

From: [Rebecca Messinger](#)
To: [Peter L. Fels](#)
Cc: [Gary Medvigy](#); [Karen Bowerman](#); [Glen Yung](#); [Jose Alvarez](#); [Michelle Belkot](#); [Sue Marshall](#); [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#)
Subject: RE: Population, Housing and Employment Allocations for Clark County Comp. Plan update
Date: Monday, May 6, 2024 3:53:04 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Good afternoon, Mr. Fels.

This is to confirm receipt of your comments, which will be added to the record.

Thank you.

Rebecca



Rebecca Messinger
Clerk to the Council
COUNTY MANAGER'S OFFICE

564-397-4305



From: Peter L. Fels <plfels@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, May 6, 2024 3:42 PM
To: Rebecca Messinger <Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov>; Karen Bowerman <Karen.Bowerman@clark.wa.gov>; Glen Yung <Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>; Michelle Belkot <Michelle.Belkot@clark.wa.gov>; Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>; Gary Medvigy <Gary.Medvigy@clark.wa.gov>; Cnty 2025 Comp Plan <comp.plan@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Population, Housing and Employment Allocations for Clark County Comp. Plan update

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Peter Fels

5121 NW Franklin Street, Vancouver WA 98663

May 6, 2024

Clark County Council

RE: Population, Housing & Employment Allocation

Dear Councilors:

I urge you to accept and adopt your staff's recommendations for Population, Housing & Employment allocations with the slight modifications recommended by the Cities, as noted in Bryan Snodgrass's report (i.e., using projections that are halfway between the ones produced by Method A and Method B).

Clark County should retain as much of its rural character as possible outside existing city limits and urban growth boundaries. There is no need to expand current UGAs. Doing so will hurt the essential character and livability of the county, which are the reasons we all like living here.

As noted by Mr. Snodgrass, the cities have adequate room for projected housing and business needs by utilizing density, redevelopment and infill. Adding housing and industry to rural areas not only interferes with the potential for agricultural enterprises but also adds to the need for public transportation infrastructure, which is already lacking in the county, and also will result in additional vehicle miles traveled. The staff projection of 5% growth in rural housing and business is a reasonable expansion.

CCCU's comments seem to say that "rural people" need unlimited access to increased rural housing. It is unclear who CCCU represents or is referring to, but adding to the rural housing base with unrestricted growth will ultimately lead to loss of the rural character they now enjoy.

In the 29 years I've lived in Clark County I've seen the loss of hundreds of acres of farm and forest land. It is time to put an end to that loss and preserve what remains.

I note the Competenomics report at Table 6 does not list agriculture as a source of employment despite agriculture's historical significance in the County. ^[1] I urge you to consider the value of local agriculture and value-added agricultural production as having a huge potential for the County's quality of

life and for climate resilience. In addition, the growth of value added products to existing agricultural lands will not always necessitate a need for more land while it can increase employment opportunities.

Please keep rural Clark County's non-agricultural growth in check by sticking to existing UGA's without expansion.

Sincerely,

s/Peter Fels

[\[1\]](#) Also, the Competenomics comment cites at footnote 13 to a paper by the Mercatus Institute to support the claim that regulations unduly increase the cost of housing in Washington. A reading of that paper shows that it is not supported by any hard evidence. Mercatus is a libertarian think tank primarily funded by Koch industries, a notoriously ultra conservative group which gets its income from producing and distributing fossil fuels. The Mercatus report comes from a biased source and is not a peer reviewed academic paper, so you should treat it as an unsupported opinion piece by an outside source.