

From: [Jeffrey Delapena](#)
To: "Jack Androvich"
Cc: [Oliver Orjiako](#); [Jose Alvarez](#); [Rebecca Messinger](#)
Subject: RE: Support for Growth Plan Alternative 1
Date: Monday, April 20, 2026 8:18:00 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)

Good day, Jack,

Thank you for your comments regarding the Council Hearing to select the Preferred Alternative for the 2025 Comprehensive Plan.

I am forwarding to additional members of Staff, including the Council's office ahead of the Apr. 27th Hearing. This will also be added to the Index of Record.

Best regards,



Jeff Delapena
Program Assistant
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.4558



NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this email, in whole or in part may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Jack Androvich <jack.androvich@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Saturday, April 18, 2026 9:23 AM
To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Support for Growth Plan Alternative 1

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.

Greetings,

As a steward of a 10 acre farm parcel NE of Ridgefield city limits we support Alternative 1 for the growth plan. We are doing what we can to preserve & protect this land as Ridgefield urban growth skirts the area just south of us...so we know what urban encroachment looks like.

Here are key reasons for that support.

The amount of agricultural land in Clark County has been eroded by the county's actions over the decades since the passage of the original Comprehensive Plan. The de-designation of any agricultural land for unnecessary **UGA expansions would continue to undermine the capability of our agricultural sector to rise to its highest levels of productivity.**

Therefore:

1) Clark County's Preferred Alternative for the Comp Plan should reflect the county's prior decisions that **all** forecasted growth for housing, population, and employment can be accommodated within current UGAs, meaning there is **no legal reason** to expand UGAs. **Alternative 1 is the only alternative that does not expand UGAs.**

2) The hundreds of acres that Ridgefield, La Center, and Camas are requesting to pave over forever are designated prime agricultural lands and farmlands of statewide importance. Additionally, Battle Ground's proposed expansion would pave over hundreds of acres of ag-quality rural lands identified in the [Agricultural Lands Study](#)

3) Clark County must match the City of Vancouver's greenhouse gas Emissions Goals, as the recommendations made by the Clark County Climate Community Advisory Group.

4) Urbanization begets urbanization. To use encroaching development as a justification to de-designate land, will continue to chip away at agricultural land...noted by Clark County's own lawyer as "the absolute definition of urban sprawl".

These supporting summary points are also important:

- The County is required by law to have a sufficient supply of agricultural lands to sustain a local agricultural economy. I support Friends of Clark County's [vision for agriculture in Clark County](#) to maintain and sustain a climate resilient local agricultural economy.
- The Council should honor the [recommendations of the Agricultural Advisory Commission](#).
- The Council should consider the needs of the entire county and our collective future, not reward cities for failing to propose alternatives for their cities that do not include paving over prime farmland.

Thanks for considering our input as stewards of our land.

Jack & Jeanne Androvich

28610 NE 19th Avenue
Ridgefield WA 98642
jack.androvich@sbcglobal.net
408.391.3670 mobile/text