

# Public Comment

# SEPA Alternatives

April 10-April 13, 2015  
(3:35 p.m.)

# 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

*What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?*

All Statements sorted chronologically

As of April 13, 2015, 3:35 PM



*As with any public comment process, participation in Engage Clark County is voluntary. The statements in this record are not necessarily representative of the whole population, nor do they reflect the opinions of any government agency or elected officials.*

# 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

*What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?*

As of April 13, 2015, 3:35 PM, this forum had:

Attendees: 338

All Statements: 68

Hours of Public Comment: 3.4

This topic started on April 7, 2015, 5:27 PM.

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 13, 2015, 3:32 PM

We are longtime North County residents and are concerned about the need for an expedited decision on this issue – one that will affect many of us for decades to come. We ask the board and others involved in this process to defer this decision until the board has additional members to guide this process. Growth is not a bad thing, but such growth will require infrastructure improvements to our roads, schools, fire and other safety systems. The people who desire accelerated growth are also those who would ask for waived impact and building fees, and refute the need to raise the funds (taxes) to meet these needs. The cost of this growth needs to be carefully evaluated. And we don't see that these cost have been estimated or that there is consensus, particularly on the impacts of option 4. (It is very difficult to interpret option 4, as the color schematics aren't similar to the other plans.) We repeat, please defer this decision until the expanded (voter-requested) board is populated.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 3:28 PM

There are so many things wrong about Alt4. First of all, zoning revises require due diligence in preplanning for all the infrastructure needed to serve the growth and needs of any new proposed development. Schools, roads, local community needs and marketability just to name a few. Let's look at the areas affected by downsizing lot size and the impact it would have on each community. Schools. We are already at full capacity in most high schools. The roads, try driving on Hwy 503 and Main st. in Battle Ground. It's beyond capacity now. Simply put, we all know the cart has to come before the horse. Plan ahead for growth. It is what the planning board is here to do. It is what they are trained to do. Who benefits from Alt4? Certainly not the majority of us. As a Realtor here working with rural land sales I do not see any big demand for rural acre lots. The biggest issue I have is how can a person with no experience in zoning and planning just bring a proposition to the table? No to Alt4.

---

A.G. Flynn inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 2:56 PM

Land use and growth alternatives as presented on this website are difficult to compare coherently. GIS or cartographic systems were not used properly to allow for across-the-alternative comparisons. Legends, colors and overlays should match on each proposal. Sadly this basic instrument was not used to citizens' advantage. Shortcomings in basic presentation aside, it is clear that Clark County should WAIT to implement any plan proposals or alternatives until a full council is seated and sworn in 2016. Any attempt to foreclose on this important process before all five members are seated could open the county for lawsuits, frivolous and otherwise, by landowners on every side of this debate. At this date there is no need to decide the future of land use in Clark County. The State of Washington will allow deliberation in 2016, so no "straw man" arguments about timing need be advanced. IF comments are regarded by existing council electeds the first easy move is REJECTION of Alternative 4. Opening rural lands to sprawl and foolish infrastructure development will cause basic quality-of-life in our county to suffer. Several other agencies with high stakes have not been consulted on this poorly crafted proposal. WSDOT, school districts and fire suppression organizations need to comment before it could even be considered viable. Summary: REJECT Alternative 4.

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

IF the current panel of county representatives feels they must choose from the existing alternatives before they are joined by a full and complete council they would be wise to select Alternative 1 or Alternative 2. Either of these proposals allow Clark County to continue metered growth and actively seek compatible industry while maintaining good relationships with all municipalities, school districts and area service providers. Summary: Accept Alternative 1 or Alternative 2.

OVERALL - Clark County should wait to decide this issue until a full council is available to vote in 2016. Alternative 4 should be rejected as incomplete and flawed. Alternative 1 is acceptable. Alternative 2 is acceptable.

---

Elizabeth Campbell inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 2:53 PM

I support Alternative 2. It allows for ample, appropriate growth and business development in Clark County. I particularly oppose Alternative 4 which is contrary to the intent of the Growth Management Act. It would result in sprawl and an increased demand for services in our rural areas.

1 Supporter

---

Rachel Woodward Clark (unverified)

April 13, 2015, 2:27 PM

I support option 1 or 2, I strongly oppose option 4. Option 4 is strongly against agriculture. After moving here from an area where farmers and farmland are cherished, I am surprised to see such option 4. Farming, livestock and open space should be supported and we should not be looking at extending the urban growth boundary and giving up so much undeveloped land to development of business parks and housing subdivisions. Homeowners are already feeling pushed off of their own properties by developers due to increasing taxes. Open space should be preserved for the public to enjoy.

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 13, 2015, 1:37 PM

Alternative 1 is my vote and is best for our community.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (unverified)

April 13, 2015, 1:22 PM

The County Councilors should adopt Alternative 1. The current plan provides plenty of land for growth, keeps large acreage for farm and forest uses, avoids the costs of providing services to many small parcels located all over the county, and ensures we will have large enough parcels to provide for economic development/local jobs.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 11:42 AM

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

What makes Clark county a great place to live is the amount of farm land and open space; this (north Clark county) is a place where people want to come to get away from urban sprawl, breathe fresh air and experience the country. The extremely valuable resource and commodity which is Clark county is being and will be lost forever with each parcel of land developed for high density housing and unnecessary commercial use. Clark county would be better served by growing up instead of out, focusing on developing tourism, thinking about the effects of these growth alternatives on future generations, and remembering that these growth alternatives go against the Growth Management Act, and knowingly creates conditions that:

Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,321 new rural lots

Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection

Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:

Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners

Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don't divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase

More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases

Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations

1 Supporter

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 10:06 AM

It is my opinion, and shared with a growing number of concerned citizens, that this "Alternative 4", currently being considered, is the creation of an inexperienced policy analyst (a member of the Councilors' staff), at the direction of a County Councilor; and it came to be only as a result of Councilors' relationship with Clark County Citizens United, a special interest group. It needs to be noted that CCCU alleges representation of "6,000" (sometimes 8,000) rural landowners in Clark County, although absolutely no documentation exists for this number to be verified.

CCCU does not represent all rural landowners but is receiving special treatment. This was unethically, and perhaps illegally, reinforced by that fact that CCCU was the only special interest group invited to the work session held on March 11, 2015, where CCCU was supposed to be representing rural land-owners. This action in itself flies in the face of a goal of the Growth Management Act, "Citizen participation and coordination. Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts" (Goal #11).

Other community groups, such as the Clark/Cowlitz Farm Bureau, Friends of Clark County, Friends of East Fork, Clark County Food System Council or any number of rural neighborhood associations - of which none were invited to the table at a particular, well-attended and very public work session (March 11) - .have not received the attention or the ear of the majority of the current County Councilors, and, in fact, conversations have been denied ..... conversations, for example, regarding TDR's. TDR's have been suggested and encouraged by no fewer than three community groups for the last 20 years. Absolutely no consideration has been given to this program.

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

This is but one issue surrounding the development of Alternative 4 as an update to the Comprehensive Growth Plan. There are numerous violations that would be created by the acceptance of this alternative: suburban sprawl, critical depletion of ground and surface water available in rural areas, loss of productive ag land, potential infrastructure failures, increase in property taxes - and more.

It is obvious that all continuing efforts to pursue Alternative 4 is an investment of taxpayer money on something that should never come to be, and, at worst, will result in sizeable lawsuits. This is an irresponsible or even unethical use of tax money.

2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 13, 2015, 9:53 AM

I support alternative 1. Sue Cannard

---

George Espinosa inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 9:42 AM

After attending most of the "Open Houses", submitting at least two petitions and making numerous appeals to the BOCC since 2007, we have yet to see that all the public input and personal appeals has influenced the direction of this plan. When one studies the current boundaries of the City of Vancouver, and the area now in Urban Holding, you discover the area of Urban Hold is more than twice the size of the City. Then consider that none of the projected growth and job creation estimates have even come close to reality, one can only conclude this whole exercise is nothing more than an expansion of Government control by absorbing our Private Property Rights at the total expense of the property owners. I am not a Lawyer but have read many cases regarding property rights and believe that Property Rights are included in Constitutional right to Due Process, which has so obviously been denied in this case to the point it is my opinion it amounts to a "Taking" which demands we be compensated for being denied our intended lawful use of our properties.

Respectfully:

George L. Espinosa

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 13, 2015, 8:25 AM

In our view all four proposed maps are unsuitable. We believe the large parcels surrounded by small lots should be respectfully changed to mirror their neighbors. We own 80 acres located at 16104 NE 259th Street. The tax parcels are as follows: 986003678; 986027184; 226268000; 986027183. Our neighbors have 5 acre zoning to the north and to the west. South and adjacent of us, the zoning is ONE and two acre lots. Many houses surround us. We are located one mile north of Battle Ground main street. We have PUD water and a reservoir and pump station on our property. Fire Dist. #3 is less than a mile away. We have County road frontage. We plan to continue growing trees, but would like the option to create smaller farms in the future. We believe 5 acre mini farms are ideally suited for Clark County. We believe all ag-land should be zoned 5 acres, and all forest land should be zoned 10 acres. We also do not understand why some ag land on Alternative 4 is proposed for 5

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

acre zoning while our land on the edge of B.G. is proposed for 10 acre zoning. This new zoning will impact our personal financial retirement lives for many years to come. We thank you for all your hard work. But we believe in being realistic about an urban county being fair to the large landowners. Large land owners need to be treated with fairness and have their land zoned in a way that is reflective of their neighbors.  
Respectfully, Dave and Valerie Larwick

---

Jeffrey Posey inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 7:18 AM

I support alternative 1. Although, there should be more wilderness area and agriculture land. We are using every square inch of Clark County and it is wasteful.

2 Supporters

---

Brian Grier inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 7:15 AM

I think #4 is a bad idea. It would allow more development outside the current growth boundaries. This would create havoc with infrastructure. I prefer #1

3 Supporters

---

Vicki Kraft inside Clark County (on forum)

April 13, 2015, 12:34 AM

I recommend adoption of Amendment # 4 for the 2016 Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. It addresses the real disparities Clark County rural landowners have been facing for the last 20 years. It provides for rural zoning which is more representative of the actual lot sizes. Previously zoning had been determined inaccurately based on aerial photos which make it extremely difficult at best to really know how many acres make up a lot or area. In addition, there were many rural lands with faulty soil data and designations. These designations should have been based on the 1972 NRCS soil manual but weren't. Thankfully under this new amendment actual land size is being recognized and accounted for with new corresponding acreage zoning. This will prevent the landlock nature of downzoning which put a gridlock on most rural landowners in 1994 when the current zoning structure was implemented. Under this new amendment, rural farmers and citizens will once again have the freedom and flexibility to sell off a small portion of their property or leave 1-2 acres to their children if they choose. My hat is off to the County Councilors for taking extra measures to make sure the rural citizens are heard - including the public open houses and this online forum. This newest amendment best reflects the voice and needs of local rural landowners. I'm hopeful we'll see Amendment # 4 included for our rural community in the updated Clark County Comprehensive Plan.

---

JAN VERRINDER inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 10:05 PM

Forget 4: sprawl, increased public services demand without a payment plan, traffic congestion, ruins the rural feel. I favor #1 or 2, and would prefer we file for extension until the 5 councilors under the Charter are seated.

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

3 Supporters

---

Russ Williams inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 9:01 PM

I would prefer Option 1 or Option 2, as they support more gradual development and protect more of our environment. Also, they support a more modest increase on demand for expanded infrastructure. Option 3 is not as conservative, while Option 4, only recently presented, seems to have been developed with limited input, and minimal opportunities for widespread public evaluation and input.

---

Greg Bender inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 8:58 PM

My wife and I moved as far north into Clark County as we could afford to get away from sprawl. We are in favor of growth management that does not open the flood gates to mass development. Clark County has some of the most productive agricultural land in the state, and nothing is being done to conserve any of it.

We are 100% against alternative 4 for numerous reasons. Alternative 4 flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that:

- Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,321 new rural lots.
- Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection.
- Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies.

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:

- Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners.
- Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don't divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase.
- More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases.
- Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations.

3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 8:11 PM

I am opposed to alternative 4 because it encourages endless development and growth which rapidly begets further development and more growth. This cycle is unsustainable, like a pyramid scheme which kicks the cost down the road to the next generation. Clark County must invest in quality of life practices such as preserving arable food producing and climate controlling larger parcels from becoming another strip mall.

1 Supporter

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 12, 2015, 5:24 PM

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

For sensible growth, the facts support Alternative # 1. It already allows over nine thousand new rural parcels.

A sensible growth plan supports Alternative # 1. It already has room for over nine thousand new rural parcels. Clark County will function the best when the greatest amount of growth occurs within the cities. Having to provide services and infrastructure beyond city limits is far more costly and impractical than developing land within the boundaries of our fine, well run Cities in the County. Creating over seventeen thousand lots as would be permitted under alternative #4 would be an expensive disaster for the County, raise taxes on all the

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

neighbors of the upzoned properties, and keep the cities where those services are already provided growing on a far more orderly basis. Paul Christensen

Rory Bowman inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 3:48 PM

I was born and raised in Clark County, a fifth-generation Washingtonian. As such, I have watched the process and effects of suburban development in Clark County for almost all of my fifty years, and this gives me some perspective on how development can unfold and the many different impacts it can have: positive and negative, expected and unexpected.

Of the four alternatives on offer I support either Alternative 1 (no substantive change) or Alternatives 2 or 3 (with small, mostly city-requested changes). I absolutely oppose Alternative 4.

Previous growth-management planning was completed before the 2008 economic downturn and predictions of greater economic and population pressures made then have not yet been fulfilled. In the absence of even those levels of growth, no major change is warranted at this time, and so Alternative 1 is most appropriate. We planned for growth that did not happen, much as a parent might buy clothes for a growing child. Just as it would make no sense for such a parent to buy more even larger clothes, it makes no sense for us to discard Alternative 1, which Clark County hasn't yet grown into.

Alternative 3 is more aggressive than present population numbers or available funds for infrastructure warrant, and will be a fine starting point as an aggressive-growth option during the next planning cycle, but is arguably too aggressive and expensive at this time, negatively impacting agriculture. With one set of too-large clothes, what reasonable parent would buy more?

Alternative 4 seems less like a serious professional proposal than a real-estate development wish list of the kind that was common in the late 1980's and 1990's, as incoming money sought to overbuild in the areas opened by I-205 with strong hope of fast returns on the southern California development model then ascendant. It does not show signs of serious input from trained development staff, and there is every indication that it was put forward by David Madore and non-planning staff Peter Silliman and Don Benton, in violation of the newly-adopted county charter and standard land-use planning protocols and procedures. Completing the parents' new clothes analogy, Alternative 4 is a whole stack of of too-big britches.

Alternative 1 is more than adequate for this planning cycle and the oddly aggressive Alternative 4 should absolutely be taken off the table. Given the current political situation in Clark County with the newly adopted council system, it would be even better if these discussions could be delayed until all five county councilors have been seated and had time to "get up to speed" on lawful and ethical planning methods. If such a delay is not possible, the conservative course is to hold position and not commit county resources to any major change.

Alternative 1 is much to be preferred of the three serious alternatives on offer.

- Rory Bowman, Post Office Box 202, Vancouver

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

5 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 3:32 PM

The timing of, and the process/resources used to bring alternative 4 to the comprehensive plan update for Clark County is, in my opinion, of concern:

Late in the process, well after cut-off for new options.

Rushed to the discussion.

Presented by one councilor, with some assistance from a non-planner staff, and input from a limited number of citizen activists.

Non-collaborative with local jurisdictions (schools, cities, transportation planners, water and power providers)

Non-collaborative with county planning staff who are trained, and obligated to follow laws and best-practices in following public involvement.

Consequence of Alternative 4

Encourages suburban sprawl.

Diminishes the size and productivity of agricultural lands.

Impacts forested areas (with related water quality risks due to septic tanks and de-forestation)

Adds no road capacity, while increasing quantity of residents in rural areas.

Related environmental failures probable: water supply, water quality, air quality.

Pressure on rural schools (building capacity and transportation)

Straining public services like law enforcement, fire protection, and emergency medical response.

Most importantly:

Limits future necessary expansion of city urban growth boundaries when the county areas are too small and highly-parcelized for job-lands, and built with rural housing. This will kill the city & county jobs producing ability in the next 20 years, further forcing our kids/grand-kids to leave to find a job/career elsewhere.

And, the risks, if it is adopted, to the county budget for legal defense.

I support alternative 2, cleans up some left-over issues, yet does not increase sprawl, keeps citizen costs low (taxes remain low).

5 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 2:53 PM

I am in support of options 1 and 2 but would prefer this decision was postponed until the full 5 councilors are seated in January 2016. I am against option 4 as it makes the most changes with out any required review of the individual properties. There are many non-similar changes made that would be better handled on a case-by-case basis taking local factors into consideration.

1 Supporter

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 2:39 PM

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

I am in favor of delaying adoption of the GMA plan until the Council has 5 members and can have a full discussion without the pressure of a last minute addition to the alternatives addressed. Alternative 4 is too broad and creates future uncertainty. It is hard to compare its impact on future development in the County given that the maps for the various alternatives do not follow the same format. However, overall, it just takes too many scattered properties out of the rural, agricultural and forestry zones creating a random pattern of development that will make it a) hard for genuine farmers to carry on normal business, and b) making it almost impossible to respond to new residents requests for services that will be inevitable over time. Alternative 1 provides adequate growth opportunities with some minor adjustments. For example, I believe staff said option 3 offered a more open timeline for appeals and I would possibly in favor of this for those who were residents of non-conforming lots prior to the adoption of the last Growth Management Plan. Or, I would possibly support a TDR plan for these 'grandfathered' rural landowners - - but not for those who purchased after the last plan's adoption. Alternative 4 is not acceptable as it is.

2 Supporters

---

Bill Baumann inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 1:51 PM

I support alternative 2. I strongly oppose alternative 4. It was created in a back room by a special interest group and one councilor and does not take into account the interests of the entire county.

3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (unverified)

April 12, 2015, 11:14 AM

I oppose Alt 4. It will further unbalance the ratio of developable land to farm land and threatens the future of Clark County's local food supply. David Madore continues to push his personal agenda which flies in the face of State law and policy and ignores the needs of our citizenry except for those of his big business buddies. NO ON ALT 4. Patty Ingraham

---

Warren Neth inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 10:51 AM

Board of Clark County Councilors,  
Clark County is a rapidly urbanizing county and part of an ever-expanding metropolitan area. Our natural resources, rural character, great schools and neighborly community are a few of the reasons, which make Clark County a highly desirable community to live in. Your stewardship of the Comprehensive Plan process is crucial to preserving that livability.

Slow Food Southwest Washington does not believe that ALT 4 should be considered in this round of GMA updates. The proposal opens developments into Clark County's rural areas without consideration of:

1. The smaller parcel sizes that ALT4 proposes will put increased market pressure on our remaining agricultural land, out pricing larger lots for 'commercially viable farms', as described in the 2007 "Analysis of the Agricultural

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

Economic Trends and Conditions in Clark County, Washington” by Globalwise.

2. How will these new, smaller parcel size designations be used in the future? Developing these smaller parcel sizes, without creating zones where they will be used in the long-term, will open the smaller parcel sizes to be used during Annual Review process anywhere in the rural area. I do not believe the discretionary procedure of clustering similarly sized lots will provide adequate direction for future clustering of similar sized lots that you have proposed.

3. ALT4 directs development toward Rural areas, which does not honor the considerable investment made to direct development toward Cities, Rural Centers, and Urban Reserves that Clark County has already made.

Slow Food Southwest Washington questions:

Rural Character -

How will the 1 acre parcelization of Clark County's forest and fields effect traffic and other lifestyle benefits of Clark County's rural character?

Property taxes - Has their been an assessment of how rural landowners taxes will raise as the new smaller zoned lots, as well as the houses and infrastructure they require as they develop?

Capitol Improvements - How does the BOCCC plan to pay for the new roads, utilities, sewer, fire districts, sheriff's presence and other Capitol Improvements as we open up 15,000 new parcels across our rural areas?

Water- Clark County's rural residents are dependent on wells that draw from already stressed aquifers. Who will be monitoring the effect of new wells drilled and manage our water resources?

Process-

1. After the community had already given input during the first two years on ALT1, ALT2, ALT3, Council member Madore proposed ALT4, with minimal analysis and outreach to effected stakeholders.

2. At the March 11th, BOCCC Work Session Council member Madore continually insisted "No new parcels will be created". At the following Open House, Community Planning stated an estimated 15,000 new parcels would be created between ALT3 and 4.

3. The 2013 survey of AG20 and FR40 landowners called the Rural Census was not a scientific poll, vote or an actual census. The questions left ambiguity and were loaded. Removing AG20 and FR40 based on this survey is not good stewardship of the Comprehensive Planning process nor Clark County's agriculture or forest resource lands.

Slow Food Southwest Washington requests:

1. Consider zoning options that would provide flexibility to family's who might want to share their land, not a blanket zoning policy that opens Clark County's rural areas to subdivision.

2. Focus residential development to Cities, Rural Centers, and Urban Reserves.

3. Protect Clark County's last large acreage parcels of class 1 growing soils. Develop Agricultural Production

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

District's, Transfer of Development Rights and Purchase of Development Rights as described in numerous reports developed by citizen led committees, such as Clark County Agriculture Preservation Strategies Report, Clark County Food System Council's "Conserving agricultural food production in Clark County", Slow Food Southwest Washington's "Grow Clark County" recommendations.

4. Consider the Grow Clark County recommendation to develop policy that conserves farmland and strengthens the farm economy. More info here: [www.slowfoodswwa.com/growclarkcounty](http://www.slowfoodswwa.com/growclarkcounty)

I look forward to talking further about these issues.

Thank you,  
Warren Neth  
Executive Director  
Slow Food Southwest Washington  
360-771-1296  
[warren@slowfoodswwa.com](mailto:warren@slowfoodswwa.com)  
[www.slowfoodswwa.com](http://www.slowfoodswwa.com)

8 Supporters

---

D Olson inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 8:19 AM

Alternative Four is flawed in many ways but among the most egregious is the unacceptable level of capitol costs such unplanned population increases will cost County taxpayers due to the 'leapfrog' nature of such development.

A second problem with Alternative 4 is the lack of professional guidance and citizen input that such projects demand. The last minute-hurried nature of the proposal left little or no time for meaningful public involvement or process.

I urge the Councilors to reject Alt-4 based on future costs and the lack of public transparency and input from Clark Co citizens outside the developer and 'stand to profit' supporters of the proposal.

2 Supporters

---

Bob Brewer inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 7:28 AM

How can it be considered planning when properties within 100 yards of an elementary school remain zoned 5 acres or larger?

Communities thrive in close proximity to their schools and public facilities. Forcing families away destroys their community.

Sequestration of school adjacent properties sacrifices the safety of our littlest school children and is the death sentence to family centered communities.

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 12, 2015, 7:14 AM

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

WHERE WILL WE GET OUR FOOD,WE NEED MORE FARMS NOT HOUSES, THEPRICE OF LAND IS SO HIGH THAT YOU CANT AFFORD TO FARM UNLESS SOMEONE IS WORKING.WITH NEWHOUSING COMES MORE WATER USAGE WHERE WILL FARMS GET THEIR WATER/DO ANY OF YOU SUPPORT YOUR LOCAL FARMERGO OUT TO A FEW FARMS AND YOU WILL SEE THEY FARM BECAUSE THEY LOVE IT NOT TO GET RICH.

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 11, 2015, 5:52 PM

I support Alternative 1.

---

Kathryn Ketcham inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 4:43 PM

I would like to comment in favor of Alternative 2 which I understand is Alternative 1 with some additions to Urban Growth Areas requested by some of the cities and a few corrections. This is a conservative choice which is responsive to some urgent needs.

I would also like to note that it is difficult to compare Options 1-3 with Option 4 on the available maps because the categories and color scheme are different.

That said, I oppose Alternative 4 for these reasons: 1) From the maps it looks like Alternative 4 increases residential lots without regard to maintaining Resource Lands including Forest and Agricultural land and, possibly, without regard of wetlands, riparian lands and wildlife habitat. 2) The addition of so many residential lots (I have heard figures ranging from 6,000-8000) with the associated non-permeable surfaces of rooftops, driveways, and access roads is a storm water management issue. 3) In addition, I am concerned about the cost of infrastructure for these diffuse residences and how it will be paid. No detailed plan for paying for the infrastructure has been presented.

Sincerely,  
Kathryn Ketcham  
123 W. 30th St  
Vancouver, WA 98660  
360-693-5373

2 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 2:22 PM

Alt 4 is bad because it negatively affects environmental impacts on air/water quality/wildlife protection. It also creates risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies. Finally Alt 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of: Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners.

The Best choice is Alt 1 still allows for the growth of 9,390 new rural parcels. Alt 1 keeps Clark County out of

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

legal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected. It minimizes pressure on rural schools and public services. Changes are not needed because growth assumptions of 2007 were never realized.

3 Supporters

---

Betty Montgomery inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 1:23 PM

"I am alarmed by the process underway. I respectfully request that no action be taken on selecting or deleting any of the alternatives until after the full, five-member council is seated in January 2016. I believe that the state will support the county's request for a postponement due to our newly enacted Home Rule Charter."

2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 11, 2015, 1:09 PM

We need to extend deadline for public comment.

We need farmlands in Clark County! The key is to manage growth but not at the cost of losing precious small farms.

Donna Roberge

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 12:21 PM

I support Alternative 1. The current Comprehensive Growth Management Plan was adopted in 2007 with overly optimistic population assumptions that were never realized. Alternative 1 still has room for population growth while protecting forests, agricultural land and ground water supplies. infrastructure and emergency services are designed to accommodate Alternative 1.

I oppose Alternative 4. It violates the State Growth Management Act by encouraging suburban sprawl and diminishing agriculture and forest lands. Alternative 4 would create an additional 17,321 new rural lots scattered haphazard over east and north Clark County. These additional lots will cause increased taxes for all county residents to provide infrastructure, including roads, schools, police, fire and other emergency services. Additional scattered development could affect watersheds and aquifers by creating more hardscape that encourages runoff rather than percolation into the groundwater. The changes in zoning will increase property taxes for those who do not subdivide. Current rural landowners who complain of the inability to reap economic benefits by subdividing their land ignore the fact that they have benefited economically for years from lower property tax rates for agricultural and forestry zoning. Wildlife habitat will decrease as more forest lands are cleared and farmlands are converted to subdivisions. All county taxpayers will be burdened with the costs of defending the county against lawsuits for violation of state law, when those funds in the county budget to be better used to serve current needs.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 12:19 PM

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

I support Alternative 1, the no change alternative as the growth assumptions of 2007 were never realized. Alt 1 still allows for the growth of 9,390 new rural parcels. Alt 1 keeps Clark County out of legal entanglements, which keep taxes down, emergency services reliable and our water supply protected.

Alternative 4 is a bad plan. It flies in the face of state law, the Growth Management Act, by knowingly creating conditions that:

Support suburban sprawl and diminish the size and productivity of agricultural lands, creating over 17,321 new rural lots

Sets the stage for the associated infrastructure failures, negative environmental impacts on air and water quality and wildlife protection

Creates real risk to the depletion of ground and surface water supplies

Alternative 4 also creates credible financial risks to taxpayers in the form of:

Increases in property taxes to all property owners and especially to some rural landowners

Property value increases due to zoning so even if citizens don't divide and develop their land, taxes will still increase

More pressure on rural schools and public services, furthering tax increases

Costs to defend against lawsuits re non-compliance with GMA process, rules and regulations

1 Supporter

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 11:29 AM

The Comp plan over estimated growth from 2007. Alternative 1 is the only one that makes sense. Why would the County want to increase urban sprawl and ruin the rural lifestyle, not to mention the added taxes and costs that would be required if Alternative 4 were adopted. Keep Clark County horse friendly with urban/rural buffers which can blend high density urban areas with low density rural areas and protect agri/forest areas. Protect our watershed and our soil.

2 Supporters

---

William Maiden inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 11:15 AM

Alternative 4 takes the county in absolutely the wrong direction. It would increase sprawl and put pressure on public services with no way to pay for them. It is a bad idea. By the way... It seems like this was a surprise to the county planning department. How could that happen?

---

Chuck Green inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 10:53 AM

All Statements sorted chronologically

As of April 13, 2015, 3:35 PM

<http://peakdemocracy.com/2623>

Page 17 of 29

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

As a candidate for Clark County Council District 2, here is why I am opposed to Comprehensive Plan Alternative 4. I offer the following comments for the record, and a proposed solution.

-Chuck Green  
Ridgefield

Beside the fact it was developed by one County Councilor, who will also be voting on it as a preferred land use alternative, and one special interest group, it has a number of flaws.

Take a look at the maps, which I am attaching to my post here. What do you get?

- Parcelization of rural Clark County into 1-5 acre parcels. It will add 8,000 new lots (see page 26, [http://clark.wa.gov/thegrid/documents/2015\\_0414\\_BOCC\\_H\\_SEPA\\_ALT\\_STAFF\\_REPORT\\_and\\_ATTACHMENTS.pdf](http://clark.wa.gov/thegrid/documents/2015_0414_BOCC_H_SEPA_ALT_STAFF_REPORT_and_ATTACHMENTS.pdf)).

- No protection for small farms or other agricultural uses, including wineries.

- 8,000 large houses on these new lots, translating to 20,000 more people in the rural area.

- With 25-30 percent of Clark County workers commuting to Portland, this potentially adds 12,000 more vehicles a day crossing our already-overcrowded I-5 and I-205 bridges.

What do you also get?

- NO NEW JOBS. Other than a few service workers cleaning or doing landscaping at these new rural mansions, this alternative creates no new jobs.

- NO RELIEF TO I-5 CONGESTION. Those opposed to previous efforts to add capacity to I-5 across the Columbia River wanted Clark County to add jobs to reduce I-5 Bridge congestion. Alternative 4 does not alleviate I-5 Bridge congestion; it increases it.

- NO PROTECTION OF SMALL FARMS and other agricultural uses. If you want to see what you get when you have 1-5 acre rural lots, check out the Rolling Hills area south of Ridgefield.

- STRANGLING OF SMALL CITIES. Creating a ring of large, expensive houses around our small cities prevents future growth. Which means no new small city neighborhoods and no new jobs.

- INCREASED TRAFFIC CONGESTION ON RURAL ROADS AND THROUGH SMALL CITIES. With no rural services, retail areas, or job centers, 20,000 rural residents will travel southward into Vancouver and across the I-5/I-205 bridges, adding substantial traffic to substandard roads.

- NO ACCESS TO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION. There is no way C-TRAN can afford to serve these outlying areas, nor are there sidewalks or paths for rural residents to use or to access C-TRAN.

- IMPACT ON GROUNDWATER. Rural lots will be served by wells and septic tanks, not water and sewer lines.

# 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

## MY VALUE-BASED COMPREHENSIVE PLANNING PROPOSAL

- Extend the current Comprehensive Plan one year (Alternative 1) as the “interim Comprehensive Plan.” Extending the current plan one year allows two new councilors to have a say. It allows for the county to meet the state-imposed June 2016 deadline, staving off state sanctions.
- Undertake a broad, value-based community discussion on what should go into the Comprehensive Plan.
- Agree on values and performance measures with which to develop and evaluate the Plan.
- Include a comprehensive variety of community groups, such as Clark County Citizens United, Friends of Clark County, land conservation as well as the building and development community, and others, to provide input and discuss trade-offs of various options.
- Bring in a group such as WSU-Vancouver’s Initiative for Public Deliberation to facilitate a series of forums to capture community input.
- Allow County Planning staff to fairly and equitably develop and evaluate a plan for community review, before acted on by the FIVE County Councilors.

### 1 Attachment

[https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/132tu3zpgaeo.427/Alt4\\_Uses.jpg](https://pd-oth.s3.amazonaws.com/production/uploads/attachments/132tu3zpgaeo.427/Alt4_Uses.jpg) (87.6 KB)

### 2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 11, 2015, 10:30 AM

I support Alternative 4. Most people living in the rural area are there because they wanted to live in the country. This alternative would be the best plan. Most landowners would not build houses on every parcel of land they own.

---

Garrett Hoyt inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 9:40 AM

The Growth Management Act allowed Clark County to designate areas that were important resources areas for the county. In 1994 our elected leaders, citizen groups and came together and made decisions on what resources needed to preserved for our county. Alternative 4 is supported by a special interest group that disagreed with the GMA in 1994 and are trying to overthrow the will of the people that was decided 20 years ago. If Alternative 4 were adopted, it would be challenged in court and would likely lose (like happened last time). All of this is done at the taxpayers expense for the benefit of a special interest group. This option needs to be abandoned before sending it to the environmental process.

In the previous Comprehensive Plan, the county planned for growth because the county was growing quickly at the time. Then came the recession and growth slowed dramatically. Alternative 1 is the so-called 'do nothing'

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

alternative, but in reality this alternative is saying that we've already planned for growth that didn't end up happening and that plan is still a good one. I fully support Alternative 1.

2 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 8:48 AM

I strongly support alternative 4.

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 11, 2015, 12:38 AM

My property/home is on one of the parcels proposed to be re-zoned by Alternative 4.

Alternative 4 would allow development that would negatively impact the rural nature of our area and add further stress and add traffic to an already failing road (Sunset Falls Road), not to mention the impacts to the East Fork Lewis River. When I found out that a large chunk of land along the East Fork (thankfully currently owned by the Columbia Land Trust) was being considered for a housing development a few years ago, I was absolutely shocked. Who thought THAT was a good idea?? As a former land use planner, I understand the need to have consistency - but I do not agree with setting the land use and zoning to current use. That presumes that what we have been doing and what we are currently doing is the right thing. It should be set to the intended future use that is most appropriate for the area. It is ridiculous to increase density in an area that is surrounded by Weyerhaeuser, the East Fork Lewis River and the Gifford Pinchot National Forest (respectively) on 3 of its sides. My husband jokes that he would love to drive down our driveway and see a taco cart at the bottom of the hill so we don't have to drive a half hour for a meal out, but he is kidding. That would be horrible and totally wreck the natural landscape that provides habitat for so many important flora and fauna. It is unfortunately the nature of American government to be short-sighted and focused on re-elections, but we need to do better for our children.

I didn't ask for my property to be re-zoned to a more dense use as part of Alternative 4 and if it is approved, I'm tempted to fight to keep my current FR-80!

If Alternative 4 really is considered, I'd love to know how the County intends to fund to maintain the roadways out here in the stix as well as fix exponentially more power outages than they already do because more houses are being built out here.

3 Supporters

---

Liz Pike inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 4:27 PM

I am supportive of Alternative 4.

---

Rita Dietrich inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 3:57 PM

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

I strongly support Alternate 4 as it gives the rural landowner more flexibility in planning for the future and allows more parcels of land to be in compliance with the zoning.

1 Supporter

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 10, 2015, 2:28 PM

Mr. Malinowski, your memory is not exactly right--the courts actually concurred with the GMA, with one minor exception. The decision can be found in the link below:[http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Legacy/western/decisions/1995/95-67\\_comp\\_ord.htm](http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Legacy/western/decisions/1995/95-67_comp_ord.htm)

---

Debbie Nelson inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 12:19 PM

I strongly request that no action be taken on adopting or narrowing any of the alternatives until after the full, five-member council is seated in January 2016. I believe that the state will support the county's request for a postponement due to our newly enacted Home Rule Charter.

4 Supporters

---

Tom Gibson inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 10:42 AM

Clark County's view that endless growth and urban sprawl is sustainable or good for the community is very curious because the only supporting evidence that this is so comes from third party interests who would profit from such delusional thinking. Apparently Clark County believes that there are no criteria or examples that would result in a determination that development of land should be moderated, that there are no larger principles in play regarding the environment or community that could result in moderating growth into our rural areas. Further it appears that rapidly depleting natural and human resources is seen as a goal to solving financial concerns and that those financial concerns are of paramount importance while no value is given to other uses of land other than building, retail and industry.

Tax policy has been to value land actively being farmed and providing the sole or main living source for at least one person in a household as residential if housing has been allowed in neighboring areas. Tax burdens have been placed on people's profession if they are a farmer that don't exist in any form for anyone else.

Currently Clark County imports almost a billion dollars a year in food while it produces less than 5% of food consumed in the county even though hundreds of land parcels exist in Clark County, which is a prime year round growing area with adequate water and labor, which are appropriate for this use. Since studies have shown that for every dollar spent buying food from a local grower create about \$2.50 in the local economy it is unreasonable to say that the only productive use of so much of this land is for the tax revenues gained from mostly housing development. Housing development provides a short term profit for a local builder but almost as many liabilities as it does revenue and most of the expense of the housing is spent on goods, materials and often labor that come from out of state so that economic gain is an illusion of growth that creates as many or more problems than it solves. Cities in Clark County have only been able to keep up with the demands to keep roads paved, sewage treated, trash hauled, and children educated from the fees and taxes of even more development which means in essence that the only way to get out of the mess we created is to create an even

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

bigger one and to keep doing so in a continuous loop as if there will never be any end to how much we can keep growing and developing.

The current land use alternatives, especially Alternative 4, provide more of the same tired old thinking that continuous growth of the housing market is a good sign that the county is doing well, in spite of the many obvious flaws in that logic. Making decisions by cherry picking which facts to promote to make an argument to keep on developing is just working backward to justify doing what you already planned to do without ever once considering a complicated plethora of facts about the health, vitality and functionality of this county. County Councilors have worked tirelessly to defeat transportation issues that link the community and region together yet they demand that we not only continue but work to accelerate development, even in sensitive rural areas that will be permanently damaged by such activity.

Communities in the county are increasingly at risk for being cut off from the most essential services by random acts of building sans any real community development and apparently the plan is to make people even more dependent on the government and other similarly sized enterprises that have the cash to steer government's thinking in this direction. County Councilors instead of getting the support they need to verify the validity of their ideas have chosen to avoid asking for this help and get advice from other sources that they prefer to work with, even without acknowledging that they and our government are apparently working in some kind of secret cabal whose goals and purposes can only be guessed at. Gold and wealth is worthless without agriculture.

Agriculture is the basis of all wealth. The real question is whether you want to keep your sovereignty or yield it to other people and countries. The focus of agriculture in this country has been growing commodity crops for chemical companies, middle men and distributors that make the majority of the profit in huge monoculture operations that tend to rely on high levels of mechanization and investment. Agriculture has started to shift away from this disastrous production model to growing food by and for people.

Clark County's refusal to consider promoting agriculture and local food production or see it as having any value is both short sighted and potentially dangerous. In my opinion every community should set goals for what percentage of food eaten is from the local community and work to increase that amount as one of the most lucrative jobs programs they could participate in. Given the continuing drought in California, Eastern Oregon and Eastern Washington, which some predict could last generations as it has in the past, and our own water problems why are we as a nation giving our food sovereignty and be dependent on imports from other countries for the long term?

Clark County has been a leader in agriculture in some ways as evidenced by our very popular farmer's markets but much more work needs to be done to develop a comprehensive plan to take care of the health of the people and the county. The current land use alternatives don't speak to this at all and primarily serve as a guideline to help developers but do little to address how this development is going to impact everyone in Clark County.

### 4 Supporters

---

Susan Rasmussen inside Clark County (on forum)

April 10, 2015, 10:01 AM

Alternative 4 is needed. It is the only plan recognizing the obligation to address the long-standing issues of rural landowners.

- Alt.4 is the only plan employing an inclusive policy with the rural communities.
- The shift in policy is commendable. This recognizes the rural landowners as being significant stakeholders and gives merit to the issues in designing their futures
- Alt.4 is a step towards diversifying our rural economy and become less dependent on natural resources.

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

- Alt. 4 recognizes small-scale agriculture, family-owned woodlots, rural lifestyles.
  - Counties across the state have moved towards friendlier rural growth provisions.
  - Alt.1 is exact status quo, Alt.2 nearly is
  - The rural lands have been neglected over 20 yrs.
- Alt.1 would freeze these lands for 40 yrs.
- Alt. 4 would align rural zoning to correspond with the patterns of historical development.
  - Alt.4 is a step forward in correctly defining Clark County's Rural Character per GMA policy.

2 Supporters

---

Jim Malinowski inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 10:20 PM

It is clear that many of the contributors to this forum have not read the GMA. The county violated the clear mandates of the GMA in their 1995 massive down zoning. CCCU won its lawsuit against the county for this reason. Judge Poyfair's decision stated that "the result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA." (See the Columbian article of April 6, 1997). The county has been acting in defiance of that court order ever since. We deserve better of our county government. Alternative 4 is a move in the direction of obeying the clear terms of the GMA and reducing the current high percentage of non-conforming lots in the rural areas of the county.

Jim Malinowski  
Amboy

2 Supporters

---

Jerry Winters inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 10:20 PM

I support Alt. 4. Ag. 20 needs to break down even more, 5s, and 1s. This would allow small home framing and build community. After a plan is adopted will there still be holding ie. Lt. Industrial overlay. Vancouver needs to increase the UGB it may not be the county's job, but the city missed the boat!! It's Clark County's plan, why let Vancouver control the outcome!!

2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 9, 2015, 9:15 PM

We support Alternative 4. It is the only appropriate choice as this is a county wide plan, not just a plan for the cities. The old plan before 1994 was working fine. We should just go back to that one. Small parcels that are less than 10 acres in the rural and resource lands is what this county and the people need and want. Then they can afford to buy, farm, forest and live on the land.

Dennis Karnopp inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 9:09 PM

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

Clark County and Washington in general where a trashy state compared to Oregon and it's land use zoning. We moved into Washington in 1979 and where appalled by the lack of zoning, it looked like trailer trash. I am firmly in favor of keeping the existing land use laws and zoning restrictions to keep Clark and Washington not becoming trailer trash again. I know that people want to use their property for whatever they want but, sometimes its to the detriment to the community as a whole, and will lower growth and property values. Now we have Oregonians moving into Washington because of the tax structure and Clark County is slowly getting cleaned up, this transformation of wealth will definitely stop if the existing zoning and land use laws are relaxed.

2 Supporters

---

Name not available (unclaimed)

April 9, 2015, 7:24 PM

I support alternative #4 and suggest we make it rural 5 acre minimum. As a property owner and not just a group that has no financial investment in real property.

---

Terry Conner inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 6:30 PM

The citizens of Clark County did NOT ask for this.

Alt 4 is yet another half-cooked, special interest move, credited to the same rogue Councilour who continues to defy long standing protocol and logic. Alt 4 began as a direct violation of the HRC, having been directed by Madore to have his non-qualified protégé, Silliman whip up some maps, while he (Madore) tried his single hand at Planning. No experience, no intelligence, no vetting.

Then, the brass tacks of Alt 4 are simply and tragically BAD for rural farmers, suburban landowners, and the County community that depends on and supports local farming.

Just a few of the bad results would be water shortage, taxes to support development of the 8000 lots, detachment of rural well being, violating the GMA curfew, future legal costs, further morale decline to citizenry, further animous towards the BOCC from Clark County residents.

3 Supporters

---

Tim Gaughan inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 5:43 PM

I am opposed to Alternative 4. This Alternative was composed, proposed and maps attempted to be modified midway through the open house process by a lone county councilor who has no apparent expertise or professional credentials to draft a land use plan to be considered under the GMA. Madore has ignored the planning process, advice of planning professionals and apparent dismay by legal staff. Alternative 4 appears to move against the grain of the primary intent of the GMA by promoting urban sprawl and future costs to all taxpayers in ClarkCounty. This alternative has the potential of litigation and sanctions by the State.

8 Supporters

---

Suzanne Kendall inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 4:46 PM

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

I oppose Alternative 4 for the following reasons:

1. Phase 2 of the Growth Management Plan Update Process is scheduled to last 24 months. The time was initially spent getting Public Input on the three staff-proposed alternatives that concluded with the August and October 2014 hearings. The remainder of Phase 2 was to be spent analyzing the three established alternatives.

Instead, over 12 months into Phase 2 and after the August and October 2014 Public Hearings, one of the three County Councilors introduced a 4th alternative without meaningful consultation with the citizens or County planners. No public hearings have been held on Alternative 4. Instead, the County Councilor held "open houses" with the opportunity for hundreds of citizens (at each open house) to crowd around a room full of maps and make an attempt to get the attention of County staff (6-8) or County Councilors (3) to ask questions and have a meaningful conversation.

If the Clark County Council demands that the tardy Alternative proposed by one individual representative remain and be fully analyzed for its intended and unintended consequences, the Growth Management Act DEADLINE OF JANUARY 2016 MUST BE EXTENDED BY AT LEAST FOUR MONTHS.

2. I am very concerned about the costs to Clark County taxpayers if the Council decides to allow an unannounced Alternative 4 proposal 18 months into our 36 month process. If this Alternative is allowed to stand the County must, and will, be taken to court. If history is any indication, the County will be in costly litigation for up to, including Supreme Court litigation, 7+ years.

3. It is my understanding that Alternative 4 creates at least 8000 more parcels and that the current minimum 20 acre agricultural parcels will be reduced to as low as 5 and 10 acres. I value our local, productive farm lands and believe strongly that our working farms must be protected.

In this age of changing climate and reduced water supplies, we should treasure what good water we have left in Clark County. I have experience in managing farm land of approximately 1500 acres and know how difficult it is to farm on a 5 acre postage stamp-size plot with good farm practices which require crop rotation.

4. Adding over 8000 parcels with Alternative 4 will also make it difficult to supply water to all the new development. Wells are already drying up and Clark County Public Health must review all new private wells for adequate water availability to meet GMA regulations prior to the issuance of building permits.

5. It will also be very difficult to maintain the QUALITY of the water we have. With the addition of thousands of new lots and a steadily increasing population in our former agricultural areas, we will have to pave over ground and greatly increase runoff, contamination and pollution.

6. The costs to the taxpayers for the dramatic increase in the need for public services will be immense. The mass development of our county from 9300 to 17000+ parcels will benefit outside developers to the detriment of all citizens. I believe that a decision of this magnitude must be considered by the full 5-member Council required by our County charter.

13 Supporters

---

John Ley inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 3:59 PM

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

I am grateful there is an Alt. 4.

The facts as presented at the public hearings: "6 of every 10 parcels in the Rural category do not conform to our current zoning map. Seven of every 10 parcels in the AG category do not conform to our current zoning map. Eight of every 10 parcels in the FR category do not conform to our current zoning map."

Are the land owners wrong? Or is the map & previous zoning wrong?

Clearly, the previous map (20 year old) was wrong, and is penalizing current land owners.

We clearly need to respect property ownership rights. We need a zoning map that at a minimum, reflects current reality. It is irresponsible to have 60-80% of rural land owners 'not in compliance' with current zoning law.

My understanding is that Alt 4 does that. Thank you!

3 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 10:18 AM

We need the combination of ALT 3 AND 4. Let's expand the UGB and create more local Jobs within the cities. The plan was poorly organized back 20 years ago, like a shotgun approach; we can do SO much better for this county and our communities! Not saying to make everything 1 acre lots but if there's a 40 acre parcel with 5's or 10's around it, maybe we need to have some adjustment. It's not like it used to be, farming, forest, etc. Plus how many people can afford 40 acres instead of a 10? We need a better plan and to have some consistency in zoning/UGB. If a person living on 40 acres wants to split their land into 10's for their children to start their own families/memories as they did growing up at that location, what's so wrong with that? And if not, that's their choice but it should be an option, and their right. By do this it's going to keep local families here, add local work, and create more tax dollars for the help of the community!

4 Supporters

---

Michele Wollert inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 10:04 AM

I am a Clark County resident of Vancouver. Although I am not a rural landowner or farmer, I contribute more than my fair share of county taxes on several properties in the city. I support local agriculture by being a committed consumer of local produce, pasture-raised eggs, and meat. I am a loyal customer who supports Clark County businesses, restaurants and farmer's markets that sell local farm products and I have purchased CSA farm shares. I am including this personal information as a preface to my comments because I have heard two councilors diminish the testimony of residents who do not own large amounts of rural land or who live in urban areas. All Clark County voices count when considering changes to the Growth Management Act and I hope you will consider mine.

I am opposed to Alternative 4 of the GMA for the following reasons:

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

Alternative 4 was developed without the input of Clark County community planning experts. It was written by one councilor, who has no experience in planning, with the limited and biased feedback of one honored group of landowner advocates. It excludes important other stakeholder and expert information, which places Clark County at increased legal risk.

Alternative 4 threatens our water quality. Evidence-based research shows that urban sprawl pollutes water by removing native vegetation, increasing impervious surfaces, erosion, and pollution from cars and trucks on roads since more residents will need to drive.

Alternative 4 threatens our drinking water supplies. This option will create more rural lots than can be served by ground water supplies. Rural development is already contributing to wells going dry and Alternative 4 will exacerbate the problem.

Alternative 4 threatens our working farms and fertile land by paving over a precious, threatened resource. Once that it done, the loss of farmland cannot be regained.

Alternative 4 will cost taxpayers and ratepayers more money than they are spending now. Many peer-reviewed studies show that compact development saves taxpayers money in property taxes and community services.

Alternative 4 increases litigation risks and the costs of appeals to Clark County and its taxpayers. During the last GMA update, Clark County spent seven years in appeals, all the way to the Washington State Supreme Court. In the end, Clark County was mandated to take 1,500 acres of farmland out of the urban growth areas and re-designate it as Agriculture 20. These appeals are costly in terms of time and tax payer money.

The argument that all landowners should be able to develop their property as they wish, ignores the importance of carefully-crafted land use and zoning laws that benefit the greater good. Without a thoughtfully-developed, evidence-based plan for the control of future growth, quality of life and environmental protections are lost for current and future generations. Chaotic, self-interested development harms everyone. We purchase our property with the full knowledge and understanding that it can only be developed within certain legal restrictions. We can sell it, as I did with two CC zoned lots not conducive to residential housing, when its zoning and land use designation does not meet our future needs.

Alternative 4 should be abandoned as it is not a viable option for Clark County's environmental and livability future.

15 Supporters

---

Loren Sickles inside Clark County (on forum)

April 9, 2015, 12:02 AM

I am in opposition to alternative 4 primarily on the basis of how this alternative was brought forward. The primary proponent has openly stated that no-one with knowledge of growth management, land-use or environmental laws was involved in the development of Alt 4. The formation of alternative 4 was done behind closed doors and without prior knowledge of the whole council or county staff. Alternative 4 should be, at the least, put on hold until the two new council members are installed, or scrapped altogether.

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

Given the time constraints of State law the prudent path forward is to continue discussions focused on alternatives 1-3 as they are the only ones which have been thoroughly vetted by knowledgeable people.

12 Supporters

---

Esther Schrader inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 11:05 PM

Anything is better than Alternative 4.

8 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 9:59 PM

While I really do not think Alt 1 is even viable anymore and Alt 2 is really bad in my opinion especially for my area I think Alt 3 has potential as does Alt 4. If we could work Alt 3 for the urban growth boundary areas and Alt 4 for the rural and Forestry and Ag plots I would see a seriously happy balance for all the landowners.

3 Supporters

---

Angela Pond inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 9:58 PM

Alternative 3 gets my vote as the best option. Allow our smaller communities to develop and marginally expand their boundaries. Alternative 4 is a thinly veiled attempt to develop the north county with thousands more homes. That sounds good...but wait..the homeowners will be working in Portland and there is no way to get there now without sitting in traffic for an hour or more each way. No plans in our lifetime to change this. Keep the north county rural, beautiful and producing goods on family farms.

10 Supporters

---

Linda Tubbs inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 9:50 PM

Sadly, it appears feedback such as mine and others (including planners) is meaningless. I do not wish to live in Los Angeles. I would like to continue to be able to purchase local farm products. The entire process behind alternative 4 smacks of inside baseball. If there is sanity, it will not be adopted. Mr Malinowski--the court actually upheld the GMA--see the decision attached:

[http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Legacy/western/decisions/1995/95-67\\_comp\\_ord.htm](http://www.gmhb.wa.gov/Legacy/western/decisions/1995/95-67_comp_ord.htm)

8 Supporters

---

Name not shown inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 9:20 PM

I believe Alt 4 violates the Growth Management Act. It is also an insult to the qualified and talented staff who have worked on putting together robust and viable alternatives. It risks lawsuits and more wasted money by this council. I live in north county and do not want to be surrounded by McMansions. I believe in the viability of

## 2016 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan update

What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

---

Clark County's agricultural community.

10 Supporters

---

Marvin Case inside Clark County (on forum)

April 8, 2015, 4:03 PM

I have examined maps of the four suggested land use alternatives. I have talked briefly with two county staff members. I think Alternative 4 is the most honest and realistic of those offered. In my area (although the plan does not benefit me) the plan coincides with existing parcel sizes. It is logical, drawing lines between larger and smaller forest zones along coinciding or conforming parcels. Alternative 4 preserves rural character while recognizing existing conditions. Selfishly, I would like my parcels to be located in smaller zones. But failing that, Alternative 4 is an intellectually honest portrayal of growth objectives in the county.

Marvin Case

7 Supporters

---

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Kamp, Jacqueline  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 1:49 PM  
**To:** Anderson, Colete  
**Subject:** FW: New Clark County portal

FYI

**From:** Rob Hines [<mailto:robhines@peakdemocracy.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 1:42 PM  
**To:** Kamp, Jacqueline  
**Cc:** Robert Vogel  
**Subject:** Re: New Clark County portal

Hey Jacqui,

When a citizen who has not registered posts a response to a topic, they're asked whether or not they would like to post the response online or via another method. I've attached a screenshot of the page that citizens are presented for you're review.

### How do you want to share your statement?

You have two choices:

#### 1. Online (sign in required)

Sign in, and we'll show your statement with or without your name on Engage Clark County. Which do you prefer?

Show my statement *with* my name

Show my statement *without* my name

#### 2. On Paper (sign in NOT required)

Instead of signing in to show your statement on Engage Clark County, you can download a PDF with your statement, then print and send it to Clark County however you wish (e.g. mail, fax, hand-deliver, etc.)

Download my statement

Clark County, Peak Democracy | © 2015

 Select Language

PEAK DEMOCRACY

At this point citizens make a choice. However, some do not, and for those who do not, and for those who do not complete all of the steps (in order to post their statement online) their statement is placed 'off-forum' where you and other administrators may see it.

For those who register but fail to verify their email address, they are sent an email to verify and when they are on the system a persistent verification message appears at the top of the page.

So, as you can see, we have designed the system in a way to advise people at every step about how they can post their statement online. Over the years we've made many changes and have managed to increase the number of people who leave online statements and we're always open to making changes to further improve!

You should know that while we've managed to get the majority of our clients up to a 60% online rate, the topic on the plan review is up to 80% and you've got over 90% of people who have completed the satisfaction survey having agreed to like using Engage Clark County. You can see more of the satisfaction survey's by logging in as an admin and going here: [http://www.peakdemocracy.com/customers/4/accounts/2/portals/192/report?name=satisfaction\\_survey](http://www.peakdemocracy.com/customers/4/accounts/2/portals/192/report?name=satisfaction_survey)

The 'admin message' that you see is the way for an administrator to send a message to the author of the response. It is intended primarily for responding to a question a citizen may have posted in a response, or for clearing up mis-information.


Please let me know if there is anything else I might do to help.

Cheers,

Rob

Rob Hines  
Director of Public Engagement  
Peak Democracy, Inc.

510 666 6931 tel  
866 506 4598 fax



On Apr 13, 2015, at 11:04, Kamp, Jacqueline <[Jacqueline.Kamp@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Jacqueline.Kamp@clark.wa.gov)> wrote:

With those that posted without registering, do they get any kind of message that informs them that their comment will not be "Live" until they register? I'd like to assist those commenters with getting registered, but I'm curious as to whether they received a message on what they need to do to add their comment. We may have their email as part of our distribution list.

Under the one "Unverified" comment we have so far, I see that there is a link for an "admin message". Could you explain what that does or how to best utilize it to assist people?

Thank you!

Jacqui

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Kimberly Pincheira <KPincheira@credc.org>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 1:18 PM  
**To:** Madore, David  
**Cc:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan; Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; McCauley, Mark; Mike Bomar  
**Subject:** Joint Business Community Comments on Alternative 4  
**Attachments:** Joint Business Community Letter on Alt 4.pdf

Good Afternoon, Chairman Madore:

Attached, please find a joint letter regarding Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Alternative 4 on behalf of the Columbia River Economic Development Council, the Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, Identity Clark County, the Camas-Washougal Chamber of Commerce and the Battle Ground Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Best regards,

*Kimberly Pincheira*

Director of Communications and Strategic Partnerships  
D: 360.537.3181 | O: 360.694.5006 | [kpincheira@credc.org](mailto:kpincheira@credc.org)  
605 Broadway, Ste 412 | Vancouver, WA 98660 | [credc.org](http://credc.org)



Clark County Board of County Councilors  
Attn: David Madore, Chair  
P.O. Box 5000  
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

Monday, April 13, 2015

**RE: Alternative 4 - Rural and Resource Lands Changes**

Dear Chairman Madore and County Councilors:

The business community thanks you for your aggressive approach to creating more opportunities for job creation to thrive in Clark County. We support your increase in the jobs-to-household ratio goal and believe that approach will help provide more Clark County residents with opportunities to work where they live.

In 2011, the Columbia River Economic Development Council (CREDC), in concert with its private, public and non-profit partners, studied the inventory of existing and future industrial lands and came to the conclusion that there were few truly shovel-ready options for significant acreage that would suit primary job creation. The conclusion of this study led the CREDC to adopt several industrial lands policies that express the need to preserve and protect the few significant sites that are remaining. Furthermore, our efforts are focused on applying all reasonable planning and development tools to ensure that those lands are ready and available when a significant employment opportunity arises.

In consultation with our private sector partners, as well as our local jurisdictions, we have serious concerns about how the proposed Alternative 4 will limit our ability to meet our aggressive jobs goals for the region. Specifically in areas where there are key transportation and other infrastructure investments needed for quality job growth, we anticipate this proposal will lead to incompatible uses and/or additional costs for development that will cause opportunities to look elsewhere.


We believe in strong property rights. We also understand the need for planning and predictability so that land owners do not make uninformed decisions about their property that ultimately lead to an inability to maximize the value and use of their land.

We respectfully ask that you work to find a solution that both provides for strong property rights and also avoids future tension and conflict between residential, commercial and industrial uses. We look forward to an opportunity to help shape a plan that adequately reflects the needs and values of our community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

*Please see following page for signatories in support of this letter.*

We, the undersigned, support the comments submitted above on behalf of our respective organizations.




---

Russel Brent, Chair  
Battle Ground Chamber of Commerce

---

Brent Erickson, Executive Director  
Camas-Washougal Chamber of Commerce




---

Mike Bomar, President  
Columbia River Economic Development Council



---

John McKibbin, Executive Director  
Identity Clark County



---

Kelly Love, President/CEO  
Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Richard Carson <richcarson@q.com>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 2:58 PM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Cc:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** Re: Comp Plan Question

Just following up. I never got an answer to this question.

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

**From:** Richard Carson  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 02, 2015 2:13 PM  
**Subject:** Comp Plan Question

I wanted to confirm that my property and my neighbors are proposed for Forest-10 (FR-10) in the new Alternative 4 of the comprehensive plan. The parcels are (PIN 206918014, 015, 016).

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 12:43 PM  
**To:** Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; O'Donnell, Mary Beth  
**Subject:** FW: GMA Revision proposition

FYI and for index!

**From:** Patricia [<mailto:pattysproperties@aol.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 12:35 PM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** GMA Revision proposition

Hello,

I strongly oppose the Alt4 plan. I have had 23 years of real estate sales and worked in rural land development and sales helping people with their land and real estate needs. I was born and raised here. We cannot afford to allow more growth without proper planning. I hope you take this and can use any of it to help us here in Clark co. We need our planning team behind us. I trust our zoning and planning commission will protect our beautiful county.

There are so many things wrong about Alt4. First of all, zoning revises require due diligence in preplanning for all the infrastructure needed to serve the growth and needs of any new proposed development. Schools, roads, local community needs and marketability just to name a few. Let's look at the areas affected by downsizing lot size and the impact it would have on each community. Schools. We are already at full capacity in most high schools. The roads, try driving on Hwy 503 and Main st. in Battle Ground. It's beyond capacity now. Simply put, we all know the cart has to come before the horse. Plan ahead for growth. It is what the planning board is here to do. It is what they are trained to do. Who benefits from Alt4? Certainly not the majority of us. As a Realtor here working with rural land sales I do not see any big demand for rural acre lots. The biggest issue I have is how can a person with no experience in zoning and planning just bring a proposition to the table?

Thank you,  
Patricia Bergren  
Coldwell Banker United Brokers  
360-798-6733  
Pattysproperties.com

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 1:35 PM  
**To:** Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon; O'Donnell, Mary Beth  
**Subject:** FW: Joint Business Community Comments on Alternative 4  
**Attachments:** Joint Business Community Letter on Alt 4.pdf

FYI

**From:** McCauley, Mark  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 1:24 PM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Cc:** Euler, Gordon; Swanson, Axel; Silliman, Peter  
**Subject:** FW: Joint Business Community Comments on Alternative 4

For the record.

**From:** Kimberly Pincheira [<mailto:KPincheira@credc.org>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 1:18 PM  
**To:** Madore, David  
**Cc:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan; Stewart, Jeanne; Mielke, Tom; McCauley, Mark; Mike Bomar  
**Subject:** Joint Business Community Comments on Alternative 4

Good Afternoon, Chairman Madore:

Attached, please find a joint letter regarding Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Alternative 4 on behalf of the Columbia River Economic Development Council, the Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce, Identity Clark County, the Camas-Washougal Chamber of Commerce and the Battle Ground Chamber of Commerce. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

Best regards,

*Kimberly Pincheira*  
Director of Communications and Strategic Partnerships  
D: 360.567.3181 | O: 360.694.5006 | [kpincheira@credc.org](mailto:kpincheira@credc.org)  
805 Broadway, Ste 412 | Vancouver, WA 98660 | [credc.org](http://credc.org)



Clark County Board of County Councilors  
Attn: David Madore, Chair  
P.O. Box 5000  
Vancouver, WA 98666-5000

Monday, April 13, 2015

**RE: Alternative 4 - Rural and Resource Lands Changes**

Dear Chairman Madore and County Councilors:

The business community thanks you for your aggressive approach to creating more opportunities for job creation to thrive in Clark County. We support your increase in the jobs-to-household ratio goal and believe that approach will help provide more Clark County residents with opportunities to work where they live.

In 2011, the Columbia River Economic Development Council (CREDC), in concert with its private, public and non-profit partners, studied the inventory of existing and future industrial lands and came to the conclusion that there were few truly shovel-ready options for significant acreage that would suit primary job creation. The conclusion of this study led the CREDC to adopt several industrial lands policies that express the need to preserve and protect the few significant sites that are remaining. Furthermore, our efforts are focused on applying all reasonable planning and development tools to ensure that those lands are ready and available when a significant employment opportunity arises.

In consultation with our private sector partners, as well as our local jurisdictions, we have serious concerns about how the proposed Alternative 4 will limit our ability to meet our aggressive jobs goals for the region. Specifically in areas where there are key transportation and other infrastructure investments needed for quality job growth, we anticipate this proposal will lead to incompatible uses and/or additional costs for development that will cause opportunities to look elsewhere.

We believe in strong property rights. We also understand the need for planning and predictability so that land owners do not make uninformed decisions about their property that ultimately lead to an inability to maximize the value and use of their land.

We respectfully ask that you work to find a solution that both provides for strong property rights and also avoids future tension and conflict between residential, commercial and industrial uses. We look forward to an opportunity to help shape a plan that adequately reflects the needs and values of our community.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this proposal.

*Please see following page for signatories in support of this letter.*

We, the undersigned, support the comments submitted above on behalf of our respective organizations.




---

Russel Brent, Chair  
Battle Ground Chamber of Commerce


---

Brent Erickson, Executive Director  
Camas-Washougal Chamber of Commerce



---

Mike Bomar, President  
Columbia River Economic Development Council



---

John McKibbin, Executive Director  
Identity Clark County



---

Kelly Love, President/CEO  
Greater Vancouver Chamber of Commerce

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 1:36 PM  
**To:** Anderson, Colete  
**Subject:** FW: Comprehensive Growth Planning

fyi

**From:** Bill Baumann [<mailto:baumann@pacifier.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 8:05 AM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** Comprehensive Growth Planning

Greetings:

I'm writing you because I think you will include my comments in the official record and may have the most impact on the discussion.

I am very concerned about Councilor Madore's last minute efforts to bow to the special interest group of which Susan Rasmussen is a member. I believe that if Alternative 4 is adopted, it will create huge infrastructure problems and costs so that individuals seeking to develop small lots have utilities as well as transportation opportunities. Alternative 4 is phenomenally short-sighted and obviously created by someone who knows nothing about planning. Plus, it will raise taxes of everyone in the county so that rural landowners can be served.

Please do everything you can to persuade the councilors to reject this option. Councilor Madore says he listens to cogent arguments. If we are to take him at his word (which he's proven we should not) then explain to him that his Alternative 4 will increase costs and reduce the opportunities for jobs in rural Clark County. Most employers seeking to relocate here need larger plots of land on which to build. Alternative 4 will remove those, consigning Clark county to be a bedroom community to Portland forever more.

Thanks for your time.  
Best Regards,

Bill Baumann,  
Box 817, Ridgefield WA 98642

And thanks for the good job you are doing under conditions of such extreme difficulty.

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 1:39 PM  
**To:** Anderson, Colete  
**Subject:** FW: My public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

FYI

**From:** Dylan Normington [<mailto:dylannormington@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 11:46 AM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** My public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Mr. Orjiako,

This is my public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

Alternative 4 was prepared by a County Councilor without substantive input from Clark County staff. This Alternative should not be approved to move forward for the following reasons:

- 1) The presentation to the public on this Alternative was inconsistent and was not readily available to all residents of Clark County. There were two "open houses" held on this Alternative. Neither open house was held in the city of Vancouver, the largest incorporated area in Clark County. This made it a burden to residents in the Southern and Western portions of the County. In addition, there was different information presented at each open house and it is my understanding that Alternative 4 was modified between the Open Houses. Therefore, the public involvement process was not done correctly on this Alternative and therefore the Alternative cannot move forward because the presentation of the Alternative to the public violated processes and procedures mandated by Washington state law.
- 2) Councilor David Madore developed and promoted Alternative 4 prior to presenting the Alternative to the public for comment. This is a violation of the state's processes and procedures for implementing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.
- 3) Alternative 4 does not address the County's need for future commercial and industrial uses in the rural areas of Clark County.
- 4) Alternative 4 does not comply with state law. The County will incur costly legal bills if this Alternative is approved. I recommend that County Councilors do not approve Alternative 4 to move forward.
- 5) Councilor David Madore has violated the ex-parte requirements of preparing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. He has frequently consulted with and has taken recommendations from Clark County Citizens United, an entity that represents the interests of some, but not all, rural landowners. He has stated that Alternative 4 is a good alternative for the Growth Management Plan. He has not consulted with other groups that would oppose Alternative 4 (e.g. Friends of Clark County) and he has not conducted a poll, sample or vote of all residents of Clark County regarding this Alternative. In my opinion, state law has been violated by Councilor Madore.

Please accept my comments.

Thank you very much.

Dylan Normington  
503 NW 108th St  
Vancouver, WA 98685

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 12:13 PM  
**To:** Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; O'Donnell, Mary Beth  
**Cc:** Cook, Christine  
**Subject:** FW: My public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

More comments coming in and are provided to the councilors!

**From:** Dylan Normington [<mailto:dylannormington@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 11:46 AM  
**To:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** My public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

Mr. Orjiako,

This is my public comment on Clark County's Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.

Alternative 4 was prepared by a County Councilor without substantive input from Clark County staff. This Alternative should not be approved to move forward for the following reasons:

- 1) The presentation to the public on this Alternative was inconsistent and was not readily available to all residents of Clark County. There were two "open houses" held on this Alternative. Neither open house was held in the city of Vancouver, the largest incorporated area in Clark County. This made it a burden to residents in the Southern and Western portions of the County. In addition, there was different information presented at each open house and it is my understanding that Alternative 4 was modified between the Open Houses. Therefore, the public involvement process was not done correctly on this Alternative and therefore the Alternative cannot move forward because the presentation of the Alternative to the public violated processes and procedures mandated by Washington state law.
- 2) Councilor David Madore developed and promoted Alternative 4 prior to presenting the Alternative to the public for comment. This is a violation of the state's processes and procedures for implementing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan.
- 3) Alternative 4 does not address the County's need for future commercial and industrial uses in the rural areas of Clark County.
- 4) Alternative 4 does not comply with state law. The County will incur costly legal bills if this Alternative is approved. I recommend that County Councilors do not approve Alternative 4 to move forward.
- 5) Councilor David Madore has violated the ex-parte requirements of preparing a Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. He has frequently consulted with and has taken recommendations from Clark County Citizens United, an entity that represents the interests of some, but not all, rural landowners. He has stated that Alternative 4 is a good alternative for the Growth Management Plan. He has not consulted with other groups that would oppose Alternative 4 (e.g. Friends of Clark County) and he has not conducted a poll, sample or vote of all residents of Clark County regarding this Alternative. In my opinion, state law has been violated by Councilor Madore.

Please accept my comments.

Thank you very much.

Dylan Normington  
503 NW 108th St  
Vancouver, WA 98685

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 11:41 AM  
**To:** O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Euler, Gordon; Anderson, Colete  
**Cc:** Cook, Christine  
**Subject:** FW: Your dissent is respectfully rejected.

Just FYI and for index and our record. Thanks.

**From:** Chuck Green [<mailto:sjclgreen@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 11:35 AM  
**To:** Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; McCauley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** Re: Your dissent is respectfully rejected.

Thank you for your quick and timely response, Councilor Madore.

By way of copying all three Councilors and others who were part of my original comment transmittal, I am requesting that your response to me be considered by all involved parties and that your response be added to the official public record for the Comprehensive Plan update.

Sincerely,

-Chuck Green  
Ridgefield Resident

On Monday, April 13, 2015 8:40 AM, "Madore, David" <[David.Madore@clark.wa.gov](mailto:David.Madore@clark.wa.gov)> wrote:

Chuck Green,

We hear a wide variety of opinions on each topic. Some prefer stagnation over prosperity, backwardness over progress, fear over responsible growth. It is reassuring to see that common sense is by far, the predominant voice that easily provides compelling reasons for moving our community forward. Your endorsement of Alternative 1, the "do nothing" option has been noted in the public record.

There are divergent views regarding the appropriate role of an elected representative. Some see that office as a license to overrule and to rule over the people and as a means to use the force of government to exploit the people. That corruption is easily corrected by respecting our foundational documents that authorize these positions in the first place.

The valid role of an elected representative is of course, to faithfully re-present the people as expressed by the consent of the governed. I encourage you to consider the preamble and first three sections of our state constitution:

"We, the people of the State of Washington, grateful to the Supreme Ruler of the Universe for our liberties, do ordain this constitution.

SECTION 1 POLITICAL POWER. All political power is inherent in the people, and governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed, and are established to protect and maintain individual rights.

SECTION 2 SUPREME LAW OF THE LAND. The Constitution of the United States is the supreme law of the land.

SECTION 3 PERSONAL RIGHTS. No person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

I will continue to listen to and faithfully serve the citizens in compliance with those principles as intended by our wonderful form of representative government. As you should be aware, your statements regarding the Charter are exactly backwards from the truth. The fact is that the Charter will diminish representation of rural citizens from 100% (voting for all three county commissioners) to 40% (voting for 2 of 5).

We will continue to proactively work to move our community forward with all due diligence. We will fulfill our responsibility to analyze the four reasonable options in a timely manner to satisfy SEPA requirements including Alternative Four. Your dissent is respectfully rejected.

David

**From:** Chuck Green [<mailto:sjclgreen@yahoo.com>]

**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 7:02 AM

**To:** Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; McCauley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver

**Subject:** Comments for the Record, April 14 Comprehensive Plan Hearing

Good morning, County Councilors, Mr. McCauley, and Dr. Orjiako

I am submitting the attached for the written record for the April 14 Comprehensive Plan Update hearing. Time permitting, I do plan to speak these into the record, but in case I am not available to do so, please take these as my comments.

Thank you.

-Chuck Green  
Ridgefield resident  
360-449-2132

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

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Orjiako, Oliver  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 10:02 AM  
**To:** Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; O'Donnell, Mary Beth  
**Subject:** FW: Comments for the Record, April 14 Comprehensive Plan Hearing  
**Attachments:** CompPlan\_RecordComments\_CGreen.pdf

A letter from Chuck Green as FYI and index.

**From:** Chuck Green [<mailto:sjclgreen@yahoo.com>]  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 7:02 AM  
**To:** Madore, David; Mielke, Tom; Stewart, Jeanne; McCauley, Mark; Orjiako, Oliver  
**Subject:** Comments for the Record, April 14 Comprehensive Plan Hearing

Good morning, County Councilors, Mr. McCauley, and Dr. Orjiako

I am submitting the attached for the written record for the April 14 Comprehensive Plan Update hearing. Time permitting, I do plan to speak these into the record, but in case I am not available to do so, please take these as my comments.

Thank you.

-Chuck Green  
Ridgefield resident  
360-449-2132



April 13, 2015

Clark County Councilors  
P.O. Box 9810  
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

Oliver Orjiako  
Director, Clark County Community Planning  
P.O. Box 9810  
Vancouver, WA 98666-9810

**Comments submitted electronically for the Administrative Record for the April 14, 2015 hearing.**

Dear Clark County Councilors and Dr. Orjiako:

I am submitting these comments for the record in advance of the April 14, 2015 hearing on the Comprehensive Plan update. Time permitting, I plan to be in attendance to read these into the record; however, I am submitting these in writing to inclusion in the record as well.

#### **SEPA Process and Schedule**

The current Comprehensive Plan process, including SEPA Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement development, would have the current three-person Council making a preferred alternative decision in November 2015. That would prevent the two new Council positions, under the adopted Home Rule Charter, from having a part in such an important policy decision.

**I recommend that the County Council adopt Alternative 1, the current Comprehensive Plan, as the "Interim Comprehensive Plan", and postpone the alternatives narrowing process until the new councilors take office in January 2016.** Extending the current plan as the "Interim Plan" for approximately one year allows two new councilors to have a say. It allows for the county to meet the state-imposed June 2016 deadline, staving off state sanctions.

Although not required, the SEPA process should include an **economic and financial impact assessment**. Alternative 4, especially, is a blanket "upzone" and results in a de facto tax increase; it will increase property values, and thus property tax assessments, on most rural land. Clark County Councilors can only cap about  $\frac{1}{4}$  of the total property tax assessment; the other  $\frac{3}{4}$  is controlled by the State and other school and special districts.

6. **This alternative adds population with no access to public transportation.** There is no way C-TRAN can afford to serve these outlying areas, nor are there sidewalks or paths for rural residents to use or to access C-TRAN.
7. **Alternative 4 impacts groundwater.** These new rural lots will be served by wells and septic tanks, not water and sewer lines.

#### **My Value-Based Planning Proposal**

After talking with a number of people across the political spectrum at and subsequent to the Hockinson open house, I recommend that the county hold off on further developing and assessing alternatives and instead, undertake a broad, value-based community discussion on what should go into the Comprehensive Plan. As a candidate for County Council, if elected, I would be happy to champion such an effort. I do not have any financial gain realized in any of this effort nor am I associated with anyone who does stand to gain financially.

#### **My Value-Based Plan process includes:**

- **Reaching community agreement or informed consent on values and performance measures** with which to develop and evaluate the Plan.
- **Inclusion, rather than exclusion,** by involving a comprehensive variety of community groups, such as Clark County Citizens United, Friends of Clark County, land conservation as well as the building and development community, and others, to provide input and discuss trade-offs of various options.
- **Bringing in a group such as WSU-Vancouver's Initiative for Public Deliberation to facilitate a series of forums to capture community input.**
- **Allowing County Planning staff to fairly and equitably develop and evaluate a plan for community review, before acted on by the FIVE County Councilors.**

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,



Chuck Green

Ridgefield Resident

Candidate for Clark County Council District 2

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov  
**Sent:** Monday, April 13, 2015 9:03 AM  
**To:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No: 190247000

Subject: Growth Management Plan

Comments:

We own 20 acres in Ridgefield that are currently zoned ag-20. We would love to divide our property into smaller parcels. According to the maps, both alternative 2 & alternative 4 will provide us the the opportunity to divide into 2-10 acre parcels. This will be better for us than alternative 1 which is "do nothing" but we would prefer to divide into even smaller parcels such as five acre lots or even as small as one or two acre lots. Many of the parcels surrounding ours are five acres in size. There are also one acre lots close to us. Ten and twenty acre properties are unmanageable for most people today. We are one family among many that we have spoken with that attempt to maintain their property while working fulltime elsewhere. Hence, our property currently sits un-used. Please consider changing the current zoning to something that will be more beneficial to the large number of property owners with situations similar to ourselves.

Submitted by:  
Alison Fulton

Email: [fulton06@comcast.net](mailto:fulton06@comcast.net)

Address:

Ridgefield, WA

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** Fulton, Mike <Mike.Fulton@iberdrolaren.com>  
**Sent:** Sunday, April 12, 2015 6:29 PM  
**To:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** 2016 Comp plan changes

Parcels:190247000/190248000

We own a 20 acre parcel, currently divided into two 10 acre tax parcels, that is adjacent to a cluster of less than 10 acre parcels. We believe the concepts behind Alternative 2 and 4 make sense given that the county must consider future needs of a growing population, a population that does not merely want to be located in dense urban housing within the urban boundaries of the various towns in the county.

It is not economically viable for us to maintain the 20 acre parcel as a farm. We could lease the property to a larger farm, but that does not cover our taxes on the property or the cost to carry the property. It makes sense to allow us to divide the parcel into 5 acre lots, which would give us the opportunity to build a home and use the land for our own farm needs and reduce our costs of holding that much unused acreage. In addition, it would provide an affordable option for three other families.

Thank you,

Michael Fulton  
[Fulton06@comcast.net](mailto:Fulton06@comcast.net)

=====  
Please consider the environment before printing this email.

If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender and immediately delete this message and any attachment hereto and/or copy hereof, as such message contains confidential information intended solely for the individual or entity to whom it is addressed. The use or disclosure of such information to third parties is prohibited by law and may give rise to civil or criminal liability.

The views presented in this message are solely those of the author(s) and do not necessarily represent the opinion of Iberdrola Renewables, LLC. or any company of its group. Neither Iberdrola Renewables, LLC. nor any company of its group guarantees the integrity, security or proper receipt of this message. Likewise, neither Iberdrola Renewables, LLC. nor any company of its group accepts any liability whatsoever for any possible damages arising from, or in connection with, data interception, software viruses or manipulation by third parties.

=====

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** NoReply@Clark.Wa.Gov  
**Sent:** Saturday, April 11, 2015 12:15 PM  
**To:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** 2016 Comp Plan comments submitted

Following comments were submitted online:

Parcel No:

Subject: Alternative 4 support

Comments:

My property is currently zoned AG-20. Across from my 70 acre farm luxurious houses are being built on 3/4 acre lots. 88th St. is being considered for an alternative artillery. It is also slated for an improvement for the bridge over 5th Plain Creek. A better use of my 70 acres would be to have it zoned for 2.5 to 5 acre parcels. This would be a much better use of my land at some time in the future.

Respectively submitted, Frank Grobli

Submitted by:

Frank Grobli

Email: [fgrobli@gmail.com](mailto:fgrobli@gmail.com)

Address:

17802 NE 88th St

Vancouver, WA 98682

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** CenturyLink Customer <macbun@q.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 10, 2015 5:04 PM  
**To:** Cnty 2016 Comp Plan  
**Subject:** Fwd: comments about the comprehensive growth plan proposal 2016

Dear whom it concerns...

Will you see that this letter gets to the commissioners before this coming Tuesday meeting on April 14, 2015.

Our family representatives will also attend and have comments if there is an opportunity.

Thank you,

Alina Ahola McElveny

---

**From:** "CenturyLink Customer" <macbun@q.com>  
**To:** "comp plan" <comp.plan@clark.wa.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, March 24, 2015 5:24:12 PM  
**Subject:** comments about the comprehensive growth plan proposal 2016

With respect: To the commissioners,

In September 2012 We three Ahola sisters inherited "tenants in common" 49.05 acres (forest Tier II) east of Hockinson (Tax parcel # 2053840)

This 49.05 acres is the remainder of our Finnish immigrant Grandfather Eliel Ahola's 1905 Homestead.

Grandpa Ahola and his wife Hilda, raised 10 children on this Homestead. My Father, Eliel and Hilda's youngest living son

took over the care of the Homestead in 1939 paying off two mortgages put on during the Big Depression of 1930's.

My Father Alfred Ahola and MOM Ruth raised 7 children on this beloved land.

The rest of the 160 acre tree farm (except for 2.2 WN corner acres) are owned by our Ahola siblings and my son Mickael McElveny.

In 2013 we had the 160 acres surveyed, hired a professional Forester, submitted a Timber Management Plan, communicated with the Fish and wildlife so they could inspect and designate properly and ecologically our two creeks,

and we have continued to consult our family lawyers.

On legal advice we have changed the designation from Forestry to Timberlands, in preparation to divide this last 49.05 acres.

As instructed by the Forestry people, we have carefully marked all the boundaries of the separate pieces of this family land.

Now in 2015, or 2016, we three sisters want to divide the 49.05 acres inherited from our Mother's trust.

Alice "Ahola" Chandler would receive 18% (9 acres), to add to her 15 acres, (Tax#205455 & #205410).

Donna "Ahola" Andrews would receive 49% (24 acres) as her fair share.

and I, Alina "Ahola" McElveny would receive 33% (16 acres), having already received 6 acres which my son owns.

Zoned at 40 acres, as it is now, or 20, or 10 acres which you say it WILL possibly be, you can see that this is NOT possible.

We need the new zoning under the Comprehensive Growth Plan to be 5 acres as are almost all the lands around us

to the West, South, East and about 1/2 of the North boundary which we share with what was logged off and replanted school land ,  
but we now know that 80 acres of school land was sold to PLUM Creek, a large concern that manages forest products, mineral extraction and property development.  
We used your Clark County interactive maps to attempt to count how many smaller lots are all around us in our neighborhood, extending from 189th St to the north,  
to beyond 139th St to the South, to below 212th ave to the West and East up over the hill to the EAST including and farther East of Bonanza road  
which borders the Ahola Homestead on the east border. We think there are about 264 or possibly 300 lots of small size.  
We counted hundreds of lots from 5, 6 and 7 acres the average acreage size. These mostly have homes built on them.

Will you help us? What do you advise???

Yours to help,

truly,

Alina "Ahola" McElveny

22501 NE 159th St.

Brush Prairie, WA 98606

## Anderson, Colete

---

**From:** warren neth <warren@slowfoodswwa.com>  
**Sent:** Friday, April 10, 2015 3:02 PM  
**To:** Stewart, Jeanne; Madore, David; Mielke, Tom  
**Cc:** Orjiako, Oliver; Alvarez, Jose; Anderson, Colete; Euler, Gordon  
**Subject:** Follow-up - Purchase of Development Rights, Transfer of Development Rights or Agricultural Production Districts  
**Attachments:** DeedDevRights.doc

Greetings,

I wanted to follow-up on my comments at this weeks April 7th BOCCC Hearing.

Slow Food Southwest Washington would like to offer to put together a tour of a collection of Clark County's mid-sized farms and infrastructure to help you better understand the economic and social value of these mid-sized farms in Clark County's rural areas. If we can get commitment from at least two of the BOCCC members, I would be happy to put that together. We could also try to have some of the possible partners from the Ag land conservation and economic development sector join the tour.

As I said at the BOCCC hearing, I appreciate that you have gone forward with your considerations in ALT4, because of concerns you have heard from rural citizens. Over the last decade plus, rural citizens have worked on a number of reports that advocate for Purchase of Development Rights, Transfer of Development Rights or Agricultural Production Districts. I wanted to send you links to each of these reports to make them more easily accessible:

**Analysis of the Agricultural Economic Trends and Conditions in Clark County, Washington** April 2007  
[http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/comp\\_plan/documents/final\\_ag\\_analysis\\_prelim\\_report.pdf](http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/comp_plan/documents/final_ag_analysis_prelim_report.pdf)

**Clark County Agriculture Preservation Strategies Report** March 2009  
<http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/RuralLands/documents/2009%20APAC%20AgPreservationStrategiesReport.pdf>

**Rural Lands Task Force Recommendations** March 2010  
[http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/rurallands/documents/10-0310\\_RLTF-RecommendationsReport.pdf](http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/rurallands/documents/10-0310_RLTF-RecommendationsReport.pdf)

**Promoting Agricultural Food Production in Clark County**, NOV 2013  
<http://www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/about/documents/FSCProposalDraft.pdf>

Considering the significant and continued advocacy for Purchase of Development Rights, Transfer of Development Rights or Agricultural Production Districts, I feel it prudent that the BOCCC make efforts to at least explore the option further.

I wanted to offer you this short video that tells the story of agricultural land conservation pretty concisely:  
<http://www.pbs.org/food/features/lexicon-of-sustainability-land-trust/>

That video provides a good short story of how the program works generally and how it effects a farm family. To help the county get through the fine details of developing a farmland conservation program, in Washington State, we have the Office of Farmland Preservation. Here is a link to their department: <http://ofp.scc.wa.gov>

In the short-term, the the USDA is offering \$332 Million to pay for easements or technical assistance in developing land conservation programs. Applications are due May 15th, it would be great to have the BOCCC's and community planning's support on submitting the proposal. Here are more details:

<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/easements/acep/>

Many Counties in WA and across the country have developed these programs. Two nearby county's that would be willing to provide feedback and help with the details are Thurston County and Clackamas County. Here is a link to Thurston County:

<http://www.co.thurston.wa.us/planning/workingland/workingland-home.htm>

King County is a much larger program, but lots to learn from their model. I have attached the actual "DEED OF AND AGREEMENT RELATING TO DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS" that King County uses, in case that is helpful. Here is their website:

<http://www.kingcounty.gov/environment/stewardship/sustainable-building/transfer-development-rights.aspx>

Thank you for the opportunity to share this information. I hope it provides some information for your inquiries into Purchase of Development Rights, Transfer of Development Rights or Agricultural Production Districts.

Please feel free to give me a call to discuss this more and talk about the opportunity to tour Clark County's mid-sized farm economy.

Thank you,  
Warren Neth

--  
Warren Neth  
Executive Director  
Slow Food Southwest Washington  
[www.slowfoodswwa.com](http://www.slowfoodswwa.com)  
cell- [360-771-1296](tel:3607711296)

**DEED OF AND AGREEMENT RELATING TO  
DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS**

**THIS DEED AND AGREEMENT** is made this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 199\_\_, **BY  
AND BETWEEN**

hereinafter referred to as "Grantors," **AND KING COUNTY, a political subdivision of the State of Washington** hereinafter referred to as "Grantee."

**WHEREAS:**

The Grantors are the present owners of the lands described in Exhibit A which is attached hereto and incorporated herein by reference (the "Land").

The Grantors recognize that the Land is Farmland or Open Space Land as defined in King County Ordinance No. 4341, and they desire to cooperate with the Grantee in preserving land devoted to agricultural and open space uses.

The Grantors are willing to grant and convey to the Grantee the Development Rights in the Land as such rights are defined in King County Ordinance No. 4341 (said rights being the interest in and the right to use and subdivide land for any and all residential, commercial, and industrial purposes and activities which are not incident to agricultural and open space uses), on the terms and conditions and for the purposes hereinafter set forth. The Grantee is willing to purchase the Development Rights in the Land and accept this instrument of conveyance.

The Grantee has determined that the acquisition by the Grantee of Development Rights in Farmland and Open space Land will benefit the public through the preservation of property devoted to agricultural and open space uses.

The grant and conveyance of Development Rights by the Grantors to the Grantee will preserve the Land for activities consistent with agricultural and open space uses in perpetuity in accordance with the specific terms and conditions hereinafter set forth.

**NOW THEREFORE WITNESSETH**, that the Grantors, for and in consideration of \_\_\_\_\_ **DOLLARS** lawful money of the United States of America, paid to the Grantors by the Grantee, the receipt whereof is hereby acknowledged, and the Grantors being therewith fully satisfied, do by these presents grant, bargain, sell, transfer and convey unto the Grantee forever all Development Rights in respect to the Land, hereby perpetually binding the Land to the restrictions limiting permitted activities to agricultural and open space uses as specifically delineated in the covenants, terms, and conditions contained herein, and do also grant such interests, rights and easements, make such covenants, and subject the land to such servitudes as are necessary to bind the Land in perpetuity to such restrictions.

The Grantors and Grantee hereby agree that the Land shall be bound by and permanently subject to the following restrictive covenants, terms, and conditions. None of these covenants, terms, and conditions shall be construed as allowing a use that is not otherwise permitted by applicable state and local laws, codes, standards, and ordinances.

**RESTRICTIONS ON USE OF THE LAND**

- I. **Uses Restricted to Agricultural and Open Space Uses; Agricultural and Open Space Uses Defined.** Use of the Land is permanently restricted to solely agricultural and open space uses.
- A. "Agricultural uses," as used herein, means:

- (1) The growing, raising, and production of horticultural and agricultural crops, including, but not limited to, vegetables, berries, other fruits, cereal grains, herbs, hay, and silage, and the processing and the marketing for off-premises consumption of such crops grown, raised, or produced on the Land;
- (2) All forms of animal husbandry, including the processing and marketing for off-premises consumption of the animals raised on the Land or the products of the same;
- (3) The lying fallow or disuse of the Land.

Agricultural uses do not include the construction, habitation, or other use of a dwelling unit, except to the extent such use is specially reserved in this instrument.

B. "Open space uses," as used herein, means:

- (1) Agricultural uses as defined above;
- (2) Non-agricultural uses that conserve and enhance natural, scenic, or designated historic resources and that do not permanently compact, remove, sterilize, pollute, or otherwise impair the use of the soil on the Land for the raising of horticultural or agricultural crops.

Neither open space nor agricultural uses include the following: The construction, habitation, or other use of a dwelling unit, except to the extent such use is specifically reserved in this instrument; construction or expansion of buildings or structures for non-agricultural uses; the construction or use of golf courses, parking lots unassociated with agricultural uses, athletic fields, campgrounds, or vehicle raceways or animal raceways other than those principally used for the exercise of animals grown, raised, or produced on the Land. Open space uses may include trails for non-motorized use by the public that are maintained and owned by or for the benefit of a government agency or are maintained and owned by a non-profit conservation agency.

II. **Reservation of Dwelling Unit(s).** The Grantors reserve the right to the use of \_\_\_\_ single-family units(s) on the Land for the sole purpose of accommodating the Grantors and their successors in interest to the Land, the farm operator, or the families of such persons, or for accommodating agricultural employees of the owner or operator and their families. No more than \_\_\_\_ dwelling units(s) in total will be permitted regardless of whether the Land is subdivided by the Grantors or by any successor in interest of the Grantors. If the land is subdivided, the number of dwelling units allocated to each subdivided parcel out of the total number of dwelling units specified above shall be indicated in the deed to each such parcel and on the face of any plat or other instrument creating the subdivision or conveying an interest in the Land, however, failure to indicate the number of such dwelling units thereon shall not invalidate or otherwise affect the restriction of the total number of dwelling units on the Land. The dwelling unit(s) shall be (a) permanent or mobile structure(s) designed and used for single-family residential occupancy.

III. **Further Restriction on Use of the Land.** Potential uses of the Land are limited in that the Grantors, their heirs, successors, and assigns shall only be entitled to use, lease, maintain, or improve the Land for agricultural and open space uses, and they shall comply with the following terms, conditions, restrictions, and covenants, which are permanently binding on the Land:

A. No subdivision of the Land that reduces any parcel to less than 20 acres shall be permitted.

EXCEPT THAT the Grantors, their heirs, successors, and assigns may elect to subdivide the Land resulting in the creation of a parcel or parcels less than 20 acres in size where each of the following requirements are met: (1) a reserved homesite is attached to each parcel of the Land, after the subdivision; and (2) the reserved homesites on the subdivided parcels would not increase the density of housing on the Land, which means the total acreage prior to the subdivision, to more than one reserved homesite per 35 acres. All restrictions imposed by this instrument shall survive any subdivision.

B. No more than 5 percent of the Land, or of any parcel thereof resulting from a subdivision of the Land, shall be covered by structures and/or nontillable surfaces. "Structures" shall include but

are not limited to residences, barns, machine sheds, permanent greenhouses, associated structures, retail and processing facilities, surfaced parking areas, surfaced driveways, surfaced roadways, and surfaced pads. Temporary shelter for soil-dependent cultivation of horticultural or viticultural crops is not considered a structure. "Non-tillable surfaces" shall include but are not limited to asphalt, concrete, gravel, and any other cover material not normally associated with cultivation of the soil.

- C. No mining, drilling, or extracting of oil, gas, gravel, or minerals on or under the Land shall be permitted that causes disruption of the surface of the Land to any extent inconsistent with agricultural uses, and no part of the surface of the Land shall be used for storage or processing of gas, oil, or minerals taken from the Land, other than storage for the private use of the occupants of the Land.
  - D. No subsurface activities, including excavation for underground utilities, pipelines, or other underground installations, shall be permitted that cause permanent disruption of the surface of the Land. Temporarily disrupted soil surfaces shall be restored in a manner consistent with agricultural uses, including restoration of the original soil horizon sequence within a reasonable period of time after such installation.
  - E. No dumping or storage of non-agricultural solid or liquid waste, or of trash, rubbish, or noxious materials shall be permitted.
  - F. No activities that violate sound agricultural soil and water conservation management practices shall be permitted.
  - G. No signs shall be erected on the Land except for the following purposes:
    - (1) to state the name of the property and the name and address of the occupant;
    - (2) to advertise any use or activity consistent with the agricultural or open space uses as herein defined; or
    - (3) to advertise the property for sale or rent.
- IV. **Restriction on Use of the Land to Satisfy Open Space Requirements for Development or Use of Other Real Property.** Except as is otherwise provided below, in the event that an application is made at any time to a federal, state, or local governmental authority for permission to make use of any other real property including, but not limited to, real property that is contiguous to any of the Land hereby restricted, which proposed use is conditioned by such government authority on the existence of a specified quantity of open space or other restrictions on development, the Land shall not be used to contribute toward the satisfaction of any such open space requirement. This restriction shall not apply if the proposed use of the other real property is an agricultural or open space use, as defined herein.

#### **ADDITIONAL COVENANTS AND AGREEMENTS**

The Grantors and Grantee further agree as follows:

**Covenant Against Encumbrances.** The Grantors covenant that they have not done or executed, or allowed to be done or executed, any act, deed, or thing whatsoever whereby the Development Rights hereby conveyed, or any part thereof, now or at any time hereafter, will or may be charged or encumbered in any manner or way whatsoever.

**Remedies.** If the Grantors, their heirs, successors, assigns, agents, or employees violate or allow the violation of any of the terms, conditions, restrictions, and covenants set forth herein, then the Grantee will be entitled to all remedies available at law or in equity, including, but not limited to, injunctive relief, rescission of contract, or damages, including attorneys' fees and court costs reasonably incurred by the Grantee in prosecuting such action(s). No waiver or waivers by the Grantee, or by its successors or assigns, of any breach of a term, condition, restriction, or covenant or of any other term, condition,

restriction, or covenant contained herein.

**No Alteration or Amendment.** The terms, conditions, restrictions, and covenants contained herein shall not be altered or amended unless such alteration or amendment shall be made with the written consent of the Grantee, or its successors or assigns, and any such alteration or amendment shall be consistent with the purposes of King County Ordinance No. 4341, as heretofore or hereafter amended.

**Restrictions Binding on Successors.** The Grantors and Grantee agree that the terms, conditions, restrictions, and covenants contained herein shall be binding upon the Grantors, their agents, personal representatives, heirs, assigns, and all other successors in interest to the Land and possessors of the Land, and shall be permanent terms, conditions, restrictions, covenants, servitudes, and easements running with and perpetually binding the Land.

**Transfer of Rights by Grantee.** The Grantee agrees that the Development Rights to the Land shall not be sold, given, divested, transferred, or otherwise reconveyed in whole or in part in any manner except as provided in King County Ordinance No. 4341, as heretofore or hereafter amended. The Grantors, their personal representatives, heirs, successors, or assigns, shall be given the right of first refusal to purchase the Development Rights in the Land provided such disposition and reconveyance be lawfully approved.

**Condemnation.** If the Land is subject to any condemnation action, and if a mutually acceptable agreement as to the compensation to be provided to the Grantee is not reached between Grantee and Grantors within a reasonable period of time, the Grantors will request that the Grantee be made a party to such action in order that it be fully compensated for the loss of, or devaluation in, the Development Rights hereby conveyed.

**No Affirmative Obligations; Indemnification.** Grantee, in purchasing the Development Rights and related interests described herein, assumes no affirmative obligations whatsoever for the management, supervision or control of the Land or of any activities occurring on the Land. Grantors shall indemnify Grantee and hold Grantee harmless from all damages, costs (including, but not limited to, attorneys' fees and other costs of defense incurred by Grantee), and other expenses of every kind arising from or incident to any claim or action for damages, injury, or loss suffered or alleged to have been suffered on or with respect to the Land. This provision shall be binding upon the Grantors for so long as they hold fee title to the Land, and shall bind their successors in interest to the fee title to the Land.

**Grantee's Right to Enter onto the Land.** After giving reasonable notice to the possessors of the Land, the Grantee or its authorized representative shall have the right to enter from time to time onto the Land and into structures located thereon for the sole purposes of inspection and enforcements of the terms, conditions, restrictions and covenants hereby imposed.

**Severability.** If any section or provision of this instrument shall be held by any court of competent jurisdiction to be unenforceable, this instrument shall be construed as though such section or provision had not been included in it, and the remainder of this instrument shall be enforced as the expression of the parties' intentions. If any section or provision of this instrument is found to be subject to two constructions, one of which would render such section or provision invalid, and one of which would render such section or provision valid, then the latter construction shall prevail. If any section or provision of this instrument is determined to be ambiguous or unclear, it shall be interpreted in accordance with the policies and provisions expressed in King County Ordinance No. 4341.

**IN WITNESS WHEREOF,** the parties have hereunto set their hand and seals the day and year first above written.

GRANTEE

GRANTORS

KING COUNTY



RECEIVED APR 13 2015

April 8, 2015

TO: BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS

RE: COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ALTERNATIVES/COMMUNITY PLANNING

We have been following the alternatives presented for proposed changes to the comprehensive plan, and would like to comment.

We are wholly in favor of the changes proposed in Alternative Four. We feel these are fair and equitable for rural landowners. Agriculture has changed a lot over the years, and there is no longer any need for large tracts to be set aside for farming. Five and ten acres are sufficient. The other alternatives do not begin to adequately address the problems rural landowners face in order to make the best decisions about their land.

Please consider Alternative Four as the only reasonable choice.



Ed Sarkinen, landowner



Elaine Sarkinen, landowner

22713 NE 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, Battle Ground, WA 98604

### David Madore

April 10 at 11:22pm · Edited ·

Speak up while there is time – your future property zoning:

Three days remain for you to record your voice in the public record on Alternative 4, the proposed rural property zoning for the next 20 years.

[http://www.clark.wa.gov/engageclarkcounty/...](http://www.clark.wa.gov/engageclarkcounty/)

Your few minutes to weigh in on your preferences will provide one more way that we can hear from our neighbors that own rural property.

Some say that no citizen should have private property rights, that the "greater good" is served by requiring citizens to live in high density transit oriented inner cities and that rural properties should be left to nature, that government should buy up private property rights to prohibit any further rural development.

Yet, the overwhelming feedback I hear in person from rural land owners is that private property is far better off in their hands than in government hands. They want their freedom, flexibility, and private property rights restored.

Skamania County's declared State of Emergency is an example of government gross mismanagement of our rich forests by the US Forest Service squandering our natural resources.

<http://clark.wa.gov/.../docum.../SkamaniaCountyResolution107.pdf>

Who do you say should own the property rights of rural land in Clark County?

## What do you think about the four suggested land use and growth alternatives?

177 Views · 20 Comments · April 10, 2015 · Updated

On Forum (20)



Sort by: Date · Report

Download: PDF | CSV

### 20 Statements On Forum

177 Pike inside Clark County

I am supportive of Alternative 4.

Like · Comment · Share



Eric Cordova, Allen Hoff and 2 others like this.

2 shares

View 4 more comments



**Stacey Shrull** I agree with Scott. Agenda 21. My property is mine. Not the Government's.

Like · Reply · April 11 at 11:13pm



**Alvin Fischer** We are developing the way in which property is useful for all people, regardless of economic class. The fact that we pay taxes for roads and many other things we have in common, regulations for the safety of all people, means that the community and individuality are both important for our time and time to come. It's not one and not the other, it's "both and".