From: Jeffrey Delapena
To: "Mark Leed"
Cc: Oliver Orjiako; Jose Alvarez
Subject: RE: Comment RE: 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update
Date: Thursday, September 3, 2026 8:32:00 AM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png

Good day, Mark,

Thank you for submitting comments related to the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update.

These comments will be added to the Index of Record and brought to the attention of the Planning Commission prior to tonight's Hearing.

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: Mark Leed <markleed02@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 4:12 PM
To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Oliver Orjiako <Oliver.Orjiako@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <Jose.Alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Comment 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 Commissioners,

Many of us in the community were eager to see new Planning Commissioners who we saw as wanting to protect our farm and forest land, but were surprised when the Commission selected a Preferred Alternative that needlessly expands UGAs and destroys designated agricultural land, and in the case of Battle Ground, ag-quality rural land that should be designated as ag land. We are confused by this decision given that it has been reiterated multiple times that the VBLM shows that it is unnecessary to expand UGAs to accommodate projected population growth.

Now the county's Final Environmental Impact Statement has put this fact in writing as well. It states, "Given the planning assumptions for growth rate and jobs/acre, the Preferred Alternative exceeds the land capacity needed to accommodate the housing and job growth projected for the next 20 years." So even if you stick with your previous position to expand UGAs as you did with the Preferred Alternative, we believe you owe it to the public to really discuss this in your deliberations and explain why you believe UGAs should be expanded when that's not what the VBLM shows is necessary, when the county's own FEIS document states so, and when it violates the Growth Management Act to needlessly expand UGAs which could land the county on the losing end of a court battle that will cost taxpayers immensely.

We also urge you to clarify how a Transfer of Development Rights program would be applied in conjunction with de-designation of agricultural land. Though we oppose de-designation, the public needs a clear explanation of how the TDR process would be used to protect other lands from development to mitigate the loss of de-designated ag land. It would appear that using a TDR program to mitigate de-designation of ag land would still result in a net loss of farmland. This contrasts with how TDRs have been used in King County to protect undeveloped land from future development in exchange for upzoning in areas that are already urbanized.

Respectfully,

Mark Leed
Chair, Loo Wit Group of The Sierra Club
3419 E 21st St Apt. 4
Vancouver, WA 98661