

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

1

The Board convened in the Councilors' Hearing Room, 6th Floor, Public Service Center, 1300 Franklin Street, Vancouver, Washington. Councilors Jeanne E. Stewart, Julie Olson, David Madore, Tom Mielke, and Marc Boldt, Chair, present.

PUBLIC HEARING: RECONSIDERATION OF A PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE FOR THE
2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE AND, IF NEED BE, CORRECTION TO THE
PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE MAP

The purpose of the hearing will be to review and reconsider the Board's selection on November 24, 2015 of a preferred alternative under SEPA; and, if necessary, to consider adoption of proposed corrections to the map for revised Alternative 4; and to take public testimony concerning the matter or matters being considered. A hearing regarding corrections to the revised Alternative 4 map was originally scheduled for Tuesday, January 19, 2016.

BOLDT: With that, we're on to the agenda for our comprehensive growth plan. Thank you for being with us.

Before we start, we would first like to hear from staff. Second, after the staff concludes, the members of the Council are welcome to ask the staff. Please keep them down to ten minutes to staff so people can come up here that is here to testify. Then we will have testimony from everybody. Please keep your comments to three minutes.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

2

STEWART: Mr. Chair, can we relight here or do we lose the resolution on the screen? Thank you.

BOLDT: Then we will, after public comment, we will have deliberations. Please keep your comments to around 15 minutes. If it goes late, we will probably have lunch around 12:30. Just hopefully, most of you can testify to that, and from then on, I'll probably have some general comments after -- before public testimony.

But with that, let's get on with the staff presentation.

ORJIAKO: Good morning, Councilors.

BOLDT: Good morning.

ORJIAKO: For the record, my name is Oliver Orjiako and I am the Clark County Community Planning Director. With me this morning is legal counsel, Ms. Chris Cook. Gordy Euler will be joining us here as he will be the one presenting the environmental review. Before that, let me just make a quick opening remark before I turn it over to Gordy Euler.

Councilors, in your packet you will find the staff report for this hearing, that is in Tab 1. Tab 2 through Tab 5 are the exhibits cited

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

in the staff report. I assume that the Councilors have read the staff report. The agenda will cover environmental review, preferred alternative, the next steps. We will then take questions and seek direction from the Councilors.

The Councilors, we are here today because at the January 13th, 2016, work session staff provided you an update on the comp plan and we also reviewed the R.W. Thorpe report. The Council wanted a hearing today to reconsider the Preferred Alternative approved on November 24th, 2015, given the analysis and the findings of R.W. Thorpe.

The Thorpe report, in my opinion, presents a big challenge and a risk for us going forward. I will say that we are stuck and we need to move forward to complete the comp plan update.

The Councilors are aware that we are still in the SEPA process. What has been completed is the Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. That is very clear that has been completed. We want to move forward to complete the final supplemental or the Final Environmental Impact Statement, but we're unable to do so given the Thorpe report.

If I may add, Mr. Thorpe was brought in to review the planning assumptions and the proposed changes that were made following

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

October 20th and then on the 24th and we have their report now. The Board has reviewed it. The public have seen it. I believe at your work session on the 13th, he was asked to make some changes. He did not. The consultant came back reaffirming the report that they prepared.

One of the changes he was asked to make was, as you are aware, he found that of the eight planning assumptions, four were invalid, two were partially invalid. He was asked to, if he can, if you will, determine that the two invalid could be characterized as indeterminate. I think he came back making a case that you are either valid or invalid, very similar to the same way that the Growth Management Act states that your plan is either compliance or noncompliance.

When we make determination on SEPA, it's either you make a determination of significance or insignificance. So he came back and maintained the valid and partially invalid conclusions. So my staff reviewed that report and now it's final. It is attached in your packet.

What I will do is turn this over to Gordy Euler who will go over the environmental review. I will come back to make a final remark to the Councilors. Gordy.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

EULER: Thank you, Oliver. For the record, I'm Gordy Euler, also with Community Planning.

Skip a -- let's skip the next slide and then the next slide. We don't need to cover all of this ground. Most people are fairly familiar with the process. But as Oliver said, we are in the SEPA part, SEPA documentation part of the 2016 comp plan update and this is a process that we have to finish. I might also say that to distinguish between the land use decision that the Board will ultimately make before our June 30th, 2016, deadline, we're trying to get to a point where we finish the environmental review on what is becoming the Preferred Alternative, so...

As you can see, we issued a notice more than a year and a half ago that we were going to prepare a supplemental document. Because we're adopting the 2007 EIS, given the fact that a lot of the land that we brought in urbanized in 2007 is still there, is ready to be developed because of the recession, we had scoping meetings. We hired a consultant. That's ESA. They prepared a draft document.

We had three alternatives at the point. Earlier last year the Board asked that we add a fourth alternative what we're referring to as Alternative 4, and we did just that. Gave the consultant some new direction, some new information, some more money. And as Oliver said on August 5th, we released the draft supplemental statement, and

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

right now we're trying to get to a point where we can finish the Final Supplemental Impact Statement.

So next slide. These are some of the key dates that Oliver reviewed. The Board adopted a Preferred Alternative on November 24th as Oliver said. It was based on new planning assumptions for the Preferred Alternative that we had tested or vetted, that has been done by Robert W. Thorpe & Associates. We have the results of that.

At a work session on January 13th just a month ago, the Board asked that we hold this hearing today for purposes of talking about the Thorpe report in light of the Preferred Alternative and to give us direction as to how to move forward. So that's pretty much where we're at. As Oliver said, we are stuck in terms of how to complete the Final Supplemental EIS, which is something that we have to do.

ORJIAKO: Okay. Thank you, Gordy.

What is our part forward? The Board in reading the staff report will see that we did not come to you with a recommendation because we don't know what the Councilors are going to do. But as I stated, we are now at a point that we still have the June 30th, 2016, as our deadline, which we are obligated to meet. There is no excuse for that.

But the purpose for us to move forward is not so much on the timeline,

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

but to prepare a plan that is consistent with the State law. That is critical. Our role is to advise the Council to do that. Because we are at impasse now, I am asking the Board to reconsider the Preferred Alternative that was adopted on November 24th, but to do so, you have to do that within the four alternative that have already been studied in the Draft EIS and the public have seen and the County allowed more than 40 days for the public to review.

I am asking you to stay within that because, again, you and those that have read the Thorpe report may not agree or may not like the writing style of the consultant, but we cannot disagree with the conclusions. The purpose of bringing Thorpe in was to vet the planning assumptions that were introduced late in the process and to help us build a bridge we have to cross in order to do the Final EIS.

He was to do so by preparing an addendum, assuming he comes back with a clean slate, that the introduction of those planning assumptions were clean for us to proceed and then we were to hand over the completion of the Final EIS to our existing consultant ESA. We can't get there now. We can't cross that bridge. I don't know how we do that. So that is really, in a nutshell, my conclusion of my remarks this morning.

I don't want to take your time. We know how we got here now. I don't

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

want to rehash that, but we know why we're here today. And I will leave it at that. I've always said that land use planning is about moving forward. It's not about going backwards. So we have to move forward. I need a preferred plan that I can advance with the help of the Council to complete the Final EIS. That's what staff need.

When you get to your deliberation and how you want to proceed, staff will assist you to get there, but I will conclude my remarks and take questions if you have any.

BOLDT: Thank you, Oliver. If I can start by going backwards to move ahead hopefully. The first meetings, I believe, were in 2013?

ORJIAKO: We started the process July of 2013, Councilors.

BOLDT: July of 2013. And in them meetings, I've not been able to figure out a foundation of this plan which is my primary concern, but... So as I understand it, when the population number was finally settled upon because the 2007 plan was 2 and 2.2, pretty aggressive population, but because of the population estimate by the last Board, it was concluded that there was enough land within the current growth plan to handle the increase in population; is that correct?

STEWART: Can I ask you for a clarification on that statement. When you say prior Board, will you tell us what period of time that you're

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

talking?

BOLDT: 2013.

STEWART: Thank you.

ORJIAKO: Yes, Councilors. The 2007 plan, if you recall, Councilors, was based on 2.2 percent growth rate in the first six years of the plan and 2 percent thereafter. That growth rate did not materialize. And it wasn't that the decision was wrong, it's just that that growth did not materialize. And you can actually put that to the recession, which was very deep and we are still coming off of.

During that time period, the State Office of Financial Management, which is required by the Growth Management Act to provide population forecast that counties planning under the growth plan should use, came out with their forecast for 2012, if you will. They do that forecast by giving us a range and within that range they also give us we can estimate. They don't give us a growth rate; staff estimates that. But they always -- their position and it's in the WAC that they need range of their forecast is the most likely to occur and they came out with a forecast that is different from what their forecast had anticipated before it's all forecast, and the number that they came out for the midrange is much lower than what was used

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

in the '07.

But to answer your question, Councilor, the Chair, yes, when we started this process, we looked back, engaged the cities. We looked at -- we did a study. When I said a study, I mean the vacant buildable lands model that we use and have been using since 1994 to estimate how much land is available for development. That was completed by our GIS staff and reviewed by the cities and everyone else and concluded that we have sufficient land within the existing urban growth boundary to accommodate the growth that we are planning for and consistent with the population that the Board approved.

BOLDT: So with that, did the Board vote, the Board in 2013 vote that the urban growth boundary would stay the same?

ORJIAKO: With that information it was apparent, and the cities can speak to this, that for a majority of the seven cities, if you will, saw no need to expand the urban growth boundaries. So that information and the fact that we have sufficient land to accommodate a 20-year growth we are planning for was very apparent and the cities were coming to the table indicating and communicating to the Council or the Board at the time that they do not want their urban growth boundaries to be expanded.

So inherent in that decision is that, yes, there's no need to expand

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

the urban growth boundary given the fact that the land that was brought into the urban growth boundary in '07 are still vacant.

BOLDT: But that was done verbally, not in a resolution or ordinance or any formal action?

ORJIAKO: The adoption or the direction of population to plan for was adopted by resolution.

BOLDT: Okay. But not before. Okay.

Other questions for staff?

MIELKE: Mr. Chair, a couple of points I want to make clear. The population references are within the urban growth boundary that we get from OFM; is that correct?

ORJIAKO: It is countywide, Councilor Mielke, countywide.

MIELKE: Okay. So that goes back and addresses the ratio that we had for the urban growth boundary and rural.

ORJIAKO: It doesn't. What happens is when we get that population and the County chooses what number to plan for, we go through another step on how much of that new growth will be allocated to the urban area and how much of that new growth will be allocated to the rural

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

area. That's where you get the term urban/rural split.

MIELKE: And also it's important, and I want to stay focused, it's a 20-year plan, not a one-year plan or a seven-year plan. You said we plan every seven to ten years.

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

MIELKE: Thank you.

BOLDT: Yes. Commissioner Madore.

MADORE: Mr. Chair, I have -- I put a lot of work into this and I have a document to present that it's titled Errors and Omissions Corrected by Evidence Based Planning Assumptions, and what I'd like to be able to do is bring that up. It's worth --

BOLDT: That can be done in deliberation. Do you have any questions for staff?

MADORE: As long as we have an opportunity to present it, I'm fine.

BOLDT: Okay. Any other questions of staff?

ORJIAKO: Councilor. Councilor, let me jump in quickly. If you're

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

presenting something that I have not seen, let me just disclose now I will be unable to answer your question properly.

MADORE: Understand.

OLSON: Mr. Chair.

BOLDT: Yes.

OLSON: Mr. Orjiako or Dr. Orjiako, there's also some rural lands piece here that we haven't really talked about, so can you address just the rural piece here in Alternative 2 and where we got to because we've been talking about the urban, urban/rural split. We've been talking about inside the UGA, but we've got some rural land piece in here that's been studied.

ORJIAKO: That's correct. In Alternative 2 - and Gordy may speak to this better than I can - in Alternative 2, the proposal is to what was studied in this Alternative 2 is to take AG-20, currently we have AG-20 in our rural area with a minimum of 20 acre. And also forest, we have two type of forest. It's a two tier. Tier I is 80-acres minimum; Tier II is 40-acres minimum. What is proposed in Alternative 2 is to take the AG-20 to 10-acres minimum and the Forest 40 to 20-acres minimum with staff developing a cluster provision on how to implement that.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

The other item which will be 2.d, also in Alternative 2, is when the county went through complying with some of the remand orders from the Growth Board, we had Rural 10 and Rural 20 to buffer resource areas, ag and forest. What is proposed in 2.d is to where, if we are successful and the Board approve including this provision, we will look at those areas where Rural 20 may abut resources and also reduce those to 10-acres minimum, so that's what is in Alternative 2.

I didn't go into details as to how that came about, but that's what is in Alternative 2.

OLSON: Okay. And then you also mentioned that the cities prior had said that they don't need to expand their urban growth areas but yet we do have some requests from the cities in the Alternative 3 portion.

ORJIAKO: Yes. And the reason I said so, and some of my city counterpart can speak for themselves, but we throughout the process engaged the cities in terms of coordination and cooperation required by the Act, and in the initial process, they have maintained that they're not interested in expanding their boundary. But we encourage them to go through their own planning process, open houses, engage those in their community before as we move on and they did so. And I think, if I'm not mistaken, only one city or two submitted

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

a proposal to expand their urban growth boundary.

The City of Battle Ground was asking for 80 acres and I believe the City of La Center was asking for 56 acres. At some point I know the City of Ridgefield submitted a request and the Council, Councilor Madore, Mielke and Councilor Olson -- no, excuse me -- Jeanne had it on their consent item dealing with the City of Ridgefield request and that turned into county staff, again, reaching out to the cities for the second time to ask them to reaffirm their previous position or let us know what is it that they would like to do, and that's when we formally had the request to include the Ridgefield request. It's about 110 acres.

And also additional, I believe, a request from the La Center School District to add a school site. And then the City of Washougal, those came very late, but they changed their mind, if you will, some of that may have been property owners driven, but they did change their mind sometime in, I believe, maybe mid-March or maybe around, but we gave them a second chance.

OLSON: Thank you.

MIELKE: Mr. Chair.

MADORE: I have a question --

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

BOLDT: Yes.

MADORE: -- when you're ready.

MIELKE: Well, I was under the assumption or understanding that Washougal was still looking for an urban growth boundary expansion.

ORJIAKO: That's what I said that they did come back very late --

MIELKE: Oh, okay.

ORJIAKO: -- and that was included and studied in the Draft SEIS. All those requests were included and studied. Camas and Vancouver did not make any request for UGB expansion. And we've already worked, which the Council is aware, we worked and helped the Town of Yacolt to do their own planning process which they submitted to the State.

MIELKE: So we have Ridgefield, Battle Ground, La Center, Washougal and Yacolt.

ORJIAKO: That's not from Yacolt. We completed the Town of Yacolt.

MIELKE: So you have four who have requested an urban growth boundary

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

and I was confused by Gordy's remarks is that the cities chose not to expand their urban growth boundaries. That's what I thought you said, but so we do have four who are recognizing growth needs.

ORJIAKO: That's correct. I think what Gordy was referring to is that in the beginning of the process that was the cities' position, and the comment I made was we encouraged them to go through their own process, engage their community and let us know what is it that they would like to do because we were in the beginning of the process and they came back with some requests.

STEWART: So could we go over just a little bit the Washougal proposal. What is -- please tell me what the current status of that is. We've received a tremendous amount of communication.

ORJIAKO: The request from the City of Washougal is for 40, I believe, 40 acres that is currently designated for Rural 5. Again, this came in very late. Their request is, I believe, and Mitch Kneipp is here that he can speak to that when he testified, if you can put, if we have a map, we can put that up so that the Councilors can see where that property is at.

STEWART: And what is the status of that request? Is that pending still today?

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

18

ORJIAKO: Yes. If you -- if you -- yes, that site, and we can talk about it, that site has an approved cluster subdivision. Here's the site if we can get -- okay. See where it says 3.e, Washougal, that's the site. It has an existing cluster subdivision that have been approved and it is a request that the City would like to see honored.

The Planning Commission, when you get into determining what to do in considering a Preferred Alternative, this will come up again, the Planning Commission, I believe it was a 4/2 not to include this property in the Washougal UGB. You may come -- you may accept the recommendation of the Planning Commission or come up with your own proposal when you consider what the cities are requesting.

STEWART: Sure. Thank you. I'm just wanting to see the chronology of this process.

ORJIAKO: Right.

STEWART: Thank you.

MADORE: Mr. Chair.

BOLDT: Yes.

MADORE: I have a question for Mr. Orjiako. Planning Assumption

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

Number 1 counts, the original A assumption counts cluster remainder lots and then you found that that they quote here that that is not legal. Those lots are not legal to develop, which means that we are counting them. Those extra numbers have inflated in both Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 and Alternative 4, and the question is, if we don't correct that with the Assumption B, are you suggesting that we adopt A anyway?

ORJIAKO: Councilors, you have heard me throughout this process say that we need to take care of that particular issue. I also recall that you sent me an e-mail in which you said do not go back and try to capture every remainder cluster lot, so I stopped that review. However, I engaged and dedicated one of my staff to go back, work with GIS staff because I know this is going it's a prudent thing to do, go back, let's look at the remainder lots.

This started before, I will say, our time here as staff with the County when the County allowed cluster going back to the 1980s. Some of those files are in what is called microfilm, but I engage my staff, Jose and GIS staff to work on trying to estimate how many are the remainder lots and what can that yield so that we can make that correction going forward.

What I will say to you, sir, is it will make more sense going forward to say how can we document this cluster remainder lots that are out

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

there. Because if you recall as of today, the County still allow cluster in Rural 5, Rural 10 and Rural 20 with the exception of the resource areas. So the issue will be going forward how can we do a better job documenting, maintaining our records so that we don't have this issue going forward. I'm already doing that now with our GIS staff and (inaudible) Community Development so that we can document that and maintain it going forward.

We have a record going back to beginning in 1979 or 1980, if you look at the work that my staff and GIS did, we can look at, okay, let's look at if what is the number that we may have overstated in Alternative 1, 196 lots; Alternative 2, 235; Alternative 3 similar to Alternative 1; Alternative 4, 330 potential lot. I will add that these numbers are insignificant. When you do a SEPA, you're role is to look at the worst case scenario so that you can be able to assess the potential environmental impacts. If you subtract these numbers from what was stated in the DEIS, you will find that is very, very insignificant. That will be my conclusion.

But to answer your question correctly and directly, I will recommend that whatever choice the Board decides to make today going forward, we'll do. We should be able to come up with a better mechanism to identify remainder lots and document them properly and then give us some direction when we estimate the potential number of lots in the rural area what should we be doing and how should we be treating the

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

remainder cluster lot, at least we need to know where they are, flag them, document them maintain the record properly going forward. That's what I would recommend.

COOK: Mr. Chair.

BOLDT: Yes.

COOK: Chris Cook, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney. I would like to point out, if I could, that choice, the Planning Assumptions that have been labeled as choice A are not necessarily the Planning Assumptions that the Board was working under prior to adoption of choice B. Those were, in fact, written the same time that choice B was written and they are not necessarily what the County was using up till that point. So saying that reconsidering or rescinding choice B takes things back to choice A is, I would say, an inaccurate way to couch the process here.

MADORE: Excuse me, Mr. Chair. Which assumptions are not accurate in column A?

COOK: Well, for example, and I do not have column A in front of me, column A states that certain lots were counted that were not, the forest lots.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

22

MADORE: Do you see -- there should be a copy there. Let me know which one you're speaking of.

COOK: Excuse me. Staff did not use a rural vacant buildable lands model in proposing planning assumptions that the Board adopted on April 14, I believe it was, 2015.

ORJIAKO: That's correct.

COOK: And that's consistent with one of Judge Poyfair's orders in June of 1997 that said that you shouldn't be using a rural vacant buildable lands model.

ORJIAKO: Yes.

COOK: So some of these are inaccurate and many of the rest of them are simply not that important. For example, as Dr. Orjiako just explained, the remainder lot number is pretty insignificant when compared to the total number of lots that are being worked with.

MADORE: Chris, I have a -- I'm curious. I thought that the PA's Office related to us that the existing assumptions were not only revealed to the Board but approved by the Board. How can there be assumptions that we don't know about?

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

COOK: April 14, 2015, is a list of existing assumptions that were approved in Resolution 2015-0405. Those are the Planning Assumptions.

MADORE: The assumptions, there's no link between those in here. I have no idea what document you're speaking of.

COOK: It's on The Grid and it is on the Councilors' meeting and its Planning Assumptions that was adopted by the Council in 2015 which you were chair of.

MADORE: I understand that we adopted some planning assumptions, for instance, the rural/urban split that was a planning assumption. What I'm speaking of is the planning assumptions that is used in the software that once you export these document, the parcels out of our maps of Alternative 1, 2 and 4, that that software changes those numbers substantially and none of those, or let me say that the ones that -- the few that we did approve, we're very aware of those. But you just brought up some that you said they're not necessarily, and I'd like to know what are they, because each of these assumptions are there because they change the numbers.

ORJIAKO: Councilor, let me answer the question this way. You are mixing the urban area assumptions and applying them to the rural area. Two, the assumptions are what we call the -- call it the perimeters

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

or how we estimate available buildable lands in the urban area. In the urban area. Those assumptions are understanding of what County staff and GIS should be doing, took us almost two to three years to develop. Some of the members that were on that task force are sitting here in the audience. It was put together by the Council or the Commissioners in place at the time that included members of the development community, members of the environmental community, planning staff and representative from the cities to develop a methodology that we are going to use when we look at estimating what is available, what is developable in the urban area.

As Chris indicated, we have not been traditionally doing or extending this methodology to the rural area. We have not traditionally done that. If you look at how much will be set aside for infrastructure, market factor, development on critical areas, these are all urban assumptions that you exported to the rural area. A big mistake. And the review by Thorpe makes that very clear. So you cannot be saying that, okay, column A needs to be imported to the rural area. No. What we have in column A, even though some of them have some issues, what you have in column A is how we do this in the urban area. That's it.

And this Board, not this Council, but the previous Board have reviewed this. It has been vetted. It has been challenged all the way to the Growth Board, which I and the late Rich Lowry defended and Bronson

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

who is now with the City of Vancouver defended in front of the Growth Board and all the way to the court. So how we deal with estimating vacant buildable lands in the urban area has been vetted and defended. That's what we mean.

We also had two work session, if not three, with Bob Pool going through the vacant buildable lands model with the Council. Are there issues, are there stuff, what are the issues that the Board would like us to make changes to, because that's how the model had changed.

We, staff and GIS staff, have no authority to change any of the assumptions in the vacant buildable lands model. We don't do that. We come to the Council or the Board with the cities and the public and present the information and ask for the Councilors to tell us, give us direction if you want anything to be changed based on what has happened, what we have learned to inform us what needs to be done. You had those two work sessions.

I don't know if Bob Pool is in the audience. He will attest to that. We had those meetings. He laid out how it is used and how it is done. That's what is in column A, some of it, not never have been applied to the rural area.

MADORE: Mr. Orjiako, let me make sure that we understand we're on the same wavelength. There is never any indication, any intention

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

whatsoever to change any of the urban assumptions and there is no, so that is -- you spent a long time describing how the urban assumptions came in. It's unrelated to the rural assumptions. The rural assumptions in column A are being used now, as best we understand. If any of them are not being used now, it would be very helpful to be able to identify which ones are different.

ORJIAKO: Council Madore, none of them are used in the rural area. Column A, if you want to go one-by-one, we can do so, none are being used in the rural area. I have GIS staff here who can also help answer the question, none are being used. Do we use -- did we say that 30 percent or 100 percent of the environmental constraint area should not develop in the rural area? No. Do we apply market factor in the rural area? No. Do we apply infrastructure deduction in the rural area? No.

Councilor Mielke, when I met with you, you agreed that we shouldn't and I agreed with Thorpe report. I'm not sure what we've done wrong, but I'm only saying that, no, we do not apply this column A as you stated or as you're claiming to the rural area. We don't. All we typically will do is and with the help of our GIS staff based on the current zoning, based on the current zoning, give us an estimate, just an estimate of what the potential number of lot, if those that could potentially further divide, if they were divided, how many additional lot would be created. That's how it's been done in the

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

27

rural area, not applying infrastructure, market factor, development or environmental, 30 percent, 10 percent or even coming up with vacant because there's so many things that we don't know about the rural area.

Two, the rural area develop differently than the urban area. Okay?

MADORE: Mr. Orjiako, I'm aware that the citizens are waiting. I just want to make one, one correction here because we keep asserting that we're trying to apply column A to column B. That is not at all the case. Column A simply identifies the assumptions that have been used all along, as best we understand.

ORJIAKO: In the urban area.

MADORE: In the rural area is -- so we'll go over this when we go over the errors and omissions document, because each of those have been verified with the GIS Department. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Okay.

Moving on -- oh, thank you. Great job. Moving on to the public testimony. Once, again, please keep your comments to three minutes. If you have things that people have already said, please keep them germane, be respectful for each other. I would ask that, first of

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

all, you speak slowly because it is being recorded, also spell your last name would be very helpful. And also it would be very helpful for you to give us your specific request. If you would like one of the menu items in the rural, Forest 40 to 20 or whatever or if you want to be included in the urban growth boundary, whatever, it really helps us when we start deliberation of trying to figure out where all the pieces are.

So with that, we will start out as our 1st grade example, Mr. Ron Onslow, the City of Ridgefield. Good morning.

ONslow: Good morning. Jeff Niten, our Community Development Director, is going to join me at the table.

Thanks for including Ridgefield's request for the 111-acre expansion to our urban growth boundary in your Preferred Alternative. We remain committed to work with the applicant to support and defend the expansion as the Preferred Alternative. We submitted an analysis early in 2015 and detailed why the expansion is not viable for agricultural uses. The area is already broken up into five-acre parcels. Every five-acre piece is owned by a different corporate entity. Those may be run by the same person, but when he passes away, they'll be spread around to a bunch of people and all hopes of bringing them together will be gone.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

Under the current zoning, we fully expect a bunch of five-acre martini-farms as Lee Wells, one of our councilmen, calls them to develop soon. That would be really inefficient use of the acreage, not urban with services to support them and not farming to produce food.

If 111 acres are brought into the Ridgefield's urban growth boundary, they're next to an existing urban service that can get water, sewer and roads to them instead of a bunch of wells and septic fields bordered by a county road. We'll bring them in with an urban density that gives more opportunities for people to live in a city, as the Growth Management Act requires, but we'll do it in a low enough density to produce a really high quality neighborhood bordering the rural area.

And, finally, we want to, once again, let the Council know that Alternative 2 or 4 would have significant negative consequences for Ridgefield. Dividing large rural parcels immediately outside of our jurisdiction would seriously impact the future economic development opportunities because jobs need large contiguous single-ownership parcels. Ridgefield's entire urban area around I-5 has developed good paying jobs because they were brought into the urban growth boundary as large blocks of lands that employers needed. That happened because we had farm families in Ridgefield with land and a vision for diversifying job opportunities for their kids and their

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

kids' kids.

New parcels outside the Ridgefield urban growth boundary would have an impact on the city's transportation network which hasn't been studied. Alternatives 2 and 4 with an increased number of household in the rural area surrounding Ridgefield would require more police and fire services and water and septic services under Alternative 2 and 4 would face significant impacts.

The County and all the cities are under a timeline here to complete our comp plans and it all depends on the County's decisions. It's important for you to complete these decisions so that we can move forward also. And thanks for listening to us.

BOLDT: Thank you. Anything else to add?

NITEN: No, Mr. Chair. I just wanted to mention that the City is on track to complete their comprehensive plan February 25th.

BOLDT: Very good. Okay. Sounds good. Thank you very much, Mayor.

ONSLOW: Thank you.

NITEN: Thank you.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

BOLDT: Greg Thornton. Good morning.

THORNTON: Good morning, Councilors. I'm Greg Thornton, mayor of La Center. My address is 34401 NW 11th Avenue, La Center, Washington 98629.

I am here today with a simple request. When you pick a Preferred Alternative, please include La Center's request to add 17 acres for a new school, school site and 56 acres for new jobs at the La Center I-5 junction.

When the County Planning Commission considered our I-5 UGA expansion, they reached a tie. Because the Planning Commission voted ended in a tie and because these 56 acres are so vital to our future job pace, La Center asked GlobalWise, the consulting firm that wrote both the 2006 countywide ag study and the 2015 La Center ag study to compare the two reports written ten years apart. Their letter is in your record.

The GlobalWise letter provides two significant conclusions: First, the level of site-specific detail in the 2015 ag report is far greater. The 2006 analysis was a countywide 60,000-foot planning level review. Ten years later, GlobalWise walked these 56 acres, talked to the owners at length and studied the decline of each farms

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

agricultural production.

Second, in ten years, the urban character of La Center interchange has changed. Since 2006, Clark County has approved several land use applications for public and quasi-public development on AG-20 land immediately adjacent to these 56 acres, including the KWRL school bus complex, the Clark Public Utility well fields and the Clark Public Utility electrical substation. Those facilities are being built to serve urban-style development.

New well fields, pump stations and electrical substation and high voltage transmission lines all speak to the dramatic changes which have occurred and will occur at our doorstep. The facts are these 56 acres are no longer viable for ag production and they are prime land, prime lands for job creation.

La Center's wrapping up our comp plan update process. The Planning Commission is conducting public hearings this month. The city council will conduct public hearings on the plan in March. If you adopt a Preferred Alternative that includes this 56 acre request, we will complete our hearing process in March and send our plan to you. Thank you for your time and consideration.

BOLDT: Thank you very much. Anything to add?

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

EISEMANN: No, sir. Just here to answer questions.

BOLDT: Good job. Sandra Day. Morning.

DAY: Good morning. I'm going to be joined by our Community Development Director for Ridgefield. Sandra Day, 230 Pioneer Street, Ridgefield, Washington.

I want to thank the Councilors for your journey on this complicated and intricate growth management plan or comprehensive plan. Ridgefield is, as the mayor said, on track to approve our plan February 25th. We have had open houses. We've had the people of Ridgefield assess and comment on our comprehensive plan. So we feel confident that our track to approve our plan on February 25th is very good.

Portions of Alternative 2 or 4 would have significant negative impacts for Ridgefield. Ridgefield is one of the fastest growing cities in Washington, if not the fastest growing city. We're not only adding population, but we're adding jobs. So item 2.k adding the Tri-Mountain Golf Course to the Ridgefield UGA and retaining the parks and open space zoning and adding an urban holding overlay, we thank you for that.

For the Ridgefield 111 acres in item 3.d, we remain committed to work

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

to with the applicant to support the expansion under the Preferred Alternative, so the city is very supportive of adding that to our urban growth area. Thank you very much.

BOLDT: Thank you. Mitch Kneipp. Morning.

KNEIPP: Good morning. For the record, my name is Mitch Kneipp, K-n-e-i-p-p, and I have the pleasure of serving as the Community Development Director for the City of Washougal.

I have three items I'd like to talk to you on today. First, the City of Washougal is in favor of Alternative 3 with the additional (inaudible) from the cities. This is a well-balanced approach to our growth needs for the next 20 years and it allows us to move forward with a process whose time frame is rapidly shrinking.

Second, Alternative 4 should be avoided and the original planning assumptions used. What was originally discussed is simply a plan to recognize existing lots that now would create over thousands of rural and resource building lots that could be created under existing zoning. This intensification of resource and rural lands is inconsistent with the past emphasis of the courts in Clark County. It could prove a substantial legal risk to us.

And, finally, I'd like to speak to the 41-acre parcel being considered

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

under 3.e. This was a specific request from the property owner to be included in the City of Washougal's urban growth boundary and that request was forwarded to this Council. Since that original request, the property has received preliminary approval from the County for a cluster subdivision. I received several e-mails, and I know you have as well, and they are addressing concerns relating to the environment, traffic, destruction of the rural lifestyle by an out-of-state developer.

This property was identified by the City to be included in our urban growth boundary in 2005 along with approximately 700 additional acres to the south and west stretching across the Washougal River to Washougal's western urban growth boundary; however, with the ultimate adoption of the current UGB in 2007, all of the 750 acres were removed. Hindsight being 20/20, with the coming of the great recession, that was a good thing. It was a blessing in disguise.

But the facts are, Washougal planned for that property to be in our city limits over 11 years ago. We developed capital facility plans consistent with our request and we continue to plan for these areas to some day be in our UGB and ultimately is our city limits. That is our charge under GMA to plan for growth that is coming. Your Planning Commission recommended that you don't include the property. They had concerns over the shape, the surrounding properties, that we didn't take them in. It was just a dart toss. It wasn't. It

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

was simply just a request forwarded to you.

If you choose to include this property in the urban growth boundary, I want to make sure there's no confusion, it will remain under County jurisdiction as long as it's your UGB -- in our UGB and won't fall under Washougal's jurisdiction until such time it is annexed into Washougal. I understand the neighbors concerns. They moved to the country to be in the country. I get that. That's easy to understand. But I would be remiss if I didn't note that Washougal only has one direction to grow. We can only go to the north.

We are working on ways to increase our density in our urban area. We will work on those, but we can only go to the north. I'm not advocating for inclusion of this property in the UGB today, but I'm reiterating that the Washougal City Council is in favor of honoring the property owner's request.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you very much.

Is there anyone else from any other cities? Oh, I figured you'd want to come up. I didn't say your name, so... Good morning.

SNODGRASS: Good morning, Councilors.

BOLDT: Thanks for coming.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

SNODGRASS: Bryan Snodgrass, City of Vancouver. And I don't know if you've received it last week, we submitted a letter from Chad Eiken dated February 9th. I think we submitted it, perhaps, on the 11th. I just wanted to hit a couple of the high points.

First of all, pleased to have the opportunity to testify for the first time before the full Board. The City of Vancouver is not proposing any urban or supporting any urban growth boundary expansions to its UGA within this update. Frankly, we're still catching up with the prior update in 2007. We do however support the small cities in their requests which are small in focus and primarily jobs based. So we support Alternative 3 which has been recommended twice now by the Planning Commission.

I think just a quick word about Alternative 3 that may not have been -- may have been a bit obscured with the focus on Alternative 4, and that is that there are growth opportunities within Alternative 3. The countywide jobs forecast driving Alternative 3 and the other alternatives was the highest option informally provided by Employment Security Department economist Scott Bailey back in 2013, and, in fact, as you may recall from that process before it got adopted, there was an initial memo from Mr. Bailey that was a little bit lower and so he was asked to come back with a second memo that raised that number a little bit.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

The population forecast driving Alternative 3 and the other alternatives has been increased also once during this process. It started out at 561,000, which was what the State predicted back in 2012 would be most likely to occur here. It was increased by some 15,000 people up to the current 577 or 578. The Growth Management Act doesn't require adopting formally the annual rate, but it is quite useful in making comparisons.

In this case, that rate provides for an approximate annual growth of a little bit less than 1.3 percent, that averaged over 20 years would be similar to what this county has experienced as the end of the annual recession back in 2010. Because the plan has to be and the land supply has to be refurbished every eight years, in effect, Alternative 3 provides enough growth that you could grow a population approaching 3 percent before the eight-year mandatory update cycle. So certainly there's some support for growth there.

It's also worth noting that that growth isn't limited to urban areas. In the rural area, economic development could occur through the rural industrial land bank, through growth in rural centers and through some of the growth on resource and rural properties that I think this Board and the prior Board has expanded opportunities for recently.

Regarding Alternative 4, certainly there's been a lot of discussion about the Thorpe report. I think one overriding concern of ours is

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

that regardless of what assumptions are taken in the Thorpe report, even if all of those Thorpe recommendations are disregarded, the number of new lots that would be created would still be within a range of about 6100 or about 6600 new rural lots that the EIS has already found would be potentially prohibitive in cost, would potentially require improvements throughout the county and through which the County Planning Commission rejected, so...

I don't want to add further to the discussion about Alternative 4. I know you'll have further deliberation and comment on the individual assumptions that I think is the overriding point of our reading of the recent record is that regardless of what assumptions you use, the impacts are at a level which the County Planning Commission and the County EIS has found would create a number of problems. So you do also have a number of procedural alternatives.

As you know, the rural changes are not required by the Growth Management Act unlike the forecast and the urban changes to be done by June. Certainly that's something you could take up in a future year, and our letter provides further documentation on some of those options.

So I think in concluding, Vancouver supports a dynamic rural area, but in this case, given the magnitude of the impacts that the County's own analysis has shown and that really haven't been rebutted through

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

the process, we've not heard any indication of, well, the growth could be paid for this way or the traffic concerns are inaccurate. We do add to the voices, I think, with concerns about Alternatives 4 as well as 2. Thank you.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you. Any other representatives from cities?

ORJIAKO: We have Camas and Battle Ground.

BOLDT: Morning.

CRUMMETT: Good morning, Councilors. Sam Crummett,
C-r-u-m-m-e-t-t. I'm here representing the City of Battle Ground.

I'd first of all like to thank the Councilors for including adoption of Alternative 3 in the latest proposal. And I'd note that your Planning Commission also recommended approval of Alternative 3. Battle Ground's request specifically does include an 80-acre expansion to the west and this is for job growth. This would take existing rural zoning and change it to a mixed use employment based zone.

The City is concerned with the Alternative 4 proposal. This directly relates to Battle Ground in the sense that given the assumptions were not reviewed as part of the environmental review in the SEPA, we feel

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

that that could also muddle our process in terms of getting this comp -- comprehensive plan adopted on time.

In terms of the what alternative would allow for is further parcelization of the rural areas. When this happens near city urban growth boundaries, it's harder to convert those areas into urbanization. So, for example, when a developer is looking to locate, it's much easier for them to deal with large parcels, convert those into an urban pattern rather than multiple two or five-acre parcels.

Another piece of this is the City of Battle Ground is bisected by State Route 502 and 503. With the number of lots created in the rural area, we haven't analyzed exactly how much traffic would funnel through our city and what that could mean for our capital facility planning that has already been completed. Those are all the comments I have at this time.

BOLDT: Thank you. Very good.

And I believe Camas, he did his in two minutes so he gets points just to let you know.

MAUL: I'm going to keep it less than a minute then. Good morning, Councilors, and welcome to our newest member and chair. It's a pleasure to see you.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

I'm not going to reiterate whatever all my other partner cities have gone into, but what I will say is that the City of Camas has consistently supported Alternative 3 early on in this process.

BOLDT: Oh, sorry. You didn't give your name for the record.

MAUL: Oh, my apologies. Robert Maul, Planning Manager, City of Camas.

Oliver had assembled all of us early on in this process to collaboratively work together through this comprehensive plan update and through that we, as a collective group, had agreed upon alternatives and planning assumptions to use, and while we are not asking for any expansion and we're still not, we do respect the wishes of our partner cities. So Camas will still consider supporting Alternative 3 understanding that the Planning Commissions' recommendation does have some changes to that. That's all we wanted to say. We're as consistent on the record as we've been, so thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you very much. Any other cities? No Yacolt. Okay. Moving on. Don Vogel. Morning.

VOGEL: Morning. My name is Dan Vogel and I'm speaking on Washougal

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

parcel that you talked about a little bit earlier.

The new landowner I believe he doesn't come from our area, he hasn't lived in that area like all of us property owners around that area have, so this is obviously just an investment for him. If he -- I believe he could have taken all the trees down and that would have wiped out a huge wildlife area and with all the streams that would have created more silt and washing into the creeks that are around that area.

After watching the March 9th Washougal City Council meeting, I came to a conclusion that they really weren't sure what they wanted to do pro or con on that issue. They talked a lot about the what ifs and didn't take a vote on that and I think they are okay with whatever the County decides. In watching this, I felt that at one point that it sounded like they were, you know, thought this little piece was kind of out of the way of where the current boundary is and they've said in the past, you know, they really don't need that extra land.

And one problem I have is I kind of resent the fact that both Washougal and the County never asked for any input from any of the landowners around there. I mean, none of us knew this was coming. We kind of found out about it by accident, so... Anyway, I think that process needs to change. So that's all I got.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you very much.

Jim Malinowski. Jim, could you spell your last name for people.

MALINOWSKI: Yes. It's M-a-l-i-n-o-w-s-k-i.

BOLDT: Thank you.

MALINOWSKI: There are many shameful elements of this dysfunctional planning process that's occurred. I think one of the ones that I'm most disgusted with is the personal attacks on all of you. I think you all deserve to be treated with respect and I hope that everyone that participates today will focus on the issues and not on personal attacks.

Another shameful, I think one of the most shameful aspects of this is the performance of County staff. One of the reasons this is a dysfunctional process is because staff refused to consider the concerns of rural residents in coming up with alternatives. They basically came up with three no growth alternatives. And the reason Alternative 4 had to be developed was because of County staff. If the rural citizens have to sue the County because you go -- you decide to adopt a plan other than Alternative 4, one of the issues will be performance of the staff. We did not have a valid public process in establishing the alternatives for this plan.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

And it's interesting, it seems to me like I sense a gleefulness on the part of the County staff that they may be able to persuade the moderate majority now to adopt a different preferred plan.

I urge you to maintain Alternative 4 as the preferred plan. If you elect to make one of the staff alternatives the preferred plan, I believe you need to explain to the rural citizens of this county why it's okay for our county to have far more restrictive rural zoning than any other county in the state.

BOLDT: Thank you.

James Morgan -- Excuse me. Please don't do that -- James Morgan.

MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, respective Councilors, my name is James Morgan. I reside in Clark County about two miles north of Washougal.

I'm strongly opposed to the plan specifically to add the 40-acre Kysar Development, RODJK subdivision to the urban growth boundary for several reasons. I have a PowerPoint that I will highlight shortly. I have environmental concerns deforesting the remaining 28 acres of a large number and a large number of 20-plus year old Douglas Firs and other mature tree species to (inaudible) significant environmental impact.

Destroying several non-fish bearing streams and a watershed critical

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

aquifer recharge area and riparian habitat conservation area that flow to the Washougal River from this elevation of 500 feet to the river at 79 feet above sea level about one mile to the west. Displacing or destroying very desirable species of wildlife including deer, small mammals, owls and other raptors, amphibians and reptiles from the neighborhood.

Addressing the PowerPoint, it is entitled an aerial environmental perspective of proposal to add the 40-acre RODJK subdivision to the urban growth boundary in Clark County north of Washougal.

Next slide, please. This highlights the RODJK subdivision which is an L-shaped lot, again, with a stream flowing through the middle of it.

The next slide, please. This is an aerial photo from Google Earth. Unfortunately it was taken before 12 acres of trees were removed from the southern aspect of this site in preparation for the cluster development of eight one-acre lots.

Next slide. It is hard to see this slide, but there is some white shady hazy areas that point out streams flowing from this area to the Washougal River down this elevation.

The next slide. This is a terrain photo showing how the natural

watershed occurs.

Next slide, please. This shows the corner of that development. As you may have noticed on previous slides, there is also a rather isolated eight-acre parcel in the northwest corner that is excluded from the request in this expansion of the urban growth boundary. It is a rather peninsular extension of the urban growth boundary to add this 40-acre lot.

Next slide, please. Here you also see arrows highlighting the drainage.

Next slide, please. That was copied from the County website three days ago. It shows that it is land valued as designated forest land. It points out its critical aquifer recharge area. It shows the riparian habitat conservation area and highlights slopes more than 15 percent.

Next slide, please. Please consider the pertinent aspects of the environmental element, goals and policies of Clark County in your planning decisions. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Good job.

Barbara Zavanelli-Morgan. Did I get that right? Morning.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

ZAVANELLI-MORGAN: Morning. Morning, Mr. Chairman and Councilors, respective Councilors. I will spell my name because everybody asks me to. It's Barbara, Z-a-v-a-n-e-l-l-i hyphen M-o-r-g-a-n. I live west and downhill from the parcel that James Morgan just discussed.

I oppose the inclusion of this Washougal parcel, 40 acres bordered by SE 342nd Avenue and SE 20th Street into the 2016 Clark County urban growth boundary expansion. It is my understanding - now I'm not quite sure I understand, but this is what I wrote - it's my understanding that prior to presenting the developer's request to include these 40 acres into the urban growth boundary, the City of Washougal reported to Clark County that it had enough land to accommodate the predicted growth through 2035. If this is so, then why would Clark County allow this inclusion? That's all I have to say. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Very good.

Nathan Ek.

EK: Good morning, Councilors. I'm Nathan Ek, E-k, from Yacolt, Washington. Nathan Ek.

HOLLEY: Ek?

EK: Yes. E-k. Yeah.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

I have a unique perspective as a land use consultant in the area of septic systems and soils while also being a fourth generation north county resident. There's a couple of myths out there that I'd like to clear up for the record.

One myth is that septic systems are primitive and that they pollute the groundwater. The State of Washington has the most advanced septic codes in the nation. New homes have excellent sewage treatment much so -- much so that on-site systems are cleaning up the sewage even better than the municipal sewer systems all while recharging the aquifers, and Clark County's model O&M program assures these systems work properly.

Another myth is that the infrastructure cannot handle this growth. Last Friday there was a town hall meeting at Hockinson High. The fellow from CPU explained that they are well positioned to handle development with adequate water rights available to supply 50 years of growth in this county and we all know that the rural component is a very small percentage of that.

A third myth is that Madore cooked up this plan on his own. Councilor Madore worked to surround himself with volunteer experts, industry experts to analyze the codes and apply them to rural areas in developing a plan that will stand in court. He contacted myself and

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

other members of the local on-site septic system advisory committee and also local water/well experts as to the limits of lot sizes and setbacks while also correcting errors in the Draft EIS regarding soil types. These letters supporting these efforts are in the public record.

One item of note, and this is very interesting to me, was during one of these discussions we were trying to figure out what to write in this letter and I had asked for a suggestion from Councilor Madore. His response was we want the truth. That's all he wanted was the truth. That was so refreshing. As a constituent and an industry member, it was invigorating to us. We wanted to help and there's this perception out there that he's going at it alone. He surrounded himself with industry experts that know the codes, know the industry, know the land development and it made us realize that he was doing this for the right reasons.

Why did Commissioner Madore have to turn to the local industry for help? Because staff wouldn't. When recently asked, the staff at the Health Department implied that they hadn't even been contacted by the County planning staff regarding the planning assumptions. Planning staff apparently refuses to do anything productive regarding analysis of Alternative 4, instead doing what they can to place sticks in the spokes of the Preferred Alternative. You cannot continue to turn a blind eye to the staff agenda.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

There's another falsehood that if this the County will be paved over if the Preferred Alternative stands, this is simply not the case. There is for a 20-year supply of lots, it will be a gradual supply, and listen to the rural residents. They are who put you into office, not these myths. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Val Alexander. Val Alexander. Morning.

REISBICK: Good morning. Sydney Reisbick, R-e-i-s-b-i-c-k. I'm asking to switch with Val Alexander because I have a sister in the hospital in Olympia and need to go.

I would like to consider a little bit about some lot issues, but first one is that there are small acre lots all over the county and it was that very increase in the small acre lots all over the state that was the urge, the impetus for starting the growth management plan all over the state as a state issue because the small lots were being developed helter-skelter all over and there was not a way to look to the future and try to preserve some agricultural and forestry reserves for the future. Okay. And that is -- that is why there are so many one-acre lots or small lots all over the county.

The second reason is that as soon as people started talking the idea

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

of keeping some large areas for the future, a lot of people started dividing their land in case there should be a growth management plan and that created more small acres. So, yes, part of the truth on the ground is small acres, but that doesn't mean that those should determine what the future looks like.

BOLDT: Okay.

REISBICK: Am I out?

BOLDT: No.

REISBICK: Okay.

The other thing is that there's another use of the small acres that I heard being used in Alternative 4 and that was as truth on the ground and that the small acres could determine the acres around them. So if you had small acres beside you, you could develop. You could divide and develop. We don't have any way to know -- okay. Now, as I understand it, the Assessor's map was used by Alternative 4. If that's true, that includes a lot of tax lots which are not buildable. So are we going to use lots that are not buildable to take apart larger lots nearby them? Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Very good.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

Is it James and Vicki Brunberg?

BRUNBERG: The spelling of my last name is B-r-u-n-b-e-r-g. And I live about a mile and a half north of the City of Washougal.

And my reason for being here is to state that it's essential that the County Councilors vote to not include Parcel 130047 in the Washougal earth or urban holding area. The map that is labeled Page 3 clearly encloses this area and many others are going to speak to the multiple environmental, habitat and water-related features of this. My process, my concept here is to define the process, my understanding what's happened.

On August 13th of 2014, approximately 18 months ago, that piece of property was purchased by a logger/developer. The property was identified by the County as being a riparian habitat conservation area and designated forest land. The satellite map that's on Page 4, the next page, on the right side demonstrates the appearance of this property at the time. It was the purchaser's immediate first action to apply for a logging permit for the mature logs that are on that property and to apply for a development permit.

An environmental assessment was done by the County on the property and it identified that there was a single seasonal stream on the property. If one looks at these maps taken by a satellite from outer

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

space, it's clearly evident there are several streams on that property and those streams are outlined on Page 5. That property does not have a single non-single seasonal stream on it. It has at least three streams that go through it. That same stream goes through the back of my property immediately adjacent to it.

This has dramatically influenced the logging that was done on that property, which is on the picture on the left side of Page 4 where this area has now been clear-cut. This has been done and the owner has been given a map for cluster development on the property that he has subsequently applied to the City for Washougal to change that designation to make it an R1-7.5, which will place 200 houses or more, roughly 250 onto that single parcel of land, and the picture of that is obvious from the first page.

I'm urging you to vote no on this. I'm also indicating that I feel that our due process of citizens has been violated in this process. There has been no input to the City of Washougal and the (inaudible) indicates that he will not accept input regarding this property.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you.

Vicki Brunberg.

BRUNBERG: Thank you. You have the spelling of my last name and I live on 20th, SE 20th also, and I wanted to just make a couple of

comments about the process.

There has been no due process. There's not one neighbor that has been notified, old or new, in that neighborhood, not one single one. I want to reiterate what Oliver said and what the City has said about that parcel not being necessary for the urban growth pattern at this time.

At the City Council meeting that is on video, there was one comment that was mentioned by I think it was not one of the council members but someone else who was advising the council member for a reason for doing this at this time and that was that it doesn't cost any money and the City then could control the property. So the statement that this property control remains with the County until it's annexed is, to me, completely irrelevant and, in fact, false.

What I see as the immediate motivations for this bringing this parcel into the urban growth pattern is, first of all, to negate the agreement that was made with Clark County to establish this cluster lot and retain the rest of the 28 acres for the wonderful urban or the wonderful natural habitat that exists there that was done about a year ago. That would be null and void if this is brought into the urban growth area. Instead what would replace that agreement is that, under my understanding, logging could proceed on all of the property and we've been told by several people that that could happen

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

immediately.

Also the land zoning goes from one home per five acres up to 5.8 homes per acres which, by my calculations, is 232 homes or 29 times the present zoning density. My son said the other night that's 2900 percent and I looked at him and he said, well, it is. Figure it out. But an easier way to think of it is we're going to 29 times what has been there.

It's completely inconsistent with the rest of the area that's there and that's why you're getting this reaction from homeowners old and new. You've heard from someone who's been there, I think, for decades, your first testimony and from those of us that just moved in.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you very much.

BRUNBERG: Thanks for listening.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Rick Dunning. Morning, sir.

DUNNING: Morning. For the record, Rick Dunning, D-u-n-n-i-n-g. And I'm here to ask for your support of Alternate 4 to maintain a crucial part of this county.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

57

I am honored to speak for the small landowners of our county. Had the opportunity to do that for a number of years around this state. And why do we need to protect these folks? Well, the reason is because they are your unsung heroes when it comes to air quality, water quality, wildlife habitat. I could give you all the details of how 5.6 of our automobiles, the carbon dioxide is used up for every acre of timberland we have out there. I could tell you that out of the 400,000 acres in this county, half of it is forested and half of that is owned by these small forest landowners and the importance of them and the location they are.

So why do we need Alternate 4 for these people? Their business plans that they must have if we're going to maintain them is not like anyone else's business plan in this county. It's multi-generational in the fact that their product is 70, 80, 90 years old before it gets sold. These folks need some support of integrating their families on to their large lots. We need small acreages on the corner of these parcels to keep families engaged.

Love of the land is as important as their management practices and their ability to harvest through time. If we continue to marginalize that, we will lose them. And so I just speak strongly to consider finding a way to keep these folks out there, because without them, our county is going to change greatly.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

Now, Clark County has taken a different way of dealing with this through time. I was here when Busse Nutley, Commissioner Nutley and Magnano brought this GMA down on us and King County, for instance, through the work of Forterra are doing a tremendous job of transfer of development rights and purchase of development rights. Our planners and our county are not looking at that. We should be doing so. And in due respect to the planners, I mean, these guys are GMA experts. They're urban planners. They've come out of school with a great amount of knowledge, but they really don't have a grasp of the issues of rural areas.

So with all due respect for them, just a little bit of education would go a long ways in getting them to understand the needs out there. We can provide that. We'd like to help you with that, but please allow us to have some flexibility in our land division rights on these rural parcels. Thank you.

BOLDT: Very good. Thank you.

Jamie Howsley. Jamie Howsley.

HOWSLEY: Already to me?

BOLDT: Morning.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

HOWSLEY: Morning. Chair Boldt, Councilors. For the record, Jamie Howsley with the law firm of Jordan Ramis.

I thank you for the opportunity to represent five clients with site-specific requests here today. With me also who will later testify is Bruce Prenguber from GlobalWise. He will speak to two of these specific site-specific requests. Go ahead and move forward, Jose.

Here's a key which has been provided to you that indicates where the properties are located. The first request is in regards to the massive property off of Columbia Tie Road north of Yacolt. If you can go ahead and forward it, Jose. Here's the property. As you can see, it's a highly parcelized area, sort of surrounded by larger forest land that's owned by Department of Natural Resources. The request here would be if the County does move forward to create a Forest 20 zone that that would be applied to this area and specifically that property.

Go ahead and move forward. One more, Jose. The next request is one that you already heard Mayor Onslow and Councilwoman Day speak about that the City of Ridgefield is bringing forward and this is the Milt Brown request. Bruce will come forward and give a specific update as to what GlobalWise has done to analyze the resource aspects of this. We've also provided a legal memorandum in the record to give

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

our legal view as to this as to whether or not it is resource land or not. I would just ask that the Commissioners look at that and support the request from the City of Ridgefield.

Go ahead and move forward a couple, Jose. The next request, this is out in the area of Duluth at 219th and 10th. This is more of a long-term request for the Councilors that should we look at bringing in additional employment lands in the future that this area give due consideration. It has urban and industrial reserve overlay over it.

Go ahead and move forward a couple. The next two requests are off of 152nd just north of 99th. This parcel is called the Riverview or Dempsey property. It was brought into the boundary in 2004 with a zoning and comprehensive plan designation of business park. Since that time, the Battle Ground School District has been interested in purchasing a large portion of this property for a K through 8. That is -- so with that request, we would like to see this comp plan designation changed over to urban low in order to facilitate that as a permitted use rather than seeing that move forward as a conditional use.

And then right across the street - I'm trying to be efficient with my time here. Move forward a couple, Jose. - is the Gustafson property. So this is a little bit confusing, Because the cities were asked as to whether or not they would entertain additional properties

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

coming into their urban growth area. This property is in the City of Vancouver UGA, but it doesn't have a specific advocate because it is in unincorporated urban Clark County. We, therefore, submitted a request similar to when the other time frames for the other cities were submitted on March 3rd. It included an analysis provided by GlobalWise which we submitted later supporting the inclusion of this property.

Surrounded by it is you have the Urban Oaks subdivision directly to the south as well as Dunning Meadows and across the street is the Fieldstone Estate project. Clark Regional Wastewater District also submitted a letter to the Board, I believe, last week indicating that it has sewer readily available and, in fact, the district made a huge investment in the area with the sewer pump station located right in front as well as transmission line.

And, finally, to answer one of the questions about doing a Supplemental EIS on this property, this area going north as well was included in the 2004 comprehensive plan under Alternatives 1 and Alternative 4, so it's already been studied. I think it could be supplemented very easily with the additional information that we've provided in the record for consideration and at this juncture. So with that, I'll entertain any questions that you may have on this as well as the process.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

BOLDT: Okay.

HOWSLEY: Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you very much.

John Ley.

LEY: John Ley of Camas.

Councilors, we hear a great deal these days about affordable housing. One portion of the Growth Management Act is about providing enough land for cities to expand their boundaries and add land for growth without increasing the supply of land for homes, businesses and infrastructure, a city becomes unaffordable for its citizens. Since 1994, our county population has almost doubled from 280,000 to over 450,000. Cities within the county are requesting additional land be added to their city limits so they can grow. They've also adjusted their zoning in many cases often lowering minimum lot sizes so more homes can be built in a neighborhood. Smaller lots are more affordable than larger lots.

Today I'd like you to consider this idea of affordable farming. Imagine a young couple in their early 20s, they've been married for two to three years and want to start a family, but they also desire to raise that family on a small family farm. Their meager savings

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

won't go very far, but the rural lifestyle will provide the opportunity to teach their children about raising animals, like chickens, goats and lambs. Farm chores will teach responsibility and provide physical fitness. The eggs, milk and meat will provide fresh wholesome food. But there's a problem, the minimum lot size for a significant number of R and AG zoned lots is 20 acres. Only the rich can afford to buy these lots. A young small family can't afford the price let alone the taxes on the larger lot sizes.

The 1994 GMA zoning map increased minimum lot sizes on rural lands. Far too many parcels with one- or five-acre zoning were increased to 10 or 20 acres in both R and AG zones. More importantly, even as local cities reduced their minimum lot sizes for development and new housing, the exact opposite was happening in our rural areas. With the stroke of a pen, affordable farming was made much, much harder. A friend of mine lives on a small two and a half acre family farm in our county. How sad is it that a young couple today will be hard-pressed to find a similar small parcel of AG or R zoned land where they can start their own family farm and raise their children.

Please take the personalities and egos out of this. Say yes to affordable farming. Say yes to affordable rural lifestyles for current and future Clark County families. Let's make our rural lifestyle more affordable by reducing minimum lot sizes. Please restore their property rights rural landowners have taken from them

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

21 years ago. Say yes to Alternative 4 and say yes to affordable farming. Thank you.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you.

Steve Horenstein.

HORENSTEIN: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

BOLDT: Morning.

HORENSTEIN: Good morning. Mr. Chair, members of the Council, for the record Steve Horenstein, local land use attorney.

I want to speak on two topics today. First is Alternative 4. I support the desires of the rural landowners. I'm saddened by the path that their leadership has taken them down because it's a huge distraction. Alternative 4, as it is before you and the various iterations that have been before the Board, is not sustainable under the Growth Management Act. It simply isn't. It will be appealed to the Growth Management Hearings Board. It will be sent right back to you.

And the reason for that, the reasons for those are many and in some cases complex, but fundamentally there are two. One is that the Growth Management Act requires that we urbanize the urban areas and

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

that includes expansion of urban growth boundaries to accommodate urban development and that we keep the rural areas rural. Did rural landowners in some cases lose under the Growth Management Act? Yes, it definitely created winners and losers.

The better option rather than adopt Alternative 4 is to finish the plan and deal with the rural area and then come right back and deal with some of the options that are available, are legal and are defensible to address the concerns of the -- of the rural landowners. It just saddens me that we've gotten to where we've gotten on this.

The second thing I'd like to very briefly -- oh, the other thing about Alternative 4 that fundamentally is indefensible is our inability to fund a capital facilities plan particularly for transportation that will support the level of urbanization in the rural area. As those of you that have been through the travails of the Growth Management Act appeals before know you have to have a capital facilities plan to match your land use plan, and if you don't have -- if you can't afford a capital facilities plan to do that, then you have to cut back on the land use plan. The County does not have the transportation dollars to support a capital facilities plan for the existing Alternative 4. That's an indisputable legal principle that we would have trouble with here.

The other thing that I want to quickly reference is to support City

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

of La Center's request for a very modest expansion to its urban growth boundary along the La Center Road. I represent 3B NW an LLC that owns about 15 or thereabouts, give or take, of those 56 acres. We had some discussion about that - I think I did with Commissioner Madore at the last hearing on this issue - agreed that the expansion of the boundary should be limited to the western boundary of that boundary and not Paradise Park Road. You may recall that, Commissioner. And that's my testimony. Happy to answer any questions.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you very much.

HORENSTEIN: Thank you.

BOLDT: Good job.

Mark Collier. We have three more before lunch. Morning.

COLLIER: Morning.

BOLDT: Or good afternoon, I guess.

COLLIER: Yeah. My name is Mark Collier and I'm a local septic designer. Last name is C-o-l-l-i-e-r.

I was reviewing what was written for Assumption 3 which talks about

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

lot sizes and septic systems and they basically said rural parcels that have less than one-acre environmental unconstrained lands significant for septic systems and well clearances should not be counted as likely to develop. And the consultant said basically that was an invalid conclusion.

When you have less than an acre, it's very, very difficult to get a septic approval, plus you can't create new lots for septic approvals using variances on it. So basically the numbers are so low in my jobs that I do in a year, maybe I'll do one, maybe two a year, so if you take all the other consultants involved, it's just a very low number.

The consultant's response was the ability to request waivers when property size is not adequate to host septic systems coupled with large on-site septic systems serving multiple residences makes these lots possible to develop. That statement is just taking apples and oranges from the rules and throwing it all together and it sounds good, but it's just really not a true statement.

A large on-site system is if you have 3500 gallons per day in a development. You don't see taking existing lots, putting it together and doing a large system off-site for several reasons: The Health Department policy is to have each septic system on the same lot that it serves. It's expensive to have these large on-site

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

systems. They've got to be designed by an engineer and approved at the State level, not the local level. It's constantly -- it's very time consuming. Also you can't do large on-site systems on the poor soils because they're not allowed. We're required to have two foot of vertical separation.

So in a lot of these cases where you see single-family homes in the rural areas that you think are wet areas, we're doing advanced treatment systems where we can't do it for large on-site. Also the operation and maintenance of these systems that is very intense, they want a separate entity to do the operation/maintenance, usually meaning public agencies, and they don't want to take them on. I think they also talk about setbacks that can be reduced. The Health Department takes reducing setbacks very seriously and the numbers of those setbacks are very low.

At the end, they refer to examples of other counties which I kind of question why they didn't talk about Clark County and what we actually do here. So I think it's just their response was just very poor, and like I say, grabbing fragments of rules and regulations and try to put together something that sounds good which just isn't correct.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

MADORE: Mike Collier, can you provide that in a written document for us, please.

COLLIER: I can write something up, yeah.

MADORE: Thank you.

BOLDT: Bruce Prenger. I probably said that wrong. Prenger. You can spell it for me. I always get it wrong, Bruce.

PRENGUBER: Absolutely. It's Bruce Prenguber, P-r-e-n-g-u-b-e-r.

I'm here today to discuss two properties in reference to Mr. Howsley's comments and Mr. Onslow's comments. The first property is located called the Gustafson property that you've heard referenced previously. It's on -- just abuts the Vancouver UGA, and I would like to -- my analysis covers the agricultural feasibility or lack thereof, and my report has been submitted to you, so I'll only highlight some main points.

My analysis supports de-designation from agricultural use of this land with the request that this property be brought into the Vancouver UGA. There are two ag improvements on this property: perimeter fencing and subsurface tile drainage, both are nonfunctional. The property was part of a dairy farm. It's been closed as a dairy farm

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

for over 20 years and there's been no maintenance of those agriculture improvements. The land is rented for about \$700 an acre. The landowner cannot cover their costs of taxes and other ownership expenses with that amount of rent.

I have also analyzed economic feasibility of that property in terms of producing crops, the crops that have been grown on it and/or livestock production, and there's no feasible net return from the cost of production. So I've also looked at soils -- excuse me -- soils are very much a part of productivity. The soils in that area on that property are 6e by USDA's classification. That is well below prime farm soils.

Let me quickly turn to the other property that I'd like to discuss very briefly and that is the 18 properties abutting the Ridgefield UGA that has been referenced by Mayor Onslow and others. Again, I looked at that and you have a report in your possession, I won't go into great detail, but again, by my analysis, looking at all the GMA factors, those parcels do not meet the standard of long-term commercial viability for agricultural use.

I will really cut short my comments here by also saying that both of these properties, if you look at while they're in the ag zone, the parcelization that has gone on around them is to the point that the conversion of these lands to non-resource lands would not impact

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

the other properties in their vicinity. So, again, the soils on this other property are also not in the prime category of USDA.

I appreciate very much the opportunity to speak to you this morning. If you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Troy Uskoski. Morning.

USKOSKI: Morning. Troy Uskoski, U-s-k-o-s-k-i. I'm a large lot owner and a tree farmer in Northern Clark County. Mark probably knew my grandfather, Everett Uskoski. He was from the Hockinson area and was a farmer and a tree farmer in La Center.

I'd like to follow up on Rick's speech and just say that I recently purchased a tree farm in Northern Clark County and it was mostly clear-cut and had some second growth timber on it, but I planted trees five years ago. I may or may not harvest those trees. My children may. At this time, I'm a 40-acre lot in a 80-acre zone. I have five-acre R-5 just across the fence from me, but I have no options for allowing my children to actually build on that lot. It's one buildable lot at this point. So I would just ask that Alternative 4 at this point is really the only rural landowner alternative available that you would at least consider that or some modified version of that to accommodate our needs. Thank you.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

BOLDT: Thank you very much. Good job.

David McDonald. David McDonald.

ORJIAKO: He left.

BOLDT: Okay. We are going to break for lunch for a half hour. We will be back at 1:10 and probably give you a warning, looking at the pages, we will try and get through public testimony today and then we will probably have deliberations next week, the way it looks to me, so give you fair warning. And with that, we're at ease until 1:10.

(Pause in proceedings.)

BOLDT: Thank you. The Board will reconvene and we'll start off with Val Alexander. I know she's here.

MIELKE: No, they traded.

MCCAULEY: She shook her head no.

BOLDT: What?

STEWART: Well, so she has somebody to speak for her.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

MCCAULEY: She needs somebody to speak for her. She switched with Sydney.

MIELKE: They traded with Sydney.

BOLDT: Oh. Oh, her name is here again. Okay. Just raise your hand when she's here.

Okay. Curt Massie. This may be it. Always is interesting in the afternoon.

Jim Kasla. Hello?

Okay. Robert DeFord. No one here? We can go fast.

Thomas West. Thomas West. Very good. You got the lucky number. Steve Cox is next. Afternoon.

WEST: Good afternoon. I hope you enjoyed your lunch as much as I enjoyed mine. It was quick. My name is Thomas West, W-e-s-t.

I live at the end of 20th Street north of Washougal and I'm here to speak in opposition to Parcel No. 130047-000, the inclusion of the L-lot into the additional urban growth boundary for the City of

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

Washougal. I also represent and serve as the president of the Skyriver HOA, which is a rural community of 32 families that lives astride the Washougal River in that beautiful area.

And as their representative, I want to speak also to the fact that we've enjoyed the opportunity to create a community up there and I believe that the folks living up on what I would call the bench or the plateau there above Washougal are able to enjoy a really lovely lifestyle for ourselves and our families and we respect and acknowledge the economic ties that we share with the City of Washougal and the City of Camas because obviously we're closely tied to them.

Those of us that have children, they go to school there. We're part of those communities. But we're opposed to this proposal, and I think you've heard a lot of reasons why. It's an L-shaped development. It's a peninsula into an area that's already developed fully, but I'd like to respond to some of what the City of Washougal said. They said, first of all, we have adequate space and we're not advocating for this additional property, but since the developer asked for it, we're willing to accept it.

What I'd first like to point out that the developer asked for two things. They first asked to clear the land and develop it. They struck a deal with the County and the forester to salvage a key part of that land which was riparian and forest and protected the wildlife

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

75

in that area. And then at the same time, they were in the midst of that deal, they were in the process of making another deal with the City of Washougal to have this property added by their request to the urban boundary.

Well, that seems to fly in the face of what they were agreeing to with the County, which was to leave 28 acres because we know that taking it out is going to shorten the period of time before it's taken into the City. So we feel that what this amounts to is there's not a need for this property. The City is saying we don't care, but they really do care. They're willing to do the worst type of planning, which is to take it by default and then develop it and destroy a community in the process.

We believe that a more honest and appropriate approach would be to engage the neighborhood in trying to identify how to best develop that area rather than back-dooring into the process, and I thank you for your time.

BOLDT: Thank you. Good job.

Steve Cox. Afternoon

COX: Good afternoon, Chair. My name is Steve Cox, C-o-x. I'm here on behalf of Liz Pike, executive as it was Legislative District 18 to read a letter that she had written to the Councilors last night

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

for the record. May I begin?

BOLDT: Yes.

COX: Dear Councilors, I urge you to support the Preferred Alternative that includes Alternative 4 adopted November 24th, 2015, as you move forward with Clark County's comprehensive land use plan update because it is the right thing to do.

As representatives of the people, we are reminded by our Supreme Court the essence of democracy is that the right to make laws rests in people -- with the people and flows through the government, not the other way around. Freedom resides first in the people without need of a grant from the government.

As a State representative in Legislative District 18, I represent a larger number of rural landowners in Clark County more than any other district. For the past four years in office, I have heard repeatedly from constituents about the need for comprehensive land use reform in our rural areas. Since 1994 our citizens have been shortchanged and disrespected by past elected Boards of County Commissioners. It is my sincere hope they will not be shortchanged and disrespected by this current Board of Councilors.

Instead of deferring to staff who has no skin in the game, Councilors

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

should respect the desires of a broad majority of those who actually own and pay taxes on the land. Councilors have an obligation to support the rich culture heritage of our farming and forestry families that span many generations.

I urge you to support a strong, thriving and a sustainable rural economy in the same manner you support economic development with our cities. Why would Clark County Councilors place a higher value on employment within our cities over jobs in our rural counties -- communities? There is no cognitive reason to deny economic development opportunities for all citizens regardless of which hamlet they reside.

Alternative 4 will allow for more affordable housing by increasing the supply of a variety of parcel sizes to meet the real estate demands of the citizens desires. Alternative 4 will increase tax revenue to the County while utilizing existing infrastructure. It is clear Alternative 4 is fully compliant with the Growth Management Act provisions for five-acre minimum lot size. Since this plan is consistent with the majority of the counties in Washington State by using predominant parcel sizes, the threat of limitation by land use attorneys and government bureaucrats is simply a red herring designed to intimidate members of the Council.

Furthermore, Alternative 4 uses accurate population growth

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

assumptions and enables the County to comply with Washington State's Office of Financial Management Protection numbers.

Lastly, Alternative 4 represents a major compromise from a plan originally represented -- presented by Clark County's rural land -- most landowners two years ago. Most importantly, it is clear Alternative 4 represents what the majority of rural and resource landowners desire in responsible land use policy. It is our job as elected officials to represent the will of the voters we serve. We must never forget we answer to them.

At your hearing on February 16, 2016, you have two choices: you can further advance the negative stereotype of politicians who make promises and then ignore the will of the citizens they serve or you can take a refreshing approach to governance of the people by the people and for the people. I urge you to respect the values of an overwhelming majority of our constituents and reaffirm Alternative 4 as the Preferred Alternative in support and in efforts to update Clark County's land use plan. Respectfully, State Representative Liz Pike, Washington's 18th Legislative District.

I support her comment as well.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you.

**BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016**

COX: Thank you.

BOLDT: George Hacker. George Hacker. Afternoon.

HACKER: My name is Hacker, H-a-c-k-e-r, and thank you for listening to me, Councilors. I am a property owner in rural Clark County. I live in Venersborg. I live on a 2.7-acre parcel.

I have no benefit for Alternative 4 because I can't subdivide and that's okay. The reason I'm here is because I'm representing my neighbors. I believe that I have neighbors that have larger lots and parcels that have been in the community much longer than I have. The 1994 moratorium on rural development has impacted them, and so I would encourage you to support Alternative 4 and uphold it. I think it's something that's an important part of a comprehensive plan and I think rural homeowners deserve something that comprehensive if it's done every 20 years.

I don't -- the only way I would be impacted by Alternative 4 is that I might have more neighbors. There might be a little more development, but I hear people talking about being paved over in high density. It's rural development. It's different. I live on two and a half acres and I raise my family there and I'm glad that I had that opportunity, but I never could have had that opportunity with 5, 10, 20 acres of prime land. So I would ask you, Councilors, please

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

80

continue to move forward with Alternative 4. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Jessica Sarkinen. Jessica Sarkinen. Sarkinen.

James Misner.

MISNER: Good afternoon, Councilors.

BOLDT: Hi.

MADORE: Good afternoon to you.

MISNER: It's a unique time. The last time I was in this room, I was on that side of the bench. Good to be back here with you today. My name is Jim Misner. I reside at 18013 NE 159th Street in Brush Prairie otherwise know as the Hockinson.

I'm here in support of Alternative 4 specifically the Forest 40, two 10 and even more specifically regarding Parcel 205384. That is the parcel that belongs to my wife's family. It's 120-year-old, 160-acre homestead where they have raised their families and where my wife and I hope to raise ours.

There's a couple of points I'd like to make. I've had many roles in my life. The one that I have currently is that of a lender here

in Clark County. And I've got a really unique problem right now is that I have a lot of buyers that are pre-qualified, ready to buy and they cannot buy at their level. First-time home buyers level is about 200,000 to 215,000, and we have a crisis in Clark County right now around affordable housing that is happening.

The other thing I wanted to touch on is from a builder's perspective. I've had opportunities to build. I've developed land both here in Clark County and in Cowlitz County. The last big project was turning a 50-acre island into a zip line park with tree houses in the middle of a lake. It wasn't easy, but we were able to do it.

So some of the misconceptions I'd like to talk about is that if we are turning some of these larger acre parcels and going smaller, there are some people who say, well, you know, what about the impacts? What's going to happen to these areas that we so love? Well, I'll tell you not much. You're going to have a house there is what you're going to have, but you're still going to have a lot of forest around them.

When you are building, the process of dividing your property should be rather simple; however, being able to prove that you can build on that property is not. You still have to meet minimum setbacks. You still have to be 200 feet from an open tributary. You still have to be able to find water that can pump from three to five gallons