

From: [Carol Levanen](#)
To: [Eileen Quiring](#); [Gary Medvigy](#); [Kathleen Otto](#); [John Blom](#); [Julie Olson](#); [Temple Lentz](#); [Mitch Nickolds](#); [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Pacific Legal Foundation reports the housing crisis - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD
Date: Friday, May 15, 2020 6:24:36 PM

CAUTION: 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 Councilors,

This article came from the Pacific Legal Foundation website, as they reported on a particular article. This organization is on the cutting edge of legal property rights and have prevailed in the United State Supreme Court many times over. The Nolan and Dolan cases came from PLF. They know what they are talking about, and so do you know what they are talking about. The bottom [http://line.....build](#) more homes.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Exec. Secretary

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. P.O. Box 2188 Battle Ground, Washington 98604 E-Mail ccuinc@yahoo.com

We are at an intersection of two critical crises: health and housing. The COVID-19 pandemic has highlighted that, now more than ever, having a safe home is a basic human need.

But needlessly restrictive land-use policies have left our communities with too few homes that are too expensive. That crisis that has been deepening for decades and could dramatically worsen — unless we commit to addressing the housing shortage with the same urgency and priority that we have shown in response to COVID-19.

Earlier this year, the home mortgage underwriter Freddie Mac estimated the U.S. needs an additional 2.5 million homes to accommodate the current population. This figure, however, does not capture the extent of the crisis, as it does not include projected housing needs. Nor does it take into account the skyrocketing home prices that have made purchasing or renting a home difficult, if not impossible, for many people—particularly in larger cities like Los Angeles where “affordable” housing can cost up to \$1 million dollars for an apartment.

The solution is simple: build more homes. But for too long our cities and counties have clung to exclusionary land-use policies, such as wastefully large minimum lot

sizes or inflexible single-family zoning, that hinder new construction and drive up housing costs.

The war on construction accelerated thanks to the COVID-19 response, which shut down numerous activities deemed “non-essential.” City officials from Philadelphia to Seattle have shut down residential construction sites, despite the fact that much of the work could be conducted with sufficiently effective social distancing. And in California, officials extended the already lengthy and costly permitting processes to give third-parties, like neighbors or activists, an additional three months after the current state of emergency ends to file lawsuits objecting to new construction—further hindering building in the near future.

Thankfully, there are several simple steps that can be taken now to spark the production of new affordable housing to better meet current and future needs. These include allowing homeowners to construct accessory dwelling units (ADUs), eliminating occupancy restrictions, and limiting who can challenge permits approved by planning officials or city councils.

Allowing a homeowner to construct an ADU—commonly known as a “granny flat”—would spur a boom in the construction of affordable units. Indeed, this solution has worked where implemented. In 2017, San Diego enacted an ordinance loosening restrictions on ADUs, allowing homeowners to add a unit to their backyard, basement, garage or as an addition. The San Diego law also streamlined the permit process by pre-approving several building plans.

The results are impressive. The first year, San Diego saw 15 new ADUs. But since easing its permitting requirements even further, San Diego property owners produced 179 new granny flats in 2019, with even more expected in future years. Similarly, Portland has significantly expanded its housing capacity by allowing ADUs on an estimated 116,000 residentially developed lots, resulting in 2,000 new units.

Streamlined and by-right permitting are essential to the goal of creating more affordable housing. In many of our most populated regions, permitting costs are estimated to constitute nearly half the price of a new house, which significantly

inflates area rent and purchase prices.

To build on these successes and ensure that ADUs actually alleviate the housing crisis, communities should also remove occupancy restrictions from their zoning codes. Such restrictions, which limit the number of unrelated persons that can share a property in areas designated for single-family homes, are a throwback to zoning's exclusionary history and unnecessarily constrain housing capacity.

A final critical reform step is to limit who can challenge an ADU approval and on what grounds. Although the law recognizes the right of neighbors to oppose plans that may harm their property, obstructive "not in my backyard" lawsuits add significant cost and insecurity to new housing and are estimated to cost the economy more than \$1 trillion annually. This cost, just like regulatory costs, finds its way into the sale price of the new house and area rents. Requiring a person to show an actual injury before challenging an ADU approval would go a long way to protect against this massive waste.

Unfortunately, the slowing economy as a result of the COVID-19 shutdown will likely exacerbate the housing shortage, at least in the near term. While the solutions to this crisis will require substantial reform to our zoning and land-use policies, the three steps outlined above would immediately expand the community's housing capacity and reduce the cost of new units.

Brian Hodges is a senior attorney at Pacific Legal Foundation, which litigates to enforce the Constitution's guarantee of individual liberty. Angela C. Erickson is strategic research director at PLF.

This op-ed was originally published by [*The Orange County Register*](#) on May 12, 2020.

From: [Carol Levanen](#)
To: [Eileen Quiring](#); [Gary Medvivy](#); [Kathleen Otto](#); [John Blom](#); [Julie Olson](#); [Mitch Nickolds](#); [Temple Lentz](#); [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: Flawed Public Process for the Vacant Buildable Lands Report - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD
Date: Monday, May 18, 2020 6:09:00 PM

CAUTION: 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.

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Dear Councilors,

One would assume that something as important as the Vacant Buildable Lands Report, required under the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.215 would have a full and robust public process, prior to any consulting firm deciding the topics and format for the project. In addition, the public would not expect to finance any particular consulting firm until that firm was hired by the county in a formal public process way.

That did not happen, when ECONorthwest was hired to provide the work for the VBLM. As one can see, in these excerpts from Clark County VBLM documents, there was approximately nine months between a January 29, 2019 staff report to the Council, approximately eight months between the February 14, 2019 VBLM report and recommendations from ECONorthwest, and when the firm was actually hired by Clark County on October 1, 2019 for the VBLM process. The 1-29-19 and 2-14-19 documents note a Clark County Buildable Lands team, but members of that group have never been disclosed to the public, nor has the group "AHBL" and "other key stakeholders". The 10-1-19 documents claimed the county went through a thorough vetting and bidding process, prior to the hiring of ECONorthwest, but the county documents do not support that statement.

The VBLM Project Advisory Committee did not convene until December 6, 2019. Yet, the 2-14-19 document note that such a committee existed. It was the public's understanding that the VBLM work would commence after the 10-1-19 contract signing of a consulting firm. But, a great deal of work had been going on by ECONorthwest, staff and the undisclosed "team", long before this Committee was formed. The purpose of the Committee was to inform ECONorthwest what items were of importance, but it looks like the process has been just the opposite, and very little input has come from the Committee, except what was coerced by ECONorthwest.

The VBLM public process has been flawed from the beginning, and continues to go down that path, as committee meetings are scheduled and completed. Excerpts from Clark County documents tell the story.

DATE: January 29, 2019
TO: Clark County Council
CC: Jose Alvarez, Clark County FROM: Bob Parker, Becky Hewitt, and Margaret Raimann, ECONorthwest

SUBJECT: Clark County Buildable Lands Issue Summary Introduction

"Clark County contracted with ECONorthwest and AHBL to assist in identifying and addressing needed updates to the County's Buildable Lands Methodology and prepare the 2021 Buildable Lands Report in collaboration with the Clark County Buildable Lands Team, a Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee (BLPAC) and other key stakeholders"

DATE: February 14, 2019 TO: Clark County Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee

CC: Jose Alvarez, Clark County
FROM: Bob Parker, Becky Hewitt, and Margaret Raimann, ECONorthwest
SUBJECT: Overview of Updated Topic List and Tentative Meeting Dates and Topics

"Clark County contracted with ECONorthwest and AHBL to assist in identifying and addressing needed updates to the County's Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) and prepare the 2021 Buildable Lands Report in collaboration with the Clark County Buildable Lands Team, a Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee (BLPAC) and other key stakeholders. The goal of the process is to ensure that the County's methodology is consistent with state law (including recent legislative changes); reasonably accurate in estimating land capacity for each Urban Growth Area; and supported by the available evidence and a broad base of stakeholders."

DEPARTMENT: DATE: REQUESTED ACTION: BACKGROUND CLARK COUNTY STAFF REPORT

Community Planning October 1, 2019
Approval of contract with ECONorthwest for the Buildable Lands Progtatn update. Consent Hearing
County Manager
Clark Cowity is updating its Buildable Lands Program required under RCW 36.70A.215 and WAC 365-196-315.

"Clark County is seeking a consultant with technical expertise in the Growth Management Act (GMA), practical knowledge of buildable lands process and capacity analysis models, and skilled at facilitation of multi-party technical groups with competing interests. "

"ECONorthwest was selected through a competitive process (RFP#761) to review the County's procedures and methodology, identify changes if necessary and coordinate with a project advisory committee based on the new guidelines prior to initiating the next Buildable Lands Program analysis and prepare a buildable lands report. A total of 12 firms were solicited for proposals. Purchasing received four proposals. Proposals were evaluated and two firms were interviewed. ECONorthwest was selected by the interview panel due to their demonstrated knowledge of the Buildable Lands Program and their work with Pierce and Snohomish counties on a similar project. The contract is in the amount of \$150,000. " (The contract was signed by Clark County Council Chair, Eileen Quiring.)

***(Note: The aforementioned documents have been directly copied and pasted to this email from the original county documents. It is noted there are many incorrect spellings in the county text)

The decisions for what will happen with the Vacant Buildable Lands Model Report were already cast in stone, and regardless of what any Committee says or does, that will be the outcome unless something is done differently. The members of the Buildable Lands Project Committee need to insist that their mission is to assure that staff does not control the outcome, a thorough county wide evaluation is performed and the results are as accurate as possible.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Exec. Secretary

Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. P.O. Box 2188 Battle Ground, Washington 98604 E-Mail ccuinc@yahoo.com

From: [Carol Levanen](#)
To: [Eileen Quiring](#); [Gary Medviqy](#); [Kathleen Otto](#); [John Blom](#); [Julie Olson](#); [Temple Lentz](#); [Mitch Nickolds](#); [Dan Young](#); [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Fw: VBLM - Getting a ticket for potential speeding - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD
Date: Monday, May 18, 2020 6:53:30 PM

CAUTION: 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.

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Dear Councilors,

At the May 1, 2020 Committee Meeting for the Vacant Buildable Lands, the consultant's recommendation:

#5. Infrastructure gaps proposed recommendations:

- . Continue to exclude Yacolt from urban capacity assumptions due to lack of sewer*
- . Do not exclude any other areas due to infrastructure gaps*

This proposed recommendation was first declared in a reply to a question from Jim Malinowski,

Dec. 6, 2019, the first PAC meeting:

Question: "Why exclude Yacolt?"

Answer : "Yacolt does not have a density target because it doesn't have a sewer system."

The term "infrastructure gap" is a work of art that has many meanings, all attainable.

INFRASTRUCTURE GAP: What does it mean for public policy makers?

Published on March 27, 2017



[Will Bueno](#) Follow

Inovação, Infraestrutura e Tecnologia

The term “infrastructure gap” is frequently used to indicate the current need for investments in infrastructure, whether at global, regional, or local level. It is an important indicator for officials and public authorities as it provides valuable orientation on infrastructure strategic planning.

Infrastructure gap reports provide valuable orientation on how to select and prioritize infrastructure projects for greatest sustainable socioeconomic impact.

Infrastructure gap is a monetary value that can be expressed in absolute or relative terms. It is usually represented as percentage of Gross Domestic Product. Some reports present this indicator as the average of the indicators of countries categorized by their level of development. As an example, see the graph below. It shows the annual infrastructure investment needs as % of GDP for certain country groups.

This indicator is usually presented on infrastructure reports issued by international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund and World Bank. Some reputable private consulting firms such as McKinsey and PricewaterhouseCoopers also publish reports covering in detail the infrastructure gap for several countries. Each organization has its own standard for defining and measuring this indicator. However, these different definitions share a basic common ground. Simply put, infrastructure gap is the **difference between the required infrastructure and the current economic infrastructure.**

The complete understanding of the infrastructure gap definition requires the concept understanding of additional terms such as infrastructure investment, economic infrastructure, functional infrastructure, and strategic infrastructure.

Infrastructure investment usually refers to a new asset or an asset improvement. However, the infrastructure gap indicator goes beyond. In addition to new assets and asset improvements it also comprises the monetary value necessary to maintain and operate an asset, either new or existent.

***Economic infrastructure** refers to projects that generate economic growth and enable society to function. Examples include transport facilities (air, sea and land), utilities (water, gas and electricity), flood defenses, waste management and telecommunications networks. Power plants are usually included in the definition of economic infrastructure as well. [[Strategic Infrastructure](#) - WEF]*

***Functional infrastructure** is infrastructure that works and satisfies the demand. Examples include electricity grids that can cope with peak demand and motorways that are rarely congested. Due to inter-dependencies between different infrastructure assets, infrastructure that is not functional often affects the functionality of other infrastructure networks. For example, if an airport link road is being rebuilt, not only is the link road not functional but so is the airport. [[Strategic Infrastructure](#) - WEF]*

***Strategic infrastructure** investments are functional projects that create the greatest impact in terms of economic growth, social uplift and sustainability, i.e. they deliver the highest societal benefit. [[Strategic Infrastructure](#) - WEF]*

[Strategic Infrastructure Steps to Prioritize and Deliver Infrastructure](#)
...Strategic infrastructure is the backbone that interconnects our modern economies. The most strategic investments...

Project classification as strategic or not strategic depends on the country's level of development. For developing countries, for example, most of the strategic projects involve building new assets due to the high impact they have on leveraging country's productivity. In contrast, for developed countries, such projects involving new assets may not be classified as strategic because the benefits they delivers may not have the same socioeconomic relevance.

From the strategic and functional infrastructure definitions derives the **required infrastructure** concept. Required infrastructure refers to a project that is both strategic and functional. It relates to the investment needed to improve an existing asset in order to make it functional or to build a new asset so it can provide functionality to adjacent infrastructure projects. Therefore, projects such as a "railways to nowhere" or duplication of roads without traffic demand are not classified as required infrastructure.

According to these concepts, the infrastructure gap definition is better described as the **amount of money required to deploy all strategic and functional infrastructure projects a country currently demands.**

In the context of emerging and developing countries, putting together a portfolio of strategic and functional projects is not an easy task. In this sense, infrastructure gap reports can be very handy as they provide orientation on how to select and prioritize infrastructure projects for greatest sustainable socioeconomic impact.

So you see, correcting infrastructure gaps are clearly attainable.

On Dec. 6, 2019, the subject of Yacolt had not yet endured any sort of public process and vote to warrant exclusion. The question was answered by staff, anyway. Yacolt isn't ever identified as a stakeholder or allowed voting privileges. Yacolt is not on equal footing, even though they have a viable growth plan in place, with other jurisdictions and that leaves them vulnerable to manipulations. This is a form of censorship.

The treatment of Yacolt can be summed up this way. It is much like a police officer pulling you over and ticketing you because you have the *potential* to speed. Yacolt has the potential to grow jobs and housing. This appears to be a road-block to Vancouver's goal of increased density. Yacolt's future growth for jobs and housing is sacrificed to advance Vancouver's increased density target. The policy becomes; density at all costs.

Its no accident Yacolt is excluded.

Its no accident Yacolt does not enjoy stakeholder privileges.

Its no accident Yacolt can't vote.

Its no accident Yacolt's potential future growth is being sacrificed.

Its no accident Yacolt is being censored.

Its no accident the goals of one jurisdiction are advanced at another's expense.

If Yacolt is denied growth, those people must be accommodated someplace. Reasons begin percolating to the surface that enable Vancouver to adjust its land capacity figures using infill and redevelopment as tools. Easy land to build on is in short supply, to constrained or to expensive to build on. That further enables Vancouver to increase density within neighborhoods and not expand it's UGA. The pursuit of infill and redevelopment at increased density within neighborhoods, appears plausible because it is the only option on the table for

consideration. The options are intentionally limited. Stakeholders are denied an education on all impacts. Votes are taken, anyway.

Missing from discussions, the *real costs* of the effects from this type of development associated with neighborhoods that must bear density impacts. The issue is the *kind* of dense infill and redevelopment forced on the neighborhoods. The desires and well-being of the people that will actually live in the affected areas are not in the discussions. Impacts to their property values and rights aren't discussed. The impacts the good citizens of Yacolt must endure to enable Vancouver's increased density is another topic. . . beginning with the loss of their potential jobs in their community. There are other options to consider in Clark County that are able to supply the land capacity for affordable housing that don't cause neighborhood disruptions and harm to another jurisdiction. Those are overlooked.

Professional staff and the contractor have problems respecting overall county growth allocations, competing goals of jurisdictions and the tasks they are required to fulfill stated in the **Public Participation Plan, Resolution No. 2019-07-06, Relating to the Buildable Lands Program, Exhibit I. Adopted and signed by John Blom, July, 16, 2019.** Even though the P.P.P. is a formal document and is foundational to the body of work produced from this committee, it is irrelevant. Staff and the contractor have their own internal planning process.

CCCU is concerned with the word "continue" in the first goal of #5. What this is apparently saying is that Yacolt has never been considered a viable consideration when it comes to urban vacant buildable lands reports. Does that mean that all of Yacolt's population is not included in the urban growth counts of the population projections and instead projected into the rural growth counts? Or has Yacolt population numbers been used for both urban and rural counts? Such actions would be flawed under RCW 36.70A.215 and the GMA.

CCCU is already aware, and staff has confirmed, that remainder parcels from cluster subdivisions that have been placed in a covenant, were counted for both rural and urban growth projections, thereby causing an inflation of the numbers. This too is flawed planning. The Thorpe Report confirmed that the GMA intended those covenant parcels were to remain protected and not used in a VBLM report. Yet, the county has on its books that the planning director has the power to remove those lands from the protection of the covenant. Again, this is flawed.

It is time the Council wakes up to what has been happening to the population projection numbers and the vacant buildable lands model, resulting in skewed numbers and inaccurate assumptions. The GMA now requires the county must show it's work as to how and why they come up with particular numbers. CCCU will be watching closely during this process.

Best Regards,

Susan Rasmussen, President,

Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

From: [Carol Levanen](#)
To: [Jose Alvarez](#); [Jerry Olson](#); [Jim Malinowski](#)
Subject: Fw: Flawed Public Process for the Vacant Buildable Lands Report - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD
Date: Monday, May 18, 2020 8:53:44 PM

CAUTION: 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.

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Carol Levanen <cccuinc@yahoo.com>
To: Eileen Quiring <eileen.quiring@clark.wa.gov>; Gary Medvigy <gary.medvigy@clark.wa.gov>; kathleen.otto@clark.wa.gov <kathleen.otto@clark.wa.gov>; John Blom <john.blom@clark.wa.gov>; julie.olson@clark.wa.gov <julie.olson2@clark.wa.gov>; Mitch Nickolds <mitch.nickolds@clark.wa.gov>; Temple Lentz <temple.lentz@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <jose.alvarez@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 18, 2020, 06:08:55 PM PDT
Subject: Flawed Public Process for the Vacant Buildable Lands Report - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Dear Councilors,

One would assume that something as important as the Vacant Buildable Lands Report, required under the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.215 would have a full and robust public process, prior to any consulting firm deciding the topics and format for the project. In addition, the public would not expect to finance any particular consulting firm until that firm was hired by the county in a formal public process way.

That did not happen, when ECONorthwest was hired to provide the work for the VBLM. As one can see, in these excerpts from Clark County VBLM documents, there was approximately nine months between a January 29, 2019 staff report to the Council, approximately eight months between the February 14, 2019 VBLM report and recommendations from ECONorthwest, and when the firm was actually hired by Clark County on October 1, 2019 for the VBLM process. The 1-29-19 and 2-14-19 documents note a Clark County Buildable Lands *team*, but members of that group have never been disclosed to the public, nor has the group "AHBL" and "other key stakeholders". The 10-1-19 documents claimed the county went through a thorough vetting and bidding process, prior to the hiring of ECONorthwest, but the county documents do not support that statement.

The VBLM Project Advisory Committee did not convene until December 6, 2019. Yet, the 2-14-19 document note that such a committee existed. It was the public's understanding that the VBLM work would commence after the 10-1-19 contract signing of a consulting firm. But, a great deal of work had been going on by ECONorthwest, staff and the undisclosed "team", long before this Committee was formed. The purpose of the Committee was to inform ECONorthwest what items were of importance, but it looks like the process has been just the opposite, and very little input has come from the Committee, except what was coerced by ECONorthwest.

The VBLM public process has been flawed from the beginning, and continues to go down that path, as committee meetings are scheduled and completed. Excerpts from Clark County documents tell the story.

DATE: January 29, 2019 TO: Clark County Council

CC: Jose Alvarez, Clark County FROM: Bob Parker, Becky Hewitt, and Margaret Raimann, ECONorthwest

SUBJECT: Clark County Buildable Lands Issue Summary Introduction

"Clark County contracted with ECONorthwest and AHBL to assist in identifying and addressing needed updates to the County's Buildable Lands Methodology and prepare the 2021 Buildable Lands Report in collaboration with the Clark County Buildable Lands Team, a Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee (BLPAC) and other key stakeholders"

DATE: February 14, 2019 TO: Clark County Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee

CC: Jose Alvarez, Clark County

FROM: Bob Parker, Becky Hewitt, and Margaret Raimann, ECONorthwest

SUBJECT: Overview of Updated Topic List and Tentative Meeting Dates and Topics

"Clark County contracted with ECONorthwest and AHBL to assist in identifying and addressing needed updates to the County's Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) and prepare the 2021 Buildable Lands Report in collaboration with the Clark County Buildable Lands Team, a Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee (BLPAC) and other key stakeholders. The goal of the process is to ensure that the County's methodology is consistent with state law (including recent legislative changes); reasonably accurate in estimating land capacity for each Urban Growth Area; and supported by the available evidence and a broad base of stakeholders."

DEPARTMENT: DATE: REQUESTED ACTION: BACKGROUND CLARK COUNTY STAFF REPORT

Community Planning October 1, 2019

Approval of contract with ECONorthwest for the Buildable Lands Progtatn update.

Consent Hearing County Manager

Clark Cowity is updating its Buildable Lands Program required under RCW 36.70A.215 and WAC 365-196-315.

"Clark County is seeking a consultant with technical expertise in the Growth Management Act (GMA), practical knowledge of buildable lands process and capacity analysis models, and skilled at facilitation of multi-party technical groups with competing .interests. "

"ECONorthwest **was selected through a competitive process (RFP#761)** to review

the County's procedures and methodology, identify changes if necessary and coordinate with a project advisory committee based on the new guidelines prior to .initiating the next Buildable Lands Program analysis and prepare a buildable lands report. A total of 12 firms were solicited for proposals. Purchasing received four proposals. Proposals were evaluated and two firms were interviewed. ECONorthwest was selected by the interview panel due to their demonstrated knowledge of the Buildable Lands Program and their work with Pierce and Snohomish counties on a similar project. The contract is in the amount of \$150,000. " (The contract was signed by Clark County Council Chair, Eileen Quiring.)

****(Note: The aforementioned documents have been directly copied and pasted to this email from the original county documents. It is noted there are many incorrect spellings in the county text)*

The decisions for what will happen with the Vacant Buildable Lands Model Report were already cast in stone, and regardless of what any Committee says or does, that will be the outcome unless something is done differently. The members of the Buildable Lands Project Committee need to insist that their mission is to assure that staff does not control the outcome, a thorough county wide evaluation is performed and the results are as accurate as possible.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Exec. Secretary

Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. P.O. Box 2188 Battle Ground, Washington 98604 E-Mail
ccuinc@yahoo.com

From: [Carol Levanen](#)
To: [Eileen Quiring](#); [Gary Medvivy](#); [Kathleen Otto](#); [John Blom](#); [Julie Olson](#); [Temple Lentz](#); [Mitch Nickolds](#); [Dan Young](#); [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: Fw: #2- Flawed Public Process for the Vacant Buildable Lands Report - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD
Date: Tuesday, May 19, 2020 3:02:25 PM

CAUTION: 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 Councilors,

As Clark County Citizens United, Inc. continues to research the flawed public process that Clark County is conducting for the Vacant Buildable Lands Model Report, required by the GMA, more and more data surfaces to confirm the illicit actions. On May 29, 2019 Planning Director, Oliver Orjiako presented to the Council a power point report of the Buildable Lands Guideline Update. On page 8 it notes the **Next Steps** to the process, stating that in **June, 2019**, the county will proceed with a **RFP process** to garner bids and determine a consultant firm that will "assist staff with technical analysis". October 1, 2019 a contract was signed with ECONorthwest claiming they "were selected through a competitive process." That clearly was not the case, as the firm was already working on the project beginning in January 2019.

Even though there was staff discussion on February 14, of an existing "technical advisory committee", that committee wasn't chosen until after July/August, noted as "Next Steps" in the May 29 Report. **Resolution 2019-07-06**, signed and dated on **July 16, 2019**, states the document is the public participation plan for the buildable land analysis. It states in **item 2.4** that a "project advisory committee" will be formed. Again, this committee is already referenced as a working group long before the signing of this document.

The list of flawed activity by staff goes on and on, over the buildable lands analysis, and appears to mock the legal process that was intended by the change to RCW36.70A.215 in the GMA. One wonders why Clark County is so brazen in its disregard for the law. Time will tell CCCU the answer, and in the meantime we will continue to submit information into the public record to demonstrate what is and is not being done.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Exec. Secretary
Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

Oliver Orjiako, Director Community Planning

**Presentation to Clark County Council,
May 29, 2019**

Clark County Public Service Center, 6th Floor Training Room 1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA 98660

Next Steps

Buildable Lands Guideline Update 05/29/19 Page 8

June – Begin RFP process for a consultant to assist staff w/ technical analysis of items identified for update

- July/August 2019 - Appoint Technical Advisory Committee members with charge/scope
- Check-in with Council as project proceeds as this will be a foundational document for the comprehensive plan update

-- Forwarded Message -----

From: Carol Levanen <cccuinc@yahoo.com>

To: Eileen Quiring <eileen.quiring@clark.wa.gov>; Gary Medvigy <gary.medvigy@clark.wa.gov>; kathleen.otto@clark.wa.gov <kathleen.otto@clark.wa.gov>; John Blom <john.blom@clark.wa.gov>; julie.olson@clark.wa.gov <julie.olson2@clark.wa.gov>; Mitch Nickolds <mitch.nickolds@clark.wa.gov>; Temple Lentz <temple.lentz@clark.wa.gov>; Jose Alvarez <jose.alvarez@clark.wa.gov>

Sent: Monday, May 18, 2020, 06:08:55 PM PDT

Subject: Flawed Public Process for the Vacant Buildable Lands Report - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Dear Councilors,

One would assume that something as important as the Vacant Buildable Lands Report, required under the Growth Management Act, RCW 36.70A.215 would have a full and robust public process, prior to any consulting firm deciding the topics and format for the project. In addition, the public would not expect to finance any particular consulting firm until that firm was hired by the county in a formal public process way.

That did not happen, when ECONorthwest was hired to provide the work for the VBLM. As one can see, in these excerpts from Clark County VBLM documents, there was approximately nine months between a January 29, 2019 staff report to the Council, approximately eight months between the February 14, 2019 VBLM report and recommendations from ECONorthwest, and when the firm was actually hired by Clark County on October 1, 2019 for the VBLM process. The 1-29-19 and 2-14-19 documents note a Clark County Buildable Lands *team*, but members of that group have never been disclosed to the public, nor has the group "AHBL" and "other key stakeholders". The 10-1-19 documents claimed the county went through a thorough vetting and bidding process, prior to the hiring of ECONorthwest, but the county

documents do not support that statement.

The VBLM Project Advisory Committee did not convene until December 6, 2019. Yet, the 2-14-19 document note that such a committee existed. It was the public's understanding that the VBLM work would commence after the 10-1-19 contract signing of a consulting firm. But, a great deal of work had been going on by ECONorthwest, staff and the undisclosed "team", long before this Committee was formed. The purpose of the Committee was to inform ECONorthwest what items were of importance, but it looks like the process has been just the opposite, and very little input has come from the Committee, except what was coerced by ECONorthwest.

The VBLM public process has been flawed from the beginning, and continues to go down that path, as committee meetings are scheduled and completed. Excerpts from Clark County documents tell the story.

DATE: January 29, 2019

TO: Clark County Council

CC: Jose Alvarez, Clark County FROM: Bob Parker, Becky Hewitt, and Margaret Raimann, ECONorthwest

SUBJECT: Clark County Buildable Lands Issue Summary Introduction

"Clark County contracted with ECONorthwest and AHBL to assist in identifying and addressing needed updates to the County's Buildable Lands Methodology and prepare the 2021 Buildable Lands Report in collaboration with the Clark County Buildable Lands Team, a Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee (BLPAC) and other key stakeholders"

DATE: February 14, 2019 TO: Clark County Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee

CC: Jose Alvarez, Clark County

FROM: Bob Parker, Becky Hewitt, and Margaret Raimann, ECONorthwest

SUBJECT: Overview of Updated Topic List and Tentative Meeting Dates and Topics

"Clark County contracted with ECONorthwest and AHBL to assist in identifying and addressing needed updates to the County's Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) and prepare the 2021 Buildable Lands Report in collaboration with the Clark County Buildable Lands Team, a Buildable Lands Project Advisory Committee (BLPAC) and other key stakeholders. The goal of the process is to ensure that the County's methodology is consistent with state law (including recent legislative changes); reasonably accurate in estimating land capacity for each Urban Growth Area; and supported by the available evidence and a broad base of stakeholders."

DEPARTMENT: DATE: REQUESTED ACTION: BACKGROUND CLARK COUNTY STAFF REPORT

Community Planning October 1, 2019

Approval of contract with ECONorthwest for the Buildable Lands Progtatn update.

Consent Hearing County Manager

Clark Cowity is updating its Buildable Lands Program required under RCW 36.70A.215 and WAC 365-196-315.

"**Clark County is seeking a consultant** with technical expertise in the Growth Management Act (GMA), practical knowledge of buildable lands process and capacity analysis models, and skilled at facilitation of multi-party technical groups with competing .interests. "

"ECONorthwest **was selected through a competitive process (RFP#761)** to review the County's procedures and methodology, identify changes if necessary and coordinate with a project advisory committee based on the new guidelines prior to .initiating the next Buildable Lands Program analysis and prepare a buildable lands report. A total of 12 fu:ms were solicited for proposals. Purchasing received four proposals. Proposals were evaluated and two 6nns were interviewed. ECONorthwest was sdedcted by the interview panel due to their demonstrated knowledge of the Buildable Lands Program and their work with Pierce and Snohomish counties on a similar project The contract is in the amount of \$150,000. " (The contract was signed by Clark County Council Chair, Eileen Quiring.)

****(Note: The aforementioned documents have been directly copied and pasted to this email from the original county documents. It is noted there are many incorrect spellings in the county text)*

The decisions for what will happen with the Vacant Buildable Lands Model Report were already cast in stone, and regardless of what any Committee says or does, that will be the outcome unless something is done differently. The members of the Buildable Lands Project Committee need to insist that their mission is to assure that staff does not control the outcome, a thorough county wide evaluation is performed and the results are as accurate as possible.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Exec. Secretary

Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. P.O. Box 2188 Battle Ground, Washington 98604 E-Mail
cccuinc@yahoo.com

From: susan.rasmussen
To: [Eileen Quiring](#); [John Blom](#); [Gary Medvigy](#); [Julie Olson](#); [Temple Lentz](#); [Mitch Nickolds](#); [Kathleen Otto](#); [Jose Alvarez](#)
Cc: MayorListek@townofyacolt.com
Subject: Reasonable Measures and Infrastructure Gaps
Date: Friday, June 5, 2020 12:06:58 PM

CAUTION: 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.

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

The **2018 Buildable Lands Guidelines** provides ample advice for solutions regarding infrastructure gaps. The document explains, if a jurisdiction will be unable to meet their capacity over the 20-year period, the jurisdiction may use reasonable measures or adjust capacity to satisfy the gap in infrastructure. There are solutions written in the Guidance that address the issue.

2018 Buildable Lands Guidelines, Dept. of Commerce Chapter 3: Methodology, Pg. 31 Infrastructure Gaps

RCW 36.70A.215 (3)(b)(i) indicates that an assessment of land suitable for development must also include infrastructure gaps (including but not limited to transportation, water, sewer, and stormwater) that could prevent assigned densities from being achieved.

For infrastructure, RCW 36.70A.070(3) already requires local comprehensive plans to have a capital facility plan element that includes (d) a requirement to reassess the land use element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the land use element, capital facilities plan element, and financing plan within the capital facilities plan element are coordinated and consistent.

. . . While the capital facilities plan addresses a number of items, including water, sewer, storm, schools and transportation to support growth, infrastructure gaps pertaining to those capital projects may still be possible. For example, if a planned treatment facility upgrade is needed to support additional growth, and that planned and financed project experiences a significant delay, funding lapse, or difficulty acquiring sufficient land for the facility, then growth could be impacted. The achieved density analysis could point to this issue and, if necessary, reduce capacity or reasonable measures might be needed if the planned facility's delay would extend beyond the 20-year planning period.

. . . The key is to make sure the issue is documented so measures, including reasonable measures, can be implemented where appropriate. (Pg. 32)

Best to all,
Susan Rasmussen

Clark County Citizens United, Inc.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Oliver Orjiako](#)
To: [Christine Cook](#)
Cc: [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: FW: The Buildable Lands Committee
Date: Thursday, May 7, 2020 4:50:41 PM

Hello Chris:

Here is the email. Thank you and stay safe.



Oliver Orjiako
Director
COMMUNITY PLANNING

564.397.2280 ext 4112



From: David Ridenour [mailto:davidwr@copper.net]
Sent: Sunday, May 03, 2020 4:41 PM
To: Oliver Orjiako
Subject: The Buildable Lands Committee

CAUTION: 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 Oliver,

I am the Town Attorney for Yacolt. I wanted to thank you for your comments and explanation at Friday's Buildable Lands Committee meeting. Clark County always seems to do a great job recognizing and protecting the interests of stakeholders, and has always been a wonderful partner to the Town. Yacolt's interest in the Committee was based on concerns raised by outside interests. I think your comments probably satisfied those concerns. If the Town's Council members have any other questions, we will let you know.

Thank you again, and I hope you are well and staying safe.

David

David W. Ridenour
Attorney at Law
4001 Main Street, Suite 306
Vancouver, WA 98663

Tel: 360.906.1556
Fax: 360.906.1558

[This e-mail message (including attachments) is for the sole use of the intended recipient(s). It contains confidential, proprietary or legally protected information which is the property of David W. Ridenour, Attorney at Law, or its clients. Any unauthorized disclosure or use of the contents of this e-mail is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and destroy all copies of the original message.]

From: [Tina Redline](#)
To: [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: FW: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Fw: No Existing Rural Character Recognized - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD
Date: Monday, May 18, 2020 6:43:12 AM

FYI



Tina Redline
Office Manager
COUNTY MANAGER'S OFFICE

564-397-4978



From: Carol Levanen <cccuinc@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 14, 2020 9:41 PM
To: Eileen Quiring <Eileen.Quiring@clark.wa.gov>; Gary Medvigy <Gary.Medvigy@clark.wa.gov>; Kathleen Otto <Kathleen.Otto@clark.wa.gov>; John Blom <John.Blom@clark.wa.gov>; Julie Olson <Julie.Olson2@clark.wa.gov>; Temple Lentz <Temple.Lentz@clark.wa.gov>; Mitch Nickolds <Mitch.Nickolds@clark.wa.gov>
Subject: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Fw: No Existing Rural Character Recognized - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

CAUTION: 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.

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Dear Councilors,

The Growth Management Act discusses much about recognizing and preserving existing rural character. Counties are to determine what that character is in their communities. But, here in Clark County, staff is attempting to create a new generic "rural character", to justify large lot zoning. But, that is not, and never has been what "rural" is in Clark County. Even the historic 1800s map on the wall of the Councilor meeting room shows smaller parcelization than what is on the books for rural and resource zones of today. Most certainly it is time the councilors recognize existing development and zone those areas accordingly.

RCW 36.70A.011 --- Rural Lands.

The legislature finds that this chapter is intended to recognize the importance of rural lands and rural character to Washington's economy, its people, and its environment, while respecting regional differences. Rural lands and rural-based economies enhance the economic desirability of the state, help to preserve traditional economic activities, and contribute to the state's overall quality of life. . .

Finally, the legislature finds that in defining its rural element under RCW 36.70A.070(5), a county should foster land use patterns and develop a local vision of rural character that will: Help preserve rural-based economies and traditional rural life-styles; encourage the economic prosperity of rural residents; . . . enhance the rural sense of community and quality of life.

The arrival of European settlers to the Fort Vancouver region brought a variety of trades and vocations. All were not farmers, foresters and trappers. The actions of these early settlers are reflected in the land development patterns of north Clark County. The land parcels help reveal how they lived their lives, raised families and conducted commerce. Their actions laid the groundwork for what becomes the county's unique rural character.

Keep in mind, rural commerce, the trades and businesses evolved over time. They thrived because they satisfied gaps and fulfilled needs. They also supported local jobs, schools, built utilities and roads. At one point, the La Center School supplied the town's water when the well failed. Local folks supplied the labor force that felled trees to build Portland. Yacolt milled the lumber and the Chelatchie Prairie Railroad transported goods to outward destinations. Commerce was thriving.

The patterns of land developments also evolved over time. The lot patterns reflect the needs of the settlers, successive generations of children and developing communities. The lands weren't stagnant, but continuously evolved to accommodate young families and communities. The historical patterns of parcel developments document their lives and compose the county's unique rural character. Their histories are foundational to Clark County's rural character; similar to reports that are foundational documents to the county's Comprehensive Growth Plan.

Some basic facts of rural culture remain true today. The region's "rural character" still relies on residential uses associated with small farms, family forests, animal husbandry, trades and businesses. In relatively recent history, (past 25 years), Clark County's large lot zoning laws, Home Occupation ordinances, animal keeping regulations and critical area environmental laws have administered progressively strict regulatory controls over the region's home-grown rural livelihoods and lifestyles. If Clark County is to ***foster land use patterns*** that ***preserves the local visions of rural character, enhances rural-based economies*** and ***traditional rural lifestyles*** (per GMA); Clark County should rely on the settlers as resources and ask:

- What things are rural characters doing on their lands?
- What makes these private lands worth preserving?

The focus of key **GMA Rural Lands** planning laws aim at preserving and enhancing rural economies.

Clark County's county-wide Planning Policies say;

Clark County Comprehensive Plan, Rural Center, 3.3.4:

Rural commercial development should support the needs of rural residents and natural resources activities rather than urban area uses. Appropriate uses for Rural Centers include:

- resource-based industrial development consistent with rural character and levels of service;•*

commercial uses supporting resource uses, such as packing, first state processing and

processing which provides value added to the resource products may occur in resource area.

- post offices, veterinary clinics, day care, small medical practices and schools that provide*

employment, shopping services and housing opportunities within Rural Centers. . .

The uses outlined in the Comprehensive Plan, are linked to rural lifestyles and important to the welfare of rural communities. However, Clark County adopted codes referencing "Home Occupations" add unreasoned restrictions to rural businesses, parking equipment, number of employees, retail activities, and storing materials used on job sites on private properties. The Health Department used procedures and wrote additional restrictions linked to equestrian boarding, training facilities and animal keeping in general. Large lot zoning laws make 88%-92% of the parcels non-compliant to their designated zone size. Large riparian buffers consume much land that can't be built. Countywide planning policies say one thing, but county codes infer something else.

Rural character has always relied on residential and business uses. Private lands have been historically used in this manner. Today, generations of rural children may not be allowed to build homes, run businesses, trades and practice animal husbandry on private properties as their Fathers, Mothers and Grandparents did. When good rural jobs and housing fail to accommodate future generations of rural children, rural character isn't being supported and maintained. Families will suffer harm.

Clark County did not follow through on what is promised by **GMA law**: *Foster land use patterns that preserve the local vision of rural character by enhancing traditional rural lifestyles; encouraging rural-based economies.*

Clark County did not follow through on what is promised in the **County's Community Framework Plan: Goals and Policies:**

3.0 Countywide Planning Policies

3.0.1 The county shall recognize existing development and provide lands, which allow rural

development in areas, which are developed or committed to development of a rural

character . . .

County 20-Year Plan Policies

Rural Areas --- General

Goal: Compatible with maintaining rural character and rural (levels of service) (services), ensure

that lands outside of urban growth areas are viable places to live and work.

Tampering with legislative directives, public policies and processes is a form of political activism. Rural communities and land owners are already disadvantaged by the powers held by cities. That is on full display at the Buildable Lands Committee meetings. Our lands remain fixed in a time capsule dated 1994. Meanwhile, generations of rural children are unable to establish rural homes and raise their young families according to local culture and history. There are now consequences from county codes that work to prohibit rural character, lifestyles, culture and economies. This is not what the people were promised.

Sincerely,

Susan Rasmussen, President

Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

From: [Carol Levanen](#)
To: eric@vpmax.com; [Susan Rasmussen](#); [Jose Alvarez](#)
Subject: [Contains External Hyperlinks] Fw: Yacolt Comprehensive Plan and Clark County VBLM - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD
Date: Tuesday, May 5, 2020 7:17:33 PM

CAUTION: 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.

Clark County Citizens United, Inc. P.O. Box 2188 Battle Ground, Washington 98604 E-Mail
cccuinc@yahoo.com

----- Forwarded Message -----

From: Carol Levanen <cccuinc@yahoo.com>
To: Eileen Quiring <eileen.quiring@clark.wa.gov>; kathleen.otto@clark.wa.gov <kathleen.otto@clark.wa.gov>; Gary Medvigy <gary.medvigy@clark.wa.gov>; John Blom <john.blom@clark.wa.gov>; Temple Lentz <temple.lentz@clark.wa.gov>; Mitch Nickolds <mitch.nickolds@clark.wa.gov>; julie.olson@clark.wa.gov <julie.olson2@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Monday, May 4, 2020, 12:55:46 PM PDT
Subject: Yacolt Comprehensive Plan and Clark County VBLM - FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

FOR THE PUBLIC RECORD

Dear Councilors,

Particular comments were made by staff, when the Vacant Buildable Lands Committee comments on May 1, 2020, turned to the city of Yacolt. One of the comments by Mr. Orijako was that the Clark County Health Department indicated to him there was no water contamination problem with the city of Yacolt's water system. He said because of that the city is not eligible for grants. Another general comment made by Mr. Alvarez, was that no industrial land is allowed outside the urban growth areas. Given these statements, Clark County Citizens United, Inc chose to do research on those topics.

CCCU found that the city of Yacolt has quite a history, going back to the 1800s, and the town was incorporated in 1909. The city has an extensive Comprehensive Plan that was first established in 1977 and has been updated periodically. The current Plan was adopted in 2013. In that Plan is more than adequate information regarding residential, commercial and industrial land, as well as previous studies and plans for a sewer. For staff to simply brush off any commercial growth being allowed in Yacolt because they don't have sewer, is premature and poor judgement on their part. Most certainly, this city has just as much opportunity for such growth, as any other city in Clark County.

I have included excerpts from the Yacolt Comprehensive Plan for your review. Currently the city has 15 acres that are zoned industrial in the Chelatchie Prairie Railroad easement and line. In addition the railroad goes through the middle of the

town, and rezoning for industrial is most certainly possible. Sewer is not required, to use land for commercial and industrial use along the railroad, according to the GMA in RCW 36.70A and associated state law. The water research documents in the Plan indicate that Yacolt does indeed have a water contamination concern, and why the Health Department would say otherwise, is a mystery. Therefore, the city needs help to establish a sewer and can develop their industrial sites in the UGB, without having to depend on a sewer connection.

The Plan has a passage indicating the county owns the easement for the railroad line. That is not true. There are three landowners who continue to have exclusive rights on that line. It is interesting to note that when the county went around buying up the "easements" for the railroad, they actually coerced the landowners to sell the actual land. Most of these folks were unaware of what they were doing, when they signed the documents. One landowner showed CCCU the letter he received from the county claiming he only had X number of time to accept the offer, otherwise he would miss out. He took it to mean they would file against him, if he didn't sign the document. He wound up selling 3.5 acres of prime commercial land to the county, for \$2,000, and he thought he was just selling the "easement" rights. The process the county used to get these lands, for a fraction of their worth, is shameful at least, and likely an illegal takings.

There is much language in the GMA that mandates counties to assure that rural areas have adequate housing, employment and infrastructure. Clark County needs to roll up their sleeves and help this community become economically independent and treat the city of Yacolt in an equitable way, similar to all of the other cities in Clark County.

Vancouver is not the only city in the county, and Yacolt has a lot to offer all of the Clark County community.

Sincerely,

Carol Levanen, Exec. Secretary

Clark County Citizens United, Inc.
P.O. Box 2188
Battle Ground, Washington 98604

C. Background and Legislative Framework for the Plan

The Yacolt Town Council adopted its first Comprehensive Land Use Plan on April 4, 1977, which was prepared by Regional Planning Council of Clark County. The town engaged in a thorough comprehensive planning process in the early 1990s, in compliance with the provisions of the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA), which was passed in 1990. This process culminated in a plan document entitled Town of Yacolt Comprehensive Growth Management Plan,

Policy 8-10

Utilize the following criteria as a guide in evaluating and ranking proposed capital facility projects: • Public health and safety protection. • Private property protection. • Environmental protection and natural resources conservation. • Statutory or other legal requirements. • Level of Service compliance. • Facility deficiency correction. •

Obsolete facility replacement. • Community growth and development support. • Operating cost reduction. • Financial feasibility. • Outside funding availability

Policy 8-13 Seek funding support for capital facility projects by engaging staff in monitoring viable state and federal programs, and developing applications for financial assistance. Technical assistance shall be sought from Clark County, Clark Public Utilities, and other public agencies in developing plans, strategies and applications for outside funding assistance.

Policy 8-15 Seek funding assistance to advance elements of Yacolt's wastewater management program, including the design and construction of a public sanitary sewer system.

Most of Yacolt's residents who participant in the labor force work outside the community. Of the 376 labor force members, 349 workers travel to places of employment located outside the community, and 105 of these workers journey to jobs located out of the state—most of whom probably commute to employment centers in the Portland area. The mean travel **time to work for Yacolt commuters is 41.3 minutes, as compared to 24.7 minutes for commuters countywide** (U.S. Census 2010, prepared by the U.S. Census Bureau

E. Urban Growth Area

Yacolt's Urban Reserve Area embraces 317.0 acres and the incorporated area of the town comprises 344.66 acres. Yacolt is proposing a change in its Urban Growth Area to accommodate growth projected within the 20-year planning horizon. Yacolt does not have a public sewer system, although **Ecology issued a letter of approval for a Facility Plan on August 1, 2012**. Residents depend upon individual onsite septic systems to dispose of wastewater. Yacolt is not able to manage wastewater generated by development at urban densities. Clark County has been growing rapidly. Communities and rural areas in the northern portion of the county are impacted by this growth trend, and Yacolt is no exception. Development has occurred within Yacolt and the surrounding valley. Without a public sewer system, Yacolt will be unable to absorb development and rural residential sprawl may continue in the surrounding area—a development pattern that runs counter to GMA goals. Yacolt adopted a General Sewer Plan and a Facility Plan and is advancing the wastewater management program set forth in the plan. The Town has developed an inspection program in concert with Clark Public Health. The program provides for frequent, rigorous inspections of on-site systems and swift correction of wastewater problems. The inspection program will continue while Yacolt designs, assembles funding, and secures permits for a public sewer system.

There are 33 acres of land designated for commercial use, of which 23 acres are undeveloped. Approximately 15 acres are under private ownership. The remaining commercially designated land is within the county's railroad right-of way, albeit absent rail infrastructure.

Public Facilities

Existing public facilities occupy 71.5 acres within the UGA. Plans are underway for a

wastewater treatment plant in the newly designated Urban Growth Area. Wastewater Management Plan: **Yacolt has adopted a General Sewer Plan**, which is better described as a wastewater management plan. The plan calls for the eventual construction of a small diameter public sewer system. This system will utilize existing onsite wastewater disposal equipment. Effluent from septic tanks will be pumped to a central treatment facility—a re-circulating sand filter treatment plant and subsurface effluent disposal system. Sites south of the UGA have been investigated as possibilities for the treatment plant.

Railway

The Clark County Railroad line passes through Yacolt. The track runs from Fruit Valley Road in the Burnt Bridge Creek lowlands to Chelatchie Prairie. The county owns the track and the right-of-way, and leases use of the line to Lewis & Clark Railroad and the Battle Ground-Yacolt-Chelatchie Prairie Railroad Association (BYCX). Lewis & Clark has a right to use the entire line for freight service but no freight service is operating at this time. BYCX operates a tourist passenger service on the northern segment of the line, under a tripartite lease with the county and Lewis & Clark. The tourist train runs periodically throughout the year.

Yacolt Hydrogeologic Study, Hart Crowser, January 1996.

The study evaluated hydrogeologic conditions and existing groundwater quality in the aquifer that supplies Yacolt with drinking water. It found elevated levels of nitrate in water sampled from Yacolt Comprehensive Growth Management Plan Page 7 supply and monitoring wells. The study determined a background or natural nitrate value of 0.5 mg/L. Samples from a monitoring well located in the southern portion of the community (a location down-gradient given the flow of groundwater) ranged in nitrate values between 2.6 and 3.1 mg/L. Applying a statistical analysis to the samples taken from the monitoring wells yielded an extreme nitrate value of 3.64 mg/L as being possible. **The study concluded that the town should be served by a public sewer system** with a centralized wastewater treatment facility to protect its drinking water supply.

Preliminary Alternative Feasibility Study

for the Yacolt Wastewater Management Committee, December 1999. The study evaluated alternatives to onsite wastewater disposal and concluded that the town needs to work toward establishing a public sewer system. The committee recommended that the town advance a plan for a public sewer system that involves septic tank effluent pumping and gravity wastewater collection. The specific wastewater treatment and disposal methods were left to further analysis. Yacolt Designated as an Area of Special Concern. **The Southwest Washington Health District** (now Clark County **Health Dept**) **adopted Resolution 93-42 designating Yacolt an area of special concern.** This designation was made recognizing the potential of failing septic systems contaminating the vulnerable aquifer in the area—the drinking water supply. Regulation 92-01 (authorized under WAC 246-272) requires owners of onsite systems in an area of special concern to inspect and maintain their systems in accordance with a program administered by the Health Dept. Town of Yacolt General Sewer Plan, EES Consulting, 2002. Yacolt adopted the plan on May 20, 2002. The sewer plan is the first step for integrating GMA

requirements with state sewer planning requirements under WAC 173-240. The plan sets forth a wastewater management program for the town. Town of Yacolt, Washington Wastewater Facility Plan, Kennedy Jenks Consultants Kennedy/Jenks Consultants completed a Facility Plan for the future public sanitary sewer system in Yacolt. The Department of Ecology issued a letter of approval on August 1, 2012 and the Town Council adopted the Facility Plan on XXXXXXXXX.

The capital facilities presented in this program are schedule to be undertaken within a six-year period extending from 2013 through 2018, except the wastewater management projects, which extend over a 20-year period. The program includes schedules for water facility, street, storm water control, and wastewater management projects for which Yacolt and Clark Public Utilities are responsible. Priorities are assigned to some of the projects. The scheduling of a project may indicate its relative priority as well.

Project Description Financing Method

2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2013-29

Priority Install septic tank inspection ports SRF loan to CPU \$217,500 Septic tank inspection study PWTF loan to CPU \$10,800 \$10,800 Septic tank inspection and maintenance program Inspection & maintenance fee Applications for wastewater mgt program funding General fund and CPU \$4,000 \$4,000 \$4,000 \$4,000 \$5,000 \$5,000 Collection system engineering report Grants & loans \$24,000

Treatment plant facility plan Grants & loans \$88,000 Collection system design Grants, loans & SDCs \$150,000 Collection system permitting Grants, loans & SDCs \$30,000 Treatment plant design Grants, loans & SDCs \$340,000 Treatment plant permitting Grants, loans & SDCs \$80,000 Collection system construction Grants, loans & SDCs \$1,740,000 Treatment plant construction Grants, loans & SDCs \$2,300,000 Total Wastewater Management Six-Year Program: \$377,100 Total 20-Year Wastewater Management Program: \$4,752,000 to \$5,017,000

Six-Year Capital Facilities Program Project Cost Summary

PROJECT CATEGORY TOTAL COST OF PROJECTS

Water \$473,700

Streets & Stormwater Control \$4,824,000

Wastewater Management \$377,100

TOTAL \$5,674,800

http://gis.clark.wa.gov/vblmreports/2018/maps/VBLM2018detail_YAC.pdf