities once held dear, the promise of which was perceived to have became thwarted by public policy decisions and 2) an assertion that private property rights are a more important community value than the common good. The Growth Management Act and Comprehensive Plan are intended and designed to plan for the future, not to preserve or restore the past. The GMA Comprehensive Plan is intended to be a place-based approach for managing growth, grounded in local conditions, constraints, and culture and looking towards a community vision of a desired future. I urge planning commissioners and county councilors to stay true to an orientation to the future grounded in Clark County circumstances and to balancing the diverse interests of individuals with the common interests of our entire urban-rural community of Clark County.

In this regard, I suggest loosening lingering attachments to the way things used to be and embracing future scenario planning as a way to open up everyone’s thinking and visioning about what a comprehensive plan could look like that addresses, balances, and integrates the diversity of interests and values in our community. Most of the testimony I have witnessed in these matters perpetuates historical “us vs. them” thinking and does not look to a future in which the social and cultural makeup of our county will be increasingly more diverse than it is now and in which projected impacts from various climate change scenarios will demand new ideas about how we are going to live together in ways that don’t further existing income inequalities and that assures there is adequate food, water and shelter for everyone. Most economic, business, and political analysts agree that the pace and complexity of change will continue to increase. Holding to the past and to 20th century possibilities will not prepare us for the uncertain future we are facing in the 21st century.

It is my testimony that to intelligently prepare for our future and our children’s and grandchildren’s future, we need more facts and more time for creative thinking and problem-solving before committing as a community to changes in the existing Comprehensive Plan. Adopting Alternative 1 as short term interim plan creates the time and space during this exceptional time of transition in government to 1) get all the elected decision-makers seated; 2) allow planning staff to address information gaps and analyses, and suggest some possible future scenarios; and 3) allow for thoughtful citizen deliberation and engagement around designing a preferred future vision for Clark County—one that truly balances and integrates the present diversity of interests and values among citizens and provides a foundation for a future of thriving resilience for all people, regardless of their race, creed, or income level.

Sincerely submitted,

Heather Tischbein
1119 NW 131st Way
Apt. A
Vancouver, WA 98685