



TO: Clark County Community Planning
clark.wa.gov/planning
360-397-2280

FROM: Gerry M. Coppedge, Trustee
Coppedge Family Living Trust
767 West S Street
Washougal, WA 98671
360-210-7599

DATE: August 24, 2015

RE: Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan

I am the current owner of two (2) parcels of land located at approximately 5700 NE Landerholm Rd., LaCenter, namely:

Property Acct. No. 222594000 #67 Sec 7 T4N R2EWM 35.03 acres
Property Acct. No. 222542000 #15 Sec 7 T4N R2EWN 20 acres

I acquired this property through a bad debt from John Morris who originally owned a total of 65 acres. He had already separated a 10-acre parcel through a boundary line adjustment and had sold that parcel upon which a house with a horse arena was constructed by the present owner, Cory Kjose, before my possession of the property in 2008. Before I agreed to accept the two parcels, I had completed my "due diligence" through talking with all the governing offices and I was assured that I would be able to either sub-divide, short plat or "cluster" my property into smaller segments to achieve the best use of the property. This property is covered with scrub trees, blackberries and other wild undergrowth and is uncondusive to any productive use other than residential or agricultural.

I attended two public meetings in which the four alternative plans were presented regarding the committee's future plans for several areas in Clark County. My questions and my search for answers are limited to the area in and around LaCenter.

According to county records, my two parcels are zoned R-20 with at least one of the alternative proposals going to RL. I do not completely understand the distinction among the classifications of RL, Agricultural or Forest land; why they exist and how they can change depending on the use that is granted. When John Morris divided the 65 acres into three parcels in May 2008, how did that R-20 designation allow for a 10-acre parcel? In addition, approximately 18 parcels (see attached Exhibits 1 and 2) were already established beginning approximately 1985 (according to County Dept. employees). These parcels seem to reflect between 1 acre, 2.5 acres and 5 acres each and are immediately adjacent to the eastern boundary of my two parcels with ingress/egress located from 60th Ave., 59th Ave. and 315th St. Also, to the immediate west of my property at approximately 5617 Landerholm Rd. there are three parcels: 1 approximately 6.5 acres with an existing house located on the property and 2 parcels approximately 5 acres each, all owned at one time by Dave Pettit, both 5-acre parcels having received building permits in the last 6 months with houses currently being constructed on each parcel.

Clark County Community Planning
Gerry M. Coppedge
August 23, 2015 - Page 2

In addition, there are properties located just off Lockwood Creek Rd. on NE 40th Ave. which are 5-acre "horse properties" as well as approximately eight properties located on NE Landerholm Rd. that appear to be 5-acre "horse properties" with very nice newer homes and surrounded by white fencing.

I question why is my property currently zoned R-20 with proposed zoning to RL when I am surrounded by adjacent properties ranging from 1 acre to 2.5 acres on the east, two 5-acre parcels and one 6.5 acre parcel adjacent to the west with several nearby 5-acre properties on Landerholm Rd. and 40th Ave.?

I have public water as well as power serving my 20 and 35-acre parcels running along a road easement approximately 900 to 1,000 feet from Landerholm Rd.

An increased tax base through new jobs and new housing can help alleviate the costs for more public services such as roads, schools and public safety services. The permitting process can control new construction and the "urban sprawl" as voiced by opponents to Alternative 4. Development fees can help the County recover some of those costs.

One argument I repeatedly hear from those involved in the planning process is the criteria for job growth and income from development. If large rural tracts are allowed to downsize, as desired by thousands of rural property owners, building permits and the construction of new housing as well as an increased tax base will only help the economy of small towns as well as the County. In the case of LaCenter, one planner reiterated that they were looking at job and economic growth. And as you know, it was the County that allowed for the approval of the Indian casino, stating job and economic growth for the region. Job and economic growth will require more housing and downsizing rural properties will allow for housing for future employees who choose to live where the jobs are located. It will be interesting to see how the properties west of the city of LaCenter and extending west to I-5 and beyond is going to be zoned to accommodate the Cowlitz Indian Tribe and the commercial development surrounding the proposed casino.

Before many of the public hearings were held regarding the Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, an article published in the Columbian indicated that two leading candidates for Clark County Chair had already established preferences for Alternatives 1 or 2 and had criticized Madore for his Alternative 4 proposal. They appeared to have made their decisions even before hearings scheduled for Sept. 3 and 10 are held. "Alternative 4 proposes to correct the massive mismatch between the actual rural land and the inappropriate zoning map that was imposed 20 years ago," as stated by Madore. Alternative 4 will address the hardships created by the 1994 Comprehensive Growth Plan that created too many large lots, resulting in severely limiting the ability to subdivide, either for sale or designating to children.

It has already been stated that Alternative 4 puts the county at risk of legal challenges over noncompliance with the Growth Management Act. There will also be considerable legal challenges by those harmed should Alternative 4 not prevail.

It would seem grossly unfair for the County to mandate an alternative plan that would restrict property owners from utilizing the highest and best use for property that is already situated in an area already

Clark County Community Planning
Gerry M. Coppedge
Page 3 - August 24, 2015

developed as residential, especially as there is no real viable alternative for economic use. As Clark County Citizens United has stated, the goals of respect for property rights, affordable housing and rural economic vitality should not be slighted. Development of property into housing would not only provide for jobs and housing but would put increased property tax money into the County coffers. The planners should not boldly assume that rural landowners are to be preservationists and charities but should have the right to utilize their property as they deem fit, whether it be for housing or merely to divide to pass on to their heirs.

Sincerely,

Gerry M. (Mike) Coppedge

Attachments: 3

La Center Exhibit 1 B pg 1

Parcel #				
222594000	3.5 acres	Coppedge		
222542000	20 acres	Coppedge		
222550000	10 acres	Cory Kiose		
		5707 NE Landholm Rd	7/1/08	\$250,000 10 acres
Map:				
# 1	222553000	Casey Dean	2/18/15	\$389,000 5 acres/home
		5409 NE Landholm Rd		
# 2	222551000	Frank Howard	1/30/15	\$442,000 6.51 acres/home
		5517 NE Landholm Rd		
# 3	222566000	John Love	1/20/14	\$160,000 5.02 acres
		5519 NE Landholm Rd		
# 4	222560000	Anthony & Aaron Paul	10/5/00	2.5 acres
		31414 NE 59th Ave.		foreclosure
# 5	222594000	John Mayfield	D-QCD 9/24/10	5.08 acres/home
		5811 NE Landholm Rd.		
# 6	222565000	Jaremillo Trust	D-QCD 6/28/12	5 acres/home
		31612 NE 60th Ave		
# 7	222559005	Sylvia Stokes	Death 3/17/13	1.9 acres/m. home
		5916 NE 315 St.		
# 8	222561000	David Baldasano	3/19/12	2.5 acres/home
		31220 NE 59th Ave.		
# 9	222562	Craig Lilly	1/28/13	\$225,000 1.51 acres/home
		31214 NE 59th Ave		
# 10	222564000	Maureen Howe	4/9/13	5 acres/men. home
		3112 NE 59th Ave.		
# 11	222563000	Michael Wright	3/18/03	\$35,000 5 acres
		no available address		
# 12	222562005	Sean Epperson	1/29/08	\$207,000 0.99 acre/men. home
		31208 NE 59th Ave.		

#12	222577000 David Pettit 12/30/08 BLA 5511 NE Landesholm Rd \$325,000 6/28/05	6.37 acres
#13	222567000 R47 Diversified Services 9/10/13 BCD 5217 NE Landesholm Rd	5.03 ^{min.} / acre
#14	222552000 Phuoc Le 10/11/06 \$470,000 5117 NE Landesholm farm & agricultural	9.63 acres
#15	222576000 Phuoc Le 10/11/06 \$470,000 farm & agricultural	12.93
#16	222343000 Andrew Shaffer 11/14/14 \$360,000 5608 NE Landesholm Rd	7.77 acres / house
#17	22233700 Richard Hall no sales data 32011 NE 59th Ave.	7.34 acres
#18	222375000 Kristina Hughes/Hinch 7/3/2000 \$119,900 6200 NE Landesholm Rd	5 acres

Workplace Improvement Project
Occupational Climate and Communication Team
Meeting Minutes
October 28, 2015

Present: Emily Zwetzig, Annie Wentland, David Bottami, Kathy Smith, John Milne, Travis Moultrie, Christina Monks, and Scot Brantley .

When I arrived talk was around Leadership Academy. Must have servant leadership involved in all training and will need to ask for training budget in 2017-2018 biennium. Mark mentioned he still has \$60,000 that can be used in this biennium. Discussed what types of leadership training other departments are using. PW sends folks to Leadership Lab. There is a group of professors at PSU that have a Leadership program. With Chris we are figuring 5-6 2.5 hour sessions total needed.

Scot expressed concern that with three or four types of trainings within the three groups we could have problems obtaining budget approval. He thinks we should have one training plan that incorporates all of the training similar to what our team has thought. We just have been hesitant to step on toes. Hopefully we can find a way to make this happen in the implementation plan. We need to get subgroups together and approach this in a professional manner.

We need 1 package to present for Training that includes Leadership, Management, and Employee training. Do we need a Servant Leader Committee that monitors the inputs from the other groups? Start Clark County University or Clark County Academy?

We talked about whether it was a good idea to do outreach now to line staff or wait until leaders are trained. Pros and Cons to doing it at either time. Waiting will show line staff employees that Clark County is serious about this culture change. However, waiting might also make them feel left out again.

Mark has compiled a list of leaders who are ready to attend. We talked about getting the contract with Chris in place. Developing the implementation plan and tweaking it after the first go-round of trainings. We would continue planning and add Ethics-Code of Conduct in more sessions and so on.

Need to plan more sessions; how many cycles per year. First training is April-June 8-10 weeks. We are hoping we will get a group from the first training that will be able to facilitate additional training.

Front line staff are concerned with accountability and want to know when there will be a payoff or when they will see results. This is the biggest barrier we have to overcome along with BOCC buy-in and budget.

Kathy Smith