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What are your thoughts on the 2016 Comprehensive Plan proposed alternatives analysis?

Terry Conner inside Clark County (on forum)  September 17, 2015, 10:58 AM
I support Alt 1, not because I believe that status quo is the best option long term, but because it is the best option now. Until a more realistic and accepted plan is presented, vetted and evaluated by environmental and community studies, we must not "re-create the wheel" at the whim of an unethical Council member. The political motives of Clark County Citizens United and Councilor David Madore are wholly responsible for the illegitimate creation of Alt 4. I am completely against Alt 4.

1 Supporter

Suzanne Kendall inside Clark County (on forum)  September 17, 2015, 10:36 AM
I am in full agreement with these two positions submitted previously:

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.

Suzanne P Kendall
Vancouver WA 98663

Roseann Thomsen inside Clark County (unverified)  September 17, 2015, 7:36 AM
Having lived in rural Clark County for 30 years, I believe the current growth management plan is satisfactory. Alternative 4 will benefit individuals that currently own large parcels, but would negatively impact their neighbors and local towns as infrastructure needs grow. Benefiting a few at the cost of many is short-sighted. The environmental, social, and economic impact does not pencil out in a positive way for our community.

Name not available (unclaimed)  September 16, 2015, 5:55 PM
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The alternatives outlined in the draft EIS 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 developed portions of 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 Plan.

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 of the current growth management plan draft EIS, 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

Name not available (unclaimed)  September 15, 2015, 3:55 PM
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What are your thoughts on the 2016 Comprehensive Plan proposed alternatives analysis?

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
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 be 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
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
2016 Comprehensive Plan Proposed Alternatives Analysis
What are your thoughts on the 2016 Comprehensive Plan proposed alternatives analysis?

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.
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Sincerely submitted,

Heather Tischbein
1119 NW 131st Way
Apt. A
Vancouver, WA 98685
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 be 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 become 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
September 15, 2015

Planning Commission
Board of County Councilors
2016 Comprehensive Plan Proposed Alternatives Analysis

What are your thoughts on the 2016 Comprehensive Plan proposed alternatives analysis?

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 be 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

1 Attachment
2016 Comprehensive Plan Proposed Alternatives Analysis

What are your thoughts on the 2016 Comprehensive Plan proposed alternatives analysis?

This is another power play by David Madore to get what he wants in this county, total control over the county.

1 Supporter

Name not available (unclaimed)  
August 11, 2015, 7:17 AM

Well I certainly think Alternative four is not a good choice at all. It would certainly create rural sprawl. This is not a viable alternative in any way, shape, or form. There is not enough infrastructure to support it. Property owners may think they want it, but wait until it happens and see who the first people to complain are. You like your peace and wide open space don’t you?....that will be all gone people....Really a bad bad idea...

Name not available (unclaimed)  
August 6, 2015, 7:52 AM

Table the entire Plan until a THOROUGH study has been done on long term effects of URBAN SPRAWL in rural Clark County. (Environmental is only a small part of the total effect on the land and resources!)

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)  
August 6, 2015, 7:15 AM

Alt 4 should be tossed. It was drafted by a non-union employee which is in violation of contracts. Otherwise Alt 2 appears to have a good balance and the biggest concern we have is ground water protection of small personal wells due to sprawl.

2 Supporters