

Schroader, Kathy



From: Coyote Ridge Ranch <coyoteridge@tds.net>
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2015 6:44 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Hearing, 10 21
Attachments: Comments, Val 10 21 pages

Valerie Alexander
Coyote Ridge Ranch
2404 NW Coyote Ridge Rd.
La Center, WA 98629
Phone & Fax 360-263-2521
cell: 360-607-8797
coyoteridge@tds.net

Schroader, Kathy

From: Valerie Alexander <coyoteridge@tds.net>
Sent: Tuesday, October 20, 2015 3:40 PM
To: Schroader, Kathy
Subject: Re: Hearing, 10.21
Attachments: Val's comments, 10.21.rtf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

On Oct 20, 2015, at 8:18 AM, Schroader, Kathy <Kathy.Schroader@clark.wa.gov> wrote:

Valerie

The attachment you sent is not readable to us, it appears to be an apple program, please resend to us as a PDF

Thank you

Kathy Schroader, Office Assistant II
Community Planning Department
360-397-2280, X 4958
kathy.schroader@clark.wa.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Coyote Ridge Ranch [<mailto:coyoteridge@tds.net>]
Sent: Monday, October 19, 2015 6:44 PM
To: Cnty 2016 Comp Plan
Subject: Hearing, 10.21

Valerie Alexander
Coyote Ridge Ranch
2404 NW Coyote Ridge Rd
La Center, WA 98629
Phone & Fax: 360-263-2521
cell. 360-607-8797
coyoteridge@tds.net

This e-mail and related attachments and any response may be subject to public disclosure under state law

Valerie Alexander
Coyote Ridge Ranch
2404 NW Coyote Ridge Rd

La Center, WA 98629
Phone & Fax 360-263-2521
cell. 360-607-8797
coyoteridge@tds.net

Subject: Comments
Preferred Alternative for the 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Update

To: Community Planning
Comprehensive Plan Comments
PO Box 9810;
Vancouver WA 98666
Comp plan@clark.wa.gov

From:
Valerie Alexander
2404 NW Coyote Ridge Rd.
La Center, WA 98629
360-263-2521
Coyoteridge@tds.net

Please add my comments to the record.

My name is Val Alexander and I have lived in rural Clark County for 50 years and have operated an organic farm for over 20 years. I have reviewed the WRIA documents and comments that have been placed in the record and oppose the creation of any additional lots in the rural area as the domestic water supply is currently over allocated. I also have had a well fail on my property at the same time that others were drilling wells near my land.

I also am a board member of FOCC and support all of the substantive comments, facts and legal analysis that have been placed in the record by our members and our attorney, Mr. McDonald.

Today, I would just like to emphasize the following:

A clear majority of the Planning Commission recommends against the upzoning of any property in the rural area by votes of 5-1 and 4-2.

A clear majority of the Planning Commission believe that the expansions proposed under Alternatives #2, #3 and #4 are not fiscally sustainable and that the County cannot afford the development which would be allowed under alternatives 2,3,and 4.

The Cities of Vancouver, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Washougal, and Battleground oppose the upzoning in the rural area proposed in Alternatives #2 and #4, with small exceptions to their boundaries.

I suspect that if you ask the Community Planning Department and Legal Counsel to speak

candidly and openly, they would oppose the upzoning in the rural area proposed in Alternatives #2 and #4.

All four candidates for the two new council positions and the chair and have actively campaigned for them, all oppose upzoning in the rural area proposed in Alternatives #2 and #4.

Your financial advisors have advised against your proposal to remove the 2% increase in property taxes because it is not financially sustainable for the County;

The 2007 Capital Facilities Plan is a skeleton of its former self, having over 500 million dollars of projects deleted, presumably necessary to sustain the population numbers which are now in Alternative #1.

Councilor Madore, you are not a planner and have no known background in planning yet you insist on bypassing the paid and trained staff to create both alternative #4 or whatever combination you are about to promote. You continually violate the public trust by meeting out of the public light with CCCU members to plot and plan—This is your version of transparency?

You seem to be blind to this huge majority of stakeholders, elected officials, planners, legal staff, and councilor candidates who all oppose the up zoning in the rural area set forth in Alternatives #2 and #4. Rather you are only listening to a small group of land developers who have bought up properties, logged them, and subdivided the rural and resource areas for their own personal wealth. By following the wishes of the vocal few, you are either going to place huge tax burdens on the majority of the county's taxpayers or the county will simply not be able to put the required services in place to serve the explosive growth your plan will allow to occur in the rural area. If that happens, then when your anecdotal grandma calls 911 to get help when she falls and breaks her hip, she will get a voicemail loop because that is all the County will be able to afford.