

From: [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
To: [Sylvia Trujillo](#); [Cnty Community Planning](#)
Subject: RE: Public Comment and Request for Data and Clarifications on 2025 Comprehensive Plan Proposals
Date: Monday, June 9, 2025 8:05:56 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Good day, Sylvia,

Thank you for submitting comments regarding the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update.

These will be entered into the Index of Record.

Best,



Jeff Delapena
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4558



From: Sylvia Trujillo <sylviajtrujillo@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, June 8, 2025 8:01 AM
To: Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>; Cnty Community Planning
<CommunityPlanning@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Public Comment and Request for Data and Clarifications on 2025 Comprehensive Plan Proposals

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.

Dear Clark County Planning Commission and County Council,

We write on behalf of concerned residents of Clark County, including those from Ramble Creek and surrounding neighborhoods. Having attended the

recent public Comprehensive Plan meeting and conducted an initial analysis of the planning documents, we respectfully submit the following request and analysis.

We have concluded that the Planning Staff have not offered three truly distinct and meaningful options for public consideration. Rather, Options 2 and 3 represent nearly identical expansions of Business Park zoning at the environmentally sensitive area southwest of WSU Vancouver. Option 1, as currently drafted, meets only 90% of the projected need using the medium-growth projections provided by the Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM), rendering it noncompliant unless the County either adopts the OFM low-growth projection or develops a legally sufficient fourth option.

Furthermore, none of the current proposals appear to include a modern alternative grounded in smart growth and infill—such as a mixed-use urban model that does not rely on conversion of farmland, residential and rural areas, or environmentally critical lands near Salmon Creek, Mill Creek, and important watersheds.

As such, we are conducting our own independent due diligence and respectfully request the following data and clarifications to inform both our review and potential proposals to the Council and Commission. Given the limited time left and how late the public meetings were held to review the alternatives, we seek access by this Friday at the very latest.

REQUESTED DATA & TECHNICAL QUESTIONS

Land Use and Zoning Data

1. Parcel-level maps or GIS data showing current zoning and land use designations in the Vancouver subarea (especially near WSU Vancouver and Salmon Creek).
2. Acreage of Business Park, Light Industrial, and Commercial-zoned land that remains vacant or underutilized within the current UGA boundary.

3. Total acreage of residentially zoned, unbuilt land and estimated housing unit capacity.

Infill and Redevelopment Potential

4. Availability of any infill analysis or buildable lands inventory conducted since 2015.
5. Constraints or assumptions that limit infill/mixed-use alternatives in the current proposals.
6. Whether the County has considered targeted rezoning or upzoning in existing urban/transit-accessible areas.

Population and Employment Assumptions

7. Specific assumptions used in applying OFM's medium-growth projection.
8. Methodology for determining the residential-to-employment land allocation ratio (e.g., VBALM).
9. Whether the County has modeled the low-growth projection and its implications for land allocation.

Environmental and Climate Impacts

10. Environmental data layers used to evaluate impacts in Proposals 2 and 3:
 - Tree canopy loss / heat island effects
 - Wetlands and floodplains
 - Aquifer recharge areas
 - Proximity to Salmon Creek, Mill Creek, and tributaries

11. Timeline and scope for SEPA Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) on Proposals 2 and 3.
12. Metrics used for climate resilience and mitigation goal compliance.

Infrastructure and Mobility

13. Results of any traffic studies, cost estimates, or modeling for infrastructure needs near the proposed expanded Business Park.
14. Projected impact of Proposals 2 and 3 on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit accessibility in the subarea.

Public Participation and Options Process

15. Whether a fourth proposal (Option 4) may still be developed that focuses on infill, mixed-use, and environmentally sound development.
16. Process and timeline for submitting such an alternative.
17. Whether the final plan will be reviewed by the State under RCW 36.70A.130 and implications of failing to meet projected thresholds.

We recognize that planning for growth is complex and challenging. However, the lack of meaningful alternatives and the similarity between Proposals 2 and 3 place the County at risk of failing to meet state requirements while simultaneously jeopardizing environmental health, community values, and responsible long-term development.

We urge the Planning Commission and Council to publish this requested data promptly and to commit to modeling a fourth alternative consistent with climate and community protection.

Thank you for your time and public service.

Sincerely,

Sylvia Trujillo

On behalf of Ramble Creek and Clark County Residents Opposed to Proposals
2 and 3