

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

per minute to even get financing, without that you're not going to. You still have to have soils that can handle a septic system that will perk. The new septic systems work on drip operations. They are completely different than they were 35 years ago. These things are built to last. And having done a lot of work with water resource and inventory areas around Washington State, it is true that when you have water come through a septic system that's being pumped out of an aquifer, it's actually returning to your tributaries, more water in the tributary is the net result of that.

Furthermore, they talk about Option 4 that there may be 12,401 lots through this if this were to occur. The median household price in Clark County is \$271,000. Okay. If that were to occur and if you were to attach a one percent assessment on those which is slightly lower than what we're currently at, that would equate to about \$33,606,710 of additional revenue in Clark County annually. Over that 20-year period, if we chose to do nothing, Clark County would miss out on about \$672,134,200 of that 20-year period. That is your roads. That is the money that you would need for those impacts. And people say we'll have additional impacts. Yes, we will.

So, in conclusion, for somebody to stand up here and say that they advocate for one parcel turned into hundreds of developable properties on one parcel yet they do not support others who have 40-acre parcels that want to go to a 10, to me, that is self-centered

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

and borderlines on hypocrisy. I think if you supported this, you will have a debate and you will be challenged by the Department of Ecology no matter which way you go. I implore you that if you are going to debate with them anyway, please do it on behalf of the will of your constituency in rural Clark County. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Good job.

Russell Chambers. Russell Chambers. Deane Allin is next.

CHAMBERS: Russell Chambers, C-h-a-m-b-e-r-s. I live at 4105 C Street in Washougal. I own a property adjoining the 40-acre proposed inclusion north of Washougal.

We've talked about riparian zone. We've talked about environment. I'm here to talk about an additional 4 to 500 trips a day through the 32nd Street/Evergreen across the railroad tracks, up 32nd Street and down a lane and a half unlined county road that's being proposed. This is a lump, a wart on a proposed -- on the Washougal urban growth boundary that really doesn't belong. Washougal can't afford to maintain it, can't afford to maintain the roads they have and they're not going to get any better by adding this group of houses, so...

BOLDT: Okay.

CHAMBERS: I agree with everything else that's been said and that's

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

all I have to say.

BOLDT: Thank you. Good job.

Deane Allin.

ALLIN: Good afternoon, Councilors, staff and attendees. My name is Deane, D-e-a-n-e, Allin, A-l-l-i-n. Both names are spelled differently. I reside at 1401 SE 329th Avenue in Washougal.

My purpose in speaking here today is against Alternate 3.e which is the development that was previously spoken about up there in yellow and I've got a number of reasons for opposing this. It is our understanding that if this occurs, this parcel would be rezoned R1-7.5, which will allow up to six 7500-square foot lots per acre. Per Mitch Kneipp, the Washougal Community Director, if it comes into the City, it will be 7500-square foot lots. It also -- it is also our understanding that the Clark County Planning Commission recommended that the above land not be included in the Washougal growth area, but that the County Councilors ignored this recommendation.

There are numerous valid reasons for our opposition, including, but not limited to, the adverse impact on existing vegetation, wildlife and waterways and the lack of suitable infrastructure to handle increased traffic.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

Additionally, the County approved an eight-lot cluster development on 12 acres, 12 of the 41 acres in question. This occurred just in the last 18 months. These eight lots were in lieu of the eight five-acre parcels as zoned. I viewed this as a win/win decision. The developer was able to build eight upscale homes in a 12-acre cluster for which construction of the needed civil infrastructure is much lower and the neighborhood preserved we thought the remaining 28 acres of forested wildlife habitat. I respectfully request that Alternative 3.e be removed from the proposed urban growth boundary.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Pauline and Red Warren.

WARREN: That's two; right? Pauline and Red, two, three and three is six. Hi. I'm Pauline Warren and he's got to help me. I'm confused. I do live here in the county just out of the boundaries of the city and I love county. I come here as a nonprofessional. All this is tremendously confusing.

There was a chart up there and I thought, hmm, I went four rounds through here and I couldn't find it. It said Table 1-2, couldn't find it. But I found this other one and it's on Page 1 of 8 and it says Table 1: GIS Rural Vacant Buildable Lands Model (VBLM) Assumptions and it's a chart. So it says here (existing) and

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

(proposed). Every possible -- (existing). Every possible rural parcel shall be counted as a parcel and will -- will develop regardless of conditions that would likely make such development unlikely. Now, that sounded peculiar to me.

And on the other side (proposed) it's quite a bit different. It says these rural assumptions should be used not to reflect what is possible, but to reasonably plan for what is likely. Parcels cannot reasonably be expected to develop should not be counted as parcels likely to develop.

Then I go back on the (existing) side and it says on 2, rural parcels located in areas far from basic infrastructure with continuous long term commercial forestry operations should be counted as parcels that will develop. I thought that's existing. That's existing, it says it here. Parcels located in areas far from infrastructure with long term commercial forestry - this is on the (proposed) side - operations likely to continue should not be counted as likely to develop.

Then I go down to Number 6, although county code prohibits most nonconforming parcels from developing, all, a-1-1, nonconforming parcels with 1 acre shall be counted as, not urban, it says here r-u-r-a-l, rural parcels that will, w-i-l-l, develop. Got it all?

BOLDT: Thank you.

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

WARREN: Red Warren here. We support Alternative 4 as the most equitable solution to a very longstanding problem foisted on the rural communities in our midst. This Board is now at a crossroad whether to determine to listen to the people or to impose their own ideas or the ideas of the professionals upon our rural neighbors.

This land -- these landowners have suffered for over 20 years with dogmatic regulations imposed upon them from above. Is this what we now will continue or will you five representatives actually consider representing these oppressed ones? To have unreasonable restrictions imposed upon those who sacrificed and worked for their property is unjust.

As we reflect on the impact that Washington and Lincoln had on American history, we were profoundly reminded of the importance and power of their office. You too are powerful and exert power for or against the people of this county for good or for evil. Are these within the bounds of the city -- are those -- excuse me -- are those within the bounds of the city limits to impose their philosophy and will on those in the rural areas? Is this not dividing and pinning one against the other? Has this not been the case for many years? Why else would one faction seek to impose its will on another if not for the love of money, the root of all evil. Where is the freedom of these property owners to control their fruit of their own labor?

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

Lincoln understood that the ultimate enemy of this great nation was not outsider borders but within that could ultimately be capable of bringing down this great nation or this county. The curse of one faction imposing its will on another, was that not what the whole Civil War was to correct? Lincoln said, America will never be destroyed from outside. If we falter and lose our freedoms, it will be because we destroyed ourselves.

We support Alternative 4 because it is the only alternative that recognizes the rights of our neighbors in the rural lands of Clark County. They have waited far too long for corrections to be made. Now is the time for reasonable decisions to recognize the rights of these families we have invested much time and money and effort in caring for this land. We all benefit. Let us recognize this fact and return to them the rights they had at one time but which were improperly taken away from them. Thank you for listening.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Harry Smith. Harry Smith. Harry Smith. Okay. Nicholas, is it Greene?

GREENE: Yes.

BOLDT: Good afternoon.

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

GREENE: My name is Nicholas Greene. I'm representing my father Stanley Greene.

The Clark County Planning Commission recommended to the Clark County Councilors for the Councilors to, quote, allow for a process for flexibility and opportunity for landowners who continuously owned their property prior to the 1994 plan to possibly divide their property, end quote. Our family supports the recommendation of the Planning Commission. We respectfully request that this Planning Commission recommendation please be included in whichever alternative update becomes the Preferred Alternative for the GMA update.

You have heard other members of our family speak on this subject. I know that other families have been severely affected by the 1994 GMA. We have heard Mr. Jones from Yacolt and a gentleman who owns property in the Camas area speak on the same subject. Also, the Styres family who own property near us in the Yacolt area have been adversely affected by the 1994 GMA. We should have the right to build homes for ourselves on our own land, but with that right, some of us may choose to build while others may choose not to build.

We believe it would be an alienation of our property rights if Clark County attempts to prohibit us from building our own homes on the

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

property which has been owned by our family for 60 years. We believe it would be unequal treatment for a non-compensated taking of the use of our property if Clark County attempts to prohibit us from building our homes on the property which we have owned in our family for 60 years. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Good job.

George Espinosa. Afternoon.

ESPINOSA: Good afternoon. George Espinosa, E-s-p-i-n-o-s-a.

Well, gentlemen, there's not much I can add to all the eloquent words you've heard this afternoon. I stand with Liz Pike. I think it's time that we return property rights to the people. I do have two requests. Number one, been going on for nine years now, please remove us from the urban growth boundary. We've been vacillating out there all this time. And please support Alternative 4 because that is the will of the people. And I think that you folks, the three of you committed the ultimate insult against the people when you failed to acknowledge and show up at the town meeting at Hockinson last Friday night. I felt insulted that you weren't there. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Nice job.

Is it Milan Kokta? I have that wrong. Afternoon.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

KOKTA: Hello. Good afternoon.

BOLDT: Uh-huh, right there, sir.

KOKTA: My name is Milan Kokta and I lived on the property which is about 15 or 1600 feet from the property mentioned in Alternative 3.e and I lived there for, like, 34 years.

I strongly oppose this putting 200 houses on the property into the middle of the rural area. There is no transportation. There is one lousy road which goes through there and which is not adequate for the traffic as it is now. And putting in 500 cars in there or 400 cars would actually make the problem much, much better.

The other thing is I look at the motives for this. The motives appear to be strictly perfect motive. There is no need, there is no major industry coming to Washougal, there is no need to put high-density housing development into the middle of the rural area. And I -- and it creates potential problems as have been stated here.

It creates a problem with ecology. It creates a problem with ecology of the Washougal River. It creates problem with the environment and habitat protection of the wildlife in there and it's absolutely unnecessary and I hope that this Commission will put higher priority

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

on protecting the environment than perfect motive of single corporation. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Elena Kokta, did you want to testify?

Okay. Jeff Eustis.

KOKTA: I'm coming. I'm coming.

BOLDT: Oh. Oh, okay. Could you spell your last name.

KOKTA: K-o-k-t-a.

BOLDT: Very good. Thank you.

KOKTA: Kokta, I'm his wife, yeah.

So I'm here for a similar reason for this by now famous Washougal parcel and I cannot see a reason why anybody would want to put 200 houses in the middle of five-acre lots. It does not fit there. And all the problems associated with this would be have already been mentioned, the traffic, the wildlife. But there's another aspect that nobody seemed to mention and that is a fire.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

93

The 20th Road, 20th Street ends on a dead-end. If there was a fire, there's no way out for us and then for the people that would live up there because the road that is there is really small and it's just like, you know, we don't burn there and there's quite a few residence on the dead-end road and then there's dead-end on 15th. All those would be eventually going on Lehr Road where this development is going to be.

So please be reasonable and take this out of this boundary and just leave it the way it was. By the way, I was here in 2007 discussing the same thing and at that time it went well. So please do it again. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Is it Jeff, Jeff Eustis?

PUBLIC: He had to leave.

BOLDT: Okay. He was no.

Megan Light.

LIGHT: Hello, Councilors. Thank you for your time today. My name is Megan Light. I'm here on asking you to reject the Washougal's request to add the same 41 acres. I'm not going to go into all of my testimony. I'll just keep it short.

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

We already know that the City does not need it. I would like to further emphasize this lack of need. If you look at the map, I live on 27th Street, it seems to me if they did need the property, they would ask the neighbors around if they also wanted to be included, but yet it's causing a peninsula. They didn't even ask the property owner in the corner there, right, that one, so it's obvious that they don't need it.

Related to this is a lack of transparency and notice. We bought our home one year ago on SE 27th, and at that time I did research. I have a real estate background. I did research to see what the surrounding zoning was and where the current urban growth boundary was and where it might be. We knew what the proposals were. We can see (inaudible) subdivision. I knew where the urban growth boundary was and we were willing to accept those to buy our property.

There was no indication at this time that the 41 acres was even being considered for the urban growth boundary. I did know about the cluster development and I thought that was actually kind of a great idea putting eight homes on one-acre lots, saving the remainder for open space and forest, less environmental impact, less development cost, a win/win situation and a legal property right for the owner and developer, couldn't argue it. That cluster development is happening to me now. The roads are currently being built. There's

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

heavy equipment up there right now.

So until very recently, actually about two weeks ago, it appeared that what was agreed to was taking place and the rest would be set aside. But meanwhile, without any notice, there is an attempt being made to add this parcel to the urban growth boundary vastly increasing the potential development capacity over the current zoning. This is the same zoning that the developer must have known about when he purchased the lot.

So the proposal before you to include this parcel is absolutely inequitable. I believe that to support this request would be to support the financial interest of one property owner to the detriment of the surrounding property owners and neighborhood. And I'd just ask you again to please reject the proposal on this 41 acres. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Good.

LIGHT: And if I didn't spell my last name, I don't think I did, it's Light, L-i-g-h-t.

BOLDT: Very good. Thank you.

Carol Ahola. Afternoon.

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

AHOLA: Good afternoon. Contrary to my last name, I'm Carol Ahola. It is aloha backwards but it's a good Finnish name.

My husband's grandfather homesteaded in Hockinson, Washington, shortly before the 1900s. He passed his 160 acres down to his son Alfred, and Alfred who is has departed, passed it down to his children. There were seven kids. My husband was the oldest. And after -- he actually was in the Department of Defense serving our country in Japan when they discovered brain cancer. He lost that battle, but gained heaven and left me with the 20 acres we had received from Milt's folks.

I just want to put a personality, a face. It's so easy to dismiss it. I'm a grandma that wants to share my inheritance. I want to share it with my children. And we're not talking about, for instance, the Washougal property of having homes that the lot is just a little smaller than some people's houses. We're talking I would like to see my 20 acres divided into five-acre parcels with one house on each one available for my children to enjoy what their dad and their grandpa and their great grandpa enjoyed. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Donna Anderson. Donna Anderson.

ANDREWS: Andrews.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

BOLDT: Andrews. Oh, okay. Afternoon.

ANDREWS: This one?

BOLDT: Yeah.

ANDREWS: Hi. We're graduates of Hockinson Elementary School, so that makes us neighbors. My name is Donna Andrews and I am a co-owner with my siblings of Tax Parcel 205384, which you see on the board above Hockinson, 49 and a quarter heavily wooded acres now in current use timberland with one existing historic farmhouse, and as my sister-in-law said, the remainder of grandpa Eli's 160-acre homestead.

As you research all sides of these many, many issues that you're considering, we just urge you to take your time and do not throw out all of the helpful changes of the Preferred Alternative which was passed on November 24. And this would include supporting, in our case, instead a 40-acre limit, at least a 10-acre maximum size. And, yes, we would prefer five. I have two sons and they would like some of grandpa's land.

Our mom and dad had farmed and stewarded their -- farmed and stewarded their property since 1940 and then they transferred several lots to

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

siblings in the 1970s and 1980s. Happy families grew there. By our widowed mother's will, we three daughters have now inherited proportional percentages of 49 acres and we cannot legally divide. None of our siblings on smaller lots can divide and two of us are deprived of the right to build any home on our wooded property.

We appreciate the hard detail work that everybody has been doing and we appreciate the investment of your time and the good intentions of the Planning Commission. A younger gentleman just read that Exhibit 4.x in the Preferred Alternative. They discussed possibly a promise for flexibility for historic families like ours, and I understand why this language is too general, and according to Note 4.x, it cannot be written into the -- because it can't be measured by the Environmental Impact Statement. That's logical. But we appreciate the good intentions of the Councilors and the Planning Commission in really listening to everybody.

People have spoken quite clearly about some of the unfair issues from the GMA issue in 1994. They made so many lots nonconforming. In our case, the lots were not congruent with the prevailing lots in the neighborhood. If my neighborhood, my 49 acres, is just my siblings, their lot sizes are two and a half, 5 acres, 6 acres, 10, 15, 20 and 21, so 49 is not congruent. And I just would say GMA seemed to have been rather than maintaining rural character of the neighborhoods, overly constricting that rural character.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

OLSON: I have a quick question, real quick.

ANDREWS: Sure.

OLSON: Are you forest?

ANDREWS: Yes. We are forest, yes.

MCELVENY: We're asking that GMA should preserve --

BOLDT: Excuse me. Your name.

MCELVENY: -- should preserve the habitat --

ANDREWS: Your name.

MCELVENY: Oh, Alina McElveny, M-c-E-l-v-e-n-y, and I'm one of the Ahola sisters, and we ask that GMA should preserve the habitat and the resources while respecting property rights.

Yes, wildlife habitat is important. Deer graze up the backdoors of homeowners and coyotes dine on our household pets. Several adjacent five to ten-acre lots of timbered land provide covered dams and travel corridors for our wildlife. We carefully cooperate with the

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

requirements of the Department of Natural Resources, the State Department of Ecology, Department of Wildlife and Fisheries and Yakama Nation Fisheries to ensure clean water for fish-bearing waters on the lower reaches of our Morgan Creek. We follow the rules and have no intention of recklessly clear-cutting. We only do select logging.

Scenic views valued as natural resources were emphasized by the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Neighbors, travelers and passing tourists on local arterials should be able to enjoy the green hill vistas and this would enhance the tourists economy of this county, yet this does not require sheer wilderness. The six homes on grandpa's homestead are not even visible from any neighbor or any county road. The hillside presents a pristine green forest. If you're down in Hockinson, you look up there, all you see is forest. The topography would not lend itself to multiple building lots, no way, but behind our tall Douglas Firs even three or four more homes with gardens and fruit trees would not be visible to neighbors or travelers on roads west of us.

The time is now. Being retired and aging and aware of our own mortality, we want to set up our affairs so our adult children could begin helping us manage the timber and eventually build homes or retirement cottages for themselves on their own individual properties. We are asking the Board of Councilors to carefully

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

maintain those provisions of the GMA alternatives that would be fair and just, especially for historic rural families like us. We thank you.

ANDREWS: Thank you very much.

AHOLA: And thank you very much.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Bill Wilder. Bill Wilder. Something H. Matson. Sue Marshall.

MIELKE: It wasn't John Matson, was it?

BOLDT: Hu-huh. Afternoon.

MARSHALL: Good afternoon. Chair, members of the Council, my name is Sue Marshall.

We have a 20-acre family farm in rural Ridgefield and we're going into our third generation of farming the land. The current zoning of the farm is AG-20 and we would like to retain that designation as a long-term protective overlay to assure that it continues in farming.

Alternative 4, well, 2, 4 and 4.b would all upzone to AG-10, so we

don't want to see that. I urge that the planning -- you to adopt the Planning Commissions' recommendation that was passed twice after thoughtful deliberation as the best option that protects resource lands. The reality is with Alternative 4.b, we're simply running out of time to pursue that any further.

There remains active farming economy in Clark County. Further parcelization threatens long-term viability of agriculture on some of the best soils in the state. USDA estimated that between 2007/2012 there was a 41 percent increase in income in the ag, agriculture, nearly \$2 million a year. Large acres of dedicated to farming are important. And contrary to previous testimony, the per acre value skyrockets the smaller the parcel is. So if you want to make it affordable, you need to have larger parcels.

There is uncertainty when you're suburbanizing around agriculture. There's long-term investments. We're looking at putting in an orchard, that's like a 50-year investment and it will be an investment that lives beyond us. And I think primarily our property does not have water rights. We're dry land farmers, which is absolutely viable in this county. You can't get water rights. And divvying up the property into five-acre parcels, you're not going to have water to support agriculture. So with dry land farming there's fewer options as far as crops that you can grow and you need larger acres to make it economically viable.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

The Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement had listed many problems with Alternative 2, 4 and I presume Alternative 4.b, so I'd just urge you rather than further delay, to move forward with the Planning Commissions' recommendations. And I would also encourage, as the Planning Commission did, if there is a process that you can develop to look for exceptions for those families that are struggling especially if they want to have family members come on and help them or accessory dwelling units could be a solution rather than wholesale divvying up agriculture and other resource lands. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Kyle Hammon. David Peel. Afternoon.

PEEL: Hi. Thanks a lot. My name is David Peel. I live on 15th Street in Washougal and I'm concerned with the annexation of the 41 acres for Washougal.

It's been described as -- just a couple of points, most of the things have already been said, but a couple of points. It's described as a peninsular area. I think it's more accurately described as an island, an island of very, very high density development around low density development. Which comes to my second point, which it doesn't make a lot of sense except for the second point which is to

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

the single out-of-state developer who plans to make a lot of money with this. So when you're deciding on this, I would ask you to think about the people who live there as opposed to the single person who stands to make a whole lot of money with this.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you. Good comments.

John Matson. Afternoon.

MATSON: Good afternoon, Councilors. John Matson, M-a-t-s-o-n.

I would just like to say that it sound like the cities have got almost everything they want and they're trying to get more which we can't even get the little bit we want. And the reason they want the more, keep it the way it is so that then they can take it over and then get it and plug it up with houses and that's urban sprawl.

And a good example of that is I have 25 acres and I'm probably a half a mile from the growth boundary and they jogged the growth boundary out around the park and they developed the park which was against the rules that they wasn't supposed to -- it wasn't supposed to be developed outside the rural area -- urban area unless the roads and everything was in, but they developed it without that and they never did anything to the roads to improve the traffic out of there.

But, anyway, I have 25 acres just up from the park on Ward Road and

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

I can't put a second house on my 25 acres under this growth management plan, which is unfair to the rural people of Clark County, because they say, well, we're going to plug the whole county up with roads and they're going to destroy it.

Well, with all the land out there and the maybe 6,000 lots that would go in there and probably over 20 years, it's pretty sparsely populated over in the rural area which is there's 320,000 acres out there which would make it 40 -- if there was 80 -- 8,000 lots, that would be 40 acres per lot.

But, anyway, just down the road two miles, there's been a sign up there and I haven't stopped, but my wife and I went to town last week and I stopped and looked at the sign, and there's 2.2 acres right on Ward Road. I'm on Ward Road, but I can't put a second house out there because I'm going to plug the roads. There's 2.2 acres, they just starting cutting, taking the trees out and moving some dirt and I stopped and they're putting 12 houses on 2.2 acres. Now this is urban sprawl. I mean, they're plugging - and that's what the cities tend to do - they plug up and increase their density where they're at until they have to move out and then that's urban sprawl because they put the subdivisions in there and it just plugs it up where a few houses spread out over Clark County wouldn't be urban sprawl. But I can't put the second house on there because it's going to plug the roads, but now they can put 12 houses, not improving the road,

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

just down two miles, and this is urban sprawl.

And this is just unfair to the rural property owners, so we need to be fair so that I can put the second house. If I put ten houses on mine, that would be two and a half acres per house. And if they could, my children could build a nice house on there and have a barn and a garden and that and the tax revenue, they could live on a farm and the developers wouldn't be able to come out there and buy that up and plug it up with houses because it would be rural area from now on.

So they can put 12 houses down there, but I can't put the second house. So it's just common sense and all the information that's been submitted has been fair information mostly other than the ones that oppose Option Number 4, so let's do what's right.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Bruce Kincaid. Bruce Kincaid. Okay.

MIELKE: Here comes somebody.

BOLDT: Oh. Afternoon.

KINCAID: Good afternoon. The name is Bruce Kincaid. I bought 60 acres in Clark County almost 40 years ago.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

At that time the land was basically not zoned. The Health Department said you needed an acre to have a well and a septic on the same land. Subsequently, it became zoned for five-acre minimums. That's, you know, all well and good. In 1994 my property and two adjoining properties were sort of a notch into the State land. This is rural Washougal, Bear Prairie, backs up against State land. Myself and these two adjacent properties, we became an 80-acre minimum. So I went from no zoning to 80-acre minimum and I have 60 acres. One thing to think about is what does that do to my IRA?

The other thing is I've gotten to the point in life where I have four sons, I'd like to see some or all of them living around me. The idea of four or five houses on 60 acres doesn't seem excessive to me. I think the rural should be such that I could do that. And as I've listened to some of these proceedings today, my problem versus some of the other problems presented to you, you know, by people that are in Ridgefield and want to expand the urban boundaries and so forth are just -- they are so different that it's just hard for me to comprehend how you can really handle decisions like you're faced with one set of rules that would be fair to each of us, but I say good luck.

BOLDT: Thank you for coming.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

108

OLSON: And, again, you're forest? A quick question. You're forest also? You're forest 80? You're forest, zoned forest 80?

KINCAID: Yes, ma'am. Yes.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Melinda Zamora, did I get that right? Afternoon.

ZAMORA: Good afternoon. I'm Dr. Melinda Zamora, Z-a-m-o-r-a. I have property north of Battle Ground in the Heisson area.

I, like the gentleman before, only have two and a half acres, so nothing that happens here today will affect me financially; however, as a physician, I would love to see all my patients have the opportunity to live in the rural area on a few acres, and this just isn't available for them. The lots are not out there. I would like them to be able to experience the health benefits that were talked about before, being able to have a big garden, grow your own -- excuse me -- have a cow or a horse, be able to take care of that property and take care of their families. While it's nice to have a big park down the road from your apartments or your high-density housing, it's just not the same for health benefits for people.

It was talked about earlier also that small parcels are more expensive in the rural area, that we should have more large parcels because

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

they're cheaper. This is true because they're very small, few small parcels out there. Supply and demand is driving the price up. If there were more parcels available, parcels would be cheaper.

As a parent, I want my children to be able to live out in the rural area, if they choose to, to be able to have this lifestyle, to be able to grow the things that they want to grow, to teach their children, to be able to teach them work ethics and moralities and the things that can't necessarily be taught if you live in a small apartment in town or on a small lot. I would encourage you to look at these things that people have talked about today and to support Alternative 4. And thank you very much.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Carolyn Crain. Carolyn Crain. Afternoon.

CRAIN: Good afternoon. You guys have been very patient today and everybody's been really nice. I'm really proud of everybody.

I want to talk to you about something, you know, you guys are on a really hot topic, I don't know if you saw the front page of the Columbian today, but they're talking about revisiting all of the annexation and it's kind of hysterical because it's my neighborhood. Okay.

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

110

So when you look at what you're doing as you move forward, I'm still an advocate for somewhere between 3 and 4. I like a lot of what David did with 4. I really want you to think about one thing, out there there's a whole bunch of condominiums, single-floor apartments that are stacked on top of each other, goals of 1200 people per acre and there's probably somebody who wants to live there, not me, but I'm sure there is, and close your eyes and think of going up towards Lucia Falls or out towards Yacolt and think about what the countryside looks like out there and recognize there's somebody that wants to live there.

In this very room you've heard rural people argue they didn't want 200 houses on the acreage put out there by Washougal and you've heard rural people say I want the right to do something with my land and have more houses on my land. Everybody has their own idea of what they want to live with, and you know what? They're entitled to that. And I love you, Oliver, but I heard something you kept saying, you kept saying our county, we have enough land. Well, it is our county but is it our land? And that's something that we all in this room need to recognize.

Every individual person owns their own land and there's a balance in there between how we cooperate with each other as a society and how we financially pay for the improvements that have to come, the schools that have to be built and those kinds of things. And, yeah,

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

111

they have to be done because if you look at the street in front of my house, no improvements were made and 185 houses were added across the street from me. There isn't enough parking. There isn't enough sidewalks to cover what those kids are having to do to go to school on a school bus. The improvements were not made. So we do have to consider things carefully.

But one thing we have to consider, it's not our land. It is our county. It's our society. It's our financial budget, but it's not our land. It's every single individual's piece of property and their rights are needing to be considered. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. I can't read the name, but it's 33009 SE 15th Street.

PEEL: What's that?

BOLDT: Do you want to testify?

PEEL: I just did.

BOLDT: Oh, okay.

PEEL: I will again.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

BOLDT: Oh, okay. No, that's okay.

Dick Rylander. Afternoon.

RYLANDER: Good afternoon. My name is Dick Rylander, the last name is spelled R-y-l-a-n-d-e-r. I am a resident of the area just south of Battle Ground, Washington.

Some of you have talked to me about a different topic associated with that. I am here not as a rural property owner with large amounts of land to sell, we have about four and a half acre we built on about ten years ago, can't be subdivided, don't want to subdivide it, but we moved to rural Clark County because we were looking for a rural lifestyle. I have four grown children and currently 11 grandchildren and I'm here on their behalf as well, because I hope that they have the opportunity to enjoy a rural lifestyle in the coming years in their future.

So I'm here to ask you to continue to support Alternative 4 and I'll give you three base reasons. One, landowners, I believe, have a right to have a path forward to the sale of their property if they deem that that's appropriate because they have taken the risk and they have paid the bills, and to restrict that right and that ability to me is unconscionable.

Two, the County and the people need a long-term path to more land

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

113

for people who actually do want a rural lifestyle. I understand the cities want to stuff people into small parcels and stack them on top of each other because it makes it easier to deal with road issues and utility issues and sewage and everything else, but not all of us want to be stacked into sardine cans.

The third point is that not allowing landowners a choice to sell or not, I actually think holds them hostage to other people's view of what's right and what's wrong. And in reality, we all make our best decisions and I understand that you're faced with the responsibility of having to make choices that will have significant impacts on others.

But I guess I would close and ask you if by choosing to not follow something like Alternative 4 that allows choice from the rural landowners standpoint, are you, in essence, enforcing a form of discrimination just based on your particular points of view? Look to the larger group, look to the people, because the people are the ones, not only that have elected you, but they're the ones ultimately that have to live with the consequences. Thank you.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you.

Val Alexander. We are going to take a break at 2:30. Afternoon.

LINDGREN: Good afternoon, Councilors. I'm speaking -- I'm Calvin

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

114

Lindgren -- excuse me -- Calvin Lindgren, L-i-n-d-g-r-e-n, and I'm speaking for my wife Val Alexander. And this is a little off the subject, but it's a cautionary that we've gone through that is water and so I'll read her report here.

I own 65 acres in northwest Clark County. We grow much of our own food but need a good water supply to accomplish that. When I bought the property in 1969 -- '65, I put in a well and a septic system and put my mobile home on the property. After several months, I bought another parcel to the south that had a well, and much later bought another parcel and the well along with it. All together we had five wells. But as the property around us was subdivided into five-acre parcels, the original well at the north end went dry. I tried everything I could to bring it back, but nothing succeeded. So I had a -- had to pipe water from the main well which I now use to the north and almost a half a mile.

The point I want to make to those who are deciding how many divisions to allow in rural area is that there is simply not enough water to support more homes in our county which would be far from the municipal water supply that is almost two miles from our property and is about \$2 and half million per mile. I can't afford that.

One of our state representatives has written you asking to support Alternative 4, and this is a classic example of the straw man argument

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

designed to put political pressure on the current Councilors rather than stating any facts in support of her bold allegations. Such actions are a new low for her. She also claims that the rural residents support Alternative 4. Nothing could be further from the truth. I am a neighborhood association chair and know many landowners as well as farmers who do not support the rampant growth that would be allowed under Alternative 4 or 4.b. As a farmer, a good supply of water is critical to my business of producing organic food which we sell at the markets and locally on-site.

BOLDT: Thank you. Joe --

MADORE: Levesque.

BOLDT: -- Levesque.

MADORE: We all know Joe.

BOLDT: Afternoon.

LEVESQUE: Good afternoon, young man.

BOLDT: Good to have you.

LEVESQUE: One question, did you get that letter out?

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

BOLDT: It's coming.

LEVESQUE: It's coming or do you have it?

BOLDT: It's close.

LEVESQUE: Did you get that letter I wrote? I wrote a letter for you to type or something to send to Washington State University, to have them look into the program that I've got. And if the program works, what do we have to do to make it work. And if it can't work, why can't it work. If you can do that, that would make me happy. I don't know if that will solve the problems, but if they don't do something about it, I'm going to be really frustrated.

Anyhow, I come here for a different reason here. I've been around a long time. I'm probably the oldest guy in this room. I've seen what free enterprise can do. Right now we're losing our country, and people don't even talk about that. I read in the paper this morning that 3500 people died homeless in Clark County. That's a shame. Not in this country. Affordable housing, that's what I used to do. You know why? Because there was always a market for affordable housing. There always is. In housing there's two markets when it comes to affordable, either you build a Volkswagen or you build a Cadillac.

Now, the government gets involved and they start building gold-plated apartments and they start financing the profits and everything else in the loan so the guy doesn't have to worry about selling the property. He just holds onto it. And then a lot of these homes that they're building don't pay real estate taxes, I don't know if you knew that, and that low-income housing tax credit.

Anyway, when I see that flag out there, I'd like to see that flag standing on the platform on one of these things here. You pledge under God and then it says justice for all. You know what? Those 3500 people didn't have justice. There is no justice for all. This is still a free country and I'll die for my country, but I don't like what the hell is happening to it.

Now, you guys right now, I couldn't do your kind of work. I'm not cut for that. You got to sit down and listen to all of these complaints from both sides. One thing that I've noticed, you know, I study this stuff, I'm not smarter than you, I just know stuff you guys don't know, the reason there's so much confusion in this community is people don't know the truth. The reason they don't know the truth is because the truth isn't being told.

I went to Washougal, I tried to build affordable housing there. I tried to show the City of Washougal how to make \$5 million off of

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

my program. I was completely ignored. The same program, the same project, I went to the Port of Camas/Washougal, they turned me down. They wouldn't even listen. They wouldn't even entertain it. Here's what I told them and this is what I'm -- I'm not accusing you guys of this now, but here's what I told them and I'm not afraid to say it, either these guys are dumb or they're corrupt and I'm not sure which they are right now. And that's a pretty strong statement.

And right now with the stuff that I've got, if Washington State University doesn't do something, I want to take this, everything that I've been through to the grand jury because I'll be damned if I'm going to waste ten years of my life trying to make things happen for my country and I couldn't do it. And that's what I've done. And I've generated over \$200 million in revenue in this country and I'm not ashamed of that.

BOLDT: Thank you.

LEVESQUE: Anyhow, I appreciate what you guys are doing. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you very much.

Steven is it Boilton?

BOYNTON: Close, but not quite.

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

119

BOLDT: Close. Hey, at least I'm close.

BOYNTON: Yeah, my name is Steve Boynton, that's B-o-y-n-t-o-n, at 31215 NE 40th Avenue in La Center. Okay.

Well, we support basically Alternative 1 with the suggestions from the Planning Commission talking about grandfathering in some of the prior landowners, and I will continue with my letter here. As I've previously testified how Alternative 2 and 4 is a boom to land developers by rezoning and splitting up agriculture and timberlands into smaller parcels, large parcels are being purchased, logged, subdivided and sold for huge profits. Land values increase roughly \$100,000 every time a parcel is split up and a home site added.

There have been two outspoken proponents for Alternative 4: they are Clark County Citizens United and Councilor David Madore. I wondered why they are so intent on splitting up the ag and timberlands, so I completed some preliminary research and have discovered some red flags.

The first red flag is found on the Clark County Citizens United face page book, post on August 28th, 2014, proudly lists the Board of Directors. The board consists of several realtors, developers, landowners and civil engineers with an attorney. Clark County Assessor's website shows that many of these board members are heavily

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

involved in real estate transactions during the past 25 years.

As a comparison, my wife and I owned 50 acres of ag and timberlands and plus some rental, and I've had eight transactions of documents in the past 25 years; however, the board members I checked on from Clark County Citizens United had 76 to 94 transactions during this same period of time. They appear to have a vested interest in cutting up the ag and timberlands for their own financial gain.

The second red flag is that of David Madore. He appears to be a land speculator himself or has a history of it. He was involved in selling 16 lots in the Valley View Subdivision located near Hockinson from 1999 to 2004 for around \$90,000 each. These lots were then developed and are now about a half a million dollars each. This is in public information and is readily available through the Clark County Assessor's website under Recorded Documents.

Alternative 4 will allow developers to make large profits at the expense of the community. It will convert our county into another Southern California, Hillsboro or Seattle. We are among the many landowners who want to preserve ag and timberlands for our family and future generations. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Carol Levanen.

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

MADORE: Mr. Chair, I'd like to make one correction. I have no -- I don't have any idea what he's talking about when it comes to the 2000-something land. Back in 1990 to 1992, we did develop a 24-lot subdivision out in Hockinson area. That's the only property that I'm aware of.

BOLDT: Okay.

Carol Levanen.

LEVANEN: There's a packet here of 102 signatures of landowners who support Alternative 4 from our town hall meeting. I haven't started talking yet, but I've got five seconds already gone. I'm talking faster. Carol Levanen for Clark County Citizens United.

Rural and resource landowners have allowed free use of their land by environmentalists and cities for over 20 years and they want it back. The economic loss in the 1994 downzoning was extreme. A person owning 20 acres who could have generated eight 2.5-acre parcels prior to '94 lost \$800,000 at the stroke of a pen. Now his land with poor soil lays fallow while he pays \$5,000 a year in taxes and generates no income. For 20 years he has lost revenue, plus the initial loss to equal almost a million dollars and still counting.

The majority of the resource zoned parcels in Clark County make less than \$10,000 a year. Reasonable economics does count when zoning

resource lands under GMA. Rural and resource landowners have lost billions as a result of the 1994 downzoning and nothing in the plan has changed to compensate them.

Washington State Supreme Court in Lewis County versus Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board, August 10th, 2006, states, if the State wants to conserve all land that is capable of being farmed without regard to its commercial viability, it may buy the land.

In Superior Court, April 4, 1997, Judge Poyfair said, previous Growth Management Board decisions appeared to prevent the county from allowing any growth in rural areas. The Board is not above the law which gave it its existence. The Board must comply with expressed statutory mandates.

The Board had an end in sight restricting growth in rural areas. The Board erroneously interpreted and applied the GMA when it failed to meet the statutorily mandated definitional criteria for resource lands. Additionally, the failure to solicit meaningful public input violated the public participation provisions of the GMA.

Comprehensive plan EIS issued by the County violates the State Environmental Policy Act regarding changes to the pattern of rural development was clearly erroneous. A variety of residential

densities and housing types which the Clark County community framework plan met by identifying preexisting small development patterns in rural areas. There is no requirement in the GMA that the OFM projections be used in any manner other than as a measure to ensure urban growth areas.

This Board decision, however, compelled the County to downzone substantial portions of the rural areas. The only requirement for rural areas in the GMA is that growth in rural areas not be urban in character. While the GMA contains no restrictions on rural growth, it does require a variety of residential densities.

The Board had an end in sight and disregarded the GMA's mandate in applying an unauthorized formula to the review of the Clark County comprehensive plans land use densities. The Board's interpretation was erroneous. The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development and direct contradiction of the terms of the GMA.

The Preferred Alternative with Alt 4 adopted on November 24, 2015, is the only alternative that comes even close to complying with court mandates and the GMA. It is critical the Councilors understand the repercussions if Alternative 4 is removed. CCCU wants to support the County in land use decisions, but we cannot support the economic ruin of rural and resource landowners for the sake of Sunday drivers

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

124

and irrational cities. If they want the land, they must buy it.
Thank you.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you. We will take a 15-minute break.

(Pause in proceedings.)

BOLDT: Thank you everyone. We are going to reconvene. Just for your reference, we will not be deliberating any today. We're going to try and get all the public testimony in. We need to be out of here by 4:30 at the latest, so put your -- please put your testimony to two or three minutes, if you can, or we just won't be able to have everybody today.

So with that, Susan Rasmussen.

RASMUSSEN: Good afternoon, Councilors. Susan Rasmussen,
R-a-s-m-u-s-s-e-n, for CCCU.

Before you is a copy of our Superior Court orders, the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law and order April 4th, 1997, written by the Honorable Edwin J. Poyfair.

Now, I'd like to talk for a moment about statutory mandates. CCCU welcomes open conversations about statutory GMA mandates. In

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

particular, let's start with those outstanding mandates from the Superior Court orders that have been swept under the rug by the planners.

There is a distinction to be made between the County's plan being GMA compliant and the County's compliance to CCCU Superior Court orders mandating County action to correct the violations of the GMA. Those arguing to maintain status quo had their day in court with CCCU. They lost in Superior Court, case closed. The Poyfair remand remains unsatisfied. You are sorely mistaken if you think we are going to stand by and let this go.

I particularly would like to address Page 29, actually it starts on Page 28 of the remand. The Board's interpretation was erroneous and the County's decision to follow the Board's lead was unfortunate. The result is a plan that gives little regard for the realities of existing rural development in direct contradiction in terms of the GMA. That is why you have 17 percent of the AG-20 lots comply to their zone. That's why you have nine out of ten lots in the forest district out of compliance to their zone.

Furthermore, on Page 27, actually it starts on Page 26, furthermore, there is no substantial evidence in the record to support the designation of agri-forest lands as resource lands under GMA. The NRCS soils manual to this day was never used in designating Clark

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

126

County's resource lands. Again, on Page 28, you will see right at the top the EIS absent additional environmental analysis regarding the agri-forest designations and changes to the pattern of rural development was clearly erroneous.

An important question needs to be answered. What happens when planners ignore the Superior Court orders and fail to correct the violations of the GMA? And more important still, why are the orders being ignored, and who is going to hold the feet to the fire to make sure compliance is upheld?

BOLDT: Thank you.

Pat Anderson. Good afternoon.

ANDERSON: I have 31 seconds on here already, 34 seconds. Pat Anderson.

And I wanted to reflect back on the Washington State Constitution, Article I, Declaration of Rights. Article I, Section I, Political Power. All political power is inherent in the people and the government derives their just powers from the consent of the government. And at -- and are established to protect and maintain individual rights. So please don't let an unelected bureaucrat take away your rights to represent the citizens. Thank you.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

127

BOLDT: Thank you. Very good.

Bill Zimmerman. I didn't see Bill here. He left early.

Okay. Is it Derik Dykes. Did I get that right?

DYKES: No. Dennis.

BOLDT: Dennis. Sorry.

DYKES: Good afternoon.

BOLDT: Afternoon.

DYKES: Hi. I'm Dennis Dykes. I live at 3800 NE 399th Street.
It's about four or five miles north of La Center.

I have 65 acres of Forest 40 land that we bought in 1990 which is just before the planning process began the last time. And I remember that process because I was really surprised when so many people that claimed to be wanting to live in a rural environment, as I had just finally achieved in my life, came and said, no, you have to allow us to subdivide and build as many houses out here as we could under the old plan which was one-acre lots in my area according -- across the whole county basically. And I, you know, that just seemed wrong to me because I had moved out there because I didn't want that.

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

128

I understood the need for the Growth Management Act to re-establish or to establish a rational land use planning where people who wanted to live in a rural environment could stay there, people who lived in the city would, and to make government efficient. I don't like it when you guys aren't efficient and spend my money in taxes and you have to raise taxes to do that, you have to maintain roads, otherwise we have lousy roads and I don't like that. You look at that map over there and it says farm to market roads, okay, that historic map on the wall, farm to market. It's not rural residential to jobs in Portland roads, you know. That's an important thing to keep in mind.

Okay. Back to I have two main issues to bring forward to you. Forest 40, any honest forester will tell you you need more land than less in order to have forestry, okay, to actually accomplish something with it. You cut it down to tens, which is proposed for my land, you are taking that out of production essentially. People will divide it up, build houses on it. That's what the economy forces you into. It pushes you to do that kind of thing.

The 90/10 split that was in the original growth management plan was a policy developed through the community to encourage over time people to -- the kind of people who want to live in a rural resource based economy and lifestyle to live there. 10 percent was thought to support and promote that. It would develop over time. Nobody

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

expected it to happen very quickly because of what had been going on. Okay. That's there. There's a lot more I could say about that.

But I also want to talk about water because I wear another hat. I'm a licensed hydro-geologist in the State of Washington. There is a rule, a Washington Administrative Code that says that you -- there is a reserve in that for a limited number of parcels or exempt wells that would go on parcels in the rural lands. If you go with Alternative 1, that will run out almost at the same time as the lots run out.

You add more lots through Alternative 4 or whatever you want to call it, there will not be water rights for those exempt wells and you will be in the role of putting those people as you have to do a WAVE test to prove there's water there now. You will have to have a water right that you will have to buy from somebody.

Whether the PUD can come out there and do that is a nonissue because they own the water rights. That's what they're not telling you. You will use up the rural residential water rights and then they will come in because they own the water rights and have it. I'm sorry. That will be a process.

I really encourage you to start now because it will come up in the eight years or whatever the next growth plan comes. I'd be happy

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

130

to help you with it. I'd like to talk about TDRs because there was a process in the '90s for a transfer of development rights. Look for it. Joe King chaired the thing. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Harry Wiebold. Okay. Brian Clarke. Margaret Jacobs. All these are questions so I'm not sure. Julie Jacobs. No. Lane Dullum, Dallum. All right. Rick Dallum. Gary Weber. No. Fred Pickering. I didn't see him. Dianne Koern or Kurn. All right. Mark Martin. There you are. Good afternoon.

MARTIN: Hey, Mark Martin here. I'm from 52nd Way in rural Clark County.

And the first thing I want to say is that I support Alternatives 1 and 3, although I must say that I've been persuaded by some of the really, really difficult stories for families with huge parcels today. I think there should be exceptions for those people and I know that's quite difficult in what you guys are trying to do here, but it seems to be the appropriate thing to do, so... But, okay.

So the proponents of Councilor Madore's handcrafted Alternative 4, like to site property rights as a justification, what they failed to mention is that Alternative 4 seeks to benefit a small minority of large landholders at the expense of tens of thousands of rural

residents who in the past two decades have bought property in rural portions of Clark County precisely because of the rural quality of life in these parts. Zoning is an important consideration when purchasing land.

When a family is selecting a home to purchase, zoning is similar to privately enacted CC&Rs in that they help to give the buyer of property some certainty that they won't eventually find themselves surrounded by incompatible land uses that seriously detracts from their property values and enjoyment of their property rights. In other words, families who seek serenity and pastoral environments gravitate towards areas with larger minimum lot sizes. It does one no good to buy a larger parcel if subsequently he or she will be surrounded by high-density subdivisions and that's the part of Alternative 4 I don't like.

This is particularly true in well water dependent areas where a continued inhabitability of one's home is so dependent on ensuring that the groundwater is not fouled up on what the effluent of hundreds of nearby homes that lack sewer hookups or the lack of water. The proponents of Alternative 4 claim that opposition to Alternative 4 is Frankenstein's monster masquerading as land use planning is really being biased towards urban living.

As a rural landowner, I say such opposition is really common sense.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

It's a basic rule of physics and public health that densely packed in residential areas require the removal and treatment of sewage. Let's not make Clark County a third world county where rivers of effluent impact public health. I don't want Clark County to have its current nickname changed or downgraded to Cholera County. I'd much rather see this county continue its recent move towards rational and professional governance that we can shape our negative connotations.

I thank Councilor Stewart, Olson and Boldt for their efforts to reverse the harmful ploys of the prior majority. I sincerely hope that this will extend to the most important issue at hand, the GMA update.

In closing, I believe the growth of Clark County of the rural population over the past few decades was based in large part on the reliance of these new rural residents on the County's protective zoning of rural residential and agricultural areas. To overturn these this protected zoning on which we relied in purchasing our land solely to benefit a few large landholders and developers would constitute a taking of our property rights affecting thousands of families in Clark County. Thank you very much.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Is it, I might have this wrong, Linda Broadely in Amboy?

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

BODALY: Bodaly.

BOLDT: Oh, okay. Bodaly. Afternoon.

BODALY: Good afternoon. How are you?

BOLDT: Fine. How are you doing?

BODALY: I'm doing well. Thank you.

BOLDT: I'm glad.

BODALY: Excuse my attire, I had to go home to feed animals.

BOLDT: That's okay.

BODALY: Anyway my parcel is 265517000, 22 acres --

BOLDT: Please spell your last name.

BODALY: B-o-d-a-l-y.

BOLDT: Thank you.

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

BODALY: Anyway, parcel is 265517000, 22 acres are in ag, five acres are in forest. I run chickens, ducks, geese, goats, and in spring to fall, I have bees. All the next-door neighbors have cattle, goats, horses, et cetera, and we all request - and I speak for them because they're all at work - to keep our zoning as it is.

You might want to bring one thing up which has nothing to do with the zoning though, my address is La Center. I live six and a quarter miles from La Center. I live 12 miles from Battle Ground, yet I am forced to pay Battle Ground School taxes which means that the bus from Battle Ground drives 1300 miles a year to bring kids, which there really aren't that many out there, but I just thought that was an interesting thing. I don't know why.

And one more thing, if all of you have gone over to the Ridgefield area and seen what they've done over there on the way to Ridgefield, 3,000 to 5,000-square foot lots, it's a mess. And half of them, believe it or not, are financed by the U.S. Department of Agriculture under zero percent down and some of the closing costs are financed as well. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you. Good job.

Lee Jensen.

MIELKE: He left a long time ago.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

BOLDT: I thought so.

Donald McIsaac.

MIELKE: Look at all of these people that are still here.

BOLDT: Afternoon.

RASMUSSEN: How are you doing?

BOLDT: Fine.

RASMUSSEN: Good.

BOLDT: How are you?

RASMUSSEN: I'm good. He's going to take up part of my time.

BOLDT: Is he?

RASMUSSEN: Is that all right?

BOLDT: I've never known you to leave to do that, but...

RASMUSSEN: There's probably some truth in that.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

136

MCISAAC: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good afternoon. For the record, Dr. Donald McIsaac. I'm here with Mr. Pete Rasmussen who will introduce himself here. I'm testifying on behalf of myself and my family and some friends in the mostly in the Hockinson area but elsewhere in the county and I'm not a member of any of the organized groups that showed so heavily the other night in Hockinson.

First a couple of things on the Thorpe report, then a recommendation on a pathway forward and then last I'd like to clarify a question of Councilor Olson's earlier on Alternative 2, the rural parts of Alternative 2.

So first let me say, it's a little bit disappointing that after the months of December and January have gone by that there are only four pieces of information on The Grid now for your decision today, three of which were available before the November 24th meeting and the fourth one being the Thorpe report. We would have expected a lot more progress. And I've handed you and you can see on the screen what it appears to us to be the status of Planning Assumptions now. And if you look at that little chart, you'll see eight assumptions, and then on the left, you'll see in the Draft SEIS an asterisk that shows below it. These were not evaluated for validity in the Thorpe report.

You'll see the new updated data and approaches that were part of the motion that passed in November and you'll see some valid, some invalid, some partially valid, invalid, partially valid. You'll see under the Thorpe comment out of their report, for example, on Assumption Number 3 that some lots could develop. There's an assumption that the SEIS might not be accurate. There's a comment in their report about more data review needed before you could determine the validity. There's a comment that that might likely be invalid, but there's some qualifiers that it's not absolutely invalid leading to the question marks down the right side.

So what do you use? Do you use the new approach where it says valid? Do you use the new approach or the old approach where it says partially valid? What do you do to try to make a responsible decision right now? There's a lot of outstanding questions there.

I don't think you have the information right now to make the decisions based on this. The bottom row there is the urban/rural split. And the Draft SEIS shows 90/10. The new approach is 87 and a half to 12 and a half and the Thorpe comment says either of the values are legitimate valid policy choices. So which one do you use? If you're going to make a decision today conceivably on eliminating Alternative 4, which one would you use? That one alone enables Alternative 4 to be fully GMA compliant if you use the new approach.

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

138

So let me just leap forward to a pathway forward. You heard a little bit about being stuck, about being at an impasse. We recommend that you cement your policy on your assumptions today. After you do that, order more analysis with white papers, legal opinions or whatever you need in writing and get those results before you decide. Order the completion of all the paperwork, the capital facilities report, the Title 40 business, all the paperwork and then make an informed decision in late May, early June. Don't make a decision now before you have all the information. Wait for the results make a good responsible decision then.

MIELKE: Times up.

MCISAAC: I would like, Mr. Chairman, just quickly on rural Alternative 2, the answer this morning was AG-20 goes to AG-10, FR-40 goes to FR-20 that is true in some areas, very few areas. How were those areas selected? Ask the staff. And it's a very minor amount of rural benefit in Alternative 2.

BOLDT: Okay.

RASMUSSEN: Does this work? Peter Rasmussen, R-a-s-m-u-s-s-e-n. And essentially I want to echo what Jim Malinowski said when he spoke and Rick Dunning as well.

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

In the rural community, there is a real problem and when you have the large lots and you want to bring on a child into your business, it really, right now, it's almost impossible to do without jeopardizing the whole operation.

I also and this is -- this is maybe just a little bit -- well, in all due respect to the staff, if you cannot get the things done that need to be done, I know two women who can help you out and I'm married to one of them. So I don't want to be, you know, I don't want to be callous about it, but you're not getting the work done and Susan and Carol can get it done for you, if you need help. Thank you very much.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Dennis Ritola. Dennis Ritola. Gretchen Starke. Margaret Tweet.

MIELKE: Margaret.

BOLDT: Afternoon.

TWEET: Good afternoon, Councilors, and citizens.

For the new Councilors, please consider the citizen input from 2015. There's a strong record there. Alternative 4 is based on strong input, it returns options to landowners lost in 1994. It recognizes

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

140

existing parcels and predominant parcel size, which is the formula used by most counties. It allows families to keep their homesteads and farms and pass them on to future generations.

We've heard from some today that developers want large lots, not the two and a half or five-acre parcels. What if the predominant parcel size in an area is two and a half or five acres? Do we just bow down to the large developers that can afford the large lots? Affordable housing in rural areas is facilitated by smaller lots. Other counties have more flexible zoning for variable lot sizes and they are compliant with the GMA.

Clark County since 1994 has imposed highly restrictive measures to keep growth down. We expect correct data, accurate minutes. It's not asking too much. And the recommendation that was just made is extremely reasonable, take the time to get the correct information. If you need another study, another opinion, take the time to get it. Don't make a decision ahead of the information and definitely don't make a decision based on incorrect or faulty information. That's not what you're here for.

We also see that, and just one example of that, the County having decades of data showing a roughly 85 to 50 urban/rural split and yet we have this 90/10 ratio that's being used. That makes no sense. It doesn't reflect the reality of our county and the data that we've

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

141

collected for decades. Let's not ignore the information that we have available from the GIS Department, small businesses and farms are fostered by smaller lots. Defend this duly developed Alternative 4. Correct the wrongs. Return the property rights to the rural landowners.

And I also want to say in giving notice for these types of hearings, in Clackamas County they send out a postcard that tells when a hearing is happening that affects any kind of a zoning change and that's a small expense, very worthwhile to do. Oh, I'm going over. Sorry. So I want to suggest that that's a good way to notify homeowners that would be affected by a zoning change and then you -- all these property owners, how did they find out about it today? Probably Clark County Citizens United, but we can do a better job. Some counties do that kind of a mail notice and I think that's a good thing to maybe consider adding. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Warren, Warren Neth. Robert Watkins. Warren? Oh, sorry, Warren. Afternoon.

NETH: Afternoon. I tried to sneak in the hallway and get some work done. So good afternoon, Councilors.

First of all, I'd like to thank you for reconsidering the Preferred

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

142

Alternative. I understand that the clock is ticking for staff to get a plan submitted by the State-mandated June deadline.

Considering that deadline time frame, I advocate that the Clark County Council adopt the Planning Commission's recommended Preferred Alternative adopted November 19th, 2015. I do however advocate that with much regret.

Alt 4 has been proposed as a rural alternative, but it was not guided by the decades of planning done by hundreds of citizens working to develop citizen led road maps to guide the comprehensive plan to give rural landowners flexibility and conserve ag land resources. Plans like the Agricultural Preservation committee's report of 2009, the Rural Lands Task Force recommendations, the Clark County Food System Councils promoting agricultural food production in Clark County and many more have collected dust while you have hastily created Alt 4.

David, you and I have had starts and stops in our dialogue around how in your words to maximize local healthy food. You went on a four-hour tour, met numerous 10 acre to 400-acre farmers that were creating jobs, conserving open space and bringing healthy local food to our table, but you have failed to provide any hint that you understood what you saw. You have given rural landowners false hope in Alt 4, not tools that will stand up in courts and provide adequate protection to ag resource land. Besides being a State mandated possibility of the GMA process, why should we protect ag resource

lands?

All throughout two USDA numbers that I hope show the opportunities that our changing food system provides, \$6 million a day is spent on food in Clark County. One percent of the U.S. food supply is sourced locally, 100 miles range. Those two observations I would like to offer two reflections. One, let's capture more of those \$6 million a day and bring those into local farmers pocketbooks, into local food producers, conserve open space and create jobs and a livable future.

Two, where does the rest of the 99 percent of the food come from? Well, a large portion comes from areas like the Central Valley where as was recently brought to light mega farm owners have made deals with Chevron to purchase tens of millions of gallons of wastewater from their oil fields to water their crops, while field workers complain about the petroleum smell of the water watering those crops that we eat. This is one example of what happens when you create mega farms that are managed by for investor profits rather than farmers that are stewarding the soil.

As the public recognizes the unhealthy food that our industrial food system has created, trends are moving to rebuild our local food system. That work needs not only happen at the federal level to stop subsidies to support mega farms, but it needs to happen at local

leadership to do things like create agriculture production districts, fund purchase development rights, keep parcelization in rural centers, provide more flexible ADUs for rural landowners to share the land with their family and farm partners.

One example of where I see that trend to localize our food system locally was at last weekend's Clark County growing seasonal social that Southwest Washington hosted where we had 90 people packing the Barberton Grange where there was farmers, chefs and local food advocates.

So I'd just like to conclude saying that I'd recommend in the short time frame that you take on the Preferred Alternative created by the planning committee, advocated by the planning committee and start soon to create a rural alternative for our next round of comprehensive plan updates.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you.

Mary Schwarz-Baur. All right. Bridget McLeman. Afternoon.

MCLEMAN: Good afternoon. My name is Bridget McLeman,
M-c-L-e-m-a-n.

It's hard to start, I've been listening so long. But I wanted to go back and think about the GMA vision, the community framework that

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

we developed in 1994, that was a 50-year vision and we are partway through the process and it's obviously under attack in multiple ways, but the people responsible for steering that vision through our community are the staff and that doesn't make it always a popular job, but they have been holding firm to what we the community created back then and I want to thank them for it because it's not easy because we do have competing demands.

And some of those competing demands came out of the fact that in the year before the plan was adopted, the applications for segregation of lots increased by 800 percent. And if we wonder why we've got so many legal noncomplying lots, that's a part of the reason. We created small five-acre lots. And then it gets appealed to Judge Poyfair who comes up with a decision, we've heard much about Clark County not being in compliance, but that's a ruling and a judgment that goes back to the Growth Management Board.

The Growth Management Board puts in requirements for compliance. Clark County met the conditions for compliance and is in compliance. So I think to continually say we're violating Poyfair's recommendations is just wrong. And, again, we have to thank staff for managing to get us out of that situation in a way that kept our plan intact.

I did listen with great interest several people talking about TDRs

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

146

and ADUs and I think Mr. Madore had a proposal for ADUs at one point and I don't know what happened to it. But on the TDR question, that had been working through the process and there are documents there from the Planning Director recommending moving ahead with a TDR program. And I have to say, Mr. Madore put a stop to that by pulling the consultant's contract. And even on his Facebook page, I'm sorry, but you likened it to fascism, and fascism is not what TDR is all about. It could be a way to help people who want to age in place on their properties and ADUs can help with a child or a caretaker.

The big thing that I learned on Friday, thank you to the town hall, was the idea of predominant zoning. So we have a lot of legal noncomplying lots. They are 5 acres, 2.5 acres. And what was said then, and people can correct me if I'm wrong, was that the new requirements would be around, if the predominant zone, around a lot. Now, once you do that and you say 20 acres can go to 5, then the next time GMA comes around, you've got another layer of fives and it's creeping sprawl. And contrary to what Mr. Matson said, this is sprawl.

The cities have density. What we're creating is rural sprawl, and it's not good for agriculture and it's not good for resource lands and this argument has been nothing about helping farming in this county. Thank you.

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

BOLDT: Thank you.

Frank White. And then Marge White. Okay. Philip Haggerty.
Afternoon.

HAGGERTY: Good afternoon, Councilors. I'd like to spend a minute speaking about Alternative 4 and what it can do for the people in rural Clark County. Excuse me. Last name H-a-g-g-e-r-t-y. Thank you.

The people in rural Clark County right now don't have options to do the things that they need to with their land. I think it's mistaken that a lot of people look at property rights as property rights. People have rights; the property doesn't have rights. And they need to have the right to do what they want with their property within limits, and I think Alternative 4 provides those limits.

And the opportunity for the farmer whose land is no longer able to be viable for them, to allow them to bring their family on to that land and to share that land and to make it more viable, for the person in La Center that has 65 acres that says he wants his children to be able to enjoy that land, well, unless he plans to build an addition, they're not going to enjoy that land. This alternative would give them the option of having their family on that land. We need to look at the rights of the people. Please consider Alternative 4.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

148

BOLDT: Thank you.

Jodie Phelps. Afternoon.

PHELPS: Hi. I've been here all day listening and there's a lot of opinions, and we're not big business. We're not city.

I live in rural Clark County on 120 acres. My parents got tired and we took over. We're getting tired. Now all of our kids want to come back. We have no way to provide that and the other option is to lose it all. I'm asking you to come up with a solution, if it isn't Option 4, find something that will fit the rural Clark County. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

OLSON: I'm sorry. Can I get, your 120 acres, is it -- what's its designation?

PHELPS: It's forestry, FR-40.

BOLDT: Okay. Thank you. Good job.

Lucy Krantz. Chuck Miller.

MIELKE: That guy's still here.

MILLER: Good afternoon.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

BOLDT: Good afternoon.

MILLER: Chuck Miller. Common spelling, M-i-l-l-e-r, representing Washington Citizens for Responsible Government.

The GMA has no limitation on rural growth; it just requires development be rural -- be rural in character. The Preferred Alternative is a composite of Alternative 1, 2, 3 and the rural plan 4. This is a fair and balanced way to do it and I highly recommend adoption of the policy of Alternative 4.

You Councilors, the three new Councilors, have a real choice to make. You can continue to hurt the rural family owners by voting against Alternative 4 or you can stand up for them. It's been 21 years. How many more years do you want to hurt them? We're asking you to stand with the rural property owners. Thank you.

BOLDT: Thank you.

Quan Tran.

MIELKE: He left.

BOLDT: I thought so.

Loretta Steele. That's all I have. Is there anyone else?

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

MIELKE: There was a gentleman, thought he might have been called after lunch.

BOLDT: I don't know.

MIELKE: Nobody else?

BOLDT: Anyone else? Okay. Thank you. Now close public testimony and we don't have time to deliberate now.

Is there any questions, questions for staff?

MADORE: Yes. There is one piece of one action item that's not on this agenda and I would encourage you to bring it next week. It has to do with the layer that was turned off that was grayed out and staff went in and finished that up. They were the special lots zoned by public entities and split zones. If staff isn't advocating one way or another, then I would think it would be wise to bring that forward so that we have the option to continue and don't lose that momentum.

ORJIAKO: Certainly, Councilor Madore, we will do that.

This hearing was, and I believe the hearing, the legal for this hearing had that in it, that depending on the action of the Board,

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

151

we will, if the Board decide to reconsider the alternative, that will give us one way to see where the Board wants to go, but that was included in the legal for today, yes.

MADORE: Okay. Good. Thank you.

The other is this document that I provided staff -- or I'm sorry -- provided my colleagues, I encourage you to please read it. I will assert that Thorpe did the wrong project, instead of comparing A to B, they compared B to other county popularities. So please read this through. I welcome feedback. Thank you very much.

BOLDT: Is there any other questions?

OLSON: Yeah, Mr. Chair, I do have one question.

BOLDT: Yes.

OLSON: We've got our legal folks here and our planning staff obviously, we have heard for a long period of time now about the Poyfair decision, about the remand, about whether we're in compliance, not in compliance. We've met those requirements from the Judge. Could you address that just for the folks that are still left here and for my sake, please.

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

COOK: I'd be delighted.

So the Judge Poyfair wrote two orders, one is the April 4th order. There were seven Conclusions of Law in that order and the first one said the court has jurisdiction. Okay.

Second, the court reviews the Board's decision and questions of law, on questions of law looking at the whole record. Okay. That's fine.

Third, the Board is required to comply with the statutory mandates, and when they say Board, they're talking about the Growth Board and guidelines set forth in GMA. Okay.

Then we get to agri-forest lands. The agri-forest resource designations violate the GMA. And then we have the entire -- we have an entire paragraph that I've heard read today, but the finding, the conclusion is agri-forest resource designations violate GMA. So I am at a loss to know how it is that people say, well, Judge Poyfair made these rulings and the County hasn't complied with them. I don't think we still have agri-forest resource. I think that the agri-forest resource designation was eliminated on remand in accordance with this court order. Yep, the County complied with that.

Additionally, says Judge Poyfair, the failure to solicit meaningful

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

public input for the agri-forest resource lands violated the public participation provisions of the GMA. So agri-forest is eliminated. The issue of public participation in designating agri-forest is also, I would argue, eliminated, but in addition, after this remand, the County created task forces and committees that met and dealt with what to do with the agri-forest. There were meetings. They were well publicized. There were public hearings. So, again, what more is the County supposed to do to comply with that? All right.

Next, agricultural resource lands. This is the one they don't read. There is substantial evidence in the record to support the County's designation of agricultural resource lands. Okay. No. 6, the comprehensive plan EIS issued by the County violates SEPA. Now, let's read about why. The agri-forest resource land designations were disclosed subsequent to the publication of the final plan EIS and were not disclosed or discussed in any way in the EIS alternatives, but on remand, the County eliminated agri-forest, so you don't need to put anything in the EIS about agri-forest. Then he says, the removal of rural activity centers was also not addressed in the EIS. The County did not require additional environmental review and did not solicit additional public comments.

So here are the two ways that the EIS violated SEPA: One, agri-forest designation was established after the Final EIS; Two, there wasn't public comment and environmental review when rural centers, which

were sometimes called rural activity centers and sometimes called hamlets, were eliminated from the plan. Let us note that on remand the County established rural centers, so we don't have agri-forest. We do have rural centers.

What more are we supposed to do? What it says at the end of the Judge's paragraph on that was the Board's - again that's the Growth Board - the Board's decision to uphold the adequacy of the EIS absent additional environmental analysis regarding the agri-forest designations and changes to the pattern of rural development, and that is eliminating the hamlet or activity center designation, that was clearly erroneous. Okay. Those are fixed. So the EIS was also fixed.

And then Number 7 is rural land densities. The County's rural and resource development regulations are inconsistent with GMA. One of the planning goals requires a variety of residential densities and housing types, which the Clark County Community Framework Plan met by identifying pre-existing small development patterns in rural areas and creating rural activity centers with a variety of rural densities. The eradication of the centers and their replacement with the uniform lot density violates the planning goal requiring a variety of residential densities. So that was what was wrong, according to Judge Poyfair, with the residential densities. It eliminated the rural activity centers.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

And then it goes on with this stuff about it is evident that the rural land density regulations were driven in part by earlier GMHB decisions regarding urban. So that's what is read, but the idea was the County erred by eliminating rural centers. The County now has rural centers. Every single item that Judge Poyfair ruled on has been addressed and cured by this County. There is not one more thing. That's the opinion of the Prosecutor's Office and it is upheld by the Growth Board's findings on compliance.

OLSON: Thank you.

MIELKE: I have a question, Mr. Chairman.

ORJIAKO: I have nothing more to add. I think Chris covered it very well. The ag-forest issue, some of you will probably read, was 35,000 acres, that could have gone either way; however, the designation of ag-forest which the Judge ruled was not compliance with the GMA because the GMA does not call for a hybrid. The question will be, where did that 35,000 acres go? What happened to that 35,000 acres? It was rezoned to Rural 5, predominantly Rural 5, additional Rural 5.

There was a point where about 3500 acres of that 35,000 were left. The two groups or the group that were reviewing that couldn't come

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

to a consensus of what it should be. Through remand, which Chris alluded to, that 3500 acres went to Rural 10 and Rural 20 as a way to buffer the resource land which is called for in the State law.

COOK: And which many other counties do.

ORJIAKO: And, finally, on the rural centers, we allowed for one-acre minimum, two and a half and fives. If you couple that with the one acre, two and a half in the rural centers, you have 5, 10, 20, 40 and 80, that complied with a variety of rural densities that the Judge was calling for, and the Growth Board, upon remand, and the County complied with. So I don't have anything more to add to that. That was finally how that Judge Poyfair ruling was handled through compliance hearings and through the County continuing compliance because the ruling was remanded back to the Growth Board.

BOLDT: Okay. Any of these questions for next week?

MIELKE: I have a question of staff right now, and having to do with the ag-forest. So we were out of compliance with ag-forest, but when we did away with ag-forest, did we just create an ag and a forest? Is that --

COOK: As Dr. Orjiako just said, virtually all of the 35,000 acres that were in agri-forest were zoned R-5.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

157

PUBLIC: No.

COOK: Oh, yes.

PUBLIC: No, they weren't.

MIELKE: Well, you said that the point I was making was and so we have an ag and we have a forest. At the time we had an ag-forest.

COOK: And an ag and a forest.

MIELKE: Oh, okay. So then when we did away with the ag-forest that became R-5, R-10s, where were they? Were they recognized what was legal lots before? I mean, before the GMA, we had several legal lots that were --

COOK: That had nothing to do with legal lots.

MIELKE: So they created more 5s and 10s.

ORJIAKO: Yes. 5s predominantly and the 10 and 20 was used to buffer the resource. There is -- it is true on this and there are reports that is available. That's my understanding of what was done. While I was here, I wasn't the Planning Director or the Planning Manager,

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

but I was on the staff and that was my understanding of how the County came in compliance with the Judge Poyfair ruling.

MIELKE: Can we identify those? Because I just don't see them.

COOK: Councilor, how about for the next meeting we show or staff gets the 1994 map.

BOLDT: Can you do that?

MIELKE: That will work.

STEWART: And this a recap of just what you've said here and I've made some notes, but if we could see a recap of --

BOLDT: Maybe a chart.

STEWART: Yeah, that's fine, a chart, simple, that talks about how we resolved the agri-forest and what it became and, you know, how we remedied that or mitigated it.

COOK: Certainly.

MADORE: At the beginning, near the beginning of the meeting, Christine Cook, you mentioned that the column A assumptions are not

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

159

the column -- or are not the original assumptions and you weren't able to put your finger on anything specific. I would like to be able to, if for some reason column A assumptions do not clearly relate the original assumptions, then please let us know specifically which one is not accurate. If there are other assumptions that we don't know about, please let us know.

BOLDT: Okay. Any other questions for next week?

STEWART: I'm going to be really interested in transfer of development rights just in the sense of how that works. Over the years, I've seen a lot of that sort of thing develop in different ways, wetland banking, all kinds of stuff where you buy in or exchange value or whatever, it doesn't always work that great. I'm going to be interested in all this conversation about accessory dwelling units. And a question that I have, and we may not have the answer to this, I appreciated Liz Pike commenting on what she thinks the County should be doing here.

What I'm interested in, though, is since GMA is State law, I'm interested in knowing if there's anything underway in the legislature now that legislatures are working on an upstream fix because we're constrained right now what we can do to a large degree by State law. So is Liz Pike or others looking at the GMA in order to remedy that in the upstream field by making a recommendation for certain aspects

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

160

of the State law that's looked at because that would surely give us relief at the County level? So if we're aware of any action going on in the legislature, if we could just have that identified, it would be really helpful.

BOLDT: Okay. Anything else for next week?

MIELKE: I have a point of order.

BOLDT: Next week?

MIELKE: Do we have to do just a hearing continuation so we have to make a motion?

COOK: We need to continue. Yeah. Continue to a date and time certain which would be 10:00 a.m. next week, next Tuesday.

BOLDT: So, Oliver, I would have just a couple of questions. So the people that didn't get in either changing the urban -- being added to the urban growth boundary, perhaps the rural center, a few things like that, that didn't get in there, how do we make them whole or how do we address them? Also is there a next step if they don't get in? Can we go to reserve docket items, annual reserve, anything like that?

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

161

And then after that, probably just we need to have some sort of chart, I'll say, of the next steps, policies for work session, capital facilities, just sort of regroup where we are, what they do, everything like that because it's going to be a very fast pace from now till June, so that would be mine.

So with that, I entertain a motion to convene, reconvene the meeting for deliberation next Tuesday, February whatever it is --

MCCAULEY: 23rd.

BOLDT: -- 23rd at 10:00 a.m.

OLSON: So moved.

BOLDT: Second?

STEWART: Second.

BOLDT: All in favor say aye.

STEWART: AYE

OLSON: AYE

BOLDT: AYE

MIELKE: AYE

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

162

BOLDT: All opposed? Motion carried.

MADORE: I abstain.

BOLDT: Thank you. Thank you. Meeting adjourned.

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS
MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 16, 2016

BOARD OF COUNTY COUNCILORS



Marc Boldt, Chair



Jeanne E. Stewart, Councilor



Julie Olson, Councilor

David Madore, Councilor

Tom Mielke, Councilor

ATTEST:



Rebecca Tilton, Clerk of the Board

Minutes Transcribed by:
Cindy Holley, Court Reporter/Rider & Associates, Inc.