

**From:** [publiccomment](#)  
**To:** [Oliver Orijako](#); [Jose Alvarez](#); [Cnty 2025 Comp Plan](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Council Hearing Public Comment  
**Date:** Wednesday, April 22, 2026 12:11:31 PM  
**Attachments:** [image001.png](#)

---

Please see the public comments below. Thanks.



**Rebecca Messinger**  
Clerk to the Council  
COUNTY MANAGER'S OFFICE

Phone: 564-397-4305  
Email: [Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov](mailto:Rebecca.Messinger@clark.wa.gov)



---

**From:** Clark County <[webmaster@clark.wa.gov](mailto:webmaster@clark.wa.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, April 22, 2026 11:12 AM  
**To:** publiccomment <[publiccomment@clark.wa.gov](mailto: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 Wed, 04/22/2026 - 11:11 AM

**Name**

Jordan Hamann

**Phone Number**

[3608698287](tel:3608698287)

**Email Address**

[jthamann4@gmail.com](mailto:jthamann4@gmail.com)

**Subject**

Preferred Land Use Alternative for the 2025-2045 Comprehensive Plan Update

**Date of Hearing**

Mon, 04/27/2026

**Comment**

I would like to know the general future plans had by the Cowlitz Tribe for the properties surrounding their reservation territory and whether or not those plans have driven the insistence by the cities of La Center and Ridgefield to de-designate agricultural lands between their jurisdictions for inclusion into their Urban Growth Areas despite State modelling showing that existing UGAs can accommodate all projected growth.

As the Cowlitz Tribe is not subject to the Growth Management Act the way that cities and counties are, would the persistence of County Ag zoning even prevent the tribe from developing such properties they own in ways not compatible with Ag-20? That is, will those properties surrounding the reservation and between Ridgefield and La Center even remain agricultural with the zoning or will the Tribe be able to build and develop them for their casino-resort regardless of the County's decision?

This mentality does seem to lead to a "race to the bottom", where everyone tries to get a piece of the Tribe's pie assuming those lands will all be developed into one big city anyway. It raises concerns that agricultural designations are meaningless and further raises concerns whether forest, mineral, or critical land designations are as well.

If the Tribe desires to be a stalwart community partner, they need to share their plans with other local agencies so that they all can make informed decisions together. Simply sharing that "big things are coming", and that we must prepare both dramatically and swiftly, but then withholding any further information as "proprietary" may be legal but casts the idea of community partnership in a different light. How can the County make an honest and informed decision if there is a vigorous development plan being prepared by a sovereign neighbor that is being withheld from any of their decision-making?

I am generally in favor of Alternative 2. The State's numbers do indicate that all projected growth can be accommodated within existing UGA boundaries, but I do not believe that those projections adequately account for shifting market factors. I do believe that the City of Vancouver needs to actually annex more meaningful amounts of their existing UGA (which would be the 5th-largest city in the State if incorporated as a single entity) before being handed any more county lands.

This plan DOES need to address, in statute, the impending death-spiral for agricultural production within the county as ardently as it addresses housing and employment. We cannot eat houses any more than we can eat warehouses. We can ONLY eat food. Preserving a critical mass of agriculturally-capable lands should be treated as a priority in the name of regional food security.

Lands that are not currently being farmed but are still capable of transitioning to food production if needed should be purposefully held in preserve against a future need.

We have already seen that disruptions to our food supply are possible; this is no longer a paranoid hypothetical. The COVID-19 pandemic significantly, even severely, disrupted the distribution of food across the country and that was definitely felt here. The more reliant we become on acquiring our food from farther and farther away, the more fragile we make ourselves. We have already seen that disruptions do not need to be as traditionally catastrophic as an earthquake or war to rapidly cause issues with feeding ourselves.

I feel strongly that we will regret moving agriculturally-capable lands forever out of potential production without strong quantitative justification and binding assurances of maintaining a critical mass of farmland.

© 2026 Clark County Washington