

From: [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
To: [Sam Charlie](#); [Jenna Kay](#)
Cc: [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#); [Oliver Oriako](#); [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: RE: Panel Discussion 6.18.25 Re: 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update
Date: Friday, June 20, 2025 8:10:08 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Good day, Sam,

Thank you for submitting your feedback regarding the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update.

This has been forwarded to additional members of Staff and will be entered into the Index of Record.

Best,



Jeff Delapena
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4558



From: Sam Charlie <bibte1@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, June 19, 2025 2:51 PM
To: Wil Fuentes <Wil.Fuentes@clark.wa.gov>; Jenna Kay <Jenna.Kay@clark.wa.gov>; justin@burgerfamilyfarm.com
Cc: Cnty 2025 Comp Plan <comp.plan@clark.wa.gov>; Michelle Belkot <Michelle.Belkot@clark.wa.gov>; Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>; Matt Little <Matt.Little@clark.wa.gov>; Glen Yung <Glen.Yung@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Panel Discussion 6.18.25 Re: 2025 Comprehensive 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.

Dear Councilor Fuentes, Planner Jenna Kay and Board member Burger,

Thank you for your time and participation in the recent panel discussion regarding growth planning and land use within Clark County.

After watching the presentation on YouTube, I wanted to share a few concerns specific to Ridgefield. The discussion seemed heavily focused on opposing any growth or expansion, emphasizing the need to preserve so-called **prime** agricultural lands. While I fully support thoughtful planning and environmental stewardship, it's important to clarify that the area proposed (westside of Ridgefield) has been designated as *Urban Reserve* since 1994 and has **never** been classified as agricultural land of long-term commercial significance under RCW 36.70A.030(2).¹

Historically, this land has not produced food crops or any meaningful yield beyond hay—certainly not qualifying as “commercial production.” Its designation was intended to support future urban growth. The proposed expansion area is bordered on three sides by existing Ridgefield city limits and is already served by the infrastructure necessary to support higher-density development, including roads, utilities, and public services.

Perhaps most importantly, the west I-5 Ridgefield plan includes:

- Approximately **1,000 units of affordable housing**
- **Over 50 acres of parks and open space**
- A **robust trail system** connecting to services like the Costco area
- **Employment opportunities** projected to support over **800 jobs**

These features align directly with GMA requirements and state climate policies by placing affordable housing near services and jobs—significantly reducing vehicle use and supporting climate change goals.

Given the severe affordable housing shortage and a shared responsibility to plan for responsible growth, it was disappointing that the presentation failed to acknowledge any of these critical benefits or the practical realities of this land and the substantial public and environmental benefits of this proposal. Rather than opposing growth outright, you should work together to shape it responsibly in ways that reflect both environmental values and human needs of our communities.

Frankly, I was anticipating that the presentation would conclude with at least some recognition—or even kudos—for Ridgefield's efforts in putting forward such a well-balanced and thoughtful plan. The proposal not only meets GMA required growth targets, but does so with an emphasis on affordability, density, connectivity, environmental protection and job creation. That kind of planning deserves acknowledgement, not dismissal.

I hope future narratives will reflect a more balanced and fact-based perspective, rather than promoting one-sided opposition.

Sincerely,
Sam C.

¹ RCW 36.70A.030(2): “‘Agricultural land’ means land primarily devoted to the commercial production of horticultural, viticultural, floricultural, dairy, apiary, vegetable, or animal products or of berries, grain, hay, straw, turf, seed, Christmas trees not subject to the excise tax imposed by RCW 84.33.100 through 84.33.140, or livestock, and that has long-term commercial significance for agricultural production.”