From: Jeffrey Delapena
To: Steve Thalberg
Cc: Sue Marshall; Oliver Orjiako; Jose Alvarez
Subject: RE: submission to planning commission for 9/3 meeting: PBRS
Date: Friday, September 4, 2026 3:33:00 PM
Attachments: image001.png
image002.png
image003.png
image004.png

Good day, Steve,

Thank you for providing this additional feedback. I will forward your comments to the members of the Planning Commission.

Best,

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: Steve Thalberg <sathalberg@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, September 4, 2026 3:28 PM
To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>
Cc: Sue Marshall <Sue.Marshall@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: Re: submission to planning commission for 9/3 meeting: PBRS

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.

Hello Jeff,

There is no evidence that even one PC member reviewed my comments.
This is very disheartening.

There would have been no 'down side' had the PC inserted a consideration for a Public Benefit Rating System in chapter 4 (the Environmental Element) of the county's proposed CGM Plan, particularly sections 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.10.2.
It would have helped preserve agricultural lands.
This was even more important, in light of the PC not approving LeDuc-Montgomery's TDR motion.

There would have been no 'down side' had the PC added the 'I-5 exit 11 connector towards Ridgefield' to the Arterial Atlas.
growth in Ridgefield is proceeding at a rapid rate, and the PC should consider the infrastructure (roads) to support that growth.

Please let the PC members know of my disapproval of their apparent act of ignoring public comment.

Sincerely,
Steve Thalberg

On 9/3/2026 8:30 AM, Jeffrey Delapena wrote:

> Good day, Steve,
>
> Thank you for submitting comments related to the 2025 Comprehensive Plan Update.
>
> I am forwarding to additional members of staff. 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: Steve Thalberg <sathalberg@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 2, 2026 11:57 AM
To: Jeffrey Delapena <Jeffrey.Delapena@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: submission to planning commission for 9/3 meeting: PBRS

Dear Planning Commission,

Please accept these comments to help you in your deliberations.

Please consider the following comments for the Environmental Impact Statement portion of the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan for Clark County.

A Public Benefit Rating System (PBRS) for the county will dovetail nicely with HB1181, which encourages tree crown cover, reduction of greenhouse gases, improvement in air and water quality and enhances the quality of life of residents.

Trees benefit long-term health of the local neighborhood citizens, improve neighborhood value, decrease summertime energy use and costs, and have an unmatched positive benefit-cost ratio.

See my 8/20/2026 e-mail submission to the planning commission for further details.

I encourage the Planning Commission to recommend adding a recommendation for the adoption of a PBRS to chapter 4, the Environmental

Element, of the county's proposed Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, particularly sections 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 and 4.10.2.

- my PBRS proposal (https://clark.wa.gov/sites/default/files/media/document/2026-08/ag-comm-pbrs-presentation-2026-08-26.pdf) is based on the 2019 PRBS proposal, and about 95% of both proposals are identical.
- I have reviewed and collated the PBRS rules and regulations for all 16 counties that have adopted a PBRS (334 pages of fine print) - Clark County is one of the 23 counties without a PBRS.
- my proposal has taken the best features from each county and included them in the proposal.
- the 2019 PBRS proposal was supported by the assessor's office and the County Council, but then Covid occurred and a change in County Council membership resulted in no further action at that time.
- the current County Council is in favor of a PBRS and would like the support of the Planning Commission.

Sincerely,
Steve Thalberg