

Rebecca Messinger

From: Clark County <webmaster@clark.wa.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 12:30 PM
To: publiccomment
Subject: Council Hearing Public Comment

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



Clark County

Submitted on Tue, 09/30/2025 - 12:30 PM

Name

Rowen Oaks

Phone Number

[3909034857](tel:3909034857)

Email Address

Rowenander@gmail.com

Subject

Opposition to Law Enforcement Use of Conservation Property

Date of Hearing

Wed, 10/01/2025

Comment

Dear Clark County Council,

I am writing to express my strong opposition to expanding law enforcement agreements that would allow the ATF, SWAT, or Bomb Squad to conduct activities on our conservation lands, including Camp Bonneville. These lands were set aside to protect our forests, watersheds, and wildlife, and they should not be used for military-style training or exercises involving explosives or chemical agents.

Clark County residents have already voiced concern about the history of contamination and the risks to Lacamas Lake and surrounding ecosystems. Continuing to allow such activities undermines the purpose

of conservation property and puts community health, water quality, and safety at risk.

I urge you to prioritize the long-term wellbeing of our forests and community by saying no to federal or bomb-related activities in our conservation areas. Please protect these lands for future generations and uphold the commitments made when they were designated for conservation.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,
Rowen Oaks

© 2025 Clark County Washington

Rebecca Messinger

From: noreply@clark.wa.gov
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 1:13 PM
To: Cnty Board of County Councilors General Delivery
Subject: Write Your Councilor

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.



Clark County

Submitted on Tue, 09/30/2025 - 1:12 PM

Recipients

Sue Marshall, Chair/District 5
Glen Yung, District 1
Wil Fuentes, District 3
Matt Little, District 4

Name

Nancy Zimmer

Phone Number

3602567361

Email Address

nancyz849@comcast.net

Address

12800 NE 58 th Ave
Vancouver , Washington

Subject

Charley Kirk

Message

I am not wanting Michelle Belkots proposal with Charley Kirks name. It is offensive to put him above all the shooting victims. Also have difficulty direct emailing counselors

Councilor District

The address provided is not within Clark County.

Property ID

The address provided is not within Clark County.

© 2025 Clark County Washington

Rebecca Messinger

From: Ann Shaw <ampshaw@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 30, 2025 9:47 PM
To: Rebecca Messinger
Cc: ampshaw@gmail.com
Subject: Oct 1 Public Comment: AFT, SWAT and MEDU

You don't often get email from ampshaw@gmail.com. [Learn why this is important](#)

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Councilors:

The use of Camp Bonneville by AFT, SWAT and MEDU is inappropriate and has cost Clark County money.

Camp Bonneville was gifted to the County under the terms of a BRAC Conservation Conveyance that explicitly states the property is to be used for the conversation of natural resources.

There are no provisions in this Conservation Conveyance that allows for the storage or detonation of explosives by Law Enforcement. This means that that explosives as well the containers used to store explosives must be removed from the property, including any located at the current firing range.

An ATF agreement with CCSO expired in 2017, yet ATF's use of the property was never terminated. Neither CCSO nor any Sheriff has ever had any authority to sign an agreement with ATF or any other Law Enforcement agency to use Camp Bonneville.

In addition, AFT has never paid any compensation to Clark County to store or detonate explosives at Camp Bonneville, nor to use the firing range. The extent of activities ATF has conducted on the property is unknown. After decades of use we do not know when and if ATF has detonated explosives that contaminated property.

Storing explosives at Camp Bonneville is an attractive nuisance that invites more thefts, further endangering local citizens.

As reported in the County's own Frequently Asked Questions about Camp Bonneville, SWAT teams have routinely used the property for ATV training, navigation training, group runs, vehicle-stop procedures, and other kinds

training. This expansive of Camp Bonneville has never been authorized in any use agreement, and off-the-cuff approvals by County staff for other training events has violated the terms of the cleanup and further eroded public trust.

In addition, the records indicate that SWAT training has not been limited to regional SWAT teams but regularly includes FBI SWAT. Any SWAT agreement may create a backdoor that would allow the FBI continued use of the property.

The County has received no compensation from SWAT to use the property, nor has SWAT provided funds to remediate contamination or other damage that has resulted from their activities.

There is no record of an MEDU use agreement, yet MEDU has used Camp Bonneville as a disposal location to detonate explosives. MEDU has never paid compensation to Clark County to use Camp Bonneville nor has MEDU provided any funds to clean up the contamination from these explosions.

For decades, Clark County has never been compensated for expenses that support ATF, SWAT, and MEDU's use of Camp Bonneville. These organizations have introduced unknown contamination and damage to a Conservation Property that is subject to the terms of the BRAC transfer. Clark County citizens will now also foot the bill to cleanup decades of contamination and damage from ATF, SWAT and MEDU activities.

It is time to terminate AFT, SWAT, and MEDU's activities at Camp Bonneville, and to remove all explosives along with all containers used to store explosives from the property, including all such containers located at the current firing range.

Thank you, Ann P. Shaw

Rebecca Messinger

From: tweetfamily@comcast.net
Sent: Wednesday, October 1, 2025 1:35 PM
To: Rebecca Messinger
Subject: Oct. 1, 2025 public comments submitted for Council Time
Attachments: Oct_10,2025CtranCountyCouncil.docx

EXTERNAL: This email originated from outside of Clark County. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Attached are public comments submitted to the Clark County Council re the agenda item

8. Policy Updates

8.2 Legislative Delegation Briefing Sessions??

8.3 C-Tran 2045

Submitted by Margaret Tweet, County Council Oct. 10, 2025 CTRAN Light rail plans, Light rail has been repeatedly rejected by Clark County voters. The CTRAN board should again hold a public vote CTRAN PTBA district-wide on light rail prior to spending more on light rail planning.

Clark County had all **3 Councilors on the CTRAN board until 2015** when a **County Rep was replaced by City of Ridgefield/LaCenter** instead.

Current CTRAN Board: Vancouver-3 Clark County-2

Camas-1 Washougal-1 BattleGround-1 Ridgefield/LaCenter/Yacolt-1

<https://c-tran.com/about-c-tran/c-tran-board-information/board-of-directors>

In 2025, a majority of Clark County Council removed Councilor Belkot, District 2 with much County area from the CTRAN board. They replaced her with Councilor Fuentes, District 3, which seems to have more Vancouver area per the County District Map. Councilor Fuentes is a strong light rail supporter per his public comments.

Per RCW [36.57A.050](#)

Governing body—Selection, qualification, number of members—Travel expenses, compensation. *(Effective until January 1, 2026.)*

A majority of the governing board may not be selected to represent a single component city.

WA state wants 4 Vancouver City Reps, plus 3 County Reps and 2 small city reps on the CTRAN BOARD

3 out of 5 County Districts include Vancouver area, County District 1 and District 3 are heavily Vancouver area wise.

What is the County population by County District? No maps on PTBA or County or cities with population are posted for the 2025 rushed Composition Review Process that is being pushed early, prior to the required every 4-year review slated for 2026. Why the last minute rush?

Vancouver-4 + County-1 Rep with Vancouver area= 5 Vancouver area Reps, a majority, at a minimum on 9-member board under state proposal. If Clark County appoints 2 Vancouver area Reps, that would be 6 Vancouver area reps out of a 9 member board.

The County represents more areas, more residents. All County districts have unincorporated county area. If Clark County has 4 reps on the CTRAN Board, it would be more fair to more residents. CTRAN started as a countywide Clark County Transportation District, and should still represent all county residents. If all County Reps were properly notified of their right to vote at the 2022 Composition Review Meeting, perhaps all the County reps would have attended!

2022 Composition Review, Based on email exchanges, Clark County Councilors were not all clearly invited to the Board Composition Review Committee meetings as voting members. Only 2 attended all 3 meetings, both from Vancouver areas. Therefore, UGA, unincorporated county areas were not well represented in the faulty 2022 CTRAN Board Composition Review process.

August 2025 Composition Review Meeting- 4 out of 5 County Councilors attended, they must have been better informed of their voting participation on the committee.

Clark County Council has previously taken positions on various aspects of the I-5 IBR Program including opposition to light rail and tolls on the I-5 bridge and tolls on the I-5 and I-205 Corridors.

[This site](https://clark.wa.gov/councilors/i-5-interstate-bridge-replacement-program) serves as a repository of the resolutions passed by county council, still posted at county website on August 18, 2025: <https://clark.wa.gov/councilors/i-5-interstate-bridge-replacement-program>

The Clark County [resolution on the Modified Locally Preferred Alternative](#) for public transit is for bus service, and opposes light rail, in accordance with the 2013 advisory vote by Clark County voters.

In 2024, Vancouver Rep Anne Ogle urged the CTRAN board to circumvent voters for light rail funding, and go directly to the legislature for funds instead. **All county residents pay the .7% CTRAN sales tax when they shop in Clark County PTBA where most retail is located and should be represented on the CTRAN board, and included in votes on light rail funding.**

Ctran presentations in 2025 to cities indicated a public vote on light rail funding would occur. See example:

IBR and LRT O&M Funding Update January 22, 2025 C-TRAN Sales Tax Funding Overview

- RCW 82.14.045 (Sales and Use taxes for public transportation)
- Voter approval required for all public transit agencies in the state of Washington, including C-TRAN (up to 0.9% - 9 cents on \$10 purchase)
- C-TRAN currently collects 0.7% (0.2% voter approved authority remains)
- 1980 – Voters approved 0.3% sales tax (county-wide plus state match)
- 2005 – Voters approved a 0.2% increase to make it 0.5%
- 2011 – Voters approved a 0.2% increase to make it 0.7%

C-TRAN LRT O&M Existing Options

1. RCW 82.14.105 – **Seek voter approval for a 0.1% or a 0.2% sales tax**

increase as noted and discussed in the previous slides.

2. RCW 81.104.170 – High Capacity Transit Sales Tax

- **Voter approved PTBA wide sales tax up to 0.9%**

3. RCW 81.104.200 – High Capacity Transit Sales Tax

- **Voter approved “sub-district” sales tax up to 0.9%**
- This provides an option of not taxing the full PTBA, rather a smaller geographic area which could include the city of Vancouver or other variations as well.

The 2022 capital costs For the costly elevated light rail tracks and stations, starting at \$2 BILLION are supposed to be updated in 2025 or later.

Current Light Rail O & M costs assume a 25% Fare recovery rate, TriMet and CTRAN fare recovery rates are far below this. Light rail Costs are yet to be updated.

The June IBR presentation stated local transit ridership modeling was higher than ridership based on federal standards. Extremely high unrealistic transit ridership increases are used to justify costly light rail.

At June, 2025 CTRAN board meeting, IBR Director Greg Johnson stated that a public vote on transportation projects like the I-5 bridge was not a thing. Yet **In 2012 a C-Tran ballot proposition to extend Oregon’s**

TriMet Max light rail into Clark County over a proposed I-5 Bridge Replacement was a thing, and voters in every city in Clark County and limited county areas in the CTRAN boundary REJECTED the proposition. Many residents continue to oppose costly light rail on I-5 bridge.

Nov. 06, 2012- voters in every city in Clark County and county areas in PTBA boundary REJECTED C-Tran ballot Proposition 1 to extend Oregon's TriMet Max light rail into Clark County over a proposed I-5 Bridge Replacement.

C-Tran Proposition 1 November 6, 2012. "Resolution BR-12-009 and RCW 81.104 authorize a proposition to increase the sales and use tax by 0.1 percent, or one penny on a ten dollar purchase, to fund the C-TRAN share of the maintenance and operations costs ONLY of the Columbia River Crossing Project light rail extension between Expo Center and Clark Park & Ride and the local capital share and operations and maintenance costs of the Fourth Plain Boulevard Bus Rapid Transit project."

Clark County Public Transportation Benefit Area Authority (C-TRAN) Proposition No.1

APPROVED	64,310	43.49%
REJECTED	83,570	56.51%

General and Special Election — Clark County, Washington — November 06, 2012

<https://clark.wa.gov/sites/default/files/fileuploads/Elections/2015/09/2012Nov6ElectionResults.pdf>

Residents who pay CTRAN sales tax, and lived outside the CTRAN PTBA voting boundary were not allowed to vote on the measure.

Nov. 5, 2013- County Councilors placed an advisory vote on the ballot to oppose any Light Rail project in Clark County unless it is first supported by a majority of voters in a county-wide vote of the people. Over 68% of voters approved the measure. <https://results.vote.wa.gov/results/20131105/clark/>

Clark County

Advisory Vote No. 1

LIGHT RAIL ADVISORY VOTE

Should the Clark County Board of Commissioners approve proposed Resolution 2013-07-17 which opposes any Light Rail project in Clark County unless it is first supported by a majority of the voters in a county-wide advisory vote of the people?

☐ YES ☐ NO

CLARK COUNTY Advisory Vote No. 1 Light Rail Advisory Vote

Measure	Vote	Vote %
Yes	60,424	68.39%
No	27,929	31.61%
Total Votes	88,353	100%

In July, 2022 the CTRAN board approved the Modified Locally Preferred Alternative for the IBR I-5 Bridge replacement to include light rail, with conditions. Current CTRAN board members Anne Ogle, Bart Hansen, and Molly Coston all voted for the conditions. Yet, In November 2024, Vancouver Mayor Anne Ogle proposed lifting the conditions to allow CTRAN funds to be used for light rail, prior to a vote of the people on light rail. Discussion about a public vote on light rail has not been held since the presentations by CTRAN and IBR were made at the beginning of 2022.

Unincorporated Clark County poorly represented in 2022 CTRAN Board Composition Review process

[June 14, 2022 Board Composition Review Committee Meeting](#)

Greg Anderson – City of Camas, Joshua Beck – Town of Yacolt, Karen Bowerman – Clark

County (virtual) District 3, Temple Lentz – Clark County District 1, Richard Rylander – Clark County District 5 (virtual)

Sean Boyle – City of La Center, Molly Coston – City of Washougal, Philip

Johnson – City of Battle Ground, Anne McEnerny-Ogle – City of Vancouver, Ron Onslow – City of Ridgefield,

[July 12, 2022 Board Composition Review Committee Meeting](#)

Greg Anderson – City of Camas, Joshua Beck – Town of Yacolt, Karen Bowerman – Clark

County District 3 (virtual), Temple Lentz – Clark County District 1, Sean Boyle – City of La Center, Molly Coston – City of Washougal, Philip Johnson – City of Battle Ground, Anne McEnerny-Ogle – City of Vancouver, Ron Onslow – City of Ridgefield

<https://c-tran.com/media/uploads/board/2022/071222 Board Comp Review minutes.pdf>

[September 27, 2022 Board Composition Review Committee Meeting](#)

Only 2 Clark County Councilors attended, Karen Bowerman –County District 3, Temple Lentz –County District 1

County Districts 1 especially, and District 3 are heavily Vancouver Area