

From: [publiccomment](#)
To: [Sue Marshall](#); [Glen Yung](#); [Michelle Belkot](#); [Wil Fuentes](#); [Matt Little](#); [Oliver Oriako](#); [Jose Alvarez](#); [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#)
Subject: FW: Council Hearing Public Comment
Date: Friday, April 10, 2026 11:25:16 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Hello,

Please see the comp plan-related public comments below.

Thank you!



Rebecca Messinger
Clerk to the Council
COUNTY MANAGER'S OFFICE

Phone: 564-397-4305

Email: Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov



From: Clark County <webmaster@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Friday, April 10, 2026 10:32 AM
To: publiccomment <publiccomment@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Council Hearing Public Comment

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.



Submitted on Fri, 04/10/2026 - 10:31 AM

Name

Rick Johnson Johnson

Phone Number

[3609071006](tel:3609071006)

Email Address

rick.g.johnson@gmail.com

Subject

DEIS Findings 179th/Salmon Creek

Date of Hearing

Mon, 04/27/2026

Comment

I am submitting this comment for the permanent record in response to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS). I am particularly concerned that the realities experienced by existing residents are not being adequately reflected or weighted in the DEIS analysis or in the policy direction that follows.

The DEIS acknowledges that increased residential density and continued development place additional demands on transportation systems, emergency services, schools, and other public facilities. However, the lived experience of residents demonstrates that these impacts are already occurring, not merely projected.. Development approvals and land use decisions continue to move forward while infrastructure capacity remains insufficient, resulting in real time hardship, reduced mobility, and increased safety risk.

In practice, nearly all remaining open land in my area and throughout Vancouver is being converted to residential development, often at high density and on exceptionally small lots. While the DEIS discusses growth accommodation, it does not adequately address the cumulative impact of allowing concentrated density without first delivering commensurate infrastructure. The result is compounded congestion, overstressed access routes, and increased burdens on surrounding neighborhoods.

Current and prolonged construction activity—particularly along NE 179th Street and key east-west connectors such as NE 50th Avenue—has produced persistent bottlenecks that severely restrict neighborhood ingress and egress. These conditions directly conflict with the DEIS objective of evaluating transportation system capacity and public safety impacts. Entire neighborhoods are now functionally limited to one or two congested access points, making routine activities difficult and costly.

Of particular concern, the DEIS does not sufficiently account for the public safety risks created by constrained emergency access. Fire, police, and emergency medical vehicles must be able to reach residents reliably and without delay. When development intensity is increased while roadway access is narrowed, closed, or congested for multi year periods, emergency response times are unavoidably jeopardized. This represents a significant adverse impact under SEPA that warrants stronger mitigation and prioritization.

The DEIS also references the need to align growth with available public services. Yet residents are experiencing increased strain on schools, utilities, and transportation systems at the same time that property tax assessments continue to rise. These rising taxes are not translating into timely improvements to core infrastructure or neighborhood livability. Instead, residents are paying more while experiencing declining access, increased congestion, and elevated risk during

emergencies. This disconnect suggests that planning and spending priorities are not aligned with the needs of the residents funding these systems.

While growth is often described as necessary and beneficial, the DEIS should more clearly acknowledge that the sequencing of development versus infrastructure delivery matters.

Approving dense residential development ahead of functional transportation and public safety capacity shifts the impacts onto existing residents for years at a time. This outcome conflicts with the intent of SEPA analysis, traffic concurrency policies, and impact fee frameworks designed to ensure that growth pays for and is supported by adequate facilities.

I respectfully urge the County to ensure that the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) more fully addresses:

- The cumulative impacts of small lot, high density development on already constrained infrastructure
- Real world transportation and emergency access conditions during long term construction phases
- Public safety implications of limited ingress and egress for existing neighborhoods
- Alignment between development approvals, infrastructure delivery, and resident impacts
- Mitigation measures that prioritize immediate safety and access—not only long term projections

Growth should not come at the expense of resident safety, basic mobility, and quality of life. The FEIS should reflect not only planned outcomes but the present conditions residents are experiencing today, and it should guide decision making that places equal or greater weight on protecting existing communities.

Thank you for accepting this comment into the official record.

Respectfully,
Rick and Jill Johnson