

O'Donnell, Mary Beth

* 7 2 5 7 5 5 *

CP16#0478

From: Euler, Gordon
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2014 2:26 PM
To: 'gordons50@comcast.net'
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth; Orjiako, Oliver; Niten, Jeff
Subject: RE: Ubar Holding between N.E. 199st and N.E 209 st off NE 10th AVE

Mr. Coop:

Thanks for your email. I'm not exactly sure what you are telling us, other than food and food production are important. But your comments are in the record.

The area you refer to along NE 10th between NE 199th and NE 209th Streets is already in the urban growth boundary—it was brought in 2007. As a planning tool, per county code, lands brought inside urban growth boundaries are placed in urban holding. Urban holding is intended to be 'temporary' zoning until such time as the infrastructure (water, sewer, roads, etc.) are in place to support any proposed urban-level development.

There have been discussions about the 'Discovery Corridor', the area along both sides of I-5 that includes the Fairgrounds northward. If you want more details, please contact Jeff Niten of our staff—his address is in the cc line above.

Gordy Euler
Clark County Community Planning

From: Orjiako, Oliver
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2014 1:44 PM
To: Euler, Gordon; Alvarez, Jose
Cc: Cook, Christine; Wendt, Brian
Subject: FW: Ubar Holding between N.E. 199st and N.E 209 st off NE 10th AVE

FYI

From: Cnty Board of Commissioners General Delivery
Sent: Wednesday, November 19, 2014 1:38 PM
To: Orjiako, Oliver; Tilton, Rebecca
Cc: O'Donnell, Mary Beth
Subject: Ubar Holding between N.E. 199st and N.E 209 st off NE 10th AVE

From: gordons50@comcast.net [<mailto:gordons50@comcast.net>]
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2014 9:29 PM
To: Mielke, Tom; Madore, David; Barnes, Ed; Orjiako0@clark.wa.gov; "<mailto:boardcom@clark.wa.gov>"
Cc: gordons50@comcast.net
Subject: Ubar Holding between N.E. 199st and N.E 209 st off NE 10th AVE

I know that I am sending this after 5pm so technically you may not have to consider what I am writing, but hope you will.

It is apparent to me that the county intends to take this area into the Growth Boundary regardless of the property owners not wanting it to happen. So instead of answering the same question with same

answer I am going say I do not want this in a different way. When the Growth Management Act was adopted, I was very much in agreement with how the county growth was designated. At that time this area was designated AG due to the fact that it consists of quality AG land. I do not currently have the means to produce off season, I still have the ability to produce thousands of pounds of food. Food as you may remember from grade school is number one of the three needs the human race needs for survival. Clark county is food dependent. Clark County is not capable of feeding itself. I was under the understanding that Growth Management was more about nurturing growth than about controlling growth. There is thousands of acres in Clark county, the majority are junk AG land. I have read some articles in Grower Magazine and Green Builder Magazine about huge changes that are taking place with regards to land management. There are currently large developments both finished and currently be developed that require a large portion to be permanently zoned as AG. There are areas that taken to the growth boundary but with multiple zones including AG. There is a current new thought that in being practiced that takes a look at the echo system of an parcel of land instead of breaking it into several minimum parcels they are cluster building on designate areas and leaving the majority of the parcel undeveloped.

Sincerely;

Gordon M Coop
1304 NE199th st
Ridgefield, WA 98642