CHECKING IN
ON OUR FUTURE

2016 COMPREHENSIVE
GROWTH MANAGEMENT PLAN

OPEN HOUSE

Environmental Impact Statement – Scoping
WELCOME!

Purpose of this open house
To provide you with information about the alternatives Clark County is studying to accommodate the population and employment growth expected over the next 20 years.

Share your ideas
We encourage you to share any thoughts and information or concerns with staff.

Ask questions, too. That helps us as we do our analysis.

There will also be additional opportunities for you to provide input as the process continues.

Thank you
Thank you for joining us this evening. We appreciate your time and interest in helping plan for our community’s future.
Possible alternatives

1. No action alternative
   The adopted 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, as amended. This would include current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies, and implementation ordinances.

2. County-initiated actions
   The new planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning, and principles and values defined by the commissioners will be used in this alternative.

3. City-initiated actions
   The cities of Battle Ground, La Center, and Ridgefield are considering expanding their urban growth areas to support job growth.
Welcome!

Welcome to tonight’s meeting!
Thank you for attending.
1. Purpose of the meeting
   a. Introduce the SEPA Process
   b. Answer questions about the comp plan update
   c. Comment

2. Next steps

2016 Comprehensive Plan progress to date

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PRE-PLANNING</td>
<td>DATA ANALYSIS</td>
<td>ADOPTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PLAN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMA Overview</td>
<td>Public Review &amp; Comment</td>
<td>Public Review &amp; Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBLM Review</td>
<td>Dept. of Commerce Checklist</td>
<td>Department of Commerce Review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Scoping Timeline</td>
<td>20-year Population Range</td>
<td>Planning Commission Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Participation Plan</td>
<td>Countywide Planning Policies</td>
<td>County Commissioner Hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Growth Trends &amp; Allocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Planning Assumptions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildable Lands Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Housing Technical Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Capital Facilities Technical Report</td>
<td>Capital Facility Plan (CFP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Technical Report</td>
<td>County Capital Facility &amp; Financial Plan (CFPP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Environmental Technical Report</td>
<td>VBLM Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use Transportation Analysis Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Travel Demand Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Draft Comprehensive Plan Text</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

IN PROCESS
State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

- Requires potential environmental impacts from projects and non-development projects be reviewed
- Requires preparation of environmental impact statements (EIS) for large projects
- EIS contains: description of proposal and alternatives; analyses of potential impacts; known and potential mitigation
- EIS presents options and effects; not a decision document
- Scoping meetings initiate process

General SEPA Process

1. Environmental threshold determination
2. Request for comments on scope
3. Scoping open house
4. Development of alternatives
5. Draft Environmental Impact Statement
6. Final Environmental Impact Statement
Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

Elements of the environment studied

Natural environment:
- Earth
- Water
- Fish and wildlife habitat
- Energy and natural resources

Built environment:
- Land and shoreline use
- Transportation
- Public services and utilities
- GMA conformance

2016 Comp Plan Update - SEPA Process

- Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for 2007 comprehensive plan update studied a large area (maximum study area on the handout map)
- Urban growth boundaries (UGBs) established with adoption of 2007 plan
- Challenges to 2007 plan resulted in current UGBs
- Growth Management Act (GMA) requires a 20-year land supply
- Can vacant and buildable lands in current urban growth areas accommodate population and employment, based on planning assumptions adopted by the Board?
## 2016 Planning Assumptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assumption</th>
<th>2016</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2035 total population projection</td>
<td>562,207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projected new residents</td>
<td>136,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/rural population growth split</td>
<td>90/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assumed annual population growth rate</td>
<td>1.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing type ratio</td>
<td>No more than 75% of one housing type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons per household</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New jobs</td>
<td>91,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs to household ratio</td>
<td>1:1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure deduction, residential</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure deduction, commercial and industrial</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VBLM (definition of vacant)</td>
<td>$13,000 residential, $67,500 commercial and industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market factor</td>
<td>15% residential; 15% commercial, business park, industrial</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2016 Comp Plan Update-SEPA Process

- Given the planning assumptions and the amount of vacant and buildable land, there appears to be enough land to accommodate the 20-year growth projection
- Preparing a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement EIS (SEIS) based on 2007 EIS
2016 Comp Plan Update-SEPA Process

Possible SEIS alternatives:

1. No action alternative: present plan as is

2. County-initiated actions to include:
   - Public facilities zoning designation
   - Map clean ups/recent BOCC decisions (SMO)
   - Arterial map update
   - Sub-area plans
   - Rural lands

3. City requests

SEPA Process Schedule

- **Scoping Open Houses**
  - Aug. 19, Vancouver Library
  - Aug. 20, Lacamas Lake Lodge
  - Aug. 27, Ridgefield Community Center
  - Aug. 28, Battle Ground Community Center

- **DSEIS Completion**
  - December 2014

- **Joint BOCC/PC Hearing**
  - January 2015

- **FSEIS completion**
  - April/May 2015
Purpose of the Open House

Let us know what else should be considered in the environmental review process.

- **Information stations:**
  - Current comprehensive plan
  - Planning assumptions
  - Environmental constraints/built environment
  - Transportation system
  - Parks

- **Staff available to answer questions**

---

Food System Council

The Clark County Food System Council’s mission is to increase and preserve access to safe, local and healthy food for all residents of Clark County by:

- Strengthening the connections between food, health, natural resource protection, economic development and the agricultural community.
- Researching, analyzing and reporting on information about the local food system.
- Advocating and advising on food system and food policy implementation.
- Promoting and providing education on food system issues.
Ways to provide comments

- Fill out a comment sheet.

- Submit a comment on the web:
  - [www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments](http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments)

- Email a comment to [comp.plan@clark.wa.gov](mailto:comp.plan@clark.wa.gov)

- Submit a comment in writing:
  - Comprehensive Plan EIS Scoping
    Community Planning
    P.O. Box 9810
    Vancouver, WA 98666

- Comments are due September 1, 2014.

Questions?

[www.clark.wa.gov/planning/](http://www.clark.wa.gov/planning/)
Environmental Impact Statement – Scoping
OPEN HOUSE

Purpose of this open house
Clark County is revising its Comprehensive Growth Management Plan. As part of the process, the county will prepare a supplemental environmental impact statement (SEIS) in compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA). The review process will keep the public informed about environmental impacts anticipated under each of the proposed growth alternatives.

Agencies, affected tribes and the public are invited to comment on the scope of the SEIS. The scope determines the range and kinds of issues studied in the SEIS. You can comment on alternatives, mitigation measures, probable significant adverse impacts, or other relevant issues.

You can submit comments using the comment form or submit them in writing on the county website at www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments.html.

Comments must be received by September 1, 2014.

How it works
The open house will start with an explanation of the purpose of an environmental impact statement and description of input helpful to determine what an EIS should include. You can then walk through the room to ask questions at any of the seven stations featuring information on relevant topics.

The stations are:
Station 1: Welcome; purpose
Station 2: Current Comprehensive Plan zoning map
Station 3: Planning assumptions
Station 4: Possible alternatives
Station 5: Environmental constraints and the built environment
Station 6: Transportation system
Station 7: Parks Master Plan update

Context for comprehensive planning
Since the Clark County Comprehensive Growth Management Plan was updated and adopted in 2009, conditions in the county, as well as state and federal laws, have changed, requiring corresponding changes to the plan. In addition, we now have better mapping and more accurate information about buildable lands. This additional data might change conclusions in the previous plan about the current urban growth areas’ capacity to accommodate future population and jobs. As a result, in early 2014, the Board of Clark County Commissioners issued planning assumptions and policy direction for reviewing and updating the growth management plan.

Environmental impact statement – a general statement of impacts
SEPA requires potential impacts of proposed changes as part of a comprehensive plan update to be evaluated in an environmental impact statement. As allowed by SEPA, analyses are not detailed to specific sites, but instead give an overview of what could be expected under any alternative.

SEPA allows adoption of other documents when researching existing conditions and anticipated impacts. Because growth hasn’t occurred as predicted in the 2007 SEIS, the county will re-adopt that document and supplement it with additional information for the 2016 update.

Alternatives in the SEIS will be considered based on requirements of the Growth Management Act (GMA), objectives of the comprehensive plan, and county planning policies.

STATIONS

STATION 1: Welcome; Purpose
To provide you with information about the alternatives Clark County is studying to accommodate the population and employment growth expected over the next 20 years.

STATION 2: Current Comprehensive Plan zoning map
This map shows the current zoning in unincorporated areas of Clark County.
2007 EIS STUDY AREA AND CURRENT URBAN GROWTH BOUNDARIES

City Limits
2007 Study Area Boundary
Adopted UGA Boundaries

STATION 3: Planning assumptions

Planning assumptions guide the amount of land needed for future growth. Assumptions, for example, predict how many people might live or work in Clark County, how densely they will live, and how much land must be set aside to avoid wetlands and other environmentally critical areas. The Board of Clark County Commissioners approved the following key assumptions:

Policy assumptions
- Base year for the plan is 2015; end year is 2035.
- Population forecast is 566,207, an increase of 1.22 percent annually.
- Jobs forecast is 91,200, an increase of more than 2 percent annually.
- Urban/rural population split is 90:10.
- Employment density is 10 employees per commercial acre, nine employees per industrial acre.
- Add a market factor of 15 percent to acreage needed for residential lands.
- Add a market factor of 25 percent to acreage needed for industrial and commercial lands.

Consultative assumptions, County planning policies
- Housing densities of eight units per acre in the Vancouver urban growth area; six units per acre in the Battle Ground, Camas, Ridgefield and Washougal urban growth areas; and four units per acre in the La Center urban growth area.
- New housing will be no more than 75 percent of any one product type, such as detached or attached housing.
- 2.66 persons per household.

Data-driven assumptions
- For every new acre of residential land inside an existing urban growth area, 97.7 percent will be used for infrastructure. This set-aside rate includes both onsite and offsite infrastructure.
- For commercial, industrial and business park zones, 25 percent overall will be used for infrastructure.
- 50 percent of vacant residential inventory will not convert to accommodate growth over the 20-year plan.
- 50 percent of underused residential inventory will not convert to accommodate growth over the 20-year plan.
- Underused commercial and industrial parcels have a building value per acre of $50,000 or less.
- Future development on critical lands is based on excluding the portion of land hindered by critical areas. The portion not hindered by critical areas is included in the buildable lands inventory.

Values and principles articulated by the Board of County Commissioners

The Board of Clark County Commissioners stated its values for the revised plan and lands to be included in urban growth areas. The complete text and details of the planning assumptions are available from Community Planning at www.clark.wa.gov/planning/zonupdate/index.html.
STATION 4: Possible alternatives

The county population forecast for 2035 is 562,207, lower than the 2024 forecast of 584,200. Because of this lower forecast, the county has determined that most, if not all, of the expected population and jobs can be accommodated within existing urban growth boundaries.

For this scoping, the county has identified a range of options for land use changes instead of options for adding land to urban growth areas. They are:

• **No Action Alternative**, which would be the adopted 2007 Comprehensive Growth Management Plan, as amended, including current urban growth boundaries, planning assumptions, policies, and implementation ordinances.

• **County-initiated changes**, such as recent work to update application of the surface mining overlay, creation of a public facilities zone, and review of minimum parcel size for agriculture and forest lands; and areas proposed for change by property owners within existing boundaries.

New planning assumptions, policy direction, changes in land use/zoning, and principles and values defined by the commissioners would be used for this alternative.

• **Expansion of urban growth areas proposed by cities**.

The cities of Battle Ground, La Center, and Ridgefield are considering expanding their urban growth areas to support job growth.

After EIS scoping, a preferred alternative will be developed based on technical analysis, input from cities, principles and values, and results of the environmental scoping and analysis. The preferred alternative is expected to include areas roughly equivalent to current urban growth boundaries, plus lands selected from within the 2007 EIS Study Area (see map on the page) sufficient to meet 2030 planning assumptions and policy directions.

STATION 5: Environmental constraints and the built environment

**ELEMENTS OF THE ENVIRONMENT**

By adopting the 2007 EIS, the county will use much of its data and analyses as a starting point for additional study. Interested parties are invited to comment on the elements commonly included in SEPA, as well as other issues of concern. These elements are listed below.

**Natural environment**

1. Earth
   a. Soils

2. Water
   a. Surface waters
   b. Floods
   c. Groundwater and aquifer recharge areas
   d. Public water supplies

3. Fish and Wildlife Habitat
   a. Habitat, numbers, diversity of plant, animal species
   b. Wetlands
   c. Threatened and endangered species
   d. Migratory species and migration routes

4. Energy and natural resources
   a. Amount required, rate of use, efficiency
   b. Source, availability
   c. Conservation and renewable resources

**Built environment**

1. Land and Shoreline Use
   a. Relationship to existing land use plans and to estimated population
   b. Housing
   c. Economy
   d. Resource lands

2. Transportation
   a. Roadway network, including freight
   b. Transit
   c. Non-motorized modes

3. Public services and utilities
   a. Fire
   b. Police
   c. Schools
   d. Parks or other recreational facilities
   e. Libraries
   f. General government facilities
   g. Public water supplies
   h. Solid waste
   i. Sanitary sewer

4. GMA requirements
   a. State statutes
   b. County-wide planning policies
   c. Concurrency
   d. Fiscal impacts
   e. Public involvement
STATION 6: Transportation system

Transportation is a key aspect of the comprehensive plan, shaping Clark County’s development patterns. Clark County’s transportation network connects state highways, neighboring city streets, and adjacent county roads. It connects to transportation facilities operated by other special purpose districts, such as sewer and water districts, and for-profit businesses. The public does not experience a series of separate transportation systems, but a single, unified system. This starts with coordinated planning as required by GMA. The transportation system must be affordable and minimize environmental impacts to maintain the quality of life. It must serve all users and modes, despite mobility, age, or income issues. A safe, efficient transportation system can work to enhance economic development in conjunction with supporting land use plans.

STATION 7: Park’s Master Plan update

Clark County Parks is updating the Parks Plan. It shows current parks, open spaces, and trail systems in unincorporated areas. During the next few months, we will ask for public input regarding the Parks Plan update, looking at topics such as levels of service, amenities, and locations of future parks, open spaces, and trails.

HOW TO HELP SHAPE THE SCOPE

We need your input about what to discuss in the supplemental environmental impact statement and potential impacts of the alternatives. Most likely, urban growth boundaries would change minimally, if at all. What concerns do you have about planning issues? Do you see areas with important physical characteristics that should be recognized or areas with built features that need special attention? Look at the list of factors for the natural and built environment. Are there special issues for the scoping area? Please identify them.

Ways to submit a comment:

• Fill out a comment sheet and leave it with staff.
• Submit a comment on the county’s website at
  www.clark.wa.gov/planning/2016update/comments.html
  or mail it to Comprehensive Plan RE Scoping, Community Planning,
  P.O. Box 9840, Vancouver, WA 98666.

Please direct questions to
Oliver Orjako, (360) 397-2280 ext. 4112 or to comp.plan@clark.wa.gov

THANK YOU FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION
2016 Comp Plan Update

• Food Systems Council
  The Clark County Food System Council’s mission is to increase and preserve access to safe, local and healthy food for all residents of Clark County by:
  • Strengthening the connections between food, health, natural resource protection, economic development and the agricultural community.
  • Researching, analyzing and reporting on information about the local food system.
  • Advocating and advising on food system and food policy implementation.
  • Promoting and providing education on food system issues.
WHAT YOU CAN DO TO SUPPORT LOCAL AGRICULTURE AND PROMOTE FOOD PRODUCTION

- Submit comments on the county website at www.clark.wa.gov/planning/iso6update/comments.html.
- Let your friends and neighbors know about this important issue and encourage them to get involved.
- Learn more about efforts to promote a healthy food system at www.clark.wa.gov/public-health/about/foodsystemsjencil.html
- Purchase locally grown and locally produced food as much as possible.

For more information: Please email Theresa.Cross@clark.wa.gov

CLARK COUNTY Public Health
Always working for a safer and healthier community
Street Address: 1601 East 4th Plain Blvd, Vancouver, WA 98661
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 9823, Vancouver, WA 98666
Telephone: (360) 397-8000
Website: www.clark.wa.gov/public-health

CONSERVING FOOD PRODUCTION IN CLARK COUNTY
CHECKING IN ON OUR FUTURE

Why conserve food production land in Clark County?

Clark County farms support the local economy
- Local farms employ more than 4,000 people. Preserving agriculture land provides economic opportunity for new farmers and allows for existing farms to expand, keeping these jobs local.
- Supporting local farms keeps our money circulating locally.
- Locally produced food travels shorter distances, reducing transportation costs and carbon footprint while maintaining food quality.
- Privately-owned and managed agriculture land generates more local tax revenues than it costs in services.

Local food is healthy for people and for land
- Good farming practices can help preserve clean water and healthy soil.
- Encouraging the production, distribution, and procurement of food from local farms increases the availability to and consumption of locally produced foods for our community.
- Maintaining the potential to grow more of our own food helps make us resilient in the event of major emergencies.
- Local food has a lower risk of causing food-borne illnesses because it spends less time in transit, doesn’t change hands as often and is more apt to be processed in small batches.

The rural character of farm land enhances the quality of life
- A high quality of life is attractive to employers wanting to locate in Clark County.
- Agricultural land provides habitat for wildlife and allows natural water filtration.
- Food grown closer to consumers uses less fossil fuels which contribute to pollution, greenhouse gases and emissions, extreme heat days, flooding, drought, deteriorating air quality, and other impacts to human health.
How can food-producing lands be conserved?

Transfer of Development Rights (TDR)

A TDR program is a voluntary, incentive-based, and market-driven approach to preserve land and steer development growth away from lands that have high value for other uses.

A TDR program is based on free-market principles and prices that would motivate landowner and developer participation. Rural landowners realize economic return through the sale of development rights to private developers who are able to build in designated unincorporated urban areas and cities.

A market in development rights allows rural landowners to receive financial compensation without having to sell or fully develop their land. TDR programs enable the transfer of development potential from one parcel of land to another—developers "buy" development rights from agricultural land owners to be used for growth in designated development zones.

Conservation Easements and Purchase of Development Rights (PDR)

A conservation easement is a deed restriction that landowners voluntarily place on part or all of their land. The easement limits development in order to protect the land's natural resources.

An agricultural conservation easement is an easement specifically designed for agricultural land. Agricultural conservation easements can be donated, usually to a non-profit land trust, or sold to a public agency or qualified conservation organization through a PDR program. Some state's PDR programs are administered by the state Department of Agriculture.

The federal Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program provides cost-share assistance to states, cities, and land trusts to help fund the purchase of development rights. Landowners can also combine the sale and donation of an agricultural conservation easement through a bargain sale. Through a bargain sale, a landowner sells an easement at less than its fair market value, taking a charitable deduction on the donated portion of the easement.

Whether to donate or to sell an easement, or how much of a donation to make as part of a bargain sale, is often a complex decision that is influenced by a landowner's income level, tax bracket, cost basis in the property, business and/or personal objectives, and the availability of town, state, or federal funding for the purchase of development rights.

Agricultural Production Districts

Agricultural Production Districts are specific geographic areas, regardless of zoning, where farming would be actively supported by the county over the long term.

In the 2009 report released by the Clark County Agriculture Preservation Advisory Committee, a goal of maintaining or aggregating contiguous blocks of land 100-150 acres in size was identified as a desirable goal. An Agricultural Production District may encompass one, or several, of such blocks. These should be considered priority areas for use of tools such as PDR and/or TDR and cluster development concepts to maintain or aggregate larger contiguous blocks of land dedicated primarily to agricultural activities.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRINT NAME</th>
<th>MAILING ADDRESS</th>
<th>ZIP CODE</th>
<th>PRINT - E-MAIL</th>
<th>e-mail list?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ikuyo Masterman</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imasterman@esasassoc.com">imasterman@esasassoc.com</a></td>
<td>98107</td>
<td><a href="mailto:imasterman@esasassoc.com">imasterman@esasassoc.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shareese Graham</td>
<td>ESA 5301 Shilshole Seattle</td>
<td>98107</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sgraham@esasassoc.com">sgraham@esasassoc.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sean Theroux</td>
<td><a href="mailto:spjazzjazz@y56.net">spjazzjazz@y56.net</a></td>
<td>98029</td>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michelle Scott</td>
<td>18218 NW 28th Ave</td>
<td>98042</td>
<td>michelle.scott@hock ed. org</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Ross</td>
<td>PO Box 65182, Vancouver, WA 98665</td>
<td>98665</td>
<td>Lisa@Selectther</td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jade Wait</td>
<td>POB 442 VanC</td>
<td>98666</td>
<td><a href="mailto:judith.wait@wsu.edu">judith.wait@wsu.edu</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alan Babichka</td>
<td>23105 NE 67th Ave, Bellevue, WA</td>
<td>98664</td>
<td><a href="mailto:BabichkaA@Gmail.com">BabichkaA@Gmail.com</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karonwood</td>
<td>14110 NE 66th St, Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kwood@pacificer.com">Kwood@pacificer.com</a></td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reuben Johnson</td>
<td>4111 SE 162nd Ct, Vancouver, WA</td>
<td>98683</td>
<td>ReubenLA <a href="mailto:Johnson@Comcast.net">Johnson@Comcast.net</a></td>
<td>NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE L. Jensen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sondra Teuwe</td>
<td>City of Vancouver</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
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<td>98682</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bo-peep@q.com">bo-peep@q.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Robert Maul</td>
<td>City of Camas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ikako Masterson</td>
<td>ESA</td>
<td>98107</td>
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<td>98107</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>John Ley</td>
<td>444 NW Fremont St Camas</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:PILOTJPL@aol.com">PILOTJPL@aol.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Warren Nefu</td>
<td>66 Rhododendron Dr. Vancouver</td>
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<td><a href="mailto:warren.cascade@gmail.com">warren.cascade@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mellie Cantrell</td>
<td>27202 NE Bradford Rd.</td>
<td>98682</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Bill Cantrell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Bob Pond</td>
<td>9011 N.E. 312th Ave Camas WA</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Pond.B@mac.com">Pond.B@mac.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Madeline Lyne</td>
<td>755 NW View Ridge Camas</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Lyne2720@gmail.com">Lyne2720@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Olivia Bierke</td>
<td>1710 NE 72 Ave Vancouver WA</td>
<td>98686</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Olivia.Bierke@gmail.com">Olivia.Bierke@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINT NAME</td>
<td>MAILING ADDRESS</td>
<td>ZIP CODE</td>
<td>PRINT - E-MAIL</td>
<td>e-mail list?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam Kluka</td>
<td>7021 NW Prince St.</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td><a href="mailto:akluka@kahlsnw.com">akluka@kahlsnw.com</a></td>
<td>☑ YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greg Anderson</td>
<td>P.O. Box 470 Camas</td>
<td>98607</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carol &amp; Nick Bowling</td>
<td>1825 N. T. St. Washouer</td>
<td>98671</td>
<td></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaine Feifer</td>
<td>81 Maefair Rd. Washouer</td>
<td>98671</td>
<td><a href="mailto:epeifer@earthlink.net">epeifer@earthlink.net</a></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kris Gano</td>
<td>P.O. Box 551 Camas</td>
<td>98671</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kris.gano@comcast.net">kris.gano@comcast.net</a></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Kletz</td>
<td>2918 SE 293rd Ave Washo</td>
<td>98671</td>
<td><a href="mailto:aspitfire@aol.com">aspitfire@aol.com</a></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan Prempera</td>
<td>S.C.U.</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:sprazza@tcs.net">sprazza@tcs.net</a></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carolian</td>
<td>S.C.U.</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cocauine@yahoo.com">cocauine@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>☑ NO</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>