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mentional Environmental Impact Statement (DEISs) used by the commission to form their original recommendation in Oc-
tober, saying it used "unrealistic" assumptions about the county's growth. In response, he made alter-
tations to the proposal—a fact which, in itself, has become a point of contention as critics openly worry about the effect of changing foundational facts so late in the process.

"The concerns and recommen-
dations expressed by the DEIS's citizen testimony and city repre-
sentatives have provided me with valuable feedback to make Alterna-
tive 4 better," Madore said. "As a result, Alternative 4 has been updated to lessen impacts and mitigate concerns."

But commissioners questioned the process by which Madore came up with the new planning ac-
asumptions. At a meeting at Ridgefield High School last week, Madore invited community mem-
ers to examine different assumptions for themselves to see which set they find more reasonable.

To arrive at their original rec-
ommendation, the planning com-
mision examined each of the 4 pro-
aposed alternatives and voted on every individual provision separately. No part of Alternative 4 survived that process.

Thursday's hearing took a dra-
astically different direction early on as planning commission 
Chair Ron Barca moved to re-issue the previous recommendation and end the

hearings almost immediately af-
ter convening. That idea caused a stir among several citizens who made a special trip to the 
Public Service Center to voice their concerns.

"Does that mean I won't get to speak?" one woman called from the audience.

In the end, county legal staff advised against ending the meet-
ing without hearing public testi-
mony. The motion did not pass.

Throughout the week, often passionate rural and urban cit-
tizens, elected officials and city repre-
sentatives talked about their concerns for and against Alternative 4 and the proposed planning assumptions.

"I don't think people should be afraid of the future," said Mike Hadman, an accountant who works in Portland and owns rural prop-
erty near Ridgefield.

"And you know what?" he con-
cluded. "The future includes a lot more people."

Fulton expressed frustration at what he called the planning commission's "defensive" stance and refusal to consider Madore's changed assumptions.

"The problem is they obvious-
ly weren't willing to listen to any-
thing but their own assumptions," he said. "For instance, if you look at the jobs, they just assumed everything would be buildable. But that's actually not true."

Fulton pointed to the building permit process as evidence that many rural properties will be slow to develop and many may never develop at all because of environmental constraints.

Alternative 4 does not con-
sider the future like it should," he said.

"Property is actually going to end up being more expensive because they're not going to meet the housing needs of the community," he added.

"Others disagreed. In a joint letter to the planning commission signed by representatives of the cities of Battle Ground, Camas, La Center, Ridgefield, Washingle, Vancouver, and Woodland, officials expressed grave concerns with the BOC's process and Alternative 4's viability under Washington's Growth Management Act. Madore brushed off concerns of legalists Tuesday.

"We would be silly to propose things that we know, on the face of it, would not just not comply with the law," he said.

When asked, he admitted he expected Alt 4 to be challenged in court if adopted.

"What's important is that we can defend it if it gets there," he said.

In a separate letter to the planning commission, Chad Eiken, Community and Economic De-
velopment Director with the City of Vancouver, took issue with the proposal to alter planning as-
sumptions.

The proposed rural assumptions are not supported by rural development data and in many cases not even with a credible rational," Eiken wrote in the letter.

Fulton also expressed dismay at a perceived infringement of rural landowner's property rights under the current Comprehensive Plan, which would remain in ef-
fect under Alternative 1.

You have these people in the city who don't own land in the county and they want to tell people in the counties what they can do with their land," he said. "They don't want people in the county to do anything with the land because they want to impose and enjoy nature regardless of what the people who own the property would like to do with it."

Despite the complicated pro-
processes and tangled web of the
commission kept to a simple path.

Commissioners voted 5 to 1 to ignore the revised planning as-
sumptions, disregard alterations to Alt 4, and reverse their earlier recommendation.

The hearing of County Com-
mmissioner will now be up on a preferred

alternative to be studied in a Final Environmental Impact State-
ment during a regular hearing Tuesday morning. Check www.
TheReflector.com Tuesday ev-
ning for an update.

On Friday, a day after the planning commission rejected Alternative 4 for a second time, Commissioner Madore posted a social media update stating the public to the Tuesday hearing at the Pub-
lic Service Center, 1011 Franklin

Street for an update.

Madore wrote.

Commissioners made the re-
commendation during a public

hearing Thursday evening at the end of a busy week for the Comp Plan update process. In recent weeks, Councilor David Madore has proposed a new "Plan B" set of planning assumptions that, among other things, would raise the projected population for Clark County over the next 20 years. The BOCG has recently ap-
proved the Alternative 4 update proposal in response to an earlier planning commission recommendation, which also left out any sign of Alternative 4.

Madore questioned data and projections in the Draft Supple-
mentary Environmental Impact Report (SEIR) that was released with the planning commission's original proposed alternatives and planning assumptions and re-issued an earlier Comp Plan recommendation unchanged.