Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Comments on the 2016 Growth Management Plan Update

The alternatives outlined in the draft SEIS each have their degree of unavoidable adverse effects. We strongly oppose Alternative 4, as it has the highest potential for negative impacts among all of the presented alternatives, could promote extensive and excessive growth in the county, and could affect the largest amount of acreage. We are alarmed at Alternative 4’s proposal to allow dramatic reduction in rural lot sizes. Perhaps instead Clark County should be exploring strategies that would allow large tracts of forested and/or rural lands to remain in their original uses in a way that is not just feasible, but profitable, for the property owner. We oppose Alternative 2 for much the same reasons.

We have no real objections to either Alternative 3, which would address cities’ concerns and allow growth within their respective communities. We believe communities should be consolidated with their infrastructure development, and not scattered. We also have no objection to the no-action alternative that would maintain the existing 2007 Comprehensive

When viewing the various county maps, it appears evident that there has not been historically controlled human growth in Clark County, regardless of past growth management plans and guidelines. And this human growth continues to expand cumulatively into otherwise non-intruded and undeveloped areas. The maps show mosaics of various land uses, such as residences, businesses, infrastructure development, support facilities, and so on, which implies uncontrolled and unregulated past human growth. This has allowed individuals to create their residences, their businesses, secondary businesses, roads and small support businesses, stores, shops, without structured guidelines and constraints.

Our principal concerns on the current growth management plan draft SEIS, on which a preferred alternative should be selected, are:
1. Preservation of continuous tracts of undeveloped rural, farm, and forested properties in the county.
2. Prevention of future human intrusion into undeveloped and non-impacted forested, rural, wildlife habitat, and farmland.
3. Maintaining and addressing the historic, cultural, rural, and cultural perceptions of the county in this planning effort.
4. Consolidating human development in already impacted/developed areas. The current planning effort does not seem to have covered these important issues in appropriate detail. And we do not perceive the term “mitigation” as an appropriate or acceptable means to compensate for unavoidable long-term effects.
We believe more controlled growth, and efforts to enhance the county’s agricultural base, are important to Clark County and its residents, than creating thousands of rural lots that will adversely impact taxpayers, the environment, and cultural values.

Carl and Colleen Keller
Brush Prairie, WA
ckeller360@q.com